The Director’s Parting Report

At the end of the 1990-91 academic year I will step down as Director of the Clark Library and the Center for Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Studies to resume a life of full-time teaching and research. The last three years have seen tremendous steps forward for the Library and the Center. We have increased the Library’s endowment by $500,000 and raised over $260,000 in foundation grant money to fund conferences, programs, and workshops. We have set up an Advisory Council of supporters in the community at large to help raise funds. And we have been able, as a result of budgetary reform, to increase the annual book budget by $20,000, a sum that will be further augmented by the $500,000 increase in endowment.

We have also been able to establish a variety of new programs: an ongoing workshop and lecture series, a distinguished scholar program that enables graduate students to meet and discuss their work with senior scholars, an interdisciplinary faculty seminar, and a series of Library workshops designed to examine issues that grow out of materials in the Clark’s holdings. The Library and the Center have also hosted two major international conferences. To complement these programs, we have increased both the number and the types of fellowships offered, including a new one for predoctoral students.

As a result of these efforts our programs have brought to the Clark and Center scholars not only from all over the United States but from Canada, the West Indies, the United Kingdom, Holland, France, Italy, Germany, Norway, the Soviet Union, and Australasia. Within California, scholars from twenty-four institutions have participated in our programs.

There have also been changes on the Clark Library site. In November we formally opened the new north range of buildings, containing storage space, offices, a seminar/common room, and three apartments. The library itself has become a more prominent venue for university and scholarly functions.

I have been very glad to contribute to these efforts and extremely grateful to all those who have worked so hard to see the innovations and the expansion come about. I feel, however, that it is time for me to return to full-time teaching and scholarship. I have now worked in administration at Harvard and at UCLA for over ten years. A decade is more than enough. I wish my successor every good fortune and look forward to taking part in the flourishing intellectual life of the Library and Center.

JOHN BREWER
Director

Gibbings, Groom, and the Muse

[For several years the Clark Library’s holdings in the literature and history of earlier centuries as well as in modern fine printing have served as resources in a study of illustrations of Paradise Lost by Virginia Tufte, Professor of English Emeritus, University of Southern California; Wendy Furman, Professor of English, Whittier College; and Eunice Howe, Associate Professor of Art History, University of Southern California. Their book, tentatively titled Visualizing Paradise Lost: Artists as Interpreters of Milton’s Epic, focuses on the designs by John Medina, Henry Aldrich, and Bernard Lens in the first illustrated edition (1688), and those by William Blake (1807 and 1808), John Martin (1827), and Mary Groom (1997).]

It is a thick handsome volume 13½ by 10 inches, too heavy to hold in your hands as you read it but comfortably manageable on a desk or reading stand. The half binding of black pigskin, gold-lettered on the spine, sets off the brilliant hand-marbled cloth sides with their waves of coral and fiery red, black, tan, and beige whorling and snaking from bottom to top in a pattern that seems almost in motion. It represents the flames of hell. The pages, handmade from pure linen rag, bear a uniquely appropriate watermark—a tree and serpent.

The volume is, of course, Paradise Lost, and the edition is that of the Golden Cockerel Press, published in 1937. The text is from Milton’s ten-book first edition of 1667, along with the prose arguments and the preface explaining his use of blank verse added by the poet in later issues.
of the first edition. It was prepared for the press by J. Isaacs, M.A., Lecturer in English Literature, University of London.

The Golden Cockerel edition was limited to 200 numbered copies, 196 printed on paper and 4 on vellum with full bindings of white pigskin. The Daily Sketch (25 June 1937) thought it newsworthy that the skins of “more than a hundred lambs ... had gone to make the vellum” for the pages of each of the four superdeluxe copies and that “more than a hundred pigskins were inspected before four were found suitable to make the white bindings.” The Sunday Dispatch (20 June 1937) reported that it had taken 980 lambkins for the four vellum volumes and noted that all four were sold even before they were finished, although they cost £100 each. “The other 196 cost 10 gns. each and they, too, are nearly all sold,” the Dispatch added.

An endnote in the volume gives testimony of the time, talents, energies, and loving care that went into the publication and made its completion a proud accomplishment to celebrate the coronation of a new king:

THE GOLDEN COCKEREL EDITION OF PARADISE LOST has been designed and printed by Christopher and Anthony Sandford, Francis Newbery, and Owen Rutter. Work was begun on the 22nd January, 1935, and finished on the Eve of the Coronation of King George the Sixth and Queen Elizabeth of England on the 12th May, 1937. All the titling and the type used belong to the Golden Cockerel Press, designed by Eric Gill and cut by Caslon. ... All the type has been set by A. H. Gibbs, assisted by H. Batchelor, and the press worked by H. Barker. The lamb-vellums were prepared by Band. The Batchelor paper was hand-made. ... The engravings are by Mary Groom. The binding is by Zaechnsdorf. The cloth sides were hand-marbled by Sydney Cockerell. ... God save the King!

Although production was begun early in 1935, the plan to publish Milton’s epic had been set in motion in 1930 by Robert Gibbings (1890–1958), the talented wood engraver, author, printer, sculptor, and book and type designer who had headed the Golden Cockerel Press since 1924. He had illustrated many of its books himself, had enlisted the talents also of Eric Gill, Gertrude Hermes, Blair Hughes-Stanton, and other fine wood engravers, and had made the Golden Cockerel a leader among the private presses before passing it along in 1933 to Christopher Sandford and his associates. The new owners took over the publication of Paradise Lost.

Early in 1936, a year before the book came off the press, and again in the spring of 1937, notices to prospective subscribers described the edition as “monumental,” “by far the largest volume printed at the Press,” and “with its 988 pages considerably thicker than our earlier book, THE FOUR GOSPELS.” Published in 1931, that book had combined Gibbings’s and Gill’s talents as page and type designers with Gill’s as illustrator, and it became the crown jewel on the Golden Cockerel list. Having printed in The Four Gospels “the grandest of English prose,” the press now announced its intention of making its “poetical debut” with “the highest and most dignified of English poetry.” But the press had a surprise for its patrons. The prospectus announced:

the volume will be decorated throughout with engravings on wood by Mary Groom, one of our younger artists, whose illustrations cannot fail to excite the keenest interest and, it is hoped, admiration among collectors and critics of art. At the same time the Press wishes to take this opportunity of expressing its regret that Robert Gibbings, who had originally intended illustrating the edition himself, should have decided that this Poem was not entirely suited to his muse.

Gibbings had undertaken the illustrations and had decided, quite rightly, that the techniques he had employed in such books as Keats’s Lamia and Flaubert’s Salambo would not do for Milton’s epic. His initial effort is preserved in a specimen page he drew for the opening of Paradise Lost that appeared in a Golden Cockerel prospectus in the spring of 1930.

One fails to see in Gibbings’s design a literal representation or an imaginative or symbolic interpretation of any specific lines in the epic, certainly not the opening of book 1 that appears with it on the page. Perhaps the artist meant simply to depict what he saw as the most interesting and crucial action of the epic, the seduction of Eve by the serpent, an event that takes place in book 9. But Gibbings’s pensive Eve, lying on a bed of iris leaves in a pose conven-

OF MANS First Disobedience, and the Fruit Of that Forbidden Tree, whose mortal Tast Brought Death into the World, and all our woe, With loss of Eden, till one greater Man Restore us, and regain the blissful Seat, Sing Heav’nly Muse, that on the secret top Of Oreb, or of Sinai, didst inspire That Shepherd, who first taught the chosen Seed, In the Beginning, how the Heav’ns and Earth Rose out of chaos: or if Sion Hill

tional for naked women in private-press books, hardly suggests Milton's engaging Eve who's tending the garden when the serpent comes upon her:

Beyond his hope, Eve separate he spies,
Veil'd in a Cloud of Fragrance, where she stood,
Half spi'd, so thick the Roses bushing round
About her glow'd, oft stooping to support
Each Flowl'r of slender stalk... 

(9.424–28)

And Gibbings's serpent, coiled about a stylized palm tree with its tail dangling into the initial "O" of the text, unsuccessfully imitates Gill's medievalizing decoration of initial letters, besides appearing a dull creature indeed compared to Milton's, with its

Circular base of rising folds, that tow'r'd
Fold above fold a surging Maze, his Head
Crested aloft, and Carbuncle his Eyes;
With burnish'd Neck of verdant Gold, erect
Amidst his circling Spires...

(9.498–502)

What about Mary Groom (1903–1958), the new "youn-
ger artist" who took on the task that Gibbings felt he could not complete? Was Paradise Lost entirely suited to her muse? We believe that her twenty-nine illustrations constitute the most coherent visual reading of Milton's text since Blake's, and that among Milton's many illustrators she is the one most attentive to the "two great Sexes" (8.151) that animate Milton's cosmos, a divinely and joyfully gendered universe, mythic and multicultural. Groom's designs of Milton's Muse, of his Godhead, of Adam and Eve, of Eden, of Satan, of the Fall and Restora-
tion, give visual form to something like the redemptive fertility myth that a number of recent critics, Stevie Davies and Douglas Anderson among them, have discovered in Milton's words.

Patience Empson, editor of The Wood Engravings of Robert Gibbings (London, 1959), believes that it was Gibbings who approached Groom for the task. Relatives of Groom recall that Blair Hughes-Stanton introduced her to Gibbings. Mary Groom was a close friend of Hughes-
Stanton and of Gertrude Hermes (who for a time were married to each other), the three of them having been art students together in Leon Underwood's Brook Green School in the early twenties. They were at the center of the English wood-engraving movement between World Wars I and II, which was closely linked with the development of the private presses. The Underwood group studied and experimented together, preferring the technique of white line on black, which they regarded as an exciting rediscovery of a medium that, to quote Albert Garrett, "had lain dormant for so long under the avalanche of commercialism." Concepts were being clarified, Garrett wrote, and "the white-line aesthetics were firmly estab-
lished" (A History of British Wood Engraving [Tunbridge Wells, 1978], 165).

If it was Gibbings who invited Mary Groom to illustrate Paradise Lost, the commission was confirmed by Christopher Sandford when he became owner of the Golden Cockerel Press in 1933. In any event, Groom completed at

least five of the illustrations by 1935, two years prior to pub-

lication, and showed them at an exhibit held at the Redfern Gallery in London by the Society of Wood Engravers.

In Mary Groom's illustration for the opening of Milton's book 1, the Muse whom Milton appeals to in the invocations swoops down on powerful dove-like wings that fill the sky, releasing from her hands a descending dove, thus linking the Muse's identity with that of the androgy-
nous Spirit who "from the first" was "present, and with mighty wings outspread / Dove-like satst brooding on the vast Abyss / And mad'st it pregnant" (1.19–22). The poet, in Puritan garb, standing firmly on the scroll that is his manuscript, extends his pen for her blessing: "I thence / Invoke thy aid to my advent'rous Song, / That with no middle flight intends to soar / Above th' Aonian Mount, while it pursues / Things unattempted yet in Prose or Rhyme" (1.12–16).

On the right are images of the Hebrew and patriarchal figures whom Milton says she inspired:

Sing Heav'nly Muse, that on the secret top
Of Oreb, or of Sinai, didst inspire
That Shepherd, who first taught the chosen Seed,
In the Beginning how the Heav'n's and Earth
Rose out of Chaos...

(1.6–10)


Mary Groom, illustration for book 1 of Paradise Lost. Reproduced by permission of the Golden Cockerel Press.\]
The crowned figure in the foreground with the harp of sacred song perhaps links “That Shepherd” (Moses) with the other divine singer-shepherd, David. The small figure above him is Moses holding the tablets of the law, received on Mount “Oreb” or “Sinai.” At right, Moses experiences Yahweh’s self-revelation in the vision of the burning bush. In the background rises the monumental dome of the temple of Jerusalem, summing up the Judaic side of Milton’s inspiration.

In the invocations Milton compares his Muse to the nine muses of the classical tradition, implying his belief that pagan myths were shadows of scriptural truths and announcing his own intention: as a Christian poet to outdo his classical models, to “soar / Above th’ Aonian Mount,” which was sacred to the pagan muses. On the left, Groom shows the nine classical muses clustered about a classical epic poet, perhaps Milton’s “blind Thamyris” or “blind Maeonides” (Homer) (3-35). Elevated in the far background is a classical temple reminiscent of the great altar of Zeus, the central feature of the acropolis at Pergamum. Thus Groom gives comparable attention to the two streams of Milton’s inspiration—classical on the left, Judaic on the right.

At lower left in the initial letter “O,” Groom shows “the Fruit / Of that Forbidden Tree, whose mortal taste / Brought Death into the World . . .” (1.1–3). At lower right, next to David and his harp, Groom draws sprigs of fresh foliage, perhaps suggesting the regeneration Christ’s coming will offer. We recall that David, like Moses, is one of the Old Testament figures widely depicted in Christian art as foreshadowing Christ. Since Groom frequently uses Christian iconography, and a fish is an often-used symbol for Christ, it seems likely that the fish-like contour of the harp also suggests the “greater Man” who will “Restore us” (1.4–5).

When the Golden Cockerel’s Paradise Lost came off the press, reviews of the book appeared in a number of British publications. All were laudatory. As was customary in reviewing such books in the thirties, most of the critics focused on physical qualities of the book: the paper and the presswork were flawless, the letters on the leather were perfectly tooled, the size was manageable, the rubricated title page engraved by Gibbons and the type designed by Gill were characteristic of the press, and so on. Little attention was given to Groom’s illustrations; she was simply one of the team who had produced a “monumental” and sumptuous book. There were a couple of exceptions. The Times Literary Supplement (26 June 1937) reprinted Groom’s engraving of the expulsion, noting that although the newspaper’s reproduction was taken from an “electro,” it would give “some idea of the quality of Miss Groom’s work; in the book itself the pictures are printed from the wood-blocks with consummate skill.” But only Humbert Wolfe, writing in the Observer (8 August 1937), gave any thought to the illustrations in relation to Milton’s text: “Did that admirable engraver Miss Groom see Milton plain—or did she perhaps see him coloured?” And he raises the question, “are [we] too ridden by our own conception of Milton to see him with other eyes?”

Mary Groom’s interpretation of Paradise Lost is indeed “coloured” by her own response to the epic, her world view, the era in which she lived. Such is true of any artist. Her illustrations, and those of other artists and eras, interest us not simply as “decoration” or solely as interpretation of Milton’s text but also as texts in their own right, participating in cultural patterns and concerns. Illustrations grow uniquely out of each artist’s talent and choices, his or her perceptions of the poem, literary and art-historical traditions, the artistic media and techniques employed, the audience, patronage, the politics and economics of publication.

In the specialized environment of the private presses of the thirties, where publishers and purchasers tended to expect illustrations to be uncomplicated, conventionalized, decorative, and erotic, Robert Gibbons found Paradise Lost “not entirely suited to his muse.” Ignoring the prevailing modes of private-press illustration as well as some of the traditional conceptions of Paradise Lost, Mary Groom created, from a fresh and modern perspective, genuinely interpretive accompaniments to Milton’s words. Her muse served her well.

WENDY FURMAN
EUNICE HOWE
VIRGINIA TUFT

Rhetoric Workshop-Conference: A Report and a Comment

The Scope of Eloquence: Texts and Contexts of Rhetoric after the Renaissance

The workshop-conference of 8 December 1990 inaugurated the Clark’s series of programs in the history of rhetoric and language. The format included a number of unusual and experimental features which were designed to move away from the rigidity of formal paper presentations, encourage interplay among the participants, and publicize the extent of the Clark’s holdings in the area of rhetoric. My original idea had been to have an intensive workshop, to have a table piled high with two hundred lesser-known books and manuscripts, surrounded by a dozen scholars who would read, discuss, and squabble until nightfall. As the small workshop developed into a larger conference—attendance quickly reached capacity, with some registrants flying in from the East Coast—we had to reduce the number of rare books (primarily for conservation), enlarge the table, and adopt a program schedule.

The saner format which finally prevailed tried to remain true to the intentions of the original. A major innovation was that of dividing the program into two parts, a smaller workshop followed by the larger conference. All of the scheduled speakers gathered at the Clark on the Friday immediately preceding the conference in order to read intensively in materials relevant to their areas of discussion scheduled for the next day. Most of the materials set aside for them had been selected by graduate students at the University of Southern California who were doing research in the history of rhetoric and who understood the range of the Clark’s collections (see Newsletter no. 17). The hope
was that the speakers’ introductory remarks would reflect their reading in the Clark’s materials, where appropriate, and that the resulting conference discussions would be based to a great degree on texts immediately available to all participants.

On Saturday, the principal speakers introduced their respective subject areas with brief presentations rather than formal papers. In the morning, Thomas O. Sloane (Berkeley) initiated discussions on “Academic Disputation after the Renaissance” and Arthur Quinn (Berkeley) on “Figural Rhetoric and Scriptural Hermeneutics.” The afternoon discussions grew out of comments by Lloyd F. Bitzer (Madison) on “Religious Controversy and Rhetorical Theory” and James J. Murphy (Davis) on “Searching for Rhetoric in the ESTC and the ISTC,” and my own remarks on “Rhetoric and the Clark Collections.” The sessions were moderated by Richard A. Lanham and Debora K. Shuger, both of UCLA. Many of the materials which the speakers had consulted on Friday were back on the conference table in the main drawing room on Saturday, and the moderators encouraged the participants to take advantage of these materials—to read, discuss, and squabble until nightfall.

**Foldout from John Holmes’s Art of Rhetoric Made Easy (1739)**

While the scheduled discussions were taking place in the drawing room, over forty other rare volumes were made available in the north bookroom. Participants were encouraged to leave and rejoin the scheduled discussions in the drawing room at their leisure in order to sit down and leaf through or read these supplementary volumes in the bookroom. The volumes were selected to represent the scope of eloquence in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and provide a sense of the range of materials in which scholars will find significant discussions relevant to the history of rhetoric. Materials included standard works on rhetoric and logic, such as those by Ramus, Fênelon, Farnaby, Arnauld, Lamy, as well as unusual sources, such as The Whole Art of Converse (1685), Lenglet Dufresnoy’s New Method of Studying History (1728), and Chambers’s Cyclopaedia (1728), which has articles of sufficient length and detail to constitute an independent and substantial treatise on rhetoric. While forty volumes on a table seems much more modest than the two hundred originally planned, the strains upon the Library staff still were extraordinary, and even some of the participants seemed unnerved by being allowed, indeed asked, to consult more than the usual one-rare-book-at-a-time.

Thomas F. Wright, the Clark Librarian, conceived the idea of a series in the history of rhetoric and language, and his encouragement of the experimental format of this inaugural event is itself an act of archival bravery.

**Lawrence D. Green**

*Department of English*

*University of Southern California*

**Scoping Eloquence, Sighting Culture**

Rhetoric shapes and is shaped by culture. It can awaken us to our status as social, political, and politicized beings, just as it can heighten our sense of alienation from centers of sociability and polity.

As simple as this observation may seem, historians of rhetoric have on the whole been reluctant to document the many, varying ways in which their object of study at once constructs and deconstructs culture. Their stories of choice have focused on rhetoric’s history within specific textual or institutional settings, such as individual rhetorical handbooks, the classroom, or the pulpit. And who can blame them for keeping rhetoric in these tightly controlled historical and historiographical spaces? From Descartes and Sprat to the nightly newscasters of our own era, after all, the Western mind has claimed for itself a unique relationship to “truth” by touting the capacity of its science to keep rhetoric at bay. That historians have tended to micromanage rhetoric’s past is thus only a reflection of the way most of us like our rhetoric anyway. We naively expect it to surface only at specifically sanctioned moments in specifically sanctioned venues.

Those naive expectations are changing and, as a result, there are now many alternative, rhetorically informed projects in need of a voice. Fortunately, there are alternative historiographical approaches to speak them, such as the ones currently being tried out by those who consider themselves cultural historians or new historicists. This is especially heartening for scholars of the period stretching from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment, for as the Clark holdings themselves attest, discussions of rhetorical strategy and capacity once surfaced in what to us seem like very diverse cultural and textual spaces indeed.
“The Scope of Eloquence” encouraged participants to consider the heterogeneity of the Clark’s holdings as evidence, not of the idiosyncratic tastes of any individual book collector, but of the diverse and contested spaces which rhetoric itself occupied in early modern European culture. The extent to which December’s workshop-conference questioned the common wisdom about rhetoric and its historiography is surely a reflection of Professor Green’s innovative format.

One of the best features of the program, it seems to me, was the balance struck between the time allotted the speakers for the presentation of their findings, the time permitted for questions, and the unstructured time which encouraged informal discussion among all participants. Especially cheering was the diversity of historiographical perspective expressed by those who spoke during the structured question-and-answer segments. As many of the questions came from junior scholars interested in applying the analytic frames of the new cultural history to the historiography of rhetoric, the Clark might want to consider designing future programs in such a way as to bring junior and senior scholars to the same podium rather than merely to the same table. Topics that might get the dialogue going: the function of eloquence in specific cultural spaces, such as the Renaissance villa, the early modern laboratory, or the Enlightenment salon; the ties forged between the verbal and the visual in early modern rhetoric texts; the mania for system and method in later seventeenth- and eighteenth-century rhetorics; and rhetoric’s role in shaping European views of the New World.

Few institutions or scholarly journals seem to be thinking programmatically these days about rhetoric’s future. With Professor Green’s bibliographical project and the series of programs in rhetoric now underway, the Clark is in a good position to become a lively and relatively informal center for rhetoric studies.

Jay Tribby
Center NEH Fellow, 1990–91
Department of History
University of Florida

Clark Receives English STC Project Grants

The Center for Bibliographical Studies at the University of California, Riverside, has given the Clark Library two grants totaling $7,000 to support its participation in the establishment of the English Short-Title Catalogue. Proposed and organized by Henry Snyder, Director of the North American Eighteenth-Century Short-Title Catalogue and of the Center for Bibliographical Studies, the English STC project is arguably the most important bibliographical undertaking of this century.

When completed, the English STC will combine in a single data base the Eighteenth-Century Short-Title Catalogue, already in machine-readable format, with an online version of the two earlier standard bibliographies of English books: the Pollard and Redgrave bibliography, covering the period from 1475, the beginning of printing in England, to 1640; and the Wing bibliography, covering the years 1641–1700 (known respectively as STC 1 and STC 2 within the combined bibliography). The English STC will exclude periodicals, most job printing, and some types of engraved materials. With these exceptions, all works in English printed anywhere, and all foreign-language works printed in Great Britain or its colonies, from the very beginnings to the eve of the nineteenth century—over three hundred years of text production—will be searchable within seconds not only by the usual author, title, subject categories found in card catalogues, and by such additional categories as publisher, date, or place of publication, but also by key words in the title and by combinations of categories, options unique to computer searches.

The idea of a single bibliography has long been discussed, but it was not until the development of machine-readable cataloguing and national bibliographic networks such as RLIN that the idea became practical. The Eighteenth-Century Short-Title Catalogue (ESTC), which was to become the genesis of the English STC and will be its largest component with an estimated 350,000 entries, was intended from the outset as a computerized data base. Now that it is nearing completion, work on the next phase of the English STC project—the conversion of records in the printed bibliographies into the same computer-compatible format—has begun. Though the number of records in these bibliographies is smaller (approximately 100,000 for Wing, 36,000 for Pollard and Redgrave), the task is still complex and time consuming.

One immediate strategy of the Center for Bibliographical Studies was to draw upon the enormous resources in its own geographical area. A grant of $5,000 to the Clark last summer enabled the Library to complete its union list of the Wing numbers of titles held by the Clark and the Huntington libraries, a project originally developed by John Bidwell of the Clark staff. Since the STC 2 portion of the English STC will describe titles on the basis of copies held by the Clark or the Huntington whenever possible, the union list will be useful to the project in determining which Wing titles are available at one or both libraries. The list is of course also useful to the libraries themselves as the first reliable joint record of Wing holdings. Periodic revisions of the data base will enable each institution to stay current on the other’s acquisitions and allow either one the option of not buying an item that the other holds.

A second grant of $5,000 last fall provided seed money for the Clark to begin reporting its entire Wing collection—some 26,000 titles—in full bibliographical detail to the English STC, a procedure that we anticipate will take about two years to complete and require additional funding by the Library of well over $15,000. While the Clark also reports Wing holdings and acquisitions to Yale, where a revision of the Wing printed bibliography is in progress, there are significant differences between the STC 2 component of the English STC and the successive printed versions of Wing that began in the mid-1940s. Although labeled a short-title catalogue, the electronic bibliography will contain much fuller titles than the printed versions and provide more information, such as a greater number.
of locations of copies. The nature and extent of the differences make it essentially a new project, requiring new reporting of titles.

The Clark Library has been closely connected with the ESTC since its beginnings, reporting all of its eighteenth-century holdings of more than 18,000 titles, and we welcome the opportunity to be involved in the development of the English STC. The implications of this project for the future of scholarship, its potential for suggesting new ways of combining and organizing material and for fostering radically new interpretations, have just begun to be recognized.

THOMAS F. WRIGHT
Librarian

WORK IN PROGRESS

FELLOWS IN RESIDENCE, FALL 1990 AND WINTER 1991

CATHERINE B. BURROUGHS, Cornell College (Short-Term, 11 February–18 February), “The Theatrical Criticism of English Romantic Women Writers”

DIANNE DUGAW, University of Oregon (Short-Term, 1 September–30 November), “‘Deep Play’: John Gay and the Politics of Parody”


DEBORAH HARKNESS, Northwestern University; University of California, Davis (Predoctoral, 1 January–31 March), “European Natural Philosophers and the Language of Nature”

ROBERT ILIFFE, Imperial College, London (NEH, Fall–Winter; Short-Term, Spring), “Aspects of Editing in the Early Eighteenth Century”


NICHOLAS MIRZOEFF, Warwick University (NEH, Fall–Winter), “Sense and Sensibility: Knowledge and Representation of the Body in France, 1650–1800”


JAMES TIERNEY, University of Missouri, St. Louis (Short-Term, 10 October–10 December), “A CD-ROM Subject Index to Pre-1800 British Periodicals”


A SELECTION OF REPORTS

PETER GOLSTEIN, “ANDREW MARVELL, HISTORIAN”

Traditional wisdom divides Andrew Marvell's literary career into two separate, irreconcilable phases: the lyric (and to a lesser extent political) poet of the Interregnum, and the satirist of the Restoration. Connections between the two are rarely made, as if Marvell had completely altered course after 1660. But neglect of the prose has obscured an important unifying strand in Marvell's career: the concern with the place of the political moment in sacred history.

The Restoration Marvell was, indeed, a satirist, but he was also a Christian historian. In 1676 he published _A Short Historical Essay, touching General Councils, Creeds, and Imposition in Religion_ (appended to Mr. Smirke), a history of clerical persecution during the first five centuries of the Christian era, complete with contemporary parallels. This was followed by _An Account of the Growth of Popery, and Arbitrary Government in England_ (1677), a narrative of the previous decade of British politics, located in an eschatological framework of Protestant good versus Roman Catholic evil. These are polemical histories, which argue for particular political courses on the basis of their potential roles in the saga of sacred history. In retrospect, we can see such concerns haunting Marvell throughout his career: in the skeptical view of Cromwell's mission in the “Horatian Ode,” the unstable visions of national redemption in “Upon Appleton House,” the serene apocalypticism of “Bermudas,” the anxious prophecy of “The First Anniversary,” the accounts of the Civil War in _The Rehearsal Transpro'sd_. Marvell's turn to history in the 1670s was not a new direction: it was the logical culmination of a career that conceived of political utterance as a branch of historiography.

Frontispiece to Marvell's Miscellaneous Poems (1681)
Marvell appears to have been fascinated by the question, Is Christian political progress possible? Nurtured in the powerful tradition of English Protestant progressivism, he was one of many in his time who thought earthly political events might result in the fulfillment of sacred history. Like Milton, if not as vocally or confidently, he cherished the millennial hopes of an elect nation. We can see this most explicitly in “The First Anniversary” and “Bermudas,” where England’s political institutions are tied to the destiny of the world. But there is also a strong Augustinian thread in his writings, which preserves the separation of the earthly and heavenly cities and locates salvation exclusively in the individual. In “The Garden,” the dream of transcendence is sacrificed for the reality of collective social action; in “Upon Appleton House,” Lord Fairfax disengages himself from the moral ambiguities of public service to “Ambition weed, but Conscience till.” These two antithetical views of Christian historiography for supremacy throughout Marvell’s writings, and their dynamic tension is never fully resolved. Even in the dark days of the 1670s we find Marvell wrestling with the possibility of national redemption. In the second part of the Rehearsal Transpond Marvell hesitantly prophesies a universal Christianity that will end the need for civil government, and he continues such hopes at least through the Short Historical Essay.

The Clark’s holdings have been extremely helpful in establishing the political and rhetorical contexts of Marvell’s writings, particularly his prose tracts. For instance, by examining the series of opposition pamphlets protesting the Non-Resistance Oath of 1675 and the Long Prorogation of 1676–77, one can see the way in which the Account of the Growth of Popery transforms the current arguments over law into more universal arguments over morality. In this way Marvell subordinates secular battles over the validity of institutions to the broader historical war between good and evil. Similarly, the controversial pamphlets surrounding Herbert Croft’s The Naked Truth (1675) reveal the remarkable originality of the Short Historical Essay. Marvell enters a debate over the authority of general councils with a full-scale analysis of the deterioration of the Christian church, arguing that councils which impose creeds are wrong in themselves and that councils which did so in the past (the Nicene, for example) were instrumental in its decline from apostolic purity. The Clark’s holdings also reveal how the Short Historical Essay became a reliable warhorse of Dissenting controversy. Republished in 1680, 1687, 1703, and 1709, it was the most frequently reprinted of Marvell’s works before the twentieth century. That it should be completely unknown today is the best evidence that our accounts of Marvell’s career need rethinking.

Dianne Dugaw, “‘Deep Play’: John Gay and the Politics of Parody”

The book I have been writing at the Clark Library, tentatively entitled “Deep Play”: John Gay and the Politics of Parody, will reinterpret Gay’s satire in terms of its social politics. Consistently, Gay critiques the eighteenth-century world around him by reworking forms and ideas drawn from popular traditions; the lower-class otherness of these traditions is an alterity that he never forgets. He creates in his satire not only a deep and enigmatic irony but also a class-based social criticism subversive enough to warrant Bertolt Brecht’s admiring adaptation of The Beggar’s Opera (1728) in The Three-Penny Opera of our own century.

Gay is now chiefly remembered as the friend of Swift and Pope, as a lesser poet in his own right, and as the inventor of ballad opera, forerunner of today’s musical comedy. The Beggar’s Opera was the most popular play of the eighteenth century and still pleases audiences today even in its original form. But Gay has remained something of a puzzle, a writer just beyond the critics’ reach. As I hope my book will show, his ties to, and self-conscious use of, folk tradition explain some of the most perplexing features of his satire. Moreover, just as popular traditions clarify Gay’s sensibility, his conscious reworking of the lore of lower-class people illuminates their place, perspective, and significance in Georgian England.

Gay’s works call on a profusion of folk materials: ballads, mumming plays, tales, legends, proverbs, riddles, customs, beliefs, and traditional motifs and forms of all kinds. This aspect of his writing has gone largely unexamined by folklorists and literary scholars. If Gay’s use of popular airs for the songs in The Beggar’s Opera is well known, just how their traditionality serves that drama, particularly its social satire, deserves further analysis. More importantly, Gay’s transformations of lower-class popular songs in The Beggar’s Opera need to be seen in the context of the conscious traditional borrowings elsewhere in his work: in his mock-pastoral masterpiece, The Shepherd’s Week (1714); in the genre-confounding playlet The What D’Ye Call It (1715); in poems like Trivia (1716), The Espousal (1720), and many of his Fables (1727 and 1738); and in early plays like The Wife of Bath (1719) as well as in late ones like Polly (1729) and the posthumously published Achilles (1739). Gay’s appropriation of popular discourse is the crucial feature of his most successful works and the key to his parodic sensibility.

The first chapter of “Deep Play” outlines the premises of the book and its method. (A revised version of this chapter will appear in the Summer 1991 issue of Studies in English Literature under the title “Bowzybeus Bequest: Folkslore and John Gay’s Satire.”) The second chapter, “The Hare without Friends: Gay’s Literary Reputation,” follows the history of Gay’s reputation through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, showing a current of depreciation. Particularly after the Lives of the English Poets appeared (1779–81), critical interpretations of Gay, relying upon Johnson’s authority, viewed him from a morally charged vantage point. His character was seen as a dangerous example, his works as a dangerous lesson. For the most part, twentieth-century scholarly criticism has not run free of this canonical current. Gay has hardly been read on his own terms.

In the third chapter, I embark on my reading of Gay’s satire, explaining his early works within the context of his era’s preoccupation with the pastoral and the Virgilian tradition. Gay’s parodic reworking of these traditions is
characterized by sensitivity to class and by the use of popular forms. His method surfaces in the early poem Rural Sports, which I read in both its versions: the original mock-pastoral of 1719 and the revised "georige" of 1720. (Unaware of the substantial differences between these texts, critics have virtually ignored the initial poem—which I find the more interesting of the two.) My discussion goes on to examine Gay’s complex transformations of the Virgilian tradition in The Shepherd’s Week, Trivia, and The Birth of the Squire (1720). These early works continually play out a two-part parodic agenda: (1) a “conversation” with the pastoral tradition of Virgil, Dryden, and Gay’s own eighteenth-century contemporaries and (2) a counterpointing “lower” point of view which plays simultaneously with and against that tradition, its hierarchies and its premises. The result: a profound and unresolved irony that creates a class-conscious satire on power and the politics of hierarchy.

The remaining chapters continue the exploration of Gay’s politics of parody in such works as The What D’Ye Call It, Acis and Galatea (1718), Dione (1720), The Beggar’s Opera, Polly, Achilles, and the Fables. As Gay matured, his satire deepened in its capacity to question the configuring of power by class, by gender, and by the politics of language itself. As Brecht noticed and as I hope to show, John Gay spoke tellingly not only for his own time but to the needs and interests of ours as well.

CYNTHIA LOWENTHAL, "THE FEMALE WITS"
[Professor Lowenthal, Department of English, Tulane University, was a Short-Term Fellow last summer.]

My reading at the Clark Library allowed me to begin a study of Restoration and eighteenth-century drama which concentrates on the relationship between the plays written by women, the “less canonical” playwrights, and those written by the “major” male dramatists of the era. My hope is that such a study not only will rescue the female playwrights from their undeserved marginal status but will also, through a recontextualizing of the lesser-known plays with their canonical counterparts, enrich the study of the whole of eighteenth-century play production.

This additional context—one not simply gendered but expanded—will shed light on the growth and development of the theater, especially after the division of the playhouses and the opportunities for playwriting such changes produced. At the Clark, I concentrated on the late seventeenth-century theater, especially the explosion of play production after the Betterton “uprising”—after the United Company dissolved and Betterton, Barry, and Bracegirdle formed the Lincoln’s Inn Fields Company (in the 1694–95 season). The need for twice as many plays was immediately apparent, and women playwrights stepped in to fill a significant part of that need. Mary Pix, Delariviere Manley, and Catherine Trotter (the objects of the satire in The Female Wits [1691]) were the focus of my reading, and their status—including the contemporary responses to their work—was central to my investigation.

The Clark collection allowed me to chart some of these responses. That the “new” system of the dual playhouses was not without its detractors is clear in an early eighteenth-century dialogue, A Comparison Between the Two Stages (1702). One of three characters, Chagrin, laments, “I hate these Petticoat-Authors; ’tis false Grammar, there’s no Feminine for the Latin word, ’tis entirely of the Masculine Gender, and the Language won’t bear such a thing as a She-Author” (26–27), while another commentator, Ramble, calls Pix’s Spanish Wives (1696) “a most damnable Farce,” and the third, Sullen, says dismissively that Manley’s Royal Mischief (1696) “made a shift to live half a dozen Days, and then expir’d” (28, 31). The narrator, pointing in the preface to the “low” state of contemporary drama generally, despair of its improvement precisely because the playhouses are divided, opening opportunities for women playwrights.

Yet both Charles Gildon, in The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatist Poets (1699), and Giles Jacob, in The Poetical Register (1719), celebrate these writers. Of Manley, Gildon writes, “This Lady has very happily distinguish’d her self from the rest of her Sex, and gives us a living Proof of what we might reasonably expect from Womankind, if they had the Benefit of those artificial Improvements of Learning the Men have, when by the meer Force of Nature they so much excel” (90). He is equally approving of Pix and Trotter, not simply for their ability to create dramatic impact but also for their personal excellence: “the Distress of Morena [in Pix’s Ibrahim (1696)] never fail’d to bring Tears into the Eyes of the Audience” (111), and, claiming Trotter’s Fatal Friendship
(1698) "transported" him with its natural and moving passions, he goes on to cite "the Chastity of her Person, and the Tenderness of her Mind" (179).

The "progress"—or the downward slide—of the reputations of these playwrights, and their subsequent relegation to the lower orders of the drama hierarchy, are easily traceable to Dr. John Doran's "Their Majesties' Servants," *Annals of the English Stage* (1864), which dismisses these playwrights altogether, pointing, not to their dramatic skills, but only to their personal characteristics: "[T]here were seven ladies who were more or less distinguished as writers for the stage. These were the virtuous Mrs. Philips, the audacious Aphra Behn, the not less notorious Mrs. Manley, the gentle and learned Mrs. Cockburn [Trotter], the rather aristocratic Mrs. Boothby ... , fat Mrs. Pix, and that thorough Whig, Mrs. Centlivre" (1:229).

![Scene from Susanna Centlivre's A Bold Stroke for a Wife (1718). From Bell's British Theatre, vol. 7 (1791).](image)

Reading the works of Manley, Trotter, and Pix, however, one sees the thematic and formal unity common to plays written by both men and women, a unity that places the female playwrights squarely in the "mainstream" of late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century drama. However, one important difference is apparent: the women playwrights accord to their female protagonists a strength and centrality not found in canonical plays. Manley's strong and aggressive heroine, Homais, in *The Royal Mischief* is the force that drives the tragic plot, while Trotter's *Fatal Friendship* presents not only a suffering heroine but a "feminized" hero, caught in his own unsolvable dilemma. Pix's comedy *The Innocent Mistress* (1697) features a heroine "Too Studious for her Sex" who, because she has "form'd her self a Hero" (4) from reading plays and romances, packs up and flees to London to avoid a displeasing marriage. The Clark collection allowed me to see that the women playwrights, viewed in light of the issues raised by the canonical dramatists, begin to establish a female literary tradition in British theater and also provoke new questions about the larger theoretical problems of theatrical representation.

JAMES TIERNEY, "A CD-ROM Subject Index to Pre-1800 British Periodicals"

As the modern periodical does for our times, the pre-1800 British periodical reflects the entire scope of that era's societal life, opinion, and cultural progress. Hence, these periodicals are a necessary scholarly resource for any study of the age, whether it is concerned, for example, with politics, religion, science, literature, economics, art, or manners. Unfortunately, no research tool exists that affords quick access to their contents. Anyone wishing to discover what the periodicals have to say on a particular subject must wade through them by title by title, page by page—a veritable needle-in-a-haystack process that wastes both time and money and, because of the sheer bulk of material, is doomed to be less than comprehensive.

The project I am engaged in aims to supply that need by producing a computerized subject index to these periodicals, a data base resident on compact disks with read-only memory (CD-ROM). The data base will allow immediate access to the subject content of the periodicals when used on any computer equipped with CD-ROM capability. It will support the kinds of studies that previously would have been regarded as almost humanly impossible. In a matter—of seconds, searches of the data base will reveal all instances of any subject treated in the periodicals (not merely titles of articles). Boolean searches can be used to retrieve all instances within a particular year or within a particular decade or to limit the search to material appearing in designated periodicals.

The initial stage of the project has been undertaken using an already existing set of subject indexes to 150 periodical titles, the Osborn Subject Index, a card file of 85,000 entries compiled by hand in the 1930s but never published. In short, the project is not starting from scratch. However, attempting to provide for modern scholarly interests and needs (particularly the increased interest in publishing history), I have expanded the simple seven-field citation format of the Osborn Index into a data base of fifty fields that account for, among other things, the identification of publishers, printers, sellers; the prices of periodicals and their frequency of appearance; genres of articles; dates and locations of any reprints or translations of articles.

Although extensive samplings suggest that Osborn's indexes are generally reliable, the integrity of the project's final product requires that the Osborn entries be collated with the texts of the original periodicals before the data is entered into the computer. This process verifies assigned pagination, dates, and volume and issue numbers and provides supplementary subject entries where necessary. In addition, data for many fields added to the Osborn format—titles and genres of articles; days and frequency of publication; publishers', printers', and sellers' names and addresses; and periodical costs—are retrieved from the texts of the periodicals at this time.

But data for still other fields—authors, editors, reprints, translations—can normally be discovered only from secondary sources. Major assistance in this search is
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provided by two book-length annotated bibliographies concerned with the mass of secondary literature on the pre-1800 periodical. Together, Katherine K. Weed and Richmond P. Bond’s Studies of British Newspapers and Periodicals from Their Beginning to 1800: A Bibliography (1946) and my own unpublished sequel to Weed and Bond list some four thousand studies of the periodical conducted since the eighteenth century.

After collating sets of cards for individual periodical titles with the texts and doing the needed secondary research, I enter the data into Datasight’s DBMS package, Concordance, loaded on an IBM-compatible 8086 20 MHz computer equipped with a 160 MB hard drive. Concordance, the best text-oriented data base available, allows unlimited storage capacity for expansion of the data base and affords the construction of “user-friendly” screens for the ultimate end-user of the product.

As large sections of the data base are completed, they will be downloaded into Datasight’s CD Author Development System by Research Publications, Inc., Woodbridge, Connecticut, which microfilmed the Burney collection of newspapers and periodicals at the British Library and the Nicholas collection at the Bodleian, and which has been contracted as the publisher of the CD-ROM disks for the Pre-1800 British Periodicals project.

Special Events

“In and Out of the Ghetto: Jewish-Gentile Relations in Late Medieval and Early Modern Germany” (Thursday-Saturday, 9–11 May). A three-day interdisciplinary conference will bring together scholars of history, sociology, religious studies, linguistics, literature, and folklore from the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Germany, and Israel to examine historical aspects of Jewish-Gentile relations in Germany. Sessions will focus on Jewish religious exclusivity and the formation of a Jewish cultural minority in the Middle Ages; social stratification of Jewish communities in Central Europe in the fifteenth through the eighteenth centuries: Jewish-Gentile contacts and relations during the pre-emancipation period; representations of German Jewry in the arts and in popular culture; and patterns of political authority and toleration as they affected daily life in the ghetto. All sessions will be held at the Clark. The conference is cosponsored by the German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C.; and the Center for Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Studies, the Clark Library, the Committee for Jewish Studies, the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, and the Department of History, all of UCLA. Registration information is available from the Center office: (213) 206-8552.

Library Workshop (Saturday, 25 May, 9:30 A.M.–4:00 P.M.). The year’s final quarterly Library workshop, centering on the transmission of the text, is to be conducted by Nicolas Barker of the British Library. Scheduled speakers are Michael J. B. Allen and A. R. Braunmuller, both of UCLA; Anthony Grafton, Princeton University; and John Sutherland, California Institute of Technology. Reservations will be taken between 6 May and 17 May at the Library: (213) 731-8529.

Consumption and Culture Bibliography

The Center for Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Studies is pleased to announce the publication of a bibliography on consumption and culture in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. A compilation of over 2,500 entries arranged by subject and indexed by author, the bibliography covers principally secondary sources representing research done in the past twenty years on the development of consumerism in Western Europe, and particularly the British Isles. It reflects the interdisciplinary nature of the work presented during the Center’s three-year NEH-supported study of consumption and culture and should be of interest to scholars working in history, art history, literary and cultural studies, law, anthropology, or the social sciences.

Copies are available at the Library or the Center for $35; mail orders can be placed by sending the form below and a check to Publications, Clark Library, 2520 Cimarron Street, Los Angeles, CA 90018.

ORDER FORM

Consumption and Culture in the 17th and 18th Centuries: A Bibliography

Name ___________________________________________________________

Address _________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

Telephone number ____________________________

Please make your check or money order payable in U.S. dollars to the Regents of the University of California.

Number of copies ______ x $35.00 ________

Sales tax (California residents only) ______

Total ________

The Clark Newsletter is published by UCLA’s William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 2520 Cimarron Street, Los Angeles, California 90018. Library Telephone: (213) 731-8529. Editor, Nancy M. Shea; Associate Editor, Marina Romani. Please direct all correspondence to the above address.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 April</td>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Felicity Nusbaum, Syracuse University, <em>Monstrous Women: Motherhood, Sexuality, and Empire</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 April</td>
<td>10:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Papers by Terry Castle, Stanford University; and James Grantham Turner, University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 April</td>
<td>1:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Papers by Mary Sheriff, University of North Carolina; Elizabeth Kubek, Dickinson College; and Jan Fergus, Lehigh University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April</td>
<td>10:00 A.M.</td>
<td>(Workshop) Papers by Anne Wagner, University of California, Berkeley; and Nicholas Mirzoeff (Center NEH Fellow), Warwick University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April</td>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>(Clark Lecture) Thomas Crow, University of Sussex, <em>Paying the Piper and Not Calling the Tune: The Limits of State Control in Pre-revolutionary French Painting</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 April</td>
<td>10:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Papers by Kathleen Wilson, State University of New York at Stony Brook; and David Kunzle, University of California, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 April</td>
<td>1:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Papers by Richard Sorrenson, Indiana University; and Ann Geneva, Yale University Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May</td>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Richard Leppert, University of Minnesota, <em>Social Order and the Domestic Consumption of Music in Eighteenth-Century England: The Politics of Sound in the Policing of Gender Construction</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 May</td>
<td>10:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Papers by Neil McKendrick, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge; and Stana Nenadic, University of Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 May</td>
<td>1:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Papers by Paula Rea Radisch, Whittier College; and Charles Saumarez Smith, Victoria and Albert Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 May</td>
<td>10:00 A.M.</td>
<td>(Workshop) Papers by Mitzi Myers (Center NEH Fellow), University of California, Los Angeles; and Peter Pawlowicz (Center NEH Fellow), East Tennessee State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 June</td>
<td>10:00 A.M.</td>
<td>(Clark Lecture) Ann Bermingham (Clark Professor, 1990–91), University of California, Irvine, <em>Elegant Females and Gentlemen Connoisseurs: The Commerce in Culture and in Self-Image in Eighteenth-Century England</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>