



The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer

N.S. Volume 34, Number 1: March 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 memberships. For information about the EC/ASECS, see the current EC/ASECS homepage, www.ec-asecs.org (maintained by Susan Cherie Beam). The next submission deadline is 15 September 2020.

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 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. 1-33; Old Dominion University has archived issues from 1987-2009. Issues for May 2007 through March 2018, the indices for 1992-2019 (that for **2012-19 added in 2020**), and a table of contents for issues since December 1986 are all available at the Newsletter Archive of the EC/ASECS website noted above.

A Gettysburg Address EC/ASECS Presidential Address, October 26, 2019

Sylvia Kasey Marks

Before beginning, I'd like to say that I am grateful to all those who have been responsible for the stewardship over the past fifty years of the East Central American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies. I'd like to thank the organizers of this wonderful conference. And then I'd like to welcome all those founding members of the East Central who are here to celebrate our fiftieth anniversary. It's always good to see the staunch regulars who have come and to acknowledge the new faces of those who are joining us for the first time.

Four score and seven years ago. Or should I say more correctly, two score and nearly ten years ago? When I learned at our Washington meeting in 2017 that I would be giving the presidential address at the fiftieth anniversary celebration of the founding of the East Central, I was rather overwhelmed by both the honor and the responsibility to say something exceptional on this important occasion. Or, as my more illustrious predecessor at Gettysburg, Abraham Lincoln, observed, to say "some appropriate thing."¹

I would like to take you on a little odyssey of my meanderings over the past two years to determine what I would say today. Would I talk about the history of our group and come up with some witty stories from times past? Having been a member since the eighties, I knew I definitely could pay tribute to the spirit and collegiality that marked our group from the beginning. Or, to go in a different direction: Would I try to find out what people were reading in Gettysburg in 1863, particularly eighteenth-century books? What was Lincoln reading; what was his wife Mary Todd Lincoln reading? How were booksellers doing? Would I try to do a close textual analysis of Lincoln's speech to learn about speechwriting at the time?

Or, would I examine what was going on fifty years ago in 1970 both academically and historically? Or, would I entertain some grand philosophical idea or present a different angle on an eighteenth-century literary figure? And then there was always something I could do to expand on my own research in conduct books and in eighteenth-century young adult fiction. Many options presented themselves.

However, although I don't regard myself as particularly pugnacious or combative, I kept returning to the motif of battle. While we are celebrating an anniversary, we are, after all, meeting here in Gettysburg, scene of one of the most famous battles in American history and the occasion for one of the most famous speeches in the world. Lincoln's Gettysburg Address appears in nearly every list of memorable speeches.

What was going on in the world at large in 1863? The United States, the great experiment, was only eighty-seven years old. Authors like Emily Dickinson, Mark Twain, Herman Melville, Charles Dickens, Thackeray, Ibsen, Dostoevsky, and Tolstoy were at work. Johannes Brahms was composing his musical masterpieces. In Boston, Sarah Josepha Hale (1837-1877), editor for over forty years of *Godey's Lady's Book*, a nineteenth-

century combination of Martha Stewart and the *New Yorker*, had compiled the *Woman's Record* (1853). This is an exhaustive and instructive encyclopedia that includes, according to its subtitle, *Sketches of all Distinguished Women, from "The Beginning" till A.D. 1850*. Jane Austen, Frances Burney, and Maria Edgeworth are among those on Hale's roster. On another front, Hale had unsuccessfully lobbied presidents for seventeen years for a national day of thanksgiving, and it's only her letter to Lincoln that prompted him to sign the act establishing Thanksgiving Day, as an official national holiday. This was in October, 1863, a month before the Gettysburg Address, certainly one attempt to promote unity during the Civil War.²

The battle at Gettysburg in July, 1863, had been a grisly and awful affair, resulting in over 20,000 casualties on both sides, including fatalities, and the small town of just over 2000 citizens found itself tasked with identifying and burying bodies in the stench of the July heat. Contemporary photographs chronicle scenes of unburied soldiers on the battlefield. Pennsylvania governor, Andrew Curtin, appointed David Wills, a prominent citizen and lawyer of Gettysburg, to arrange for the burials as quickly as possible. Lincoln stayed in Wills' home, just across the street from our conference hotel, the Gettysburg Hotel, and probably worked on one of the five extant versions of his speech there.³

In the meantime, plans were made for a dedication of the boot-shaped cemetery with each concentric semicircle dedicated to the fallen soldiers of a northern state. The eminent orator and classically trained New Englander, Edward Everett, agreed to be the main speaker and requested two months to allow for his preparation, accounting for the dedication date of Thursday, November 19, 1863. Lincoln had accepted an ordinary invitation only to attend the ceremonies. The invitation to speak formally was an afterthought of Governor Curtin and David Wills. Lincoln was, after all, the president. Lincoln accepted with only two weeks to prepare!⁴

Lincoln had a great deal on his mind. The war raged on and was of primary concern for him. On a personal level, the Lincolns were still mourning the death of son Willie Lincoln, who had died at age twelve the previous year in February, 1862. Tad, the Lincolns' fourth son, ten years old, was ill with a fever in Washington just before the dedication, and Mary Todd Lincoln didn't want her husband to go to Gettysburg.⁵

At the dedication, Edward Everett, the main speaker, delivered an address lasting the expected two hours of the grand orators of the time. Lincoln's speech was notable for its brevity, just under three hundred words and delivered in about two minutes. The public's response to Lincoln's two-minute oration was mixed; it had all happened so quickly. But Edward Everett later wrote to Lincoln, "I should be glad, if I could flatter myself that I came so near to the central idea of the occasion, in two hours, as you did in two minutes."⁶

What did Lincoln bring to the speech in terms of background and preparation? We know that he mostly educated himself through constant reading. Did he bring to his adult life any connections with eighteenth-century works? Among his jobs as a young man of twenty-two in Salem, Illinois, 1831-1837, was that of running a store. As the story is told, at the bottom of

an empty barrel he discovered *Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England* published in 1765, and this work greatly influenced his thought.⁷

During the White House years, someone in the family borrowed Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* and Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* from the Library of Congress. But studies of books Lincoln might have read suggest that the likelihood of his having read those works is slim; perhaps it was Mary Todd Lincoln who enjoyed them. However, we do know that besides *Blackstone*, Lincoln was well versed in the King James Bible. He read Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, Milton's *Lycidas*, and Pope's *Essay on Man*. He was a great raconteur and could quote Shakespeare at length. During the summers, he and John Hay, Lincoln's private secretary at the time, would escape the heat of Washington by heading to the Soldiers' Home, a small retreat outside the city, a sort of summer White House, enjoyed by all the Lincoln family. There, Lincoln and Hay would read Shakespeare aloud together. Lincoln's comments on Shakespeare underscore a thorough familiarity with the works of the English bard, particularly the history plays and *Macbeth*.⁸

But we are celebrating an anniversary and not dedicating a cemetery, and I knew I still had more to do by way of tying things together and reflecting on our festivities. What was going on in the world in 1970, the year of our founding? The Vietnam War continued. Alexander Solzhenitsyn won the Nobel Prize in literature. Noted figures who died were Alvin Toffler author of *Future Shock*, John Gunther, E.M. Forster, John Dos Passos, and Charles de Gaulle. The latest inspirational book was Richard Bach's *Jonathan Livingston Seagull*. These were pre-Google days. The words digital humanities and database were not in our vocabulary, and we searched for bibliographies of eighteenth-century studies in hard-copy volumes of the *MLA Bibliography*, *Philological Quarterly*, *Studies in English Literature*, *Eighteenth-Century Current Bibliography*, and the *Year's Work in English Studies*, among other publications.

For the historical background of our group, I turned to Joan Stemmler's thorough history of the East Central up to the year 2000 published in the *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*. After the 1969 MLA meeting, ASECS was founded on the model of the Renaissance Society. Eager to start a regional group geographically convenient for scholars, the first members of the East Central met to organize in the spring, 1970, in Cleveland. The first conference was held in West Virginia on October 31 through November 1, 1970. So we are anticipating that first gathering by celebrating this fall, 2019. The meeting was a small one, but the model was set for future years: papers, principal speakers, a banquet, a musical performance, and the presentation of a play, in this case Henry Fielding's *Tom Thumb*.⁹

Stemmler notes Beth Lambert's report on the East Central group titled "What Makes Us Unique," which was presented in 1990 at an ASECS meeting. I think her assessments hold true today: Our spirit is welcoming. We encourage well-established scholars, as well as independent scholars, strong graduate students, and even exceptional undergraduates mentored by our members. Many members from other regions have felt very much at home with us. We continue the tradition of financially supporting the

attendance of graduate students and awarding a prize for the best paper. The early mimeographed *Newsletter* was succeeded by the *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*, now a well-respected publication in its own right.¹⁰

I had saved some copies of the early *Newsletters*. Of particular interest is Leland Peterson's presidential address published in the Winter, 1985-86, issue. The sixteenth annual East Central meeting was held here in Gettysburg, and Peterson's talk was titled "Reflections on the MLA Centennial: a Valedictory?" Peterson reports on the statements of the candidates for the Delegates Assembly of the MLA, and he also supplies tables of statistics to support his observations on the state of the profession. His comments are prophetic, telling, and sound familiar. He paints a bleak picture of our profession in 1985.¹¹

One candidate, David Covert, cited in Peterson's talk describes his concern about "certain deplorable trends within departments of English: vocationalism, the incremental devaluation—or at least displacement—of literary studies, and the paradoxical ghettoizing of composition." Peterson adds, "Most English departments will become Communications departments and will be void of courses in the earlier periods (before 1970) if they profess any literature at all."¹²

Peterson observes that Latin and Greek were required for a liberal education in the early part of the twentieth century, but by 1985, language requirements could be fulfilled by studying modern languages like French, German, and Spanish. These languages, he says "must now suffer their demotion in turn." In fact, several of my colleagues tell me of the recent closing of foreign language departments. Peterson observes the reduction of the number of PhD degrees awarded between 1973 and 1983, acknowledging that departments may be acting responsibly in view of a decreasing job market. At the same time, he notes that departments and professional organizations are arranging seminars and workshops and publishing advice books for brand-new PhDs to learn how to find jobs outside of academia. On a positive side, while noting the decline in MLA membership in the 1970s, he also recognizes the establishing of new scholarly societies such as ASECS. Peterson celebrates the "superior degree of conviviality and elegance that one unfailingly finds at our 18th-century conventions." This is something we continue to enjoy today.¹³

I turned to the most recent issue of our own *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*, where I found that Leland Peterson's concerns in 1985 about the profession are echoed in a related way nearly twenty-five years later. Melvyn New bemoans the state of the academic classroom today and is especially alarmed by the fact that *Robinson Crusoe*, in particular, and classical works, in general, are not being taught and are instead being subjected to a subtle form of censorship.¹⁴

Two score and ten years after the founding of East Central, we find ourselves in the midst of a cultural and academic battle. The observations of Leland Peterson and Melvyn New were corroborated when I started going through the articles I'd clipped and saved for the past two years. In some ways, it's a disparate collection but points in the same direction to an academic and cultural upheaval. Here's a random selection.

New York's Metropolitan Opera is in trouble. The Met took in only sixty-seven percent of its potential box office revenue in 2018, a record low. Its credit rating is down. Administrators hope that perhaps the introduction of the Sunday matinée will help. But even the lighter-weight Broadway box office worries about Sunday matinée competition from televised football.¹⁵

The public's enthusiasm for the last twenty years for all history museums and historic sites, including Colonial Williamsburg, has waned. Attendance levels at civil war destinations have also fallen. Five sites declined to 3.1 million visitors in 2018, down from 10.2 million in 1970. In 2018, Gettysburg itself had about 950,000 visitors, 14% of its draw in 1970, and it experienced the lowest annual number of visitors since 1959.¹⁶

Books checked out at the New York Society Library, a private circulating library, fell 36.7 %. Then there is the rise of the graphic novel, which seems a dangerously close relative of the barely approved comic book many of us grew up with. Some lawyers are spicing up dense documents with cartoons to make them more readable.¹⁷

STEM, short for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, is the ubiquitous buzz word today, and it's hard to convince anyone to insert the A for Arts to create STEAM in the acronym. Sales of books on cleaning are up 94%. It occurred to me that the positive application of this trend in the battle against STEM is for all of us to clean out our offices and retool our lecture notes following the advice of such gurus as Marie Kondo in her best-selling book, *The Life-Changing Magic of Tidying Up*.¹⁸

On the academic front, newspapers have reported that Hampshire College in Massachusetts is on the brink of closing. In Vermont small institutions such as Green Mountain College are also shutting their doors. Small state schools like the University of Wisconsin at Stevens Point and other rural colleges are struggling. University English departments lost 20% of their majors. Even prestigious MBA programs at Harvard, MIT, and Stanford report a steep drop in applicants. I've heard it said that in the future professors may be called academic technicians.¹⁹

All of us will know of other signs in our own academic world that are not hopeful. At the same time, there is some light; the patient is not dead. On our front, the programs of the International, American, and our own regional eighteenth-century societies still have papers devoted to Swift, Fielding, Richardson, Dryden, and Pope. And the most recent issue of our *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer* alone, with its articles on teaching the eighteenth century, reminds us of our origins and the original mission of our group.

My final observation for this anniversary time is the recounting of a literary and rollicking friendship that points to the kind of rapport and collegiality I and many others have come to expect from East Central members, even if we only meet once a year. It encapsulates what we can learn about the mutual appreciation of each other's scholarship, about collegiality, and about the joy that comes from the sheer fun of eighteenth-century figures and their works. Theodore Roosevelt had a portrait of Abraham Lincoln in his office, and sometimes, when faced with a difficult question, asked himself what would Lincoln do? During my meanderings in preparation for this talk I finally asked myself what would Samuel Johnson do?²⁰

Frances Burney had published her first novel *Evelina* anonymously in 1778, and its eager readers wondered about the identity of the author. Devotees of the novel such as Edmund Burke had sat up all night to read this newly popular work, as did Sir Joshua Reynolds. Sir Joshua vowed he would give fifty pounds to know the author.²¹

Samuel Johnson had been living with the Thrales at Streatham for about ten years. For Frances, her first formal meeting with Johnson at Streatham in August, 1778, was, according to her, “the most Consequential Day I have spent since my Birth.” She worried about her awkwardness and suffered in advance of the visit from what she called the “Fidgets.”²²

Frances Burney was twenty-six, and Samuel Johnson was sixty-nine. If Burney’s father, the musicologist Dr. Charles Burney, and Samuel Crisp, a close and long-time family friend, were affectionately identified by her as her two Daddys, perhaps that makes Samuel Johnson her Great Granddaddy. Most of Johnson’s work had already been completed: *The Rambler*, *The Idler*, *The Journey to the Western Island of Scotland*, *London*, *The Vanity of Human Wishes*, *Irene*, *The Dictionary*, *Rasselas*, and the *Shakespeare Prefaces*. At the time he met Frances he was working on *The Lives of the Poets*. Johnson was completing his life’s work, while Burney was just beginning.

How do we know what happened between that first formal introduction in 1778 and Johnson’s death in 1784? The visit is not described in the usual biographies except in bits and pieces. I was intrigued by Chauncey Brewster Tinker’s one-volume collection, published in 1911, titled *Dr. Johnson and Fanny Burney*. This work draws from the 1842 edition of Burney’s diary and letters edited by Charlotte Barrett, Burney’s niece and literary executrix. While Tinker’s collection does not benefit from the superb modern editing practices of Peter Sabor and other scholars at McGill’s Burney Centre, the volume, a combination of dialogues, letters, journal entries, recorded conversations, and vivid descriptions, is a single-volume quarry for the friendship and reads almost like a Burney novel. One might say it’s a version of the course packet.²³

I hope this very brief tour through Frances Burney’s dramatic and lively accounts of her friendship with Johnson will contribute to yet another picture of him and of Burney herself as a budding author and, at the same time and most importantly, be an inspiration for us as scholars and mentors.

Frances had already described Johnson’s physical appearance in her diaries from an earlier visit Johnson made to her father: “His mouth is in perpetual motion, as if he was chewing; . . . his Body is in continual agitation, *see sawing* up & down; his Feet are never a moment quiet;--&, in short, his whole person is in perpetual motion.”²⁴ But on the occasion of this first formal meeting between the two at Streatham, the emphasis was on *Evelina*. Johnson couldn’t say enough good things about Burney’s first novel. He laughed heartily at the comic parts. He recollected amusing scenes and, according to Mrs. Thrale, raved about Mr. Smith, his favorite character: “Harry Fielding never drew so good a Character!--such a fine *varnish* of low politeness!--such a *struggle* to appear a Gentleman!” Burney, ever reserved and self-effacing, writes, “I almost poked myself under the Table; never did I feel so “queer” a confusion since I was Born! But he added a great deal *more*,-- only I cannot

recollect his exact words, & I do not chuse to give him *mine*.” This bit of annotation suggests that Burney attempted to be scrupulous about her observations and about how they were recorded.²⁵

The first meeting was a good one; Burney did not want to be noticed as the author of *Evelina*, and Johnson obliged: ”But how grateful do I feel to this dear Dr. Johnson for never naming *me* and the *Book* as belonging one to the other. . . . But, indeed, the delicacy I met with from him & from all the Thrales, was yet *more* flattering to me than all the praise with which I have *heard* they have Honoured my Book.” It was also a happy day because Burney was invited to visit Streatham and to stay with the Thrales for some time. And so from 1778 to 1784 Burney had the opportunity to live in the Thrale household, to enjoy the benefits of a lively salon of visitors, to travel with the Thrales, and to observe and befriend Johnson, or perhaps it was just the opposite. She even enjoyed a course of Latin lessons from Johnson along with Hester Thrale’s daughter Queeney.²⁶

What was Burney’s method of writing? There’s a 1717 play by John Gay, Alexander Pope, and John Arbuthnot, *Three Hours after Marriage*, in which Phoebe Clinket, a female poetess, is accompanied by a maid who has a writing desk strapped to her back so that Phoebe can write down her thoughts as they come. I don’t think Burney was quite this dramatic or obvious. Guests at Streatham spent the mornings on their own, leaving writing time for Frances. Johnson himself sometimes slept in until noon. Evenings were reserved for dinner and conversation afterwards, sometimes with Johnson alone in the library, where they could hear each other better, given Johnson’s slight deafness.²⁷

Their conversations, or confabs, as Burney calls them, usually included literary discussions. At the same time, she recalls Johnson’s recollections of his Scottish tour during which he “quite *gravely*” wished she had been one of the party and other “long & melancholy discourses” after Mr. Thrale’s death in 1781. Frances was a reader, but when Johnson queried her about her reading, she responded, “O, sir! . . . I dread being Catechized by You--I dare not make *any* answer, for I am sure whatever I should say would be wrong! . . .” He Laughed, & to my great relief, spared me any further questions upon the subject. . . . I am sure the examination . . . would have turned out sorely to my discredit.”²⁸

In order to record these conversations, Burney talks of “absconding” to her room and amusing herself in writing till she tired. Her accounts were written mostly to her sister Susannah, her father, or Samuel Crisp. When describing Burney’s method of letter and journal writing, I am reminded of Samuel Richardson’s phrase of “writing to the moment.” One gains a sense of immediacy in Burney’s amazingly detailed and lively entries. At times Burney admits to falling behind in her “journalising” because, as she says, she has never had “so many curious anecdotes to record.” In another account, she speaks of Johnson being “in a sportive humour” but regrets that she can only “write some few disjointed speeches, wanting *Time* to be prolix, not *inclination*.” Though Burney’s novels after *Evelina* were not written in the epistolary form, her journals, letters, and diaries retain this liveliness of drama, dialogue, and character delineation throughout her life.²⁹

Burney reports on Johnson's social behavior. He was at times ungainly and disruptive, and Frances noted that he did not receive invitations for dinner, "either from too much *respect* or too much *fear*." He could be critical; he had ready commentary on all subjects. Fanny herself felt the awkwardness of being near him in public: "I dread [being with] him before strangers, from the staring attention he attracts both for himself & all with whom he talks."³⁰

Johnson was playful and affectionate. He teased her for being a wit; he had pet names for her: "little Burney" and "little Rogue." Once, she writes, "Dr. Johnson *forced* me to sit on a very small sofa next to him, which was hardly large enough for himself, & which would have made a subject for a Print by [caricaturist] Harry Bunbury that would have diverted all London."³¹

Johnson had Frances' literary reputation at heart. In anticipation of the Bluestocking Elizabeth Montagu's dinner with the Thrales, Johnson forcefully urges Burney: "'Down with her, Burney!—down with her!—spare her not! attack her, fight her, & down with her at once!--You are a rising Wit,--she is at the Top.'" During the dinner Johnson praised *Evelina* highly, and after the evening was over, Johnson, according to Burney, "taking both my Hands, & looking at me with an expression of much kindness, he said, 'Well, Miss Burney, Mrs. Montagu now will read *Evelina*.'" To which Burney responded with her usual reserve, "'You were very kind, Sir . . . to speak of it with so much favour & indulgence."³²

Following the success of *Evelina*, Mrs. Thrale encouraged Frances to write a comedy. Johnson teased Frances: "You little *Character-monger* " And turning to Mrs. Thrale and laughing, he added, "'Why, Madam. . . she is Writing one up stairs all the Time.'" Johnson's suggested title for the comedy was "*Stretham* [sic], a *Farce*."³³

Burney followed up on the suggestion, and the project was supported by others among the Streathamites, as well as by her father and Samuel Crisp. The play, *The Witlings*, was completed in 1779, but after a private reading, Charles Burney and Crisp both warned that the satire might offend Bluestockings such as Elizabeth Montagu in the character of Lady Smatter, a character who inaccurately quotes Pope and Shakespeare; even Charles Burney might have taken exception to a veiled connection of himself with the less-than-poet Dabler. Mrs. Thrale, too, thought that she might be mirrored in Lady Smatter.³⁴

Are any of the others among the Streathamites satirized in Burney's later novels? Do they make an appearance in another guise? Does Johnson? Burney's gift for characterization was recognized. On another occasion Burney describes Edmund Burke, "looking very archly at me & around him, . . . 'Are you sitting here [looking] for Characters?'" Burke added, "'Nothing, by the way, struck me more in reading your Book, than the admirable skill with which your *ingenious* Characters make themselves known by their own Words.'" Mrs. Thrale, too, would acknowledge Burney's powers of observation, "'How well you know [Johnson], and me and all of us."³⁵

Burney's novels are peopled by good, older men as well. In *Camilla* (1796), *Camilla's* father, Reverend Tyrold, is a steady pastor with a good deal of common sense, much on the order of Reverend Villars in *Evelina* and in the mold of the good French Catholic bishop in *The Wanderer*.

At the same time, Burney was not a stranger to unusual or exceptional individuals. She had observed them in her father's home. Before even associating with Johnson at Streatham, she had introduced that type in *Evelina* in such characters as the boisterous Captain Mirvan and crass Mr. Branghton. After *The Witlings*, we meet other older and kindly, but eccentric men like Albany in *Cecilia*, at once generous and kind, but driven mad and crazy by his charitable adventures. In *Camilla*, we encounter a wealthy, benevolent uncle, Sir Hugh Tyrold, whose good intentions are misguided. In *The Wanderer* there are a number of eccentric, yet helpful and earnest, older men whose monetary assistance is refused for prudential reasons by Ellis, the heroine, in spite of her nearly destitute state: Farmer Gooch and Mr. Stubbs the steward; Mr. Tedman, a merchant; Ellis' feisty uncle, Admiral Powel; and Sir Jaspas Herrington, a gouty old bachelor of seventy-five who is subject to fantastic dreams and exhibits a strong attachment to the heroine.

However, none of these individuals seems to be a clone of Johnson or to encapsulate his character. A close analysis may show that Burney combined and divided the characteristics of the people she knew from her experience and reading to create a unique character. One might argue that Burney has kept Johnson's confidence and not discovered him publicly in her novels, something that would not happen until the 1842 publication of her diaries by her niece Charlotte Barrett. And, if anything, we may be meeting in her novels something of Burney's own self that's reflected and echoed in her letters and journals: an intelligent, refined, reserved, self-effacing young woman, a young woman susceptible to being imposed upon.

Dr. Johnson's health was precarious during 1784. He welcomed Frances' visits and had asked her to remember him in her prayers. She records, "I longed to ask *him* to remember *me!* but did not dare. I gave him my promise, & very heavily indeed, I left him." Later, close to the end, Johnson was too weak to see her. But Fanny records Charles Burney's visit during which Johnson asked him to tell Fanny about continuing their conversation: "I think I shall throw the Ball at Fanny yet." Affection and humor till the end.³⁶

In 1786 Frances reluctantly, at the recommendation of friends, assumed the role of Assistant Keeper of the Robes to Queen Charlotte in the court of George III. The duties of the position impaired her health. But she writes amusingly about an encounter with James Boswell in 1790. Burney had agreed to meet Boswell for old time's sake after the Evening Service in St. George's Chapel. According to Burney, Boswell was seeking her help: "You must give me some of your choice little notes of the Doctor's,--we have seen him long enough upon stilts; I want to shew him in a new light. . . . I want to shew him as Gay Sam, agreeable Sam, pleasant Sam!-- so you must help me with some of his beautiful billets to yourself." She adamantly refused. In the meantime, as Burney describes it, the encounter between the two was creating a commotion and becoming embarrassing. A crowd was gathering "at the Iron Rails of the Queen's Lodge." Her commanding and demanding supervisor, Mrs. Schwollenberg, was observing the scene from her window. The King, Queen, and Royal Family were approaching. Burney escaped, but Boswell tried again the next morning after early prayers. Burney held firm: "I shall

hold sacred those revered & but too scarce testimonies of the high honour his [Johnson's] kindness conferred upon me." Interestingly, the side of "Sam" Boswell wanted to hear about is found in Burney's journals and letters.³⁷

In approximately 1781, Burney reports that Johnson had arranged for her books to be added to the Bodleian. She writes, "When he goes to Oxford, he will write my Name in the Books, my Age when I writ them; & sign it with his *own*:--' & then, he says, the World may know that we so mix'd our studies, & so join'd our Fame—for we shall go down Hand in Hand to Posterity!"³⁸

There is no evidence Burney's book was deposited at the Bodleian. In any case, the subtitle of *Evelina* is "The History of a Young Lady's Entrance into the World." Indeed, Dr. Johnson had accompanied Frances Burney on her "entrance into the world" as a new writer. And she had accompanied him. Her "journalising" allows them to go down hand in hand to posterity!

And so I come full circle to Lincoln. If Lincoln's dedication of a cemetery wrests something inspiring and memorable out of a somber and divisive moment in American history, the Burney-Johnson friendship reminds us of the best of the eighteenth century and the best of the East Central. Their friendship is more than just a good story to enliven a class or to remind us of the rewarding experience of returning to primary sources. We learn from the people and events that have come before us. But the learning is reciprocal, as our mature scholars cheer on and learn from the efforts of newcomers.

In Albert Camus' *The Plague*, which I teach in my medicine and literature course, Dr. Rieux says that "the only means of fighting a plague is—common decency. . . . in my case I know that it consists in doing my job." Our job is a demanding one today. We must regard the disturbing signs I've outlined earlier in this talk as more than a wakeup call. Perhaps we are dealing with a four-alarm fire or a case of the frog in the pot of water that doesn't recognize that the heat is slowly being turned up.³⁹

Two score and nearly ten years ago. I hope this celebration will inspire us to rededicate ourselves to the goals of the East Central founders and to commit ourselves in practical ways to continue the good work of our group and thus to engage in the current cultural and academic battle. Let us continue to nurture the spirit of collegiality; to pay active attention to the status of our field of scholarship; to give new life to the characters, works, and century we love; to freshen up our teaching in imaginative ways and to share what we have learned with the rest of us. East Central depends on your active participation at our annual meetings; on offering a home for our future gatherings; on contributions to the *East-Central Intelligencer*. Invite a friend to a meeting. Give a gift membership to welcome back an established colleague. Give another gift membership to welcome into the fold a new PhD just starting out. On our battleground, we must fight rigorously, vigorously, and cleverly against being marginalized or forced into obscurity. Each of us must, and will, find his or her own way to do this, to make a difference in this time of cultural and academic upheaval.

Drawing on the words of Abraham Lincoln, I hope I have said "some appropriate thing" for the occasion. Happy Anniversary, East Central!

Notes

I would like to thank Jim May for providing East Central archival materials and bibliographical information. Parts of this talk were presented at the 2017 ASECS meeting in Minneapolis in a paper entitled “Frances Burney and Samuel Johnson: The Streatham Years.” I would also note that any facts or statistics are accurate as of the original presentation of this talk on Saturday, October 26, 2019.

1. Martin P. Johnson, *Writing the Gettysburg Address* (Lawrence: U. Press of Kansas, 2013), p. 218.

2. Philip B. Kunhardt, Jr., *A New Birth of Freedom: Lincoln at Gettysburg* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1983), pp. 5-6 and 35-39; on Sarah Josepha Hale, see Andrew F. Smith, *The Turkey: An American Story* (Champaign-Urbana: U. of Illinois Press, 2006), pp. 74-76, pp. 190-191, n. 41.

3. On the aftermath of the Gettysburg battle, see Gary Wills, *Lincoln at Gettysburg* (New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1992), pp. 20-24, 30; Kunhardt, pp. 32-39, photographs on pp. 8-10.

4. On Everett, see Kunhardt, pp. 32-39.

5. On Tad, see Kunhardt, pp. 3 and 17.

6. On mixed response, see Johnson, pp. 188 and 230 and Wills, p. 36. For Everett’s compliment, see Johnson, pp. 16 and 238-239.

7. Lincoln read Blackstone assiduously and recommended it as a course of study for an aspiring lawyer: Abraham Lincoln, *Abraham Lincoln: His Speeches and Writings*, ed. Roy P. Basler (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1946), pp. 2 and 6; Roy P. Basler, *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, 8 vols. (New Brunswick: Rutgers U. Press, 1953), 3: 344 and 4: 121. See also William H. Herndon, *Herndon’s Life of Lincoln* (New York: Albert and Charles Boni, 1930), pp. 92 and 261. Also see *Herndon’s Informants*, ed. Douglas L. Wilson and Rodney O. Davis (Champaign-Urbana: U. of Illinois Press, 1998), pp. 9, 81, 91, 440, 441, 540. On Lincoln’s purchase of Blackstone, see Allen C. Guelzo, *Abraham Lincoln: Redeemer President* (Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), pp. 76-77. On the rubbish barrel story, see Frederick Trevor Hill, *Lincoln the Lawyer* (New York: The Century Co., [1906] 1912), p. 50, and Dale Carnegie, *How to Win Friends and Influence People* (New York: Gallery Books, 1998), p. 19.

8. For a study of Lincoln’s reading that ranks the likelihood of his having read particular works, see Robert C. Bray, “What Abraham Lincoln Read—An Evaluative and Annotated List,” *Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association*, vol. 28, no. 2, Summer, 2007, pp. 28-81. For a longer study and a list of specific works Lincoln is known to have read by his own admission or according to the comments of others, see Robert C. Bray, *Reading With Lincoln* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press, 2010); *The Annotated Lincoln*, eds. Harold Holzer and Thomas A. Horrocks (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard U. Press, 2016), pp. 4, 6, 8, and 351. On reading the Bible, see Kunhardt, p. 42; on the Bible and Shakespeare see A.E. Elmore, *Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address: Echoes of the Bible and Book of Common Prayer* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois U. Press, 2009), pp. 44-46. On reading Shakespeare, see Kunhardt, pp. 30-31; John Taliaferro, *All the Great Prizes*.

The Life of John Hay, from Lincoln to Roosevelt (New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2013), pp. 51-52 and 73.

9. Joan K. Stemmler, "Towards a History of the East-Central/American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies," *The East-Central Intelligencer*, n.s., 15, no. 1 (January, 2001), pp. 6-19; Program for "American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, East Central Regional Conference," West Virginia University, October 31-November 1, 1970.

10. Beth Lambert, "What Makes Us Unique?" cited in Stemmler's "Towards a History," p. 6.

11. Leland D. Peterson, "Reflections on the MLA Centennial: A Valedictory?" *EC/ASECS Newsletter* (Winter [19]85-[19]86), pp. 7-21.

12. Peterson, "Reflections," pp. 7 and 10-11.

13. Peterson, "Reflections," pp. 10-11; about EC conviviality, p. 9.

14. Melvyn New, "*Robinson Crusoe* and the Canon," *The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*, n.s. 33, no. 2 (Oct., 2019), pp. 6-9.

15. Michael Cooper, "In a First, Met Opera To Perform Sundays," *New York Times* (Sept. 15, 2018), pp. C1 and C4; Ted Alcorn, "At the Opera, Applause for an Unsung Cast of 42," *New York Times* (Nov. 18, 2018), pp. MB 4-5; Michael Cooper, "Opera's Phantom Fans," *New York Times* (Dec. 22, 2018), pp. C1 and C5.

16. Mitchell B. Reiss, "A Message from the President," *2017 Annual Report Colonial Williamsburg*, p. 3; Cameron M. Whirter, "Civil War Destinations Are Losing Ground," *Wall Street Journal* (May 28, 2019), p. A3.

17. Carolyn Waters, "Greetings from the Head Librarian," *Books & People*, 26, no. 1 (Spring, 2019), p. 2; Mike Cherney, "Lawyers Take a Comic Approach To Spice Up Boring Contracts," *The Wall Street Journal* (June 1-2, 2019), pp. A1 and A10.

18. Ellen Gartnerman, "To Declutter, First Get Lots of Books," *Wall Street Journal* (Oct. 2, 2019), pp. A1 and A11.

19. Tom Perrin, "One Way to Make College Meaningful," *New York Times* (Feb. 3, 2019), p. SR12; Jon Kamp, "In Vermont, Small Colleges Are Closing," *Wall Street Journal* (May 18-19, 2019), p. A3; Jon Kamp, "Tiny Liberal-Arts College Fights to Survive," *Wall Street Journal* (July 3, 2019), p. A3; Mitch Smith, "At Struggling Rural Colleges, No Future for History Degrees," *New York Times* (Jan. 13, 2019), p. A1; on loss of English majors, Adam Kirsch, "Stop Worrying About the 'Death' of the Humanities," *Wall Street Journal* (April 27-28, 2019), pp. C1 and C2; William McGurn, "Is Majoring in English Worth It?" *Wall Street Journal* (Sept. 10, 2019), p. A13; Chip Cotter, "Elite M.B.A. Programs Lose Applicants," *Wall Street Journal* (Oct. 16, 2019), pp. B1 and B2.

20. Theodore Roosevelt was a great admirer of Lincoln. On Lincoln's portrait see Carnegie, p. 11; Joseph Bucklin Bishop, *Theodore Roosevelt and His Time*, 2 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons's [sic], 1920), 1: 352. Before TR's inauguration, John Hay, Lincoln's secretary and then TR's secretary of state, presented TR with a ring containing a lock of Lincoln's hair, Bishop, 1: 362-63; *The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt*, ed. Elting E. Morison and John M. Blum, 8 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1951-1954), vol. 4 (1903-1905), 1132-1133; vol. 8 (1914-1917), 1057.

21. On Burke and Reynolds see *Dr. Johnson and Fanny Burney*, ed. Chauncey Brewster Tinker (New York: Moffat, Yard and Company, 1911), p. 24; hereafter this work will be referred to as Tinker. *The Early Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney*, 5 vols., vol. 3 (Pt. I, 1780-1781), ed. Lars E. Troide and Stewart J. Cooke (Montreal: McGill-Queens U. Press, 1994), 79; hereafter this work will be referred to as “*EJL*.” Quotations will generally follow *EJL* and other most recent scholarly editions.

22. Johnson at Streatham, Tinker, p. 13 and *EJL*, 3: 62; Peter Sabor, “‘The March of Intimacy’: Dr. Burney and Dr. Johnson,” *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 42, no. 2 (April, 2018), p. 47. For Burney’s comments, Tinker p. 15 and *EJL* 3: 66-67.

23. A member of the audience following my 2017 ASECS talk in Minneapolis noted that Tinker had compiled the Burney and Johnson passages as a course packet that was later published. Gordon Turnbull, general editor of Yale Boswell Editions, has not been able to confirm this.

24. On Johnson’s physical appearance, Tinker, p. 2 and *EJL* (vol. 2: 1774-1777), ed. Lars E. Troide, 2: 225.

25. Johnson on *Evelina*, Tinker, p. 11 and *EJL* 3: 58; on Mr. Smith, Tinker pp. 16-17 and 32-33 and *EJL* 3: 70, 90.

26. On first meeting and Streatham invitation, see Tinker pp. 22-23 and *EJL* 3: 77-78; on Latin lessons, see Tinker pp. 114-115, 120 and *EJL* 3: 336, 452, 268.

27. On Burney’s method Tinker p. 37 and *EJL* 3: 94; on Johnson’s routine see Tinker p. 241, n. 2; on Johnson’s deafness, see Tinker pp. 138-139 and *EJL* (vol. 4, Pt. II, 1780-1781), ed. Betty Rizzo, 4: 463-64.

28. On confabs, see Tinker p. 37 and *EJL* 3: 94; on conversations and Scottish tour, see Tinker pp. 89-90 and *EJL* 3: 127; on Henry Thrale’s death, see Tinker p. 131 and *EJL* 4: 386; on Burney’s reading, see Tinker p. 50 and *EJL* 3: 106.

29. On writing see Tinker p. 37 and *EJL* 3: 94. Charlotte Grandison speaks of “writing to the moment” in Samuel Richardson, *The History of Sir Charles Grandison*, ed. Jocelyn Harris, 5 vols. (London: Oxford U. Press, 1972), 3: 24. On journalising, see *EJL* 3: 18, 267; on Johnson, Tinker p. 90 and *EJL* 3: 128.

30. On Johnson’s social behavior, Tinker p. 152 and *EJL* (vol. 5, 1782-1783), ed. Lars E. Troide and Stewart J. Cooke, 5: 145; on Johnson’s criticism, Tinker p. 27 and *EJL* 3: 86; on Johnson’s commentary see Tinker pp. 41, 44 and *EJL* 3: 97, 100; on Johnson in public see Tinker, pp. 153, 178 and *EJL* 5: 148.

31. Johnson playful and affectionate, see Tinker p. 107 and *EJL* 3: 247; on “little Burney,” see Tinker p. 97 and *EJL* 3: 221; “little rogue,” Tinker p. 32 and *EJL* 3: 89; on the sofa episode, Tinker pp. 122-123 and *EJL* 4: 366.

32. Johnson on Montagu, see Tinker, p. 68 and *EJL* 3: 151; at the dinner, Tinker p. 75 and *EJL* 3: 159-160; after the dinner, Tinker p. 76 and *EJL* 3: 161.

33. Thrale on writing a comedy, Tinker, pp. 53-54 and *EJL* 3: 109-110; *Streatham, a Farce* see Tinker, p. 62 and *EJL* 3: 122n.

34. On *The Witlings*, see *EJL* 3: xi-xiii, 279, 345-354; Tinker p. 53, n.2

35. For Burke's comments, see Tinker p. 162 and *EJL* 5: 194; for Mrs. Thrale, see Tinker p. xxv.

36. For Johnson's health and death see Tinker pp. 187, 181, 191; *The Additional Journals and Letters of Frances Burney* 2 vols., vol. 1 (1784-1786), ed. Stewart J. Cooke and Elaine Bander (Oxford: Oxford U. Press, 2015), 1: 149-151; *The Letters of Dr. Charles Burney*, vol. 1 (1751-1784), ed. Alvaro Ribeiro, SJ (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 1: 463, n. 2, and 1: 464.

37. On the Boswell episode see Tinker pp. 202-204; *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, 6 vols., vol. 6 (1790-1791), ed. Nancy E. Johnson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2019), 6: 207-211.

38. On the Bodleian book, see Tinker p. 120 and *EJL* 3: 444-45 n. 14. Geoffrey Sill and Peter Sabor recently confirmed that they do not know of any copies inscribed by Johnson of Burney's works in the Bodleian. This was also confirmed in an email response from the Bodleian after a search by Daniel Haynes, Bodleian Library Graduate Trainee, on October 10, 2019.

39. Albert Camus, *The Plague*, trans. Stuart Gilbert (New York: Vintage Books, 1991), pt. 2, p. 163.

Remembering Don Mell

By James Woolley

Donald C. Mell, Jr. (1931–2019), Professor of English Emeritus at the University of Delaware, died on 9 November 2019, just two weeks after he chaired the EC/ASECS Swift roundtable for the last time. He was 88. He had served Delaware as director of the University Press 1997–2016, investing most of his energies in what was in effect a second career, though he continued also to be a full member of the English Department; he retired from the faculty in 2017, having taught his last class in the fall of 2014.

My long friendship with Don began in the late 1970s, when we were both working on Swift's poems. This was when Don and John Irwin Fischer founded the Swift Poems Project, which I soon joined and which is still ongoing. Though Don was an active member of the editorial team for only a few years, he remained an unfailing supporter of the project. I know of no one who could take greater pleasure in another's successes or offer wiser and more practical encouragement when the going got tough.

Jerry Beasley and Manny Schonhorn have shared with me memories of Don which resonate with my own and which (with permission) I'd like to quote:

Jerry: "Gifted as a scholar and leader, Don was always modest and kind. People warmed to him instantly and they were never disappointed. Don's directorship of the University of Delaware Press for so many years was a major reason the Press made so much progress toward its great potential as a leader in scholarly publishing. I was a member of the Press Board for several years and marveled at Don's gift for dealing humanely, wisely, always firmly

with authors of submitted manuscripts. As a friend and colleague he was generous and kind, always supportive and ever a source of good advice, personal as well as professional.”

Manny: “Don Mell and I were graduate students at the University of Pennsylvania in the late 1950s. I then knew Don for 60 years. He was a quiet, secure gentleman of grace and courtesy who seemed to delight in going out of his many ways to do things for his profession and colleagues. To his very end, he was one of the most kind, thoughtful, and considerate citizens of our illustrious eighteenth-century community.”

Don graduated from Yale in 1953; after Army service, he returned to Yale for an MAT (1956) and an MA (1959). In 1961, he earned his PhD at Penn. After teaching at Rutgers and Middlebury, he joined the Delaware English faculty in 1968, rising through the ranks to become a full professor in 1983. There he remained until retirement, except for a year in Washington as an NEH program officer. He taught the British literature survey, courses in satire and eighteenth-century British literature, and a graduate course in eighteenth-century British poetry.

His Penn dissertation, which Maurice Johnson had supervised, was at length published as *A Poetics of Augustan Elegy: Studies of Poems by Dryden, Pope, Prior, Swift, Gray, and Johnson* (Rodopi, 1974). He continued to publish articles and some courteous but trenchant reviews. In 1981, he and John Fischer edited the essay collection *Contemporary Studies of Swift's Poetry* (Delaware). In 1982, he published an important and still useful annotated bibliography, *English Poetry, 1660–1800* (Gale). A. J. Sambrook, reviewing that volume, said that in Don's annotations, “he has scored a remarkably high proportion of bull's-eyes.” Sambrook identified Don as “a prominent Swift scholar,” and for the rest of his life, that remained an accurate characterization. His later books included a co-edited essay collection, *Man, God, and Nature in the Enlightenment* (Colleagues Press, 1988), and another edited collection, *Pope, Swift, and Women Writers* (Delaware, 1996). He completed Robert Hogan's edition, *The Poems of Patrick Delany* (Delaware, 2006), modestly listing himself as associate editor, though more than half the work was in fact his. The edition made an invaluable contribution to Irish studies and Swift studies. His latest curriculum vitae (2018) listed a book in progress on modes of self-presentation in Swift's autobiographical poems.

Don was a founding member of EC/ASECS and was devoted to our society, chairing or co-chairing the annual conference in 1983, 1995, and 2014. He was conspicuous at ASECS and EC/ASECS meetings for staffing the book exhibits, and, especially at ASECS, for hosting the much-anticipated University of Delaware Press party. In 1998 he became the sixth recipient of the Leland Peterson Award, given “to longtime members for outstanding service” to EC/ASECS. At the EC/ASECS conference in 2012, an extraordinary ceremony celebrated his “long and industrious support for eighteenth-century studies” and highlighted the University of Delaware Press's outstanding strength in eighteenth-century scholarship under his leadership.

Don chaired a “Current Research on Swift” roundtable at 17 annual EC/ASECS conferences 2001–2019. Most years from 2004 to 2017, he also chaired a “Jonathan Swift and His Circle” session at ASECS, numbering them

I-XIV like Super Bowls. Swift scholarship published since 2001 repeatedly includes work first presented in one of Don's conference sessions. And books published on the long eighteenth century since 1997 include many with the University of Delaware imprint—books in each of which he invested meticulous and expert editorial attention. There can be very few who have done as much for as long to support the work of other scholars in eighteenth-century studies.

Kate Crassons, Director of the Lehigh University Press, has indicated that in Don's honor, her press will publish a volume of essays, to be edited by Sandro Jung. Don's wife Katherine and their children Elizabeth and Don III have kindly suggested that donations in Don's memory might fittingly be made to the EC/ASECS Future Fund (ec-asecs.org).

Lafayette College

A Note on Stylistics and Non-Traditional Authorship Attribution

By Joe Rudman

Writing this note was suggested by Jim May and grew out of the paper I delivered at the Gettysburg Conference, "A Primer on Determining the Validity of Non-Traditional Authorship Attribution Studies of Eighteenth-Century Literature." The purpose of that paper was to give the 'traditional eighteenth-century scholar' – not well versed in stylistics, statistics, and computational techniques – a way to begin to critique a paper on non-traditional authorship attribution on authors in our period. The case I tried to make was that we are experts on the primary input data for all of these 'experiments' – the text itself. We should make sure that the studies: 1) use first editions; 2) use only texts of known and undisputed authorship; 3) do not mix genres or sub-genres; 4) use a restricted chronology (e.g. +/- 5 years); 5) unedit, de-edit, and edit all of the texts. A good introduction for all five of these is my "Unediting, De-editing, and Editing in Non-Traditional Authorship Attribution Studies: With an Emphasis on the Canon of Daniel Defoe." (Published in *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 99.1 [2005]: 5-36.) Most of the examples in my talk (my previous presentations and my publications on eighteenth-century literature) are negative in nature. Jim suggested I give a list of readings of a more positive bent to the eighteenth-century scholars starting out in the field.

The following bibliography and lists grew out of a 2017 three day retreat that took place at the Wojtatwka pension in Żarnica in the idyllic Beskid mountains of Poland. The Retreat was organized by Jan Rybicki and was by invitation only. Attendance was limited to 13 practitioners from 6 countries. Discussions lasted from breakfast thru dinner (one an outdoor pig roast) and well into the night with plenty of zywiec (a local beer) and wine. Two of the items that came out of the retreat are a bibliography of stylistics and a

recommended list of readings in stylometry. The bibliography (sortable and searchable) has ~4000 entries and is administered by Christof Schöch who combined the bibliographies of many of the participants and put them on: <<https://www.zotero.org/groups/643516/stylometry_bibliography/library>>

The following URL is for the list of “Recommended Readings in Stylometry” that came out of the retreat and is as close to what Jim had in mind as I can get: <<<https://raw.githubusercontent.com/christofs/stylometry-bibliography/master/recommended/recommended-readings-in-stylometry.pdf>>>.

The list of readings contains 48 entries under 4 headings: 1) Milestones in the history of stylometry; 2) Survey papers and introductions; 3) Papers on specific methodological aspects; and 4) Applications of stylometry. I will list only those under (2). For a shorter and more basic overview than the fourteen entries under “Survey Papers and Introductions” that follows, see my “Authorship Attribution: Statistical and Computational Methods.” In *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, 2nd edition, edited by Keith Brown (London: Elsevier, 2006), vol.1: 611-17. Note that the URLs are given for 12 of the 14 articles in the above URL ---also note that the formatting and order are from the original.

Survey Papers and Introductions

- Milic, Louis T. “Progress in Stylistics: Theory, Statistics, Computers.” *Computers and the Humanities* 25, no. 6 (1991): 393-400.
- Holmes, David I. “Authorship Attribution.” *Computers and the Humanities* 28, no. 2 (1994): 87-106.
- Chaski, Carole E. “Who Wrote It? Steps Toward a Science of Authorship Identification.” *National Institute of Justice Journal*, no. 233 (1997): 14-24.
- Holmes, David I. “The Evolution of Stylometry in Humanities Scholarship.” *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 13, no. 3 (1998): 113-17.
- Oakes, Michael P. “Literary Detective Work.” Pp. 199-248 in *Statistics for Corpus Linguistics*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1998.
- Rudman, Joseph. “The State of Authorship Attribution Studies: Some Problems and Solutions.” *Computers and the Humanities* 31, no. 4 (1998): 351-65.
- Delcourt, Christian. “Stylometry.” *Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire. Belgisch tijdschrift voor philologie en geschiedenis* 80, no. 3 (2002): 979-1002.
- Love, Harold. *Attributing Authorship: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Craig, Hugh. “Stylistic Analysis and Authorship Studies.” Pp. 273-88 in *A Companion to Digital Studies*, edited by Susan Schreibman, Ray Siemens, and John Unsworth. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.
- Juola, Patrick. “Authorship Attribution.” *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval* 1, no.3 (2006): 233-334.
- Hoover, David L. “Quantitative Analysis and Literary Studies.” Pp. 517-33 in *A Companion to Digital Literary Studies*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.

- Koppel, Moshe, Jonathan Schler, and Shlomo Argamon. "Computational Methods in Authorship Attribution." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 60, no. 1 (2008): 9-26.
- Stamou, Constantina. "Stylochronometry: Stylistic Development, Sequence of Composition, and Relative Dating." *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 23, no. 2 (2008): 181-99.
- Stamatatos, Efstathios. "A Survey of Modern Authorship Attribution Methods." *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 60, no. 3 (2009): 538-56.

Carnegie Mellon University

Teaching Defoe as a Single-Author Course

Leah Orr

University of Louisiana, Lafayette

Defoe provides a good opportunity to teach a range of genres of eighteenth-century literature as well as to show students how early literature has inspired and influenced more contemporary writers. One potential problem with Defoe is attribution: scholars are still in some disagreement about what he wrote and who knew he wrote it. In this class, I adopted a broad view of "Defoe" as a construction of later readers and scholars, and I made authorship a recurring theme of conversation. For each text we read, students looked at a copy of the original title page and discussed the different interpretive implications of the claims made about authorship. We also compared eighteenth-century representations of Defoe to the ways he was described in their modern paperback editions so the students could think critically about editorial choices they were accustomed to accepting at face value. Over the semester the course became less a single-author study focused on one person's life and works and more an investigation into print culture and the ways that authorship and the literary canon are constructed and change.

Curriculum Considerations

This course counted as a pre-1800 and a "major figures" course, and the standard Shakespeare survey remains the model for "major figures." With this in mind, I kept most of the course centered on Defoe rather than his contemporaries. The course features generic variety to give students a sense of the range of eighteenth-century literature.

University Considerations

I taught this course in Fall 2019 at the University of Louisiana, Lafayette, which is a public, state-serving institution with approximately 18,000 students (Carnegie classification: High Research Activity, or R2). The university library has been underfunded for many years and has not been buying new

books regularly, nor does it have ECCO, the Burney papers, or the DNB (though it does have EEBO). Research is a slow process of sending to other libraries for books, and there is a fee per article for using interlibrary loan, so students need a long time to acquire materials for research assignments. At the same time, like many English departments we are under pressure to show the research value of the humanities in an otherwise STEM-focused campus. There are student research exhibitions in the fall and spring that are chiefly oriented towards the sciences. With this in mind, I included in this course a research poster assignment so that students could do contextual and critical research using the tools available (EEBO, the ESTC, the MLA bibliography, Google Books and Scholar, HathiTrust). They presented their findings to the class (through a virtual poster session on our class Moodle page), and then to the university community (by printing their final posters and participating in the research exhibition). Students also wrote a traditional research paper at the end of the semester which could expand on their poster or tackle a new topic.

Student Considerations

This is a course that mixes graduate and undergraduate students together, bringing an enormous range of experience. The prerequisite for undergraduates is that they must have junior status (60 credit hours) and have passed at least three 200- or 300-level English classes. This meant that there were both undergraduate juniors and second-year Ph.D. students, and everyone in between. The commonality was that almost none of our students have any prior experience with eighteenth-century literature: most of the graduate students are in creative writing and have a background that focuses on contemporary literature, and our undergraduates may have taken a 200-level British literature survey or a course on Renaissance or medieval literature, but neither is required for them to sign up for this course. As a result, they worked together to learn something new to all of them, even though some students had much more extensive backgrounds in English studies than others did.

One other consideration for our students at all levels is their financial and time pressures. Most of our students are on a very tight budget and are working and/or caring for family while going to school. To address this, I minimized the number of books required for purchase and chose inexpensive paperbacks. I provided the first several weeks' readings online so that students using financial aid to pay for their books had time to wait for that funding before they needed them for class. This also meant that I could assign texts not easily available in a modern paperback and students could get exposure to reading texts in eighteenth-century typography. Keeping the reading list short enabled students to work through texts they found difficult while having time to read for their own individual projects.

Syllabus for English 496: Daniel Defoe

Daniel Defoe was one of the most prolific and innovative writers of early English literature. His published writings are in nearly every genre—fiction, poetry, nonfiction prose, dialogue—and commented on the most significant events and issues of his time. He wrote about shipwrecks and piracy at sea,

life on the grubby streets of London, and the adventures of ordinary people from prisons to royal court and everywhere in between. Defoe was no mere observer of life, however, and his own experiences included writing political propaganda as a pen-for-hire, working as a secret government agent in Scotland, serving time in the pillory, and undertaking business ventures of varying success and honesty. In this course, students will read some of Defoe's major works in order to understand more about the literature of this period through the eyes of one of its most notorious authors. We will conclude with two modern reinterpretations of Defoe's most famous novel, *Robinson Crusoe*.

This course will help you achieve several goals:

- 1) Understand works of eighteenth-century fiction in their literary and historical context, including their relevance to earlier and later works of literature.
- 2) Develop a research question and examine possible ways to answer it using primary and secondary sources, library databases, and other advanced research tools.
- 3) Synthesize the results of research in an extended analytical essay.
- 4) Demonstrate expert writing skills, including argumentative reasoning, correct grammar and spelling, proper and consistent citations, and fluency in English at a high level.
- 5) Design and execute a poster showing the results of your research in a visual form appropriate for a professional context.

Note: this is a combined undergraduate/graduate level class. In class, I will make no distinction between you, and I encourage you to do likewise and to treat all your classmates as equal peers. Outside of class, there will be some differences: namely, graduate students will be required to write a longer research paper than undergraduates and do more substantive research.

Required Texts

J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, Penguin Books

Daniel Defoe, *Colonel Jack*, Broadview Press

Daniel Defoe, *Moll Flanders*, Oxford World's Classics

Daniel Defoe, *Robinson Crusoe*, Oxford World's Classics

Jane Gardam, *Crusoe's Daughter*, Europa Editions

Additional readings will be posted on the class website (Moodle).

Grading

Weekly Moodle Forum	20%
Poster Proposal	10%
Article Review	10%
Poster Project	20%
Research Proposal	10%
Research Paper	30%

Course Schedule

Moodle Forums will be posted after class on Tuesdays and are due Fridays at 5:00 p.m. All other work is due at the start of class on the day listed.

Unit 1: Defoe the Poet, Projector, and Spy

Week 1: *The True-Born Englishman* and *The Shortest-Way with the Dissenters* (Moodle)

Week 2: *Hymn to the Pillory* and Selection from *The Consolidator* (Moodle)

Week 3: *Giving Alms No Charity* and Selected Letters of Defoe (Moodle)

Unit 2: Defoe the Journalist

Week 4: Begin *The Storm* (Moodle); **Poster Proposal Due**

Week 5: Finish *The Storm* (Moodle); **Article Review Due**

Week 6: (Fall Break; no class)

Unit 3: Defoe the Novelist

Week 7: Begin *Robinson Crusoe*

Week 8: Finish *Robinson Crusoe*

Week 9: Begin *Moll Flanders*; **Poster Due**

Week 10: Finish *Moll Flanders*

Week 11: Begin *Colonel Jack*; **Research Paper Proposal Due**

Week 12: Finish *Colonel Jack*

Unit 4: Defoe's Afterlife

Week 13: *Crusoe's Daughter*

Week 14: (Thanksgiving; no class)

Week 15: *Foe*

Finals Week: Final Paper due

English 496: Poster Assignment

For this class, you will be conducting research on some aspect of eighteenth-century literature and presenting your results on an electronic poster using Powerpoint. This assignment will help you learn how to create a professional poster, how to research historical context, and how to present research in an easily accessible form. It has two components, to be assessed separately.

Part 1: Poster Proposal (10% of course grade)

The poster proposal should be approximately 500 words (two pages double-spaced) plus an annotated bibliography of at least 5 sources. In the proposal, you will explain to me the following information:

- Topic and relationship to eighteenth-century literature. You may choose any aspect of historical, literary, or cultural context—narrative

form, letter-writing, medicine, journalism, travel, etc. Explain the scope of your topic and the connection to the fiction we are reading this semester. You may use a page reference if you are researching something mentioned in the texts we are studying, but you can also research contextual elements that are not mentioned so long as you can explain the relevance of your topic to eighteenth-century literature.

- Preliminary findings. Describe briefly what you have discovered so far.
- Plan for the poster. Describe what you will feature. What elements are most surprising to a modern reader, or most important for understanding the texts? Mention one or two images or other visuals that you will include on the poster.

The annotated bibliography should have at least 5 sources, cited using appropriate MLA or Chicago style. These may be both primary and secondary sources, and they should be scholarly sources rather than popular sources. Each annotation should explain in 3-4 sentences what information the source contains and how it pertains to your topic. If the source has a particular bias or argument, be sure to mention it and explain how you will account for that in your research. The poster proposal (including the annotated bibliography) is due at the start of class on **September 17th, 2019**.

Part 2: Poster Project (20% of course grade)

The poster will display the results of your research in an accessible, interesting, professional format. On **October 22nd, 2019**, you will upload your poster to our class Moodle page before the start of class. You will also upload a copy of your final bibliography of sources. I will examine and assess your poster, and everyone will look at the posters in Moodle. That week's Moodle forum will ask everyone to read the posters and comment on them—so we will be having a virtual poster session outside of class. I will be assessing your posters on the quality and focus of your research, its connection to eighteenth-century fiction, and the way that the design of your poster enhances the reader's understanding of the content.

Both the proposal and the poster should represent your best work: they should state information clearly and concisely, citing sources as appropriate. Your writing should also demonstrate a high level of written skill, free of errors and otherwise appropriate to a 400-level English course. The poster should synthesize information and present the most important points with a clear connection to the course topic.

Poster Tips

Planning and Research:

- Think about your topic broadly as well as specifically: you may need to narrow your original plan, or you may want to cover it from multiple angles.

- Seek out both primary sources (books, illustrations, music, art, etc. from the eighteenth century) and secondary sources (modern-day historical and critical books, articles, etc.).
- Record which sources provide you with which facts and ideas so you can cite them properly later.
- Consider your audience: what do they need to know? What interests them?
- Look for illustrations or diagrams you might use on the poster (and record their sources).

Design:

- Before you do anything, re-size the Powerpoint slide to be poster-sized (as demonstrated in class). Or, use a free template from one of the sites linked on Moodle.
- Your poster should have a clear, catchy title.
- Boil your research down to one main takeaway point, with further information supporting it. Do not simply give a list of facts. This main point is your thesis.
- You should have an abstract/introduction/overview in the top left portion of the poster, and a conclusion in the bottom right.
- Consider the ways your visuals catch the audience's eye.
- Choose a background color that is neutral, and a font design and color that is easy to read.
- Your title should be visible from several feet away; more detailed information should be at least 14 point font.
- Group your information into sections, with clear headings in a larger font.

Prioritize legibility over aesthetics, but do think about how to make your poster attractive and enticing to passerby.

Lissa Paul. *Eliza Fenwick: Early Modern Feminist*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2019. Pp. xxi + 295; bibliography [277-87]; 22 illustrations; index. ISBN: 9781-644530108. Paperback, \$35.00. (Available as e-book.)

As a literary scholar interested in researching and writing about Eliza Fenwick, I was pleased to see the publication of Lissa Paul's new biography *Eliza Fenwick: Early Modern Feminist*. As Paul notes, a thoroughly researched and objective account of Fenwick's life is long-overdue, since Fenwick has become increasingly part of the eighteenth-century canon, while information about Fenwick's life after 1790s in London remains obscure. Indeed, Paul's biography happily superannuates the most important previous source, A.F. Wedd's *Fate of the Fenwicks* (1927), and, in the process, exposes the ways in which Wedd's editorial practices worked to erode Fenwick's reputation while bolstering the importance of Wedd's ancestor, Mary Hays.

To create this incredibly useful resource, Paul has conducted wide-ranging and painstaking archival research that crosses borders and even continents. Paul brings together primary documents from an impressive 36 institutions, large and small, including the Barbados Historical Society, the Bodleian, and the Cotsen Children's Library, that reveal new information about Fenwick's life and add much-needed context to previously reported incidents. Especially fruitful was Paul's detailed account of Fenwick's later years in "Upper Canada," during which Fenwick was still actively parenting her deceased daughter's children and attempting to support the family through a variety of educational work.

Paul's writing style is lucid, and she is an engaging storyteller, using a "mystery" surrounding the death of Fenwick's grandsons to pique reader curiosity about Fenwick's life. Indeed, because Fenwick was often in the background of the political and intellectual circles she occupied, this book is not a standard literary biography. Instead, as Paul notes, "the story of Eliza's life offers to twenty-first-century readers . . . a glimpse of how her private day-to-day life of teaching, writing, running schools, negotiating friendships, providing a home, and raising children and grand-children was determined by and intersected with the historic events of the times and places in which she lived" (9).

While Paul discusses the writing of Fenwick's well-known novel for adults, *Secresy* (1795), and her prolific educational writing for children, the biography also makes an important argument about the literary importance of Fenwick's correspondence. Business and family responsibilities rendered difficult Fenwick's continued literary career after leaving England, but she kept up a lively, intellectual correspondence with several friends that Paul carefully analyzes in ways that illuminate networks of female friendship and professional mentoring.

All these aspects make the book well-worth reading; however, as a feminist scholar, I have been struggling with certain aspects of a biography subtitled "Early Modern Feminist." First, a small, taxonomic issue: the subtitle stretches uncomfortably the notion of the "early modern," which, even in the most capacious historical definitions, ends around 1800. Fenwick was (mostly likely) born in 1766, published the majority of her work in 1790s-1810s, and died in 1840.

My second, and most ideologically important concern is Paul's early, and often repeated, claim that "at the heart of this book is Eliza's colonial immigration success story . . ." (3) because Fenwick established successful schools in Barbados and Canada "that were informed by the Enlightenment radical philosophies of education promoted by Mary Wollstonecraft, William Godwin, Anna Barbauld, Maria Edgeworth, and Mme de Genlis" (4). However, as we learn in later chapters, the school in Barbados was established for the daughters of elite planters, necessitating Fenwick's networking with and marketing to the powerful owners of slave plantations. The school's tuition—an eye-popping 40 guineas per year—was accessible only to girls whose wealth and privilege derived from forced labor. For comparison, Paul relates that the tuition at Eton was £50 at Eton and £16-20 at Methodist day schools (43). Second, despite her professed abhorrence for slavery, Fenwick

hired slaves as day laborers and eventually became a slave owner herself. Paul quotes a classified advertisement placed by Fenwick promoting the sale of her “Furniture and the rest of her servants” before she left Barbados, estimating that Fenwick owned five slaves: two men, two boys, and one woman (182).

To the biography’s credit, it fully discloses Fenwick’s departures from her early reformist politics, telling the reader in detail of Fenwick’s gradual capitulation to slave culture. Yet, in this reviewer’s opinion, a school that depends (even partially) upon slave labor cannot be classified as a “successful” within the context of “Enlightenment radical philosophies” nor contemporary feminist scholarship, which should include a self-conscious understanding of the ways in which systems of power and privilege operate along racial, gendered, geographic, linguistic, and economic axes.

As Paul notes, Fenwick faced difficult choices when establishing a profitable school. “She [Fenwick] kept trying to stay true to her radical roots and do the right thing, while also sustaining her viability in a society whose values she theoretically despised” (158). Paul invokes philosopher Robert Gibb’s explanation that Fenwick was negotiating “spheres of responsibility,” deciding that providing for her family was of greater importance than living according to her anti-slavery principles (158). This reads as too neat of a way to dismiss the important concerns the book raises; many 18th- and 19th-century women provided for their families without resorting to slaveholding.

Ultimately, parsing Fenwick’s culpability is non-productive. Rather than condemning or absolving Fenwick, I would suggest an alternate way of framing Fenwick’s experience that might have proven more fruitful in terms of thinking about how gender works within larger systemic forms of oppression. This reader would like to see more analysis of how Fenwick leveraged forms of privilege (her race, her education, her ability) to overcome obstacles to sites of marginalization (her gender, her poverty, her status as a single woman) and how her survival came at the expense of those who are even more disenfranchised than she, i.e. the slave population of Barbados. Answering this question would, I believe, lead Paul to a more tempered conclusion than that Fenwick “deserves recognition as a pioneering figure on the long road toward independent, enfranchised lives for women” (10).

Reservations about how one interprets Fenwick’s economic success aside, this book is comprehensively researched and thought provoking. Readers interested in diverse topics such as women’s transatlantic social networks and commercial enterprises, children’s literature, the book trade, female education, plantation culture, and early Canada will find much useful material in considering Fenwick’s life as a “case study” through which to approach women’s lives in the long eighteenth century. I have already recommended the book to several graduate students interested in colonialism and Enlightenment feminisms, while incorporating Paul’s research into my own work-in-progress.

Ellen M. Ledoux
Rutgers University—Camden

Warren Oakley, *Thomas ‘Jupiter’ Harris: Spinning dark intrigue at Covent Garden theatre, 1767-1820*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018. Pp. xi + 236; bibliography [207-26]; 11 black-and-white illustrations; index. ISBN 978-1-5261-2912-3. Cloth. £80; \$120.

This is a book with genuine virtues and frustrating failures. Thomas Harris (1738-1820) bought into Covent Garden in 1767; became principal owner and manager in 1774; and operated the theatre until shortly before his death in 1820. Between 1776 and 1809 his principal competition was Drury Lane under the management of the feckless Richard Brinsley Sheridan. Harris was a vastly more competent and attentive manager, and Covent Garden mostly flourished under his direction. He was responsible for the major structural alterations of 1792 and the rebuilding of the theatre after its destruction by fire in 1808. That Harris was hugely influential on the directions taken by the London theatres over a period of nearly half a century is simply a fact. His life and work have received, however, singularly little attention. Cecil Price (editor of Sheridan) published a useful little chapter back in 1972. The *ODNB* entry is scanty, and the Highfill-Burnim-Langhans *Biographical Dictionary* account runs barely more than three columns. Detailed attention to a major force in London theatre of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is long overdue and welcome. Unfortunately, there are some serious conceptual problems with this enterprise.

Oakley announced this venture as a “biography” in *Theatre Notebook* back in 2013. The jacket copy says flatly that the book “is the first biography of Thomas Harris.” This is not really true, because so far as anyone knows the materials necessary for the construction of a “biography” do not survive. The book comprises five chapters, and collectively they have astonishingly little to do with either the life of Thomas Harris or the actual operation of Covent Garden Theatre. Chapter 1 (“Introducing Thomas Harris”) sketches his background and family and deals with such matters as his bastards by the actress Jane Lessingham. Chapter 2 (unhelpfully titled “The King of clubs”) concerns his participation in the purchase of Covent Garden from John Rich’s heirs and the extended legal squabbles that preceded his eventually gaining control of the venture in 1774. Chapter 3 (“‘Plausible’ Jack and the Royalty adventurers”) concerns John Palmer’s construction of the “Royalty” theatre and its immediate suppression in 1787, when the owners of Covent Garden and Drury Lane exercised the monopoly rights conferred by the patents granted by Charles II in 1662 and 1663. Harris joined forces with Sheridan to squelch a would-be competitor, but the episode is well known to scholars and almost nothing of substance is added here. Chapter 4 (“When sorrows come, they come not single spies”) concerns the destruction of Covent Garden by fire in 1808 and Harris’s struggles to finance, construct, and operate a new theatre on that site. Chapter 5 (“Selling a life”) comprises three disparate items with no real pretense of yoking them together into a whole. The first is Harris’s late life financial and legal problems with the Sixth Duke of Bedford (who owned the ground on which the theatre stood); the second is a rather skimpy account of the sale of seventy-one lots of Harris’s theatrical pictures on 12 July 1819; and the third, melodramatically titled “Mrs Inchbald and the casting couch,”

devotes nine pages to Harris's longstanding connection to the actress and playwright without arriving at any real conclusion.

These disparate pieces do not add up to much of anything, certainly not a biography. Individually they have varying degrees of merit. To Oakley's credit I can attest that they are based on serious archival research in such repositories as the British Library, the Folger, the Houghton Library at Harvard, London Metropolitan Archives, the National Archives (Kew), and the Theatre Museum in the Victoria and Albert. Oakley has also read extensively in newspapers, pamphlets, memoirs, and biographies from the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. There are 619 endnotes; the bibliography lists 176 "primary" sources and 117 "secondary" works of various sorts. Notwithstanding the silly melodramatic title and tiresome fascination with non-theatrical issues (e.g., bastards and Harris being ground landlord for a brothel), this book can fairly be said to reflect far more research than most books by independent scholars. Oakley is not, however, much concerned to assess the reliability of his sources. Some of the early nineteenth-century memoirs and biographies are now regarded by theatre historians as sound scholarship for their time (James Boaden's accounts of Elizabeth Inchbald and others, for example), but many are dodgy or worse—and they can be difficult or impossible to fact-check or verify. Newspaper items often need to be viewed pretty skeptically, as do satiric references in playscripts of the time.

Treatments of some particulars are disappointing. Oakley's account of the Harris-Colman wars 1767-1774 is a missed opportunity. The owner-managers' infighting is recounted at length, mostly from newspapers, pamphlets, and later memoirs. Oakley cites but disappointingly draws very little on the extensive documentation available in the National Archives Chancery suit C12/1024/36 and related legal records. He seems more interested in the ugly and tiresome squabble than in what the documentation can tell us about the internal operations of the theatre. There is a good book still to be written about Covent Garden between John Rich's death in 1761 and Harris's arrival in power in 1774. Oakley has little to say about the long-planned, abortive project to open a third patent theatre in Knightsbridge (though some documentation exists), which dragged on from 1777 to 1791. In this regard I must point out Oakley's incomprehension of the "patent" situation. He says that "The patent privilege now owned by Harris had been established over a century earlier by Charles II as a reward for two courtiers, Davenant and Killigrew ... and both had been inherited by Harris upon taking control of the Garden, despite only needing one" (101-102). Actually, the two were united in May 1682 when the Duke's Company absorbed the King's Company (for the articles of union, see British Library Add. MS 20,726, fols. 10r-13v). After 19 January 1715 the company operating in Drury Lane was legitimized by a lifetime-plus-three-years patent issued to Sir Richard Steele (National Archives, C66/3501, no. 13), renewed thereafter for various twenty-one year periods. Whether the "Killigrew" patent could be legally separated after amalgamation and used in its own right was the subject of extensive legal wrangling between 1777 and 1791.

Oakley's views on the size and audience capacity of the patent theatre buildings in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries strike me as

bizarre. He states as fact that in 1808 Harris “had known that his small, snug theatre was built for another age” and could not be expanded because he could not buy and demolish the buildings that surrounded it (137; and see 164, note 47). But even in more prosperous times, the patent theatres operated *way* below capacity most of the time. In 1794-95 the newly enlarged Drury Lane grossed £48,647 in 192 nights (some £253 per night), though a packed theatre every night would have generated £770 per night or a total of about £147,800. At Covent Garden that season the gross as reported by Hogan was about £45,800 over 201 nights, though full houses at £570 per night would have generated as much as £114,500. Drury Lane was operating at about 33% of capacity, Covent Garden at about 40%.¹ Greater seating capacity they did not need.

I refer here to the season of 1794-95 in particular because Oakley makes that season the only occasion for substantive reference to the full-season daily account books that exist in some profusion for both patent theatres after about 1770. Appendix 3 consists of a two-page comparison concerning “Covent Garden versus Drury Lane in the season 1794-95.” For several reasons, this is a problematic enterprise. No effort is made to explain the causes of high or low receipts at either theatre. The figures for Drury Lane are taken *not* from its synoptic account book for the season (which survives as Folger MS W.b. 297) but from British Library Add. MS 31,972, a set of private memoranda kept by John Philip Kemble from 1788 to 1815 (not altogether a comparable source). Oakley worked extensively with Folger manuscripts. Why he did not draw on W.b. 297 I cannot imagine. In making his calculations he did not include “after money” on the grounds (a) that the figures are not reported in Add. MS 31,972 and (b) that the sums “usually averaged a negligible ‘two to three pounds’ each night.” (“After money” refers to receipts generated by latecomers who paid a reduced price for admission.) But the “after money” sums *are* in the Folger account book (and they are duly reported in Part 5 of *The London Stage*), and the amounts are by no means always “negligible.” For example, on 8 October 1794 Covent Garden grossed £210 *7s 6d* plus £16 *5s* in “after money.” Against a preliminary gross of £210 we might arguably regard £2 as a rounding error, but £16 is not negligible. I fail to understand why Oakley did not at least work from the “after money” as reported by Charles Beecher Hogan in Part 5 of *The London Stage*. An hour of counting those sums would have shown that the Covent Garden “after money” in 1794-95 came to £1684 *14s 6d* and that on fifty-nine occasions the sum was more than £10. The “after money” average for the season was more than £8 per night. In terms of present-day buying power, MeasuringWorth.com calculates £8 in 1794 as worth £903 in 2018 according to the retail price index figures, but at £10,740 (“labour value”) or £13,590 (“income value”). In 1794 even £2 was very far from being an inconsequential sum of money.

The problem here, however, is more serious than this. Oakley’s bibliography does not include (and he does not cite) Joseph Donohue’s long, important, and still-standard “The London Theatre at the End of the Eighteenth Century.”² Oakley’s figures say that Drury Lane’s total receipts in 1794-95 came to £44,100 *13s 6d*. Hogan’s total for receipts at Drury Lane that season is £48,646 *17s 11d*. But Donohue points out that Hogan’s figures “do not reflect

post-seasonal entries attributable to the season in question.” Taking such figures into account, Donohue reckons total receipts at Drury Lane this season at £51,854 12s 3d. For a variety of reasons Oakley’s total of receipts for 1794-95 is low by £7,754, which is 17.6% of his “total” and really not acceptable.

A more general disappointing oddity is Oakley’s failure to exploit the extensive manuscript archives still in the possession of the Duke of Bedford. I believe that most or all of the relevant documents for historical London real estate were transferred from the Bedford Estate Office in London to Woburn Abbey about twenty years ago.³ Oakley regards Harris’s problems with the Sixth Duke between 1808 and 1820 as dire and deeply upsetting in the last years of Harris’s life, but the only documentation cited in his book is from London Metropolitan Archives. I would be astonished if there are not pertinent manuscripts at Woburn Abbey. Oakley does not say that he was refused access or could not pay the Bedfords’ admission fee. Did he ask? There are also some holes in documentation. Oakley does not cite and apparently did not consult Arnott and Robinson’s magisterial *English Theatrical Literature 1559-1900* (Society for Theatre Research, 1970), which among other things would have pointed him at *A Catalogue of a collection of theatrical portraits ... formerly forming part of the gallery of the late Thomas Harris, Esq.* auctioned in London in 1848. The index is moderately helpful but gives long strings of unanalyzed page numbers for people like John Philip Kemble and Sheridan; annoyingly it omits all modern scholars— and also omits John Russell, Sixth Duke of Bedford, for reasons totally unclear to me.

What we need in relation to Thomas Harris and Covent Garden for the period 1767 to 1820 is a study (or several different studies) addressing at least five important and still very incompletely understood areas. First, an analysis of changing repertory over the decades, looking both at new plays and at revivals. Second, a sequential analysis of income and outgo making full use of the nearly complete run of “season” account books. Third, a sober analysis of Harris’s radically evolving relationship with Sheridan, including some analysis of their misconceived joint purchase of the King’s Theatre Haymarket in 1778 and the woes of the Italian opera company they were ill-prepared to manage. Fourth, a systematic assessment of personnel employed at Covent Garden, with a fresh investigation of the huge public ruckus over increased benefit charges and deprivation of what the performers regarded as longstanding privileges in 1799-1800.⁴ And fifth, an analysis of what we can determine about Harris’s collection of theatrical portraits from the auction catalogues of 1819 and 1848. A lot of important work remains to be done on the Covent Garden theatre and its management between the death of John Rich in 1761 and that of Thomas Harris in 1820.

Robert D. Hume
Penn State University

Notes

1. See *The London Stage, 1660-1800*, Part 5: 1776-1800, ed. Charles Beecher Hogan (Carbondale: Southern Illinois U. Press, “1968” [1970]), III,

1678-81, and Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume, "Playwrights' Remuneration in Eighteenth-Century London," *Harvard Library Bulletin*, n.s. 10.2-3 (1999), 3-90 at 23. Oakley cites both sources.

2. Chapter 12 of *The London Theatre World, 1660-1800*, ed. Robert D. Hume (Carbondale: Southern Illinois U. Press, 1980), at 364.

3. Judith Milhous and I transcribed some thousands of pages of "Bedford" manuscripts in connection with volume 2 of *Italian Opera in Late Eighteenth-Century London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000). The Bedford family archives concerning their enormous London property holdings are phenomenal.

4. For an account of which see Milhous and Hume, "Theatrical Custom versus Rights: The Performers' Dispute with the Proprietors of Covent Garden in 1800," *Theatre Notebook*, 63.2 (2009), 92-125. Oakley includes this article in his bibliography but has nothing whatever to say about one of the major 'public' events of Harris's life.

Joanne B. Freeman and Johann N. Neem (editors). *Jeffersonians in Power: The Rhetoric of Opposition Meets the Realities of Governing.*

(Jeffersonian America.) Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019. Pp. x + 324 + [2]; index. ISBN: 978-0-81394-305-3. Hardcover: \$39.50. (Also available as e-book.)

Thomas Jefferson is on the nickel. He wasn't always. His profile replaced that of an American Indian in 1938, the Indian having in 1913 replaced no less a personage than Liberty. In Jefferson's own time, and partly on his initiative, the obverse of all the brand-new coins of the not yet democratic American republic, was a portrait in profile of Liberty, a revolutionary female Liberty with unbound flowing hair. Liberty was and still is the West's leading icon of a "republic," a state which Dr. Johnson's *Dictionary* confidently defined as one which is governed by more than one person at a time. Now that profiles of dead white CEOs have replaced Liberty on every circulating coin of the United States, it can be hard for many to believe that the first of our coins to abandon Liberty for a President was the Lincoln penny in 1909. (The "Indian" before Lincoln was actually "Liberty," and the word was inscribed on her native American headdress.) Now, American Republicans find it hard to believe that the United States President does not personify the government, that the President does not make the laws, and that the President's principal duty is to see that those laws are "faithfully executed" and to obey them.

Thomas Jefferson was a Republican, the leading figure and first President of the first political party to be called "Republican." Narrowly winning the odd and unprecedented election of 1801 on the 36th ballot in the lower House of Congress, ten states to four with two abstaining, Jefferson brought Republicans into the executive branch of government with him, and he and the succeeding two Presidents, also Republicans (and also from Virginia) did the same. Like the new United States, Virginia, too, was a republic, a "Commonwealth" with no king, like mid-17th-century England.

What was it like for a President, who ran in part on limiting executive power, to be the chief executive of the still new American Republic? And how did he and his fellow Republicans “govern.” Joanne B. Freeman and Johann N. Neem have collected articles answering this question in twelve different ways, all by a younger cohort of scholars of the Early National period and by admirers of a major figure of the older generation, Peter Onuf, the mentor of the editors and the author of *Jefferson’s Empire*. The result is a kind of *Festschrift* that does what many *Festschriften* do not: highlight the best of new work and remind us of the sometimes unsettling fact that, when historians change, History changes, too, and that, if it doesn’t, it becomes myth.

Robert G. Parkinson’s “Friends and Enemies in the Declaration of Independence” focuses on the Republican use of the idea of “the American people” to exclude those we now call African- and Native Americans and aliens. Parkinson sees this as beginning with the latter half of the Declaration of Independence which extends the blame for King George’s “tyranny” from the King himself to three specified categories of enemies of the American people, “domestic insurrectionists” (slaves, he thinks), “merciless Indian savages,” and “foreign mercenaries” (mostly Germans). The many details Parkinson adduces from the subsequent history of the Revolution, do much to prove his case. Now that we have learned from so many of our historians that the Founders and Framers were not moral demigods, we owe it to our students to chip away at our founding myths.

Mark Smith’s “Beyond Strict Construction” takes up the well-tilled field of Jeffersonian Republican “strict construction” (the Jeffersonians’ term has remained apt) and tries to widen it. Like Leonard Sadosky in his smartly titled Chapter 7, “How the Jeffersonians Learned to Love the State,” Smith’s “Beyond Strict Construction” finds Jefferson and the Republicans, narrow on the Constitution in opposition and expansive on it after taking power, coming off as more hypocritical than previous generations of historians once thought. Smith reminds us that when they confronted the Bank of the United States (created by a bill that both Jefferson and Madison unsuccessfully encouraged President Washington to veto), the Jeffersonians’ interest in “strict construction” was at the forefront; but he also shows, convincingly, that the Jeffersonian opposition to the BUS, both before and after they took power, was as much economic as it was constitutional, including the argument that a nationally chartered bank would unduly favor some classes against others, and that the law could give the President dangerous power (the power to create banks). They even questioned “the utility of banks in general” (83). Similarly, Smith shows that they opposed the Neutrality Proclamation and the now infamous Alien and Sedition Acts for reasons that went beyond simple constitutionalism.

Martin Öhman’s “The Mississippi Question in Jeffersonian Political Economy” fills out the details that show how the Louisiana Purchase was not only the result of the diplomatic upheaval around the French Revolution, but a deliberate economic policy initiative to develop commerce via the Ohio and Mississippi River, a policy that was at first opposed by Tidewater states like Jefferson’s Virginia for reasons that were fundamentally economic. Brian Schoen’s article brings out the military and imperial side to the question.

Thanks to my selective ignorance, I learned the most from Brian Schoen's chapter, "Lower South Jeffersonians," which provides what he correctly calls the "backstory" of the important and still famous 1830 debate between Senator Robert Hayne of South Carolina and Senator Daniel Webster of Massachusetts, which opened the Nullification crisis, and the link between sectional conflict and the conquest of what we now call the Old Northwest and what we should surely call the Old Southwest. My high-school students knew about Webster's Reply to Hayne, about Nullification, and about the Cherokee expulsion from Georgia. They knew considerably less about the Yazoo land sale, and a bit more about the Battle of Fallen Timbers by which the just created United States Army defeated the native peoples of the Old Northwest and conquered Ohio, Indiana and Illinois in 1794;¹ but their textbooks and my reading had never turned up the 1805 Treaty of Mount Dexter by which the Choctaw people transferred 4,142,720 acres of land in what is now Mississippi to the United States, or the Treaty of Fort Jackson in 1814 by which the Creeks ceded another 23 million acres in what is now Alabama. Maybe this is because we were in school in Brooklyn, rather than Georgia or Mississippi.

What Schoen's article gives us is the difference between the Jeffersonian federal government's relation with the South and the North with respect not only to tariffs and trade, slavery and abolition, but also to the use of federal power to take western land from the native peoples. It was the U.S. Army that conquered Ohio and Indiana, and John Quincy Adams' State Department that acquired Florida from Spain; but it was the southern states' militias that conquered Georgia, Florida, Alabama and Mississippi. When General Andrew Jackson defeated the Red Sticks faction in the Civil War of the Creek people, bringing on the Fort Jackson land cession, he was a General of the Tennessee state militia. It was only after the federal government that year formed an alliance with the Creek's enemies, the Choctaw and Cherokee, and took charge of the treaty, that Jackson was ordered to defend New Orleans against the British and became a General of the United States Army. The federal and state shares in our imperial wars against the western Indian peoples were quite different in the North and South, and under Washingtonian Federalists and Jeffersonian Republicans. And this is only a part of Schoen's neat dossier on the Jeffersonian "backstory" of American political sectionalism.

No less irresistible to me was John Ragosta's contribution, "A Religious Republican and a Republican Religion," no doubt because I am working on a book relating Jonathan Edwards and other awakened ("woke"?) believers of the 18th century to their contemporaries in the Enlightenment and the Counter-Enlightenment. Ragosta assembles evidence, some of it new, of Jefferson's very self-conscious policy, at a time when 15 of 18 states had religious establishment clauses in their constitutions, of fostering religious liberty, of privately maintaining his hostile view of revealed religions in general and established religions in particular, while carefully avoiding using his office as a pulpit for any religion, including Deism. Jefferson maintained a pretty good relationship with the influential Baptist minister John Leland, who had some sympathy for Jefferson's preference for decorum in religious expression, and enthusiastically agreed with him on religious freedom, but not at all on the nature of God. It does remain curious that when evangelical revival led by

Baptists and others broke out in Virginia between Richmond and Monticello in 1785, Jefferson took no interest; but of course, he was in Paris in 1785, and between revolutions, and the news may not have reached him.

This is the Enlightenment in action. Jefferson was a central figure in the Enlightenment in America, perhaps even in the West at large, but the Enlightenment has many aspects, and the radical is only one of them, so I'd urge any reader to take account of two volumes of Jonathan Israel's massive masterwork, "The Radical Enlightenment" (2002) and "A Revolution of the Mind" (2009) for a look at the "radical" aspects, and to go to Andrew Trees's "Apocalypse Now: Thomas Jefferson's Radical Enlightenment" (Chapter 9) for the bloodiest possible consequences of some of the Enlightenment principles that Jefferson endorsed and adhered to. Jefferson seems to have been good at imagining bloodshed, but he did not like to see blood actually shed. He did command a military briefly as Governor of Virginia during the Revolutionary War, but did not do it very well. Benedict Arnold's army drove him out of Richmond, his new capital city, and burned it to the ground.

Kevin Gutzman's "Thomas Jefferson's Virginian Revolution" impressed me as a historian of republicanism. It begins with the assertion that, when Jefferson in "unhappy" retirement tried to sum up his career and achievements and reduced them all to three in the famous epitaph, he effectively subsumed them all in just one, the cultivation and preservation of a "republican" culture in Virginia. Gutzman, who has written three books on the Virginian, or Jeffersonian, version of the American republican project, also thinks that Jefferson "had reason to despair as he reached his life's end," conscious of having failed to finish the job. After all, only the earliest of the three tombstone reforms, the Declaration of Independence, seemed permanent, while church disestablishment had passed the legislature without him and the University of Virginia had suavely ignored his democratic admissions policy. After Jefferson was governor of Virginia, and even after his presidency, Virginia still had not redistricted its legislature by population, or limited its elected legislators and governors to one- or two-year nonrenewable terms, or lengthened its senatorial terms to nine years (reforms he asked for in three separate proposals he sent to Virginia's constitution drafters). Virginia still had not reformed its Draconian criminal penalties, still did not have public education for all free citizens (women included), still had not provided 50-acre land grants to propertyless white men, and still had not freed its slaves (and sent them back to colonize Africa, as the property owning voters thought best). The federal government had taken more than one Hamiltonian leap beyond "state sovereignty" and the enumerated powers of the Constitution's first Article. A standing federal military was developing, and increasing federal banking and sponsorship were accompanying industrialization.

Jefferson's Embargo—Benjamin Carp's article on the Embargo in Chapter 6 provides new details and a fresh view—had badly failed to unite the country behind a republican anti-imperial peace policy. As Christa Dierksheide's Chapter 11, "Taking Root Deeper Than Ever: Jeffersonians and Slavery" shows, the Jeffersonian project of gradually ending slavery by compensation and colonization had failed of execution, even after the abolition of the slave trade in 1807. Jefferson's chief disciple, Madison, had been unable

to avoid war. Another, James Monroe, had signed the Missouri Compromise. The last of Jefferson's tombstone projects, the University of Virginia, though modern in architecture and curriculum, continued to insist on being a finishing school for the plantation elite, instead of becoming a college for "yeoman farmers." Such had been the fate of Jefferson's desiderata for a Virginia republican culture. No wonder Gutzman echoes his mentor Onuf about Jefferson feeling "virtually suicidal" in his last decade.

Aaron Burr, who lost to Jefferson in 1800, and was dropped from the ticket in 1804, showed less anguish and changed his plans. It is refreshing to see the Burr secession conspiracy treated interestingly and without myth by James E. Lewis in Chapter 10, "'The Strongest Nation on Earth' Proves Its Strength." Throughout the Burr crisis, Jefferson maintained that the strongest weapon the Republic could deploy against Burr was the loyal opposition of its ordinary free citizens. Against a drumbeat of Federalist criticism he would not agree to use either the criminal Common Law or orders to the U.S. military to arrest Burr, but insisted that he could not act without an enabling statute from Congress. The Burr affair broke open in 1806 but Jefferson did not order Burr's arrest until 1807 when he received evidence that the former Vice-President planned to violate a treaty by attacking Spanish territory.

In that same year, 1806, I found this same ideally republican view of executive powers (which looks quite Enlightened today) expressed in federal court in New York by Supreme Court Justice William Paterson. The case was a prosecution of two men who had sponsored an invasion of Venezuela and who argued in court that their action was not a criminal violation of law (the Neutrality Act of 1794), because President Jefferson had ordered it. Wrote Paterson, "Supposing then that every syllable of the affidavit [that the order was the President's] is true, of what avail can it be on the present occasion? Of what use or benefit can it be to the defendant in a court of law? Does it speak by way of justification? The president of the United States cannot controul the statute [the Neutrality Act], nor dispense with its execution, and still less can he authorise a person to do what the law forbids. If he could, it would render the execution of the laws dependent on his will and pleasure The law is paramount. Who has dominion over it? None but the legislature."² This issue is still with us.

On the other hand, it is disappointing to see a book called *Jeffersonians in Power* neglect the midnight appointments of outgoing Federalist Secretary of State Marshall and the resulting epic reversal of Republican administration in Chief Justice Marshall's decision in *Marbury vs Madison*. Richard Samuelson's fine last chapter, "The Constitutional Statesmanship of James Madison," does not address it. Such lack of attention could return *Marbury* (which is not in this book's index) to the netherworld of events whose titles are known to school children but whose content and implications are known only to lawyers and professors. Still, even with historians as well-informed and broadly interested as these are, you can't take on every instance of Jefferson's governmental revolution. It was too big. And once these twelve scholars have put the successes and failures of Jefferson and his genuinely republican Republican Party firmly in their historical context, their flowing-hair-Liberty revolutionary nature becomes clear. This is an exceptionally

useful work for people who want to keep up with the riches of recent American historiography.

William R. Everdell
Saint Ann's School, Brooklyn (Retired)
weverdell@saintannsny.org

Notes

1. This fundamental but forgotten campaign was recently resurrected by William Hogeland in *Autumn of the Black Snake: The Creation of the U.S. Army and the Invasion That Opened the West* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2017).

2. Robert J. Reinstein, "An Early View of Executive Powers and Privilege: The Trial of Smith and Ogden," 2 *Hastings Constitutional Law Quarterly* 309, 320–21 n.50; or 2:2(Spring, 1975), quoting Paterson on p. 323: [https:// repository.uchastings.edu/hastings-constitutional-law-quarterly/vol2/iss2/1](https://repository.uchastings.edu/hastings-constitutional-law-quarterly/vol2/iss2/1), quoting from the complete stenographic transcript of the case: T. Lloyd, *The Trials of William S. Smith and Samuel G. Ogden, for Misdemeanours, had in the Circuit Court of the United States for the New-York District, in July, 1806* (1807), excerpts from which are reproduced in *United States v. Smith and Ogden*, 27 F. Cas. 1186, 1192 (Nos. 16,341a, 16,342, 16,342a, 16,342b) (C.C.D. N.Y. 1806).

Andrew Franta. *Systems Failure: The Uses of Disorder in English Literature*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2019. Pp. x + 215; index. ISBN: 9781421427515. Hardcover, \$54.95.

"Criticism should . . . be comprehensible, which is to say not written by Frenchmen with esoteric theories and befuddling jargon." So wrote the late John Simon, whom I cite not so much to illustrate his biases as my own. Let's face it. Literary critics are all systems-builders, none more so than literary theorists. They create imaginative constructs which, depending on one's point of view, either discover patterns in or impose patterns on the underlying literature. It is not too cynical to say that when readings confirm our own views of the literature or the theory, we find them useful, enlightening, even brilliant. When there is no confirmation, we employ different words and phrases, like "Procrustean bed" or "building castles in the air," an expression often used in the eighteenth century. I shall try to avoid either extreme in evaluating Mr. Franta's challenging book.

Six authors are treated in the six chapters: Johnson, Sterne, Smollett, Godwin, Austen, and De Quincey—a very brief coda deals with Mary Shelley. The Introduction offers an interesting thesis: "while we tend to regard skepticism about systems as postmodern, stories about the drive to order the world and its inevitable unravelling like those told by Borges and [Lewis] Carroll have their roots in the eighteenth century. . . . I make the broad contention that, to appreciate the power of systems, we must pay attention to

how often they fail” (2-3). The contention has wide-ranging implications, troubling “our persistent tendency to equate the pursuit of knowledge with the development of systems” (4) and offering a counter-tradition to the novel’s rise as a movement toward greater realism and individualism (13-14). Franta gives us introductory remarks about each of the six authors who will be his subsequent concern and goes on in some detail about Sterne since “this book takes up where *Tristram Shandy* leaves off” (12), thereby providing illustrations both of this book’s chief virtues and most annoying shortcomings.

Drawing on the implications of one of the epigraphs of this section—all epigraphs in the book are well-selected and well-employed,—Franta discusses Uncle Toby’s increasingly frustrated attempt to describe exactly where he was wounded during the Battle of Namur, culminating by his constructing a model of the site on his bowling green. In a finely woven, if not entirely original, argument, Franta moves from the initial ambiguity over the “site” of the wound—whether on Toby’s body or the battlefield—through a progression, logical enough perhaps but increasingly absurd, that ends in frustration caused by an attempt to make the present physical location an accurate representation of an event from the past: “The failure of language prompts Toby’s obsession with maps, and he replaces maps with models when two-dimensional representation fails to answer his purposes. . . . Toby and Trim’s work on the bowling green is animated by the same self-defeating ambition that produces the life-size maps that Borges and Carroll describe. . . . Toby’s freedom [Tristram explains that the military reenactment “freed him from a world of sad explanations”] is predicated on his withdrawal from the world; what begins as a search for knowledge becomes an autotelic activity” (8-9). This is Franta at his best and there are many instances of such clearly drawn close readings under the theoretical rubric that he has laid out.

Among the shortcomings apparent in the Introduction and throughout the book is a systematic failure to proofread adequately quotations from the authors examined. A spot-check of those from Sterne and Johnson indicates that the odds of finding a flawless quotation of any length are longer than one in two. Many of the errors are careless treatment of accidentals, but some are substantive. Typical examples include:

“Stop! My dear uncle Toby,—stop!—go not one foot further into this thorny and bewildered track” should read [s/r] “Stop! my dear uncle *Toby*,—stop!—go not one foot further into this thorny and bewilder’d track” (6).

In a seven-line quotation on page 5:

St Nicholas s/r *St. Nicolas*
 Maes s/r *Maes*
 badly bewildered s/r sadly bewilder’d
 get neither s/r neither get
 oft-times s/r oft times

An eight-line block quotation on page 8 includes these minor errors,

Toby’s s/r *Toby*’s
 crowded s/r *crowded*

Blondel s/r *Blondel*

Pagan s/r *Pagan*

and a major omission:

“instruments and snuffers;—to catch the snuffers in falling,—he thrust”
 s/r “instruments and snuffers;—and as the dice took a run against him, in
 his endeavouring to catch the snuffers in falling,—he thrust”

The choice of texts for citation is somewhat curious. For *Tristram* it is the 1997 Penguin edition, whose text is that of the Florida Sterne. But why not simply use the Florida Sterne directly and throughout—volume three of which is cited at one point—instead of, for instance, the Gardner Stout 1967 *Sentimental Journey*? More curious, a Sterne letter is quoted from a 2006 monograph (W. B. Gerard’s *Laurence Sterne and the Visual Imagination*) rather than from the Florida *Letters* (2009). None of these choices is the source of the errors cited above, however. The author thanks and acknowledges by name eight colleagues who read parts of his manuscript, as well as two editors of the press. Would that one of these people had turned to a personal bookcase, perhaps just to see the context of a particular quotation, and then suggested to the author a more careful job of citation. We are told that the book was ten years in the writing—and its careful and thorough arguments support that time frame. An additional month checking final proofs versus original sources would have been very well spent.

The best-known facts about Richard Savage are his friendship with Samuel Johnson and the titles of his poems, *The Wanderer* and *The Bastard*. Franta provides the most integrated view I know of Johnson’s biography of Savage, a man who moved aimlessly it seemed outside society—thus the poems’ titles—and whose life challenged Johnson to make sense of its lack of a conventional pattern. Here are just a few insights from this strong chapter: “More than anything else, the *Life of Savage* is the record of a writer’s struggle with the meaning of his subject’s comings and goings The attempt to represent the chaos of Savage’s life makes the *Life of Savage* into a compelling, and formative, engagement with the questions about arrangement and order that [Virginia] Woolf identifies as the core of the biographer’s art” (22). Noting the memorable scenes of Savage “wandering the streets of London,” Franta links “the aimlessness of his peripatetic existence” with his periodic disappearances; often “Johnson has Savage exit the stage; he repeatedly all but disappears from the narrative of his own life. . . . He disappears, and his friends (and biographer) are left with the task of trying to make sense of his actions” (23-25). I agree with Franta that, although it is “blindingly obvious” that all biography, as external description, must mean “the kind of life with which biography is concerned is necessarily social” (28), emphasizing the social externality enlightens much about Savage’s biography. Suddenly the meaning of what John Hawkins said about Savage becomes apparent: he was “such an one as is seldom exhibited to view; a man dropped into the world as from a cloud” (29).

“Sterne and the Uses of Disorder” begins, appropriately, at the beginning of *Sentimental Journey*, with Yorick’s remark, “They order . . . this matter

better in France.” Dealing with *Tristram* as well, the chapter enforces what may at first seem merely a clever thesis, specifically that “rather than trying to mimic the disorder of lived reality . . . Sterne thematizes it. He doesn’t ask us to choose one version of reality over the other. Instead, one of [Sterne’s] novels’ central ironies is that the drive for order is both a matter of course (you can’t not do it) and an impossible project (it can’t be done). Rather than novels about disorder, his [Sterne’s] works are about the collision between the impossibility of ordering the world and the impossibility of not ordering the novel” (43). Some might object to the length to which Franta pushes his subsequent analysis. For instance, the many sight-jokes in the novels certainly reflect an interest in the significance of nonverbal communication, but must it be true that “Sterne’s interest in gestural language has to do with the distance, and the oscillation, between the claims made for its efficacy and the novelistic potential of its failure” (47)? Perhaps. I have always considered much of the physical humor of the early Marx Brothers’ movies to be more than simple vaudeville pratfalls, but I am not certain that they were meant to cast an ironic light on the art of traditional film direction.

For most of this chapter, and once earlier, Walter Shandy is called “Sir Walter.” How critics have referred to characters in *Tristram* has a history, especially for Walter’s brother. As the entirely sentimental view of Toby was supplanted by one that pointed out his flaws, for which Sterne may actually have satirized him, critics shifted their lexicon from “my Uncle Toby” to either “Uncle Toby” or “Toby.” But Walter’s knighthood is a new one, I think. Since the marriage contract in the novel identifies him simply as “Walter Shandy, merchant,” and since “Tristram Shandy, Gentleman” might have otherwise been “Tristram Shandy, Esq.,” this seems merely a lapse, albeit a disconcerting one to the reader.

In “From Map to Network in *Humphry Clinker*” Franta shows rather conclusively that, while previous scholars have focused on what type of geographical map best explains the work—one of England, Scotland, and Wales or one of Great Britain—a better metaphor for this epistolary, picaresque novel is the social network. To call attention to a few of the insights that spring from this approach:

The development of the narrative can be plotted on a map. But this map must be understood also in terms of movements that it does not record—not only the expedition of Bramble and his extended family but also the lines traced by their letters. . . . All but one of the letters . . . are sent by the various travelers to friends back at home, reporting on their adventures The novel’s epistolarity thus has the effect of doubling the episodic character of the picaresque novel. . . . [The characters’] forward movement is shadowed by the recursive trajectories of their letters, describing a communication network composed of a branching web of nodes and links. (72-73)

In a marked contrast with Richardson, Smollett’s “epistolary form is as much a way of marking distance as cultivating interiority and of approaching character from the outside in as from the inside out” (83).

Regarding chapters four and six (about Godwin's *Caleb Williams* and De Quincey's essays) I will say little, for I know little about these writers. I suspect that the idea for this book originated in De Quincey, although Franta does not say this, for De Quincey writes expressly and repeatedly about "systems." "Godwin's Handshake" offers analysis of three scenes in *Caleb Williams*, all dealing with handshakes or failed handshakes, and the social and political implications of each one. Even though Franta admits that the climax of the novel is outside his analysis somewhat, this strikes me as an interesting approach to the work.

In dealing with Savage's social and physical exclusion (as a bastard and a wanderer of London's streets), with *Humphry Clinker's* two most conspicuous qualities (as an epistolary picaresque), and Sterne's treatment of disorder's triumph over systematic ordering both in life and in writing, Franta has seized the critical bull by the horns, and he does so once again in his discussion of Jane Austen, for what are Austen's novels about if not marriage? "The Morphology of the Marriage Plot" provides a rather convincing alternative explanation for what has been traditionally taken as an explanation for Austen's apparent lack of interest in the outside world and the uneventfulness and small scale of her novels. Maintaining that "formal realism does not exhaust Austen's achievement as a novelist" (117), Mr. Franta "makes a case for the centrality of structure and plot to Austen's theorization of the relationship between the novel and social reality" (113). Although the previous quotation suggests that on occasion the argument comes close to what seems to me murky abstraction, for the most part it is clear, partly because it originates in an excellent explication (and application) of a passage from an Austen letter to her niece, an aspiring novelist: "You are now collecting your People delightfully, getting them exactly into such a spot as is the delight of my life;--3 or 4 Families in a Country Village is the very things to work on--& I hope you will write a great deal more, & make full use of them while they are so favourably arranged" (112).

Franta explains, "Commentators have understandably focused on how '3 or 4 Families in a Country Village' reflect the narrow scope of the novels' imagined worlds. They have paid little attention, by contrast, to what the remark suggests about Austen's handling of that restricted world" (112). Here are just a few of the implications: "The idea that novelists collect people in order to arrange them—to get them 'into . . . a spot'—articulated a different sense of novelistic practice, one that approaches characters from the outside rather than in terms of their interiority." And "'3 or 4 Families in a Country Village' may well be 'the very thing to work on' not because they stand for society in general but because they offer a cast of characters sufficient for the purposes of plot" (113-114).

James Boswell allegedly said that, although many people build castles in the air, he was the first person to attempt to live in them. While I would not wish to make Mr. Franta's aerial edifice my permanent abode, I enjoyed visiting for a few days because of its numerous stimulating insights.

Berta Joncus. *Kitty Clive, or The Fair Songster*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: The Boydell Press, 2019. pp. 527; bibliography, index. ISBN 978-783273461. Hardcover, \$99. [c. \$62 on Amazon]

Berta Joncus's biographical study of Catherine Raftor Clive (to give the book's heroine her full name) from the angle of her musical repertoire (as far as documents allow) and of the mid-18th-century theater business and its commercially successful play repertoire is an immense achievement. Joncus argues that we have been misapprehending the source of Clive's successful life, lost sight of many of the works that she performed which counted most, or understood those we have paid attention to in a skewed context, for insufficient attention has been paid to Catherine Clive as a highly trained knowledgeable singer or sophisticated musician with her voice as her instrument. This reader came away enormously impressed with Clive's work and place in musical and theatrical history. Much of the book's innovative core is musicological analysis. The curve of its trajectory and where the book unfortunately ends comes from a determination to study Clive as an outstanding, compelling important actress-singer in the era. We hear her voice, but Joncus comes as close as she can to suggesting what that was.

I say unfortunately because had not Joncus left off the woman's life with another nineteen years on the stage to go, and beyond that sixteen more in retirement, this book could have been a more fully alive, wholly persuasive biography. Beyond the musicology, Joncus intermixes (because she must) accounts of the major comic types Clive was most known for enacting: she repeatedly took roles, often written for her, of aggressive intriguing female servants or lower-status women who pro-actively stage manage other characters' behavior across a play. Joncus deals at length with Clive's courage but at the same time complete self-interest (as when she stayed on at Drury Lane when others left) when her employers (the patent-holding manager-owners of the theaters) attempted to cheat all they could out of, or drive down, the sum of their actors' contracted wages. Clive's public letters and her *The Case of Mrs Clive* (1744) are examined (275-301). Joncus analyzes one of Clive's best-known texts, *The Rehearsal, or Bayes in Petticoats*, including its successive staging revisions (378-408). She covers Clive's aggressive-competitive attacks on female rivals, especially Susannah Arne Cibber and Peg Woffington, not just pre-emptively lest they steal her roles, but personally (almost obsessively) as promiscuous or unchaste women (unlike, she would have her public know, herself).

In so doing, through such close attention to what we have of Clive as singer, on stage, as writer, Joncus slowly builds a perceptive complex portrait of this woman's personality, which included a loving (what today might be called lesbian) relationship with Jane Pope, a younger actress whom Clive mentored and to whom most of her letters that survive from late in life are addressed (353). A second area that that also ought to have been gone into in the same meticulous way (it would not have upset the book's balance and no one has tried this before so thoroughly) is Clive's long straight acting career: she was as successful at the serious grave acting roles (at first Anne Oldfield parts) whether she portrayed them seriously (from Shakespeare to Steele's

heroines) or not (she turned Shakespeare's Portia into a mocking spirit). She equally made her own the older fine and domineering ladies of later sentimental issue-oriented comedy, for example, Mrs Heidelberg in Colman and Garrick's masterpiece, *The Clandestine Marriage* (meant to deal with the anxieties stemming from the 1753 Marriage Act), still done today.

The opening and closing chapters form a diptych. The first chapter (1-27) offers what is thought to have been Clive's origins in Irish middling gentry who aligned themselves with James II. Joncus then summarizes Clive's career "in the playhouse," documenting from early on Clive's ability to enact related diverse identities (connected back to her own), portray admired middle-class manners, and speak in a harmonious voice: she was acclaimed for her tonal speaking voice. She was also lucky: we learned she "arrived" (succeeded in her first roles) just around the time when masques and elite style Italian operas were beginning to be undermined and replaced by English ballad opera. Later parts of the book treat Clive's work for Handel and Arne; she was also an able singer in oratorios and serious opera (227-74). As Joncus sees it, Clive's insistent staging of herself as sexually "blameless" (Joncus's word, 18), combined with a psychologically and socially perceptive personality enabled her to become what today is called an alluring (box office?) star.

The last chapter is a brilliant portrait of the type once seen in the last part of older biographies (including Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*). Joncus extrapolates from all she has put before us, brings together many contradictions, summarizes once again, and asks, "Who was Kitty Clive?" (409-26). What Joncus sees as Clive's elusiveness is presented as a fundamental element of numinous (so Joncus treats this) celebrity. It would seem that by 1750 Clive's successes as a woman who participated in public controversies, and made a handsome salary morphed her public identity into (or made her perceived as) an arrogant and domineering resented figure (411), someone most people would rightly dislike, an old woman interfering where she has no right to, and to be treated with implicit contempt. She had aged too visibly, become very heavy, never had been regarded as pretty in her face and, from the one seemingly accurate depiction of her body (357), was mannish in figure. She found that, to carry on working and earning money, she had to take roles in which she caricatured her previous public identity and type roles, and pretended to accept or be complicit in humiliating self-abasement. Joncus talks about the beginning of this last phase of her career as an almost chosen courageous "marketing strategy" (404). One can though equally interpret her *Rehearsal* as embittered and hurt, cataloguing all the frustrating time-consuming sycophantic hard work that went into say a monetarily successful benefit night. Joncus quotes one audience member who describes as distasteful what he sees as Clive counter-attacking the audience and other players, but, alas, also blames her for not quitting the stage, accuses her of greed (402).

In this last chapter Joncus also goes beneath the period cant to show us the hardships and ambivalent experiences of the theatrical careers in this era for writers, musicians, poets, and male actors, sums up reasons for failure in the case of Henry Carey who killed himself (she treats his work for Clive in Chapter Two, 28-63) and James Miller (targeted by cabals because he exposed the sexual predation of young men on the part of a Warden of Wadham

College, Oxford, 69-70). Since Miller so often worked with Clive, an account of James Miller's career may be pieced out from this book (65-72, 161-68, 194-95, 213-18, 334-35). Joncus assumes that Clive's husband was homosexual (153-58) from snide jokes Clive and others made about him; so too was Miller probably gay. Given the probabilities of fluid sexuality in another of Clive's female protégées, Mary Edwards, whom, however, Clive dropped when Mary openly and outside marriage took up with man (192-93, 309-10, 348-53), and then her long relationship with a very supportive Horace Walpole (beginning in 1748), Joncus suggests one area for further research in Clive's circles and the 18th-century theater in general is far more frank studies of their same-sex politics (422).

I must treat Henry Fielding separately and at length. His many plays providing ideal roles for Catherine Clive are central to her career, from the more obvious Lucy plays, staples for her, with specific ones, *The Lottery*, *The Intriguing Chambermaid*, *The Mock Doctor*, *The Miser*, *The Virgin Unmask'd*; longer plays, *The Author's Farce* (with prologue and epilogue for her), *The Old Debauchees* paired with *The Covent Garden Tragedy*, and, to name no more, Fielding's benefit farce just for Clive, *Deborah, or A Wife for You All* (149). Throughout the book Joncus displays a vehement animus against Fielding. He is "obsessed with sex," misogynistic (but to my mind his plays are no more ultimately or in passing misogynistic than a huge majority of plays in this era). He continually deliberately composes parts for Clive intended to debase, attack, do all that's possible to ruin her public character or career. There is no reason given for this spite against Catherine Clive. Joncus's arguments amount to one, a repeated assumption that Fielding had very specific personal and or political aims in his mind when he sat down to write complicated plays; and, two, the members of an audience were as alert as Joncus to pick up insulting nuances in the characters Clive played, measuring that character's worth against another who the audience would equate with, say, Cibber, and thus be led to think the better of him and worse of her (e.g., 105-6, 109, 119, 127 150, 170, 184-85 and elsewhere). She does not distinguish between a burlesque part and a realistic portraiture (105-6, 119, 126-27, 164-65 et passim)

Robert Hume has shown decisively that Fielding did not write with specific political or personal aims in mind most of the time; Simon Varey, Pat Rogers, and other Fielding scholars have suggested a real friendship or cordiality between Clive and Fielding; beyond the supply of all these parts, Fielding praised Clive warmly and strongly; for example, in the preface to one of these, *The Intriguing Chambermaid*, where she played the title and central role, he describes her as "the best Wife, the best Daughter, the best Sister, and the best Friend." He made a rare defense of her behavior during the several disputes with the management. The holders of the two patents used their monopoly to exploit and control the players beyond salary theft because they saw that the players had nowhere to go; the Lord Chamberlain sided with the managers based on the understood norm that to wealthy aristocrats it was a scandal that such low-status people could make a good salary, and in the earlier conflict Clive chose to say at Drury Lane when the other actors struck. Though the word was not used, a need for solidarity was understood; later the

players were angry at Garrick for making a separate agreement, and seeming to desert Charles Macklin. I quote Fielding's defense of her and describe Clive's behavior in these situations because the mis-characterizations of Fielding's plays in this book are so lengthy. He wrote of Clive: "the Part you have maintain'd in the present Dispute between the Players and the Patentees, is so full of Honour, that had it been in Higher Life, it would have given you the Reputation of the greatest Heroine of the Age. You looked on the cases of Mr. Highmore and Mrs. Wilks with compassion, nor could any promises or views of interest sway you to desert them; nor have you scrupled any Fatigue ... to support the cause of those whom you imagin'd injur'd or distress'd (Hume, *Henry Fielding & the London Theatre* [Oxford, 1988] 181n54).

In several places elsewhere in the book, it seemed to me that Joncus so identified with her heroine, that she lost perspective, treating Susannah Cibber with less than respect (225), always, as it were, siding with Clive (see one of Clive's public venomous letters attacking Cibber; also 310-16 on the involvement of the theater with the Jacobite uprising), eager to repeat over and over what a success Clive was here, how respected there. This is Team Clive. We are told that, far from having forwarded Clive's success as Fielding claims, Fielding "flubbed her straight acting launch, and put her reputation at risk, above all in epilogues and songs" (106). Joncus is probably rightly sceptical about the rumored "scuffle" in the Green Room between Clive and Woffington (told years later) where once confronted with Woffington in the same space, Clive is described as finding it irresistible unprovoked to accuse Woffington of sexual transgression (318-25), but it is telling that in Clive's very last letters to Pope, she is inveighing against George Anne Bellamy for having in her own autobiography told about the sexual harassment, betrayal and exploitation Bellamy felt crucially shattered her earlier years (1).

It is very hard to understand someone's life or character, especially from another time and culture, even harder probably to evoke the nature of theatrical and musical productions of the past. Joncus with energy, flair and attention to exacting nuances not in the text but subtextual, brings out a complicated art like Clive's, at once raucous caricature and enchanting emotionalism, in a large variety of musical performances hitherto unexplored. The reader can also trace through Clive's roles the frightening violence with which women were as a matter of (comic) course treated, from her earliest roles, from the multi- or group-authored *Damon and Phillida* (42-47) to *The Devil to Pay* (Joncus labels this one "entertaining sadism," 72-106), to the later Clive playing a butch Mrs Riot in Garrick's two different *Lethes* (338-60). A modern biography to be successful has to be a work of creative art, founded on private and public documents; also a means of introspective expression for its powerfully-involved author (remember Virginia Woolf's "granite and rainbow;" see also Andre Maurois's *Aspects of Biography*). So Joncus's book may be the better because biased, for the passionate convictions and validations with which she has told her heroine's tale up to where Clive's public turned on her.

Ellen Moody

Osher Institute of Lifelong Learning, George Mason & American University

Note by the Reviewer: I read what is left of Clive's letters at the Folger Shakespeare Library, in "Collections of Letters to Jane Pope," W.b.73. They are numbered but there are considerably fewer than the presumably original one hundred; many are just chosen excerpts; next to some numbers there are what seem to me to be commands: "nothing," i.e., copy nothing. There are at least two different amanuenses, and at the close except for the final letter, they are by others. Two desperate notes are by Clive's brother seemingly after her death (perhaps destitute); and several also after Clive's death to Jane Pope who had written this correspondent looking for some means of support or patronage from him. Nonetheless, what is there is revealing. As opposed to what has been averred, they are not simply Clive performing the gentlewoman. Her connection to and dependence upon Horace Walpole and the life of the house on his property she and her family were living in are there, but we also see her defensively eager to assert how happy she is, how good her life, at the same time as keeping up an intense interest and curiosity in what is happening in the theaters, especially about other actresses (Siddons, Abingdon whom she visits). There are details about her two servants' lives (Jemima and Thomas); her sister and brother are mentioned. There is what can only be described as a love letter to Pope (quoted by Joncus), Popian verse apparently by Clive, a beautifully copied out letter to her doctor. The letters showing anger and resentment at George Anne Bellamy in her autobiography are Nos. 73, 75, 77.

Andrew O. Winckles. *Eighteenth-Century Women's Writing and the Methodist Media Revolution.* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2019. Pp. x + 278; bibliography [253-66]; index. ISN: 978-1-78962-018-4; hard cover, c. \$66.00

This innovative book combines astute analysis of the macro-level concept of a religious "media revolution" with fascinating micro-level case studies of religiously inspired women writers. Speaking directly to the reader to explain clearly his meanings and theories of change—or mediations,—Andrew O. Winckles builds convincing arguments and new insights from the ground up, based on close readings of women's lived experiences and literary culture. As a volume in the Liverpool University Press series of "Romantic Reconfigurations: Studies in Literature and Culture, 1780-1850," Winckles also maps his perspectives onto contemporary literary moments of the era to point out new avenues for further thought and study.

Winckles begins by re-contextualizing familiar stories of the origins of Methodism, focusing primarily on John Wesley and his brother Charles. He argues that Methodism *became* Methodism at a "full blown media event," the open air preaching of John Wesley in March 1739. Winckles accepts the definition of a media event developed by literary scholar William Warner in his 1992 study, *Licensing Entertainment: The Elevation of Novel Reading in Britain, 1685-1750*. Warner's definition of a "media event" is wide-ranging and rather inelegantly stated as: "1) not precipitated by some prior historical event (such as a battle, a trial, or a coronation) 2) feeds upon itself 3) triggers

repetitions and becomes the subject of critical commentary and interpretation that is not only a symbol of change but also carries genuine effects into culture” (30). A more succinct definition, however, would be a worthy goal for any further such studies.

Winckles maintains that the rise of Methodism came through media innovations rather than theological innovations. By expanding and creating new practices of discourse, John Wesley laid the groundwork for a religious revolution that fundamentally transformed British public life over the following 100 years. Winckles’ clear language and compelling case studies sustain his cumulative analysis, resulting in productive explorations of new ways to think about Methodism and evangelicalism.

Winckles’ depth of knowledge and clarity of writing shines as he shows how early Methodism drew on existing discourse patterns, such as Puritan conversion narratives, which Wesley adapted to become unique to evangelicalism. Wesley understood the power of popular discourse and linked discursive practices, like oral testimony and field preaching, with manuscript and print culture to create a distinctive Methodist discourse culture. Most importantly of all, for the purposes of this study, the innovations in discourse culture provided new spaces for participation by women within and beyond Methodism as preachers, teachers and writers.

For example, as Winckles points out, Wesley drew on the oral culture of early Methodism to innovate field preaching. Even before women themselves became preachers, male preaching in open spaces enabled women to actively participate as “hearers,” choosing to listen publicly. John Wesley instructed preachers to use the “language of common life,” easily accessible to female hearers as well as males. Moreover, he created new spaces, the Methodist society, class and band structures, where women were encouraged to talk about their religious ideas and spiritual lives. Given these opportunities, women quickly became leaders in these homosocial structures.

Wesley also encouraged women to participate in Methodist literary culture, and Winckles traces the many ways that women shared their religious views and built bonds with one another through print and manuscript letters, diaries, journals and life writing. While some women chose to publish, Winckles points to the too often under-researched wider range of women’s written media, including memoirs, essays, poetry, circulation of manuscripts as scribal publication and the choice to publish anonymously.

Having established the significant widening of women’s literary participation through the Methodist media revolution, Winckles turns to mapping its growing influence on literary moments from the 1740s through the 1790’s. For example, he cites Methodist influences on Samuel Richardson and the rise of the novel, happening roughly simultaneously with Wesley’s revolution. He notes the similarity in Richardson’s discourse practices, both in terms of content and the centrality of *Pamela* as a female writing letters about her religion.

Fast forwarding to the 1780s and ‘90s, Winckles makes interesting comparisons between the published writings of feminist writer Mary Wollstonecraft and the influential Methodist writer Hester Ann Rogers. Both created new public space for women’s religious life by publicly writing about

their passions, daring to claim female subjectivity and community outside male dominated discourse structures. Focusing on Wollstonecraft's *Short Residence in Sweden*, which also uses a letter-writing format, Winckles shows how both women expanded female discourse by expressing their desires as a form of "mystical erotic religion."

In his final chapters, Winckles examines the shifting culture of Methodism in the four decades following the death of John Wesley in 1791. Here, the separation of media innovations from historical events becomes a bigger challenge for me, given the revolutionary political, social and economic changes of this time period. For example, the historical event of Methodists separating from the Church of England in 1795 and the rapid expansion of evangelicalism are too little discussed.

Winckles is consistently at his best, however, in his micro-level case studies of women's religious and literary roles. He evinces extraordinary ingenuity and empathy as well as deep knowledge of a wide-range of source materials to show how women writers inside and outside of Methodism adapted or innovated new forms of media during this time of change. After Wesley's death, women's roles quickly became more restricted within Methodism and in the wider evangelical movement. For example, Winckles documents the steeply declining number of printed works by women in Methodist publications. Yet stressing the need to look beyond print sources, he searches out and analyzes primary sources and women's literary practices. For example, he rigorously re-examines a misunderstood primary source described as a Letterbook belonging to early Methodist preacher Sarah Crosby. Winckles restores its significance as evidence of how she and her manuscript community continued to create, read and circulate discourses relating to female religious experience, although barred from or no longer choosing to publish.

As Winckles maintains, although Methodist women were no longer preaching or publishing printed works, many women, Methodists and evangelicals, participated in religious discourse through the mediation of such forms as anonymous publications, commonplace books and manuscript networks. Some, like the evangelical, Hannah More gained influence through her actions of founding Sunday schools with an emphasis on evangelical salvation in her education work. Others, like Sarah "Sally" Wesley, John Wesley's niece, became second generation Evangelical Bluestockings with diverse practices of textual production and circulation. Sally Wesley's Bluestocking network, for example, included at least 30 women writers and visual artists, not all of whom were Methodist, most notably Hannah Moore and Hester Thrale Piozzi.

These women shared a larger evangelical "enthusiasm," derived from and now much bigger than Methodism, focusing on religion as a form of emotional engagement. Together, for example, Sally Wesley's network negotiated their own forms for the role of religious enthusiasm in women's lives. Some of them mediated their evangelicalism through nature writing and poetry. Others found acceptable expressions of their emotions through religious painting. All of them sought to create shared lived experiences and social interactions, rather than focus on individual expressions of artistic or religious inspiration.

Winckles convincingly demonstrates how John Wesley's Methodist media revolution shaped and informed how individuals, especially women, experienced and practiced popular religion in the long eighteenth century. He begins his study by saying evangelicalism is not a single defining ideology, and he ends by saying it is still a contested category in current US politics and debates around LGBTQ inclusion. He offers his conclusion that it is more productive to think about evangelicalism as a set of discursive practice that can be called on for a multitude of purposes.

This book is well worth reading for its paradigm-shifting macro concept revealing how media innovations happened long before the advent of the internet. Personally, I enjoyed and benefitted from his micro-level presentations of the many women who expressed their deepest religious beliefs during times of expansion and restriction of their literary culture. Winckles values these micro stories greatly. In his words, they provide a glimpse of what literary culture looked like from the ground up. Most of all, Winckles truly honors and respects the voices of the women he presents.

Judith Jennings, Ph.D.
Independent scholar
JJENN1947@aol.com

Anthony W. Lee (editor). *New Essays on Samuel Johnson: Revaluation.* Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2018. Pp. xx + 261; index. ISBN 978-1-6114-9678-9. Hardcover: \$95.00. Ebook: \$90.00

New Essays on Samuel Johnson is the first of three Johnsonian collections edited by Anthony Lee and published between the fall of 2018 and the summer of 2019. (Its companions are *Samuel Johnson Among the Modernists*, which appeared from Clemson University Press in 2019, and *Community and Solitude: New Essays on Johnson's Circle*, which appeared in the same year as part of Bucknell's important eighteenth-century *Transits* series; reviews of these volumes are expected in the next *Intelligencer*.) This review will consider the contributions gathered in the *New Essays* volume, but it bears remarking at the outset that these three collections, taken together, constitute an extraordinary feat of editorial organization and labor. Lee's volumes marshal some of the most distinguished and learned scholars working in eighteenth-century studies today, and we are indebted to his diligence.

Lee's intriguing one-word subtitle to this volume, *Revaluation*, deserves explication. Literary criticism, as practiced by eighteenth- and twentieth-century critics alike, trades in *evaluation*: the assigning of literary worth, often by ranking and comparing different works or authors. Johnson wrote and spoke authoritatively in this evaluative mode, as both the *Lives of the Poets* and Boswell's *Life of Johnson* bear witness. *Revaluations* does something different. Lee does not wish to re-evaluate Johnson, giving him a higher or lower rank in the House of Fame. Nor does he wish to denigrate imagined rivals to Johnson or promote others at Johnson's expense. Rather, he takes Johnson's value for granted. Johnson's writing is, in Lee's words,

“inexhaustible,” a perennial source of “remarkable surprises and captivating discoveries” (xvi). Revaluation is thus the critical process of articulating new reasons to cherish what we already know is valuable.

This is a program that the contributors to this volume, several of whom have been reading and writing about Johnson for decades, are well equipped to follow. Particularly compelling is John Sitter’s “Sustainability Johnson,” which shows how the works of Johnson, who lamented deforestation and argued for the responsibility of academics to offer ethical education to the wider public, can help us respond to our current environmental crisis. Sitter concludes that we would do well to remember that “sustain” was for Johnson a near synonym for “endure”—and that Johnson thus understood human life as “a state in which much is to be sustained” (127). As academics, this means we must bear the troubles of the wider world, and take up our part in seeking to ameliorate them.

Another contribution that explicates Johnson’s enduring relevance as an ethical thinker is Thomas Curley’s essay on Johnson’s political pamphlet *Taxation no Tyranny*. Curley convincingly shows that indignation at the violence of European colonialism and the slave trade runs throughout Johnson’s writings and conversation, and accounts for his hostility to the American revolutionaries of the 1770s—even though this hostility put him in the paradoxical position of defending the British empire as a lesser evil.

Other scholars take up Lee’s project of revaluation in another way, taking Johnson’s enduring value as an incitement to explore obscure or unanalyzed archival materials, biographical episodes, and themes. Thus Lynda Mugglestone examines the copy of Warburton’s edition of the plays of Shakespeare that Johnson used when gathering example quotations for the 1755 *Dictionary*, showing how lexicography prepared the way for Johnson’s own Shakespeare edition in the following decade. Greg Clingham’s learned and delightful “Playing Rough: Johnson and Children” recovers the playfulness and affection that subsisted between the childless Johnson and children such as Queeney Thrale and Veronica Boswell, to the former of whom he wrote touching and kind letters beginning when she was eight. And Emily Friedman’s “Considering Johnson’s ‘Nose of the Mind’ and Mind’s Nose” follows not the Shandean symbolism of eighteenth-century noses but rather the scents and odors present in Johnson’s life and works: Boswell and Hester Piozzi testify to Johnson’s acute gourmandizing sense of smell, yet Johnson’s *London* contains fewer pungent olfactory details than its Juvenalian original.

Two distinguished contributions visit the topic of Johnson’s own critical valuations. Adam Rounce poses, and answers, an ingenious question: why is the canon represented in the *Lives of the Poets* so eccentric? This is not merely a matter of changing tastes. Eighteenth-century contemporaries and twentieth- and twenty-first-century readers have alike found it odd that the collection to which Johnson contributed prefaces included Sprat and Blackmore but not Spenser or Goldsmith. Rounce explains that the *Lives* were shaped primarily by bookseller’s agreements, copyright law, and commercial considerations; they are only marginally an expression of Johnson’s own critical preferences. John Richetti, meanwhile, focuses on Johnson’s “heterodox” critical assessment of Gray, whom he held in much lower esteem

than most other readers. Without endorsing this negative view, Richetti grounds it in Johnson's general literary principles, which elevate "passion" and "nature" over the "extravagance" of poetic manner that he diagnosed in poems such as Gray's "Progress of Poesy."

Three thoughtful essays consider the broad theme of Johnson and personal writing: Katherine Kickel places Johnson's prayers in the context of eighteenth-century Protestant devotional culture, Steven Scherwatzky explores Johnson's complex relationship to autobiography, and Paul Tankard offers a census of the resolutions that Johnson recorded at regular intervals over the course of his life.

For the volume editor, the value of Johnson lies in part in his layered intertextual engagement with earlier poets such as Pope, Milton, Shakespeare, Spenser, and Virgil. Lee's own essay works primarily by tracing verbal echoes across sequences of canonical poets. He uncovers some clear and resonant allusions, such as Pope's repetition of the phrase "watery waste," which appears first in Dryden's *Aeneid*. Other connections that Lee draws are more distant, and some readers will see a shared literary language and tradition where he posits a conscious allusion.

Taken individually, these essays will be of use to scholars pursuing specialized research topics in British eighteenth-century studies: sustainability studies, the history of criticism, life-writing research, and so on. Taken together, they will remind all readers who value Johnson that we have good reason to do so.

Jacob Sider Jost
Dickinson College

Michael Edson, editor. *Annotation in Eighteenth-Century Poetry.* (Studies in Text and Print Culture.) Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press; Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017. Pp. xxxv + 241; 5 illustrations; index; 4 tables. ISBN: 978-1-61146-252-4. Hardcover, \$95. (Paperback, \$39.99.)

The eleven essays in this collection and, especially, Michael Edson's introduction can sharpen the critical approaches of most readers of 18th-century literature—though the essays all treat British poetical literature, the motives, conflicts, and impacts of increasing annotation during the 1700s are important considerations for other genres and national literatures. This volume demonstrates to any who would doubt it that annotations (foot-, end- and side-notes--all considered here) are important texts in diverse fields and have much to say about changes in author- and readership and the publishing business—and about the relation of British poetry to other fields and traditions (e.g., classics, religion, antiquarianism, science). The first eight pages of Edson's introduction, with excellent citations for additional reading, condense and interrelate major considerations—forty years ago, an introduction this good on an important, neglected field would have been reprinted in an "Essential Articles" collection, and it would make a good addition to collections like Eleanor Shevlin's *The History of the Book in the West: 1700-1800* (2010).

The major critical issues addressed include the relation of poetical annotations to the poetry; their relation to those of other genres and to commentary and notes that are separately published; the placement and handling of notes by the press (with conflicts between convenience and the aesthetics); the motivations for notes: to elucidate especially for less educated readers (as readership expands), to add supplemental information, such as geographical, historical, and scientific; to attack or to praise; to nationalize; to display vainly, to add variety, to bulk up for profit and ensure longer copyright; the continuation and removal of the notes from reprintings; and the responses of readers, offering insight into reading practices. Moreover, Edson adds considerations peculiar to us as we prepare editions, with digital texts and bibliographical tools readily available. In recognizing the economic factors, Edson might have considered the printer's perspective more fully. He remarks that "footnotes saved paper and therefore money" (xvii), but I doubt this was usually the case, a note or two at a foot led to more spacing and frequently the use rules between text and notes, though the font size employed must be considered. (In non-poetic books marginal notes took up more wasted space.)

After quoting 19 selected comments by authors on annotation and briefly looking for common responses, Edson provides a good overview of the eleven essays gathered in four groupings. The first group includes Karina Williamson and Edson's "Annotating Georgic Poetry," a smart first choice since the georgic entered the century with annotations and became after the 1730s heavily annotated. Through notes, authors advanced didactic and descriptive purposes, and their editors, in addition, defined genre and canonized authors and poems. A good table shows the generally increasing range of notes per line, and well-chosen examples are detailed to show varied intentions (Wm. Warburton's, Joseph Wharton's, and Gilbert Wakefield's *Windsor-Forest* and Charles Dunster's of John Philips's *Cyder*). Also here is William Jones's "William Falconer's *The Shipwreck* and the Birth of the *Dictionary of the Marine*." Jones considers Falconer's alteration and addition of notes to accommodate the expansion and revisions of the text for a more general audience. The first edition (1764) was directed more toward the instruction of seamen; nautical information that would be removed from the notes of the 1769 edition was recouped by publishing the *Dictionary* in 1768 (38).

The second grouping, linking antiquarianism and nationalism, includes Jeff Strabone's "The Afterlife of Annotation: How Robert of Gloucestershire Became the Founding Father of English Poetry"; Thomas Van der Goten's "Topographical Annotation in Thomas Percy's *The Hermit of Warkworth* [1771] and John Pinkerton's *The Bruce*, [1789], the first "*A Northumberland Ballad*," the second an epic by 14th-century John Barbour, both editions rooting into the local and celebrating cultural patriotism; and Alex Watson's "Marginal Imprints: Robert Southey's Notes to *Madoc* [1805]," on incoherence in historical notes and Southey's changing political views. Strabone explains how Thomas Hearne, whose importance in his day is now too little recognized, resurrected the thirteenth-century Chronicle for its poetic value as well as its historical information (1724), and Hearne's Latin notes influenced the conception of native Anglo-Saxon poetry among later poets.

In the third grouping (“Varieties of Annotation”), David Hopkins energetically celebrates Pope’s translation of *The Iliad* as the best ever by stressing its paratextual materials, notes included (called “Observations”), which supplement the decorous verse with historical and linguistic details and critical commentary. Tom Mason’s title “Allusion and Quotation in Chaucerian Annotation, 1687-1798” seems misleading: Mason demonstrates the inclination to discover resemblances and associations. And Adam Rounce argues that Thomas Warton’s annotation of Milton in 1785--“bursting with matter that is squeezed into notes” (164), and detailing the poetical traditions received by Milton--is “both a curio of its learned age and a notable anticipation of a style of editing that would follow,” making it “one of the most significant” 18th-century editions of English poetry (152).

The last group, “Annotating the Canon,” offers Mark Pedreira’s “Zachary Grey’s Annotations on Samuel Butler’s *Hudibras* [1744],” where notes demonstrate through borrowings the poem’s canonicity and attempt to instruct both expert and novice readers; Barbara M. Benedict’s “Paratexting Beauty into Duty: Aesthetics and Morality in Late 18th-Century Literary Collections,” which examines notes and other additions to market anthologies, as of fables, to diverse audiences, especially uneducated readers (buying for literary or moral improvement, for show, etc.); and Sandro Jung’s “William Hymers and the Editing of William Collins’s Poems, 1765-1797.” The last is the only essay previously published (2011); Jung is the Series Editor; and its inclusion also seems inappropriate as it mainly concerns MS drafts and annotations on John Langhorne’s edition (the cover reproduces the annotated title-page).

This collection should be better known. A diversity of important editions are examined by scholars, usually in clear prose with good closing summaries. I’m disappointed to find only one review recorded for it in *ABELL*, by Billy Hall in the Spring 2019 *ECS*, which is appreciative when not confessing to silly expectations (e.g., Hall felt “mildly frustrated by how the authors . . . often reduce poetry to a backdrop upon which the historical and interpretative arguments about annotation play out”). Here, notes are noteworthy.

James E. May

Faith Barringer Wins 2019 Molin Prize

The S. Eric Molin Prize for the best presentation by a graduate student at EC/ASECS’s 2019 annual meeting is awarded to Faith Barringer for her paper “The Coquette, the Libertine and Fragonard: An Intertextual Look at *The Stolen Kiss*.” Barringer’s paper offered an original contribution to interdisciplinary studies. Her argument that Fragonard’s painting *The Stolen Kiss* was influenced by French erotic and sentimental novels was deftly illustrated by noting specific details in three novels: Marivaux’s *La Vie de Marianne*, Diderot’s *La Religieuse*, and *Les Liaisons dangereuses*. She further argued that Fragonard uses the novels not by depicting specific scenes but by employing the characters “to mold his own stories within the paintings.”

While Barringer utilized research from literary and art historians in the development of her argument, her own deep understanding of Fragonard's work permeated the discussion.

Ms. Barringer is a Teaching Assistant in the Department of Art and Art History at the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa. She will take her M.A. this year after completing a thesis involving female artists of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Her major field is Early Modern and her minor is Modern and Contemporary. This coming fall Faith Barringer will enter the University of Florida's Ph.D. program in Art History.

The Molin Prize was established in 1989 to honor Eric Molin (English, George Mason University), who died in 1987. It brings a cash prize of \$150. Three at-large members of the EC/ASECS executive board form the prize jury, making sure one of them attends each candidate's presentation, since excellence in performance a consideration for the prize. This fall the judges will be Elizabeth Lambert, Jane Wessel, and chair Anthony W. Lee. (For submission details and a history of the Prize, see www.ec-asecs.org.)

Minutes from the Business Luncheon, Gettysburg, October 2019

After our enjoying a sumptuous midday repast, I disrupted the collegial conversation by calling the meeting to order. The usual items of business manifested themselves. John Heins assumed the presidential mantle; Joanne Myers was wheedled into being the vice president—having been granted a year off from the presidency for excellent convention-al behavior; the irreplaceable Beth Lambert was . . . well, replaced on the Molin Prize committee by executive committee noob [plagiarized from a recent *NYT* crossword puzzle answer], Jane Wessel; Tony Lee assumed the chair of that vital and hard-working committee; and, running against stiff opposition (i.e., unopposed), yours truly, as allowed by the by-laws, was elected to a second and final (that's in the bylaws, too) three-year term as x-sec.

After the business stuff, we took time to recognize one of the hardest-working members of our association, Eleanor Shevlin, as the winner of the Leland Petersen Prize for extraordinary contributions to us all. Giving this award to Eleanor was one of my favorite moments as x-sec, because she has been inordinately helpful to me as I've struggled to follow my near-legendary predecessor, Linda Merians. I decided to add a new wrinkle to the award in addition to the traditional bottle of wine and the plaque by giving Eleanor a recent historical novel set in both the 1660s and the present, a beautiful read entitled *The Weight of Ink* by Rachel Kadish (Houghton-Mifflin, 2017), an especially moving novel not merely because it is set in "our time" but also because it "identifies" Shakespeare's dark lady. Mind you, Eleanor, far from being dark, brings light to every situation.

And speaking of being helpful, this year's president, Sylvia Marks, delivered a wonderful presidential address, entitled "A Gettysburg Address," that walked us through fifty years of ECASECS. And, as if that weren't

enough, she and Eleanor have teamed up to act as co-chairs of the next ECASECS conference, which will take place in Delaware at the Winterthur Museum (22-24 October). The executive committee considered several venues, but Matthew Kinservik wangled a generous grant from the University of Delaware that helped us seal the deal. You should have received the CFP on the reverse of the recently posted dunning letter.

Let me put in a plea here for volunteers for future conferences. The executive committee has some veteran conference organizers who will make your job surprisingly manageable. We would love to visit Pittsburgh or Philadelphia or Baltimore or Richmond or Williamsburg or, best of all, your campus. Don't be shy or fearful. We would very much like to be able to announce the location and theme of the 2021 conference at the Business Luncheon at Winterthur. Please, help us out. I promise that you will enjoy it, especially after you have survived it and I say wonderful things about you.

And speaking of that, Professor Joanne Myers hosted a truly memorable conference at Gettysburg to help us celebrate our 50th anniversary. Everything just seemed to click, including the beautiful autumn weather (and colors) that she assured me she special ordered. She is to be greatly commended.

Before I close this "epistle," let me bring you up to date on the society's finances for 2019. We began the year barely treading water (\$198.79), having had a relatively expensive and small conference at Staunton. However, the membership was quite prompt with dues payments, so the account regained its fiscal footing in January. As usual, our expenses during the year consist almost exclusively of publishing two issues of the *ECI*, which runs us close to \$1,500/issue. I usually spend another \$500 on my two mailings. Dues should cover these expenses, and certainly did this year. Our other expense is the conference, which we aim to pay for with registration fees. As you know, we began a new fund last year that we call the Future Fund [FF]. It is intended to enable us to charge graduate students only \$25 for conference registration. As of this writing, we have a balance in the FF of \$7,414.03, just under one thousand dollars coming from donations solicited by the family of Don Mell in lieu of funerary flowers. In fact, in our initial conference year with the active fund, we didn't have to use a penny of it, such was the fiscal care Joanne exercised in running the conference. In fact, not only did we leave the FF untapped, but we managed to end 2019 with a balance of \$4,473.03. [High-fives and fist-bumps all around!]

However, please, do not let that turn you into a slacker on dues payments. AND, please again, consider a contribution to the FF, especially all of you lifetime members who have put dues in the rearview mirror. When that tax refund comes rolling in, remember us and help keep us a healthy and vibrant academic culture.

I hope you are starting to see signs of spring. I look forward to seeing a whole bunch of you at Winterthur in October.

Peter Staffel, EC/ASECS Executive Secretary
West Liberty University

EC/ASECS 2020 Conference at Winterthur Museum & Library

The 2020 EC/ASECS organizers want to welcome you to our regional society's annual conference, scheduled for 22- 24 October. Through the efforts of Matt Kinservik at the University of Delaware, the society has secured the Winterthur Museum and Library, Winterthur, Delaware, as its 2020 conference site. Winterthur's particularly strong collection of American decorative arts and material objects from 1640-1860 has inspired our conference theme: "Material Matters in the Long Eighteenth." We invite papers that address material objects of our period and matters material either literally or figuratively—found in literature, music, sculpture, painting, home arts, exploration, scientific experimentation, or in other arenas—not only in American and British settings, but in international settings as well. We interpret "material matters" in the broadest sense, from the materials required to matters, be they physical or conceptual, for any endeavor of our period.

We are looking forward to receiving paper and panel proposals on the "Material Matters" theme as well as others of your choosing. In addition to material culture panels, the conference will also feature longstanding EC/ASECS sessions. Gene Hammond with David Palumbo will continue the "Jonathan Swift and His Circle" session that the late, beloved Don Mell had organized and hosted for so many years. The Book History, Bibliography, and Textual Studies panel, another long-running offering, is accepting proposals, and we are hoping a version of the Works-in-Progress session will be resurrected. Several panels proposed particularly for this conference are also seeking papers including "John Gay at 300," "Encountering the Orient: Diplomacy, Discovery, Travel, Trade, Colonialism, and Representation in the British and American Eighteenth Century," and "The Function of Material and Still Extant Objects & Places in Historical Fiction." Full details and contact information about these panels' calls can be found on our conference website: <https://ecasecs2020.wordpress.com/panels-seeking-papers/>.

Dr. Suvir Kaul, the A. M. Rosenthal Professor of English at the University of Pennsylvania, has graciously accepted our invitation to deliver this year's keynote. The author of numerous books and articles, Professor Kaul teaches courses in eighteenth-century British literature, contemporary South Asian writing in English, and literary and critical theory at Penn. Commenting on his monograph *Eighteenth-Century British Literature and Postcolonial Studies*, Professor Donna Landry has noted that "Eighteenth-century studies has never appeared in a more engaged and fascinating light." We know Professor Kaul's plenary will similarly engage as it prompts us to consider material matters in fresh, fascinating ways.

As has been a long tradition, Peter Staffel's Aural/Oral Experience will open the conference on Thursday evening, October 22nd, at the conference hotel, The Mendenhall Inn (323 Kennett Pike, Mendenhall, PA) about a nine-minute drive to Winterthur. The conference rates are \$101 (two double beds) or \$105 (king bed) for Thursday night, and \$170 (two double beds) and \$177 (king beds) for Friday and Saturday nights; the rates include breakfast, and parking is free. We will work with those who do not have their own vehicles to

shuttle and carpool back and forth from Winterthur. The hotel only allows blocks of ten rooms to be reserved at a time; once ten rooms are reserved, then we will have access to another ten rooms. So please reserve as soon as possible. You can cancel the reservation without incurring charges if you cancel a minimum of *one week* before the first night of your stay. Again, full information can be found on our conference website:

<https://ecasecs2020.wordpress.com/hotel/>.

EC/ASECS has a well-deserved reputation of being an especially welcoming group. Our members often attend their first EC/ASECS as graduate students and then return year after year as they launch their careers, earn tenure, and eventually retire. To support graduate attendance, we are pleased that the society's Future Fund enables us to set our conference registration fee at just \$25.00 for graduate students. This fee includes the business lunch and all other events, and we hope that the conference's affordability will encourage more graduate students to attend. To further foster graduate participation, we also offer the Sven Eric Molin Prize for the best paper presented by a student at the conference; the award, entering its third decade, offers a cash prize and appreciative recognition in the *Intelligencer*.

The deadline to propose panels is fast approaching—March 31st. Individual paper proposals are due June 1st, and completed panel should be submitted by June 15th. Please visit the conference website—<https://ecasecs2020.wordpress.com>—for more information about the meeting, lodging, surrounding sights, and more. We hope to have a draft program by July; it will be posted on the conference website once it is ready. Registration will follow shortly after we have a tentative program. As we continue our planning, we will post announcements about any tours or entertainment we have been able to arrange. Please direct any questions to co-organizers Drs. Sylvia Marks and Eleanor Shevlin at ecasecs2020@gmail.com.

We are looking forward to seeing many old and new faces at Winterthur this October. A conference flyer is downloadable at our website, and we urge you to circulate it widely. It should be a memorable meeting, and we will be doing all that we can to ensure it is.

Sylvia Marks (NYU Tandon School of Engineering)
and Eleanor Shevlin (West Chester University)

Additions and Corrections to the Directory

Berry, Chelsea: new position: History Dept. / Randolph College /
2500 Rivermont Ave. / Lynchburg, VA 24503
Cahill, Samara. English Dept. / Blinn College / 902 College Avenue /
Brenham, TX 77833
Everdell, William M. new address: weverdell@saintannsny.org.
Mace, Nancy (on retirement from USNA and until later in 2020):
1201 Barefoot Lane / Owings, MD 20736; nmace4@gmail.com
McFarland, Bridget. 118 Sherman Ave. / Jersey City, NJ 07307-2242

Ormsby-Lennon, Hugh: new email: hormsby302@gmail.com

Potkay, Adam. [address outside of fall term when at William & Mary:]
717 N. Ocean Ave. / Seaside Park, NJ 08752-1535

Richards, Katherine. (Director of Advising) Central Penn College,
600 Valley Rd / PO Box 309 Summerdale, PA 17093-0309

Wilcox, Lance. email: Lancewilcox@gmail.com

Wilder, James C. (hand-press printing, esp. Irish) jcw567 @gmail.com;
7905 Burdette Road / Bethesda, MD 20817

News of Members

Right off, we thank **Joanne Myers** for organizing and then conducting one of our best meetings of the past decade. From Joanne's impromptu announcements shepherding us through events to her late-night attendance at O'Rourke's Pub Friday, where **Patrice Smith** had organized the performance of Irishtown Road, Joanne made it look easy. Joanne thanked **Peter Staffel** and **Eleanor Shevlin** for their assistance. On 24-26 October, Gettysburg town, the Gettysburg Hotel, and then the College's buildings used for Saturday sessions, luncheon, and reception were ideal locations for discussions of "Crossroads and Divergences." One of Joanne's brilliant ideas was to create a plenary for two of Gettysburg's distinguished professors to introduce us to their work, **Timothy Shannon** on Peter Williamson (see below) and **Kay Etheridge** on Maria Sibylla Merians. Kay had beautiful slides enticing us to visit the concurrent exhibition of Merians' texts and illustrations of insects and their favorite plants at the Schmucker Art Gallery. Many graduate students from Maryland participated along with plenary speaker **Tita Chico**--Delaware and Penn State were well represented too. There were some unusual session topics like "Domesticity," "Visitors and Voyeurs in Catholic Europe," and "Jacobitism" along with those more usual on literature (Austen, Johnson, Swift, and American and French literatures), theatre, women's studies, and book history (once again Eleanor Shevlin chaired multiple sessions). The meeting, which began with the Oral-Aural Experience hosted by Peter Staffel at the hotel, concluded with a gathering of old timers celebrating the early history of EC/ASECS, during which **Mary Margaret Stewart**, a former Executive Secretary, had the sharpest recollections. **Sylvia K. Marks** delivered a substantial presidential address (our lead article), which pivoted from Lincoln's address with its reflections on America's founding to Sylvia's on that of EC/ASECS "two score and ten years" earlier; then she took the present temperature of our group and the humanities in general, and concluded with a biographical inquiry into Frances Burney, particularly her engagement with Samuel Johnson. Also satisfying was the bestowal of our Leland D. Peterson Award to **Eleanor Shevlin** for her many labors in service of EC/ASECS. At the luncheon Peter Staffel passed out the program for our 1979 meeting in Williamsburg, "The Pan-Atlantic Enlightenment," chaired by Merrit Cox of William & Mary. The registration was \$18.50 and lodging, arranged by Cox, \$33.28 a night ("shared room, \$16.64") at The Hospitality House. **James Woolley** made some observations about that conference: 1) we

met in southern Virginia, where we now almost never go; 2) we met in an undeniably important site for 18C studies; 3) there were sessions on philosophy, Latin America, history of science, religion, and politics, all fields we're now weak on; 4) lodging was inexpensive; 5) many speakers came from outside the region; 6) we had a Friday evening banquet [besides the business meeting at Saturday's lunch]; and 7) fewer women were on the program.

For those of us who attended **Donald C. Mell's** Swift Roundtable at Gettysburg, it will be remembered better than most of the meeting, for Don died soon thereafter, on 9 November. Papers by the regulars, Gene Hammond, David Palumbo, and James Woolley were good as ever, but up front Don was apologetically struggling to articulate clearly his introductions, for he'd had some oral surgery recently. Despite his good cheer then and at the receptions, Don was weighted by a recent diagnosis of cancer, which Peter Staffel learned he had deferred treatment of until after our conference. Matt Kinservik passed on the sad news of Don's death by email, attaching his daughter Elizabeth Mell's well detailed account of his life (which we can forward to any wishing to read it). James Woolley has given the memorial tribute for our beloved colleague above (pp. 14-16), and I wrote one for the Spring *Scriblerian*. On first receiving the news, the refrain from colleagues was invariably a version of Gene Hammond's remark, "Don was one of the two or three kindest and most generous people I've met in my life, and he stayed that way to the very end. His approach to life was no different at our recent EC/ASECS than it ever had been." And James's: "It's hard to think of anyone else who did as much for as long to support the work of other scholars in eighteenth-century studies." Although he was a fixture at ASECS, his affection for our humble Society was so well known to his family, as Elizabeth indicated in closing her obituary, that, in lieu of flowers, "the Mell family requests that donations in Don's memory be given to the Future Fund of the EC/ASECS, which will provide scholarship opportunities to graduate students." Besides his regular participation and special effort to offer book exhibits, Don co-chaired three meetings for us in Newark, co-editing papers from the first, *Man, God, and Nature in the Enlightenment* (1988), and contributed repeatedly to the newsletter. And, of course, he was the teacher, colleague, or midwife for many us, as Matt Kinservik stressed in his eulogy at the memorial service at Christ Church Christiana Hundred in Wilmington on 22 November. Another speaker, Robert Deitz, who'd been Don's student at Middlebury College, recalled how, after being drafted, while on leave from the army, he dropped in on Don and his wife Kay when they were all dressed up to leave for a party. After Don convinced Robert to go along, he slipped upstairs to change his clothes so that Robert in his Mao jacket and the like would be the less conspicuous.

Peter Perreten, who knew Don for over 50 years, offers this recollection: "We arrived at the University of Delaware at the same time in 1968: he as a faculty member and I as a graduate student. I was in one of his first graduate seminars at Delaware, an experience that deepened my interest in the 18th century. Don directed my dissertation on Christopher Smart's *Midwife: or the Old Woman's Magazine*, and through his efforts I joined the faculty at Ursinus College. He continued to mentor me when I began to present papers at ASECS and EC/ASECS conferences. We met at these meetings nearly every year and

enjoyed exchanging news and having a glass of cheer and dinner together. Although my scholarship after graduate school didn't focus on Swift, I attended Don's yearly sessions on research in Swift studies which both entertained and enlightened me. One special personal memory has stayed with me all these years. After I completed my dissertation defense, Don and Katherine invited me to their home for dinner. After dinner, before I left that evening, Katherine—a plant lover, as am I—gave me cuttings, bulbs and roots for a number of plants, some of them quite rare. Several of those plants remained with me for many years. They served as a fond, living memory of Don and Katherine and my graduate days at the University of Delaware." I'd add that the last dissertation Don supervised was Michael Edson's, which Don co-directed in 2011 (he then helped Michael get his position at Wyoming.)

Hermann J. Real sent a remembrance of Don, styling him *Vir bonus atque eruditus*: "Like numerous friends and colleagues, I will continue to remember Don Mell as a man of extraordinary humanity and kindness. As scholar, I will remember him, first and foremost, as a lover of poetry, as a reader who took acute pleasure in contributing to the revaluation of Augustan poets, both male and female, which was going on since the seventies and eighties, and, as he confessed in the introduction to his *Poetics of Augustan Elegy* (1974), to the analysis of its rhetorical and stylistic practices in the unfolding of meaning and purpose. In doing so, Don saw himself committed to a function of criticism outlined by Northrop Frye in a famous essay for the MLA in 1963, which posited description and analysis as the two crucial methodological criteria of good academic criticism. In his thematic as well as generic analyses, Don, an expert musician all his life, gladly professed to have indulged his affinity with what in musical composition is called 'variation.□ Two subsequent anthologies, both equally superb, manifest more of Don's scholarly virtues. One, the first collection of essays devoted exclusively to Swift's poetry, he co-edited with the late John Irwin Fischer and David M. Vieth, *Contemporary Studies of Swift's Poetry* (1981); the second, a remarkable extension of the first's, entitled *Pope, Swift, and Women Writers*, he edited on his own (1996). Both demonstrate Don's 'Lovejoyan□ capacity for co-operation, for bringing experienced scholars together, for organizing forums, round tables, and organs of publication. To most of us in the community, Don was a legendary communicator, or broker if you prefer, who having encouraged his fellow-researchers to pursue their approaches, goaded them on into expanding perspectives (explicitly soliciting feminist readings), and finally made them meet head-on in animated discourse. How will the community replace one so irreplaceable?"

Carla Mulford, who was a graduate student of Don's at Delaware, posted on Facebook, "Very saddened by the passing of my friend and former teacher at the University of Delaware, Don Mell, whose courses (like those of J.A. Leo Lemay) introduced me to the literature I have spent my career studying. Don was witty, thoughtful, always *always* helpful. Thinking back, I realize now that he was the kindest and most generous person I've known in the academic world. I was able to have a nice lunchtime catch-up talk with Don at the recent EC/ASECS meeting in Gettysburg. Getting to see him there was the primary reason I wanted to get to that conference." Leo Lemay's son John

replied, "I'll always remember Don coming over to the house. He was a great friend of mom and dad." And so many more.

Corey Andrews contributed "Teaching the 18C Laboring-Class Georgic" to *Teaching Laboring-Class British Literature of the 18C*, ed. by Kevin Binfield and Wm. J. Christmas (MLA, 2018). **Faith Barringer**, who won the Molin Prize for her presentation at Gettysburg (see above), presented "The Progress of Masculinity in Catherine Leroy's Corpsman in Anguish" in a session on the history and practice of photography at the SECAC conference in Chattanooga last fall (photographs from the Viet Nam war). The Univ. of Delaware Press has just published *Art and Artifact in Austen* (288 pp.; 20 illustrations; index), edited by **Anna Battigelli**, with essays, as she notes, "that expand and enrich a dialogue begun at SUNY Plattsburgh's 2017 bicentenary conference 'Jane Austen and the Arts,'" organized by Anna. We have a review copy for a suitable reviewer.) (N. Delaware's books are now distributed by the U. of Virginia Press, which been publishing a great deal on the 18C and has always been responsive to the *Intelligencer's* request for review copies.) Anna's introduction begins, "Jane Austen was immersed in the arts. She loved dancing. She was a proficient pianist who practiced daily and collected and transcribed piano scores" (1). There are thirteen essays including Anna's introduction, subtitled "The Intimate Ironies of Jane Austen's Arts and Artifacts." These include **Peter Sabor's** "Portraiture as Misrepresentation in the Novels and Early Writings of Jane Austen," a "significant revision" of his position in "'Staring at Astonishment' . . ." in *Jane Austen's Business*, 1996; **Marilyn Francus's** "Jane Austen, Marginalia, and Book Culture"; **Barbara M. Benedict's** "Gender and Things in Austen and Pope"; **Tonya J. Moutray's** "Religious Views: English Abbeys in Austen's *Northanger Abbey* and *Emma*"; **Juliette Wells's** "Intimate Portraiture and the Accomplished Woman Artist in *Emma*"; and **Jocelyn Harris's** "What Jane Saw—in Henrietta Street"; as well as contributions by Elaine Bander, Nancy Johnson, Deborah Payne, and others.

Barbara Benedict contributed essays to three volumes published in 2019: "Jewels, Rings, and Bonds: Objects and the Body in *The Merchant of Venice*, *Cymbeline*, *Mansfield Park* and *Sense and Sensibility*" to *Jane Austen and William Shakespeare: A Love Affair in Literature, Film and Performance*, edited by Marina Cano and Rosa Garcia-Periago, 97-125; and "Curiosity in British Literature: Investigators, Curiosities, Motifs and Methods" to *Curious about Curiosity: Toward New Philosophical Explorations of the Epistemic Desire to Know*, edited by Mariana Papastefanou, 67-85; and "The Virtuous in Distress: *David Simple*, *Amelia*, *Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph*" to *The Sentimental Novel in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by **Albert J. Rivero**, 69-86. Barbara gave two plenaries in Europe last year, the first entitled "So Much to Read! So Little Time! Booksellers' Solutions to the 18C Explosion of Printed Pleasures" for the "Reading Miscellanies/Miscellaneous Reading" Conference of the Journal Literature Research Group, in Cologne, 29 August 2019; and the second, "Collecting and Recollecting: Defoe's Survival Guide to Exile," a plenary at the Center for 18C Studies Joint Conference at York U., 12 July 2019. Bucknell UP lists on its website for publication on 18 September 2020 *Writing Lives in the 18C*, ed. by Tanya M. Caldwell, with essays by **Lisa**

Berglund, Marilyn Francus, Peter Sabor, Victoria Warren, et al. A month later Bucknell will publish *Paper, Ink, and Achievement: Gabriel Hornstein and the Revival of 18C Scholarship*, edited by **Kevin L. Cope** and **Cedric D. Reverand II**, with their own essays and others by **Jim May, Leah Orr, John Scanlan, Linda Troost, Manuel Schonhorn**, David Venturo, et al.

Kevin Berland contributed “The Secret History in British North America and the Early Republic” to *The Secret History in Literature, 1660-1820*, ed. by R. Bullard and R. Carnell (2017). More than several members of the Society contributed to *Approaches to Teaching the Works of Eliza Haywood*, ed. by Tiffany Potter (MLA, 2020; xi + 238 pp.), including **Martha Bowden** (“Avoiding Oroonoko Syndrome: Teaching Haywood and *Fantomina* in Context”), **Toni Bowers** (“Haywood and ‘Amatory Fiction’”), **Aleksondra Hultquist** (“Reforming the Reformation Narrative: Demythologizing Haywood and the Rise of the Novel through *Betsy Thoughtless*”), **Catherine Ingrassia** (“Teaching beyond the Heteronormative: *Fantomina* and Queering Haywood”), and **Tonya Marie Howe** (“Nonfatal Inquiry: *Love in Excess*, Print, and the Internet Age”). The volume contains a great many short essays, some very much focused on pedagogical and research tools, such as Patrick Spedding’s “Haywood’s Works, Availability, Editing, and Issues of Bibliography”; others not, such as Earla Wilputte’s “Literary Communities: *The Tea-Table* and the Hillarian Circle.” The Fall 2019 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Studies* in its “ASECS at 50 Interview Series” with interviews of senior scholars by junior, offers an interview by Nathan Brown of **Theodore E. D. Braun**, praising him for and querying him about the founding of ASECS, the ISECS, the Society for 18C French Studies, and the Ibero-American Society for 18C Studies. Ted’s sharp memory reflects on ASECS meetings back to 1970, when no CFP occurred but speakers were invited to give plenaries, and on those who strongly shaped ASECS, like Donald Greene. Ted’s regular attendance and six-years as Affiliate Societies Coordinator provide him with in-depth knowledge about ASECS and its relation to other Societies. The issue also contains interviews with former ASECS President Paula Backscheider, Robert Darnton, and **Suvir Kaul**, who will be the EC/ASECS speaker this fall at the Winterthur. Ted has brought his good humor under a flag of orange dress to more regional meetings than our own. This February he was at the SCSECS in St. Augustine to speak on “Religious Censorship in Cyrano de *Bergerac’s L’Autre Monde*.”

After teaching for ten years at the Nanyang Technological Univ. in Singapore, **Samara Cahill** returned stateside and took a position at Blinn College in Texas, east of Austin. In 2019 Bucknell UP published Samara’s monograph *Intelligent Souls? Feminist Orientalism in Eighteenth-Century English Literature*. Also that year she launched a continuation of the journal *Religion in the Age of the Enlightenment*, formerly edited by Brett McInelly and published by AMS. The two numbers of the 2019 Volume 1 of *Studies in Religion and the Enlightenment* are available for open access on the web, the separate contents being posted in PDFs. The second number released this fall begins with Sam’s lengthy and enthusiastic survey of conferences and events on the Enlightenment during 2019; then comes a report by **Tonya Moutray** on the “History of Women Religious of Britain and Ireland” conference in

London during June; and then **Brijraj Singh's** report on papers involving religion & Enlightenment at the International SECS in Edinburgh last July. Several essays and six book reviews follow, including **Kevin Cope's** of *A Jesuit in the Forbidden City: Matteo Ricci 1552-1610* by R. Po-Chia Hsia; Brijraj Singh's of *New Approaches to Religion and Enlightenment* edited by McNelly and **Paul Kerry**; and Jeffrey Galbraith's of *Anglican Enlightenment: Orientalism, Religion and Politics in England and its Empire* by the productive William J. Bulman of Lehigh U. (who needs to be induced to join EC/ASECS). But let me return to Brij's report on the Congress in Edinburgh. His survey includes an account of **Joanne Myers'** talk on Catholic identity in 18C Britain, illustrating degrees of divided loyalty toward faith and country in a comparison of Bishop Richard Challoner and the mass-attending merchant William Maude, who sheltered Challoner during the Gordon riots. At the end of his survey, Brij sums up his own talk, "Ziegenbalg Debates the Hindus," which examines Ziegenbalg's debates with a Hindu holy man and later with several Hindus (Brij is returning to Ziegenbalg, the subject of his *The First Protestant Missionary to India: Bartholomaeus Ziegenbalg, 1683-1719* [OUP, 1999]). Ziegenbalg learned, partly from the first debate, that he knew the Hindu scriptures better than devout Hindus tended to (for the Brahmins kept the holy books close), and he exploited that advantage in a subsequent impromptu debate with several Hindus. Perhaps Samara had her journal in mind when she posted CFPs for the SCSECS on "Women and Religion" and "Fort Augustine, Colonial History and the Catholic Enlightenment." But then she might have simply been embracing the 18C, for, if one simply picks a year in ECCO and reads all the titles, one will find religion outnumbers sexuality 100 to 1. I think the journal will thrive *online*—certainly more contributions will be read than when the journal was an expensive hardback. Note that David Gies in 2015 took the premier 18C Spanish studies journal *Dieciocho* online, dropping all subscriptions—if you want the Spring 2020 issue (43, no. 1, well over 200 pp.), ask for it (dtg @virginia.edu). *Dieciocho* was always a good journal, but the recent issues are longer, stronger on scholarship, and better illustrated, and the contributors apparently more international.

Susan Carlile's biography *Charlotte Lennox*, recently reviewed here, receives high praise from Fanny Lacôte in *Journal of Eighteenth-Century Studies*: it "constitutes not only a fascinating and curious" biographical narrative but a "significant and necessary contribution to scholarship" on Lennox and women's writing (42: 558-59). It is also praised (on 688-89) by Jayne Lewis in her survey of "Recent Studies in the Restoration and Eighteenth-Century" within the summer 2019 issue of *SEL: Studies in English Literature* (which she dedicated to Robert Folkenflik—whom she eulogized in the Autumn 2019 *Scriblerian*). Other books favorably examined by Lewis include **Peter Sabor's** edition of Vol. 2: 1791-1840 of *Additional Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, 2018 (690-91), and the 30-essay collection *Women's Periodicals and Print Culture in Britain, 1690-1820*, edited by Jennie Batchelor and **Manushag N. Powell** (2016), with essays by **Eve Tavor Bannet**, **Susan Carlile**, **Laura Engel**, and **Chloe Wigston Smith** (681-82). *Women's Periodicals* was also reviewed in *J ECS* in 2019 (42.1: 119-20). **Chelsea Berry** reviewed Suman Seth's *Difference and Disease: Medicine,*

Race, and the Eighteenth-Century British Empire (2018) in the January issue of *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* (75.1: 109-12).

Andrew Carpenter is working on broadside elegy poems printed in Dublin early in the 18C. He's also co-editing with his wife Lucy Collins the anthology "Reading Women: Poems about Women from Ireland, 1600-1820" (probably coming out in 2021). Andrew has two chapters--one on landscape poems and one on songs--coming out later this year in books from Cambridge UP and has published the following articles: "Katherine Philips, 'Philippa' and Restoration Dublin," in *Eighteenth-Century Ireland/Iris an dá chultúr*, 33 (2018), 1-32; and "Lawyers and the Circulation of Scurrilous Verse in Restoration Dublin" in *Law and Revolution in Seventeenth-Century Ireland*, edited by Coleman A. Dennehy (Four Courts Press, 2020) 289-301. Andrew reports that "The first of these argues that a famous, anonymous poem praising Katherine Philips that has always been assumed to be the work of a woman is probably that of a disrespectful young man. The second suggests a legal audience for the poem *Purgatorium Hibernicum*, which I edited for the Irish Manuscripts Commission a few years ago." His recent lectures include one on poems about smallpox in 17C and 18C Ireland--which led him to the Dublin elegies and poems about death from the 1720s and early 30s. He adds, "This is a much more cheerful subject than one might expect if one looks at the poems celebrating minor figures and the mock elegies as the strange objects that they are--spaces for the energetic poetasters of Dublin to indulge themselves, coining extraordinary new words and creating bizarre rhymes."

Tita Chico contributed "From Fleece to Fleets: Wool and the Production of Wonder" to the Fall 2019 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, a special issue edited by Robert Markley, entitled "Ecological Footprints: Crusoe's Island and Other Alien Environments." Tita's essay treats John Dyer's *The Fleece* (1757), looking at the georgic's creation of wonder in the production and trade in wool. The issue includes the rather timely "Plague Ecologies: Daniel Defoe and the Epidemic Constitution" by Christopher Loar; also Melissa Bailes writes on Maria Riddell; Bethany Williams, on Defoe's *Tour*; Lucinda Cole, on "Defoe's Animals" in a 1815 *Robinson Crusoe*; and Denys von Renen, on Mungo Park's *Travels*. **Jeremy Chow** with Brandi Bushman published "Hydro-Eroticism" in *ELN*'s April 2019 issue, showing how in contemporary fiction "aqueous locations become sites of queer community" and have "associations with the fluid female body" and enhance "human and nonhuman intimacy." **Greg Clingham** has been working on the writings and watercolours of Lady Anne Barnard, publishing recently "Lady Anne Barnard: Remnants and Renewal," *Bulletin of the National Library of South Africa*, 73:2 (Dec. 2019): 167-78, and "Anecdotes of Bishop Thomas Barnard," *Johnsonian News Letter*, 70:1 (March 2019): 23-44. This is all grist to a mill that will eventually become a monograph on Lady Anne: "Enlightened Orientalism: Lady Anne Barnard and the Cultures of the Cape." In the spring of 2020 Greg was to co-curate (with Esther Esmiol) an exhibition of Lady Anne Barnard's watercolours at the William Fehr Collection of the Castle of Good Hope Museum, Cape Town, and giving several lectures. In other work, Greg has co-edited with **Baerbel Czennia** *Oriental Networks: Culture, Commerce and Communication in the Long Eighteenth Century*, forthcoming

this year in the Bucknell UP *Apercus* series (now edited by Katarzyna Lecky). The volume includes Greg's "Cosmology and Commerce on Lord George Macartney's *Embassy to China, 1792-1794*." In addition, Greg has written the Foreword ("Global Johnson") to a collection of essays on *Johnson in Japan*, edited by Mika Suzuki and Kimiyo Ogawa, forthcoming from Bucknell. His review essay about the final volume of the Yale Edition of Samuel Johnson, *Johnson on Demand: Reviews, Prefaces and Ghost Writings*, ed. by Robert De Maria and **O M Brack Jr.** (2018), is forthcoming in volume 26 of *1650-1850*. Finally, with the support of John Morgenstern, Director of Clemson UP, he started a new series of books and collections of essays in 18C studies—***Eighteenth-Century Moments***—with Clemson UP (in partnership with Liverpool UP), which complements Liverpool's series, *Eighteenth-Century Worlds*. "This new series will publish good books about topics and moments in the long 18th century; it will be broad in its critical interests, appeal, and focus, placing the emphasis on quality, rather than on genre, methodology, ideology or theoretical persuasion. *Eighteenth-Century Moments* is thus open to publishing not only scholarly monographs, but also biographies, essay collections, editions, and translations . . . 1660-1860." Send queries to Greg at clingham@bucknell.edu and to John at jmorgen@clemson.edu.

At Gettysburg **Thomas M. Curley** presented "Johnson at an Intellectual Crossroads: His Collaboration with Sir Robert Chambers in 1766-67 and the Conservatism of Johnson's Political Tracts of 1776." Tom's biography *Sir Robert Chambers: Law, Literature, and Empire in the Age of Johnson*, was published by Wisconsin in 1998 and won the Choice Outstanding Academic Book Award. This work complemented his two-volume 1986 Clarendon edition *A Course of Lectures on the English Law Delivered at the University of Oxford, 1767-1773* by Sir Robert Chambers, Second Vinerian Professor of English Law, composed in association with Samuel Johnson. Tom remarked wistfully in an excellent Q&A that his work on Chambers has had little effect on Johnsonian studies, offering as an example that there is no mention of Chambers in Leo Damrosch's *The Club* (reviewed in our last issue)—this despite Tom's demonstration that there was a fusion in the legal thought of SJ and Chambers and despite SJ's being likely closer to Chambers than to Boswell (Tom is confident of that, and there is some confirmation in John Radner's examination of SJ's correspondence with them). At the same session **Lance Wilcox** delivered "Johnson, Savage, and the Ascription of Biographical Agency," making many interesting points about Johnson's relations with Savage and biography in general. (In 2016 Lance and Nicholas Seager co-edited the *Life of Mr. Richard Savage* for Broadview.) **Anthony Lee**, unable to attend due to earlier illnesses preventing him from missing further classes, passed the duties at the lectern to **Ellen Moody**, who ably chaired the session and read Tony's paper on Johnson. Last May the MLA published *Teaching Modern British and America Satire*, edited by **Evan R. Davis** and Nicholas Nace (384 pp.). The editors have gathered essays, typically 8-10 pp. in length, covering satire very generally (e.g., "Verbal Irony" by Evan, "Parody" by Anne Stevens, and "Satire and Elitism" by Aaron Santessa), 18C satires (e.g., Frederic Bogel's "Satire and Materialism in the 18C" and Adam Rounce's "Satire on Scholarship in the 18C"); traditional satirical forms (e.g., **Catherine**

Ingrassia's "Gendered Satires in Dialogue" and Howard Weinbrot's "Apocalyptic Satire"); contemporary satire (e.g., Matthew Henry's "Animated Television Satire"); and pedagogy (e.g., David Mazella's "Satire and the Gateway Course").

J. Alan Downie contributed "'The Best of Poets of that Age': Christopher Marlowe's Posthumous Reputation" to *Christopher Marlowe, Theatrical Commerce and the Book Trade*, ed. Kirk Melnikoff et al. (2018). **Emile Durand**, who chaired the session "Domesticity in Odd Places" at Gettysburg, will review for us Stephanie Insley Hershinow's *Born Yesterday: Inexperience and the Early Realist Novel* (Johns Hopkins UP, 2019), pp. xv + 176), a treatment of novelistic characters "unlikely to develop" in works by Richardson, Fielding, Walpole, Radcliffe, Burney, and Austen. **Michael Edson** organized a session at the 2020 SCSECS entitled "Poet, Sailor, and Lexicographer: William Falconer," at which he spoke on additions and restructuring by Falconer in revisions of his epic *The Shipwreck* (1762-1769); **Mel New** offered a comparative discussion of Sterne's treatment of soldiers and Falconer's of sailors, with some informed speculation about the possible meeting of the two at a mutual friend's home in London; and Bill Jones, the editor of a fine edition of *The Shipwreck*, offered "Falconer as Poet, Sailor, and Lexicographer: Influence and Achievement." Bill had come from England for the session, which he noted was the only session to his knowledge ever devoted to Falconer. **Marilyn Francus** brought out Vol. 16 of *The Burney Journal* in December, featuring essays on Frances by Bethany Wong and Linda Zionkowski, "The Burneys and their Montagu Patrons" by Joy Hudson, and "The Antiquarian Reception of Charles Burney's *A General History of Music*" by Devon Nelson. **Daniel Froid** published "Charlotte Smith's Ugly Feelings" in *SEL* last summer (59:605-24). He examines Smith's "engagement with the sublime aesthetic" in *Elegiac Sonnets*, finding that Smith "brings the sublime into contact with melancholy, describing scenes that first appear to evoke the sublime feeling but culminate in fatigue, anxiety, and sorrow." *SEL* indicates that Daniel is working on a dissertation involving the devil and forbidden knowledge in 18C literature. **Michael Genovese**, recently promoted to Associate Professor at Kentucky, in October published *The Problem of Profit: Finance and Feeling in Eighteenth-Century British Literature* (U. of Virginia Press, 2019; 312 pp; \$49.99). Michael argues that 18C attacks against profit-taking in commerce and finance rose "from a distaste for individualism." He examines attitudes to profits as checked by more sympathetic and communal ideals in works by Addison, Defoe, Steele, both Fieldings, Hume, Johnson and Sterne. A review is forthcoming here.

Congratulations to **W. B. Gerard** and **E. Derek Taylor** on the publication of the 144-page Autumn issue of *The Scriblerian*, as also to many other EC/ASECSers on the editorial team, such as **Melanie Holm**, **Catherine Ingrassia**, **Anthony Lee**, **Mel New**, **Rivka Swenson**, **Kathryn Temple**, **Linda Troost**, and **Robert Walker**. Note that *Scriblerian's* scope now includes Samuel Johnson; the fall issue includes reviews of many essays on Johnson by **John Dussinger**, **Peter Sabor**, and, esp., **Anthony Lee**--several written by **Steven Scherwatzky**. **Alison Gibeily** contributed the annotated bibliographical survey "Some Current Publications" to the Fall 2019 issue of

Restoration. At Gettysburg Alison spoke on themes and topics in Lady Mary Wortley Montagu's writing. There we persuaded her to review for the *Intelligencer* **Samara Cahill's** book *Intelligent Souls? Feminist Orientalism in Eighteenth-Century English Literature* (Bucknell, 2019); pp. 243, with a lengthy bibliography [205-222]. In recommending the book, Laura Stevens writes that it examines how British feminists during the Enlightenment accepted and developed a "disturbing aspect of anti-islamic thought—the false notion that Muslims believe women do not have souls."

At Gettysburg, on **Donald Mell's** perennial Swift session, **Gene Hammond** applied to the Trumpian era *The Art of Political Lying*. Gene returned to St. Petersburg, Russia, last summer to teach Russian humanities students. He hopes to return this summer to the Far East, including Bhutan. **Gerard Holmes**, who is writing his dissertation on Emily Dickinson, last year published in *The Emily Dickinson Journal* "'Invisible Music—': What Musical Settings of Emily Dickinson's Poems, Including Two Previously Unknown, Tell Us about Dickinson's Musicality." **Judi Jennings**, whom we thank for the review above, is researching Mary Morris Knowles, the "celebrated Quaker who challenged Samuel Johnson in conversation and then James Boswell for his presentation of her conversation." Judi has identified Knowles's maternal grandfather as John England: "He travelled from Staffordshire to the Chesapeake area and established the largest iron foundry business in the Colonies before dying in what is now northern Maryland in 1734." Judi would love to hear from colleagues with information about John England or the Principio Company for whom he worked. **George Justice** and **Albert Rivero** are editing the collection "Daniel Defoe in Context" for Cambridge; it will include essays by several dozen contributors.

Steve Karian's March newsletter for the Johnson Society of the Central Region contains abstracts for the cancelled April meeting—now we see a new benefit of that practice. **Deborah Kennedy** published "Ann Radcliffe's Legacy and Del Toro's *Crimson Peak*" in *Gothic Afterlives*, edited by Lorna Piatti-Farnell (Lanham: Lexington, 2019): 111-122. The collection that **Paul Kerry** edited with Brett C. McNelly, *New Approaches to Religion and the Enlightenment* (2018), is reviewed in the fall *ECS* by Naomi Taback of Temple U. (somebody needs to induce her to join EC/ASECS). One of the five essays examined in detail is **Kevin L. Cope's** "insightful analysis" of German theologian Friedrich Christian Lesser's *Insecto-Theologia* (1740), where insects exemplify God's splendor and artistry. Kevin shows that, in Pierre Lysonnet's 1742 English translation with notes and illustrations, insects' activities are shown to "continually and directly build the design that to some they seem only to signify" (*New Approaches*, 30). The Winter 2019 *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* offers Ula Lukszo Klein's "Dildos and Material Sapphism in the 18C," which confirms that in poems like "Signior Dildoe" and some later prose narratives the "dildo becomes specifically aligned with a usurpation of male power and sexual prerogative, as well as Sapphic pleasure" (31.2: 395-412). At the fall meeting, **Matt Kinservik** returned to Charles Macklin, surveying his repeated and varied roles in managing theatricals in Dublin and London. The fall issue of *The Eighteenth Century* includes **Ellen Malenas Ledoux's** "The Queer Contact Zone: Empire and Military

Masculinity in the Memoirs of Hannah Snell and Mary Anne Talbot, 1750-1810” (60.3: 223-48). Ellen examines these two narratives by cross-dressing war veterans within a colonial context to discover “an unsettling relation between queer historicism and the history of imperialism.” We thank Ellen for patiently awaiting publication of her review above: we received it before October’s issue was printed but lacked the space for it.

Anthony W. Lee published the note “Neara’s Tangled Hair: Johnson, Hammond, and Milton’s *Lycidas*” in the December 2019 *Notes and Queries* (66.4: 584-87), involving pastoral language in Milton and James Hammond and Johnson’s observations in the *Lives* of both. In this same issue of *N&Q* we find Philip Smallwood’s review of *New Essays on Samuel Johnson: Revaluation*, edited by Tony (2018) and reviewed above by **Jacob Sider Jost**. Smallwood’s thoughtful critique has appreciative remarks on—sometimes summaries of—essays by Tony, **Greg Clingham**, **Thomas Curley**, **John Richetti**, **Steven Scherwatzky**, and others, especially Lynda Mugglestone on Johnson’s annotation of Warburton’s 1747 *Shakespeare*. Tony is presently finalizing the draft of “A ‘Clubbable Man’: Essays on Eighteenth-Century Literature in Honor of Greg Clingham,” while also working on the “Selected Johnsonian Papers of J. D. Fleeman (1961-1994)” (Oak Knoll Press) and, with **Melvyn New**, “Scholarly Annotation and 18C Texts” (U. of Virginia Press). Tony is currently teaching at Arkansas Tech University. **Devoney Looser** co-edited with Janine Barchas the Winter 2019 issue of *TSL: Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, a special issue entitled “What’s Next for Jane Austen?” Besides full-length critical essays, the issue has others on pedagogy and short introductions to projects and tools, such as curator Mary Guyatt on the Jane Austen House Museum, Deidre Le Faye’s “Biography, Archives, and Research: Keep Hunting,” and **Peter Sabor**’s “*Reading with Austen*” (441-42). Back in 2015 while a visiting fellow at Chawton House, Peter studied the 500 or so volumes formerly in the library of Jane’s brother Edward Knight’s Godmersham Park in Kent. He also studied the two-volume catalogue of the library compiled in 1818, the year after Jane’s death. Since Jane Austen visited her brother “on six, occasions, for a total of about ten months,” and spent much of her time in this library, Peter produced the website *Reading with Austen* to record the contents, location, and the like of those books. The website, launched in fall 2018, has “links to online editions” and, for copies located (mostly at Chawton House), “photographs of the spines and title pages of extant volumes, together with their bookplates and marginalia.” Another project report is Kathryn Sutherland’s “Inside Jane Austen’s Laboratory” on the *Jane Austen’s Fiction Manuscripts Project*, a digital aggregator reunifying scattered texts in high resolution facsimiles of MS pages, a project that went online with open access in 2010 and led to *Jane Austen’s Fiction Manuscripts* edited by Sutherland in five volumes (Oxford UP, 2018).

At Gettysburg, **Nancy Mace** discussed more interesting legal battles in the history of musical copyright, this time involving London copyrights vs. the Irish reprint trade in the early 19C. One case stands out: a defendant made the claim that the clichéd love-lyrics of “Silent Kisses” were too immoral to deserve copyright protection. We thank **Sylvia K. Marks** for letting us print her presidential lecture at Gettysburg at the top of this issue and her co-

chairing with **Eleanor Shevlin** our 2020 conference at the Winterthur. **Ashley Marshall** published two articles that reshape the landscape for Sir Richard Steele, pointing out how his political and religious writings have been neglected by all but his biographers (despite the popularity of his pamphlets): “Recontextualizing Richard Steele: Bishop Hoadly and Reformist Whiggery” in *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 82.3 (2019), 351-78; and “Radical Steele: Popular Politics and the Limits of Authority” in *Journal of British Studies*, 58.2 (2019), 338-65. In the latter, where she investigates the “nature of the polemical canon now ignored,” Ashley finds much to engage scholars today: “Steele did as much as any other writer to give his readers a sense of themselves not as subjects but as citizens and to remind leaders and establishment writers of the potency of a politics of inclusion and popular vigilance. *The Englishman* went so far as to articulate the startlingly progressive conviction that ‘the greatest man in England is accountable’ to the meanest.” This belief in the vox populi she links to an insistence on “journalistic authority.” Ashley is the Book Review Editor for *ECL*, and she stepped in to review Joseph Hone’s *Literature and Party Politics* in the January issue. At the SCSECS **Jim May** discussed the printers of Roman Catholic books between 1710-1740 in London (most were not avowedly Catholic and printed Protestant books and generally for diverse publishers).

We are pleased to welcome to EC/ASECS **Bénédicte Miyamoto**, an Associate Professor of British History at the U. Sorbonne-Nouvelle and a 2019 Fellow of the Society of the Cincinnati and short-term Fellow at the Folger Shakespeare Library. Her research focuses on the artistic culture of Britain, 1600-1800, and the technical training instructional manuals afforded artists. Her publications include “British Buying Patterns at Auction Sales, 1780–1800: Did the Influx of European Art Have an Impact on the British Public’s Preferences?” in *London and the Emergence of a European Art Market*, edited by Susanna Avery-Quash and Christian Huemer (Getty, 2019). At Gettysburg, Bénédicte organized an excellent session entitled “Folds and Formats: Fitting Knowledge to the Page,” exploring the experimental intertwinings of format and content. Panelist Faith Acker, then a research fellow at the Folger, presented a well-illustrated account of the varying formats of Shakespeare’s sonnets and potential impact that diversity of volume sizes and shapes might have had on publication and collecting decisions, and **Eleanor Shevlin** spoke on considerations of format and genre surrounding Harrison and Co’s *The Novelist’s Magazine* (1780s-90s) in 8vo format in two columns. (Eleanor is researching this and other serial productions for a book on James Harrison.) Also on the program was **Jacqueline Reid-Walsh**, who spoke on an illustrated strip in multiple folds from 17C England, *The Beginning, Progress and End of Man*, distributing a reproduction by Penn State University Libraries (she also discussed this strip’s reprinting as a booklet in 19C America as *Metamorphosis, or a Transformation of Pictures*). Following the conference on 1 November Jacqui wrote about her presentation and the implications of a question after it by Eleanor (regarding the significance of inner images revealed when flaps are lifted and sequences of unfolding altered). Jacqui’s comments came on her site *Unfolding Metamorphosis: The Learning as Play*

Blog (sites.psu.edu/learningasplaying/2019/11/1...). I was struck at what a great resource a blog is for advancing discussions after a conference.

We welcome **Aaron Montalvo**, a first-year PhD student at Penn State, whose primary fields are 20C literature and visual studies. His work typically focuses on depictions of the American West and the interaction between physical spaces and their artistic and cultural mediations. But at Gettysburg he gave an illustrated lecture on 18C values evident in Joseph Highmore's illustrations of Richardson's *Pamela*. **Carla J. Mulford** was also on the program, speaking on Ben Franklin and piracy & the slave trade), and on 16 January she gave a talk at the Library Company of Philadelphia entitled "Benjamin Franklin and Women; Or, Franklin's Women" as part of a series celebrating the 19th Amendment's first century. She published "Benjamin Franklin, Virtue, and the Good Life" in *College Literature*, 46.3 (2019): 741-50. The most recent *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* includes her essay "Richard Whitworth, Benjamin Franklin, and Political Electricity." And the December issue of *Reviews in American History* contains her review essay "Benjamin Franklin's Winter of Discontent in Passy, 1784-1785" on the most recent volume of *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*. Besides teaching and co-directing the English Honors Program at Penn State, she has two monographs in progress, one on Franklin's "electrical diplomacy," the other on Franklin and the Mediterranean. This coming fall she will attend the conference of the Pennsylvania Historical Association, on whose council she serves.

Maureen E. Mulvihill (Princeton Research Forum, NJ) is at work on brief reviews for *The Scriblerian* of three published papers from the 2017 Swift Symposium (Münster) and an immersive review essay for *ECS* of the *Cambridge History of Ireland*, vol. 2. She is a guest writer / consulting researcher (2016-) for Bruce McKinney's Rare Book Hub, San Francisco. Unfortunately, due to the corona virus, her presentation "Rare Books by Early Women Writers: The Formation & Utility of a Private Collection," with digitals & book display, Selby Library, Sarasota, will be rescheduled. From James Burmester Rare Books (Bristol), Maureen acquired two important (Celtic) items. First, *On The Connexion of the Physical Sciences* by Mary Somerville, Royal Astronomical Society (London: Murray, 1834); 12mo, 6 1/2" x 4", 493 pp., in a decorative gold-tooled binding, with author's aquatint astronomical plates and dedication to Queen Adelaide, consort, William IV of England. This important book by a self-educated Scots polymath (10th edition, 1877) demonstrates Somerville's new interdisciplinary methodology in telescopic observation and scientific writing. *Restoration* (Fall, 2019, pp 105-06) ran an extended annotation on Maureen's essay "Looking Skyward: Mulvihill Collection Acquires Mary Somerville, Queen of Science" (*Rare Book Hub*, September 1, 2019 upload; 16 pp, 14 images with generous caption notes). This essay includes 17C contexts in Cavendish, Galileo, Newton, Pepys, and Vermeer; six images (binding, frontispiece, plates, author's scientific calculations); and a handsome display page of Somerville's self-portrait (Somerville College, Oxford). Somerville was a gifted visual artist, a member of Turner's circle. Maureen's second acquisition is an uncommon copy of *The Royal Irish Academy: Charter and Statutes* (Dublin: Graisberry & Campbell, 1818); 4to, 10" x 8", 14 pp., large t.p. vignette; disbound. The

complete and good-condition 14-page stitched text was recently given a deluxe binding and its own clamshell book box by the conservator of the Mulvihill Collection, David H. Barry (Griffin Bookbinding, St Petersburg, FL), a Welsh born-&-trained book specialist. The new binding includes marbled endpapers and gold-tooled lettering on the top board and book box. Early members of the Royal Irish Academy were Edmund Burke, Maria Edgeworth, and Charles Darwin. Maureen is planning an illustrated essay on this restoration project for *Fine Books & Collections* magazine.

Joanne Myers is working on 17C Catholic literary culture, particularly an MS illustrated prayer book and other materials located during her sabbatical in England two years ago—one of her discoveries involves an object with fabric pockets created by a Poor Clare nun. She’s also researching notions about and responses to pregnancy and miscarriages. **Melvyn New** has been the Book Review Editor of *The Scriblerian* for over sixteen years, probably the most demanding position of the many editorial posts producing that review twice a year. In the Autumn 2019 issue he offers some observations about the challenges that editions and companions directed at students offer for scholarly journals like *The Scriblerian*: what merits review? to whom should the review be assigned? and what should be evaluated with what “scholarly values”? Mel is provoked by the “plethora” of these books despite a “dwindling student population in the Humanities.” He compares a number of editions of Smollett’s *Humphry Clinker* and discusses companions pouring forth from the MLA and Cambridge in particular (as does **Michael Edson** in the January *ECL*). Mel doubts the need to supplement editions with critical essays (as the Norton’s do) and even further-readings bibliographies given what university libraries offer with a few clicks. Finding good reviewers is a great challenge for book review editors (finding impartial reviewers--avoiding incest--is even a greater one). Partly for that reason, Mel himself often reviews several difficult volumes for an issue, as in this last (Alan Ereira’s *The Nine Lives of John Ogilby*, and Jacopo Agnesina’s *The Philosophy of Anthony Collins*). In the Spring 2019 *Scriblerian* Mel offered “Scholia to Sterne’s Subscribers” (Sterne’s subscribers was covered in the ninth and final volume of the Florida Edition of Sterne, edited by Mel and **W. B. Gerard**).

Yvonne Noble wrote a fine performance review for *RECTR* (32.1 [2018]): “Handel’s *Acis and Galatea*. Conducted by Nicholas Ansdell-Evans, directed by Sarah Tipple, English National Opera, ENO Studio Live June 2018.” Yvonne, who is *The Scriblerian*’s contributing editor for Anne Finch, has been working on the poet, presenting papers on her at BSECS, Finnish SECS, and Jennie Bachelor’s conference on *The Ladies’ Magazine* and other 18C magazines. The BSECS paper is in a session on Finch Yvonne organized to mark the 300th anniversary of her death, with other papers from Tessa Somervell and Margaret Doody. Yvonne has an essay on biographical problems with Finch in the volumes that the **Women’s Studies Group 1558-1837** has published to mark its 30th anniversary—*Exploring the Lives of Women 1558-1837*, edited by Louise Duckling, Sara Read, Felicity Roberts, and Carolyn D. Williams (Pen & Sword Books Limited, 2018). Yvonne wrote, “The editors wanted the books to be readable by people who knew nothing of our field, so my rather pedantic musings they interlarded with livelier extracts

from Finch's verse. I strongly recommend what is the best essay in the volume—by our member Peter Radford, 'Better than the Men: The Use and Abuse of Women's Strength, Speed, Skill, and Endurance in the Long Eighteenth Century,' on women in sports and as workers in coal mines. I have heard him elsewhere on 18C women as runners, horsewomen, and cricket- and tennis-players—always eye-opening." Yvonne founded WSG in the 1980s on learning from the feminist movement "the perils of isolation and, aided greatly by the support of Carolyn Williams over all those years," they "have been able to persist." WSG meets now at the Foundling Museum in Bloomsbury, on Saturdays, three or four times during the academic year for papers and once for a workshop (with a keynote from a senior scholar and five-minute presentations from everybody else). Yvonne added that they also have an annual "outing," to a play, exhibition, library, or museum—"this February our member Karen Hearn will guide us round her exhibition of pregnancy portraits (from Holbein on). WSG is particularly valuable for displaced scholars like me, and beginners, and those with precarious jobs, but we rely on our longtime senior members like Carolyn, Judith Hawley (who will be our workshop keynote speaker next May), and Isabel Grundy for the essential links that come from permanent university affiliation. We have many international members, who find keeping contact important and value our online newsletter. For our recent anniversary and following WSG conferences, we are pleased to be able to offer some small bursaries to our young or more marginalised researchers. Readers of the *Intelligencer* are warmly invited to come to WSG events, to join as members, and to give papers whenever they are in London" (see www.womenstudiesgroup.org).

On 16 March Bucknell U. Press published the Stoke Newington Edition of Defoe's *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, edited by **Maximillian E. Novak**, **Manuel Schonhorn**, and the late Irving Rothman (cloth, \$120; paper and kindle, \$54.95; minus a 30% discount this spring to ASECS members; 429 pp.; 16 illus.). After many years of effort, the edition was parked when AMS died, but Bucknell picked it up and will make it more available. Besides the 62-page critical preface, the edition includes bibliographical descriptions [261-90], list of variants [291-358], and an index (369-). I was impressed to find that textual editor Rothman has a paragraph crediting the many people (students one imagines) who collated the first through seventh editions for variants. The illustrations include the portrait fits to *Jure Divino* 1706 and *RC* itself as well as plates in the 3rd and 7th editions.

The December 2019 issue of *The Library* (20, no. 4) includes "English Books at Auction c. 1680" in which **Leah Orr** investigates the prices of second-hand books sold at several auctions between 1676 and 1682 (based on the Folger copy of the 1678 *Catalogus variorum librorum . . . bibliothecae clarissimi Gisberti Voetii* and annotations from other sales therein). Her findings, explained with excellent tables, fill an evidentiary void even if many are rather predictable. While well bound and large paper copies were expensive, readers could cheaply obtain early editions, especially of classics in translations; books a hundred years old were not treated as antiquarian rarities; as today, a complete set of two volumes could expect to sell for three times the price of a single volume of the set (524-25). Of particular note is her finding

that “relatively new books vended second-hand at auction sold for discounted prices, in many cases over fifty per cent off the advertised retail price from the *Term Catalogues*” (502). And we thank Leah for taking time out from her valuable research and teaching to prepare one of her syllabi for our pedagogical corner in this issue. **David Palumbo**’s talk in Gettysburg on Swift and Jane Collier’s *The Art of Ingenious Tormenting* reflects his working now on 18C women writers’ use of Swift. **Catherine Parisian** is studying the printing history of Burney’s *The Wanderer* (1814) and spoke at the SCSECS on her efforts to identify the number of presses involved in early editions (the press seems to have produced 3000 copies of the second edition, 5 vols. 12mo, in a week). **Kate Parker** co-editor of Bucknell’s Transit series, published “Recovering 18th-C Erotica” in *Literature Compass*, 16.3-4 (2019), 9 pp.

Peter Perreten writes that he hopes to see his EC/ASECS friends this fall at the Winterthur: “For the last two years my volunteer duties at Hawk Mountain Sanctuary have kept me very busy. The height of the raptor migration (when the Sanctuary has several thousand visitors per day) occurs in the same time frame that the fall meetings are scheduled. Next year I’ll let the hawks and the visitors find their own way for a couple of days. For the last three years, I have also volunteered with the Perkiomen Watershed Conservancy, where I help with their native plant initiative and other projects. I am also a contributing editor for the conservancy news magazine, *The Watershed: News from the Perkiomen*.” Among the historical topics Peter is researching for latter is the harvesting of ice for Philadelphia. **Andrew Pisano**, who spoke at the Gettysburg meeting, published “Moving Inside Out: Success and Failure Navigating Race-Based Class Discussions” in *Transformations: Journal of Inclusive Scholarship and Pedagogy*, 29.1 (2019), 106-12—it’s an honest effort to learn from problems arising in a class discussion of Frederick Douglass’s *Narrative*. **Adam Potkay** wrote in October that “For the next two years I’m teaching at William and Mary in VA for Spring term only (2020 and 2021) and will otherwise be here in NJ between beach house and Princeton.” **Hermann J. Real** and his colleagues at the Ehrenpreis Centre sent to press this year’s issue of *Swift Studies*. Hermann’s preface—always a gracious and kind account of events at the Centre and in Swift studies, includes a fine tribute to **Don Mell**, recollecting a concert in Dublin that they attended together. Hermann also announced recipients of the residential fellowship at the Centre (established through the generosity of Sabine Baltes-Ellermann) and of the winner of the Richard H. Rodino Prize for 2017-18, awarded to “the best article on Swift and his age” by “anyone who has not yet achieved tenured status.” The issue begins with two articles by Pat Rogers on Dr. John Arbuthnot, one involving “the Smallpox War of 1719,” the other opera and *The Devil to Pay at St. James’s*. There are two essays on *Gulliver’s Travels*: on adaptations for children and on “Judaeophobia in Swift’s Portrayal of the Yahoos.” Two notes (by Hermann and by Ulrich Elkmann) and bibliography follow. Hermann and his frequent collaborator Dirk Passmann were going to offer “Doctor Swift and his Medical F(r)iends” at a conference in Newcastle organized by Allan Ingram on “Writing Doctors,” but it has been called off due to the corona virus. At the SCSECS **Cedric Reverand** aided by his asst. editor at *Eighteenth-Century Life*, **Michael Edson**, and **Kevin Cope**, editor of

1650-1850, offered a panel discussion with much Q&A on getting scholarly articles published—it drew easily the largest audience at the conference. Ric and Michael recently brought out the third issue of vol. 43 of *Eighteenth-Century Life*, containing **Adam Potkay**'s "Lucretius, Englishman: Meter, Mortalism, and Love in Dryden's Translations from *De Rerum Natura*" (1-22), along with Hillary Havens on Burney's "Consolatory Extracts," Jeffrey Merrick on Voltaire and others; Anna Sagal on "Female Intimacy in Eliza Haywood's Epistles for the Ladies," and Michael Kassler's "Queen Charlotte's 1789 Account Book." The issue's six reviews include David H. Richter's of **Leah Orr**'s *Novel Ventures* (with a good overview) and Nicholas Hudson's of Aileen Douglas's *Work in Hand: Script, Printing, and Writing*. Also here is **Robert Hume**'s "Reevaluating Colley Cibber and Some Problems in Documentation of Performance, 1690-1800" (43: 101-14), which focuses on Elaine McGirr's *Partial Histories: A Reappraisal of Colley Cibber*. Rob praises some "genuine virtues," such as the "critiques of hostile and dismissive account of Cibber," but also finds some overstated conclusions on Cibber's genuine importance and some failures of omission and documentation. As his title suggests, Rob investigates McGirr's claim that Cibber was "the most frequently performed playwright of the century," adding his "Appendix: Comparative Performance Data Issues" (111-12). Drawing on the *Index to the London Stage, 1660-1800*, edited by Ben Ross Schneider, Jr., Rob confirms that, after Shakespeare, Cibber was more often in the 18C repertoire than any other playwright. (We have a review by Rob above in this issue, but we might have had this, but Palgrave-Macmillan failed to respond to two requests for a review copy.) **Katherine Richards** left the West Virginia U. last year to take the position of student advisor at Central Penn College in the Harrisburg area. Besides the volume on Defoe co-edited with **George Justice** (noted above), **Albert Rivero** was at work last year on a book involving Jane Austen and the sentimental novel. **Hanna Roman** published "Buffon's Language of Heat the Science of Natural History" in *SECC*, 48 (2019), 187-205, drawing too on significant remarks on writing outside his *Natural History* (1749-1788). **Laura Rosenthal** edited a strong issue of *Restoration* last fall, including essays on Shadwell's *The Tempest*, religious toleration in Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther*, "communicating experimental philosophy" in Cowley and Butler, and Behn's *Oroonoko*, plus **Alison Gibeily**'s "Some Current Publications" and Brian Corman's review of RSC performances at the Swan in London of Otway's *Venice Preserved* and Vanbrugh's *The Provoked Wife*.

At Gettysburg **Joseph Rudman** offered "A Primer on Determining the Validity of Non-Traditional Authorship Attribution Studies of 18C Literature," studies involving computer-driven analysis of diction and syntax. Joe laid out the common failings in the creation of datasets of texts for such studies. At the St. Augustine SCSECS in February he specifically focused on problems in the texts analyzed by studies c. 2018 by Ryan Boyd et al. and by Mel Evans aimed at determining whether Aphra Behn wrote certain disputed plays. (These relate to Elaine Hobby and other editors' attribution decisions for the forthcoming 8-volume CUP edition of Behn.) As **Eleanor Shevlin** remarked in introducing Joe's Gettysburg presentation, he "has been working on non-traditional authorship attribution since the mid 1970's. He has published widely on the

topic and lectured throughout the United States and in fourteen foreign countries on the subject.” She noted that last year he reviewed *The New Oxford Shakespeare Authorship Companion for Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* and published in *American Notes and Queries (ANQ)* “Aphra Behn’s Dramatic Canon: Stylistics, Stylochronometry, and Non-traditional Authorship Attribution.” More recently Joe produced a critique of Irving N. Rothman and others’ assessment of the likelihood of “Defoe’s Contributions to *Robert Drury’s Journal*” [or *Madagascar*]. (He had discussed the application of non-traditional methods to Defoe’s canon in an important *PBSA* article in 2005.) On our request, Joe has offered a list of exemplary non-traditional and stylometric studies above in this issue. One of **Kevin Cope**’s many good decisions in organizing the SCSECS (besides daily receptions and ordering Minorcan dishes) was appointing **John Scanlan** to be plenary speaker (he infused good humor and fellowship throughout the meeting). He argued the benefits of perceiving Fielding’s fiction writing and judicial experiences in tandem, enriching each other. John, who had been the Book Review Editor of *The Age of Johnson*, confirmed that volumes are forthcoming from Bucknell.

Rebecca Shapiro’s “The ‘Wants’ of Women: Lexicography and Pedagogy in 17th- and 18C Dictionaries” appears in *Historical Dictionaries in their Paratextual Context* (2018). **Norbert Schürer** published “Charlotte Lennox in Germany: Female Intellectual Networks and Literary Success” in *Modern Language Review*, 115.1 (2020), 1-16, as well as a review of Annika Mann’s *Reading Contagion: The Hazards of Reading in the Age of Print* in the Winter 2020 *ECS*. At Gettysburg we heard an excellent talk by that College’s **Timothy J. Shannon** on Peter Williamson, who at 13 arrived from the Aberdeen area to Pennsylvania as an indentured servant; later he wrote a false captivity narrative, *French and Indian Cruelty Exemplified in the Life . . . [of] Peter Williamson*, describing with conventional incidents his capture by and escape from Indians at the start of the French and Indian War. Later in Scotland Williamson as a showman exploited his fake history. In his book *Indian Captive, Indian King: Peter Williamson in America and Britain* (Harvard UP, 2018), Shannon examines Williamson’s life and his narrative, separating out fact from fiction, and finding both telling regarding the American and later Scottish worlds in which Williamson lived. The book is perceptively reviewed by Benjamin G. Scharff in *Pennsylvania History*, 86.4 (Fall 2019). In the same issue is a review by Douglas Miller of *William Penn: A Life* (OUP, 2018; 488 pp., 24 illus., \$34.95), the first full biography of Penn in decades, written by Andrew R. Murphy (he earlier wrote a book on Penn’s political thought). **Eleanor Shevlin** on 8 March was invited to join a panel on Career Pathways at a conference of the National Humanities Alliance, a coalition dedicated to advancing humanities education, research, preservation, and public programs. She continues to chair the Washington Area Group for Print Culture Studies that she co-founded and that meets at the Library of Congress—in March the speaker was **Juliette Wells**, who discussed the donors of a Jane Austen collection to Goucher College (the subject of a book she’s working on). **Jacob Sider Jost** will be participating at Indiana U.’s 18C seminar in Bloomington this summer; the symposium is on “18C Ecologies and Networks,” and Jacob will speak on networks of interest and patronage.

The U. of Rochester Press in February published **Frances Singh's** study *Scandal and Survival in Nineteenth-Century Scotland: The Life of Jane Cumming* (360 pp.), offering a 35% mark down to \$71.50 with promotion code BB535. It's a deeply researched and fascinating book, as won't surprise those who have heard Frances speak on facets of the subject at our meetings the past decade. It offers a biographical narrative of the life of Indian-Scottish Jane Cumming, brought to Scotland as a girl, who in 1810 makes accusations about her two boarding school teachers, which in turn leads to a defamation suit involving Jane's grandmother—this personal and legal drama became the basis for Lillian Hellman's play *The Children's Hour*. Jane has a life after the trial too, also covered, and the subject of the blog Frances wrote for the Press's web-posting (to which she added some illustrations). The book offers in-depth background information on Anglo-Indian cultural relations. At the SCSECS meeting St. Augustine Frances presented a related talk on Jane's boarding-school teachers, Marianne Woods and Jane Pirie, as "Failed Business Partners and Romantic Friends," and Frances chaired the session "There's Something about Mary (Wollstonecraft and Shelley) as well as about Charlotte [Charke]: An Exploration of Creative Adaptation." **Robert G. Walker** published "Boswell and the Graunt-Petty Authorship Controversy" in the December 2019 *Notes and Queries* (66.4: 581-84), which focuses on "A puzzling phrase" in James Boswell's *Rampager* 19 (23 Aug. 1780), in its rambling coverage of a duel between Lord Shelburne and Col. Fullarton. Boswell reflects that MPs killed in duels could be a common enough death to merit a demographic calculation by "Honest Sir William Petty, the plain sensi-Citizen of London, from whom Lord Shelburne is descended, [who] little Thought [of such] when composing his *Political Arithmetic*." This leads to Bob's discussion of the possible reasons for "sensi-Citizen (a typo etc.) and to the ongoing controversy over the authorship of John Graunt's *Natural and Political Observations . . . upon the Bills of Mortality*, which many credited to Graunt's friend Petty, who revised the fifth edition (the conversion to Roman Catholicism of Graunt, a true "Citizen of London" as he is styled in the *Biographia Briannica* [1757], unlike Petty, seems to have led some like Boswell and Gilbert Burnet to de-attribute *The Bills* from him). Bob also contributed a review of Keith Thomas's *In Pursuit of Civility: Manners and Civilization in Early Modern England* to the fall *Scriblerian*. **Dr Kwinten Van De Walle** has been awarded a two-year post-doctoral fellowship with the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation to work at Freiburg (Germany) on his project "Eighteenth-Century Book Illustration in Review." Kwinten and **Sandro Jung's** edited collection *The Genres of Thomson's The Seasons* (250 pp.) was published in 2018 by Lehigh UP; other contributors included **Kate Parker** and **Thomas Van der Goten**. The Summer 2019 issue of *ECF* has a review by **Juliette Wells** of Sheila Johnson Kindred's *Jane Austen's Transatlantic Sister: The Life and Letters of Fanny Palmer Austen*. **Jane Wessel** published "'My Other Folks' Heads': Reproducible Identities and Literary Property on the Eighteenth-Century Stage" in the Winter 2020 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 53.2: 279-97. We are very pleased to welcome **Jim Wilder** of Bethesda, MD, into our fold. After careers in journalism and university and foundation administration, Jim took up hand-printing as an avocation and has produced at

his Wild Apple Press beautiful broadsides and pamphlets, usually of Irish stories and poems. Last year he printed Dermot McGuinne's *Colm O Lochlainn: An Irish Book Lover*. Each year Jim and others in the Chesapeake Chapter of the American Printing History Association print leaves for a calendar, and for 15 years he's researched and printed a small pamphlet on Irish printing history, which then is included in the UK annual *It's a Small World*. This winter he printed his account of Irish printer and newspaperman Cornelius Carter, stressing Carter's place in the development of the early Dublin newspaper (such as his first soliciting these newspaper advertisements).

Announcements

Back in November James Woolley wrote that he had heard from Trinity College Dublin's cataloger Stephanie Breen that she had finished cataloging the **bequest by A. C. Elias, Jr.** of books by and about Swift. The Library posted on 21 November a good description in "The Arch C. Elias Bequest of Jonathan Swift Material," noting unique items but also the general strength of the collection (multiple copies of Faulkner editions and the like). A keyword search "Arch C. Elias bequest" can bring up 597 records. Hand-press items receive full collational formulae; pre-1801 books were reported to the ESTC.

On 10 October David Vander Meulen sent us David Whitesell's press release "**Paul Ruxin's Johnson & Boswell Collection Now Open at UVA**": "the Paul T. Ruxin Samuel Johnson, James Boswell and Their Circle Collection has been received by Special Collections and is ready for use! Formed by the late Paul T. Ruxin (UVA Law '68) and given to UVA by his widow, Joanne Ruxin, the collection includes upwards of 500 'rare' editions (most previously lacking at UVA), a few manuscripts and prints, and a substantial reference collection (only partially duplicated in the UVA Library system). The collection would not have come to UVA without the splendid and deeply appreciated cooperation of our colleagues in the English Department, who encouraged Mrs. Ruxin to consider UVA as a fitting home for her husband's books." Whitesell attached a "complete listing of the collection's contents, which will serve as a finding aid until items can be cataloged in Virgo. . . . Anything in the collection may be requested for reading room consultation." David Vander Meulen concluded his email with an invitation: "Paul Ruxin's collection of is a perfect fit for UVA and its active programs of 18C studies. I hope you can visit the new collection."

David Vander Meulen also sent a PR with news of the fulfillment of Jefferson's 1719 "plans for a planetarium spanning the dome of the University of Virginia's Rotunda Library. Due to ballooning costs, insurmountable technical hurdles, and delays in the Rotunda's construction, however, Jefferson's proposed celestial dome was never realized." But on 1 November the **Rotunda Planetium** reached fruition. "An array of digital projectors . . . transform[ed] the Rotunda's dome room (UVA's architectural centerpiece and a UNESCO world heritage site) into a vast enlightenment planetarium. A paired exhibition, 'Rotunda Planetarium: Science & Learning in the University of Virginia's First Library,' display[s] books, instruments, specimens, and

artifacts from the Rotunda's early history," highlighting the Rotunda's original function as a site for interdisciplinary discovery, while also "bringing renewed attention to the stories of those who built, worked, taught, and learned under its dome." On 1-2 November a scholarly symposium and weekend of public events marked the launch of the Planetarium. Anne L. Bromley in *UVA Today* on 31 October provides a fuller account praising the work of three PhD students, who found Jefferson's sketch for his Dome Room planetarium during research in Special Collections for their "Rotunda Library Online" project (google it up for more, especially the video of the moving early 19C constellations, based on research into John Flamsteed's star atlas and three-volume catalogue of constellations, which Jefferson purchased).

The BBC reported on 28 November of the previous day's sale at Christie's Paris of a 1770 **portrait of Mozart** age 13 (€4.4 million). It is one of four or five portraits of Mozart. He is playing harpsicord while on an Italian tour with his father, during which Venetian official Pietro Lugjati, then in Verona, commissioned it, probably from his cousin Giambettio Cignaroli.

In the BBC news feed on 10 February was an account of remarks on the innateness of homosexuality in the 1810 diary entries of Matthew Tomlinson, a Yorkshire farmer, then a widower in his forties (three of his eight diaries for 1806-1839 are in the Wakefield Library). Tomlinson felt a court martial's sentence of death for a naval surgeon contradicted what was dictated by nature and ordained by "God Almighty," and, if a "defect in nature," still "cruel."

We may submit revised papers from ASECS and affiliate meetings for vol. 51 of *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, i.e. papers delivered from July 2019 through June 2020 (in Chicago style for blind reviewing, 6000-10,000 words). They are due to David Brewer (secc@osu.edu) by 15 August.

Scholars with both the first and second instalments of **ECCO** from Gale should be watchful that their libraries do not lose the second addition. This happened without warning at Penn State in the fall and had happened earlier at Lafayette College. I would add that Gale's distribution of the Burney Collection has a new interface--perhaps someone might advise us how the database changed. On the bright side, the ESTC has added to the end of records, beside that for a copy on ECCO, active links to copies not only on HathiTrust and Google Books but at research libraries like the Boston Public, Library of Congress, and the National Library of Ireland, allowing one to place the ECCO copy and another for comparison on one's computer monitor.

In the October *Intelligencer* I described as the fall issue of *Dieciocho* what was a special issue on the Republic of Letters; shortly thereafter I received from David Gies the regular fall issue, vol. 42, no. 2, with six articles, the bibliography, and many reviews. For a copy, ask Gies at dtg@virginia.edu,

In December the Huntington Library announced that "the **Kashnor Collection of Early American Maps** is now available to the public in the Huntington Digital Library (HDL)" The collection includes 84 maps and a drawing, executed 1754-1856, many mapping the territory fought over in the French and Indian War; they were acquired from Leon Kashnor in 1924-27.

The National Gallery in London was to open on 4 April the first UK exhibition devoted to the painter **Artemesia Gentileschi** (1593-1656), a Baroque master and Italy's most celebrated 17C woman painter, occasioned

by its purchase in July 2018 of the first of her works owned by a public collection in that country. In the late 1630s Artemesia joined her father Orazio in London to paint for the court. The National Gallery and curator Letizia Treves produced an illustrated website with an appreciative account of the painter's work and life. It takes as a motto Artemesia's words to a patron, "I'll show you what a woman can do." Maureen Mulvihill alerted us to the show's cancellation due to the pandemic, passing on an article in *The Guardian* of 16 March by Jonathan Jones, whose illustrated account (a puff for his book *Artemesia Gentilschi*) focuses on Artemesia's *Susanna and the Elders*, signed and dated by her at age 17, which Jones interprets while recounting how Artemesia had been raped and then slandered in the subsequent trial (her father brought charges against the painter Agostino Tassini in 1612). Many of marvelous loans were to come from Italian and American collections (29 paintings were to be shown, including one of her *Judith beheading Holofernes*).

The *Intelligencer* needs reviewers for Anna Battigelli, ed., *Art and Artifact in Austen* (Delaware, 2020), 288 pp.; 20 illus. (discussed above). Also, Scott Black, *Without the Novel: Romance and the History of Prose Fiction* (Virginia, 2019); 220 pp. Also, Elizabeth Dill, *Erotic Citizens: Sex and the Embodied Subject in the Antebellum Novel* (Virginia, 2019), pp. 296; illus.; drawing on cartoons, novels, and Shaftesbury's *Characteristics*, Dill argues that the early American "proliferation of texts about extramarital erotic intimacy" reflects an endorsement of the unfetter'd life, that the "narrative of sexual ruin" was a critique of . . . the social contract and the sovereign individual." Also, Michael Genovese, *The Problem of Profit: Finance and Feeling in Eighteenth-Century British Literature* (Virginia, 2019), 312 pp; an examination of major literary works for attitudes to profits, esp. as checked by more sympathetic and communal ideals. Also, Juan Carlos González Espitia, *Sifilografía: A History of the Writerly Pox in the Eighteenth-Century Hispanic World* (Virginia, 2019); 408 pp.; 34 halftone illus.; a well researched and written account of syphilis, its depiction, and efforts at treatment in the transatlantic Hispanic world during the long 18C, arguing its extensive impact, ultimately on science and the Enlightenment. Also, *Community and Solitude: New Essays on Johnson's Circle* ed. by Anthony W. Lee (Bucknell, 2019), 269 pp. (contents previously listed). Also, John D. Lyons, *The Dark Thread: From Tragical Histories to Gothic Tales* (Delaware, 2019); 266 pp.; 14 essays on "perennial narrative motifs centered on violence within the family." Also, Frances Singh, *Scandal and Survival in Nineteenth-Century Scotland: The Life of Jane Cumming* (Rochester, 2020); 360 pp. (discussed above). Also, as previously listed, Trevor Ross, *Writing in Public: Literature and the Liberty of the Press in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Johns Hopkins, 2018); 307 pp.

Cover illustration: "Red Frangipanni (*Plumeria rubra*)," plate no. 92 in Vol. 2 of Mark Catesby's *The Natural History of Carolina, Florida, and the Bahama Islands* (London: Printed at the Expence of the Author, Sold by W. Innys . . . and by the Author, 1743 [Vol. 1 dated 1731]), hand-colored engraving, c. 14" x 10." From the Collection of Dr. and Mrs. George Benjamin Green, National Gallery of Art. We thank John Heins for his help with the illustration.

The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer

The Newsletter of the EC/ASECS

N.S. Volume 34, Number 1: March 2020

James E. May, editor

1423 Hillcrest Road

Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17603

U.S.A.