Clark Acquires Major Wilde Manuscript

Bruce Whiteman, Head Librarian

On 3 March this year, the Clark Library was the successful bidder at a Christie’s, London, auction on perhaps the most significant addition to its Oscar Wilde manuscript collection since the days of William Andrews Clark Jr., a notebook kept by Wilde during the mid-1870s, while an undergraduate at Magdalen College, Oxford. The manuscript contains Wilde’s notes on philosophy and comprises almost three hundred pages of jottings and remarks about Greek thought, Mill, Spencer, Hume, Carlyle (whose writing desk Wilde later owned), Bacon, logic, philosophical method, and many other subjects. It joins a series of Wilde’s student notebooks already in the Clark’s Oscar Wilde collection, including one from his days at Trinity College, Dublin (mainly a record of Greek proverbs), two Oxford notebooks on philosophical and literary subjects, and a separate notebook devoted to Aristotle’s Ethics. The newly acquired notebook, which was part of the library of Halstead Vander Poel, is far and away the most extensive of these student compilations. It relates closely to another manuscript by Wilde called “Plato’s Psychology,” which was published for the first time only last year in the article “The Importance of Reading Plato,” by Jerome de Groot and Richard Kaye (Times Literary Supplement, 17 October 2003). The Clark Library acquired that manuscript two years ago from its former owner, a Texas collector.

Halstead Vander Poel (1911–2003) was an American collector who, after receiving a Yale degree and serving in World War II, worked first for Union Carbide and then for the Eisenhower administration as an advisor on nuclear matters. He moved to Rome in 1956, and collected not only Charles Dickens but also English literature in general, as well as books on Roman archaeology. (The Roman collection was donated to the Getty Research Institute in 2001, and the Dickens material went to the University of Texas). Vander Poel had a soft spot for Oscar Wilde and owned a number of significant manuscripts, letters, and inscribed printed books, none of which has been seen or studied for many decades, if at all. In the auction of this collection, the Clark also acquired the autograph manuscript of the last of Lord Alfred Douglas’s three autobiographical works, Without Apology, published in 1938.

The philosophy notebook, like Wilde’s other student notes, will undoubtedly yield many interesting things for scholars. Wilde excelled as a student of philosophy and classics, and the resultant knowledge can many times be spotted in his mature poetry and other writing. The notebook contains, for example, finished Wildeisms such as this rumination on Philia (friendship): “If not a virtue it accompanies virtue and is the most necessary thing for life.”

The Ahmanson Foundation contributed substantially to the acquisition of both the Wilde and Douglas manuscripts, and we are deeply grateful to the foundation for its support.
The Age of Projects: Changing and Improving the Arts, Literature, and Life during the Long Eighteenth Century

I - Projecting: Alchemy, Capitalism, and Creativity

Kimberly Latta, University of Pittsburgh

What was a projector during Daniel Defoe’s “Age of Projects,”? In late seventeenth-century England, the term projector obviously had nothing to do with psychoanalysis or the machine that shows films, since neither thing had been invented, although it was associated with controversial science and the commercial imagination. In the language of natural philosophy, however, a projector was an alchemist who cast the powdered Philosophers’ Stone (called the powder of projection) into the crucible in the final stage of the transmutation of metals. At this point, the metals “multiplied,” or grew, and the experiment yielded its “profit.” Defoe employed a decidedly commercial sense of this alchemical word in his Essay upon Projects (1697), in which he defined a projector as both an “author” and a “merchant” who used “wit” and “invention” in order to bring forth the New. Defoe identified projectors with the “merchandizing part of the world,” those artists of wealth-getting who used their “genius” in order to produce riches. “All Foreign Negoce,” Defoe argued, “is in its beginning all project, Contrivance, Invention.” If an alchemical projector transformed dross into gold by bringing a spiritual “something”—the divine essence inherent in all matter—out of “nothing,” or base metals, Defoe’s projector brought metallic coins out of ephemeral ideas. He thereby de-based the alchemical elevation of spirit over matter by reversing its terms: “somethings” now corresponded not to idealized spiritual truths, but rather to cold cash. Defoe’s projector was both an enterprising artist and an artist of enterprise who generated ideas in order to generate money.

How might Defoe have arrived at this formulation? The Essay, of course, is read today as a tract that imperfectly rehabilitated a purely financial, pejorative sense of the term projector: a huckster who employed legerdemain and verbal illusions to cheat people of their money. How then did that negative notion of the projector arise at the same time as the idea of the noble alchemist? And what, in particular, might alchemy have had to do with representations of the projector as an artist? In order to answer these questions, we must understand that merchants, authors, and alchemists could regard themselves equally as artists and artisans, for the two words had not yet become distinct from one another. We should also remember that Defoe regarded honest labor as redemptive, as most alchemists did.

We can answer the questions I’ve just posed with reference to an enterprising German apothecary and alchemist, Johann Rudolph Glauber (1604–70), some of whose writings, re-entirely translated into English as The Works (1689), are at the Clark. A barber’s son, Glauber occupied a liminal position between artisan and scholar. He regarded himself as a natural philosopher whose commercial activities were as laudable as his scientific pursuits, and he was in every sense the kind of projector that Defoe praised, an enterprising artist and an artist of enterprise who sold the projections of his own mind for material profits. Like a professional author, Glauber sold both tangible and intangible commodities—objects and concepts—in the form of medicines and tinctures manufactured in his laboratory, as well as recipes for reproducing those products, and he came under attack for doing so. Glauber defended all of his activities—generating new theories, new chemical formations, and new books—as contributions both to the world’s wealth and to universal redemption.

In Glauber’s time, though, alchemists became vulnerable to the charge that they were no better than financial projectors, gold-obsessed swindlers who only pretended to good intentions. Mechanical philosophers escalated such attacks towards the end of the century in a successful attempt to discredit their only rivals to the mantle of scientific modernity. Alchemy had briefly contended with mechanism to supercede medieval scholasticism (still enforced at the universities), which held with Augustine that the creature could not create and that there was a fixed amount of wealth in the world. Mechanical philosophers may have had something to do with the transmutation of the positive, alchemical connotations of projector and projecting into negative terms, which Defoe in turn labored to rehabilitate in his Essay.

The etymological outline of the concept of projector that I have sketched out here illustrates a component of my book-in-progress, “[En]gendering Generation: Creativity, Commerce, and Sex from Milton to Defoe.” Many seventeenth-century Puritan writers rejected scholasticism, although not always on mechanical grounds, in order to celebrate the human potential for generating limitless knowledge and wealth. Advocates for the new commerce and science justified those practices on the grounds that all creative activity, if inspired by and carried out with charitable intentions, magnified God’s glory. In its more utopian manifestations, this emergent philosophical orientation towards the generation of the New encouraged many people, female and male, rich and poor, learned and lay, to write and publish their ideas. It encouraged people to become projectors, as it were, who distilled the “quintessence” of their souls and of original creation into new ideas and new books.

The new utopian ideas encouraged the prolific visionary author Jane Lead (1623–1704) to describe God,
in both alchemical and emergent capitalist terms, as a teeming “Womb” and “Bank,” who, through the intercession of the Philosophers’ Stone (a feminine manifestation of Divine Wisdom) had transmuted her “lead” into “gold,” “quickened” her own powers of creative authority, and made her a merchant “trader” who multiplied and profited in spirit. A testimony to the self-confidence that Lead and the new philosophy of artistic enterprise inspired is left to us by an unknown (possibly feminine) hand on the verso of the title page to one of Lead’s books in the Clark’s collection, The Heavenly Cloud Now Breaking (1681): “Thus our faith is directed to a Godlike almightiness within our selves.” Defoe, who remained forever ambivalent about his prodigious ability to project shadows on the wall in a stunning outpouring of books, tracts, pamphlets—all of which he was tempted at times to compare to “ephemera,” or even “trade whimsies”—surely would have recognized this anonymous writer, too, as someone possessed by the “humor of projecting,” albeit on a more elevated plane.

II - Conjuring Invention
Sarah Kareem, UCLA

In An Essay upon Projects (1697), Daniel Defoe describes projecting as the “Humour of Invention.” My research at the Clark explores the way this “humour of invention” was associated in the eighteenth century at once with the dubious figure of the projector and the celebrated figure of the genius. This topic stems from my doctoral dissertation, “Stranger Than Fiction: Wonder and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century Britain,” which argues that the author of fictions is increasingly a figure of wonder in the mid-eighteenth century; the disreputable hack who spun his project skillfully enough is transformed at this time into an icon of creativity. This conversion of professional ignominy into cultural prestige was a cunning sleight of hand. As this metaphor suggests, I am particularly interested in the connotations of conjuring, and its attendant associations with magic, an activity that is figuratively invoked in descriptions of both the projector and the genius. While descriptions of the projector, on the one hand, analogize him to a conjurer intent on deluding the people and stealing their money, descriptions of the genius, on the other, figure him as an aesthetic magician, pulling ideas out of thin air and professionally producing marvels for his readers’ pleasure. By attending to conjuring as a recurring motif in the representation both of those eighteenth-century writers dismissed as projectors and those lauded as geniuses, we are able to cast a fresh eye over the usual suspects who inhabit our accounts of literary invention in the eighteenth century.

My research at the Clark has been divided between two intriguing figures in eighteenth-century popular culture, Duncan Campbell and Rudolph Erich Raspe. The former was a conjurer who was depicted as a scientist, the latter a scientist who was depicted as a conjurer. As my “Age of Projects” conference paper focused on Raspe, a geologist more famous as the author of the Baron Munchausen tales, I will limit my discussion here to Campbell, the deaf-mute fortune-teller known as the “deaf and dumb conjurer.” Biographical narratives about Campbell held at the Clark include The History of the Life and Adventures of Duncan Campbell (1720), A Spy on the Conjurer (1724), and The Dumb Projector (1725); the first is attributed to William Bond, the latter two to Eliza Haywood. All three texts acknowledge those skeptics who dismiss Campbell’s reputed abilities as mere projecting, but, overall, they idealize him. Yet they differ strikingly in their assessments of the type of genius he embodies: the Bond biography constructs Campbell as a genius in the mold of a Newtonian natural philosopher, while the Haywood narratives depict him as an artistic genius and the darling of fashionable society.

The narrator of The Life assures his readership that he is not introducing “some strange new Miracle-Monger or Impostor into the World,” but rather portrays Campbell as a natural philosopher whose prognostications are “experiments” which “force our belief.” Such language might imply that Campbell also forces his clients’ hands, except that Bond rhapsodizes that “the amazing singularity of those experiments provokes both our wonder and esteem.” The rhetoric of genius that emerges in The Life identifies human creativity with divine creativity, as do many of the elegies to Newton written in the late 1720s. More specifically, Bond’s evocation of public regard for Campbell echoes Campbell’s own description of how divine faith works in his publication Time’s Telescope Universal and Perpetual (1734). In this almanac, Campbell predicts lunar cycles, appearances of comets, and other celestial events for the years ahead, while also explaining and endorsing the findings of natural philosophers including Copernicus, Hooke, and Boyle. Just as The Life suggests that the singularity of Campbell’s “experiments” compels wonder and belief among his audience, so Campbell argues that the aesthetic power of singular divine signs—such as comets and rainbows—compels belief in God.

The Spy on the Conjurer is also a conversion narrative of sorts. At first Haywood’s narrator, Justicia, supposes Campbell to be the worst sort of projector, one who exploits public credulity by imposing upon the ignorant Sort of People.” During the narrative, however, Campbell is elevated from projector, not to natural philosopher, but to artist. By the book’s close the narrator is praising the “Wonders of his [Campbell’s] Discernment” and Campbell’s consulting rooms have been declared “a celebrated Shrine.” This shift may have reflected Haywood’s firsthand experience of Campbell’s coterie; Felicity Nussbaum notes that Haywood was among those who frequented Campbell’s home (“Speechless: Haywood’s Deaf and Dumb Projector,” in The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood, ed. Kirsten T. Saxon, 2000).

As Haywood’s narrator’s faith in Campbell grows, she increasingly identifies his creativity as genius rather than as projecting, and transforms Campbell’s persona from small-time showman to international man of mystery. Thus her second Campbell narrative, The Dumb Projector, reports that when one
of Campbell’s awestruck clients “was told that this was the Dumb Oracle whose Predictions had made so great a Noise in the World, his Wonder was a little abated, but his Admiration of him increased.” Campbell’s persona is similarly transformed in The Virtuoso. The story ends with the narrator meeting Campbell again after many years. Campbell, the Scottish orphan whom he had seen as an object of “Pity and Commiseration,” is now a London celebrity. The narrator describes the young man he now sees: “His Eyes were large, full of Lustre, Majestick, well set, and the Soul shone so in them, as told the Spectators plainly, how great was the inward Vivacity of his Genius.” This aura inspires devotion in Campbell’s coterie of devout followers, who “all rather seem’d to adore than to love him . . . as if he had been some little Prophet peculiarly inspired, and while they all thus admired and wonder’d they all consulted him as an Oracle.” Here Campbell elicits neither gawking wonder nor patronizing pity, but rather admiration.

The Campbell narratives allow us to see that the eighteenth-century exaltation of the intellectual virtues was forged, not only in the world of the salon and in the words of aesthetic theory and lyric poetry, but in the world of London shows and the words of popular science and biography. The interplay in these texts between personae that we now think of as unrelated—such as the conjurer, the scientist, and the artist—forged figures of invention that continue to resonate today.

III - Belligerent Siblings

Martin Gierl, Georg-August Universität, Göttingen

Ever since Werner Heisenberg’s enunciation of the uncertainty principle, we have accepted as a commonplace that the observa-tion of things can change the ways the things interact—at least in the realm of atoms and smaller particles. But this principle has a corollary of sorts, never consciously spelled out but nevertheless active: observers observing is a social phenomenon and this social observation influences the practice of scientific observation.

Nowhere is the truth of this “corollary” more evident than in seventeenth-century battles between “modern” natural philosophers and their critics. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, for example, writing in 1700 to colleagues who were establishing the Berlin Academy, remarks that the new institution “must not be directed to mere curiosity or desire for knowledge, and unfruitful experiments, as it happened in Paris, London and Florence (whence derision and the famous English comedy The Virtuoso), but rather, from the beginning, the mechanism of the new academy must direct all knowledge towards usefulness. Accordingly, the aim is to connect theoria cum praxi.”

Leibniz had good reason for these remarks, for a battle was raging over the proper definition of and boundaries for natural philosophy. Ancients were quarreling with Moderns over the proper scope of natural philosophy and the status of modern practitioners. Henry Stubbe, a theologian, and Joseph Glanville, one of the staunchest defenders of the Royal Society, were engaged in 1670–71 in a lively pamphlet debate about the social and religious dangers inherent in new scientific ideas as practiced by members of the Royal Society. In 1676, in The Virtuoso, Thomas Shadwell picked up this dispute and transformed it in the service of laughter, satire, and the cause of the Ancients. His protagonist, the Virtuoso Sir Gimcrack, is forced to cry in self-defense, “We virtuosos never find out anything of use, ’tis not our way.” Indeed Shadwell shows virtuosos assiduously dissecting spiders and discovering whether rotting fish might glow in the dark like charcoal. In 1726, echoing Shadwell, Jonathan Swift has Gulliver report that the Moderns have “procured a Royal Patent for erecting an Academy of PROJECTORS in Lagado . . . the only Inconvenience is, that none of these Projects are yet brought to Perfection; and in the mean time, the whole Country lies miserably waste.” And he has Gulliver describe a most fantastical Lagadosian contrivance, an automatic text and philosophy-producing machine, the quintessential symbol of modern excess. No wonder the Moderns stopped calling themselves Virtuosi in the first half of the eighteenth century!

The Virtuoso was still playing on London stages when Leibniz recorded his recommendations for the Berlin Academy, and he seems to be suggesting in his letter that in order to earn a good reputation, the new academy must place abstract knowledge in the service of utility. Whether he was especially concerned with social ridicule, or just referring to The Virtuoso as a satire likely known to his readers, his letter clearly reveals that the issue of social reputation was influencing his ideas about the organization of scientific practice. And from our perspective, it is possible to see that he was not overreacting to social pressures. Even though the Moderns abandoned the nickname “Virtuosi,” their reputation as eccentrics persisted. Edward Ward’s London Spy (1718) depicted a ruminating natural philosopher staring at the pavement in the yard of the Royal Society; and Swift described a member of the Lagado Academy as a man of pale yellow face and beard, “his Hands and Clothes dawded over with Filth. . . . His Employment from his first coming into the Academy, was an Operation to reduce human Excrement to its original Food.”

These repugnant, degrading images reveal unspoken hostility and aggression felt towards projectors: the Ancients were indeed fighting the Moderns, over the future and over their dreams! But if we focus too much on their conflict, we miss a crucial fact: that as ideas and intellectual forms, satires and projects were really little more than belligerent siblings whose differences and conflicts disguised common origins and concerns. Both projects and satires reflected an aspiration to a world of utopian perfection and a belief that perfection was, or would eventually be, attainable; but they viewed utopia from different perspectives. Projects articulated plans for creating utopian conditions on earth and attempted to bring those plans into being: once a project...
was implemented, utopia would be realized. Satires, in contrast, lived in a dynamic, flawed world, one in which perfection was just out of reach. Their critiques of specific projects pointed to dangerous implications in them and attempted to taboo those implications. In the process satires not only invalidated specific projects, but they articulated even better visions of utopia.

We can suggest, therefore, that satires may have had a significant role to play in shaping the subjects and practices of modern natural philosophy. Perhaps it is to satire, as much as to projecting ingenuity, that we are indebted for the transformation of the fantastical Lagadosian automatic text machine into the reality of the modern computer. Through the words of his virtuoso, Shadwell the Ancient laughed at the “impossible” human wish to fly: “A man by art may appropriate any element to himself... Nay, I doubt not but in a little time to improve the art [of flying] so far, ‘twill be as common to buy a pair of wings to fly to the world in the moon as to buy a pair of wax boots to ride into Sussex with”; while Glanville the Modern proclaimed: “Those Heroes go on as they have happily begun, they’ll fill the world with wonders. And I doubt not but posterity will find many things, that are now but Rumors, verified into practical Realities. It may be some Ages hence, a voyage to the Southern unknown Tracts, yeas possibly the Moon, will not be more strange then one to America. To them, that come after us, it may be as ordinary to buy a pair of wings to fly into remotest Regions; as now a pair of Boots to ride a Journey.”

IV - Geographical Pastimes
Alison O’Byrne, UCLA

The eighteenth century witnessed what we might think of as the development of tourism in its modern sense, complete with guidebooks, pocket-sized maps, and souvenir items. Young British gentlemen were still making the Grand Tour to learn Continental ways, but increasing emphasis was being placed on their acquiring knowledge about Britain too. While this experience often amounted to little more than a season in London, it was hoped that it would allow young gentlemen not only to engage with foreigners in informed discussion about British government, religion, and history, but also to avoid seduction by foreign ways. As early as 1708, for example, Edward Hatton offered up his New View of London to “Noble and Gentlemen” as a means of enabling them “when in Foreign Countries, to give a satisfactory Account of the Metropolis of their own.” Over half a century later, The London and Westminster Guide (1768) presented itself as a chance for young gentlemen to explore their own capital before “extending their curiosity to other countries.”

At the same time, improvements in roads and the increase in disposable income among the wealthier middling sorts were opening up domestic tourism, and people with claims to polite society were making their way to London, or Bath, or more regional centers of fashionable life. Printers and booksellers began catering specifically to the growing interest in travel by offering guidebooks, maps, engravings, and travel narratives. For armchair travelers, unable to travel or wishing to recollect a former journey, large illustrated folio volumes such as Thomas Malton’s Picturesque Tour through the Cities of London and Westminster (1792) and The Itinerant; A Selection of Interesting and Picturesque Views in Great Britain and Ireland (1779) allowed the reader to trace a route or view specific sites from home.

From the mid-1770s, John Wallis began serving readers interested in travel narratives and descriptions. Amongst his publications was The Stranger’s Guide through London and Westminster (1786), an architectural treatise transformed into a series of walking tours complete with foldout map. Wallis also published an abridgement of Pennant’s Some Account of London (1790) under the title London; or, an Abridgement of the Celebrated Mr. Pennant’s Description of the British Capital and Its Environs (1793), in duodecimo, thus reducing Pennant’s quarto into a pocket-sized book. In addition, Wallis’s stock included guidebooks to and descriptions of travel throughout Britain and around the world.

Wallis’s most interesting foray into the market for travel publications, however, was his Geographical Pastime series, board games in which players were required to make their way through a set itinerary ending in London. Wallis’s Tour of Europe, published in 1794, takes players on a journey from Harwich across the whole of Europe and back to London, “the first city in Europe.” The first player to reach London wins the game. As players spin and move along the board, they are instructed as to the chief attributes of a town by descriptions lining the sides of the board, which, at the same time, present the problems and constraints an actual traveler might face. Throughout the tour, danger looms large. The traveler who lands in St. Malo, for example, is “taken up for a spy,” missing three turns before being “set at liberty,” while he who lands at Oporto, a Portuguese city “famous for its wine,” is sent back forty-four spaces as “punishment” for “having been tempted to drink too freely.” On the way back to England, the traveler who lands on the Scilly Isles “run[s] foul of the rocks and loses the game.” The game privileges Britain over the rest of Europe; while most of the place descriptions are merely topographical, many recount British naval victories.

Wallis’s Tour through England and Wales was also published in 1794. The rules and goals of the game are similar to those of the Tour of Europe, but here the small map provides the frame-
V - Living Forever in Early Modern Europe

DAVID BOYD HAYCOCK, Oxford University

The words health and medicine in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Europe tend to conjure up images of plague, consumption, distemper, bloodletting, and leeches. The common picture is one of lives frequently blighted by illness and cut suddenly and brutally short: as John McManners has meticulously shown (Death and the Enlightenment, 1983), premature death was all around. Yet although wealth increased in Britain through the eighteenth century, health, it appears, did not. Dr. William Stukeley was not alone in observing that the increase in trade and luxury was coeval with the appearance of what were termed “nervous disorders”: “Our leaving the country for cities and great towns, coffeehouses and domestic track of business, our sedate life and excesses together, have prepar’d a plentiful harvest for these disorders” (Of the Gout, 1722). George Cheyne famously declared that this was the “English Malady.”

But the inevitability of widespread ill health, unhappiness, and premature death was rejected by some philosophers and doctors. Looking back to the Biblical accounts of Adam and the Patriarchs, they read that Noah and Methuselah had lived for hundreds of years. The classical Roman historian Josephus defended these stories, adding that “all the historians of antiquity” reported such long lives. So what exactly had gone wrong? How had eighteenth-century humans fallen so far behind their ancestors in terms of health and life expectancy? And what greater project could there be than recovering the full potential of the human life-span?

Jean-Jacques Rousseau believed that the decline in health was the effect of humans living outside the state of Nature, and that the remedy was a return to simpler living (see his Discourse Upon the Origin . . . of Inequality, 1761). But by the end of the eighteenth century it seemed that human artifice and progress in the sciences promised greater results: “It is impossible to imagine the height to which may be carried, in a thousand years, the power of man over matter,” wrote Benjamin Franklin in 1780 to his friend Joseph Priestly: “all diseases may by sure means be prevented or cured, not excepting even that of old age, and our lives lengthened at pleasure even beyond the antediluvian standard.”

The great English philosopher Sir Francis Bacon—one of the undisputed creators of the intellectual milieu from which the Enlightenment was later born—had made human longevity one of the cornerstones of his philosophy. In one of his earliest philosophical works, the collection of fragments known as Valerius Terminus (1603 [?]), he determined that the end of knowledge was “a discovery of all operations and possibilities of operations from immortality (if it were possible) to the meanest mechanical practice.” In the influential Advancement of Learning (1640 edition), he declared that the prolongation of life was “the most noble of all” the duties of medicine and not yet given proper attention. His Historie of Life and Death (1638) investigated the potential of human prolongevity, rejecting the widely held opinion of doctors and philosophers since Hippocrates’ time that death was inevitable, and instead suggesting that the youthful body’s ability to repair itself “might be eternall.”

Bacon’s belief in the potential for human immortality might at first be dismissed as eccentric, but his successors keenly ex-
The English adventurer and alchemist Sir Kenelm Digby reported that Descartes had told him “that he was very sure it was possible to lengthen out his [i.e. Man’s] life to the period of the Patriarchs” (see Gerald J. Gruman, “A History of Ideas about the Prolongation of Life,” Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 56 [1966]). Digby was later suspected of having accidentally poisoned his wife by making her drink “viper wine,” a medicine made by steeping skinned adders in Madeira, and said to have the property of renewing youth. By the following century, the mysterious Comte de St. Germain was informing Casanova “with a casual air, that he was three hundred years old.” Casanova considered this “very singular man” to be “the most barefaced of all impostors,” but confessed “I found him astonishing in spite of myself, for he amazed me” (see Rives Childs, Casanova: A New Perspective, 1988).

From Bacon to Franklin, my research at the Clark has explored this grand project for human prolongevity. It advances upon the significant work already undertaken in this subject in the 1960s by Gerald J. Gruman, and has been inspired by my collaborative work over the past six years with George S. Rousseau, who has written of a “geriatric Enlightenment.” It remains a subject with contemporary scientific and cultural relevance. To take but two current examples, researchers at the University of California in Berkeley recently proclaimed that children born in the year 2000 may be able to live beyond the age of 130, and last April, associates at the University of Michigan Geriatric Center announced that they had been able to extend the lifespan of a genetically mutated dwarf mouse by approximately 30% (that is, from three years to four years). Yet the irony remains that whilst Franklin’s dream may perhaps one day be realized, modern Western society remains plagued by depression and profound health dilemmas posed by obesity and asthma. Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s fear remains real: notwithstanding our advances in science, it seems that our failure to live in a state of nature is slowly killing us.

Ahmanson-Getty Fellowships, 2005–06

**VITAL MATTERS: EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY VIEWS OF CONCEPTION, LIFE, AND DEATH** is the theme of the Center/Clark’s core program for 2005–06, and of the fellowships associated with it, now offered for one full academic year in residence at the Clark. The program will be directed by Helen Deutsch, English, UCLA, and Mary Terrall, History, UCLA. Professors Deutsch and Terrall have provided the following summary of the program theme:

Many writers and readers in the eighteenth century worried about how to think about matter, and especially about matter’s capacity to move, organize itself, respond to outside influences, and eventually to decompose. The core program for 2005–06 will look at the many ways of speculating about and experimenting with matter in this period, structured around three different kinds of moments: conception, life, and death. The programs will situate the history of materialism within a larger history of literary, cultural, and scientific practices. Areas of investigation include the relation of the mind to the body, the brain to the soul, the physical to the abstract, the empirical/experimental to the theoretical, and the concrete to the speculative or conjectural.

Scholars who have received a Ph.D. in the last six years and are engaged in research pertaining to the announced theme are eligible to apply. Fellows are expected to make a substantive contribution to the Center’s workshops and seminars. Awards are for one full academic year in residence at the Clark.

**Stipend:** $27,600 for the academic year.

**Other fellowships and support programs:**

Several other programs, for postdoctoral and predoctoral scholars, and for undergraduate students, support research at the Clark. Most of the resident fellowships provide a stipend of $2,000 per month.

Details, updates, and application forms can be found on the Center’s website; inquiries should be addressed to the Fellowship Coordinator at the Center. See the box on page 8 for all contact addresses.

**Application deadline:** 1 February each year, for all fellowships.

---

**Bruman Summer Chamber Music Festival 2004**

This summer’s Henry J. Bruman Summer Chamber Music Festival runs from 15 July through 5 August. Performances take place at 7:00 p.m. in Korn Convocation Hall at the Anderson School on the UCLA campus.

15 July — **La Camerata**: works by Arcangelo Corelli, Maurice Ravel, Franz Schubert, and Heitor Villa-Lobos

19 July — **Armadillo String Quartet**: compositions by Barry Socher, Charles Ives, Tan Dun, Astor Piazzolla, and Peter Schickele

26 July — **Il Palpitio Soloists**, presented by Young Artists International: works by George Friederich Händel-Johan (August) Halvorsen, Zoltán Kodály, and Johannes Brahms

2 August — **Mládi**: works by Richard Strauss, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, and Bohuslav Martinů

5 August — **Tamar Chernyak, Kristine Hedwall, Minor L. Wetzell, and Gloria Lum**, string players from the Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra: works by Ludwig van Beethoven and Johannes Brahms.

• ADMISSION is free, and no reservations or tickets are required. The complete program is available at the Center office and on the Center’s website. For an informational recording, which includes directions and parking information, call 310-206-5078.
Karmiole Lecture Series Established

Kenneth Karmiole, a Santa Monica antiquarian bookseller, recently established an endowment at the Center and the Clark to fund an annual lecture on the history of the book trade, with an emphasis on England and Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The lectures will be called *The Kenneth Karmiole Lecture Series on the History of the Book Trade*, and the first one will take place in the spring of 2005. Increasing interest among scholars in the history of the book, and the Clark’s growing collection of materials relating to the collecting, publishing, and dissemination of books in the early modern period, make this lecture particularly appropriate.

Ken Karmiole has run his own rare book business in Los Angeles since 1976, and is a highly respected member of the book trade. The Center and the Clark are deeply grateful to Ken for this gift, and for the expression of faith in our programs and collections that it represents.

Bruce Whiteman, Kenneth Karmiole, and Peter Reill at the Clark.

On View at the Clark

*July–September:* Ninja Press at Twenty, 1984–2004. A retrospective of books, broadsides, and keepsakes published by Carolee Campbell, the press’s founder whose craftsmanship fuses word, image, and structure into unique books designed to reflect the poetry they enclose. Mounted by Carolee Campbell.


- Exhibits may be viewed during public programs and during specially arranged tours of the library and grounds.

For information and appointments call 323-731-8529.

University of California, Los Angeles Center for 17th- & 18th-Century Studies William Andrews Clark Memorial Library Los Angeles, California 90095-1404
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