



The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer

N.S. Volume 34, Number 2: October 2020

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

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

Executive Secretary: Peter Staffel
Humanities Dept., West Liberty University
208 University Dr., CUB #130,
West Liberty, WV 26074
staffelp@westliberty.edu; Tel. 304-336-8193

The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer is distributed twice a year (spring and fall) to members of the East-Central American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies. For membership information, contact Executive Secretary, Peter Staffel, at his address above. Annual dues are \$25 for regular members; \$15 for students; \$40 for joint member-ships. For information about the EC/ASECS, see the current EC/ASECS homepage, www.ec-asecs.org (maintained by Susan Cherie Beam). The next submission deadline is 15 March 2021.

Through this newsletter, scholars and teachers can pass along to colleagues news, opportunities, and practical tips normally not communicated in scholarly journals. Members are encouraged to submit book reviews, notes and essays, notices, accounts of travel, conferences, concerts, and exhibitions, pedagogical advice, light verse, and queries. They are asked to report news of their publications, lectures, grants, and on-going projects. Please submit contributions as an attachment in Word 2003 or in RTF or on paper. Contributions to these pages may be reproduced in the newsletters of ASECS Affiliate Societies unless the article states that the author's permission must be obtained. Pertinent articles are indexed in *The Annual Bibliography of English Language & Literature*, *MLA International Bibliography*, *The Scriblerian*, and *Year's Work in English Studies*.

The EC/ASECS gratefully acknowledges financial support from Robert D. Hume, Evan Pugh Professor of English, Pennsylvania State University. The *EC/ASECS Newsletter* was founded in January 1978 by Leland D. Peterson and later edited by W. R. McLeod (1981-1983) and Kevin J. Berland (1983-1986). The newsletter was entitled *The East-Central Intelligencer* from 1988 until February 2005. Indices for preceding volumes appear in the issues of May 1992, September 1996, September 2001, January 2005, January 2008, and October 2011; the January 2005 contains a register of EC/ASECS newsletters 1978-2004. Penn State University Library has archived n.s. Vols. 1-34; Old Dominion University has archived issues from 1987-2009. Issues for May 2007 through March 2020, the indices for 1992-2019, and a table of contents for issues since December 1986 are all available at the Newsletter Archive of the EC/ASECS website noted above. The *Intelligencer* has been printed by Action Graphics of Clearfield, Pennsylvania, since 1986.

The Authors of *The Examiner*

By J. A. Downie

When William Wadd, Esq., F.L.S., surgeon-extraordinary to George IV, included Dr Joseph Browne in his “biographical miscellany” of surgeons in 1824, the entry was evidently quoted verbatim from the Revd Mark Noble’s continuation of James Granger’s *Biographical History of England*:

Joseph Browne, a charlatan ... was a mere tool to the booksellers, and always needy. A libeller of the purity of Queen Anne’s Whig Ministry, he was exalted to the pillory. But this medico-politico quack had the assurance to continue the “*Examiner*,” when discontinued by Swift, Prior, Atterbury, Oldisworth, and Mrs. Manley; consequently it became as inferior to what it had been as his abilities were to theirs.¹

On 4 November 1714, *The Daily Courant* carried an advertisement: “This Day is Published, *The Examiner*. N^o I. Printed for J. Roberts in Warwick-lane: where Advertisements will be taken in, and Letters of Correspondents, as formerly, by J. Morphew. To be continued Wednesdays and Saturdays.” This elicited an immediate response in the following day’s *Post Boy*, No. 3041:

Whereas yesterday there was a Paper published, call’d *The EXAMINER*, N^o I. from Friday July 23. to Wednesday, Nov. 3. 1714. Printed for James Roberts in Warwick-Lane. These are to inform the Publick, That the said Paper is neither written nor printed by any Persons concerned in the late *Examiner*; nor have they any hand in Writing or Publishing another Paper, call’d *The CONTROLLER*, being a *Sequel to the EXAMINER*.

A few weeks later, *The Post Boy*, No. 3057, printed “*A Copy of the Presentment of the Grand-Jury of Middlesex, against the Author, Printer, and Publisher, of the Weekly Paper, Entitled, The Examiner*,” subsequently reporting in No. 3061 that: “The Grand-Jury of the County of Middlesex, found Two Bills against the Publisher of a Paper, entitled, *The Examiner*.” That was not the end of Browne’s travails. According to *The British Weekly Mercury* for 25 June-2 July 1715: “Last week Dr. Browne, a Physician, who had been taken up for writing a Paper call’d *The Examiner*, was admitted to Bail.” This did not prevent Browne from advertising his writings in prose and verse, “Printed, and Sold for the Benefit of the Author,” as *State Tracts ... By the Author of the EXAMINER* (1715) on the title-page of the first volume.

This is by way of hors d’oeuvres to the principal purpose of this note, because the Revd Mark Noble’s listing of the previous “authors” of *The Examiner* raises unresolved questions about the identities of those who wrote the essays between August 1710 and July 1714. The earliest retrospective account offered by Swift of the way in which he came to write his *Examiner* essays is to be found in his *Memoirs relating to that Change which happened in the Queen’s Ministry in the Year 1710*. Written in October 1714, though unpublished in his lifetime, it sought to justify his conduct in public affairs, particularly in connection with the ministry in power from August 1710 until

the death of Queen Anne four years later. “Upon the rise of this ministry,” Swift explained,

the principal persons in power thought it necessary, that some weekly paper should be published, with just reflections upon former proceedings, and defending the present measures of her Majesty. This was begun about the time of the Lord Godolphin’s removal, under the name of the Examiner. About a dozen of these papers, written with much spirit and sharpness, some by Mr. Secretary St. John, since Lord Bolingbroke; others by Dr. Atterbury, since Bishop of Rochester; and others again by Mr. Prior, Doctor Freind, &c. were published with great applause. But these gentlemen, grown weary of the work, or otherways employed, the determination was, that I should continue it, which I did accordingly for about eight months. But my stile being soon discovered, and having contracted a great number of enemies, I let it fall into other hands, who held it up in some manner till her Majesty’s death.²

While it is true that *The Examiner* began to be published in August 1710, the first two numbers appeared *before* Queen Anne wrote to Lord Treasurer Godolphin ordering him to break his white staff of office. Advertised in *The Post Boy*, No. 2374, for 29 July–1 August 1710, the first number of *The Examiner: Or Remarks upon papers and occurrences* duly appeared on 3 August 1710, and the second a week later—the day before Godolphin’s fall.

There is no documentary evidence, as far as I am aware, to indicate who wrote those first two essays, or, indeed, who the promoters of the new periodical were, although it would seem a reasonable assumption that Henry St John was involved. That is certainly what contemporaries believed. “It was not long after the *Examiner* was publish’d, that a Letter came out, directed to the Author, containing Instructions how he should behave himself in it,” John Oldmixon observed, “that Letter no Body doubts, was a Production of Mr. *St. J—n*’s.” “Mr. *Maynwaring* never doubted, but that Mr. *St. J—n* was the main Promoter of that Paper,” he explained, “and if Mr. *H—y* paid for it out of the Publick Purse, he not only contributed to it out of his private One, but also by his Assistance in Writing and Correcting.”³

Whether Oldmixon’s assertions about St John’s role in the establishment and organisation of *The Examiner* are correct, documentary evidence exists to suggest that Harley personally contributed to its funding. In the Harley papers in the British Library there is an interesting bill sent to him in 1715—the year after he had ceased to be Lord Treasurer—by the printer and bookseller, John Barber, which includes two items relating to *The Examiner*: “For 100 Exam. No. 5 to No. 50 inclu. at 1^d ½ each”; and “Paid M^r O. for writing the Exam.--two years 306 Guineas, a 3^d part to y^r Lordship, 102 Guineas.”⁴ The second item patently refers to William Oldisworth’s authorship of *The Examiner* for over two years from its revival on 6 December 1711, “upon the Second Meeting of the present Parliament,”⁵ to the issue for 23–26 July 1714. (Oxford surrendered the Lord Treasurer’s white staff of office on 27 July 1714.)

What is especially interesting about the first item is that although the first volume of *The Examiner* consisted of fifty-two numbers, Barber only charged

Oxford for “No. 5 to No. 50.” As Frank H. Ellis pointed out in the most recent edition of *The Examiner* to have been published: “In every edition since the first Swift’s *Examiners* have been misnumbered.”⁶ The reason for this is that when the first volume of *The Examiners* was reprinted in 1712 as *The Examiners for the Year 1711. To which is prefix’d, A Letter to the Examiner*, Nos. 13 and 49 of the original folio half-sheet edition were omitted. This meant that the number of essays in the reprinted edition amounted to exactly fifty, though it remains unclear why Barber’s bill did not include the first four numbers, i.e. those for 3, 10, 17 and 24 August 1710.

Interestingly, none of the first four numbers has been attributed to any author, either by contemporaries, or by modern scholars. Citing *A Supplement to Dr. Swift’s Works* (1779), Ellis asserted that: “In August 1710 ... Harley recruited Dr William King to undertake a new periodical, *The Examiner*, with the assistance of Francis Atterbury, Dean of Carlisle, Dr John Freind, Matthew Prior, Delariviere Manley, and Henry St. John” (p. xxv). In a footnote, Ellis noted that John Nichols “attributes *The Examiner*, No. 7, to Dr King,” but that Gwendolyn B. Needham pointed out that a number known to have been written by Manley, that for 28 June-5 July, is a sequel to *Examiner*, No. 7.⁷ On its own, that proves nothing of course. *Examiner*, No. 29, for instance, is entitled “*An Answer to the Letter to the Examiner*,” but was written by Swift, not by St John, the putative author of *A Letter to the Examiner*. This is of some importance, because there is no *contemporary* evidence to indicate that Manley wrote any of the first thirteen *Examiners*, or that she was involved until she took over from Swift in June 1711 to complete the first volume with No. 52 for 19-26 July. When Noble listed “Swift, Prior, Atterbury, Oldisworth, and Mrs. Manley” as the periodical’s authors prior to Browne’s spurious continuation, therefore, he was not necessarily suggesting that Manley had been involved before Swift assumed authorial duties with *Examiner*, No. 14.

Matthew Prior, on the other hand, was widely suspected of being the author of *The Examiner* long after Swift had taken over. “They have in their Prints openly tax’d a most ingenious Person as Author of it,” Swift wrote in the issue for 1 February 1711: “One who is in great and very deserv’d Reputation with the World, both on account of his Poetical Works, and his Talents for publick Business” (212). “There were several Persons said to be the Author of the first *Examiner*,” Oldmixon noted. “As Mr. Prior, Dr. Swift, Dr. A—y, &c. But Mr *Maynwarding* always inclin’d to think the former had the greatest hand in it, at least when it was first set up.”⁸ And when *The Medley* itself turned to the question of the authorship of *The Examiner* in February 1711, Prior was the first to be indicated: “sometimes they insinuate he is a Poet, sometimes a Priest, sometimes a Physician, sometimes a silly Academick, and sometimes even an old Woman.”⁹ When “J. G.” (usually assumed to be John Gay) observed in *The Present State of Wit* in May 1711 that *The Examiner* “is a Paper, which all Men, who speak without Prejudice, allow to be well Writ,” he noted that: “The reputed Author is Dr. S—t, with the Assistance, sometimes, of Dr. Att—y, and Mr. P—r.”¹⁰ Despite this accumulation of references to Prior, however, only a single *Examiner* essay, No. 6, was actually attributed to him by contemporaries. “Mr. Oldmixon thought that Mr. Prior had a principal hand in the early numbers,” Nichols

noted, “and it is well known that he wrote N^o 6, professedly against Dr. Garth.”¹¹ Consisting of an introduction to, and criticism of, Garth’s poem, “To the E. of G-----n,” it included an interesting passing comment on the Kit-Cat Club: “Thus it happens, that Mr. P-----r, by being expelled the Club, ceases to be a Poet.”¹²

Two of the early numbers were attributed by contemporaries to Atterbury, No. 10 (5 October) and No. 13 (26 October); and it was the omission of the latter from *The Examiners for the Year 1711. To which is prefix’d, A Letter to the Examiner* (1712) which led to the misnumbering of Swift’s first contribution right through to the publication of Frank Ellis’s edition in 1985. This also misled Nichols into wrongly asserting that: “On the 26th of October, no *Examiner* at all appeared; and the next number, which was published Nov. 2, was written by Dr. Swift.” As an authority Nichols invited his readers to “See the ‘Memoirs of Dr. King.’”¹³ Interestingly, the subject of the folio half-sheet edition of *Examiner*, No. 13, was the “Principle of *Non-Resistance*, [which] has of late been so much Condemn’d, Curs’d, Exploded and Ridicul’d.” Perhaps the reason why this particular essay was omitted from the collected edition was because of Swift’s very different view of this particular principle as propounded in *Examiner*, No. 34, for 22 March 1711 and elsewhere in his writings. He consistently acknowledged that “Universal Obedience and Non-resistance” was demanded by the supreme power in the state. Where he differed from Atterbury and other proponents of the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance was in the location of this supreme power. As he put it in *Examiner*, No. 34: “among us, as every Body knows, this Power is lodged in the King or Queen, together with the Lords and Commons of the Kingdom” (317).

In addition to St John, Prior and Atterbury, one other contributor to the first “dozen of these papers” is mentioned by Swift in the *Memoirs*. Dr John Freind, who had been taught by Atterbury at Oxford, was the “Physician” mentioned by *The Medley* in its list of reputed authors of *The Examiner*. I am not aware of any attribution of a particular number to Freind in a contemporary publication, but MS annotations in the run of *Examiners* in the Burney Collection of Newspapers in the British Library state that No. 8 was “By D^r Friend—or by M^r Secretary S^t. John,” and No. 9 “By D^r Friend. quære.” The same source suggests that No. 10 “was probably written by D^r Atterbury,” and that Nos. 11 and 12 were “By D^r. W. King.”

Strangely, Dr William King is mentioned in neither the *Memoirs* nor in *Volume V. of the Author’s Works. Containing The Conduct of the Allies, and the Examiners* published by George Faulkner in Dublin in 1738, even though, according to Nichols, “The original institutors of *The Examiner* are supposed to have employed Dr. King as their publisher, or ostensible author.”¹⁴ That Swift should fail to mention King in connection with the early *Examiner* is odd, particularly as he knew him quite well, and even settled the editorship of the official *Gazette* on him at the end of 1711.¹⁵ Once again, Nichols’ source appears to have been the “Memoirs of Dr. King,” by which he meant *The Original Works of William King, LL.D.* (1776). In fact, he simply lifted the passage about the early *Examiner* from it. In turn, the anonymous editor of *The Original Works of William King, LL.D.* cites as his source “the account given

by the publisher of his Posthumous Works.¹⁶ Interestingly, when *The Posthumous Works Of the late Learned William King, L.L.D. in Verse and Prose* appeared in 1734, the title-page claimed that it was “Published from his Original Manuscripts Purchased of his Sister, By Joseph Browne, M.D.” Whether Browne wrote “Some Account of the Author and his Writings” which preceded the works themselves is unclear, and the identical section to be found in *Remains Of the Late Learned and Ingenious Dr. William King* (1732) makes no mention of “Original Manuscripts Purchased of his Sister.”

Whatever is the case, the account offered cannot be regarded as authoritative on the origins of *The Examiner*, as the relevant passage makes abundantly clear:

ABOUT half a Year after Dr. *Sacheverel's* Trial, Dr. *King* was applied to by Dr. *Swift*, Dr. *Friend*, and some others, to write the *Examiner*; which accordingly he undertook, and began that Paper about the 10th of *October* 1710 which he continued by the Assistance of those Gentlemen, and many others, who afterwards favoured him with their Correspondence; but the Doctor's ill State of Health, at that Time, did not permit him long to prosecute that Weekly Fatigue; and therefore, in about four Months Time he quitted it, and it fell into other Hands.¹⁷

In addition to postdating the appearance of the first number of *The Examiner* by over two months, Browne (if he was in fact the author of “Some Account”) insinuates that Swift was involved in the periodical's initial planning even though he did not arrive at Chester en route from Ireland to London until 1 September 1710. Swift met Harley for the first time on 7 October, but it was not until 11 November that he was introduced to the man who, according to Oldmixon, was suspected by Maynwaring of being the “main Promoter of that Paper,” Henry St John, by which time Swift had already published his first two *Examiner* essays. Moreover, the assertion that King wrote weekly essays for *The Examiner* for “about four Months” from 10 October 1710 onwards is palpable nonsense.

Yet “Some Account of the Life and Writings” appears to have been the source not only for the assertions made about King's role in the early *Examiner* in *The Original Works of William King, LL.D.*, but also Ellis's assertion that King was recruited to edit it with the assistance of Atterbury, Freind, Prior, Manley and St John. However, the source of Nichols' assertion that “Dr. *King* was the author of N^o 11, *Oct.* 12; and of N^o 12, *Oct.* 19” was not “Some Account of the Life and Writings.”¹⁸ For that he appears to have been indebted to a sentence in *The Original Works of William King, LL.D.*: “It is not clear which parts of the first *ten* numbers were Dr. *King's*, though the *sixth* seems much to resemble his manner; but he seems pretty evidently the writer of N^o 11, *Oct.* 12; and N^o 12, *Oct.*”¹⁹

One other early number of *The Examiner* has been attributed to King. A MS note on the flyleaf of the British Library copy of *The Examiners for the Year 1711. To which is prefix'd, A Letter to the Examiner* (shelf-mark 1485.aaa.22) explains that:

The early numbers of y^c *Examiner* were published under the superintendence of D^f. W^m. King, who was the Author of the fifth, 11th. 12th papers. He was assisted by Bolingbroke, by Prior who contributed No. 6, by Freind, by Atterbury. D^f. King was soon superseded by Swift who commenced with No. 14, he wrote 33 papers in succession, and then relinquished the task to M^{ts}. Manley who finishd the 1st Vol. the management was then entrusted to Oldisworth. However scurrilous this Work, it had the merit of giving origin to the Whig *Examiner* of Addison, to the Reader of Steele, and the Medley of Maynwaring.

What we know about the authorship of the first thirteen folio half-sheet *Examiners*, therefore, can be tabulated as follows. (Quotations are from the run of *Examiners* in the Burney Collection of Newspapers.)

- Numb. 1. *Thursday, August 3*. 1710. [Unknown]
- Numb. 2. *Thursday, August 10*. 1710. [Unknown]
- Numb. 3. From *Thursday August 10*, to *Thursday August 17*, 1710. [Unknown]
- Numb. 4. From *Thursday August 17*, to *Thursday August 24*, 1710. [Unknown]
- Numb. 5. From *Thursday August 24*, to *Thursday August 31*, 1710. [William King?]
- Numb. 6. From *Thursday August 31*. to *Thursday September 7*, 1710. [“By Prior.”]
- Numb. 7. From *Thursday September 7*. to *Thursday September 14*, 1710. [William King?]
- Numb. 8. From *Thursday September 14*, to *Thursday September 21*, 1710. [“By D^f Friend—or by M^r Secretary S^t. John.”]
- Numb. 9. From *Thursday September 21*. to *Thursday September 28*, 1710. [“By D^f Friend. quære.”]
- Numb. 10. From *Thursday September 28*. to *Thursday October 5*, 1710. [“This Paper was probably written by D^f Atterbury.”]
- Numb. 11. From *Thursday October 5*. to *Thursday October 12*, 1710. [“By D^f. W. King. Suppl^t. to Swifts Works”]
- Numb. 12. From *Thursday October 12*. to *Thursday October 19*, 1710. [“By D^f. W^m. King. Suppl^t. to Swifts Works.”]
- Numb. 13. From *Thursday October 19*, to *Thursday October 26*. 1710. [Atterbury?]

Swift wrote the next thirty-two *Examiners* before handing over to Manley. Whether he chose to relinquish his writing duties is unclear. On 7 June he wrote:

As for the *Examiner*, I have heard a whisper, that after that of this day, which tells what this parliament has done, you will hardly find them so good. I prophecy they will be trash for the future; and methinks in this day’s *Examiner* the author talks doubtfully, as if he would write no more, so that if they go on, they may probably be by some other hand, which in my opinion is a thousand pities; but who can help it? (225)

That day's *Examiner* was the last for which Swift was solely responsible. Parliament was prorogued the following day. Between 9 and 20 June Swift stayed with Lord Shelburn at his country seat, Loakes Manor, Marlow Hill in High Wycombe. He resumed his journal on his return, writing on 22 June:

“Yesterday's was a sad *Examiner*, and last week was very indifferent, though some little scraps of the old spirit, as if he had given some hints; but yesterday's is all trash. It is plain the hand is changed” (228-29).

On the basis that he “had given some hints,” *The Examiner* for 14 June 1711 (folio half-sheet Numb. 46; N^o 45 in the 1712 collected edition) is conventionally attributed jointly to Swift and Manley, and the remaining six numbers (that for 5 July is omitted from the collected edition) to Manley alone. It is because Manley completed the first volume after Swift's run of contributions ended that she is listed by Noble as one of the authors of *The Examiner* along with Swift, Prior, Atterbury and Oldisworth.

On 5 December 1711 Swift wrote in his journal that he had “got an under spur-leather to write an *Examiner* again, and the secretary and I will now and then send hints” (338). The first number of Volume II, published the following day, 6 December 1711, opened by insisting it had always been the *Examiner*'s intention “to revive my Paper upon the Second Meeting of the present Parliament.” From then onwards, *The Examiner* ran without a break until Vol. VI, Numb. 19, for 23-26 July 1714. The “under spur-leather” was William Oldisworth, but the extent to which, in practice, Swift and St John sent him hints is a question.²⁰ A single entry in the *Journal to Stella* on 15 January 1713 indicates that Swift “gave te [sic] Examindr a hint” (483), but he claimed not to be “acquainted with him,” because Oldisworth was “the most confounded vain Coxcomb in te World” (511). A single *Examiner* essay, Vol. III, Numb. 21, for 30 January-2 February 1712 [i.e. 1713], written in defence of Swift's friend, Erasmus Lewis, is included in The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift. Yet as late as 1735 Oldmixon maintained that while “The Common Drudge for *The Examiner* was one *Oldesworth*, an obscure Person ... Mess. *St. John*, *Swift*, and *Prior*, were Fellow-Labourers in supporting it.”²¹

In Vol. IV, Numb. 2, for 18-22 May 1713, however, the *Examiner* went out of his way to acquit “a *certain Gentleman* of having any Share in this *Paper*.” Oldisworth felt obliged to do this because Richard Steele had made some mischievous remarks on the authorship of *The Examiner* in *The Guardian* for 12 May 1713. Although he almost certainly knew that neither Swift nor Manley was responsible for writing *The Examiner* at this juncture, Steele insisted that “it is nothing to me, whether the *Examiner* writes against me in the Character of an estranged Friend, or an *exasperated Mistress*.”²² Angered by Steele's comments, Swift wrote to Addison to complain about the treatment he had received from his erstwhile friend. “I believe you are an accomplice of the *Examiner*,” Steele wrote to Swift by way of reply, before perceptively observing that Swift did “not in direct terms say you are not concerned with him [Oldisworth]; but make it an argument of your innocence that the *Examiner* has declared you have nothing to do with him.”²³ In making

the insightful response that Swift was “an accomplice of the *Examiner*,” it seems to me that Steele describes the circumstances perfectly.

Conclusion

When the Revd Mark Noble mentioned Swift, Prior, Atterbury, Oldisworth and Manley as the authors of the *Examiner* prior to Dr Joseph Browne’s spurious continuation, he apparently did not realise that few of the 52 essays that made up the first volume were written by anyone other than Swift. Of the writers named by Noble, Manley contributed the most—a mere six essays (including the one for 14 June which benefitted from “hints” by Swift)—while Atterbury and Prior seem to have written no more than two or three between them. I am not aware that any of the 216 essays published in the five volumes of *The Examiner* appearing between the beginning of December 1711 and the end of July 1714 has been attributed to Prior, Atterbury or Manley, although, as I have already noted, a single essay is re-printed in The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift (Vol. III, Numb. 21). As for the other 215 essays that made up volumes two to six of *The Examiner*, the evidence of Barber’s bill (“Paid M^r O. for writing the Exam.-- two years 306 Guineas”) suggests that they were the work of William Oldisworth.

Emeritus, Goldsmith’s College, University of London

Notes

1. William Wadd, *Nugæ Chirurgicæ; or, a Biographical Miscellany, Illustrative of a Collection of Professional Portraits* (London, 1824), p. 27. Cf. *A Biographical History of England, from the Revolution to the End of George I.’s Reign*, ed. Mark Noble, 5 vols.

(London, 1806), vol. 2, p. 232.

2. Jonathan Swift, *The Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Herbert Davis et al. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1939-1975), vol. 8, pp. 123-124.

3. John Oldmixon, *The Life and Posthumous Works of Arthur Maynwaring, Esq;* (London, 1715), p. 158.

4. Printed in J. A. Downie, ‘Swift and the Oxford Ministry: New Evidence’, *Swift Studies*, no. 1 (1986), 2-8.

5. *The Examiner*, Vol. II, Numb. 1: 6 December 1711.

6. *Swift Vs. Mainwaring: The Examiner and The Medley*, ed. Frank H. Ellis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), p. lxx. Quotations from Swift’s *Examiner* essays are from this edition and page numbers are given within parentheses in the body of the essay.

7. Gwendolyn B. Needham, “Mary de la Rivière Manley, Tory Defender,” *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 12 (1948-49), 253-88 (pp. 271-2). Interestingly, the essay to which Needham was referring, No. 49, 28 June-5 July 1711, was the one omitted, along with the original No. 13, from *The Examiners for the Year 1711* (1712). It opens: “I Presented the Publick some time ago with a Letter from an Officer at *Bender* I had had another from the same Hand.” The previous letter from *Bender* appeared in *Examiner*, No. 7,

“Thursday, *September 7*. To Thursday *September 14*, 1710,” which, as Ellis points out (p. xxv n. 2), Nichols attributed to Dr. William King (*A Supplement to Dr. Swift’s Works, Being the Fourteenth in the Collection: Containing Miscellanies in Prose and Verse, by the Dean; Dr. Delany, Dr. Sheridan, Mrs. Johnson, and Others, his Intimate Friends* (London, 1779), p. 63n.)

8. Oldmixon, *The Life and Posthumous Works of Arthur Maynwaring, Esq.*; p. 157.

9. *Swift Vs. Maynwaring*, ed. Ellis, p. 254. While this final reference to “an old Woman” might be taken as a reference to Manley, who was around forty at the time, her name does not appear to have been mentioned in connection with *The Examiner* until after Swift’s run of essays ended.

10. J. G., *The Present State of Wit, In a Letter to a Friend in the Country* (London, 1711), p. 10.

11. *A Supplement to Dr. Swift’s Works*, p. 63n.

12. *The Examiners for the Year 1711. To which is prefix’d, A Letter to the Examiner* (London, 1712), p. 32.

13. *A Supplement to Dr. Swift’s Works*, p. 63n.

14. *A Supplement to Dr. Swift’s Works*, p. 63n.

15. See Jonathan Swift, *Journal to Stella: Letters to Esther Johnson and Rebecca Dingley 1710-1713*, ed. Abigail Williams, The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 2013), p. 358. Quotations from the *Journal to Stella* are from this edition and page numbers are given within parentheses in the body of the essay.

16. *The Original Works of William King, LL.D.* (London, 1776), I: xxi.

17. *The Posthumous Works Of the late Learned William King, LL.D. in Verse and Prose. Published from his Original Manuscripts Purchased of his Sister, By Joseph Browne, M.D. To which is Prefixed, An Account of his Life and Writings, with a True Copy of his Last Will and Testament made by himself the Night before he Died* (London, 1734), pp. 71-72.

18. *A Supplement to Dr. Swift’s Works*, p. 63n.

19. *Original Works of William King*, vol. 1, p. xxi.

20. For information about Oldisworth, see Robert J. Allen, “William Oldisworth: ‘The Author of *The Examiner*,’” *Philological Quarterly*, 26 (1947), 159-180. See also Ashley Marshall, “Swift, Oldisworth, and the Politics of *The Examiner*, 1710-14,” *Reading Swift: Papers from The Seventh Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift*, ed. Janika Bischof, Kirsten Juhas and Hermann J. Real (Leiden, Boston, Singapore and Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink, 2019), pp. 401- 431.

21. John Oldmixon, *The History of England* (London, 1735), p. 456.

22. *The Guardian*, ed. John Calhoun Stephens (Lexington: U. Press of Kentucky, 1982), p. 210.

23. *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.*, ed. David Woolley (Frankfurt on Main: Peter Lang, 1999-2007), vol. 1, p. 487.

The Pedagogue's Post

Edited by Linda Troost (ltroost@washjeff.edu)

[Please consider sending to Linda Troost for a future issue either a syllabus for a course perhaps taught by other members or an essay describing a course or methodology of use to them.]

Perusall in Practice

By Emily C. Friedman, Auburn University

Teaching in online or hybrid forms has pushed many of us to consider new ways to create discussion, especially in times of “Zoom fatigue.” Several years ago, I jettisoned asynchronous forms like the “discussion post” (which never really seem to spark discussion) and wanted to find a way of engaging with the text directly with my students as we prepare for class discussion.

Perusall (<https://perusall.com/>) is a free, collaborative annotation platform that allows students to perform social reading. It is one of several such options, including Hypothes.is. Hypothes.is is ideal for annotating the open web, including nontextual sources (like video). Both are compatible with most of the major learning-management platforms (LMS) used in higher education. In my courses with eighteenth-century content or other content out of copyright, I find Perusall to be best suited for my own needs. I use it in face-to-face and online courses, in core-curriculum courses, majors courses, and graduate seminars. What follows is an overview of how I introduce Perusall to students, assessment of their contributions, and my adjustments over the past year.

What I Put on Perusall

Perusall can be used for purchased textbooks, website “snapshots” (not live), or manually-uploaded documents (PDF, EPUB, or Word). As of Fall 2020, you can now also upload or link to YouTube, Vimeo, Dropbox, SharePoint, or Google Drive, or a direct URL to MP4, MPEG, or Ogg video files.

Files from the open web are uncontroversial, but copyrighted materials are a kind of edge case. Because this is a locked system restricted to students at my institution, I feel comfortable uploading materials that would be available to them through our library’s digital holdings, including PDFs from ECCO and various journals. I include full citation, including DOI (Digital Object Identifier), for all works.

Because I am a book historian, I provide an early edition of the literary text under consideration, and assign a paper teaching edition. Students are expected to read the paper edition and then consult the Perusall copy to annotate. For eighteenth-century content, this is usually from ECCO, though Hathi Trust is also an excellent source for editions prior to 1920.

I then create assignments in my LMS (Canvas), which are linked to Perusall. When students visit the assignment, they click a button and are taken directly into Perusall. No additional/new login is required, there is no setup on their end. Perusall has excellent documentation for how to create assignments (support.perusall.com) through the LMSes they support (Blackboard, Canvas, Moodle, Desire2Learn, Sakai, Schoology) as well as how to create a standalone course. Syncing with your LMS requires a key provided by your institution IT support, which is usually just 1-2 emails. Perusall can also be used without linking to a LMS.

How Perusall is Described to Students

In my courses we are reading various kinds of material:

- Primary (eighteenth-century) works of fiction and other genres.
- Secondary (scholarly) works written in the 20th and 21st century about those 18th-century works. For secondary readings (essays and articles), you will read them exclusively on Perusall.

Additional eighteenth-century material is also exclusively uploaded to Perusall. Some of these are assigned to individuals, some are optional. Most of our primary readings have two forms:

- Modern physical scholarly teaching editions (where available)
- Eighteenth-century editions of those same texts uploaded to Perusall

For our main texts, our reading will be two-fold:

- Once through in the modern physical edition (which is faster, clearer, and has useful notes & annotations)
- Then again in the eighteenth-century edition on Perusall. Here you will explore the physical details of the copy, and place discussion observations and questions on the appropriate pages. This will help guide our class discussion and when courses are hybrid or online-only, will allow us some asynchronous discussion time to supplement a shorter synchronous meeting schedule.

In theory, you could choose to read the course novels online exclusively in Perusall—I don't recommend this for you folks who are new to eighteenth-century material, because you will miss out on really useful explanatory notes and supplementary material.

Your goals in annotating each reading assignment are

- to stimulate discussion by posting good questions or comments;
- to help others by answering their questions.

Research shows that by annotating thoughtfully, you'll learn more and get better grades, so here's what "annotating thoughtfully" means:

- deeply engage points in the readings;
- stimulate discussion;
- offer informative questions or comments;
- help others by addressing their questions or confusions.

To help you connect with classmates, you can “mention” (using the @ symbol) me or a classmate in a comment or question to have us notified by email (we’ll also see a notification immediately if online), and you’ll also be notified when we respond to your questions. For each assignment, Perusall will evaluate the annotations you submit on time. Based on the overall body of your annotations, you will receive a score for each assignment. This score is designed as a guideline for you and for me: your final calculated reading grade will weigh this information against other evidence, including in-class participation, conversations with me, and the reports of your peers.

How I Grade the Annotations

Perusall provides feedback based on metrics you can customize (number of annotations, their placement in the text, how much other students engage with them, a nebulous notion of “quality”). For very large classes, this kind of immediate, weekly feedback is potentially quite useful.

My custom settings (in the “scoring” tab) are currently as follows:

- Slight preference (25%) for annotations throughout the text;
- All annotations, even cruddy ones, receive at least one point;
- Maximum credit for annotations that start a conversation (“Getting Response”) or that get upvoted by me or students (“Upvoting Component”);
- A late-period window for partial credit (for my graduate class, a week).

That said, I would never entrust any part of a student’s grade to an algorithm. While I allow Perusall to provide this feedback (see notes below), the algorithmic “grades” count for 0% of the students’ final grade. Instead, I do manual check-ins at two weeks in, at midterm, and at the end of the semester. Perusall allows me to see the individual contributions of each student to do this kind of assessment. Students can also provide a metacognitive reflection highlighting their strengths prior to the end of the course. Part of the final grade also comes from peer evaluation: I create a brief survey (I use Qualtrics, but SurveyMonkey or others could work) where students peer-assess their classmates’ contributions (as “MVP,” “helpful,” “no info to comment,” or “actively harmful”).

Students are encouraged to use their annotations for their formal writing assignments, and in some courses, I assign a midsemester reflection that asks them to look back over their annotations to find controlling questions, themes, or ideas that can fuel their future work.

In the spring of 2020, I set the default at seven annotations but did not tell students this was the threshold (which is Perusall’s recommendation)—I understand why, theoretically, but it was unnecessarily nerve-wracking for my spring term’s students. I am planning (as of Fall 2020) to be less prescriptive with its use in graduate seminars, while modeling how it can be used to start thinking about their larger research.

Author’s Note: Adapted from material posted on the “Resources on Teaching” section of my website <https://www.ecfriedman.com/>.

Eighteenth-Century Studies and the Interdisciplinary Back History of the Natural Sciences

By Thomas Hothem

As students who are preparing for careers in the sciences come to terms with the organic, perhaps even amoebic, nature of scientific knowledge—especially in general education courses that challenge them to contextualize what they do, for the wider world beyond the laboratory—they could do worse than to revisit how other budding scientists initially attempted the same things in a comparable era of discovery whose arts and sciences readily overlapped. Wisdom and whimsy abound in the multifaceted, omnigenic eighteenth-century literature of the natural world, providing a range of instructive methods, cautionary tales, and everything in between. In the present Information Age, the “primordial soup” of eighteenth-century scientific knowledge might be the twenty-first-century student’s as well, both for its pitfalls and its promises. By engaging with eighteenth-century writers’ attempts to understand the natural world, we imaginatively tour conditions that gave rise to today’s science, art, and scholarship, and explore means of reconciling them all to each other.

The mechanisms of such formative structures as that of taxonomy—at which sundry eighteenth-century philosophers, scientists, artists, and encyclopedists tried their hand, with famously mixed results—describe the very nexus of knowledge production, no matter the era. After all, classification enables interpretation by defining what we know; if we can’t name something, we can’t so much as talk—let alone reason—about it. The power inherent in the act of naming reminds us that classification entails a degree of authority that, if exercised uncritically, can also occasion inaccuracy or objectification—the stuff of bad science. Hence when science journalists David McFadden and Danica Coto tell us that in 2008 an American evolutionary biologist “discovered” the world’s tiniest species of snake, *Leptotyphlops carlae*, by entering it into the annals of scientific classification (naming the diminutive Barbadian reptile after his wife), and subsequently braved the ire of Barbadians who have known the creature for generations and crave credit for the “discovery” themselves (shorn of reference to the biologist’s wife), we aren’t all that far removed from Carl Linnaeus’s Uppsala study circa 1750, similarly poring over semantic details for how best to name and place species. Science has of course progressed, but it tends to involve familiar conceptual and ethical hurdles whose lot it is humanity’s to continually puzzle out.

The lessons in Linnaeus’s extensive taxonomic pursuits are myriad, and applicable across the sciences and humanities. It is perhaps testament to the scientific ethos of progress that we tend not to study Linnaeus much at all anymore: his system essentially still works for us, even though it has always needed work. Aided by advances in evolutionary theory, genetic variation, scientific method, and humanistic understanding, we’ve revised Linnaean taxonomy extensively. Continually reassessing the practice of classifying the plant and animal kingdoms according to species, genus, family, order, class,

phylum, and kingdom is important because it forms the syntax of natural science. This is because we yet adhere to Linnaeus's charge that "the elements of all science" amount to informed conversance in "the great alphabet of nature"—for "if the name be lost, the knowledge of the object is lost also" (*Systema Naturae*, 1806 translation by William Turnton, 3). If we know what to call something, we can also recognize its perch in the tree of life, and comprehend something of its characteristics and of its context.

Understanding the order of things cultivates insight into a system's limits, affording an interpretive reflexivity whose need becomes apparent in *Systema Naturae* as soon as Linnaeus elaborates the six classes of animals. The description of mammals will look familiar to expert and novice alike, consisting of creatures whose

lungs respire alternately; [with] *jaws* incumbent, covered; *teeth* usually within; *teats* lactiferous; *organs* of sense, tongue, nostrils, eyes, ears, and papillae of the skin; *covering* of the hair, which is scanty in warm climates, and hardly any on aquatics; and in most a *tail*; *walk* on the *earth*, and *speak*. (*Systema Naturae* 4)

Aside from some idiomatic quirks, climatological assumptions about hair, and perhaps a couple of clunky metaphors about animals "walking" and "speaking," this description is passable scientific fare (as far as objective observation goes).

The description of amphibians, meanwhile, immediately calls attention to itself for its odd preoccupations. Here it is in its entirety: "*Jaws* incumbent; *penis* (frequently) double; *eggs* (usually) membranaceous; *organs* of sense, tongue, nostrils, eyes, ears; *covering*, a naked skin; *supporters* various, in some; *creep* in warm places, and *hiss*" (*Systema Naturae* 4). Students often remark that Linnaeus's characterization of amphibians amounts solely to their *not* being mammals; the most inarguable characteristics are those that pertain equally to other classes of animals (which raises questions about Linnaeus's discernment). Some will also observe that such problems are inevitable if only because the summary of amphibians is significantly shorter than that of mammals, putting amphibians at a decided descriptive disadvantage. Amphibians' apparent predilection for "creeping" and "hissing" affords discussion of figurative language in science (which purports to eschew fanciful characterization but oftentimes cannot dispense with it). Which brings us to the "penis (frequently) double" criterion, a distracting remark for readers of all eras about a sexual characteristic of which there is no parallel in the description of mammals. Some of my students have suggested that it may reflect male fish (as opposed to amphibians) having dual pincers that help enable the reproductive act. But that's about as far as we go with that terminology, which we're usually happy to attribute to Linnaeus's incomplete sense of animal sexuality (and a kind of apparent licentiousness for which eighteenth-century readers often criticized him).

If Linnaeus's goal was to fully catalogue the plant and animal kingdoms, he also had to face up to humankind's place in the order of things. This he does, and quite spectacularly. Mistakenly conflating race with species and

subspecies, he elaborated such a range as to require categories for both *homo sapiens* and “*homo monstrosus*.” Ironically, Linnaeus was attempting to convey a sense of the great racial diversity on Earth, albeit for a fairly exclusively Caucasian European audience. Unfortunately, the result was a veritable Rosetta Stone of racism, including many infamous racial delineations endorsed too long by science but eventually put right over the years. In this catalogue presumably presided over by the “fair, sanguine, and brawny” European *homo sapiens* subspecies, one also meets with the “four-footed, mute, hairy” Wild Man, “copper-colored, choleric, erect” American Indian, “sooty, melancholy, rigid” Asian, and “black, phlegmatic, relaxed” African (*Systema Naturae* 9), all of whom Linnaeus identifies in terms of temperament. These criteria, of course, have nothing to do with nature—which begs important questions about that category and the recourse thereto. In cultivating the capacity to stare down such nonsense, students examine intellectual traditions that, by dint of learned authority, have been used as tools of oppression. They also learn to contextualize Linnaeus’s work for what it often is—early, bad science—and to seek more accurate means of classification and to point up the problem of having so much confidence in science as to think it monolithic.

By way of closing, I want to suggest that, in dramatizing the mechanisms of intellectual inquiry, eighteenth-century writers also redeem science and art for us by anatomizing the processes of their respective, interdependent logics. Literature can foreground an interdisciplinary fluidity that both refines and dissolves such taxonomies as Linnaeus’s to reveal their ongoing evolution in nature and culture. In elaborating the idea of evolution years before his grandson Charles would formalize it, Erasmus Darwin suggested in *The Botanic Garden* (1798) that verse was best suited to “enlist Imagination under the banner of Science.” Poetry encouraged imaginative interplay among ideas and suggested new syntheses. It also provided durable generic structures via which new intellectual pursuits—such as the fledgling science of biology—could shape their inherent logic.

Note, for instance the fluid storyline and sinewy structure of this passage from the elder Darwin’s poem *The Temple of Nature* (1803), a veritable biology textbook presented in philosophical verse essay form:

Organic life beneath the shoreless waves
 Was born and nurs'd in ocean's pearly caves;
 First forms minute, unseen by spheric glass,
 Move on the mud, or pierce the watery mass;
 These, as successive generations bloom,
 New powers acquire and larger limbs assume;
 Whence countless groups of vegetation spring,
 And breathing realms of fin and feet and wing. (I.296-302)

In the space of four interwoven heroic couplets Darwin’s takes life from sea to land to sky, elucidating the evolutionary concept of generational change and sequentially establishing the scientific behind it. The stages of evolution are both clarified and blurred to emphasize its process—which might in turn

empower readers to imagine the forms from which and to which scientific phenomena might tend. In sum, poetic form affords scientific system.

In using poetry to illustrate the structure of scientific knowledge, or using scientific contexts to illustrate the logic of literary traditions, we call attention to the rich implications of both science and art. We're reminded that classification's origins are as much creative and fantastical as they are empirical and factual, incorporating contributions of both artists and scientists. Teaching eighteenth-century natural history thus might help us contextualize the process by which knowledge is produced, and encourage students to imagine new inroads into interdisciplinarity.

University of California, Merced

Works Cited

- Coto, Danica. "Barbadians Slam Discovery, Naming of Tiny Snake." *USA Today* 10 Aug. 2008. Web. 1 Aug. 2016.
- Darwin, Erasmus. *The Botanic Garden*. New York: T. & J. Swords, 1798.
- Darwin, Erasmus. *The Temple of Nature*. 1803. Edited by Martin Priestman. *Romantic Circles Electronic Editions*. Oct. 2006. Web. 1 Aug. 2016.
- Linnaeus, Carl von. *Systema Naturae*. 1788. 13th ed. Translated by William Turton. London: Lackington, Allen, & Co, 1806.
- McFadden, David. "World's Tiniest Snake Found in Barbados." *MSNBC News* 3 Aug. 2008. Web. 1 Aug. 2016.

Iconoclasm, Summer 2020

The movement to protest unlawful police violence and, more generally, social injustice intensified after the murder of George Floyd on 25 May 2020 in Minneapolis, and this led within many Western nations to a surge in the removal or destruction of public statues and other historical memorials and the renaming of edifices and sites. Among the latter are the renaming of buildings and streets in Glasgow. Activists in Glasgow during June put up new street signs alongside the old names of former plantation owners who benefited from slavery. Thus Buchanan gained the sign "George Floyd." The *Daily Mail* on 9 June reported that Barclay's in response to a petition has dropped the name "Buchanan Wharf" from its commercial development in Glasgow. The developer said that it was named for the steamboat owner William Buchanan, but the linkage with William Buchanan, Lord Provost of Glasgow, who owned plantations in Virginia, forced the change. Closer to home, the Berkeley United School District is changing the names of a "Thomas Jefferson" and a "George Washington" schools. Attacks on statues have been common, flaring in early June as when protestors in Boston's north end chopped off the head of a statue of Christopher Columbus. Some protests have been criminal and dangerous, as on 31 May when protestors in North Carolina started a fire in Fayetteville's Market House, where slave auctions had been held. Some

ignorant or unprincipled vandals have directed their violence against abolitionists: the AP reported 24 June on the decapitation and drowning of a statue of Col. Hans Christian Heg in Madison. Heg, a newspaper editor and anti-slavery activist, died fighting in the Union army during the Civil War.

To preclude vandalism, authorities have often removed statues, as of Confederate soldiers in Birmingham, Louisville, Richmond, etc. In Albuquerque on 16 June the mayor had the statue of Juan de Oñate y Salazar removed, a day after protestors tried to destroy it, provoking the counter-protest that led to someone's being shot. The dynamic multiple-figured sculpture of Oñate, was created by Reynaldo Rivera in 2004. Oñate's conquest of Pueblo people included a 1599 massacre at Acoma Pueblo; though he explored the southwest and was its governor (1598-1610), his career is not particularly related to Albuquerque. The same week a bronze equestrian of the conquistador was removed from Alcalde, NM. In Santa Fe on 18 June its mayor had a statue of Don Diego de Vargas removed from Cathedral Park. Vargas resettled Santa Fe in 1692, 12 years after the Spanish had been driven out; he remained governor until 1697. While his siege led to a peaceful, if forced, re-entry into the town, he violently suppressed the natives on re-entry in 1693. Vargas's triumph had been memorialized for centuries in an annual procession of the Virgin as "La Conquistadora," ending in 2017 after protests.

The conservative website *Thefederalist.com* on 22 July 2020 posted a "List of 183 Monuments Ruined since Protests Began" ("ruined" is a misrepresentation, for the article indicates most were removed for safekeeping. Only a minority involve Confederate soldiery: the leading targets were Columbus (33), Founding Fathers (9, including 4 of Jefferson), and Junipero Serra (8). The attacks on Serra include the destruction around 20 June "by five dozen indigenous activists" of the statue in Fr. Serra Park of Los Angeles, erected by the Knights of Columbus in 1932. That same month, mindful of the destruction of a Serra statue in Golden Gate Park, officials removed one of Serra from before Ventura City Hall. At night on 13 August in L.A.'s Grand Park hooligans tore down and sprayed red a life-sized bronze of George Washington in a military uniform—one of 30 copies of the 1796 granite statue in Virginia's State Capitol; it had been set up by the Women's Community Service in 1933. Seven people between the ages of 20 and 33 were arrested.

Targets soon included statues not associated with racism. A Virgin Mary at St. Stephen's in Chattanooga was beheaded on 15 July (the head never found), and a Jesus Christ at the Good Shepherd Catholic Church in southwest Miami was decapitated on 16 July. Caleb Parke in a Fox News account of the attacks quoted activist Shaun King as calling for the destruction of Christian statues with "White European" depictions as forms of "racist propaganda" for "White Supremacy." (Hundreds of millions of Christians of non-European descent might reject that claim.) With such rage in the wind, arson is suspected in the fire 11 July that took the roof of the San Gabriel Mission founded 249 years ago. Not surprisingly, some reactionary vandalism has come from right-wing counter-protestors. NPR reported that around 4 July a statue of Frederick Douglass in Rochester's Maplewood Park was ripped down and dragged 50 feet to where a fence protected it from being tossed into a gorge.

One of the more publicized iconoclasms occurred in Bristol, England, where on 8 June protestors pulled down a statue of Edward Colston, dragged it through the streets, and dumped it into the harbor. The BBC account noted, “Colston was a member of the Royal African Corporation, which transported about 80,000 men, women and children to the Americas. On his death in 1721, he bequeathed his wealth to charities and his legacy can still be seen on Bristol’s streets, memorials, and buildings.” British Home Secretary Priti Patel called for police to find and prosecute those responsible for the “lawless behavior.” Defending the iconoclasm, history professor David Olusoga is quoted by BBC as claiming the attack was overdue: “Statues are about saying, ‘This was a great man who did great things.’ That is not true, he was a slave trader and a murderer.” For many of Olusoga’s stripe this will imply that Washington and Jefferson were not great men because they owned slaves, requiring destruction of memorials to them. Olusoga is stripping “great” of many of its designations, like those underlying *Time Magazine*’s “person of the year,” which has designated such monsters as Adolf Hitler (1938) and Josef Stalin (1939 and 1942). I have seen literature classes distorted by contemporary social agendas, Olusoga’s defense alerted me to the possibility that history classes may be similarly skewed. Some of the best universities have prohibited speakers with unpopular views, yet open-minded examinations are as important as ever.

Olusoga’s justification for removing statues was developed at greater length and posted by Jack Holmes, political editor of *Esquire* (10 June 2020):

The argument in favor of removing Columbus from his current position leering down on people . . . is that he was a rampaging genocidaire and slaver who promoted the rape of Native women and girls among his lieutenants and sanctioned the murder of infants. His crimes against humanity were brutal and widespread. . . . When you build a statue of someone and place it at a center of civic life, . . . *it’s a statement that they should be honored, revered, held up as an icon around which we should organize our society.* That their deeds, and the values they lived by, should be a source of inspiration . . . the only way that Christopher Columbus gets that kind of honor is if you teach kids in school that he sailed the ocean blue in 1492 and leave out the murder. . . . These statues are not constructed to communicate history: they tell you little about Columbus. . . . [He and others honored in statues now torn down are] the beneficiaries of false histories, written and rewritten down the decades as much to absolve ourselves as these men. . . . *It is not erasing history to tear down these statues, it is rescuing it. . . . The monuments’ defenders are right that it is vitally important to preserve history, but not theirs.* [my italics]

Half the public will read Holmes’s defense of the iconoclasts as an apology for lawlessness. Many may find this division of historical figures into good guys and bad guys too black and white. Holmes views the purpose and value of the statues too reductively and has too little respect for others’ connections to and uses of the public art. His political perspective cancels out all others. Bending history to prop up a new monolithic ideology more humane

than the old one leads to shoddy history, lacking nuance and overly selective in its facts. In 1918 there was a great war to fight, so knowledge of the Kansas, later “Spanish” flu had to be suppressed. Similarly, in the iconoclasts’ preferred historical view will it be noted that the Aztecs sacrificed tens of thousands of humans and then feasted on them—20,000 at the celebration of Ahuitzotl’s new twin pyramid in 1487? (See Hugh Thomas, *The Conquest of Mexico* [1988; rpt. 1994], 24ff.) In this ideological history, we will learn of the forced relocation of 8000-9000 Navajos to Bosque Redondo in 1864-65 by General James Henry Carleton, during which perhaps 500 died, but will we hear of the incessant raiding parties previously traditional in Navajo economy or of the Comanche raids on the Navajo reservation that followed? (See Hampton Sides, *Blood and Thunder: An Epic of the American West* [2006], 362-68, which is in part a biography of Kit Carson, whose statue was removed from Denver’s Pioneer Monument in June with mischaracterizations of him—as Sides remarks, “Carson did not hate Indians . . . He was no Custer, no Sheridan . . . If he had killed Native Americans, he had also befriended them, loved them, buried them, even married them” [7].)

The professional media has sometimes parroted protest rhetoric in sketching the biographies of men like Carson and particularly Serra. Carolina Miranda writing for the *Los Angeles Times* on 20 June while covering the destruction of a statue of Serra, defines the Franciscan mission system that he established as “designed to convert” natives “by confining them to missions . . . Natives who tried to escape were captured. Those who disobeyed were beaten.” Although I am sure there were physical punishments for misbehavior by converted Indians at the missions, as there were at my Franciscan high school in the 1960s, the larger implications are slanted. The mission system’s principal conversion method was to provide a better life through agriculture and husbandry. Early missions were founded where natives were not well supplied with food, and food stores were shared as an inducement to bring people to the mission. Charitable funding in Mexico allowed the Franciscans to distribute seeds, animals, and equipment as well. From 1769 through Serra’s death in 1784, while nine missions were established, the Franciscans suffered severe hardships in pursuit of sainthood—the asceticism of fathers like Serra could never have tolerated a fat life at the expense of suppressed natives. When an old lady came to him shortly before he died to obtain one of the blankets that had all been given away, Serra gave her half of his own blanket. After the San Diego mission was attacked by natives in 1775, with several killed including a friar, Serra wrote Viceroy Bucareli in Mexico City to ask that any Indians who killed him or another priests should be pardoned (“allow the murderers to live so they can be saved”). The Viceroy agreed to this request. When the military comandante, Don Fernando de Rivera, heard that the apostate chief who had led the attack had taken sanctuary in the mission’s church, he came to seize him; Rivera was warned by Father Fuster that Popes had decreed violations of asylum entailed excommunication from the church. Impetuously, Rivera ignored the warning and carted off the chief. He returned north to where Serra was in Monterrey with Fuster’s note describing events. Serra with other priests read Fuster’s account and heard Rivera’s defense of what happened; then Serra told him he was indeed excommunicated. The comandante was forced to return

Carlos to the church. (See Don DeNevi and Noel Francis Moholy, *Junipero Serra: The Illustrated Story of the Franciscan Founder of California's Missions* [1985], 149-162. The *Wikipedia* on Serra has 166 footnotes and bibliography.)

So, research and teach what the conquerors, priests and slavers did, but don't destroy the artifacts of earlier generations. This purge of public art is censorship and indoctrination. Who is to decide that the statue of Edward Colston in Bristol is a glorification of a slave trader and not of a benefactor of Bristol's citizens? Who is to decide what a statue of Churchill honors him for? People's lives are composed of hundreds of efforts, and, whereas some may have been immoral as judged by past or present standards, others were praiseworthy. Swift, defender of Ireland, was all for keeping the Presbyterians down. Removing monuments usually removes opportunities for education—nobody reads the plaque about King Leopold's villainy when the statue is gone. A statue honoring Confederate soldiery put up in the 20th century is a reminder of how racism persisted into the recent past. Humanist educators ought to be concerned about assaults on the perspectivism they have labored to engender, on the perspectives of other places and times, and about the general disrespect for opponents' perspectives.

In assessing the continued presence and value of a monument, there should be consideration of the intentions of those investing in and making monuments and the public's responses to them now and in the past. Those destroying monuments erected by our forebears fail to show respect for our ancestors and many in our older generations, who thought well of Columbus the explorer and so erected the statue. The statue is now a memorial to those who erected it, as the Italian community in Philadelphia. Thus, the removal of monuments usually removes two historical memories, the event and the communal, artistic recollection. Often insufficient attention has been given to location. A statue of a Confederate general out front of a civic structure like a courthouse is understandably offensive given the historical suppression of African-Americans, whose votes continue to be suppressed and who are frequently victimized by our judicial system through cash bail requirements, etc.—though one can imagine critics of that system thinking such statues whisper the warning, "Expect Injustice." However, that same statue in a cemetery ought to be respected. As in sexual harassment cases, where the jury need judge by the standards of a "reasonable woman," decision makers need discover who and how many are offended by the statue and by its removal.

Scottish historian Sir Thomas Devine, editor of the groundbreaking *Recovering Scotland's Slavery Past* (2015) objected strongly to a petition to rename streets named after Glasgow's "tobacco lords," circulating in June. He told *The Scotsman*, "These signs grew out of the fabric of our past and they need to be retained as a reminder of that past warts and all. To do otherwise is to commit the nefarious intellectual sin of censorship." To the call to remove "historical artefacts [now] considered as obnoxious," he asks, "Where does that mindset lead ultimately?" He proposes instead to rewrite the school curricula to lay bare the history of Glasgow's rise due to slavery and the triangular trade and to set up "information boards" about the city.

What are the consequences of the recent iconoclasm? Besides inducing hundreds of thousands more to re-elect the lying demagogue, the removal or

destruction of monuments reduces solidarity with the anti-discrimination movement, leading to pushback that includes this indulgent editorial on my part. For many, those tearing down monuments to the Confederate soldier reveal their incapacity to appreciate loyalty and service to community.

A slippery slope leads from attacking defenders of the Confederacy to the censure of America's Founding Fathers and other 18C figures. Recall the controversy over the mural "The Life of Washington" painted at George Washington High School in San Francisco, which some students felt "denigrated" them and created a hostile environment. That 1600-square-foot mural depicts white colonists stepping over a dead Native American as well as slaves laboring at Mount Vernon. Russian-American muralist Victor Arnautoff painted it on commission by the New Deal art program (1936). It criticizes Washington and American culture for cruel injustices, much in the way that many Diego Rivera murals criticized Cortés and Spanish colonialism. The school board had voted on 25 June 2019 to paint over the mural; in response 500 academics signed a petition to save the mural (*USA Today*, 11, 14 July 2019). The board in August amended the decision, deciding to remove the mural from public view and have it digitized. Several objections to the board's decision were recorded by the *USA Today* in reporting the second decision (14 Aug. 2019). Robert Cherny, Arnautoff's biographer, "said at a school board meeting in March 2018 that the mural's purpose was to provide a 'counter narrative' for students about westward expansion and the country's slave trade." Actor Danny Glover, who attended the school, "compared covering the mural up to a 'book burning,' . . . Arnautoff's murals . . . were for me, a reminder of the horrors of human bondage and the mistreatment of native peoples, even by the father of our country. To destroy them or block them from view would be akin to book burning. We would be missing the opportunity for enhanced historic introspection this moment has provided us."

Justifications for action need show beneficial consequences—have these statues been encouraging people to look down upon non-Europeans or hurting people's self-esteem? Spencer Compton, one of those who on 4 July destroyed the Italian-Americans' statue of Columbus near Baltimore's waterfront, justified the act with the claim "Statues that celebrate European colonialism necessarily celebrate black slavery, indigenous genocide, human trafficking and rape. These statues traumatize citizens whose ancestors were enslaved in some form," but many do not find these claims credible. Few passing statues even know whom they depict. This is a country where a grown woman can insist the 4th of July celebrates our freedom from the Confederacy.

Let's instead erect memorials to populations slain by colonists with guns and germs. But will our sculptors produce anything superior as art to what artists once produced for these public squares? Indeed, it is likely there will be less public art produced. Thus there will be fewer occasions when art stimulates appreciation for humans' artistic and creative capacities and skills, fewer moments of reflection and wonder. People appreciate statues of human beings regardless of who is depicted. A bust of Columbus is any man with a face capable of being molded to express intelligence, pride, pain, sorrow, serenity, youth, or senescence, or whatever the sculptors can execute and the viewers perceive. The sculptors of these memorials intended more than the

commemoration of historical figures, just as Robert Browning's speaker did in *Fra Lippo Lippi*. Lippi is commissioned to paint saints but celebrates and interprets "the figures of man, woman, child," rejecting the narrow purposes dictated to him, "If you get simple beauty and naught else, / You get about the best thing God invents," and the effect will stir people's souls and humanize them: "This World's no blot for us, / Nor blank; it means intensely, and means good; / To find its meaning is my meat and drink." This summer's iconoclasm reflected ignorance about and disrespect for art as well as history.

James E. May
Lancaster, Pennsylvania

Anthony W. Lee, editor. *Community and Solitude: New Essays on Johnson's Circle*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2019. Pp. ix + 257; index. ISBN: 9781684480227; paperback: \$34.95.

The temptation is great, in the midst of the pandemic and lockdown, to review this collection in that light. Fortunately for the reader, I shall fight that temptation after this opening paragraph, probably because I have learned from the seemingly obligatory negative references to Donald Trump in most issues of *TLS* since November 2016 in reviews of every category (not only politics and history but philosophy and, yes, literary criticism) that such references are disconcerting to some. Johnson certainly would have hated social distancing rules, and it is an open question whether he would have complied. One bit of housekeeping: the editor of this collection, Anthony W. Lee, and contributor James May, are friends. Any bias in their favor is unintentional but possible.

This collection of ten essays begins with three solid essays, all making good use of correspondence. The best of the three is James J. Caudle's "The Case of the Missing Hottentot: John Dun's Conversation with Samuel Johnson in *Tour to the Hebrides* as Reported by Boswell and Dun." Caudle explains that "There are very few instances in James Boswell's [*Tour and Life of Johnson*] for which the same conversation is preserved by Boswell and another person present" (53). Caudle has isolated such an instance with his recent discovery of "a public-private letter from Dun to Thomas Paine in the *Whitehall Evening Post*" (62) that gives us another view of a meeting among Johnson, Boswell, and Dun on 5 November 1773; during the meeting the Anglican Johnson clashed with the Presbyterian Dun, and Boswell's record of Johnson's words to him is memorable—"Sir, you know no more of our Church than a Hottentot." Dun objected to this account, however, after its appearance in print in 1785. His 1791 letter to Paine gives Johnson's words as "Sir, you know nothing of the matter." Caudle carefully reviews the textual history of Boswell's rendition and the dispute over the verbiage between Boswell and Dun, and concludes that, despite the recently discovered letter, Boswell's version is much more likely what Johnson said. The essay combines adept use of previous research, a discovery, and a well-written argument to produce a model piece of literary criticism.

In “Connecting with Three ‘Young Dogs’: Johnson’s Early Letters to Robert Chambers, Bennet Langton, and James Boswell,” the recently deceased John Radner compares “Johnson’s early letters to Boswell with those he wrote during the same years—as well as earlier—to Robert Chambers and Bennet Langton, both of whom, like Boswell, saved all the letters they received from Johnson” (10-11). Radner moves gracefully from correspondence to biography and back again, producing reasonable suggestions, both narrow and broad. For example, as an explanation for why Johnson wrote so infrequently to Boswell from 1768 to 1772, Radner suggests that “since Johnson had urged abandoning the Corsica project, Boswell’s writing the book became an act of defiance, especially after he decided to include—without permission—much of the letter where Johnson promised his ‘unaltered and . . . unalterable’ friendship” (23). This observation and the next fit both the pattern of correspondence and the otherwise known biography: “because Boswell—unlike Chambers and Langton but like Johnson himself—was prone to depression, Johnson was reluctant to embrace this friendship” (16).

Christine Jackson-Holzberg (“James Elphinston and Samuel Johnson: Contact, Irritations, and an ‘Argonautic’ Letter”) traces in some detail the relationship between the two men, which is known to many of us because Johnson used Elphinston’s translations for some of his *Rambler* mottos. Even here the link is weaker than some suppose: “In very approximate terms: Johnson used less [sic] than one-quarter of Elphinston’s translations and, of the total Edinburgh offerings, liked only one-eighth enough to let them stand” (34). The Argonautic Letter, literally a message from a third party found in a bottle in 1788 that referred to Johnson’s letter of consolation to Elphinston on the death of his mother, serves as an anecdotal frame to this essay, but at its heart are four letters from Johnson and five addressed to him, as well as scattered references to Johnson, mostly found in the multi-volume correspondence Elphinston published in the early 1790s. Jackson-Holzberg is correct to characterize Elphinston as a well-meaning pedant who attempted often to function as Johnson’s self-appointed agent, and she has surely had the last word on this man who, even here, shines by reflected light.

In “Oliver Goldsmith’s Revisions to *The Traveller*” James E. May shows how the skills of a professional bibliographer can deepen and widen our understanding of a literary figure. His thesis is deceptively simple: “During most of his seventeen years as an author, [Goldsmith] was a professional reviser, much like a modern copyeditor. After years of straightening out others’ sentences, he brought considerable skill to late revisions of his own earlier works” (79). The digest-like nature of much eighteenth-century periodical publication, indeed often of supposedly original works as well, gave Goldsmith experience at slicing and dicing, so to speak, but May is especially interested in how that experience was manifested in his continual revisions of one of his two most famous poems: “*The Traveller* was overhauled more intensively than was *The Deserted Village*, written after Goldsmith had gained assurance as well as reputation” (82). Although he does not use the word “conversation,” May suggests that Goldsmith’s revisions reflect a dialogue between the poet and contemporary readers: “The reviewers’ focus on the political within the poem apparently encouraged Goldsmith to focus his

revisions on the political and philosophical contents of the poem” (92). Distinguishing authorial revisions from compositorial blunders is always a challenge, but May’s close analysis (e.g., “Commas inside the line are rarely cut in unrevised reprints” [89]) lends credibility to his broader assertions.

At the heart of the collection are three strong essays. Marilyn Francis hits many nails on the heads in her “‘Down with her, Burney!’: Johnson, Burney, and the Politics of Literary Celebrity.” She begins with Johnson’s advice to Burney, a literary sensation from the recent publication of *Evelina*, in anticipation of her meeting with the queen of the Bluestockings, Elizabeth Montagu: “. . . spare her not! attack her, fight her, & down with her at once!— You are a rising Wit,—she is at the Top,—& when I was beginning the World, & was nothing & nobody, the Joy of my Life was to fire at all established Wits!” (108). The anecdote provides the perfect introduction for the contrast that follows, between the rather well known, hardscrabble course that Johnson followed to literary celebrity and the much different course that Burney took, somewhat reluctantly, it turns out. In fact, Francis suggests Johnson’s advice was intentionally hyperbolic and humorous, so much was it at odds with Burney’s character. But even as a joke, “Johnson makes claims about authorship, literary value, and celebrity that Burney respects, resents, and resists” (111). From Burney’s point of view, “it was as though [Johnson] were playing the game according to the literary rules of Swift and Pope, and no one else was following those rules” (122). Only when she touches briefly on the “culture of courtesy” does Francis seem somewhat to oversimplify.

Ordinarily I do not much care for an essay like Lance Wilcox’s “In the First Circle: The Four Narrators of the *Life of Savage*.” Wilcox suggests that “rather than consider the narrator a puzzling unified entity, it may be more helpful to think in terms of multiple narrators, each with its own perspective, attitude, and rhetorical habits, and each related to the others in strategic ways” (133). But this is not an essay along the lines of “Henry James reads the *Life of Savage*.” Instead, it is a vade mecum for those of us who have been perplexed by the shifting tone and apparently shifting purposes of *Savage*. Four separate narrative personae are posited: the Sage, the Historian, the Memoirist, and the Friend. Wilcox traces the appearance of each at various spots in the biography, making sense of passages that, otherwise, would seem puzzling or self-contradictory. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. and Wilcox has created a tasty treat, in part because he writes beautifully.

Wilcox’s argument is detailed and convincing but difficult to summarize, since it is really four separate arguments, depending on the persona narrating the text at a given place. But perhaps a few of his observations will suggest the nature of his insights and style. “The results [of this approach] suggest why for Johnson the patronage system died, not in Lord Chesterfield’s waiting room, but in a prison cell in Bristol” (133). On the placement, out of chronological order, of the incident when Savage entered the house of his supposed mother unannounced and uninvited: “Had the Historian presented the incident ‘in the order of Time,’ Savage’s sudden appearance in Lady Macclesfield’s bedroom would have made him appear the aggressor. Moving it to after the trial allows the Historian to present Savage instead as the victim of his mother’s persecution. We accept his rearranging the events without much demur

because Johnson has already made us so aware of the Historian as the hand shaping the narrative” (136). And one final example: “As if against his will, the Memoirist admits that Savage is a signal failure as an object of charity. However slack his work habits, he was remarkably diligent as a sponger” (144).

Wilcox concludes with some remarks about the possible effects on Johnson, both professional and social, of having Savage as a friend. “Johnson was . . . seeking Chesterfield’s patronage at the same time that he was meticulously revising his account of how the patronage system had failed, if not destroyed, his early friend.” “It is the frankly commercial character of a professional’s work, its not being written but for money, that, paradoxically, allows the writer to maintain his integrity.” “There is, most importantly, not a single member of the Johnson Circle primarily reliant on aristocratic patronage” (147, 148, 149). Wilcox’s last word is surely right: “What we see in the Johnson Circle is a professional surrounded by professionals” (150).

Anthony W. Lee (“‘Under the Shade of Exalted Merit’: Arthur Murphy’s *A Poetical Epistle to Mr. Samuel Johnson, A. M.*”) makes an interesting case that implicitly suggests Murphy should be viewed as closer to Burney, Thomas Warton, and Anna Seward than to Elphinston, among Johnson’s friends with literary talent. Lee builds on Arthur Sherbo’s 1963 assessment of Murphy: “he is one of the major-minor writers of the eighteenth century” (153). In an opening that summarizes the friendship between Johnson and Murphy, Lee combines known facts in ways that allow him to draw fresh insights. Here are two examples: “Murphy played a persistently important role in the life of Samuel Johnson. It was Murphy who introduced him to Hester and Henry Thrale, and it was Murphy who helped arrange the annual government pension of £300—the two events that perhaps most profoundly shaped the day-to-day texture of the last two decades of Johnson’s life” (153); “When the second major edition of Johnson’s *Works* was published in 1792, Murphy was asked to write the introduction that became *An Essay on the Life and Genius of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* Most editions of Johnson’s work’s printed or reprinted in the nineteenth century included Murphy’s effort, [which] likely meant that, over the one hundred years following Johnson’s death, the number of people who read the *Essay on Johnson* was likely far greater [than] those who made their way through the entirety of Boswell’s sprawling epic” (154).

The heart of the essay is Lee’s close analysis of the “intertextuality” of Murphy’s “greatest accomplishment in verse” (162), *A Poetical Epistle to Mr. Samuel Johnson, A.M.* (1760). In the advertisement to the poem Murphy had signaled that his model had been “the second satire of BOILEAU addressed to MOLIERE” (156); Lee shows how Murphy was “working within a tradition of earlier imitations of Boileau” (157), including Samuel Butler’s and John Oldham’s. But it is in extending Robert D. Spector’s observation of the connections between Murphy’s poem and Alexander Pope’s *Epistle to Arbuthnot* that Lee makes his major contribution. The connections are as far from one-to-one as can be imagined: they are intricate and twisted back on each other. I find Lee’s reading convincing, once we posit a reading public that was attuned to recognizing direct and indirect allusions and was totally conversant with the established literary corpus. The literary shallowness of our culture is not Lee’s topic, but his sophisticated reading reminds us of it.

Regarding slavery, Johnson and Burke were against it—to borrow from the apocryphal story told of Calvin Cooledge and his minister’s attitude toward sin—Boswell not so much. Elizabeth Lambert’s “Johnson, Burke, Boswell, and the Slavery Debate” covers well-trodden ground, much of it trodden by her in previous work on Burke, especially. Here is her thesis: “While [Burke and Johnson] never agreed on the legitimacy of the colonists’ rebellion, they were in accord on the evils of slavery and the slave trade. Conversely, James Boswell, Johnson’s biographer and Burke’s sometimes friend, differed from them in his unabashedly pro-slavery views” (167). No one would disagree with this, and Lambert, Burke expert that she is, shows a degree of disinterestedness in her suggestion that, while Burke was an MP representing Bristol, “one of the three largest centers of the slave trade in England . . . [his] record on opposing the slave trade seems to evaporate” (179). And Boswell seems almost acquitted of being a racist, despite his obvious pro-slavery views: “Boswell always treated Francis Barber with respect . . . Could it be that Boswell made a distinction between a slave and a freed black? If so, he would not have been alone” (171).

Still, it is easy to make the case that Boswell is not quite given a fair shake in this essay. Lambert’s diction consistently characterizes Boswell negatively: “he *editorializes*,” “he *rhapsodies*” [sic], he “*stoops* to the ad hominem attack,” “his *blatant* insertions undermining Johnson’s argument undercuts [sic] what he claims was the ‘scrupulous authenticity’ of his biography” (169, 170, 173, 171; my emphases). The anecdote related by the famous abolitionist Thomas Clarkson, which describes Boswell supposedly conceding to the abolitionist side, only to “become inimical to it” three or four years later, is cited as an instance of Boswell’s “unreflective zeal.” “Boswell was caught up in the sentiment of the moment and by Clarkson’s display of knowledge” (172). Instead, Boswell may simply have been convinced, albeit temporarily, by the cogency of Clarkson’s statistics of the number of British sailors lost in perpetuating the slave trade.

“Samuel Johnson and Anna Seward: Solitude and Sensibility” gives us an argument that Johnson and Seward held contrasting views about solitude and sensibility. It is hard to disagree with many of Claudia Thomas Kairoff’s statements; e.g., “Her emotional response to geographical features marks Seward as a poet of sensibility, while the rarity of such evocations in Johnson’s writings marks him as the product of a different era” (193). But this is not surprising, given that Johnson was the elder by 33 years. More than age separates the two, however; two quotations on facing pages inadvertently reveal a much more important difference between the two writers. Defending Thomas Gray against an attack by Johnson, Seward described Gray as “the greatest lyric poet the world ever produced” (208). Seward was also an advocate for the Ossian poet, while Johnson’s opinion differed, to say the least: “To James Blair’s query in 1763 whether ‘any man of a modern age could have written such poems,’ Johnson retorted, ‘Yes, Sir, many men, many women, and many children’” (209). That this is really an essay marking the century’s transition in aesthetics is suggested, to me at least, by weighing Seward’s breathless hyperbole on one page and Johnson’s witty, down-to-earth judgment, expressed in a climactic parallelism, on the next. Dryden,

Pope, and others throughout the period echoed Virgil's *si parva licet componere magis*, suggesting they recognized a potential problem in comparing great things with small. It is an accidental result of this essay that Seward comes off much diminished.

Nevertheless, those interested in Seward will find much of interest here. I especially enjoyed the most apt comparison between Seward's description of experiencing an ocean storm from the height of Scarborough Castle in 1793 and the artist J. M. W. Turner's claim that he "had himself lashed to a ship's mast in 1842 so that he might be able to paint accurately the impression of a snowstorm at sea" (203-204). "Her vivid comparison of the waves to nightmarish monsters from the abyss, her account of being wet through and unable to hear due to the waves' thundering noise, appeal to the senses and the imagination. . . . Throughout her published letters, there is no better example of Seward's quest for the sublime in landscape or her passionate emotional encounters with the natural world" (201). The anecdote of Johnson's standing in the rain, bareheaded, in bad weather in Uttoxeter Market, as self-imposed penance for disobeying his father years before, would have been an interesting contrast, had it occurred to Kairoff.

"Johnson, Warton, and the Popular Reader," the final essay in this solid collection, breaks in half. Christopher Catanese begins with eight dense paragraphs describing the theory behind the reading that follows. The last half of the eighth paragraph would do just fine instead, and there would be more readers around to benefit from Catanese's perceptive and convincing reading. Sure, there is an occasional writing lapse in the second part of the essay—use of "focalize" instead of "focus"; or "historical epochs" (any other kinds?)—but generally the writing is clear, the argument insightful, even brilliant.

Catanese offers analysis of Thomas Warton's *Observations on the Faerie Queene* and selections from the *Rambler* to support the thesis that the newly developing popular reader—what he calls the "disarticulating reader"—became a "force that is openly disruptive of, or even potentially threatening to, the author figure" (218). Previously normative aesthetic values were confidently asserted from author to reader—this direction of power was maintained despite disagreements among authors as to exactly what those values were. But by mid-century, the growth of a mass reading public with its buying power was at least negotiating those values, if not determining them. Warton's most famous pronouncement in *Observations*—"in the *Faerie Queene* we are not satisfied as critics, yet we are transported as readers"—suggests that the writer of the *Observations* is "no longer a critic characterized by judgment and decorum, but rather a popular figure motivated by the promises of transport, enchantment, and delight" (220-221).

Johnson further exhibits the growing power of the reader in the opening of the *Rambler*, which contrasts markedly with the *Spectator's* assumption it could comfortably dictate to readers the proper standards by which to judge literature. The very first *Rambler* mentions that the writer of a periodical paper "may follow the national taste through all its variations, and catch the *Aura popularis*, the gale of favour, from what point soever it shall blow" (223). The Latin tag, from Horace, Ode III.2, appears again in the epigraph to *Rambler* 3—this is noted without further comment in the Yale Works—where

Elphinston's original translation rendered it "giddy critics," changed by Johnson to "giddy rabbles." Catanese is surely right when he points out that "with the decision to alter the line Johnson clearly establishes an image of a popular readership that is both dangerously dynamic and marked by the general debasement of an ignorant and even morally questionable station" (223). Catanese goes on to offer a close reading of *Rambler* 16, in which Misellus's popularity as a newly published author turns into a form of imprisonment, as he hides from the reading public due to a cacophony of fears brought on by celebrity: "The image of the disarticulating reader that worried Warton—the errant reader who takes the author apart and puts him back together at will—is literalized . . . in Johnson's mid-century parody" (226).

If Catanese wishes in another venue to extend his argument to the other extreme of the *Rambler*, he will find in the epigraph of No. 208 that Johnson, though perhaps threatened by the disarticulating reader, never surrendered:

Be gone, ye blockheads, Heraclitus cries,
And leave my labours to the learn'd and wise:
By wit, by knowledge, studious to be read,
I scorn the multitude, alive and dead.

The final paragraph of this *Rambler* reads, in part, "The essays professedly serious . . . will be found exactly conformable to the precepts of Christianity, without any accommodations to the licentiousness and levity of the present age. I therefore look back on this part of my work with pleasure, which no blame or praise of man shall diminish or augment."

Robert G. Walker
Washington & Jefferson College

Juan Carlos González Espitia. *Sifilografía: A History of the Writerly Pox in the Eighteenth-Century Spanish World.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019. Pp. xii + [2] + 395; bibliographies [357-79]; 1 chart; 34 halftone illustrations; index. ISBN: 9780813943152; hardcover: \$84.95. ISBN 2019019194: ebook: \$35.88. (Also available in paperback, \$45.)

Long before Siddhartha Mukherjee crowned cancer "the emperor of all maladies," syphilis might well have held that dubious distinction. Unlike cancer, identified 4600 years ago by Imhotep, physician, chancellor to the pharaoh Djoser and high priest of the sun god Ra, syphilis wasn't—until it suddenly was. When, in early 1495 the French armies of Charles VIII invaded Italy, they brought with them to Naples a sexually-transmitted disease that caused genital sores, ulcerating pustules, festering sores, crippling, stinging pains, black spots on the face, teeth and hair loss, ball-like inflammations in the mouth, head and bones, bone lesions, and ate the nasal septum. The standard treatment was mercury, which, if its toxicity did not kill you, affected your voice, destroyed the uvula and caused uncontrollable drooling.

The pathology of syphilis is the stuff of medical textbooks. In *Sifilografía: A History of the Writerly Pox in the Eighteenth-Century Hispanic World*, Juan Carlos González Espitia, an associate professor of Romance Studies at North Carolina at Chapel Hill, examines the disease from a medical humanities perspective. How was syphilis constructed in Spain and in the Americas in the eighteenth-century? Over the course of nineteen chapters, the reader learns of the many and varied responses to that question.

González Espitia dedicates a chapter to the hospitals in eighteenth-century Spain and the Americas that treated syphilitics. The chapter makes it clear that overall they were inhospitable spaces, the air polluted with soot from the coal-driven fumigation braziers. For one of the writers González Espitia discusses, Diego de Torres y Villaroel (1651-1770), the hospital Antón Martín in Madrid became a metonym for the horrors of the disease itself. After describing the repulsive appearance of a Señor Don Misfortune, Torres Villaroel concludes by saying that he was “a living and revolting portrait of rot, a walking copy of disgrace....an abbreviated Antón Martín.” (89) In Peru, the hospital conditions were somewhat better, but in Spain the patients were regarded as lost causes and were provided with beds fitted out with dirty, greasy, probably verminous, mattresses and linens. González Espitia suggests that the spiritual exercises prepared by Manuel María de Arjona (1771-1820), a priest attached to the Hospital de las Bubas in Seville, may have provided some hope and relief for the dying. I hope so, for by the time the disease killed you, if you were not a physical wreck and in great agony, you may also have become paralyzed, blind, and demented.

But where was this depopulating disease before it came to Spain and Naples? Of necessity, González Espitia goes over the still not QED-proved but generally accepted history of its transmission route. Since a subset of Charles’s soldiers had served with Columbus, it was soon hypothesized that they had brought the disease from Hispaniola after sexual contact with natives. I will return to this theory later. The 50,000 soldiers in Charles VIII’s armies were mercenaries, and, after hostilities ceased, they and 800 camp followers returned to their respective homelands, spreading the disease. By the end of 1495, most towns in Italy were infected. By 1500, syphilis had reached France, Spain, England, Scotland, the Low Countries, Switzerland, Denmark, Hungary, Greece, Poland, and Russia. The disease went global. Portuguese and British traders brought it to Brazil, Macao, and Calcutta while Spanish colonists brought it to the areas of the Americas under their control. There was an outbreak in Canton (now Guangzhou) in the early sixteenth century.

Fernández de Oviedo (1478-1559) arrived in the Americas in 1513 and published his *Historia general y natural de las Indias* (1535). He states that he had it on the highest authority (his own) that the disease came from the New World and suggested that the disease should be called after its source, “mal de las Indias,” but the suggestion did not gain traction. Nor did syphilis. The Italian physician -poet Girolamo Fracastoro (1478-1533) called the disease “syphilis” in an epic poem after one of his characters, a shepherd whom he named Syphilis. In Fracastoro’s foundational epic, the shepherd was punished with the disease now bearing his name for challenging the sun god—a Haitian solar deity according to González Espitia, Apollo in other sources.

However, syphilis as a name for the disease did not come into general usage in Spanish until the end of the nineteenth century, and González Espitia avoids anachronism by referring to the disease as *gálico* or *el mal francés*.

Always considering it an alien invader, each European nation named the disease after its neighbor, frequently also its enemy. As just mentioned, for the Spanish it was *el mal francés* or *gálico*, and it was feared. As already mentioned, Diego de Torres y Villaroel described the disease in intense and revolting images. In his 1738 sonnet (translated by the author) addressed to the newly-minted, fun-loving young male graduates of the University of Salamanca where he was for some time professor of mathematics, he employed this tactic so as to scare these young men into sexual temperance. In the sonnet, he connects their enjoyment of life's pleasures, identified as consumption of wine, attendance at bull fights, and frequenting of brothels, as ineluctably leading to those penile syphilitic sores called chancres in English and "*bubas*" in Spanish. I must confess, though, that what made the poem memorable to me was not Torres y Villaroel's use of literary terrorism but his presentation of Salamanca's business community. For them, the students were economic stimulants. Interested only in profit-making, lacking any sense of concern for society at large, the local businessmen encouraged their hedonism.

Perhaps, had they figured out that dead students and infected prostitutes were not good for a town's economy, they would have supported the proposals put forth in Nicolás Fernández de Moratín's (1737-1780) *Arte de las putas*, which dates to the 1770s. Moratín argues that, since sexual desire is natural and since men, particular nonaffluent ones, need to make the best use of their money, prostitutes should organize themselves into a self-regulating association that would guarantee customers a steady cohort of "fresh healthy meat," who would "serve the public for low prices" (226). Moratín also argues for the use of those prophylactic sheaths called condoms and available on the grey market in Madrid, but whether students could afford isn't broached.

As for the misogyny of Moratín's text, it is as offensive as it is unsurprising, and mild in comparison to the multilayered solution proposed by the reform-minded Count Francisco de Cabarrús (1752-1810), a Spaniard born in France. He conceived of *gálico* as a public enemy to be fought and conquered through a series of regulations, issued by the government, controlling the freedom of female sex workers, whom he regarded as the spreaders of the disease. They were to be maintained strictly within brothels whose supervisor was aided by a military squad. The health of each brothel was monitored on a daily basis by a doctor. A sick prostitute was put into quarantine and treated, but, if she became sick two more times, she was deported to the colonies. On the other hand, a prostitute's report that a customer was infected was taken as reliable. If a prostitute was found freelancing in the streets, she would be punished. If a client had her accompany him to the theatre, she had to wear a yellow feather so that she could be distinguished from women from the higher strata of society. As González Espitia notes, "the reformer's problem was not only [containing the] contagion of *gálico* but also the homogeneous appearance and access to similar ways of dress—a crisis of socioeconomic roles." (253). Cabarrús's French birth was not a problem until another *mal* from France turned up.

These were the Napoleonic forces who invaded Spain in the early years of the nineteenth century. Not long after his death in 1810, Cabarrús's remains were disinterred from the cathedral of Seville and thrown out.

Eighteenth-century Spain was repressive, authoritarian, fearful. No book could be published unless it had been cleared by the Catholic church in the form of the Holy Office or Inquisition. Books considered challenging to the status quo were banned. Books which rehashed old and by the eighteenth century outmoded ideas like the theory that all illness, syphilis included, was produced by an imbalance of the four humors, received the Inquisition's imprimatur. However, as *Sifilografía* proves, more books got through than you would have thought. *Arte de las putas* circulated clandestinely after the Inquisition Court in 1777 ruled that it was "scandalous, provocative, blasphemous, heretical, injurious to the state of state of Christianity, and with the flavor of atheism and polytheism." (201). González Espitia ascribes the ruling to Moratín's presentation of one friar as the inventor of the condom and another religious as sexually active and infected with syphilis, but Jose María Blanco's epic-gallic poem addressed to "*El Incordio*," [a hard inguinal tumor, one of the stigmata of syphilis], which characterized the Church as institutionally diseased, got through. Thanks to González Espitia's close readings of substantial chunks of the poem, his Anglophone audience can appreciate how extensively Blanco alluded to syphilis and sexual profligacy to establish that the church leadership from the time of the Borgias was infected with spiritual and moral rot. The blasphemous poem made it past the censors, but the author found it convenient to move to England in 1810. On the other hand, nothing happened to Francisco Benegasi y Luján (1656-1742), who, to quote González Espitia, "play[ed] with Inquistional fire" (61) when he compared and punned on the sacrament of extreme unction during which a priest anoints the dying person's body, and the treatment of *gálico* with *unciones*, a barber's application of a mercury ointment on a syphilitic's body.

Not surprisingly, the dominant power structure started to fear that the Enlightenment ideas taking hold in France would destroy traditional Spanish culture. Subsequently, ordinary Spaniards suffered under Napoleonic tyranny and occupation. As a result, the contagion of "*gálico*" acquired a political signification, connoting or representing French cultural and political influence, which could only do you irreparable harm. In *Sifilografía* we meet Manuel Freyre de Castrillón (1751?-1820), whose solution to keep Spain safe from the contagion of *gálico* has an eerie ring. Chauvinistic to the point of xenophobic, Freyre proposed a kind of lockdown to prevent the spread of this variant of the French disease. In his 1809 *Remedio y preservativo contra el mal francés de que adolece parte de la nación española*, written just after Napoleon conquered Spain, Freyre argued for the building of a thick and tall border wall. This physical barrier would be complemented by a core law designed to ensure the purity of Spanish blood. Spanish kings would be prohibited from marrying French princesses. Spanish commoners would not want to marry French women as their lands would be confiscated by the crown.

When, under the influence of French ideals, the Spanish colonies began thinking about independence, back in Spain their ideas were mocked as Gallic pus. A sign of infection they might have been to the power structure based in

Madrid, but in the colonies, particularly among writers born there, Enlightenment ideas helped writers construct an image of the colonies as fertile, beautiful, economically self-sufficient, and naturally robust. González Espitia writes that the goal of these writers was to “craft a discourse of engagement through differentiation with Europe” (151), by means of which they “construct[ed] a sense of equality between the hemispheres” (151). (But as I read through his presentations of these writers, it seemed that they were arguing that the Americas were better than Spain and better off without its sickly colonial authority.) Among others, he points to Mexican-born Francisco Javier Clavijero (1731-1787) and Dominican-born Antonio Sánchez Valverde (1729-1791). They not only marshaled evidence to argue that the New World was not the source of syphilis but contrasted the Americas imaged as “a beautiful and robust maiden” to Europe imaged as a “frail and sterile old lady” (151). Fr. Joseph Gumillo (1686-1750), a Jesuit who wrote a natural history of what is now present-day Colombia, celebrated a vine native to the region, sarsaparilla, as a proven remedy for syphilis. In his 1788 medical compendium, Juan Manuel Vanegas takes Gumillo’s point one step further. Identifying with the Americas, Vanegas emphasizes that population-ravished Europe should be thankful to the New World for sarsaparilla, as well as other botanicals native to the Americas, for they will be its salvation.

Guatemalan born and bred Jose Flores’s 1782 bestseller *Específico nuevamente descubierto en Guatemala para la cura del cancer y otras enfermedades*, touted the meat of a lizard found in Guatemalan jungles as the cure for syphilis. Its effectiveness rested on three equally weighted and cross-referencing sources, the authority of an open-minded caring Spanish priest who recommends a native treatment to a Catalonian doctor dying of cancer, the positive experience of an indigenous syphilitic woman, and that of the doctor who returns to health after eating the recommended lizard that had rid the native woman of *bubas*. Guatemalans, blessed with robust constitution, could eat the lizard meat as raw meatballs, but Flores, writing for a more delicate European audience, maintained that the lizard meat would still be beneficial if eaten Old World style--thinly sliced in wafers, like a sandwich. Unlike sarsaparilla, which was imported to Europe, there is no evidence that Guatemalan lizard meat became a staple of the European pharmacopoeia. However, in a few years, Flores’s tome was translated into four languages and published in Madrid, Cádiz, Lausanne, Halle, Rome, Turin and Warsaw. The international response shows an openness to new and unconventional ideas emanating from an “other” and very different civilization.

For Spain, it was all Gallic pus until their empire struck back. The Mexican War of Independence began in 1810, and, in his 1816 novel *El Periquillo Sarniento* (The Mangy Parrot), José Joaquín Fernández de Lizardi (1776-1857) fired his salvos through the portrayal of the Spanish corrupt bureaucratic notary Chanfaina [Offalstew]. Chanfaina has a twangy voice, no teeth or uvula, and a spittle-splattering mouth. These marks, characteristic of one who has the disease and endured the treatment for it, are used to express the rot of the colonial administrative apparatus and justify this erstwhile colony’s war of independence.

In the mid-1990s, Linda Merians edited *The Secret Malady*, a collection of essays that looked at eighteenth-century representations of syphilis in England and France. Juan Carlos González Espitia's *Sifilografía* is a full-length study of how syphilis was constructed in the Hispanic world. Readers who come to *Sifilografía* via *The Secret Malady* will notice a certain overlap. Both discuss, for example, the hospitals set up for syphilitics and the treatment offered to them, and the essays on Hogarth segue neatly into González Espitia's nuanced analysis of Goya's *Los Caprichos*. In Britain and France as well as in the Hispanic world, men blamed the contagion on women. The position that the internal organs of female sex workers harbored the contagion and that female sex workers were held responsible for infecting men was a *donnée*. Certainly with respect to syphilis, misogyny was the prevailing ethos.

Those commonalities acknowledged, what struck me was how different England was from Spain in the eighteenth century. England was a literate society with a strong and unfettered print culture that could be easily accessed via books, handbills, signboards, and advertisements, and also one in which women's voices could be directly heard. In Spain censorship obtained, paper was expensive, and the price of books, particularly such hefty tomes as those González Espitia discusses, was such that only medical students with deep pockets, a few doctors, and some men of letters could afford them. Perhaps because this was coterie writing, men writing to men, I got the sense that some of these authors were engaging in alpha-male theatrics. On the other hand, the sheer quantity of writers who populate the pages of *Sifilografía*, far more than those I single out in this review, speaks to the determination of these men to find a way to address the social and political issues of their times.

While overwhelmed (in a good way) by the number of writers about whom I knew nothing until I read *Sifilografía*, I found one particular aspect of it disconcerting. The author obviously found himself in possession of a lot of information that he thought relevant to his presentation of syphilis. He wanted to share it even if it didn't quite go with the flow of the narrative. His solution was to insert it in the form of paragraphs set off from the text—think of Power Point slides that somehow migrate back onto the pages from which a presenter is reading. I found these insertions disruptive and the information a mixed bag. The biographical sketches of some of the writers contextualized their contributions; the capsule life story of Cabarrús is spot-on. On the other hand, was this the place, smack bang in the narrative, to learn nineteen Spanish verbs for copulation? Somewhere in between falls the material on the craft of condom making. It is only loosely connected to his discussion of Moratín's *Arte de las putas*, and I thought it would have been better used as the basis of a free-standing article. And if these inserts, as opposed to a list of important writers, a glossary of Spanish terms, some appendices, and perhaps a spin-off article or two, were the mode chosen for the delivery of information, why were Bartolomé de las Casas (c.1484-1566) and yaws left out?

Born in Spain, Bartolomé arrived in Hispaniola as a layman, became a religious, served as the first resident Bishop of Chiapas, and described atrocities committed by the Spanish against the indigenous people. Something of an anthropologist as well, he stated that he "repeatedly questioned the natives who confirmed that the disease [syphilis] was endemic in Hispaniola.

And there is plenty of evidence that any Spaniard who was unchaste while there caught the infection. . . .” (quoted in J. S. Cummins, “Pox and Paranoia in Renaissance Europe,” *History Today*, 8 Aug. 1988). Sophisticated analysis of human remains recovered from a historical site in Mexico City in 2008 supports Bartolomé’s account, or aspects of it. The bacterium that causes syphilis belongs to the same family as a nonvenereal infection called yaws, which spreads through skin-to-skin and oral contact. It produces skin lesions and, like syphilis, deforms bones and joints. Widespread in the Americas at the time of Columbus’s landing, yaws is, like syphilis, debilitating, deforming, and painful—but not fatal. From the recovered bones, the researchers were able to recover genomes which indicated that the individuals carried the bacterium that causes, not syphilis, but yaws. When Bartolomé’s informant said that the disease was endemic to the island, might he have been referring to the tell-tale signs of yaws? The researchers said that their findings support the hypothesis that Columbus’s men carried the nonvenereal bacteria back to Europe where the organisms mutated into the disease we now call syphilis. This paleopathological research was conducted a decade before *Sifilografía* was published and bears directly on his topic.

Despite these problems, *Sifilografía* has much to recommend it. González Espitia’s copious and annotated translations of Hispanic writers make them accessible to an Anglophone audience. In sum, *Sifilografía* is a solid addition to eighteenth-century studies in the cultural construction of disease in particular and the medical humanities in general.

Frances Singh
Hostos Community College, CUNY

Scott M. Cleary. *The Field of Imagination: Thomas Paine and Eighteenth-Century Poetry*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019. Pp. xi + 172; bibliography; index. ISBN: 978-0-8139-4293-3: hardcover, \$39.50.

Written with alacrity and insight, Scott M. Cleary’s *The Field of Imagination: Thomas Paine and Eighteenth-Century Poetry* represents an important new contribution to the study of a fascinating talent and his role in the transatlantic literary marketplace during the Age of Revolutions. While today the image of Paine as a cosmopolitan polemicist and brilliant pamphleteer remains distinct, the picture of him as a maker, arbiter, and inspirer of verse proves far more nebulous. *The Field of Imagination* casts welcome light on this hazy picture, and readers interested in the eighteenth century generally, or in Paine and his milieu specifically, will likely find this book immensely edifying.

Across eight accessibly rendered chapters, Cleary rereads Paine’s career with pointed emphasis on the ways in which the radical author was meaningfully and lastingly involved in the transatlantic culture of poets and poetry, whether in colonial America or in the Europe of the French Revolution. In chapter one, Cleary establishes that Paine’s work as an editor for the *Pennsylvania Magazine* enabled Paine to select, arrange, and publish

the sort of poetry that he found companionate with his vision of America's independence from Great Britain (8-9). Interestingly, these pieces included sections of "Corsica" by Anna Letitia Barbauld, an eventual ally whose *Eighteen Hundred and Eleven*, published three years after Paine's death, scandalized English readers with its vision of an America ultimately ascendant over Britain (26-29). Here Cleary also treats what may well be Paine's best-known original poem, 1775's "Liberty Tree," the analysis of which carries into the book's second chapter, a section principally concerned with Paine's "The Death of General Wolfe" and the poet's attempt to show that "the origin of all political power rests in . . . individuals' relations and not in any institution or structure prior to those individuals" (43). A thorough and knowledgeable reader of poetry, Cleary takes special care with both "Liberty Tree" and "General Wolfe" early in his book, and understandably so, given his contention that in the latter we may discern "nothing less than the basic liberty that preoccupied Paine for the rest of his life" (45).

Paine's practices as both an editor and a creator of poetry, then, go well beyond the use of verse as a propagandizing instrument at a moment of great historical change. Indeed, his sense of poetry—his own and others' alike—is at the very heart of his advocacy of political autonomy and self-determination, and it contributes to both the content and the spirit of an oeuvre best known now for seminal prose works. In evaluating the importance of poetry to Paine's prose, Cleary writes some of the book's most intriguing material, including fine discussions of James Thomson's influence on *Common Sense* and of the satirist Charles Churchill *vis-à-vis* the second *Crisis* paper. Given the paucity of scholarship on Churchill (whose grave Byron visited in 1816, before sailing from Dover for the continent), this chapter proves especially engaging. From there, Cleary offers a close look at Paine's later disparagement of poetry, which "inevitably speaks only about itself" (85), in *The Age of Reason*. For Paine as deist apologist, poetry—particularly in the form of biblical prophecy—causes epistemological havoc among the many to the advantage of the few who truly prosper through institutionalized religion: "the register of poetry as esoteric imagery tied inexorably to rigid metrical patterns gives the appearance of proleptic persuasion, knowledge of the future, and grasp of moral ills," thus allowing poets "to make up the consequences and importance of that imagery to belief, and to substitute [their] own narratives for objective knowledge, or . . . attempts at constructing objective knowledge."

If Paine appeared to have disowned poetry for the sake of an egalitarian theology, British poets of 1790s certainly did not dismiss the radical thinker as a subject, or, more properly, as quarry. Cleary offers an overview of the "veritable subculture if not subgenre of Paine poems written and published during the decade, on the whole a massively underrepresented body of literature" (101), that includes lesser-known figures, such as Samuel Ashby, as well as more renowned satirists, such as Peter Pindar (John Wolcot). This section has its counterpoint in the book's closing chapters, both of which concern Paine's influence on poets of the nascent American republic. Chapter seven addresses Philip Freneau, "an entrepreneurial microbrewer of democracy" (125), who saw in Paine "the best of what the progressive politics and fiery revolutions of the 1790s could achieve" (122) even as Ashby, Pindar,

and myriad others derided and scapegoated him. Chapter eight examines the work of Joel Barlow, to whom Paine “was an instructive literary friend” (134); here Cleary highlights the significance of Paine’s *A Letter Addressed to the Abbé Raynal* and its depiction of a so-called “emergent, enlightened globalism” (141) on “Barlow’s own cosmopolitan theory of rights” (134-35) as this helped to shape his artistic vision of America. Taken together, these last three chapters skillfully map the international market of political verse within which Paine was to varying degrees involved throughout his professional life.

All in all, Scott M. Cleary’s *The Field of Imagination* profits from authoritative research, lively prose, and authentic originality. The book invites readers to see Paine in fresh ways at a moment when vital conversations about the American past, and the provenance of American national identity, are taking place. For these reasons, Cleary’s new work merits serious attention from readers who take interest in transatlantic literature of the eighteenth century, particularly as the corpus teaches us of ourselves and our world today.

Timothy Ruppert
Slippery Rock University

Samara Anne Cahill. *Intelligent Souls? Feminist Orientalism in Eighteenth-Century English Literature.* Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2019. Pp. 232; bibliography; notes. ISBN: 978-1-68448-097-5; paperback: \$34.95.

For a book that promises a discussion of eighteenth-century English literature, *Intelligent Souls?* starts in an unlikely historical place and time: the 2016 Democratic National Convention. More specifically, Samara Cahill opens with a meditation on the flippantly Islamophobic comments made by the current president of the United States in response to Ghazala Khan’s silent presence during her husband speech at the 2016 DNC. The comments themselves deserve no further reproduction. However, Cahill’s introductory dissection of these comments illuminates the enduring legacy of “misogynistic mortalism,” a fundamental concept in her book defined as “the accusation that Islam denies that women have immortal souls and, therefore, intelligence” (15). Over the following five chapters, Cahill draws a connection between this misogynistic mortalism, its Islamophobic underpinnings, and eighteenth-century arguments for women’s education which, as she posits, framed a Protestant British identity in contrast to a negative ideal of Islam. To be British was to allow women intellectual freedom; anything less was not only a betrayal of country, but more importantly, a dangerous betrayal of faith and a submission to the allegedly sensory world of the “Mahometan.”

Intelligent Souls? covers just under a century of material as it chronicles texts from the Trinitarian controversy in the 1690s to the early Bluestocking writings of Mary Wollstonecraft in the late eighteenth-century. To better understand the “circuitous route by which the exclusion of Islam became central to the defenses of Anglican orthodoxy in the 1690s,” Cahill’s first chapter acts as a helpful historical overview of the major players in the

Trinitarian Controversy (15). Among the many dissenters in late Restoration England, the Socinians, Latitudinarians, High Church Anglicans, and Roman Catholics posed a critical threat to Protestant unity and its attending British nationalism. To discredit these voices, Protestant authors and orators drew comparisons between Christian variants and Islam, suggesting that any deviation was an acceptance of human mortalism and thus resembled Islam far more than Christianity. Serving mostly as a “useful polemical tool” to advance Protestant propaganda (25), misogynistic mortalism rarely represented the actual beliefs of any group, but that truth did not prevent its pervasive spread. To make her case, Cahill considers such works as the satirical treatise *Disputatio Nova Contra Mulieres* (*A New Argument Against Women*, 1595), Richard Knolles’s *The Generall Historie of the Turks* (1603), and Giovanni Paolo Marana’s *Letters Writ by a Turkish Spy* (translated 1687). While misogynistic mortalism was certainly present before 1700, Cahill convincingly outlines how it took a distinct Islamophobic turn at that moment and, further, how it informed feminist critiques in favor of women’s education.

Cahill’s work appropriately privileges women writers, including Katherine Phillips, Margaret Cavendish, Mary Astell, Elizabeth Singer Rowe, Penelope Aubin, and Jane Barker, among others. Through these women, Cahill tracks how misogynistic mortalism became increasingly Islamophobic during and in the wake of the Trinitarian controversy. As she notes in her second chapter, each of these women is invested in bettering women’s education and social status in her own way. All of them, however, capitalize on the “alignment of Islam with the oppression of women and the denial of the trinity” in order to “displace their critiques of male authority onto a distant, demonized Islam” (54). That is, rather than directly criticizing British patriarchy, many of these women take Islam as a convenient proxy through which to filter their censure.

Though there are fictional Muslim women who escape this feminist orientalist treatment, particularly those imagined by Cavendish, Phillips, and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, Cahill’s chronology suggests a sharp uptick in the use of the Muslim despot trope in which a Muslim man entices and converts Christian women by convincing them to indulge themselves in the sensual pleasures of a mortal life. Likewise, the third chapter traces the rise and misogynistic fall of the “platonic lady” trope, which presents a woman so dedicated to her intellectual improvement that she jeopardizes any potential of marriage and reproduction. As she appears in the works of Eliza Haywood, Samuel Richardson, and Henry Fielding, the platonic lady receives vastly different treatment. A feminocentric possibility in some cases, she is an indulgent, sensual cautionary tale in others. In all, Cahill carefully details how powerful a weapon Islamophobic misogynistic mortalism proved to be for women and men alike as they argued for the value and complexity of female intellectual fortitude.

As Cahill turns her attention to the works of Samuel Johnson, Charlotte Lennox, and Mary Wollstonecraft in her final two chapters, she further solidifies the ties between British women’s arguments for their own education and the increasingly Islamophobic bent of misogynistic mortalism against which they defined their motivations. What she leaves her readers with is less

a conclusive study than a new way of understanding the exclusionary foundations of contemporary feminist thought, for as she explains, “The trope of misogynistic mortalism and the wider problem of feminist orientalism is not just feminist prehistory, or even history” (201). This trope is embedded in the very fabric of western feminism specifically, and western thought broadly. It undergirds the widespread Islamophobia that came on full display in the United States after the September 11th attacks. It allows for comments like those made about Ghazala Khan in 2016.

Intelligent Souls? contributes many new avenues for scholarly exploration, but there are a few that strike me as especially enduring. Cahill challenges us to understand how Islamophobia entered the proto-feminist rhetoric of the eighteenth century and, further, how it has remained a staple in Western feminism, all without excusing its presence in either period. She handles the most misogynistic of texts without endorsing them. She highlights factually inaccurate information that circulated in eighteenth-century writing, particularly regarding the Islamic faith, and arms her readers with sound analysis that corrects misconceptions about Quranic teachings without giving into the convenience of presentism. Cahill’s interventions in *Intelligent Souls?* are as much literary as they are historical, theological, and political, and she effortlessly passes between disciplines to produce rich and rewarding scholarship.

Allison Y. Gibeily
Northwestern University

Michael Genovese. *The Problem of Profit. Finance and Feeling in Eighteenth-Century British Literature*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019. Pp. xi + 312; bibliography [239-79]; 7 b/w illustrations; index. ISBN: 978-0-8139-4289-6; hardcover, \$49.99. (Available as an ebook.)

Michael Genovese’s *The Problem of Profit: Finance and Feeling in Eighteenth-Century British Literature* is divided into five chapters and ends with a Coda. At 190 pages of argument and explication, it is thorough, yet well-paced, and holds the reader’s attention as Genovese deftly moves through a combination of philosophical works on identity and selfhood, non-fiction works on commerce, and *belletristic* literature. His goal is to explore the tensions between capital, personhood, and social responsibility and cast new light on sentimentalism, georgic, and profit within the overarching context of the social value of all three combined. As such, Genovese offers a new reading of the concept of early modernism through the lens of capital conversations and conversions of authority, responsibility and ownership for economic activities in the larger British culture. As he explains, “By entangling finance with feeling, [georgic works] reimagine how commercial growth might spark buyers and sellers to both seek profit and resist their most individualistically wayward tendencies” (4).

As a noun, the use of the word “finance” is first noted in England in 1770 associated with money management, with an implied sense of the science of

the money-based business. The French and Latin use of the term from *fine* was used in the context of payment or settling an account. So, Genovese is on target in looking at how this word “finance” is undergoing transformation in the century. More commonly, matters of finance were bundled in eighteenth-century writing with the idea of economy, a word that was broadly applied in such titles as *The Oeconomy of Human Life* by Robert Dodsley (1749).

Genovese posits that the hybridity of the idea of “economy” in the eighteenth-century is best represented by georgic verse with its exploration of work as human labor leading to larger social gains that profit both the individual and the nation at large. As a poetic form, the georgic is nationalistic in nature and celebrates an emotional equation between productivity and profit in a sentimental way. For example, as Genovese points up in his initial introduction of Defoe’s 1719 *Robinson Crusoe*, the hero’s discomfort with his wealth ostracizes him, makes him vulnerable and anxious about how to manage his wealth, and ultimately causes him such pain as to provoke a groundswell of feelings he is unequipped to manage. In the end, the success he experiences captures the shift between the feudal and monarchical culture of profit for the nation and the burgeoning reality that commercial success benefited the individual first, with such requirements as expansive taxation, license fees, and fines needed to be sure that the nation got its share.

The perceived conflict between individual wealth and wealth management informs the discussion in *The Problem of Profit* regarding sentiment and production, debt and credit, the role of commerce in enlightened self-interest, and, ultimately, money. Using the term “affective finance,” Genovese is thus able to explore how individuals on their own are both unable to generate and own the wealth they accumulate through commercial or agricultural activity. Again, as the georgic is well-designed to show, to enjoy a true sense of profit, there must be an interplay between groups who labor towards productivity and an assignment of the value of that labor to the notion of the common good within the framework of sentiment. *Crusoe* must be isolated ultimately because his gain is only for himself. Thus, it is both logical and necessary for literary and non-literary texts to take up the conversation about profit as the wealth of the nation was a central concern throughout the eighteenth century driven by the need to find ways to finance and sustain the English economy.

Chapter 1 opens with Genovese’s reading of what he sees as the contradiction in Samuel Johnson’s definitions of the noun and verb forms of “profit.” Both definitions recognize “advantage” and “improvement” as part of the word’s meaning. As a noun “profit” is tied to “Gain; pecuniary advantage” and as a verb, “To benefit; to advantage.” The question that the definitions leave open for descriptive elaboration is gain and benefit for whom? In this ambiguity, Johnson is demonstrating the conflict surrounding the ethics of engaging in work and productivity for self-determining purposes. The contexts in which Johnson defines profit, through Shakespeare and Swift, reflect what Genovese calls a “cynicism” about profit for its own sake or for an individual actor. To make his point about the isolating effect of individual wealth as opposed to a wealth shared for the good of the nation, Genovese introduces readings on profit by Marx and Mill, then circles back to Adam

Smith and David Hume to show where and how *The Wealth of Nations* engaged *The Theory of Moral Sentiment* around ideas of justice, fairness, and an insistence that private profit be used for the public good. Examining George Lillo's 1731 *The London Merchant* permits Genovese to illustrate the potential hypocrisy of the individual capitalist, here in the character Thorowgood (the London merchant) while his apprentices show various forms of failure and inability to manage their trading. Had all the apprentices adhered to the behaviors of Trueman, then self-interest would have been suppressed, ethical lapses avoided, and all economic decisions would have supported the mutual benefit of the community. The pain Barnwell and Millwood cause are in the same vein as the sentimental pain afflicting Crusoe, showcasing the foibles of individuals subverting or avoiding the overwhelming value of the public good.

Chapter 2 suggests that in order to be comprehensive in rejecting selfish motives, the georgic's agricultural world was another medium for examining the problems of profit. In the georgic world, the collective work of agricultural laborers traditionally was depicted to celebrate the beauties of creation, of England, labor, and the English laborer. The work of the laborer was the work of England. Here Genovese provides detailed close readings of John Philip's 1708 poem *The Cyder*, Christopher Smart's 1752 *The Hop Garden*, Robert Dodsley's 1753 *Public Virtue*, and John Dyer's 1757 *The Fleece*. The four texts combine to reinforce the notion that community labor is the only way to realize full selfhood as a community member with a communal purpose to support one's entire society with full application of individual talents ordered for the common good.

Comparing Dodsley with Dyer allows Genovese to explicate how the ethos of both poems draws the reader's attention to how much happier the workers are because they can work together, as opposed to working alone, and how they can experience a larger sense of success and satisfaction in knowing they all came together around one mission in their husbandry. Smart and Philips are read together to provide an examination of how the persona of the poet could be used to mediate between the agricultural labor to be performed and the owner or actor agent of the field, as in Philips' effort to explain how the work in the apple orchard should be carried out to its titled owner. In their hands, the sentiment of the labor has to be directly addressed since the social-emotional context is not the "point" of the work. This point is made stronger when the poets can loop all of nature into the work and as partners with the human laborers, such that all creation is part of the yield and the harvest.

An organic process underlies the collective profit from sheep-raising in the sentimental economy: the sheep eat the grass and the flowers that the bees pollinated; the plants make the sheep grow; their health makes their wool useful; and the shepherds then fleece them to create clothing that will support the textile industry. The cycles of group labor outweigh the agency work of the laborer who cannot create anything. Interestingly, Genovese hones in on what he calls the violence of the georgic, suggesting that, starting with Pope's *Windsor Forest* (1713), Smart and Dyer follow the positioning of the English oak (symbol of nationhood) in another dialog about the "militancy" of commerce when associated with foreign trade, incursions on English markets,

imperialism, and colonialism, over which the larger profit of pure georgic sentimental laboring must be allowed to triumph.

The eighteenth-century literary magazine showed the enlightened British citizen how to have a conversation about a variety of serious and social topics. In contrast, the rise of the newspapers provided readers with two very important additional lenses on the world- politics and commerce. Eighteenth-century newspapers, I would suggest in light of Genovese's thesis, are best seen as all about finance, profit, and the work of the individual merchant. Though he does not elaborate on the London dailies, it is here, in the advertisements placed in the daily papers, that the real conflicts he studies are staged as readers see the names, shop locations, and goods available for the sole purpose of their comfort and/or stimulation and the work is assigned to an individual shop owner. Buyers had to have their own money or lines of credit to access these goods and to participate in this manifestation of personal wealth. Because the "better" stories were of consumers who failed to stay within their financial means, the periodical writers Addison and Steele took up finance as credit and debt in the pages of *The Tatler* and *The Spectator* as would Defoe in the *Review*.

As with Lillo, the affecting stories are of those who overspent or were victims of money-based crimes and ended up in debtors prisons. The point of these excursions is that individuals unable to manage their money will suffer the pain of imprisonment and the loss of reputation. Buying on credit, because it was handled by someone else, put the debtor at risk, so credit was aligned with lack of trustworthiness and, as such, when combined with the real jail time or worse, was associated with affective finance. Those on the verge of debt needed to read in the belletristic magazines and pamphlet literature moving stories of poor decisions, deceptions, and ruin in order to regulate their behavior before they fell. Genovese introduces Moses Pitt's *The Cry of the Oppressed* (1691) supplemented with five reproduced engravings of the suffering of debtors to show that the bad decision of one family member could ruin the whole family, for in the English criminal justice system the community was as responsible for the debt of one member as they were for the productive communal work of the same under the guidance of the sentimental economy of the idealized georgic world. The notion of "private" credit is false: credit is not private at all. A debtor in need of credit has to "go public" to get money to address the debt and then, when unable to repay, is publicly sanctioned and isolated in a real jail, not Crusoe's limited, but no less isolating, social ostracism. *The Tatler*, *The Spectator*, and the *Review* are of one voice in alleging that the pursuit of individual wealth is risky, and that, if a person fails to manage self and resources, there should be no expectation that anything but recovery of borrowed money is the business of the creditor, who will go to any lengths to regain, with additional profit, the loaned sum. These early, and popular, literary essay periodicals counterbalance the stories of the eighteenth-century newspapers and taken together provide another way to read the problem of profit around the age-old story of temptation and freedom of choice. Defoe, Addison, and Steele challenge the ethics of debtor and creditor; the newspapers are the "apples" that allow for free will in a deterministic accounting process.

Chapter 4 turns to Sarah Fielding's 1741 *The Adventures of David Simple* and Henry Fielding's 1751 *Amelia*. Genovese examines how readers are encouraged to understand and accept affective finance in ways that were not damaging. The novels allow him to introduce gender differences in perception of profit, showing that they in particular argue that profit is not undignified, but a necessity of survival for women. As such, women who are active in pursuit of moneymaking are forced to engage in commerce because the men in their lives have failed to provide the foundations for sustainability. Genovese's reading of *David Simple* is further strengthened by his ability to show David's naiveté as a form of blindness to the needs and differences in the lives of others in the close reading of David's initial interest in Nanny Johnson, the jeweler's daughter David aspires to wed. Eventually her commodity-centered view of the world lessens her attractiveness to him. In the hands of Sarah Fielding, Johnson is an ambivalent character, whose choice to marry for a better social and financial situation, is neither an asset nor a detraction from her overall humanity. Unlike David, who persists in his idealism and makes choices based on his worldview, Johnson is shown as having a bit more character, or at least capacity to see how choices must be made in the economy of human life even if personal happiness is not always the final outcome. More directly, the story of *Amelia*, and her husband, Booth, is surrounded by money issues, debt, and the theme of investments. Miss Mathews is the epitome of the unscrupulous creditor while *Amelia's* steps to free her husband from prison reinforce the economy of marriage. *Amelia* has to work against her husband's failure to provide for and protect her because of his pursuit of individual wealth and his poor finance habits. He generally misses the benefits he enjoys in his resourceful wife for most of the novel, finally agreeing that because of her, he has been able to repay his debts to his not-so-private creditors and swear off further financial decision-making. The miniature portrait becomes the metonym for *Amelia* as Booth's "gold" and his "treasure." Here, I think it would have been interesting for Genovese to push forward a little in his chronology and discuss Juliet Granville in Burney's *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties* (1814) or even go to the middle of the next century to talk a bit about *Vanity Fair* (1848) since Juliet is a working music teacher and Becky Sharpe's entrepreneurial approach to social climbing would have been interesting parallels to the works of the Fieldings.

Genovese's Chapter 5 brings together remarks by Hume, Johnson and Sterne on the physical presence of money. He looks at how his three authors "treat metallic coinage as the mediator, that, but restraining the possessive individual who hoards affect and wealth, guides encounters towards shared progress- and profit" (147). For Moll, whose need for self-support aligns with Genovese's overall argument of affective finance, the coinage was the pearl necklace she tried to steal, which would have allowed her to support her *self* and was in no way related to the overall good of any community. She, too, exemplifies Hume's "sensible knave," the focus of Genovese's reading of part of *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Within the larger construct of intrinsic value, Hume, Johnson and Sterne question virtue, property, coins, and happiness or autonomy. Hume asks readers to think of the materiality of wealth as the instrument through which the community can engage with the wealth of the

possessor (159); for Hume, money drives the financial economy through transparent buying and selling, twin engines of prosperity good for the nation.

In *Rasselas* money is the language of belonging since Rasselas cannot speak Arabic. Cairo is a merchant's economy and money with goods in trading is the universal language. Echoing Addison, Steele, and Defoe the periodical writer, the money talks that Rasselas experiences in Cairo is ultimately unsatisfying and false and has no place in Happy Valley, where sensibility and feeling are the currencies of autonomy. By comparison, in Sterne's *A Sentimental Journey*, the traveller's time in France is read through a lens of cultural brokering, commodification, and forms of exchange, mostly sexual. Sterne's protagonist seems to show no profit in his desire to merge sentiment with profit, and he is doubly "foreign" as an Englishman in France and his sense of the economy of interaction with women renders him as subject to his solipsistic impressions of the world and others, particularly working women.

The Coda allows for a discussion of the themes of Genovese's work applied to slave narratives by Equiano (1789) and William Earle (1800). The detailed reading of these books comparatively inverts the georgic: "when the object of sympathy is also the source of (not the participant in) profit, it becomes estranged from the commercial group" (183). Integrating Grainger's *The Sugar-Cane* (1764) into the final paragraphs of the study reinforces the differences between individual and collective labor, the source of that labor in the idealized world of the georgic or the reality of the slave labor of harvesting the sugar cane in the Caribbean. Sentiment and finance are forced together in the slave narratives and in the medallion struck by Josiah Wedgwood in 1787 for the Society of the Abolition of the Slave Trade (Figure 7, 187). When the slaves are cast as sentimental figures, the world of the enslaved become the embodiment of the personal, emotional, and financial gaps that slave labor exposes since the enslaved will not be able to join the societies in which they work. Equated with gold, the body of the slave is the money that makes the planters in *The Sugar-Cane* wealthy. In the end, the logic of the profit becomes the problem of the profit in that "the human sources of wealth will never join the communities their subjugation makes possible" (189).

The problem of profit then, as studied here, is that no matter how much or how well one might describe the desired advantages of individual profit and how self-sufficiency might improve sensibility and cultivate a more just society, the ways of profit-making mitigated against any systemic organizational justice theory. As such, economic theories, theories of money as espoused by Hume, and stories about the dangers of debt and credit all end with the same theme of an uneasy, but unavoidable and tense relationship between individual and collective labor and wealth production.

Genovese's *The Problem of Profit* is well-reasoned and thorough. He has chosen his primary texts judiciously and interspersed other texts in each chapter to demonstrate concerns about profit and profit-making in the period. The notes are copious, detailed and informative. Genovese's book would be a good for a topics class on the economies of eighteenth-century culture. The chapters are arranged to support a graduate seminar syllabus while at the same time allowing for additional texts and evidence from commodity-based cultural studies, such as the work of Barbara Benedict and others on

consuming and collecting, to be introduced to expand the argument beyond literary works.

Beverly Schneller,
Kentucky State University

Janika Bischof, Kirsten Juhas, and Hermann J. Real, editors. *Reading Swift: Papers from The Seventh Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift*. Leiden, Netherlands: Wilhelm Fink, 2019. Pp. xiv + 705; 37 illustrations; index; abstracts. ISBN: 978-3-7705-6397-5; hardcover, €176.64; \$216.

The easily recognized title of this collection sends an immediate note of pleasure to scholars and students of Swift studies. Though five years have passed since the last Münster Symposium publication, it seems the level of research interest in the Dean of St. Patrick's has not waned in the least. In fact, the variety of topics may have expanded if one judges by the numerous sections within this collection. The editors stress the conviviality of the symposium (held in June 2017), and they have a gift for immersing the reader in that environment, offering "Biographical Aspects," "Bibliographical and Textual Studies," "Poetry and Music," "Gulliver's Travels," "Political Problems," "Ireland," and "Philosophical and Religious Issues," among others.

Spreading the gospel of biography, Eugene Hammond's "What Do Young Men Know? ..." studies the early biographies of Swift: Orrery (1752), Deane Swift (1755), and Thomas Sheridan (1784), sorting the facts and inferences and assuring us that "inferences' origins [are] sometimes only a single fact" (30). Using unsubstantiated evidence and general surmise created a false view of Swift's early life and personality, and Hammond shows later biographers often adopting ill-founded material. The distinctions between the three biographies lend a welcome account of early Swift research—Deane Swift, intending to improve upon Orrery's views, seems "a lunatic," according to Hammond, and the two writers both seem "major misleader[s]" (14-15). We learn Sheridan relied on Swift's "late-life tendencies" (19) in discussing his early life, but each biographer has particular strengths, too. Hammond's careful research, often found in the numerous footnotes, provides new insights and grapples with the fragile concerns of three little-known biographers.

J.A. Downie's "The Biographer as Historian" reminds one of Hermione Lee's phrase, "Biography is a misleading way of writing about the past." He argues that Swift had only a partial set of facts about the Oxford's ministry's operation and used second-hand information when writing his party pamphlets and the *History of the Last Four Years*, which appears "to raise serious issues for Swift's biographers and critics" (31). Downie focuses on a few less well-known Swift writings in making his point that "the task of a biographer and the historian often intersect" (36). Though no one would argue this point, the essay re-iterates the role of the biographer as one who "must be aware of the complex politics at work ... including understanding why" (42) before making those modest inferences essential to life-writing.

The section on bibliographical and textual studies provides rich observations about the ebb and flow of uncanceled copies of poems, the variety of Dublin imprints, the diverse practices of Dublin printers, and an “inflated” account of a major reading period during Swift’s life. Andrew Carpenter and James Woolley’s “Faulkner’s *Volume II: Containing the Author’s Poetical Works ...*” studies a unique copy of Faulkner’s 1735 edition, revealing the efforts to cancel personal satire and limit the printer’s exposure to prosecution. The essay reveals fascinating evidence of what was cancelled and why and shows the superb research of a host of Swiftians. Was Swift responsible for these cancellations and the verdict: “uncertain,” but he did not want poems of “private Resentment” published. James May’s “False and Incomplete Imprints in Swift’s Dublin, 1710-35” discusses Dublin printers and their typographical practices, particularly the relationships among members of the book trades, authors, readers, and other cultural forces (60). He closely examines various imprints and the possible motivations them, and he identifies printers from their typography and cut ornaments, providing a list of George Faulkner’s incomplete imprints. Turning to Swift’s (actually Temple’s) library, Dirk Passmann and Hermann Real’s “Annotating J.S. Swift’s Reading at Moor Park in 1697/8” focuses on the extensive historical research Swift completed, providing the titles and considering the degree to which some titles may have influenced him. After explaining that Swift read “403 lines [of Latin] per day” and other “facts,” the authors quickly repair any misunderstandings among scholars—they are “mining the quarry of Swift’s library ... to advocate caution” (124).

A new Symposium section on Poetry and Music finds Moyra Haslett’s “‘With brisk merry lays’: Songs on the Wood’s Halfpence Affair” adding to the growing scholarly interest in the popularity of ballads and their value toward understanding Swift. Though he had no ear for music, Swift knew these 18 songs, and their rhythms could send a message rallying political opposition, increasing the impact of his *Drapier’s Letters*. Haslett also notes these songs have links to Irish Gaelic music, increasing their political impact in attacking the English plan of foisting a corrupt coinage on the Irish.

On sorting out a consensus for *Gulliver’s Travels* Book IV, Allan Ingram points to Swift’s “horse problems” in “Travels with Horses,” finding he maintained an interest in equine management, kept a catalogue of “promising horses,” and read the best ancient and modern works on the responsibilities of humans to horses. As Ingram posits (recalling Michael DePorte, 1993; and Hermann Real, 2015, but forgetting Anne Cline Kelly, 2013), “the stage was set for Houyhnhnm land”; horses were symbolic, an idealized version of the human self and a metaphor for the proper balance between reason and imagination, but also ironically for man become irrelevant—and so does apparently any reference to *Gulliver’s Travels* in the index.

The second half of this 26-essay global celebration of Swift examines the philosophical and religious, political, and Irish issues, closing out with a curious double section entitled “Reception and Adaptation.” Melinda Rabb’s “Swift, Defoe, Civil War, and the Meaning of (Bare) Life” prompts readers into asking what is meant in the title’s final phrase. Discovering this meaning requires struggling (profitably) with her analysis of Defoe’s *Memoirs of a*

Cavalier and Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* and *The Drapier's Letters*, but more so with such terminology as "indirection and avoidance," "detachment," and "displaced trauma." Rabb, understandably horrified by the record of war's inhumanity, examines civil war and the resulting political and moral dilemma such conflicts cause, especially among the intelligentsia who understand warfare as the dismemberment and dehumanization of the human body, resulting in moral deformity too.

Stephen Karian's "Lost Works by Swift and the Ballad of January 1712" identifies a lost ballad as the collaborative work of John Arbuthnot and Swift, known as "An Excellent New Song Call'd the Trusty and True English-Man." This piece was meant as pro-Ministry propaganda for Oxford's peace policy, but apparently had little impact on the events or Swift's overall canon. Karian modestly notes "we can cross off another item from our list" (397), but his persuasive essay serves as a template for students and scholars interested in learning how one recovers a writer's "lost" work.

Ashley Marshall's "Swift, Oldisworth, and the Politics of *The Examiner*, 1710-14" probes Swift's role as Mr. Examiner, both his pre- and post-phases in this important 33-essay series for the new Tory government. Her thesis depends on our rejecting the accepted notion of Harley's removing Swift as chief writer and embracing instead Henry St John's more significant role in managing the paper. Certainly, Swift objected when he found himself a mouthpiece between the two ministers, but Marshall has more interest in sensing the extreme High Tory viewpoint—one espoused by St John—and skillfully making the reader see that the paper continued without any moderating views. In this exhaustive, but nonetheless fascinating, piece, we find Harley either urged Swift to resign, or Swift unhappily chose to do so; thus, as Marshall says, we must "rethink Swift's frustratingly obscure relationship with the Ministry" (431).

Highlighting the Irish section, Jonathan Pritchard conducts a literary and historical survey of the Liberty of St. Patrick's Cathedral, in "Dubliners: Swift and his Neighbours." That Liberty was the district where Swift lived with his immediate neighbors, and Pritchard decides "his dealings with his many neighbors ... can finally be seen [as] a source of considerable personal contentment" (497). At various points Swift exercised his authority with confidence and took responsibility for all the residents; however, he did have disagreements with his closest neighbors, the archbishops of Dublin. Pritchard's including a color map (Fig. 21-1) of Patrick's Close (as known locally) was an unexpected aide to the reader's sense of the physical place and reminds one of certain gerrymandered U.S. congressional districts.

The last group of essays celebrating the 350th birthday of Dean Swift set the final scene, the titles aligned in a rhythmic cadence: "Speaking with/of the Dead: Hester Thrale Piozzi and Swift," "Swift's Whig Pamphlet: Its Reception and Afterlife," "Swift among the Scientists, ad infinitum...." and others. Kirsten Juhas and Mascha Hansen's "Speaking with the Dead" discusses how Hester L. Thrale Piozzi, a well-known woman diarist and friend of Samuel Johnson, responded to Swift as a model, while simultaneously probing her homage ("Three Dialogues on the Death of Hester Lynch Thrale") to Swift's *Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift*. Juhas and Hansen have certainly focused on

an exciting convergence, an interplay of revelations about Swift, Johnson, and Thrale Piozzi (one alluded to in Nussbaum [2012], Doody [1988], and McCarthy [1985]), but this study of the “Three Dialogues” and Swift’s *Verses*, within the *Dialogues of the Dead* genre has so much potential. Juhas and Hansen point to four key ideas: Stella’s beneficial influence on Swift echoing the same softening effect between Johnson and Mrs. Thrale; a general comment on eighteenth-century women writers, especially Thrale Piozzi’s considerable library, containing many books bought by Johnson and the extensive number of Swift’s *Works* she continues adding to the collection; her avid reading habits and her patient, long-term strategy of annotating her books, similar to Swift’s practice—“both inveterate scribbler[s] of marginalia” (535); and her admiring emulation of Swift’s style, using it as a model for her “Three Dialogues.” Juhas and Hansen shift in the last part of the essay to the homage, comparing it to portraiture, though less aggressive than Swift and more a “bouquet from the hothouse,” while disclaiming satiric intent. Both writers provide striking glimpses into Thrale Piozzi’s remarkable life, and welcome insights to enhance her character and passions.

This volume joins with its previous symposia, in proving a superb statement on Swift scholarship in the second decade of the twenty-first century. Could the book be 50 pages shorter? Probably. The essays have become longer, the prose more demanding, the footnotes more prolific, but given the complexity of its subject and the comprehensive research, I found I didn’t mind. Serious scholarship owes no apology to its readers.

Paul J. deGategno
Penn State University, Brandywine

Daniel Defoe. *The Life and Strange Surprizing Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, with an Introduction and Notes by Maximillian E. Novak, Irving N Rothman, and Manuel Schonhorn, with contributions from Kit Kincade and John G. Peters.* (The Stoke Newington Edition.) Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2020. Pp. xlix + 379; bibliographies; 16 illustrations; index; with bibliographical descriptions and list of variants. ISBN: 978-1-68448096-8; paperback, \$54.95. (Available in hardback.)

My Defoe library includes two earlier volumes of The Stoke Newington Edition of the works of Daniel Defoe: *An Essay upon Projects* (1999) and *The Consolidator* (2001), both published by AMS press in New York City, and as far as I know until the appearance of this volume there have been no other volumes published in the series, owing partly as I have learned by the death in 2017 of AMS’s publisher, Gabriel Hornstein and the termination of the press’s activities. If this handsome and informative volume predicts the future of the Stoke Newington edition, that is a very good sign for Defoe studies. Bucknell Press is to be commended for reviving this excellent project, although this edition is far more ambitious in its editorial fullness than the two earlier volumes. And of course this edition is the work of three distinguished Defoe scholars; one couldn’t ask for a more seasoned and expert group of editors.

For one crucial aspect of this edition, the copy text of the novel is the first 1719 edition published by Taylor, but in their acknowledgments the editors insert the following somewhat grandiose caveat that theirs is “a definitive edition” that “required the examination of the first edition and all subsequent editions” (p. xi), which is to say all subsequent eighteenth-century English editions. They add that in preparing their edition they felt “free to correct or alter text, depending upon “data that Defoe, himself, might have chosen to alter” (pp. xi-xii). That is to say that in addition to providing a few facts left out of the first editions, they have to some extent emended their copy text, the first edition, by citing on a number of occasions from the enormous collation of variants from seven eighteenth-century editions, enumerated in a one-hundred and sixty-six page list of variants among these editions at the end of the book, with the first six given an ID beginning with, “O,” and the last two (for some reason that eludes me) beginning with “D.” Obviously, with its presentation of all these variant readings, this volume is not for the casual reader or for classroom use but is intended for the well-funded scholar. It may be the most expensive paperback I’ve encountered, no bargain at nearly \$55.

Novak et al. have produced what amounts to a modified variorum edition of Defoe’s text whose features are meant to facilitate advanced scholarly work on the book. Although knowledge of the many variants in the text among these eighteenth-century editions may conceivably be useful and perhaps even valuable for critics and scholars, it strikes me as in practice unnecessary and misconceived, even irrelevant. The variants are insignificant just about all of the time: one typical example: “wake” in the first edition, “Wake” in all subsequent eighteenth-century editions. What sort of knowledge about the book is gained by this kind of niggling exactness? Such an elaborate apparatus was performed as the acknowledgments note by a host of volunteers, tracing what must be largely compositors’ errors or small revisions. Of course, these are not changes or revisions Defoe made, and the notion of a variorum consisting of a detailed accounting of small and arbitrary or accidental textual changes as new editions were prepared, one word or two substituted for the ones in the first edition, seems to me an impressive labor but nearly worthless for adding to our understanding of Defoe’s narrative and not really a variorum in the traditional sense. As W.R. Owens, editor of *Robinson Crusoe* in the multi-volume Pickering & Chatto edition observes in his textual notes, in the seven authorized editions of the novel to appear in Defoe’s lifetime and a posthumous eighth, one scholar has calculated that “there were more than 14,000 textual variants . . . with almost 1,500 of them representing substantive word changes.” But as Owens goes on to note, scholars are unanimous in their opinion that none of these are authorial changes. Rather, they are “the kinds of changes that occur as compositors set successive printings of a text, with corrections being made but further errors introduced” (*The Novels of Daniel Defoe* [2008], 1: 326). I’m puzzled that these three distinguished scholars have more or less ignored these crucial facts about textual variants in Defoe’s novel and offered an enormous rendering of all these variants which signifies just about nothing important.

Nevertheless, despite what I would call a wasted (if in one sense heroic) effort to document insignificant variations in the text, there is much to praise

and to value in this new edition. The introduction (by Max Novak) is authoritative, exceedingly informative and often suggestive in quite original ways, although perhaps too long at 48 pages, including notes. I also confess that I was puzzled and even annoyed by the pedantry displayed by referring throughout to Defoe's book as *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures* and not by its familiar title as *Robinson Crusoe*. What I wondered is gained by that choice? The book has been called *Robinson Crusoe* for more than three centuries. Even scholars call it that! And I fear that there are a couple of embarrassing errors: Pope's father was not a grocer (p. xiv), no matter what Gildon said but a linen merchant, and it is Crusoe, of course, and not Defoe as the introduction seems to claim who jokes about his rule over his island ("his fantasy about being an absolute monarch of his island," p. xxxi), although "his" is a careless stylistic awkwardness whereby the antecedent of the pronoun looks like Defoe but obviously refers to Crusoe. That should have been corrected in proof reading. In the text itself, the notes are generally helpful and bursting at times with interesting and relevant information, even for scholarly readers familiar with the period and with Defoe's life. For a scholarly edition, elementary proof reading standards are at times a bit low, with W.R. Owens becoming "Owen" and then "Owens" on the same page (xl). This page also contains a typo: "threat" for "thread." With that army of searchers for variants who are very nicely named and acknowledged, I would have thought that such errors could have been avoided. On the plus side, the edition includes sixteen enthralling black and white illustrations, from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

For my taste, the book's cover is garish: a large footprint, toes and all, referring to the single footprint left by the visiting cannibals, the first sign of trouble for Crusoe. Otherwise, despite the wasted paper and effort in listing the variants in the texts of *Robinson Crusoe*, this is a fine edition that scholars will want to acquire. I'm glad to have it and will look forward to further additions to the Stoke Newington Edition.

John Richetti
University of Pennsylvania

Simon Rosenberg. *Book Value Categories and the Acceptance of Technological Changes in English Book Production*. (Müster Monographs on English Literature, 42.) Bern and New York: Peter Lang, 2020. Pp. 293 + [3, series bibliography]; illustrations; bibliography [251-93].

Simon Rosenberg and Sandra Simon (editors). *Material Moments in Book Cultures: Essays in Honour of Gabriele Müller-Oberhäuser*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2014. Pp. xxiv + 286; bibliography of Müller-Oberhäuser's publications; colored frt portrait. ISBN: 978-3-631-64794-3; hardcover: \$79.

Simon Rosenberg's study of what adds value to books is a revised dissertation written while studying and teaching at the U. of Münster's Institut für Buchwissenschaft & Textforschung, in part under the direction of its

distinguished chair Gabriele Müller-Oberhäuser. Later he became senior assistant professor and interim administrator of the Institute (2015-2020). Rosenberg's co-editor of the 2014 festschrift to their former professor is Sandra Simon, now thriving at the Herzog August Bibliothek. In 2014 while working at the Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies, Dr. Simon completed her lengthy dissertation on British book culture: "Verleger als Leser und als Vermittler von Lesekultur: Britische Verlegerkarrieren zwischen 1800 und 1926" Müller-Oberhäuser, though a medievalist with a dissertation on Chaucer, researched diverse subjects that took her into the Renaissance and beyond. At the Institut für Buchwissenschaft, she led groups of researchers on three projects involving late medieval and early modern book culture: "Book Gifts and Cultural Networks" in 2006-10, on "Censorship and Destruction of Books," focused on the Lollard heresy in 2008-11, and "Book as a Weapon in Religio-Political Conflicts") in 20013-15. She also organized collaborative events with the "media studies" program at the University of Leiden.

Not surprisingly, then, the English-language festschrift honoring Müller-Oberhäuser ranges across a millennium and from historical accounts of authors and publishers to theory. The first essays concern "momentous issues of book history in more general terms"; the second, "case studies," or "moments." However, while some essays clearly belong in the first section, such as Sandra Simon's exploration "Authors, Publishers, and the Literary Agent: An Ideal Literary Trinity?" one forgets this distinction while reading the essays. Within the first group are interesting studies outside our field: Eva Schaten on "Books as Objects of Magic in the Late Middle Ages"; Torsten Wieschen on "Forms of Addressing the Educated Reader in Early [Humanist] Printed Paratexts" (on establishing an authoritative ethos); Sarah Ströer's "Juvenile Sunday Reading in 19C England," that is, religious reading, with distinctions made by sect and social class; and, a case study within the long 18C, Matti Peikola's "Signing the Diabolical Pact: Aspects of Supernatural Written Communication in *Records of the Salem Witch-Hunt, 1692-1693*," a fascinating examination of what witnesses testified about a satanic codex into which covenants were signed, usually by finger but sometimes pen—the inquisitors first thought the contract was signed on a sheet but soon learned there was a book, usually described as a pocket-book with blood-red binding.

The second half of the volume contains more for our period. Mirjam Christmann offers a groundbreaking study of the Huguenot booksellers the Vaillants' integration into the London trade 1685-1740 (with a list of cited Vaillant publications 1707-40, in English and Latin as well as the French books with which they are usually associated). Another solid essay on publishing history is Paul Hofstijzer's "Leiden-German Book-Trade Relations in the 17C: The Case of Jacob Marcus." Two essays suiting a festschrift to Müller-Oberhäuser are Janika Bischof's "The Printed *Acta Synodi Nationalis Dordrechtii* as a Networking Tool," on the gift to Reformed churches in England and elsewhere of the printed acts of a 17C synod to strengthen networks, and Hermann J. Real's "Swift as Bookman: Reader, Collector, and Donor," most noteworthy for its account of Swift's donating and gifting books, typically to elite friends and patrons, often to express affection and sometimes to aid their learning. For instance, Swift gave to his friend Dr.

Richard Helsham four landmarks in the history of medicine and to both Lady Anne Acheson and Esther Johnson, the second edition of Sir William Temple's *Introduction to the History of England*. With unparalleled command of his subject, Real provides many insights into Swift's books and also his relations with individuals to whom he gave books or received them. The volume concludes with an essay by Müller-Oberhäuser's collaborator at Leiden, Adriaan van der Weel, on the future of book studies as a discipline.

In *Book Value Categories and the Acceptance of Technological Changes in English Book Production*, Rosenberg brings to bear on our 21C digital revolution an examination of values influential during two periods of revolutionary change, that when printing began in England and that when the hand-press was replaced by faster industrial processes. Identifying what led to the "acceptance of new book production methods" can help assess what aids or inhibits the acceptance of digital developments (28). Rosenberg's conception of "value," employed more in the social sciences than humanities, might be strange to literary scholars but will not be to writing teachers, who teach the values clarity, brevity, coherence, emphasis, etc.; to put it simply, Rosenberg examines what has added value to books for publishers, purchasers, etc. just as fuel-economy, durability, etc. are values in deciding what car to buy.

Rosenberg spends the first 50 pages, Section 1, defining books, people's relations to them, and the economic, content, and symbolic value of books. There follow examinations of successful practices introducing printing into England by William Caxton, Wynkyn de Worde, Richard Pynson, and, more briefly, those who failed in Oxford, Cambridge, and St. Albans, 1478-1522. The focus is on the acceptance of print by a world that once knew only manuscript books. We consider the value of certain fonts, of illustrations, of texts relative to potential buyers, and the like. Caxton exploits paratext playing up patronage; De Worde for a time continues to use Caxton's printer's device and finds contemporary literature to have market value; Pynson exploits being King's printer while supplying a demand for devotional books. I learned much I wished to know from this account of the early hand-press; whereas, the late 19C developments were outside my interests. There Rosenberg attends to expanding importance of authorship (related to the increase in journalism) and changes in publishing, printing, and distribution. Stereotyping and faster printing machinery were not of value to many in the print trades. The capacity to print novels in a single volume was held up by the publishers' valuing the sale or loan in circulation libraries of the book in three volumes.

In the fourth section on "The Digital Age," as in sections on the Gutenberg and industrial ages, we learn many historical developments, while looking for the advantages and disadvantages of digital books (and consider what sorts of books profit most from digitization, such as reference works). There is a good discussion of hindrances to the acceptance of the digital texts, like piracy, altering reading devices, and pricing that seems excessive--as ebooks' prices often do to us--or that were in practice too low. (Amazon's 2007 offer of *NYT* bestsellers at \$9.99 led to a loss on each book sold and threatened to lower what consumers would pay for printed books, but it expanded the use of its reading devices.) By its close, this book is about *us*, engaging us as consumers--are we the sort who put more status in printed

books or in using digital products? Do we prefer reading printed books in which we can underline and make marginal comments, which we can store physically beside us? Or, even if so, are those values outweighed by preference for the lighter-weight Kindle or tablet? A final consideration is whether etexts invite skimming and lead to poorer comprehension.

Rosenberg's book was initially of value to me as a well-documented repository of book history by the best scholars. The same clear and informative account, rooted in references to important studies (sometimes unnecessarily), was offered for alterations in book production and consumption during the early industrial age. I perked up for the closing examination of value conflicts today, tolerating well the application of principles discovered in the Gutenberg and industrial ages. In Rosenberg's book, I valued clear phrasing, a well demarcated organization, previews and summaries for emphasis, and, above all, erudition. Developments in the material book's content, production, marketing, and consumption are problematized as Rosenberg considers the perspectives of multiple stakeholders and identifies conflicting values. I hear lots of facile discussions of the book as a commodity; this is not one.

James E. May
Lancaster, Pennsylvania

Roy Wolper, 1931-2020

By Hermann J. Real

My friend Roy Wolper was not a very regular correspondent; as a rule, we would exchange greetings at Christmas and good wishes for the New Year, and that was it. Thus I was pleased and surprised to see an email from him spring up on the screen, a month or so ago. I was always pleased to receive email communications from Roy for the simple reason that his handwriting was the lousiest I have ever known (my own included). I (a Roman Catholic) remember once telling him (an ethnic Jew) that deciphering one single postcard in his script would spare me some 500 years of punishment in the flames of purgatory, 500 being the appropriate remission for a Wolper postcard. Roy just stared at me uncomprehendingly: he had not a clue about Christian eschatology nor did he think his scrawl particularly repellent.

For his most recent email, I was entirely unprepared. He had not been in good health recently, he told me, and for the first time, too; in fact, he had been suffering from cancer, he continued. But the tone in which he told me that sounded vaguely optimistic, somehow suffused by that irrepressible Wolperian energy. My worries began to lessen at his boast that he was still driving a car. What I did not realize at the time was that this email was Roy's farewell to a friend: he was saying goodbye, but he did so in a way which would not make his recipient unnecessarily alert or even suspicious.

I first met Roy Wolper in the spring of 1978. I was forty at the time, a young and inexperienced professor of English at the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster, who, at the recommendation of his mentor Bernhard Fabian, had just been appointed German advisor to *The Scriblerian*. As it happened, Roy had been granted a sabbatical simultaneously, which he was spending in Paris, accompanied by two members of his family, his wife Jane and his daughter Page. On hearing this, Erika and I decided to invite the family to spend an extended weekend with us at our home in Beckum, some 45 km south east of Münster, and were very happy to welcome them on our own turf shortly after on a Friday in March 1978. On the following Saturday, we took the Wolpers to Münster. While the ladies explored the delights of the City under the expert guidance of Erika, Roy addressed a seminar of my students at the University, and it was on this occasion that I first experienced what Roy was best at: talking, more precisely, talking with a passion. I tend to take to people with passion. He extemporized freely on his favourite brainchild, *The Scriblerian*, recounted the journal's foundation and subsequent history, its spectrum, editorial objectives and critical standards, the practice of co-operating with his fellow-reviewers, Peter Tasch and Arthur Weitzman, and, with an emphasis I thought unusual in those pre-global times, expatiated on the 'rationale' (one of Roy's favourite words) of why a journal with the rigorous, not to say inexorable standards of *The Scriblerian* was 'absolutely necessary' in the American academic system. If this was not to be corrupted, Roy insisted, it had to be subjected to the critique, and ideally, correction, of all its researches all the time, and the key word to strive for in these endeavours was 'honesty, unconditional honesty.' Lies were the death of scholarship, Roy held, again with a passion. I vividly remember how awestruck my students still were by Roy's rigour when I discussed his 'performance' with them the week after. 'Terrifying,' one of them murmured.

I do not pretend to know all Roy's passions, but another one certainly was 'to educate' As early as that first meeting at Beckum in the spring of 1978, he made me hunker down in my study with him to discuss stylistic infelicities, or rather what he took to be infelicities, in the raw and unpolished reviews I had submitted. In all the years during which I served as Advisor for Germany, we quarreled—always amicably—with Roy insisting on precision and conciseness, on structured syntax and rhythmical cadence, on the excision of expletives and dangling modifiers. At times, he (and fellow-editors) would chuck out whole paragraphs from my submissions. Each time he had singled out a weak spot in a review or a note, he would propose a corrected ('better') version, look up at me and ask, 'Does that make sense to you?' There were moments in our working relationship when intransigence shone through, too. Roy loved to argue, and by hindsight I have to admit that in 90% of the cases he had the better arguments. But in the 1980s and 1990s at the height of my co-operation with *Scriblerian*, when my vanity had been hurt, feelings might have been different. Whatever the merits in each individual case, however, in one respect Roy Wolper was nonpareil: HE CARED. Indeed, he is likely to continue nonpareil for a long time to come because he cared so passionately.

Editor's note: Roy S. Wolper, born in July 1931, took degrees in his hometown at the University of Pittsburgh. After his B.A., he served as a lieutenant in the U.S. Army, 1952-54, and then took his M.A. in 1959 and his Ph.D. in 1965 (his dissertation was entitled "Samuel Johnson and Drama"). After teaching at Pitt in 1964-65, he taught for two years at the U. of Saskatchewan, and then remained at Temple University until his retirement in 1998. With Peter Tasch also at Temple and Arthur Weitzman at Northeastern, he founded *The Scriblerian* and *the Kit-Kats* in 1968. His interests and publications involved English and French 18C literature, particular Voltaire among the French (he produced an important essay on *Candide*), and Jewish literature. Roy wrote short fiction, for which he received an NEH creative writing fellowship in 1974. By 2017 he had written 1500 reviews for *Scriblerian*. He was a tough critic, helping establish the journal's reputation for such, and tough too on his contributors, insisting on brevity and clarity (as his fellow editors wrote in 2017, "Roy could be merciless with copy"). He was the sort of man who shouted into a phone. See the tribute by fellow editors to Roy upon his retirement in *The Scriblerian*, 49.2 (Spring 2017), 1-2, and his *Wikipedia* page, where we learn he was the father of two children.

In Memory of W. B. Gerard, 1960-2020

We lament the death of our colleague Blake Gerard at the end of August, an EC/ASECS member long the principal editor of *The Scriblerian* and a distinguished contributor to studies of Laurence Sterne. The obituary on *Legacy* was reposted on C18-L on 1 September by Melanie Holm:

Dr. William Blake Gerard, age 60, a native of New York City living in Montgomery, passed away in his sleep on August 30 after a hard-fought fight with cancer. He was born on January 11, 1960. Blake graduated from Stuyvesant High School in 1978, and went on to ultimately accrue his Ph.D. in English Literature from the University of Florida. He was married to Carol Rosen on May 16, 1991.

A man with an insatiable intellectual curiosity, Blake worked as a garment and cab driver, as well as for radio, magazines, and eventually as a Professor of English at Auburn University Montgomery. He enjoyed long walks appreciating nature, expressing his creativity through writing and storytelling, meeting and learning from new people he encountered, spending time with his family, and appreciating culture in books, movies, music, and all of its forms. He was co-editor of the semi-annual journal *The Scriblerian and the Kit-Cats*, general editor of *THAT Literary Review*, and sat on the editorial board of *The Shandean*.

He is survived by his wife, Carol Rosen Gerard; sons, Sam Gerard and Joe Gerard, as well as his brother, Brett, and mother, Eileen.

Those contributing appreciations on C18-L stressed Blake's congeniality and generosity: especially as editor of *The Scriblerian*, he had corresponded

with many in the 18C community. The obituary has some very important details: his doctoral studies at Florida, studying Laurence Sterne under Melvyn New, occurred in his late thirties; he was very happily married to Carol for 29 years, the two being a very engaging tag-team at some conferences; as recently as this summer his correspondence commented on things seen walking in woodlands; and he was a very engaged father of two sons whose embrace of adult challenges bubbled up in proud comments. Blake lived as full and diverse a life as were his literary interests. One of his early publications was on Wallace Stevens's "Peter Quince at the Clavier" (in *The Explicator*, 1998); at another extreme is his co-publication with Eric Sterling of "Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* and the Transformation of England from Absolute Monarchy to Egalitarian Society" in *Contemporary Justice Review* (2005). Blake wrote short fiction and taught creative writing and directed creative theses by graduate students at Auburn's Montgomery Campus.

The following 2018 evaluation on "Rate My Professors" is typical: "Dr. G. is probably too much talent for too small a school. He is professional without being abstruse. His lectures are jam-packed with information, and he expects you to listen and take notes . . . He responds well to effort but grades w[ith] heavy pen. Expect to be challenged and to learn." Another commented, "Grades too harsh[ly], class is required, and I'm not an English major. Ridiculous way to harm your GPA"; a third remarked, "One of my advisors told me 'Gerard, Hard,' and boy were they [sic] right. His tests are 20 questions but will take you every second of the two hours and thirty min[utes]. Tough lectures . . . no outside sources are allowed or he will fail you for plagiarism even if you look up a story for insight." We can infer here that Blake was generous enough to set high expectations and to teach rigorous classes even if that cost him good student evaluations.

From his teaching and writing fiction and from a commitment to service sprang *THAT Literary Review: The Journal of the Unexpected*, the first of whose five issues appeared in 2016 (freely available as PDFs on the WWW and for sale on paper at Amazon). The notes on the editorial board at the little magazine's home-page indicate Blake was "a survivor of workshops with John Gardner and Frank McCourt." His editorial board introduces half a dozen fellow editors, most at Auburn—Montgomery, and half a dozen student assistant editors and production staffers. (He created teams.)

Also reflecting Blake's embrace of collaborators is his editorial service to *The Scriblerian*, founded in the 1960s by Roy Wolper, Peter Tasch, and Arthur Weitzman, but increasingly dependent on a large team of general (typically four to eight) and field-specific contributing editors. Roy Wolper served as a principal editor into the last decade, until the 2016 double issue, but Blake began playing an important role by 2003, when submissions were directed to him alone in Montgomery in place of Roy in Philadelphia. Though I'm outside the inner circle, I suspect that for over a decade Blake took the lead in managing the editors and their material (so many reviews to keep track of!), and preparing issues for press, though supported by a stable international cadre—the fall 2019 issue is edited by Blake and E. Derek Taylor, with five "Senior Editors" and two dozen Contributing Editors; the spring 2020 issue is much the same with Melanie Holm moved up to Managing Editor, leaving

four Senior Editors, and there are 21 on the “Contributing” bench. By 2015 Blake had joined Roy in being the contact for advertising and editorial questions, a role he played through the last issue. For at least the last several years or more, the period when he was fighting cancer, Blake handled all the financial headaches that come with not only advertising but subscriptions, production, and print and on-line distribution (Project Muse). For many years now I have been sending to Blake the “Scribleriana Transferred” survey of antiquarian books and MSS, and that has been a pleasant experience even when Blake would ask for stylistic changes, corrections, and large cuts suggested by himself, Mel New, and others. Robert Walker shares my sense that Blake did much of “the heavy-lifting” as Roy’s role diminished, and he added, “He cared deeply about the journal and the profession and has left a large hole.” Blake’s concern for colleagues (as in regularly calling Roy after he left the team) and general congeniality must have helped maintain the large editorial staff. We had a friend in Montgomery.

The focus of Blake’s research was Laurence Sterne, particularly Sterne’s sensibility, and illustrated editions of his novels. He published “Benevolent Vision: The Ideology of Sentimentality in Contemporary Illustrations of *A Sentimental Journey* and *The Man of Feeling*” in *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* (2001/2), “Sterne Illustrated” in *The Shandean* (2002), and “‘All that the heart wishes’: Changing Views toward Sentimentality Reflected in Visualizations of Sterne’s *Maria*, 1773-1888” in *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* (2005). He returned to the latter topic in “Laurence Sterne’s ‘Poor Maria’ as Model Empathic Response” in *The Palgrave Handbook of Affect Studies and Textual Criticism* (2017). In 2006 Ashgate published his *Laurence Sterne and the Visual Imagination* (xvi + 251 pp.; 47 illus.), exploring “the ability of Sterne’s texts to inspire the visual imagination,” explaining why the two novels were so profusely illustrated and defining pictorial styles—it included a 50-page catalogue of representations in 1760-2005 (See Peter Briggs’ review in the *Intelligencer*, 22.3 [Sept. 2008], 18-20, or, among others, Jack Lynch’s in *Age of Johnson* 2010 or Chris Fanning’s in the Winter 2009 *ECL*). Before and after that monograph, he catalogued illustrations and editions with Brigitte Friant-Kessler, the two publishing in *The Shandean* from 2005 to 2011 [2012] seven bibliographical articles that included the title-phrase “Towards a Catalogue of Illustrated Laurence Sterne.” Among other essays is his “‘Betwixt one passion and another’: Continuations of Laurence Sterne’s *A Sentimental Journey* (1769-1820)” in *On Second Thought’: Updating the Eighteenth-Century Text*, edited by Debra Taylor Bourdeau and Elizabeth Kraft (2007). All this bibliographical research required a good deal of travel to distant libraries.

With E. Derek Taylor and Robert G. Walker, fellow students of Mel New, Blake edited *Swiftly Sterneward: Essays on Lawrence Sterne and His Times in Honor of Melvyn New* (Delaware, 2011), which contained his “Laurence Sterne, the Apostrophe, and American Abolitionism, 1788-1831,” treating the frequent reprinting and considerable influence of passages in Sterne’s novels on antislavery rhetoric. And, alone, he edited and introduced *Divine Rhetoric: Essays on the Sermons of Laurence Sterne* (Delaware, 2010), which also has something unexpected, an audio CD with a reading of the 17th sermon in Sterne’s 2-volume *Sermons* 1760, performed in a Yorkshire church

by Patrick Wildgust in 2008. Blake recruited many important essays for this focused volume, including Jack Lynch's "Reading and Misreading the Genres of Sterne's Sermons," Mel New's "Reading the Occasion: Understanding Sterne's Sermons"; Arthur Cash's "Sermons in *Tristram Shandy*," and Robert Erickson's "Swift, Steele, and the Anglican Sermon Performed." From New's forthcoming tribute in *The Shandean and Scriblerian*, I learned that Blake co-edited a third collection, with Mary-Celine Newbould, entitled *Laurence Sterne's A Sentimental Journey: A Legacy to the World* (due March 2021). At the risk of stirring envy, I mention one more publication, with New, editor of most volumes of The Florida Edition of Sterne, Blake co-edited the final, ninth volume: *Miscellaneous Writings and Sterne's Subscribers, an Identification List* (2014). This was a more important volume than recognized, for, although it did not offer a text for which Sterne is famous, it had the burden of culling the canon of anonymous works wrongly attributed to Sterne. It offers Sterne's "Memoirs," political writings in 1741-42, *A Political Romance*, and half a dozen or so other works; thereafter the volume includes New's personal hobby-horse, a 300-page examination of subscribers to Sterne's publications (certain to be very useful to anyone working on subscriptions in the period and any future biographer of Sterne or student of mid-century Yorkshire).

Blake Gerard carried on heroically after he had begun to fight cancer with debilitating therapies at various medical centers that would have made an ordinary man stumble and set aside at least one of his heavy commitments. Mindful of all that Blake accomplished after starting his career when roughly 40 years old, I close with lines from Dryden's "To the Memory of Mr. Oldham": "To the same goal did both our studies drive; / The last set out the soonest did arrive."—JEMay

Irma Spritz Lustig, 1921-2020

Irma Spritz Lustig, former EC/ASECS President and the editor of James Boswell, died 5 February in her native Philadelphia at the age of 98. There is a loving account of Irma's college years and early career by Barrows Dunham, "Irma Spritz Lustig," in the Fall 1989 *Intelligencer*. Irma studied philosophy with Dunham at Temple (he writes that at this bright and beautiful woman, "My heart leaped up"). Irma interrupted her education during WW2 to follow Rosie the Riveter into factory work. After the war she took other classes with Dunham and researched quotations of erroneous doctrines for his often reprinted *Man against Myth*, earning high praise in its acknowledgements. After taking her B.A. at Temple, she wrote her dissertation at Penn under the direction of Joe Scouten: "Boswell's Portrait of Himself in the *Life of Johnson*." Dunham picks up the story by noting her commitment to Boswell & Johnson and her marriage to Morton Lustig. Morton died in May 1984, after retiring from Penn, where he administered a Government Studies Center; Dunham characterized him as a man of "most sensitive wisdom, . . . a Johnson without the guffness." Irma and Dunham remained friends, and she persuaded him to translate John Ker's 1725 Latin poem *Donaides*, which with Irma's

introduction and David Mallet's imitation of Ker, treating repairs to the University of Aberdeen, became Augustan Reprint Series, no. 188 (1978).

The Spring 2020 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Scotland* carries a fine "In-Memoriam" tribute to Irma by Gordon Turnbull, General Editor of the Yale Boswell Editions. He notes that she became Managing Editor of the Yale Boswell in 1975 and joined its editorial board four years later. The NEH grant that she largely wrote "allowed the funding of significant expansions in the Editions staff, helping to accelerate work for . . . trade edition. Her appointment became Senior Research Associate in English, Yale University. With Frederick A. Pottle she co-edited *Boswell: The Applause of the Jury, 1782-1785* (1981) and *Boswell: the English Experiment, 1785-1789* (1986), contributing the introductions and much of the textual apparatus and annotations." She received other grants, as from ACLS and APS.

After retirement, she returned to Philadelphia and taught at Penn; in particular, in 1995-98 she taught a seminar on autobiography & fiction, and she twice taught NEH Summer Seminars for Teachers on Boswell and Johnson. Now becoming more active in EC/ASECS, from the late 1980s through the 1990s she regularly presented papers at our meetings—sometimes on panels with John Radner, both with probing biographical approaches. While EC/ASECS President she helped organize our 1992 conference with ECSSS in Philadelphia, then hosting a reception at her home. Irma contributed four times to the *Intelligencer* between December 1987 and September 1996. Her first contribution was on Frederick A. Pottle's memorial service at Yale, 12 November 1987 (she admired Pottle and spoke of him often), and her last was "James Boswell, Our Contemporary," which ended with a bibliography of the Yale Boswell trade and research editions.

The February 1996 *Intelligencer* contains a review of *Boswell, Citizen of the World, Man of Letters*, a collection of eleven essays that she edited (1995), including her own, "'My Dear Enemy': Margaret Montgomerie Boswell in the *Life of Johnson*." Turnbull characterizes it as a "subtle, original, and personal analysis of what she termed a 'sub-plot' in the biography, in which many of Samuel Johnson's letters to Boswell serve the deeper agenda of seeking to resolve the antipathy which Johnson knew Margaret had toward him." Turnbull's closing summation reads, "Her high achievements, in editing, scholarship, and project administration rank her as one of the most significant contributors" to the Boswell Edition. Irma was survived by her daughter Judy Scully, Judy's husband, and a grandson. We regret having lost touch with Irma during the last decade.—JEMay

Zoom into the EC/ASECS 2020 *Brief Intermission*, A Virtual Gathering, October 23rd and 24th

As you all know, our regional society's annual conference "Material Matters," scheduled for this fall at the Winterthur Museum and Library, Winterthur, Delaware, has been postponed to next year. Yet, don't despair of a whole year passing before we meet. The EC/ASECS 2020 organizers hope to see as many of you as possible at our virtual gathering, "A Brief Intermission."

Taking place via Zoom, the EC/ASECS's "A Brief Intermission" features five events held over two days, October 23rd and the 24th.

On Friday, the 23rd, a "Teaching & Research Roundtable" will launch our mini-conference at 4 pm. Later that evening, please join us for a perennial EC/ASECS favorite, the Aural/Oral Experience, which will start at 7:30 pm and run until 9 pm. If you have not yet contacted our inimitable Secretary, Peter Staffel, to let him know what you would like to read, please don't delay.

The next morning, Saturday the 24th, we will reconvene at 10 am to hear a panel of graduate students present papers as they compete for the Molin Prize. After a lunch break, we will gather for our annual business meeting. The 2020 Presidential Address will immediately follow. EC/ASECS President John Paul Heins, PhD, will deliver a talk entitled "Both Here and There in Wörlitz" with the ensuing Q&A bringing the mini-conference to a close.

While there is no charge for the conference and no need to be a current member to attend, we do ask you to register. You can do so by going to the "A Brief Intermission" website:

<https://ecasecsabriefintermission92586884.wordpress.com/>

and click on the registration tab. If you are not currently a member, we urge you to consider joining or renewing your membership. Complete membership information and a link to join online can be found at our society's website: <http://www.ec-asecs.org/>. Please direct any questions to the "A Brief Intermission" co-organizers, Professors Sylvia Kasey Marks and Eleanor Shevlin at ecasecs2020@gmail.com.

Additions and Corrections to the Directory

Ascher, James P. new member: (Graduate Student, English, U. of Virginia); james.ascher@gmail.com

Australian National University Library: / Menzies / Building 2 / Canberra, ACT 2601 / Australia

Bisnoff, Robert. 1913 N. Rhodes St, #15 / Arlington, VA 22201

Cahill, Samara: new email: samara.cahill57@gmail.com

Hahn, H. George. ghahn@towson.edu (English, Towson U.)

204 Enfield Road / Baltimore, MD 21212

Kennelly, Laura, & Robert Mayerovitch: new address for mail:

585 Grayton Road / Berea, OH 44017

Kinsley, William. (English, U. of Montreal, emeritus); Wbkinsley34@gmail.com;

3505 Jefferson St. / Hyattsville, MD 20782

Mace, Nancy: address for the next year: 116 8th Street / Indiana,

PA 15701; nmace4@gmail.com

Parker, Michael. mparker63@gmail.com

O'Donnell, Mary Ann. New Address: 6 Spruce Dr. / White Plains, NY 10605

Ormsby-Lennon, Hugh: address while in London: 70 Great Percy St., London WC1X 9QU

Richetti, John. 276 Riverside Dr., #9E / New York, NY 10025;

and in the right season: 1857 Cerros Colorados / Santa Fe, NM 87501; jrichett@gmail.com

Schonhorn, Manuel: new address: 301 W. 110th St., #2-S /
New York, NY 10026

Schneller, Beverly (Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Kentucky State
University, Frankfurt) email: beverly.schneller14@ gmail.com

Shanafelt, Carrie. Shanafelt@grinnell.edu; carrieshanafelt@gmail.com
(English, Fairleigh Dickinson U.)

Singh, Frances and Brijraj: new postal address: 7355 136th St. /
Flushing, NY 11367

Thomas, Leah. (Dept of Languages and Literatures) / Virginia State U. /
P.O. Box 9401 / Virginia State University, VA 23806

Van de Walle, Kwinten: vandewalle.kwinten @gmail.edu; Albert-Ludwigs U.
Freiburg, / Platz der Universität 3 / 79085 Freiburg / Germany

Walker, Adam. (Grad student, English, Harvard University) 6731 W. Brook
Dr. / Keystone Heights, FL 32656

News of Members

We should be grateful to **Sylvia Kasey Marks** and **Eleanor Shevlin**, co-chairs for our 2020 and now 2021 meetings—they have had to work unusually hard over shifting sands to organize our annual meeting. They signed on in fall 2019 to coordinate the 2020 meeting under considerable difficulties, before we had a location for the meeting, and then they had to scout possible locations. After initially searching out sites in Cape May, NJ, with the aid of Matthew Kinservik, they set up a meeting with splendid prospects to be held at The Winterthur Museum and Gardens on October 22-24. For lodging and events they secured the nearby Medenhall Inn and built up a strong program with the theme “Material Matters in the Long Eighteenth Century” (see their invitation on pp. 54-55 of the March *Intelligencer*). Matt Kinservik secured substantial funding from the University of Delaware to make it all possible. Then, the month of the last newsletter, covid-19 closed conferences, libraries, and schools. While we held our breath, the chairs polled members by email to ask who would come under iffy-viral conditions (44 yes, 65 no, most due to covid-19), and, so, our meeting was scrapped, requiring much more correspondence. (If you don’t receive emails from Executive Secretary Peter Staffel, please send him your address.). Members who booked rooms needed to cancel their reservations at the Mendenhall by calling 610-388-2100). Then Eleanor and Sylvia created an online conference with a series of presentations that all can zoom into without expense—hopefully this will lead to an even larger audience than would have gathered for papers in Winterthur. Above you will find their account of these programs, entitled “A Brief Intermission,” to be broadcast 23-24 October (when we would have been at the Winterthur). Remember that one need register for the invitational links to each of the four Zoom events. **Joanne Myers** is organizing a Teaching and Research Roundtable for Friday, which should be helpful to those teaching, given the shift to remote and mixed instructional formats. Peter Staffel is still seeking readers and singers for Aural/Oral Experience on Friday at 7:30 p.m. **Anthony Lee** stepped up to draft new procedures for the Molin Prize competition to be

held online with three speakers from 10-11:30 Saturday. Peter will lead us through the business meeting at 1:00, immediately followed by **John Paul Heins's** Presidential Address. After our Zoom extravaganza is concluded, Sylvia and Eleanor will work toward the postponed conference, still themed "Material Matters in the Long Eighteenth Century," to be held at Winterthur Museum to Fall 2021 at a date to be announced. They will issue a new call for papers in the spring of 2021, but they are hoping that those who were intending to speak in 2020 will keep their papers for the 2021 meeting--or update them with newer work. All involved hope our 2021 meeting will make up with vitality for the privations of the shut-down.

In her introduction to the Spring 2020 *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*, "Journal Work in the Time of Corona Virus" **Jennifer L. Airey**, reflects on our beleaguered situation, noting for many that "productivity is . . . a way of reestablishing some sense of normalcy and control." **Corey Andrews** received a research travel grant from Youngstown State U. for his newest book project: "A Bard's Epitaph: The Lives of Robert Burns, 1828-2009." He writes that "It will examine both biographical and creative representations of the poet, beginning with John Gibson Lockhart's controversial biography in 1828 and ending with the most recent biography, written by Robert Crawford in 2009 during Scotland's Year of the Homecoming (a celebration of Burns's 250th birthday). I hope to conduct research in Glasgow, Edinburgh, and Ayr in summer 2021." This year's *Eighteenth-Century Scotland* includes Corey's review of Arum Sood's *Robert Burns and the United States of America: Poetry, Print, and Memory, 1786-1866*. We are lucky to have among our new members **James Ascher**, a graduate student at Virginia, who heard of the *Intelligencer* on C18-L and intends to present at future meetings. ASECS President Jeffrey Ravel reported in May that the Executive Board renewed **Lisa Berglund's** term as Executive Director (it expired 20 June) and its office will remain at Buffalo State College. The review "found that Professor Berglund has been an excellent steward of the Society for the past three years. With the assistance of the ASECS Office Manager, Dr. Aimee Levesque, Professor Berglund has updated many of the Society's administrative processes. She has run two successful annual conferences, in Orlando and Denver, and guided us through the painful process of canceling this year's conference in St. Louis with great thought and diligence. Her engagement with American Council of Learned Societies on behalf of the Society has resulted in the implementation of many best practices that will benefit us for years to come. . . . our finances remain sound." On 11 Sept. Lisa led a Zoom roundtable regarding the use of ECCO, which Gale Cengage provided free to ASECS members through 30 Sept., an opportune time. Representatives from Gale supposedly participated to help it assess its value (not necessarily to correct its many blunders and citation errors since corrected in ESTC).

This year *Eighteenth-Century Studies* is running "ASECS at 50" interviews, about four in each issue. In March I noted the impressive long interview featuring **T. E. D. Braun**. The Spring issue includes Jess Keiser's "Interview with **John Richetti**" and Rebekah Mitsein's with **Maximilian Novak**." Spring's reviews include Misty Krueger's of Devoney Looser's *The Daily Jane Austen: A Year of Quotes* and George Boulukos's of *Teaching*

Modern British and American Satire ed. by **Evan R. Davis** and Nicholas Nace (a book discussed in our last issue). We are proud to note that the Summer issue offers Sonja Lawrenson's "Interview with **Kevin Joel Berland**, former EC/ASECS President, well known for founding C18-L. With a jovial tone and candor, Kevin remarks on his own career and the intellectual travels that led to certain projects and also on the changing state of teaching and scholarship (he recognizes the role of EC/ASECS and many of our members in his career).

In 2021 at Winterthur we hope to shake hands with new member **Robert Bissnoff**. Robert practices law in Washington, DC, and holds a PhD from Arizona State U., having written a dissertation on poetry of the late 18C and decades of the Romantics. Robert teaches at the U. of Northern Virginia—he has a book MS awaiting acceptance at a publisher's. In June Edinburgh U. Press published **Thomas F. Bonnell's** edition of Vol. 4: *1780-1784* of James Boswell's *'Life of Johnson', An Edition of the Original Manuscript, in Four Volumes*. This completes the Yale Boswell Editions' Manuscript Edition of the *Life of Johnson*, "designed to stand as a research supplement to the Hill-Powell version of the *Life*. The first volume, edited by Marshall Waingrow and covering the years 1709–1765, appeared in 1994, and the second, 1766–1776, edited by Bruce Redford with Elizabeth Goldring, in 1998." Tom's edition of the third, 1776-1780, was published in 2012. "This fourth volume continues to trace Boswell's processes of composition from first draft to final publication. It restores much deleted material and passages overlooked or misread during the initial typesetting and subsequent revisions in proof. Brought to light for correction in the process are a host of errors that have stood in all editions of Boswell's biographical masterwork." As with volume three, Tom's critical and textual apparatus untangles many knots and reveals "Boswell's processes of selection and deletion." The hardback volume, 506 pp., is priced \$95.00 / \$125.00 (ISBN: 9780748606054; also available in ebook). **Samara Cahill** wrote us a nice note on the March issue: "For those of us negotiating the broad gap between being beginners and senior members of the profession it is such a delight to read the perspectives of those who can think back through 50 years of eighteenth-century studies. I know I'm not the only junior/mid-career-ish scholar who enjoys hearing more of the particulars (formal realism!) of how leading lights of eighteenth-century scholarship were real people, at real institutions, who had real influence on younger scholars and generations. Eighteenth-century studies generates a great community in the present, but labors of communal love like the March issue remind us that the community encompasses past, present, and future generations. For a variety of reasons, personal and professional, the March issue is a treasure." (Good karma led to the quick return of **Allison Gibeily's** review of Sam's book, printed above.)

Tita Chico contributed a review essay entitled "Periodicals and Feminism, in Practice" to the Winter 2019 issue of *The Eighteenth Century* (v. 60.4), which she co-edits. Her focus is the important collection *Women's Periodicals and Print Culture in Britain, 1680-1820*, ed. by Jennie Batchelor and **Manushag Powell** (2018). This same issue includes a review by Peggy Thompson of **Jocelyn Harris's** *Satire, Celebrity, and Politics in Jane Austen*. **Lorna Clark's** *Burney Letter* for Spring (26.1) begins with **Peter Sabor's** celebration "Journals and Letters of Frances Burney Complete!" The first 12

of 25 volumes under the editorship of Joyce Hemlow appeared in 1972-83; OUP published the final volume, the sixth and last of the *Court Journals*, ed. by Nancy Johnson, in 2019 (it includes Burney's letter to Mary Gwynn in August 1789 discovered in 2018—future discoveries will be posted on Oxford Scholarly Editions Online). Lorna and Peter each edited two volumes. The issue includes Theodore Mould on the Burney family as music patrons and A. P. Woolrich on Dr. Charles Burney and Marmaduke Overend, the “scientific organist of Isleworth.” Also the Society's President Elaine Bander reviews Johnson's *Court Journals* Vol. VI, and Beth Cortese reviews Hillary Havens' *Revising the Eighteenth-Century Novel: Authorship from Manuscript to Print* (CUP, 2019), with chapters on Burney, Austen, and Richardson. **Marilyn Francus**, editor of *Burney Journal*, in a status report announces that Hillary Havens (hhavens1@utk.edu) will co-edit Vol. 17 and then take over with Vol. 18. Lorna's Fall *Burney Letter* arrived in early August. It begins with her account of an enamelled posy ring sold at auction in March 2019 that was reputedly owned by Frances Burney and is now in private hands; the white enamelled band has the gold letters “SA DOUCEUR M'ENCHANTE.” The issue includes **Emily Friedman**'s account of the 2019 joint meeting of the N.A. Burney and the Behn societies in Auburn; **Anthony W. Lee**'s “‘Hand in Hand’: Johnson and Burney, Pope, and Swift, Dryden and du Fresnoy,” identifying quotations and allusions in Burney's report of a 1780 conversation with Johnson; and Peter Sabor's account of “Two New Burney Letters” with a good illustration of FB's letter of 15 January 1784 to Mary Delany. Three reviews follow, including one of John Wiltshire's *Frances Burney and the Doctors* (2019). **Greg Clingham** is hoping the research travel with lectures in South Africa, cancelled by the pandemic, will soon occur. Greg has been looking for good material for a new book series he co-edits for Clemson UP.

On Labor Day weekend, **Kevin Cope**, writing for himself and co-editor **Cedric D. Reverand II**, announced to contributors that Bucknell U. Press “has released our . . . Festschrift in honor of publisher, bibliophile, and friend Gabriel Hornstein,” *Paper, Ink, and Achievement: Gabriel Hornstein and the Revival of 18C Scholarship*, 252 pp. with 10 b/w and 2 color images (distributed by Rutgers U. Press, 800-621-2736; \$24.46 in paperback with 30% off + free shipping with discount code RFLR19 in the US and Rutgers20 in Canada). Ric and Kevin hope “that the many colleagues around the world who have benefited from or read publications released under the aegis of Gabe Hornstein and the legendary AMS Press will want to own what is likely to be the final publication pertinent to what Ric Reverand has genially characterized as the Maecenas of our specialty field. It can be ordered at Bucknell's website or purchased from Amazon or Barnes & Noble. Mindful that few university presses publish festschrifts any longer, Kevin urges us to recommend the volume to colleagues and post information about it on social media. Besides Kevin (who edited two), other EC/ASECS members edited annuals published by AMS Press: **George Justice & Al Rivera**, **Jack Lynch & John Scanlan**, and **Linda Troost**. See our tribute to Gabe in March 2017 (31.1:53-54). The volume contains Ric Reverand's Foreward “Gabriel Hornstein (1935-2017)”; Kevin Cope's Introduction; then in Section 1 on Publishing: **J. T. Scanlan**, “Raising the Price of Literature: The Benefactions of William Strahan and

Bennet Cerf”; **Leah Orr**, “Eighteenth-Century Publishers and the Creation of a Fiction Genre”; **James E. May**, “Elizabeth Sadleir, Master Printer in Dublin, 1715-1727”; Section 2 on Neglected Authors: **Susan Spencer**, “Ihara Saikaku and the Cash Nexus in Edo-Era Osaka”; **Linda Troost**, “Frances Brooke, *Rosina*, Sense and Sensibility”; **Manuel Schonhorn**, “Justus Lipsius, Alexander Pope, and *An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*”; Section 3 on Reevaluating Literary Modes: Brett C. McNelly, “‘When Worlds Collide’: Anti-Methodist Literature and the Rise of Popular Literary Criticism in the *Critical Review* and *Monthly Review*”; David Venturo, “Swift, Dryden, Virgil, and Theories of Epic in Swift’s *Description of a City Shower*”; and Philip Smallwood, “Tensions, Contraries, and Blake’s Augustan Values” (plus bibliography, etc.). We’ll need a reviewer—ideally someone who’ll say Jim May has revealed wonders about the Dublin print trade!

Manuel Schonhorn, born 1930, has a new pacemaker with new wires, and appreciates all the good thoughts of all this EC/ASECS colleagues and friends during mid-winter when he wasn’t tick-tock. He is delighted to receive his last article out this fall in Kevin and Ric’s “thrilling well-deserved and beautifully imagined festschrift for unique Gabriel Hornstein. We owe Gabe a lot, as all of us of THAT generation know.” He recollected with pleasure visiting Gabe in his “impossible office” and enjoying “the Italian lunches he was so generous with”: “What a day it was to go to Brooklyn, to AMS’s warehouse, factory and inner sanctum, to see books upon books piled up and mounted on the metal book cases in the storage area as far as the eye could penetrate, to ride that finicky elevator to Gabe’s closet, his desk filled always to eye height with books, articles, drafts, correspondences, all encircled in the tobacco smoke that, like Gabe and his excitement and his respectful dedication to scholars and learning, brought us to another time and place and power. What a boost the visit was to my self-esteem and my sense of participating in a noble enterprise!” (Like me, Kevin was glad to hear recollected Gabe’s dining and smoking—Gabe wasn’t much on “the excessive sobriety of our profession” and, given all the open-bar receptions he paid for, might well find the current conferences smacking of a “new age of Puritanism” full of isolated careerists.)

JoEllen DeLucia reviewed Richard Gough Thomas’s *William Godwin: A Political Life* in *ECF*, 32.4 (2020), 655-57. This summer’s *ECF* is strong and diverse like most, working with an expanded canon—it includes, for instance, **Mercy Cannon**’s “On the Edges of the Gothic: The Neglected Work of Mrs. F. C. Patrick and Sarah Green.” What I found particularly interesting and recommend to fellow dinosaurs was Amy Culley’s recommendation of *The Future of Feminist 18C Scholarship: Beyond Recovery*, edited by Robin Runia (Rutledge, 2017), a collection of nine essays fighting “‘an uncomfortable undercurrent’ of feeling in 18C literary studies that ‘the feminist recovery project . . . has done its work.’” The message is that it has but moved beyond poetry and the novel to “travel writing, autobiography, letters, and translation . . . both print and manuscript” (32.4:641). Future directions involve such fields as “trauma, disability, ageing, material culture,” etc., and an encouragement “to examine our own culpability in the perpetration of under-examined assumptions or metanarratives about

18C women's writing" (quoting from p. 4). *The Oxford Handbook of the Eighteenth-Century Novel*, 2016, edited by **Alan Downie** has just been re-issued with minor corrections in paperback—it has always been available at OUP's website to subscribers,—and Alan and Nick Seager are editing *The Oxford Handbook of Daniel Defoe*. Alan wrote in April that most of the essays were in. He is contributing two essays to Cambridge UP's 'In Context' books series: "Professional Authorship" to *Daniel Defoe in Context*, edited by **George Justice** and **Al Rivero**, and 'Pamphleteering and Political Journalism' to *Jonathan Swift in Context*, edited by Joe Hone and Pat Rogers. Sometime between October and January, Anthem Press of London and New York will publish **John Dussinger's** *Samuel Richardson as Anonymous Editor and Printer: Recycling Texts for the Book Market* (pp. 250, in hardback \$120 and paper \$40). The publisher describes it as "a comprehensive account of Richardson's numerous editorial interventions in producing books and pamphlets for his press." John's been throwing off discoveries about SR's printing and editing for at least two decades, and this will be an indispensable book for the study of Richardson and the London book market of the 1720s-50s. **Michael Edson's** *Annotation in 18C Poetry*, reviewed here in the last issue is also reviewed favorably in the last *Scriblerian* by **Mel New**, in Cynthia Wall's annual survey for *SEL*, and by Bridget Keegan in the January 2020 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Life*. In that January *ECL* (44.1:104-12), we also find Michael's "Planned Obsolescence," a review essay on *The Oxford Handbook of British Poetry, 1660-1800*, edited by **Jack Lynch** (2016). It is a superbly researched and executed comparative analysis of Lynch's handbook with two others, *The Cambridge Companion to 18C Poetry*, ed. by John Sitter (2001) and Wiley's *A Companion to 18C Poetry*, ed. by Christine Gerrard (2006), with thoughtful reflexions on the aims of essay collections as guidebooks (mentioning others by way of introduction and along the way).

In the spring appeared vol. 52.2 of *The Scriblerian*, edited by **W. B. Gerard** and E. Derek Taylor, with **Melanie Holm** as Managing Editor, and with many in EC/ASECS serving as contributing editors: **Frank Boyle**, **Anthony Lee**, **Mel New**, **Yvonne Noble**, **Mary Anne O'Donnell**, **Rivka Swenson**, **Kathy Temple**, **Linda V. Troost**, and **Robert G. Walker**. The issue includes book reviews by **Vincent Carretta**, **John Dussinger**, **Leah Orr** (whose own book *Novel Ventures* is here reviewed by **Emily Friedman**), **Manushag Powell**, **Carole Sargent**, **Mel New**, and **Robert Walker** (whose two reviews include Robert DeMaria and **O M Brack's** Yale edition *Johnson on Demand* and Stefka Ritchie's *The Reformist Ideas of Samuel Johnson*). **Jim May** contributed his "Scribleriana Transferred" column and an appreciation of the late **Donald Mell**, and many members contributed reviews or had their work reviewed, among the latter are **Teri Doerksen's**, **William McCarthy's**, and **Peter Sabor's** essays on Richardson in a gathering edited by Louise Curran in *ECF* 2016-17 [29.2]; **Anthony Lee** on Dr. Johnson; **David Palumbo** "lively and provocative essay" on Swift's *Modest Proposal*; **Sandro Jung's** remarks about illustrations of Thomson's *The Seasons* (correcting errors while illustrating the usual erudition and severity of *Scriblerian's* reviews); **Kwinten Van de Walle's** "helpful survey and useful compendium"

of “The French Translations of Thomson’s *The Seasons*” and **Tara Ghoshal Wallace**’s on Pope’s Abélard and Eloisa).

In two tributes above we celebrate our late colleagues **W. Blake Gerard** and **Roy Wolper**, longtime members who were editors-in-chief of *The Scriblerian*, the only review journal surveying Restoration and 18C English literature. *Scriblerian* has expanded its attention further into the 18C, now reviewing studies of Goldsmith, Hume, Johnson, and Adam Smith. Thus, it responds to the shift in 18C studies, with the greater attention to women authors playing a role in the expansion—*Restoration* is similarly adapting, the most recent issue having almost nothing on Restoration writers. Our news-of-members section is always full of reference to *The Scriblerian*, for its issues typically carry contributions from over 50 scholars, its two issues having twice the number of contributions that some quarterlies have in a year. The many who read it cover to cover would fail without it to hear of important articles (they, not books, are easily missed). Roy co-founded the journal in 1967-68 (after coming to Temple U.) with Peter Tasch and Arthur Weitzman. Roy seemed to *Scriblerian* contributors to be irreplaceable, but then Blake replaced him, with the recent issues maintaining *Scrib*’s high-quality content, editing, and production values. **Melvyn New** has written a fine tribute to Blake for *The Scriblerian* and *The Shandean* (i.e., “Sterne studies”), on whose editorial board Blake served from 2014. Mel, whom Blake sought out at Florida as a mentor and who drew Blake into his responsibilities at *Scriblerian*, has joined with fellow editors **Melanie Holm**, E. Derek Taylor, and Donald Wehr to get the Autumn 2020 issue printed and distributed and to plan the journal’s future. This sad circumstance is an occasion for appreciative readers and contributors to pay their subscription (\$20), to submit outstanding reviews, and to consider if they have the expertise to fill a slot in the journal’s editorial board.

In November Palgrave Macmillan will publish *Birds in 18C Literature: Reason, Emotion, and Ornithology, 1700-1840*, edited by **Sayre Greenfield**, Brycchan Carey and Ann Milne. The essays treat representations of birds in diverse genres, by such authors as A. L. Barbauld, W. Cowper, J. Gay, H. Fielding, C. Smith, L. Sterne, G. White, M. Wollstonecraft, and W. Wordsworth. See www.palgrave.com/gp/book/9783030327910. On 28 April **Philip Harth** died at an assisted-living home in Madison, where he had lived for ten years or more. Harth, took his doctorate from the U. of Chicago first to Northwestern and then to Wisconsin Madison, where he taught from 1965-1996. Besides much more, he was the author of three seminal books: *Swift and Anglican Rationalism* (1961), *Contexts of Dryden’s Thought* (1968), and *Pen for a Party: Dryden’s Tory Propaganda in its Contexts* (1993). Colleagues and former students soon posted tributes to this distinguished scholar and teacher of English Restoration and early 18C literature. **Howard Weinbrot**, who co-edited a festschrift to Harth (*Eighteenth-Century Contexts* . . ., 2001), wrote that, “In active life as in retirement, he was and is a model from which I learned and toward which I continue to strive.” **Stephen Karian**, another editor of that festschrift, has written a very insightful and thorough account of Harth’s scholarly accomplishments and virtues as a critic and scholar (examining the books noted above and other efforts, such as his textual criticism); Steve also attends with anecdotes to Harth’s superb teaching, driven

by passion for the literature and facilitated by a “prodigious memory” and biting sense of humor. It will appear in next year’s *Swift Studies*, along with a contribution by Weinbrot in an issue that editor **Hermann J. Real** is shaping as a tribute to Harth. Also with regard to Harth, **Maureen Mulvihill** wrote, “Philip Harth was a valuable adviser of mine at Wisconsin, and his seminar on Dryden and Pope was the highlight of my first year in Wisconsin’s doctoral program. He was respected and also liked by students and advisees. His published work on Swift, Dryden, Mandeville, as well as his important contribution to the early formation of ASECS, shall be long remembered.”

Robert D. Hume has produced a long essay with a “massive table” entitled “Paratext Printed with New English Plays, 1660-1700,” which may end up on the WWW—it’s long for a journal and short for a book. It is a valuable examination of the paratexts in Restoration editions digested in the introductory essay. The paratexts recorded and examined include author credit, genre designation, “auspices” (where performed and by whom), license, dedication, prefaces, list of characters, cast of performers in first production, location of action, and prologue & epilogue. Rob examines “every new play known to have been professionally performed and subsequently published in London,” with footnotes often offering new information on the performed and published versions of the plays. General trends are quantified whenever useful, often compared to those of earlier and later periods—e.g., Rob notes that 20 of 68 plays in the 1660s offered the names of actors, then 79 of 125 in the 1670s, and 100 of 123 in the 1690s; that dedications appeared in only 29% of the plays of 1660s but in 61% for 1660-1700; and that only 35% of plays new when licensing was required bore a license. This month Routledge published **Beverly Jerold’s** Royal Musical Asso. Monograph on a subject with “striking parallels with today’s current events”: *Disinformation in Mass Media: Gluck, Puccini and the Journal of Paris*. As the publisher’s blurb indicates, the book focuses on a divisive disinformation campaign by the *Journal of Paris* (founded 1777): “To attract a large readership and bar competition for C. W. Gluck’s works at the Paris Opéra, it [the *Journal*] launched a prolonged campaign of anonymous lies, mockery and defamation against two prominent members of the Académie Française who wished the Opéra to be open to all deserving composers.” Unlike most of Beverly’s publications, this book with its political drama is not only for musicologists. Another that should appeal to a broad readership is her “A 1760 Dream for Better Performance Standards” in *The Musical Times*, 161/1952 (Fall 2020), 85-99. Bless **Jacob Sider Jost** for trying to make me feel good after calling him “Justin” in the last printed issue. **Sandro Jung** (Shanghai U. of Finance & Economics) edited a special, April issue of *ECL* on “Literary Ephemera.” **William Kinsley’s** been paying EC/ASECS dues for 30 years from Montreal, and, after he made the anticipated move to Maryland to be near family and thought he would be attending EC/ASECS regularly, covid-19 came along. See you in 2021!

In June **Katharine Kittredge** launched an online newsletter entitled *The Early Children’s Literature and Culture Chronicle* (her description is provided below). Last February died **Irma S. Lustig**, Boswell scholar and former EC/ASECS President (1992); she is remembered in a tribute above and another by Gordon Turnbull in *Eighteenth-Century Scotland*--right after

another by **Jeff Loveland** on his mentor and collaborator **Frank Kafker** (one was and the other is our expert on encyclopedias). Boydell in September published **Ashley Marshall's** new book *Political Journalism in London, 1695-1720: Defoe, Swift, Steele and their Contemporaries* (328 pp). Ashley examines the “evolving ideologies of London’s political newspapers” of the period. Publications in this decade have not responded to how much 18C journalism is now digitized—Ashley is tapping a field with opportunities. Boydell is offering a 40% discount with promo code BB873 through 31 December, bringing the price down from \$115 to \$69. I should buy it, for I know from her prior work (including the essays on Steele praised in here March) that it will teach much I should know. I often lament how miserly we academics are, relying on campus libraries for access to a journal that is only 20-some bucks a year, etc., yet living for our own publications that we expect others to buy. I’d bet most American scholars spend far more on their cable TV bills than on printed research materials. **William McCarthy** contributed to the Spring 2020 *Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature* (v. 39.1) the critique and addenda “The Lim Transcriptions of Anna Letitia Barbauld’s Letters to Lydia Rickards.” Last October (33.2:71), we reported on this article by Jessica W. H. Lim with transcriptions of Barbauld’s 30-some holograph letters to Lydia Rickards (and three to her mother), written between 1798-1815. McCarthy states that Lim’s transcriptions of Barbauld’s difficult hand are “often erroneous.” He should know, for Bill purchased the originals and, after transcribing and photographing them, passed them on to the Carl H. Pforzheimer Collection of the NYPL in 2016. As the biographer and editor of Barbauld, knowing her hand well and the subject and context of her remarks, he transcribed the texts more correctly, finding 249 errors, involving 18 words added, 30 words omitted, and 201 words misconstrued (151-52).

James M. McGlathery died this past spring. *Encyclopedia.com* records that Jim was born in New Orleans in 1936, educated at Princeton and Yale (Ph.D. 1964), and, after teaching German at Harvard 1963-65, he taught German literature at Illinois in Urbana from 1965 to 2000, where he chaired the Department for ten years and long was managing editor of *JEGP* (1972-2000). After an illness in middle age, Jim was confined to a wheelchair, but remained so active that the word “confined” seems wrong. He and his wife Nancy participated in several EC/ASECS after his retirement, giving papers on opera libretto. Jim wrote and edited a number of books, such as *Desire’s Story: The Plays and Stories of Heinrich von Kleist* (1983), *The Brothers Grimm and Folktales* (1991), *Music and German Literature* (1992), the Twayne series *E. T. A. Hoffmann* (1997), and *Wagner’s Operas and Desire* (1998). During the past year, **Ellen Moody** delivered a paper for a Trollope Society group online (run by the London Branch) called “The Modernity of Trollope’s *Last Chronicle of Barset*,” which the Victorian web editor has put on their site. She delivered the lecture by Zoom, and the video is on YouTube and the Trollope Society site. It is prettier and more contextualized at <https://trollopesociety.org/about/lectures/chronicle-barsset/>. At our Gettysburg meeting in 2019, Ellen delivered “‘At this crossroads of my life’: Books and Movies about Culloden and its Aftermath.,” focusing on Naomi Mitchinson’s historical novel, *The Bull Calves*. Her project on Winston Graham’s *Poldark* has

morphed into a book on historical romance set in marginalized areas in the long 18C. She writes, “Teaching came to a sudden stand still with the pandemic, but I managed to learn Zoom and taught a course about the Bloomsbury group at both OLLIs this summer. I’ve returned to writing regularly at my online blog essays on 18C women painters, actresses and poets (<http://reveriesunderthesignofausten.wordpress.com/>).

In April, **Mel New** wrote of his pleasure on receiving a copy of the Folio Society’s limited edition (750 copies) of *Tristram Shandy* (“beautifully done”), whose text reprintd Mel and Joan New’s Florida edition: “[ten] illustrations are by Tom Phillips, and, while I quarrel with illustrated texts (I think Sylvia Marks in her presidential address commented on comic-book versions of texts), I am pleased with this--Phillips does an illustration at the beginning of each volume, and they all reflect his usual bricolage/collage style, which allows him to absorb images from the text--which he has obviously read carefully. The text is set in Caslon; the marbled page [by Jemma Lewis] is unique in each. The two volumes are in a cloth box [10”], with the text in one volume and in vol. 2 the commentary on the art work by Patrick Wildgust (of Shandy Hall) and my introduction and annotations from the Penguin ed. All in all, very nice, although whether [it is] worth \$350 except to collectors, I rather doubt.” Mel is pleased to see “another tribute to Sterne.” An advt on the WWW claims “over half” the copies have sold. Min Wild in the *TLS* of June 12 reviewed the edition of Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* edited by **Max Novak**, Irving Rothman, and **Manuel Schonhorn** (Bucknell UP, 2020), remarking that “if it’s not [the definitive edition], I can’t imagine what one would look like. . . . Maximillian Novak has been “Mr Defoe” for a long time, with his authoritative biography *Master of Fictions* leading the field. . . . This book does all that you could ask of a thoroughly scholarly work, but won’t deter any enquirer; its introduction is thorough, judicious and wise, its bibliographical apparatus refrains from crowding the story and authentic illustrations are expertly annotated. Crisp footnotes, on the right page, are thorough, responsible and concise. . . . The book indeed might serve as a teaching example of what a truly effective scholarly edition can do, with its fine-grained bibliographical descriptions and painstaking variants section.” (See **John Richetti**’s review above.) **Mary Ann O’Donnell** published “A Survey of the Poetry Collection in Manuscript of the Noble Family of Huntingdon” in the *Harvard Library Bulletin* this year, in Vol. 28, no. 3 (Fall 2017). The editors announced previously that “Following the release of volumes 27.3 and 28.1-3, the publication . . . will go on hiatus as the journal is redesigned. At that time, our subscription program will cease.” Mary Ann says a couple of years ago a new editorial team took over in whom she has great confidence. **David Palumbo** wrote at the end of May while sending out invitations to participate in a panel on Swift in honor of **Don Mell** (for 2020, now 2021). David wrote that his essay “Raillery and Satire in the Bathurst-Swift Correspondence” was accepted for *Swift Studies*, vol. 36 (2021): “This essay had its start at the 2012 EC/ASECS Swift panel that you and I participated on with **Gene Hammond** and **Ashley Marshall**. Don was honored right before our session. I was sad that I could not share the good news about the essay with him.” At Emmanuel College this past year, David, who co-chairs the

curriculum committee and is also a member of a Title IX task force, served on the Phase II committee tasked with reorganizing the General Education Program. The good news is that the College now has “a new General Education Program set to start in 2021.” The bad news is that David has found himself “on the Phase III committee, which will create rubrics for the new GE Program and approve classes for it.” His summer plan was to write a paper on “rhetorical connections between Anne Finch and Swift in Finch’s poems.”

Christopher N. Phillips will talk about his book *The Hymnal: A Reading History* in the Library Company’s online Fireside Chat series on 1 October. The study was published by Johns Hopkins UP in August 2018, 272 pp; illus. (priced \$39.95 on Amazon, 29.95 for Kindle). JHUP describes it as the first book-length study of the practice of reading and using hymnals, tracing influences on poetry, literacy, and devotion. In his introduction, Christopher indicates that the book is crafted for non-specialists and specialists alike (the notes serving esp. the latter). He departs from the old approach that relied on singing as the principal feature distinguishing hymns from religious poetry, and stresses experiences peculiar to the practices of hymnody: people read (or sing) “rightly when they can voice the words as if they were their own.” He situates hymns and hymnody “within larger discourses of poetry, sentimentalism, and denominational identity.” He now is working on a related book. **Manushag Powell** edited a special issue of *Restoration* in the spring (44.1) dedicated to Eliza Haywood. Essays on Haywood included **Catherine Ingrassia**’s “Eliza Haywood’s Captive Message (67-86) and others by Kathryn King on “Haywood’s Old-Age Rewritings of *Love in Excess*,” Anna K. Sagal on *The Female Spectator*, Helen Thompson on *Secret Histories*, and Aleksondra Hultquist on *Lasselia*. *Restoration*’s editor, **Tita Chico**, added some reviews, including one of a collection of essays, *Travel and Travail*, treating early 17C women travelers, half on representations of them and half on their writings, and another of *The Circuit of Apollo: 18C Women’s Tributes to Women*, edited by Laura Runge and Jessica Cook (2019), to which Catherine Ingrassia also contributed. Reviewer Paula Backscheider remarks that the essays highlight how “literary achievement and personal friendship are intertwined” (as might be said of 21C scholarly achievement).

Elizabeth Powers’ article “In their Father’s Library: Books Furnish not only a Room but also a Tradition,” appears in Spring-Summer 2020 *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and Classics* (Boston U.), 28.1: 115-30. Elizabeth asks questions about the canonical tradition, particularly c. 1800 with reference to Frances Burney and Goethe, and also about recent efforts to identify a tradition of English literary women (heavily dependent on writing for the marketplace). She also brings in for comparison the somewhat ironic 21C responses to the tradition by English-language authors from outside the Anglophone world. The essay offers great critical writing, big and ambitious, shaking the whole tree. The definition of literary traditions and their role in generating great literature is excellent, as Elizabeth problematizes the balance of the new and the inherited (see p. 125). Goethe’s remarks about the pace of transience, his *veloziferisch*, has great resonance. The closing warning (or lament) put me in mind of my fear that scholars read too little of what was formerly written by good critics and scholars of the 20C and too little of

literary masterpieces, especially of poetry before our period, rarely taught to literature majors. Elizabeth wrote the chapter “Critiquing the Enlightenment: The Seminar on 18C European Culture (#417)” on pp. 16-29 in *A Community of Scholars: 75 Years of the University Seminars at Columbia*, ed. by Thomas Vinciguerra (Columbia, 2020; xxvi + 235). In this retrospective celebration, Elizabeth’s concerns the 417th seminar in the series, begun in 1962.

In the last issue when recommending that younger scholars apply for the travel grant offered by the Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies, I misspelled the first name of Sabine Baltes-Ellermann, who generously established the endowment (on applying for the grant, see below). **Hermann J. Real**, in his preface to the 2020 issue of *Swift Studies* (vol. 35) reports on the research conducted by two fellowship winners: Dr. Corrina Readioff of Liverpool, who worked on the illustrations of *A Tale of a Tub*, and Marleen Waffler, a doctoral student at Erlangen-Nürnberg, who researched Dr. Arbuthnot. Readioff also won the 7th Richard H. Rodino Prize (\$300) for the best article on Swift and his age in 2017-18 by a scholar not yet tenured. The report on Centre activities includes a year spent editing the seventh *Reading Swift* volume, reviewed above by **Paul deGategno** (a tough assignment if only due to its 700 pp.); also the many volumes acquired (the duplication of Swift’s library zipped passed 94% completion and Hermann could not list them all), and tributes to some late Swift scholars, including **Donald C. Mell**. Hermann offers deep appreciation of the Centre’s staff, colleagues, and patrons (**Gene Hammond** atop the list), adding a bibliography of “Recent Books and Articles Received” (many contributed by their authors—a smart gift for anyone with extra off-prints). The issue contains two essays by Pat Rogers, “Dr. John Arbuthnot and the Smallpox War of 1719” and “Authorship and Xenophobia in *The Devil to Pay at St. James’s*: John Arbuthnot and the Rival Queens of Opera”; other essays include Remi Majersdorf’s “Adapting Swift for an Imagined Audience: . . . , Four 21C Children’s Versions of *Gulliver’s Travels*”; and Shanee Stepakoff’s “Hiding in Plain Sight: Juacophobia in Swift’s Portray of the Yahoos in *GT*”; Hermann’s “Swiftiana Rarissima: New Acquisitions by the Ehrenpreis Centre” and Ulrich Elkmann’s “Dr. Franz Kottenkamp, Translator of *Gulliver*: Addenda to his Biography.” Hermann does not cover a momentous event at the center at the end of May: since 2015 he has been engineering the adoption of responsibilities for the Centre by the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, that the Centre may survive until doom’s day, and now that has been accomplished, with WWU pledging such improvements as expanded space with atmospheric controls for the library. Dr. Klaus Stierstorfer replaces Hermann as Director and Dr. Kirsten Juhas as the Centre’s Manager and Dr. Janika Bischof becomes the Centre’s Treasurer); also, both Juhas and Bischof become permanent members of the university. Hermann’s resignation as Director allowed his friends to honor him in June with a framed certificate, drafted by **James Woolley** and **Andrew Carpenter** and presented to him out of the blue by Dirk Paßmann for the Centre’s Advisory Board (seven of whom are EC/ASECS members)—before fitting libations and photographs. The text offers thanks for such services to scholarship as mentoring and teaching young scholars, providing research and publication opportunities as by founding *Swift Studies* 35 years

ago, holding seven symposia, creating a superb collection, undertaking the *Swift.Online* edition, and for his own many publications in multiple languages.

The Sentimental Novel in the 18C ed. by **Albert Rivero** as well as **Eve Tavor Bannet's** *18C Manners of Reading* are reviewed in the Summer *ECS*. The Winter 2019 issue of *The Eighteenth Century* (v. 60.4) includes **Laura J. Rosenthal's** interesting review of Lisa Freeman's *Antitheatricality and the Body Politic* (2017). Laura notes that Freeman, plunging "in depth into specific cases of antitheatricality" (the first involves Puritan William Prynne), rejects Jonas Barish's claims of an embedded antitheatricality in the West since Plato (1981), finding theater contributes to a "body public" and is therefore resisted by those supporting other, usually undemocratic, forms of authority. Theater has the "potential to unsettle hierarchies of class, religion, gender, and sexuality." Laura concludes by applauding Freeman's pro-theatrical book for finding "something to like, even defend . . . when the arts and humanities are under attack." **Christoforos Sarris**, who graduated in May from West Chester U., where he studied book history with **Eleanor Shevlin**, has begun an M.A. program in English at Villanova, after considering offers of assistantships and/or fellowships also from Temple, Lehigh, and Delaware. He will pursue his interests in book history and American history and literature before 1900. The Library Company awarded him a summer internship in consequence of his selection for the PAAH Mellon Scholars Program intended to strengthen the field of early African-American history. One current interest is the reception of Shakespeare in 19C America--with a special focus on Philadelphia. He opted for Villanova because he can also study Greek literature there, in which he is a native speaker and because he may pursue a career in academic librarianship after his MA. He was to speak at Winterthur on a book encountered while interning in Special Collections: "a key volume in the history of the modern Greek language and the Hellenic diaspora: the second edition of Yerasimos Vlachos' *Thesaurus Tetraglossos... (Θησαυρός Τετραγλωσσός...)*, published in Venice in 1723 by Antonio Vortoli. This dictionary contains modern Greek, ancient Greek, Latin, and Italian. However, its preface and other paratexts make it clear that the book was aimed at a Hellenic, Greek-speaking audience in Venice. . . . A comparison between the original, 1659 edition and the one housed in WCU's library shows that the latter (second edition) was designed for practical usage (e.g., it includes far fewer ornamental woodcuts), and the 1723 preface advertises the publisher's Philhellenism as well as the great demand and need for the republication of Vlachos' dictionary. Following the work of Vasilis Tatakis on Yerasimos Vlachos, I argue that the second edition served two purposes: a) keeping the first post-Byzantine, diasporic community of Greeks intact by reconnecting its members with their cultural memory . . . and b) providing a tool for upward mobility in a highly cosmopolitan, trade-based society, in which the understanding of several languages would have been an immensely useful skill." Cataloguing the book, Christoforos found that Vlachos's title-page "clearly states that it contains four languages," but no catalogue listed more than three. In fact, several citations listed the fourth as "unknown." After some reading of Greek sources he discovered that "the 1723 dictionary considered modern and ancient Greek as separate languages."

John Scanlan contributed “Johnson and Impeachment” to the March *Johnsonian New Letter* (Vol. 71.1), in which we find editor Robert DeMaria’s review of *New Essays on Samuel Johnson: Revaluation*, ed. by Anthony Lee, and **Lorna Clark**’s review of **Susan Carlile**’s biography *Charlotte Lennox*. **Richard Sher** distributed *Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (vol. 34) digitally for the first time. It’s in the usual format when you print it. While there is always a valuable survey of new research opportunities and products at the front and then usually an article on research (in this issue Moira Hanson’s “Exploring the Mental Health of Robert Burns”) and a bibliography of members’ publications at the end, the “newsletter” is largely a superb series of lengthy book reviews of the important editions and studies related to 18C Scotland, written by the best hands and carefully edited by Rick. The longest review essay here is **Frances B. Singh**’s “The Frasers and Baillies in India and Scotland, 1757-1857” (pp. 8-13), examining Kathy Fraser’s *For the Love of a Highland Home: The Fraser Brothers’ Indian Quest* (2016) and Alexander Charles Baillie’s *Call of Empire: From the Highlands to Hindostan* (2017), both over 400 pp., both bringing “trunks of family documents” to chronicle ancestors working in India during the century beginning with the Battle of Plassey (1757), which secured India for Britain—the Baillie archive is “now catalogued, classified, and summarized at the Highland Archive Centre in Inverness.” Fraser’s book follows the lives of four brothers (as well as their parents and families at home in Scotland). Baillie’s book is more thoroughly researched and academic, focusing on William Baillie of Dunain, who dies in a dungeon after his troops’ defeat at the Battle of Pollilur, and his scholar nephew, John Baillie of Leys, professor of Arabic and Persian, MP, and East India Company director. Frances was especially attentive to the authors’ accounts of women and children, coming to the books from her long study of Indian-born and Scottish educated Jane Cumming: *Scandal and Survival in 19C Scotland: the Life of Jane Cumming* (U. of Rochester Press, 2020), which we hope to see reviewed here in March. The book was reviewed in *The Times* (London) by history correspondent Mark Bridge, presenting a nice overview inviting readers to the book. A better preview is Frances’ own on pp. xxviiiiff. There is much to learn here about the Scottish engagement with India, the history and relations of the Scottish family who raised the girl sent from India about age eight or nine and later oversaw her marriage and provided her cleric husband with a parish—Frances has diaries detailing, for instance, what was consumed at what prices on what days, etc. Also, much is told about Scottish legal practices and attitudes toward sexuality, for Frances found transcriptions of the stages in the libel case brought by two teachers’ against Jane Cumming’s grandmother following her spreading Jane’s claims that the teachers engaged in Lesbian lovemaking while quartered with their students. Another book reviewed here that I’m glad I bought is the revised edition of Daniel Szechi’s *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (2019).

We lament the death in January of **Mona Scheuermann**, who received a short tribute in the last *Scriblerian* (52.2:245), concluding with the observation that the editors with whom she corresponded over her reviews from 1991 to 2013 were “always left with the happy sense that she was the profession’s most cheerful scholar.” Despite a heavy course load at Oakton Community

College (Des Plaines, IL), Mona produced five engaging critical studies marked by cogent close readings, such as *Her Bread to Earn: Women, Money, and Society from Defoe to Austen* (1993, reissued as an ebook in 2015), a revisionist account challenging stereotypes established by “images of women in the works of only women novelists,” distorting women’s portrayal in 18C fiction, as if they were perceived always as victims—I once put its chapter on Austen on reserve for students. Mona’s first book, after a dissertation on the novels of William Godwin, was *Social Protest in the 18C English Novel* (1985), which was followed by *In Praise of Poverty*, treating Hannah More in depth. Her last book, *Reading Jane Austen*, was reviewed in the *Intelligencer* by **Lorna Clark** (28.2 [Sept. 2014], 56-58). Mona regularly participated in ASECS meetings, which she enlivened with her beauty and engaging, refreshing, and witty personality. **Beverly Schneller**, who contributed a review above, was appointed Provost for Academic Affairs at Kentucky State in Frankfurt last year, and her first important challenge involving the University’s assessment went successfully: 100% SACSCOC compliance.

Linda Troost co-chaired a committee at Washington & Jefferson that surveyed faculty about teaching experiences and plans and then posted at the College library’s website lessons learned from online teaching and also best-practices material for classes mixing remote and in-person instruction. Linda has taken over “**The Pedagogical Post**” and will endeavor to find and edit copy for future issues (please send her copy at ltroost @washjeff.edu). We thank her for **Emily Friedman**’s account of using Perusall software in literature courses, which Emily first presented 17 April at an ASECS virtual panel, “Zooming through the Eighteenth Century”—it was “a trial for a virtual ASECS 2020.” (See ASECS’s online posting.) Linda will try out Perusall in her current Austen seminar this fall—“it works rather differently from the other annotation tools I have used with students but I think it will be less superficial, too.” We are grateful to **Robert Walker** for his review above of an essay collection on Samuel Johnson and his circle, one listed twice in our call for reviewers—essay collections require extra work. Bob’s two reviews in the Spring *Scriblerian* are noted above—the institutional affiliation for our retired colleague is “Washington & Jefferson College,” for he serves on the College’s Advisory Board. He has forthcoming three essays and a note: “Laurence Sterne and Jonathan Odell: A Transatlantic Connection” in this fall’s *The Shandean*; also, Bob published “Laurence Sterne’s Subscribers: Additional Updates” in this fall’s *Philological Quarterly*; and “The Social Life of Thomas Cumming, or ‘Clubbing’ with Johnson’s Friend, the Fighting Quaker,” in “A Clubbable Man: Essays on 18C Literature in Honor of Greg Clingham,” ed. by Anthony W. Lee, forthcoming from Bucknell UP; and Bob’s “Addenda to the Documentation of Facts and Inventions: Selections from the Journalism of James Boswell” will appear in the December *Notes and Queries*. **Jane Wessel** published “Samuel Foote’s *The Mayor of Garret* without the Election: What Promptbooks Can Tell Us about Provincial Theater” in the Spring *Huntington Library Quarterly* (81.1:119-42). In April **James Wilder** finished printing on his handpress and published Marie Bourke’s appreciative account of the life and scholarship of a late 19C Irish antiquary: *Margaret Stokes: A Pioneering*

Scholar of Early Medieval Ireland. (Beautifully done, letter-press so crisp you could read it in the dark.)

Forthcoming Meetings (Haha!) and Other Announcements

On 7 July its President Marta Kvande announced that **SEASECS's** annual meeting in February, planned for Ft. Myers, "Oceans Rise, Empires Fall: Tidal Shifts in the 18C," is postponed to 2022 and replaced with a virtual conference. Proposals should be sent to the new program chair for the online conference, Dr. Bryan Rindfleisch (bryan.rindfleisch @marquette.edu)—those for panel topics are due Oct. 31 and for paper abstracts, Dec. 1.

SCSECS will hold an advisory board meeting in October to decide whether the situation has "significantly improved" to allow a short meeting.

ASECS will hold its 2021 meeting virtually on 8-10 April. Proposals were due 1 October. On 7 May, while inviting proposals, Executive Director Lisa Berglund announced: "To ensure the continuing vitality of ASECS," it offers "free membership renewals for 2020-2021 to current graduate students, non-tenure track faculty, and members unemployed as a result of this crisis. Graduate student memberships will be renewed automatically. NTTF faculty or unemployed members should fill out the form on the ASECS website to request free renewal." ASECS will meet in Baltimore during Spring 2022.

The **Columbia Seminar** on the 18C has its fall meetings cancelled but expects to meet in 2021, probably online. For information, contact co-chair Stephanie Insley Hershinow (stephanie.insley @gmail.com).

Lehigh U's Lawrence Henry **Gipson Institute for 18C Studies** will hold virtual colloquia on the 1st Friday of Oct.-Dec from 12-1:30 p.m. Registration is required; for a Zoom link, write go.lehigh.edu/Gipson1. That Oct. 2 offered three presentations on British and American history by graduate students. The Institute is co-chaired by Michelle LeMaster (mil206@ lehigh.edu).

The **Eighteenth-Century Scottish Studies Society's** June 2020 conference in Princeton on "Religion and the Enlightenment" was cancelled. The next ECSSS meeting is planned for Liverpool, 29-31 July 2021, hosted by Mark Towsey (U. of Liverpool), focused on "Scots Abroad: Scots in Ireland, England, Europe and the British Empire." Jon Mee will give the plenary.

Academia & Scholarship vs. the Novel Corona Virus, 2020

A rush of closings and cancellations occurred in mid March as covid-19 reached epidemic scope. I rushed the completion of the March *Intelligencer* to get it printed before the Governor closed businesses. I also feared the mail might be suspended. The March issue was, however, delivered to many members at locked college buildings or at least mailrooms. Thus, we posted the revised PDF of that issue in the EC/ASECS Newsletter archive (ec-asecs.org). We will similarly place this issue there in a month after revisions occur. In order to send members news from Executive Secretary Peter Staffel and conference chairs Sylvia Marks and Eleanor Shevlin, Eleanor revised what directories we had to create an updated email distribution list.

During the second half of March the learned world ceased to meet face to face. Auctions, museums, and historical sites closed. Universities closed dorms, libraries, and offices, shifting classes to remote learning. Around 16 March many governors closed public schools. Most 18C conference scheduled for spring and summer were cancelled, and during the summer those scheduled for fall were cancelled or went virtual. The 18C Ireland Society replaced its summer meeting with a virtual one 19 September. The Columbia 18C Seminar was cancelled for fall. The exception seems to be Canadian SECS meeting jointly with the Midwestern ASECS at the U. of Winnipeg 13-15 October. By the end of September, the spring 2021 AGMs of SEASECS and ASECS have been cancelled. As October begins 31 states have rising cases.

As countries like the U.S. closed borders in the spring, researchers overseas joined tourists in returning home in crowded airports and planes, spreading the virus. Research in Canada, Europe, etc. has remained nearly impossible for Americans. Organizations like ASECS had to extend the period when fellowship travel could occur. International mail has slowed, for fewer jets carrying people has meant fewer carrying mail (thus, for instance *Swift Studies* waited well over a month to reach subscribers in North America). Some older scholars must be among the million killed by covid-19, and it has driven many older faculty into retirement, creating opportunities for youth.

Scholars have turned to **Zoom** and other online media to convene meetings with mixed results. Some retired scholars will not attempt Zoom or find it dissatisfying, and, in so far as Zoom becomes the norm forced on employees, it will lessen face-to-face encounters, as institutions refuse to fund travel. Traditional conferences have been important sources of new members and funds for ASECS and its affiliates. The Zoom-meeting also allows the employer to invade the home, reducing freedom and leisure (experts say productivity has usually been increased by working from home). A colleague who has served her university and groups more than anyone I know wrote with exasperation: "Zoom will be the end of all of us! . . . Now that we are captives in our homes, colleagues at the universities feel that they can call a meeting almost any time and expect one to come! 5:30-6:30 p.m. on a Friday! Really?"

But the experience of Zoom meetings by two of our own colleagues have often been positive. Eleanor Shevlin wrote in late May: "I attended an excellent virtual session of Material Texts at Penn--all their weekly meetings were cancelled of course, but they put together a wonderful single session at the end that had six very short papers--and excellent discussion--about 100 people were in attendance--and it worked really well (they usually have about 30 to 40 tops). The Bibliographical Society is having many events online, and SHARP is doing a whole week in June. . . . I did an undergraduate and a graduate virtual graduation on Zoom--and they were actually far more personal. After we announced the name of each student, various faculty spoke about the student and the student spoke and we moved on to the next." Linda Troost wrote regarding the ASECS virtual panel 17 April co-chaired with Bethany Williamson (Biola U.), at which Emily Friedman presented a paper related to her pedagogical offering above: "Zooming through the Eighteenth Century," "a trial for a virtual ASECS 2020." (See the webpage with that title phrase posted at www.asecs.org.) Linda said that there were 30 people online

for the session, more than attend most in-person sessions: “Even hardened cynics revealed later on Facebook that it was a lot of fun and actually useful.”

By late May there was a flood of online presentations offered by such libraries as the Library Company of Philadelphia and organizations such as SHARP and the **Bibliographical Society of America**. The last sent out a calendar of virtual events, from which I quote several items: “May 28th, 10-10:45am EST: Demonstration of Paste Paper and Orizome Paper Decoration Techniques with Yukari Hayashida and Andrijana Sajic, hosted by the Thomas J. Watson Library at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. No registration required. Click here to join via Zoom, password 033152. May 28, 2pm EST: Dr. Derrick Spires will be giving a virtual book talk with the American Antiquarian Society on The Practice of Citizenship: Black Politics & Print Culture in the Early United States Registration required, click here. June 2, 12-1pm EST: Dr. John Buchtel of the Boston Athenaeum leads a "Curator's Choice" session on books celebrating trees in the Athenaeum's special collections. . . . June 4-7, 2020: . . . the inaugural Antiquarian Booksellers' Association of America Virtual Book Fair. Browse and shop June 15-19, 2020: SHARP in Focus will be a week of all kinds of book history all for you on all your devices! There'll be a virtual book launch highlighting recent publications by members, pedagogy brainstorming, a peek into the new *SHARP News*, and of course, our Annual General Meeting and awards ceremony! We will also be opening a SHARP coffeehouse for informal conversations with Executive Council members” The BSA itself on 10 June announced that its 2021 meeting would be held virtually on 29 January 2021, during Bibliography Week, “with a combination of pre-recorded and live videos shared on a stand-alone meeting website”—in part because large meetings are likely to still be dangerous but also because “institutional funding for travel to the meeting may be limited.” Registration will be required. BSA hopes “small in-person gatherings may be possible.”

The **Library Company of Philadelphia**'s has offered online programs weekly during the covid months, such as biographer Stephen Fried's talk “Breaking News in Benjamin Rush History” on 8 September (Fried is the author of *Rush: Revolution, Madness, and the Visionary Doctor Who Became Founding Father*). It offered a series of web-based, weekly programs entitled Library Company Fireside Chats, co-sponsored by GradFutures, an initiative by the Dean of Graduate Studies at Princeton. The talks on 17 and 24 September and 1 October were “18C Seeds & the Case for Greening Book History” by Maria Zytaruk, “William Paterson and the Afterlives of the Patriot Opposition, 1740-1762” (both at the U. of Calgary, suggesting how the virtual lecture enables remote scholars to find an audience they otherwise might not); and “*The Hymnal*,” a book-talk by Christopher N. Phillips. Forthcoming on 22 and 29 October are Vincent DiGirolamo's book-talk “Crying the News: A History of America's Newsboys” and Glenda Goodman's “Cultivated by Hand: Amateur Musicians in the Early American Republic.”

Margaret Ford, President of The Bibliographical Society (London) on 7 July sent members the following invitation to its first “virtual Summer Visit, teletransporting us up and down the UK in a single hour to visit three libraries: the Thomas Plume Library in Essex; the Innerpeffray Library in

Perthshire; and Lincoln College Library at Oxford. There will be time for bibliographical socialising afterward. It will be held on 23 July, 5.00 p.m. BST. Please register your interest, and you will be sent a Zoom link.” Besides increasing reliance on other media, the movement to online remote meetings will surely benefit learned societies that have relatively few members living at great distances, such as the Kant Society and its affiliates. Online meetings for Kant specialists occur this October in Kaliningrad, Russia, and Cardiff, Wales. The normalization of virtual meetings could invigorate very marginal groups dedicated to specialties such as recipe or chap books or particular composers.

The greatest impact of the epidemic has been the **closure of colleges & universities and of research libraries** (in practice often one and the same). Most closed in March. In July and August, what with declining new cases in many regions and a decreased death rate everywhere, there was news from organizations of both cancellations and openings. The *USA Today* reported 11 June that just 37% of American libraries had plans to reopen by July. The New York Public opened branches progressively from mid July into September, but the research division is still closed. The British Library opened for readers on 17 July with measures that include face coverings, one-way walkways in the library, and quarantining books for 72 hours after use. The Royal Irish Academy opened 10 August to those with appointments (10:30-1:30 only). The National Library of Ireland remains closed until 12 October—like most libraries it directs us to substantial digitized items (125,000 at NLI). Now in late September all Los Angeles libraries are all closed, and the Clark will remain so “at least through January 1.” Like the British Library, most American research libraries that do offer entry do so by appointment. The Newberry’s reading rooms are open by appointment Tu-F 10-4:00, and the Library Company opens by appointment on 5 October. There is pressure on universities to offer more than the curb-side pick up that schools like Penn State and UVA have practiced--UVA calling it “library takeout.” Illinois offers remote services and, when needed, “appointment-based on-site access.” Maryland’s stacks are closed but the first floor of McKelden is open and one can make an appointment to see special-collection items on 9-1:00 Tuesday and 1-5:00 Thursday. Beginning 28 Sept., Wisconsin Madison will make collections accessible at different times to reduce traffic (special collections takes appointments from 1-4:00). On 24 Aug., the Kenneth Spencer Library at Kansas opened its reading room by appointment from 1-3:30. They ask visitors to quarantine for 14 days prior to the visit, wear face covering, etc. They refuse admission to people who have attended mass gatherings, traveled on cruise ships, or resided in certain zones considered hot by Kansas’s Dept. of Health, which included Ireland, Britain, EU’s Schengen area, etc. Covid pushed libraries to acquire more digital resources, as by subscribing to Oxford Scholarship Online (by December that brought access to 16,764 OUP publications with the promise of a thousand added annually). Penn announced in June the addition of more than 28,000 ebooks (it then boasted of ownership/access to 2M digital titles). Hathi Trust holds 6,300,000 e-books!

Almost all American colleges went to remote instruction by mid April; many did so well before March ended. By 14 April Edward Sutelan reported on www.pennlive.com: “Several Universities Considering Remote Learning

through the End of 2020,” noting as among such Boston U., Harvard, Oregon State, and the U. of Arizona. During the summer many universities announced plans to offer both remote and in-person instructions: as late as 10 July the *Guardian* reported 60% of American colleges expected to hold in-person classes. Later in the summer, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* in partnership with Davidson College’s College Crisis Initiative posted that, of nearly 3000 reporting institutions, roughly one third were fully online and another third fully in person. But by September, after covid surges in Florida, Texas, and other southern states, many colleges were scheduling most classes remotely. Schools claiming mixed instruction often offer on campus only low-enrollment upper-level seminars. Students were thus induced to rent lodging on or near campus only to discover that they might have stayed at home, saving expenses and living more safely. Some colleges reduced dorm enrollments intentionally, as by having freshmen or sophomores or both remain off campus in the fall or all the academic year (Franklin & Marshall in Lancaster took the first option; Northwestern, the second). As noted, library services are greatly diminished, often reduced to computer and study rooms.

While college costs were often a greater burden than usual due to reduced family income, protests and petitions went up all summer over the failure of schools to reduce tuition (complaints began during spring semester, from those who contracted for room & board on campus but were barred from residence halls). In June the 14-campus Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education expected a \$100M loss due to refunds. Looking forward, the U. of Arizona is projecting \$250M in losses; Michigan’s estimates are twice that. Refunds in the spring made it clear that room & board was an important money-maker. Very few schools have reduced 2020-21 tuition (Georgetown and Princeton are exceptions, reducing tuition by 10%). Morgan Eichensehr reported in the *Baltimore Business Journal* (4 Sept.) that the U. of Maryland, UMBC, Towson U., and the U. of Baltimore froze tuition, but increases occurred at Johns Hopkins, Loyola U. of Maryland, Goucher College, and Morgan State. California’s state universities have held firm on tuition. The *Stanford Daily* reported Stanford’s undergraduate tuition went up 5%; the school responded to complaints by noting that more students now needed aid (70% receive such), with the Trustees approving a 3% increase in payouts from the endowment. Private schools without endowments and, especially state schools, who for years have been receiving less and less state funding, ask the public to understand the straights that they are in. Colleges face reduced enrollment, the loss of room & board as well as sports revenue, and expenditures required for remote learning and for protecting students and staff, including testing (some like Kansas tested all at the start of classes).

That more than ever many cannot afford college tuition is suggested by NPR’s report 24 September that a study found community college enrollment down 8% this fall (normally in high unemployment, they see increases). The soaring cost of college had already threatened to reduce enrollments. BrokeScholar on the WWW reported that in inflation-adjusted dollars the cost of college tuition and fees “more than tripled between 1971/72 and 2019/20.”

Many students will need in-person instruction for better understanding and motivation. On 1 September, *USA Today* carried a story about a student

who did poorly with remote learning in the spring and, so, wanted the structure of in-person instruction; thus, he enrolled and rented housing, only to find he had one class on campus meeting but once a week. The impact on instruction in some fields may be considerable. One wonders too about how much academic integrity has been lost with remote learning, how much testing as a true measure has declined. Finally, given the lost revenue from tuition (including from out-of-state and overseas students), covid presents an existential threat to many schools (particularly costly, smaller private colleges), leading to hiring freezes, increased reliance on adjuncts, and cuts in travel and research funding. A thoughtful discussion of financial issues was published 2 June on *Forbes* by Andrew Depietro, but he does not contemplate the more severe budgetary woes and reduced enrollments coming in 2021-22. In 2020 many schools received Paycheck Protection Program loans/grants. Wesley Whistle on *Forbes*, 6 July, reported on hazy figures released by the Small Business Administration, indicating that, while most schools received much smaller loans, 33 universities received loans in the range of \$5-10M.

Many colleges and universities that started back in August with in-person instruction suffered hundreds of new cases, forcing students to be sent packing as at Chapel Hill or to be locked down for two weeks as at Notre Dame. The latter strategy is being imitated by other schools, as Wisconsin at Madison (where related cases totaled 1400). Universities have suspended many for “violating health protocols.” The majority of positive covid cases at most schools are in students off-campus. Some quarantine not only those with positive tests but others potentially infected—covid in wastewater at a Franklin & Marshall dorm led to quarantining 90 students. The SUNY system has a policy that requires suspension for 14 days when 100 new cases occur within 14 days. The highest new case rates in Pennsylvania are in university towns like Bloomsburg, State College and York.

As September ends, new cases are increasing in Britain, France, and Germany. French universities started back in late summer, requiring masks but conducting classes under crowded conditions (entrance exams had been cancelled, and, with grades the sole determinant, many more qualified for entry, raising French university enrollment by 270,000 to 2.8M). French leaders wish to see students in school “to bridge educational inequalities that the pandemic has exacerbated.” Covid is surging at the Sorbonne and other French schools, where students have complained of inadequate soap & sinks for hygiene and of poorly ventilated buildings. As in France, German schools are likely to hold in-person classes while requiring protective measures. Some British universities are relying on testing (Cambridge will test all living on campus weekly); others rely on increased social distancing. St. Andrews will go remote except where hands-on instruction is needed. University College London is requiring masks, reducing building occupancy, providing an app for reporting illness, testing 1000 daily, and setting up residences for quarantine. International students face 14-day quarantines on arrival.

Covid is also threatening the existence of many bookstores, museums, historical venues, and performance companies. Campaigns are afoot to aid independent bookshops, with best-selling writer James Patterson donating \$500,000 to one. A story on Fox News online c. 26 July by Frank Miles,

“Corona Virus May Close One-Third of American Museums for Good,” reports on a survey by the American Alliance of Museums of 760 museum directors conducted 8-30 June 2020. The AAM President Laura Lott reported that 90% of museums have only enough cash to operate for another year, and 56% can last less than six months. In March we had an example of a larger museum filing Chapter 11 for bankruptcy protection: the National Museum of American Jewish History in Philadelphia, founded in 1976, was crushed by debt from a new building on Independence Mall built in 2008-2010. Many museums received PPP-loans/grants, allowing staff to be maintained. Yet 40% report that they will be reopening with fewer staff. The AAM claims that museums support 726,000 jobs and put \$50B into the economy. In May, the Museum of Natural History in NYC, with severe financial losses, laid off 450 employees (*NYT*, 6 May). In September, the Smithsonian, having lost \$49M, made 237 layoffs permanent. The Met opened with restrictions in late August, the Smithsonians a month later. On 23 September the Metropolitan Opera, which had closed 12 March, cancelled its 2020-21 season; the company’s losses between the two seasons are projected at \$154M. It is now more noteworthy if a philharmonic season is *not* cancelled or a museum is open.

More Announcements

On 7 May 2020 Malau Haine (haine @gmail.com) and co-chair Alain Cernuschi wrote that the ENCCRE Project calls for papers for an international colloquium "**Les Planches de l'Encyclopédie en lumière: Mise en perspective et recherches sur le Recueil de planches (1762-1772)**" to be held at the Sorbonne May 27-29, 2021." Papers in French or English, due 30 Sept, were to offer updated research on the plates of the *Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire des sciences, arts et métiers* (1751-1772) ed. by Diderot and D'Alembert."

In its June newsletter the **Voltaire Foundation** announced that it and the IZEA in Halle have established the blog *Café Lumières: 18C Research in Dialogue*, “an informal digital space for colleagues in the international 18C research community to exchange ideas, discuss their projects, and forge connections.” (IZEA=Interdisziplinäres Zentrum für die Erforschung des Europäischen Aukklärung, at Martin Luther U.) The VF has partnered with Liverpool U. Press to distribute VF publications as ebooks. Almost monthly the Voltaire Foundation publishes more volumes of the *Œuvres complètes de Voltaire*, it announced that its staff are still working hard on the authoritative 50-year project, on track to be completed this year in over 200 volumes.

On 14 April the ARTFL Project at Chicago and the Voltaire Foundation announced the release of *Tout d’Holbach*, a database that brings together fully searchable transcriptions of the vast majority of d’Holbach’s works. By 14 April it included what Jeroom Vercruyse in his *Bibliographie . . . d’Holbach* (1971; 2017) classed as separately published original works. Later other works as his translations will be added and perhaps controversial attributions. Those who’d like to contribute to the project (as by proofing) or learn about it or the critical edition *Digital d’Holbach*, should email ruggero.sciuto@voltaire.ac.uk.

The 2019 *Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (v. 34) offers essays on John Toland’s *Patheisticon*, George Berkeley on toleration, Oliver Goldsmith as “Historical Thinker and Writer,” Maria Edgeworth’s child heroes, and Honora

Sneyd Edgeworth (“Harry and Lucy”). The reviews cover some important books that might have escaped notice: *Cambridge History of Ireland*, vol. 3: *1730-1880*, ed. by James Kelly (2018); Patrick Hyde Kelly’s edition of Molyneux’s *The Case of Ireland’s Being Bound by Acts of Parliament* (2018), Swift’s *Irish Political Writings after 1725*, part of the Cambridge Swift, ed. by David Hayton and Adam Rounce (2018), the collection *Taxation, Politics, and Protest in Ireland, 1662-2016* (2019), ed. by Douglas Kanter and Patrick Walsh; and the five-volume *The Proclamations of Ireland, 1660-1820*, ed. by James Kelly with Mary Anne Lyons (Irish Manuscripts Commission, 2014). The 2020 volume will appear in Autumn published by Liverpool U. Press.

Katharine Kittredge initiated the online newsletter *The Early Children’s Literature and Culture Chronicle*, with its first issue on 6 June 2020 (its notices and links, however, do not involve 18C children or juveniles). I quote now from Dr. Kittredge’s proposal: “In response to the cancellation of our community-building and networking events, the pressing need for additional and richer on-line resources, and exacerbated plight of younger and non-traditional scholars, I propose that we institute a monthly newsletter, to be called: *The Early Children’s Literature and Culture Chronicle*. [Its three] Goals [are]: 1) Create a place where scholars can share information about work and resources; 2) Provide an outlet for work that would have been presented at conferences; and 3) Share information about on-line materials that can be used in remote teaching. *Mechanism*: Members submit elements for inclusion by the last day of the month, and I will format it and distribute it by the 15th of the next month [kkittredge@ithaca.edu]. Each month, I will generate a pdf of the newsletter and send it to all the members on the mailing list, unless they write to me to unsubscribe. *Contents*: I envision this as more a portal than a content-rich document. Its goal is to connect and inform, not to be an outlet for published work. The areas that I would like to feature are: Abstracts of books or articles in the field that have been recently published (to get additional hits and readers); Descriptions of (and links to) on-line texts or archival caches which are open-access (to publicize collections and to provide affordable materials to classes); Links to blogs or videos, with a brief description of their contents (in addition to institutionally-sanctioned material, scholars and teachers could post lecture-capture or narrated powerpoints of papers or class lectures for use by others) . . . ; Calls for papers for edited collections and on-line conferences; Announcements of Zoom events & communities of scholars connecting through virtual networks; Requests for information; Offers to Skype/Zoom as guest lecturer, i.e., people could post their willingness to speak on specific topic, or teachers could post a request for an expert on a theme, topic, or source.” There follows resources with links and summaries, such as a 2020 article in *Feminist Media Studies* and a video narrated by Laura Wasowicz, the AAS Curator of Children’s Literature, showing “the recently acquired card game *The Animals Picnic*” from 1870s.

Princeton University Press has published *A Catalogue of the Cotsen’s Children’s Library Pre 1801*, with 1309 entries divided A-K and L-Z, pp. xli, 258; xxxvii, 2, [260] (sold by Oak Knoll Press, clothbound, \$125). The introduction is by Andrea Immel, Curator of Lloyd Cotsen’s books since the

cataloguing project began in 1996. Two volumes on 19C books appeared in 2019 (6370 entries). An index volume will be published in 2021.

There is much of note in April and August newsletters of the **Children's Books History Society** edited by Susan Bailes and Brian Alderson (who at 90 remains a font of erudition). I'm astonished at how clear and vibrant its color illustrations are, and this pays off in such illustrated articles as August's "A 'Seeing Eye': Beatrix Potter's Animals" by Annemarie Bilclough of the V&A. That issue also contains an article by Jill Sheffrin on "Children's Librarians & Children's Book Publishing" in the first half of the 20C, with a focus on Toronto's Osborne Collection. The CBHS was founded as the British branch of the Friends of the Osborne and Smith Collections, given its present name in 1994 at the suggestion of the late L&A librarian Joyce Irene Whalley, who receives a tribute in the issue (with a bibliography of her publications). Two of the reviews concern the long 18C: Nigel Tattersfield's *Dealing in Deceit: Edwin Pearson of the "Bewick Repository" Bookshop 1838-1901* (he backdated items and added misattributions to Bewick's canon), and Dennis Butts's *The Vagaries of Fame: Some Successes and Failures in Children's Literature*, which reaches back to the 18C (Christopher Smart) in discussing why authors, books, and publishers "disappeared despite immense popularity in their time."

The April issue came with Occasional Paper XV: *Mrs Bragge's Children's Reading 1795-1808* by David Stoker. Describing an MS on six octavo "quarter-sheets" he provides an account of the reading diary kept by Charlotte Bragge of Gloucestershire for five of her children in 1795-1808; she was the wife of a wealthy lawyer and MP. Stoker thinks entries were made in 1795-99 and 1806-08. It is an astonishing record of books read to and then by young boys and girls for education and recreation, striking for the quantity and relative difficulty. The pages of the diary are headed by the name of the child and his or her age, as "Charles from 4 to 5" and "Mary from 8 yrs to 11." Stoker attends to individuals and the children as a group, trying to identify from notations what was read (with ESTC citations). He notes "Each young child began their reading" at four with Ellenor Fenn's illustrated dialogues *Cobwebs to Catch Flies* (1784), followed by Fenn's *Fables in Monosyllables*, illustrated fables (1783), and then by Anna Letitia Barbauld's four age-adapted vols. of *Lessons for Children*, and then Sarah Trimmer's *An Easy Introduction to the Knowledge of Nature and Reading the Holy Scriptures*, etc. And so on. Son Charles at eight and nine before heading off to boarding school was reading Charles Rollin's *Ancient History of the Egyptians, Carthaginians . . .* (12 vols., 1730-38). All read much history. Reading for children age 11 and older is only recorded for daughter Mary, who read John Newbery's *History of England* and Goldsmith's *Grecian History*, "Crossman on the Catechism, and much travel literature, as Priscilla Wakefield's *Excursions in North America* and Charles Wilkinson's *A Tour through Asia Minor and the Greek Islands*.

Judaica Digital Humanities at Penn announced in June the launch of the digital 2nd edition of *Judaica Americana*, expanding Robert Singerman's two-vol. bibliography of pre-1900 American Jewish publications (1990). Though long Librarian at Florida's Price Library of Judaica, he donated his draft and copyright to Penn's center last October. Users can search the database of 9600 records by author, language, holding institution (the first edition had 6500

records); links are provided to open-access digitized resources. Visit [https:// repository.upenn.edu/judaica.americana/](https://repository.upenn.edu/judaica.americana/) in *ScholarlyCommons*.

The **Ehrenpreis Centre** for Swift Studies in Münster invites applications for its annual **Jonathan Swift Travel Grant** for research costs of young scholars exploring “the extensive holdings of the Ehrenpreis Centre for their research projects.” The application requirements, stated at the Centre’s website, are predictable, including a project description, budget, letter from an academic supervisor, and an explanation of why one needs to work in the Centre’s collection. Applications are due 31 January. Contact the Chair of the Centre’s Board of Friends, Hermann J. Real, at realh@uni-muenster.de. The Centre has a cordial staff and 10,000 sources close at hand, including most editions of Swift, much written by his contemporaries, as well as a duplication of Swift’s library, and all significant discussions of Swift’s works and life.

As in the past, the application deadline for ASECS’s **A. C. Elias Research Travel Fellowship** is 15 November. The fellowship’s \$2500 annual purse supports research by an ASECS member in Ireland or a member of the Eighteenth-Century Ireland Society in North America. Applications should be sent to the two trustees: Dr. Jason McElligott, Keeper, Marsh’s Library, St. Patrick’s Close, Dublin 8, Ireland (jason.mcelligott@marshlibrary.ie) and Dr. James May (jem4@psu.edu; 1423 Hillcrest Road / Lancaster, PA 17603). Applications consist of a cover-letter with personal & project information (this formerly was to be entered in a cover-sheet at ASECS’s travel-fellowship website, now replaced by cover-letter); also a short C.V. (no more than 3 pp.), a narrative description of the project (3 pp. or less, treating its contribution to the field and work done and to be done during the proposed research period), a one-page bibliography of related books and articles, a short budget, and two signed confidential letters of recommendation sent directly by their authors. Please try to submit all the materials but the letters as one Word file or PDF. If the two letters of support cannot be supplied as PDFs of signed letters on institutional stationery, the original copies should be mailed to one of the trustees. An international jury of readers in diverse fields will select the winner or winners around the first of the year. Further information is available from the Trustees and at the websites of Marsh’s Library and ASECS.

The Center for Printing History & Culture founded by Birmingham City and U. of Birmingham libraries is launching on 5 November “**The History of the Printed Image Network**” for conversations on artistic prints, illustrated ballads, chapbooks, etc. To join, email John.Hinks (john.hinks@bcu.ac.uk).

There was an uproar this past June over the minimal sentencing by Judge Alexander P. Bicket of the Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas of Gregory Priore for **thefts from the Carnegie Library**, where he was the special collections room manager from 1992, and for the sale of the stolen material by John Schulman of Caliban Books in Pittsburgh: for this most extensive theft from an American library in a century, Priore received three years of house arrest and 12 years probation; Schulman, four years of house arrest, 12 years of probation, and the order to pay \$55,000 in restitution. The light sentences were in part attributed to the covid-19 epidemic. Priore’s thefts included most materials with the greatest value: books such as the library’s earliest (1473) and nine other incunables, a 1787 book signed by Thomas

Jefferson, and the first edition of Newton's *Principia*, and more commonly engravings cut from books (such as all 276 maps in a 1644 Blaeu Atlas). Priore stopped stealing in late 2016 when a collection audit was announced. In April 2017 a few days after beginning the audit, the appraisers reported the thefts, which numbered in the hundreds; Priore, if only for failing to discover such massive losses, was suspended in April and fired in June. Priore and Schulman were arrested in August 2017 after search warrants found some of the Carnegie's \$8M in missing treasure in Schulman's warehouse. Since the material was liberally marked to indicate Carnegie ownership, Schulman had been stamping items with a library "withdrawn" stamp. Priore explained he needed the money to support his family, including private-school tuition for four children, and he was in fact sometimes behind in paying rent for a modest apartment and in school tuition. These and other details about the holdings stolen, the thieves, and the aftermath are reported in "The History Thief" by Travis McDade in the September 2020 *Smithsonian*.

The *Intelligencer* needs reviewers for: Kevin L. Cope and Cedric D. Reverand II (editors), *Paper, Ink, and Achievement: Gabriel Hornstein and the Revival of 18C Scholarship*, pp. 252 pp. with 10 b/w and 2 colored images; contents noted under "Cope" in News of Members above. Also Clive Probyn, *Jonathan Swift on the Anglo-Irish Road* (Brill/Fink, 2020), pp. 300; 8 b/w and 3 colored illus.; maps; examining the role of geography on Swift's life, treating such topics as travel, the landscape, genealogy, the Irish Sea. Also Barbara Crosbie, *Age Relations and Cultural Change in Eighteenth-Century England*. (Boydell, 2020), pp. x + 276 + [3, series bibliography]; bibliography [245-68]; 14 b/w illus.; 15 tables & graphs; index; with data from 18C Newcastle, Crosbie explores "links between age relations and cultural change, using an innovative analytical framework to map . . . generational transition in 18C England. The study reveals how attitudes towards age were transformed alongside perceptions of gender, rank and place. It also exposes how shifting age relations affected concepts of authenticity, nationhood, patriarchy, domesticity and progress." Also Noah Shusterman, *Armed Citizens: The Road from Ancient Rome to the Second Amendment* (Virginia, 2020); pp. x + 273; it traces the ideal of the citizen militia from ancient Rome though Machiavelli to 17-18C England's reaction to France's professional army; with an epilogue on the Second Amendment. Also, the following described in the last issue still have no reviewers: Scott Black, *Without the Novel: Romance and the History of Prose Fiction* (2019); Also Elizabeth Dill, *Erotic Citizens: Sex and the Embodied Subject in the Antebellum Novel* (2019); Also John D. Lyons, *The Dark Thread: From Tragical Histories to Gothic Tales* (2019); Also *Beyond 1776: Globalizing the Cultures of the American Revolution*, ed. by Maria O'Malley and Denys Van Renen (2018)--10 essays treating exchanges and other consequences of the Revolution. Remaining from March 2019: Annika Mann, *Reading Contagion: The Hazards of Reading in the Age of Print* (2018); chapters on 18C medicine, Pope, Smollett, Blake, Mary Shelly, etc.

Cover illustration: *The Sack of Rome by the Visigoths on 24 August 410* by Joseph-Noël Sylvestre (1890).

The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer

The Newsletter of the EC/ASECS

N.S. Volume 34, Number 2: October 2020

James E. May, editor

1423 Hillcrest Road

Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17603

U.S.A.