



The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer

N.S. Volume 33, Number 1: March 2019

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 2019.

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 1992-2011, and a table of contents for issues since December 1986 are all available at the Newsletter Archive of the EC/ASECS website noted above.

***The Man of Mode* and Its Influence on 18th-Century Comedy (The EC/ASECS Presidential Address, 27 October 2018)**

By Matthew Kinservik

The Man of Mode is among the most famous English stage comedies, partly because it endured in the repertory well beyond its initial run and era and partly because it seems so neatly to represent that era, for good or for ill. That representative function of *The Man of Mode* is what interests me today because it figures into the play's significance at a key moment of generic change: the early eighteenth century. Most obviously, Etherege's play was central to the dispute between Sir Richard Steele and John Dennis, who used it as a negative and positive example, respectively, of English comedy. And as recent scholarship has shown, this was more than just a literary debate about the comic genre; rather, it was a dispute laden with political significance. It occurred at a moment of generic change as satiric comedy was moving away from the model offered by Etherege and his contemporaries, but (perhaps surprisingly) this moment also saw an increase in the number of annual performances of *The Man of Mode* and other "Restoration Comedies." That seems counterintuitive. And it raises the question of what, exactly, early eighteenth-century theatergoers saw in the play that amused them? It seems so inconsistent with all of the values and comic emphases of the newer plays of the era. Who would possibly confuse an Etherege play with a play by Farquhar or Centlivre or Steele?

And this question gives rise to another. Was amusement even the basis of the play's enduring popularity in the early eighteenth century? In posing this question, I mean "amusement" in a very specific sense. Did the play give rise to comic laughter in the audience based upon the same terms that other, more contemporary plays did? In one sense, there is no way to answer this question. We don't have reviews or diary entries that can help us to answer this question. But even so, I think we can venture an educated guess based upon two data points: (1) the critical debates about comedy in the early decades of the eighteenth century; and (2) our own responses to last night's performance of the play by the American Shakespeare Center at the Blackfriars Playhouse. In short, I'm interested in looking at why *The Man of Mode* was, and remains, an important play because it is, to my mind, an oddly unfunny play. It's a comedy that does not occasion much laughter nowadays, and, perhaps, never did. Why, then, has it endured? And given that, why were you, like me, so grateful to be a spectator at last night's performance?

The answer I will venture is that *The Man of Mode* has always been a costume drama. From its premiere, it has functioned as a period piece meant to challenge and please its initial audience by presenting a stylized portrait of a certain sort of high life in London. Ever since, it has done the same for critics and audiences who have found that portrait to be compelling, repulsive, or simply convenient for their own purposes. Theatre historians might object to the generic phrase "Restoration Comedy" because it is based on a small, unrepresentative sample of late seventeenth-century plays, yet it has proven to be a powerful concept that endures in classroom editions of English drama.

The characters, values, dialogue, and plot of *The Man of Mode* seem designed to make it serve as the representative play of its era. It is a virtual synecdoche of the reign of Charles II, and that representative function is, at once, the source of historical controversy and the enduring pleasure audiences take in the play.

Steele Versus Dennis

Let's start with the historical controversy. As I said, *The Man of Mode* was at the center of a debate between Steele and Dennis in the early eighteenth century. To call it a "debate" is a bit misleading because it is a decidedly asynchronous exchange involving two essays published eleven years apart. Steele wrote first, publishing *Spectator* Number 65 in 1711. Dennis did not weigh in until 1722, when he published his *Defence of Sir Fopling Flutter*, which directly responds to *Spectator* Number 65. Why the delay? Dennis had a sincere difference of opinion with Steele regarding the proper nature of comedy and the merit of Etherege's play, but that alone did not prompt him to publish his essay. There were more immediate catalysts. One was the delay in the production of Dennis' play, *The Invader of his Country*, a decision made by Steele and his fellow managers at Drury Lane that Dennis regarded as injurious to himself and as an example of the arbitrary nature of their stewardship of Drury Lane. Another catalyst was the elaborate public relations campaign Steele undertook to promote the success of *The Conscious Lovers* in the lead-up to its premiere. Dennis had attacked Steele and the other Drury Lane managers on multiple occasions for what he considered to be their absolutist and arbitrary exercise of theatrical power. But the imminent premiere of Steele's much-anticipated signature work provoked Dennis to publish his belated rejoinder to *Spectator* Number 65 just five days before the premiere of *The Conscious Lovers*.

Dennis' *Defence of Sir Fopling Flutter* is less a defense of that play than it is an attack on Steele's play. Although the premiere had not yet taken place, Steele had talked up the play in his own periodical essays, shared it widely in manuscript, and puffed it in the newspapers. In the preface to the *Defence*, Dennis fulminates thus:

These are some of the Methods which the present Managers of the Stage have us'd to ruine the *Dramas*, and with it all other Human Learning, which is in some Measure dependant on it. For since Cabal and Trick, and the Favour and Interest of three or four sordid Wretches, have been found necessary for the obtaining Success; every one who is duly qualify'd to write for the *Stage*, has either with a just Disdain refus'd it, or has undertaken it with extream Reluctancy. The *Drama* therefore is like to be lost, and all the Arts dependent on it; therefore every one who is concern'd for the Honour of his Country, ought to do his utmost Endeavour to prevent a Calamity which will be so great a Disgrace to it.¹

Dennis accuses Steele of betraying the king's trust by degrading the theatre he was charged with ennobling. The Drury Lane managers are a "Cabal" of

“sordid Wretches” who threaten to ruin English drama “and with it all other Human Learning, which is in some Measure dependant on it.” These are strong words to introduce a pamphlet that aims to rebut a periodical essay published more than a decade before, focusing on a play that premiered forty-six years earlier.

So what did Steele say about *The Man of Mode* to earn Dennis’ ire? For Steele, the play is fundamentally a character-driven enterprise, so the nature of those character is of primary importance. He writes, “The Received Character of this Play is, That it is the Pattern of Gentile [sic] Comedy. *Dorimant* and *Harriet* are the Characters of Greatest Consequence, and if these are Low and Mean, the Reputation of the Play is very Unjust.”² His premise, then, is that genteel comedy is a genre of exemplarity; therefore, if the normative characters are found to be not genteel, but instead are “Low and Mean,” then the play does not deserve this high reputation.

Pursuing this line of inquiry, Steele takes aim at *Dorimant*, stating, “I will take for granted, that a fine Gentleman should be honest in his Actions, and refined in his Language. Instead of this, our Hero, in this Piece, is a direct Knave in his Designs, and a Clown in his Language” (1: 278). And later, he adds sarcastically, “The Falsehood to Mrs. *Loveit*, and the Barbarity of Triumphant over her Anguish for losing him, is another Instance of his Honesty, as well as his good Nature” (1: 279). These judgments should come as no surprise. The insistence on honesty and refinement are consistent with Steele’s views, most memorably expressed in his 1701 tract, *The Christian Hero*. And the emphasis on good nature is consistent with the ethos of the *Tatler* and *Spectator*. Indeed, it would be surprising if Steele concluded anything else. His entire dramatic oeuvre seems dedicated to directing comedy to a moral purpose that finds its fullest expression in *The Conscious Lovers*.

Steele famously described the effect he aimed at in this type of comedy as “a joy too exquisite for laughter.” This is a brilliant formulation of the aesthetics of a new kind of comedy that meant to replace the Hobbesian laughter that springs from a sudden apprehension of one’s superiority. Inasmuch as *The Man of Mode* can be said to be funny, the source of its humor is found in opportunities to laugh at others, not with them. This made the play the perfect foil for Steele. He concludes *Spectator* Number 65 with this observation: “To speak plainly of this whole Work, I think nothing but being lost to a Sense of Innocence and Virtue can make anyone see this Comedy, without observing more frequent Occasion to move Sorrow and Indignation, than Mirth and Laughter. At the same time I allow it to be Nature, but it is Nature in its utmost Corruption and Degeneracy” (1: 280). Fundamentally, what Steele objects to is a particular kind of breach of decorum. *Dorimant* is a fine gentleman; therefore, we ought to expect him to deport himself in ways that showed him to be superior to, say, the shoemaker. But he does not, and to Steele’s mind this is both an aesthetic and a moral fault in a play that presents itself as a genteel comedy.

For Dennis, the expectations Steele brings to *The Man of Mode* are simply incompatible with comedy as he understands it. Dennis claims that it is, “the Business of a Comick Poet to cure his Spectators of Vice and Folly, by the Apprehension of being laugh’d at” (2: 248). This didactic sense of the

purpose of drama was commonplace. Elsewhere, Dennis gave rare voice to the notion that the primary aim of drama was entertainment, not instruction. But here, he is proceeding from an assumption that even Jeremy Collier himself could nod in agreement with (although their agreement would end there). Dorimant, he claims, “instructs by his Insulting, and his Perfidiousness” (2: 249). So the very qualities that Steele regards as disqualifying are praised by Dennis—and praised in terms of exemplarity. Dorimant is a positive example because he leads our scornful laughter against the other characters. His treatment of Loveit might be cruel, but it is also deserved:

Loveit has Youth, Beauty, Quality, Wit, and Spirit. And it was depending upon these that she repos'd so dangerous a Trust in *Dorimont* [sic], which is a just Caution to the Fair Sex, never to be so conceited of the Power of their Charms, or their other extraordinary Qualities, as to believe they can engage a Man to be true to them, to whom they grant the best Favour, without the only sure Engagement, without which they can never be certain, that they shall not be hated and despis'd by that very Person whom they have done every Thing to oblige. (2: 249)

This is tortured logic. Dorimant is exemplary and instructive because his bad treatment of Loveit serves to remind beautiful women that if they have sex out of wedlock on the vainglorious assumption that their charms will not fade, they may be in for an unpleasant surprise. When they are cast off, as Loveit is, they will learn the error of their ways. Loveit delivers this lesson most emphatically “by the Violence of her Resentment and her Anguish” (2: 249). So the worse Dorimant is, and the more injured Loveit is, the better the didactic effect. The fundamental morality of the situation is ignored entirely. This is comic realpolitik: Dorimant guides us not in morals but in tactics.

The reason Dennis overlooks morality is because his entire defense rests on the claim that comedy is an emphatically contemporary genre: “What Vices and Follies may infect those who are to come after us, we know not; 'tis the present, the reigning Vices and Follies, that must be the Subjects of our present Comedy: The Comick Poet therefore must take Characters from such Persons as are his Contemporaries, and are infected with the foresaid Follies and Vices” (2:248). Ridicule and scorn, therefore, are the chief effects aimed at, and in order to achieve those effects, the vices and follies must be contemporary or they will not be meaningful. This seems an odd way to defend of an old play because it suggests that all comedy has a short shelf life relative to tragedy, which Dennis says transcends historical change. But it makes perfect sense because Dennis is accusing Steele of unfairly judging Etherege's play by subsequent moral and aesthetic standards of what constitutes gentility:

But if Sir *George* did design to make it a genteel one, he was oblig'd to adapt it to that Notion of Gentility, which he knew very well, that the World at that Time had, and we see he succeeded accordingly. For it has pass'd for a very genteel Comedy, for fifty Years together. Could it be expected that the admirable Author, should accommodate himself, to the

wrong headed Notions of a would be Critick, who was to appear fifty Years after the first Acting of his Play. (2: 244)

This is an important point. By making it, Dennis indicates to us that by the early eighteenth century, *The Man of Mode* was already valued as a historical artefact that represented the era that gave rise to it. This is key to understanding the play's enduring value and, hence, to Dennis' defense of the play. He writes,

Dorimnot is an admirable Picture of a Courtier in the Court of King Charles the Second. But if *Dorimont* was design'd for a fine Gentleman by the Author, he was oblig'd to accommodate himself to that Notion of a fine Gentleman, which the Court and the Town both had at the Time of the writing of this Comedy. 'Tis reasonable to believe, that he did so, and we see that he succeeded accordingly. For *Dorimont* not only pass'd for a fine Gentleman with the Court of King *Charles* the Second, but he has pass'd for such with all the World, for Fifty Years together. (2: 244-45)

The last clause is the most important. Dennis is not claiming that Dorimant is still, in the year 1722, the model of a fine gentleman; rather, he is claiming that Dorimant is still, in the year 1722, the model of a fine gentleman of the era of Charles II. *The Man of Mode* is, and ever was, a costume drama.

The Man of Mode in the Early 18th-Century Repertory

The one point on which Dennis and Steele would agree is that *The Man of Mode* represents its era. But for Steele, this was an indictment. Leonard Welsted wrote that Steele, "attempted with much vigor to bring into disrepute the writings of Etherege, doubtless because they had, in his judgment, a tendency to corrupt the chastity of manners, and introduce a wrong taste. . . Dorimant is the great Giant, with whom he is at war; and every lady, who has or may suffer by broken vows, and the perjury of false men, is the object of his care."³ These comments by Welsted were made in reference to a 1721 epilogue Steele wrote for a revival of *Measure for Measure* at Lincolns Inn Fields. In that epilogue, he bemoans the neglect of Shakespeare in favor of the likes of Etherege:

This is the taste our sad experience shews;
This is the taste of Belles as well as Beaux:
Else say, in Britain why it should be heard
That Etherege to Shakespear is preferr'd. (79)

The danger in this audience taste is that, although Dorimant might be from a different era, he remains a powerfully attractive example for men and women, alike, coarsening manners and the state of the drama:

Loveit untpity'd mourns, unpity'd wooes;
Still Dorimant triumphant guilt pursues;

You've lost the sense of giving Virgins aid;
 Tis Comedy with you, an injur'd Maid:
 The perjur'd Dorimant the Beaux admire;
 Gay perjur'd Dorimant the Belles desire:
 With fellow-feeling, and with conscious gust,
 Each sex applauds inexorable lust. (80)

Given that Steele was a partner in the management of Drury Lane, we might expect that he used his influence to suppress performances of plays by Etherege and his contemporaries. But this is not the case. As Daniel Gustafson has shown, between 1714 and 1720, libertine plays were repertory staples.⁴ *The Man of Mode* was performed about three times a year, as was *The Country Wife*. If we look at the period from 1708-1728, we see that there were sixty performances of *The Man of Mode*, which dropped to half that number in the period from 1729-1745. This is surprising because we would expect the number to be lower when Steele was ascendant and higher after he left the management.

Even more surprising, given Steele's posthumous reputation for morality, is that some of his contemporaries noted these repertory trends and attacked him for it. Alarmed by these repertory choices, Defoe writes in a 1715 pamphlet, "The Play-Houses [have] arriv'd to a greater degree of Grandeur and Worth, than ever they were in King Charles II'd's Time!"⁵ And who is to blame for this resurgence of Restoration-era excess? "It can never be forgiven [Steele], either by God, or Man, till he Repents of and Reforms [the stage]; that he did more by recommending the Play-Houses, to promote the present Madness of the Age, in running up the Humour of following Plays to such an Extream, as we now see it, than all the Agents of Hell ever employed before" (20). And Defoe was not alone. An anonymous pamphleteer in 1720 laments, "The same Leud Plays being Acted and Reviv'd without any material Alteration." The business of stage comedy, according to this writer is "the Criminal Intrigues of Fornication and Adultery, ridiculing of Marriage, Virtue, and Integrity, the giving of a favourable Turn to vicious Characters, and instructing loose People how to carry on their Leud Designs with Plausibility and Success, thus among other Plays, they have revived *The Country Wife; Sir Fopling Flutter; The Rover; The Libertine destroy'd*; and several others."⁶ Change the tone to be more sociable and this could have been written by Steele, not *about* Steele.

What do we make of this? Was Steele a rank hypocrite? Was *The Man of Mode* simply a useful foil for *The Conscious Lovers*? Did Dorimant appear at Drury Lane just to set off the virtues of Bevil Junior? I don't think so. If we could summon Steele's spirit here and put the question to him, I think he would tell us what his partner Cibber said about pantomime: he would have preferred to produce more ennobling, literary mainpieces, but operating in a commercial theatre system meant that many repertory choices were dictated by the profit motive. Audiences continued to have an appetite for Etherege and Wycherley, even as they also applauded the work of Farquhar, Cibber, and Steele. And this is neither surprising nor contradictory. In a repertory theatre, variety was an imperative. And if we take Dennis as a guide, we might

conclude that audiences believed that comedy was a distinctly contemporary genre. So new comedies were written to current standards of decency, humor, politics, and so on. But old comedies were under no such obligations. They could offend contemporary morals and offer a different sort of humor precisely because they were old.

The Question of Humor in *The Man of Mode*

Alarmists like Defoe and the anonymous pamphleteer just cited might fret over the potential for playgoers of the early eighteenth century to wish to imitate a rake like Dorimant and lead the country in a backslide to Restoration-era lewdness. But I think it is much more reasonable to conclude that for those spectators, a play like *The Man of Mode* was a safe but fascinating look back to the recent past that allowed them the titillation of vicarious lewdness and cruelty. This is the conclusion that Robert D. Hume reaches in his evergreen essay about *The Man of Mode*. After reviewing critical efforts to elevate the play in terms of moral seriousness by reading it as a searing social satire, Hume writes:

What kind of play is *The Man of Mode*? It mingles a number of elements—straight romantic lovers, a fantastic fop, some elderly “humours” characters, and a high-life rake who finally meets his match. Little happens: the whole concoction is a piece of creampuffery, and entertaining display of wit and character spiced with a touch of scandal in high life.⁷

This strikes me as fundamentally true. Dennis is precursor to many twentieth-century critics when he asserts that there is something profound about the nationalist ridicule of Sir Fopling Flutter or when, as we have seen, he tries to argue that Dorimant’s cruelty is designed as a lesson about the dangers of premarital intercourse. But such attempts to declare a higher purpose really just belie the fact that the play might just be “creampuffery.”

Critics have always struggled with *The Man of Mode*, even as readers and playgoers have always applauded it. In the early twentieth century, Montagu Summers admired the play, but was disquieted by some elements, remarking “We can only marvel at the consummate art with which Etherege had glozed over these ruffianisms and degradations, for if one examines the matter quite sincerely, I think *The Man of Mode* the most immoral comedy I know.”⁸ Similarly, Bonamy Dobree found Dorimant’s cruelty to Loveit inexcusable and unamusing: “This is sex-antagonism with a vengeance; we are down to bedrock here, and thus expressed, it is not very laughable. There is too much spite in it.”⁹ Later in the century, Charles O. McDonald found it to be a trenchant social satire. But Jocelyn Powell recoiled from the affective bind that the play puts a spectator in, arguing that our conventional generic expectations of comedy lead us to admire and identify with Dorimant, but as we do so, we recognize the plight of his victims: “We are given a double view of the situation, a view of the pretence, and of the truth, and before it we are helpless, aware that our intellectual and emotional responses form a devastating

contradiction.”¹⁰ For Harriet Hawkins, the way out of this contradiction is to lighten up and see that Etherege’s aim is to display the “Ovidian game and art of love.” She suggests that “the best way to enjoy Etherege’s comedy seems to be to follow the advice given in its prologue and ‘be not too severe.’”¹¹ And I agree. She, in essence, concludes that the play is, and always has been, a costume drama:

The primary purpose of this comedy seems to be neither immoral nor moral, but rather spectacular—to exhibit, rather than to censure, the features of fashionable vice, fashionable virtue, and unfashionable folly, and to show their interaction in a glittering, amusing, and witty dramatic spectacle. (94)

I believe that’s exactly what we saw last evening at the Blackfriars Playhouse. The American Shakespeare Center’s production of *The Man of Mode* was entertaining, but without moral purpose. It was amusing without being terribly funny. The director, Christopher Marino, offers the following observations in his program notes:

The Man of Mode is of its time and for its time, in this sense, it is a wonderful snapshot of George Etherege’s world and fascinations. . . . At its core, it is a play not only unconcerned with seriousness and deeper issues, but that solely exists to celebrate the artifice (both verbal and worn) of the age. In this sense, it could be said that the play is one of the more “true” play texts of the Restoration era. In Etherege’s world, there is only the now, and in our production, we will endeavor to honor his aesthetic.

* * * * *

The prepared remarks ended here and what followed was a lively discussion among the members of EC/ASECS regarding the production we were all fortunate to have seen the previous evening. For the benefit of those who were unable to attend, here are some of the observations that came up in the course of our discussion.

The Man of Mode as a period piece. As noted above, the director regarded the play as a period piece. That came through in performance in two ways. First (and most obvious), the language and much of the costuming indicated that this was a Restoration era play. There was no attempt to modernize the language or the topical references, and the waistcoats, wigs, etc. indicated that the scene was late 17th-century London. Second, and less obvious, there was a subtle 1980s aesthetic to the production. Before the start of the play, the actors come on stage (partly costumed) with an assortment of musical instruments and lead the audience in song. For this production, the music was 1980s British New Wave hits, such as Joy Division’s “Love Will Tear Us Apart” (1980) and Dexy’s Midnight Runners’ ubiquitous hit, “Come On, Eileen” (1982). Once the play began, this ’80s theme was immediately evident upon John Harrell’s entrance as Dorimant, sporting a costume that featured tightly pegged black pants and a top that bore a strong resemblance to

a Members Only jacket. Dorimant looked like he walked right out of an early MTV video, which put as much historical distance between us and him as there was between Steele and the original (about thirty-five years). Dorimant's costume conveyed just a hint of punk rock attitude, which helped the uninitiated members of the audience to understand at the outset that he was attractive, but dangerous.

Sir Fopling Flutter. If Elton John and Liberace were running from opposite directions at full tilt and smashed into each other, the result would be Greg Brostrom's interpretation of Sir Fopling. Subtle, it was not. But the audience loved him and the scenes he was in had an energy and spirit that set them apart from the rest of the play. Sir Fopling is, of course, not altogether nice (nobody in the play really is), but Brostrom played the role with a blend of fashionable hauteur and puppy-dog innocence that helped one to appreciate how the fop character can be at both the object of deserved ridicule and affectionate indulgence. Specialists might feel that the role was played too broadly, but the audience could not get enough of Sir Fopling.

Not nice people. One of the struggles one has on reading *The Man of Mode* is understanding how one is to regard the tormenting of Loveit. If Etherege meant for us to sympathize with her, then he obviously did a poor job of it. But are we really meant to enjoy her degradation as much as Dorimant and the others do? Initially that may have been the case, but this is inconsistent with modern sensibilities. We're more inclined to sympathize, especially when the role is played with a good measure of dignity, as the ASC's Jessika Williams did. Or, if "sympathize" is too strong, then perhaps we just recoil from the aggressive humor that the characters in the play consider amusing. And even they may not always find this aggression to be amusing. Dorimant at one point warns Belinda not to expose herself, hissing, "Softly, these are laughers; you do not know 'em" suggesting that laughter in their world is a weapon, not a symptom of amusement. Even more than Dorimant, Medley seems to exemplify this. Played very skillfully by Chris Johnston, the nature of Medley and his function in the play came across very clearly. He looked like a young and sinister '60s playboy, slick, urbane, aware of all the unspoken social rules that govern high life, and untroubled by any of it. He performed a kind of choric function, leading the audience to approve of Dorimant, sneer at Loveit, relish the ridicule of Sir Fopling, and worry a bit for Harriet's welfare. Dorimant calls him, "the spirit of scandal," and in the ASC production, he felt like the guiding spirit.

University of Delaware

Notes

1. *A Defence of Sir Fopling Flutter, A Comedy Written by Sir George Etherege*, quoted from *The Critical Works of John Dennis*, ed. Edward Niles Hooker, 2 vols. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U. Press, 1943), 2: 242.
2. *The Spectator*, ed. Donald F. Bond, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press), 1: 278.

3. Leonard Welsted, *A Prologue occasioned by the Revival of a Play of Shakespear*, in *The Works, in Verse and Prose, of Leonard Welsted*, ed. John Nichols (London, 1787), 77.

4. Daniel Gustafson, "The Rake's Revival: Steele, Dennis, and the Early Eighteenth-Century Repertory," *Modern Philology* 112.2 (2014), 358-80.

5. Daniel Defoe, *The Fears of the Pretender turn'd into the Fears of Debauchery* (London, 1715), 36.

6. Anon., *The State of the Case, between the Lord Chamberlain of his Majesty's Household, and Sir Richard Steele* (London, 1720), quoted in Gustafson, 370.

7. Robert D. Hume, "Reading and Misreading 'The Man of Mode,'" *Criticism* 14.1 (1972), 10-11.

8. Montagu Summers, *The Playhouse of Pepys* (New York: MacMillan, 1935), 313.

9. Bonamy Dobree, *Restoration Comedy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), 70.

10. Joceylyn Powell, "George Etherege and the Form of a Comedy," *Restoration Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon Studies* 6, ed. J. R. Brown and Bernard Harris (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965), 68.

11. Harriet Hawkins, *Likeness and Truth in Elizabethan and Restoration Drama* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972), 80, 93.

Thomas Cumming as Celebrity

by Robert G. Walker

Thomas Cumming (?1714-1774) was quite famous in the middle of the eighteenth century for his participation in the British taking of Senegal during the Seven Years' War. Today he is known by some students of eighteenth-century literature as a friend of Samuel Johnson and he has been mentioned recently in passing in several quasi-scholarly histories as an American slave-trader. It has never been established that he traded slaves and he certainly was not an American: his living in New York for a couple of years at the beginning of the 1750s made him no more an American than Benjamin Franklin's living in Paris for eight years made him French. This note calls attention to a newspaper notice in 1769 that suggests Cumming's contemporary fame due to his war exploits extended longer than one would assume.

As a merchant in the 1750s, Cumming became aware of the vulnerability of French trading ports in Africa and began to advocate to William Pitt for military action after war began. When a small fleet finally set out in March 1758, Cumming captained one of the ships. The expedition was successful and Cumming, an adult convert to Quakerism who wore his religion on his sleeve, became known as "the Fighting Quaker."¹ The episode received typical news coverage as it happened, and afterward coverage shifted to the debate about whether Cumming should be awarded a gum concession from Senegal, the

prize that had prompted his original recommendation to Pitt. In the event, he had to settle for a pension of £500 annually for 31 years. Tobias Smollett treated the episode in great detail in his *Continuation of the Complete History of England* (1760-65), defending both Cumming's religious identity ("If it was the first military scheme of any Quaker, let it be remembered it was also . . . one of the first that was ever carried on according to the pacific system of the Quakers, without the loss of a drop of blood on either side") and his courage ("Mr. Cumming . . . not only formed the plan, and solicited the armament, but also attended the execution of it in person, at the hazard of his life").²

So Cumming was famous in mid-century, but did that fame last longer than the modern interval of fifteen minutes? Evidence increasingly suggests it did. The appearance of a vicious satire directed against him in the *Town and Country Magazine* ("Memoirs of Tomocomingo, the celebrated political Quaker," January 1774, 14-16) is at first somewhat puzzling. What would trigger a vicious attack on someone who had been out of the public eye for at least a decade, if we use the publication of Smollett's *History* as a terminus ad quem of the Senegal story?³ Legend has it that the attack in print contributed greatly to Cumming's death five months later—or so Cumming himself believed according to an anecdote Mrs. Piozzi recorded.⁴ That anecdote was popularized by the nineteenth-century editor of Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, John Wilson Croker, who consequently termed Cumming "morbidly sensitive."⁵ Did anyone except Cumming really care about his reputation in 1774, and was he affecting an exaggerated sense of his noteworthiness, or was the anonymous contributor to the *Town and Country*, the *National Enquirer* of its day, really seizing on a still-current celebrity?

A brief newspaper notice from early November 1769 suggests the latter:

On Tuesday Dr. Samuel Johnson was introduced to General Paoli, by James Boswell, Esq; and they conversed together a considerable time, greatly to their mutual satisfaction: and yesterday Mr. Cumming (the Quaker), of Surry-street, was introduced to the General, as the conqueror of Senegal. The General seemed much surprized at Mr. Cumming's not taking off his hat in return to his salute, but remaining with it on, when a gentleman present explaining the nature of Mr. Cumming's religious principles, they entered into an agreeable conversation, at the close of which the General told Mr. Cumming he wished he could point out to him a method for his recovering Corsica with as little bloodshed as the conquest of Senegal cost.⁶

The greatest recent celebrity here, of course, is General Paoli, just arrived in England from Corsica. The newspapers at this time are full of his comings and goings—he visited Oxford, for example,—but it is his introduction to fellow celebrities that is the staple of the coverage. We can only speculate as to the source of the item.

Boswell is well known to have planted items like this, anonymously, in the papers of the day. Moreover, his connection with Paoli had been and remained special. On the other hand, Boswell's plate was especially full at this time. He was helping to entertain Paoli as well as finalizing his imminent

marriage. In fact, as lamented by his modern editors, Boswell's personal journal stops on 26 September, leaving us to piece together his subsequent activities from notes, memoranda, letters, and passages from the *Life of Johnson*.⁷ This creates problems. For example, in his *Life of Johnson*, Boswell dates this first meeting between Johnson and Paoli as 10 October, but "this appears to be a mistake. Boswell makes no mention in the Memorandum covering this day that he had brought Paoli and Johnson together, and *The London Chronicle* (2 November 1769) declared that Boswell introduced Johnson to Paoli on 31 October [Tuesday]."⁸ Even Homer nods, and Boswell was writing his Johnson biography many years later, without as much mnemonic assistance as he usually had from his journal due to the lacuna. So making a mistake about the meeting date is not determinative in assessing whether or not Boswell penned this notice. A further bit of external evidence in favor of his involvement is his relationship with the *London Chronicle*: "This paper received the greatest number of Boswell's periodical contributions; Pottle identified almost two hundred—almost a third of his identified journalistic output."⁹

Regardless of the author, the item establishes the continuing celebrity of Cumming to the end of the decade. Here he is, a conspicuous Quaker, refusing to pay "hat honor" to a fellow military hero. George Fox, the founder of the Quakers, refused to doff his hat to anyone, of course, and that tradition, as well as the wearing of the Quaker hat and generally unadorned clothing and the use of "thee" and "thou" in speech, was adopted by Cumming in a way that garnered comment from his associates. See, for example, the playfully satiric reference by Dr. Alexander Hamilton in his *History of the Ancient and Honorable Tuesday Club*, where, according to Hamilton, the Cumming's character is obsequious to the club's president: "he pulled off his hat tho a Quaker, kneeld down upon one knee, and humbly desired that his Lordship would permit him the honor of kissing his Lordships hand."¹⁰ More generally, the news item establishes Cumming in 1769 as a public figure easily identifiable by and interesting to readers, and, by one standard at least, the near equivalent to Boswell, Johnson, and members of the Court in the fugacious category of celebrity.

Washington & Jefferson College

Notes

1. For my summary of Cumming's life here and throughout I rely on Melvyn New and Robert G. Walker, "Who Killed Tom Cumming the Quaker? Recovering the Life Story of an Eighteenth-Century Adventurer," *Modern Philology* 116 (Feb. 2019), 262-98; hereafter "Tom Cumming the Quaker."

2. *Continuation of the Complete History of England*, vol. 2 of 5 (London: Richard Baldwin, 1760), 2:273n. and 278, respectively. "So important did Cumming seem to Smollett that when he published this installment of his *History* . . . according to the advertisement in the *Public Ledger* it was illustrated with 'the Head of THOMAS CUMMING, who plan'd the successful Expedition to SENEGAL,'" ("Tom Cumming the Quaker," 266).

3. New and Walker express this puzzlement (“Tom Cumming the Quaker,” 294, 297).

4. Hester Thrale Piozzi, *Anecdotes of the Late Samuel Johnson*, in *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, ed. G. B. Hill, 2 vols. (1897; rpt. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970), 1:274.

5. John Wilson Croker, ed., *Life of Samuel Johnson*, 5 vols. (London, 1831), 2:454n.

6. *London Chronicle*, 31 October - [Thursday] 2 November 1769. There are minor difference between this version and those in *Independent Chronicle*, 1-3 November; *Lloyd’s Evening Post*, 1-3 November; and the *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, 3 November. For instance, following the *London Chronicle*, *Lloyd’s* gives the day of the Paoli-Cumming meeting as “yesterday” [presumably Thursday], while the *Gazetteer* makes it “Wednesday,” and the *Independent Chronicle’s* “Thursday.”

7. See *Boswell in Search of a Wife 1766-1769*, ed. Frank Brady and F. A. Pottle (London: Heinemann, 1957), 327.

8. *Boswell in Search of a Wife*, 334n.

9. Paul Tankard, ed., *Facts and Inventions: Selections from the Journalism of James Boswell* (New Haven: Yale, 2014), xxviii.

10. Robert Micklus, ed., 3 vols. (Chapel Hill: U. of North Carolina Press, 1990), 2:215.

Teaching Eighteenth-Century Texts to Retired Adults in Osher Institute of Learning Programs

by Ellen Moody

The forms non-traditional learning in the humanities have both proliferated and become more varied in the past couple of decades. Our discipline has had to watch its place in too many universities vanish as “the humanities” have been either expunged or joined with other disciplines so as to make these studies nearly invisible or transformed, such as in how they are viewed as useful and in which kinds of publication we are allowed or driven to assign. It could therefore be heartening to know about new groups of learners who want to experience and some even to study closely humanities writing, visual art, and music in order to engage actively with a work for its own sake and to enrich their lives.

“New” is a relative term, for the people I’ve been teaching in two different places are usually over 50, with most between 60 and 80, and not a few yet older. I call these programs “new” because they got their start in 2001 when the Bernard Osher Foundation endowed by a wealthy respected businessman and community leader, decided to expand its activities to include building lifelong learning programs modeled on successful “Senior Colleges” within the university of San Francisco. Bernard Osher’s wife, Barbro Osher, Swedish born and educated at Stockholm University, was a pro-active prime

mover; Mary G. F. Bitterman, a woman who has spent her life fostering philanthropic and educational institutions must also be credited here. The idea was to offer grants of \$100,000 to such programs once a clearly viable lifelong learning institute affiliated with the appropriate facilities of a respected university or college campus. Criteria included stimulating non-credit courses and educational activities designed for people over 50 who become members, strong support from the host institution, and a sustainable organization.¹

There are now over 120 such institutes across the United States. These are highly varied, some more heavily academically oriented than others, with academic defined as having a less practical goal. I teach (and now take courses occasionally, too) in two such places: an OLLI at George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia, and an OLLI at American University in northwest Washington, D.C. Over the five years I've been there, I've seen both offer courses on how to make out your taxes, coping with investment and other problems and needs during retirement; various workshops in the arts; lecture series, which usually include contemporary politics; and activities designed to enable people to socialize, get involved with community needs, and enjoy local museums and other similar places together. Both have regularly given courses called something like "Reading the *New Yorker* together," and "Understanding the American musical"--both host clubs. But both also offer academic college-like courses too; at the OLLI at Mason more than half are, and at the OLLI at AU something like three-quarters.

All these institutes (122 networking) have developed to the point they have yearly conferences in different places in the US where ideas, methods, problems, and achievements are discussed. We were delighted at AU to be told our program has been at these conferences deemed (by a number of measurements) to "have a reputation for high academic standards." From my experience in the two places and what I've read and been told about others, OLLI at AU is more like a senior college, though both have the advantage that non-retired faculty from the two different universities (and elsewhere) give courses and seminars. I've taken three of these in literature (none I confess in chemistry, physics, or math, and various technologies, which are also given regularly). We have retired faculty as members of the teaching staff: I'm one; John Radner loved OLLI at AU and regularly gave courses in Johnson there (though his teaching career was at Mason); I've met old friends from Mason at both, such as Coilin Owens (a renowned Joyce scholar). We occasionally have stars: Elaine Showalter taught at the OLLI at AU two semesters ago. The two colleges are not that apart: from my house in Alexandria, Va., it takes me on average 35 minutes to reach either.

In both institutes all but a tiny group of people helping to operate them do it for free, without monetary rewards, such as those who work on the curriculum committees, perform functions like "Treasurer" (the person does the taxes of this non-profit), serve on committees like the curriculum or finance committees," or have roles such as "trip coordinator." There are four paid people at the OLLI at AU, and think there are maybe the same at the OLLI at AU--a central chair, a vice-chair (someone who does everything else, perhaps manages the website and organizes all sorts of things), and one or two tech people. There are over a 1000 people now registered at the OLLI at AU.

Over 90 courses in fall and again spring. It should hearten people who despair at a new world order where everything is assumed to be done for money, and no one to be trusted to fulfill promises or missions, that in both these places all the people who stay do what they promise. The whole place is based on trust. Some OLLIs fail or wither away, but obviously many flourish variously. For myself and many beyond the teaching staff or study group leaders, one reimbursement involves library privileges. At the OLLI at George Mason University I have (as when I worked for the college itself) compete access to the George Mason database at home; I was able to extend my old faculty library card and can take out books with the same privileges as college faculty. At the OLLI at AU the terms offered are less generous: access to the database from the college and library privileges comparable to those of the students.

The older people who attend appear to be mostly a mix of successful professional people: I've had lawyers judging trial scenes in novels; judges; people who succeeded in various businesses, teachers, librarians, published writers, and artists who've had exhibitions of their work. When I went on a Road Scholar tour to the Lake District and Northern Borders of England, I met a super-rich mine owner, a still working psychiatrist (at 87, holding out for the talking cure), a woman who ran non-profits and others who attended an OLLI in Asheville, North Carolina, and a medieval art and archaeological scholar who attends one in New York State. I followed her about all the cathedrals the group visited so learned something.²

I've now dared six times to teach or lead a group of such older people to learn about the long 18th century. Well, I would, wouldn't I? I pass over one on Jane Austen at AU the first term I taught there, one each on the first two (Mason) or four (AU) Poldark novels (I remind all they are set in the later 18th century), one on two historical novels set during and just after the 17th-century British civil war and the 1790s revolution in Naples (Daphne DuMaurier's *King's General* and Susan Sontag's *Volcano Lover*) and one which included the gothic (both these latter two at Mason). I don't have the space, and I didn't concentrate on trying thoroughly to convey historical, cultural, biographical knowledge the way I did the two times I taught Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones* (once each at both places) and now once in a course I called *The Enlightenment: At Risk?* (fall 2018). We read Voltaire's *Candide* (with a selection from his *Letters on England*), Diderot's *The Nun*, Johnson's *Journey to the Western Islands* with a selection of his journalism, and an abridged Englished text of Madame Roland's *Memoirs* from her time in prison covering her political and private life.

I say dare because the 18th century is just not as familiar a period as the nineteenth or twentieth (most who register for my courses are readers in the novels of these eras); and, because of Shakespeare and history courses and Tudor serial dramas, the Renaissance at first seems familiar to people. People hesitate before the unfamiliar. OTOH, films have become a central educational medium for our time, and I've discovered how difficult it is to dislodge inaccurate (yes, I do believe there is a text in the room) distortions from super-popular well-known films set in the 18th century or Napoleonic era from people's minds. Two such films are the 1935 MGM *Tale of Two Cities*, famously starring Ronald Colman ("It is a far far better place"), and the

1966 Tony Richardson and John Osborne *Tom Jones*. Many people have not forgotten or have had their memories somehow refreshed for the scene of Albert Finney and Joyce Redman eating at one another, and the famous hunting sequence. The 1935 film I regret to say has fostered a hostile attitude towards the French revolution (doubtless picked up also from American culture), the 1966 wholesale misunderstandings and false expectations upon opening Fielding's long novel. I use film too: as prologue to Johnson's *Journey*, we spent one of our precious sessions watching all of Peter Watkins's astonishing achievement in his pseudo-reporting on-the-spot in 1965 docudrama for the BBC of the battle of *Culloden* (1745) and its aftermath.³ It made a very strong impression on the class members (he made us feel we were at the battle of Culloden), and I had many questions to research for them. I will show it again this coming summer at OLLI at Mason, where I will repeat this course omitting only Madame Roland's book as the summer course lasts only 6 weeks not 11 as in the OLLI at AU fall term.

My syllabus for the two times I taught *Tom Jones* was simply to divide the book up into as many weeks as we had available (11 at OLLI at AU, 8-9 at OLLI at Mason) and every other week or so send by attachment in an email what I hoped was a readable helpful essay or chapter from a book on Fielding's *Tom Jones*. I included a bibliography with a few readable books on Fielding. My pedagogy at first was to send ten questions on the chapters assigned, but I found that the pre-set question, while it could start talk, did not work to create a whole group conversation focused on a particular stretch of text. I found it better to write out topics on the board. (Yes, I write on the board and do not use power-point presentations). It's necessary to trust to the people in the room to move from topic to topic – there Fielding's own explicitness was a great help. My job is to enable them to play off one another's points. Many are well-informed educated people (if not necessarily in literature), and I wanted them to understand the meaning of what Fielding's words truly meant for us to infer, and that meant breaking through his and our cant and taboos. The language of the book did not present as much of a barrier as I feared. I did close reading of chosen passages where I could. These are classes meant for enjoyment and so the way I did critical thinking (or how to read a book) was to put on the board a series of features in books (characters, plot-design, point of view, satiric devices) and try to exemplify how to talk about these things – as well as indulge in talk about the characters and how we identify or don't.

Obstacles included Fielding's use of irony (subtle and evasive, elusive as Robert Hume says), and not only the class's misconceptions but my own ideas imbibed 40 years ago that the book had a benign providential scheme. Imagine my horror when about 3 months before the course was to start for the first time sitting down to close read and discovering that I had not been reading the book in front of me, but been fooled (as I now see it) by the Battestin approach. I learned a lot listening to them too, and on my own I read recent literary criticism (much is online at the Mason database), and ended reading *Tom Jones* as a Sadean didactic chaotic book in the vein of Robert Hume's conclusions in his article, "Fielding at 300."

My aim for this class became to use many of the famous crucial incidents as jump off points to discuss the history of the period, Fielding's life, and

topics of interest to them and me: the forms money took I found interested them; attitudes to women and rape in the era and in the book (a cause of much tension in the class whenever I proposed to the men that Tom was a frat boy and presented the women in the book in a different light than they were used to seeing). What were houses and city life like; the theater in which Fielding worked and as reflected in his book's characters and scenes. I found that not enough people in either class had seen enough 18th-century plays to make this material vivid enough. And I don't have anywhere near enough DVDs of those plays. I began with what I thought was an astonishing 35 people in both places, and lost people, about a quarter of the class. *Tom Jones* is still among these older people a famous enough novel. It is understood at the OLLI at AU that one should read the assigned book; it is not quite that at the OLLI at Mason, but in both places I have found people stop coming when they stop reading. Getting through the inset history of "The Man on the Hill" seemed the real test for those giving up.

I saved showing clips from the two films for the last session of each; both times we had a sort of party, with wine and snacks. They were eager to re-see what they remembered, and we talked of the use of the narrator and intertitles and speeding up, the savagery, comedy and Ealing comedy actors in Richardson's film. One difference between the two classes that mattered was that there were more women than men in the Mason class, and, when I spent far more time on the BBC 1997 *Tom Jones* (I much prefer it and it was useful to have a retrospective of the book), I found women in general did like the later rendition much better with its strong women characters dominating the story space. The use of John Sessions and his conception of Fielding as ironic and congenial supervising the action ended both classes well.

My goal in *The Enlightenment: At Risk?* was more complicated: I aimed to enable people in the class to understand and appreciate the contributions of the Enlightenment in western Europe to the spread of humane, egalitarian, and cosmopolitan ideas; of educational practices which can improve the lives of all peoples, and to see in the texts we read the origin and nuances and that, where these norms spread, they countered evil and harm. I wanted by indirection to discuss what is happening across the world and in the US today as serious retrogression. I had in mind discussing the present political events in the US and elsewhere in the world, what was happening and what legacy from the 18th century endangered. One day I read aloud from Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws* about the importance of the separation of powers of government and that day we had good discussion of what was happening in the US. I think I did succeed, though it seemed that more often we were looking at how far the period and the majority of its people were from the principles espoused by the particular author we read.

I wanted to make them aware of the emergence of new genres in the era (the realistic novel, truthful biography and travel writing, journalism, life-writing forms) as a response then to new needs, which have furthered developed since. People found it interesting to know these were new genres. It was a great help to have asked those who would read Dorinda Outram's *The Enlightenment* before the class began because she demonstrates these ideas were spreading across the population and were the product of condition in

countries other than France. We had the advantage this time that all our texts (with the exception of Roland's *Memoirs*) were short, and I was able to devote more than two sessions to each. I also used film throughout the term to try to convey a feel for the era and some of its history itself. I showed clips from Ettore Scuala's *La Nuit de Varennes* in the first session

In brief now,⁴ I was more successful with Johnson's *Journey to the Western Islands*, and Madame Roland *Memoirs* than with Voltaire's *Candide* and Diderot's *Nun*. Come summer I will substitute Voltaire's *Letters on England* for *Candide*, and use selections online from his *Philosophical Dictionary*. *Candide* was the text that drew in participants, but faced with it, they missed psychological and sociological realism; they found it repetitive, but more importantly it did not show the mindset directly of what is meant by enlightenment. They also kept looking for redemptive, hopeful, and funnier ideas. They were more comfortable and got more out of learning about Voltaire's life, his campaigns to help victims of barbarous intolerance, his way of life on his estate, how he became so wealthy. They did better with Diderot's (to them) relentless protest novel, *The Nun*. I thought to concentrate on parallels with our own era: Suzanne's response is that of a hostage; the core of the story is violence against women; the perpetrators deny Suzanne any right to her own identity, to bodily security of any kind; she experiences repeated trauma. I made connections with rape (and described Richardson's *Clarissa*, which Diderot had read and was influenced by), and we did get to talking about why women feel rape is such a violation. I found they did want to talk about Catholicism and religious guilt. So I showed a clip from the 2013 French film *The Nun* (scripted, directed by Guillaume Nicloux, featuring Pauline Etienne). It caused distress in the room, but they were suddenly alert to what the text had not so graphically realized for them. I found them afterward to have original insights of various sorts: one woman pointed out that the mother who so berated Suzanne for poisoning the mother's existence and thus being sinful was herself the one who committed the sin; Suzanne was innocent.

For me the real problem in assigning Diderot with the aims I had is that there is no single text that can enable a teacher in a limited classroom to convey his rich original personality and achievements

I started with fourteen people and ended with nine, and, though I didn't do a count, it seemed to me over half (five?) also read Boswell's *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*. It came in the available affordable paperback edition I chose. Four of these people had been to the Hebrides (which I have not or only seen the Western Islands from the northwest shores of Scotland). One confirmed the spiritual feeling he had when at Iona. While two people enjoyed Boswell more ("much more fun"), others preferred Johnson and some talked of memories of Boswell's *Life of Johnson* (!) and said "this man" was quite different from the caricature they remembered. Two men had read John Wain, one man W.J.Bate. Johnson still has a following. One man had taken two courses with John Radner and mentioned him. They understood the value of both books as truth-telling. I had been thinking of ordering Donald Greene's *Oxford Authors* as it contains a goodly amount of Johnson's *Journey* plus excellent choices of other texts, but now I'll stay with Ian McGowan's dual edition for Canongate. Of course, my themes after *Culloden* were the agonies

of a society being destroyed, the politics of the Jacobite uprisings (ethnic cleansing); I presented Johnson's book as ultimately having a tragic vision, showing the difficulties and hard efforts people make to survive. I did assign Lisa Berglund's essay on Johnson's cat Hodge and tried to amuse them with that, but I don't know if I managed. I did talk about Francis Johnson too – and they liked to hear about him.

The real engagement with Madame Roland was similar: we became more personal in both cases. And here was another brilliant person, one thoroughly engaged with egalitarian and progressive ideals, who was revealing her powerful, passionate nature and ultimately tragic life. We were able to talk of the early phases of the French Revolution, the terror, and they engaged with her as they were used to doing with characters in realistic novels. Here I was able to talk of feminism in the 18th century, brought in Jean-Jacques Rousseau (whom Roland had imbibed), Danton (whom Roland hated), Marot, Robespierre. There is an incident of sexual harassment in the earliest part of her life story; we asked why when the Girondists were arrested hadn't she fled or tried to escape because she had time and chance on her side if she had wanted to save herself. One man who had in his working life been a psychologist and social worker said she wanted to be "the author of her own life." They seemed to be struck with how she would interrupt herself to tell us of the prison conditions and immediate concerns as if this was a break in decorum they had not expected. I regret I will not have time for this book this coming summer, but hope to do something similar again with Mary Wollstonecraft's *The Rights of Women*.

The long eighteenth century as a topic draws far fewer people than many other humanities topics or well-known respected novels. Forty people showed up for a class in Anthony Trollope's *He Knew He Was Right* (OLLI at Mason), and they didn't come for me. Our era is not enough known. On the evaluations some people talked of how they had never read these books and learned much that was new to them. So, if you take heart, courage, and don't flinch when it comes to choice of powerful and unknown films too, and bring out relevancies, people can respond just as deeply as they do to what they know better how to cope with.

This is a tough time for the humanities, and I believe what I acted out when I was teaching undergraduates and am now continuing with, only for the first time in years getting a chance to do with beloved texts, requires one not to have a failure of nerve. There are still many places in our society where we can purvey our wonderful wares.

Alexandria, Virginia

Notes

1. See the on-line website for a history thus far:
[http:// www.osherfoundation.org/index.php?olli](http://www.osherfoundation.org/index.php?olli)
2. See [http:// www.olli-dc.org/](http://www.olli-dc.org/), <https://olli.gmu.edu>, and <https://olliashville.com/>
3. See Wikipedia articles for Watkins and *Culloden*: <http://>

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peter_Watkins and [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Culloden_\(film\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Culloden_(film)). I sent the class Nicholas Cull, "Peter Watkins's *Culloden* and the Alternative Form in Historical Film-making," a chapter from *Retrovisions: Reinventing the Past in Film and Fiction* (Pluto Press, 2001).

4. I wrote separate blogs for each of the authors I covered: these two URLs will take anyone interested to all of them: <https://reveriesunderthesignofausten.wordpress.com/2016/02/29/after-teaching-tom-jones/>; and <https://reveriesunderthesignofausten.wordpress.com/2018/12/20/the-enlightenment-at-risk-another-handy-list/>

“Talking Treason: Eighteenth-Century Literature and the Origins of the First Amendment”: An Interdisciplinary Course in British Cultural and Intellectual History

By Anna Foy

Editor’s note: Anna Foy first taught this course to undergraduates while finishing her Ph.D. at the University of Pennsylvania. With some changes, she taught the course to graduate students in Fall 2015 and Spring 2017 at the University of Alabama at Huntsville (during eighty-minute sessions on Mondays and Wednesdays). We present first a 2012 description of the course, which reflects on her first experience teaching it, and thereafter her most recent syllabus.

This class explores a selection of classic British and American texts from the long eighteenth century (roughly 1660-1800) as a way of asking where the First Amendment came from. The First Amendment protects not only what we refer to today as “free speech,” but also the right of the people to assemble peaceably, to petition the government for a redress of grievances, and to practice their respective religions without congressional interference. In other words, it envisions loyal opposition and religious dissent as civic virtues at the foundation of good government. “Talking Treason” charts a gradual progress toward this way of thinking about literature and government, away from the earlier notion—widely prevalent in the seventeenth century—that attitude of the ideal English subject toward God and government was “obedience.” This interdisciplinary course seeks to draw students into the period by investing them in knotty literary-historical questions such as:

- Does Dryden support monarchical absolutism in *Annus Mirabilis*?
- How does Mary Chudleigh’s presentation of wifely “obedience” in “To the Ladies” complement Locke’s refutation of Filmer’s *Patriarcha*?
- How does Swift’s representation of “liberty” in *Gulliver’s Travels* accord with contemporary rationalizations of the importance of free speech?
- How radical is Paine’s vision of monarchy in *Common Sense*?

“Talking Treason” combines several related lines of inquiry. The most prominent is an investigation in British-American intellectual history: the charting of a gradual transition from the longstanding assumption that the ideal subject was “obedient” to his or her superiors and habitually supportive of government policy to the paradoxical colonial conviction that a government permitting dissenting speech could be more secure than a censorious government. On the first day of class, after leading a discussion of the text of the First Amendment (as suggested above), I distribute excerpts from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century documents illustrative of the then-pervasive notion that one should “obey” God, king, and country. Looking closely at the language of these passages, we unpack the hierarchical, patriarchal vision of civic order that typically undergirded conceptions of secular obedience in the period (e.g., a belief in the Great Chain of Being as described by Lovejoy). I explain that during the seventeenth century, the reflex assumption of an easy alignment between monarchical and divine obedience encountered significant challenges in the form of the Civil Wars, the Exclusion Crisis, and the 1688-89 Revolution; and I suggest further that many English/British/colonial writers of the eighteenth century sought to complicate (if not subvert) this hierarchical vision of society in which masters, monarchs, and husbands were viewed as divinely-ordained, secular authorities deserving of absolute obedience. As the course progresses, we refer back to this juxtaposition repeatedly—sometimes directly, as in our discussion of Locke’s deconstruction of Filmer’s patriarchal reading of *Genesis* (Sept. 28).

Moreover, the principal texts on the syllabus have been selected because they reveal or assert changing conceptions of the proper relationship between monarch and subject, license and liberty, master and servant, government and citizen. The early classes explore a variety of approaches to royal propaganda and critique:

- Dryden’s *Annus Mirabilis*, a “Historical” heroic poem whose dedicatory panegyric to the “people” is as deferent as his versified portrait of Charles II;
- Behn’s *Oroonoko: Or, The Royal Slave*, a romance whose depiction of the rise and fall of its dignified titular hero combines royal praise with royal instruction;
- Rochester’s satire on Charles II, whose bawdy barbs simultaneously impugn their royal target and (as in his other erotic poems) undercut the author’s more subversive meditations on the problem of secular “obedience”; and
- Defoe’s *True-Born Englishman*, whose “Satyr” on the “ingratitude” of William III’s English subjects marshals to the project of “Reformation” the very caviling character that it criticizes.

A second phase of the course explores representations and assertions of English “liberty”:

- Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels*, with its satires of ministers and politicians and its narrative portrayal of an English adventurer’s gradual descent from

self-assertive agent of his own “liberty” to self-loathing, unsociable misanthrope;

- Gay’s *Beggars’ Opera*, with its entertaining portrayal of systematized governmental corruption and its daring lampoon of the then-Prime Minister (notably, not the monarch himself); and
- Pope’s 1728 *Dunciad*, a sly satire on George II as a “dunce” and an embodiment of English “liberty,” insofar as Pope’s personal attacks tested the limits of contemporary libel law.

The common association of all three Scriblerians with “oppositional” political stances helps to make the general point that critiques of government were becoming gradually more explicit during the early eighteenth century, as England/Britain was conceived with increasing confidence as a “limited monarchy” where absolutist ambitions would not be tolerated. Addison’s *Cato* provides a bridge for these two units, with its middling portrayal of its titular hero, who was historically a republican and an oppositional enemy of tyranny, but who is represented within the play as a rigid (and arguably unattractive) adherent to forms of personal authority that readers of the day would have recognized as monarchical. In addition, a handful of class meetings focus on issues that constitute subsidiary elements of our master narrative: religious dissent and toleration (Oct. 5-7, Nov. 30); libertinism (Sept. 16, Nov. 23, Nov. 30); wifely obedience and women’s rights (Sept. 28, Nov. 11-18, Dec. 9); social class and literacy (Nov. 9, Dec. 9). Throughout the course, I encourage students to think about these texts not only as historical documents that unconsciously record dominant ideologies of the day, but also as purposeful interventions in contemporary debates about the character of British culture and the nature of good British government. Sir William D’Avenant imagined poetry as an agent of civic control that “begets such obedience as is never weary or griev’d.” I invite the students to take seriously this way of understanding authorial intention and writerly influence.

A second strain of investigation relates to the theory and practice of long-eighteenth-century libel law. In their enshrinement of the right to free speech as a foundational feature of American government, the authors of the Bill of Rights were breaking with a longstanding common-law tradition—its guiding principles, if not also its recent practice. British libel law was comparatively authoritarian. It prioritized the protection of magnates over the protection of private individuals, and it treated anti-government speech as a potential threat to civic order. In the First Amendment, by contrast, the protection of oppositional speech was seen as a necessary, potentially productive component of good government. Although, in practice, American presidents of the early republic did not always take criticism lightly (cf. the Alien and Sedition Acts, an end-of-semester talking point), First Amendment protections imagined well-ordered disagreement, debate, and dissent as an animating feature of the republican settlement. In its broad outlines, then, this legal history parallels the intellectual history traced in our study of canonical “Augustan” texts. The students read excerpts from Siebert and Kropf’s accounts of long-eighteenth-century libel law. The syllabus also incorporates several personalities who witnessed or even played a role in these libel skirmishes (e.g., L’Estrange, the

Restoration Licensor; Curll, the first publisher to be prosecuted for obscene libel; and Wilkes, who helped to alter a longstanding tradition whereby British publishers could not publish verbatim accounts of parliamentary proceedings). In addition, several texts provide a practicum for testing our technical understanding of libel prosecution, its privileging of magnates, and its relative unconcern with “obscenity: e.g., Young’s *Love of Fame*, Pope’s *Dunciad*, Cleland’s *Fanny Hill*.

Buttressing this investigation is an exploration of eighteenth-century disagreements over censorship and free speech. The syllabus highlights three historical moments: the mid seventeenth century (which pits Milton’s republican refusal to “praise a fugitive and cloister’d virtue” against L’Estrange’s royalist discussion of the pragmatics of confiscating threatening written material); the early eighteenth century (which pits Gordon and Trenchard’s bold defenses of the importance of criticizing government against the anonymous *Arguments Relating to a Restraint on the Press*); and the pre-Revolutionary period (where I highlight John Wilkes’s colorful, popularly-celebrated skirmish with royal and parliamentary authorities). Taken together, these philosophical disagreements reveal gradual shifts in the dominant lines of debate about free speech. Making our way through these pairings helps to make the point that the earliest British advocates of free speech did not necessarily appeal to a secular, rights-based discourse, and it gives the class the vocabulary necessary for studying the history of British censorship (e.g., licensing, prior restraint, Stationer’s Company, etc.).

What worked well in the course, and what didn’t work? I would say that the First Amendment hook worked as I had hoped. At Penn, it drew students from a variety of undergraduate majors (English, History, Intellectual History, Political Science, Anthropology), and ten stalwart students enrolled in the seminar, despite its late-spring advertisement and its twice weekly, 9 am time slot. In addition, classroom discussions remained at an extremely high level throughout the semester, and several students told me independently that they found the course’s bridge between history and literature especially compelling, in particular the idea that “literary” works might enter into political dialogue with one another. As for texts, after polling the students, I would say that the usual suspects went over well: *Gulliver’s Travels*, *The Beggar’s Opera*, *Common Sense*, the women’s writing, *Fanny Hill*. *Pamela*, for many (though not all) students, was too long to read in the time that I had allotted for it. There were surprises, too: one fan of L’Estrange’s colorful discussion of seizing local presses, another of Addison’s *Cato*, and a third of Young’s concept of “purging the passions” with satire.

Upon reflection, there are several things that I might work to improve in the course. It is too full, the bridge between the British and American sections of the course needs work (partly because of the British bias of my own research), and I am not convinced that I have yet lighted upon the best secondary sources for our purposes. Nonetheless, I was happy with the course overall as a way of helping the students to analyze long-eighteenth-century literature not only by evaluating it according to their own systems of value, but also by using terms that the practitioners themselves might have understood. One of the class’s most significant accomplishments, in my view, was the

sense of confidence and fluency that it inspired in the students as literary-historical analysts. From the first week, the students were asked to read documents printed from EEBO and ECCO, with their confusing spellings and typographical eccentricities and their lack of an editorial apparatus; and the students were also assigned oral presentations (the guidelines for which are attached) that gave them practice negotiating these and other databases on their own. Using these projects as seeds for later research, the class produced the finest and most diverse group of final papers that I have yet encountered among undergraduates, with topics ranging from Walpolean politics to Gray's lesser-known verses on education and government to Wilkes's American reception to Paine's varied reception among commoners and elites to "emergent homosexual identity" in eighteenth-century England (a paper inspired by discussions of the expurgated sodomy scene in *Fanny Hill*). I look forward to learning what the next iteration of the course produces.

Talking Treason: Eighteenth-Century Literature and the Origins of the First Amendment



The idea that citizens should have a right to free speech was widely contested, sometimes violently, in Britain and America—not only in courts and legislature, but also in the world of culture: in novels, pamphlets, plays, and bold poetic experiments. This class explores a selection of classic literary texts from the long eighteenth century (roughly 1660-1800) as a way of asking where the First Amendment came from. Reading rebels and jokesters alongside advocates of restraint, we will ask how British and North American

writers gradually subverted the longstanding assumption that the ideal citizen was “obedient” in favor of the paradoxical idea that a system of government that permitted free speech was safer and more secure than a government that did not. We will examine not only revolutionary articulations of the benefits of a free press—John Milton’s *Areopagitica*, for instance—but also fiction and poetry from the period that tested the limits of law and good taste. How did satirists such as Alexander Pope exploit loopholes in libel law to ridicule their contemporaries mercilessly in published verse? What should we make of the raciness of John Cleland’s amatory fiction? To what extent did the authors of the Bill of Rights intend to protect the right to disseminate sexy and obscene materials? Authors examined in the course include Locke, Defoe, Swift, Pope, Chudleigh, Montesquieu, Wilkes, Paine, J. Madison. We will also be working with UAH’s exciting new seventeenth- and eighteenth-century databases, EEBO and ECCO. Requirements include weekly responses, a midterm paper, and a final research paper.

Official Course Description: Extensive and intensive study of various early modern texts, with attention to interdisciplinary contexts. (Credit hours: 3.0. Grading system: A, B, C, D, F.)

Course Objectives:

- Identify and discuss several canonical and non-canonical texts from Britain and the American colonies representative of the Restoration and eighteenth century
- Describe a general cultural transformation that occurred in the period: a gradual shift from a cultural conviction that the ideal English subject was “obedient” to a belief that good governments could sustain loyal opposition
- Perform close readings of texts that register or assert one or more of these political ideals
- Enumerate important differences between long-eighteenth-century British libel law and modern U.S. libel laws
- Conduct primary research on Restoration and eighteenth-century literature using tools including EEBO, ECCO, and the OED
- Devise ways of speaking and writing persuasively about Restoration and eighteenth-century British literature

Course Requirements

- Weekly readings (variable in length: 150-200 pages on a typical week)
- Weekly writing assignments (brief responses to be posted to Canvas)
- Punctual attendance and active participation in class activities
- One class presentation (5 minutes)

- Midterm paper (6-8 pages)
- Final paper (15-20 pages)

Required Texts

- Aphra Behn, *Oroonoko*, ed. Janet Todd (Penguin)
- Joseph Addison, *Cato: A Tragedy, and Selected Essays*, eds. Christine Dunn et al. (Liberty Fund)
- Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Robert DeMaria (Penguin)
- John Gay, *The Beggar's Opera*, eds. Bryan Loughrey and T. O. Treadwell (Penguin)
- John Cleland, *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure*, ed. Peter Sabor (Oxford)
- Thomas Paine, *Common Sense*, ed. Isaac Kramnick (Penguin)

These volumes can be obtained at the UAHuntsville Bookstore. Other readings can be accessed through our class Canvas site: Canvas Learning Management System (canvas.uah.edu).

Pertinent Online Databases

1. Early English Books Online
2. Eighteenth Century Collections Online
3. Oxford Dictionary of National Biography
4. American National Biography
5. Oxford English Dictionary

Accessible via the UAH library website (www.uah.edu/library), these databases are excellent resources for your scheduled presentations and research projects.

Course Schedule: (details may change depending on class needs)

Mon., Jan. 9 – Introduction

Seventeenth-Century Censorship and Circulation

Wed., Jan. 11 – *John Milton, *Areopagitica* (1644); *excerpts from Nigel Wheale, *Writing and Society* (1999), Ch. 4

Mon., Jan. 16 – MLK Holiday

Wed., Jan. 18 – Roger L'Estrange, *Considerations and Proposals in Order to the Regulation of the Press* (1663) [EEBO]; *John Wilmot, Second Earl of Rochester, “The Imperfect Enjoyment” (1680?) and “A Satyre on Charles II” (read by the king in 1674); *excerpts from Paul Hammond, *The Making of Restoration Poetry* (2006), Chs. 1, 2

Instructing the Monarch, Courting the People: Restoration Royalisms

Mon., Jan. 23 – *Stephen Orgel, from *The Illusion of Power: Political Theatre in the English Renaissance* (1975); *Ben Jonson, *The Golden Age Restored* (1616) and *The Masque of Blackness* (1605)

Wed., Jan. 25 – Aphra Behn, *Oroonoko: Or, The Royal Slave* (1688)

Mon., Jan. 30 – *Oroonoko*, ctd.; *John Miller, *The Glorious Revolution* (1997), Ch. 1; *Corrinne Harol, “The Passion of *Oroonoko*: Passive Obedience, the Royal Slave, and Aphra Behn’s Baroque Realism” (2012)

The English Revolution and the Prospect of Virtuous Opposition

Wed., Feb. 1 – *excerpts from Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha* (pub. 1680) and John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government* (pub. 1690); *Miller, *Glorious Revolution*, Chs. 3-4; *Mary, Lady Chudleigh, “To the Ladies” (1703); begin reading Addison’s *Cato*, at least through Act II

Mon., Feb. 6 – Joseph Addison, *Cato* (1713); *Tatler*, No. 161 (1710), pp. 103-07; *Spectator*, No. 287 (1712), pp. 167-72; *Freeholder*, Nos. 10 & 12 (1716), pp. 214-25

Religious Dissent and Toleration

Wed., Feb. 8 – *Miller, *Glorious Revolution*, Chs. 6, 9; Isaac Watts, “Preface” and “When I survey the wondrous Cross” in *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* (1707) [ECCO]; Elizabeth Singer Rowe, “Dedication” and “Preface” [by I. Watts], “Supreme Love to God,” and “Breathing after God, and Weary of the World” in *Devout Exercises of the Heart in Meditation and Soliloquy* (1738) [ECCO]

Mon., Feb. 13 – *Daniel Defoe, *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters: or, Proposals for the Establishment of the Church* (1702) and “A Hymn to the Pillory” (1703)

English Liberty and Narrative Satire

Wed., Feb. 15 – Jonathan Swift, *Travels into Several Remote Nations of the World, In Four Parts. By Lemuel Gulliver, First a Surgeon, and then a Captain of Several Ships* [i.e., *Gulliver’s Travels*] (1726), I-II

Mon., Feb. 20 – *Gulliver’s Travels*, III-IV; *excerpt from Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu, *The Spirit of the Laws* (1748), I.3; *from Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke, *A Dissertation Upon Parties* (1733), I, VII

Libel Law and Political Dissent: Early-Eighteenth-Century Episodes

Wed., Feb. 22 – From Siebert, *Freedom of the Press in England, 1476-1776* (1965)

--excerpts from anon., *Arguments Relating to a Restraint upon the Press in a Letter to a Benchet, from a Young Gentleman of the Temple* (London, 1712) [ECCO]

--*excerpts from *Cato’s Letters* [John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon] (Nos. 15, 32, & 100 - 1720-22)

--*DNB*, "Trenchard, John"

--*excerpts from *The Craftsman* (Nos. 1, 235, 574 – 1731, 1737)

-- *DNB*, "Francklin, Richard"

--*"Cato" [John Alexander], "An American 'Cato' Defends Criticism of the Government" (NY, Nov. 12 and 19, 1733)

Midterm Paper due Friday, Feb. 24 by 5 pm

Naming and Shaming in the Age of Walpole

Mon., Feb. 27 – *C. R. Kropf, "Libel and Satire in the Eighteenth Century" (1974-75); *Alexander Pope, "The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated" (1733); begin John Gay, *The Beggar's Opera* (1728)

Wed., Mar. 1 – *Beggar's Opera*, ctd.

"Paper Wars" and the Public Good

Mon., Mar. 6 – *David Hume, "Of the Liberty of the Press" (1742); *Pope, *The Dunciad* (1728), I-II

Wed., Mar. 8 – *Pope, 1728 *Dunciad*, III; *excerpts from contemporary responses to the 1728 *Dunciad*; look again at Pope's Satire II.1; *excerpts from the 1743 *Dunciad*, esp. IV

Mar. 13-17 – Spring Break (no class)

Gender Politics and the Question of Social Mobility

Mon., Mar. 20 – *Stephen Duck, "The Thresher's Labour" (1730); *Mary Collier, "The Woman's Labour" (1739); *Thomas Gray, "An Elegy Wrote in a Country Churchyard" (1751) and "The Bard. A Pindaric Ode" (1757); *excerpt from Wheale, *Writing and Society*, Ch. 2

Wed., Mar. 22 – *Mary Leapor, "An Essay on Woman" and "Man the Monarch" (1751); *excerpt from Samuel Richardson, *Pamela, Or Virtue Rewarded* (1740)

Obscenity

Mon., Mar. 27 – *Geoffrey R. Stone, "The History of Obscenity, the British Novel, and the First Amendment" (2013); *excerpts from *Venus in the Cloister* (pub. by Edmund Curll, 1724); begin John Cleland, *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1748)

Wed., Mar. 29 – *Memoirs*, ctd.

The American Context: Rumbblings of Revolution

Mon., Apr. 3 – *Jonathan Mayhew, *A Discourse Concerning the Unlimited Submission and Non-Resistance to the Higher Powers* (Boston, 1750); *John Wilkes, *The North Briton*, No. 45 (1763); Jack Lynch, "Wilkes, Liberty, and Number 45" (2003)

Wed., Apr. 5 – Isaac Kramnick, "Editor's Introduction" to *Common Sense* (1985); Thomas Paine, *Common Sense* (Philadelphia, 1776)

Mon., Apr. 10 – *Common Sense*, ctd.; *J.M. Bumsted, “‘Things in the Womb of Time’: Ideas of American Independence, 1633 to 1763” (1974)

Constitutional Ratification and Its Aftermath

Wed., Apr. 12 – *Noah Webster, “Reply to the Pennsylvania Minority” (1787); *Alexander Hamilton, *Federalist* 84 (1788); *James Madison, “Introduction of the Bill of Rights” (1789); look up “Alien and Sedition Acts” on Wikipedia

Mon., Apr. 17 – *Moses Seixas, “Letter to George Washington” (1790); *George Washington, “Letter to the Hebrew Congregation at Newport” (1790); *Anna Barbauld, *An Address to the Opposers of the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts* (1790)

British Debates on the Slave Trade

Wed., Apr. 19 – *Hannah More, “Slavery, A Poem” (1788); *Robert Southey, “The Sailor, Who Had Served in the Slave Trade” (1799); *Anna Barbauld, “Epistle to William Wilberforce, Esq. on the Rejection of the Bill for Abolishing the Slave Trade” (1791)

Mon., Apr. 24 – Conclusions

Final Paper due Friday, Apr. 28 by 5 pm

Course Policies

Preparation: Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century texts can make for challenging reading, so give yourself adequate preparatory time to grapple with difficult material. You should read the assigned materials at least once before the class meeting; take notes in the margins if it helps you to focus or to locate key passages swiftly; look up unfamiliar terms or historical items in a dictionary or encyclopedia. Make it a goal to come to class with at least one big question to ask. ****Bring hard copies of all texts to class, including scholarly articles.**** [Exceptions: Miller’s background and basic biographical information.]

Attendance: Arriving punctually and being present, alert, and prepared at all class meetings demonstrates respect for our classroom community. I do notice whether you are present or absent, and I will not hesitate to pull you aside—even to penalize your grade—if scarce attendance becomes a problem; however, I have no official attendance policy for graduate classes.

Comportment: It goes without saying that you are expected to treat others in the classroom with civility and respect. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in points being deducted from a student’s final numerical average. **NB: I also ask that you turn off your cellphones and close your computers during class.** While I understand that there can be good reasons to use both of these items, even during the course of an engaged class discussion, it can be tempting to use them for purposes that distract us from

our collective academic goals. I therefore ask that you get in the habit of taking notes with pen or pencil and do what you can to show that you are fully present in class discussions, whether talking out your ideas or actively listening to other participants.

Discussion Board Posts: One of the principal aims of this course is to help you to enter into a dialogue about literature with your peers, who have a lot to teach you (and to learn from you) about the readings at hand. To this end, you are asked to post brief comments in response to each collection of readings. There are few rules for these responses. Talk about what you found interesting in the readings; make a controversial claim; pose a question; articulate your delight, puzzlement, or frustration at some aspect of the assigned readings. Ideally, you will actually take this opportunity to learn from and respond to your classmates and to test out your coolest ideas, and you may even find the germ of a formal paper idea among your responses; at a bare minimum, the conscientious fulfillment of this ongoing assignment will leave you with a log of your thoughts about the course material. Aim for 200 words per post. Please post your reading responses by noon before the class meeting in question. Your prompt completion of this assignment counts as part of your participation grade. Each post that follows the above rules will receive 9 points by default; extremely conscientious posts will receive 10 points. These post grades will be averaged together to give you a “weekly response” grade that will be averaged into your participation grade. You will not receive full credit for late posts (i.e., posts received after 12:00 noon on the day of class). Woefully late posts are likely to receive no credit.

Presentation: You are asked to do one oral presentation during the semester. It should be carefully planned, as explained in the instructions, and carefully limited to **five minutes**. (See separate handout for details.) If you follow all instructions to the letter, you will receive at least a 90 for this assignment, which will count as part of your participation grade (see below). Exceptional presentations will receive up to 100 points.

Assignment Guidelines: Midterm and final papers should follow MLA or Chicago Style format guidelines. For instance, compositions should be double-spaced throughout and printed with one-inch margins; include page numbers, the date, your name and mine, and a title that is neither underlined nor highlighted by boldface type. Please use 12-point Times or Times New Roman font. Include a bibliography.

Evaluation: Your final grades will be calculated as follows:

Class Participation, Presentation, Weekly Responses:	30 %
Midterm Essay:	25 %
Final Essay:	45 %

Please note that any tally or average of your course grade available on Canvas is an estimation, not a record or guarantee of your final grade.

Late work: Late papers will incur penalties of one letter grade (e.g., B → C) for each full day of delayed submission.

Plagiarism: Your written assignments and examinations must be your own work. Academic misconduct will not be tolerated. To ensure that you are aware of what is considered academic misconduct, carefully review the definition and examples provided in Article III, Code of Student Conduct, *Student Handbook*, p. 93. If you have questions, please contact me right away.

University of Alabama in Huntsville

Leah Orr. *Novel Ventures: Fiction and Print Culture in England, 1690-1730*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2017. Pp. x + 336; index. ISBN: 9780-813940137. Hardcover, \$45 (also \$45 as an e-book).

At the conclusion of her broad study of the fiction and print culture in England between 1690 and 1730, Leah Orr asks the “loaded question,” as she terms it: “Did the novel rise?” Obviously, Ian Watt’s *The Rise of the Novel* (1957) hovers around the edges of this study. However, Watt represents not a straw man that Orr is trying to take down but rather an entrenched approach to the study of eighteenth-century prose fiction that purports to show a development of what we call (but can never quite define) the novel. For sixty years, Watt’s work has been debated, praised, attacked, and emulated, thanks to its seductive study of the great “novelists,” Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding. While other studies have expanded or challenged Watt’s legacy, Orr instead rivets our attention to the forty years leading up to Fielding’s and Richardson’s works, studying what was published and at what price and asking who decided what was marketable and who could afford to buy books. These considerations force us to look beyond the printed pages of the “great novels” and to think about the book-selling and book-buying world of the early eighteenth century.

In the first part of her study, Orr takes on various critics’ approaches to trying to define the novel. As she goes through the slippery issues of genre, she refocuses our approach—asking that critics of the fiction of the period look at what sellers marketed rather than at the works that have been canonized, a badly needed realignment of how we approach the study of early fiction. Orr’s aim is clearly stated: to discover what was being bought and to see if and how fiction changed from 1690 to 1730. Her methodology of studying re-issues and new editions of selected works through the period suggests what the booksellers thought would make a profit. To that end, one of the strongest chapters deals with the economics of the book trade and the sellers’ strategies for publishing cheap jest books or chapbooks or tales of adventure to attract the buyer and to make a profit. Orr studies the way that economics drives the market and that the booksellers themselves prepared their offerings based on the cost of paper, ink, overhead, labor, stipends to the authors, and taxes.

An important question related to publishing and popularity is the size of the print run and the price of the individual book. Prices are not easy to determine unless printed on the title page or noted in an advertisement—or inked in by the buyer. A print run is also hard to determine. Certainly the bookseller had to estimate how many copies would sell and at what point there was return on investment, and this balance could determine whether the bookseller would then underwrite a new work or an untested author. To study the fiction published at this time, Orr examined over five hundred separate titles published between 1690 and 1730. That there could be so many works of fiction—and so many now forgotten or ignored works from this period—should itself be a surprise. Orr pioneers in isolating a key time period and attending to works previously dismissed by most critics. Whether anonymous publications, chapbooks, or cheap redactions—they were “fictions,” and they were purchased and probably read. And price was clearly a factor for the seller—and for the buyer.

Orr asks what percentage of all publications in this period could be categorized as fiction, and while acknowledging Paula Backscheider’s low estimate of 1.5%, Orr suggests 2%. Just two in every one hundred works published until 1720 (Orr’s cut-off date for this estimate) could be called “fiction.” Orr found that the words “Novel” or “History” appeared on over half the title pages of these fictions, with others using “letters” or “secret history.” To demonstrate popularity, Orr attends to works that saw at least five reprints within the century and particularly in her specific time frame. Averse to risk, the booksellers favored translations of works already popular in another language, especially French and Spanish, despite religious issues that these translations could raise when fiction of a predominantly Roman Catholic culture was Englished for a predominantly anti-Papist society. However, sex, religion, and power—always controversial—always sell. The booksellers saw a market for the “secret histories” and “letters,” for “novels” and “histories.”

These purveyors of fiction were a small group, and one of the earliest, Richard Bentley, popularized previously published novels in *Modern Novels* in the early 1690s, in his twelve-volume duodecimo reissue of translations and original English fictions. In his collections, not counting “second parts” or continuations of titles published, Bentley brought out close to fifty separate works. Orr pays insufficient attention to the person John Dunton called “novel Bentley” and what he published. Understandably, given her methodology of taking cross-sections of the most re-issued titles every ten years, Orr does little with Behn’s *Love-Letters between a Nobleman and His Sister*, a partly epistolary fiction that some scholars feel comes closest to what subsequently is categorized as a “novel” and one that saw at least a dozen editions and reissues through 1759. However, Orr elsewhere has suggested that this three-part *roman à clef* does not belong in Behn’s canon, a suggestion that still needs to be parsed, but not here.

These are small quibbles compared to the important discussions Orr draws us into. She challenges the development of the English “novel” and asks us to reconsider our previously firm beliefs. She points out that the works most frequently reprinted through the early eighteenth century are not necessarily the works that critics have tagged as part of the development of the novel.

Further, new works, old works, and translations all appeared on the sellers' shelves with little to distinguish old from new, translation from home-grown (140). Thus, the contemporary reader could have had little sense of what twentieth-century critics would call a growth or continuity in the fiction, a linear development.

Orr takes us through several densely packed chapters on foreign translations, on fiction with a purpose, and on fiction for entertainment, while acknowledging some overlapping among the categories. She determines that translated works comprised twenty-five percent of the fiction published in this early period. One such example is the work of the Countess D'Aulnoy, whose influential *contes des fées* and memoirs of various European courts saw many editions well after her death in 1705. Aulnoy is discussed as an exemplar of amorous tales linked to convents, a motif popularized by the Vicomte de Guilleragues's *Five Love-Letters from a Nun to a Cavalier*, which saw constant reprints after its 1678 debut in English, yet it is her fairy tales for which she is still revered. The stories of Scarron were also popular, so much so that a notice is attached to the first issue of Behn's short fiction "Memoirs of the Court of the King of Bantam" in 1698, claiming that Behn imitated the style of "the Celebrated Scarron," the result of a wager. Unfortunately, the attribution of such posthumous pieces published under Behn's name has also been called into question and awaits further study, but this uncertainty does not diminish the recognizable influence of Scarron. The most detailed study of translated fiction is given over to Cervantes's *Don Quixote* and Fénelon's *Telemachus*. The English were the first to embrace the Spanish knight in a translation published while both Shakespeare and Cervantes were still alive, and both Cervantes's wandering knight and Fénelon's wandering son satisfied a growing taste in England for amorous and exotic adventures.

The heart of this study comes in the chapters on fiction with a purpose and fiction for entertainment. Satire fits well into the concept of fiction with a purpose, and Orr is correct to include it in her study, not simply because the early eighteenth-century reader did not make such nice distinctions as we do today but also because satiric writing, even *romans à clef*, entails fiction. While many works are discussed briefly, the two works chosen to highlight political satire are Delarivier Manley's *Secret Memoirs . . . from The New Atalantis* (1709) and John Arbuthnot's comic satire in parts (1712), which later were collected as *The History of John Bull*. This part of Orr's study identifies a category, illustrates it with one or two works, and glosses a handful more. Although this pattern can be sometimes superficial, it reveals a world of publications long ignored in our studies of fiction and its development, publications that deserve more of an in-depth study than Orr has time to do, given her attempt to cover so many works of fiction. Orr rightly spends time on *Pilgrim's Progress*, an adventure story in religious allegory that is essential to this category. In the category of adventurous religious fiction, *Robinson Crusoe* is highlighted to illustrate the way contemporary readers would celebrate the hero's movement to his and Friday's salvation through orthodox Christianity. Yet even by eighteenth-century standards, this work must have been read as a flat-out adventure story and as part of a continuity of taste that can be traced back to Henry Neville's *The Isle of Pines* (1668) and Aphra

Behn's *Oroonoko* (1688) as readers were invited to share in a world they could never on their own experience.

The chapter on fiction for entertainment, non-didactic fiction, covers a broad spectrum of materials read and reread in the early part of the century, from works on crime and on punishment with a focus on prostitution and on pirates, to such categories as travel, amorous fiction, courtships with or without happy endings, among others. Orr makes clear that her categories have fluid parameters and boundary leakage between them, but some of the works discussed as examples are hard to accept in their grouping. For example, *Moll Flanders* (now here no longer attributed to Defoe) can just as easily be read as a repentance fiction, a kind of fiction discussed with *Robinson Crusoe* as a spiritual novel. This kind of fiction was already popular in the late seventeenth century as scaffold literature; granted, the genre was shorter and less well-constructed. So it is hard to divorce vicariously self-indulgent reading of the sins of others from stories of repentance.

Finally, in answer to the loaded question posed at the beginning about a rise of the novel, Orr indicates that the novel "rose" but not quite in the way that critics of the last century might have imagined or appreciated. Yes, there was a Defoe and *Robinson Crusoe*, which with its sequel went through at least fifteen editions throughout the eighteenth century. As Orr points out, adventure stories with a religious conversion made a profitable combination. But with some of the works formerly attributed to Defoe now questioned, Ian Watt's celebration of *Moll Flanders*, a tale of crime and redemption that enjoyed at least five editions in the eighteenth century, is set aside, the book's popularity noted but marginalized as an influential text.

Several points about the book itself should be made. It is well-made, with good paper, a strong binding, and a handsome and appropriate dust jacket. It feels good in the hand. In addition, included are addenda to McBurney's *Check List*, of value to those who pursue the early novel. The bibliography is superb, with a listing of the primary works examined, and the secondary bibliography providing the best of the critical analyses thereof.

Novel Ventures: Fiction and Print Culture in England, 1690-1730 is exhaustive and exhausting. Orr's many charts and graphs command attention and provide clear analyses. While sometimes frustrating in its formulaic approach and broad but porous categories, this study demands that we re-examine our assumptions and biases, that we give full hearing to what clearly the booksellers were issuing with the idea of finding a market and staying solvent. That is one good measure of what was popular, if only with a small group of buyers who were able to buy and to read.

Mary Ann O'Donnell
Manhattan College

Jocelyn Harris. *Satire, Celebrity, and Politics in Jane Austen.* Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press; Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017. Pp. 349; appendices; notes; bibliography; index; illustrations. ISBN-13: 978-1-61148-839-5; hardcover, \$110.00; and 978-1-61448-844-9; paperback, \$49.99. Also available as an e-text, ISBN: 978-1-61148-843-2 (\$47.50).

Jocelyn Harris has studied the influences on Jane Austen's writing for a long time. I remember her paper at the 1981 ASECS meeting in Washington, DC, detailing Austen's transformation and refiguring of characters from Samuel Richardson's *Sir Charles Grandison* to fashion the more complex, nuanced, and sophisticated characters of *Pride and Prejudice*.

Harris's *Jane Austen's Art of Memory* (1989) and *A Revolution Almost beyond Expression: Jane Austen's Persuasion* (2007) expand on this approach by adding contemporary historical and social phenomena to the literary underpinnings of Austen's novels. Her articles "Jane Austen and the Subscription List to *Camilla* (1796)" in *Persuasions On-Line* 35.1 (Winter, 2014), and "Jane Austen and Celebrity Culture: Shakespeare, Dorothy Jordan and Elizabeth Bennet" in *Shakespeare* 6.4 (Dec. 2010) anticipate her most recent study, *Satire, Celebrity, and Politics in Jane Austen*.

This last monograph examines how Austen takes the literary and political celebrities and the scandals and controversies of her time and reworks them into the characters and situations in her novels to create a subtle satire or to improve on the published work of another author. The book jacket and illustrations from such caricaturists as James Gillray and George Cruikshank provide visual examples that complement Harris's arguments.

According to her nephew and biographer, James Edward Austen-Leigh, in *A Memoir of Jane Austen and Other Family Recollections*, Austen apparently led a quiet life and paid little attention to political events of the day (xvii-xviii; 143-44, referencing 71 and 181 in Kathryn Sutherland edition of *Memoir* [2008]). But Harris's research, like that of other scholars, contradicts this image. Chapters 4 and 5 suggest that Austen was not averse to or incapable of satirizing public figures; she had satirized dead royalty in her early 1791 *History of England* (157). The contents of a huge trove of letters destroyed by Austen's sister Cassandra may also contradict the view of Austen as isolated from and uninterested in the outside world (3). For example, Austen's letter to Martha Lloyd, 16 February 1813, declaring her hatred of the Prince Regent, was not reduced to ashes because it was not written to Cassandra but rather to Martha Lloyd, Austen's good friend and posthumous sister-in-law.

What strikes the reader is how Austen's own immediate world seems to intersect intricately with the public world. It is remarkable that there is no record of a meeting between Austen and Frances Burney, given the close-knit community of mutual friends and acquaintances who were well aware of what everyone was doing and saying. An examination of the Austen-Burney connection forms something of a test case to demonstrate the interconnectedness of the two authors that applies to the other celebrities Harris examines.

Cassandra Leigh Cooke is a pivotal figure in this story. She was Jane Austen's mother's cousin, and her husband, Reverend Samuel Cooke, was Jane Austen's godfather for her public christening in 1776 (4). He baptized Frances Burney and Alexandre d'Arblay's son in 1795 (15, 23). The d'Arblays lived in the Cooke neighborhood of Great Bookham from 1793 to 1797 (4). Susanna Burney, Fanny Burney's sister, was a nearby neighbor in Mickleham from 1784-1796 and babysat for the d'Arblays (5). Interestingly or significantly, Harris notes that Susanna Burney does not mention the Cookes in her surviving letters (64, n. 15).

Harris speculates that Susanna Burney and Mrs. Cooke would have shared news, including news of Fanny's life at Court, that was ultimately passed on to Jane Austen by Mrs. Cooke (7, 235, noting Jane's letter to Cassandra Austen, 13/14 June 1814). Harris suggests that Austen draws upon this information when she depicts Fanny Price's place in the Bertram household in *Mansfield Park* as a reflection of Fanny Burney's difficult years in Court under the tyrannical Mrs. Schwellenburg, Mrs. Norris' counterpart (32, 34-35). Harris sees a parallel in the elopement of Henry Crawford and Maria Rushworth (50) to the elopement of Sarah Harriet Burney and her half-brother James to Ireland.

There is not room here to elaborate on the other links Harris establishes with the Cookes, but she does not allow us to forget that rakish George, the Prince Regent and Prince of Wales, later George IV, lived at Kempshot House from 1788 to 1795, only three miles from Steventon rectory; Kempshot was the home of Maria Fitzherbert, George's mistress (173). Mrs. Cooke observed the Prince Regent hunting on her husband's fields (177), and Jane Austen's clergyman brother James knew and hunted with the Prince Regent (172). Harris speculates that John Thorpe and General Tilney in *Northanger Abbey* satirize the profligate and debauched George and his brother William, the Duke of Clarence, later William IV (181).

Austen's brother Henry lived in London around the corner from the prominent actress Dorothy Jordan, mistress of the Duke of Clarence, and mother of his ten children, (239). Though Dorothy Jordan's personal life would suggest that a connection with Elizabeth Bennet in *Pride and Prejudice* is a bit of a stretch, Harris argues that Jordan's physical appearance, dress, lively and unconventional behavior, and the Shakespearean roles she played may have been recalled by Austen when she drew Elizabeth Bennet's character (215-33). Also living in the neighborhood of Henry Austen's London bank was Mrs. Harriet Quentin, another mistress of George, the Prince Regent (235-237). Based on a possible association between Mrs. Cooke's friends, the Lawrell family, and Mrs. Quentin (233-34), Harris again draws what might seem as an unlikely inspiration for Jane Bennet from the "sweet, amiable," Mrs. Quentin (237).

Chapter 3 argues Harris's assertion that Austen's response to reading some popular new novels was to follow up with revisions to her manuscripts "up to the very last moment before publication" (129, 136). Among other topics, Harris analyzes parallel courtship scenes in Maria Edgeworth's successful novel *Patronage* (1814) and *Mansfield Park*, comparing the dilemma of Caroline Percy and Buckhurst Falconer (127) with Sir Thomas

Bertram's insistence on Fanny Price accepting Henry Crawford (129). The result is that *Mansfield Park* is a "more complex version" of Edgeworth's work (108).

Moving to current events, in Chapter 2 Harris exhaustively reviews the conflicting written and pictorial accounts of the death of Captain Cook in Hawaii in 1779. She analyzes the burning question of whether Molesworth Phillips, James and Frances Burney's abusive brother-in-law, was responsible for Cook's death or whether Phillips acted bravely. For the Austen side of the controversy Harris looks at Austen's naval brothers, Francis and Charles, who were students of men who studied under and admired Cook. Harris suggests that Jane Austen disliked Molesworth Phillips for failing to save Cook and for his ill treatment of Susanna Burney, and she explores veiled references to Austen's antipathy toward Phillips in *Mansfield Park* (71-81).

Chapter 7 deals with the widespread interest in abolition and in Africans, particularly Sara Baartman, an African, who was publicly exhibited as a curiosity and whom Austen might have seen on a visit to London (275). Harris suggests that Austen's uncompleted *Sanditon* (1817) may potentially have been a response to "caricatures that purported to show the cash-strapped Duke of Clarence proposing to Saartjie or Sara Baartman" (250-51, 253-54, 260, 262, 282). But we will never know if the fictional Sir Edward Denham expresses any interest in the wealthy West Indian, the half-mulatto Miss Lambe. The novel stops before we ever meet her; except for her fragile health, she is never described, and she and Sir Edward Denham have yet to be introduced to each other.

Harris' bibliography and notes reflect the fact that she is not the first to notice many of these connections. Among the scholars cited are Pat Rogers (2), Marilyn Butler (105), Elaine Bander (117), Christopher Kent (177-78), Tim Fulford (186), and Robert Sales (187). Harris noted in her monograph *Jane Austen's Art of Memory* that Alvin C. Metcalfe's 1970 unpublished dissertation is one of the earliest studies to unearth Austen's debt to other writers in his demonstration of the strong connections between *Sense and Sensibility* and *Sir Charles Grandison* (224-227 in the 2003 paperback edition). But Harris's thoroughness and detailed and intriguing analysis are exceptional. The text is dense. Her sleuth work is incredible and includes compelling evidence. In her effort to support the "possibility of causal connection" (218), Harris recognizes that some of these conclusions may seem tenuous or require more evidence. Qualifying phrases like "mimics," "invokes" (214); "winks," "glances," "gestures" (215); "any connection . . . remains not proven" (239) are prudently inserted.

Did Austen's contemporaries see the veiled resemblances or recognize the objects of her satire? We don't know. Unlike Edgeworth's *Patronage*, *Mansfield Park*, for example, was not professionally reviewed (118). But the twenty-first century student of Jane Austen will never read her in the same way after reflecting on Jocelyn Harris's latest book.

E. Claire Cage. *Unnatural Frenchmen: The Politics of Priestly Celibacy and Marriage, 1720-1815*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015. Pp. x + 238; illustrations; index. ISBN: 9780813937120; hardcover: \$39.50. (E-book, \$39.50.)

When “a priest causes a scandal somewhere, he is sent somewhere else,” noted the journalist Paul-Louis Courier in 1824. He was outraged by the rape, murder, and dismemberment of Marie Gérin at the hands of the predator-priest Antoine Mingrat in 1822. Calling out the Church in its protection of criminals, Courier was one among many who scoffed at the notion of priestly celibacy. E. Claire Cage’s *Unnatural Frenchmen: The Politics of Priestly Celibacy and Marriage, 1720-1815* is a valuable and rich contribution to our understanding of attitudes about clerical celibacy during the long eighteenth century in France. The unique angle here is Cage’s focus on the legalization of clerical marriage in 1791 and the simultaneous criminalization of celibacy by revolutionaries during the Terror. The work investigates the ways in which political, utilitarian, literary, and theological contexts informed not only how celibacy was perceived in French society, but also legislation that freed—or forced—priests to marry. Included in the analysis are the voices of priests themselves, which are positioned alongside those of politicians, medical authorities, legislators, philosophers, journalists, and theologians. While influential figures such as Voltaire, Charles-Maurice de Talleyrand, and Maximilien Robespierre contributed to the debates, it was often the case that lesser-known individuals, including priests themselves, played a role in shaping responses within local communities to discussions about clerical celibacy. Cage also examines police records, petitions to the papal legation after the Concordat of 1801, as well as the marriage and divorce rates of priests, bringing these rich sociological artifacts into conversation with the other documents. In addition, the book includes illustrations from a variety of sources, which enrich the textual narrative.

The reader can easily follow the various points of debate through the lens of the changing political and legislative landscape that Cage explores. Chapter 1 reviews the early Christian theologies of celibacy and its association with ascetic, spiritual practices. Though clerical marriages were highly discouraged, it was not until the First Lateran Council in 1123 that marriage was prohibited for clergy. A counter discourse emerged before and during the Protestant Reformation, hallmarking clerical celibacy as a defining characteristic of the Catholic priesthood in post-Reformation Europe, a notion that is called into question during the French Enlightenment.

Chapter 2 is thus an examination of the various arguments for and against clerical celibacy that emerged during the eighteenth century. Analyzing the debate literature from the 1720s to the 1780s, Cage argues that: “Enlightenment texts grounded arguments against celibacy in scripture, ecclesiastical history, and, most important, the authority of Nature.” The notion that celibacy was unmanly or unhealthy gained traction as the century continued, and was reinforced in anti-Catholic literature satirizing priests, monks, and nuns as sexual deviants engaging in transgressive acts. The depopulation argument—that celibate priests, nuns, and monks were

contributing to a falling birth rate—was used throughout the century, just as others considered celibacy a logical form of population control. Cage positions the voices of *philosophes*, such as Diderot and Voltaire, next to priests' own testimonies, including Charles-Irénée de Castel de Saint-Pierre, and Jacques-Maurice Gaudin, who provided strong support for a married clergy both in public appeals and theological writings. The notion of the married “citizen-priest” elevated his “civic and social roles” in the community, a notion in line with an emerging political framework that positioned marriage and reproduction as a civic duty (33).

Chapter 3 examines the spreading political movement that promoted clerical marriage as a central element of the “cult of Nature” in the early years of the Revolution. Anti-Catholic pamphlet literature depicted celibate priests as disloyal to the nation in their allegiance to the Pope. An act of isolation from society—and by extension the state—celibacy was thought to make priests' integration into the social fabric of the nation impossible. To promote the secularization of the priesthood, the Constitution of 1791 legalized marriage for priests. Thus marriage became a mode of assimilating within a changing society, as well as a symbol of the regeneration of the French nation “de-fanaticized” from Catholicism. Alongside former nuns and monks who married, priests who wed were financially supported by the Assembly; inheritance and succession rights were restored to them, and in 1792 legislation was passed that legalized divorce and remarriage, and transferred the regulatory and legal oversight of marriage from the Church to the state, furthering a secular political agenda.

The peak of the cult of marriage is discussed in Chapter 4. The majority of clerical marriages took place between 1793 and 1794, and celibate hold-outs (which were many) were stigmatized as counter-revolutionaries. Cage provides an interesting analysis of the ways that theatre and satire reinforced the message that civic virtue equaled marriage. As ideas of French citizenship became intertwined with the concept of Nature, familial and reproductive success became an important test of one's patriotism. While some priests embraced the freedom to marry, others arranged marriages for themselves for economic and political strategy. For others, marriage signaled an end to their careers as they embraced a secular world-view. Priests married lovers, widows, divorcées, ex-nuns, domestic servants, and relatives, such as nieces or cousins. Some chose elderly or infirm women to signal that they were marrying under compulsion rather than passion. Priests who refused to conform could face deportation, mandatory conscription into the military, imprisonment, and even execution.

With the Concordat of 1801, Napoleon established a reconciliation between France and the Roman Catholic Church, ushering in a new phase in which the government sought to “erase the marriage of priests from the collective French memory” (129), the subject of Chapter 5. Cardinal Giovanni Battista Caprara supervised the process of papal petition in which nearly 4,000 married monks, nuns, and priests participated in order to be reconciled with the Church. The Caprara Correspondence, which contains these petitions and is held at papal archives, reveals significant details about married priests, and is a highlight of the book. The papal legation gave some dispensations, which

allowed priests to remain married and continue in their parish duties. However, if a priest did not petition to receive a dispensation, his marriage was illegitimate in the eyes of the Church. Marriages were honored according to civil law, but a priest's pastoral functions were not (a distinction made in the Organic Articles passed by the French state in 1802), unless he sought papal reconciliation. Some priests gave up their occupation to remain married, while others left the Church altogether. About 16% of married priests desired to re-enter the priesthood and forgo their marriages. The Caprara Correspondence reveals the "highly varied attitudes" of married priests, even as it provides little information on priests' wives' identities and lives (145). Children of reconciled priests were left with their mothers. Although the issue was supposed to be resolved by the post-Concordat legislation and the papal legation, Cage suggests that the process "set the stage for renewed conflict" around clerical celibacy in nineteenth-century France, which witnessed the re-emergence of the same anti-celibacy arguments promulgated in the century before.

Cage's extensive use of archival materials and analysis of various genres makes for rich reading. I thoroughly enjoyed following the legislative changes that mark the period, and the direct responses of priests as recorded in their official correspondence to the government. Though the book's subject is priests, Cage also discusses nuns and the differences in how they responded to dictates to get married and/or dismantle their celibate communities. Nuns' "exclusion from full participation in the polity," and parish priests' public visibility in the promotion of--or obstruction to--political and social change, gave nuns and priests very different experiences during this time (81). Cage clarifies that nuns were far more resistant to leaving conventual life, marrying at a much smaller rate (600 to 700 nuns married in contrast to around 6,000 clerical marriages).

Because the book is arranged chronologically, there is a repetition in the arguments for and against celibacy, revealing just how frequently ideas were recycled for over a century and beyond. Each chapter employs multiple artifacts and textual sources to examine the time frame under question. Cage makes evident a disconnect between public perceptions of priests and their criminal histories. For example, as discussed in Chapter 2, only rare literary works satirized priests' illicit acts such as sodomy and pederasty, while Parisian police records from the late seventeenth- to the late eighteenth-century reveal that numerous priests were arrested for these crimes; those who were convicted faced punishments such as being defrocked or burned alive. There are also lengthy police records of around 1000 clerical arrests at brothels between 1755 and 1769. In addition to lists of names of priests who were arrested, about two hundred of the police reports were published, not unlike the list of credibly accused priests widely available on the internet today.

The Epilogue does not lose steam, challenging us to consider how the feminization of the Catholic Church in the nineteenth-century temporarily quieted the scandal of priestly marriage, shifting the focus to women religious and their new roles in a post-revolutionary society. Yet, the 1822 ordeal of the sexual assault, murder, and dismemberment of Marie Gérin by the priest Antoine Mingrat provides a chilling example of how priests functioned

“outside of the state, outside of the law [*hors de l’Etat, hors de la loi*],” as phrased by the journalist Paul-Louis Courier in 1824. Courier had followed Mingrat’s story since he had been a parish priest in Saint-Aupre, where he was accused of sexual involvement with a young women, and subsequently was transferred to Saint-Quentin where he moved onto his next victim, Gérin. Although sentenced to death, he evaded capture (it was rumored that the Church was providing him sanctuary), while Gérin’s family felt silenced and discredited by civil and Church authorities. As was the case before and after Mingrat’s crimes, clerical celibacy is today considered a contributing factor to the sexually criminal culture within the Catholic priesthood, a connection briefly explored in the Epilogue.

This study is particularly timely, even more so now than when the book was published, as contemporary discussions about celibacy in the priesthood are clouded by and conflated with the sexual abuse scandals that have undermined public trust, and call into question the authority and legitimacy of not only the Church’s teachings on human sexuality, but the Church hierarchy itself. As of January 2019, following the release of the 2018 grand jury findings of credible sex abuse allegations leveled against over 300 priests in Pennsylvania, there are 20 local, state, or federal investigations underway in the U.S. More recent allegations of priests’ abuse of nuns in France have also made headlines. Indeed, these revelations have initiated a new era of priestly and papal responsibility informed by feminism (the movement #nunstoo is gaining traction), trauma studies, and sheer public outrage. In this way, the book appeals not only to historians and scholars of Catholicism or the French Revolution, but also to a wider public. After finishing Cage’s work—and her careful uncovering of priests’ lives over two hundred years ago—it is difficult to understand how the rule of celibacy in the priesthood endures to present day.

Tonya Moutray
Russell Sage College

Ralph Cohen. *Genre Theory and Historical Change: Theoretical Essays of Ralph Cohen*. Edited by John L. Rowlett. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2017. Pp. xxv + 401; bibliography of Cohen’s Essays; index. ISBN 978-0-8139-4011-3; hardcover, \$65; 978-0-8139-4012-0; e-book, \$65.

Ralph Cohen is best known as the founding and longtime editor of *New Literary History*. He was born in New York City in 1917, the child of immigrants whose language was Yiddish. His father was a dressmaker. He received his BA from CCNY in 1937; served in the army Signal Corps during World War II; and received his Ph.D. from Columbia in 1952. He taught at UCLA (where he was the first Jew in the English department) until he moved to the University of Virginia in 1967. He founded *New Literary History* in 1969 at the age of 52 and edited it through 2008, dying in 2016 on his ninety-ninth birthday.

As of 1969 *New Literary History* was the *only* English-language learned journal devoted to “literary theory” and it has from its inception been enormously influential. Other theory-oriented journals of various sorts followed—*Critical Inquiry*, *Diacritics*, *Clio*, *boundary 2*, *Signs*, *Cultural Critique*, and *Social Text*, for example, but *NLH* was the pioneer, and it remains a top outlet after fifty years. I cannot imagine how anyone familiar with Cohen’s early career and publications could as of 1969 have predicted the trajectory of his next forty years. His first book (*not* derived from his Columbia thesis on David Hume) was *The Art of Discrimination: Thomson’s The Seasons and the Language of Criticism* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964), a massive tome of 529 pages devoted (in the words of the dustjacket) to “a study in the relation between critical theory and practice, taking as its test-case James Thomson’s *The Seasons*.” Cohen traces critical responses to Thomson’s multi-part poem from 1750 to 1950. The book is in essence an analysis of “kinds” of criticism and an evaluation of how well they function when applied to nature poetry.¹ Six years later Cohen followed up, as promised, with *The Unfolding of ‘The Seasons’*, “an explication” published by Routledge in 338 pages in 1970—a thorough, competent exercise in contextualized New Criticism. How Cohen came to conceive *New Literary History*, and how it evolved over the forty years he edited it are matters interestingly explored in some detail in a pair of articles published in 2009.²

Cohen published relatively little of his own work after founding the journal.³ Of the seventy-eight items from 1951 to 2009 listed in Rowlett’s “Bibliography of Ralph Cohen’s Essays” a dozen are book reviews and roughly thirty are scholarly articles or contributions to *Festschriften*, about 20 of them post-1970. Prior to that date Cohen published a sprinkling of articles in venues such as *Modern Language Review*, *Philological Quarterly*, *ELH*, and *Eighteenth-Century Studies*. After 1970 the journals are almost entirely below the top tier (e.g., *Papers on Language and Literature*, *Dispositio*, *Neohelicon*). As Rowlett notes, few of them have been much cited (xvii), a fact that makes the present collection doubly welcome.

Rowlett’s collection comprises twenty pieces, eight of them previously unpublished. Ten were delivered orally, of which seven are published here for the first time. Half constitute Part I (“Literary Theory as Genre Theory”) and half Part II (“Literary Change as Generic History”). Cohen almost always supplies an explicit focal question. As Rowlett says in his “Introduction,” Cohen’s aims can be “predominantly descriptive, explanatory, interpretative, oppositional, or foundational” (xix). His articles display “sensitivity, a theoretical imagination—and yet an unmistakable rigor.” They are “jargon-free and plainly expressed” (xviii). The tone is “patient” and “modest,” “never combative, insulting, or demeaning” (xx).⁴ They are indeed “respectful and thoughtful.” Some examples. In “On the Interrelations of Eighteenth-Century Literary Forms” (1974) he argues against the idea that they were “pure or rigid” (30; he is absolutely right, but this was not well understood at that time). In “The Origins of a Genre: Descriptive Poetry” he inquires how “literary works relate to one another diachronically or synchronically” (36). In “Do Postmodern Genres Exist?” he suggests that they do, and that genre can be

“evaluative,” or “educative,” or “evolutionary,” or a “system of communication,” or “ideological” (108).

In “Genre Theory, Literary History, and Historical Change” he argues that genre can reveal “a historical process that provides a valuable, practical, and theoretical understanding of the changes, gaps, incompletions, and transformations that take place in the writing of literary history” (147). He concludes this piece by saying, “We need a new literary history, and I believe that a genre theory can provide it” (167). “What are Genres?” considers the concept broadly, pointing to “history paintings, portrait paintings, abstract paintings” as well as to “kinds of architecture and music genres” (170).

“Change” in many manifestations fascinates Cohen, who passionately wanted not only to map and describe change but to identify the causal factors that drive it. I admit to some skepticism here. Granted, for example, the boom in Carolean sex comedy in the 1670s pretty clearly reflects the libertinism of Charles II’s court circle. Likewise, the Licensing Act of 1737 imposing censorship and restricting the London patent theatres to two unquestionably affects what could be shown on stage, and as the population expanded Covent Garden and Drury Lane quadrupled in size, which had a major impact on the *kinds* of plays that could be effectively staged in them. But Laurence Sterne has a substantial long-term influence on the writing of fiction. If he had died at sixteen, would *Tristram Shandy* have been written by someone else? Trends in generic evolution sometimes connect clearly and plausibly to public events or spectacular successes—but quite often they do not.

Cohen is admirably catholic, ready to see the best in anything he responds to or reviews. The enormously varied contents of *New Literary History* are potent testimony to the breadth of his interests and sensibility. By no means, however, is he unjudgmental. He has fundamental objections to purely text explicative New Criticism. He says bluntly at the outset of “Historical Knowledge and Literary Understanding” (1978) that “My argument shall be that the historical study of literature is a necessary condition for any literary analysis. . . . A ‘literary’ work . . . is a member of at least three historical classes and the object of investigation of a fourth. First, every literary work is a form or genre.” Second, each work “is part of a writer’s total work, his oeuvre.” Third, it is “part of the order of all other literary and verbal works synchronous with it.” Fourth, the work is part of “a transaction between it and the reader” (221-223). He finds things to admire in classic New Criticism, but he is decidedly contextualist in his approach, though fully alive to the possible impact of an individual’s birth characteristics and upbringing. As he notes in “Generating Literary Histories” (1993), Derrida was an “Algerian Jew,” and Henry Louis Gates is Black—and this matters quite a lot to their views and values (358-359).

About “New Historicism” Cohen is decidedly skeptical (as I am). “The New Historicists are themselves responding to a historical moment of dissention, disaffection, deconstruction in our society and in our discipline” (362). He certainly recognizes the decenteredness of that movement, if one can call it that. “Some New Historicists see texts as emphasizing ‘the possibilities of subversion of the dominant ideology’; others emphasize the hegemonic capacity of the dominant ideology to contain and control subversive moves....

Some New Historicists derive their views of history from Foucault's studies of power. Others derive their views of contradictions within a text from Derrida" (364). Some, he notes, believe in class struggle, but others do not. I agree with Cohen that most New Historicists' views were heavily influenced by their own ideological commitments, which tends to have a very distortive effect on their scholarly and critical arguments. One of Cohen's great virtues is broadmindedness. In his rather wry "Interpreting Interpretations" (1988—first published here) he observes that "the obvious conclusion" to be "drawn from this assemblage of interpretations is that we need to accept pluralism" (339). Cohen is certainly opinionated, but admirably undogmatic.

How to assess *Genre Theory and Historical Change*? It is not, obviously, a "book." It is twenty fairly disparate, mostly occasional articles and talks written over a period of some thirty-five years. The pieces share concern with "genre" and "historical change." All are thoughtful and provocative, certainly well worth reading and pondering. So far as I am aware, Cohen never seriously attempted to draw on these materials to forge out of them the basis for a cohesive and directed book attempting to demonstrate how generic theory and analysis can help us comprehend and "explain" literary "change" over time. I am seriously dubious as to the feasibility of such a venture, but that does not detract from the force and cogency of these individual pieces. Ralph Cohen was, as I can testify from personal acquaintance long ago, a genuinely good man, a deeply and widely learned scholar, and a great editor of a radically innovative and lastingly important learned journal. His work absolutely remains worth reading.⁵

Robert D. Hume
Penn State University, University Park

Notes

1. In the later 1960s when I was a student many eighteenth-century scholars believed that *The Art of Discrimination* would be a groundbreaking enterprise and one of the major books of our time. Curt Zimansky's review in the "PQ Bibliography" (July 1965) is glowing, and concludes, "This study apparently so specialized, is a prolegomenon to any future history of English criticism." Crystal balls are sometimes clouded.

2. Ralph Cohen, "Notes for a History of *New Literary History*," *New Literary History*, 40.4 (2009), A1-A28. "History and Change: An Interview with Ralph Cohen [by Jeffrey J. Williams]," *New Literary History*, 40.4 (2009), 919-943. As an interim report, Cohen's "The Aims and Roles of *New Literary History*," *Yearbook of English Studies*, 16 (1986), 177-187, is of some interest.

3. Rowlett informs us that "Some forty essays, all deserving of collection eventually, remain unpublished" (ix), though unfortunately he gives no hint of their subjects or the whereabouts of the manuscripts. Rowlett's Bibliography is unhelpful about Cohen's edited collections (and does not bother to list his books), but does at least include his important reviews for the "PQ Bibliography," which are oddly omitted from ABELL, where the "Ralph

Cohen” entry lists 55 items, of which 12 are by Ralph Alan Cohen, a Renaissance scholar born in 1947.

4. This is true even in decidedly negative reviews (not published here), for example in his account of Wesley Morris, *Toward a New Historicism* (Princeton, 1972) in *Virginia Quarterly Review*, 49 (1973), 157-160. I greatly admire his very fair and balanced critique of James Engell, *The Creative Imagination: Enlightenment to Romanticism* (Harvard University Press, 1981) in *Criticism*, 24.2 (1982), 174-180. His magisterial account of M. H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953) in some 1600 words in *Philological Quarterly*, 33 (1954), 241-243, is a model of its kind—very fair, and always polite, but blunt about conceptual shortcomings.

5. I should not fail to call attention to four substantial, focused collections of pieces by divers hands edited by Cohen. *New Directions in Literary History* (Johns Hopkins, 1974) collects thirteen articles from the early volumes of *NLH*. *Studies in Eighteenth-Century British Art and Aesthetics* (University of California University Press, 1985) collects eight pieces given as talks at UCLA during Cohen’s year as Clark Library Professor, plus his meaty Introduction. *The Future of Literary Theory* (Routledge, 1989) collects twenty-two original pieces solicited for the project. *Studies in Historical Change* (University Press of Virginia, 1992) reprints eight items from *NLH*, plus five new pieces and Cohen’s introduction.

Jonathan Swift and Esther Johnson. *Jonathan Swift’s Word-Book: A Vocabulary Compiled for Esther Johnson and Copied in Her Own Hand.*

Edited by A. C. Elias Jr. and John Irwin Fischer, continued [completed with notes and introduction] by Panthea Reid. Preface by Ann Cline Kelly. Newark: University of Delaware Press; Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017. Pp. xxxvi + 221 + 4 leaves of colored plates with 12 illustrations inserted after p. 142; bibliography; index. ISBN: 978-1-61149-655-0. Hardcover, \$95. (Available as an electronic book.)

This book is the fruition of an investment that A. C. Elias, Jr., made at a Sotheby’s auction on 22 June 1976, acquiring the “Word-Book” manuscript in Esther Johnson’s (Stella’s) hand with her and Swift’s later corrections. The 76-page octavo MS was later bound, presumably by Elizabeth Secan, who received it from Swift with the notation “This is all in our late Friends own hand.” After working toward an edition (transcribing and analyzing the MS), and while dying of cancer, Elias, bequeathed it with many Swift books to Trinity College Dublin (catalogued as MS 11324), and secured his friend John Irwin Fischer’s promise to complete the edition, passing on to him photocopies, notes, and other editorial materials. Fischer pushed forward the project with further study prior to his death in 2015. Fortunately, his wife, Panthea Reid, long engaged with Fischer’s work on Swift despite her own scholarship (such as biographies of Faulkner and Woolf), “continued” the project, editing the editors’ edition, and saw it through publication by the

University of Delaware Press. Delaware's former Director, Donald C. Mell, a Swift scholar and friend of Elias and Fischer, made sure the press took all the necessary pains to produce a fine edition, and colleagues at the Ehrenpreis Centre supplied portraits to illustrate the cover. Reid gets high marks for thinking through the reader's experience in the book. She provided notes and cross references (her inserted notes are usually in brackets and identified as hers), and she completed the documentation for the essays and then indexed the volume.

The *Word-Book* itself has "1947 separate entries, some of them compound or dual, representing 2046 different words, depending on how cognates are counted," with most deriving from Latin and Greek roots (62). All but 27 words have definitions, and these tend to me short ("few are more than five words long," xxi). Some words appear more than once under variant spellings. Esther Johnson produced this fair copy either from an earlier MS booklet by Swift and/or herself or from a stack of slips with individual words and definitions. She was careful in producing the fair copy (see Reid's description p. xx). Swift maintained a book of words and definition through his life, in part for tutoring other women besides Johnson; one reaching to the letter N, now lost, was described by Sir Walter Scott (the editors compare Johnson's *Word-Book* to it). Johnson did make some mistakes as in misspelling words or conflating two adjacent definitions. Afterwards corrections were made in her and Swift's hands, and Swift added more words "squeezed in at ten different places" (62). Elias was "convinced, Swift compiled the *Word-Book* piecemeal over the years for Johnson as a teaching tool, and at least partly as an outgrowth of her directed reading" (63). His conclusion was based on the words defined and on the nature and sources of definitions drawn from at least eight dictionaries, four heavily relied on, none in Swift's library's inventories, and presumed to have been at diverse locations over time (64-70). There are groups of words from the *Book of Common Prayer* (concerning confirmation in the church, which Elias thought dated to Stella's confirmation in the 1690s), Swift's *A Tale of a Tub* and related writings, Swift's odes, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Sir William Temple's writings, and Sir Thomas Browne's *Pseudodoxia Epidemica, or Vulgar Errors* (67-70). Elias makes further observations about Swift's approach to dictionary-making (he tends to lump rather than dissect meanings and his meanings tend to be modern relative to others' in the period, 71-72).

The *Word-Book* as transcribed by Johnson and corrected by herself and Swift is offered on pp. 77-142, in a text transcribed by Elias. Thereafter are inserted eight pages with twelve illustrations (most in color) of the *Word-Book*. Before and after it come seven introductory essays, Reid's textual note, and six appendices. The first chapter, Reid's "Background," introduces the project and argues the value of the *Word-Book* to students of the English language, of Swift's and Johnson's lives, and of Swift's works. Reid advances many points later developed by Fischer and Elias about the manuscript, its creation, the lives and relation of Johnson and Swift. She shares Fischer's inclination to psychoanalyze Johnson's and Swift's relations, perceiving a shift in Swift's attitude about 1713, when he became Dean and began his long life in Dublin near Johnson and her companion Rebecca Dingley. Reid and

Fischer at greater length sympathetically conjecture how Johnson related to Swift, specifically, how she likely felt pain and irritation when her carefully written *Word-Book* was corrected by Swift. There follows Fischer's account of his involvement and the materials supplied by Elias. Fischer advances two disagreements with Elias's views, first Elias's dating of the MS to 1713-14 (Fischer here and repeatedly claims 1710) and, secondly, Elias's not including a particular dictionary among those Swift consulted.

Ann Cline Kelly's short Preface joins Reid's essay in extolling the value of the *Word-Book* for diverse studies. She provides a helpful precis of the four introductory essays by Fischer and Elias: three by Fischer: "'But Who Shall Arbitrate on Stella's Hand'" (Harold Williams's query)--a provenance study largely, printed in *Reading Swift*, 2013, there described as being the introductory chapter that it is; "Pygmalion Reversed: Joined in Obscurity" and "'Our late Friend'" (both focused on Johnson, on the little evidence of her writing, life, and relations with Swift, the second ending with the case for believing Elizabeth Sican's claim that Johnson and Swift were secretly married); and Elias's "Swift the Lexicographer: His 'Explanation of Difficult English Words' Rediscovered" (delivered in the 2000 at the Fourth Münster Symposium on Swift, which makes descriptive and interpretive points included in this review's second paragraph--Elias is more focused on the *Word-Book* as a dictionary).

Now the appendices: Appendix A lists MSS in Esther Johnson's handwriting and contains Fischer's in-depth description of Esther's hand, early on very similar to her "writing master" Swift's hand, with Fischer disagreeing with Abigail Williams (editor of the Cambridge edition of the *Journal to Stella*) about the relative similarity of Johnson's and Rebecca Dingley's hands to Swift's. Then Appendix B treats MSS in Esther's or Rebecca Dingley's hand—in both there is great attention to the providence of the documents, which most will skim or skip. Also Fischer's are Appendix C on two poems sometimes attributed to Johnson in Matthew Concanen's *Miscellaneous Poems* (1724), offering a fruitful examination of the poems by or potentially by Swift's circle in the volume (on its pp. 137-243), leading with Fischer's characteristic rigor to doubt that "Jealousy" and "By the Same" can be attributed to her; and Appendix F with Fischer's case that Elias should have included Adam Littleton's 1684 English/Latin, Latin/English dictionary among his list of possible dictionary sources for Swift's definitions. Appendices D and E offer Elias's preparatory research to editing the *Word-Book*: "A Checklist of Early English Dictionaries" and "Sample Entries from the *Word-Book* Compared with other Contemporary Dictionaries."

In conclusion, the book provides us with a hitherto unpublished addition to a major author's canon, shedding more light on Swift's life-long preoccupation with language. The definitions in the manuscript are relevant to the meanings of Swift's literary works. The manuscript and the thoroughly researched essays and notes surrounding it offer much new information about Swift and his circle, especially about Swift and his relations with Johnson, one of the central curiosities in Swift studies, suggesting much about his character, and there is new information about other members of the circle, including Patrick Delany and Elizabeth Sican and her family. And finally the *Word-Book*

is of value to the historical study of the English language itself, the use of dictionaries, and women's education. The scholarship is up-to-date, engaging the recent volumes of the Cambridge edition of Swift and of Eugene Hammond's biography. Just as anything Swift wrote belongs in print, the same may be said of Elias's scholarly work, and Fischer was also a meticulous Swift scholar who never rushed or cut corners. Lastly, I would note that the book has a certain compelling quality due to its unusual history as the labors of three individuals (much as the word-book itself does as a collaboration over time). The multiple perspectives where Elias and Fischer do not agree prepare the book for the scholarly engagement that is sure to follow its publication.

James E. May
Lancaster, Pennsylvania

Samuel Johnson. *Johnson on Demand: Reviews, Prefaces, and Ghost-Writings*. Volume 20 of *The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson* [23 volumes (1958-2018)]. General Editor, Robert DeMaria, Jr. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018. Pp. xxxviii + 632; index. ISBN: 978-030022828-1. Hardcover, \$125.00.

The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson was officially launched in 1955; the first volume, *Diaries, Prayers, and Annals*, appeared in 1958. Despite early expressions of optimism, the set was not completed until six decades later. This span may be said to roughly correspond to the length of Johnson's writing career, from his earliest publication, the *Messiah* in *Husbands' 1731 Miscellany*, to the first collected edition of his *Works* in 1787. While this protracted length of time has generated irritable grouching from impatient scholars, the release of the final volume is certainly cause for celebration.¹

Gratitude for this celebration are due to general editor Robert DeMaria, Jr. While the *Yale Edition* is a collaborative, inter-generational project, it is his labors over the past decade that have brought it to completion. Apart from his own contribution, volume 18 (co-edited with Gwin Kolb), DeMaria has performed the melancholy task of inheriting volumes 21-23, and 19-20, the former due to the death of long-time general editor John Middendorf (to whom he plangently dedicates *Johnson on Demand*) and the latter due to the death of the series' most recent bibliographer, O M Brack, Jr. Volume 19, *Biographical Writings*, and the present volume were particularly tricky, given the less-than-complete state of Brack's materials and their dispersal over multiple decades and varying versions of computer program files. Despite these challenges, DeMaria has skillfully brought the ship home to port. Johnsonians and eighteenth-century scholars can now usefully cross-reference connections amongst texts across Johnson's oeuvre with relative ease. Such navigations are expedited by the existence of a searchable digital version of

the edition, happily available without cost to all: <<http://www.yalejohnson.com/frontend/node/1>>.

As DeMaria notes in his preface, *Johnson on Demand*—containing as it does school exercises, advertisements, proposals, occasional letters, appeals and addresses, dedications, prefaces, reviews, and ghost-writings—is easily the most heterogeneous one in the series. But, as the title suggests, what threads the whole book together is that “Johnson wrote these pieces for others or as parts of the planning or aspects of the reception of others’ works” (x). Items included range from the admittedly minor, such as the one-sentence Advertisement for the School at Edial (1736), the idiosyncratic “Jests of Hierocles” (1741), the important essays on the “Origin and Importance of Small Tracts and Fugitive Pieces” (1744) and “Of the Duty of a *Journalist*” (1758), the collected Lauder and Dodd materials—these last two framing Johnson’s involvement in notable public controversies,—to the final item, the most recent admission to the canon, “On the Character and Duty of an Academick” (1793). Curiosities luxuriate within these pages. We find, for example, in the Preface to Rolt’s *Dictionary*, Johnson’s most sustained engagement with business and trade; in the *Account* he composed for Zachariah Williams we discover him engrossed in a theory for ascertaining the longitude at sea—something crucial to eighteenth-century navigation. His literary interests are not neglected: we discover here a 1759 advertisement for a new edition of *Pilgrim’s Progress*—a book of which Johnson once remarked, “was there ever yet any thing written by mere man that was wished longer by its readers?”² *Johnson on Demand* also contains many items that supplement major writings found elsewhere: “The Signification of Words How Varied” can profitably be collated with the *Dictionary* materials, while the Lauder papers illuminate the 1779 Life of Milton. While many of the works presented here offer more authoritative texts of texts previously available in Allen T. Hazen’s 1937 *Prefaces and Dedications* and volumes five and six of the long-standard (but textually unreliable) 1825 Oxford, much is here printed for the first time or hitherto available only in privately-printed and otherwise obscure formats. In the following review, I will not endeavor to account for all of the numerous texts included in *Johnson on Demand*, but only a representative sample that offers the reader a sense of the volume’s accomplishment.

The book commences with eight pieces dealing with education: six schoolboy exercises, Schemes for the Classes of a Grammar School, and the Edial Advertisement. The first bundle reflects upon Johnson’s student experiences, the last two upon his perspective as a teacher. Education was crucial to Johnson’s intellectual outlook—as he says in the 1748 Preface to the *Preceptor*, found later in the volume, “The importance of education is a point so generally understood and confessed, that it would be of little use to attempt any new proof or illustration of its necessity and advantages” (p. 170). These initial offerings may be fruitfully collated with Johnson’s remembrances of his early schooling in *Diaries, Prayers, and Annals*, as well as such mature discussions found in the “Life of Milton” and *Boswell’s Life of Johnson*.

While the schoolboy papers are of minor status, they contain things of undeniable interest. In the first Latin exercise, Audiet Pugnans, the editors

observe that Johnson's "sub undis genus mortale obruere cogeretur" is perhaps a conflation of Ovid's *Ex Ponto* 3.6.29 and *Metamorphoses* 1:260. Other such possibilities remain unexplored. For example, his "avaritia adeo est insatiabilis" from the same piece might very well recall "Avaritia pecuniae ... insatiabilis est" from Sallust's *De conjuratione Catilinae*, 11:3. If so, it is notable to observe his early acquaintance with what would become a favorite author. Johnson alludes to Sallust in *Rambler* 60, 64, *Adventurer* 99, and Sermon 1; he incorporates the passage cited in *Rambler* 60 into 4.8.2-7 of his play, *Irene*. That he translated the entire book the year before he died (chapters 27-48 survive and are printed here, at pp. 584-606) would then constitute a cyclical return to his scholarly origins. These youthful themes thus should be more thoroughly canvassed by scholars with a background in classics for similar appropriations, given that they likely contain further seeds that would exfoliate in later, more significant writings.³ It is certainly true that the exercises contain elements portending Johnson's later interest in Juvenal's 10th satire (the basis of his poetic masterpiece, *The Vanity of Human Wishes*), Macrobius' *Saturnalia* (from which he drew the famous portrait of the scholar in chapter eight of *Rasselas*), as well as his later, more fully developed anti-imperialist views. The child is father to the man.

The headnotes and editorial annotation contextualize these themes; however, they may be supplemented. For example, the sentence "In early times the Romans made no law against parricide, since they thought indeed that no one would be so wicked as to dip his hands in a father's blood, and for this crime, when committed by someone, they devised the heaviest of punishments," from *Bonae leges ex malis*, is appropriately glossed by a cross reference to *Rambler* 148: "It was for a long time imagined by the Romans, that no son could be the murderer of his father, and they had therefore no punishment appropriated to parricide" (*Yale Works*, 5:23). Also worth noting, is this cross reference, not mentioned by the editors, from Sermon 20:

This is a degree of guilt against which it might seem, at the first view, superfluous to preach, because it might be thought impossible that it should ever be committed; as, in ancient states, no punishment was decreed for the murderer of his father, because it was imagined to be a crime not incident to human nature. But experience taught them, and teaches us, that wickedness may swell beyond imagination, and that there are no limits to the madness of impiety" (*Yale Works*, 14:224).

Likewise, the sentiment that "To do good to a villain is as dangerous to do harm to a good man" provides an illuminating precedent for Johnson's later avowed hostility to David Hume:

"When a man voluntarily engages in an important controversy, he is to do all he can to lessen his antagonist, because authority from personal respect has much weight with most people, and often more than reasoning. If my antagonist writes bad language, though that may not be essential to the question, I will attack him for his bad language."

ADAMS: "You would not jostle a chimney-sweeper." JOHNSON: "Yes, Sir, if it were necessary to jostle him *down*."⁴

And for the remark "The first physicians were related to the gods, and temples were built in their honor," from *Quis enim virtutem*, it would be helpful for some readers to be informed that this is most likely a reference to Asklepios (although in Greek mythology Maleatas and Amphiaros are also held as divine healers), son of Apollo, to whom temples were erected in the healing cities of Epidauros, Kos, Lebena and the Tiberine Island in Rome. Of course, each editor must make his or her own decisions as to what to include and exclude: perhaps financial considerations dictated curtailment of a fuller flow of annotative communication.

For a more mature display of Johnson's views on education, consultation of Preface to *The Preceptor* is requisite. This undeservedly neglected work demands closer scrutiny: if it is an occasional piece necessarily restricted by the demands of the larger work to which it is harnessed, the Preface contains some marvelous nuggets of wisdom and memorable examples of stylistic finesse. For example, Johnson's unflinching allegiance to the truth⁵ is memorably and succinctly captured with this rejoinder to self-deception and remission of duty: "Against this cause of error there is no provision to be made, otherwise than by inculcating the value of truth, and the necessity of conquering the passions" (185). The indissoluble connection between education and morality is perhaps nowhere better expressed than here:

Ethics or morality, therefore, is one of the studies which ought to begin with the first glimpse of reason, and only end with life itself. Other acquisitions are merely temporary benefits, except as they contribute to illustrate the knowledge, and confirm the practice of morality and piety, which extend their influence beyond the grave, and increase our happiness through endless duration. (187)

Moreover, his remark "*Rhetoric and poetry* supply life with its highest intellectual pleasures" (184) memorably condenses his more extensive panegyric on the poet in chapter ten of *Rasselas*. Johnson's attention to the rudiments of the education of youth demonstrated in the Preface to *The Preceptor* deftly exemplifies the praise he once bestowed upon one of his own heroes, Isaac Watts: "Every man, acquainted with the common principles of human action, will look with veneration on the writer who is at one time combating Locke, and at another making a catechism for children in their fourth year" (*Yale Works*, 23:1303).

Donald J. Greene has hazarded the claim that "a good case could be made for thinking of Johnson primarily as a journalist."⁶ Johnson wrote for journals and magazines for much of his life; during the decades before he was awarded the 1762 pension, such work was often his primary source of income. He applied his quill in the service of the *Gentleman's Magazine* (for which he also served as editor for a time), *Universal Chronical*, *London Chronical*, *Public Ledger*, *Universal Visiter*, and his own short-lived *Literary Magazine*; the *Rambler*, *Idler*, and *Adventurer* papers were often reprinted in some of

these and other journals. Thus, when he came to write “Of the Duty of a *Journalist*” in 1758 (for the *Universal Chronical*) he had ample immediate experience from which to draw. This brief theoretical exposition is principally driven by Johnson’s concern for the ethical probity of the journalist and his or her adherence to the truth. A few passages merit reproduction here. He offers early on his definition of the journalist and an enumeration of journalistic obligations:

A journalist is an historian, not indeed of the highest class, nor of the number of those whose works bestow immortality upon others or themselves; yet, like other historians, he distributes for a time reputation or infamy, regulates the opinion of the week, raises hopes and terrors, inflames or allays the violence of the people. He ought therefore to consider himself as subject at least to the first law of history, the obligation to tell truth. * * * All that he can do is to consider attentively, and determine impartially, to admit no falsehoods by design, and to retract those which he shall have adopted by mistake. (406)

Having established the ideal to which the journalist should aspire, Johnson moves on to note—and lash out at—deviations from this ideal:

Accounts are sometimes published of robberies and murders which never were committed, mens (*sic*) minds are terrified with fictitious dangers, the public indignation is raised, and the government of our country depreciated and contemned. These scriblers, who give false alarms, ought to be taught, by some public animadversion, that to relate crimes is to teach them, and that as most men are content to follow the herd, and to be like their neighbours, nothing contributes more to the frequency of wickedness, than the representation of it as already frequent. (407)

The acuity of Johnson’s observation that “most men are content to follow the herd” and that the purveyors of lies in the media contaminate the public good has particular force in our present age of “fake news,” when we find ourselves awash in a culture where the highest elected official in the land fabricates lies on average fifteen times a day.⁷

Grouped with “Of the Duty of a *Journalist*” are three essays, published in the *Public Ledger* in December 1760. These are brief, informal, and playful—what Johnson elsewhere refers to, in the preface to the *Literary Magazine*, as “the pleasing amusements of harmless wit” (p. 266)—and they may be read as additions to the *Idler* series Johnson wrote earlier that year. While not profound, they are worth perusal and at times contain matter of substance and stylistic verve. For example, the first offers insight into Johnson’s conception of his audience. His is not a hopeful expectation:

A book is seldom taken up with very kind intentions: few wish to be pleased, and much fewer wish to be taught. The general design of readers is to exert the acuteness of remark, or to display the superiority of contempt. *** A writer therefore does not engage his readers on equal

terms: he presents himself to their notice, but they may neglect him without hazard. The most laboured performance of wit and learning is as easily thrown into the fire, as a taylor's bill.⁸ (416)

The second offers speculative ruminations upon the coronation of George III that would take place the following year.⁹ The prospect of George's coronation affords Johnson to display one of his typically melancholy observations upon the human mind:

No human performance can rise up to human ideas. Grandeur is less grand, and finery less fine, than it is painted by the fancy. And such is the difference between hope and possession; that, to a great part of the spectators, the show will cease as soon as it appears. (418)

The last essay is an epistle from "a great lover of building and demolishing" (418), Tom Stucco, who devotes his time to inciting people to ruin themselves by erecting expensive and unnecessary buildings. Stucco thus joins Ned Drugget, Jack Whirler, Dick Minim, Dick Shifter, and Sam Softly in the gallery of humorously satiric characters of Johnson's imaginary universe.

"Reflections on the Present State of Literature" may likewise be classed with the *jeux d'esprit* scattered throughout the *Idler*. Starting with sober tone of deliberation, this "little dissertation" weighs the pros and cons of "literature"—a term exhibiting a more elastic usage in the eighteenth century than that found today: in his *Dictionary*, Johnson defines "literature" as "learning; skill in letters" and "letters" as "learning"; the word embraces history, philosophy, and related genres of the humanities, as well as creative writing. This initial sobriety allows him to assert the importance of *studia humanitatis*:

though they may sometimes incommode us, yet human life would scarcely rise, without them, above the common existence of animal nature: we might indeed breathe and eat in universal ignorance, but must want all that gives pleasure or security, all the embellishments and delights, and most of the conveniencies and comforts of our present condition. Literature is a kind of intellectual light, which, like the light of the sun, may sometimes enable us to see what we do not like; but who would wish to escape unpleasing objects, by condemning himself to perpetual darkness? (254)

Soon after, however, he modulates into apparent humor, when considering the unfortunate condition of writers:

If I were to form an adage of misery, or fix the lowest point to which humanity could fall, I should be tempted to name the life of an author. Many universal comparisons there are by which misery is expressed. We talk of a man teased like a bear at the stake, tormented like a toad under a harrow; or hunted like a dog with a stick at his tail; all these are indeed states of uneasiness, but what are they to the life of an author! of an

author worried by critics, tormented by his bookseller, and hunted by his creditors. (258)

Finding that “the number of authors is disproportionate to the maintenance which the public seems willing to assign them” (259), Johnson proposes ironic remedies to reduce the number, such as taxing those who employ or harbor them a groat, or impressing them into military service.

If humor defines the surface tone of the piece, a deeper darkness glints beneath, one found, for example, in the passage

that there is neither praise nor meat for all who write, is apparent from this; that, like wolves in long winters, they are forced to prey on one another. The *Reviewers* and *Critical Reviewers*, the *Remarkers* and *Examiners*, can satisfy their hunger only by devouring their brethren. I am far from imagining that they are naturally more ravenous or blood-thirsty than those on whom they fall with so much violence and fury; but they are hungry, and hunger must be satisfied; and these savages, when their bellies are full, will fawn on those whom they now bite. (259)

This recalls one written a few years earlier, from *Rambler* 143:

Among the innumerable practices by which interest or envy have taught those who live upon literary fame to disturb each other at their airy banquets, one of the most common is the charge of plagiarism. When the excellence of a new composition can no longer be contested, and malice is compelled to give way to the unanimity of applause, there is yet this one expedient to be tried, by which the author may be degraded, though his work be revered; and the excellence which we cannot obscure, may be set at such a distance as not to overpower our fainter lustre. (*Yale Works*, 4:394)

The savage competition found among authors seeking literary fame—if not outright physical survival—marks both, punctuated by operative metaphors of cannibalism and bestiality. We find in both passages Johnson’s darkly harsh view of the literary landscape, a view formed indeed by direct experience: he had been arrested for debt only a month before the “Present Reflections” was published. If in a more sanguine mood he could write “the chief glory of every people arises from its authours” (*Yale Works*, 18:109), the grim assessment of his profession as “the lowest point to which humanity could fall” operates with a compellingly countervailing force. It is no wonder, then, that the coldly relentless mid-century literary market forces led him to conclude the essay with the pointed observation that, if the hypothetically impressed “authors and authoresses” “should be destroyed in war, we shall lose only those ... whom ... nobody will miss” (262).

A substantial portion of *Johnson on Demand* is devoted to reviews.¹⁰ Most of those appearing in *Johnson on Demand* are drawn from the *Literary Magazine*, a periodical that Johnson was closely associated with during its brief life in 1756-57. The Yale editors include twenty-seven of these, reprinted

either in part or wholly (at times, lengthy citations from the text examined are omitted), ranging across a wide spectrum of topics: literary, scientific, technological, geographic, historical, economic, political, travel, religious, and medical—so wide were Johnson’s intellectual interests.

Often, the reviews consist of extended summaries and quotation of representative extracts. Such specimens possess their own value, exhibiting as they do Johnson’s reading—as he remarked in the *Miscellaneous Observations on the Tragedy of Macbeth*, “In order to make a true estimate of the abilities and merit of a writer, it is always necessary to examine the genius of his age, and the opinions of his contemporaries” (*Yale Works*, 7:3). Of greater value, however, are those displaying what he calls “naked criticism” (p. 281): Johnson’s personal analysis and evaluation. We find such, for example, in his review of Joseph Warton’s *Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope*, where he interleaves his assessment of Warton’s book with his own critical aperçus. There he defends Pope’s inclusion of the stag chase in *Windsor Forest*, and he identifies what he considers the best verse in the St. Cecilia Day Ode: “Transported demigods flood round, / And men grew heroes at the sound” (p. 284). While Johnson neglects to say why he finds this the best, he later justifies his dictum upon Dryden’s “Alexander’s Feast,” that “the grossest fault in that composition, which is that in this line, ‘Revenge, revenge Timotheus cries,’ he has laid much stress upon the two latter words, which are merely words of connexion, and ought in music to be considered as parenthetical” (p. 285). In this practical criticism, we are granted gems worthy to stand beside those found in the later Lives of Pope and Dryden—as well as corroborative anticipation of these mature masterpieces, such as his defense of the Alpine traveler in the *Essay on Criticism* as “the best simile in our language” (p. 286).

Of the non-literary reviews found in the *Literary Magazine*, perhaps the most summoning consists in the two-part review of merchant and philanthropist Jonas Hanway’s *A Journal of Eight Days Journey* and Johnson’s subsequent reply to a letter of complaint by the author. In the second part, he defends tea-drinking from Hanway’s animadversion that “the consumption of tea is injurious to the interest of our country” (360). The latter’s bilious letter provoked Johnson to something he rarely indulged—a public response to one of his critics. He was doubly provoked to do so because of his love of tea and his hatred of hypocrisy. With respect to the former, he memorably describes himself as “a hardened and shameless tea-drinker, who has for twenty years diluted his meals with only the infusion of this fascinating plant, whose kettle has scarcely time to cool, who with tea amuses the evening, with tea solaces the midnights, and with tea welcomes the morning” (360). More important is his indignation at Hanway’s moral blindness, particularly with respect to the neglect of his young charges at the Foundling’s Hospital, where Hanway was a governor. On a personal visit, the deeply religious Johnson discovered that the children were not taught their catechism:

My opponent in the first paragraph, calls the inference that I made from this negligence, a hasty conclusion: to the decency of this expression I had nothing to object. But as he grew hot in his career, his enthusiasm

began to sparkle, and in the vehemence of his postscript he charges my assertions, and my reasons for advancing them, with folly and malice. His argumentation being somewhat enthusiastical, I cannot fully comprehend, but it seems to stand thus. My insinuations are foolish or malicious, since I know not one of the governors of the hospital; for he that knows not the governors of the hospital must be very foolish or malicious. (376)

The embedding of hot fury within the icy envelope of irony and satire reveals Johnson at his polemical best: the Review and Reply's denunciation of Hanway's self-complacent hypocrisy rivals his handling of Soame Jenyns in the 1756 Review of *Free Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Evil*.¹¹

The ghost-writings mentioned in the subtitle of *Johnson on Demand* form a substantial component of the book. His exertions on behalf of Charlotte Lennox, Giuseppi Baretti, Charles Burney, Anna Williams, Thomas Percy, Henry Thrale, John Hoole and others testify at once to Johnson's loyal friendship and his skill in composing dedications, proposals, and prefaces. But it is in his writings for a relative stranger, William Dodd—the "macaroni" parson whose extravagant lifestyle led him to desperately and fatally forge a bond using the name of a patron—that Johnson's command of rhetoric and style reaches a high point. The Dodd dossier includes speeches, declarations, public letters, petitions, and a sermon, *The Convict's Address to his Unhappy Brethren* (printed separately in *Yale Works*, 14, *Sermons*). The ultimate failure of Johnson's efforts to deliver Dodd from a capital sentence in no way diminishes the eloquent humanity and sympathetic compassion on display in the archive.

The edition concludes with the recently discovered "On the Character and Duty of an Academick" (1793), ratified to the canon by eminent Johnsonian J. D. Fleeman.¹² This brief piece has been published a few times previously.¹³ Noteworthy in the present redaction is, in paragraph two, an important textual revision:

Every man has his task assigned, of which, if he accepts it, he must consider himself as accountable for the performance. The individuals of this illustrious community are set apart, and distinguished from the rest of the people, for the confirmation and promotion of national knowledge. An academick is a man supported at the public cost, and dignified with public honours, that he may attain and impart wisdom. (611)

In David Fairer's edition, the word "national" in the copy text was emended, with Fleeman's approval, to "rational":

David Fleeman agreed that the word originally printed as "national" in the second paragraph was probably a misreading of Johnson's handwritten "rational" ("his initial ragged 'r' is very like an 'n' to those unfamiliar with his hand"), and he also cited in favour of the emendation Johnson's sense of the internationalism of learning and knowledge.¹⁴

The Yale editors, following an argument initiated by John Sitter (see *Johnsonian News Letter* 65.1), revert to the original wording of Moir's 1793 publication. They marshal evidence from other uses of the word "national" in the *Rambler*, the "Life of Blackmore," the Preface to the *Preceptor*, and the first *Dictionary* definition, "Public; general; not private; not particular."¹⁵ At stake is which version of Johnson the readings respectively encourage us to take: the insular Englishman of stereotypical legend—"His dislike of the French was well known to both nations," *Anecdotes*, in *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, 1:216; "The noblest prospect which a Scotchman ever sees, is the high road that leads him to England!" *Boswell's Life*, 1:425; "Sir, they [Americans] are a race of convicts, and ought to be thankful for anything we allow them short of hanging" *ibid.*, 2:312)—or the internationalist who saw himself as an integral part of the larger community of European humanism stemming from the Latin Middle Ages, a view Robert DeMaria, Jr. has cogently urged in his *The Life of Samuel Johnson: A Critical Biography* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1995). As is always the case with a complex figure such as Johnson, plausibility attends both sides, and we are left, as Boswell says of the parentage of Johnson's friend Richard Savage, to "vibrate in a state of uncertainty as to what was the truth" (*Boswell's Life*, 1:174).

While I find this book to be eminently praiseworthy and enormously useful, it is my duty as a reviewer to point out any errors and shortcomings. With respect to the latter, I feel the book's structure could have been improved. It generally follows a chronological order, except when items on related topics are clustered together. For example, the four Harleian Library writings, spanning 1742-44, are presented as a unit; the same is true of those devoted to Johnson's writings for Henry Thrale, Charlotte Lennox, the *Literary Magazine*, Charles Burney, etc. However, at other times, items on related topics are curiously dispersed throughout the volume: for example, the prefaces and notices for the *Gentleman's Magazine* and the writings for Anna (Zachariah) Williams. This practice seems to me arbitrary at best and inconvenient at worst. It requires the reader to consult the table of contents and to shuffle back and forth across the pages when seeking to examine the individual texts within their proper sequence. It also results in the unhappy confusion of placing the biographical note about Anna Williams on page 486, after an earlier piece concerning her printed on page 200.

As Gwin Kolb used to tell me, it is impossible to eliminate all errors; one can only reduce them to the greatest minimum. Of course, there are such found here. Some are minor. The citation of William Cooke's biography of Johnson on p. 244 has faulty italicization, while a note to "An Account of the Harleian Library" (79n7) cites the third *Dictionary* definition of "ornament" when the second is meant: there are only two in the 1755 first edition. Others rise to a higher level of significance. Note six to the "Proposals for Printing Anna Williams, *Essays in Verse and Prose*" says that the poem "An Ode on a Lady Leaving Her Place of Abode; Almost Impromptu" formed part of the 1750 Williams publication, when in fact the poem was first published in 1964 (see *Yale Works*, 6:38). In the headnote to the Preface to *The Preceptor*, we find the claim that "Bishop Percy told Boswell that the preface was Johnson's favorite of his own writings" (169). This is not true: Percy was referring not to

the Preface but “Vision of Theodore” fable that was included in *The Preceptor* (see *Yale Works*, 16:190); the editors misread a passage in *Boswell’s Life of Johnson* (1:192).

Despite such quibbles, a great deal of conscientious and skillful labor was expended in assembling *Johnson on Demand*. It is a magnificent achievement, testament at once to Brack’s pioneering investigations and DeMaria’s adroit consummation of them. This generously sized and handsomely produced book contains over one hundred pieces, many of absorbing interest. If all do not rise to the transcendental heights of the Preface to Shakespeare or the Life of Pope, on display is a smorgasbord that many general readers will find instructive and delightful and all Johnsonians will find indispensable.

Anthony W. Lee
Arkansas Tech University

Notes

1. The *Yale Edition* does not collect all of Johnson’s writings—not found in it, for example, are the letters, the complete first and fourth editions of the *Dictionary*, and the Chambers *Lectures on Law*—nor does volume 20 properly constitute the last word: yet to be published is a projected volume, *Contributions to the Works of Others*. While there are plans for this to be published by Bucknell University Press at some future date, serial publication of these items commenced in the *Johnsonian News Letter* 69.2 (September 2018), with the “Life of the Author” from Zachary Pearce’s 1777 *Commentary with Notes on the Four Evangelists and the Acts of the Apostles*.

2. Piozzi’s *Anecdotes*, in *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, ed. G. B. Hill, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1897), 1:332

3. For an example of such a canvassing, that of *Quis enim virtutem*, see Barry Baldwin, “Johnson’s Juvenile Juvenal,” *Latomus* 67.4 (2008): 1041-46.

4. *Boswell’s Life of Johnson*, G. B. Hill, ed., rev. L. F. Powell, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934-64), 2:443. Johnson, in keeping with this disapprobation, had earlier insulted Hume by departing a gathering upon the latter’s entrance into it: see *Private Papers of James Boswell from Malahide Castle*, ed. Geoffrey Scott and Frederick A. Pottle, 21 vols. (1928-34), 1:128.

5. See J. D. Fleeman, “Johnson and the Truth,” *Johnsonian Studies*, ed. Magdi Wahba (Cairo, 1962): 109-13.

6. *Samuel Johnson* (New York: Twayne, 1970), 69.

7. Glenn Kessler “A Year of Unprecedented Deception: Trump Averaged 15 False Claims a Day in 2018,” *Washington Post*, December 30, 2018.

8. In a note to *The Taming of the Shrew* (4.3.106; *Yale Works*, 7:349), Johnson observes, “The taylor’s trade having an appearance of effeminacy, has always been, among the rugged English, liable to sarcasms and contempt”; see also *Boswell’s Life*, 2:218, 3:269.

9. The editors might have pointed out other Johnsonian parallels to the coronation, such as his letter to Thomas Percy, 12 Sept. 1761, and contributions to John Gwynn’s *Thoughts on the Coronation* (*Yale Works*, 290-300).

10. In their preface, the editors observe that a handful of reviews by Johnson are not included in the present collection. I believe that there are six, and it might be helpful to list them here. Four may be found in *Yale Works*, 10:197-260, the *Political Writings*: Johnson's review of Lewis Evans' *General Map*, plus three reviews of pamphlets on the infamous Byng case (a fourth Byng pamphlet is reviewed in the present volume, pp. 381-90). A brief review of Sir Thomas Browne's *Christian Morals*—a work that Johnson himself edited!—is located in *Yale Works*, 19:375, *Biographical Writings*. His greatest review, that of Soame Jenyns' *Free Inquiry*, is housed in the Crousaz volume, 17:387-432.

11. Elsewhere, alluding to the *Journal of Eight Days Journey*, Johnson remarked that Hanway "acquired some reputation by traveling abroad, but lost it all by traveling at home" (*Boswell's Life*, 2:122).

12. Fleeman, *A Bibliography of the Works of Samuel Johnson*, 2 vols., prepared for press by James McLaverty. (Oxford, 2000), 2:1750-52. As a supplement to the *Yale* headnote in the present volume, the reader might wish to consult my "John Moir and his Brief Encounters with Samuel Johnson," *Johnsonian News Letter* 69.2 (Sept. 2018): 12-28, which provides additional background information on Moir and his shadowy relationship with Johnson.

13. It was printed with an introduction by David Fairer in *Studies in Bibliography* 48 (1995), 23-24; in 2000 a facsimile version was printed privately for The Johnsonians as Samuel Johnson, *On the Character & Duty of an Academick*, the introduction there by Robert DeMaria, Jr., who names two further reprints dating from 1994 (both similarly private).

14. *Studies in Bibliography* 48 (1995): 1-24 (23).

15. To this list, the editors might have added the appearance of the word in Johnson's Dedication to *The Female Quixote*: "How can vanity be so completely gratified, as by the allowed patronage of him whose judgment has so long given a standard to the *national taste*?" (p. 206, my emphasis).

Paige Dean and Daniel Froid Share Molin Prize for 2018

The 2018 Molin Prize has been awarded to two contestants: Paige Deans of Virginia Commonwealth University for her paper "The Prodigal Daughter: Possession, Performance, and Propaganda of the Great Awakening," and Daniel Froid of Purdue University for his paper "Performing (Secular) Devilry in the Theatrical Afterlives of *Le diable boiteux*." Both papers, delivered at the EC/ASECS annual meeting in Staunton, Virginia in October 2018, were marked by intensive exploration of fascinating 18th-century texts and by impressive engagement with relevant secondary literature. Deans's paper regards a narrative poem, published anonymously in Boston in 1736, which adapts the parable of the prodigal son (as interpreted in a sermon by "the Reverend Mr. Williams") for a female protagonist. Deans draws out the ways in which the poem figures female prodigality as a kind of satanic possession where conversion is distinctly traumatic and intimately tied up with the

daughter's relationship to the mother. The paper is remarkable for its clear organization, its treatment of both visual and literary material, its close work with details of the text, and its placing the text within gendered religious discourse in colonial North America. Froid's paper regards the Asmodeus flight motif in two theatrical adaptations of Alain-René Lesage's *Le diable boiteux*, or *The Devil on Two Sticks*, within the history of secularization in England. His paper is particularly strong in the way that it places his central texts within a complicated, ambivalent secularization, by engaging clearly and deeply with published scholarship. His writing is remarkably smooth and clear while operating on a sophisticated level of argumentation. The committee, comprised this year of Ellen Moody, Tony Lee, and chair John Heins, felt that both papers exhibited noteworthy original research and admirable engagement with evolving understandings of 18th-century religion and secularization.

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

The Executive Secretary's Reflexions on Staunton and 2018

We are all on the backside of spring break and racing toward the end of the academic year. In the midst of the busy-ness, please visit the website for the Gettysburg conference on October 24-26 and put it on your calendar and keep your appetite whetted for the summer announcement of the program. Joanne Myers has much excitement in store for us. See <http://www.ecasecs.org/2019-conference.html> or <https://ecasecs2019.wordpress.com/> and read Joanne's invitation to the meeting below. The theme is "Crossroads & Divergences." Please consider submitting a panel proposal (right away) or a paper proposal (deadline June 1), sending it to Eleanor Shevlin (eshvlin@wcupa.edu), who is helping with the program—and carbon copy Joanne (jemyers@gettysburg.edu). I look forward to seeing many of you there.

Speaking of conferences, we had a wonderful one in Staunton, VA, last October, including an excellent evening of theatre next door in the Blackfriars: Etherage's *The Man of Mode*. Some of us went back for Jane Austen the next afternoon and then returned to the Stonewall Jackson Hotel's gorgeous lobby to close the conference with a program of classical piano by *Maestro* Robert Mayerovitch, which included his informative and witty commentary. It was sort of like an 18C piano bar experience, in comfy lounge chairs.

If this wasn't sufficient entertainment, Mary Baldwin University lent us some of their faculty and graduate students for an extraordinary performance panel—with real performance and then interactive audience commentary—a treat. Plus, we snagged one of their faculty for ECASECS, Katherine Turner, so I anticipate more collaboration with MBU. The chair of that program, Professor Paul Menzer, gave a brilliant plenary ("William Shakespeare, b. 1709"), which you can read on the conference website (thank you, Web *Maestra* Susan Beam). I wish we had recorded it, as Paul has a real

comedian's sense of timing and delivery. I intend to ask for permission of all future plenary speakers to post their address on the conference website. Who knows, maybe we will start doing visual recording so all can enjoy the presentation for free in the comfort of your Barcalounger and jammies! Matthew Kinservik's presidential address was also innovative. He wrote on 18th-century theatre and used the *Etherege* performance from Friday evening for the second half of his talk.

As is announced above, Daniel Froid and Paige Deans are co-winners of the 2018 Molin Prize for graduate student conference presentation. We were fortunate to have yet again an excellent crop of graduate student presenters. And, I must confess, they really can enliven an evening. Several of them relaxed in the gracious lobby of the SJH with bottles of wine and small-eats leftover from our reception, carrying-on in an appropriately raucous but serious 18C manner, purely academically, of course.

While we have a location for our 2020 meeting (to be announced at Gettysburg), we are looking for a host for 2021. I am hoping for the Pittsburgh or greater Philadelphia area, maybe New Jersey or Maryland. Anyone interested in hosting a campus conference? It has been a while since we had one. The hotel-conference center is probably easiest, as it is all in one place and the hotel staff provides assistance. But the latter tends to be more expensive than a meeting at a campus with a generous president or provost. We have several experienced conference hosts who will lend a hand to anyone ready to take the plunge.

At our 2018 meeting Sylvia Kasey Marks was elected president (she will chair the 2019 executive meeting and deliver our Presidential Address), John Heins, Vice President; and Beth Lambert, Executive Board Member.

I referred in the dues letter to a decision by the executive board to create what I am calling the "EC-ASECS Future Fund." We all remember the tight budgetary necessities of graduate school. Mind you, back in the day, graduate students seldom attended conferences, but that has changed over the decades. Long ago EC/ASECS created the Eric Molin Prize as an inducement to graduate students to attend what we strive to maintain as a very welcoming conference. We felt that we should increase the welcome by limiting graduate registration fees formally to \$25. That will entail coming up with funding to support this "scholarship," which we consider vital to sustaining ECASECS as a vibrant regional organization that values scholarship from all perspectives and the mingling of people at all stages of their careers. I would welcome your generosity in helping us build a fund that sustains this organization we love. All gifts will remain anonymous, although at the annual conference and in the financial statement the executive secretary will report on all activity in the fund: new gifts, payments to cover conference expenses, and fund balance.

The executive committee has exercised another brainstorm to try out this conference. We have asked our celebrity blogger Ellen Moody to host a panel/roundtable on the "contemporary 18C novel," another way of speaking very broadly about the historical novel. I think it is fair to say that we are living in the golden age of the historical novel, and our century is the star of the field—no, I'm not in the least biased. Members who wish to present a paper on a novel or lead a discussion should submit their proposal to Ellen.

The historical novel needn't be one published recently because we've been reading excellent ones for more than two decades. I would hope this develops into a column in the *ECI* for Ellen, a more compact version of her extended novel, play, and film blog posts.

Well, I have avoided playing Scrooge for the entire letter, but, while the dues letter is still vibrating and the financial statement is close to hand, I would note the membership rolls stand at 321, with 109 paying dues last year (plus 58 lifers). That is a significant improvement over the previous year: 364 & 73. Good for us, but still only half of our members pay dues, even though everyone receives the *ECI*. I am well aware that many of our members have retired and no longer attend conferences—which is a sadness to us all. We need to use the Future Fund as well increased dues paying to keep EC/ASECS going strong, so, I ask you to please, help out as much as you can.

Enough!! I sound like a terrible old scold, which is not my intent, tho' I did turn 70 on Groundhog Day, which surely entitles me to venerability if not downright oldsterhood. I simply wanna keep meeting up annually to share scholarship and stories. You are all very good company. Stay in touch.

Peter Staffel, EC/ASECS Executive Secretary
West Liberty University

ECASECS Financial Report for 2018

This report will run from March 31, 2018 (end of last year's financial report, which ran into 2018 due to late closing of 2017 conference expenses), to December 31, 2018. This year's financial statement will appear in the spring 2020 issue of the *Intelligencer*.

Beginning balance 3/31/2017: \$1,938.80.

Credits: \$14,919.18 [Dues, registration, & donations/gifts]

Debits:

\$50.00	[Bank fees]
\$241.29	[Website licensing renewal]
\$166.00	[Conference letter—postage]
\$2577.44	[<i>ECI</i> —printing, labels, postage (Spring & Autumn issues)]
\$10,192.71	[Conference expenses—hotel, catering, printing, misc.]
\$800.00	[hotel deposit for 2019 conference]

Total Expenses: \$14,187.44

Fiscal Year End Balance: +\$2,670.54

Membership: We have 321 members on our “books.” There are 58 members who have paid “lifetime” dues. 109 members have paid current dues, including graduate students and couples. Our policy is to drop members from the mailing list after three years of non-payment of dues.

Peter Staffel, EC/ASECS Executive Secretary

COME TO THE EC/ASECS IN GETTYSBURG, 24-26 OCTOBER

As the organizer of this year's annual meeting of the East-Central chapter of the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, I extend a warm invitation to consider submitting a proposal for our 24-26 October 2019 conference in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

Capitalizing on the conference's Gettysburg location, the conference's theme is "Crossroads and Divergences." We invite papers that consider the range of connections, including missed connections, symbolized by the crossroads. In this period, what paths – intellectual, aesthetic, and personal – cross in surprising ways? How are high roads and low roads mapped, and do they ever intersect? What key moments in the eighteenth-century culture served as a crossroads for the period and have not yet been fully considered, or should be reconsidered? What do divergences from the period's well-trodden paths teach us? Papers that reflect on 'crossroads' in eighteenth-century studies, historically and today, are also welcome.

Our keynote speaker will be Professor Tita Chico of the University of Maryland, whose most recent book is *Experimental Imagination: Literary Knowledge and Science in the British Enlightenment* (Stanford Univ. Press, 2018). Participants will have the opportunity to see artwork by the eighteenth-century German-born botanist Maria Sibylla Merian and tour Gettysburg College's Special Collections. To celebrate the fact that the 2019 meeting will be the 50th annual gathering of the EC/ASECS chapter, we are hoping to close the conference with a session reflecting on the organization's history and wind up at a local Irish pub celebrating with some of Jonathan Swift's own music!

On Thursday evening and on Friday, we will meet in the Gettysburg Hotel in the center of town. Saturday sessions will be held on the campus of Gettysburg College. Members wishing to book a room should mention their ECASECS affiliation to receive the conference rate of \$149/night. Contact the Gettysburg hotel at www.hotelgettysburg.com or (01) 717.337.2000.

Submission of abstracts for individual papers should be sent by 15 June to ecasecs2019@gmail.com. To view the full CFP and pre-constituted panels, and for further information about lodging options, please visit the conference website at <http://ecasecs2019.wordpress.com>. Registration will cost \$125 for members, but graduate student participants will enjoy a newly established registration rate of \$25 for students and should remember to apply for the Molin Award, given annually to the best paper presented by a graduate student. Questions can be directed to Joanne Myers at jemyers@gettysburg.edu or (01) 717.337.6763.

Joanne Myers
Gettysburg College

News of Members and Announcements

Our thanks again to **John P. Heins** for help with the cover illustration. Special thanks to **Geoffrey Sill** for sending me, in several mailings, 1978-81 issues of the *EC/ASECS Newsletter*, edited by Leland Peterson and Rennie McLeod, part of the archive I will pass on to the next editor. Also, some have told me they preferred receiving the newsletter as a PDF, which allows them to magnify the print or search it on the computer. Let me know if you would prefer a PDF copy (jem4 @psu.edu)—you would save us the postal expense.

Congratulations to **Peter Staffel** for organizing a delightful conference free glitches, at the very hospitable Stonewall Jackson Hotel, seated below Mary Baldwin U. on the picturesque commercial lanes of lovely Staunton, Virginia. We had two superb plenaries, first the lecture by **Peter Menzer** (Mary Baldwin U.) on Shakespeare in the 18th-century, developing various anecdotal insights, and then **Matt Kinservik's** presidential address after Saturday's luncheon (the lead article above), examining the significance of George Etherege's *The Man of Mode, or Sir Fopling Flutter* capped with his leading a discussion by members of the performance offered Friday night at The American Shakespeare Center beside our hotel. **Brett D. Wilson** published in the Fall 2018 *Restoration* a review of the performance (143-45), noting, "The company kept up a lively energy . . . Jessica Gaffney's costumes evoked the period without literalism, nary a peruke nor pannier in sight. Men's styles recalled Coldplay's 'Viva La Vida' era with a touch of Sgt Pepper's." Brett thought the principals did a fine job, and esp. liked flirtation between Young Bellair and Harriet Woodvill and "the inclusion of distinctly non-Etheregean jokes." The meeting started Thursday night with the "Oral-Aural Experience," with **Ted Braun's** diatribe "The 18C Trump: Voltaire!" and ended Saturday dinner hour with **Robert Mayerovitch's** piano recital in the lobby—though, sadly, most had hit the roads by then. (As happened last year, more conferees were present on Friday than on Saturday, and I wonder if that is now the rule.)

Many sections focused on the theme, "Performing the 18C": "Exploring Select Performances of Jonathan Swift," "Material Performances," "Colonial Performances and Staging the Other," "Performing Gender," and "New Methodological Performances: Performance Theory, Celebrity as Collaboration, and Improvisation." The latter included **Megan Bruening** on the "performative authorship" in Haywood's early plays, **Teri Doerksen** on Pamela's impact on popular culture (race horses bore her name), **Gerard Holmes** on improvisational poetry, particularly in Tuscany as noted by Hester Piozzi, and **Marie McAllister** on "Speaking Assignments in the 18C Classroom." Some were analyses of texts, as **Brett Wilson's** of Richard Cumberland's popular comedy *The West Indian*, and **Anna Foy's** of Dryden's "modernized" *Aeneis* illustrated with Ogilby's 1668 plates (given new function)--Anna finds the playful translation supporting limited monarchy and she asks to what extent it is an anti-Williamite text. Many papers involved biographical contexts, as **Doreen Saar's** on Royal Tyler's *The Contrast* (tracing his unsuccessful courtship of John and Abigail Adams' daughter Abigail—she dumped him and he wrote how it should have gone), **Syvia**

Kasey Marks on the relation of novelist Rachel Hunter to Jane Austen; **Tony Lee**'s on revisions Johnson made (as to *Rambler* no. 153 in 1756) after Chesterfield's "fallacious patronage" of the *Dictionary*, and, in **Donald Mell**'s perennial Swift session, both **Gene Hammond**'s on the *Project for the Advancement of Religion* (details to explain its problematic tone) and **James Woolley**'s on the historically awkward "Richmond Lodge and Marble Hill." There was illuminating historical context centered about Miss Rose, a girl playing male roles like Tom Thumb, in **Aparna Gollapudi**'s paper, read expressively by **Catherine Ingrassia**. Even in sessions without any claim to treating performance one could find the theme, as, within two sessions chaired by **Eleanor Shevlin**, **Nancy Mace**'s study of the efforts of music publishers to protect their copyrights. Several sessions were very coherent as the papers by **Sayre Greenfield & Dorothea Lint**, **Lori Halvorsen Zerne**, and **Jennifer Wilson** in the Austen session chaired by **Linda Troost**. It was tough to decide which competing session to attend—I regret not hearing that with **Joanne Myers** on "Performing Faith in 18C British Catholic Life-Writing" and **Geoffrey Sill** on "Capt. James Burney, an Officer and Gentleman," which treats Burney's editing of William Bligh's *Narrative of the Mutiny on the Bounty*, but suspect they will be published. Two panels testify to the variety in the program: three professors at Mary Baldwin, **Katherine Turner**, **Matt Davies**, and **Paul Menzer** offered "Tom Jones as Vehicle for Discussing Shakespeare and 18C Performance," and **Gerard Holmes**, **Eleanor Shevlin**, **Scott Krawczyk**, **John Heins**, and chair **Kathryn Temple** conducted a roundtable on "Reinventing Graduate Education: Roles for Faculty, Graduate Students, and Administrators." The sessions were well chaired, and papers kept within limits (nobody was drunk, nobody threw chairs); some papers were illustrated with good slides and at least one, **Patricia Smith**'s, with music—Pat is going to try to get her Irish band, Irish Town Road, a venue during the evening near our Gettysburg meeting! We were fueled by ongoing refreshments in the lobby, good coffee, baked goods, and even ice cream, and the rooms employed for session were conveniently located and furnished.

One important development from the Executive and then members' business meeting is the proposal to fix graduate student registration at \$25 in future conferences and to pay for that added cost with a new fund, an initiative suiting EC/ASECS's 50th anniversary in 2019. The funds will be collected in a separate dedicated fund. It is hoped that long-standing members comfortably established, especially those who long ago paid life-memberships, will contribute to the fund. The Executive was also addressed about a possible future joint meeting with ASECS by **Lisa Berglund**, who has worked hard the past year as ASECS's Executive Director, plumbing the depths of its many financial funds and archival records. And we were all delighted with the announcement that **Joanne Myers** will chair the 2019 meeting at Gettysburg, with Friday sessions at the Hotel Gettysburg and Saturday's at the college—this was the location of two of our best meetings (see her invitation on p. 63).

At the start of the Fall 2018 issue of *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* (37.2: 265-69), **Jennifer L. Airey**, as its editor, announces the completion of a project, begun in 2008 by her predecessor **Laura M. Stevens**, to produce abstracts of all *TSWL* articles printed up to that year before

abstracts were routinely included (2009-). Since then the journal's interns have written up those abstracts, aided by content overviews once prefacing *TSWL*. Now Jennifer and the managing editor, Karen Dutoi, "will edit the abstracts and send them off to their authors for feedback and approval before finally uploading them" to the *TSWL* website. Besides adding clarity, the abstracts will increase demand for former articles and thus royalties from Project Muse. The project led the editors to formulate a definition of what makes for a good abstract, one that they would use in their revisions and also in their acceptance with revision of contributors' future abstracts. In a nutshell, Jennifer writes that *TSWL* values abstracts that provide a "clear overview of the article's argument" and "explains the essay's importance and positions its argument within the broader scholarly conversation," making clear what's "new and different" in the study. I would recommend this short discussion to humanities students, particularly in the methods course (if still a part of the curriculum).

Eve Bannet continues on as co-editor of *SECC*. **Temma Berg's** essay "After the Golem: Teaching about Golems, Kabbalah, Exile, Imagination, and Technological Takeover" will appear later this year in *Teaching Approaches to Jewish American Literature*, ed. by Roberta Rosenberg and R. Rubinstein (MLA). Temma wrote nine entries for the forthcoming *Cambridge Guide to the 18C Novel, 1660-1820*, ed. by **April London**: *Madagascar: or, Robert Drury's Journal during Fifteen Years Captivity on that Island (1729)*; *The Fair Coquette (1752)*; *Memoirs of a Coquet; or the History of Miss Harriot Airy (1765)*; *The Male-Coquette; Or, the History of the Hon. Edward Astell (1770)*; *The Confessions of a Coquet (1785)*; *Ponsonby (1817)*—all anonymous,—and three by Charlotte Palmer including *Integrity and Content (1792)*. The guide should be online in 2019. Some of Temma's recent publications on Charlotte Brontë are "Imagine My Surprise": Anne Lister, Emily Brontë, and Charlotte Brontë's *Shirley*" in *The Brontë Sisters and Their Work: Proceedings of the 20th METU British Novelists Conference* (Ankara, 2015); "Reading Amazon Fragments: Queering *Shirley*" in *Brontë Studies* 41.3 (2016): 217-28; and "The Business of Coquetting," *ibid.*, 43.1 (2018): 61-70—Temma served as guest editor for this special issue dedicated to the Brontë Society Bicentenary Conference 2016 ("...the business of a woman's life...": Charlotte Brontë and the Woman Question"). In April 2018 Temma delivered the Keynote, "Becoming Victorians: What the Brontë Sisters Can Tell Us about Sexual Harassment" at the #MeToo@ECU Conference, at East Carolina. **Andrew Black** published "'Cannot You Trust God for a Sermon?' Anti-Methodists and the Rhetoric of Methodist Spirituality" in the January *Eighteenth-Century Life*. Contributors to *Prose Fiction in English from the Origins of Print to 1750*, ed. Tom Keymer, 2018 (also in Oxford Scholarship Online), are **Toni Bowers** ("Epistolary Fiction"), **J. A. Downie** ("*Clarissa* and *Tom Jones*"), **J. P. Hunter** (Defoe, journalism, and the novel), **Robert Hume** ("Authorship, Publication, Reception: 1660-1750"), **John Richetti** (non-fictional discourses), and **Peter Sabor** (mid-century "Moral Romances").

Theodore E. D. Braun, addressed the Académie de Montauban at a meeting held at Pompignan 4 June 2018, offering two presentations. He was asked to speak, extemporaneously, at the village church just outside the chateau, on the subject of **Jean-Jacques Le Franc de Pompignan's**

philanthropy to the villagers in the 1760s and 1770s, prior to Ted's formal presentation at the chapel of the chateau, "Mensonges, calomnies, faits alternatifs: Voltaire contre Le Franc de Pompignan." Braun is a corresponding member of the Académie de Montauban, with a specialization in 18C French literature, in particular focusing on Voltaire and on Le Franc de Pompignan. An audience of over 100 people attended each presentation. In the first, shorter presentation, he related some of the remarkable things that Le Franc had done for the villagers: he rebuilt the houses in the commune, at no cost to the residents, who thus found work during this period of extremely high unemployment; besides having all the streets in the town broadened to two wide lanes, he had roads constructed through the village, linking it directly to nearby towns and to major highways leading to Bordeaux, Toulouse, and Paris, partly financed through the province of Quercy; he built a large restaurant and tavern in the town; he provided a source of drinking water for the villagers more conveniently located, saving them an average of a kilometer each time they had to seek water; he filled the village church with paintings by celebrated artists of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries from France, Italy and Holland, along with a splendid retable behind the altar, and gave numerous vessels destined for church services. In return, the villagers refused entry to the revolutionaries who wanted to dismantle the church and to destroy the chateau. Ted's main presentation covered the many lies, calumnies and alternative facts that Voltaire created in his (successful) attempt to turn Le Franc into an object of ridicule, a tactic he then used on other public figures, whom he designated enemies because they had criticized his works and thoughts. Ted's discourse was based almost entirely on Voltaire's own writings in his correspondence and published works. Voltaire depicted Le Franc as an egoist, an insane man of no personal or professional worth, succeeding in destroying the reputation of this honorable man. Braun was assisted in the presentation by Prof. Claude Sicard (emeritus, U. of Toulouse), a member of the Académie de Montauban, who read passages from Voltaire's writings, thus adding a dramatic dimension, akin to a dialogue between the narrator (Ted) and Voltaire.

During the fall **Caroline Breashears** was an Adam Smith Scholar in Residence at the Liberty Fund's library in Indiana, where she researched *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* in relation to George Anne Bellamy's *Apology*, which she discovered was in Smith's library. During her residence, she wrote, "Yes, I like the way Liberty Fund makes excellent books available at affordable prices. Their mission (they're a private foundation created by Pierre Goodrich) is educational. The second floor offices are devoted to publishing (print and online), and the first floor offices are held by the Fellows who run conferences. The library, of course, is used by both groups and (currently) by a series of visiting Smith Scholars. It's full of classics across the disciplines, with a special emphasis on books related to their focus on liberty. I have a carrel on the second floor. When I arrived, they had stocked it with free books they thought I might need! Aesthetically, the library is stunning, with a "tree-of-knowledge" motif. The windows are covered with screens to block harmful light; worked into the screens are the names of great authors (Shakespeare, Aristotle), which are visible at points of the day when the sun strikes them."

This month appeared Volume 33 (for 2018) of *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, the 18C Ireland Society's annual, in which the lead article is **Andrew Carpenter's** "Katherine Philips, 'Philo-Philippa' and Restoration Dublin" (11-32). Andrew argues that the flattering poem "To the Excellent Orinda," given to Philips following the 1663 performance of her translation of Corneille's *Pompey* (while in Dublin during 1662-63), was a sarcastic parody and not the panegyric it was taken for by Philips' friend and posthumous editor Sir Charles Cotterell, who included it among the preliminary verses in Philips' *Poems* (1667). Andrew first builds a generalization about a new taste in poetry around 1660 in Dublin, one distinct from the labored and exaggerated manner of earlier coterie poetry circulated in MS: "Burlesque, parody, ridicule and buffoonery are found in other [i.e. many] texts written in Ireland between the Restoration and the Battle of the Boyne" (23). With comparative examples of parodic verse, Andrew then examines passages in Philo-Philippa's panegyric, and finds mockery of pretense, exaggeration, and "the patronizing attitude of male poets towards a woman who 'dares translate'" (21). Andrew, after editing many volumes of Irish verse from the 17C and 18C, must be as good a judge as any as to how this and other Dublin verse of the Restoration would have been read. This issue of *EC Ireland* also includes Moyra Haslett's "'For the Improvement and Amusement of Young Ladies': Elizabeth Carter and the Bluestockings in Ireland," treating the reception of the Blues in Ireland, with particular focus on the miscellany *Select Poems, Designed for the Improvement and Amusement of Young Ladies. By Miss Carter and Others* (Waterford, 1772). Also here is Padhraig Higgins's "Paddies Evermore: Stereotypes and Irish National Identity in the Late Eighteenth Century" (on the development of and responses to Paddy, "the male personification of the Irish nation" in the late 18C). There are three other articles and ten reviews, including one of **Andrew Carpenter's** edition of *The Poems of Olivia Elder*. **Jeremy Chow** published "Crusoe's Creature Comforts" in the Fall 2018 *Digital Defoe*, freely available on the WWW. At the end of his essay, after examining the use and depiction of bears and wolves late in the novel, Jeremy concludes, "Creatures by the novel's wielding, violate and are violated, enact revenge, and serve as reminders of a lesser state of being that is proximate to death. *Robinson Crusoe* demonstrates the potential for the subaltern creatures to intervene by forcing the renegotiation of hierarchies of supremacy, and *that* is of great comfort to his readers."

Greg Clingham has now retired from directing Bucknell Univ. Press. Bucknell has published a remarkable amount of scholarship during Greg's tenure: 700 books with 233 of them in the long 18C! The BUP has an interim director (Amy McCready, Professor of Political Science at Bucknell), while it conducts a national search for a replacement. Greg will "continue to co-edit *Transits: Literature, Thought & Culture, 1650-1850*, with **Kate Parker** (U Wisconsin-LaCrosse) and Miriam Wallace (New College of Florida), and to lend a hand as needed. Other 18C series will continue under their respective series editors--viz. the series on *18th-Century Scotland*, under **Richard B. Sher** (NJIT); *Scènes francophones: Studies in French and Francophone Theater*, under Logan Connors (U Miami); and *New Studies in the Age of Goethe*, under Karin Schutjer (U Oklahoma). In addition to these 18th-C series

we have also commenced publication of *1650-1850: Ideas, Aesthetics & Inquiries in the Early Modern Era*, with volume 24 in February 2019 [discussed below]. Also, we hope that we will be publishing *The Age of Johnson*, edited by **Jack Lynch**, with **John Scanlan** as book review editor.” Greg promises us an article on the archive of Lady Anne (Lindsay) Barnard (1750-1825). He is writing on that topic first for *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* (to appear in 2021). But he won't repeat himself: “the material is so abundant and so interesting that it needs more detailed treatment, and it needs to be noticed by younger scholars or PhD students.” Greg is “writing an intellectual and cultural biography of Lady Anne Barnard, provisionally called, ‘Lady Anne Barnard, the Enlightenment, and the Cultures of the Cape,’ but in addition to what I might say in this book and in several articles, the archive is rich enough to sustain a great deal of additional scholarly and critical work.” Related published scholarship includes “Lady Anne Lindsay Meets Dr. Johnson: A (Virtually) Unknown Episode in Johnson and Boswell's Scottish Tour,” *Johnsonian News Letter*, 68.2 (2017): 25-39, and two essays involving “discoveries of unknown or virtually unknown and unrecognized works of art that depict Dr. Johnson.” The first of these, “John Opie's Portraits of Dr. Johnson” in the *Harvard Library Bulletin* in March 2019 (27.2: 21-44), presents and discusses a 1783-1784 John Opie portrait of Johnson at Balcarres House, Fife, the home of the 29th Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, and the birthplace of Lady Anne Lindsay (Barnard). Greg argues that “this virtually forgotten version of Opie's portrait of Johnson is actually the original, taken from Johnson's sittings for Opie in fall 1783 and spring 1784.” The second essay publishes for the first time an unknown drawing of Johnson and Boswell by Lady Anne Lindsay (Barnard), drawn while Johnson and Boswell were on their tour of Scotland in 1773: “‘I stole his likeness...’: An Unknown Drawing of Samuel Johnson and James Boswell,” in *The Burlington Magazine* March 2019 (161:220-22). Also arising from work on the Lady Anne Barnard archive is “Anecdotes of Bishop Thomas Barnard” to appear in *Johnsonian News Letter*, 70, no. 1 (spring 2019). Greg has essays in **Anthony W. Lee's** volumes *Samuel Johnson among the Modernists* and *New Essays on Samuel Johnson: Revaluation* (145-82) as well as in *1650-1850*, discussed below. Lately Greg has been working on a piece for **Jack Lynch's** “Oxford Companion to Johnson,” and another project has recently taken him to South Africa.

In February Bucknell U. Press published its first volume of *1650-1850: Ideas, Aesthetics & Inquiries in the Early Modern Era*. This is the 24th volume of the annual edited by **Kevin L. Cope**, and the last with **Baerbel Czennia** editing the book-review section. The book reviews in Vol. 25 will be edited by **Samara Anne Cahill**. The volume, all 447 pp. of it (with a couple dozen illustrations, mostly colored), is priced \$150, but Bucknell has a flier offering anyone a 30% discount on it. Kevin Cope's Foreword looks back to the annual's first conception and then to the future, noting that *1650-1850* has “a new publisher, a new look, a new editorial board, and a new commitment to intellectual and artistic exploration” (x). Among the essays we find: **Kevin J. Berland's** “Classical Example and Gospel Rhetoric in the Sermons of Independent Preacher Thomas Brooks” (145-66); **Greg Clingham's** “Johnson and China: Culture, Commerce, and the Dream of the Orient in Mid-

Eighteenth-Century England” (178-242), which is noteworthy for some beautiful colored illustrations and meaty documentation (the notes occupy pp. 227-42); **Patricia Gael**’s “William Congreve as Satirist” (120-44); **Ashley Marshall**’s “Robert Harley and the Politics of Daniel Defoe’s *Review*, 1710-1713” (54-97); **Morgan Strawn**’s “Addison’s Anglican Rationalism, Cato’s Tragic Flaw, and Stoicism” (32-53); **Alex Seltzer**’s “Catesby’s Eclecticism and the Origin of his Style” (263-86), which examines Catesby’s sources and considers how those diverse sources impacted his presentations and style in general. This article has fifteen illustrations, all well reproduced and almost all in color (many of the reproductions are quite large—it’s an eye-ful). The volume contains a special-feature section edited by William Stargard on “Sacred Spaces and Spirituality in the Long 18C” (289-51), with essays on 18C sacred spaces and how they were experienced and by whom. These essays include, for instance, Robin L. Thomas’s examination “Convent and Crown: Redecorating Santa Chiara in Naples, 1741-1759,” with ten illustrations, noting an iconographic program in the convent church linking the nuns to the crown (328-51). Among the reviews that **Baebel Czennia** has gathered are some drawn from volumes of *ECCB* that she was co-editing and were to go unpublished following the demise of AMS Press. Among these, I know, are two by **Ellen Moody**: of Lyndon Dominique’s *Imoinda’s Shade: Marriage and the African Woman in 18C British Literature, 1759-1808* (2012) and Teresa Barnard’s *British Women and the Intellectual World in the Long 18C* (2015), appearing on 424-28 and 432-36. Christopher D. Johnson reviews *SECC*, vols. 41-42. Baerbel reviews Audrey Carpenter’s *John Theophilus Desaguliers: A Natural Philosopher, Engineer, and Freemason in Newtonian England* (396-402), and **Kevin Cope** examines Michael Austin’s *New Testaments: Cognition, Closure, and the Logic of the Sequel, 1660-1740* (392-95). Also **Paul J. deGategno** reviews two: Robert Zaretsky’s *Boswell’s Enlightenment* and Howard Weinbrot’s *Samuel Johnson: New Contexts for a New Century* (415-20). Among members’ books reviewed are **John Radner**’s *Johnson and Boswell* and **Marilyn Francus**’s *Monstrous Motherhood*.

J. A. Downie reviewed Joseph Hone’s *Literature and Party Politics at the Accession of Queen Anne* in the November *Review of English Studies*. Alan lectured in China last year, during his first year of retirement; and he and wife Lizzie traveled again this month to visit a daughter who is an M.D. working in a hospital in Rotorua, NZ. Alan wrote early this month after being interviewed for a Radio 3 program to mark the 300th anniversary of the publication of *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of **Robinson Crusoe**, of York, Mariner*, “printed [by Henry Parker] for W[illiam]. Taylor” in 1719. He rightly reminded me that the tercentenary should be observed here. The enormity of the book is evident in all the 1719 publications: a “second” and two “third” editions co-printed by Parker, Hugh Meere and Wm. Bowyer for Taylor, two “fourth” editions by Parker for Taylor, a piracy (with “*Robeson*”), an abridgment (with “*Crvsoe*”), two Dublin editions—all in 1719! The first edition appeared 25 April and a fourth by 6 August! No wonder Defoe and Taylor produced that same year *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe; Being the Second and Last of his Life*, which also saw repeated editions in London and Dublin. In 1720 Taylor published *Serious*

Reflections during the Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, which was not, however, a bestseller. Early this year a set of all three was offered by a dealer in Devon for about \$17,000. Presently, AbeBooks lists no copy of the first edition, but the third edition of vol. 1 and first of vols. 2-3, with maps and frontispieces, are offered by the William Reese Co. of New Haven for \$16,500. In recent decades the first edition of *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures* has sold repeatedly for over \$10,000. The tercentenary has brought forth many new reprints—such as one illustrated by N. C. Wyeth—and library exhibitions, from the BL’s to Lehigh University’s.

Paul deGatego published “Replying to a Crisis: James Macpherson’s *The Rights of Great Britain Asserted against the Claims of America*” in *Britain and the World*, 11.2 (2018): 195–211. Paul argues that “One of the most popular and effective statements of the British position” regarding the American Revolution “emerged from James Macpherson, poet of Ossian, historian, and government writer.” His pamphlet *The Rights of Great Britain Asserted against the Claims of America* (1775) “was a persuasive appeal to the British public for preserving order and supporting the Monarchy. Macpherson displays a controlled, often dispassionate voice in dealing with the American rebellion, while seeking humane solutions with creativity, conviction, and agility in an environment of popular discontent and political instability.” Paul thinks Macpherson maintains “a liberal spirit of dialogue often in opposition to the dominant opinion of his King and ministers.” Paul is on sabbatical this spring and working at the British Library on Macpherson’s involvement with the East India Company. The March 2019 issue of *Notes and Queries* offers **John Dussinger**’s “Samuel Richardson as Printer as well as Exemplary Author for Frances Sheridan’s *Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph, Extracted from Her Own Journal, and Now First Published in Three Volumes* (1761),” which begins by adding to Keith Maslen’s cataloguing of Richardson’s presswork volumes 1-2 of the first edition of the *Memoirs* (114-15). John contributed the entry “*The History of Sir William Harrington*,” a four-volume novel published anonymously in 1771, to *The Cambridge Guide to the English Novel 1660-1820*, ed. by **April London**. John writes that “manuscript letters in the BL written in the later 1750s between Richardson and an aspiring novelist in her twenties leaves no doubt that Anna Meades was the author of the first version of *Harrington*, but it remains undetermined to what extent Thomas Hull, the actor and dramatist, may have altered the novel before its publication.” (The publisher claimed Richardson made corrections to it, something denied by SR’s family.) John wrote the introduction for a facsimile edition of Mary Astell’s *Some Reflections upon Marriage* (1700), published by the U. of Illinois Press (\$30). **Michael Edson** reviewed Erasmus Darwin’s *The Botanic Garden*, ed. by A. Komisaruk and A. Dushane, in the December *Notes and Queries* (65:582-84). Michael now serves as the Associate Editor of *Eighteenth-Century Life*. The ASECS travel fellowship for research on 18C Ireland established by the late **A. C. Elias, Jr.**, went to **Sonja Lawrenson** of Belfast for work at the U. of North Carolina on Maria Edgeworth. Arch’s and **John Irwin Fischer**’s work on the Swift-Stella *Word-Book* is reviewed above.

We thank **Anna Foy** for sharing her challenging syllabus above with us. At ASECS Anna joined a workshop on digital humanities and a roundtable on

“Archives, Mediation, Publication” by the Scottish Studies group. At year’s end we heard from **Mascha Hansen**, who’d crossed the Baltic to spend the holiday in Sweden with family. She had just submitted an essay on Frances Burney and historiography, and she was looking forward to participation in an EU-funded network on Sociability, Greifswald U. finally having signed the required treaty. Mascha teaches seminars on ecocriticism, and she is organizing for the coming year a week of “sustainability in teaching” at her university. **Jocelyn Harris** wrote from New Zealand that she was excited about attending the Denver ASECS, where she will contribute to the roundtable “Recovering Women’s Voices: or, a Feminist’s Work Is Never Done.” To the Cleveland chapter of JASNA, she will explain in “What Jane Saw—in Henrietta Street” just where Austen could have seen wicked satiric caricatures. Then, in New Haven, she will give two talks to the joint meeting of New York and Connecticut chapters of JASNA, 5-7 April: “A pair of fine eyes: Dora Jordan and Elizabeth Bennet” and “Irish, I dare Say: Satire in *Persuasion*.” In September, Jocelyn offers a plenary at the annual JASNA meeting in Williamsburg, VA, entitled “Marvellous Miss Morland,”; she will then deliver to the Burney Society of the UK, meeting at Chawton Great House, a paper on the “strong family ties between Jane Austen, the Burney, and the royal families.” She has recently published in *Persuasion Online*, 39.1, “Captain Wentworth and the Duke of Monmouth: Brilliant, Dangerous and Headstrong,” which uncovers “surprising links between Austen’s hero and the most glamorous of her doomed beloved Stuarts.” Jocelyn’s book *Satire, Celebrity, and Politics in Jane Austen*, reviewed above by **Sylvia Kasey Marks** (35-37), can be purchased at a discount from “the ever-helpful Jane Austen Books (write orderaustenbooks@gmail.com).”

As part of on-going work towards the book “Historicist Methodologies for Literary Study 1926-2017,” **Robert D. Hume** wrote “What Is Your Evidence?” R.S. Crane as Scholar, Critic, and Theorist of Methodology,” which appeared in the May 2018 issue of *Modern Philology*, the journal Crane edited from 1930 to 1952. Besides surveying Crane’s scholarly and critical productions (broken into seven categories, 445ff.—like Crane, Hume is a splitter), Rob also surveys the Chicago, or neo-Aristotelian, school of criticism, which in practice means several generations of scholars (like Wayne Booth) who received their graduate education from Crane and his colleagues at the U. of Chicago. Many of Crane’s contemporaries there were also contributors to the essay collection *Critics and Criticism*, 1952: W. R. Keast, Richard McKeon, Elder Olson, et al. Rob has read very broadly for this study, not just the works of these critics but the reviews of Crane’s works and scholarly reflections since published on Crane’s criticism (such as Northrop Frye’s diaries). Few 21C literary scholars read 20C critical theory by Crane (or others), and Crane’s prose was often abstract and turgid, needing clearer articulation of the sort Rob provides. Rob finds a critical consensus that Crane and his contemporaries at Chicago failed to develop and employ a scientific methodology related to Aristotle’s criticism that would be (or could be) followed. (Crane’s most exemplary work of practical criticism seems to be that on the plot of *Tom Jones*, which, makes an important division in the sorts of plots and attends ingeniously to Fielding’s plot, but is rather indifferent to

what the novel means or how it affects readers.) This has been frequently observed in part because Crane was a very severe critic of others' criticism, despite his belief that pluralism in criticism, multiple approaches and perspectives attempted where useful, was necessary (439). But like the Yale school that was attacked in *Critics and Criticism*, Crane stressed historical, inductive criticism focused on features intrinsic to the work (like genre)—subsequent Chicago-school critics would take intention, context, readers into consideration and write good practical criticism—besides Booth's, Rob appreciates Richard Levin's criticism (on English Renaissance drama). He concludes by attending to "What we can learn from Crane," and this fifth section of the essay should be read by all literary scholars and esp. English majors. Crane stressed the importance of *all* the evidence and the testing of multiple hypotheses, skeptically subjecting one's own hypothesis to the same rigorous questioning one directed at others' (something I recently failed to do despite my telling freshman comp students to do so over decades). Crane's essential method for Rob boils down to posing questions that have multiple answers, gathering all the evidence, admitting the limitations of that evidence, and then testing "all seemingly plausible hypothetical answers" (472-73).

Rob reflects that, in rereading Crane, he found he had taken much more away from him while young than he had realized. I was struck by how Crane's methodology had to my mind long been Hume's methodology, contributing too to the success of students like **Nancy Mace**, **Ashley Marshall** and **Leah Orr**. The method is evident in his contribution to *Revising Shakespeare's Lost Play*, edited by Deborah C. Payne (2016): "Believers Versus Skeptics: An Assessment of the *Cardenio/Double Falsehood* Problem." Here Rob addresses multiple problems involving the authorship of *Double Falsehood*, a 1728 tragedy that Lewis Theobald claimed was based on manuscripts of an early 17C play by Shakespeare (and in his 2nd-edition preface, by Shakespeare and John Fletcher). Scholars have asked about its relation to a text performed in 1613, to a MS recorded in 1653 by Humphrey Moseley in the Stationers' Register as "The History of Cardenio, by Mr. Fletcher. & Shakespeare," and to adaptations undertaken in the 1660s resulting in MSS that Theobald claims to have employed in his adaptation. Rob's essay is built around fundamental questions, some of which had not yet been asked. He considers all the answers in the scholarly record and tests them against all the evidence, giving credit to his predecessors where due. He notes along the way erroneous statements by critics, dead-end approaches ("drivel"), and what questions the evidence will not allow us to answer. He rules out the claim that *Double Falsehood* was a forgery by the Shakespearean Theobald, in part as repeated stylistic analyses confirm Fletcher's hand in the palimpsest—though evidence for Shakespeare's is very scanty, but whatever Shakespeare may have contributed (and he likely did contribute) cannot be identified. To this broader discussion, Rob has added knowledge about "the availability of old play manuscripts, the circumstances of the Duke's Company in the 1660s, the . . . implied stemma, the possible performance of a 'Davenant(?)' version . . . Theobald's adaptive habits . . . and what relevance copyright issues have to the 'old' manuscripts" (55). Because skeptics doubt Theobald's claims to having MS adaptations from the 1660s since there were "no performances" then, Rob asks can we know if such a play

was then performed? And he marshals evidence showing we cannot. One can also see Rob's penchant for turning problems into questions pursued with multiple explanations in his discussion of the Larpent MSS collection in the October 2016 *Intelligencer* (30.2:1-7). A fuller account with more attention to the Licensing Act of 1737 is offered among the essays to the Adam Matthew Digital collection *Eighteenth Century Drama: Censorship, Society and Stage*. Rob has remained active on the advisory boards for editions of Behn and Pope.

Deborah Kennedy in November wrote, "I've been doing some work on the eighteenth-century gothic and popular culture. I just had a book chapter come out in a collection on the AMC series *The Walking Dead*. I discuss some of the gothic elements in the series, while focusing on one of the female characters. It's called "The Beauty of Beth Greene," in *The Politics of Race, Gender and Sexuality in The Walking Dead*, edited by Elizabeth Erwin and Dawn Keetley (Jefferson: McFarland, 2018): 107-118. Last fall the Univ. of Delaware Press published *New Essays on Samuel Johnson: Revaluation*, edited by **Anthony W. Lee**, 284 pp., available on Amazon for about \$80. Its eleven essays include Tony's "No Poem an Island: Utopian Intertextuality in *London, A Poem*"; **Thomas Curley's** "Samuel Johnson and *Taxation No Tyranny*: 'I am willing to love all mankind, except an American'"; **John Richetti's** "Samuel Johnson as Heterodox Critic and Poet"; **Greg Clingham's** "Playing Rough: Johnson and Children"; **Steven Scherwitzky's** "Samuel Johnson and Autobiography: Reflection, Ambivalence, and 'Split Intentionality'"; and other essays by Lynda Mugglestone, Adam Rounce, Katherine Kickel, John Sitter, Emily C. Friedman, and Paul Tankard.

This month Bucknell publishes another collection edited by Tony Lee: *Community and Solitude: New Essays on Johnson's Circle*, part of the Transits series treating 1650-1850, available in both hardback and paperback and distributed through Rutgers U. Press. It includes seven essays by EC/ASECS members: the late **John Radner** on Johnson's correspondence with three younger men (Chambers, Langton, and Boswell); **Lisa Bergland** on "Piozzi and the Johnson Letters," exploring Johnson's relationship with the Thrales and Hester Lynch Thrale Piozzi's editing of *Letters to and from the late Samuel Johnson* (1788); **Marilyn Francus's** "'Down with her, Burney!': Johnson, Burney, and the Politics of Literary Celebrity"; **Christine Jackson-Holzberg's** "James Elphinston and Samuel Johnson: Contact, Clashes, and an 'Argonautic' Letter"; **Elizabeth Lambert's** "Johnson, Burke, Boswell, and the Slavery Debate"; **Anthony Lee's** "'Under the Shade of Exalted Merit': Arthur Murphy's *A Poetical Epistle to Mr. Samuel Johnson, A.M.*"; and **James E. May's** "Oliver Goldsmith's Revisions to *The Traveller*," likely impacted by reviews and also glancing at revisions to *The Deserted Village*. Finally, Clemson U. Press this spring publishes another volume edited by Tony: *Samuel Johnson among the Modernists* (256pp.), with nine essays treating Modernist writers' engagement with Johnson, including Tony's "Introduction: Modernity Johnson?" and his "'St. Samuel of Fleet Street': Johnson and Woolf" (1-20, 41-68); **Melvyn New's** "Johnson, T.S. Eliot, and the City" (21-40); **Jack Lynch's** "Johnson Goes to War," focused on WW1 (115-32); **Thomas M. Curley's** "Samuel Beckett and Samuel Johnson: Like-minded Masters of Life's Limitations" (133-64); **Carrie D. Shanafelt's** "'Plexed

Artistry’ of Nabokov and Johnson” (165-88); **Greg Clingham’s** “Johnson and Borges: Some Reflections” (189-212); and **Robert G. Walker’s** “Ernest Borneman’s *Tomorrow Is Now* (1959): Thoughts about a Lost Novel, with Glances toward Samuel Johnson and other Modernists” (213-38). Other contributors are Clement Hawes (on SJ, Conrad, and Joyce) and Joe Moffet (on Pound’s SJ). This is the first book to combine the study of Johnson and Modernist authors and to examine him from the perspectives of Modernist writers. Tony also published some notes and articles the past year, including “Samuel Johnson, Chesterfield, and *Rambler* 153” (on patrons and patronage) in *Notes and Queries* for March 2019 (111-14). His review above of the final volume in the Yale Johnson is another rigorous scholarly performance for us. Tony was in Denver to speak on Johnson and Nicholas Rowe, the subject of forthcoming notes in *The Scriblerian* and *Johnsonian News Letter*.

After publishing twice on teaching Eliza Haywood’s story “Fantomina” (in 2009 and 2012), **Kate Levin** has a third essay on a new experience teaching the story within “Reinventing Literary History: Women and College” to first-year students at Barnard College: “‘The Course of her Whimsical Adventures’: ‘Fantomina’ and Trigger Warnings at a Women’s College,” in *Pedagogy*, 18.3 (Oct. 2018), 550-65. **Devoney Looser** published “Fame in the Family: Jane Austen’s Political Legacy” in *Victorians*, 133 (2018), 7-23. The March 2019 issue of *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* contains **Nancy A. Mace’s** “The Preston Copyright Records and the Market for Music in Late Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth-Century England” (111.1: 1-54). Nancy offers an enlightening account of one of the few extant financial records kept by 18C music sellers, and that from the firm of John Preston and his son Thomas, whose firm, following its founding in 1773 and by the end of the century, came to dominate London music sales. Nancy explores an album of letters, clippings, and “receipts signed by composers, authors, and a few music sellers transferring copyrights to the Prestons” and their successors, including 115 receipts predating 1811 (75 from the 1801-1810). These receipts are analyzed and transcribed in a lengthy series of tables. As we have heard and seen at our annual meetings, Nancy has been revealing much about the sale and consumption of music while employing advertisements, copyright battles, and Stationers’ Company records. Now, she and other investigators have even more evidence in reshaping our sense of popular musical tastes. One of Nancy’s many observations is that musicology previously underestimated “the contributions of British composers and the musical genres in which they traditionally worked.” Among the notes in the March *PBSA* is **Sandro Jung’s** “The Color-Printed Plates for Edward Jeffery’s Edition of Walpole’s *Castle of Otranto* (1796) (55-68), and the issue also contains a review of Sandro’s *James Thomson’s* *The Seasons*. The September issue of *Eighteenth-Century Life* is fully devoted to reviews, and so **Ashley Marshall**, the book-review editor, deserves a “job-well-done” toast. It contains **Anthony Lee’s** Olympic-sized review essay “Bucknell University Press, 1996-2016” (1-28), and then twelve other reviews, including **Leah Orr’s** of Alessa Johns, *Reflections on Sentiment: Essays in Honor of George Starr* (2016), **Vincent Carretta’s** of Ramesh Mallipeddi, *Spectacular Suffering: Witnessing Slavery in the 18C British Atlantic* (2016), and **Jacob Sider Jost’s** of Natalie Phillips,

Distraction: Problems of Attention in Literature (2016). **Jim May** is looking into who printed Catholic books in early 18C London. In mid July Oxford UP will published the first volume of **William McCarthy**'s four-volume edition *The Collected Works of Anna Letitia Barbauld*: it has a critical edition of *The Poems, Revised*, including all Barbauld's poems, redefining her canon with much new information on the dates of composition and publication (512 pp.; ISBN: 9780198704348; \$175). **Judith Milhous** reviewed *Music in the London Theatre from Purcell to Handel*, ed. by Colin Timms, in *Music & Letters* for May 2018. **Rebekah Mitsein**'s "Trans-Saharan Worlds and World Views in Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko*" appeared in the Spring 2018 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* (30.3:339-68). Rebekah also contributed "Upon a Voyage and No Voyage: Mapping Africa's Waterways in Defoe's *Captain Singleton*" to the Fall 2018 *Digital Defoe*. In Denver this month **Ellen Moody** presents "The Poldark Novels: A Blend of Precise Accuracy and Imaginative Reasoning" (part of a book project), and chairs "Factual Fictions and Fictional Facts" (in which **Tom Hothem** offers "Natural Fictions': Landscape Aesthetics and the Spatial Imagination"). This summer at Osher institutes in the Washington area (see her discussion of them above on pp. 13-20), she'll repeat her course on "Enlightenment at Risk" and teach "The Booker Prize Niche: Short and Short-listed" on three short books and a movie by a Prize-winner. The Winter 2019 *Pennsylvania History* begins with **Carla J. Mulford**'s "'Prevent[ing] . . . restless Spirits from Disturbances': Benjamin Franklin and the Wyoming Valley" (86.1:1-37). Historians have overlooked Ben Franklin's role in resolving a 1780s land battle, in part between wealthy and common people. But Carla finds that Franklin, while President of Pennsylvania's Supreme Council, "had a significant role to play as the controversy reached its resolution in the formation of the County of Luzerne." Carla presented a seminar at the Library Company of Philadelphia on 6 March entitled "Franklin and Immigration." The event, limited to 20 persons, included "an intimate and interactive presentation of historical materials in the Reading Room followed by dinner in the Logan Room."

Melvyn New published a review essay in the winter *Eighteenth-Century Studies* on the Cambridge UP edition of *The Letters of Oliver Goldsmith*, edited by Michael Griffin and David O'Shaughnessy (52.2: 263-70). Mel develops four criticisms of the edition, including deficiencies in its annotations and textual apparatus—there is good advice here for anyone thinking of undertaking an edition. In October Mel wrote us to take up **Hugh Ormsby-Lennon**'s musings in the last *Intelligencer* about Johnson and Franklin: "Now, as part of Bob Walker and my campaign to turn *ECIntel* into the *Tom Cumming Newsletter and Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*, we will offer a solution to the problem raised by Hugh Ormsby-Lennon as to whether or not Johnson ever met Ben Franklin, and, if so, was it through the mediation of Boswell? Had Boswell brought them together certainly he would have noted it the *Life* as another one of his achievements, as when he brought Johnson and Wilkes face to face. So, we would suggest instead, that if Johnson and Franklin did meet (and it is quite possible they did not, since neither seems to have acknowledged meeting the other), we would offer Tom Cumming as the likely mediator. Cumming had met Franklin and his family in America in

1750-51 and a letter of 1763 suggests they had remained friends in the interim. Franklin was in London from 1757-1775 (excepting 1764) as was Cumming until his death in 1774, and they were very possibly close neighbors. Cumming lived on Surrey Street in 1770 (we do not yet know when he moved there) just off the Strand (and close to Johnson, of course). Given the fact that we have found Cumming to be a most "clubbable" man, if anyone might have introduced Franklin to Johnson (or vice versa), it could well have been Tom Cumming, good friend to both famous men. We have not yet established Cumming's full responsibility for Boswell's *Life* and for the American Revolution, but we are working on that." There's more coming on Mel and Bob Walker's foundational research below. **Maximillian E. Novak's** spirited defense of Defoe's character and artistry at the fifth biennial Defoe conference in September 2017, "The Deplorable Daniel Defoe: His Supposed Ignorance, Immorality, and Lack of Conscious Artistry, is the lead essay in the Fall 2018 issue of *Digital Defoe* (Vol. 10, no. 1). It is introduced with the heading "Distinguished Scholar Invited Essay." In the Fall 2018 *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, **Leah Orr** favorably reviewed *Restoration Printed Fiction: A Comprehensive Searchable Database of Fiction Printed 1660-1700*, a website created by **Marta Kvande**, a Delaware Ph.D. once in our regional. Leah notes that it "meets an important need by presenting the first digital bibliography" for fiction of the period, building on printed bibliographies by such as Charles Mish (1967) and esp. Robert Letellier (1997) and literary histories by Paul Salzman (1985) and Robert Adams Day (1968). Leah finds it easy to search and well detailed. Leah's *Novel Ventures* is reviewed by **John Richetti** in the Fall 2018 *Digital Defoe*, who characterizes it and her quantitative approach as "sweepingly ambitious" and "important, original, and even path-breaking." It is also reviewed above in this issue by **Mary Anne O'Donnell** (31-34) and by Kathryn King in the November issue of *Review of English Studies*.

David M. Palumbo's article "From 'Laughing' to 'Rayl[ing]' with a Few Friends': *A Modest Proposal* as Private Satire" appears in *The Eighteenth Century: Theory & Interpretation*, 59.3 (Fall 2018), 259-78. The abstract indicates that David "accounts for Jonathan Swift's 1734 revision of his theory of satire in *Intelligencer*, no. 3 (1728), through a reinterpretation of *A Modest Proposal* (1729) as a source of interpersonal raillery." **Elizabeth Powers** published an interesting and favorable review of Will Stone's translation of Wilhelm Waiblinger's biography of Friedrich Hölderlin, *Friedrich Hölderlin's Life, Poetry, and Madness* in the *TLS* of 21-23 August 2018. Waiblinger in the 1820s, while a young man, repeatedly visited the poet in Tübingen, providing a detailed analysis of Holderlin's attitudes, activities, and mental condition. **Jonathan Pritchard** published in the March 2019 *Notes and Queries* "Pope's 'Floors of Plaister' and 'Stucco Floors'" (66.1:105-7), clarifying for modern readers the references to such floors in Pope's *Of the Use of Riches* and a Horatian imitation by Swift. This issue of *N&Q*, full of essays on our period, contains Nicholas Seager's "*The Clause Proposal in the English Parliament to Prevent the French Goods being Imported thro' Scotland* (1707): A **New Defoe Attribution**" (83-85). Seager has identified a 2 ½ page pamphlet as that Defoe in a letter refers to himself as writing. The first two thirds of the pamphlet give "the title and the clause that excepts "Her Majesty's Natural

born Subjects of Scotland from the Drawback Bill [involving import restrictions].” This part is “identical to the text . . . given as an appendix in Defoe’s *History of the Union*.” There follow three paragraphs of “remarks” (transcribed by Seager as an appendix). Defoe’s title is identical to that in his *History* and not identified as used by others, and Defoe’s language and points fit those of essays he published in the *Review*.

Hermann Real has edited and sent to press the 2019 *Swift Studies* (the first issue produced by Dirk Passmann’s publishing company, Dirk, a distinguished Swift scholar has long been an officer of the Ehrenpreis Centre). After the preface on Centre activities, it contains Moyra Haslett’s “Swift’s Birthdays,” **Christine Jackson-Holzberg**’s “Politicizing and Politicized: Swift’s *Proposal* and the Brothers,” **Ashley Marshall**’s “Richard Steele’s Rhetorical Duel with the Authors of *The Examiner* (1710-14),” Dirk Passmann and **Hermann Real**’s “Charles Bernard, Horace, and the Critical History of Lydia’s Lips, with Some Sidelights on Jonathan Swift,” Gene Washington’s “‘Said the Thing which was not’: A Note on Book Four of *Gulliver’s Travels*,” Hermann’s “Daniel Schiebeler (1741-71), Swiftian Parodist,” and Ulrich Elkmann’s “Platzregen in der Stadt: *A Description of a City Shower* in German.”

This month was published *Reading Swift: Papers from the Seventh Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift*, edited by Janika Bischof, Kirsten Juhas, and **Hermann J. Real** (W. Fink); pp. xiv + 705; 26 black/white and 13 colored illustrations; €189). The tome has 26 essays, four of them co-authored, revised from presentations at the symposium in June 2017 and then carefully edited by Team Ehrenpreis—who check all the quotes, all references (as to the ESTC and Teerink), and generally improve the style and often the documentation. At least two of the three editors pored over each contribution. I have seen no editors take this care, though those of *The Scriblerian* and *Studies in Bibliography* may be rivals. (These editors have helped me dodge many a bullet.) Team Ehrenpreis spent half a year editing the volume and then producing the index—imagine doing this for seven volumes of others’ work that occupies a foot and a half of book-shelf—and then add in several feet of *Swift Studies* produced with the same care! The contributors enjoyed a scholarly honeymoon in lovely Münster, flying there with the aid of grant funding sought well in advance by the Ehrenpreis Centre, and then now comes this new debt! The essays, all beginning with abstracts, are divided into the sections: biography, bibliography, Early Satires, Poetry and Music, *Gulliver’s Travels*, Philosophical and Religious Issues, Political Problems, Ireland, and Reception & Adaptation. EC/ASECS members made many contributions: **Eugene Hammond**, “What Do Young Men Know? All-Too-Powerful Inferences Masquerading as Facts” (3-30); **J. A. Downie**, “The Biographer as Historian” (31-43); **Andrew Carpenter** and **James Woolley**, “Faulkner’s *Volume II, Containing the Author’s Poetical Works: A New Uncancelled Copy*” (47-58), **James E. May**, “False and Incomplete Imprints in Swift’s Dublin, 1710-35,” with an appendix listing “Some Hidden and False Imprint Editions by George Faulkner, 1726-35” (59-99); Dirk F. Passmann and **Hermann J. Real**, “Annotating J. S. Swift’s Reading at Moor Park in 1697/8” (101-24); **Stephen Karian**, “Lost Works by Swift and the Ballad of January 1712” (385-400); **Ashley Marshall**, “Swift, Oldisworth, and the Politics of

The Examiner, 1710-14” (401-32); **Jonathan Pritchard**, “Dubliners: Swift and his Neighbours” [on the liberty of St. Patrick’s Cathedral] (497-524); Kristen Juhas and **Mascha Hansen**, “Speaking with/of the Dead: Hester Thrale Piozzi and Swift” (527-52); and **Ian Higgins**, “Swift’s Whig Pamphlet: Its Reception and Afterlife” (553-72). Other contributions came from such distinguished scholars as Sabine Baltes-Ellermann, Norbert Col, Daniel Cook, Christopher Fauske, Rebecca Ferguson, Rudolf Freiburg, Moyra Haslett, D. W. Hayton, Allan Ingram, Florian Klaeger, Patrick Müller, Melinda Alliker Rabb, Marcus Walsh, Peter Wagner, and Howard Weinbrot—I cannot type these names without a big smile of recollection (the October 2017 *Intelligencer* reports on the symposium). Some essays, as Haslett’s on music and Ferguson’s and Wagner’s on visual art, are very well illustrated. Please support these colleagues working on Swift and his contemporaries by asking your librarian to order the volume (ISBN: 978-3-7705-6397-5).

In the festschrift *From Enlightenment to Rebellion: Essays in Honor of Christopher Fox*, ed. by James G. Buckerood (Bucknell UP, 2018), we find Dirk Passmann and **Hermann Real**’s “Shipwreck with Spectators: or, Watching the Pain of Others in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Intellectual History” (95-113). Hermann and Dirk describe the vilification of Epicureanism in the Renaissance and thereafter, stressing references to passages of Lucretius’s *De rerum natura* that depict the philosophical sage as self-sufficient, tranquil spectator of the shipwrecks of life. Then they consider the positive transformation of the Epicurean sage through various intellectual positions, like Bacon’s praise of curiosity as a divine benefit and the defense of self-love in Montaigne and others. This leads to an examination of Swift’s poem “The Day of Judgment,” wherein God is found to have attitudes akin to the God described by Lucretius and the epicurean sage.

I did not say enough about the publication of **John Richetti**’s *A History of Eighteenth-Century British Literature* (384 pp.), which Wiley-Blackwell published during 2017 in its History of English Literature series. John mentioned to me that he worked “laboriously, over many years” on the historical and critical survey, and, on reading over the contents table, I cannot imagine how it could have been otherwise—it is the sort of book that one might have shaped one’s teaching around over a couple decades, for it surveys poetry, fiction, non-fiction, and drama, working in chronological units within these major divisions (early, mid, late century). The selective focus reflects what John judges to be most important, much as the Oxford histories of literature by C. S. Lewis, et al. did—I’m not sure we have had a shake-down of this sort by anyone of John’s erudition in recent decades. The price was a surprise too, about \$52 on Amazon and ten bucks less for the kindle edition. The book is reviewed in the 2018 issue of *Digital Defoe*. John this past year edited a fine collection for *The Cambridge Companion to Robinson Crusoe*, of 14 essays plus his introduction (bibliography, chronology, illustrations, index), very affordably priced at \$20 plus change on Amazon. It includes what one would think should be the significant topics for discussing the novel and its impact: **J. P. Hunter**, “Genre, Nature, *Robinson Crusoe*” (3-15); **Rivka Swenson**, “*Robinson Crusoe* and the Form of the New Novel” (16-31); **Maximillian E. Novak**, “RC [*Robinson Crusoe*] and Defoe’s Career as

Writer” (32-48); Pat Rogers, “RC: Good Housekeeping, Gentility, and Property” (49-60); G. A. Starr, “RC and its Sequels: *The Farther Adventures* and *Serious Reflections*” (67-83); **Eve Tavor Bannet**, “RC and Travel Writing: The Transatlantic World” (128-41); **Dennis Todd’s** “RC and Colonialism” (142-57); David Blewett, “The Iconic Crusoe: Illustrations and Images of RC” (159-90); Jill Campbell, “Robinsonades for Young People” (191-206), and others, including treatments of modern reactions and films.

Laura Rosenthal, now editing *Restoration*, last year published *The Experimental Imagination: Literary Knowledge and Science in the British Enlightenment* (Stanford UP). Laura, while attending to the production of knowledge by 17C and 18C women, examines issues in literary form, gender theory, and cultural studies and discusses how scientific discourse relied on literary tropes and technologies. The book is reviewed by **Danielle Spratt** in *Digital Defoe*, 10.1 (Fall 2018). **Beverly Jerold Scheibert** published an article on an 18C music critic, distinguishing him from another with a similar name, in “Pascal Boyer: A Pioneer in Journalistic Music Criticism,” *Fontes Artis Musicae* (65.3 [2018], 146-56). **Eleanor Shevlin** was at the MLA in Chicago to perform her duties as Chair of the Theory and Methods Forum on Book History, Print Culture and Lexicography. At ASECS she presented “Absence in the Face of Presence: Printer Mary Harrison.” Eleanor will step down later this year from serving as membership secretary for SHARP, a post she has worked at for many years (building SHARP’s membership and faithful attending meetings around the world). Eleanor oversaw eight program reviews this year at West Chester U.—plugging away at them from home over the winter recess. She was also reading novels in search of prospects for her classes (one of her courses involves the university in fiction, which has been starting with Francis Coventry’s *Pompeii the Little*, set in Oxford) and working on a study of illustrations in the publications of Harrison and Co. late in the 18C. **Geoffrey Sill’s** “Robinson’s Transgender Voyage: or, Burlesquing Crusoe, drafted for a presentation at the Defoe Society meeting in September 2017, will be published in *Crusoe at 300*, ed. by Andreas Mueller and Glynis Ridley, forthcoming this year from Bucknell U. Press. Geof published “Frances Burney and the French Revolution” in the fall 2018 issue of *The Burney Journal*.” Also his “Robinson Crusoe, ‘Sudden Joy,’ and the Portuguese Captain” appears in the Fall 2018 issue of *Digital Defoe* (some of which we heard at EC/ASECS in 2017, but now it is dressed up with illustrations and notes). The Winter 2019 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* is the second of two issues on “Material Fictions” edited by Eugenia Zuroski and Michael Yonan. It contains **Chloe Wigston Smith’s** “Bodkin Aesthetics: Small Things in the 18C” (271-94). Note that the first special issue in fall 2018 ends with Sean Silver’s “Afterword: What Do We Mean by ‘Material Fiction?’” Chloe published “The Haberdasher’s Plot: The Romance of Small Trade in Frances Burney’s Fiction” in *Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature*, 37.2 (Fall 2018), 271-93. **Diana Solomon’s** “Restoration Actresses: The Case of Elizabeth Barry and Anne Bracegirdle” appears in the last issue of *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* (Winter 2016). At ASECS **Rivka Swenson** co-chaired “Feminist Approaches to the Fieldings” and presented “Cupid’s Queen Geometry of the Eyes.” G. Thomas Tansell’s

letter in February on developments within the Bibliographical Society of Virginia to its membership (in advance of its March meeting) promotes the Battestin Fellowship, named for the late **Martin** and **Ruthe Battestin** and providing support to graduate students doing bibliographical work during the summer at the UVA library. Here we learn that **David Vander Meulen** and Anne G. Ribble will serve another year as Vice President and Secretary-Treasurer. Also, David and his assistant Elizabeth Lynch have completed editing Volume 60 of *Studies in Bibliography*, due out this spring. Also, Virginia Press will publish John Bidwell's essays entitled *Paper and Type*."

Bob Walker wrote in October to correct my mistaken remark that Tom Cummings was American: "Tom Cumming was not an American, unless of course Ben Franklin was French because he lived in Paris. This is one of the commonly held views, along with his being a slave-trader, that our work corrects. Mel New and I have kidded back and forth about the formation of the Tom Cumming Foundation, supported perhaps by Barclay's or another institution founded by Quakers, which would fund the *Tom Cumming Quarterly* and Cumming travel grants, etc. The possibilities are endless. Of course Mel and I would draw huge salaries for our roles as the Foundation's directors. Seriously, Cumming was born near Edinburgh and was known to be Scottish, despite his having spent a few years in the early 1750s in America. (Perhaps the very favorable treatment he received at the hands of Smollett in his history was influence by a shared nationality.) . . . one of the difficulties we discovered in tracking down information about him lay in the possible variations in the spelling of his name. One variant that shows up somewhere among the Johnson editors is something like 'Cumyns,' for example. Generally 'Cumming' (without the 's') is more Scottish and with the 's' more English or Irish. Fortunately, A photocopy of Cumming's will was available via PRO, and we chose to use 'Cumming,' which was how Tom C. signed the document." We learn more about Cumming in Bob's note above (10-13) on his London interactions, and Bob and **Mel New's** long article in *Modern Philology* has the biographical freight of a monograph: "Who Killed Tom Cumming the Quaker? Recovering the Life Story of an Eighteenth-Century Adventurer" (262-98). The article itself reverses the titular topics, examining the record Cumming left behind before delving into the authorship and motives for a disparaging account of Cumming in the January 1774 issue of the magazine *Town and Country* (shortly before Cumming's death), thus allowing scrutiny and judgments about claims made regarding Cumming. As Bob and Mel track Cumming's life (or lives as author, printer, trader, etc.), from Scotland through Ireland and America and ultimately to London, we learn a great deal about more than Cumming. In addition, they have a note forthcoming in the spring-summer issue of *Scottish Literary Review*: "Thomas Cumming and William Leechman: An Early Spat for the 'Fighting Quaker,'" and Bob alone has a "fourth-cumming" note in the *Johnsonian News Letter* for Fall 2019, "'Curious Particulars': The Will of Thomas Cumming, the Fighting Quaker." (This is largely an annotated edition of the will, transcribed from a copy at the PRO.) And Bob has several separate points to make in other notes or short articles. **Erlis Glass Wickersham**, who has been a frequent reviewer for the *Goethe Yearbook*, reviewed a couple more books for the 2017 volume

(24): an English translation of Joseph von Eichendorff's Romantic novel *Ahnung und Gegenwart* (1815) and Sarah Vandegrift Eldridge's *Novel Affinities: Composing the Family in the German Novel, 1795-1830*.

Manny Schonhorn writes that the **18C studies seminars at Columbia** are coordinated by Prof. Kathleen Lubey of St. John's U. (Kathleen.lubey@gmail.com). In February the group was addressed by Kathleen Wilson (History, Stony Brook) and in March by Lauren Kopjtic (Philosophy, Fordham). Remaining is April 25th's meeting with a panel on Human Rights and the 18C with Ala Alryyes (English, Queens College), Kristine Huang (English, Wisconsin), and Michael Ralph (Social & Cultural Analysis, NYU).

The Eighteenth-Century Ireland Society holds its 2019 annual meeting at Queen's U. Belfast on 14-16 June 2019, co-organized by Ciara Conway and Moyra Haslett. Proposals are invited for papers on any aspect of 18C Ireland, including its history, literature, language, and culture. There is no specific theme, but proposals for papers and panels addressing the following topics will be esp. welcome: 18C Belfast, Ireland & Europe, and Music & Performance. Proposals with 250-word abstracts should be submitted to Moyra Haslett (m.haslett@qub.ac.uk) before 29 April 2019 (decision will follow by 6 May). The plenary speakers are Fionntán de Brún (Maynooth U.), Catriona Kennedy (U. of York), and Finola O'Kane (DUC). The conference will include an exhibition of MSS and prints from the Bunting Collection of QUB and a performance of Irish music from that collection on 15 June. The next morning (Sunday) historian Sean Connolly will lead a walking tour of Belfast. There are four postgraduate bursaries, one funded by Marsh's Library.

The 15th **International Congress on Enlightenment** meets in Edinburgh this 14-19 July (see www.bsecs.org.uk/osecs/). The CFP is closed.

The **Aphra Behn Society** will hold its biennial meeting with the **Burney Society** on 6-9 November 2019 at the Caroline Marshall Draughon Center for Arts & Humanities at historic Pebble Hill, sponsored by Auburn U's College of Liberal Arts. Papers, roundtables and workshops are sought, with proposals due by 15 May. See www.behnburney2019.com.

The ninth **"Money, Power, and Print: An Interdisciplinary Colloquium on the Financial Revolution"** will be held in Dublin on 4-6 June 2020. Topics include the history of personal credit, central banking and other financial institutions, and the effect of finance on culture and governmental policies. Contact Charles J. Larkin (larkincj@tcd.ie) and see www.moneypowerandprint.org.

The **MWASECS** holds a business meeting at ASECS this month and meets with the **Canadian SECS** during October 2020 in Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Library Company of Philadelphia opened the exhibition *Stylish Books: Designing Philadelphia Furniture* on 2 November 2018. Organized by Curator of Art and Artifacts and Reference Librarian, Linda August, *Stylish Books* runs through April 26, 2019. The Library Company's exhibition gallery is free and open to the public Mondays through Fridays from 9:00 a.m. - 4:45 p.m. The Library Company is also promoting a book talk and signing **"William Penn: A Life"** on Tuesday 15 April, 6-7:30 p.m., held at the Arch Street Meeting House (320 Arch St., Philadelphia): "Drawing on his new biography, *William Penn: A Life*, Andrew Murphy, will bring William Penn

down from his pedestal [atop City Hall] and explore the significant aspects of his extraordinary life.” BTW, as I write, this OUP hardback at 488 pp., published in November, is just under \$20 on Amazon.

The **Tate Britain** will mount from 11 Sept. 2019 to 2 Feb. 2020 “**William Blake: The Artist**,” billed as “The most comprehensive survey” of Blake “since 2001,” displaying 300 drawings, paintings, and prints.

The **Dr. Williams’s Library** in London has been closed since the fall and likely to remain so for a year, after a structural engineer identified problems in the building (built 1848), requiring “urgent work.” There will be events in the lecture hall, but the printed material will be inaccessible. Also, **Haverford College’s** Quaker and Special Collections is closed until Fall 2019 for renovations. The **Huntington Library’s** November 2018 fund-raising letter estimates that 1800 scholars will be “on site to access our collections over the course of this academic year,” with 160 receiving grants. Also, “More than 100,000 items were added to the Library’s collections over the past year, and some 43,000 images were added to the Huntington Digital Library.” Wow.

For Heritage Week 2018, **Steve Dolan’s Irish Workhouse Centre** produced several informative 35-p. booklets, with two providing compilations in facsimile of newspaper articles on laborers related to Galway and Tipperary through the 1700s. The Centre in Portumna, a cultural centre for that region, is “dedicated to telling the story of the workhouse in Ireland.” Google it up.

Pat Garret, founding member of the Children’s Books History Society and for many decades co-editor of its *Newsletter*, died in November 2018. The December 2018 issue of the *Newsletter* carries her photo on its cover and has several tributes to her and a long obituary by her fellow founder and co-editor Brian Alderson. Susan Bailes, the Chair of the Society, has stepped up to take her place as co-editor (bailes21@btinternet.com). Pat left £5000 to the Society and another £5000 to the Osborne Collection in Toronto. Her children’s books (including an important collection of alphabet books) were willed to Seven Stories and the Robinson Library at the U. of Newcastle. Besides celebrating Pat, the issue has the usual boatload of reports and announcements as for exhibitions, plus essays and reviews—including a good long article by Anne Hobbs on Arthur Rackham.

The Spring 2019 issue of *Dieciocho*, 42, no. 1, edited by David Gies of UVA, was published in February—another strong issue. It includes the essays “La caracterización cómica del otro en la literature dieciochesca de la Villa Imperial de Potosí: El caso del indígena en el *Entremés de los compadres* del convent de Santa Teresa” by Silvia Ruiz-Tresgallo and José Luis Ramírez Luengo; “Antonio Marqués y Espejo y la *Biblioteca selecta de las damas* (1806-1807)” by Felipe Rodríguez Morín; “The Realization of a Dream: Spain’s Role in Humboldt’s American Expedition” by Sandra Rebok; “¿Por qué vale la pena leer *La portentosa vida de la Muerte*, de fray Joaquín Bolaños?” by María Isabel Terán Elizondo; and a roundtable on “Opinión pública y prácticas culturales en el cambio de siglo” with contributions by Elisabel Larriba (on the press of the Antiguo Régimen, 1808-1823), Francisco Quiroz Checa (on the *Mercurio Peruano*), et al.—plus the usual bibliography of recent studies (“Cajón de sastre bibliográfico”) and reviews.

Restoration's fall 2018 issue contains a group of essays treating Restoration dramattick opera intermedially. Scott A. Trudell explains the terminology that may be new to readers in his "Introduction: The Intermediate Restoration": these essays treat Restoration texts "from the standpoint of their media—that is, the technological processes and communication conventions . . . in their circulation and production," extending the "interdisciplinary conversation of media studies back in time." In "The Intermedia Dramaturgy of Dramattick Opera: Understanding the Genre through Performance" (13-38), Amanda Eubanks Winker claims that scholars have failed to appreciate Restoration dramattick opera because they've privileged the text to the degree that they are anxious about seeing the author and his words subordinated to music and other media. Sharon J. Harris in "Music, Text, Stuttering: An Intermedial Approach to Dramattick Opera in *The Fairy Queen*" (65-94) considers how "three media—music, text, stuttering—interact and draw on each other in the scene of the Drunken Poets in the dramattick opera *The Fairy Queen*," an adaptation of Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. This issue's "Some Current Publications" was written by April M. Fuller (147-62). *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* has fallen behind—its last issue is winter 2016 (31.2), and its website indicates nos. 1-2 of vol. 32 will appear in spring and summer 2019. The journal is now edited by Anne Greenfield (Valdosta State U.), with Jessica Munns (U of Denver) "co-editor." The editor for book-reviews is Penny Richards (Gloucestershire U.) and for theatrical performances, Derek Hughes (Aberdeen U.)—there are five of each. N. the essay by Tim Keenan on "A Database of Restoration Stage Directions."

Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture, vol. 50, for papers presented between July 2018 and June 30, 2019: Revised papers may be submitted by 18 August 2019 to the editors (electronic submission to etbannet@ou.edu). Essays should be 7000-9000 words in length, in Chicago Style, and suited to blind reviewing (be sure to use third person to refer to your own scholarship).

In January the **Voltaire Foundation** published (in association with Liverpool U. Press) *Les Lumières catholiques et le roman français* by Isabelle Tremblay (288 pp.), a collection of essays billed as "the first volume to study the Catholic Enlightenment from a literary point of view." In addition the Foundation published as Vol. 21 of its *Complete Works of Voltaire*, the first volume of *Essai sur les mœurs et l'esprit des nations* (pp. xx + 478), with the work's general introduction and analytical index, edited by Bruno Bernard, John Renwick, Nicholas Cronk and Janet Godden. This completes the first full critical edition of the work, covering its "genesis, publication and reception" and "offering a detailed analysis of Voltaire's historical vision." Also in November the VF published as vols. 37-43 of the *Complete Works* Voltaire's *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*, 8 vols., edited by Christiane Mervaud and Nicholas Cronk, with contributions by David Adams, Marcus Allen, François Bessire, Christopher Cave, Graham Gargett, et al. This is the first full edition in over 200 years of Voltaire's longest work, with vol. 1 containing a general introduction. The *Questions*, dating from 1770-1774, "is a compendium of Voltaire's views on a broad range of subjects including religion, history, art and literature," varying greatly in style and tone. The editors examine the work's relation to Diderot and D'Alembert's *Encyclopédie*

and “assess the complex technique by which Voltaire fashions new material through extensive copying and borrowing from his earlier publications.”

Our archaeology desk received a link from Hugh Ormsby-Lennon to an illustrated *BBC News* web-posting 31 October: “**Blenheim Palace Dredging Project Reveals Hidden Rooms.**” Thirty rooms, long hidden within the bridge at Blenheim, were uncovered during the removal of 400,000 tons of silt from the lake about the bridge. These rooms, many with fireplaces and including what looks to be a theater, were built c. 1708 under the direction of Sir John Vanbrugh, but there is no evidence they were ever used. (Vanbrugh’s expenses led to his falling out with Sarah Duchess of Marlborough and he was banned from the property.) Experts suppose the “habitable viaduct” was flooded after Lancelot “Capability” Brown “created lakes on the estate in the 1760s.” The dig discovered sunken boats and graffiti dating back to 1760s.

The *Intelligencer* needs reviewers for: James G. Buickerood (ed.), *From Enlightenment to Rebellion: Essays in Honor of Christopher Fox* (Bucknell UP, 2018), pp. xix + 302; frt; 4 illus.; index; 17 essays on medieval to modern literature—only those on the long 18C should be reviewed. Also: *Beyond 1776: Globalizing the Cultures of the American Revolution*, ed. by Maria O’Malley and Denys Van Renen (U. of Virginia Press, 2018), pp. x + 259; index; 10 essays treating such consequences of the Revolution as the flow of ideas to the Continent and “surprising exchanges in . . . the West Indies and in the first penal colonies of Australia.” Also: *Memoirs on the Life and Travels of Thomas Hammond, 1748-1775*, ed. by George E. Boulukos (Johns Hopkins UP, 2018); pp. lxix + 303; illus.; index—the first publication of Hammond’s MS, illustrated with his own drawings (from England, he traveled in France, Spain, and Italy)—Kristina Straub notes that this “fascinatingly diverse life” offers insights into the status system, entertainment and sports, and the experience of religious differences. Also: Annika Mann, *Reading Contagion: The Hazards of Reading in the Age of Print* (U. of Virginia Press, 2018), pp. xiii + 257; one reviewer calls it an “energetic study of contagion as both metaphor and medico-descriptive term for writers”; another notes its connections between “science, medicine, and book culture.” Also: Anton M. Matytsin and Dan Edelstein (eds.), *Let There Be Enlightenment: The Religious and Mystical Sources of Rationality* (Johns Hopkins UP, 2018); pp. [vi] + 304; illus.; index; 12 essays from a 2014 symposium, including such essays as Matytsin’s “The Struggle for Light in the French Enlightenment,” Edelstein’s “The Aristotelian Enlightenment,” William J. Bulman’s “Secular Sacerdotalism in the Anglican Enlightenment, 1660-1740,” Jo Van Cauter’s on Spinoza & the Quakers, and Jeffrey D. Burson on “Alternate Genealogies of Enlightenment”). Also: Trevor Ross, *Writing in Public: Literature and the Liberty of the Press in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Johns Hopkins UP, 2018); pp. vi + 301; index.

Cover illustration: We gratefully reprint Giuseppe Maria Crespi’s *Tarquin and Lucretia* (c. 1695-1700), oil on canvas, 88 x 79.5 inches, from the Samuel H. Kress Collection in The National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. (Gallery 30). / Focus Section—Italian Painting of the 17th and 18th Century / NGA Online Editions, <https://nga/collection/art-object-page.41640.html>.

The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer

The Newsletter of the EC/ASECS
N.S. Volume 33, Number 1: March 2019

James E. May, editor
1423 Hillcrest Road
Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17603
U.S.A.