

The Ill-Tempered Researcher or What Did Washington Eat at His Inaugural Dinner?

By Doreen Alvarez Saar

It had been a pleasant presidential year: I was secure in the knowledge that I had fulfilled my campaign promises (of course, my single one being that I would not raise annual dues, since they had been raised for the first time in many years during the previous administration), and the future looked bright and calm. That is, until I came to the horrid realization that I would have to deliver a presidential address. After the bouts of vomiting stopped, reason returned and I began the hunt for a subject. Then, one day, while searching for a use for celeriac and perusing *The Thirteen Colonies Cookbook*, I noticed the menu for the reception for George Washington and the French Ambassador Luzerne at the Fraunces Tavern on November 25, 1783, the British Evacuation Day reception given for more than 100 guests by Governor Clinton. The facts were entrancing--so enthralled was I by the description of the meal: "In addition to an exceeding amount of punch and spruce or spruce beer, one hundred and thirty three bottles of Madeira, port and claret were consumed, and eight lights, sixteen wine glasses and six decanters were broken. The extensive menu included Fish House punch, pate maison fraunces, sorrel soup with sippets, poached striped bass with cucumber sauce, roast lamb with oyster forcemeat, ragoon French beans, yam and chestnut pippins and tansy pie."¹ All of a sudden, the mists cleared, the lightening flashed, and my mind was clear: I thought, East Central is in Washington, the weekend after the election, I'm an Americanist and I have been working on receipt books, those collections of recipes and cures. Bang, I had my subject! What did Washington eat at the first inaugural!!! Just explaining the changes in the language of the cookery of the day, for example what a sippet is, might be a talk and there would be interesting parallels to what is served at inaugurations today. By George, I thought,² I have a winner, for there is nothing so dear to the heart of an academic at a conference as the quantity, regularity and nature of the food.

The next morning, I rushed to my computer, thinking, this was going to be a piece of cake (no pun intended). I typed in Washington and inauguration on Wikipedia and learned very little (thereby echoing the research efforts of most undergraduates). I moved onto Google, and I was off as thousands of sites appeared. After clearing away the debris, I found the majority of sites seemed to be interested in two things: the argument around the structure of the act of the inauguration and the inaugural address. But then, there were these other sites . . . and I fell victim to one of the most virulent diseases that can infect the researcher: I began to learn lots of irrelevant and fascinating things. The flag used at the Inauguration is at the Metropolitan Museum. The Bible used at the Inauguration is property of the Freemasons--St. John's Lodge No. 1 of New York, since it was provided by a member of that lodge at the first inauguration in 1789. (I pondered for a second the suitability of an obscure English professor from Drexel penning a major blockbuster novel linking the current market terrors in the United States to the plotting of the Freemasons--but dismissed the subject as too farfetched.) I was pleased to learn Martha Washington did not attend the Inauguration (a fact that made me much

more respectful of that lady), and nothing, therefore, was written about what she did or did not wear. Much, however, was made of Washington's attire, including the fact that he did not choose to appear in uniform. Even in 1789, Washington was aware of making a statement about the superiority of American manufactures: he wrote to General Knox on April 10, 1789: "The cloth & Buttons which accompanied your favor of the 30th Ult, came safe by Col Hanson; and really do credit to the manufactures of this Country."³ The buttons displayed the American bald eagle, emblazoned with a shield on its chest and clutching the symbols of war and peace in its talons with the sun shining above its head--essentially, the same design that serves as the Great Seal of the United States was embossed on the buttons.⁴ Washington's specially made plain brown suit was woven by Jeremiah Wadsworth, his chief of supplies during the Revolution. Wadsworth had established the first New England woolen mill in Hartford in 1788: a fact that was loudly trumpeted by Hartford on a website. By the way, there is a brisk market in the buttons made by New York and Connecticut button makers to the eager public on the Inauguration. (If you should find a Liberty Cap Brass button from the Inauguration, you would be \$17,000 to the good.)⁵ Wait, I thought, that's another paper.

Many hours later, bleary eyed, having eaten no lunch or dinner, I had discovered nothing to the point but found myself and every available space around me covered by hard copy of fun Inaugural facts: I knew all the signs--I was in the drugged stupor of computer researching, an ugly place where I had wasted many years of my life. Slapping myself briskly on each cheek, I filled out reams of interlibrary loan forms for material not available at Drexel, applied for an intervention with my college librarian, and took myself to the local library for a dose of organization. My local suburban library is a superior version of the general public library, but my research on Washington led me to discover that currently most public librarians and most popular biographers think we know everything about Washington and so the titles reflect an attempt at novelty in their subject matter, such as "George Washington, Spymaster," "The Unexpected George Washington," "George Washington on Leadership." But I found nothing that was to my mind a complete biography. Certainly as I thumbed through the volumes, I gleaned some fun food facts. For example, Benjamin Latrobe wrote of a breakfast at Mount Vernon that was served "Virginia style, tea, coffee and cold boiled meat."⁶

My talk with my college librarian was not calming. A gentle man, he had not been often troubled by this kind of question before, Drexel being devoted to the struggle for technological supremacy, not humanistic endeavor. Drexel's library, in fact, boasts a whole floor of books acquired after our President declared that we didn't need a library since everything anyone needs is on line. The librarian suggested a few web sites and smilingly announced his brain storm, perhaps the CIA! Bowled over by the thought of tackling the government, I gulped and recovered only when he reassured me that he had intended the Culinary Institute of America. And so I was off again, to an endless series of telephone consultations beginning with the Culinary Institute whose extensive collection of menus and other culinary history did not include anything on Washington but whose librarian suggested Mount Vernon. Mount Vernon, I found, had a remarkable interest in

Washington and his stomach but did not have anything on the first Inauguration. Joanne Stahl, the helpful librarian there, wished me well and said that Mount Vernon would be delighted to use anything that I found. A call to the Fraunces Tavern's Museum because its original owner, Samuel Fraunces, who had hosted the Evacuation Day Ball, had been hired by Tobias Lear as Washington's steward was equally unrewarding. Once again, I was sent on, this time to the Jay homestead in New York since Jay's wife had written extensively on everything. Phone on my ear and computer in hand trawling leads, I would discover all of Mrs. Jay's material was included in the online Jay papers at Columbia, which I had already read and searched.

The collection at Drexel offered a few more biographies, but these, too, were lacking in detailed information. For example, after a long peroration, James Thomas Flexner's *George Washington and the New Nation* offered the following. After the Inauguration, Washington goes to Saint Paul's Chapel, where there was no sermon, and Washington was allowed to have his dinner quietly at home . . . [before going] out again in his carriage to attend a pair of receptions, to see the illuminations and the fireworks."⁷ I began to worry, perhaps there was nothing! At the same time, interlibrary loans began to pour in. Jim Bendat's *Democracy's Big Day* arrived. Hurray! Bendat is considered the nation's leading expert on inaugural history: he would save me. From Bendat, I was to learn that,

In the old days, the food at the ball would be superb, often including delicacies from Europe . . . [In 1997] Most of the Inaugural Ball guests were surprised to find that their admission charge included no hors d'oeuvres. Potato chips could be purchased for \$1.50, a small glass of wine for \$4 and water for \$2. . . . Then, there are the entrees: For \$5.50, guests can purchase little plastic boxes with choices such as pasta primavera, ham and cheese sandwiches on dry biscuit or turkey and pesto on a croissant.⁸

And this was Clinton! From Boller's *Presidential Inaugurations*, I was to learn that only that Washington dined after the inauguration at Franklin House with friends (a fact that Boller supports with Frank Momaghan's "Notes on the Inaugural Journey and Inaugural Ceremonies of George Washington,"⁹ a private typescript held in the Library of Congress, and not to me the most trustworthy of sources.)

Finally, I went and sat in the stacks at Penn, the largest open stack collection in the country, to find that after the service at St. Paul's the president retired to his house for a private dinner with his aides Lear and Humphreys.¹⁰ Further, the diaries that Washington kept from 1789-97 are mostly missing. There were two balls held in May for Washington. The first held on May 7 was a private affair, and the second held on May 14 was given by the French Ambassador Count Moustier. Needless to say, I attempted to track down information about Tobias Lear and David Humphries, hoping that there would be some sweet, secret nugget. I found a good deal about Lear and Humphries, including a recent book entitled *The Checkered Career of Tobias Lear* and the well publicized fact that Lear recorded the death of Washington but the project was, essentially, at an end.

Filled with sympathy for my undergraduates who had often chased various hares in their research projects, I had learned that in asking a question that we should be careful of how we frame the question within our contemporary understanding. The structure of the eighteenth-century Inauguration had only certain points in common with the modern one. Certainly the matter of the Washington's inauguration was of great concern to the new government who had to establish Republican principles for a form of governing that had never existed. There are volumes about the structure of the ceremony of the Inauguration and of Washington's speech. The founders knew that the blueprint for democracy was being made, but they drew upon their knowledge of contemporary forms of monarchical social structure. Some elements of the celebration could be drawn directly from common forms so that, for example, the fireworks and illuminations that took place in New York the evening of the Inauguration were typical of eighteenth-century public celebrations. Although we moderns associate The Inaugural Ball with the Inauguration, for the first Inauguration there was only a private ball on the evening of May 7 in Washington's honor--later called the Inauguration Ball--at the Dancing assembly.¹¹ Decisions about the President's activity became more difficult as issues about the distinction between the public and the private came into play. Unlike a monarch, the President represents the state but is not the state: he could and would be replaced and not by a creation of his body. The President is a private individual in a public role.

In fact, the public-private distinction was one of the first issues with which Washington had to contend. When he left Mount Vernon on April 16, he wrote, "About ten o'clock I bade adieu to Mount Vernon, to private life, and to domestic felicity; and, with a mind oppressed with more anxious and painful sensations than I have words to express, set out for New York."¹² Even in the midst of many other matters of significance, because he was conscious of setting a precedent, Washington considered the paradigm, or role, he was developing as a matter of importance. As Freeman notes, in New York, President Washington was advised to "extend no invitations and, further, to accept none." This advice troubled Washington, who felt, according to Freeman, that, by behaving in such an aloof manner, he might be considered to be imitating a king and also losing valuable information that could be gained from the general population.¹³ On May of 1789, he wrote to John Adams, Alexander Hamilton and John Jay for advice on proper etiquette:

The president of the United States wishes to avail himself of your sentiments on the following points.

- 1st Whether a line of conduct, equally distant from an association with all kinds of company on the one hand and from a total seclusion from Society on the other, ought to be adopted by him? and, in that case, how is it to be done?
- 2d. What will be the least exceptionable method of bringing any system, which may be adopted on this subject, before the public and into use?
- 3d. Whether, after a little time, one day in every week, will not be sufficient for receiving visits of Compliment?

- 4th Whether it would tend to prompt impertinent applications & involve disagreeable consequences to have it known, that the President will, every Morning at 8 O'clock, be at leisure to give Audiences to persons who may have business with him?
- 5th Whether, when it shall have been understood that the President is not to give *general entertainment* in the Manner the Presidents of Congress have formerly done, it will be practicable to draw such a line of discrimination in regard to persons, as that Six, eight or ten official characters (including in rotation the members of both Houses of Congress) may be invited informally or otherwise to dine with him on the days fixed for receiving Company, without exciting clamours in the rest of the Community?
- 6th Whether it would be satisfactory to the Public for the president to make about four great entertainmts. in a year on such great occasions as . . . the Annaversary of the Declaration of Independence . . . the Alliance with France . . . the peace with Great Britain . . . the Organization of the general Government: and whether arrangements of these last two kinds could be in danger of diverting too much of the Presidents time from business or of producing the evils which it was intended to avoid by his living more recluse than the Presidts. of Congress have heretofore lived.
- 7th Whether there be any impropriety in the President making informal visits—that is to say, in his calling upon his Acquaintances or public Characters, for the purposes of sociability or civility—and what (as to the form of doing it) might evince these visits to have been made in his private character, so as that they might not be construed into visits from the President of the United States? and in what light would his appearance *rarely at Tea parties* be considered? (Freeman, 6:303).

Eventually Washington decided to limit his public guests to one hour, two days a week on Tuesdays and Fridays between two and three with a weekly dinner for members of Congress. Because of the pressures of adapting a republican style, Washington, whose hospitality had been luxurious, attempted republican simplicity and simple meals. However, by the end of that summer, Martha and George had returned to their old habits and gave lavish dinners. The change did not go unnoticed: immediately, a newspaper declared that "in a few years, we shall have all the paraphernalia yet wanting to give the superb finish to the grandeur of our AMERICAN COURT! the purity of republican principle seems to be daily losing ground . . . we are on the eve of another revolution" (Unger, pp. 190-91). However, if we are to believe Abigail Adams' descriptions of Mrs. Washington's levees, which usually took place on Friday evenings at 8:00, we would find them simplicity itself: "She gives Tea, Coffee, Cake, Lemonade & Ice Creams."¹⁴

Mrs. Washington's role in setting the tone of the administration made me consider that the first Inauguration was not filled with modern-day family values but reflected 18th-century mores. Mrs. Washington was not at the Inauguration; it would be some weeks before she joined the President. Her absence was in keeping with contemporary sensibilities. In fact, "eighteenth-century celebrations were

thought to be men's business. Only balls and related supper parties were occasions that linked women to public celebrations" (McNamara, p. 15).

There is still much to be considered about the original inauguration, but I would like to return to the subject of research. This study reaffirmed for me that, while computers have given us incredible access, there is nothing like a good library and that there is a continual need for basic histories of a period. The comprehensiveness of the multi-volume Douglas Southall Freeman biography is indispensable to the researcher. This need extends even more to the need for accurate historical work in interdisciplinary subjects: in my research into the cookery and the Inauguration, I found a great deal of material had been popularized and, thereby, both accuracy and access to original sources became problematic.

Looking back at my experience, I was reminded of Diedrich Knickerbocker's Postscript to the *Legend of Sleepy Hollow*, in which "The story-teller . . . observed, that the story was most logically intended to prove "That there is no situation in life but has its advantages and disadvantages--provided we will but take a joke as we find it!"

Drexel University

Notes

1. Mary Donovan, Amy Hatrak, Frances Mills, and Elizabeth Shull, *The Thirteen Colonies Cookbook* (New York: Praeger, 1975), p. 97.
2. By "George" here, I was not sure whether to reference George the Third or George Washington.
3. http://www.politicalbadges.com/washington_inaugural_buttons2.htm
4. <http://www.mountvernon.org/store/shopping/index.cfm/fuseaction/viewitem/pid/746/>
5. <http://mosc95.pld.com/kirk/CobbGW/index.html>
6. Benjamin Latrobe's diary, July 16, 1796, 141n.-142n. in James Harlow Unger, *The Unexpected George Washington* (Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2006), p. 234.
7. James Thomas Flexner, *George Washington and the New Nation* (Boston: Little Brown, 1969), p. 188.
8. Jim Bendat, *Democracy's Big Day* (New York: !Universe, Inc, 2005), pp. 75-76.
9. Paul F. Boller, *Presidential Inaugurations* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 2001), p. 19.
10. Willard Sterne Randall, *George Washington a Life* (New York: Henry Holt, 1997), p.449.
11. Brooks McNamara, *Day of Jubilee* (New Brunswick: Rutgers U. Press, 1997), p. 27. Cited hereafter as "McNamara."
12. Ralph Andrist and Joan Patterson Kerr, *George Washington: A Biography in His Own Words* (New York: Newsweek, 1972), p. 295.
13. Douglas Southall Freeman, *George Washington*, Vol. 6: *Patriot and*

President (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1954), 200. Cited as "Freeman."

14. Dorothy Twohig, ed., *George Washington's Diaries, An Abridgement* (Charlottesville: U. of Virginia Press, 1999), p. 340.

An Introduction to "The Newdigate Newsletters" (13 January 1674 through 29 September 1715)

by Philip Hines, Jr.

I have transcribed for publication the 3950 manuscript newsletters at the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, DC, called the "Newdigate Newsletters," for most of them were received by Sir Richard Newdigate (d. 1710), Arbury, Warwickshire. (The Folger Library's call numbers for the letters start at L. c. 1 and end at L. c. 3950, and this reference system is used in my edition to number the letters.) They date from 13 January 1674 to 29 September 1715, and were issued on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays by the Secretary of State's office. The Newdigate series contains 127 newsletters from 1674 and, on average, about 146 letters per year between 1674 and 1683 and about 130 per year between 1704 and 1708 (and over 150 in 1709). The principal overseer and producer of these newsletters was Sir Joseph Williamson (knighted 1672), Undersecretary of State, 1660-74, Secretary of State, 1674-79; and Keeper of State Papers and of the Royal Library, 1661-1701.

These letters are valuable as primary sources, with much matter of interest on the Stuart courts and most European courts; on social, diplomatic, and military history; parliamentary news; commercial and maritime relations, particularly with the colonies in North America and the Indies, West and East.

They have many, many ships' names. They report on the whole history of the Popish Plot. They have 17 items, from 29 December to 15 March, on activities on the River Thames during the Great Frost of 1683-84. They comment on nearly every event of the time, including much on Louis XIV's court, the honoring of Marlborough after the Battle of Blenheim, the Act of Union with Scotland, Anne's death and the tributes paid her, the dismissals of Oxford and Bolingbroke (and Bolingbroke's flight), and, as though to put a period to its own era, Louis XIV's death--15 letters from the end of the series. They cast light on the early history of the press in England. Indeed, they cover all the period from the last 11 years of Charles II to the first months of George I, a time when newsletters began in Britain on a regular basis and then became the most important medium for domestic news, their spread much stimulated by the coming of the penny post in 1680.

My intention has been to let the worth of these unedited letters speak for itself, to change as little of the original spelling and punctuation as possible so as to preserve content, style, tone, and linguistic integrity. In fact, this edition began as an aid to readers of the letters. The collection is readable and clear in such a printed form. I have thus made a good road through the often

difficult, crowded, and faded "terrain" of the many handwritings, enabling a reader to examine not eight or ten letters per day but many more. Until recently few readers could find a sufficient number of newsletters to study the genre; now this edition will make a large, important collection both accessible and easy to read.

The newsletters were usually written on three sides of a bifolium--first recto, then first verso, then second recto. The clerk next turned the sheet sideways and filled the left margins of the three surfaces in inverse order, ending on the first recto (except in the few cases when letters continued through the upper third or--rarely--upper half of the second verso. He then folded the letter in thirds and addressed it to Newdigate on the (usually) blank second verso.

The Newdigate series has perhaps 40 to 50 different handwritings. One—"Ra: Hope"--prevails through #250; another clearer, easier-to-read hand prevails from #548 (8 November 1677) to #962 (17 July 1680), and from #1467 (22 December 1683) to #2070 (20 March 1690), almost half the letters before 1692. Handwritings continue to change fairly often until the end.

With regard to the letters' appearance and paleography, a relatively few have salutations (usually "Sr" or "Sir," often elaborately written). Sentences in the letters frequently lack terminal punctuation (I observe an interval of two spaces between sentences). They do have paragraphing, but they frequently do not indent at the beginning of letters and at the start of a paragraph at the top of a verso or new folio. Usually letters are written by a single scribe, but in a few cases changes come within a letter, though seldom more than once. Some evidence emerges that letters were at least slightly edited, for at times a word is added or an error corrected in another contemporary hand. Redundant passages occur sometimes in the series. When a whole letter, a paragraph, or a sizable part (usually three or more lines) is identical with or very similar to an earlier part, I so note and omit the repetition (an example is in Letter 56.) Dates on the letters are all old style.¹

The Newdigate newsletters have fifteen temporal gaps, from a month to almost four years in length:

- 22 May-23 June 1674;
- 11 December 1684-18 February 1686 except for one letter on 9 January 1686;
- 24 March-23 October 1688;
- 26 September 1689-10 November 1691 except for single letters on 16 and 30 January, 20 March 1690, and 7 February 1691;
- 7 January-4 June 1692
- 23 June-20 August 1692;
- 23 March 1697-18 January 1701;
- 20 March 1701-30 May 1704 except for an undated letter and other single letters on 5 July 1701, 14 May, 9 July, 20 August, and 13 and 20 October 1702;

- 27 June-19 September 1704;
- 2 February-30 March 1706;
- 8 May-1 July 1707;
- 6 September 1707-10 February 1708 except for single letters on 8 October and 6 December 1707 and two letters on 1 January 1708;
- 30 July-17 September 1709;
- 22 December 1709-2 April 1712 except for single letters on 16 March and 8 June 1710 and an undated letter; and
- 11 August-15 October 1713.

By comparison, the Newdigate letters cover more years than do the series received and collected by Narcissus Luttrell and deposited at All Soul's College, Oxford, which extends from late September 1678 to 1 April 1714 (see *Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs*, 6 vols. [Oxford, 1857; reprinted, Wilmington, Delaware, 1974]). The two series have many news items that are similar but never identical. Luttrell's are usually briefer, less specific, and often of later date, at times appearing to be from the same source as Newdigate's but edited. Also, gaps occur in both series. Luttrell's work has only two such gaps, 31 March 1711-1 January 1712 and 9 February 1712-25 March 1714. But, since Luttrell's series has entries for only 17 days in January and early February 1712 and four days in late March 1714, its coverage in effect ends with 31 March 1711. (Similarly, the two largest gaps in Newdigate, March 1697-January 1701 and March 1701-late May 1704, connected by only the 26 letters of early 1701 and seven others through May 1704, make a "crater" of more than seven years in this series.) Of course, both works have dozens of smaller gaps.

Furthermore, as to two gaps in Newdigate cited above, the second shows that the collection is silent upon the last two months of Charles II's reign, his final illness and death, and the first year of James II's reign. Even so, more than 340 letters date from within James's rule, and the letters always feature the reigning monarch first of all. And a note in Newdigate's hand on the second verso of Letter 230 shows that he knew of the first gap: "R. H. Newes being a transcript of Sr Joseph Williamson from ye 13 of Jan: 73/4 at wch time I began to have them untill the 1st of Oct 75. but many are wanting viz all May June 74 & Mar. 75 and many others." But this note raises confusion too: the collection has ten letters from May 1674 (two each on 2 and 9 May) and three from late June. From March 1675 the collection has 14 letters (two on 18 March) with only a four-day gap; from March 1676—which is later than the last date in the note—it has 11 letters (two on 4 March) and a six-day gap; even in March 1673 it has 11 letters (two on 14 March) and a four-day and an eight-day gap.

Other good points are made in the next six paragraphs and the list of letters per month from the Folger Library's brief "Key" to the series:

That these were at the beginning the official Newsletter of Sir Joseph Williamson is shown by the pencilled note in Sir Richard

Newdigate's hand on the verso of L. c. 230, 28 Sep. 1675. That at least two other newsletters are included is suggested by the following evidence:

a. Letters of Henry Muddiman: L. c. 1411, 2 Aug. 1683 gives proof through the note on its verso that Sir Richard [Newdigate] also subscribed to the letters of his personal friend, Muddiman. (The Whitehall heading is, in itself, sufficient identification.) These letters ran regularly for . . . several months. Now and then they appear at other times . . . as may be seen in . . . L. c. 2317, 28 Apr. 1694. . . .

b. In 1708 and 1709 a second series of letters appears once again. Letters received during that period were dated and identified on the verso, one of the following codes being usual: nNL, oNL, WNL, DNL. On L. c. 3271 and 3272, however, is found "6 nov 1708 News old" and "Nov 6: 1708 new N'let." News old is equal to oNL which . . . is equal to W[for Williamson]NL. The identification of the DNL is still in doubt, at least from the evidence of the letters alone.

Williamson's letters were franked, while those of "D" were paid.

That the newsletters were usually sent out with a one page printed advice ("The Gazette"?--see L. c. 2360. . . the only printed matter in the collection) is easily seen by the frequency of faint fresh ink transfers on the first page.

Ordinarily . . . 12, 13, or 14 [letters were sent] each month. In some periods two were occasionally sent on the same day, and for a time during 1708 and 1709 this became common practice (there being 22 letters each for June and October 1708). In all parts of the 42-year span there were small irregularities in the spacing. . . . also, letters appear to have been lost, so that there are many gaps. . . . It is impossible to determine how many of these losses occurred after Newdigate received the letters and how many, if any, resulted from loss in transit. It is possible also that for some periods, long or short, the letters were not sent. There are indications, however, that losses did occur after receipt. The total of the gaps may be appreciated by calculating that 13 letters per month would have amounted to 6500 letters over the whole period, while what we have are 3950, or approximately 60 percent.

Much work need be done to sort out the relations of the different extant series of newsletters. To my mind, if the heading "Whitehall" safely identifies Henry Muddiman's newsletters (this is noted in several sources, as by Joseph George Muddiman below), then in this edition five early letters--239 and 240, 19 and 21 October 1675; 331, 3 June 1676; 416, 30 December 1676; and 464, 17 April 1677--are his. Other letters through 464 have only a date at the top. From that point through 751, 24 February 1679, more than two-thirds (about 195) of the letters are headed "Whitehall." Then "Whitehall" disappears, with

no change in handwriting at first, and is not used for four and a half years. Nearly all letters from 800 to 960 are headed "London"; handwritings then change, but "London" heads nearly all letters through 2100. However, from 1411, 2 August 1683, a Thursday, until the next 7 February Sir Richard received on Thursdays letters headed "Whitehall" with the "W" written elaborately. In fact, from 25 October to 20 December 1683 the series has only letters so headed, including one--1460, 10 November, a Saturday. These 29 letters, in my opinion, are the most likely of all to be Muddiman's.

The *Calendar of State Papers Domestic* has a small collection of Greenwich Hospital newsletters of the same date as Newdigate's with items on some of the same subjects, but seldom in the same order. Greenwich's are usually fuller and more detailed, often by a small degree. The notice on Thomas Hobbes's death is a good example, but here Greenwich is much fuller:

Greenwich, 11 December 1679: Last Thursday the famous Mr Hobbs of Malmesbury died at the Duke of Devonshire's house at Hardwick, much in the same humour as he lived, his last words being said to be that he waited for the coming of the carrier, Death, and that he had been fourscore and twelve years in looking for a hole to go out of the world, he being 92.

Newdigate (dated 9 December in letter): mr Hobbs the Reputed Atheist died last night Aged 92 much in the same Humour as he lived.

Greenwich has more military and government news. (Curiously, on the four days in September 1683 that both series have letters, Greenwich has two on 1 September, Newdigate two each on the other three days.) In some letters the wording is very close:

Greenwich, 31 May 1684: A false report having been spread that his Majesty designed speedily to call a parliament and that thereon many gentlemen had made interest in order to their being elected, his Majesty has commanded circular letters to be sent to all the Lords Lieutenant

Newdigate: A false Report having been spread Abt the Country that his Matye designed speedily to Call A Parliamt & that thereupon many Gent had Made Interest in order to their being Elected his Maty hath Comanded Circular letters to be sent to all the Ld Lieutenants

Greenwich, 14 June 1684: Sir Thomas Armstrong was this day brought to the King's Bench bar. His warrant of commitment was read and he commanded to hold up his hand and required what he had to say why execution should not be awarded against him, he being outlawed for high treason

Newdigate: This day Sr Tho: Armstrong was brought to the Kings bench barr & bid to hold up his hand which he did & Required what he had to say

why Execution should not be awarded Agt him he being outlawed for
Treason

Greenwich, 10 July 1684: Holland letters say that the States of Friesland have recalled their troops of repetition into their province and, having by a public edict disbanded them for not coming, the States have sent a deputy to them to represent the dangerous consequence

Newdigate: Our Holland letters say that the states of ffreizland have Recalled the Troops of their Repairition [*sic*] into their Province & by Publick Edict have disbanded them for not Comeing but the states Genll have sent A deputy to them to Represent the dangerous Consequences

(Passages from Newdigate above have the same dates as matching passages from Greenwich.) The two series at times help to fill each other's gaps—insofar, of course, as letters in the two collections are equivalent. From February to December 1685, in James II's reign (and in Newdigate's Gap 2), the *Calendar* has 16 Greenwich letters (at 13 letters per month, 115 letters shy of filling this gap). In 1686-87 Newdigate fills Greenwich's gaps in 17 places, in autumn 1686 doing so with 22 consecutive letters. In another case (26 March-14 September 1689), in William and Mary's reign, Newdigate fills in with 66 letters. Then in Newdigate's Gap 4 (26 September 1689-10 November 1691), as if in reply, Greenwich has 66 letters but with gaps (since at full these months would have over 330 letters). In 1692 until August, Newdigate has two gaps, then 18 letters for the rest of the year. For all 1692 Greenwich has one letter in November and one in December; Newdigate has none on either date.

In 1693 Newdigate is all but complete; Greenwich has only 12 letters from August through December. Newdigate fills nearly all these gaps; on two dates, when it has no letters, it has earlier and later letters that fill the gaps. In 1694-95 Greenwich has 56 letters and in all months but one in 1694 and three in 1695. Newdigate has letters on all these dates except one and intervening letters that close the gaps. After November 1695 Greenwich letters disappear. The *Calendar* has "news-letters" that are not similar to Newdigate or Greenwich, but are extracts of letters mostly from Williamson's associates. And so for the rest of William III's tenure (he died in March 1702) and into Anne's until October 1705, when State Papers of her reign cease to be calendared. Gap 7, Newdigate's largest (almost 46 months), starts in March 1697; then comes Gap 8, the next largest (38 months), which ends just before June 1704. I find nothing on Newdigate or Greenwich or newsletters like theirs before calendaring ends. The *Calendar* resumes in 1714 (Anne died that year). I have read a typescript volume, "George I, 1714-19," with captions and summaries but not whole papers through September 1715, when Newdigate ends, and also find no mention of either series. ([The paragraph's references are] *Charles II*, 21, 1 January 1679-31 August 1680, 308; 27, 1 May 1684-5 February 1685, 39, 54, 92-93.)

Surprisingly little has been published about this and other manuscript newsletters. The *Calendar of State Papers Domestic* for the first 21 years of the

Newdigate series has newsletters from another series with parallels to Newdigate. More recent works that comment on newsletters have other good information and perspectives (one claims that newsletters began in Germany in the 1500s): a biography of Sir Richard with much matter from this series; three works on Henry Muddiman, perhaps the best writer of newsletters, 1667-89; a life of Richard Legh of Lyme and his family that discusses newsletters, 1679-1715, at Lyme; a surprising offer of 178 Restoration newsletters for sale in 1934; a work on the gathering of official intelligence by the two Secretaries of State and their correspondents (especially Williamson's); two articles on the newswriter John Dyer (d. 1713); and five articles that record and annotate items on the theater, actors, playwrights, and entertainments from the collection.

Still, newsletters of the time deserve more attention, especially for their evidentiary and corroborative value. Newsletters *are* part of the history of journalism. More work is needed on the several--perhaps many--collections to show their similarities and differences. Muddiman's and Dyer's careers alone cover nearly all the years of the Newdigate series. Fundamental questions include how newswriters directed their news at particular subscribers? For another, are other newsletters from the same week as nearly akin as those that I have compared?

The practice of writing and sending newsletters dates back to the 1500s. Agnes Leigh has noted that the German banking family of Fugger in Augsburg in the 1500s and 1600s, financiers to the powerful, with branches in large European cities, employed newsletters. Newsletters in England continued well after the Newdigate series ends, for Leigh published excerpts from "under fifty" newsletters at Stoneleigh Abbey that are dated in the first seven months of 1728 ("Some Old Newsletters," *National Review*, 85 [August 1925], 911-26).

In December 1859 John Gough Nichols writing to *Notes and Queries*, considers it well known that before printed newspapers were common, professional scribes in London sent out newsletters by the post to subscribers. The country squire read it, lent the sheet to family and friends, "the parson, the doctor, and the more curious of his tenants," among whom it was read for perhaps days. Nichols has two parcels of such letters (from 1681-83 and 1691), their contents much resembling those of newspapers of the time. He asks if any such letters survive ("Manuscript News Letters," *Notes and Queries*, 2nd series, 8 [1859], 450-51).

Lady Newdigate-Newdegate's *Cavalier and Puritan in the Days of the Stuarts* (London, 1901), a life of Sir Richard Newdigate, uses his diary and account books, but for her the newsletters date from only 1675 to 1712. After citing "momentous events" from 1685, a year of "overwhelming interest to Protestant England," she explains Gap 2: "Charles II's sudden illness on . . . February 2, ending in his death four days later; James's accession to the throne; the subsequent risings in Scotland and England . . . by the Earl of Argyle and the Duke of Monmouth; their speedy suppression; the capture of the two leaders, followed by their death upon the scaffold. . . . It was probably . . . necessary precaution" that he kept no newsletters then. With "his pronounced opinions and well-known championship of . . . Monmouth, [Sir Richard] could hardly have escaped being a marked man. . . . Suspicion was rife on all sides, and . . . warned by previous experience," he may have feared a raid on his

papers. She also regrets Gap 3 (of seven months in 1688): "In this last year of James II's reign we are left in ignorance of the newsmen's version of the crisis. . . . They give us no subtle indications of the slumberous discontent which was shortly to be roused" and which ended the Stuart kings' rule. "Nor have we any record of the . . . Prince of Wales [and] . . . disbelief in [his] genuineness." She notes that, not until October when Prince William arrived "with a small following, to be rapidly increased . . . [do] the news-letters recommence" (*Cavalier and Puritan*, x, 263-64, 264-65).

The identification of Williamson as a central figure in the British government's newsletter enterprise dates back to early in the twentieth century. To support his showing some newsletters and other letters of 1664-65 in March 1915, E. P. Merritt reports that they were sent out by Williamson (*Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, 18 [1915], 69-71). Clerks in his paper office copied and mailed the letters to subscribers and persons in English ports who sent back news from their area. Letters went out thrice a week and were long (with news of a week) or short (with news of two days). Even with the prevalence of printed news, the latter half of the 1600s had much activity in newsletters, which were of more interest than the prints. "The news-letters are in miniature a very fine prototype of the modern newspaper, containing Parliamentary news, reports of criminal trials, of cases of conspiracy and non-conformity, and of libel suits, news of shipping, both domestic and foreign, war reports, and even society items."

While Sir Joseph Williamson was over time the principal "publisher" of the letters received by Newdigate, some of the newsletters within this series can be characterized as coming from Henry Muddiman, often credited as the main gatherer and distributor of news during much of the Restoration. Henry Muddiman was researched early in the last century by Joseph George Muddiman. In "Newsbooks and Letters of News of the Restoration" (*English Historical Review*, 23 [1908], 252-76), J. G. Muddiman made several salient points about early newsletters and Henry Muddiman, frequently repeated by commentators on newsletters since. First, he stressed the importance to the manuscript newsletter of the House of Commons forbidding in June 1660 the printing of its votes or proceedings without special leave and order. Second, he noted the high cost of newsletters: the usual subscription price for newsletters in 1670 was five pounds a year, whereas newsbooks cost a penny per copy. But, third, in 1661 Muddiman was granted free postage for his letters, a boon to him that seems never to have been withdrawn. And he noted that a full collection of Muddiman's newsletters for 29 April 1667—12 October 1689, dated on alternate days, was archived in the Marquis of Bath's library at Longleat in 14 folio volumes, "some thousands of consecutive newsletters by one person." ("Newsbooks and Letters," 252, 263, 275.)

Writing under the pseudonym of J. B. Williams, in *A History of Journalism to the Foundation of the Gazette* (London, 1908), Joseph George Muddiman notes that after May 1661, Henry Muddiman was the "sole privileged journalist of the kingdom," and, from the start of the *Gazette* in the mid-1660s until he died, he was almost an institution. He thinks Henry Muddiman was little known in the early twentieth century because he was devoted to journalism and not a pamphleteer or

controversialist. More of his newsletters survive than all other contemporary newswriters' combined. Printed newsheets were of small value because they could not include votes or proceedings of the House of Commons without its special leave. So manuscript newsletters, free of this ban, grew apace, as did Muddiman's importance. Not until two years after his death were manuscript newsletters put under this stricture. Since newsletters' cost was dear, their circulation was restricted mostly to upper classes and coffee houses—another reason that they escaped the ban on Parliamentary news. Little political danger was feared from them. The author thinks that Muddiman's virtual monopoly of news earned him a good living. When Charles II became king, the Secretaries of State were Sir William Morice and Sir Edward Nicholas. Muddiman attached himself to Morice and his Undersecretary Williamson, to whom he gave domestic intelligence and from whom he had foreign news. Early in the reign Muddiman's copying clerks worked at the Seven Stars in the Strand, whence he sent out newsletters, heading them "Whitehall" to show his privilege of writing. Later his office was at the Peacock, also in the Strand. Williamson did not send out newsletters until after he and Muddiman quarreled in 1666. In 1662 Henry Bennet (later Earl of Arlington) became a principal Secretary of State, Williamson remaining as Undersecretary. A fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, Williamson succeeded Arlington as Secretary in 1674. He was the son of a north-country clergyman and was a very able businessman who kept all his letters and papers. He left behind a mass of papers in the State Papers that show his complex relations with Muddiman. Williamson was a self-advancer who valued Henry Muddiman's work and the use it could be in his own political and social rise. Until 1665 Muddiman sent out his letters at Williamson's direction. But in early 1666 Muddiman moved his enterprise to the other Secretary of State and had his mail addressed to John Cooke, the other Undersecretary, because of an intrigue by Williamson and a clerk, John Hikes. Muddiman was prepared and was ready to leave. An earlier attempt to stop his correspondence had failed. According to J. G. Muddiman, Henry Muddiman's work on the *Gazette*, which HM helped to found (and edited until the break with Williamson), was secondary to his newsletters, for which he was known long after he died. (*A History of Journalism to the Foundation of the Gazette*, 1908, pp. 176, 182-84, 188-89, 193, 197.)

J. G. Muddiman later published *The King's Journalist, 1650-1689: Studies in the Reign of Charles II* (London, 1923; reprinted New York, 1971). He stresses Henry Muddiman's support from the king, evident in his sole use of the heading "Whitehall," reserved for him. He discusses Muddiman's relations with Williamson. He notes that Muddiman kept his monopoly on written news until the end of 1687 and that the collection at Longleat "is the only complete record extant of the reigns of the last two Stuart kings"; he ranks Muddiman's work among the most valuable records of James II's reign. Since almost no State Papers survive for that reign, newsletters for those three years "ought to be printed almost in their entirety." Up to the Revolution of 1688 the *Gazette* has little domestic news; "Muddiman's newsletters took its place." Newsletters competed well and long with printed news, particularly the *Gazette*, because (again) of the ban on Parliamentary news. (*King's Journalist*, 1971, vi, 125, 187n, 195, 204, 207, 245.)

An early discussion of another newsletter series appears in Lady Newton's *Lyme Letters, 1660-1760* (London, 1925), a life of Richard Legh (1634-87), his wife Elizabeth, and family. The author identifies in footnotes almost everyone the Leghs meet at home or in London. She quotes from 22 London newsletters at Lyme. The oldest, 8 April 1679, has an item on the bill of attainder against the Earl of Danby. Newdigate letter 770, 10 April 1679, in an item also dated 8 April, has the same matter. But the closest parallel in the two series is from 14 April 1709. The Lyme letter reads: "His Grace the Duke of Marlborough has got a grant of the Spring Gardens near St James's adjoining to the Parke, where he designs this summer to begin the Building of a stately Palace of 16 rooms on a floor." Newdigate letter #3366 of that date has the same sentence. Five more newsletters at Lyme (30 December 1704, 21 August 1705, 22 November 1712, and 31 March and 19 July 1715) have clear but less-close parallels to Newdigate letters of similar date; accounts in Lyme in fact are often fuller and more specific than Newdigate's. Of Lyme newsletters that have no parallel with Newdigate, 11 date from within gaps in Newdigate, five (and an item from Luttrell) being from Gap 7 in Newdigate, 1697-1701. (*Lyme Letters*, 106, 231, 229, 230, 237, 263, 267, 107, 186, 204, 277.)

The author of "Newsletters and Early Newspapers," *TLS*, 11 January 1934, p. 32, is surprised that three series of Restoration newsletters are listed in Birrell and Garnett's recent sale catalogue: "Such newsletters are of the greatest rarity: only a very small number could have been written and sent out . . . and few of these, except those in the Public Record Office and one or two . . . large public libraries can still be extant. They are important for recording Court and Parliamentary intelligence...and for their considerable influence on the form of later newspapers." The series are: 40 weekly newsletters, 30 March-28 December 1672, probably from Williamson's office to Sir Willoughby Aston, £52 10s.; 25 professional thrice-weekly newsletters, 11 December 1688-14 February 1689, of unknown origin, 15 guineas; 113 thrice-weekly newsletters, 27 March-25 December 1690, to Sir Willoughby, £42. Regional interest in the Aston newsletters led R. S. B. to note the sale in "The Aston Hall Newsletters," *Cheshire Sheaf*, 29 (May 1934), 35. Besides quoting from the catalogue, the author discusses their contents, especially as to Sir Willoughby and Cheshire, and observes that it was only by subscribing to such letters that Sir Willoughby kept abreast of news in London.

In *The Intelligence of the Secretaries of State, 1660-1688* (Cambridge, 1956), Peter Fraser writes that the value of newsletters is that "they record the immediate reaction of the Secretaries or their subordinates to the events of the day." Until 1688 the Secretaries had a monopoly of licensed news, and up to 1676 only official newsletters circulated, "each Secretary sending about a hundred . . . per week to a select list of domestic and foreign correspondents." Henry Muddiman was famous as the most reliable source of news, many people taking him in error as an independent journalist. Fraser remarks that "Williamson repaid his correspondents in kind" by having a newsletter that took the best from the weekly letters of some 50 correspondents "from all over the kingdom, added news of his own such as official appointments and parliamentary proceedings, employed . . . four or five clerks to multiply the copy . . . and sent out these newsletters every week as a 'quid pro quo' to

all his correspondents and to . . . 'country friends,' who [paid] . . . for the privilege." Money thus raised covered the wages and upkeep of the office. So profit was no motive; the "chief purpose was to get intelligence, not to sell it." The best news usually went to the newsletters to raise their value in exchange for other (especially foreign) newsletters. Abraham Casteleyn, founder of the *Haarlem Gazette*, put his best domestic news in newsletters and sent copies only to foreign newswriters who he thought could "send him a newsletter of equal quality." In fall 1674 Henry Ball, manager of Williamson's paper office, had four clerks who on post days copied letters. Each man prepared some with a week's news and other short letters "with two days' news for [recipients of] three newsletters weekly." Late at night the letters were sent with a list of addressees to the Post Office. Fraser counts the domestic correspondents in 1667-69 as including 37 "Lieutenants and titled persons in the counties who wrote only on extraordinary occasions and paid . . . for the newsletters"; 35 "Customs officers, naval storekeepers, and others in the ports"; 23 "Postmasters and others inland"; 9 "Governors of garrisons, commanders of fleets, etc"; 9 of "Williamson's personal friends"; 6 "Privy Councillors and office-holders in London" and about three other unidentified persons. Fraser notes that after 1676 newsletters grew in volume and were sold by professional writers, which the Secretaries tried to stop together with unlicensed prints that spread with the Popish Plot. Whig newsletters (that sprang up at the time) "were in general restricted to much the same classes who paid for the Secretaries' newsletters, the nobility and gentry in the counties, and the merchants, lawyers, and professional men in the City. The exception was that Whig newsletters were also by then bought by London coffeehouses and "reached a wide general public." (*The Intelligence of the Secretaries of State, 1660-1688*, 1-2, 8, 28, 30, 32-33, 34, 40, 44, 127.)

Henry L. Snyder in "Dyer's News Letters—A New Source for the Study of the Early Augustan Period," *Books and Libraries at the University of Kansas*, 2, no. 6 (1965), 1-5, records the acquisition by the University of Kansas Library of microfilms of two large runs of John Dyer's newsletters and another run (the Newdigate series at the Folger Library). "[W]e now have the most complete collection of *Dyer's News Letters* in existence in one repository...well over a thousand in all." Dyer was a well-known, even notorious (and "remarkably accurate") Tory newswriter from soon after the Revolution of 1688 until he died. He was indicted several times "for sedition, for writing false news, for breach of parliamentary privilege and other misdemeanours" but never silenced. He tangled with Daniel Defoe in print, but both agreed in 1710 not to use each other's names in their publications. After Dyer died, Defoe in fact helped to put out some of the letters, which appear to have ceased by 1715 (3, 4). Snyder returned to Dyer and his newsletters in "Newsletters in England, 1689-1715, with Special Reference to John Dyer--A Byway in the History of England," in *Newsletters to Newspapers: Eighteenth-Century Journalism*, ed. by Donovan H. Bond and William R. McLeod (Morgantown, WV 1977), 3-19. Here he adds that Dyer lived about 60 years, was well known by 1693, and that the Newdigate collection has more than 150 of his newsletters (4, 5, 7).

Newsletters have also received scholarly attention as resources for theater

history. Edward A. Langhans in "Theatrical References in the Greenwich Hospital Newsletters," uses three Greenwich newsletters to help date four play performances in London in January 1682 (*Notes and Queries*, n.s., 11, no. 3 [1964], 338). Even earlier, John Harold Wilson published two articles in *Theatre Notebook*, "Theatre Notes from the Newdigate Newsletters," 15, no. 3 (1961), 79-84, and "More Theatre Notes from the Newdigate Newsletters," 16, no. 2 (1961-62), 59. Wilson noted a total of 59 references to the theater, actors, playwrights, and entertainments of the time. I have followed with three articles in *Theatre Notebook*, noting a total of 237 such entries, including 26 from Luttrell: "Theatre Items from the Newdigate Newsletters," 39, no. 2 (1985), 76-83; "More Theatre Items from the Newdigate Newsletters," 49, no. 2 (1995), 91-98; and "New Theatre Items from the Newdigate Newsletters," 56, no. 3 (2002), 143-55.

Notes

1. Advice and help have come to me from many friends, colleagues, and former students, all of which I gratefully acknowledge. I wish especially to thank Laetitia Yeandle, Manuscript Curator Emerita at the Folger Library; Garland F. White III, former Director of the Computer-Based Laboratory for Instruction and Analysis at Old Dominion University; and Henry L. Snyder formerly of the University of California, Riverside, Director of The Eighteenth Century Short Title Catalogue—North America, for much very fundamental aid. I thank the Research Foundation and the Research and Publication Committees of the College of Arts and Letters and of the Department of English (all of Old Dominion University) for grants-in-aid in support of this project. And for their faithful and effective help in transcribing the letters I thank Eric Bing, Wayne E. Bowman, Kevin Farley, Frances Johnson, Daniel Martin, Gwen McAlpine, Alison Rand, Nancy Rector, and Mark Thorsen.

Paraklausithyron: Some Vestiges of a Forgotten Literary Genre in Seventeenth-and Eighteenth-Century Poetry

Hermann Josef Real

FOR LELAND PETERSON

Among the some two-hundred specimens listed by the bibliographers of literary genres, there is presumably more than a handful that have gone unnoticed.¹ Surely, the reasons for this absence are manifold: lack of popularity, low canonical prestige, blurred boundary lines, not to mention plain ignorance of historical fact, to name but a few. "There are still plenty of literary scholars around, who pretend that there is nothing but that [ancient trinity] of epic, dramatic, and lyric poetry," the German historian of genre poetics, Friedrich Sengle, grumbled, and rightly so, some

50 years ago; a view that has more recently been endorsed by the perhaps most eminent of all genre theorists, Alastair Fowler: "Since [traditional genre poetics] deals with a very small repertoire of modes, it has tended to narrow the literary canon."² Of course, this is not to deny the very grave problems any genre poetics is confronted with. These problems have in many cases given rise to acute terminological hassles, and they have at times also occasioned a resistance to all conceptual and classificatory efforts claiming more general validity; in fact, in some cases, they have turned out to be so serious, historically and logically, that they may be impossible to overcome.

However, all these difficulties notwithstanding, if it is time "to enlarge the critical repertoire: to recover a sense of the *variety* of literary forms" (Fowler, v, my emphasis). I may be able to make a contribution, however small and insignificant. My case study is the ancient genre of *paraklausithyron*, for which not even a name seems to exist in either English or any other modern language.³ *Paraklausithyron*, "the Lament, or Complaint, before the Closed Door," deals with the theme of *exclusus amator*, the excluded lover, whose deplorable state and conduct were depicted by Lucretius (c.99-c.55 BC) in three pithy and precise lines in his famous attack on the nature of love in Book Four of *De rerum natura*:

At lacrymans exclusus Amator limina sæpe
Floribus & Sertis operit, posteisque superbos
Unguit Amaracino, & foribus miser oscula figit.

[Mean time excluded, and expos'd to cold,
The whining Lover stands before the Gates,
And there with humble adoration waits:
Crowning with flow'rs the threshold and the floor,
And printing kisses on th' obdurate door.⁴

Coined by Plutarch in the first century AD,⁵ the term, *paraklausithyron*, tends to veil the fact that by the time it was created the genre it signified was already some 400 years old.⁶ Two of its first poetic practitioners seem to have been Callimachos, the Alexandrian poet (c.310-240 BC), some of whose epigrams sketch lovers' troubles,⁷ and Theocritus (*fl.* c.270 BC), the father of pastoral poetry, who in two of his Idylliums, nos 3 and 23, deals with the theme of the excluded lover. Structurally and narratively, neither of these is paradigmatic for the future development of the genre, always excepting the thematic dichotomy of the cruel nymph and the excluded swain: on the whole, there is diversity as well as variety of tones and techniques. As Dryden's translation of Theocritus' twenty-third Idyllium, which he contributed to Jacob Tonson's second miscellany, *Sylvæ: or, The Second Part of Poetical Miscellanies* (1685), demonstrates (see *Poems of John Dryden*, ed. Kinsley, I:424-27 and IV:1955), the structure may be tripartite. The first part focuses on the cruelty of the nymph, who for a plethora of motives – pride and greed, contempt and scorn, love of freedom and downright shrewishness – refuses to admit the despairing lover to her room (ll. 1-30); the second contains the lover's dirge, his "lament before the

closed door," which ends with the swain's suicide and the nymph's punishment (ll. 31-109). Both parts are supplemented by a brief exhortatory moral: "Lovers farwell, revenge has reacht my scorn; / Thus warn'd, be wise, and love for love return" (ll. 110-11).⁸ This moral and the fact of the lover's death account for Theocritus' choice of distanced third-person narration, by which it is possible to chronicle events impassively.

Conversely, Francis Fawkes's rendering of Theocritus' third Idyllium later in the eighteenth century shows that the last part may be missing. In this more teasingly playful Idyll, a goatherd, who is both a participant in the scene and the scene's recorder, blends the praise of his cruel mistress Amaryllis' beauty with the promise of presents and love songs (ll. 1-84), yet distracted at the prospect of not obtaining her favours, dramatically and self-indulgently resolves to die: "Stretch'd near your grotto, when I've breath'd my last, / My flesh will give the wolves a rich repast" (ll. 85-86). In his learned headnote to this translation, which is annotated throughout, Fawkes was the first English critic to embed Theocritus' Idyll in its generic tradition: "This Idyllium affords us a specimen of ancient gallantry, namely, of the *paraklausithyron*, or mournful song, which excluded lovers used to sing at the doors of their mistresses." The lovers had, Fawkes continues, "two methods of performing this, one was to sing it as they lay on the ground" . . . [the other] was performed standing, and with great gesticulation of body, and motion of the feet . . . called *Comastes*, which signifies . . . a shepherd that dances and sings at the same time" (p. 179n*).

Horace (65-8 BC) was one among many in first-century Rome to try his hand at the *paraklausithyron*.⁹ In *Odes* III, 10 ("Extremum Tanain"), a densely learned and allusive poem of only 20 lines,¹⁰ he opted for the more serious tone of Theocritus' twenty-third Idyll, evoking many features of the generic stock as he went along: the juxtaposition of the cruel nymph and the despairing swain, the door as the byword for separation, the (pale-faced) lover's lament (l. 14), and, particularly, his complaints about the hardships of the inclement weather (ll. 6, 12, 17, 29).¹¹ Discredited though it may be,¹² Thomas Creech's translation of 1684 makes all this unmistakably clear:

Did *Lyde* Drink cold *Tanais* Flood,
A *Scythians* Bride that fed on Blood;
Yet would you grieve to see the Kind,
The constant *Horace* grasp the Floor,
Extended by thy cruel Door,
Expos'd to th' fury of the Native Wind.

Dost hear what Tempests beat thy Gate?
How all rush on as arm'd with Fate?
And how thy pleasing Groves are tost?
With what severe and piercing light
The Moon and Stars now guild the Night,
And glaze the scatter'd Snow with hoary Frost?

Thy haughty Pride and Scorn remove,
Ingrate and Enemy to Love;
My passions Tide may ebb again;
No *Scythian* Mother brought Thee forth,
And hardned by the freezing North,
That ardent Lovers thus should court in vain.

If all my Prayers and Gifts are weak,
Nor violent paleness of my Cheek
The Lover's Livery, can move;
If that thy Husband scorns thy Charms,
And takes a Songstress to his Arms,
Can n're provoke Thee to my firmer Love.

O stiff as Oaks to warm desire
Too hard to burn in my soft Fire,
As fierce as Snakes on *Lybian* Shore;
Tho now my patient side can bear
Thy Door, the Rain, and piercing Air,
Yet time will come when 'twill endure no more.¹³

At the same time, the speaker's coolly argumentative rhetoric especially in the two final stanzas ("If . . . If . . . If . . . time will come") seems to appeal more to the cruel nymph's reason than to her emotions, and it thus prepares the ground for the threat spelled out in the concluding lines; there is a limit to what the excluded lover is ready to take: "Non hoc semper erit liminis aut aquae / caelestis patiens latus [Not for ever will my body endure thy threshold or the rain of heaven]." In other words, Horace's Ode describes the excluded lover of old on the way to self-emancipation.¹⁴

Such a voice is rather unique in the chorus of Augustan poets. The majority of them do not seem eager to explore what a man will *not* do to please a carelessly cruel mistress. But they do seem eager to play with their generic material, modifying and transforming individual constituents, often in mischievous and mocking tones. A case in point is Catullus' *Carmen* 67, his *ianua* poem. Here, Catullus (c.84-c.54 BC) expanded the established repertoire, introducing several new elements. The most striking among these is the Personified Door, which assumes the part of protagonist and engages in an inquisitive dialogue with an anonymous passer-by, who may be an excluded lover or any other disappointed suitor or the poet himself. This interlocutor tries to confirm the rumours he claims to have heard about the life the adulterous mistress of the house is leading behind closed doors: "Dic agedum nobis, quare mutata feraris / In dominum veterem deseruisse fidem [Come tell us why you are said to be changed / and to have deserted your old faithfulness to your master]" (ll. 7-8).¹⁵

Stung by the insinuation that it is no longer fulfilling its customary function as Guardian of the House ("Ad me omnes clamant: ianua, culpa tuast [All of them . . . cry out to me, 'House-door, the fault is yours']" [l. 14]), the Door launches into an angry, self-justifying speech ("Non . . . / Culpa meast, quamquam dicitur esse mea [It

is not my fault, though it is said to be mine]" (ll. 9-10)), which at once snakes towards a *diffamatio*, a vilification, of the adulteress and a "Song of the Cuckold." Since the son turned out to be impotent, he had to submit to the role of the excluded lover, and the father usurped the place of the son (ll. 23-26): "[In Catullus' *ianua* poem, the Door] stands as the protector of good Roman morality, of the sanctity of marriage; it is the servant of the husband . . . It is morally in the right, and if the adulterer is to get past it, he must persuade [the door] to give up its position as faithful servant . . . to convince it to desert its duty, to play false to its position as loyal family retainer."¹⁶

In the following years, the *paraklausithyron* continued to thrive in Roman literature, and in a variety of forms and modes, too (see Copley, pp. 51-90). However, Catullus' *Carmen* 67 meant a shift in emphasis, involving as it did novel narrative features, such as dialogue and the Personified Door, and fresh thematic foci, such as adultery and cuckoldom. Many of these traits fascinated younger Roman elegists like Albius Tibullus (c.60-19 BC) and Sextus Propertius (c.50-c.16 BC). In his unusually long and complex *Elegy* "To Delia" (I, 2), a veritable omnium gatherum of "all the ideas and motifs suggested by his predecessors,"¹⁷ Tibullus, for one, retained the *vigilatio ad clausas fores*, the vigil before the closed door ("Nam posita est nostrae custodia saeva puellae, / Clauditur et dura ianua firma sera [For a cruel watch has been set upon my girl, / and the door is shut and bolted hard against me]" [ll. 5-6]), and the Personified Door itself as interlocutor among the *dramatis personae* of his *paraklausithyron* (ll. 7-14). Thematically, the poet invites his readers to imagine him engaged in a "true" adulterous love affair (ll. 15-23, 65-66), which entails the familiar moral, emotional, and practical conflicts of a triangular relationship between the poet, his beloved, and her cuckold of a stupid husband (ll. 43-60). He justifies this conduct with a paradoxical moral bound to have discredited all the ethical norms of his time: "Audendum est, fortes adiuvat ipsa Venus [Be bold: Venus herself aids the stout-hearted]" (l. 16). In other words, the "true" lover is alone committed not to Roman society but to Venus, the goddess of love (ll. 26-28, 35, 89-90, 97-98).¹⁸

The more serious Propertius, by contrast, shows himself unwavering in his faithfulness notwithstanding the dishonourable and demeaning conduct of his mistress. Thus, in the first part of *Elegy* I, 16 (ll. 9-16), he makes the Personified Door burst into a speech lamenting the lady's dissolute amorous life: "Nec possum infamis dominae defendere noctes / nobilis obscenis tradita carminibus; / Nec tamen illa suae revocatur parcere famae / turpior et saeculi vivere luxuria [Yet cannot I save my mistress from her nights of shame / But, once so noble, am now the prey of ribald rhymes. / Nor yet is she moved to repent and have pity on her fair fame, / and to cease from living more vilely than the vileness of a wanton age]" (ll. 9-12). In the second part (ll. 17-45), an excluded lover, presumably the poet himself, vilifies the Door, accusing it of even greater cruelty and indifference than the mistress (ll. 17-44). However, as the concluding lines of this tale of woe suggest (ll. 45-48), the poet-lover does not seem able to help himself:¹⁹ he continues in his vigils, turning the innocent figure of the threshold, or *limen*, into a symbol of loyalty and a synonym for true love (Copley, pp. 74-82).

Ovid, too, dealt with the various effects of love on men in a series of

paraklausithyra permeating his work, ranging from *Fasti* and *Remedia amoris* to *Amores* and *Ars amatoria*. Like many of his predecessors, Ovid not only shows a particular preoccupation with the figure of the door and its accompanying theme of *vigilatio*, he also contributed innovations to the established repertoire. In *The Art of Love*, for example, he proposed the idea that love too easily and too frequently granted was too much of a good thing. Therefore, Ovid advised, a complaint before the closed door might prove a useful tactic in a maneuver that was not only an erotic game but also an educational necessity, to make love an enduring experience:

Quod datur ex facile, longum male nutrit amorem:
 Miscenda est laetis rara repulse iocis.
 Ante fores iaceat, "crudelis ianua!" dicat,
 Multaqua summis, multa minantur agat . . .
 Hoc est, uxores quod non patiat amari:
 Conveniunt illas, cum voluere, viri;
 Adde forem, et duro dicat tibi ianitor ore
 "Non potes," exclusum te quoque tanget amor. (III, 579-82; 585-88)

[What is easily given ill fosters an enduring love;
 Let an occasional repulse vary your merry sport.
 Let him lie before your gate; let him cry "Ah, cruel door!"
 And play the suppliant oft, and oft the threatener . . .
 'Tis this which prevents wives from being loved:
 To them their husbands come whenever they will;
 Add but a door, and let a doorkeeper say to you with stubborn mouth,
 "You cannot"; once shut out, you too, sir, will be touched by love.]²⁰

Ovid is usually thought to be the last to have practised the genre in Latin literature, but that does not mean that it became extinct with him.²¹ Indeed, a century as learned in the Roman models, and as devoted to imitating them, as the English Augustan Age was bound to discover the potentialities of the genre at some stage, even if it has to be admitted that the dozen examples or so I have come across so far do not display the variety of structures, themes, and motifs shown by their classical pre-texts. My first example, Thomas Carew's "A Deposition from Love" (1640), is a fairly "pure" representative of the genre. In its first part, an excluded lover, now frightened off "at the gate," recollects the "Paradise within" he found in happier days (ll. 1-20), concluding on a conventional lover's lament: "Hard fate! To have been once possesst / As victor, of a heart, / Atchiev'd with labour, and unrest, / And then forc'd to depart" (ll. 21-24).²² Another is Robert Herrick's polished "Covenant or Protestation to Julia," published in the collection *Hesperides* of 1648. The generic resemblance with its Greek and Roman models seems faded at first sight, it is true, yet the poem does display a motif which associates it with the *paraklausithyron*. In a farewell scene, a lover, presumably the poet, tries to comfort his beloved's affliction at parting with a "second Protestation" of his "Vowe" (ll. 6-7):

Upon thy cheeke that spangel'd Teare,
 Which sits as Dew of Roses there:
 That Teare shall scarce be dri'd before
 Ile kisse the Threshold of thy dore. (ll. 8-11)²³

Herrick both inverts and endorses his repertoire here. He inverts the tradition by transforming the *excluded* lover into a lover who has to leave and who thus *excludes himself* from his beloved's presence; he endorses it by incorporating the one symbol of Propertius' love for Cynthia, the *limen*, or threshold, which, in Propertius, "stands for the perfect loyalty of wife to husband" (Copley, pp. 74-78). The poet's promise that he will hasten to kiss it on his return is symbolic evidence of this faithfulness. The particular charm of kissing in this instance appears to be that it has a future.²⁴

This is unfortunately not the case in Matthew Prior's delightful epigram, "POOR Hall caught his Death," which shows Prior's ever ready wit and admirable technique²⁵ and in which the generic similarities become more graphic, too. This epigram parodies both the folly of love and the tripartite (Theocritean) model in which this used to be articulated. Here, in a *vigilatio ad clausas fores*, a desperate swain is waiting before the closed doors of Nanette, the nut-brown maid, and in inclement weather, too, ostensibly with the plea to his insouciant mistress to relent:

POOR Hall caught his Death standing under a Spout
 Expecting till Midnight when Nan wou'd come out
 But fatal his Patience as cruel the Dame,
 And curst was the Rain that extinguisht this flame.

Not only do all the swain's endeavors prove to be in vain, they even have "fatal" consequences. These are addressed in the concluding mock-*adhortatio* to all survivors: "Who e'er thou art that reads these Mortal Lines / Make Love at Home, and go to Bed betimes." Remarkably, this little *paraklausithyron* was set to music at least twice later in the eighteenth century.²⁶ Thus, it would have been sung in all sorts of places and on all sorts of social occasions, making sure that the written text also enjoyed an afterlife in oral presentation.

My final example, Rochester's tripartite "Letter from Artemisa in the Town to Chloe in the Country" (1674), is more serious, and more complex, in intent and orientation.²⁷ Here, the *paraklausithyron* is not an independent poem but a constituent within a larger whole. The most arresting section of this misogynist satire, in which a woman-speaker, the sharp-sighted moralist Artemisa, turns out to be womankind's own most scathing critic, is Artemisa's narration of the Fine Lady's monologue (ll. 73-188), in which this Lady Vulgarly defends her marriage to "a diseased, hard-favoured fool" (l. 84) "on the ground that men of wit demand to know things as they really are whereas fools admire appearances." (Wilmot, ed. Ellis, p. 345.) As the sneering mimicry of her fashionable "polite conversation" and beau-monde manners makes manifest, this monologue is "a fastidious aristocrat's"²⁸ *mise en scène* mercilessly exploding the hypocrisy and immorality of Restoration society as well as "the disillusioned and cynical view of love" that went along with it.²⁹

Generically, the Fine Lady's monologue is a paradoxical encomium,³⁰ a panegyric of the foolish husband, all the more paradoxical as it is delivered by an unreliable speaker. Thematically, the eulogy utilizes two motifs associated with the tradition of the *paraklausithyron*. The first is that of the foolish husband, which is familiar from Tibullus, for example, and which is here fused with the second, that of the *exclusus amator*. Immediately, on arrival in town, the Fine Lady makes sure to dispose of her "humble knight" (l. 74):

As the coach stopped, we heard her voice, more loud
 Than a great-bellied woman's in a crowd,
 Telling her knight that her affairs require
 He for some hours obsequiously retire.
 I think she was ashamed to have him seen
 (Hard fate of husbands): the gallant had been,
 Though a diseased, hard-favoured fool, brought in.
 "Dispatch," says she, 'that business you pretend,
 That beastly visit to your drunken friend.
 A bottle ever makes you look so fine,
 Methinks I long to smell you stink of wine . . .
 Prithee, farewell, we'll meet again anon.'
 The necessary thing bows and is gone. (ll. 78-92)

Of course, the theme of the excluded lover is not presented here pure and unalloyed. For the first time, the exclusion is not a *fait accompli*, not an event of the narrative past, which may then be followed by a vilification of the cruel nymph and the lover's lament. Opting for the rhetorical device of eyewitness account, Rochester rather narrates it *in the act of happening*: the Fine Lady's "gallant" is not an *excluded* lover, he *is being excluded* as a lover and, in a revolting reversal of the theriophilic paradox, replaced by Lady Vulgaritas's "dear friend, the monkey" (l. 138): "The dirty, chattering monster she embraced, / And made it this fine tender speech at last: / 'Kiss me, thou curious miniature of man, / How odd thou art, how pretty, how japan! / Oh, I could live and die with thee'" (ll. 141-45). At the same time, the eyewitness perspective accounts for the disappearance of the lover's lament in the poem. After his expulsion, he is not heard of any more, and Artemisa lapses into silence about him: nothing remains for her to say, in more senses of the word than one.

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster

Notes

1. See, for the "established" canon, Wolfgang Ruttowski, *Bibliographie der Gattungspoetik/Bibliography of the Poetics of Literary Genres* (München: Max Hueber, 1973), which lists some 140 genres. This figure has to be supplemented by a great variety of at least 80 "minor" genres; see Fritz Nies and Jürgen Rehbein, eds., *Genres mineurs: Texte zur Theorie und Geschichte nichtkanonischer Literatur* (vom

16. *Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart*) (München: W. Fink, 1978). Also, I would like to thank "my people" at the Ehrenpreis Centre: Sandra Simon and Ulrich Elkmann, for their assistance, and that *vir bonus eruditusque*, Professor Alfons Weische, Department of Classics, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, for setting me on course bibliographically.

2. Friedrich Sengle, *Vorschläge zur Reform der literarischen Formenlehre*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1969), p. 7; Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), p. v. (Hereafter cited as "Fowler.")

3. For my purposes here, it is not necessary to enlarge on the controversial issue whether *paraklausithyron* constitutes a fully developed genre or whether it is merely "a motif, theme, or story" that may appear in any genre "that can have love as its subject" (Frank O. Copley, *"Exclusus Amator": A Study in Latin Love Poetry*, Philological Monographs Published by the American Philological Association, no. 17 (1956), p. 1 (cited hereafter as "Copley"). I prefer to see it as a poetic genre inasmuch as conventions of narrative, structure, and theme are involved and have to be considered. However, that does not rule out that *paraklausithyra* were occasionally incorporated into plays or other kinds of poetry, and were thus modified in due course.

4. Quoted from *Titi Lucretii Cari De rerum natura libri sex*, ed. Thomas Creech (Oxford: A. Swall and T. Child, 1695), p. 244 (IV, 1171-74), with translation from *The Poems of John Dryden*, ed. James Kinsley, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970 [1958]), I:417-18, ll. 170-74. I have preferred Dryden's smooth and elegant translation to Creech's metrically and syntactically somewhat cumbersome lines (see *Titus Lucretius Carus, His Six Books of Epicurean Philosophy Done into English Verse, with Notes*, 3rd ed. [London: A. Stephens, 1683], p. 136).

5. See "The Dialogue on Love," *Plutarch's Moralia* (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1961), IX:331 (753 B).

6. In what follows, I am indebted, in addition to the full and comprehensive account by Copley (note 4), to Erich Burck's charming lecture, "Das *Paraklausithyron*: die Entwicklungsgeschichte eines Motivs der antiken Liebesdichtung," *Vom Menschenbild in der römischen Literatur: ausgewählte Schriften*, I (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1966), 244-56. For the beginner, I recommend the helpful and informative entry on *paraklausithyron* by H. A. G. in *Der Neue Pauly*, 9 (2000), 317.

7. See Callimachus, *Hymns and Epigrams*, ed. and trans. A. W. Mair (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1955 [1921]), pp. 165-67 (Epigram 43).

8. A. S. F. Gow, in his authoritative edition of *Theocritus*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1952), I:176-81; II:408-14, takes the nymph to be a boy, but admits that "the text is grossly corrupt and remains uncertain in many details" (II, 408).

9. For the reception of the *paraklausithyron* by the Romans, see J. C. Yardley, "The Elegiac Paraclausithyron," *Eranos*, 76 (1978), 19-34.

10. See Q. Horatius Flaccus, *Oden und Epoden*, ed. Adolf Kiessling and

Richard Heinze, 9th edition (Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1958), pp. 304-08.

11. See, for his and what follows, Hans Peter Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz: eine Interpretation der Oden*, II (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973), 117-22.

12. After the spectacular success of his translation of Lucretius' *De rerum natura* in 1682/3, Creech published an English translation of Horace in the following year, which was an equally spectacular failure. See, for the details, Hermann Josef Real, *Untersuchungen zur Lukrez-Übersetzung von Thomas Creech* (Bad Homburg and Berlin: M. Gehlen, 1970), pp. 20-33, 141-53. The memory of this failure had not even faded after forty years: "Creech murder'd Horace in his senseless Rhymes, / But hung himself to expiate his Crimes," Swift noted coolly in 1734 (*The Poems of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Harold Williams, 3 vols., 2nd edition [Oxford: Clarendon, 1958], II:666).

13. Thomas Creech, *The Odes, Satyrs, and Epistles of Horace: Done into English* (London: J. Tonson, 1684), pp. 100-01.

14. Horace's *Ode* III, 10 was imitated in a *paraklausithyron*, "The Terrible Door," by Harold E. Monro (1879-1932), which deserves a mention but lies outside the *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer's* scope; see *The Penguin Book of Love Poetry*, ed. Jon Stallworthy (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979 [1973]), p. 248.

15. Quotations are from "The Poems of Gaius Valerius Catullus," trans. F. W. Cornish, *Catullus, Tibullus, and Pervigilium Veneris* (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1966), pp. 135-39.

16. In addition to Copley, pp. 48-50, I am indebted to Hans Peter Syndikus, *Catull: Eine Interpretation. Zweiter Teil: Die großen Gedichte (61-68)* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001), pp. 226-38; and the annotated edition of Catullus' poems edited by Wilhelm Kroll, *C. Valerius Catullus*, 3rd edition (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1959), pp. 212-18.

17. Copley, p. 111. The most detailed study of the poem known to me is by Karl Vretska, "Tibull's 'Paraklausithyron' (I, 2)," *Wiener Studien*, 68 (1955), 20-46, although it focuses on a series of aspects that are not germane to my present purpose. Vretska also provides a full survey of earlier criticism.

18. Quotations are from the translation by J. P. Postgate, "Tibullus," *Catullus, Tibullus, and Pervigilium Veneris* (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1966), pp. 199-205.

19. Quotations are from *Propertius*, ed. and trans. H. E. Butler (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1967), pp. 43-45. Even if my conclusions differ, I am indebted to the readings of Yardley, "The Elegiac Paraklausithyron," pp. 23-27, and Niklas Holzberg, *Die römische Liebeselegie: Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990), pp. 34-35.

20. Ovid, *The Art of Love, and Other Poems*, ed. and trans. J. H. Mozley (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1969), pp. 159-61.

21. For reasons of space, I cannot discuss Ovid's various, and variously complex, *paraklausithyra* in greater detail. I must therefore refer the interested

reader, once again, to the observations by Copley in *"Exclusus Amator": A Study in Latin Love Poetry*, pp. 82-90, 125-40, and Burck, "Das Paraklausithyron: Die Entwicklungsgeschichte eines Motivs der antiken Liebesdichtung," pp. 244-56.

22. *The Poems of Thomas Carew*, ed. Rhodes Dunlap (Oxford: Clarendon, 1949), pp. 16-17.

23. Quotations are from the edition of L. C. Martin, *The Poetical Works of Robert Herrick* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1956), p. 328.

24. I am indebted for this phrase to the poet Hugo Williams (*TLS*, 22 July 2005, p. 14).

25. See R. W. Ketton-Cremer, *Matthew Prior*, The Rede Lecture, 1957 (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1957).

26. *The Literary Works of Matthew Prior*, ed. H. Bunker Wright and Monroe K. Spears, 2 vols., 2nd edition (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), II:1024. Quotations are from this edition (I:676).

27. See the splendid notes in Frank H. Ellis, ed., *John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester: The Complete Works* (London: Penguin, 1994), pp. 49-55, 344-48 (hereafter cited as "Wilmot, ed. Ellis"). Quotations are from this edition. The title of the poem is controversial; see David M. Vieth, ed., *The Complete Poems of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester* (New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1974 [1968], pp. 104-12.

28. James Sutherland's phrase; see his *English Literature of the Late Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), p. 171.

29 For this reading of the poem, I am indebted to Arno Löffler, "John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, *A Letter from Artemisia in the Town to Chloe in the Country*," *Teaching Satire: Dryden to Pope*, ed. Hermann J. Real (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1992), pp. 69-82.

30. For the definition and dissemination of "paradoxical encomium," see John R. Clark, *Form and Frenzy in Swift's "Tale of a Tub"* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell U. Press, 1970), pp. 182-94.

Assessing the Inclusiveness of Searches in the Online Burney Newspapers Collection

Once again this bibliographical curmudgeon wants to warn the world about a new digital database, despite the hypocrisy of my having mined it for dozens of hours, knowing I wasn't wasting my time. Excuse me while I bite the hand that feeds me! After carping about Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO), I shift in this issue to the "17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers" or digitized "Burney Newspapers Collections," a joint production of the British Library and Gale Cengage Learning (they've also released "19th Century British Library Newspapers"). The Burney collection, which many of us have examined at the BL or via the microfilm series Early English Newspapers from Research Publications, was initially assembled by Reverend Charles Burney (1757-1817), the novelist's brother, who left over 700 volumes of newspapers, newsbooks, acts of Parliament, broadsides, etc. to the BL, which expanded the collection to over 1000 volumes. The newspapers began to be released on microfilm in 1978, before

which we relied principally on the originals and then films from University Microfilms of Ann Arbor, whose film stock was bought by ProQuest. Ironically, as we confront the digitizing of microfilm for ECCO as well as the Burney Newspapers, we have also of late been identifying problems in the microfilming of newspapers and periodicals. Some of these problems have been discussed by James Tierney in conference papers; at our conference at Lehigh this fall, in a session chaired by Eleanor Shevlin, Jim will probably touch on these limitations (such as gaps in the runs and duplications). At our last meeting, Robert Hume and Ashley Marshall demonstrated the Burney Collection online. This past winter and spring they wrote and submitted to *PBSA* a long article on the blessings of the database, with reflections on how it can be used in courses and with very good tips for users and also advice for improvements directed to Gale and the BL. I will here steer clear of their forthcoming lucid instructions and recommendations.

My focus is how much of the information in newspapers held by major collections or microfilmed one WILL NOT FIND when searching the Burney Collection online--at least I would raise the question: how much of what's out there are you likely to get when you search the new Burney text-base.

We would expect that digitizing 18th-century English newspapers to create a searchable database must be hampered by predictable imperfections: missing leaves, dirty and smudged originals, clipping and marginal loss to the originals, words not lying level or composed with odd spacings, and font size and style. Letter-pieces like the "f" and long "s" will scan with high error and oversight rates, as will ligatures like "æ," "ct," "sh," and "st." It seems that oversights are all the greater for words in italic font or in large and small capitals. The names of some major authors have combinations often composed with ligatures (like in "Shenstone" and "Swift"), likely to result in oversights. Consequently, the oversight error rate for searches in the major new digital textbases seems to me over twenty percent. As we'll see, adding search terms increases the likelihood of oversights. Then, too, in searches restricted to a name or a few words, one has the converse problem of too much noise. A surname that's a common adjective ("Young") or a substantive often used with other denotations ("Pope") gathers too much jellyfish in one's nets.

The digital Burney can be searched in basic or advanced (multiple-term) search-pages and with varying temporal periods and locations, or it can be browsed by publication, located by publication place or time coordinates. Browsing allows a useful oversight of the newspapers and the completeness of runs. The publications are divided into the following locations for browsing: Barbados, England, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Netherlands, Scotland, and United States. By clicking on Ireland, one obtains a further division: Belfast, Dublin, and Limerick. Although for Belfast there's only one paper, *Northern Star*, for Dublin, there are numerous titles: *Dublin Gazette (DG)*, *Dublin Journal (DJ)*, *Dublin Mercury (1722)*, ditto (1766), *George Faulkner the Dublin Journal (GFDJ)*, *Hibernian Journal*, *Hoey's Dublin Mercury*, and *Public Register or The Freeman's Journal*. Clicking on the newspaper's title provides a total number of issues and a date range, thus *DJ*: 62 issues from 27 March 1725 to 26 Feb. 1726; *DG*: 253 issues from 24 Aug. 1708 to 28 Dec. 1797; and *GFDJ*: 287 issues from 23 March 1745 to 26 Dec. 1747. With a limit on Ireland, for variants of Lyttelton's name and "Faulkner," I found 32 records for news and classifieds between 1 Jan. 1730 and 29 Dec. 1779, though none for *To the Memory* discussed below.

There's much less behind "Scotland" as place of publication: for the entire database I found no advts. for Young's "Night Thoughts," and, when I searched for the printers' names "Balfour" OR "Donaldson" OR "Foulis," I got two hits that involve a "Balfour" in news articles of *Echo or Edinburgh Weekly Journal* in 1729 and 1731. When I searched for "Hume" or "Pope" or "Smollett," I got 74 hits, #1-60 to *Echo*, 28 May 1728 through 29 Sept. 1731; #65-69 involve to *The Mirror*, 30 Jan. 1779 to 10 July 1779, and #70-74 to *The Lounger*, 29 Oct. 1785 to 12 Aug. 1786 (mostly quotations of Alexander Pope). The phrase "Printed for" in all newspapers published in Scotland called forth just 114 hits, dominated by classifieds in *Echo*. Browsing publications by location, we find that these are the only newspaper runs for Scotland, with two pamphlets from 1646 and 1746 thrown in. So, the million pages in the Burney Newspapers Collection online don't offer much material for Scottish book history--whatever one learns on a day reading Scottish newspapers at the Mitchell Library won't be known to those relying on the Burney.

Users are likely to search rather than browse issues. So, let's search. My first comparative evaluation involves advertisements (advts.) for George Lyttelton's *To the Memory of a Lady Lately Deceased. A Monody* (1747-1748). When searched with terms "To the Memory of a Lady" and dates 10/1/47 to 12/29/49, one gets nine hits, seven involve the poem and one involves the *British Magazine* for March 1749's contents' listing ("To the Hon. George Littleton, Esq; on his Monody to the Memory of his Lady"). Those seven hits, all advts. for two of three folio editions, are:

- 1) *General Evening Post* (GEP) 29 [-31] Oct. 1747: "This Day was published, | (Price One Shilling) | To the Memory of a Lady lately deceased, | A MONODY. | *Te, dulcis Conjux, solo te in Littore secum . . .* for A. Millar . . . sold by M. Cooper";
- 2) *General Advertiser* (GA) 31 Oct. 1747 (ditto but differing in accidentals);
- 3) GA 10 Nov. 1747 (ditto);
- 4) GA, 11 Nov. 1747 (ditto);
- 5) GEP, 12 [-14] Nov. 1747: "This Day . . . SECOND . . . *Te, dulcis . . .* Cooper";
- 6) *Whitehall Evening Post* (WEP): 12 [-14] Nov. 1747 same basic advt. for 2nd edition as the last but varying accidentals
- 7) GA, 14 Nov. 1747: same basic advt. for 2nd ed.

If we alter our search terms to "Lady" and "Monody" and use the same time period, we receive 13 hits: four are among the seven listed above; of the new, one is the GA 30 Oct. 1747 for "This day" (same as that above for 31 Oct.); two are for the Supplement to the *British Magazine*, with contents noting "Extract of Mr. Littleton's Monody to his deceas'd Lady" (GA of 3 Feb. 1748, noting "Tomorrow" and 4 Feb., noting "This Day"); two are for *Musaeus. A Monody to the Memory*; and four are for the publication of the March 1748 issue of the *British Magazine*, whose contents include the poem "To the Hon. George Littleton Esq; on his Monody to the Memory of his Lady" (WEP 30 March 1749, GA 1 April, *London Gazetteer* (LG) 1 April, and WEP 1 [-4] April). A search with the same search words and the fuzz set at medium (thus allowing hits on things close but not quite what I spelled) gets 83 hits, and "Memory" and "Lady" gets 268 for just 28 Oct. 1747 to 12 June 1748. Missing from at least the more limited and manageable searches are the following advertisements that I found searching the microfilm years ago:

--*Daily Advertiser (DA)*, 30 Oct.-2 Nov. 1747, and 10 and 12 Nov. [n. Burney missed all the *DA* listings]; 14 Nov. lists "2nd edition"; it's rerun on 1 Dec.; and 1 and 4 June list a 3rd. ed.

--*London Evening Post (LEP)*, 29-31 Oct. and its next two issues [31 Oct.-3 Nov., 3-5 Nov.]; and 14-17 Nov. announcing the "second edition."

--*Dublin Journal* of 24-28 Nov. 1747 [and 28 Nov.-1 Dec. and 1-5 Dec.], advertizing "This Day," "Price 2d.," for George Faulkner's octavo edition. Note that I was taken to this faintly printed issue by "Lady" and "Memory" but for a news story and not GF's advt.

--*GA* 30 Oct. 1747 "This Day" "MEMORY of a LADY lately | Deceased. A MONODY. | Te, dulcis . . ."; also of 2 Dec. 1747; and, 27 and 28 May 1748: "This Day is Publish'd, Price 1 s. | The Third Edition, of | TO the MEMORY of a LADY lately | Deceased. A MONODY. | Te dulcis . . ." for Millar and sold by Cooper.

Most importantly, the Burney Newsletters online doesn't locate the Dublin edition nor the "third edition" advertised in the *DA* and *GA*, which prove crucial to working out which of two 1747 folio editions preceded the 1748 "second edition." (Also, not listed were magazine listings, a resource not to be forgotten: *To the Memory* was listed under new books in the Nov. 1747 *Gentleman's Magazine* [17:548], *London Magazine* [536], and *British Magazine* [2:517].)

If we use "Universal Passion" to search for advertisements for Edward Young's *The Universal Passion*, seven satires published separately as folios from Jan. 1725 to Feb. 1728 (republished in octavo in Dublin and Edinburgh), then republished as *Love of Fame the Universal Passion* in March 1728 and reproduced in a couple dozen editions, for the entire century, we get 25 hits (24 between 11/1/1724 and 12/31/1765 and find advertisements for Satire I in the *Daily Courant (DC)* of 27 Jan. 1725, and for Satire II in the *DC* of 2 and 5 April 1725 and for *Love of Fame* twice in 1752 (*LEP* 25 July and *GA* 27 July). Eight of the hits are for Young's *Ocean: An Ode*, "by the author of the Universal Passion," in 1728 (one for the *Daily Post [DP]* of 7 June; two (duplicate) for advts. in the *London Journal [LJ]* of 22 and 29 June and 6 July; and one for the *Universal Spectator [US]* of 28 Dec. 1728). Eleven are for James Miller's comedy *The Universal Passion* in 1737 (with several duplicated advts., involving *DP*, *LEP*, *DG*, *US*); the 25th is the phrased used in a 1787 essay. The search has only provided advts. for ten percent of the editions of Young's satires! If we search for Young's satires with "Universal Passion" and "Roberts" (publisher of folios 1725-1728), we get the *DC* of 27 Jan. 1725 and the *LJ* of 29 June 1728 twice; if we search with "Love of Fame" and "Passion," we get two useless hits (none at all if "Universal" precedes "Passion"). I believe the double "s" in early 18C settings of "Passion" is easily missed by Burney as well as ECCO. We get no hits in the entire digital Burney when searching for "Love of Fame" combined with "Tonson" (publisher 1728-1763) or the first two words of the motto, "Tanto major," even with fuzz set at medium; none for "fame satire" or "universal passion satire", "Young [or "Young's"] universal passion," or "Dr. Young's Love," and only three hits, none advts., for variants of "Young's satires" (*Daily Journal*, 16 Nov. 1733, for Swift's *Epistle to a Lady . . . Also a Poem Occasion'd by Reading Dr. Young's Satires Called, The Universal Passion*; the periodical *Olla Podrida's* four-line motto captioned "Young's Satires" ("The Briton still with fearful . . . State"), in No. 22 (11 Aug. 1787); and *The Idler*, No. 38 (rpt. on 27 Dec. 1758, #227 of *Lloyd's Evening Post* (from *Payne's Universal Weekly Chronicle*, remarking on "the Lady

in Dr. Young's Satires"). We get 77 hits by searching 1 Jan. 1728 to 29 Dec. 1765 for "love of fame," placing it in quotes to reduce junk, though we still get "Jane Love. The same Day . . ." These include advts. for four editions, three not yet located: Tonson's 1728 *Love of Fame* in *DC* 20 March 1728, the Tonson 3rd in the *Monthly Chronicle* for July 1731, the Tonson 4th in Tonson's advts for *Le Diable Boileux* in *DG* of 27-28 May 1741, and the Tonson 5th in *Covent-Garden Journal* of 1 Aug. 1752. These searches miss dozens of references to a dozen and a half editions. The missing include for Satire I in folio the *Post-Boy* of 21-23 Jan. 1725 (#5541), *DP* of 25 Jan. 1725, *The Evening Post* of 26-28 Jan. 1725; for Satire II *The Plain Dealer* of 9 April; for Satire III the *DC* of 26 and 30 April 1725; for Satire III the *DP* of 11 June 1725; for Satire the Last the *DP* of 17 Jan. and the *WEP* of 18-20 Jan. 1726; for Satire V the *DC* of 8 Feb.; and the Dublin editions, as in *Dublin Weekly Journal* the first of Satire IV on 19 June 1725, of Satire the Last on 29 Jan. 1726, and of Satire V on 25 Feb. and 4 March 1727; also advts. in the *Evening Post* of mid-June 1725 for Richard Savage's "*The Authors of the Town . . . Inscib'd to the Author of the Universal Passion*"; also an advt. for "Dr. Edward Young's Poetical Works . . . To be sold by Th. Whitehouse" in the *DWJ* of 16 and 31 July 1726, the contents listing "The Universal Passion in Five Satires." As for later editions, the Foulis 1750 in *Scot's Magazine* for Oct. 1750 and the *Glasgow Courant (GC)* of 8-15 Oct. (issue no. 262)--Foulis advts. included the title with others in lists published in the *GC* of Oct. 29-Nov. 5, 12-29 Nov. 1750, Sept. 25-Oct. 2, 1752, 2-9 April 1753 (#390). Back in London, the first Tonson duodecimo edition, 1752 was advertized as "This Day" published in the *LEP* of 25-28 and 28-30 July 1752 and as "Just publish'd" on 6-8 Feb. 1753 and the *London Daily Advertiser* of 7 Feb. 1753. A piracy called the 11th edition, "London: Printed for Robert Whitworth . . . Manchester [n.d.]," was advertised in Whitworth's *Manchester Magazine and Weekly Advertiser* on 30 March and 6 April 1756. Clearly, the record constructed by the Burney Collection online is useful but a little disappointing--as ever, the hardest editions to date are those not found advertized.

For Young's *The Complaint; or, Night-Thoughts on Life, Death, and Immortality*, from 1 Jan. 1743 to 31 Dec. 1751, the digital Burney finds 91 hits with two search terms, "Complaint" and "Night Thoughts"; if "Life, Death" is added, there are 41 hits, with fuzz set at medium on all three lines the search was repeatedly aborted. For "Life, Death, and Immortality" from 1 Jan. 1743 to 31 Dec. 1752, we get 60 hits between 18 Feb. 1743 and 14 Oct. 1752. Most of these advts. contain the motto from Virgil: "Sunt lacrymae rerum, & mentem mortalia tangunt." If you search "Sunt lacrymae," you get one hit for the entire database (presumably due to the ligature), an advt. for *The Complaint* in *WEP* of 28 March 1751. If you search "mentem mortalia," you get 25 hits, 37 with fuzz set at medium. If you search "mentem mortalia tangunt," you get 13 without fuzz and 12 with medium fuzz. If you search the whole database for "Complaint" and "Night Thoughts," you get 177 hits; if "Life, Death" is added as a third line, 67 hits, if "Life" and "Death" are on separate lines and not joined, 104 hits, if "Immortality" is added for a fifth line, 51 hits, if "Job" (also on the title-page) is added on a sixth line, 14 hits (23 Jan. 1750 to 12 Jan. 1773). Much that is found is not Young's poem and much more involves redundant issues of the same newspaper, and one is left with a total missing well over a hundred genuine advertisements--perhaps as many as a hundred in the database but overlooked. In any case, what I hope I've implied is that one must continually try to work up search terms that

cut down the useless noise without throwing out genuine hits. One observation about the capriciousness of results: font size is not always a good predictor of results. In the 77 hits for "love of fame" mentioned above, 11 were advertisements in April-May for an edition of Young's *Complaint; or, Night Thoughts* that concluded in small print by noting Millar and Dodsley also sold a *Poetical Works* containing "*Love of Fame*"; the same basic text was found reproduced in *GA*, *LG*, *LEP*, and *WEP* from 18 April to 4 May. When you search April-May 1749 for "Complaint or Night Thoughts" or just "Night Thoughts," words in larger font within the advt., you get 14 hits, including some in the *GA* and *LEP* not caught in the "Love of Fame" search, but you don't get four advts caught in searching for small font "love of fame" (in *LG* and *WEP*).

Consider a test of the digital Burney against my notes from reading the microfilm digitized, specifically for advertisements in the *LEP* of Young's *The Complaint; or, Night Thoughts* during 1748-1755. Without any fuzz, for I'm searching for principal words in large font, I get 29 hits, but my notes record over 60. Or consider the advertisements in *LEP* during 1746 for the last and ninth Night entitled "Consolation," which is preceded by "*last Night's | Thoughts*" and followed by "Containing, among | other Things. | I. A moral Survey of the Heavens. | II. A Night Address to the Deity" and later we have such phrases as "occasion'd by the | present Juncture; humbly inscrib'd to his Grace," and "Newcastle, one of his Majesty's Principal Secretaries," and the motto "*Fatis contraria . . .*" Searching 1746 for *LEP* advts within the Burney digital with "Consolation: Containing," I get seven hits and by putting "Consolation" and "containing" on separate lines, I get nine, all to the same advt. run in probably two settings stored for reuse, all advts. having the same substantives to be tested. On the *LEP* film I found 16 instances of this advt. We get no hits when we search for such smaller-font phrases as "last Night's," "Night Address," "present Juncture," "Majesty's Principal," "inscrib'd to his Grace," and "occasion'd by the." Given these empty sets, it's surprising that "moral Survey" gets ten hits, and the first two words of the motto gets one.

Let us make a final comparison, this time with Tobias Smollett's *Complete History of England* (1757-1760), and its *Continuation* (1760-1766), in octavo and quarto formats and multiple editions, another heavily advertized work. If we search "Smollett" and "History of England" for 1 Dec. 1764 through 28 Feb. 1766, we get only two hits, both found in searching "Smollett" and "Continuation," with ten hits (only one is junk). How much is missed? For starters, 13 of 14 advertisements of the *LEP*, 5 of 8 or more in *PA*, and all in the *London Chronicle*, at least several. But, of course, the Burney online finds a great many advertisements, enough to write an article on the publication history of Smollett's *Continuation*. For 1 Jan. 1760 to 31 Dec. 1763, searching "Smollett" and "History of England," we get 53 hits, only 3 of which aren't for Smollett's histories--and none are duplicate images as often occurs with Burney searches. For 1 Jan. 1757 to 31 Dec. 1766, the same two terms lead to 139 hits.

So, while we've much to be thankful for (provided we can access the expensive database), we ought to continue to check microfilm. (Don't let them throw it out!) We can let the online search direct us to film of other issues or serials where advertisements are likely to have appeared--no single advt. should be trusted, for many advts are wrong. And no publication history based solely on the Burney Collection online should be trusted, for it has repeatedly been shown to miss at least half of the material that I knew about from

very limited research on diverse titles--and finding advertisements for books or performances is a good deal easier than identifying persons or other sorts of research to which scholars put the database.--Jim May (jem4@psu.edu)

Editor's note. Around the time of the publication of the last *Intelligencer*, c. 1 February 2009, Gale distributed ECCO Part 2, which I mentioned was forthcoming. Now there are "over 180,000 titles (200,000 volumes)--newly added reproductions are flagged in green at the margin. This roughly twenty-percent increase greatly expands the number of editions for authors like Swift and Young, undercutting some of my remarks (pp. 20-30).

Devoney Looser. *Women Writers and Old Age in Great Britain, 1750-1850.*

Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008. Pp. 252; bibliography; illustrations; index; notes. ISBN 10: 0-878-8018-8705-4. Hardcover \$55.00.

Even before I was asked to write this review, I was intrigued by an announcement of the publication of Devoney Looser's *Women Writers and Old Age in Great Britain* showing a portrait of a monocled Anna Dorothea Thurbusch on the cover.

The book's lively introduction offers plenty of promise. Looser conveys considerable enthusiasm about her subject and the impressive archival research she conducted for *Women Writers and Old Age*. Throughout the six chapters, Looser maintains a lucid and engaging style that many contemporary scholars might well emulate.

The scope of the book is broader than the title suggests. Looser examines the careers and works of middle-aged as well as elderly women authors, the plight of authors and characters labeled as old maids, and the portrayal of elderly women in the eighteenth-century novel. Looser's convincing thesis is that critics of the long eighteenth century and contemporary scholars alike have tended to dismiss the work of even established women authors after those authors reached "a certain age."

To provide a social-historical context for her argument, Looser presents some highly interesting research about elderly women of the period. One of the most intriguing insights offered by the book is evidence of the substantial number of women who lived into old age during the long eighteenth century (ix). In response to these data, Looser questions the common assumption that many women of the period died in their youth or early middle years.

Most of the book's body is devoted to the challenges of being an elderly woman writer during the period. Looser examines how Frances Burney, Catharine Macaulay, Hester Lynch Piozzi, and Anna Letitia Barbauld struggled against harsh critical and societal judgment for writing in genres considered unsuitable for elderly women or for living more flamboyantly than was believed respectable during their time of life.

Of the seven authors Looser covers in depth, Edgeworth appears to be the only one who received favorable reviews for a major work that was published in her old age. Looser suggests persuasively that Edgeworth escaped critical scorn in response to her late novel *Helen* (1834) by selecting subject matter and characters appropriate to her time in life, including positive depictions of older women.

According to Looser, the late works of authors like Burney, Macaulay, and

Barbauld received more scathing reviews than Edgeworth's for *Helen* because they made risky choices regarding subject matter. Burney, although hardly recycling her youthful novels, focuses her last novel *The Wanderer* (1814) on a love story about a relatively young woman struggling to survive in a hostile society. In response, critics savaged Burney with ageist pronouncements about the novel's garrulousness, feebleness, and "total want of vigour" (quoted in Looser, 38).

While Burney was maligned for recycling old wine in a young bottle, Macaulay was attacked by critics for daring to change genres in her old age by putting aside her historical work for a philosophical treatise, *Letters on Education* (1790). In her chapter on Macaulay, Looser makes impressive use of recently discovered documents written by Macaulay to show that the ailing Macaulay struggled to protect her reputation from such attacks. Indeed, Looser brings special expertise to this chapter through her research for her earlier book *British Women Writers and the Writing of History, 1670-1820* (2000).

Macaulay's reputation suffered even more after death than during her later years. Looser describes how Benjamin D'Israeli mounted a sustained attack on Macaulay, alleging that Macaulay had removed leaves from a manuscript she had borrowed from the British Library in order to eliminate evidence that might contradict Macaulay's political position (68-71). Although Looser emphasizes the impact of ageism directed at women authors of the long eighteenth century, given D'Israeli's political conservatism, it is tempting to imagine that political differences played a significant role in this campaign against the liberal Macaulay. Whatever D'Israeli's motive, Looser provides a compelling narrative of this attack on an author who had striven mightily to protect her posthumous reputation.

Even if the elderly Edgeworth was not as maligned as Burney and Macaulay were in the later years and after death, Looser demonstrates that Edgeworth was nearly forgotten or considered passé when she published *Helen*, suggesting that acclaim for women authors was acceptable provided that those authors were young. In addition, by tracing the early uses of the words "old maid" and "spinster," Looser provides evidence that even middle-aged women authors and literary characters of the long eighteenth century were susceptible to being devalued, particularly if they were unmarried.

One of the major achievements of the book is how Looser illustrates the variety of strategies employed by older woman authors to manage their careers. Even if Barbauld was chastised by critics for venturing to shift from her usual subject matter in her dark political poem *Eighteen Hundred and Eleven* (1812), she did make a successful career change by turning to editing and biographical writing while continuing to publish poetry. In fact, Looser observes that "Barbauld was remembered as an ideal elderly woman, successfully performing happy old age, a type of memorializing among women writers of the period" (119).

Though faring less well in their late-life and posthumous reputations than Barbauld, Piozzi and Jane Porter demonstrated resourcefulness in striving to maintain their dignity as authors. Despite the recognition and opportunities they met with early in their careers, the aging Piozzi and Porter were unable to publish their late work. For Piozzi the alternative was to cultivate the handsome actor William A. Conway as an audience for her work and as a potential literary executor. Unfortunately, this plan backfired because gossip spread during her life and long after her death that Piozzi's

relationship with Conway was merely the foolish passion of a woman in her dotage for a much younger man.

Porter, best known for her historical works such as *The Scottish Chiefs*, found her work overshadowed by the competition of similar works by Walter Scott. In an effort to re-establish her reputation and shore up her income, Porter accepted a request from George IV to write a novel about his ancestor Duke Christian of Luneburg. Porter followed through on the request, publishing the book in 1824 but did not receive the pension she desired. Besides offering excellent research in support of Porter's ongoing applications for a pension, Looser provides a fascinating history of the royal pension system from the reign of George III through that of Victoria and describes how other older women authors were able to appeal more successfully than Porter for financial assistance from the Crown.

Looser not only concerns herself with the plight of aging woman authors, but devotes some attention to how those authors depicted older women, including so-called "old maids." Although Looser commends the positively portrayed women in Edgeworth's *Helen*, she conveys disappointment over the older characters in Burney's *The Wanderer*, particularly the nasty Mrs. Ireton, who to Looser seems a reiteration of similar characters from Burney's youthful novels (33, 36).

In a similar vein, Looser offers a critique of Austen's Miss Bates in *Emma*: "Austen, I argue, echoed stereotypical treatments of oldmaidism in this novel, even if she did not accept these limiting views in her own life" (76). Is Austen so hard on characters like Miss Bates? *Emma*, although narrated in the third person, is written from the perspective of the flawed title character. Because the reader perceives Miss Bates through the filter of Emma's conceit and prejudices, Austen wants the readers to learn, along with Emma, not to dismiss women like Miss Bates. Looser concedes that Emma is persuaded by Mr. Knightly to understand that it is wrong to ridicule older women, like Miss Bates, who have suffered a loss of economic and social status (91), but Looser goes on to argue that Jane Austen depicts Miss Bates as nothing more than the stereotypical garrulous spinster, a pathetic "object" of charity who exists to teach Emma a lesson (91). Yet, even though Emma thinks Miss Bates too dull to understand the insult, Austen demonstrates that Miss Bates is more astute than Emma imagines her to be: Miss Bates, no mere "object," poignantly understands Emma's quip at her expense. In addition, Miss Bates displays none of the bitterness and envy typically associated with spinsters, and, unlike the much younger Emma, disparages no one.

As Looser suggests, Emma's learning to reform her character through the intervention of Mr. Knightly might seem an endorsement of male superiority and the need of women like Emma to be guided by a man in their judgment of other women (92). Perhaps the key to exonerating Austen of perpetuating such gender stereotypes is to examine how Austen establishes parallels between the folly of Emma and Frank Churchill. Both Frank and Emma choose to flirt with each other rather than acknowledge their genuine love for someone else, and both of them make insensitive remarks about others during the picnic at Box Hill. In other words, a young *man* as well as a young woman is in need of the same kind of corrective. Mr. Knightly provides that corrective for Emma, and Jane Fairfax forces Frank to recognize his misconduct by breaking off their engagement. Far from endorsing the cliché of the old maid, Austen is critiquing a youthful disregard for the feelings of others who are older or poorer.

Despite this tendency to underestimate Austen's sympathy for old maids, Looser rightly draws attention in her book to the need for additional study of women authors as well as of old maids and elderly women in the literature of the long eighteenth century. In the conclusion of *Women Writers and Old Age in Great Britain*, Looser generously suggests a wide range of topics for future research in the field, including authors whose later careers could be explored. In addition, given the long span of these authors' lives, Looser recommends that scholars do more work across period lines and rethink chronologies of authors within periods, focusing on ordering authors by the ends of their careers rather than by their birth dates. She makes a particularly compelling case for rethinking the label of "'late' Romanticism" (169) for authors like Byron, Keats, and Shelley, who died well before the so-called first generation Romantics, such as Wordsworth and Coleridge.

It would also be interesting to read in-depth analyses of elderly characters of the long eighteenth century as well as a study about the absence of such characters in literature of that and other periods. For example, it would be worthwhile to apply Looser's pioneering research to later nineteenth-century literature through the present. We pride ourselves now on having abandoned the concept of the old maid. Instead, we and contemporary literary characters are obsessed with "biological timeclocks" and with hiding the signs of aging with hair dye, botox, and Restylane. Kingsley Amis, John Updike, and Philip Roth have produced highly acclaimed books about aging men, but how many sympathetic books are there about aging women, who continue to be held up to ridicule in literature and in the media? Many a dust jacket sports a photo of a distinguished looking silver-fox, but older female authors who are still being published must strike the sexiest, most youthful poses possible. A major contribution of Looser's book is that it forces us to recognize that the long eighteenth century is not the only period in need of correctives of ageist stereotyping.

Marilyn Roberts
Waynesburg University

David Oakleaf. *A Political Biography of Jonathan Swift*. (Number 2 in the series *Eighteenth-Century Political Biographies*, edited by J. A. Downie.) London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008. Pp. ix + 266; bibliography of works cited; index; notes. ISBN 10: 1-851-96848-2. Hardcover, \$99.00.

This book is described by its author as "a political life of Swift," one that focuses primarily on the first quarter of the eighteenth century (10). Oakleaf is especially concerned "to locate Swift's writing in his historical context" in order to determine what Swift "thought he was doing in the face of particular provocations." One of Oakleaf's theses is that "the pervasive, brutal fact of war was central to all of Swift's writing" (11), an obsession of the Dean's that his predecessors, he argues, have never properly appreciated.

The book is divided into five chapters and a conclusion. In Chapter 1, Oakleaf introduces some of his major themes: Swift's notion of war; his fear of faction, anarchy, and arbitrary power; his position vis-à-vis the colonized Irish; his Anglo-Irish identity.

Chapter 2 covers the *Discourse of the Contests and Dissensions between the Nobles and Commons in Athens and Rome* and *A Tale of a Tub*; Chapter 3 focuses on the period from 1707 through the fall of Sacheverell and the collapse of the Whig junto in 1710; Chapter 4 treats Swift's writings as *chef de propagande* for the Tory ministry, 1710-14; Chapter 5 covers the low-productivity years of 1714-20 and *The Drapier's Letters* in the mid-1720s. In the conclusion, Oakleaf turns briefly to *Gulliver's Travels* and more briefly to *A Modest Proposal*, both of which he reads as illustrating the fact that, for Swift, "Everything comes back to war" (200).

Oakleaf's principal concern seems to be to understand how some of Swift's major works reflect a set of core political principles and commitments. Swift is Anglo-Irish; opposed to absolutism; desperately concerned to protect the interests of the Church of England; obedient to Crown-in-Parliament rather than to a particular monarch; violently anti-dissent; a fierce supporter of the Test Act; a party writer who objects to partisanship and faction, fears dissension and war, desires fame and independence, and favors power residing with the landed class. Oakleaf rightly understands Swift's political writings as occasional and circumstantial, resulting from "his immediate involvement with a particular place at a particular moment" (11). As a guide for where Swift's writings fit in this early eighteenth-century political milieu, the *Political Biography* is sound and clear, but it offers little sense of how this contextualization changes the way we understand either Swift's works or his politics.

This book has the weakness of one of its strengths. Oakleaf is an amiable, generous, unfailingly polite scholar, but given the enormous amount written about Swift's politics and political writings, more positioning vis-à-vis his predecessors would have helped the reader. J. A. Downie's *Jonathan Swift: Political Writer* (1984) remains the standard account of its subject, and for a new political biography to succeed, its author really must explain how he improves on Downie or corrects him. Oakleaf is only admiring of Downie's excellent book; he is bland about F. P. Lock's *Swift's Tory Politics* (1983) and has relatively little to say about Ian Higgins's *Swift's Politics: A Study in Disaffection* (1994)—his disagreement with Higgins about Swift's alleged Jacobitism is brief and understated (157). Oakleaf's object is not to challenge long-standing interpretations of much-studied works. Such novelty of approach as he offers comes largely from his emphasis on the centrality of war and fear of war to Swift's political thinking, a fixation on Swift's part that I believe Oakleaf seriously exaggerates.

My principal reservation about the *Political Biography* is its chronological lopsidedness. A "political life" of Swift ought surely to cover the major segments of that life. Oakleaf devotes three of his four "survey" chapters to the period 1701-1714, tracing Swift's courtship of the Whigs in the very early eighteenth century and his years serving Oxford's Tory ministry. In chapter 5 we are given an overview of Swift's attitudes toward the Revolution of 1688, monarchs and monarchy, and Jacobitism. The discussion consists mostly of broad statements of principle rather than engagement with particular texts; only *The Drapier's Letters* get significant consideration. Virtually nothing is said of the Irish tracts of the 1720s. *A Proposal for the Universal Use of Irish Manufacture* gets only passing mention (141, 159-60); ditto events like the collapse of the South Sea Bubble and the Atterbury Plot. Oakleaf is understandably eager to avoid turning a discussion of Swift's politics into "another reading of *Gulliver's Travels*" (12), but the cursory treatment

of that work (and *A Modest Proposal*) in the conclusion is too thin. A study of Swift's politics really needs to offer a *political* reading of the *Travels*.

Swift's political life ends, in this account, with *Gulliver's Travels*, and the near-total omission of the 1730s represents a serious shortcoming of this study. The anti-Walpole poems of the thirties are mostly not mentioned—"To Mr. Gay," "An Epistle to a Lady," and even "On Poetry: A Rhapsody" do not show up in the index. Neither does "The Legion Club," one of Swift's most savage political satires. Swift's political writings in the reign of Queen Anne are important and his commitments in those years contested—but the chronological imbalance of this study creates a number of problems. For one thing, privileging a dozen years or so in a long, active, widely varied career creates a much greater sense of cohesion than I suspect actually existed. One of the more interesting questions, in the realm of Swift's politics, is whether or not his principles change over time. He is variously an outsider, an insider, an exile; in the late 1720s he is still hoping for patronage in England. That his friends and allies change is clear enough, but how do his positions alter over time? What are the phases of his political life? What are the levels and kinds of engagement or political participation? Unfortunately, the disproportionate coverage of Oakleaf's *Political Biography* does leave readers with the impression that Swift was consistently guided by, and that his works reflect, a set of stable political principles that barely changed between the first years of Queen Anne's reign and the dominance of Walpole in the 1730s.

The *Political Biography* is a polite and uncontentious book. Its claims are almost always fair, reasonable, and correct, and its treatment of predecessors is generous. Oakleaf is sometimes insufficiently attentive to irony or to Swift's meanings for particular words. He quotes "Fair LIBERTY was all his Cry," for example, as a straight, prideful claim (2, 5), but how often does Swift use "liberty" as an unreservedly positive term? Occasionally Oakleaf is too inclined to find direct political significance, insisting for example that "A *Tale's* political import was genuine" (51) on the grounds that "Heterodoxy . . . is an illness of the body politic" (58), which seems to me to make an ideological position into a political one. Oakleaf is, however, admirably willing to see Swift as sometimes innocent, ignorant, and/or contradictory (see, for example, pp. 110-13). He queries Ehrenpreis's sense that Swift sought, in Temple, a familial tie; Oakleaf sensibly concludes that what Swift wanted was a patron (62). He is also quite right to distinguish between Swift's *rhetorical* and *ideological* extremism, warning that the first is not to be taken as a sign of the latter (154 and elsewhere). Overall, this book strikes me as a basically sound introduction to Swift's early eighteenth-century political career—but the best place to go for a general account of Swift's politics remains Downie's lucid and balanced study of 1984.

Ashley Marshall
The Pennsylvania State University

James Raven. *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade 1450-1850*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007. Pp. 493; endnotes; index; bibliography; 26 b/w illustrations, 6 figures, and 6 tables. ISBN: 9780300122619.

Hardcover: \$65.00.

James Raven's *The Business of Books* is a majestic achievement, a culmination of an already outstanding career in the field of book history. On about 500 densely printed pages, Raven surveys the history of the book trade between the mid-fifteenth and the mid-nineteenth centuries from so many angles that the reader's head begins to spin—both with the amount of information and with the number of new avenues that information opens for historical research and literary interpretation. To my knowledge, no similar history of this scope and magnitude has been attempted before—Marjorie Plant's *The English Book Trade* (1939), Richard Altick's *The English Common Reader* (1957) and John Feather's *History of British Publishing* (1988) spring to mind, but the first two come from different generations and all three rely much less on primary material—and it is hard to imagine anyone except Prof. Raven with the necessary expertise to make the project succeed so well. The book jacket calls *The Business of Books* "definitive," and I can think of no reason to disagree with that assessment.

In the "Historiographical Overview" at the end of his text, Raven explains that he is writing a "broadly cast business history" (373). He notes politely that previous histories "have not always paid sufficient regard either to the processes whereby texts reached their audiences and achieved their influence, or to those individuals who steered writers' work through the commercial market-place" (375), and he proposes to rectify this situation by looking at the producers and production of literature (in the widest sense). Raven also finds that London has been somewhat neglected in favor of the provinces and hopes to correct the balance with his book. Finally, he devotes significant attention to two previously neglected aspects of the book trade, and the markets in imported and in used books.

As is probably inevitable in a book of this magnitude (in length and scope), there is no clear narrative or argument to *The Business of Books*. Nevertheless, Raven claims this in itself as an important fact and asserts that progress in the book trade was not inevitable. "Contemporary accounts of 'improvement' and 'progress' can be beguiling," he writes, "but we should not neglect the problems and obstacles encountered in the production and reception of the new 'decencies' and 'conveniences.' ... We must consider contradictions and resistances as well as expansion and compliance" (377). For all the protection the Stationers' Company provided, there was still legal control. While many booksellers were innovative and entrepreneurial, just as many others (or more) were safe and consolidating. These categories do not necessarily correlate neatly to whether the booksellers ended up celebrities or bankruptcies, which of course are not mutually exclusive. Transportation networks improved, but that improvement did not make much of a difference as long as printing technology created bottlenecks. Publishers tried to challenge and circumvent monopolies and copyrights, but closed systems almost always reasserted themselves in new forms. In other words, there is no convincing grand narrative to describe the development of the British book trade from about 1450 to 1850.

Nevertheless, many, many interesting mini-narratives emerge from *The Business of Books*, a few of which I will simply mention without being able to describe them in the rich detail that Raven offers. For one thing, within the 400 years covered in the book, the period from the 1740s to the early nineteenth centuries turns out to be the time when most

change occurred (130, 375) in terms of production, distribution, authorship, and financing—which turns out to be the most important area of innovation (204, 353). Raven demonstrates that many of the prominent booksellers of the period started out in other businesses (215), so success in the book trade was not related to literary knowledge. A close look shows that hardly any booksellers really worked their way up from humble beginnings, except in the sense that they married rich widows, frequently of other booksellers. There was always a conflict between large and small booksellers, but the boundaries between those two groups remained permeable (69). Booksellers were primarily after profit—so there was a tension between commerce and art (119)—and even those who supported political agendas did so only *after* securing profit with other publications (210). The social effects of the print revolution as discussed variously by Elizabeth Eisenstein and Adrian Johns are highly debatable (366). The copyright decision of 1774 was not the watershed previous historians have claimed:

In terms of actual arrangements, ... cheap reprinting has flourished for several decades, the framework for the protection of sale and investment in rights to *new* works remained intact in the final decades of the century, and leading booksellers' de facto extended copyright continued as securely as ever. Competition increased, certainly, but the advance of new cheap editions was in addition to, not in substitution of, major publishing undertakings by booksellers' associations. (232)

The reason Raven's arguments and assertions are so convincing is that he looks at the book trade from so many angles. He considers political changes and legal challenges, business models in the literary marketplace as well as changes in the wider economy of production and consumption. For instance, the chapter on "Promoting the Wares" (257-293) discusses the costs in press, type, labor, and paper, end-page catalogues, trade signs, promotion of books as fashion, reviewing, new formats for title pages, serial and part-issue publication—all under the purview of "three main strategies to stimulate demand: tailoring products to a particular clientele, experimenting in the design and packaging of products, and presenting these . . . as fashionable and *avant-garde*" (269). Here and in almost every chapter, there is a particular section devoted to questions of gender. Raven's chapter on the geography of the eighteenth-century book trade, "High and Low" (154-192) is an unparalleled *tour de force*. Of course, he considers technological advancements, but he also takes aesthetic developments into account. While his focus is on London, Raven always compares that center with closer and further away peripheries such as Edinburgh, Dublin, the Continent, and the Empire (even though the subtitle modestly only lays claim to the English book trade). Because of this exhaustive exploration of various perspectives, it is hard to imagine Raven's conclusion being disproven any time soon.

If there is anything to criticize about *The Business of Books* (lest I sound too effusive), it is that it is not always easy to find information about specific matters, simply because Raven is too cautious to treat issues in inappropriate isolation. Fortunately, the extensive index is rewarding, as long as one has the patience to follow up on all the entries. Similarly, the impressive index is perhaps overly divided into subsections, and it is unfortunate that some of the internet resources are spelled incorrectly (or have changed):

The British Book Trade Index is at www.bbti.bham.ac.uk; the Nichols Archive Project is at www.le.ac.uk/elh/resources/Nichols/index.html; and Nigel Hall and Raven's own Mapping the Print Culture of Eighteenth-Century London is currently at <http://members.lycos.co.uk/bookhistory/index.html>. In addition, it is important to clarify that this is a book for historians more than for literary critics: The implications for literature are huge, but Raven is only marginally concerned with them here.

Obviously, these are negligible faults in such a magisterial work. In his concluding section and footnotes, Raven alludes to two more books he is working on, *Print and Trade in Eighteenth-Century Britain* and *The Commercialization of the English Novel* (apparently in two volumes). If these volumes are anything like *The Business of Books*, Raven will not only have provided a comprehensive historical picture of the British book trade, but will have transformed the historiography of the field for generations to come.

Norbert Schürer
California State University, Long Beach

Katie Halsey and Jane Slinn, editors. *The Concept and Practice of Conversation in the Long Eighteenth Century, 1688-1848*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008. Pp. xxvi + 215; 11 illustrations; index. ISBN: 1-84718-497-9. Hardcover: \$69.99.

Lee Morrissey. *The Constitution of Literature: Literacy, Democracy, and Early English Literary Criticism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008. Pp. xii + 242; index. ISBN: 0804757860. Hardcover: \$60.00.

Charles Walton. *Policing Public Opinion in the French Revolution: The Culture of Calumny and the Problem of Free Speech*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009. Pp. ix + 291; index. ISBN: 978-0-19-536775-1. Hardcover: \$49.95.

The bibliographies in the first book under review testify to a growing interest among Anglophone scholars in the subject of conversation, beginning in 1993 with Peter Burke's *The Art of Conversation*. Lee Morrissey's book has to do with reading, but it reminds us of a feature of the early modern period, namely, the desire of people, ordinary folks, to be heard. Speech, however, especially the right of free speech (in contrast to freedom of the press), the subject of Charles Walton's book, has been less studied. All three books demonstrate (if less overtly the first) the attempt in the 18th century to harness multiplicity of voices and the disruptive potential of language, in the process promoting or constructing what might be called civic or social consciousness and, indeed, a modern political temper. Rather than contributing to the "openness" of the 18th-century public sphere, as Jürgen Habermas asserts, reason was rather an instrument that, according to Morrissey, effectively reduced debate. In England, this process took milder forms than in France, where, with the onset of the Terror, the project was one of outright propaganda.

The Concept and Practice of Conversation in the Long Eighteenth Century has its genesis in a conference held at the University of Cambridge in 2005. Editors Katie Halsey

and Jane Slinn point out in their introduction the striking reach of conversation into many areas of life and thought, both in texts and images "that address themselves to the description and conceptualization of conversation across a range of disciplines and genres." As with many approaches to the 18th century, the intent here is to "dialogue" with Habermas's model of the public sphere, in which talk developed into "critical discourse" from which "modern democracy was ultimately born" (xi). Of the nine essays in this volume, six offer vivid accounts of the practice and theory of conversation in the 18th century. (I omit from consideration here the postmodernist analyses by Mary Jacobus, Ludmilla Jordanova, and Peter de Bolla.)

Stefan H. Uhlig ("Improving Talk? The Promises of Conversation") responds to Stephen Miller's *Conversation: A History of a Declining Art* (Yale UP, 2006), specifically Miller's subtitle, and questions whether the 18th century, with its documented interest in conversation, can offer assistance in improving "our own professional talk." Uhlig means scholars of the humanities like ourselves, but he might be responding to Montaigne, who asked why it was that "a Master of Arts," "a man with all his advantages in learning, and in conducting debate," was no better than the rest of us? As Uhlig says, even in the 18th century, writers from Swift to Hume did not think that professional expertise (of those employed in "the Operations of the Mind") offered much guidance to the polite art of conversation.

Amanda Dickins describes the role of conversation in David Hume's work as "experiential" moral philosophy. Unlike Thomas Hobbes, Hume viewed men as sociable by nature, and conversation as a forum in which one submits one's private judgments to others and learns to see things from different perspectives. Reason by itself is not sufficient to discover standards in the absence of traditional authority, but, in connection with conversation, it can evaluate experience and arrive at considered moral judgments. Moreover, conversation is pleasurable, and by engaging in its sympathetic activity we demonstrate virtue.

Paul E. Kerry's subject is an essay by the German writer Heinrich von Kleist entitled "On the Gradual Production of Thought While Speaking." Though Kerry does not foreground it, the influence of Kant on Kleist and on this period generally reflects the "transformation in conversation" (as in the title of Kerry's essay) from a self-regulated Enlightenment model (which is sociable if not totally self-effacing) to an individualistic, self-actualizing mode of expression. The latter is exemplified by Kleist's essay (from 1805/6), which introduces the element of competition to conversation--spontaneous utterances without regard to the listener--and which, like Kant's philosophy, has radical political implications.

Kerry's essay leads nicely to the one by Jay Fliegelman on "American One-Sidedness," especially with its complementary illustrations of "textualized conversations" demonstrating the thesis that "productive horizontal conversation is never the easy back-and-forth colloquy fantasized as a foundational article of early democratic faith" (101). In discussing the role that books played in the epistolary exchanges among Founding-era writers, Fliegelman underlines what the other authors indicate (and is documented by Peter Burke), namely, that the discourse on conversation was articulated by men (mostly) who saw themselves as part of a continuing tradition of letters in which communication took place both in time and over time, was thus both diachronic and synchronic,

conducted primarily through reading and writing. Eighteenth-century treatises on writing recognize class and other personal differences, just as literary genres honor different social registers. The "authorities" on conversational practice extend back to Cicero.

Conversation as a particular kind of speech is something different, and certainly part of this difference in the 18th century was the participation of women, which is Michèle Cohen's subject. "In a Proper Exercise for the Mind" (from Hume, "On Essay Writing"), Cohen makes the counter-feminist argument that women could become well educated through conversation in domestic settings, as opposed to the narrow acquisition of skills now associated with education (and that privileged boys in the 18th century). She draws on the testimony of many female writers beginning with Anna Laetitia Barbauld. The practice of conversation appears to have taken place among the aspiring classes as well as the upper, both of whom wished to acquaint themselves with the newest "knowledge" in the sciences and arts. Habermas's public sphere has been described as masculinist, but in truth it is inconceivable without the presence of women, and Cohen's essay ultimately concerns conversation's role in constructing social beings and an "informed" democratic polis.

Though its legal history and terminology will be new territory for many readers, Jean Meiring's essay on Sir William Jones (a legal scholar as well as an Indo-Europeanist) was, for me, the most illuminating. While describing a "conversation" by which Roman law was adapted to English law, the author reveals the way in which natural law (as a system of universal principles) came to compete with a diversity of laws grounded in concrete English experience and tradition. Through the medium of Roman law, natural law methodology was introduced to England. Thus, as in every other field of 18th-century intellectual endeavor, "rational" standards and "universal" principles came to trump diverse local traditions.

Morrissey's book complements these essays, especially concerning the effect of rationality in establishing a uniform discourse and lessening the range of voices. It situates the attempt to be conversational, informed, and rational in a specific historical event, namely, the English Civil Wars. To return to a point with which I began, the desire of ordinary people to be heard, this unleashing of the inner spirit in England, resulted from what Morrissey calls "radicalized reading," encouraged by the subjective Biblical interpretation allowed by Protestantism. Democratic literacy and the sense of equality it engendered led in turn to an outpouring of uncontrolled print and, further, to political violence, because, per Thomas Hobbes, "every private man is Judge of Good and Evil actions." After the Restoration, the Civil Wars, according to Morrissey, were associated with the radical speech of the pamphlet wars and the perpetual disputation to which Milton was committed (Habermasian *avant la lettre*?). His chapter on Hobbes, particularly on *The Leviathan*, analyzes the philosopher's attempt to limit debates over reading and meaning as a way of avoiding political anarchy. Concerned with how words had been used, Hobbes called for "a strong, centralized mechanism to enforce their meaning," a "lexarch," who "shall examine the Doctrines of all bookes before they be published" (57).

The following chapters of *The Constitution of Literature* (clearly a double entendre) concern the emergence of English criticism, beginning with Dryden, and with what Morrissey calls "an official program of forgetting" (62). They take issue with the central role ascribed to criticism by Habermas in the formation of the bourgeois public

sphere. Individual chapters describe the expansion of literary critical vocabulary, attempts to counter the "powerful, distorting effects" of words, and basically the "shift away from the 'participatory' model of the 1640's pamphleteering, and toward the 'representative' model articulated by Hobbes" (63)--in other words, not openness, as per Habermas, but a move away from debate and difference of opinion. If the disruptive potential of language could be harnessed (e.g., because of its tropological dimension or the multiple meanings of words) and lexical anarchy banished, then social peace would follow. For a growing reading public, the attempt was made to elucidate rules or standards and render reading and interpretation more stable. Morrissey manipulates a vast amount of expertise, with treatments of Lutheran and Calvinist Scriptural reading, *The Spectator*, Pope, and Johnson, but the most interesting (if familiar) part of his treatment concerns Hume, who sought to create "authority" in the realm of taste, while at the same time maintaining that there was no such thing. This authority, sort of an invisible hand, directs the *sensus communis* (in the Kantian sense) with which I began.

As emerges from both of these books, "rational" conversation presupposed a class of people familiar with social rituals, eager for edification, and capable of submerging individuality. France, viewed through the prism of the salons, offers a similar model of rationality, conversation, and consensus, and it seems puzzling that men of a classical French education--as were many of the French revolutionaries--inheritors of their country's grand cultural tradition, could have perpetrated the Terror. Free speech, however, especially as we have come to know it, breaks the illusion of consensus or unity, not to mention offending against decorum and politesse. Charles Walton argues that it was France's particular "culture of honor and calumny" that contributed to the harsh sentences meted out to those found guilty of "criminal speech" during the Terror.

According to Walton, the monarchy was alert to the power of public opinion, and the policing of opinion in speech or print became increasingly theorized, beginning early in the 18th century. By mid-century, the philosophes, conducting their own battles with prepublication censorship, held varying opinions on free expression. Voltaire, for instance, believed bad books could bore, but not cause harm, while Diderot imagined "a reasonable public" that would be able to separate truth from lies. Speech was new territory, however, and most philosophes (the Marquis de Sade excepted) recognized "legitimate" limits on freedom of expression. Walton discusses representative attempts by Condorcet, Malesherbes, and Thiébauld to formulate such limits. The *cahiers de doléances* of 1789 revealed a widespread desire across all three estates for freedom of expression, again accompanied by the wish to limit it. "Individual" rights as such were not envisioned at this time, neither by the people nor in early drafts of the Declaration of Rights of Man and of the Citizen.

The optimism of the philosophes vanished almost immediately after the promulgation of freedom of opinion and press in Articles 10 and 11 of the Declaration of Rights of 1789. With the abolition of privilege and establishment of civic equality, political libel and denunciations of legislators mushroomed, as did the obsession with calumny. Articles 10 and 11 made exceptions in the case of disturbance of public order and other abuses "as shall be defined by law," but the General Assembly found itself unable to formulate punishable abuses. Although there was, up to 1792, what Walton calls a "quasi-libertarian" debate seeking tolerance for political speech (led, notably, by Jacobins

like Robespierre), as the situation grew chaotic and foreign war was threatened, the political elite equated attacks on their honor with insults against sovereign authority and collective values. Part of the problem, according to Walton, was the structure of punishments for calumny in the Old Regime, during which *lèse-majeste* divine and *lèse-majeste* were the greatest crimes recognized by law.

By the end of 1792, as Thomas Paine phrased it, the "honor" of the Republic was at stake. The law of March 29, 1793, attempted to unite revolutionaries against counter-revolutionaries, but it instead pitted revolutionaries against one another and served as a tipping point for the Terror. With the Law of Suspects of September 17, 1793, even the disparagement of patriotism was criminalized. As has been documented elsewhere, up to half of the 8,000 persons charged by the Committee of General Security in Paris during 1793-94 were imprisoned for acts of speech. Over 900 were executed for seditious or "counterrevolutionary" opinions stated verbally or publicly.

Like Morrissey, Walton traces these developments with a wealth of documentation, making good use of archival sources. After the trauma of what was in effect a civil war, authority was reconstituted in France, as in England under the banner of reason, though not via literary criticism. French authorities created "a battery of policing institutions to monitor, manipulate, and suppress vehicles of public opinion" (230-31). A unified "public spirit" was thereby created in which there could be no diversity of opinion, insofar as this was clerical or royalist. Thus began the "civil religion" that would cultivate the spirit of the Enlightenment via "enlightened surveillance" (222).

All three books offer insights into what might be called "discursive formation" in the modern period. They also suggest (to me, at least) that, though Habermas affirms the principles of cultural diversity and pluralism, his concept of discourse ethics is really an updating of Hume's conversational principle in which respect for others is recognized. Habermas would thus raise sociability to a constitutional principle (to use Morrissey's term). Clearly, contemporary debates about speech (the subject of Stefan Uhlig's paper in the first book under review) reflect the uncomfortable consequences of free expression in democracies and, as in the 18th century, the impulse to control it in ways conducive not to open debate but to uniformity.

Elizabeth Powers
New York, New York

**Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship for 2009
Shared by Padhraig Higgins and Catherine Skeen**

ASECS's Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship for 2009 has been awarded unanimously by the prize jury to Dr. Padhraig Higgins of Mercer County College and to Dr. Catherine Skeen of Villanova University. Both will conduct documentary research in Ireland, principally in archives and libraries in Dublin. Both proposals were judged to have been well detailed and contextualized, judiciously tailored to the fellowship's purposes and resources, thoughtfully based on identified holdings in Irish collections, strongly supported by letters of recommendation, and likely to lead to significant publishable discoveries. Dr. Higgins and Dr. Skeen will divide the Fellowship's \$1500 in

research travel funding.

Padhraig Higgins, who completed his doctorate in Irish history from Penn State University, is an Associate Professor of History at Mercer County College, in West Windsor, New Jersey. His essay "Consumption, Gender, and the Politics of 'Free Trade' in Eighteenth-Century Ireland" appeared in *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 41 (2007), 87-105, and he has a book forthcoming this year from the University of Wisconsin Press, *A Nation of Politicians: The Volunteers, Patriotism, and Gender in Late-Eighteenth-Century Ireland*. His proposal, entitled "'The Rights of the Poor': The Politics of Poverty in Eighteenth-Century Dublin," focuses on the House of Industry (an interesting but rarely discussed workhouse with 300 beds opening in Dublin in 1773). Higgins hopes to offer "a detailed picture of the experience of life in the House and the ways in which the wider poor population of the city interacted with this institution and the agencies of poor relief in Dublin parishes." The study is part of a larger project on the cultural history of poverty in 18th-century Dublin: on how the poor were portrayed and the sectarian politics of poverty and poor relief, as well as on the survival strategies of the poor.

With a doctorate from the University of Chicago and a Master's from Trinity College Dublin, Catherine Skeen holds a post-doctoral fellowship in Humanities at Villanova University. Her edition, with introduction and notes, of William Dunkin's *The Parson's Revels* is forthcoming from Four Courts Press. Her winning proposal, entitled "On College Property: William Dunkin and Trinity College Dublin," investigates the poet Dunkin's relations to Trinity College Dublin and the College's unusual commitment to provide him with an education and livelihood in exchange for its receipt of estates bequeathed to the College by Dunkin's great-aunt by marriage. Skeen surmises that this oddity of Dunkin's biography does more than shed light on his poetry: it opens up a contextual investigation into "the College's role as a landowner" and into the highly unsettled and litigious circumstances defining land ownership more generally in Ireland during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

This American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies Fellowship supports "documentary scholarship on Ireland in the period between the Treaty of Limerick (1691) and the Act of Union (1800), by enabling North American-based scholars to travel to Ireland and Irish-based scholars to travel to North America for furthering their research." Original research on any aspect of eighteenth-century Ireland qualifies for consideration, but recipients must be members of ASECS or its Irish sister organization, the Eighteenth-Century Ireland Society. Prize winners are chosen by an independent jury of three distinguished scholars from different disciplines, working in different countries, supported by a network of research specialists in Ireland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Each application goes through the hands of at least two readers in each pertinent field and at least two from outside disciplines. The ASECS Irish-American Research Fellowship was established in 1993-1994 by the late Dr. A. C. Elias, Jr. (independent scholar, Philadelphia), who long coordinated the fellowship, while Alexandra Mason (emeritus curator, Spencer Research Library) served as co-trustee. The fellowship is presently coordinated by Dr. Máire Kennedy, curator of the Dublin and Irish Collections of the Dublin City Public Library (maire.kennedy@dublincity.ie; 138-144 Pearse Street / Dublin 2 / Ireland) and Dr. James May of Penn State University's DuBois Campus (jem4@psu.edu; Penn State U. / College Place / DuBois, PA 15801).

The next Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship will be awarded early in 2010, with applications due on 1 November 2009 and open to all members of ASECS and the Eighteenth-Century Ireland Society. This year the requirements for applying are being altered, in part to bring them more in line with other ASECS travel fellowships. Applicants will be asked to submit to both coordinators and to ASECS (preferably by email with PDFs, though attachments in Word or RTF are acceptable this year): 1) a brief application form found at the ASECS website, functioning as a cover sheet, 2) a curriculum vitae not to exceed two pages and to indicate educational & employment background and relevant publications, manuscript submissions, presentations, & grants received; 3) a two- to three-page project description defining a) the applicant's research project and the role of the overseas research proposed within that project; b) the relation of the project to the state of scholarship (citing important studies where relevant); c) the identified materials to be examined and the sorts of information sought within them; and d) a budget of anticipated expenses; and 4) two letters of recommendation for the projected documentary research (please send copies to both coordinators and to ASECS). The website at <http://asecs.press.jhu.edu/travelgr.html> will soon reflect these changes.

Devoney Looser to Speak at 2009 Burney Society AGM

Devoney Looser, an Associate Professor of English at the University of Missouri and co-editor of the *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, will speak at the 2009 Annual General Meeting of the Burney Society. The title of her talk will be "An Elderly Lady With No Remains of Personal Beauty': Frances Burney and Old Age." She is the author of *Women Writers and Old Age in Britain, 1750-1850* (2008--it is reviewed above) and *British Women Writers and the Writing of History* (2000), both from Johns Hopkins U. Press, and *Jane Austen and the Discourses of Feminism* (Palgrave, 1995).

The Burney Society AGM will meet this year on October 8 in Bethlehem, PA, prior to the start of our EC/ASECS in Bethlehem and at Lehigh University. Attendees of the Burney AGM will have the option of registering for the EC/ASECS conference, which will begin on the evening of October 8 with a performance of scenes from Burney's *The Witlings* and will conclude on October 11.

The Burney Society AGM, featuring a single speaker, alternates with the Burney Conference, held in 2008 at the Newberry Library in Chicago. In past years, the Burney AGM has often been linked with the annual meeting of JASNA, the Jane Austen Society of North America, which in 2009 will meet in Philadelphia on the same weekend as EC/ASECS. Attendees of the Burney AGM on October 8 will have their choice whether to stay in Bethlehem for EC/ASECS, or to travel that evening (or the next morning) to Philadelphia for JASNA. The trip takes about 90 minutes by car.

The schedule for the Burney AGM calls for a business meeting to begin at 3:00 p.m. and the talk by Professor Looser at about 3:30. A cash bar reception at 4:30 will be followed by a buffet dinner at 5:30. The EC/ASECS conference will begin with the reading of scenes from *The Witlings* at 7:30 by members of EC/ASECS, including Juliet McMaster, reprising her role as Lady Smatter at the 2007 Burney Conference banquet. Registration for the Burney AGM, including the cost of the buffet dinner, will be \$40; registrants will be welcome to attend the performance of *The Witlings* whether or not they

plan to register for the EC/ASECS conference. All events will be held at the Hotel Bethlehem, 437 Main St., Bethlehem, PA, (610) 625-5000. Burney Society members may reserve a room at the hotel for the conference rate of \$129/night; mention EC/ASECS when making the reservation. Registration materials for both the Burney AGM and the EC/ASECS will be mailed to members of both societies in late summer.--Geoffrey Sill

News of Members

First, we thank **Ted Braun** and his Delaware colleague, Tom McCone, for overhauling the EC/ASECS website—see it at <http://www.udel.edu/flt/faculty/braun/ECASECS/> (you can also follow that string with “index.html”). The site now offers access to the three 2008 issues of the *Intelligencer*). Also, we encourage members sitting on the participatory fence, pronto, to contact **Monica Najar** at ec.asecs@lehigh.edu about getting on the program for **our meeting in Bethlehem, 8-11 October**. Surely all can find a place within the theme “The Sacred and the Secular in the Transatlantic 18th Century.” Next, we welcome all new members, who include **Sarah Benharrech**, in French at Maryland, working on Enlightenment moralists, Marivaux, and natural history; **Patricia Gale**, studying the English novel and book history at Penn State; **William T. Hendell**, working on French history of ideas, aesthetics, and garden history; **Michael Mulryan**, working on French Enlightenment, the French Revolution, and urban spaces; and **David Radcliffe**, who works on authors of the early 19C—I tapped David for some advice about where to browse the web for resources for 18C studies (see below).

Published or soon to be, are four essays by **Barbara Benedict**: “Reading Collections: The Literary Discourse in 18C Libraries,” in *Bookish Histories: Books, Literature, and Commercial Modernity, 1700-1900*, ed. by Paul Keen and Ina Ferris (Palgrave); “The Trouble with Things: Objects and the Commodification of Sociability” in *Blackwell's Companion to Jane Austen*, ed. by Claudia Johnson and Clara Tuite (2009), “Self, Stuff, and Surface: The Rhetoric of Things in Swift's Satires,” *Swift's Travels: 18C Satire and Its Legacy*, ed. by Nicholas Hudson and Aaron Santesso (CUP, 2008), and “Writing on Writing: Representations of the Book in 18C Lit,” in *Producing the 18C Book: Writers and Publishers in England, 1650-1800*, ed. Laura Runge and Pat Rogers (Delaware, 2009). She's working on “Editorial Fictions: Paratexts, Fragments and the Novel” for the “Cambridge History of the English Novel,” ed. by Robert Caserio and **Clem Hawes**, and on “'Male' or 'Female' Novel? The Reading Public, 1770-1832” for the “Oxford Handbook to the Novel,” ed. by **Alan Downie**. **Lisa Berglund** is working on an edition of Hester Piozzi's *Observations and Reflections of a Tour of France, Italy, and Germany*, reading at Harvard in May and the John Rylands in Manchester this August. **Matha Bowden**, presently serving as the SEASECS President, has been working on historical fiction. A book launch for **O M Brack**'s edition of Sir John Hawkins' *Life of Samuel Johnson (1787)*, involving a luncheon celebration, is being organized by Martine Brownley of Emory and Georgia UP for October. As noted, Skip has been curating a big exhibition (and catalogue) on Johnson for the Huntington, also involving books from **Loren Rothschild**'s collection. Below under conferences is an

announcement for a conference on “Quakers and Slavery” that **Carey Brycchan** is organizing for Philadelphia in Nov. 2010. Last year Stanford U. Press published **W. Bliss Carnochan's** *Golden Legends: Images of Abyssinia, Samuel Johnson to Bob Marley*--you heard it right! **Lorna Clark's** spring *Burney Letter* is loaded with interesting articles, many by herself, and some by other members (**Cathy Parisian**, **Geof Sill**, **Mascha Gemmeke**). **Greg Clingham's** conference on Johnson at Bucknell in March was a big success. **Matthew Davis** received the David Fleeman Fellowship from the U. of St. Andrews to work in its Fleeman Collection. **Blanche Ebeling-Koning** is translating from Latin a mid-17C history of a Dutch trading company in Brazil. **Robert Erickson**, who in retirement is making progress on his book "Sacred Rapture: The Poetics of Ecstasy, 1550-1750," reviewed William Slight's *The Heart in the Age of Shakespeare* (2008) for *Shakespeare Quarterly*. **Jan Fergus**, while nursing a broken leg through the early months of 2009, has been working on Austen (she'll speak at the Austen Society's AGM in October in Philadelphia) and on an essay regarding realistic novels for **Alan Downie's** "Oxford Handbook of the 18C Novel." **Mascha Gemmeke's** projects include "Love, Honour and Revenge: Suicide and the Question of Honour in European 18C Lit" for a festschrift.

Marcella Tarozzi Goldsmith is working on a book on Nietzsche and aphorisms. At the ASA meeting in Nov. she gave a response to Rancher's paper on *Antigone* (Hegel & Kierkegaard), and her book *D'un tratto*, on aphorisms (2006), won the Torino in sintesi award in 2008. **Susan Goulding** is directing the Undergraduate English program at Monmouth U. and serving on its Writing Committee. Susan's "Aphra Behn's 'Stories of Nuns': Narrative Diversion and 'Sister Books'" was published in the *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies*, 10 (Fall 2008), 38-55. **Alexander Gourlay's** iconographical study "'Art Delivered': Stothard's *The Sable Venus* and Blake's *Visions of the Daughters of Albion*" appears in *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 31 (2008), 529-50--this is Thomas Stothard's lost painting known from such engravings as Wm. Grainger's 1794 *The Voyage of the Sable Venus from Angola to the West Indies*. Stothard and Blake were both illustrating for John Stockdale, and Blake is likely to have known the work before it was reproduced as an engraving. . For the next *Intelligencer* **Sayre Greenfield** and **Linda Troost**, back from a sabbatical overseas and down-under, are preparing a forum of essays with pedagogical materials on "Electronic Archives in the Classroom," from participants in a successful panel at the 2008 EC/ASECS. **Charles Haskell Hinnant** has published "The Erotics of the Gift: Gender and Exchange in the 18C Novel" in *The Culture of the Gift in 18C England* ed. by Linda Zionkowski and C. Klekar (Palgrave, 2009)—it's a companion to the essay mentioned in our last issue. Haskell also has an essay in *Eighteenth-Century Women*, 5: "The Allegorical Portraiture and Restoration Court Beauty." **Paul Hunter** is chairing a session on Defoe's reputation at the Tulsa conference 25-26 Sept. The Spring 2009 issue of the SEASECS's *XVIII: New Perspectives on the 18C* contains **Christopher Johnson's** "History, Fiction, and the Emergence of an Artistic Vision: Sarah Fielding's Anna Boleyn Narrative" (6:19-33), as well as a

review by him of Bellanca's *Daybooks of Discovery* and other reviews by **Walter Gershuny** (Ted Braun and G. Robichez's selected works of Pompignan, *Lumières voilées*, **Charles H. Hinnant** (Ahern's *Affected Sensibilities*), and **Ruth Thomas** (Malcolm Cook's *Bernardin de Saint Pierre: A Life of Culture*), and a review by K. C. Laster of **Martha Bowden's** *Yorick's Congregation*. **George Justice** in December began a three-year term on the MLA's Restoration & Early 18C Division board, and **Catherine Ingrassia** joins the committee in 2009. A little over a year ago Oak Knoll published *American Signed Bindings* by **Thomas E. Kinsella** and Willman Spawn. **Devoney Looser** received a Huntington fellowship for two months' work on sister novelists Jane and Anna Maria Porter--while there in February, she spoke to the Southern California 18C seminar on "Mary Wollstonecraft's Restless Spirit." This June at the Sorbonne Nouvelle she delivers an invited lecture at the conference "Comment les femmes écrivent l'histoire à l'époque moderne (XVI-XVIIIe siècles)." Devoney has an exhibition review in the Winter 2009 *ECS*: "Brilliant Women: 18C Bluestockings." Congratulations to **Sylvia Marks** on her promotion to full professor last year at the Polytechnic Institute of NYU, and to **Ashley Marshall** for taking her doctorate after defending a lengthy and ambitious dissertation surveying satire as a mode during the long 18C.

Judith Mueller's "Animal Ascension in the Long 18C: The Contested Creature of Romarus 8" in *Eighteenth-Century Thought*, 4 (2008). **Maureen E. Mulvihill** spoke at the Society for Textual Scholarship meeting this spring on her edition of Mary Shackleton Leadbeater. This year **Max Novak** is honored with the festschrift *Defoe's Footprints: Essays in Honour of Maximillian E. Novak*, ed. by Robert Maniquis and Carl Fisher (U. of Toronto Press in association with UCLA's Center for 17C & 18C Studies). The volume includes essays by **Stuart Sherman** ("Defoe's Silences"), **J. Paul Hunter** ("Poetic Footprints: Some Formal Issues in Defoe's Poetry"), **Manuel Schonhorn** ("The Writer as Hero from Jonson to Fielding"), and others, such as John Richetti, Robert Folkenflik, Laura Brown, and Michael Seidel (it includes a bibliography of Max's publications). **Giulia Pacini** (gxpaci@wm.edu) and two colleagues are assembling a collection of essays on "the material culture of trees and forests in the global long 18C"; the essays (on real, not metaphorical, trees) should be 5000-6000 words and are due in Spring 2010. **Peter Perreten** is traveling in June to the ASLE conference at the Univ. of Victoria, British Columbia, all the way from Toronto by train (!), to speak on "The Canadian Eco-Travel Narratives of Florence Page Jaques and Francis Lee Jaques." Peter is also researching--in part at the Schwenkfelder Library in Pennsburg--on the transatlantic ministry and medical practices of Dr. George de Benneville (1703-1790), a founder of the Universalist Church in American and early resident of Berks Co., PA--he'll speak on the good doctor at our Lehigh meeting. I'm hoping the Schwenkfelder turns out to be a good resource on 18C Pennsylvania and Peter provides us with an account of its holdings. Congratulations to **Adam Potkay**, whose *The Story of Joy from the Bible to Late Romanticism* (Cambridge UP, 2007) won the American Comparative Literature Association's prize for the best book in 2007-08. **Alvaro Ribeiro** missed our fall meeting at Georgetown, for he was in the

second of two years at the Fairfield Jesuit Community--in Lehigh he'll speak about his edition of the letters of Dr. Charles Burney. (Alvaro, **Lorna Clark** and **Peter Sabor** were among our members at Bloomsbury's NYC auction of Paula Peyraud's Collection (Johnson & women writers) in early May, rich with Burney material.

Congratulations to **Michael Ritterson** on his retirement from Gettysburg; Michael is now engaged in literary translations from German. **Shel Rogers**, who's been working on early 18C poetry anthologies, will be up from New Zealand to participate in the SHARP and CSECS/NEASECS meetings--watch also for his review of **Tom Bonnell's** *Most Disreputable Trade* in the *Johnsonian News Letter*. **Angus Ross** was in Münster this month to work at the Ehrenpreis Centre on his political biography of John Arbuthnot, while staying with his old friend **Hermann Real**—Hermann speaks this summer at a Swift conference in Trim noted below. We're delighted that Hermann dedicated his erudite genre study above, rich with classical contexts, to this newsletter's founder, **Leland Peterson**. **Norbert Schürer**, who contributed a fine review above, has a review essay on "Continuity and Discontinuity in 18C Indian Historiography" in the Spring *ECS*. **Eleanor Shevlin** spoke at the MLA on "When Is a Book Not a Book? Using Google Book Search," which she is expanding for publication in *Digital Humanities Quarterly*. Eleanor is organizing for our Lehigh meeting a panel on electronic tools that will include **Brian Geiger**, the Asst. Director of the UC-Riverside Center for Bibliography—i.e., the North American ESTC. **David Spielman** is writing an essay on money in Defoe's novels, a version of which he'll give at the Defoe confence in Tulsa. **Robert Walker** has published "The Irishman's Three Halves: A Note on Richardson's *Grandison*" in *Notes & Queries*, n.s. 55 (2008), 333-35, and "Finding an Argument: Why Samuel Johnson Matters," in the *Saint Austin Review* (March 2009), 18-20. Bob has forthcoming "Boswell's Use of 'Ogden on Prayer' in *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*" in *The Age of Johnson*, and "Richardson and the Classics: Two Notes (Converging) in *N&Q*." **Zak Watson** finished his PhD and remained at Missouri as a Visiting Asst. Prof.; in November at the Group for Early Modern Culture, Zak spoke on "Imagination's Excess from Ancient Greece to the Gothic Revival."

Forthcoming Meetings, Exhibitions, New Publications, etc.

Oklahoma State U. in Tulsa will host the first biennial **Defoe Society** conference on 25-26 Sept. (contact robert.mayer@okstate.edu). Among the summer conferences of note is "**New Directions in Austen Studies**" at the Chawton House Library 9-11 July, with papers by Dierdre Le Faye, Isobel Grundy, Janet Todd, and other big contributors to Austen studies. The **Trim Swift Festival**, in Co. Meath, 2-5 July, organized by James Ward, University of Ulster and others, will include talks by Hermann J. Real and Robert Mahony (see www.trimswiftfestival.com).

The **EC/ASECS** meets on 8-11 October in Bethlehem, PA, hosted by Lehigh U. (see the news of members above). That weekend the **Midwest ASECS** meets in Fargo, ND, with a focus on expanding physical borders, chaired by Jeanne Hageman [jeanne.hageman@ndsu.edu] of North Dakota State U.). Also then the **Midwest**

Conference on British Studies meets at the Holiday Inn at the U. of Pittsburgh (deadline 1 May, see <http://mwcbcs.edublogs.org/>)

The **NEASECS** and **Canadian SECS** hold a joint meeting 5-9 November in Ottawa, "1759: Making and Unmaking Empires," chaired by Frans de Bruyn (confe18c @uottawa.ca). Also that weekend the **Aphra Behn Society** meets at Cumberland U., Lebanon, TN (contact Michael Rex: mrex@cumberland.edu).

The **SEASECS** meets at the Carnegie Hotel in Johnson City, TN, hosted by East Tennessee State U., organized by Judith Slagle, with program chaired by Phyllis Thompson, to whom proposals were due by 1 May (tomsop@etsu.edu)--the theme is "Echoes of Heritage and Place." The 2011 meeting will be at Wake Forest U. (Winston-Salem, NC), organized by Byron Wells and Claudia Kairoff.

Brycchan Carey of Kingston U. (b.carey@kingston.ac.uk) and Geoff Plank of U. of Cincinnati are chairing a conference on the **Quakers and Slavery** in Philadelphia, 4-6 Nov. 2010, co-hosted by the McNeil Center for Early American Studies, Haverford & Swarthmore colleges (www.quakersandslavery.org).

Sandro Jung (sandro.jung@btopenworld.com) is establishing a new journal, entitled "*Eighteenth-Century Poetry*," for which he's received institutional funding. Sandro (sandro.jung@btopen.com) should be at Lehigh Univ. in October.

Beverly Schneller brings to our attention an article likely to interest all working on Henry Fielding. It's "Oratorio a la Mode," by Ilias Chrissochoidis, in Spring/Summer 2008 *Newsletter of the American Handel Society* on Fielding's interest in Handel's *Esther*, reprinting a "**Fielding piece from 'The Comedian'** (1724) found at the Houghton Library called 'Reflection on Some Modern Plays.'"

The **Joyce Hemlow Prize in Burney Studies** for the best paper by a graduate student on Frances Burney, to be awarded this October (see Geof Sill's article above), has a deadline of 1 August (6000-word limit, \$250 prize plus publication in the *Burney Journal*); contact Audrey Bilger at abilger@cmc.edu.

Submissions to Indiana University's **Oscar Kenshur book prize** for the best monograph on the 18C published in 2009 are due by 31 January 2010 to the ASECS office (2598 Reynolda Rd., Suite C / Winston-Salem, NC 27106). Books need to be by a single author and published in English. Direct questions to Prof. Dror Wahrman, Director of the Center for 18C Studies at Indiana (dwahrman@indiana.edu). The winning author, besides a \$1000, receives an invitation to participate in a workshop on the book sponsored by the Center.

David Radcliffe, a bibliographer savvy about the WWW, recommends as good **browsing sites for 18C and early 19C materials**, and he suggested one troll the following: <http://www.oaister.org/>; <http://www.nines.org/> (it covers "a long 19C"); <http://www.intute.ac.uk/>; <http://merlot.org/merlot/index.htm>; and "Voice of the Shuttle": <http://vos.ucsb.edu/index.asp>. Good fishing!

The 2010-11 **John Carter Brown Library Research Fellowships** have a deadline of 10 January 2010. Short-term grants are for two to four months (monthly stipend of \$2000), and long-term, restricted to US citizens or residents, for five to ten months (monthly stipend of \$4000). JCBL is a premiere library for researching the history of the Western Hemisphere since the European discovery. Contact JCBL_Fellowships@Brown.edu; Box 1894, Providence, RI 02912.