

**Bibliographic Information for Fifty-three Unlocated  
Eighteenth-Century Items in Arnott and Robinson's  
*English Theatrical Literature, 1559-1900***

By David Wallace Spielman

In 1953, members of the Society for Theatre Research (STR) began the daunting task of revising Robert W. Lowe's *A Bibliographical Account of English Theatrical Literature* (1888). In the first six years of the project, several editors came and went. As George Speaight says in his introduction, "the work proved too much for our part-time labours."<sup>1</sup> James Fullarton Arnott and John William Robinson were brought on board in 1959 to bring the project to completion. The resulting volume appeared in print in 1970 as *English Theatrical Literature, 1559-1900: A Bibliography* (hereafter A&R), one of the great achievements of the Society.

A&R incorporates and substantially expands Lowe's bibliography and has been a basic reference source for theatre historians for almost forty years. Its utility prompted John Cavanagh to continue the project up through 1985 in his *British Theatre: A Bibliography, 1901 to 1985*.<sup>2</sup> Lowe personally examined all the items that he could, and Arnott and Robinson followed Lowe's precedent in their revision and expansion. As they admit in their preface, however, the editors were not able to see everything listed in the bibliography (xii). They included some items based solely on information received from sources they deemed reliable. The amount of information provided for these items varies widely, and those with no library location supplied have long been a source of frustration to scholars.

Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO) has made full-text facsimile copies of a substantial number of these "unseen" items readily available. The present article provides augmented descriptions of 53 such items published between 1701 and 1800—some trivial, some surprisingly interesting—with physical location specified. I have arranged them according to A&R numbers. Entries are formatted as follows:

(A&R Number) Author, *Title*. Place of publication: Printed by whom for whom, Date. Sale price, if known. ECCO # (source library), ESTC # (number of other known copies listed in ESTC). Record of pagination. Brief description.

In the event that an item's title page did not give its sale price or author, I was sometimes able to find this information in contemporary advertisements using the newly released database 17th-18th Century Burney Newspapers Collection. All newspaper references are taken from this database. Descriptions of pagination follow A&R's method and use the same abbreviations. Unless otherwise specified, publication dates in brackets indicate estimates given in the English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC). All ESTC numbers appear in the format that ESTC's own search engine understands. The reader may use either the ESTC number or the ECCO number given to locate the particular item listed employing ECCO's "advanced search" option. ECCO requires that ESTC numbers appear in a six-digit format, so the reader will need to include zeros

before the numbers until a six-digit format is achieved; in other words, T5942 becomes T005942.

#### Abbreviations

A&R – *English Theatrical Literature, 1559-1900: A Bibliography*, ed. James Fullarton Arnott and John William Robinson, London, 1970.

Burney – 17th-18th Century Burney Newspapers Collection, an online database, freely available to the public at the British Library

ECCO – Eighteenth Century Collections Online, an online database, freely available to the public at the British Library

ESTC – English Short Title Catalogue, available online at <http://estc.bl.uk>

Milhous and Hume – *A Register of English Theatrical Documents, 1660-1737*, ed. Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume, 2 vols., Carbondale, 1991.

#### Augmented A&R Entries

(386) Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet), *A Letter from Mr. Voltaire to Father Porée, a Jesuit*. A&R treats this item as a separate pamphlet and gives no bibliographic information except for a suggested publication date of “[1734?].” ECCO does not include this publication, but I have found a later edition in *The Works of M. de Voltaire. Translated from the French. With notes, historical, critical, and explanatory*. vol. 25 of 35. London: Printed for J. Newberry, R. Baldwin, S. Crowder and Co., J. Coote, T. Davies, W. Johnston, and G. Kearsley, 1761. Pp. 3-7. ECCO # CW3314491880 (British Library), ESTC # T138094 (11 other copies). This edition of Voltaire’s works includes the seven volume series *The Dramatic Works of Mr. De Voltaire* (1761-3) as volumes 25-31. The volume in which the letter appears is the first of the *Dramatic Works* and retains its original title page. This edition of the letter is the earliest one available on ECCO but not the letter’s first appearance in print.<sup>3</sup>

(388) Anonymous, *A Companion to the Theatre: or, The Usefulness of the Stage to Religion, Government, and the Conduct of Life. Wherein the Plan, Characters, and Design of the most Celebrated Tragedies and Comedies are Explained*. London: Printed for F. Cogan at the Middle-Temple-Gate in Fleet-Street and J. Nourse at the Lamb without Temple-bar, [March] 1736. Pp. [10] [1] 2-286 [287-288 (advts.)]. Price 3s. ECCO # CW3315538149 (Bodleian Library), ESTC # T184769 (3 other copies). Advertised 3 March 1736 in *The London Daily Post, and General Advertiser*. This item is A&R 24, *The Dramatic Historiographer* (1735), with a different title page. I have not found *The Dramatic Historiographer* advertised but have seen *A Companion to the Theatre* advertised through 1739, after which the publishers apparently reissued it again with another new title page as *A Companion to the Theatre; or, A Key to the Play* (A&R 25). It provides plot summaries for forty-five plays, mostly performed between the years 1662 and 1728, but several of which are Shakespeare’s.

(865) [Edward Ward], *The Dancing Devils: or, the Roaring Dragon. A Dumb Farce. As it was lately Acted at Both Houses, but particularly at one, with*

*unaccountable Success*. London: Printed and sold by A. Bettesworth at the Red-Lion, J. Bately at the Dove in Pater-Noster-Row, and J. Brotherton at the Bible in Cornbil, [December] 1724. Pp. [1-2] 3-70. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3306538690 (Harvard University Graduate School of Business), ESTC # T32046 (23 other copies). Advertised 19 December 1724 in *The Daily Post* as part of *The Wandering Spy; or, the Merry Observator* (1724; not listed in A&R), a collection of Ward's poems. Verse satire against John Rich's *The Necromancer; or, Harlequin Doctor Faustus* (perf. 20 Dec. 1723), proceeding act by act through Rich's pantomime, summarizing the plot and commenting (mostly negatively) on the staging. A&R 3921 supplies more useful summaries. The title refers to the dragon that eats Faustus in the final scene.

(876) Anonymous, *A Guide to the Stage: or, Select Instructions and Precedents from the Best Authorities towards forming a Polite Audience; with some Account of the Players, &c.* London: Printed for D. Job at the Spread Eagle, in King's-Street, Covent-Garden; and R. Baldwin, at the Rose, in Pater-Noster-Row, [March] 1751. Pp. [1-3] 4-28; pl [1]. Price 6d. ECCO # CW3316035938 (Bodleian Library), ESTC # T183969 (one other copy). The second edition of this (A&R 877) is advertised 20 March 1750 in *The General Advertiser*. A&R describes this as "Published 10 Dec 1750 (LS., pt. 4, p. 225). An Addisonian essay on how to behave at the playhouse," but it must have been published sooner. The piece is a satire on "proper" audience behavior, which instructs readers on how to choose a play, a playhouse, and purports to be against laughing, crying, or being too enthralled by a performance—with several humorous examples.

(1170) Anonymous, *The Managers Managed: or, the Characters of the Four Kings of Brentford*. London: Printed for W. Nicoll, No. 51; and W. Harris, No. 70, St. Paul's-Church-Yard, [March] 1768. Pp. [1-7] 8-24. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3305703722 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), ESTC # N3485 (2 other copies). Advertised 12 March 1768 in *The Public Advertiser* as being published "On Tuesday next." Satire written in couplets on the four managers of Covent Garden during the proprietors' dispute of 1768.

(1172) Anonymous, *The Ring. An Epistle, Addressed to Mrs. L-----m*. London: Printed for J. Wilkie, in St. Paul's Church Yard, [1768]. Pp. [4] [1] 2-19. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3314002416 (John Rylands Library, University of Manchester), ESTC # T169200 (2 other copies). The attribution of this pamphlet has not been definitively determined. It was published anonymously and incorrectly attributed in the ESTC to "Harris, Thomas ( fl. 1712-1755)." K. A. Crouch attributes this pamphlet to Thomas Harris (d. 1820) in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry on Lessingham: "Harris himself was quick to defend her and in *The Ring: an Epistle, Addressed to Mrs. L—M* (1768), amid protestations of her beauty and virtue, argued that she was as strong a performer as Elizabeth Barry and Mary Ann Yates."<sup>4</sup> It is one of several pamphlets written as part of the Covent Garden proprietors' dispute of 1768.

(1180) Anonymous, *Truth and Treason! or a Narrative of the Royal Procession to the House of Peers, October the 29th, 1795. To which is added,*

*an Account of the Martial Procession to Covent-Garden Theatre, on the Evening of the 30th.* [London], 1795. Pp. [1-2] 3-8. Price 1*d.* ECCO # CW3304980001 (British Library), ESTC # T51965 (7 other copies). A narrative describing crowds harassing King George on his way to the House of Lords and damaging his carriage. The second narrative describes the king's trip to the theatre the following evening, during which he was better guarded, and the cavalry reportedly cut people down.

(1582) [James Gough], *Bristol Theatre: A Poem*. Bristol: Printed by S. Farley, in Castle-Green, 1766. Pp. [1-3] 4-15 [16 ("Apology for the foregoing Lines")]. Price 6*d.* ECCO # CW3312352426 (British Library), ESTC # T80831 (6 other copies). Published anonymously. Joseph Smith's *A Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books* (London, 1867), a revised version of John Whiting's *A Catalogue of Friends Books* (London, 1708), includes this poem among James Gough's works (853). As Lowe says, the poem is an attack on vice and the stage.

(1660) D. Pinn, *Roscius: or, a Critical Examination, into the Merits of all the principal Performers, belonging to Norwich Theatre. For the last Season. The Second Edition, with Additions and Corrections*. Norwich: Printed and sold by S. White, Magdalen-Street; and by the Booksellers in Town, 1767. Pp. [4] 1-20. Price 1*s.* ECCO # CW3304878224 (British Library), ESTC # T45231 (2 other copies). Written in response to critics attacking Norwich Theatre performers, this short piece proceeds in good verse through the roster of performers, mostly praising them. Many substantive differences from the first edition (A&R 1659), which is ECCO # CW3315151838 (British Library), ESTC # T45232.

(1678) Author of *The Prospect of Liberty, The Country Spy, &c., An Epistle to the Author of Candour*. London: Printed for John Wilkie, in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1768. Pp. [2] [1] 2-18. Price 1*s.* ECCO # CW3313227779 (Huntington Library), ESTC # N30993 (3 other copies). A reproach written in verse to the author of *Candour: An Enquiry into the Real Merits of the Salisbury Comedians* (London, 1768) for his harsh criticisms of the Salisbury performers.

(1721) Anonymous, *An Epistle to Mr. Thomas Elrington, Occasion'd by the Murder of the Tragedy of Cato Last Monday Night*. [Dublin], 1730. Pp. [1-3] 4-7. ECCO # CW3311859588 (British Library), ESTC # T818 (2 other copies). A humorous attack in verse with numerous explanatory footnotes on Thomas Elrington, one of the managers of the Smock Alley Theatre, for his production of Joseph Addison's *Cato* (1713).

(1722) Anonymous, *The Upper Gallery. A Poem. Inscribed to the Rev. Dr. Swift, D.S.P.D.* Dublin, Printed. London, Reprinted, and sold by J. Roberts in Warwick-Lane, [February] 1733. Pp. [1-3] 4-16. Price 6*d.* ECCO # CW3315011282 (British Library), ESTC # T80573 (5 other copies). Advertised 27 February-1 March 1733 in *The London Evening-Post*. A charming poem written in good verse about being an audience member in the upper gallery at a play. Praises Swift.

(1785) Anonymous, *The Battle of the Players. Exhibiting the Characters*

of all the Actors and Actresses on the Irish Stage. With an Impartial Estimate of their respective Merits. Dublin: Printed for R. Lewis, at the Register-Office, in Crane-Lane, [January] 1762. Pp. [2] [1] 2 [3] 4-40. Price "a British Six-Pence." ECCO # CW3305103214 (Bodleian Library), ESTC # T186105 (only known copy). Advertised 21 January 1762 in *The Public Advertiser* for 1s. An entertaining prose narrative presenting in mock heroic fashion the rivalry between Henry Mossop and Spranger Barry, respectively the managers of the Smock Alley Theatre and Crow Street Theatre. The author invokes Swift as his muse in the preface.

(1955) Robert Playfair, *Answers for Robert Playfair, Trustee for Mr Jackson's Creditors, and Mrs Esten, Lessee of the Theatre Royal, Suspenders; to the Petition of Stephen Kemble, Charger*. [Edinburgh, 1793]. Pp. [2] [1] 2-34, <sup>2</sup>[1 (appendix)] 2-7. ECCO # CW3324513096 (Bodleian Library), ESTC # T213718 (3 other copies). Dated 19 February 1793. John Jackson and Harriet Esten's answer to Kemble's petition (A&R 1957, below). They argue that Esten's patent should be enforced and that Kemble should be prohibited from staging plays in Edinburgh. The appendix consists of correspondence between Jackson, John Seton, and Walter Ross, in which Jackson negotiates to renew David Ross's expiring patent; an itemized list of expenses incurred by Jackson in obtaining the patent; and correspondence between the Duke of Hamilton, William Gibson, and Playfair establishing that Hamilton, a patentee, had authorized Esten before another of the patentees, Henry Dundas, authorized Kemble and that Hamilton would not withdraw his support of Esten.

(1957) Stephen Kemble, *Petition of Stephen Kemble, Manager of the New Theatre of Edinburgh*. [Edinburgh, 1793]. Pp. [2] [1] 2-27, <sup>2</sup>[1 (appendix)] 2-5. ECCO # CW3324513025 (Bodleian Library), ESTC # T213714 (1 other known copy). Dated 7 February 1793. Kemble's petition to allow him the right to operate his new theatre in Edinburgh. The appendix consists of two items: a proposal dated 1 February 1785 to renew David Ross's expiring patent (and to vest it in a committee) and a letter written by Sir James Hunter-Blair in support of the proposal. Kemble points out in his introduction to the appendix that John Jackson is not named among the proposed committee, that he was not originally considered as a potential patentee, and that the proposal was against vesting the patent in an actor. This petition by Kemble appears in A&R but not his memorial, which is available on ECCO: Stephen Kemble, *Memorial for Stephen Kemble, Manager of the New Theatre of Edinburgh. Against Robert Playfair Writer in Edinburgh, designing himself Acting Trustee on the sequestrated Estate of John Jackson of the Theatre-Royal Edinburgh, and Mrs Harriet Pye Esten, Lessee of the said Theatre Royal*. [Edinburgh, 1793]. Pp. [2] [1] 2-11, <sup>2</sup>[1 (appendix)] 2-4. ECCO # CW3324513321 (Bodleian Library), ESTC # T213429 (only known copy). Dated 29 January 1793. The appendix consists of the license granted to the Duke of Hamilton and Henry Dundas in 1788; a letter from Dundas saying he wished the Lord Advocate, the Lord Provost, and the Dean of Faculty to act for him in the dispute; and finally an excerpt from a letter signed by Robert Dundas, Henry Erskine, and Thomas Elder authorizing Kemble

on behalf of Henry Dundas to begin “acting under the patent for the Edinburgh Theatre.”

(1958) Robert Playfair, *Memorial for Robert Playfair, Writer in Edinburgh, Trustee for the Creditors of John Jackson, late Manager of the Theatre-Royal, Edinburgh, and for Mrs Harriet Pye Esten, Lessee of the said Theatre-Royal*. [Edinburgh, 1793]. Pp. [2] [1] 2-29, <sup>2</sup>[1 (appendix)] 2-8. ECCO # CW3324513058 (Bodleian Library), ESTC # T213716 (1 other known copy). Dated 29 January 1793. Robert Playfair’s statement of facts in the early stages of the Jackson-Kemble dispute. The appendix consists of five items: two articles, one in *The Public Ledger* and another in *The Argus*, relating facts about Kemble’s claim to lease the theatre; a letter from Kemble’s accountant making an offer to lease the theatre; a letter from Robert Playfair in which he states that he has leased the theatre to Esten because Kemble’s offer came too late; and the minutes of a meeting of the theatre’s proprietors giving the present state of the dispute.

(2033) Aaron Hill, *An Answer from Mrs. R----n to S-----*. Published in the seventh issue of *The Plain Dealer*, 13 April 1724. Pp. [2]. Milhous and Hume # 3234. This edition of the poem is available on Burney but not ECCO, which does not include original issues of *The Plain Dealer*, just later collected editions. A reprinted version of the poem is available on ECCO in Hill’s *The Plain Dealer: Being Select Essays on Several Curious Subjects*, 2 vols., (London, 1730), I, 48-49. ECCO # CW3310660469 (British Library), ESTC # T135939 (14 other copies). The piece is ostensibly a hostile response from Anastasia Robinson to *An Epistle from S-----o, to A-----a R-----n* (London, 1724; A&R 2031). Thomas McGeary describes the letter as follows: “In this answer, Mrs Robinson does not deny the charge of her attraction to Senesino, but instead turns her eyes from his “Loose Lines” and insults and derogates the singer’s corrupting influence on British society.”<sup>5</sup> McGeary prints the piece (56).

(2038) Anonymous, *The Contre Temps; or, Rival Queans: a Small Farce. As it was lately Acted, with great Applause, at H-d-r’s private Th-re near the H---y M---t*. London: Printed for A. Moore, near St. Paul’s, [July] 1727. Pp. [1-5] 6-16. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3310712696 (British Library), ESTC # T069537 (6 other copies). Suggested month of publication given by Milhous and Hume # 3371. An entertaining farce, written as a dialogue in verse between prominent figures in opera—e.g., Faustina, Cuzzoni, Heidegger, Handel, and Senesino—in which Faustina and Cuzzoni abuse each other.

(2050) Anonymous, *The Secrets of a Woman’s Heart. An Epistle from a Friend, to Signior F-----lli. Occasion’d by the Epistle of Mrs. C--- P-----ps, to the Angelick Signior F-----lli*. London: Printed for E. Cook, in Black-fryars, and sold at the Pamphlet-Shops of London and Westminster, [May] 1735. Pp. [1-2] 3-15. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3311382518 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), ESTC # N22421 (5 other copies). Suggested month of publication given by Milhous and Hume # 3914. A harsh verse attack on Constantia Phillips addressed to Farinelli, warning him not to involve himself romantically with her. As McGeary says, “the writer hopes to show Farinelli for his own sake that a

‘British Bona Roba’ is false, delusive, beguiling, greedy, and lustful—in short, they are ‘The blackest Devils, tho’ they seem so fair’—and to dissuade Farinelli from taking Con Phillips as wife or mistress. The writer promises to explain the ghastly bleeding female heart shown in the title-page vignette and launches into the cautionary story of Matilda, cataloguing all her vices.”<sup>6</sup> McGeary prints the piece (80-85).

(2051) Anonymous, *An Epistle to John James H--dd--g--r, Esq; on the Report of Signior F-r-n-lli's being with Child*. London: Printed and sold by E. Hill, near St. Paul's, [January] 1736. Pp. [1-2] 3-8. Price 6d. ECCO # CW3306208601 (Cambridge University Library), ESTC # N784 (2 other copies). Suggested month of publication given by Milhous and Hume # 3964 and confirmed by an advertisement 20 January 1736 in *The London Daily Post, and General Advertiser*. Written in verse. McGeary describes this letter as taking “to a *reduction ad absurdum* a favorite gibe at Farinelli's expense: his feminine appearance and ambiguous gender.”<sup>7</sup> The author claims to have heard a rumor that Farinelli is actually a woman and recently pregnant. He then “relates various reactions to the news of Farinelli's pregnancy. In most cases, the persons cited are imputed to have used or desired Farinelli for various types of sexual gratification and are now disappointed” (44). McGeary prints the piece (85-88).

(2058) [Giuseppe Marco Antonio Baretto], *The Voice of Discord, or the Battle of the Fiddles. A History of a seditious and unnatural Attempt upon the Lives and Properties of fifty Singers and Fiddlers*. London: Printed for W. Owen near Temple-Bar, and T. Snelling opposite White-Fryers in Fleet-Street, [September] 1753. Pp. [1-5] 6-55. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3306073403 (Bodleian Library), ESTC # T176734 (3 other copies). Attribution from ESTC. Advertised 21 September 1753 in *The Public Advertiser*. A satiric attack on Francesco Vanneschi, written in direct response to and with burlesque criticism of *A Scheme for Having an Italian opera in London, of a New Taste* (1753; A&R 2057).

(2152) Anonymous, *Prologue Written for the Re-opening of the Theatre at Brandenbough House, after it was embellished and enlarged in the Year 1795*. Pp. [1] 2-13. [London, 1795?]. ECCO # CW3314236451 (British Library), ESTC # T752 (one other copy). Prologue first line: “Ye sacred ministers of sense and truth.” Opens with priestesses worshipping the God of Taste. Their altar is then destroyed by Jealousy, after which they relocate to the Theatre at Brandenbough House, and the God of Taste proclaims that Britain will be the home of taste henceforth.

(2307) [Thomas Vaughan], *The Retort. By The Author*. London: Printed for, and sold by W. Flexney, near Gray's-Inn-Gate, Holborn, 1761. Pp. [i-iii] iv, [1] ii [3] 4-20. ECCO # CW3311079554 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), ESTC # N13295 (7 other copies). Attribution from ESTC. An attack on Charles Churchill, Robert Lloyd, and George Colman. Part of the pamphlet controversy instigated by Churchill's *The Rosciad* (1761). Reviewed 26 November 1761 in *The Public Ledger*: “This is another poem of the same cast with the former [Arthur Murphy's *The Examiner* (1761; A&R 2305)]. There are

really a great many good lines in it, but it is certainly no small reproach to literature, that those who pretend to the greatest share of it, should treat one another in a manner beneath the most illiterate carman.”

(2308) Veritas, an unknown Hand, *The Triumvirate, a Poetical Portrait. Taken from the Life, and finish'd after the manner of Swift*. London: Printed for G. Kearsley, in Ludgate-Street, [October] 1761. Pp. [4] [1] 2-20. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3311597357 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), ESTC # N13893 (6 other known copies). Advertised 3 October 1761 in *The Public Ledger; or, Daily Register of Commerce and Intelligence*. Another attack on Churchill, Lloyd, and Colman. Part of the pamphlet controversy instigated by Churchill's *The Rosciad* (1761).

(2309) Whackum Smackum, Esq., *The Scrubs of Parnassus: or, All in the Wrong. A Comi-Tragical Heroic Poem, in Hudibrastic Verse, addressed to the Authors of the Rosciad, the Fribbleriad, the Churchiliad, the Naiads of Fleet-Ditch, and the Gentlemen of both Theatres*. London: Printed for J. Williams, on Ludgate-Hill, [June] 1761. Pp. [4] [i] ii-vi, [3] 4-31. Price 1s 6d. ECCO # CW3313559027 (British Library), ESTC # T121878 (10 other copies). Advertised 23 June-25 June 1761 in *The General Evening Post* and *The Whitehall Evening Post; or, London Intelligencer* as having been published “Yesterday at Noon.” A humorous verse satire on Churchill writing *The Rosciad* (1761), which ironically begins with a preface gently chastising Arthur Murphy for attacking *The Rosciad*, instead of simply ignoring it.

(2314) Anonymous, *The Rosciad of C--v--nt-G--rd--n. By the Author*. London: Printed for the Author, and sold by J. Gretton, in Old Bond-Street; and W. Nicoll, in St. Paul's Church-Yard, [February] 1762. Pp. [1-5] 6-33. Price 1s 6d. ECCO # CW3312046456 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), ESTC # N12942 (7 other known copies). Advertised 27 February-2 March 1762 in *The London Chronicle; or, Universal Evening Post*. A&R suggests Henry James Pye as the author. A verse satire, written as a continuation of Churchill's *The Rosciad* (1761).

(2317) Anonymous, *A Critical Balance of the Performers at Drury-Lane Theatre. For the last Season 1765*. London: Printed for C. Moran, under the Great Piazza, Covent Garden, [1766?]. Bs.; table. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3307677047 (Huntington Library), ESTC # N46210 (only known copy). A&R suggests a date of “[1765].” A large table in which the author grades performers according to twelve characteristics on a scale of 1 to 20. The author gives favorite roles in some cases.

(2590) Mr. Lun, Jr., *The Beggar's Pantomime; Or, The Contending Colombines: A New Comic Interlude. Intermix'd with Ballad Songs in the Characters of Polly and Lucy, Manager, and Deputy Manager. With the Scenes of Britannia; or The Royal Lovers. As they are perform'd at the Theatre-Royal in Lincolns-Inn-Fields. Dedicated to Mrs. Clive and Mrs. Cibber. By Mr. Lun, Junior. The Second Edition*. London: Printed for C. Corbett, at Addison's Head, against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet-Street; and W. Warner, at Dryden's Head, next the Rose-Tavern without Temple-Bar: and sold by the Booksellers and

Pamphlet-Shops of London and Westminster, [December] 1736. Pp. [1-3] 4-7 [8] 9-24. Price 6d. ECCO # CW3306175310 (British Library), ESTC # T120255 (2 other known copies). Advertised 14 December-16 December 1736 in *The London Evening-Post*. ECCO provides only the second edition of *The Beggar's Pantomime*, not the first (ESTC # N32591). Highfill, Burnim, and Langhans attribute this piece to Henry Woodward: "On 7 December was produced the first of the pantomimes he devised, *The Beggar's Pantomime; or, The Contending Colombines*, a satire on the furious contention between Mrs Cibber and Kitty Clive over the part of Polly in *The Beggar's Opera*."<sup>8</sup> The play was mounted by Giffard's company, which had moved from Goodman's Fields to Lincoln's Inn Fields this season.<sup>9</sup>

(2715) "Richard Estcourt," *A Letter from Dick Estcourt, the Comedian, to The Spectator*. London: Printed for J. Baker, at the Black-Boy in Pater-Noster-Row, 1713. Pp. [1-6] 7-32. Price 6d. ECCO # CW3313638819 (British Library), T131368 (7 copies). Written in the persona of the deceased Richard Estcourt, the letter is dated two months after his death and tells the story of Estcourt's journey into the afterlife, during which he meets and hears the stories of other dead people, both famous and common. The conversations mostly involve religion or politics—almost nothing to do with the theatre, except for a brief mention of Nell Gwynn as lecherous (22) and another of Aphra Behn: "I stepped into the Wits Coffee-house, which is kept by the Celebrated Mrs. Behn; she has turned her *Oronoko* into Rochester, and now entirely doats on the Extravagant Humour of that Celebrated Wit" (29).

(2723) Scriptor Veritatis, *The Memoirs of the present Countess of Derby, rescued by truth from the assassinating pen of Petronius Arbiter; and proving the stage, from the patronage of the most exalted personages, to have been always considered as a school for morality*. London: Printed for the Author, and sold by Lee and Hurst, Paternoster-Row, 1797. Pp. [4] [1] 2-80. ECCO # CW3315209985 (John Rylands Library, Univ. of Manchester), ESTC # T173751 (5 other copies). Defence of Elizabeth Farren (1759-1829) from Petronius Arbiter's *Memoirs of the present Countess of Derby* (A&R 2718).

(2747) Anonymous, *Letters in Prose and Verse, To the Celebrated Polly Peachum: from The most Eminent of her Admirers and Rivals*. London: Printed for A. Millar at Buchanan's Head over-against St. Clement's Church without Temple-Bar, [June] 1728. Pp. [1-4] 5-24 [25-26 (advts.)]. Price 6d. ECCO # CW3305703350 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), ESTC # N4286 (3 other copies). Advertised 5 July 1728 in *The Daily Journal*. A collection of seventeen letters written to Polly Peachum, by which is meant Lavinia Fenton, who originally created the role in *The Beggar's Opera* (1728) and became famous for it. Several letters are from male admirers. The authors and letters are fictional.

(2783.1) Minister of the Church of Christ, *An Exhortatory Address to the Brethren in the Faith of Christ, occasioned by A Remarkable Letter from Mr. Foote to the Rev. Author of Christian and Critical Remarks on the Minor. With a Serious Word or two on the present Melancholy Occasion*. London: Printed

for G. Keith, in Grace-Church-Street; M. Lewis, in Pater-Noster-Row; and J. Burd, near the Temple-Gate, Fleetstreet, [October] 1760. Pp. [1-3] 4-18. Price 4d. ECCO # CW3320038253 (Houghton Library, Harvard U.), ESTC # N8122 (5 other copies). Advertised 29 October 1760 in *The Public Ledger; or, Daily Register of Commerce and Intelligence* with an interesting note: "Be careful to ask for the Exhortatory Address, there being no genuine Answer to Mr. Foote's Letter but this." This piece is part of the pamphlet controversy over Foote's *The Minor* (1760), which includes sharp satire on the Methodists. Whoever this "Minister of the Church of Christ" is, he wrote *Christian and Critical Remarks On a Droll, or Interlude, called The Minor* (A&R 2776). Foote replied to *Christian and Critical Remarks* with a pamphlet of his own (A&R 2778), to which *An Exhortatory Address* is a response.

(2858) [William Shirley], *Brief Remarks on The Original and Present State of the Drama: To which is added Hecate's Prophecy, being A Characteristic Dialogue betwixt Future Managers, And their Dependents*. London: Printed for S. Hooper and A. Morley, near Beaufort Buildings in the Strand, and sold by J. Scott, in Pater-Noster-Row, [April] 1758. Pp. [1-3] 4-20 [21-25] 26-40. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3317144422 (Huntington Library), ESTC # N32525 (3 other copies). Advertised 18 April-20 April 1758 in *The Whitehall Evening Post; or, London Intelligencer*. Attribution from ESTC. "Supposed to be written by William Shirley" is written on the title page in a modern hand. Half of the pamphlet is a philosophical essay on the present state of theatre with long quotations from *The Herald* and other sources to demonstrate the kinds of performance pieces on offer, which the author mostly finds objectionable. The other half is a dialogue called *Hecate's Prophecy*, a harsh attack on Garrick as Roscius.

(2873) Anonymous, *The Muses Address to D. Garrick, Esq; with Harlequin's Remonstrance, In Answer to the said Address*. London: Printed for W. Nicholls, in Pater-Noster-Row, [October] 1761. Pp. [1-5] 6-9 [10] 11-23. Price 6d. ECCO # CW3317069023 (Bodleian Library), N42252 (3 other copies). Reviewed 15-17 October 1761 in *The St. James's Chronicle; or, the British Evening-Post*: "With regard to the former ['The Muses Address'], we have very little to say, excepting that it has nothing in it, in the least worthy the mighty Names it bears: But, for the latter ['Harlequin's Remonstrance'], as it contains some Attempts towards Humour, we shall here present the Reader with an Extract from it." Advertised 22 October 1761 in *The Public Advertiser*. The first half is an entreaty written in the persona of the muses Melpomene and Thalia to David Garrick, praising his greatness as the favorite of Apollo and asking him to reform the repertory and eliminate pantomime. The second half is a response to these muses written by "Harlequin" refuting the muses and defending pantomime. We are clearly meant to sympathize with the muses.

(3005) George Davies Harley, *Poems: by G. D. Harley, of the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden. 1796*. London: Printed for the Author, by J. Jarvis; and sold by Martin and Bain, Fleet Street; W. Miller, Old Bond Street; and T. Bellamy, Monthly Mirror Office, King Street, Covent Garden. Entered at

Stationers' Hall, 1796. Pp. [1-9] 10-11 [13 (unnumbered page beginning a new poem which should be 12, but the poem continues on page 14) 14-151 [150-151 are repeated again] 152-160 [pagination skips to 181, but nothing is missing] 181-295 [296-299 (list of subscribers)]; errata slip. ECCO # CW3313799414 (British Library), T132350 (14 other copies). The collected poems of actor George Davies Harley (d. 1811).

(3345) William Mountfort, *Six Plays, Written by Mr. Mountfort. In Two Volumes. Vol. I. Containing, I. The Injur'd Lovers, or, The Ambitious Father. II. The Successful Strangers. III. Greenwich Park. To which is prefix'd some Memoirs of the Life of Mr. Mountfort.* London: Printed for J. Tonson in the Strand, G. Strahan in Cornhill, and W. Mears without Temple-Bar, 1720. Pp. [2] [i-iii] iv-xi [1-10] 11-89 [19] 97-289 [290]. ECCO # CW3310781058 (British Library), ESTC # T56644 (62 other copies). The second volume is ECCO # CW3310860941 (British Library), ESTC # T56644 (61 other copies) and includes *King Edward III, The Life and Death of Doctor Faustus, and Henry the Second, King of England*. Pp. [8] 185 [pagination skips to 300, but nothing is missing] 300-368 [pagination becomes erratic here] 345 367 [4] 376-491 [492-494 (advrt.)]. The booksellers' preface to the reader points out that *King Edward III* and *Henry the Second* were not written principally by Mountfort.<sup>10</sup> Vol. I begins with a brief life of Mountfort.

(3381) Anonymous, *A Pastoral Elegy on the Death of Calista. Humbly Inscrib'd to the Honourable Col. C-----rchill.* London: Printed for W. Trott, at the Seven Stars in Russet-Court, Drury-Lane, [October] 1730. Pp. [1-2] 3-8. Price 6d. ECCO # CW3312047537 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), ESTC # N10932 (one other copy). Advertised 29 October-31 October 1730 in *The London Evening-Post*. One of several pieces written in honor of the celebrated actress Anne Oldfield after her death in 1730. This item is addressed to her late life companion "Charles Churchill (c.1678-1745), a nephew (though illegitimate) of the first duke of Marlborough," with whom Oldfield "moved in his circle as if she were his wife."<sup>11</sup>

(3385) Anonymous, *The Lover's Miscellany. Being a Curious Collection of Amorous Tales and Poems. Together with some Faithful Memoirs of the Life and Amours Of the late Celebrated Mrs. Ann Oldfield.* London: Printed by R. Walker, for the Author, and sold by the Booksellers in Town and Country, [January] 1731. Pp. [1-4] 5-45 [46 ("Epitaph on Mrs. Ann Oldfield")]. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3310438533 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), ESTC # N10755 (one other copy). Advertised 20 January 1731 in *The Daily Journal*: "None of the Tales and Poems contained in this Miscellany, were ever before in Print, except the Memoirs of Mrs. Oldfield's Life." The first half of this collection consists of thirteen bawdy poems and prose pieces. The second is a life of Oldfield, which is exactly the same as that printed in *Authentick Memoirs of the Life Of that celebrated Actress Mrs. Ann Oldfield* (A&R 3375).

(3482) Anonymous, *The Beauties of the Brinsleiad: or, a Sketch of the Opposition: a Poem. Interspersed with Notes. No. I.* London: Printed for John Stockdale, opposite Burlington House, Piccadilly, [June] 1785. Pp. [i-iii] iv-37

[38-40 (advs.)]; pagination becomes Arabic after v. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3310431496 (Houghton Library, Harvard Univ.), ESTC # N15524 (8 other copies). Advertised 3 June 1785 in *The Morning Post, and Daily Advertiser*. A satirical essay which the author claims to have written in praise of *The Rolliad* (1784-85) and Richard Brinsley Sheridan, but which in actuality criticizes them. The Whig politician Charles James Fox (1749-1806) is also targeted.

(3514) Thomas Sheridan, *An Oration, Pronounced before a Numerous Body of the Nobility and Gentry, Assembled at the Musick-hall in Fishamble-Street, on Tuesday the 6th of December, 1757, Published at their Unanimous Desire*. Dublin Printed: London Re-printed, for J. Wilkie, behind the Chapter-House, in St. Paul's Church-Yard, [January] 1758. Pp. [1-3] 4-31. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3316544758 (British Library), ESTC # T90660 (7 other known copies). Advertised 2 January 1758 in *The Public Advertiser* as being published "To-morrow Noon." A&R does not list subsequent editions. The second edition is ECCO # CW3304211909 (Bodleian Library), ESTC # T90548 (8 other copies). Pp. [1-3] 4-32. The third is ECCO # CW3306056323 (British Library), ESTC # T172409 (11 other known copies). Pp. [1-3] 4-32. This is a speech given by Sheridan lamenting the state of education in Ireland, the frequent practice of going to England for education, and the negative consequences to Irish patriotism and national development of educating young Irishmen in England. Pages 21-23 discuss Sheridan's experience managing the Dublin Theatre and its influence on his thinking about education.

(3661) Anonymous, *Woffington's Ghost. A Poem. In Answer to the Meretriciad*. London: Printed for the Author; and sold by Henry Woodgate, in Pater-Noster-Row, [November] 1761. Pp. [1-5] 6-19. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3312797959 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), ESTC # N25015 (one other copy). Advertised 9-11 November 1761 in *Lloyd's Evening Post, and British Chronicle*. Reviewed 17 November 1761 in *The Public Ledger* as "A paltry answer to a paltry performance." Praises the recently deceased Margaret Woffington in verse while also defending Catherine "Kitty" Clive from criticisms in Edward Thompson's *The Meretriciad* (1761).<sup>12</sup>

(3709) Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet), *An Essay upon the Civil Wars of France, Extracted from Curious Manuscripts. And also upon the Epick Poetry of the European Nations, From Homer down to Milton. By Mr. de Voltaire, Author of Henriade. The Fourth Edition, Corrected. To which is now prefixed, A Discourse on Tragedy, With Reflections on the English and French Drama. By the same Author*. London: Printed for N. Prevost, and Comp. over-against Southampton-Street, in the Strand, 1731. "A Discourse on Tragedy" appears pp. [1] 2-24. ECCO # CW3312358212 (British Library), ESTC # T109598 (14 other copies). This edition of Voltaire's essay is a different translation than the one attached to A&R 3710, the second edition of William Duncombe's *Lucius Junius Brutus* (1747). Voltaire identifies a number of weaknesses in both English and French tragedy and suggests improvements; for example, that love "is often no more than gallantry" and instead "must be a necessary and essential part of the plot, and not be brought in at random, to fill up the void of your

Tragedies and ours, which are all too long” (22).

(3865) A Private Gentleman, *Reflections on the Principal Characters In a late Comedy call'd The Provok'd Husband*. London: Printed for J. Roberts, at the Oxford-Arms in Warwick-Lane, 1728. Pp. [1-5] 6-32. ECCO # CW3310234133 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), ESTC # N13022 (8 other known copies). Milhous and Hume # 3392. The first third of the essay praises Colley Cibber for his *The Provok'd Husband* (1728), an adaptation and completion of *A Journey to London* by Sir John Vanbrugh.

(3871) Anonymous, *The Spleen: or, The Offspring of Folly. A Lyri-Comi-Tragic Tale. In Four Cantos. Cum Notis Variorum. Dedicated to George Colman, Esq. Author of The Spleen, a Comic Piece*. London: Printed for J. Bew, in Pater-Noster Row, [June] 1776. Pp. [i-v] vi-viii, [1] 2-43; pl. [front.]. Price 2s 2d. ECCO # CW3313824126 (British Library), ESTC # T49771 (12 other copies). Advertised 14 June 1776 in *The Morning Post, and Daily Advertiser* as being published “Next Week” and as having been written by John Rubrick, which a note in ESTC says is a pseudonym for William Kenrick. The ridiculous story follows the adventures of the eponymous hero Spleen, son of Wit and Folly, from childhood through his various occupations as an adult, before finally being turned into a bat.

(3872) Scriblerus Tertius, *The Candidates for the Bays. A Poem*. London: Printed for A. Moore, and sold at the White-Hart, next E. Lynn's, Whip-Maker, over-against Devereux-Court, without Temple-Bar, [December] 1730. Pp. [2], 1-13 [14 (advs.)]. Price 6d. ECCO # CW3316740841 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), ESTC # N1105 (2 other copies). Milhous and Hume # 3529. Advertised 17 December 1730 in *The Grub-street Journal*. Sometimes attributed to Thomas Cooke. Rails against what the author sees as a marked decline in the quality of the drama since Shakespeare. He proceeds through several contemporary writers—such as Dennis, Cibber, Fielding, and Rich—disparaging them all, and concludes ultimately that they “are worthy of Birth, but unworthy the Bays” (13).

(3921) Anonymous, *An Exact Description Of the Two Fam'd Entertainments of Harlequin Doctor Faustus; with the Grand Masque of the Heathen Deities: and the Necromancer, or Harlequin Doctor Faustus. As now Perform'd, in Grottesque Characters, at both Theatres. Containing The particular Tricks, Incidents, Songs, Dances, Alterations, and Additions, throughout both Performances. Regularly adjusted into distinct Scenes. With the Names of the Persons of both Dramas*. London: Printed for T. Payne, at the Crown, near Stationers-Hall, n.d. [early 1724]. Pp. [4] [1] 2-36. Price 6d. ECCO # CW3316886690 (British Library), ESTC # N48483 (3 other copies). Suggested date of publication given by Milhous and Hume # 3212. Plot summaries and performance descriptions of John Thurmond's *Harlequin Doctor Faustus* (perf. 26 Nov. 1723) and Rich's *The Necromancer; or, Harlequin Doctor Faustus* (perf. 20 Dec. 1723).

(3984) William Hawkins, *An Essay on the Antient and Modern Drama, occasioned by Mr. Mason's Elfrida, And the Letters Prefixed to it*. Published in

the second volume of *Dramatic and Other Poems, Letters, Essays, &c.* 3 Vols. Oxford: Printed by W. Jackson; sold by R. and J. Dodsley, in Pall-Mall; J. Rivington and J. Fletcher in Paternoster-Row; and W. Owen, in Fleet-Street, London; J. Fletcher and S. Parker, in Oxford, 1758. The essay appears on pp. 260-316. ECCO # CW3325276065 (British Library), ESTC # T127555 (20 other copies). Hawkins's theory of drama, in which he sometimes responds directly to William Mason's letters prefixed to *Elfrida* (1752) but just as often juxtaposes well-regarded critical authorities, weighing their arguments. Hawkins quotes from or mentions Dryden, Aristotle, Horace, Shakespeare, and others.

(3985) An Admirer of Bad Composition, *The Pigeon-Pye, or, a King's Coronation, proper materials For forming an Oratorio, Opera, or Play, According to the Modern Taste: To Be Represented in Opposition to the Dragon of Wantley*. London: Printed for W. Webb, near St. Paul's, [March] 1738. Pp. [1-3] 4-51. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3309713522 (British Library), ESTC # T125710 (8 other copies). Advertised 16-18 March 1738 in *The London Evening-Post* as having been that morning "drawn piping hot out of the Oven." Lowe rightly calls this piece a "curious satire." The author begins with a preface about prefaces, a prologue about prologues, and concludes with an epilogue on epilogues. Lowe suggests that James Miller is the target. Berta Joncus argues that the piece "unveiled Miller's allegedly unsavoury character, it exposed and condemned purportedly cheap stage tricks, and it drew attention to the perceived faults of famous stage personalities."<sup>13</sup>

(3994) A Gentleman, *A Letter to M. de Voltaire; with Comparatory Descants, On the extraordinary Composition and Incidents of a Dramatic Poem, called The Desert Island, written By the Author of the Orphan of China: also Remarks on the Tragedy of the Siege of Aquileia*. London: Printed for John Williams, Bookseller, on Ludgate-Hill, 1760. Pp. [1-2] 3-67. ECCO # CW3309784738 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), ESTC # N10633 (3 other copies). This piece has been attributed to Arthur Murphy, who wrote both *The Orphan of China* (1759), which is an adaptation of Voltaire's *L'Orphelin de la Chine* (1755), and *The Desert Island* (1760). The author begins with a twenty-three page preface, addressed to Voltaire, mostly praising Murphy, followed by plot synopsis of, quotations from, and commentary on *The Desert Island* and John Home's *The Siege of Aquileia* (1760).

(4000) John Penn, *A Reply to the Strictures of the Monthly Reviewers, in February, 1797, on the Tragedy of The Battle of Eddington. By J. Penn, Esq. Including both an abstract and supplement of his critical works on the drama*. London: Printed for R. White, Piccadilly; and sold also by P. Elmsly, and D. Bremner, Strand; and R. Faulder, Bond-Street, [April] 1797. Price 1s. Advertised 1 April 1797 in *The Times*. Pp. [2] [1] 2-41. ECCO # CW3316540691 (Bodleian Library), ESTC # N26354 (2 other copies). Lowe rightly describes this as "Penn's defence of his tragedy."

(4014) Anonymous, *An Abstract of the Lives of Eteocles and Polynices, the Two Sons of Oedipus by his Mother Jocasta. With a Brief Account of the famous Theban War, collected from the Best Authors. Necessary to be perused*

by those who intend to be Spectators of the New Tragedy, called the Fatal Legacy, and proper to be bound up with the Play. To which are Added, The Arguments of Phænissæ of Euripides, written upon the same Subject. London: Printed for J. Roberts, near the Oxford-Arms in Warwick-lane; and A. Dodd, at the Peacock without Temple-Bar, [May] 1723. Pp. [4] 1-28. Price 6d. ECCO # CW3300116752 (British Library), ESTC # T110348 (5 other copies). Advertised 22 May 1723 in *The Daily Post*. A&R attributes this piece to Jane Robe. An introduction to the story of Oedipus and his sons Eteocles and Polynices.

(4046) Anonymous, *The Censor Censured; or, The Conscious Lovers Examin'd: in a Dialogue between Sir Dicky Marplot and Jack Freeman. Into which Mr. Dennis is introduced by way of Postscript; with some Observations On his late Remarks*. London: Printed for T. Warnder, at the Black Boy in Pater-Noster-Row, [ca. late January?] 1723. Pp. [8] [1] 2-88. Price 1s. ECCO # CW3312043706 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), ESTC # N3753 (8 other copies). Suggested month of publication given by Milhous and Hume # 3160. A dialogue about Steele's *The Conscious Lovers* (1722). Dennis enters the dialogue in the postscript and is abused by Marplot.

(4078) Stephanus Scriblerus, *The Censor. Numb. I. To be continued occasionally. Containing Variety of Curious Matters; proper to be read by all Persons who have attended the Haymarket or the Piazza. With an epistolary dedication to Orator Mack---n. By Stephanus Scriblerus, Esq; Brother to Martinus. N.B. This has pass'd the Approbation of Jerry Buck, Timothy Catcall, and Devil Dick, all of George's Coffee-House, Esquires, Professors of Criticism*. London: Printed for T. Lownds, at his Circulating Library, the first House from the Middle of Exeter-Exchange, 1755. ECCO # CW3304206515 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), ESTC # N4181 (one other copy). Pp. [i-ii] iv-vii, 1-20. This piece begins with a dedication to Charles Macklin, followed by an essay on various topics related to the theatre. *The Censor* seems not to have been continued beyond this issue.

\* \* \*

The completion and amplification of Arnott and Robinson items presented here has been made possible by the newly available electronic databases I have cited.

ECCO gives instantaneous full-text access to tens of thousands of books published in England or in English from 1701 through 1800. Better yet, the entire database (some 26 million pages) is full-text searchable. The Burney newspaper collection in the British Library (which became available online only in December 2007) is the greatest single eighteenth-century British newspaper collection in existence. As with ECCO, it is full-text searchable, including advertisements. The power of these electronic resources is only starting to be fully appreciated. Together, ECCO and Burney allow us to do in minutes or hours what until now would have taken days, weeks, or months (and often trips to several remote archives)—or simply been impossible. Both databases are extremely expensive and are not available for individual access: one must have library privileges at an institution that has bought them to be able to use them. An important exception, however, is the British Library, which makes them

available for free to on-site users—it also makes the ESTC available for free by remote access. I have used these resources to fill in some awkward gaps in Arnott and Robinson’s magnificent bibliography, but I want to conclude by pointing out that ECCO almost unquestionably contains more such theatrical items that await our discovery.

*The Pennsylvania State University*

### Notes

For helpful comments on a previous draft of this essay, I would like to thank Robert D. Hume and Ashley Marshall.

<sup>1</sup> George Speaight, “Introduction,” *English Theatrical Literature, 1559-1900: A Bibliography*, ed. James Fullarton Arnott and John William Robinson (London: Society for Theatre Research, 1970).

<sup>2</sup> *British Theatre: A Bibliography, 1901 to 1985*, ed. John Cavanagh (Mottisfont: Motley Press, 1989).

<sup>3</sup> For a full discussion of the letter’s print history, see volume 1A of *Œuvres complètes de Voltaire*, ed. W. H. Barber and others (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2001), p. 32 n47.

<sup>4</sup> K. A. Crouch, “Lessingham, Jane (1738/9-1783),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: in Association with The British Academy: From the Earliest Times to the Year 2000*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, 61 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), XXXIII, pp. 475-476 at 475.

<sup>5</sup> Thomas McGeary, “Verse Epistles on Italian Opera Singers, 1724-1736,” *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle* 33 (2000): 29-88 at 33.

<sup>6</sup> McGeary, 42.

<sup>7</sup> McGeary, 44.

<sup>8</sup> Philip H. Highfill, Jr., Kalman A. Burnim, and Edward A. Langhans, *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers and Other Stage Personnel in London, 1660-1800*, 16 vols. (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973-1993), XVI, p. 248.

<sup>9</sup> For other documents in the “Pollies Controversy,” see Milhous and Hume nos. 4021, 4023, 4025, 4028, 4036-4041, 4043-4044, 4047-4048, 4055.

<sup>10</sup> On the vexed attributions of *Edward the Third* and *Henry the Second*, see Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume, “Attribution Problems in English Drama, 1660-1700,” *Harvard Library Bulletin* 31 (1983): 5-39, nos. 16 & 31.

<sup>11</sup> J. Milling, “Oldfield, Anne (1683-1730),” *ODNB*, XLI, p. 678.

<sup>12</sup> The *ODNB* entry on Thompson incorrectly dates *The Meretriciad* to 1763; see Clive Wilkinson, “Thompson, Edward (1738?-1786),” *ODNB*, LIV, pp. 416-417 at 416.

<sup>13</sup> Berta Joncus, “Handel at Drury Lane: Ballad Opera and the Production of Kitty Clive,” *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 131.2 (2006): 179-226 at 205.

**Hyenas and Black Swans:  
Notes on Annotating Richardson's *Grandison***

Early in Samuel Richardson's *History of Sir Charles Grandison*, Harriet Byron employs an animal metaphor to discuss her concerns about the advances of a male admirer. She is questioning both the nature of his affection (she calls it a "violent Love") and his sincerity:

O these dissemblers! The hyaena, my dear, was a *male* devourer. The men in malice, and to extenuate their own guilt, made the creature a *female*. And yet there may be male and female of this species of monsters. But as women have more to lose with regard to reputation than men, the male hyaena must be infinitely the more dangerous creature of the two; since he will come to us, even into our very houses, fawning, cringing, weeping, licking our hands; while the den of the female is by the highway-side, and wretched youths must enter into it, to put it in her power to devour them.<sup>1</sup>

Modern editor Jocelyn Harris has an excellent note to the passage, calling attention to lines from Otway's *The Orphan* that identify the hyena as female while associating it with male dissembling:

Oh the bewitching Tongues of faithless men!  
'Tis thus the false Hyaena makes her moan,  
To draw the pitying Traveller to her Den;  
Your sex are so, such false dissemblers all,  
With sighs and plaints y'entice poor Womens Hearts,  
And all that pity you, are made your Prey. (1:468n.)

This is fine as far as it goes, but perhaps an editor of *Grandison* should go further here and in annotating two subsequent references to another animal.

Harriet's tongue-in-cheek accusation that men are guilty of changing the sex of the devouring hyena is interesting on several counts. Here she is referencing and playing off the view of the hyena in western literary and visual art since at least the time of Aristotle. Beryl Rowland provides a helpful summary:

The hyena was usually represented in medieval art and sculpture as a dog-like creature gnawing at the limbs of a corpse which it had just dug out of a tomb. . . . In Elizabethan times the poet Spenser made the hyena an epitome of lust feeding on women's flesh or saw the creature as corrupted flesh and a sign of sin, concupiscence, and a fallen nature. . . . Although Aristotle refuted the notion that the hyena had two pudenda, one male and one female . . . for centuries natural historians declared that the hyena, like the hare, changed its sex. . . . Further symbolism was occasioned by the fact that the hyena was regarded as a magic animal. . . . [I]t imitated the human voice and lured people out of their homes in order to devour

them.<sup>2</sup>

References to the double sexual nature and the verbal deceit of the hyena appear among English authors as varied as Sir Thomas Browne, Sir Walter Raleigh, George Chapman, John Milton, and John Dryden. Dryden's pair of balanced couplets on the animal's bisexuality is an example of the form echoing the sense:

A wonder more amazing wou'd we find?  
Th' Hyaena shows it, of a double kind,  
Varying the sexes in alternate years,  
In one begets, and in another bears.<sup>3</sup>

Even the most common contemporary association with the hyena, its disconcerting laugh, is part of this English literary tradition, mentioned as it is by Rosalind in Shakespeare's *As You Like It*, albeit without negative connotations.<sup>4</sup> Absent any direct allusion, however, and there is none that I can find, does any of this information belong in the "Explanatory Notes" of a modern edition of the novel?

Richardson could have given us an easy answer. Sir Hargrave Pollexfen is the most serious threat to Harriet Byron's happiness in the first quarter of the novel, finally abducting her from a masquerade and attempting to force her into a real or sham marriage. Harriet's earliest description of him includes mention of his "voluble" speech—"But as he can say any-thing without hesitation, and excites a laugh by laughing himself at all he is going to say, as well as at what he has just said, he is thought infinitely agreeable by the gay, and by those who wish to drown thought in merriment" (1:45),—and this association of Sir Hargrave with immoderate or inappropriate laughter recurs several times until it reaches a crescendo in the carriage during the abduction. Harriet has screamed to attract attention, and one of Sir Hargrave's henchman has described her to a passerby as "the worst of wives," a description Sir Hargrave finds amusing: "The vile wretch laugh'd; That's *you*, my dear, and hugg'd me round. *You* are the d—n'd wife. And again he laugh'd: By my soul, I am a charming contriver!" (1:163). Certainly, then, it would be well worth pointing out to the modern reader that Richardson has consistently linked this villain with the laughing rapaciousness of the hyena from the early mention of the beast, except he has not done so. For Harriet mentions the hyena in reference not to Sir Hargrave but to John Greville, her country suitor. Even though Harriet associates these two men by noting similarities in their laughter—"[Sir Hargrave's] laugh was then such a one, as rather shewed ridicule than mirth. A provoking laugh, such a one as Mr. Greville often affects when he is in a disputatious humour . . ." (1:47-48),—Greville is never the threat to Harriet than Sir Hargrave is, in large part because the societal ties that Greville and Harriet share make his use of violence against her unthinkable. It is tempting to see a one-to-one relationship between the animal metaphor and the primary villain in the novel, with Sir Hargrave's role as sexual predator subtly undercut by the sexual ambiguity of the hyena, but Richardson does not work this way. Rather than using

allusions with pinpoint precision, he accumulates similar associations around similar characters. So his use of the hyena leaves the modern editor no easy task in deciding how much to annotate.

The editor faces dangers, moreover, when basing decisions about annotation on an author's typical style of expression, as I have just done. While no one is likely to argue that Richardson's prose is packed with the deeply hidden ironic allusions, to assume he never is working in that mode may be to flatten his style excessively. For example, twice in *Grandison* Richardson has Harriet employ the metaphor of the black swan as, well, a rare bird. When Sir Charles introduces his ward Emily to Harriet by recommending the younger girl for her instruction, Harriet notes, "There are not many men, my Lucy, who can make a compliment to one lady, without robbing, or, at least, depreciating another. How often have you and I observed, that a polite Brother is a black swan?" (1:227). Harris here annotates the phrase in question with an entry from Tilly, "As rare as a black swan" (1:476n.), and indeed it is proverbial. Later, it recurs as one of

Harriet's asides as she relates a conversation in which Doctor Bartlett is describing Sir Charles as a man admired by women "where-ever he set his foot. Bless me, thought I, what a black swan is a good man!—Why (as I have often thought, to the credit of our Sex) will not all the men be good?" (1:443-44).

Samuel Richardson's endorsement of classical learning, if any, is highly qualified, as is illustrated in his conversational Battle of the Books early in the first volume of *Grandison* (1:41-61); moreover, his definite biographers, Eaves and Kimpel, correctly observe that it is certain that he did not have the regular classical education which led to the University. He had probably less Latin than Shakespeare, and no Greek.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, it seems to me the harder assumption that he was unaware that the phrase black swan came from Juvenal's Sixth Satire, the famous (or infamous) "Satire Against Women." Juvenal's expression—*rara avis in terris nigroque simillima cygno*—occurs in the short passage when the satirist, granting for just a moment that his catalogue of horrible traits may not apply to each and every woman, points out that an unblemished woman is not without a drawback, namely the burden imposed by her perfection. John Dryden renders the passage thus:

Suppose all these [virtues in a woman], and take a poet's word,  
A black swan is not half so rare a bird.  
A wife, so hung with virtues, such a freight,  
What mortal shoulders could support the weight!<sup>6</sup>

Some of Richardson's readers, I suggest, would find it amusing that Harriet twice alludes to a passage discussing the burden of a perfect mate when referring to that paragon of perfection, Sir Charles Grandison. That there is distance between the knowledge of Harriet and the knowledge of some readers (and Richardson, I

believe) does not function to criticize Harriet, as ironic distance frequently does. Richardson does not work that way, at least not here. But certainly an editor should call attention to the classical source of the allusion and its possible implications.

Robert G. Walker  
St. Petersburg, FL

### Notes

1. Samuel Richardson, *The History of Sir Charles Grandison*, ed. Jocelyn Harris, in 3 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1972), 1:24; hereafter cited in the text by volume and page number.
2. *Animals With Human Faces: A Guide to Animal Symbolism* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1973), 111-113.
3. The English authors are listed in Stephen E. Glickman, "The Spotted Hyena from Aristotle to the Lion King: Reputation is Everything," *Social Research* 62 (1995), 501-38; 522. Dryden is translating Ovid.
4. Glickman, 521-22.
5. T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 568. But for further connections between the ancients and this writer see my "Richardson and the Classics: Two Notes (Converging)," *Notes and Queries* (forthcoming, 2009).
6. "The Sixth Satire of Juvenal," *The Miscellaneous Works of John Dryden* (London, 1760), 4:281. The lines appear in *The Works of John Dryden*, Vol. 4: *Poems 1693-1696*, ed. Vinton A. Dearing, et al. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 163.

### Some Problems in ECCO (and ESTC)

Many of the problems in Eighteenth Century Collection Online, ECCO (Gale, 2003), are related to its dependence on English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC) for information and on the related *Eighteenth Century* microfilm series for most of its texts (though the anticipated expansion of the database, "ECCO II," will contain far more works filmed by Gale in recent years). ECCO repeats errors by the ESTC not only in its selection and labeling but also in its "full citation" pages and adds others of its own. While ECCO's principal value involves its search capacity, not entirely free of problems as I'll show, I'll focus on its limitations as a set of digital facsimiles.

ECCO and ESTC regularly share the same incompleteness and occasional errors in authors, formats, relations to other issues, and the like; thus, much written of ESTC's shortcomings applies to ECCO. From ECCO's "full citation" page for each work, which includes identification of the library holding the source copy, one can click on a link to holdings, based on the ESTC file around 2003. Then, if there is one copy at the source library, readers can learn the call number of the copy

reproduced, but in many cases that library holds many copies of the work digitized and, so, readers can't know what is digitized unless its identifiable from MS annotations on the copy digitized. Since ECCO was produced, relatively few copies for 18th-century books have been added to the ESTC (relative to the total), but the ESTC office has added some backlog and some major research libraries have directly added material. For instance, in 2007-08 locations were added for copies at "National Trust" libraries, giving "National Trust" on ESTC only--the ESTC's "holdings" file does not indicate which estate library in the National Trust holds the volumes)--and for copies at the British Library (particularly those with shelf marks beginning "RB"). More often than not, however, the ESTC and the ECCO list identical copy locations. For instance, for Edward Young's Satires I and II of *The Universal Passion*, each in two folio editions, ECCO and ESTC share the same locations: the same 27 and 12 locations for Satire I (ESTC T50479 and T50480), and 17 and 18 for the folios of II (T50482 and T50483). They miss or wrongly identify a great many copies: my descriptive bibliography of Young records for these editions, respectively, 40, 22, 40, and 16 copies, over 50% more copies. For the last edition, where ESTC T50483 has 18 copies, it wrongly records eight belonging to the other edition of Satire II (at MR, MiEU, ICN, OU, CU-B, TxU, CtY[2]).

At present the ESTC's standard format provides less holdings info than does ECCO's, but the ESTC has a pull down "holdings" file that provides shelf numbers, indications that copies are not verified, and occasional copy-specific notes (e.g., "-frt")--the "copy of record" on which entries were based is no longer provided in the new format employed by the BL's service. Even with the shelf numbers, some errors creep in, as when copies have been recatalogued and so appear as if another has been added (that sometimes apparently happens for Yale's recatalogued copies). And shelfmarks can be misleading: within the new format, in the entry for Young's *Poetical Works* 1752, T78102, the ESTC lists two copies at the National Library of Scotland (E), but there is only one two-volume set, with Vols. 1-2 having different call numbers (BCL B6301 for Vol. 1, BCL B6333 for 2); ECCO parrots this misinformation. Both ECCO and ESTC sometimes duplicate the same copy from the Harold Forster collection with location entries for both Bodleian and private libraries, in some cases thus doubling the number of known copies, as for Young's *The Complaint* (Edinburgh: Darling, 1774), T165469. Some copies listed in the 1980s as in private collections are no longer in private hands, and some have ended up listed for research libraries. In 2006 the ESTC/NA office told me that it could not determine whether a "private collection" mentioned outside North America and Europe could be that of David Woolley.

Sometimes Gale's labels or titles and descriptions for the digitized texts are wrong. This occurs with the first editions of Vols. 4 (1761 [1762]) and 5 (1765) of Smollett's *Continuation of the Complete History of England*. The ESTC itself does not have a clear record on this multi-volume work (it has records for both sets of volumes and for some individual volumes), but ECCO adds to the misrepresentation. There was only one octavo edition of Vol. 5 but multiple editions with diverse dated imprints for Vols. 1-4. Vol. 5 ends up recorded by

ESTC in record T55304 with first editions of Vols. 1-4 (1760-1761[-1762]) and in record T55305 with reprint editions with later dates (1762-1765). ESTC indicates the first-edition series is on reel 157 of *The Eighteenth Century*; the reprints, on reels 1630-31. Two different copies of Volume 5 end up on ECCO: one with Vol. 4 of the first edition (T55304), all filmed; and again with four reprints of Vols. 1-4 (T55305). ECCO represents the first-editions of Vols. 4-5 as being Vol. 1 of 2 and Vol. 2 of 2, both on the results page and in the full citation. Without opening the image and looking at the title-page, searchers would not know that they had found Vols. 4-5 but think they had found Vols. 1-2. Of course, the citation page does not indicate that another copy of Vol. 5 is available on ECCO (and, since both digitized copies are dated by their sets, "1760-1765" and "1762-1765," if one just looks for Vol. 5 with title "*Continuation*" and date "1765," one won't find the work in ECCO).

Although ESTC normally notes an edition's reproduction on film and ECCO, ECCO contains hundreds of texts that the ESTC fails to indicate are reproduced. Editions available on ECCO but not so noted on ESTC (where all are noted as filmed only) include: *Works of Dr. Jonathan Swift*, 12 vols. (Bathurst, 1765), [ESTC] T193565; Young's *Complaint* (Manson et al., n.d.), T120667; Young's *Force of Religion*, 1715, 3rd ed., N9796; four editions of Young's *Vindication of Providence*: L, 1728, 4to, T128178; Dublin 1734, T155747; L, 1737, T14128; and L, 1765, T51867; *Works* (Dublin 1764) T78086; *Works of the Reverend Edward Young* (Brown, et al., 1765), N25939-- for which ECCO reproduces the Forster copy at the Bodleian [O], listed as if two copies in the ESTC; and the seven Swift *Miscellanies* 1745-1751 noted below.

As we've seen with Smollett's *Continuation* Vol. 5, ESTC and ECCO have duplicate records and texts for some editions. As another example, ECCO digitizes three copies of the first Dublin edition of Young's *Love of Fame*, 1728, one for each ESTC record (T126855, T38673, and T153506). Also, ECCO contains some duplicated copies, copies filmed twice in *The Eighteenth Century* microfilm series, usually listed under different ESTC records. One instance is the BL's copy of Swift's *Miscellanies. The Eighth Volume*, 4th ed. (Davis and Bathurst, 1751), part of one of two small 8vo multi-volume works published in 1751, the one recorded as #68 by Herman Teerink and the other as #69. Teerink's account distinguishes the two works (with identical titles, sizes, publishers, and paginations, even the repeated 247-56 in page numbering) by punctuation and case in the imprints, such that one can depend on #68's having "*Dunstan's*" in Bathurst's address with an italic apostrophe "s" and #69's having a roman "s." The ESTC, without that fidelity to accidentals, relies on title-page ornaments, noting #68 has a cherub vignette (T173422). As for Vol. 8 of Teerink #69, the ESTC has multiple records, both listing BL's copy 12276.d.7, the copy reproduced on ECCO for each record. The ESTC records principally differ with reference to the title-page ornament, pagination, and volumes in the set:

--T142564, pp. [4], 256, 247-310; vol. "8 of 9" [however, both 1751 small octavo sets have 11 vols. or 13 if one includes, as Teerink does in #68-69, *A Tale of a Tub* and *Gulliver's Travels*, not initially titled as works vols.]; Teerink #69;

squirrel title-page ornament; on film reel #5480; citing copy 12276.d.7; and --T39480, [4] 326 pp.; vol. "8 of 11"; Teerink #69; "three connected vases" [sic] as title-page ornament; on reel 1129; citing copy 12276.d.7.

The first record includes the repeated pagination 247-56 but the second does not, encouraging duplicate records. However, why the second has an erroneous account of the ornament is not clear; stranger still, ECCO's full-citation page repeats the information though ECCO's image has the squirrel vignette.

ECCO reproduces two copies of *Miscellanies. The First Volume* (London: B. Motte and others, 1731 [1730]), Teerink #26(1), 12mo: A<sup>1</sup> B-O<sup>12</sup>; pp. [2], 310, [2, advt.]. Both are referenced to ESTC T39470, which refers back to Teerink #26(1). As the ESTC notes, the BL's copy has the preface from *Miscellanies. Volume the Last* (the third volume) misbound after the title; it notes at O two copies without that error. ECCO reproduces the BL's copy 12275.g.4 with the misbound leaves A2-A6 from Vol. 3, digitizing the film in reel 1129, thus creating the 326 images for a book with only 314 pp.; and it also digitizing one of the Bodley's two copies without the preface, though which is not indicated.

Conversely, there are editions in the ESTC (some reproduced on ECCO) that are not separate editions but only reissues of earlier editions or separate issues of works collections. I wouldn't be surprised if two thousand of ECCO's 138,000 editions ("titles" but are these really distinct "titles"?) were duplicated editions. Often the failure to recognize such is understandable as the reissues are by different publishers and occur remote in time, such as *A Tale of a Tub* (London: n.p., 1734), described as an 8vo with [4] + 292 pages in ESTC T73667 (on ECCO) and reissued with the false imprint "London: R. Wilson, 1750," described in T201191 as 12mo: [2] + 292 pp. The latter description is wrong, for two leaves of preliminaries prior to the count are necessary and the format is octavo despite the signing of the first five leaves of a gathering in eights--a sign of Continental printing. Teerink #235A, though referenced by the ESTC for the 1750 issue, properly identifies the two issues as the same printing in octavo with pp. [4] + 292. If these editions were cross-listed, with the title-page information offered in the entry digitized, there'd be little need to digitize the 1750 edition.

Volume II of the four-volume *Works of the Author of the Night-Thoughts* (Dublin: A. Ewing, et al., 1764), modeled on the 1757 London *Works*, contains Young's three tragedies (T78086). The ESTC fails to indicate that all three were separately issued with the same essential setting of type, though leading was removed to allow more lines per page. Also, cut ornaments and dedications were added to *The Revenge* and *Busiris*, and italic speech prefixes at the margin replaced those centered in roman capitals within the *Works*. *The Revenge* and *Busiris* were both separately issued by "G. and A. Ewing, W. Smith," et al., the first dated 1764 (N13269), the second undated (N15282 wrongly suggests "1761?"); the same publishers but for George Ewing (who died in April) are on the 1764 imprint of the reissue of *The Brothers* (T25470).

The ESTC fails to connect or recognize separate issues of Young's plays, *The Complaint*, and *The Centaur Not Fabulous* that were spun off the piratical collected works of Young in 1752 (T78102), 1755 (N41838), and 1765 (N25939).

From *Poetical Works* 1755 there were five separate issues: *Busiris* and *The Revenge* (both Glasgow: W. Duncan, 1755; respectively, N32117 and T175051), *The Complaint* (n.p., 1755, T119520), *Love of Fame* (Glasgow: R. Urie, 1755; T143228), and *Poem on the Last Day* (Urie, 1755; not in the ESTC; sole copy at E). When whole volumes were separately issued by the same publishers in the same year, as were two of the four volumes of *Works of the Reverend Edward Young* (Brown, Hill, and Payne, 1765; N25939), Vol. 3 with *The Complaint* (N55534) and Vol. 4 with *The Works in Prose of the Reverend Edward Young* (N25541), it is surprising the reissues differing only on one and two leaves were not recognized by catalogers (the BL has the *Works* and the *Works in Prose Works*; the McMaster and E have the *Works* and the *Complaint*), but pagination totals or errors are not given in the ESTC for these multi-volume works (page 288 is mispaginated "188" in both *Works in Prose* and the *Works*). A more remarkable failure to recognize the separate issues of an edition involves the six-volume 12mo *Works of the Reverend Dr. Edward Young* (the first edition in six volumes) produced in Scotland with five separate imprints recorded in five ESTC entries, none hazarding a cross reference though the first 17 transcribed words of the title are identical: four in Edinburgh: for Alexander Donaldson (T119336), for James Dickson (T177465), for Charles Elliot (N35673), and "printed by and for Colin Macfarquhar" (N34692), and one in London: for John Donaldson (N27864). The ESTC notes that the issues for John Donaldson and for Charles Elliot are not on ECCO (and that the John Donaldson copy has not been even filmed) but only that for Alexander Donaldson is. In fact, however, the Harvard copy of the Elliot set is on ECCO, as is the BL copy with Vols. 1-3 for Alexander Donaldson and with Vols. 4-6 for John Donaldson. Thus, aside from a few variant states accidentally caused during the impression, and the altered title-pages, two copies of the same six-volume edition are on ECCO. But note that ECCO reproduces half of two ESTC records as a single record without recognizing the fact. This same error occurs with the four-volume *Works* of 1770, issued with variant title-pages, one "London: S. Crowder," et al. (N25938; noted as unfiled) and the other "Edinburgh: Martin & Wotherspoon" (T78103; noted as filmed). ECCO reproduces, referenced to T78103, O's set with Vol. 1 from the London issue, wrongly calling it T78103 on its full-citation page.

Among the attribution errors on both ECCO and ESTC is the indication that Edward Young wrote a work purporting to be by him: *An Account of the Two Brothers, Perseus and Demetrius, . . . Collected from the Grecian History, written by the author of Busiris, . . . the Universal Passion, Satires &c.* (Watts, 1743), ESTC T123956, filmed (1986). This is a historical account partly summarizing Young's tragedy *The Brothers* (1753). Known attributions are often not included: the ESTC and, thus, ECCO fail to list Young as the author of *A Sea-Piece* (Dodsley, 1755), T47231, filmed in 1985. Oddly, in the ESTC's newsletter *Factotum*, no. 9, Harold Forster long ago identified this work as Young's, noting that it included an ode adapting Young's *Sailor's Song, to the South*, published earlier in 1755 by Dodsley (T47023). The ESTC and ECCO attribute *Sailor's Song* to Young but fail to note the same of *A Sea-Piece*, yet do note that "*A Sea-Piece*" is

among poems in collections of Young, such as 1778 and 1783 editions of Young's *Love of Fame* (for "A. Mallard," et al.).

Besides attributions involving authors, ECCO like the ESTC passes on, often without comment, false claims on title-pages about publishers and places of publication, as well as flimsy conjectures by the original ESTC catalogers about the place and dates of undated works. Often examining these books as physical artifacts (paper stock, binding, typography) would reveal the conjectures are very unlikely. The ESTC itself often provides the data for good notes about the date of works with false publishers' names, if only someone searched to see what was published and where and when. For instance, ECCO like the ESTC offers a poor conjectured date of "1765?" for undated the *Poetical Works of Dr. Jonathan Swift* (London "Sold by A. Manson, R. Dilton, J. Thomson," et al., n.d.), 2 vols. 12mo, ESTC T42743, Teerink #59. The ESTC indicates that several imprints with the bogus "Manson" and his varying but connected fictional cronies do bear dates, nearly all 1777-1779, providing a much better conjectural date. Again we find one problem with the ESTC and ECCO is that nobody surveys and edits its results. To make up for that deficiency, there ought to be a way for scholars to post notes tagged to ESTC and ECCO entries for other scholars to read--a suggestion Rob Hume made here two year ago (n.s. 21.1.16).

Descriptive errors passed along from ESTC to ECCO include errors regarding format, especially for smaller books. *The Works of Dr. Jonathan Swift* published in 17 volumes by W. Bowyer, W. Johnston, et al., 1765, Teerink #92, is listed in several units: Vols. 1-12, gathered as ESTC 193565, are rightly called 18mos, as are Vols. 13-14 (T194323 and T194325); but Vols. 15-17 for Johnston, 1765, are not grouped but entered individually and wrongly called 12mos by ESTC and ECCO (15: T194322, 16: T194327; 17: T194328).

Incomplete or misrepresented works appear on ECCO (and frequently also in *The Eighteenth Century*), in consequence of the poor choice of anomalous copies of record--often due to reliance on BL's or O's holdings. For one example of the copy of record's role, a copy formerly identified in the ESTC, consider the first edition of Swift's *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse* (J. Morphew, 1711.), 8vo; pp. 416; Teerink #2(1). Herman Teerink created a false division of first edition copies, with a ghost issue, #2(1a), supposedly having leaves G6-G7 in place uncanceled and with #2(1b) having a corrected state with cancellans A8 replacing them; but only rare imperfect copies like BL's 838.g.1 have the cancellans in place as A8 and the two original leaves G6-G7 in place before G8. This anomalous BL copy was the copy of record for T39454, referenced to #2(1a), but one cannot believe that the three dozen copies listed have cancellanda in place. One of the Young editions incompletely reproduced on ECCO due to defects in the copy is *Poetical Works* 1752 (T78102), employing the BL copy lacking leaf a2. ECCO, like the film series, often reproduces incomplete multi-volume works because the copy at hand was incomplete. Thus, for instance, ECCO offers only 16 of the 17 volumes of *The Works of Jonathan Swift. D.D: D.S.P.D. With Notes . . . By J. Hawksworth* (Dublin: Williams, 1767-1768); Teerink #98.2 and ESTC N31140: Vol. 7 is lacking from the O copy filmed. Sometimes it is the frontispiece that is missing

from the copy photocopied. This occurs in ECCO's reproduction of Vol. 1 of *The Works of Jonathan Swift, D.D. . . . in six Volumes*, edited by John Hawkesworth (Bathurst et al., 1755), 4to, Teerink #87; T52755, indicating copy of record at BL (90.d.1-6).

ECCO's digital images can be faulted. First, they aren't as crisp as the digital photographs regularly sent by libraries now. Second, they are in black and white and so fail to reproduce red-lettering on title-pages. Swift's *Miscellanies*, or works, volumes published in London from 1745-51 typically have red-letter titles, and these are relatively often unnoted by both ESTC and ECCO. Examples of ECCO texts without notice of red-lettering on the citation page nor the ESTC record include: *Miscellanies. The Fifth and Sixth Volumes*, 1745, ESTC T39468; ditto, 1751 (T39469); *Miscellanies. In Four Volumes*, 1751 (T39450); *Miscellanies. By Dr. Swift. The Eleventh Volume*, 1746 (T39445); *Miscellanies. The Seventh Volume*, 1748 (T39479); *Miscellanies. The Eighth Volume*, 1748 (T39467); *Miscellanies. The Ninth Volume*, 1748 (T39476). (ESTC does not note any of these Swift editions are on ECCO.)

More seriously, ECCO has pages that are unreadable, partially blotted, or incomplete. Those that I would call "unreadable" have passages washed out and undetailed as if a printer cartridge had run low. For instance, Vol. 3 of Smollett's *Continuation of the Complete History of England*, 1762, digitizing BL's copy 291.h.22, has about 20 pages that cannot be fully read (e.g., 167-68, 258, 321, or 328), with footnotes and printed marginalia in smaller font especially obscured (as on 420). Some text is lost from stains (as on 117) and from letters down in the gutter (as 278). Texts with smaller font and without leading will suffer the most from general obscurity. Small format books with many pages tend to have the most loss in the gutters. Gutter loss is considerable in all three small duodecimo editions of Swift's *A Tale of a Tub* in 1711: ESTC N13639, T49839, and N13640, with text lost in the third on all versos between pp. 14 and 24. Some scholars quoting or collating texts will conjecturally supply words and letters.

Also, ECCO's images are sometimes distorted relative to their proportions in height and width (much of this distortion was already in *The Eighteenth Century* images, sometimes from filming bound books bowed out convexly). For instance, the title-page of *A Collection of Poems, Essays, and Epistles* (Dublin: Armitage, 1774; ESTC T167156) has the width 52.8% of the height, but in ECCO's the width is proportionately greater, 60.5% of height; in the first edition of Young's *The Revenge* the title-page's width is 54.1% of the height, but in ECCO's reproduction the width is much narrower, 48% of height. The effect of the distortion is seen by looking at title-pages of two folios of Lyttelton's *To the Memory of a Lady Lately Deceased* 1747 (Foxon L337) and 1748 (Y339), both with widths about 57.5-58% of heights in the originals, but, as reproduced on ECCO, the width of the 1747 becomes 64.2% of height, nearly 7% wider, while the 1748 remains proportional at 57.5%. Usually the reproductions are distorted to become narrower; for instance, the title-page of the second edition of Young's *The Centaur Not Fabulous*, 1755, ESTC T121374, has a width 50% of height, but as reproduced on ECCO the width becomes 45% of the height. In emails on 10-11 May 2006, A. C. Elias, Jr., and I

pointed out this distortion to Scott Dawson of Gale, who replied, "if anything, I'd think that the digital images were cleaner and straighter than the film due to some digital clean-up we do as we scan the microfilm." Arch doubted that all the distortion arose from the film, feeling that he hadn't noticed the distortion in *The Eighteenth Century* microfilm copies of the same pages. After examining eight or so reproductions involving volumes of Smollett's histories, of which I have original, film, and digital copies, I have to admit that the ECCO images, if not always, usually are proportional to the film--but the cases checked involve little distortion in the film, and I have not been able to examine the film beneath greatly distorted digital images noted above. The title of Vol. 1 of Smollett's *A Complete History of England*, first edition, 1757, ESTC T55301, has width 63.86% in the original (129/202 mm.); 65% in the film; and, on ECCO, 64% when the single page is printed at 33% of size reduction and 64.5% in the print option for multiple pages in sequence. The shift in proportions within different print formats is curious; however, the proportions were the same at 25% and at 33% of the image when printing a single page. Page A2 of the volume has the width/height proportions of 66.5 in the original, 67.7 in the film, 65.7 at 33% size when printed as a page. Here ECCO has noticeably decreased the width of the film. Usually less than 1% difference in the width-height ratios occurs between original, film, and digitized images (e.g., the title-pages of Vols. 1 (1758) and 8 (1759) of the 2nd ed. 8vo of *Complete History* and Vols. 4 (1761) and 5 (1765) of the *Continuation*. But one case of ECCO's distorting the film occurs in the title-page of *Continuation*, Vol. 4 (1768), T55308, where width in the original is 48.8% of height, 49.2% on the film, and only 44% on ECCO.

Searches for works by their titles and dates sometimes fail due to programming configurations. One must know to exclude "not" from a title search; if one searches for Young's "*Centaur Not Fabulous*," the database will appear empty when it has the work (found with "Centaur Fabulous"). Sometimes searches fail that would succeed in the ESTC. For instance, the *Supplement to Swift's Works*, 8vo, 1779, appears in an ESTC search with the date "1779" (and also by searching the date "1776"), for the ESTC records both 1776 and 1779 supplemental volumes in the record T195297 tagged to both years, but not in ECCO, the 1779 volume can only be found by searching for the *Supplement* in 1776. Similarly, Vols. 1-3 4to of Smollett's *Complete History of England* were published together in 1757 and then Vol. 4 appeared in 1758 (ESTC T55301 records all 4 vols.); all four are placed on ECCO under 1757 such that one cannot find Vol. 4 on ECCO by searching under 1758.

ECCO's search capacity is miraculous to many users, but, like all the digitized text-bases with search functions, it misses a certain percentage of words. I don't recall anyone offering a figure for how accurate ECCO is, but I have found that, along with the Burney collection, it passes over some instances of the search words, often unaccountably to look at these missed instances. One can test its accuracy by comparing how many iterations of a word it finds searching one copy versus another of the same edition and even the same copy. In the case of the two copies of Smollett's *Continuation* Vol. 5 noted above, the copy linked to first

editions, T55304, and that linked to reprints, T55305, we find that in the first is found the word "commission" 7 times but in the second only 4 times; in the first we find "office" and "measure" 23 times, but in the second only 19 and 18 times respectively; and in the first we find "Westminster" 8 times but in the second only 5 times. In neither can ECCO find the often used proper name "La Vaisse." Or test the two different digitizations of BL's copy 12276.d.7 of Swift's *Miscellanies. The Eighth Volume*, 4th ed. 1751--I give results first for that linked to T142564 ("8 of 9" vols.) and second for that linked to T39480 ("8 of 11" vols.): for "measure": four same instances but only p. 131 for the first and only p. 247 for the second; for "office": four instances shared but a fifth on p. 263 only in the second; for "face": the same six hits plus "France" in the second only; and for "safe": the same five plus two only in the second (one in roman, p. 248, and one in italic, p. 292)--plus the second gives a hit for "false" (p. 255).

In digitizing less than half the ESTC records and some other fraction of *The Eighteenth Century* microfilm series, Gale seems not to have assembled a scholarly team to recommend what should be reproduced and what should not. The same may be said of Adam Matthews in the creation of its digitizing of periodicals, one consequence of which is that much reproduced was already available and insufficient regard was given to such considerations as the completeness of runs. These big commercial products offer profusion at a cost to precision and might be excused as being "too big" for editorial supervision. No scholars' intellectual reputations stand behind them. More scholarly rigor was no doubt needed when the filming by Gale and its predecessors was done to decide which copy should be filmed. And nothing is less scholarly than reproducing images without indicating the call number of the copy reproduced (even if one can discover that from the film). ECCO and the film series underlying it are necessarily slanted toward works owned by the libraries where filming was done--if no copy was at libraries like BL and the Bodleian, a work was less likely to be microfilmed. ECCO seems to have understandably de-emphasized reprints from decades after initial publication. However, that does result in fewer Irish and Scottish printings ending up in the database, lessening its value for the study of Irish and Scottish books and booktrade. Furthermore, later reprints are often the rarest editions, and one could argue that editions existing in very few copies should have been digitized to distribute and preserve them. ECCO includes relatively fewer American editions, but this was for the best, for many are digitized on Readex/Newsbank Digital Evans.

One wonders how successful ECCO has been at focusing on first and revised editions. Many are neglected, such as the revised edition of Smollett's *Continuation of the Complete History of England*, 1766, in 2 vols. 4to (T167099, filmed in 2004), containing an index to the work as well as to the first-edition quartos of *The Complete History of England*. Especially with its index to the 60+ copies of the quarto *Complete History*, this is an important yet scarce edition, with the ESTC noting eight copies (none at the BL or O). For Edward Young, ECCO fails to include a fair number of first editions, some even sole editions: *An Apology for Princes, or the Reverence due to Government* (Worrall, 1729); ESTC T22219-

22220, in 4to and 8vo issues (the first alone filmed); *The Centaur Not Fabulous* (Millar, 1755); T113256; *The Force of Religion* (Curll, 1714); T4538 and N18726 for plain-paper and fine-); *On the late Queen's Death . . .* (Tonson 1714); T43257; and *Two Epistles to Mr. Pope* (Gilliver, 1730); T52064. These are available in *The Eighteenth Century* microfilms, but others are not: *Cynthio* (Roberts, 1727); ESTC T34549, listing four copies; and *An Epistle to the Lord Viscount Bolingbroke . . .* (n.p., 1714); ESTC N5685, known in one copy; and *Orationes Duæ Codringtono*, with pieces by Digby Cotes and Edward Young (Oxford: Peisley, 1716); ESTC T43341. Excluded editions with authorial revisions include *A Paraphrase on a Part of the Book of Job*, 3rd edition (Wilkins, 1726), N38127, listing 5 copies (filmed in 2004).

Roughly half of the pre-1775 editions of Young are to be found on ECCO. For instance, of 20 editions of *A Poem on the Last Day* printed before 1775, 11 editions are in ECCO, but not the rarest seven existing in four or fewer copies (ESTC T172977, T478479, T179909, T206392, and N11636, and 1755 and 1769 editions not on ESTC and known in only one copy--only the first of these seven is filmed). Of the nine editions of *The Force of Religion*, ECCO fails to reproduce five, including several of the rarest, as Curll's separate issue of 1741 and the Foulis 1751 edition, both not in Foxon or the ESTC. ECCO reproduces about half of the prose editions, and the plays fare a little better than the prose (8 of 14 pre-1775 editions of *Busiris*; 18 of 24 editions of *The Revenge*; 3 of 8 editions of *Brothers*--the excluded include the authorized 2nd edition for the copyright holders, not filmed and existing in but two copies, and also a rare Dublin edition for W. Williamson known in a single copy. One listing for *The Revenge* is erroneous: both ESTC and ECCO list a 1735 London edition (T44872), 70 pp., held only by the BL; this copy lacks a title-page. It is, in fact, the separate issue (N61560) with some resetting of the Dublin *Works* edition of 1764 for G. and E. Ewing, et al. (N13269)--ESTC lists the separate issue as only filmed, not on ECCO. Gale's failure to prioritize what editions were most in need of reproduction, evident from first or revised editions not reproduced, can be further illustrated with Young's *The Revenge*. The rarest editions of *The Revenge*, the most vulnerable part of the historical record, never microfilmed, are always those excluded from ECCO, such as that edition printed c. 1735-1750 and owned only by Temple University (N48294), and the Rivington 1775 edition (N23450), located in two copies. The same can be noted for Young's *Busiris*: unfiled and unreproduced on ECCO are three editions existing in but a single copy: a 1739 piracy at Illinois (N43510), a Glasgow 1755 for W. Duncan, Jr. (N32117; unknown to the ESTC; it is a separate issue of a works edition), located at CU-Riverside; and an Edinburgh 1774 for W. Darling (N23450), located at the Folger. Obviously, since the digitizing was done from film, one can't complain about the exclusion of unfiled editions but by calling the whole project ill-conceived and premature. However, to Gale's credit, over half of these omitted editions are slated for inclusion in ECCO II (so indicated on a database of forthcoming titles posted in late 2008).

Scholars need to provide a little noisy feedback to corporate ventures like ECCO if future projects are to benefit from their expertise. Gale would do well to

sponsor a conference or sessions at meetings not to plug its products but to enlist advice and contributions. And ASECS would do well to endorse some proposal that calls for reasonably priced subscriptions for small schools and individuals before the membership urge their libraries to subscribe.--Jim May

**Lennard J. Davis. *Obsession: A History*.** Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008. Pp. v + 290; b/w illustrations; index. ISBN 10 0-226-13782-1. Hardcover, \$27.50.

Lennard J. Davis is the author of two studies of the novel, but in recent years he has taken up the subject of disability. At the University of Illinois at Chicago, besides serving in the English Department, he is also Professor of Disability and Human Development and of Medical Education. Several years ago, in my capacity as head of the Columbia University Seminar on 18th-Century European Culture, I asked him to speak on the subject of disability during the Enlightenment. He was unable to do so, but we now have the book on which he was working at that time.

According to Davis, "we live in an age of obsession; or more to the point, an age that is obsessed with obsession" (3). On the one hand, obsession (as in OCD) is a disease; on the other, obsession (as in lovers, geniuses, athletes, and artists) is culturally prized. This paradox has a history, beginning in the middle of the eighteenth century in England and France, when a "scientific" discourse concerning the body and its activities led to the medicalization of mental aberrations. At the same time, behavior that had long been part of the human condition--melancholy, depression, physical tics, ennui, digestive problems, anxiety--began to be regarded as socially and culturally interesting. Science itself is predicated on excessive observation and attention to detail. Indeed, obsession, as in the specializations required in a rationally ordered, technological, bourgeois consumer society, drives progress. You might say (as Davis does) that obsession can be identified with modernity or the modern condition. The "alienated mind" is now "characteristic of human subjectivity" (81).

For 18th-century scholars, the primary interest of *Obsession* will reside in the first chapter, "Origins of Obsession," which begins with an analysis of terms, distinguishing "possession" from "obsession" and their relation to what was considered demonic possession. In the former the victim was unaware of being possessed, as the devil had completely entered the person and taken control of the soul. In the latter the victim was aware of being besieged by the devil and could offer some resistance. The English actually banned possession in 1736, in order to undermine the Catholic monopoly on exorcism, but this move would seem to indicate the need for new and non-theological explanations of mental illnesses. By the end of the eighteenth century, the physician William St. Clare was using the term "nerves" to diagnose local cases of mass hysteria. In between, Davis traces the increasing popularization of the concept of "nerves," "thought to be the fibers of the emotions" (36), which marked "a historical dividing line between seventeenth-

century ideas of human behavior and eighteenth-century ones" (35). "A man's soul," in other words, got "into his head" (70). The interest in the mind and its workings (maybe "failures" would be a better term) can be seen in the growing dominance in medical writing of publications on "madness and the malfunctioning imagination." An example is William Perfect's *Select Cases in the Different Species of Insanity, Lunacy, or Madness*, 1787, "the first publication of psychiatric case materials," which went through seven editions and was exceeded only in popularity in this field by Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (49).

Concurrent with the rise in medical or quasi-scientific explanations for mental aberrations was the rise of "lifestyle diseases" (my term), so that by the end of the century "nerves" (as among the invalids at Bath) were felt to be fashionable. Davis introduces a "quartet" of maladies that--unlike total madness--affected a large number of people and that underlay the development of the notion of partial insanity: hysteria, hypochondria, vapors, and spleen. The transition during the century can be seen in two English trials. In one, in 1723, it was claimed that a man arrested in a plot to kill the king was "totally deprived of his understanding and memory, and doth not know what he is doing, no more than an infant, than a brute or a wild beast" (quoting Nigel Walker, *Crime and Insanity in England*, 1968). The second occurred in 1760, at the trial of Earl Ferrers, during which Dr. John Monro, "physician superintendent at Bethlehem," in "the first recorded instance of an expert 'psychiatric' witness," offered "temporary total insanity" as a defense (50). In other words, a mental illness in which rationality and irrationality may coexist.

Davis's aim is to show the shift to "a particular type of mental illness based around obsessive thinking and compulsive activities" (50) and in the process "how a space opens in a cultural field" (51). We are introduced to a wide variety of phenomena and figures, including Richard Blackmore (who wrote a treatise in 1725 on splenetic disturbances); John Locke (madness as a form of incorrect thinking," 47); Samuel Richardson, "a hypochondriac, according to his physician friend George Cheyne, author of *The English Malady*" of 1773 (51); *The Man of Feeling* by Henry Mackenzie of 1771, "the signal novel for this era" (51), whose male protagonist cries incessantly; William Cullen's *First Lines in the Practice of Physic* of 1784; Samuel Johnson ("who illustrates . . . a general expansion of madness without the totalizing effect of being mad," 58); the culture of Sentimentality and Laurence Sterne's *Uncle Toby*; Rousseau (civilization as sickness); and William Godwin's novel *Caleb Williams* of 1794 ("the first obsessive novel," 54). Caleb himself represents the self-awareness that became characteristic of obsession. (*Obsession* does not include a bibliography, though the notes will lead the reader to the relevant sources.)

By the beginning of the nineteenth century obsession had become "franchised": "If each propertied man in the eighteenth century . . . has a right to vote, each one also has a right to be splenetic, vaporous, hysterical, or hypochondriacal" (59). Madness may have been "a form of incorrect thinking" (47), but by then "the idea of partial madness as characteristic of humankind had become fairly well established" (60). The new "consumerist insanity" held true,

according to Davis, for France as well, although the majority of the material in this chapter is English.

Most readers will not want to stop with the eighteenth-century material. The succeeding three chapters, moving from the French psychiatrist Jean-Étienne Esquirol, who coined the term "monomania" in about 1810, to Freud's "Rat Man" a century later, offer much for those interested in the transition to modernity. Emil Zola, himself a subject of scientific scrutiny because of his obsessiveness, embodies the phenomenon described by Davis. As Davis writes, "the mind that increasingly is postulated by the Enlightenment is one that can observe itself. It is in this sense alienated from itself." Though it might have been more pointed about this, *Obsession* complicates the "standard" view of the light and clarity of the Enlightenment and, indeed, of the emergence of Romanticism.

Elizabeth Powers  
New York, New York

**Kevin L. Cope (volume editor).** *Above the Age of Reason: Miracles and Wonders in the Long Eighteenth Century*. (British Ideas and Issues, 1660-1820: A Series of Reprinted Books and Pamphlets, Numbers, 3-6.) With facsimile texts introduced and annotated by James G. Buickerood, David Venturo, Keith Bodner, and Kevin L. Cope. New York: AMS Press, 2006. Pp. 127 + four inserted facsimile texts with separate paginations, some multiple: pp. [vi], 34; [ii], xxiv, [2], 45, [1]; [viii], 52; viii, 68 [2]. ISBN: 0-404-59653-3. Hardcoverd, \$164.50.

Although the digitized texts on ECCO available to those at subscribing institutions make facsimiles less marketable and necessary, there's an obvious convenience still in having a reproduction bound for reading and annotating. And texts are so much more valuable when joined to introductions and annotations. (Will a website be launched with introductions and annotations by students and professors for texts on ECCO?) No facsimile project in 18th-century studies has succeeded nearly so well as the Clark Library's Augustan Reprint Series, which produced over many years a series of over a hundred works in paperbacks at affordable prices for scholars. Aside from Dover's facsimiles, I cannot think of reproductions going forward that any but libraries can afford. Pickering & Chatto continues to produce expensive author-focused and thematic sets of facsimiles with introductions. *Above the Age of Reason* is the third publication in AMS Press's facsimile reprint series "British Ideas and Issues, 1660-1820," the first publications of which were paperbacks with pamphlets by John Lord Hervey (*To the Patrons of the Craftsman*, 1731), and William Yonge (*Sedition and Defamation Display'd*, 1731), edited by Alexander Pettit (the series editor) and of William Pulteney (*A Proper Reply to . . . Sedition and Defamation Display'd*, 1731), edited by H. T. Dickinson. Pettit's and Dickinson's numbers were both entitled *Walpole's Friends and Foes*. This new and hardbound volume gathers four texts involving the

miraculous and the relations of the incorporeal or spiritual to the material, published in England between 1687 and 1727. It begins with a general introduction to all four by Kevin Cope, who identifies points of resemblance and difference against the background of the history of ideas, religion, and popular beliefs, throwing some connections to the 21st century. The four works are then in turn introduced (in roughly fifteen pages) by four editors, whose annotations follow the texts: M.S. [Matthew Smith?], *A Philosophical Discourse of the Nature of Rational and Irrational Souls* (1695), edited by James G. Buickerood; Toussaint Bridoul [Flemish Jesuit, 1595-1672] *The School of the Eucharist . . . with a Preface concerning the Testimony of Miracles* [by William Clagett, D.D. [1646-1688] (1687), edited by David Venturo; Thomas Sherlock [1678-1761], [Preface and first two Discourses from] *The Use and Intent of Prophecy* (1725), edited by Keith Bodner; and Thomas Woolston [1669-1733], *A Discourse on the Miracles of Our Saviour* (1727), edited by Kevin Cope. The second and third facsimile texts are good reproductions, but the first and fourth are mediocre, with some punctuation and words lost (e.g., Woolston, p. 5).

Professor Cope's general introduction is a rousing come on for these four early modern treatments of the supernatural, offered with an eye for the paradoxical and the surprising--but then the subject is wonderful and miraculous. Cope stresses how a rational and increasingly empirical group of thinkers, some with "buoyantly skeptical optimism," were confronting traditional beliefs not yet scrutinized from a modern perspective. Some of the authors are engaged in the Enlightenment project "to probe the limits of human knowledge while also postulating that something may well lie beyond these limits." I'm struck myself at how several of the works reproduced are engaged in skeptical retrenchments of old Christian beliefs in order to protect Christianity against embarrassing attacks by those like Anthony Collins whom they considered atheists and infidels--these are controlled burns to limit the fires forthcoming from infidels.

Professor James Buickerood identifies Matthew Smith, a barrister of the Middle Temple, as the likely author ("M.S.") of *A Philosophical Discourse on the Nature of Rational and Irrational Souls* on the basis of identifications in the Bodleian catalogue and the *Term Catalogues*. He also draws circumstantial support from the dedicatee's (John Duncumb's) being like Smith an alumnus of Oxford and a barrister at the Inns of Court. Certainly the essay shows a lawyer's capacity for argument, but the subject might surprise us: that man has two distinct souls, "Sensitive and Rational," the "Sensitive" being shared with animals and extinguished at death, and the "Rational" being "Spiritual Immaterial" and thus "Immortal." I needed a program here to understand the many allusions, such as the opening qualification of Ralph Cudworth's remarks on Epicurean doctrines of creation, and Buickerood offered an excellent survey of the background, making it clear how M.S.'s "ultimate opponent is materialism" (14), yet how M.S. needed to show matter capable of sense and thus of a limited soul distinct from the immaterial soul in order for M.S. to fight the rear-guard action against the claims that animals might also have immortal souls or that there are no immortal souls. Buickerood shows that the author's ideas developed out of Francis Bacon's and Thomas Willis's

two-soul models and that there was contemporary interest in the subject, as within Dunton's *Athenian Gazette*. Buickerood also identifies the likely enemies, "miscreants responsible for material conceptions of the human soul" unnamed by Smith: Charles Blount, Charles Gildon, and Henry Layton. In a brief account of publication history, Buickerood surely errs in claiming that, when *A Philosophical Discourse* was reissued in 1704, "only its title page varying," it was reprinted from "formes [that] had remained unused for nine years" (27-28). After looking at the British Library's 1704 copy on ECCO, I'd bet a paycheck that it has a cancel title plus the reissued sheets of the 1695 edition: the 1704 BL copy is one of only two copies located by ESTC and has the same skeleton as the 1695 edition (one can't imagine the running-titles being stored along with the page-settings), and the 1704 on ECCO has more of the easily lost marginal punctuation than the 1695 Clark copy in Buickerood's facsimile--although ECCO's more crisp images regularly have punctuation that is not visible in the AMS facsimile.

The texts that David Venturo has edited have more surprises. For one, this is a two-for: while the contents page and head-title to the work mention only Toussaint Bridoul as author (for *The School of the Eucharist*), the 1687 publication begins with Dr. William Claggett's substantial 24-page tract against the Catholic notion that miracles continue and do so in the Catholic mass regularly (transubstantiation). Bridoul's work is a gathering of anecdotes involving animals that show the sanctity of the eucharist: a Jewish man's horse kneels before the eucharist, other animals protect it, and still others suffer for violating it. Venturo provides a good introduction to the political and religious context of the publication (King James was trying to overturn the Test Act and to integrate Catholics fully in the realm), to the creation of the doctrine of transubstantiation during the 13th century, to the long tradition of evidence of Corpus Christi drawn from animal behavior that Bridoul's collection draws upon, and to why these tales of wonder drawing on the animal world would seem sufficiently absurd in the 1680s, such that simply translating the work was offering it (and transubstantiation) up for ridicule. As Venturo writes, "Claggett permits Bridoul to have the last word in the book, assured that the elderly priest will be hoist with the absurdity of his own theological petard" (46). Claggett's introduction gets around to Bridoul only late in the essay (xx-xxiv), and probably his dense and documented arguments deserve a little more attention in the introduction, but then Venturo annotates this section well, as he does the main text.

The third text, Thomas Sherlock's first two discourses in a much lengthier work, *The Use and Intent of Prophecy in the Several Ages of the World*, seems sufficiently autonomous as excerpted and suits the volume quite well. Claggett and Woolston also touch on the relation of prophecy to miracles and to the evidence of Christ's divinity, and Sherlock, writing two years before Woolston, is also fighting off challenges by Anthony Collins to a main support for Christianity. Keith Bodner provides a good biographical and contextual introduction to the work, prior to an analysis clarifying the arguments. He notes that Collins, in arguing that Old Testament prophecies hadn't been fulfilled, "tends to treat the prophecies as discrete and independent," but Sherlock insists upon there being "a series of

connections between the prophecies" over thousands of years, which can't so easily be shown a "fraud" (89-90).

The fourth text is Thomas Woolston's rhetorically astute *Discourse on the Miracles of our Savior*, which has an amazing dedicatory address to the Bishop of London, who prosecuted Woolston for blasphemy--boldly insisting the Bishop has taken Woolston for an "Infidel" by "Mistake" (iv), insinuating that a true faith doesn't need the claptrap of literal miracles and boldly encouraging the Bishop to write "a Strenuous Defence of Christianity" and to "clear Christ's Church, of Infidels," for then, Woolston would joy to see, "what a Glorious Bishop would you be!" (vi-vii). In a helpful biographical account, Cope stresses how Woolston is something of a scholar-hero (104-05, and some will perceive him also as a Christian martyr), who determinedly argues that miracles are not a secure foundation for faith, "That Jesus's Miracles, as they are now a days understood [literally, not allegorically, or "parabolically," as Woolston would understand them], make nothing for his Authority and Messiahship" (Woolston, 3). Woolston's remarks of this kind in *The Moderator* (1724) had brought him a blasphemy conviction resulting in a short jail sentence and a fine, but, since he couldn't pay the fine, he remained in jail in 1727 when this work was published and he would not regain his freedom before his death in January 1733. Now he expands this argument and another, that many purported miracles never literally occurred, but are allegories of spiritual events, some yet to occur. All the while, Woolston supports his case with the writings of the Church Fathers, insisting that he's in possession of the patristic understanding of the New Testament (also shared by Erasmus, brought in as a witness). As Cope perceives Woolston, he yearns for a "theology congruent with reason and historical report" (110) as had Hooker and Tillotson, but he also has a more sublime inclination, for his account of "Scripture made even higher moral demands on Christians than its literal meaning suggests" (103) and he is "always at pains to stretch the limit of experience and to up the emotional ante." Cope thinks that for Woolston the literal miracles are too "modest" (114) or unlikely and indecorous (e.g., dumping devils in some poor farmer's pigs). Cope offers a good biographical sketch relating Woolston to Anthony Collins, Dr. Samuel Clarke, and other contemporaries, a background discussion enumerating a great body of contemporary publications on miracles (112-13), and logical and rhetorical analyses of Woolston's arguments (in the notes as well as the introduction) that are clear and add interest--e.g., his note that Woolston's allegorical understanding of miracles "excludes literal meaning" usually accepted in allegorical interpretations (120, n. to p. 2). Cope offers an interesting distinction between Woolston's attack on miracles, more anchored in rationalism and notions of decorum, and Hume's, more quantitative and empirical (124, n. to p. 21). Regarding the notes, I'd point out that the untraced word "Collyhists" (30) refers to "coine-coursers" or "rent gatherers" in two contemporary texts, and that, while Woolston may mean only Collins by both "Mr. Grounds" and "Mr. Scheme" (2), the references need be resolved mindful of others on pp. 65-66. Also, a note is needed to indicate that the marginalia on p. 42 changing "Countenance" to "Vestments" is authorial, appearing in the same hand in other copies, at least in the

BL copy on ECCO. Cope attends well to the distinctively varied diction and bold phrasing in Woolston (virtues that mark Cope's style). Some of Cope's remarks on Woolston serve as general commentary on the whole volume; for instance, "Miracles were a mixed blessing for empiricism. They transgressed against the sense of order and regularity toward which 'modern' science aspired, yet miracles were the *sine qua non* example of an empirical event."--JEM

**Jocelyn Harris.** *A Revolution Almost beyond Expression: Jane Austen's Persuasion*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007. Pp. 280; appendix; notes; bibliography; index; illustrations. ISBN-13: 978-0-87413-966-2; ISBN-10: 0-87413-966-X. Hardcover, \$54.40.

*A Revolution Almost beyond Expression: Jane Austen's "Persuasion"* underscores once again Jocelyn Harris's eye for reading literature in terms of its larger context, for making important connections, and for noticing and explicating in Jane Austen's work, in particular, Austen's transformations of the work of other authors. Harris some years ago made the case for Austen's appropriating and refashioning characters from her favorite Richardson novel *Sir Charles Grandison*. In *Jane Austen's Art of Memory* (1989), Harris devoted a chapter to Austen's *Persuasion* and to her "reworking and enriching" (220) of Chaucer's Loathly Lady story told by the Wife of Bath. Harris's latest book greatly expands her study of Austen to demonstrate that Austen was a creative and careful artist who drew upon and reanimated literary, historical, and social materials for *Persuasion*.

The first chapter of *Revolution* examines the origins of *Persuasion*. Jane Austen had defended female novelists in *Northanger Abbey*. Harris argues from external evidence and from internal evidence in *Persuasion* that this novel was written as a further response to critics who regarded Frances Burney and her novel *The Wanderer* as passé. Harris bolsters her case by drawing on Austen's letters to her niece Fanny Knight, as well as to textual references in Sarah Scott's *Millenium Hall* and Oliver Goldsmith's *Life of Nash*.

The only manuscript copies extant of Austen's published novels are two chapters of *Persuasion*. Harris closely analyzes the revisions of these chapters to demonstrate that Austen is "no warbling thrush, no wool gatherer, but an extraordinarily self-critical, self-conscious, and meticulous writer and rewriter" (72). Those revisions culminate in the pivotal scene at the White Hart Inn, where Anne Elliot and Captain Harville, in earshot of Wentworth, the suitor she reluctantly rejected eight years before, discuss the apparent fickleness of women. Austen's rewriting strengthens and refines this section to encapsulate the themes of the whole novel so that the "revolution beyond expression" Anne experiences extends to Anne and Wentworth's reunion and to a mature mutual recognition and revelation of their true feelings and motivations, a coming full circle in their relationship (R. W. Chapman, 3rd edition, 1988: V.IV.XI.237).

Chapters 4 and 5 examine the historical backdrop of *Persuasion* as it pervades and supports the thematic considerations of the novel. Jane Austen was

composing the novel in 1817, but the events of the novel conclude in 1815, just before Napoleon escaped from Elba (84). Harris parallels the movement of *Persuasion* from loss to restoration to the mood of Britain after Waterloo (73). Furthermore, Austen's brothers were naval officers, and Harris, explicating Austen's technique of "inversion and expansion" (118), suggests that Austen "divides the career of Francis Austen between two characters, assigning Trafalgar to Admiral Croft and St. Domingo to Captain Wentworth" (76). Additionally, Harris finds echoes of Nelson, Napoleon, Captain Cook, Othello, Shakespeare's Antony, and Byron's Giaour, Child Harolde, and Corsair in Wentworth. If this seems a bit of a stretch, Harris's argument, nevertheless, spurs the reader to take a second look at Austen's method of reworking literary and historical figures to underscore her themes.

Admitting that her "argument about Austen's relationship to [Sir Walter] Scott is circumstantial" (129), Harris in Chapter 6 examines *Persuasion* as a critique of Scott's early novels, particularly of his views of nobility and on the nature of women (109). Countering Charlotte Brontë's assessment that Austen's writings lack emotional power (143), Harris in Chapter 7 places Austen firmly in the Romantic tradition. She identifies moments of intense feeling in *Persuasion* and argues that Austen was not only influenced by Romantic writers in her reworking of her characters but also exerted an influence on those writers (140).

The final two chapters discuss the role of place in *Persuasion* by contrasting Lyme Regis and Bath, significant settings in the novel, as they reinforce Austen's themes. By the time Austen's family moved to Bath in 1800, the city had declined in many ways (160-62); Austen herself never liked Bath. Referring to contemporary travel guides and commentaries, Harris contrasts the seamier, seedier, false side of the city with the more energetic, middle-class spirit of Lyme Regis and all that this suggests about the characters and the themes.

Jane Austen has not lacked for commentators to defend her against charges of narrowness of vision. The text, notes, and bibliography of *A Revolution Almost beyond Expression* recognize these scholarly contributions. But where Jocelyn Harris goes beyond these critics can best be summarized by considering two pictorial representations of Lyme Regis. In R. W. Chapman's standard *Oxford Illustrated Jane Austen*, the illustrations facing the title-page of the final volume of *Persuasion* depict two views of the coastline of Lyme Regis found in the Cruikshank Collection of the British Museum. Conventional, clear, pleasant, somewhat static, they contrast with Harris's choice for her book jacket and text (158): an 1814 print of J.M.W. Turner's watercolor *Lyme Regis* (1812). Turner's *Lyme Regis*, anticipating Monet's *Impression* by about sixty years, is subtle, active, and, indeed, revolutionary. Its shades and subtleties complement Harris's view that Austen's *Persuasion* was not written in a vacuum nor can it be read in a vacuum. *A Revolution Almost beyond Expression* makes for interesting and compelling reading--a welcome companion to Jane Austen's *Persuasion*.

Sylvia Kasey Marks  
Polytechnic Institute of New York University

**Kevin L. Cope.** *In and After the Beginning: Inaugural Moments and Literary Institutions in the Long Eighteenth Century.* (AMS Studies in the Eighteenth Century, 57.) New York: AMS Press, 2007. Pp. vii + 379; 8 illustrations; index. ISBN: 0-404-64857-6. Clothbound, \$93.50.

Beginning a review of a book about beginnings is tricky, in this case in no small part because Kevin L. Cope so successfully problematizes the idea of beginnings, whether in relation to historical eras, literary movements, or specific texts. The five chapters of *In and After the Beginning: Inaugural Moments and Literary Institutions in the Long Eighteenth Century* are seamlessly integrated yet, as he suggests of eighteenth-century texts, this book "could begin just about anywhere" too: each chapter has its own atomistic quality, and in each Cope juxtaposes unexpected texts in order to yield up new ways of approaching eighteenth-century discourses and institutions.

Cope has cleverly and clearly organized his book around what he calls "five distinct beginnings in the history of beginnings" (15), ranging from the collector-function of Restoration authors who produced compilations of aphorisms, proverbs, and anecdotes to the environmental impetuses of late eighteenth-century authors including Samuel Richardson, Henry Mackenzie, Frances Burney, and William Cowper. Cope's ability to venture back and forth between scientific tracts, philosophical treatises, and literary texts is one of his book's greatest strengths; few scholars move so confidently through such a wide range of disciplines, and his acuity in examining writings from the Royal Society helps demonstrate the many different registers in which eighteenth-century readers could engage with ideas about the nature of their world. Moreover, his multi-generic and multi-disciplinary approach reinforces a point that Vivien Jones and others have elsewhere made about the fact that the genres we now valorize were not, in fact, the most popular or even the most significant ones for eighteenth-century writers and readers. What many now term "ephemera" was in fact, during the long eighteenth century, popular and respectable. As Cope suggests, Alexander Pope's "epic-satire-essay trade" should be contextualized with "now-abandoned forms" like the prose rhapsody and the digest (9).

Although this is a well-documented book, Cope tends to refer to books and articles published before 1990. Obviously many of his references are to canonical studies (Ian Watt, Michael McKeon), but some more recent criticism might have enriched his argument. For example, Katherine E. Ellison's *Fatal News: Reading and Information Overload in Early Eighteenth-Century Literature* (2005) offers strategies for reading Defoe's *Journal of a Plague Year* that might have illuminated some of the points about "communicative acts" that Cope makes in conjunction with his analysis of *Robinson Crusoe* (208-09).

In the first eighty or so pages of the book, I noticed one typo (Frances Burney is named "Francis Burney" on page 15). Several spacing errors, especially in the footnotes, were slightly distracting as well (e.g., "inFrance" in fn. 2 on 204, "an d" on 74, and "b etween" on 205). Beyond these editorial points, Cope's glib and often playful language at times leads to prose that is jarring. His use of "Lady"

before Margaret Cavendish's name comes off as slightly old-fashioned. As I read, some of these habits struck me as being in keeping with his topic—there is an energy and controlled-recklessness that makes the book fun to read—but others (like calling Cavendish "Lady" and repeatedly invoking "feminists" as a monolithic group) carried too much baggage.

This brings me to my biggest complaint about the book. Cope routinely and hostilely lambastes feminist literary theory and new historicism—two modes that have enriched eighteenth-century studies over the past thirty years. Methodologically Cope's practice of putting scientific texts in conversation with literary ones draws on scholarship from the first half of the twentieth century by scholars including Marjorie Nicholson, but the push to locate hard science "quickly rushed from the sensory world into a dispersive array of feelings, impressions, and environments" is something that recent critics like Helen Deutsch and Felicity Nussbaum have approached using the lenses of feminist theory and disability studies. Rather than push an agenda, these modes can—at their best—help critics approach texts without a sense of generic or author-centered hierarchy, which is precisely what Cope strives to do by positioning Locke with Mandeville, and Fielding and Smollett with George Berkley.

Some of Cope's cheeky comments—"Royal Society historian Joseph Glanvill seems to be a robustly masculine author with little taste for feminism or ideologies. Yet Glanvill's favorite metaphor for research is one of female productivity: that of pregnancy and the womb"—do little to advance his argument; indeed, the recent collection of essays *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England* (2005) demonstrates how commonplace the metaphors of pregnancy and the womb were in early modern men's writing. Cope's apparent insinuation that pregnancy and the womb are feminist and ideological issues ignores the long history of invocations of these concepts by male and female authors as metaphors for writing, publishing, researching, and otherwise producing knowledge. He situates Hannah Wooley as an anti-feminist by calling on a totalized category of feminists "who regard omniscient viewpoints as symptoms of the 'male gaze'" (39), and he suggests that "critics flock to feminist heroines" (154), never bothering to define or footnote the feminist scholarship he discounts. That is, until he labels feminist theory and new historicism "literary conspiracy theories" (215). This maneuver allows Cope to position himself against a stereotypical enemy: man-hating, bra-burning, psychoanalysis-inspired feminists. He then dismisses feminist contributions to novel theory in a hectoring footnote full of unnecessary invective (287).

Cope's use of such hostile phrases as "an infernal vision" (287, note 3) cordons off the contributions of feminist literary theory to studies of Frances Burney and implicates that such scholarship is seeking out a particular agenda rather than offering a complex way of reading a literary text. He writes: "In search of a heroine for feminism, her most recent critics have attempted to render her as a serious champion of political ideals and as an anguished, lonely victim of social injustice or family oppression" (287). Not only does this assessment flatten the achievements of several important scholars, it also seems dated: the "most recent

critics" that Cope cites are from 1987 and 1989. Cope may have made these choices out of collegiality to working scholars, but an important feature of feminist theory—both in general and in regards to feminist literary theory more particularly—is that it works (roughly) in waves. Feminist theory of the 1980s is by and large second-wave feminist theory, which places an emphasis on recovery work and images of women criticism. This is not to say that criticism from the 1990s and the twenty-first century is more sophisticated but rather to suggest that its aims and effects are subtly different and that critiquing studies from the 1960s to the 1980s is not the same thing as rejecting the accomplishments of scholars like Harriette Andreadis, Paula Backscheider, Ros Ballaster, Margaret J. M. Ezell, Catherine Gallagher, Isobel Grundy, Robert Markley, Laura Runge, and Kirsten Saxton, among many others, who have offered readings, brought to light forgotten texts and documents, and altered our ways of reading eighteenth-century texts.

Cope's scrupulous attention to the complexity, the sociability, and multi-generic qualities of eighteenth-century literature could yield up new ways of approaching the period and of breaking down our artificial assumptions about beginnings and endings. However, his resistance to much contemporary critical theory (postmodernism, feminist literary theory, and new historicism in particular) leads him to craft an argument that verges on being superannuated. Many of his points have been made in the past ten years by scholars who embrace these methodologies, making his beginning in fact part of a larger story that he seems unwilling to acknowledge as forming at least the context of his own theories and interpretations.

Emily Bowles-Smith  
Lawrence University

**Paul E. Kerry (editor).** *Friedrich Schiller: Playwright, Poet, Philosopher, Historian.* (British and Irish Studies in German Language and Literature, 38) Oxford: Peter Lang, 2007. Pp. 353. ISBN: 978-3-03910-307-2. Paperback.

The intellectual engagement with Schiller was once perhaps not only an integral part of a liberal education in Europe and North America, even outside of German-speaking areas—that is, a chunk of required reading—but something that was pursued out of genuine interest as well. However, as George Steiner points out in an essay in this impressive new volume, if today it is difficult to find anyone who reads Schiller "out of passion, out of an inner drive," rather than as a school or university assignment, that may be in part because we no longer believe in Schiller's idealistic view of the role of art, that "Through art, the human individual becomes an ethical being" (335). A second obstacle following from that first is Schiller's language, in his most successful late dramas a language of high moral seriousness geared to fulfilling that ennobling function of art, and therefore a language far removed from our skeptical age.

In the English-language context, a further factor in the reception of Schiller is the availability of accurate and appealing English translations for those among us

without German reading ability, and of also of high-quality secondary work in English. The present volume contributes greatly to the need for guidance in reading Schiller by supplying an excellent introduction for an English-speaking audience that might have only a glancing familiarity with this central figure in eighteenth-century German culture, but also including in-depth treatment of particular problems, substantive food for specialists' thought as well. In assembling an impressive list of contributors, mostly drawn from British scholarly circles but with a few Americans as well, and producing a wide-ranging and intellectually engaging work, editor Paul Kerry has served both the community of eighteenth-century scholars and the larger scholarly world. The Germanists among us might hope an excellent volume like this would encourage and inform the inclusion of Schiller in courses on European eighteenth-century literature in general and encourage the reading of Schiller outside the classroom as well.

Schiller tends to be known for his historical dramas, such as the *Wallenstein* trilogy (1800), *Don Carlos* (1787), *Maria Stuart* (1800), and *Wilhelm Tell* (1804), and perhaps less so in the English-speaking world for his early *Sturm und Drang* works *Die Räuber* (The Robbers, 1781) and *Kabale und Liebe* (Intrigue and Love, 1783), for his lyric poetry, for his philosophical works of the 1790's, and for his epoch-making collaborations with Goethe. This collection of essays does much to redress this lack by presenting Schiller according to the phases of his life and his writing, from his early training as a doctor through his literary breakthrough (and resulting political exile) in *The Robbers*, through his peripatetic lifestyle as he tried to establish himself and make a living, in part through prose works aimed at a wide buying public, and to his intensive study of history, leading to an appointment as a professor of history at Jena, from which position he was able to arrive at the height of his productivity. The division of scholarly labor into the phases of Schiller's life and work allows a substantive engagement with the development of his thinking, rather than encouraging a view of all of his literary works through the lens of the theories of art that he developed in the 1790's (as often occurs in work on Schiller).

Given space limitations, it will not be possible to give each chapter its due. Wolfgang Wittkowski's biographical sketch reminds us what a troubled life Schiller had, his early life's wanderings as a political refugee, followed by persistent money troubles, then health issues leading to an early grave. By the time he was financially stable, Schiller was in declining health, dying of tuberculosis in 1805 at the age of 45. The chapter on Schiller's limited forays into literary prose, an overlooked area of his early work, is given an instructive and insightful treatment here by Jeffrey L. High, with careful attention to the emergence of themes that will consume him in his justly much better-known dramas. In the prose works, High suggests, morality tales are transformed into complicated explorations of environmental psychology, even within their maudlin and melodramatic forms. Schiller's poetry is accorded a sensitive overview by Kevin Hilliard, with careful attention to immediate intellectual context and development over time.

For many readers, primary interest may well be in the chapters on Schiller's work on history, his work on philosophy, his collaborative work with Goethe, and the highlights of his late production in the dramatic genre. In Paul Kerry's account,

Schiller's productivity as a historian, beginning with his book *Die Geschichte des Abfalls der vereinigten Niederlande von der Spanischen Regierung* (The History of the Revolt of the United Netherlands against Spanish Rule, 1788) had both important practical consequences (leading to a position as a history professor at Jena, within easy reach of the intellectual circles in neighboring Weimar, home to Goethe, Herder, and Wieland) and important intellectual consequences, as his historical work is best understood as fully integrated with his literary production. Kerry suggests that Schiller has a very modern view of history writing, that for him "writing history is also an aesthetic undertaking, an attempt to shape the past. Schiller understands that history is a construct and that the past is unrecoverable" (171), and that that construct is "designed to influence and persuade readers of a particular view of the past" (159). Schiller began with the idea that his account of the Dutch revolt would be a people's history, but by the end he was "beginning to isolate individuals as the causal forces of change" (167), and this focus on individual actors as central to an understanding of great historical movement informs his later historical dramas.

Before turning to work on those historical dramas, though, Schiller spent the 1790's reading and writing philosophy, and then working closely with Goethe on a series of periodical publications. The philosophical works account for quite a bit of the writing and thinking that is still done about Schiller, although, as Frederick Beiser points out, his fortunes as a philosopher have suffered because of our academic division of labor between philosophers and literary historians. Before that division took such strong hold, Schiller was taken very seriously as a philosopher, understood as a link between Kant and German Idealism, particularly Schelling and Hegel. David Pugh's complex argument on Schiller's philosophy suggests that the philosophical writing arose in response to his reading of Kant beginning in 1791, but that Schiller was not simply an adherent or popularizer of Kant, as is often claimed. The three major works on aesthetics on which his philosophical reputation rests, *Über Anmut und Würde* (1793), *Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen* (generally referred to as *Ästhetische Briefe* [Letters on Aesthetic Education], 1795), and *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung* (On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry, 1796), constitute "reflections on the relations of the political, the moral and the aesthetic components of the modern consciousness" in which Schiller sees his task as "the rehabilitation of that middle register of the cognitive faculty which was known as the area of clear but confused perceptions" (207). Pugh argues that although Schiller is often considered to be developing a view of the aesthetic realm that is "empirical rather than speculative, popular rather than academic, pluralistic rather than authoritarian, and naturalistic rather than metaphysical," in actuality he turns out to be "a metaphysician of a Platonic character," and that through the conservative function of the category of the sublime in his work, he moves "from the naturalistic paradigm of the human sciences towards the pure metaphysics of the German Idealists, and second, away from the progressivism of the German Enlightenment towards an anxious conservatism" (229).

By arriving at "anxious conservatism," Pugh's argument falls in line with

one standard reading of the political dimension of Schiller's work: that Schiller began his writing career in revolutionary mode in the *Sturm und Drang* dramas that established his first fame, but that the Reign of Terror in neighboring France caused Schiller to re-examine his own youthful rebelliousness and commitment to radically democratic politics. The Schiller who emerges through the philosophical explorations of the 1790's is one who believes that the human race must be aesthetically and morally educated before it can be trusted to govern itself, a lesson that the horrors of the self-governing mobs in France ostensibly had made abundantly clear. This generally conservative trend in Schiller's thought, even if it was overlooked by the French revolutionaries who made him an honorary citizen of France, made him a more acceptable discussion partner for the court official Goethe, with whom a close friendship and collaboration developed after the initial years of little or no contact in Weimar. This friendship between Goethe and Schiller has become central to the development and reception of both writers, and to the public image of Weimar Classicism in general. Goethe was of central importance for Schiller, as David G. John makes clear here, by engaging in a lively correspondence with Schiller that has become a central text in German literary history, by collaborating on a series of journals with Schiller through the late 1790's (*Die Horen, Musen-Almanac, Xenia*), by premiering all of Schiller's plays on his stage in Weimar, and in general by establishing an alliance that "enabled each of them to achieve more than either could have on his own" (182). That is, Schiller was instrumental in Goethe's achievements as well, most importantly pressuring Goethe to return to *Faust*, a piece of writing that Goethe had begun but left fragmentary for years.

The four plays Schiller wrote between *Wallenstein* and his death in 1805, *Maria Stuart* (1800), *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* (*The Maid of Orleans*, 1802), *Die Braut von Messina* (*The Bride of Messina*, 1805), and *Wilhelm Tell* (1804) are often considered the pinnacle of his dramatic work, particularly *Maria Stuart* and *Wilhelm Tell*. F. J. Lampport's remarks on *Maria Stuart* focus in part on the nature of the historical subject matter to which Schiller is drawn again (as in *Don Carlos* and *Wallenstein*, and his history writing on the Dutch revolt), the political and religious struggles of the 16th and 17th centuries, or as he puts it, "the crucible from which had emerged the European 'community of states' as Schiller knew it," an order that was crumbling as he wrote. The success of *Maria Stuart* (and of *Wilhelm Tell*), Lampport suggests, is due not to their successful illustration of the aesthetic theories Schiller had developed in the previous decade, but rather to the "greater plausibility of the human situations they depict and in their subtle exploration (as in all his best work) of the relationships between individual human passions and aspirations and the complex forces of politics and power" (274).

Schiller has been renowned as a great champion of freedom and national unity. Ute Frevert's treatment of the question of Schiller as a German national poet might be of particular importance for an English-speaking audience for whom the facets of this status (and the details of German history) are less well-known. As she traces the national aspect of Schiller's reception over the last two hundred years, Frevert illustrates very well her central insight that "Schiller was a national poet not

because the entire nation took recourse to him in ritualized harmony; rather, he was a national poet by reflecting and culturally integrating the fissures and divisions present in the nation" (308). Correspondingly, the reception of Schiller varies dramatically from one historical period to another, from one interested group to another. The Nazis, to take a particularly clear and extreme example, at first celebrate Schiller as the "godfather of the Third Reich" (319), producing a popular film about Schiller that was shown in theaters as well as on the front, but then by 1941 *Wilhelm Tell* was banned, perhaps (Frevert suggests) as Hitler becomes increasingly disturbed by the assassination of a tyrant that is central in that play. Other politically interested parties have interpreted Schiller over the years in a polemical way in their definitions of German national identity, each group using the weapon of Schiller against other groups. However, in the celebrations of Schiller since the fall of the Berlin Wall, everyone seems to "love Schiller in the same way," leading her to suggest that Schiller has lost any and all political edge. She ends with the question of whether the next wave of Schiller reception might be trans-European rather than just a matter of the Germans working out their own particular problems through him.

Indeed, the central function of Schiller's poem *An die Freude* (*Ode to Joy*, 1785) in the anthem of the European Union (the fourth movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony), a circumstance that neither Frevert nor Hilliard (in his chapter on the poetry) dwells on, points in this direction. As I finished reading this volume, I began to imagine the next article I would like to read on Schiller: a comprehensive and historically detailed discussion of *An die Freude*, a poem expressing a humanistic ideal of unity and brotherhood, that might explore its original composition in 1785 (in Schiller's *Sturm und Drang* period), subsequent small but significant changes in the text (perhaps due to his de-radicalization in the wake of the French Revolution), the details of its adaptation by others, the selection of two of its four stanzas by Beethoven for his choral work, and the subsequent reception history of the poem and the choral work. This would provide a case study to illustrate in a nutshell many of the issues central to Schiller's works and reception discussed in this volume. At any rate, this collection of essays is a thoroughly edifying and enjoyable read, inside or outside the classroom, and a substantial contribution to Schiller scholarship, particularly the scholarship in English.

John P. Heins  
National Gallery of Art

**Martha F. Bowden.** *Yorick's Congregation: The Church of England in the Time of Laurence Sterne*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007. Pp. 291; bibliography; endnotes; glossary; 11 illustrations; index. ISBN 10: 0-87413-955-4. Hardcover, \$57.50.

Martha Bowden introduces her study of the Anglican Church in the time of Laurence Sterne and her radical reconsideration of value and worth in the Shandy

household with a head-note, immediately explicated. It is from *Tristram Shandy*. As Yorick's congregation exits the church, on a Sacrament Sunday, Mr. and Mrs. Shandy, pursuing Toby and Trim on their march to the Widow Wadman's house, pause outside the church (*Florida Edition of the Works of Laurence Sterne*, edited by Melvyn New and Joan New, 2 vols. [U. Press of Florida, 1978], 9:11.760; cited hereafter as "*Works*"). For Bowden, Mr. Shandy's absence, that is, his non-participation in the Eucharist, given the requirements of the Test Act of 1673 that he "take the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Church of England" since he is a public officer in his parish, "marks a significant divide in the community" (17). His neglect, or indifference, "separates him" (17) not only from his brother but, as Bowden insists in this final chapter, from every other observant character in Tristram's narrative. (One can easily go back to *Works* edition, and learn that Mr. Shandy has multiple occasions during the year for the receiving of the Eucharist [614].) And Bowden corrects, or clarifies, her judgment later (73, 223)). Given the vagaries of the multitudinous, divergent, and profuse trajectory of Tristram's narrative, one might question the critical weight heaped on a passing incident in Sterne's last volume. But the damage has been done. Ignoring the possibility that a sort of complementary sacrament is to occupy Mr. Shandy that Sunday evening, "some other little family concernments," Bowden magnifies the moment to derive from it the overriding originality of her study. Mr. Shandy assumes his role as "the impotent lord of the wasteland" (228). His private world of secular and classical clichés, whenever he utters them, isolate him from the parlor circle. He appears to know not *The Book of Common Prayer*, "a central frame of reference, to which . . . most of the inhabitants of Shandy Hall and its environs . . . turn in times of trial and rejoicing, to explain family relationships, express love, and feel grief." (217-18). Rather, he parrots classical remnants and the *Tristra-paedia*, not the catechism. Isolated and disruptive, even ignored, with his double-entendres, he always breaks the continuity of discussion, even at times corrupts the moral and religious mood of the household. Invoking the authority of the ancients, he finds himself allied with Dr. Slop, the papist (232).

Bowden acutely hears, and helps the reader to hear, what she defines as the Shandean Liturgy (Chapter 6), which, with its common Christian refrain, binds, bonds, and comforts the Shandy family; while Walter's rhetoric isolates and estranges. The former sustains Christian values and traditions; the latter's "convoluted speculation" (222), his contortions of meaning and moment, his dissent from the liturgical language of the Shandy house, are unorthodox and unsacramental. The character of Walter Shandy, the "most frequent dissertator of diatribes, polemics and set pieces" (236) is Bowden's focus.

Bowden's radical revision of faith and domesticity in the estate and parish is splendidly realized when she contrasts the words of canonical texts as used by Toby, and the marred and opaque utterances of Mr. Shandy, when they debate the marriage service (229-34). *The Book of Common Prayer* inclines Toby to the state of marriage and even confirms his virility (230). His brother's double-entendres deny the sacred and the good sense of the marriage service. But I must comment on and question her second example that posits Mr. Shandy as an agent of dispersion

and confusion. The contrasting responses of Mr. Shandy in the parlor and Trim in the kitchen, to the death of Bobby Shandy, the heir, concludes with misunderstanding; there is "fragmentation and dissolution" in the parlor (241), the fault of Mr. Shandy, but sympathy and community in the kitchen.

First, the two orations are introduced with a digression, and we have learned that Tristram's digressions are less distractions than integral, structural episodes that enable us to rightly interrogate the text. Mr. Shandy's favorite mare gives birth not to a foal of value but a mule. Mrs. Shandy and Toby "expected my father would be the death of *Obadiah*--See here! You rascal, cried my father, pointing to the mule, what have you done!--It was not me, said *Obadiah*--How do I know that? replied my father. Triumph swam in my father's eyes, at the repartee----the *Attic* salt brought water into them--and so *Obadiah* heard no more about it" (*Works*, V, 3, 353). Now let us go back to eloquence of the head and heart.

With the mournful yet affirmable periods of Cicero, via Robert Burton, Mr. Shandy's wit dilutes the unsettling moment, the death of his heir, an undeniable tragedy which would disrupt the insistent good sense, humor, and joyous comedy of Tristram's autobiography. (John Richetti sees this comic control over imminent tragic contingencies as one of the characteristics of Fielding's *Tom Jones*.) Note also Eugenius's wit, interrupting Tristram's doleful monologue on Death, bringing "blood into the cheek from whence it had been some months banish'd" (VII:1, 480)). Bowden hears nothing of this, noting that Mr. Shandy has egotistically forgotten his dead son. But in Cicero's "Remember thou art a man," I also hear the moving plaint of Macduff when he hears the death of his loved ones: "I must also feel it as a man" (*Macbeth*, IV.iii.221), even of Dylan Thomas's "A Refusal to Mourn the Death, By Fire." The Mourner's Kaddish, the most awesome prayer in the Hebrew service, makes no mention of the dead. Mr. Shandy's perspective is traditional and universal in its own fashion and is as much a satisfying consolatory embrace as Trim's. And, for that matter, does Trim's oration follow the "classic pattern of the funeral sermon" (242)? He gets lost in military memories, and with his and the kitchen audience's sighs and tears over the lamentable tale of Lieutenant Le Fever and his son, Brother Bobby Shandy is as far from their thoughts as he had been from Mr. Shandy's. Thus, it seems to me that the cadences of the father in the parlor, where tears are shed, and the many voices in the kitchen, where tears are also shed, are not that much different. Like so much of the paired sequences in Tristram's tale, they are complementary, both rich and vibrant in their ceremonial discourse on death. I share, then, Bowden's earlier, perhaps overlooked insight, that "Sterne never allows us to wallow in the language of the heart without quickly reminding us that the blood flows to other parts of the body as well" (206).

Bowden's Chapter 5, "Anti-Catholicism in the Church of England," sparingly comments on "Anti-Catholicism in Church and State," "The Catholic Community," "Anti-Catholicism in the Diocese of York," "Catechesis and Anti-Catholicism," and "Gunpowder Treason." These paragraphs are the prelude to "Anti-Catholicism in *Tristram Shandy* and *A Sentimental Journey*." Scholarly and interpretive problems abound. Bowden's analyses of anti-Catholic attitudes are relegated to commemorative occasions, like November 5, and monarchs' birthdays

and anniversary days. These were special calendar days, spiked by patriotic urges, with pro-forma sermons expected to echo virulent and anti-Catholic tirades of the earlier century. The bonfires, processions, and pope burnings appear to be excuses for wild public entertainments and mob pleasures, if not violence. Culloden and the abysmal failure of the Stuart invasion and uprising in 1745 mitigated the Jacobite threat and the fears of the English. Thus, pamphlets of the 1670s and 1680s may not be the best sources for religious attitudes after the less threatening years following 1745--just as depictions of the Japanese in the media, especially in films, have altered in the decades since the 1940s. Also, Jacobites, Catholics, English Catholics, papists, even Irish Catholics, were more clearly distinguished in the contemporary press than they are in Bowden's summary (196).

Consider Bowden's sources illustrating anti-Catholic sentiment during Sterne's impressionable early and middle years--let us say he attained his majority in 1734. They are John Cooke (1704), Thomas Bray (1704), Gabriel Towerson (1676), William Nicholson (1673, 1686), and Susanna Wesley, to name only a few. The once-unique copy at the Huntington Library of John Gordon Spaulding's *Pulpit Publications, 1660-1782*, in 6 volumes, listing sermons by authors, years of publication, and the biblical texts, with a superb index, has been published (New York: Norman Ross, 1996). With dozens of sermons noted between 1730 and 1760, it could be consulted to bolster Bowden's assertion that Sterne's anti-Catholic sermonizing is "entirely conventional" (183). Bowden concludes that the satiric impulse in *Tristram Shandy* explains its "much stronger presence of anti-Catholicism . . . [whereas] the journey of sentiment is nearly stripped of it" (207).

Her earlier chapters on the Church of England, its parish life, its rituals, its music, are readable and succinct. So too when she examines the roles for women. One rich chapter is an enumeration of the classic English sermons of earlier Anglican discourse and Sterne's contemporaries in William Rose's *The Practical Preacher* (1762), ninety-seven sermons by thirty-nine preachers, three of which are Sterne's. The "casual anti-Catholicism" of this Anglican establishment gets small consideration (116). "In this company of preachers, Sterne does not seem to be out of place; his three sermons read in the context of the other ninety-four support [Melvyn] New's frequently iterated contention that his theology and rhetoric are entirely conventional for the period" (133).

I question some of Bowden's conclusions that appear not to be grounded in old (or new) investigations. I am not convinced of the "evidence of a practicing, and committed laity tended in general by a caring clergy" (27). Poverty, ignorance, non-residency, pluralism, enclosures, some degree of loan-sharking by bishops, sycophancy, and place-hunting better characterize the church's eighteenth-century record. A balanced introduction to the problem is F. C. Mather, "Georgian Churchmanship Reconsidered," in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 36 (April 1985), 255-83. (I have seen statistics that record the number of communicants in the archdiocese of York fell by nearly 20% between 1743 and 1764.) Another investigative opportunity is Aylmer and Cant's *History of York Minster* (1977). And there may not have been the need to defend Sterne's activities as a parish priest if S. L. Ollard's edition of *Archbishop Herring's Visitation Returns, 1743* (1930)--

responses by the priests in his diocese to questions he had put about their practices and parishioners--had been consulted about Sterne's extraordinarily active and committed Lenten schedule; reviewing his preachings, his weekly catechisings, his explanations of "our Religion to the Children and Servants of my Parishioners in my own House every Sunday during Lent, from six oclock till nine," Canon Ollard concludes: "In all the hundreds of returns which I have examined, this is unique and stands alone."

Bowden's text will be useful for students of the period, with its concise summaries of Sterneana and Sternean issues. Its glossary of religious, doctrinal, and liturgical terms will help more readers navigate the stream of Anglican discourse in *Tristram Shandy*. Her insistent denial of the complementary discourses of head *and* heart, reason *and* emotion, satire *and* sentiment, should initiate vibrant debates.

Manuel Schonhorn  
Dingmans Ferry, PA

**Susan Manly. *Language, Custom and Nation in the 1790s: Locke, Tooke, Wordsworth, Edgeworth*.** Aldershot, Hampshire, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Press, 2007. Pp. 204. ISBN: 978-0-7546-5832-0. Hardcover, \$99.95.

By focusing on the centrality of eighteenth-century philosophy and linguistics, Susan Manly's *Language, Custom and Nation in the 1790s* provides an alternative to the common suppositions that the American and French Revolutions or Rousseau's intellectual authority provided the roots of Romantic aesthetics. Much of this book is focused on establishing the influence of Locke's political theory and John Horne Tooke's linguistic methods, providing the foundation for Manly's overall analysis of Romantic-era theories of literary language. Locke's and Tooke's works are complementary in their emphases on the communal aspects of producing meaning and interrogating authoritarian ideologies, a focus that offered Romantic authors effective strategies for exploring the sociopolitical potential of language. What follows these chapters on Locke and Tooke is a focus on William Wordsworth and Maria Edgeworth, whose work represents the reformist and radical potential of this language authority debate. *Language, Custom and Nation* convincingly illustrates the influence of Locke's theories with attention to the consequences of conditional language authority.

Locke establishes language as a collective enterprise that strengthens social bonds, which ultimately calls into question cultural and legal authority. His *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690) maintains that language is primarily metaphorical, rather than directly representative of things, making external authority neither absolute nor natural. Language, argues Locke, is "no Man's private possession, but the common measure of Commerce and Communication" (25). In an ideal sense, then, language functions to integrate knowledge for a common good: "This is so necessary in the use of Language,

that in this respect, the Knowing, and the Ignorance, the Learned, and Unlearned, use the *Words* they speak (with any meaning) all alike" (24). It is this contractual and social nature of language that gives Locke's argument egalitarian weight.

Locke's associating misuse of language with political corruption influenced Romantic anti-authoritarian traditions, which is perhaps best typified by Tooke's personal history and resulting publications. The Treason Trials of 1794 (which implicated Tooke, John Thelwall, and Thomas Hardy) and related Seditious Meetings and Treasonable Practices Bills galvanized arguments against government oppression. As an extension of Locke's philosophy, Tooke's linguistic theory served to historicize and contextualize language, locating it as a social artifact. In particular his *Diversions of Purley* (1786) notes the dangers of ambiguous or misused rhetoric: "For mankind in general, are not sufficiently aware that words without meaning, are the everlasting engines of fraud and injustice: and that the grimgibber of Westminster-Hall is a more fertile, and a much more formidable, source of imposture than the abracadabra of magicians" (13). As an innovation on Locke's political theory, Tooke argues that language can be both an impediment and conduit of political community. The combination of Locke's political theory and Tooke's linguistic methods provided an effective argument against legal and constitutional abuses of authority.

With such statements as that poetry is "a word of very disputed meaning," it might initially appear that Wordsworth's poetics are akin to Tooke, Thelwall, and other radicals' dissent against the establishment. Through various parallel examples, the significance of Wordsworth's emphasis on plain and emphatic language in *Lyrical Ballads* recalls Locke's focus on communal aspects of language. Manly is careful to note a contradiction in Wordsworth's innovation, also critiqued by William Hazlitt as "all things are by nature equally fit subjects for poetry, . . . [especially] those that are the meanest and most unpromising are the best, as they leave the greatest scope for the unbounded stores of thought and fancy in the writer's own mind" (104). In bridging the gap between literature and life, Wordsworth negotiates the extent to which the poet channels a populist voice. Among the strengths of this chapter is Manly's theoretical engagement with authenticity, particularly how the real language of men can be defined within the context of poetic authority. In general this poetic cross-purpose has been well-established in many other studies; however, Manly uses this tension to build her rich and innovative analysis of *The Prelude's* representations of urban spaces within historic debates about poverty and agrarian economics.

In contrast to Wordsworth's cautious representation of the mind of the populace, Edgeworth embraces the anti-authoritarian potential of literary language. Edgeworth's *Practical Education* (1801) focuses on those who would commonly be considered subordinates--children and the Irish. In representing the words and actions of "real" children, Edgeworth explores the radical potential of language acquisition "which tests words against experience, advances effective communication, and values truthfulness and candor over showy rhetoric" (183). As an extension of the radical politics in *Practical*

*Education*, the *Essay on Irish Bulls* (1803) argues for the popular genius of the disenfranchised Irish with "utterances as heard in courtrooms, streets or fields" (160). This vindication of Irish eloquence is a case for egalitarianism imbued with optimism about full emancipation. This chapter is critical to the trajectory of Manly's overall argument, as she demonstrates how Edgeworth revives the political potential of a common language (a Lockean tradition that had otherwise been tempered by *Lyrical Ballads*).

Manly effectively establishes this long eighteenth-century tradition of linking language with political rights fundamental to revolutionary Romanticism. Scholars interested in 1790s radicalism, eighteenth-century linguistic theory, and women's studies will surely appreciate this ground-breaking and engaging book.

Anne Zanzucchi  
University of California, Merced

**Sharon M. Harris and Mark L. Kamrath (eds.). *Periodical Literature in Eighteenth-Century America*.** Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 2005. Pp. xvii + 395; bibliographical appendix ("American Periodical Series, 1741-1800"); 8 illustrations; index. ISBN: 1-57233-319-7. Hardcover, \$42.00.

**Rodney Mader. "Politics and Pedagogy in *The American Magazine*, 1757-1758."** *American Periodicals*, 16 (2006), 3-22.

*Periodical Literature in Eighteenth-Century America* contains fourteen essays, if we include Sharon Harris and Mark Kamrath's helpful introduction to the field and the volume. The introduction initially surveys important secondary literature, from Frank Luther Mott's *A History of American Magazines 1741-1850* (1930) and Lyon Richardson's *A History of American Magazines, 1741-1789* (1931) to such recent tools as ProQuest's American Periodical Series Online--to my mind, the first have remained authoritative while the APS Online concluded my experimental searches with little to show for itself. The introduction wrestles to define a hodgepodge of primary materials, not only diverse but very extensive. The editors set up some important generic topics touched on by their contributors, such as the distinctions between newspapers, periodicals or magazines, and other serial publications, and competition between these forms (xii-xiii, and see 76). The volume treats publications with a range of frequencies, from the bi-weekly (*Der Wöchentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote* (1762-1779) to the bi-annual (*Lady's Magazine*, 1793-1794). Also the editors (as do the contributors) convincingly sell the importance of periodicals. Their refrain should invite many to read this book: periodicals offer an excellent introduction to popular culture in regions and across the country, allowing one to grasp the interests, needs, and pleasures of colonial and republican Americans. Harris and Kamrath also offer a helpful introductory survey of the volume's essays, knitting those too together. Besides their sixteen-

page introduction, the editors have written three-to-four-page introductions to the three temporal divisions of the essays: "Atlantic Currents," "Revolutionary Era Discourses," and "The Early Republic and the 1790s" (each part contains four essays but the last holds five, appropriately in so far as the 1790s saw a boom in new periodicals). Everyone working in 18th-century American literature, indeed everyone working in 18th-century British literature, too, would do well to read this introduction. Although it is a "site" that "leverages" and "negotiates" some predictable generalizations "dialogically," it introduces important primary resources and many recent secondary sources. It's well indexed. And all the volume's introductions and essays have ample endnotes referencing important studies, particularly those concerned with national and transatlantic identity and social history: the book as a whole provides a great launch pad for future dissertations.

*Periodical Literature in Eighteenth-Century America* identifies implicitly and sometimes explicitly (e.g., 226) many opportunities for research and publication. There are a hundred generalizations about periodicals, editors, and readers that need further support--what readers responded how in letters to what previous publications? To what degree were the periodicals "formulating" and "shaping" public opinion, to what extent just reflecting or even playing upon opinion for sales? Sometimes the editors and contributors, faced with a virgin wilderness, have been carried by the enthusiasm beyond carefully guarded articulation--for instance, Tim Hall and W. M. Verhoeven speak of two different periodicals as the "first" religious periodical in America (29 vs. 83), and elsewhere *The New-York Magazine* is called "the longest running monthly periodical of the late eighteenth century" (339), a distinction more proper to the *Gentleman's Magazine*. This is nitpicking, but there are many insufficiently precise claims of causality and of description--claiming that the *Gentlemen and Ladies Town and Country Magazine* published by N. Coverly (1789-1790) is but a continuation of *The Gentleman and Lady's Town and Country Magazine* published by Weeden and Barrett (1784; pp. 282-83) leads to the editors speaking of the two as a single magazine (224). When a field is new, one can lose sight of what's worth saying in print, as by spending pages and an illustration to demonstrate that a periodical reflects the view that the ideal woman in 1790 was white (227-31; consider: "white women were simultaneously displayed in a positive light in order to reinforce the desirability of the dominant race . . .," 230).

Essays on the pre-revolutionary periodicals (covered in Part 1) often attend to periodicals' roles in establishing and questioning colonial authority (Carla Mulford's essay on periodicals both supporting and questioning Cotton Mathers' push for smallpox inoculations), in creating a more unified public sphere (John Smolenski's essay on the evolving treatment of clubs and other organizations by the *Pennsylvania Gazette*), through newspapers and magazines that were intended for small or regional audiences, often specialized audiences (e.g., Tim Hall's essay on the evangelical *Christian History* and W. M. Verhoeven's German publications in Pennsylvania). Verhoeven offers lots of surprises to those who've taken Franklin's *Autobiography* at face value, for Franklin never there suggests the extent of his

struggles with the sectarian Germans outside Philadelphia, led by Christoph Saur and his son and grandsons, a powerful family of printer/publishers. Franklin presents the struggle to create the Pennsylvania militia as fought with the Quakers, but, according to Verhoeven, it was Saur and his pacifist Germans whose votes in the 1750s gave the Quakers their power in the Assembly (82). Franklin, seeing the "Germans as a serious threat to British American identity" (75), tried to establish English-language schools, to restrict legal documents to English, and to create an alternative German-language press, all in an effort to undermine the presence and power of this German population eager to maintain its isolation from English-speaking Pennsylvania. Power shifted away from Saur and the sectarians around 1755-1758, due to Braddock's defeat and increased Indian raids and also shifting patterns of German immigration. Progressively more non-sectarian Germans moved into Philadelphia, willing to take up arms for America and setting up rival German presses or buying their German newspapers, as that supporting the Revolution published by Johann Henrich Miller. The story is more fascinating in Verhoeven's complex and factually detailed retelling. Another fascinating conflict is discussed in Carla Mulford's account of how James Franklin's *New England Courant's* democratic appeal for individual liberty scuttled Cotton Mather's progressive advocacy of inoculations. Mather had medical science, the pulpit, and the *Boston Gazette*; Franklin and colleagues like John Checkley framed Mather's efforts as authoritarian, egging on the populace. It looks like the newspapers turned this controversy into a paper-war for subscribers.

The editors present the four essays on "Revolutionary Era Discourses" (1721-1800, not focused on periodicals during the Revolutionary War) as treating how periodicals "provided a stage or venue for constructing a liberal-democratic republic," how they "archive[d] a variety of colonial and Other discourses" that contributed to "the development of national identity," revising "existing paradigms" about the region (103-04). Chad Reid reevaluates the effect of *Cato's Letters*, on the formation of the public sphere and also the colonists' sense of their rights (Reid appends an impressive bibliography of references to *Cato's Letters*, mainly in pre-Revolutionary newspapers and periodicals, pp. 132-41). Mark Kamrath's "American Indian Oration and Discourses of the Republic in Eighteenth-Century American Periodicals" (143-78) would show "how . . . analysis of the intersection between North American oratory and periodical publications elucidates the ways print culture appropriated native oratory and used it as a means of inscribing the native and, at the same time, articulating a radical, patriotic response" to Great Britain (144). Kamrath looks particularly at representations and translations of American Indian texts and speeches in magazines published in Boston, Philadelphia, and Charleston, South Carolina, but many periodicals are referenced throughout the survey. Robert Stuff's essay "Civil Unrest and the Rhetoric of the American Revolution: Depictions of Shays's Rebellion in New England Magazines of the 1780s" finds remarkably different responses in the conservative *New-Haven Gazette* and the progressive *Worcester Magazine*. Here we clearly see a movement beyond the local into national debates. There's a similar reflection of national examination and ideological conflict in Philip Gould's "The African Slave Trade

and Abolitionism: Rereading Antislavery Literature, 1776-1800," which looks at sentimental and satirical appeals in such magazines as Matthew Carey's *American Museum* (1787-1792), making many references to the primary materials.

The editors' introduction to Part 3, "The Early Republic and the 1790s," frame the essays as showing how periodicals helped "conceptualize a new kind of republic," one distinguished by individual liberties (221), building a nation out of diverse colonies and interests. They assert, "Perhaps no aspect of cultural influence has been so overlooked in periodical literature as the ways in which these newspapers helped shape public opinion about political institutions" (222). They note periodicals were "founded to promote a particular party view," yet that there were frequent editorial denigrations of "factionalism" and "party spirit." This introduction properly calls attention to the wealth of material for women's studies offered by periodicals, so often written for and by women, and certainly with an impact on gender roles. In Lisa Logan's account of "constructions of femininity," I was surprised to learn that *The Lady's Magazine* carried a 1792 article in which a "Matrimonial Republican" objected to the "word *obey* in the marriage service" (285). Frank Shuffelton's essay "Binding Ties: Thomas Jefferson, Francis Hopkinson, and the Representation of the *Notes on the State of Virginia*" is most fully characterized as an account of the writing and publication of Jefferson's *Notes*, a story very well told here. But, in so far as periodicals allowed Jefferson to selectively play out parts of his text (initially those regarding American natural history), first in *Journal de Physique* in Paris, and then, without expressed approval, by Hopkinson in Philadelphia's *Columbian Magazine*, Shuffelton calls attention to certain purposes served by periodicals and to their relation to books. He shows how, as time passes, the extracts selected became more problematic, capable of appearing contradictory (as Jefferson's remarks on race and on slavery), and the later selections were more related to social and political issues, and reflected differently on Jefferson himself--ultimately, Shuffelton suggests, the periodical extracts "falsified a revolutionary text" (270). Seth Cotlar's "Reading the Foreign News, Imagining an American Public Sphere: Radical and Conservative Visions of 'the Public' in Mid-1790s Newspapers" considers the relations of European radicalism on American laboring-class political thought.

Sharon Harris's essay "The *New-York Magazine*: Cultural Repository" (339-64), one of two essays winning the Bibliographical Society of America's Mitchell Prize for Research on Early British Periodicals, analyzes the diverse contents of this unusually successful monthly magazine, 1790-1797. Harris demonstrates how publishers Thomas and James Swords, at least during their first years, successfully brewed a mixture of reprinted and original material from diverse fields. They aimed to promote various republican virtues through their "*repository* of useful knowledge," all the while maintaining most of their progressive positions (my guess is that a modern parallel would be a cross between *The New Yorker* and *The Nation*). Evidently in response to economic pressures (and events in France), the magazine muted its initial support for the French Revolution, but it had supported it during 1790-1792, when New York was demonstrably supportive of the Revolution). Backing off from a pro-Jacobin position, suggests Harris, may

have lost the contributions of its "premier poet," Margaretta V. Bleecker Faugeres (355). The *NYM* remained consistently opposed to capital punishment and slavery and for the education and civic involvement of women. Surprisingly, perhaps, the magazine ran pieces stressing the savagery of the American Indians, though it also ran divergent views--like Ben Franklin's "Remarks concern the Savages of North American," a clever illustration of Amerindians' rhetorical tact and civility. Harris shows the magazine offered a breadth of perspectives. Lastly, Harris surveys women contributors to the magazine in detail, a recurrent concern of contributors to this volume. Harris's accomplishment, like that of many essays in the volume, is to offer a good examination of contents, contributors, readership, and editorial perspective that should interest cultural, literary, and political historians.

This same set of topics addressed within a historical survey of a magazine's contents occurs in Rodney Mader's 2006 essay in *American Periodicals*: "Politics and Pedagogy in *The American Magazine*, 1757-1758," Mader's fine study would be right at home in the Harris-Kamrath volume. Mader examines the content and editing of William Smith's *American Magazine*, with particular attention to the achievements of the editor, a professor of rhetoric and Provost of the College of Philadelphia, hired by Ben Franklin, but soon estranged from him by virtue of Smith's lack of ecumenical spirit. *The American Magazine* reflects Smith's Scottish Enlightenment orientation (he was educated at King's College, Aberdeen, by leading lights of the Scottish Common Sense movement), but it also reflects Smith's campaign to get the Philadelphia Quakers to support the British efforts in the French and Indian War. Smith founded a good magazine, distinguished by a range of original material from regular contributing members of a sort of editorial board or society. Mader covers Smith's preference for the monthly as the best frequency for a magazine. Correspondents's columns not only assured coverage of diverse fields but also regions: Smith attempted to create a unifying sense of a transatlantic Britain. Besides covering contents, Mader looks closely at contributors. *The American Magazine* published essays by the College's faculty and students, a showcase for faculty and a pedagogical tool for students (who produced a column called "The Prattler," sometimes mildly puerile in remarks on women and satirical in veiled glances at Quakers). Mader suspects that the magazine lasted but 13 months because of the "financial" limits encountered by even the successful *New-York Magazine*, the issues cost too much to produce relative to revenue from subscribers--from records at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Mader discovered that Smith had 850 subscribers.

The volume contains occasional bibliographical details about the periodicals as printed materials, such as an opening quotation from Joseph Greenleaf's *Royal American Magazine*, 1774, apologizing for inadequate type and "poor" ink but at least of "American Manufacture" (xi); Saur's employment of the first type cast in America for the 12th issue of his second series of *Ein Geistliches Magazien* (86); and the employment of engraved illustrations in 1790 by Isaiah Thomas's *Massachusetts Magazine* (227-29), Nathaniel Coverly's *Gentlemen and Ladies Town and Country Magazine* (282-84), and the Swords's *New-York Magazine* (343). There are some remarks about readership that are more particular

than general observations that women or a wide range of readers were sought; a few are related to subscription costs (e.g., 297), but not much primary evidence is offered regarding readership. Harris and Kamrath remark that "subscription lists demonstrate . . . the impact of women as readers" (223); women were certainly the target audiences of many magazines (and cheap copy sought from them [e.g., 283]), but that subscription lists don't demonstrate such is evident from the endnote here: "While individual subscription lists are difficult to locate, access exists to subscription lists of periodical literature that was subsequently published in book form" (specifically, 20% of the subscribers to Judith Sargent Murray's "The Gleaner" essays in book form were women, and 14% of those to *The Posthumous Works of Anna Eliza Bleecker*, both largely published initially in magazines [226]). Few of the essays touch on the business of magazines, on their costs vs. revenues, or on their distribution through shops and merceries or through the post. One interesting exception is Robert Sturr's discussion of Isaiah Thomas's decision in 1786 to switch from publishing his successful newspaper (*Massachusetts Spy*) to a magazine (the *Worcester Magazine*) to avoid a tax on newspaper advertisements (190-91)--Thomas, admired for always "keeping a critical eye on the government," protested the tax as an "*unconstitutional restraint on the Liberty of the Press*" (191). Discussions of "format" involve content, not the collational formulae. I don't recall anyone's remarking on the paper employed. In short, to judge from the volume, much work by analytical bibliographers and print historians remains to be done on 18th-century American periodicals.—JEM

### **In Memory of J. A. Leo Lemay**

The early American studies community mourns the loss of J. A. Leo Lemay, who passed away on 15 October 2008. He was 73. In honoring the life of this most generous scholar, teacher, colleague, and friend, we collectively recognize Professor Lemay's energetic enthusiasm for discovery and learning. A preeminent Benjamin Franklin scholar, Professor Lemay was H. F. du Pont Winterthur Professor of English at the University of Delaware. Before joining the University of Delaware faculty in 1977, Dr. Lemay taught in the English Department at the University of California, Los Angeles, 1965-1977. Among his innumerable contributions, Professor Lemay initiated the Division on American Literature to 1800 for the Modern Language Association, which in turn gave rise to the journal *Early American Literature* in the 1960s. Leo Lemay was also an early advisor, along with William J. Scheick, to the Society of Early Americanists founded by Professor Carla Mulford in the 1990s, with Scheick initiating and publishing the Society's newsletter from 1992 to 2006. And, when the Society held its first meeting in Charlestown, South Carolina, in 1999, Leo's legendary kindness and inclusive collegiality set a most welcoming and encouraging tone, especially to scholars new to the profession, such as myself. Though we will miss Professor Lemay greatly, his prolific scholarship remains a vital source of research and a rich record of his unique voice and encompassing vision.

Professor Lemay authored seven books, edited nine books, wrote more than fifty articles, and devoted decades to Benjamin Franklin studies. His monumental works on Franklin include the series *The Life of Benjamin Franklin: Volume 1: Journalist, 1706-1730*; *Volume 2: Printer and Publisher, 1730-1747*; and *Volume 3: Soldier, Scientist, and Politician, 1748-1757* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2005-08); *Benjamin Franklin: Writings* (Library of America, 1987); and, as editor with Paul M. Zall, *Benjamin Franklin's Autobiography: An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds, Criticism* (Norton, 1986). In 1997, he launched an extraordinarily helpful website: *Benjamin Franklin: A Documentary History* ([www.english.udel.edu/lemay/franklin/](http://www.english.udel.edu/lemay/franklin/)). Professor Lemay was also instrumental in bringing attention to early American studies from an interdisciplinary perspective that included poetry, music, art, print culture, Southern literature, humor, material culture, and social & political history, among other areas, and he published widely, for example: *A Calendar of American Poetry in the Colonial Newspapers and Magazines and in the Major English Magazines Through 1765* (American Antiquarian Society, 1972); *Men of Letters in Colonial Maryland* (Univ. of Tennessee Press, 1972); *New England's Annoyances: America's First Folk Song* (Univ. of Delaware Press, 1985); *The American Dream of Captain John Smith* (Univ. Press of Virginia, 1991); *Did Pocahontas Save Captain John Smith?* (Univ. of Georgia Press, 1992).

J. A. Leo Lemay was also a recipient of numerous, prestigious awards, including grants from the American Philosophical Society and Colonial Williamsburg and fellowships from the Guggenheim Foundation, the Huntington Library, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. In 1999, the MLA Division on American Literature to 1800 acknowledged him as an Honored Scholar of Early American Literature. An extended citation of this award a "Tribute to J. A. Leo Lemay: Honored Scholar of Early American Literature" appears in *Early American Literature*, 35 (2000), 1-4. There is an "In Memoriam" page for Professor Lemay on the Society of Early Americanists' website ([www.societyofearlyamericanists.org/Lemaymemorial.htm](http://www.societyofearlyamericanists.org/Lemaymemorial.htm)). An extensive biographical essay, "J. A. Leo Lemay: A Sketch," appears in *Finding Colonial Americas: Essays Honoring J. A. Leo Lemay*, edited by Carla Mulford and David S. Shields (Univ. of Delaware Press, 2001).

J. A. Leo Lemay was a central voice and a key figure for early American studies, and his generous, inclusive manner will serve as a model for years to come, as we honor him through his memory and continue to benefit from his scholarship.

Susan C. Imbarrato  
Minnesota State University, Moorhead

*Editor's Note:* We thank Professor Imbarrato for answering our request for a memorial with this concise and ennobling record. Speaking for students of early American culture, she characterizes Professor Lemay outside our larger umbrella, eighteenth-century studies. EC/ASECS, to whom Leo Lemay gave a plenary only a few years ago at Gettysburg, also laments his passing. Carla Mulford and David

Shield's festschrift *Finding Colonial America*, mentioned above, not only includes the biographical sketch (19-27) but the introduction refers to Lemay's accomplishments and assistance to others, and appended to the volume is "A List of Scholarly Works to the Year 2000" by Lemay (439-45, in small font, densely packed). This bibliography reminds us of one of Lemay's most important books, not singled out above: *The Canon of Benjamin Franklin, 1722-1776* (1986). We hope that the University of Pennsylvania Press will bring forth at least the fourth volume of his projected seven-volume biography of Franklin.

### **Johnson Tercentenary Celebrations at Bucknell in March**

Bucknell University's Humanities Institute, with support from the Office of the Provost, is sponsoring "Johnson at Bucknell: A Tercentenary Celebration," organized by Greg Clingham, Professor of English and Director of the Bucknell University Press. The two-day conference on 23-24 March celebrates the 300th anniversary of the birth of Samuel Johnson, one of a handful of European humanists whose writings in a variety of genres continue to challenge and extend our philosophical, moral and literary experiences. Equally to be celebrated are Johnson's great accomplishments in service of his contemporaries that are no longer widely read and studied today, though many laid the foundation for much that we read, such as Johnson's Parliamentary debates, his dictionary, Harleian Library catalogue, edition of Shakespeare, his lives of the poets, and even much of his hack work and his anonymous contributions to others' projects.

Professor Clingham's program for The Bucknell Humanities Institute's celebration is aimed at "Johnson's life and work, his contribution to the western literary tradition, to the American tradition of liberal education, and to his continuing place in the curriculum on college campuses such as Bucknell." To the many planned events, the Institute welcomes Bucknell's students, faculty, trustees, invitees, staff, and alumni, as well as others interested. The provisional events include lectures by Christopher Ricks (Boston University and the University of Oxford) and Leo Damrosch (Harvard University), both distinguished chaired professors and authors of many books, Damrosch's including *Samuel Johnson and the Tragic Sense* (1972), and *The Uses of Johnson's Criticism* (1976); a poetry reading by David Ferry (Professor Emeritus of English at Wellesley College, a well published poet and translator of poetry); a recorded public discussion about Johnson, literature and criticism today with Christopher Ricks, Leo Damrosch, Greg Clingham, Philip Smallwood, and others; an exhibit of Johnsonian books, manuscripts, and artifacts in the Bertrand Library; and a dramatic reading of (scenes from) G.K. Chesterton's play *The Judgment of Dr. Johnson* (1927). There will be a reception and dinner, as well as a luncheon providing discussion between speakers and the student body. Bucknell University Press will publish a volume commemorating the event.

For further information, contact Professor Clingham in English at Bucknell University (Lewisburg, PA 17837); email: gregclingham@comcast.net.

### **Johnson Tercentenary Events in the UK and Elsewhere**

In the United Kingdom, a Samuel Johnson Tercentenary Committee was "set up to organise, co-ordinate and publicise events to mark the tercentenary of the birth of Samuel Johnson, and to promote interest in Johnson's life and work" (quoted from its website at <http://www.johnson2009.org/>). The SJTC's website provides pages on Johnson, events, patrons, mailing list, links, and contacts. The Committee, chaired by Dr. Nicolas Cambridge, with Christine Rees as Secretary and Richard Davies as Treasurer, includes representatives from The Johnson Birthplace Museum in Litchfield (Graeme Clarke), Dr. Johnson's House in Gough Square, London (curator of the house, Stephanie Pickford), the Johnson Society of Lichfield (its chair, Mary Baker), and the Johnson Society of London (Michael Bundock). The "events" page of the website lists several pages of planned events, beginning on 7 January with a lecture by Jack Lynch at the British SECS conference (St. Hugh's College, Oxford). The Committee's own celebrations "will commence on 2 March 2009, the 272nd anniversary of the departure of Johnson and [David] Garrick from Lichfield for London. A modern-day Johnson and Garrick will re-enact their journey (complete with shared horse) [Prof. Peter Martin and Dr. Cambridge will make the journey, stopping at schools along the way]. . . . On arrival in London on Thursday 12th March, a reception will take place at the Guildhall." The Committee's principal event, around the tercentenary date of 18 September (a Friday), involves a conference 14-18 September at Pembroke College, Oxford, chaired by Lynda Mugglestone and Freya Johnston, ending with a dinner at the Lichfield Guildhall on the 18th (other events in Lichfield occur 18-20 September). The Committee's UK celebrations will conclude with the laying of a commemorative wreath and an address by Christopher Ricks at Westminster Abbey on 12 December, the 225th anniversary of Johnson's death. Other events in the UK include lectures at Gresham College (lunchtime) and the Wesley Chapel, and an exhibition at the Royal Academy in London.

The SJTC "events" page, along with events as far off as Dunedin, NZ, lists a few celebrations in the United States and none as yet in Canada--the list is surely incomplete. (Organizers can add notice of their events to the website by contacting the committee at [info@johnson2009.org](mailto:info@johnson2009.org)). Besides the Bucknell tercentenary noted above for March, the spring is marked by the annual meeting of the Johnson Society of the Central Region, held 17-18 April in Chicago, whose speakers include F. P. Lock, Martha Bowden, Pat Bruckman, Jonathan Clark, Alvaro Ribeiro, Paul Ruxin, and Michael Suarez. From 23 May to 20 September the Huntington Library in San Marino offers the exhibition "Samuel Johnson, Literary Giant of the Eighteenth Century, 1709-1784," curated (with a catalogue) by O M Brack, Jr., and including books from the Huntington and the Loren and Frances Rothschild collection. Professor Brack lectures 27 May at the library to mark the opening of the exhibition (his lecture shares the exhibition title), and near its conclusion Paul Ruxin offers the lecture "Johnson and Boswell: No Theory Please, We're British." A symposium will be held 27-29 August at Harvard's Houghton Library, along with an exhibition of the Hyde Collection. Then on 22 November

the Samuel Johnson Society of Southern California will hold its annual dinner, with John W. Byrne, flying in from West Australia, as its Daniel G. Blum Memorial lecturer.

Among the books published with encouragement from the tercentenary are Peter Martin's *Samuel Johnson: A Biography* (Harvard UP, 2008) and Jeffrey Meyers's *Samuel Johnson: The Struggle* (Basic Books, 2008); among those forthcoming in 2009 are O M Brack's edition of Sir John Hawkins's *The Life of Samuel Johnson* (U. of Georgia Press), David Nokes's "Samuel Johnson" (Faber), John Wiltshire's *The Making of Dr. Johnson* (Helm), *Samuel Johnson after 300 Years*, ed. by Greg Clingham and Philip Smallwood (Cambridge)--and, possibly, the Yale Edition of the *Lives of the Poets*, ed. John Middendorf, et al.

**Cover Illustration: Dr. Samuel Johnson Depicted in  
"Emblematical Frontispiece" from the *Gentleman's Magazine* 1747**

What may be the earliest known portrait of Samuel Johnson appears in the illustration on the cover. It is the "emblematical frontispiece" from the 1747 volume of the *Gentleman's Magazine* that is explained by "The VISION. A Poem. Address'd to S. URBAN, on Completing his Seventeenth Volume," written by John Hawkesworth, printed on the verso of the Preface. John Gough Nichols, in "The Autobiography of Silvanus Urban," gives this account. "In the centre stands a column . . . emblematical of our work, and bearing the date of its foundation in MDCCXXXI. . . . The 'grinning crowd' are represented by four men with asses' ears, the personifications of Envy, Dulness, Fraud, and Revenge, and they are attacking the column with club, hammer, pickaxe, and crowbar. They were the portraits of the four booksellers who were partners in our old rival the *London Magazine*. . . . On the other side of the column is [a figure]. . . . intended to represent our *new* rival, the *Universal Magazine*, which was started in Jan. 1747. Above, suspended on the column, is a 'fair vision,' exhibiting Fame, attended by the Muses, giving audience to SYLVANUS URBAN and his coadjutors. The print is more worthy of attention from its presenting an excellent whole-length portrait of Cave, attended by Hawkesworth, Johnson, and other of his friends" (*Gentleman's Magazine* 202 [March 1857]: 283-84). Johnson is the second figure in line, looking to his left. The third figure is Hawkesworth, and the woman behind him is, presumably, Elizabeth Carter; the last figure is an unidentified man. The print is taken from a copy of the *Gentleman's Magazine* formerly in the library of the lairds of Colquhoun, now in the Loren and Frances Rothschild Collection, and reproduced here with permission. In his *Journal of the Tour of the Hebrides, with Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* (1785) James Boswell records that on the evening of 26 October 1773 he and Johnson "came to Rosisdhu, the beautiful seat of Sir James Colquhoun on the banks of Lochlomond."

O M Brack, Jr.  
Arizona State University

**The Sacred and the Secular in the Transatlantic  
18th Century: EC/ASECS Annual Meeting,  
8-11 October 2009, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA**

The next annual meeting of the East-Central American Society for Eighteenth Century Studies will be hosted by Lehigh University in historic Bethlehem, Pennsylvania—settled in 1741 as a Moravian community.

The residents of 18th-century Bethlehem designed their community to prioritize their local and transatlantic missionary work. With this aim in mind, they re-envisioned property, gender, family roles, and a communal economy. Living in dormitories segregated by gender and by age, they built no private dwellings; parents did not raise their children. These men and women also constructed one of the colonies' most important industrial districts—visiting Bethlehem, John Adams marveled in 1777 that "they have carried the mechanical Arts to greater Perfection here than in any Place which I have seen"—and established trade networks across the Atlantic and west to the Ohio River Valley. Many of Bethlehem's eighteenth-century sacred and secular buildings remain in use today, just steps from our conference site.

In light of Bethlehem's many histories, the theme of this conference will be "The Sacred and the Secular in the Transatlantic Eighteenth Century." We welcome proposals that explore these issues in light of science, history, religion, politics, literature, art, or technology. Of course, we also welcome proposals that are not directly related to the conference's theme.

We are delighted that this year's keynote speaker will be Jon Sensbach (History, U. of Florida). Professor Sensbach, an outstanding scholar of religion, race, and colonization, is the author of *Rebecca's Revival: Creating Black Christianity in the Atlantic World* (2005), and *A Separate Canaan: The Making of an Afro-Moravian World in North Carolina, 1763-1840* (1998).

Send suggestions for panels by **March 1, 2009**, and one-page abstracts of proposed papers by **May 1, 2009**. Both panels and paper proposals should be addressed to [ec.asecs@lehigh.edu](mailto:ec.asecs@lehigh.edu) or Prof. Monica Najar, 9 West Packer Ave., Lehigh U., Bethlehem, PA 18015.

**Minutes from the EC/ASECS Business Meeting:  
Georgetown University, November 7, 2008**

We began our Business Meeting by giving a hearty round of applause to Kathy Temple, who did such a splendid job as our conference chair. When accepting our applause, Kathy singled out Allison Dunlap, her wonderful assistant, for tireless dedication to ensuring our meeting would be a great success.

We announced that our 2009 annual meeting will convene on October 8-11, 2009 at Lehigh University's Lawrence Henry Gipson Institute for Eighteenth-Century Studies. Monica Najar, Co-Director of the Institute and Associate Professor of History, and Scott Gordon, Professor of English and Director of

Lehigh University Press, will serve as our chairs. Thanks be to them!

Molin Committee chair Cheryl Wanko announced that we received several submissions for the Molin Prize. Graduate students who are new to EC/ASECS should consider submitting their papers for consideration next year, and if interested they can consult our organization's website for the rules.

In her role as President of our happy society, Doreen Saar chaired the Nominations Committee, which presented the following slate to our membership, approved unanimously: in 2009, Geoffrey Sill as President; Linda V. Troost as Vice President; and Christine Clark-Evans, as Board Member to serve a three-year term, replacing Cheryl Wanko, whose term expires in December 2008. The executive board for 2009 includes, besides Professors Sill and Troost:

Past President: Doreen Saar

Past President: Kevin Berland

Elected Board Members: Lisa Berglund (term ends 12/2009);

Jean-Marc Kehres (term ends 12/2010);

Christine Clark-Evans (term ends 12/2011)

Newsletter Editor: James May

Web Master: Theodore E. D. Braun

Executive Secretary: Linda Merians (term ends 12/2010)

Past and Future Conference Chairs:

Lisa Rosner (2007 chair)

Kathy Temple (2008 chair),

Monica Najjar and Scott Gordon (2009 chairs),

We thank all for agreeing to serve, and we thank Cheryl Wanko for all her work on behalf of our Society while a board member.

Jim May, the indefatigable editor of our wonderful *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*, encouraged all members to submit articles and to stay in touch, especially those working in fields outside English literature. Jim also thanked professors and administrators at Pennsylvania State for their generous and consistent support.

Linda Merians promised a full financial report in the next issue of the *Intelligencer* (see below), and she reported to members that we are in good financial shape, so there is no need for any rise in dues. Also, she congratulated Kathy Temple for organizing a meeting that brought us so many new members.

The Executive Committee then asked the membership for their approval of a change in our Constitution. We seek to add the editor and master of our webpage to the Executive Board. Our web page is now in the very capable hands of Ted Braun (University of Delaware). Our website address is <http://www.udel.edu/flt/faculty/braun/ECASECS/>.

Prior to Doreen Saar's informative and entertaining Presidential Address, the Society bestowed its Leland D. Peterson Award for service to the Society upon Peter Staffel, long the organizer of the Aural-Oral Experience the night prior to our conferences, and to Linda Troost, former conference convener and editor of the annual *Eighteenth-Century Women*.

**Financial Report, January 1, 2008-January 17, 2009**

Our treasury is in good shape. Linda, Jim, and our conference organizers work very hard to keep our expenses as low as possible. As of January 17, 2009, we have \$5,443.00 in our bank account. This sum will ensure that we can continue to produce the *Intelligencer*, pay for mailing and supplies, award the Molin Prize, and meet our conference and other expenses. Thank you to each and every member for your continuing support of EC/ASECS.

I want to add our collective thanks again to Pennsylvania State University for underwriting a portion of our newsletter expenses, and the English Department at Georgetown University, which generously paid for some of our conference expenses.

Our total revenue for 2008 was \$26,908.04, from the following sources:

Interest: \$17.96

Gifts: \$50.00

Membership dues: \$4,730.08

2008 Conference registration: \$22,110.00

Our 2008 expenses totaled \$25,168.47, including conference-related bills we have paid in early January 2009:

Bank charges: \$48.00

Office expenses for mailings:

printing \$58.55; postage \$164.00; supplies \$43.33

Molin Prize (for the 2007 winner): \$150.00

Newsletter expenses: printing \$1,905.38; postage \$2,837.21

2008 Conference expenses: \$19,962.00

Respectfully submitted,

Linda E. Merians, Executive Secretary

**Watching *The Way of the World***

Among the attractions for those participating in the 2008 East-Central ASECS conference was the chance to attend a first-rate production of William Congreve's romantic comedy *The Way of the World* (1700), performed by the Shakespeare Theatre Company at the Lansburgh Theatre (30 September to 16 November 2008).

The brilliant set design featured classical lines complemented by a harmonious color scheme of white and green. It included several green hedges sculpted like a row of green circles that lined the back of the set. But most impressive of all was the appearance on stage of a white Georgian-style building that looked like a large luminous doll house. When the play began, servants opened the doors of the life-size doll house to reveal inside the set of an eighteenth-century coffee-house. One felt like Gulliver in Brobdingnag, but without the coarseness of that place. Here all was pristine and clean looking, and the eyes of

the characters flashed with the pleasure of wit well received. All was right with the world, until the serpent raised its head and the dialogue veered into the ways of gossip, lies, and plans of deception. The play and its myriad of plots involving the lead couple Mirabell and Millamant had started.

The actors were very well cast. Christopher Innvar was a handsome but sensitive Mirabell; Floyd King was always delightful as Anthony Witwoud; and the audience would by turns laugh at and then be appalled by the convincing performance of Andrew Long as the virile Mr. Fainall, who could shift from comic to nasty in a sentence. Veanne Cox as Millamant was tall, independent, and in full sail. The audience took to the fast-paced humor, laughing at the jokes about courtship, which were not far removed from the typical concerns on today's television shows. For the most part, the audience seemed to be heartily enjoying themselves, which demonstrated how well the play travels into the 21st century.

During intermission, I did hear someone complain about the play having too much talking and not enough action. The plots about who is courting whom and who is helping whom can be confusing. Congreve devised a very roundabout way for Mirabell to win Millamant and to obtain her aunt's approval. The theater's magazine *Asides* included a helpful essay on the play by well-known eighteenth-century scholar Cynthia Lowenthal. The comedy itself contains many insights about society and marriage, and Congreve captures something of the forgiving fondness characteristic of love, when Mirabell describes how his feelings for Millamant developed: "I like her with all her faults; nay, like her for her faults . . . . They are now grown as familiar to me as my own frailties."

The overall impression, then, was positive. The play was enjoyable for the performance of Nancy Robinette as Lady Wishfort (pronounced Wish-for-It), who reminded one of Brenda Blethyn playing Mrs. Bennet in Joe Wright's film version of *Pride and Prejudice*. Her combination of whines and rolling desires stole the show. The scene in which she complains to the maid about pouring her only a small cup of wine was comedy at its best: "Dost thou take me for a fairy, to drink out of an acorn? Why didst thou not bring thy thimble?" (278).

The simplicity of the set design acted like a foil for the verbal energy of the play. In a brave move, the period costumes were all made using fabrics of different shades of green. Green velvets and lace and silk for both the men and the women gave a visual coherence to the set, with its green hedges and its white decor and furnishings. The costumes were a tranquil feast for the eyes, and the effect was a calming one that balanced the fast-paced dialogue. The characters did talk a lot, but the turns and counter-turns, the repartee, made it like a dance, mirroring the country dance with which the play ended. In a world that, for all its high speed often seems sluggish or thuggish, hearing the sparkle of intelligent dialogue was a refreshing change.

Deborah Kennedy  
Saint Mary's University, Halifax

### Notes from Newark

by Theodore E. D. Braun

When you give directions to your house to someone who's unfamiliar with the area, do you tell that person the most direct way (even if it's slightly longer) or the shortest way (even if it's somewhat more complicated)? I opt for the first plan, thinking that the fewer the directions, the more likely the person will arrive on time--or at all. But Rand-McNally opted for the second plan, with disastrous results, when I tried to get directions from my home in Newark to Georgetown for the EC/ASECS meeting in November. Why Rand-McNally, you ask? I had already tried Google and Mapquest, to no avail. Google provided aerial maps, street maps, etc., but, for the life of me, I could not find driving directions. Mapquest somehow conflated my home address and Georgetown University's address, and repeatedly told me, apparently with a robotic straight face, that they couldn't give directions from and to the same address. Rand-McNally seemed like a good next choice. I mean, they ARE mapmakers, right?

A beautiful sunny day, with many trees still in fall foliage, and a happy pair of people somewhat beyond their teenage years. Who could ask for more? We were led through highways and tunnels, across rivers and streams, even through the Baltimore-Washington traffic areas, not yet in their rush-hour mode. The directions became somewhat more difficult to follow once we left the highways, though. We were being led through one traffic circle after another, with inaccurate distances given between points, and eventually we couldn't find one of them at all. So we wandered about, asking people for directions to Wisconsin Avenue or Reservoir Road, getting mostly blank stares. I was beginning to think that Washingtonians know only the route from their abode to their place of work, and that's it. At least a half-dozen requests led nowhere until at last a man showed me how to get to Wisconsin. We followed his simple directions, and finally arrived at the hotel with jagged nerves and a lingering question about why we didn't come by Amtrak and Metro. Let it be said right here that Kathy Temple drew us a little map with clear indications on how to get on the highway north. Something like what Rand-McNally should have done for us in the first place. Thank you, Kathy! We made it home in one piece!

But between arriving and leaving there was much going on. The first event, on the very evening of our arrival, was the Oral-Aural Experience. This I could enjoy fully, not having to get up at some ungodly hour the next day for an Executive Committee meeting (alas! in my absence the webmaster was named a member of the board, so next year I won't be so lucky). First came the wonderfully funny readings by Bob Mayerovitch and Laura Kennelly of hilarious double dactyl poems (with titles like "A Slip," "The Doc's Socks," "A Racecar Named Desire," "How Much Is That Doggerel in the Window," and "My Wicked Hero"), and then some of the century's worst poems, selected by the OAE creator and artistic(?) director, Peter Staffel, and read by volunteers in the audience, we came to a musical interlude superbly performed by a straight-faced Bob Mayerovitch

performing P.D.Q. Bach's "Notebook for Betty-Sue Bach." I particularly liked Oh! Courante! And the Capriccio Espagnole for Charles III, The Reign in Spain). At this point the program could well have been over, but the juiciest part was yet to come, a multi-person reading of Pope's *The Rape of the Lock*. I remembered how fortunate I was some 20 or so years earlier to hear Maynard Mack put life into selections from Pope's *Essay on Man*, a reading that opened up my eyes and mind to a new concept, philosophical poetry that was actually poetical. There's something about hearing a live, vibrant reading of such a poem that lets you know that eighteenth-century poetry was intended to be read aloud. *The Rape of the Lock* was clearly no exception, and the cast of 11 (six of whom served as the narrator and often another character), including a teenager (Alice Theobalt, Linda Rosner's daughter) playing poor Belinda, performed brilliantly. I don't think I had ever perceived even a tenth of the humor of the piece until then. Thank you, Mmes Berglund, Howe, Troost, Rosner and Moody, Mlle Theobalt, and Messrs Mayerovitch, Vilmar, Singh, Greenfield and Staffel!

With such a beginning, the rest of the meeting had to go downhill, right? Wrong! While the zaniness of the evening was *sans pareil*, the paper sessions were also superb, even those that were rather on the sober side, like mine was to be, as you will see. And as usual there were more than enough sessions to attract an audience, the problem being only to find the right session for oneself. I was attracted to a session subtitled When Politics Drive Arts and Literature (sounds like the mercifully defunct Bush administration, except his targets were truth and science), perhaps because the three papers I could attend dealt with Swift and Johnson. Suzanne Poor's paper on "Swift and Politics" was both witty and right up to the minute, with links aptly made between current events and the South Sea Bubble, subprime loans, and other get- rich-quick schemes. The final two papers, by Dale Katherine Ireland on "Johnson and the Politics of Order" and Eugene Hammond on "Treating the Quintessential Politician Harley Unpolitically," were papers that could be developed into articles, IMHO.

I also took in the second thread of this topic, "When Politics Drive Arts and Literature." The two papers in the session were both on Gluck operas, and were both wonderful, bringing me back to a time, over 50 years ago, when I actually had a voice and performed among the *basses nobles* in Gluck's *Orphée et Euridice*. Equally wonderful was the fact that the first paper, emeritus professor Jim McGlathery's "Passion and Politics in Gluck's *Iphigénie en Aulide*," was followed by graduate student Janet Leavens's "The Emergence of Sentimentalism in Gluck's *Alceste*." It was nice to see that the future seems bright for the profession. It was also nice to hear two papers on music.

The Business Lunch, which ensued, will be fully reported on elsewhere in this issue. Dramatic decisions by the Executive Committee! Financial report! Peterson awards! Elections! And more! Actually, I'm forcing the irony a bit here: anyone interested in internal governance should pay attention to business meetings. As a former member of over 125 departmental, college and university committees, president of the Faculty Senate, and a member of the group that won a place for the AAUP to speak for the faculty, and as twice president of EC/ASECS, co-founder

and first president of two affiliates (SECFS and IASECS), and one of five Coordinators of Affiliate Societies who have served ASECS, I know at first hand the hard work of those who guide our societies so well, and I greatly respect our colleagues who take on these responsibilities.

That said, I skipped the afternoon sessions to take a walk around campus with Anne and our friend from Milwaukee days, Alex Bendazzi, who now lives in Washington and regaled us with many tales of life in this beautiful city. Of course, we spoke about those long-ago days in the city on the lake and of the happy events we recalled from our relative youth. Among other things, we went to the 1789 House, a nearby restaurant, that happened to be closed at the time we were there, but we did go down into the bowels of the building to the Tombs and had a respite. Or was it a beer? Saying good-bye to Alex, we returned to our room to get ready for the banquet. At our table were Brij Singh, Jim and Nancy McGlathery, Suzanne Poor and her husband, and Gloria Eive. A great group for a fun time.

On Saturday morning I attended the third thread of "When Politics Drive Arts and Literature." Music was the theme of this thread. I missed Francien Marx's paper, but was able to take in the next two. Being of a somewhat mad disposition, I particularly enjoyed Stacey Jocoy's "The World Turned Upside Down: Mad Songs as British Political Commentary, from Lawes to Handel." If I can decipher my notes (if you've ever seen my handwriting, you'll understand what my problem is) in many mad songs or songs of insanity the music as well as the poetry would shift within a single piece to reflect changes in the types of madness being illustrated. Hmmm. Sounds a bit like my conversation, now that I think of it. Gloria Eive's "Rage and Passion—Donizetti and the 'Mad Bride' of the Lamermoores" was superbly backed by excerpts from the opera, as Stacey Jocoy's arguments were by recordings of some of the songs in question.

I thought it might be interesting to hear what more of our younger scholars were up to, and so attended the Graduate Student Work-in-Progress session. I'm happy to report that our young scholars give every indication of being sounder of mind than I am, and that their scholarship leads down many corridors. Just the titles of the papers will give you a taste of the richness of the meals they served. Danielle Spratt spoke on "From Bear-Men to No Men: Emasculating and Eradicating Men in Cavendish's *Blazing World*," while Jennifer Miller's topic was "How to be a Man: Homosocial Friendships in *The Monk*." It was great to hear two young women take on topics that even men dare not tread upon too openly. David Brumbley's "Pointless Pleasure: An Epicurean Explanation of 'A Ramble in St. James Park'" was quite convincing, and was followed by Gamil Alamrani's focus of *1001 Nights* from the point of view of the "Orientals" rather than looking into the Western (mis)interpretations of the stories, in his "The East: The Politics of the Erotica."

This brought us to lunch in the food court down one of the corridors, and featured a magically-expanding table. I like to think that Anne, Phil Hines and I got things started, and that additional tables were added to ours one after the other, until a dozen or so people were seated, including Manny Schonhorn, Sayre Greenfield and Linda Troost, James and Susan Woolley, Jim May, Kathy McGill,

and others as well; in my defense I offer that the distance between us and the various corners of the table was as great as the rising din of the space that I could hardly follow a conversation with my next-chair neighbors.

We proceeded from there to another building to hear J. Paul Hunter speak of "Learning to Love Couplets." In truth, I had no learning of this sort to do, since so much of French verse, and essentially all of French dramatic and epic and didactic poetry of the period was written in couplet form, with the complications that Paul mentioned (the couplets alternated between "masculine" and "feminine" rhymes, that is, those ending with no schwa or mute "e" following a consonantal sound vs. those ending with such sounds). But that was a mere sidelight to his paper, which also asked the question of where the English taste for rhyming couplets came from, with various suggestions offered, including from across the Channel. Almost makes me want to inflict a paper written in rhyming couplets on some unsuspecting audience. That would clear out the room in a hurry!

My regular readers know that I have been for some time missing my walks with my friend Phil Hines. This time I was not to be deprived of the pleasure of his company. Like the Owl and the Pussy Cat, we rambled over the beautiful Georgetown campus and the surrounding area speaking of many things, including cabbages and kings, or more precisely the then-just-completed presidential elections. I'm not sure we decided any great issues of state, but we did like the results of those elections, which in some cases were very surprising, as I'm sure some of you remember. We had to hasten back for my session on *The Catholic Enlightenment*, which had been moved from a Sunday morning opposite Jane Austen to Saturday late afternoon.

"The Catholic Enlightenment?" you ask, incredulously. Yes, indeed there was one, and, if you had been there, you would have found out about it. If not, you can redeem yourselves at ASECS in Richmond, where there will be two, count 'em, two sessions devoted to this topic. Frederic Conrod got things moving with a talk on "Desolation Beyond the Pyrenees: Voltaire's Representation of Spain as Land of Darkness." Well, OK, there was some darkness there, but the sunshine was beginning to disperse the clouds, and Voltaire—part of whose fortune came from Spanish sailing vessels leaving from Cadiz—mixed a good measure of anti-Church and anti-clerical rhetoric with other facts that he knew all too well. And he had the Black Legend on his side. Robert Frail discussed "Defrocked Priests [in France]: Custodians of the Enlightenment." Many of the authors of the *Encyclopédie* were priests, as were the authors of numerous books of fiction and non-fiction throughout the century. Mark Malin's paper focused on "The Novel and the Spanish Catholic Enlightenment," a topic he will explore further in Richmond in March. He addressed questions of liberalism and orthodoxy in certain novels of the period. "What?" you ask. "They were writing novels in Spain in the eighteenth century?" Well, you see, you've a lot to learn.

Finally, on Sunday morning, just prior to our departure time, we attended a fascinating session on "The Politics and Poetry of Law in Eighteenth-Century Britain, America, and France." Sara Schotland studied "Cause Lawyering Then and Now: Using Cultural Study of the Law for Normative Purposes." Talk about

interdisciplinarity in a single topic! Specifically, she dealt with Fielding's ideas on corporal punishment as a deterrent, which led me to comment on the constant reports of pickpockets at work in Paris during public executions of ... pickpockets! Erica Burleigh spoke of the many real and fictional reports of converting Muslims to Christianity in our period, which provoked me to note the opposite phenomenon, well documented, of captured Christian pirates converting to Islam. And Christine Clark-Evans spoke brilliantly of "De Jure Equality and the New African enslavement in Montesquieu's *De l'Esprit des Lois*."

And thus this wonderful meeting came to an end, and we drove off in the sunlight to our northern estate. I hope to see many of you in Richmond. And don't forget the Catholic Enlightenment!

University of Delaware

### News of Members

There are too many new members and address corrections to run them all here now when we are due in May to reprint the directory. **Corey Andrew's** "Ev'ry Heart Can Feel!: Scottish Poetic Responses to Slavery, from Blair to Burns" appeared in *International Journal of Scottish Literature*, 4 (Spring/Summer 2008), 1-22. The article can be seen at <http://www.ijsl.stir.ac.uk/issue4/andrews.htm>. **Temma Berg** participated in a panel on letters at a conference in Oxford during September-at which **Peter Sabor** was the keynote speaker. Temma and other panelists have worked up their papers for *Eighteenth-Century Life*. In the most recent *Studies in Bibliography*, published in December, **Thomas Bonnell** offers an important study of collections of English poets in the late 1700s and early 1800s that demonstrates the dangers of writing about book history without examining the books themselves. It is a critique of William St Clair's overly ambitious 2004 study (esp. Chpt. 7 and Appendix 6): "When Book History Neglects Bibliography: Trouble with the 'Old Canon' in *The Reading Nation*" (*SB*, 57 (2005-2006), 243-61. Tom has an important book out this winter on the late 18C reprinting of literature, *The Most Disreputable Trade: Publishing the Classics of English Poetry, 1765-1810* (Oxford UP), ground he'd already showed mastery of in articles like "Patchwork and Piracy: John Bell's 'Connected System of Biography' and the Use of Johnson's Prefaces, in *SB*, 48 (1995), 193-228. Tom shows how "mistakes that crept into *The Reading Nation* offer an illuminating case study in the importance of bibliographical accuracy," how errors result in confusion about what was published and thus in characterizations of book sales and readers' tastes. Repeatedly St Clair is shown to confuse volumes of Johnson's critical prefaces with volumes of the *Works* with poetry, to mistake the format, size of print runs, and number of volumes in different published series, to claim editions appeared that did not appear, to claim series were included poets not included, and the like.

**Andrew Carpenter**, now emeritus from University College Dublin, is general editor, for the Royal Irish Academy, of a huge five-volume series on the art

and architecture of Ireland. Andrew's radio play "Gulliver's Travels: An Event for Voices," written in the 1970s and aired first in 1988, appears in the 2008 *Swift Studies*, published last fall, where also is found a tribute to **Frank H. Ellis** by editor **Hermann J. Real**. After the last *Intelligencer*, **Ron Cleavelly** wrote with the recollection that, when he participated in **Arch Elias's** malacological sessions at our Cape May meeting, Arch "ensured that there were several important reference works to augment them. As a result I flew home with a weighty tome that he had organized on my behalf." Ron's talk to the Devonshire natural history association was published in their 2008 *Transactions*, "Discovery of the Barnstaple Zeolite: A Minor Controversy in the early 1800s," on wavellite, a mineral found in the 1780s and a story involving such early geo-chemists as William Babington, Humphry Davy, Wm. Gregor, and Charles Hatchett, and a Dr. Turton of Cornwall, an authority on shells who treated Keats when he was taken ill in Penzance. The death of Ron's colleague Michael Cooper has led to Ron's taking over Cooper's work on the mineral collection of Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire, rediscovered at Chatsworth House. Cooper et al. described it in "The Devonshire Mineral Collection of Chatsworth House: An 18th-Century Survivor and its Restoration," in *Mineralogical Record*, 36 (May-June 2005), 239-72. This encouraged Ron's research into the contributions of British women to the development of geology. In November, **Kevin Cope** and Noel Library Curator Robert Leitz hosted an enjoyable and productive symposium ("Precision as Profusion") on the blizzard of 18C texts, with long plenaries and discussions and good meals, attended by **Greg Clingham**, Blake Gerard, **Jim May**, **Peter Sabor**, Michael Suarez, Connie & Jim Thorson, et al., the essays from which will be submitted to a publisher during 2009. In 2009 AMS Press will publish two volumes of essays that Kevin edited with Serge Soupel and Alexander Pettit: *Adventure: An 18C Idiom: Essays on the Daring and the Bold as a Pre-Modern Medium* and *The Enlightenment by Night: Essays on After-Dark Culture in the Long 18C*.

**Marilyn Francus**, the editor of the *Burney Journal*, published her essay "Erasing the Stepmother Story: Frances Burney and Elizabeth Allen" in *A Celebration of Frances Burney*, edited by Lorna J. Clark (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008), 57-73. Marilyn, observing that "Burney scholars recognize Frances's abhorrence of her stepmother . . . without questioning it" (73), finding that few take the generous view that Roger Lonsdale has in his biography of Dr. Charles Burney. Marilyn's examination of Frances's progressively degenerating relations with her stepmother, her efforts to support prejudices and her refusal to accept Allen, will interest anyone with stepchildren (or stepparents)--there's a classic outline to Frances's "construction" of her stepmother, as Marilyn explains, while drawing upon journals, correspondence, and FB's biography of her father. **George Hahn's** book *The Ocean Bards: British Poetry and the War at Sea, 1793-1815* was published this fall by Peter Lang (ISBN: 0-8204-3609-7)--we're hoping to get a review copy. **Phil Hines**, after publishing many articles over the last three decades on the manuscript "Newdigate" newsletters, has had the manuscript of his edition accepted by the University of Delaware. We are hoping he'll provide a preview, perhaps a part of the introduction, for the *Intelligencer*. **Charles Haskell**

**Hinnant's** essay "Gifts and Wages: The Structures of Exchange in 18C Fiction and Drama," which offers useful analysis for anyone working on charitable giving and patronage, appears in *ECS's* fall 2008 issue, where we also find **Marta Kvande's** review of Helen Thompson's *Ingenuous Subjection*. **Joe Jackson** has co-edited with Byron Wells the volume *An American Voltaire: Essays in Memory J. Patrick Lee*, forthcoming in 2009 from Cambridge Scholars Publishing; it includes essays by **Ted Braun** and **Walter Gershuny**. Joe is the acting head of his Language and Literature Dept. at Clayton Univ., overseeing the division of the department and the search for a chair to take over the English half.

**Stephen Karian's** essay "Authors of the Mind: Some Notes on the QSUM Attribution Theory" appears in *Studies in Bibliography*, 57 (2005-2006), 263-86; Steve has been doing important work on Swift's poetry, but he's really rolled up his sleeves in tackling this dauntingly difficult linguistic method proposed in *Analyzing for Authorship: A Guide to the Cusum Technique* by Jill M. Farringdon and others (1996). The technique creates an individualize fingerprint from counting short words and words beginning with vowels. Stephen has stepped up to the scientific challenge and tried to replicate results, concluding the method is not apparently useful for distinguishing one author from another. Steve's final set of recommendations to those proposing attribution methods includes the call to "distinguish between those that reliably disprove authorship versus those that assert it" (286). **Linde Katritzky**, who has been working on Swift's poetry, published her essay "Matter for Comment and Observation: Frances Burney before *Evelina*" in *A Celebration of Frances Burney* (2008). This collection of essays edited by Lorna Clark, with an introduction by **Peter Sabor**, includes revised papers from the 2002 meeting during which a window was added to Westminster Abbey's Poets' Corner in honor of Burney (much credit for the memorial goes to Paula L. Stepankowsky). The volume (2007 [2008?]), like much else of interest the past year, was published by Cambridge Scholars Publishing of Newcastle (1-84718-320-4)--a review of the volume is forthcoming. **Deborah Kennedy** this past year published "Wordsworth's *Poems* of 1807 and the Haunting Cry of Alice Fell" in *Wordsworth Circle*, 34.4 (2007), 203-08. **Paul Kerry** contributed "Heinrich von Kleist and the Transformation of Conversation in Germany" to a collection of ten interdisciplinary essays, apparently well integrated by editors Katie Halsey and Jane Slinn: *The Concept and Practice of Conversation in the Long 18C, 1688-1848* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008).

Palgrave Macmillan this year publishes **Arnold Markley's** *Conversion and Reform in the British Novel of the 1790s: A Revolution of Opinions*. Arnold is now researching Thomas Holcroft's autobiography. **Ashley Marshall's** "The Aims of Butler's Satire in *Hudibras*," in *Modern Philology*, 105 (2008), 637-65, complicates the old understanding of Butler's targets (defeated Puritans and Cromwell's regime), showing through a reading of the poem's three parts that Butler is more concerned "with ongoing sectarian controversy in the 1660s and 1670s." Ashley defends her dissertation on satire on 27 February, and that day and the next her director, **Rob Hume**, has scheduled talks by two distinguished outside readers coming to Penn State, Thomas Lockwood and Howard Weinbrot. **William**

**McCarthy's** 15-year biographical effort has been completed with the publication by Johns Hopkins UP of *Anna Letitia Barbauld: Voice of the Enlightenment* (2008 [Jan'y 2009]; pp. xxvi, 726; + 20 leaves of plates; ISBN: 978-0-8018-9016-1; hardcover, \$60). Researched and written with great pains, this will be a much applauded study of the poet, essayist, critic, and editor (but no novels--"her work resembled Samuel Johnson's, and contemporaries were not slow to compare her to Johnson." The book's jacket characterizes Barbauld (d. 1825) as "Inquiring and witty as well as principled and passionate . . . a voice for the Enlightenment in an age of revolution and reaction." We can offer a review copy to a scholar willing to take up the challenge. **Thomas McGeary** worked at the Clark and Huntington libraries, aided by a fellowship, in part on a census of 18C British periodicals, a project undertaken with **Jim Tierney** and funded by the Andrew Mellon Foundation. Tom's book MS "The Politics of Opera in Handel's London" is under review by CUP. **Judy Milhous** and **Robert Hume** published in the March and June 2008 issues of *The Library* "One Hundred and Thirty-Seven Neglected English Play Manuscripts in the British Library (c. 1770-1809), Part I[-II]." Judy and Rob survey and sort out 137 play MSS ignored by Allardyce Nicoll and others, shelved at the BL for over a century, dating back to Richard Brinsley Sheridan's management of Drury Lane (pre-1809 submissions), later owned by Peter George Patmore, before Patmore's son passed them on the BL in 1864 (as 131 bound vols., "The Sheridan-Patmore MS Collection," Add MS 25,906 to 26,036—mostly alphabetical by title). Of the 137 plays, 13 were performed, 10 were printed, 81 are "anonymous or bear only the author's initials"—Judy and Rob offer attributions for 56 plays.

In October **Mel New**, reading the page proofs for his edition of Sterne's *Letters*, wrote of tribulations that will speak to the experience of many: "it is not the typos that one watches for at this stage but the computer hiccups--the places where the input is absolutely correct but it comes out the wrong font or mysteriously drops a few characters or respaces a line . . . Getting a clean MS is as difficult as ever despite all the mechanical aids, if only because at each production stage new errors seem liable to be introduced--it seems easier to write the book than to move it into print"). **Cathy Parisian**, ASECS's new affiliates coordinator, favored EC/ASECS with a good account of our Georgetown meeting in the Winter ASECS *News Circular*; Cathy writes particularly of the poetry reading organized by **Peter Staffel** for Thursday evening, **Nora Nachumi's** session honoring **Betty Rizzo**, and **Doreen Saar's** "thoroughly entertaining" presidential address (to be printed in the May issue). **Hermann Real** this past month has been writing two essays: "Swift and Flavius Vopiscus" and "The Dean and the Lord Chancellor: or, Swift Saving his Bacon." He reports that the Ehrenpreis Centre is making good progress on the "Online.Swift" described in our last issue (22.iii.55-57). Hermann is too prolific to note all his publications, but one too full of useful erudition not to cite is his review of Roger Lonsdale's edition of Johnson's *Lives of the Poets* in *Anglia*, 126 (2008), 557-63. **William Rivers** will be speaking in February at the SEASECS on Amhurst's contributions to *The Craftsman*, and, at the call of **Eleanor Shevlin**, the SHARP-ASECS liaison, Bill organized a session at ASECS

for SHARP on periodical literature that received enough strong proposals to populate three panels in Richmond. (I wanted to get Eleanor in this honor roll because she did a fine job chairing three sessions on bibliography, textual studies, and book history at Georgetown, her alma mater—she also gave one of several very stimulating papers on using ECCO and EBBO in the classroom.)

**Betty Rizzo's** "The Trajectory of Romance: Burney and Thrale" in *A Celebration of Frances Burney* is a pithy and pointed analysis of the five-year romantic friendship of Hester Thrale and Frances Burney—For Betty, Thrale wooed Burney till they acknowledged love and intimacy but Burney, long reluctant to let Thrale usurp the more intimate position of her sister Susan, ultimately pulled back to write, after Henry Thrale's death, forcing Mrs. Thrale to turn to music instructor Piozzi. The essay offers much insight into these two strong and talented women and into several sorts of relations between women. I'd only question the degree of a generalization underlying the importance of female friendship: "it was important to young women because tender, caring, emotional, and intimate relationship with men were all but impossible and would most likely remain so in their marriages" (171). This is undercut by Betty's admission that the friendship between Thrale and Burney "inspired both to settle for nothing less than the same qualities in marriage, and the needs of both were to be met by husbands feminized by misfortune and therefore tender, caring, emotional, and intimate" (181-82). **Shef Rogers** is working on early 18C poetical miscellanies and will be attending the SHARP in Toronto this summer. Shef expects to see the publication of the travel section for the CBEL3, which Cambridge abandoned, published by the British Library, and he's hoping contributors will direct materials to Laura Mandell and Bob Markley's "Eighteenth-Century Connect" bibliographical project (we think this is the Routledge's Annotated Bibliography of English Studies [ABES])—one might send a query to Prof. Markley at rmarkley@uiuc.edu).

Congratulations to **Peter Sabor** on his admission this past fall to the Royal Society of Canada. Peter, with Paul Yachnin, has edited *Shakespeare and the Eighteenth Century* (Ashgate, 2008). Peter and **Geoffrey Sill** spoke at the Burney Society of North America's meeting at the Newberry in October. **Norbert Schurer** spent the spring in Delhi, India, as a research fellow at the Jawaharlal Nehru Institute of Advanced Studies, where he worked on representations of the holy island of Jahangira on the Ganges. The fall *ECS* contains his "The Impartial Spectator of Sati, 1757-84," and the *TLS* carried an approving review of his edition of Charlotte Lennox's novel *Sophia* (Broadview). **James Woolley** is working on Swift's poetry this February and March at the Huntington and Clark libraries, April at the Folger, and May at the Beinecke. **Deborah Wright** worked on her electronic edition of Matthew Prior's correspondence at the National Archives in Kew and the British Library during October and November, aided by awards from the American Philosophical Society and the Bibliographical Society of America. During her stay, she gave a presentation on her project at the TEI [Text Encoding Initiative] Members' Meeting at King's College, London.

**Forthcoming Meetings, Exhibitions, New Publications, etc.**

The **SEASECS** meets in Charlotte on 5-7 March, with the theme "Tricks of the Trade." See the tentative program at [www.auburn.edu/academic/societies/seasecs](http://www.auburn.edu/academic/societies/seasecs). That same weekend the **Society of Early Americanists** meets in Bermuda. Other spring and summer meetings formerly noted here include ASECS's 40th annual in Richmond, 26-29 March; the **Johnson Society of the Central Region** in 17-18 April in Chicago, hosted by Tom Kaminski of Loyola U; **SHARP** on 23-27 June at the U. of Toronto, with the theme "Tradition and Innovation: The State of Book History"; and the **18C Scottish Studies Society** in St. Andrews. For events related to Samuel Johnson, the articles above (pp. 57-58).

Oklahoma State U. will host the first biennial meeting of the **Defoe Society** in Tulsa, 25-26 September 2009. One-page proposals for papers on Defoe's works or "related works by other writers" are due 15 March to program chair Robert Mayer of Oklahoma State University's English Dept. (Stillwater, OK 74078-4069; [robert.mayer@okstate.edu](mailto:robert.mayer@okstate.edu)). Session proposals were due 15 January 2008

The **EC/ASECS** meets on 8-11 October in Bethlehem, PA, hosted by Lehigh U. (see article above on p. 60). That weekend the **Midwest ASECS** meets in Fargo, ND, chaired by Jeanne Hageman of North Dakota State U.).

The **NEASECS** and **Canadian SECS** hold a joint meeting 5-9 November in Ottawa, chaired by Frans de Bruyn--the deadline for papers is 1 April (google up the Society's website for more). Also that weekend the **Aphra Behn Society** meets at Cumberland U., Lebanon, TN, on 5-7 November.

The **Eastern Study Group of the North American Kant Society** meets 24-25 April at Penn State U., hosted by Professor Jennifer Mensch (the deadline for proposals--on all topics but esp. those related to the history of philosophy--was 15 January, directed to Pablo Muchnik, [pmuchnik@siena.edu](mailto:pmuchnik@siena.edu)). The 11th **International Kant Congress** will occur in Pisa, 22-26 May 2010, with the general topic "Kant and Philosophy in a Cosmopolitan Sense." Submissions in for languages are due by 31 May 2009 (see [www.kant2010.it](http://www.kant2010.it)).

The **Folger Shakespeare Library** has hired Dr. Stephen Enniss to be its new Librarian (Enniss has for 15 years been a librarian at Emory's manuscripts and rare books library). The Folger through 31 January exhibits "Breaking News: Renaissance Journalism and the Birth of the Newspaper." From 19 Feb. to 30 May it mounts the exhibit "To Sleep, Perchance to Dream" on early modern beliefs about sleep and dreaming. From late January through 18 April, Yale's **Beinecke** offers "Book of Secrets: **Alchemy** and the European Imagination, 1500-2000." Penn's Rare Book and MSS Library offers the exhibition "**Did Censorship Make the French Enlightenment?**" from 2 Feb. to 13 June. In conjunction with it, lectures are offered at 5:30 p.m. on 19, 24, and 26 February by Roger Chartier ("Diderot and the *Encyclopedie*"), Alan Charles Kors ("Voltaire and the *Lettres philosophiques*"), and Joan DeJean (on Graffigny's *Lettres d'une Peruvienne*, subtitled "Did Censorship Give Women an Enlightenment?").

On the **cover illustration**--from the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1747,--see p. 60.

