

Call for Papers
49th ASECS Annual Meeting
Orlando, FL
March 22-25, 2018

Session Descriptions

Proposals for papers should be sent directly to the session chairs no later than **15 September 2017**. Please include your telephone number and e-mail address. The session chair should be informed of any audio-visual needs and special scheduling requests. Presentations by younger and untenured scholars are warmly encouraged.

Session chairs are reminded that all papers received up to the deadline **MUST** be considered. Please do not announce that the panel is closed prior to the 15 September deadline. Chairs have until 30 September to send the names of participants, their e-mail addresses and the titles of their papers to the ASECS Business Office: asecsoffice@gmail.com (Fax: 716-878-5700).

The Society's rules permit members to present only one paper at the meeting. Members may, in addition to presenting a paper, serve as a session chair, or a respondent, or a panel discussant, but they may not present a paper in those sessions they also chair. No member may appear more than twice in the program.

Please be reminded that if you submit a paper proposal to more than one session, you must notify all the chairs to whom you have made a submission. If you fail to notify the session chairs, they will have the right to decide between themselves in which session the paper will be presented or whether the paper will be excluded entirely.

All participants must be members in good standing of ASECS or a constituent society of ISECS. Membership must be current by September 30, 2017, for a participant to be included in the printed program and to receive pre-registration materials. Members of constituent societies of ISECS **must** furnish a snail mail address (to asecsoffice@gmail.com) to receive pre-registrations materials.

1. **“Contesting the Caribbean: Caught between Empires” (Roundtable).** Renee Gutiérrez, Longwood University; gutierrezar@longwood.edu

A confusion of influences from many empires roiled the Caribbean early on, even among competing indigenous tribes prior to the arrival of the Europeans, and those influences left their mark on the area throughout the 18th century. What happens when imperial powers collide on land and at sea? How can our disciplinary narratives be challenged by tracking different imperial agents and examining different proto-national voices? This roundtable will be constructed so as to foster an interdisciplinary dialog across multiple academic fields, discussing the impact of imperial projects in the Caribbean. All disciplines are welcome: literature, history, art history, linguistics, etc. To start (but by no means limit) your thinking, consider these questions: Who were the winners and losers in the Caribbean? Who controlled Caribbean economies and how? How did power shift, and how were those shifts explained? Who ruled Caribbean ports and their cities? Who resisted the imperial reach of Spain, France, and England? How were contesting narratives constructed and how did they circulate?

2. **“Ballads and Songs in the Eighteenth Century”** Ruth Perry, MIT; rperry@mit.edu

Ballads and songs were central cultural formations in the eighteenth century. They can be found enriching many other genres (novels, plays, shows, concerts); they were a pervasive influence on daily domestic and public life; and they constitute in their own right a very substantial print and manuscript tradition. This session solicits papers that demonstrate the centrality of ballads and songs, too much undervalued in the English tradition, to our understanding of Anglo-American cultural identity.

3. **“Insects, Spiders, Worms, and Other Creepy Crawlers”** Beth Kowaleski Wallace, Boston College, AND Beth Fowkes Tobin, University of Georgia; kowalesk@bc.edu and btobin@uga.edu

This panel invites presentations on any topics related to insects, spiders, worms, or, other “creepy crawlers” in eighteenth century literature and culture. While papers addressing the representation of such “creatures” in literary texts are certainly welcome, we also hope to include recent work in theoretical fields such as history of science and new materialism. What were some ways in which insects and other related phyla were studied, cognitively processed, and ultimately understood in the eighteenth century? What challenges did they pose to

human understanding? How were they deployed as emblems of various material effects? We welcome answers to these and other questions.

4. **“Health and Disease in the Eighteenth Century”** Chris Mounsey, University of Winchester; chris.mounsey@winchester.ac.uk

In previous iterations of this panel we have discussed Health and Disease in our period from the point of view of the Doctors and the Patients. At ASECS 2018 we propose to explore the notion of “Cure.” In a period when only a few regimes of care were wholly effective and restorative by modern standards, and some regimes of care were so drastic as to be life changing, expectations of the effects of treatment could never be simply stated. Adding to the complexity of the situation was the prevalence of quack remedies and of practitioners who were at best partially trained. This panel looks for proposals on all aspects of outcomes of treatment. Proposals might explore infectious disease medicines, obstetrics, amputations, venereal disease medicines, eye care, nostrums, madhouses, cancer operations, bladder stone operations. Sources may be literary, technical, archival, anthropological or historical.

5. **“Alternative Facts and Fake News” (Roundtable).** Rachael Scarborough King, University of California, Santa Barbara; rking@english.ucsb.edu

With debates over the values of a free press and journalistic objectivity central features of today’s political discourse, what can we learn from the eighteenth-century development of the news media? The spread of the periodical press played a key role in emerging notions of how to verify facts in print, but was at the same time central to the proliferation of hoaxes and distortions, from Mary Toft to the Cock-Lane Ghost to Ossian. And at the same time as the concept of “the news” solidified over the course of the century, newspapers may have become increasingly subject to political influence. How did eighteenth-century readers learn to distinguish real from fake news—and what importance did they place on this distinction? This roundtable seeks brief reflections on the reliability of the news media in the eighteenth century, considering the historical contingency of categories such as “factual” and “fake” and the ongoing intersections of appeals to objectivity combined with lies and misrepresentations. We will consider how present-day technological changes may mirror the upheaval occasioned by the takeoff in periodical publishing that shaped eighteenth-century print.

6. **“Women Satirists in the Age of Reason”** Elizabeth Tasker Davis, Stephen F. Austin State University; taskerea@sfasu.edu

Satire is still considered a masculine mode, from its prominence in the traditional genre of formal verse satire to the modern satiric novel. The purpose of this panel is to challenge the long-held perception that “the clichés about satire being a male form are legitimate,” as recently stated by Ashley Marshall in *The Practice of Satire in England 1658-1770* (28). Rather, this panel will argue that eighteenth-century women writers found satire a fruitful mode for enacting social critique and provocation. This panel seeks to deepen the conversation on women satirists by featuring papers on female satirists from any culture or literary tradition of the eighteenth century who produced works of direct, indirect, and Mennipean satire in prose fiction, drama, verse, and even visual forms such as pamphlets, cartoons, and other hybrid works. Papers might consider the following questions: What occasions and targets did female satirists address? How did their critiques challenge, respond to, or differ from male satirists of their era? What models of satire did women satirists follow in terms of purpose, structures, and genres?

7. **“Bull! Tauromachy in the Enlightenment”** Ana Rueda, University of Kentucky; rueda@uky.edu

Bullfighting has generated abundant commentary and controversy. Rousseau credited bullfighting with keeping alive a certain “vigour” in the Spanish people, while other writers linked bullfights to Spain’s backwardness and refusal to embrace the Enlightenment. The Bourbons disapproved of them for their barbaric nature, but corridas were held in commemorative festivities and served to vindicate national identity against the foreign gaze. The spectacle waned among the aristocracy, yet grew in popularity among the masses in the Iberian Peninsula and parts of France. In Spanish America bullfighting prevailed as an uninterrupted local tradition since the conquistadores introduced it in the early 1500s. How does bullfighting in its different forms enlighten us about national identity in the Enlightenments of Spain, Portugal, France, Mexico or Venezuela? How do we reconcile the ferocity of bullfights with the demarcations between rationality and irrationality as epistemic and moral phenomena? Goya sketched colorful bullfighting scenes in his Tauromaquia series, but *The Death of the Picador* (1793), depicting gruesome agony in a moment of pure

terror, suggests an aberration of the national pastime. This panel seeks to explore the ritual of taumachy and the taurine subject in order to determine the place of this tradition in enlightened societies and nations.

8. **“Addressing Structural Racism in the Eighteenth-Century Curriculum” (Roundtable)** Susan S. Lanser, Brandeis University; lanser@brandeis.edu

The 2017 ASECS panel on addressing structural racism in eighteenth-century studies opened a topic critical to the future of our field: how to come to terms with a system in which historically shaped institutional practices and cultural representations perpetuate racial inequality and privilege whiteness. Although studies of slavery, interrogations of empire, engagements with orientalism, and critiques of enlightenment have intensified in recent years, the field as a whole continues to replicate--and, one might argue, nostalgically cathect to--its investments in the dominant cultures, and the cultures of dominance, of the period itself. Changing that paradigm will doubtless require interventions into multiple sites through multiple strategies. This panel focuses on curriculum as one way to begin reshaping the field. Colleagues who have addressed structural racism in courses focused on the eighteenth century are invited to present models, explore challenges, or propose strategies for curricular transformation or pedagogical intervention. These concrete suggestions are meant to stimulate a larger conversation about the ways in which ASECS and its members might work actively against racism in our teaching, scholarship, and professional life. Contributions may focus on undergraduate or graduate education; the sharing of syllabi and course materials is particularly welcome.

9. **“The Presence of the Past: John Dryden’s Translated Verse”** Philip Smallwood, Bristol University; philip.smallwood@bristol.ac.uk

This session invites critical papers on any aspect of Dryden’s turn from drama and satire to verse translation in the final decades of his long poetical career up to the time of his death in 1700. New work on Dryden’s translations has drawn attention to the distinction of this verse and its cultural consequences for the eighteenth century, particularly the poetical work of Alexander Pope and the revolutionary aesthetic commitments of literary critics such as Joseph Warton. Papers might address the creative nature of Dryden’s interaction with both classical and early English originals and the extent to which Dryden is transmitting, via translation, his reactions to contemporary political and social tumult. Dryden’s extraordinary attention to the needs and demands of a female readership in *Fables, Ancient and Modern* (1700) may suggest the pivotal cultural significance of his final volume, while major themes of *Sylvae* (1685) on the nature of love, and against the fear of death (from Lucretius), cast new light on the Augustan practice of reasoning in verse. Papers on topics such as these or on the many issues that arise from Dryden’s commerce with poets he translated--Chaucer, Homer, Ovid, Juvenal, Horace, Boccaccio, and Virgil--are most welcome.

10. **“Mesmer Now”** Michael Yonan, University of Missouri; yonanm@missouri.edu

2018 is the fiftieth anniversary of the publication of Robert Darnton’s important study *Mesmerism and the End of the Enlightenment in France* (Harvard, 1968), a book that has defined Mesmerism’s significance for eighteenth-century scholarship ever since. 2018 also marks the 240th anniversary of Franz Anton Mesmer’s arrival in Paris, a pivotal moment in the German-born animal magnetist’s career and the beginning of his most influential and controversial decade. This double anniversary offers an opportunity for rethinking, revising, or otherwise newly understanding the place of Mesmer and Mesmerism in our collective picture of the late eighteenth century. What does Mesmer mean to scholarship now? Should our view of him be updated in light of new developments in eighteenth-century studies? How do his ideas correlate with recent concerns in the broader history of science and theorizations of immateriality? The panel especially seeks interdisciplinary papers and papers that explore understudied aspects of Mesmer’s career.

11. **“Currents of Empire: Toward a Global Material Culture”** Douglas Fordham, University of Virginia; Monica Anke Hahn, Temple University; Emily Casey, University of Delaware; currentsofempire@gmail.com

This panel calls for papers that consider how the material turn can or should inflect the global turn in early modern cultural history. In art history, scholars have increasingly embraced the importance of things and their materiality to questions of cultural construction and exchange. Together, paintings, prints, and sculpture, alongside other types of visual and material culture, can be used as evidence to reconstruct complex networks of power, exchange, and identity performance that freshly illuminate the geographies and time periods of art historical study. “Currents of Empire” asks contributors to consider how the transoceanic movement of objects enlarges our understanding of the entangled histories of the empires of Britain, Spain, and France, and first nation communities in the Americas, Oceania, and the Pacific Rim. How do things support and trouble the

performance of imperial and native colonial identities in a global world? Especially encouraged are proposals that expand traditional boundaries—geopolitical, cultural, art historical—in order to reexamine and enrich the growing interdisciplinary conversation around material culture and global exchange in the Age of Empires.

12. **“The New Secular Studies”** James Bryant Reeves, Franklin & Marshall College; jamesreeves@ucla.edu

A new era of “secular studies” has arrived. In fact, as the *New York Times* recently reported, the University of Miami will soon establish a chair for the “study of atheism, humanism and secular ethics,” the first of its kind in the United States. Following a wave of studies by scholars like Talal Asad, Wendy Brown, and Charles Taylor, the announcement points to the ongoing need to conceptualize and understand the relationship between secularism and unbelief. Although much has been said about the recent “turn to religion” and religion’s resurgence in the public sphere, secularism’s (often vexed) ties to unbelief remain relatively understudied and under-theorized. With this in mind, this session invites papers that contribute to our understanding of “atheism,” “humanism,” or “secular ethics” as such terms relate to the long eighteenth century. Papers that address the following questions are especially welcomed: What does it mean to be secular? What does it mean for literature, in particular, to be secular? What is atheism’s relationship to the secular? What do scholars of the eighteenth century have to offer secular studies? How does atheism/humanism/secularism/etc. affect literary form, and vice versa? Is “the secular” a useful category when thinking about 18th-century texts?

13. **“Mind ‘Yore’ Business?: Eighteenth-Century Studies and the Problem of Presentism”** Nicole M. Wright, University of Colorado at Boulder; Nicole.Wright@colorado.edu

Fifteen years ago, the American Historical Association President and eighteenth-century studies specialist Lynn Hunt challenged scholars in her column “Against Presentism.” Academic research and teaching, she argued, were bedeviled by presentism, manifest both as “the tendency to interpret the past in presentist terms” and “the shift of general historical interest toward the contemporary period and away from the more distant past.” Presentism, Hunt warned, threatened to put historians “out of business”; she noted, “[U]ndergraduates flock to 20th-century courses and even Ph.D. students take degrees mostly in 20th-century topics.” Hunt acknowledged that “women’s history, African American history, Latino history, gay and lesbian history, and the like have all made fundamentally important contributions to our understanding of history.” She nonetheless claimed: “But history should not just be the study of sameness, based on the search for... identity. It should also be about difference.” Ever since Hunt’s column was published in 2002, the humanities have faced increasing pressure to stay “relevant.” This session invites further debate: Is presentism a problem for eighteenth-century studies? Could it offer solutions? As pre-1900 prerequisites dwindle, do institutional enrollment benchmarks conflict with research goals? How might presentism limit—or reinvigorate—our understanding of the past?

14. **“Women Philosophers”** Julie C. Hayes, University of Massachusetts Amherst; jhayes@hfa.umass.edu

This panel will explore women’s contributions to Enlightenment philosophy, political thought, economic theory, and theology. Papers may examine the worldview of individual figures, the relationship of women writers and thinkers to the academy and institutions of knowledge, the sites and genres of women’s philosophizing, and women’s relationship to the historical tradition. I invite papers representing a range of national contexts.

15. **“Revisiting Harold Bloom: The Value of Misreading in the Long Eighteenth Century”** Glen Colburn, Morehead State University; g.colburn@moreheadstate.edu

This session will focus on the interesting and valuable developments in literary, philosophical, or historical form, content, or theory that arise from what Bloom calls “strong misreadings.” Papers from a variety of disciplinary and theoretical perspectives are welcome: eighteenth-century writers’ misreadings of their contemporaries or predecessors, misreadings and the “mind-reading” of cognitive psychology, sentimental misreadings or misreadings and affect theory, misreadings as the basis of claims to originality, historians’ misreadings of the period, etc.

16. **“Anatomical Instruction in the Netherlands in the Long Eighteenth Century”** Andrew Graciano, University of South Carolina; graciano@mailbox.sc.edu

This panel seeks proposals from a variety of disciplines (history, history of science/medicine, art history, cultural history, etc.) around the central subject of anatomical instruction in the Netherlands (especially in Amsterdam and The Hague) in the long eighteenth century. Priority will be given to papers concerned with the

very late eighteenth century until c.1815—that is, from the end of the Dutch Republic through the Batavian and Bonapartist periods. Of interest are papers that discuss the processes and/or curricula of anatomical instruction (including dissection) at universities, medical schools/institutions, private academies and other learned groups, art academies/societies, etc. Papers might treat political/ethical/legal/social issues surrounding anatomical instruction; the role of anatomical instruction in anatomical/medical professionalization and training; artistic training; amateur curiosity; medical research/innovation; artistic representation; medical texts; etc. Art historical analyses should connect such instruction to the development of artistic instruction, taste, style, and/or a move beyond (or perhaps a continued) emulation of the Golden Age.

17. **“Words and Images”** David Taylor, University of Warwick; d.f.taylor@warwick.ac.uk

W. J. T. Mitchell alerted us some time ago to the implicit antipictorialism of much Enlightenment thought. For the likes of Edmund Burke and G. E. Lessing, words were always to be preferred to images. But the eighteenth century was also the period in which new text-image imbrications began to circulate: book illustrations, satirical prints, broadsides, advertisements, and Blake’s illuminated works, to name but a few. This panel invites papers that consider any aspect of text-image relations in the period. Papers might broach philosophical negotiations of the distinction between the verbal and visual, especially in the fields of aesthetics or theology, or consider the play of word and image in specific texts, pictures, or sites of cultural exchange (playhouses, coffeehouses, art galleries, the city street). Equally, contributions are welcomed from those wishing to explore the interactions between text and image that prevail in our own scholarship or pedagogy.

18. **“Understanding Hardwicke’s Marriage Act” (Roundtable)** Jaclyn Geller, Central Connecticut State University; gellerjai@ccsu.edu

Historians agree on the facts of the 1753 Marriage Act. Sponsored by Philip York, Earl of Hardwicke, it invalidated unions formed by mutual agreement before witnesses. It stated that every wedding must be performed by an Anglican cleric in a church, with banns read and recorded. Both parties had to be of age or to have received parental consent. Clerics who violated these laws were vulnerable to transportation. Interpretations of what the Act meant, however, diverge. Some scholars see it as watershed legislation that codified new social categories of respectability (for married women) and legitimacy (for children), invalidating the traditional practice of informal cohabitation. For others, those living arrangements are themselves a fiction, read into Britain’s past by modern scholars. While it will not resolve the debates, this session invites short papers that offer compelling interpretations of what the Act meant in the lives of mid-eighteenth-century Britons. How was it perceived and debated at the time? How was it represented in fiction and drama? What was its legacy in terms of domestic law? Of particular interest are papers that explore the Act’s impact on couples cohabiting out of wedlock, never-married adults, or children born outside marriage. Papers proffering legal, historical and literary evidence are welcome.

19. **“Irish Women Playwrights from the ‘Long’ Eighteenth Century”** Dr. David Clare, Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick; DClare1@eircom.net

In recent decades, movements such as #Waking the Feminists and “There Are No Irish Women Playwrights!” have highlighted the prejudice regularly faced by Irish women when they submit their scripts to leading Irish theatres for consideration. This problem is, of course, nothing new. Irish women dramatists from the eighteenth century also had trouble getting their plays produced (in Dublin or London). For example, Maria Edgeworth had two plays rejected by Drury Lane, and her strongest plays were only ever produced as “home theatricals”. Similarly, Mary Davys’s *The Self-Rivals* was meant to be performed at Drury Lane but was subsequently dropped from the production schedule. When Irish women did manage to get their plays staged, they were rarely revived, even when the initial run was a popular success. This is true of important plays by Davys, Frances Sheridan, and Elizabeth Griffith. This panel seeks papers which discuss any aspect of plays written by Irish women during the “long” eighteenth century. Because so many plays by Irish women from this period were either rejected by those in charge of theatres in Dublin and London or have rarely been revived, there is much scholarship to be done on these unjustly-neglected works.

20. **“Bad Poetry” (Roundtable)** Erin M. Goss, Clemson University, AND James Mulholland, North Carolina State University; egoss@clemson.edu and mulholland@ncsu.edu

While the past several decades have led most critics to be wary of designating some poetry “better” than others, there seems little hesitancy about deeming some poetry simply bad. We know bad poetry when we see it and calling it out produces aesthetic pleasure, from Pope’s excoriation of modern bathos to Byron’s blasting

of self-involved Lake Poets to *The Telegraph's* "The worst poems by 7 great writers" (October 2016). Participants on this roundtable will consider poetry deemed to be bad, whether rejected on aesthetic grounds, for philosophical positions, or due to cultural unrecognizability. We will discuss what it means for writing to be "bad" and how criteria of poor writing have changed. We will assess what bad poetry means for literary study, especially with the renewed interest in methods other than "lyric reading" (with its emphasis on formal innovation and intricate interiority). How does bad poetry force us to read otherwise? Must our methods change to examine it? Send 150-200 word proposals to Erin Goss and James Mulholland that suggest a topic, example, or conceptual problem for consideration. Participants will deliver brief (5 min.) position papers before we open it to wider conversation.

21. **"Here They Come: Immigrants and Immigration in the Long Eighteenth Century"** Andreas Mueller, University of Northern Colorado; andreas.mueller@unco.edu

The panel is concerned with all things immigration: the representation of immigrants in literature and the arts; immigrants' accounts of their new lives; socio-economic treatises concerning the benefits and/or disadvantages of immigration; assessments of immigration policies; immigrants and constructions of national identity; regional culture and immigration; to name but a few possible topic areas.

22. **"Impolite Religion in Eighteenth-Century Britain" (Roundtable)** Michael Brown, University of Aberdeen; m.brown@abdn.ac.uk

Much work has been done in recent years on the intersection between the ideology of politeness and the critique of religious enthusiasm and superstition. In this, it proposed that the period saw a privatization and, arguably, a gendered domestication of religious understanding and spiritual experience. This panel asks participants to reflect on the response of those on the receiving end of that critique. It asks how they defended themselves from the accusation that their spiritual experience was improper and unbecoming; how they reoriented their public expression of faith in light of these accusations; and how they identified with of superstition and enthusiasm as a positive value, giving proof of their unbending commitment to the deity.

23. **"Intimations of the Capitalocene/Anthropocene"** Suvir Kaul and Chi-ming Yang, University of Pennsylvania; kaul@english.upenn.edu AND cmyang@english.upenn.edu

Commentators on the end of the holocene era and the advent of what has been variously described as the Anthropocene or Capitalocene have called attention to the causal role played by fossil fuel usage, the monocultural and labor practices of plantation economies, the extension of the regime of private property across other modes of land-ownership and usage, and the trading and financial practices of modern capitalism. Many of these forms of energy usage, resource extraction, land and labor management either originated in, or found full expression in the eighteenth century. We invite papers on these topics, and in particular on writing in this period that suggests an awareness, or perhaps just an intuition, of the beginnings of such epochal changes. Can we, as literary critics and historians of the eighteenth century, contribute meaningfully to discussions of the ecological crisis that rages about us? Can our reading of eighteenth-century texts allow us to add to the debate about the explanatory power of terms like the plantationocene, the capitalocene, the anthropocene, or chthulucene? We envisage 3 15-20 minute long papers, with a response from one of the panel organizers, but if we receive many exciting submissions, we might convert the panel into a roundtable.

24. **"Theatrical Rivalries"** Diana Solomon, Simon Fraser University, AND Fiona Ritchie, McGill University; dks5@sfu.ca and fiona.ritchie@mcgill.ca

This panel invites papers that discuss rivalry in Restoration and eighteenth-century drama and theatre. Papers might consider rivalries between actors, singers, theatre managers, playwrights, audience members and other personnel; "fake" rivalries designed for publicity; rivalries between genres, such as Shakespeare vs. pantomime; rivalries between acting styles; rivalries depicted in plays (e.g. between characters, groups or ideas); nationalistic rivalries, etc. We seek to address a series of questions about theatrical conflict, including the following: Were there common motivations for theatrical rivalries? To what degree was rivalry a driving commercial or creative force in the theatre? How were theatrical rivalries represented in other media (e.g. caricature and the press)? This session aims to consider the wide variety of theatrical rivalries that took place during the long eighteenth century with the goal of analyzing how they augment our knowledge of theatre history during this period.

25. **“The Place of Poetry / The Poetry of Place”** Deborah Weiss, the University of Alabama, dweiss@ua.edu

Over the past several years there has been a notable scarcity of sessions at ASECS dedicated to poetry. If one were to estimate the place of poetry in eighteenth-century literary studies by the percentage of poetry panels, that place would be very low indeed. This session seeks proposals that address the place of poetry, broadly considered. Papers might consider the history of poetry’s place in eighteenth-century studies, or the place of poetry within the eighteenth-century world of letters. Papers might also explore how place functions within eighteenth-century poetry, or how the poets of the period considered their own place within the literary landscape. Any examination of the relationship between poetry and place will be considered.

26. **“The Imprint of Women: Printmakers, Printsellers and Print Publishers”** Cynthia Roman, Yale University AND Cristina S. Martinez, University of Ottawa; cynthia.roman@yale.edu and martinezcsm@gmail.com

Significant women printmakers and publishers have long been relegated to footnotes or secondary status in national biography and academic canons. The organizers of this panel seek to recover the achievements of women in graphic culture. We invite papers on the role of women in the creation, production and circulation of prints in the long eighteenth century. We encourage interdisciplinary and global perspectives. Topics might address professional and amateur status, implications of genre and aesthetics or of technique and medium, and questions of legality, including libel and censorship among others.

27. **“Reading Defoe’s Animals in the Land of the Mouse” (Roundtable)** Lucinda Cole, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign; lcot@illinois.edu

As Richard Nash argued in 2003, for Daniel Defoe the human and the animal are symbolically and ecologically bound. This roundtable, building on Nash’s argument in *Wild Enlightenment*, explores the role of the animal in *Robinson Crusoe* and in other works by Defoe. We solicit short, critically informed papers on any aspect of Defoe, animals or animality, including animals and empire, Defoe’s island ecologies, religion and animality, posthuman representation, animals and otherness.

28. **“Here, There, or Anywhere: Eighteenth-Century Senses of Place”** Pamela Phillips, University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras; phillips.pamela@gmail.com

This panel considers the multiplicity of ways “sense of place” works itself out in the eighteenth century. Topics addressed may include but are not limited to: place attachment, abandonment, and dependence; the relation between individual or community identity and physical environment; the desire to stay vs. the start of a more mobile modern society; the process of assigning meaning to a physical space; the emergence of new communities alongside established places; eighteenth-century sense of responsibility to place; memory and place. Proposals from an array of disciplines are especially encouraged.

29. **“1808: The Peninsular War, aka The Spanish War of Independence” (Roundtable)** Yvonne Fuentes; yfuentes@westga.edu

The abdication of Charles IV of Spain in favor of his son Fernando VII took place in March of 1808. On May 2nd, the people of Madrid rose against the French troops, and the retaliation of the following day would be immortalized in Goya’s painting, *El tres de mayo*. Consequently, by the end of that same month Joseph Bonaparte sat on the Spanish throne. The crisis in sovereignty caused by the collapse of the Spanish monarchy led the allied powers of Spain, Britain and Portugal to mount offensive attacks, counterattacks, and eventually defeat the great imperial forces in a war that lasted six long years; a war known as both the Peninsular War and the Spanish War of Independence. We invite participants from different disciplines to explore the many facets and actors in these theatres of war. Additionally, we would like to address the following questions: What does each space highlight? To whom would one or the other nomenclature appeal? Can they be physical and/or imaginary spaces? We are particularly interested in textual and visual representations of events that resulted in or from those circumstances, and especially those based on or containing conflicting interpretations.

30. **“Modes of Play in Eighteenth-Century France”** Fayçal Falaky, Tulane University, AND Reginald McGinnis, University of Arizona; ffalaky@tulane.edu and rjm@email.arizona.edu

We are seeking papers on various forms or aspects of play in the eighteenth century. What are the dominant, or alternative, theories on this subject? How is play related to serious pursuits? When, or how, is play

deployed for transgressive or subversive purposes, and how is this interplay of the serious and the trivial, enchantment and disenchantment, represented in the literature of the period? We welcome proposals for papers about any eighteenth-century genre that reflect on how parody, frivolity, mockery, or irony are used to divert not just the public, but meaning itself. Interdisciplinary and comparative papers are encouraged.

31. **“Reading Closely for New Questions: The Next Phase of Scholarship on the Work of Anne Finch”** Jennifer Keith, University of North Carolina at Greensboro; jmkeith@uncg.edu

I seek papers that explore Anne Finch’s experiments with forms. “Forms” may be construed broadly, encompassing, for example, rhetorical techniques, structures that include meter and stanza, poetic kinds, and modes. These still under-studied aspects of her work are nevertheless central to Finch’s achievements. Ideally, each paper would combine a detailed attention to one element with broader reflections on how Finch’s uses of this element identify new categories and raise new questions for the next phase of scholarship on her work. How might the recent studies that have attended to the Jacobite, feminist, or literary politics of Finch’s poems (and occasionally her plays) be reoriented by such analysis of her formal experiments? What other areas of enquiry do these experiments expose?

32. **“Biblical Painting in Eighteenth-Century Britain”** Naomi Billingsley, University of Manchester; naomi.billingsley@manchester.ac.uk

This panel seeks to explore the place of biblical painting in the British art world throughout the eighteenth century. It is well recognized that there was a proliferation of painting in this genre in the latter part of the century, but there are also important examples earlier in the century, such as William Hogarth’s work for the Foundling and St. Bartholomew’s Hospitals. While the work of scholars such as Nigel Aston and Clare Haynes have examined certain aspects of this topic, it remains under-explored. The panel seeks to bring together new work to consider the importance and varieties of biblical painting in Britain in the eighteenth century. It invites papers from historians, historians of Christianity, and art historians. Possible topics include: the work of individual artists engaged in biblical painting, such as Benjamin West and William Blake; patronage of biblical painting from the church and individuals; the spaces in which biblical paintings were exhibited and displayed in the period, including the Royal Academy and venues such as the Macklin Gallery, as well as in churches and chapels; audience responses to biblical painting; commentary on biblical painting in religious discourse such as sermons.

33. **“The Humanities in the Eighteenth Century.”** Roger Maioli, University of Florida; rogermaioli@gmail.com

When did the humanities assume their collective identity? What is their scope and purpose? These are fundamental questions for contemporary debates in academia, yet the history of the modern humanities as a whole — as opposed to the history of specific humanistic disciplines — is a relatively new genre. Recent studies by James Turner and Rens Bod suggest that it was in the nineteenth century, with the institutionalization of academic disciplines, that the humanities were separated out from other spheres of knowledge, especially the sciences. Yet Isaiah Berlin identified the Enlightenment as the setting for the original “divorce” between the sciences and the humanities; more recently, Robin Valenza argued that philosophy, literature, and the natural sciences slowly parted ways not in the nineteenth century, but between 1680 and 1820. The eighteenth century, in other words, played an important yet understudied role in shaping the modern humanities and defining their nature and goals. This section welcomes papers that consider that role by discussing, among possible topics, the relationship between literature broadly construed and the sciences; the conflict between empiricism and the imagination; the debate on the arts and sciences surrounding Rousseau’s first *Discourse*; Enlightenment theories of education; and the genre of philosophical history.

34. **“Boswell and Corsica after 250 Years.”** Gordon Turnbull, Yale University; gordon.turnbull@yale.edu

Boswell’s *Account of Corsica* (1768) brought wide notice to the Corsican independence cause as well as to the unabashedly fame-seeking young author, immortalized the character of General Pasquale Paoli, helped disseminate Rousseauistic sociopolitical theory, and found admiring readerships in Europe and pre-Revolutionary North America. Boswell followed it with *Essays in Favour of the Brave Corsicans*, raised funds, and shipped ordnance to Paoli’s fighters. Contemporaries knew him as “Corsica Boswell” for far longer than as Johnson’s biographer. Johnson, curiously, felt impelled to urge him to “empty your head of Corsica which I think has filled it rather too long.” But his work brought him to the attention of such figures Gen. James Oglethorpe (founder of the colony of Georgia) and Benjamin Franklin. It prompted Catherine Macaulay to volunteer to write a Constitution for an independent Corsica, and Anna Letitia Aikin (later Barbauld) authored a

passionate poetic tribute to the “thoughts that swell’d the breast / of generous BOSWELL...”. The questions Boswell’s *Corsica* raised remain strikingly alive: the relationship between nation and region, metropole and province, individual nation-states and an unstable amalgam called “Europe,” travelogue and political polemic or propaganda, psychological need and political activism. Proposals (250 words) and brief cv, please.

35. **“The Innocent ‘I’ in the Eighteenth Century” (Roundtable)** Mary McAlpin, University of Tennessee, mmcalpin@utk.edu

The goal of this roundtable is to explore how “innocent” characters experience their introduction into society in eighteenth-century literature, and/or how such figures are represented in eighteenth-century paintings. The classic novelistic trope is that of a young society girl freshly released from the convent and thrust into the vicious social circles in which she will need to make her way and reputation. Other examples include the first encounter of recent arrivals from foreign lands, or from the countryside, with decadent European/urban mores. The critical focus would be on how this liminal moment of shock, miscomprehension, and often ridicule, is to be understood in the greater context of the literary work or, in the case of paintings, the shared cultural assumptions of the onlookers. These scenes, whether played for their pathos or for their titillation value, are a key element of the eighteenth-century esthetic. A roundtable devoted to exploring a wealth of such critical moments, from a variety of national traditions, may add significantly to our understanding of their function.

36. **“Freakery: The Limits of the Body”** Stan Booth, University of Winchester; stan.booth@winchester.ac.uk

Rosemarie Garland-Thomson theorizes the disabled body in terms of looking at freaks. When we talk of the body, corporality is often seen as the physical body as a whole, but exactly what was a whole body in the eighteenth century? This panel invites proposals that explore instances of how the extensions of the body physically, such as the hands and feet, as well as senses such as touch and sight, were understood in eighteenth century in terms of their presence and absence. The fragile body altered by traumas and dysfunctions could be extended using innovations and technologies. But the rise of mechanization often highlighted perceived failings of the whole body. Many artists produced great works despite adverse bodily constraints. Beethoven was deaf, Martha Anne Honeywell made paper cutouts despite having no hands or feet. Submissions might consider the impact of sensory maps and raised printing for the visually impaired, sight correction and ear trumpets, medical instruments, adaptations to assist travel for short and long journeys and adaptations to aid in the creative arts. By highlighting individual instances of how the extremes of the body’s physical experience were seen and represented, this panel hope to extend the wider work of representing the unique nature of experience.

37. **“And Justice for All: Women Writing for Social Change in the Long Eighteenth Century”** Angela Monsam, Fordham University; monsam@fordham.edu

This panel will examine the contributions to social justice made by women writers in the long eighteenth century. Panelists are encouraged to consider how women writers of the period reflected, questioned, or challenged dominant ideologies, and to think about how these often radical and revolutionary texts influenced the eighteenth-century social climate. This session welcomes submissions on a range of literary works written by women, including but not limited to: novels, poetry, drama, essays, and treatises. Likewise, papers may address a myriad of social issues, from slavery to poverty, from women’s rights to anti-Semitism.

38. **“Never have I ever”: Current Issues in Teaching the Eighteenth Century” (Roundtable)** Tiffany Potter, University of British Columbia; tiffany.potter@ubc.ca

The innovative format of this interdisciplinary pedagogy roundtable uses the structure of “Never have I ever”—the truth game so loved by our students—to create lively discussion of specific challenges and strategies in teaching eighteenth-century studies in the current era. Each panelist presents for 5-7 minutes, outlining a challenge in teaching the eighteenth century, with thoughts on responses to the challenge. S/he will then pose the question (e.g., “Never have I ever chosen to exclude a book from my course because of concern about student response to sexual content”). Attendees hold up a green card if they have done this thing, or a red card if they have not; confessions made, invested discussion follows on strategies to address the challenge. Topics might include teaching sexual, violent or racialized texts; teaching religious or political content to students with varying backgrounds and investments; addressing gaps in student understanding of historical, philosophical, or theoretical contexts. Does anyone still teach very long novels, epic poems, or intricate political satire? Are there ways to teach important texts we know students will dislike? Are there strategies to engage administrative demands for “employment relevance” or student expectations of “relatability”?

39. **“They were Warned and Yet They Persisted”** Yvonne Fuentes; yfuentes@westga.edu

Like today, opposition, resistance, and protest was everywhere in the eighteenth century and took many forms: caricatures, anonymous libels and lampoons, protest songs, and even street riots; and the real or imagined grievances were also multiple. For example, rising prices of bread and other food staples in England, France, and Spain were behind the many riots throughout the century. While the “new” policies on hats and coats resulted in the Esquilache Riots in Madrid, the displeasure with foreign competition and attacks on silk weavers’ looms in London brought about the Spitalfields riots and executions. Similarly, we must not forget that the taxes on lead, glass, paint, paper and tea would be one of the causes of our own Boston Tea Party. Eighteenth century public opinion was strong, and the will of the people was expressed in both indirect and direct ways. We invite papers that explore popular protest, opposition, and resistance in any medium. We are particularly interested in connections between real and/or fake news as part of the rise of the press and the attempt to shape public opinion, as well as scandals, and other causes of protests.

40. **“Public Intellectuals and the Eighteenth Century” (Roundtable)** Devoney Looser, Arizona State University; devoney.looser@asu.edu

This roundtable will consider “public intellectual” work of the C18 and present day. We will consider opportunities, challenges, and mechanisms for bringing C18 thinkers and thought before wider audiences. These questions would guide conversation both practical and exploratory: What might public intellectuals of the C18 teach us about being C21 public intellectuals? Who was doing it best or doing it wrong? Who were the unsung innovators? Why would someone, at any stage of an academic career, want to pursue or avoid “public intellectual” vs. “intellectual intellectual” (i.e. scholars-talking-to-scholars) work? What are the benefits, problems, and pitfalls of describing C18 figures and topics with C21 popular audiences? How do (or ought) “public intellectual” work count or be reimagined vis à vis our scholarly work, within ASECS and in our institutional contexts? How do (or ought) we to teach “public intellectual” skillsets in the undergraduate and graduate curriculum? What would that look like? How might we better use media as eighteenth-centuryists, expanding the reach of our ideas beyond the conference hashtag?

41. **“Teaching the Eighteenth Century: A Poster Session”** Caroline Breashears, St. Lawrence University; cbreashears@stlawu.edu

How do we continue to engage students with the eighteenth century in innovative ways? All aspects of pedagogy are welcome for poster presentations that cover an entire course or focus on a particular element of a course. Brief presentations (5 minutes) will be followed by time for browsing and conversation. Participants in other, “traditional” panels are also welcome to participate in the poster session. Posters will remain on display throughout the conference.

42. **“Forgotten Works of the Long Eighteenth Century: Recovering Authors and Texts”** Judith Bailey Slagle, East Tennessee State University; slagle@etsu.edu

This session explores literary works, by men and women, that were popular at various times during the long eighteenth century but fell into oblivion soon after the death of the authors, or at least by the twentieth century. It addresses reception, genre, changing literary tastes, political climates and asks us to think about how these recovered works contribute today to an understanding of eighteenth-century tastes and culture.

43. **“Art, Alchemy, and Royal Rivalry: The Eighteenth-Century Manufactory”** Tara Zanardi, Hunter College, City University of New York; tzanardi@hunter.cuny.edu

The long eighteenth century witnessed the foundation of countless royally-sponsored manufactories, including porcelain, tapestry, and glass. The majority of the objects produced were destined for royal consumption to decorate palatial residences in the crafting of fashionable interiors or to stage grand performances of royal prowess and taste. Many of these goods were used as diplomatic gifts, from individual works to large sets. The dissemination of these objects contributed to the intense rivalry that was inherent in the factories as one monarch attempted to outdo another. Thus, scientific experimentation, secrecy, artistic collaboration, and emulation were key components of these institutions as kings and queens fostered technical ingenuity. What were the different modes of production employed by royals to generate innovation? How did such manufacture suggest a monarch’s command over natural or man-made materials and help to forge a particular royal identity? What problems existed within the factories, such as the lack of commercial viability, the shortage of

appropriate materials, and power struggles with guilds and non-royally sponsored manufactories? How did the production of these objects participate in economic debates or in broader geopolitical conflicts? Papers should engage with these or related issues surrounding the eighteenth-century manufactory.

44. **“Memory, Remembrance, and Commemoration” (Roundtable)** Ramesh Mallipeddi, University of Colorado at Boulder; ramesh.mallipeddi@colorado.edu

Memory has witnessed a remarkable efflorescence in the past few years, both in scholarly work in the humanities and in popular efforts to address the collective forgetting of traumatic pasts. Specifically, scholars have turned their attention to how catastrophes—colonization, slavery, war, genocide, and disease pandemics—impact memory, and how traumatic events are remembered by victims, survivors, and descendants. As Fassin and Rechtman have recently argued, in modern societies, trauma—in its twin senses as a physical scar and metaphorical trace—is synonymous with the “tragic” insofar as the term marks a “new relationship to time and memory, to mourning and obligation, to misfortune and the misfortunate” (*The Empire of Trauma*, 277). This roundtable invites participants to address the following questions from a range of methodological perspectives: How do we understand pathologies of memory as they manifest in specific historical contexts, including Early American literature and the 18th century Atlantic world? What are the affinities between practices surrounding grief-work and mourning and recent accounts of melancholy? How do individual memories in testimonies trouble and reconfigure public narratives? Why are traumatic memories being increasingly mobilized to speak of “the wounds of the past” in ongoing demands for recognition, reparations, and justice?

45. **“The Eighteenth Century on Film”** John H. O’Neill, Hamilton College; joneill@hamilton.edu

Recognizing the richness and variety of representations of the eighteenth century world in modern cinema, this session welcomes and encourages proposals for papers exploring any aspect of its topic, including – but not limited to – film and television adaptations of eighteenth century narratives (e.g., Robert Zemeckis’s “Cast Away,” Tony Richardson’s “Tom Jones,” Stanley Kubrick’s “Barry Lyndon”), original films set in the period (e.g., Amma Asante’s “Belle,” Patrice Leconte’s “Ridicule,” Tomas Gutierrez Alea’s “The Last Supper”), and film treatments of eighteenth century history or biography (e.g., “Peter Watkin’s “Culloden,” Sofia Coppola’s “Marie Antoinette,” Jean-Marie Straub’s “The Chronicle of Anna Magdalena Bach”). Proposals for discussions of adaptation theory as it applies to eighteenth century works are also welcome.

46. **“Giacomo Leopardi in Europe: Between Enlightenment and Romanticism”** Martino Rabaioli, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill; martinor@live.unc.edu

The poetic and philosophical work of Giacomo Leopardi (1798-1836) inaugurated the Romantic period in Italy. Leopardi engaged with the essential aesthetic and ideological issues of Romanticism, although the same time his thought and writing were deeply influenced by the work of Enlightenment writers and thinkers, such as Locke – considered a predecessor by Enlightenment philosophers –, Condillac, and Rousseau. Both his literary and philosophical writings were in constant dialogue with eighteenth-century themes, ideas, and authors. This session seeks contributions that explore Leopardi’s reception of both the European Enlightenment and Romanticism. Possible topics include: the dialectic of heart/sentiment and reason, the role of science and analysis, the specific influences of Enlightenment and Romanticism, the relationship between poetry and prose writings in light of these influences. Papers exploring Leopardi’s thought and/or literary works through contemporary philosophical and theoretical outlooks are also welcome.

47. **“Humor in the Margins”** Yvette Piggush, College of St. Benedict and St. John’s University; ypiggush@csbsju.edu

How did humor circulate among marginalized groups in the eighteenth century? In his *City of Laughter*, Vic Gatrell admits, “What women laughed at, how unrestrainedly they laughed, whether they laughed at all, and how many of them laughed, are among the murkiest of our subjects.” The same may be said for other groups marginalized by the period’s dominant white male culture of humor, including the poor; religious, racial, ethnic, and sexual minorities; the enslaved; the disabled; and those on the colonial periphery. This panel seeks to shed light on the “murky subject” of how and why humor circulated among minoritized groups in the eighteenth century. It particularly aims to examine what Simon Dickie calls the “less definable attitudes” and unsettling ambiguities in the cultures of humor at the margins. Papers will address what marginalized groups laughed at and why, how their laughter circulated, and how this might change our understanding of the culture of humor

and its social power. The panel invites papers that address these questions from a variety of contexts and disciplinary perspectives including anthropology, art history, history, literary studies, philosophy, and theater.

48. **“Drama and Late Eighteenth Century Revolution”** Maria O’Malley, University of Nebraska, Kearney, AND Denys Van Renen, University of Nebraska, Kearney; omalley2@unk.edu and vanrenendw@unk.edu

This panel solicits papers on the intersection of drama and the wider geopolitical contexts of late eighteenth-century revolutions. Papers can discuss the ways in which dramatists interpreted war, sovereignty, or new modes of belonging. We are especially interested in how the theater provides a realm to ironize or complicate the “representational autonomy” created by print culture (Gould). As historian Eliga Gould claims, one of the reasons the British remained steadfast in their support for George III’s colonial policies in the run up to the American Revolution was because print culture—pamphlets and newspapers—generated “its own ‘reality’ independent from the actual experiences of either its authors or readers.” Did the stage participate in or challenge these versions of “reality”? How does the theater provide, as Elizabeth Maddock Dillon describes, a more inclusive “version of the ‘people’”? Following revolutionary unrest, then, how did the theater (re)imagine the relationship between metropole and periphery (e.g., Britain/U.S., France/Haiti)? Interdisciplinary approaches are welcome.

49. **“Changing Markets for Art, Theater and Literature in France at the End of the Old Regime”** Marie-Claude Felton, McGill University, AND Andrei Pesic, Stanford University; marie-claude.felton@mail.mcgill.ca and andreip@stanford.edu

During the twenty years before the Revolution, the French market for books, music, the visual arts, and theater underwent significant changes. Some of these were linked to new laws, such as one that allowed greater freedom for self-publishing in the book trade. Other relaxations of monopoly privilege were more *de facto* than *de jure*, witnessed by the multiplication of public entertainments in Paris, the city that remained the most structured by exclusive laws. This interdisciplinary panel seeks to bring together recent research on the changing markets for different art forms in order to identify commonalities and divergences during these crucial decades. By exploring multiple genres together in a comparative framework, we intend to bring into contact the vibrant recent work on commercial culture with renewed attention to the institutional and commercial history of the arts.

50. **“Sociability and Identity”** Valérie Capdeville, University of Paris 13, France, AND Ian Newman, University of Notre-Dame; valerie.capdeville@univ-paris13.fr and inewman@nd.edu

The concept of sociability has long been central to accounts of the British eighteenth century, from Addison and Steele’s narrative of coffeehouse sociability to the alehouse meetings of plebeian radicals in the 1790s. Often these accounts have focused on the major institutions of sociability, the coffeehouse, the gentleman’s club, or the radical association for example, resulting in the forms of identity that sociability engendered being obscured. This panel seeks to explore new interdisciplinary approaches to sociability by asking how men and women involved in eighteenth-century sociable practices navigated between an autonomous sense of self and collective forms of identity promoted by sociability. How did they distinguish between or reconcile public, private and sociable selfhood? What role did sociability play in the construction of social, political and cultural identities and how did gender, ethnicity, national character and colonialism shape new forms and models of sociability? What the tensions between sociability and identity were as expressed in literature, art and music, and how did they circulate and transform throughout the Anglo-American world?

51. **“Sensing Change, Changing Sense: Phenomenology in the Empirical Eighteenth Century”** Anita Law, Stanford University; anital@stanford.edu

This panel welcomes open submissions that consider the mutual reconfiguration of the modalities of sight, smell, taste, touch, hearing and proprioception (or any other senses) in relation to displacement over time. What is the relationship between change and the senses? How does change manifest the senses, and how do the senses conceive change? Given that the eighteenth century is typically viewed as the rise of empiricist philosophy and empirical practice, how does this new dependency on and theorization of the senses produce new conceptions and sensations of change? The stakes of this discussion encompass our sense of self, our sense of environment, and our sense of history. Papers might draw on current discussions of narrative, affect, phenomenology, aging, disability and environment, as well as contemporary contexts such as the practices of observation, experiment and historiography; debates over cultural development, education and maturation; experiences of travel and movement and theories of aesthetics.

52. **“New Approaches to Women’s Networks in the Long Eighteenth Century” (Roundtable)** Angela Rehbein, West Liberty University, AND Andrew Winckles, Adrian College; angela.rehbein@westliberty.edu and awinckles@adrian.edu

Despite our growing awareness of the importance of networks and networking during the long eighteenth century, we still lack a complex understanding of how networks functioned, for women writers in particular. Indeed, we lack a cohesive understanding of what we mean by the term “network” to begin with, both historically and critically. These are the questions that guide this session: what did eighteenth-century women’s networks look like, and what can their scope and nature tell us about who had access to literary culture in this period? In what form(s) did material move through networks? How did social and gendered protocols structure networks – and, in turn, how did these networks influence the larger literary culture? How did women’s networks function within the British Isles as well as in international and colonial contexts? Approaches to this topic might include re-thinking the purposes and practices of manuscript circulation; re-examining the role of women in the print trade; tracing local and/or global networks of affiliation and interest; and employing digital tools to collect “big data.” Our goal in this session is to begin sketching a more nuanced picture of what women’s networks actually looked like, how they functioned, and how they structured the era’s cultural production.

53. **“Imposture and Identity Fraud in Eighteenth-Century France”** Thomas Wynn, Durham University, UK; thomas.wynn@dur.ac.uk

Questions of authenticity and identification were fraught across Enlightenment France. Writers as distinct as Rousseau and Sade celebrated the authentic self as never before, and the Revolutionaries made it a key element of their ideology. Yet individuals of both sexes elaborated false personae for criminal, professional and sentimental reasons, and the *Encyclopédie* recognized imposture as one of the most prevalent crimes. Fictional and theatrical plots of disguise, child-swapping, and family recognition betray both an anxiety about the true self, and a longing for legitimate identification. The police may have kept certain individuals under close surveillance, but bureaucratic techniques of identification were under-developed. People from across Europe arrived in Paris, the Enlightenment’s cosmopolitan centre, to make a name for themselves, yet sometimes those names were fake. This interdisciplinary session addresses questions such as: What kinds of identity fraud existed in eighteenth-century France, not just in Paris but nationwide? How was imposture embodied and gendered? How were fraudulent identities created, sustained and challenged by individuals, experts, and corporations? How did imposture impact upon ideas of selfhood and self-fashioning? Papers will be sought from a range of disciplines, such as History, Literary Studies, and Philosophy.

54. **“Épistolarité et Identité/ Epistolarity and Identity”** Tili Boon Cuillé, Washington University in St. Louis; tbcuille@wustl.edu

Correspondence provided the framework for the Republic of Letters, which bore witness to some of the greatest letter-writers of all time. The dominant genre in eighteenth-century France was overwhelmingly epistolary writing, in both fiction and non-fiction. Epistolary novels such as *Lettres d’une péruvienne* and *La Nouvelle Héloïse* topped the charts as bestsellers. These novels, as well as the preserved collections of letters by renowned figures such as Voltaire, Diderot, Graffigny, and Charrière, remain cornerstones of Enlightenment studies. Letters not only served a social and a scholarly purpose in the eighteenth century, but also allowed for the narration and documentation of the self. This bilingual panel invites one-page proposals in French or in English that examine the connection between epistolarity and identity in French and Francophone fiction and/or correspondence from a range of disciplinary approaches. Possible topics include, but are not limited to, the relationship between epistolarity and gender; performativity; self-fashioning; transparency vs. dissimulation; translation; mediation; networks; and celebrity.

55. **“Clarissa(s) over 270 Years”** Joseph Bartolomeo, University of Massachusetts Amherst; bartolomeo@hfa.umass.edu

From the start, Richardson’s *Clarissa* has represented and invited plurality. The author’s own revisions and additions of paratextual material between editions, often following if not necessarily influenced by dialogue with actual readers, result in multiple iterations of the novel, as do the numerous abridgments from the eighteenth century to the present. Parodies, adaptations, and appropriations—across genres and languages—present additional alternatives, with varied affinities to Richardson’s novel and to each other. This panel welcomes papers that compare and contrast versions of *Clarissa*, focusing on issues of narrative (or other) form,

characterization, audience/reader response, and social/ideological commitments. Papers might also address the ways in which the versions in question exploit or elide the open-endedness endemic to the epistolary form of the original.

56. **“All the World’s a Stage-Coach: Carriages in the Eighteenth Century”** Danielle Bobker, Concordia University, AND Bridget Donnelly, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Danielle.bobker@condordia.ca and bdonnell@live.unc.edu

This session welcomes proposals for papers on the carriage and other modes of transport in relation to eighteenth-century politics, culture, literature, philosophy, science, technology, geography, visual art and/or design, and from within or across various national perspectives. Revolutions in the coaching industry throughout the eighteenth century meant that more people could travel greater distances at a lower cost and had many more opportunities to explore both the local and the remote. Papers might focus on travel literature, carriages as material objects, visual or literary representations of vehicles, carriages as sites of narration, tourism, or sociability, roads and the turnpike system, the stagecoach and postal coach industries, cultures of driving, or theories of motion. We hope to foster a robust multidisciplinary discussion of the vehicular transformations of the eighteenth century.

57. **“Sight and Seeing in Eighteenth-Century Fiction”** John Han, Indiana University Bloomington; jshan111@gmail.com

The development of the microscope and telescope drastically changed the way people used sight to interface with the world in the eighteenth century. But between such major shifts in modes of seeing – from the cellular to the cosmic – the most basic mode of sight itself changed. Manifested in technical uses – such as the technique of surveying, the practices of landscaping, and the art of engravings – vision became a formal site of practical epistemology. Sight, therefore, became the subject across a variety of texts, such as William Stow’s survey *Remarks on London*, William Hogarth’s *The Analysis of Beauty*, and William Chambers’s *Dissertation on Oriental Gardening*. But sight also came to be represented in works of eighteenth-century fiction. Related to but apart from the scientific and technical arena, the eighteenth-century literary world – reliant on images, imagination, and imagery – portrayed the act, the process, or the object of seeing in its poems, dramas, and novels. From descriptions of characters looking at one another, to mirrors, and toward an outside environment, eighteenth-century writers allegorized the act of seeing. What do fictional accounts of sight tell us about the relationship between sight and imagination, ocular proof and illusion, material visibility and internal subjectivity?

58. **“Age of Unreason: Enlightenment in the ‘Post-Truth’ Era” (Roundtable)** Mattie Burkert, Utah State University, AND Seth Rudy, Rhodes College; mattie.burkert@usu.edu and rudys@rhodes.edu

In 2004, Bruno Latour reflected on the conflicted attitude humanities scholars hold towards the intellectual legacies of the eighteenth century: “While the Enlightenment profited largely from the disposition of a very powerful descriptive tool, that of matters of fact, which were excellent for debunking quite a lot of beliefs, powers, and illusions, it found itself totally disarmed once matters of fact, in turn, were eaten up by the same debunking impetus.” In our moment of “post-truth” and “alternative facts,” Latour’s observation has new immediacy. The relativism and constructivism of humanities critique have been adapted by political movements seeking to delegitimize scientific inquiry and the free press. Unexpectedly, we as scholars may find ourselves having to defend the Enlightenment legacies we have so long questioned. This panel asks how we might do this work without losing sight of important critiques of Enlightenment rationalism. Do eighteenth-century studies have a privileged role in these debates? How can we strategically teach eighteenth-century battles over empiricism, induction, fact and fiction, and “fake news” in the classroom? Finally, is there a way to use this moment to argue for the urgency and relevance of the work we do as eighteenth-century scholars and teachers?

59. **“Tracking Changes in the Eighteenth-Century: Bibliographical Methods for Studying Ephemeral Printed Materials”** Megan Peiser, Oakland University, AND Neal Curtis, University of Virginia; meganlea.peiser@gmail.com and ndc2fb@virginia.edu

While the innovative printed layouts of Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy* and type ornaments in Samuel Richardson’s *Clarissa* have received ample attention, charting evolving typographical strategies across the eighteenth-century reveals nuanced innovations that inform these strategies and how readers would have used the look of a book. Pamphlets, periodicals, playbooks, broadsides all vary widely but aim for a sort of “crystal goblet” of

typography that changes little in a year but greatly over decades—tracking bibliographical and typographical changes in these genres over time explains what “normal” print would look like, finds strategies that faltered, and can pinpoint early attempts that became mainstream practices for eighteenth-century printed materials. This panel welcomes papers that consider change over time using bibliographical methods including but not limited to collation, considerations of typeface, paper, engravings, pagination, and ornaments. Papers should have a historical as well as a theoretical contribution—not only what is happening in one case, but how does that change how we can look at eighteenth-century books?

60. **“The Uses of ‘Prejudice’”** Bethany Williamson, Biola University; bethany.williamson@biola.edu

The *OED* defines “prejudice” as “an unreasoning preference or objection; a bias” that is not based in reason or experience. In other words, it’s a “prejudgment,” whether “favourable or unfavourable.” Keeping in mind the term’s neutrality, this panel invites papers exploring the uses (and abuses) of “prejudice” (as a term or concept) in 18th-century texts, whether literary, historical, or philosophical. Interdisciplinary approaches are welcome. Papers might consider questions such as: When are biases useful? What counts as productive prejudice? Is prejudice opposed to reason, or is it a valid way of reasoning? Is prejudice compatible with or antithetical to Enlightenment disinterest and cosmopolitan thought? Papers may also consider how the term is used to engage various political and social debates. For instance, Hume frames prejudice positively when he laments the loss of “virtuous and tender Sentiments, or Prejudices” in “Of Moral Prejudices”; and Burke famously argues in *Reflections on the Revolution in France* that “prejudice renders a man’s virtue his habit.” By contrast, Catharine Macaulay argues in her *Letters on Education* that “we must divest ourselves of all partialities and prejudices,” while Austen’s Elizabeth, of course, is ashamed to find that she has been “blind, partial, prejudiced, [and] absurd.”

61. **“Eighteenth Century Sauce-boxes”** Sara Tavela, Duquesne University; tavelas@duq.edu

From the Restoration stage to Richardson’s *Pamela* and beyond, ‘saucy’ characters abound in the long eighteenth-century. This panel welcomes papers that explore bold and cheeky figures, whether in novels, drama, art, or public life. Questions that could be considered include: What makes a character ‘saucy’? What do these figures tell us about eighteenth century life and social politics? Is there an afterlife for them? How do these sauce-boxes persist in the conversation today?

62. **“Data Visualization in Eighteenth-Century Studies” (Roundtable)** Ileana Baird, Zayed University; ileana.baird@zu.ac.ae

This roundtable discussion will introduce to the public new research that involves the use of visualizations in approaching eighteenth-century texts and cultural phenomena (graphs, maps, geospatial representations, social networks, data mapping, and/or any patterns of intellectual exchange presented in a visual format). The panelists will be invited to briefly present their work and then discuss the challenges and the benefits of using visualizations in both their research and teaching. Panelists may address such questions as: What kind of insights does data visualization give? How do such visualizations help make sense of and communicate (big) data? What kind of information becomes visible when using such exploratory tools? What visualization tools are most useful in the humanistic field? Last but not least, what are the issues one must consider when thinking about representing data visually?

63. **“State of the Discipline: Eighteenth-Century French and Francophone Theatre Studies/ État des lieux: études théâtrales du dix-huitième siècle (espaces francophones)” (Roundtable)** Logan J. Connors, University of Miami, AND Yann Robert, University of Illinois-Chicago; logan.connors@miami.edu and yrobert@uic.edu

The goal of this panel is to take stock of current trends and future opportunities for eighteenth-century French and Francophone theatre studies. How has the discipline changed over the past thirty years? How does the discipline engage with the various “turns” of the past few decades: the linguistic, the performative, and the emotional? How do scholars of eighteenth-century French theatre enter into dialogue with the digital humanities? With theories of theatre & performance studies? With theatre in French-speaking places outside of France? With women and gender/sexuality studies? With other critical paradigms of the past few decades: affect studies, the history of emotions, psychoanalysis, etc. Is there anything particular to eighteenth-century theatre studies that renders the discipline antagonistic to some critical frameworks? Are there any critical frameworks that are informed by eighteenth-century theatre studies? This bilingual roundtable seeks concise,

accessible contributions by emerging and confirmed scholars about the state of the discipline today. Presentations merging eighteenth-century theatre and pedagogy are also welcome.

64. **“Street Scenes”** Alison O’Byrne, University of York; alison.obyrne@york.ac.uk

How did eighteenth-century writers and artists describe and represent city streets? What kinds of activities did they present as taking place in the streets, and what kind of relationship do they imagine between those activities and the buildings and structures within the street? This panel welcomes submissions exploring the city street from a variety of disciplinary perspectives and national traditions. Topics might include, but are not limited to, the work of topographical prints series in constructing narratives of the city; the street as staged setting in drama; meditations on the role of the street as public place and location of sociable encounters; the street as site of conflict or confrontation; the street as setting for chance encounters.

65. **“Teaching Eighteenth-Century Literature in the Second Language Classroom” (Roundtable)** Sara Luly, Kansas State University; srluly@ksu.edu

This roundtable will explore the challenges of teaching eighteenth-century literature to second language (L2) learners. Many undergraduate degrees in world language (L2) departments require courses on the literature of target cultures. Eighteenth-Century scholars in these departments teach eighteenth-century literature classes in German, Spanish, French, Italian and other languages to non-native speakers. Students in these L2 literature classes often feel doubly overwhelmed – reading texts that are both in a second language and from a cultural/historical context that seems far-removed from their own personal experience. Literature instructors working with L2 populations face unique challenges, very different from those of our English Department colleagues. This round table is a forum to exchange teaching experiences and curricular ideas with an aim to problem-solve common challenges presented by teaching literature in a second language context. Questions might include: How do we engage students who are pursuing majors and minors in the L2, but have no experience with literature? How do we accommodate a variety of language levels in the classroom? What techniques do we use to overcome lexical and linguistic challenges? What role does 18th century literature play in the Modern Language BA degree (or BA in Spanish, German, French, or other languages)?

66. **“Material Culture Studies and Eighteenth Century Germany”** Karin A. Wurst, Michigan State University; wurst@msu.edu

Things loom large in eighteenth-century culture. We see the emergence of the lifestyle magazine such as the *Journal des Luxus und der Moden* that introduces and depicts fashionable furniture, decorative objects and dress to a broad readership. Household books allow glimpses at coveted objects and their place in the household economy. Collecting was no longer limited to elites. Toys and picture books entered the nursery. Not only writers saw themselves in “conversation with things” (Goethe 1786), but the general interest in objects of material culture including the visual arts reshapes the relationship between self and environment. British material culture studies and visual studies engage in vibrant theoretical discussions that could further stimulate the discussion in the German contexts. We seek contributions that explore the theoretical debates or the role of things in literary or theoretical texts, in periodicals, inventories, autobiographical writings, and letters. Questions could explore the implications of the new material landscape on the domestic sphere, on our understanding of gender roles, or on our view of childhood. How does the interest in things shape the relationship between everyday culture and high-culture? How does it influence consumption practices? We also welcome papers on comparative aspects in methodology and material cultural practice.

67. **“Defending the Humanities: Making a Case for Eighteenth-Century Studies” (Roundtable)** Peggy Thompson, Agnes Scott College; pthompson@agnesscott.edu

In the current anti-intellectual climate, the humanities have been attacked with special vigor. A presidential candidate announced that the country needed “less philosophers.” The NEH is in danger of defunding. Humanities faculty are caricatured as both useless and dangerous. Humanities departments and programs have suffered disproportionate reductions in recent years. Even within our ranks, we point out marketable skills in communication and critical thinking rather than voice a full-throated defense of studying literature, history, art, music, and philosophy. This session will be a roundtable discussion of contemporary threats to the humanities with a focus on eighteenth-century studies. What is the particular situation of eighteenth-century studies? Are we especially vulnerable? Do we have distinctive ways to defend our work? How can we support each other? Participants are welcome to address these questions from a variety of perspectives that might include public discourse, cultural and critical theory, history, pedagogy, course design,

administrative actions and options, academic presses and organizations, and/or one's own professional experiences. We will start with five ten-minute presentations and then move to a general discussion with the possibility of articulating action items. Scholars from all disciplines and at all stages of their careers are encouraged to participate.

68. **“Isolated Bodies”** Melissa Hyde, University of Florida; mhyde@arts.ufl.edu

To numerous Enlightenment thinkers, the body mattered as much as reason: physical, intellectual, and moral realms were seen to be closely related. Some theorists, (Locke, Diderot) claimed that the interrelation between body, mind, and morality promised human and social perfectibility; others (Lavater), read the body as a sign of interior truth; still others, (Tissot), insisted this interrelation was fraught with the dangers of imbalance. An individual who fails to care properly for the body imperils mind and morality. These theorists sought to regulate the body either to ensure its optimal functioning or to cure it of imbalances in order to (re)integrate the individual into society. However, the trouble with embodiment was that one's corporeal experience is impossible to know by others and revealed only in mediations--metaphor, imagery. Where concepts like sympathy aim to bridge the gap between observer and sufferer, such concepts often isolate certain bodies by splitting experience off from sympathetic perception, including bodies of intellectuals, women, non-Europeans, and the disabled. This seminar invites contributions that examine theories and/ or representations of the isolated, even lonely, body. What accounts for the portrayal or theorization of a body that is one of a kind, an example of extreme singularity? Send 150-word abstracts by September 15, 2017 to Melissa Hyde.

69. **“The Visual Text and the Textual Visual”** Leah Orr, University of Louisiana, Lafayette; Leah.Orr@louisiana.edu

From the use of title pages to advertise and summarize books to the inclusion of author portraits, maps, and illustrations, eighteenth-century writers and publishers experimented widely with the visual appearance and apparatus of verbal text. How do we read an image? Or visualize a text? At the intersection of book history, art history, literary criticism, and material studies, the visual additions and appearance of eighteenth-century books highlight the changing role of the book as both a physical object and a repository for ideas and information. This session invites contributions of papers on any aspect of the intersection of the visual and the textual in the eighteenth century. Papers might consider a single work, author, publisher, or artist; a type of visual motif; the role of the visual and textual in creating meaning; or a methodological or theoretical approach. This topic is by nature interdisciplinary and papers from any national literature are welcome.

70. **“The Making of the Eighteenth Century: Explorations in Applied Art and Material Culture”** Mallory Anne Porch, Auburn University; map0030@auburn.edu

This panel seeks to create an opportunity for scholars interested in eighteenth-century material culture to combine scholarly research with material explorations. Jennie Batchelor's *Lady's Magazine* project, with its public engagement element The Great Lady's Magazine Stitch-Off, revealed an enthusiastic interest in both the scholarly and the lay community for re-creating and experiencing eighteenth-century material culture in as historically accurate a way as possible. The 2018 conference in Orlando will also host another iteration of the Women's Caucus Masquerade Ball, for which many conference-goers will acquire eighteenth-century costume. This provides an opportunity to rent, buy, or, most excitingly, make various pieces of eighteenth-century apparel and/or accoutrement. The purpose of this panel is to provide an arena for scholarly inquiry into the materials, construction, methods, skills, and/or techniques of the making of eighteenth-century objects. This panel invites scholarly presentations that interrogate an aspect of eighteenth-century dress, accessory, architecture, furnishing, or other material object or objects. Panelists are encouraged to include audio/visual artifacts or material items for exhibition, although traditional papers will also be considered. The Great Lady's Magazine Stitch-Off link: <https://www.kent.ac.uk/english/ladys-magazine/stitchoff/index.html>

71. **“Women, Portraiture, and Place”** Heidi Strobel, University of Evansville, AND Christina Lindeman, University of South Alabama; hs40@evansville.edu and clindeman@southalabama.edu

The eighteenth century is home to a variety of seemingly contradictory categories: public and private, professional and amateur, and urban and rural, among others. In "Women, Portraiture, and Place," we consider how textual and visual representations of women and women's agency operate in and around the city. Literary and visual portraits of women are often set in domestic or private settings. Yet women frequently crossed the boundary between private and public as agents moving in and around the city, occupying space in decidedly non-retiring or transgressive ways. This panel will consider women's "place" via their representations

and the ways in which these images conformed to or challenged assumptions regarding gender, space, and social status in the eighteenth century. We invite proposals from a range of fields, including art history, history, literary and music history, and gender studies.

72. **“Tragedies, Triumphs and Cautionary Tales: Child Death in Fact and Fiction” (Roundtable)** Katharine Kittredge, Ithaca College; kkittredge@ithaca.edu

One of the areas in which the gap between our lives and those of the eighteenth-century people we study looms the largest is that of child and infant mortality. This disjunction was apparent in the lively discussion which followed the presentation of a paper on James Janeway's *A Token for Children* at this year's ASECS conference. For modern parents, the death of a child is the ultimate horror, and so it is hard to comprehend how families survived the loss of multiple children in this age of high infant/child mortality. The diversity of the materials depicting children's deaths further complicates our perception. Eighteenth-century parents who lost children wrote impassioned letters, poems and biographical accounts describing in detail their lost children and the depth of their grief. At the same time, didactic works cavalierly killed off disobedient children (and their unfortunate siblings) and religious tracts celebrated the glorious deaths of pious children. This roundtable invites papers on child death presented in personal artifacts, literary and artistic works, medical records, didactic texts and religious tracts in hopes of promoting discussion across disciplines and fields of study.

73. **“Imaginary Voyages, Speculative Fictions” (Roundtable)** Laura Miller, University of West Georgia, AND Jason H. Pearl, Florida International University; lmiller@westga.edu and jpearl@fiu.edu

Eighteenth-century readers enjoyed a surfeit of trips to the moon and other fantastic journeys. Nevertheless, with the exception of *Gulliver's Travels*, scholars today mostly ignore this literature, perhaps because it flouts the conventions of formal realism and stands at odds with histories of the novel—and because its far-fetched scenarios stand at odds with history itself. Imaginary voyages tested the limits of creativity and fictionalized thought experiments, positing strange alternatives to a Newtonian worldview and upending its accompanying assumptions about reality. Of course, on an allegorical level, such narratives could also reveal a variety of truths. This roundtable seeks proposals for 10-minute papers that reexamine this literature. What have we been ignoring? Why should we read it? Can we trace in these texts elements that compose genres like speculative fiction and fantasy? What can these works tell us about the larger body of eighteenth-century fiction, about eighteenth-century literature and culture more broadly? Since part of this roundtable's purpose is to share these voyages with eighteenth-century studies at large, we will be precirculating summaries of the more obscure primary texts in order to facilitate better conversation.

74. **“Really Bad Novels: Or, What to Do with Fiction of Dubious Value in Literary Research” (Roundtable)** Yael Shapira, Bar-Ilan University; shapira.yael@biu.ac.il

Since the initial flowering of eighteenth-century novel studies in the latter half of the twentieth century, cycles of self-rejuvenation have repeatedly stretched the boundaries of the field. Scholarship now encompasses an ever-growing range of fictional productions – Gothic novels, “it-narratives,” women's novels, Jacobin novels, novels of sensibility and more. As in other cases of canon-expansion, aesthetic criteria once treated as absolutes are viewed in much novel criticism as historically contingent and ideologically inflected, and thus as unstable, debatable, and possibly irrelevant. And yet the dilemma persists: how do we approach novels that make us laugh when their authors apparently wished to make us cry? What to do with the ludicrous, the bathetic, the hackneyed, the repetitive, and the utterly bizarre? This roundtable seeks to bring together scholars who confront such novels in their research (and perhaps even enjoy them). Through short presentations and subsequent discussion, participants will share examples and strategies, discuss critical and theoretical approaches, and contemplate both the challenges and the rewards of studying the aesthetically dubious in eighteenth-century fiction. Proposals welcome from scholars working on all aspects of literary research in any language and/or national context.

75. **“Bad Romances in Eighteenth-Century Literature” (Roundtable)** Kelly Fleming, University of Virginia, and Katie Sagal, Heartland Community College; kf5jz@virginia.edu and aksagal@gmail.com

For many years now, critics have been writing about the relationship between the romance and the novel. Despite this wealth of scholarship, romances retain their bad reputation in literary history. This may be because eighteenth-century literary studies does not have a cohesive definition of the term “romance.” Popular forms of literature that might be termed “romance” in the long eighteenth century include heroic romances, gothic romances, scandal chronicles, amatory fiction, pornography, and even novels. This roundtable seeks to

sift through the different working definitions of “romance” that scholars use when discussing works by women writers, and discuss why (or why not) the boundaries of romance need definition. If we are to continue to take “romance” seriously and to recover some of the lesser-known genres listed above, there are a number of questions we need to address moving forward: what is a romance? Is there such a thing as a “romance novel” in the eighteenth century? What is the difference between amatory fiction and romance? Does the generic distinction matter? What do we make of texts such as Sarah Fielding’s *David Simple* that describe themselves as a “moral romance”? Why has scholarship labeled the romance as less literary than the novel?

76. **“New Approaches to Gothic Literature”** Jeremy Carnes, Lindenwood University; GCarnes@lindenwood.edu

As the bicentennial of the publication of the early Gothic’s masterpiece, Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*, 2018 is an ideal time to reconsider how we understand the aesthetic qualities, ideological underpinnings, historical development, and cultural work of Gothic literature. Derided as juvenile or worse through most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the Gothic has enjoyed a resurgence in interest among scholars in recent decades—and of course, it has never lost the interest of popular audiences. This panel seeks papers from scholars of literature, history, art history, religion, science and technology studies, and other fields which break new ground in the study of the Gothic, a genre that is at once instantly recognizable and yet elusive of easy definition. Papers that seek to bridge the gap—or to thoughtfully chart out the terrain of the gap—between scholarship on early Gothic literature and scholarship on the Gothic in contemporary popular culture are particularly welcome.

77. **“New Approaches to Jane Austen” (Roundtable)** Kit Kincade, Indiana State University, AND Nora Nachumi, Yeshiva University; kit.kincade@indstate.edu and Nachumi@yu.edu

It is doubtful that Jane Austen (1775-1817) could have conceived of the impact that her work would have on future generations, much less modern culture. For this panel, we are soliciting papers that highlight the emerging methodologies being used to analyze her works, including big data/new bibliography, masculinity studies, trauma theory, ecocriticism, animal studies, medical humanities, age studies, cultural and material cultural studies, and cognitive science, as well as new approaches examined under more established theoretical and critical approaches. We ask panelists not only to present shorter arguments (10 min.) demonstrating their new work under one or more of these rubrics but to speculate on what they believe is most needed now and next in Austen studies.

78. **“Earlier Pope versus Later Pope”** Clifford Earl Ramsey, University of Arkansas, Little Rock; ceramsey@ualr.edu

Alexander Pope’s career falls clearly into three phases: an earlier phase (1709-1717) culminating in the collected poems of 1717; a middle phase (1717-1728) in which he is translating Homer and editing Shakespeare and in which there are no new major original poems; and a later phase (1728-1743) bounded by the first and last versions of the *Dunciad*. Though students of Pope are well aware of these phases, too little attention has been given to the differences between them. There is of course substantial variety across each phase of Pope’s career, but the differences between the poems of the earlier phase taken as a group and those of the later phase are more marked. This seminar will attend to those differences, which go beyond differences of genre. Those differences include, but are not limited to, those of style, tone, voice, and underlying aesthetic. Even Pope’s couplets in the two phases reveal subtle differences. Whereas students of the later poems tend to feel that the concept of the persona is indispensable, students of the earlier poems seldom invoke that concept. Poems as ostensibly similar as the *Essay on Criticism* and the *Essay on Man* are not that alike. And there are many other, more significant differences. Pope’s later poems did indeed “stoop” to truth, and those poems have a different music.

79. **“Novel Character and Form”** Kathleen E. Urda, Bronx Community College, CUNY; kathleen.urda@bcc.cuny.edu

Frances Ferguson’s assertion nearly twenty years ago that “what formal criticism has missed in the novel is character” seems to have remained mostly accurate, even amid renewed discussions about form and its place in eighteenth-century studies and in literary studies more generally. This panel seeks papers that explore the question of what such formal criticism of character in the novel might look like now in light of recent (and at times conflicting) accounts of form by Sandra Macpherson, Jonathan Kramnick, and Caroline Levine, among others. Varying approaches to this question (case studies, more theoretical investigations) are welcome.

80. **“Minds and Networks”** Lisa Zunshine, University of Kentucky; lisa.zunshine@gmail.com

What is the role of social networks in the construction of fictional minds in the eighteenth-century novel, drama, and visual art? In considering this question, our panel will continue and expand a conversation about cognitive literary theory and eighteenth-century studies begun at previous ASECS conferences. Of particular interest are papers that integrate insights from cognitive psychology and neuroscience with those from the digital humanities. Please send a 300-word abstract and a brief CV. Visual and auditory aids are strongly encouraged.

81. **“Coffeehouses and Print Production”** Leah M. Thomas, Virginia State University; Lmthomas@vsu.edu

From the receipt of mail to the reading of one's and others' mail, to the reading and performing of texts, to libraries and to meetings of minds, to the surrounding booksellers and printers, coffeehouses in Europe and across the Atlantic functioned as network nodes for invention, commerce, intellectualism, encounter, and gossip. The coffeehouse likewise appears in diaries and in other forms of prose and as well as in illustrations. Such illustrations, including maps, show the proximity of coffeehouses to booksellers and printers. This proximity may have impacted print production and cultivated a relationship among coffeehouses, booksellers, and printers. This panel explores the role of coffeehouses in the production, circulation, and culture of print within and near coffeehouses and the portrayals of coffeehouses in print as spaces of intellectualism, debauchery, and commerce. Coffeehouses were focal points within the larger realms of the European and transatlantic world that allowed people in the Caribbean to communicate with people in other European colonies as well as in Europe, especially London. Examining the coffeehouse as a locus for print production, reveals the social complexity of its role in print production, circulation, and culture not only in Europe but also across the Atlantic.

82. **“New Theories and Histories of Eighteenth-Century Genre” (Roundtable)** David Mazella, University of Houston, AND Anne Stevens, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; mazella@central.uh.edu and anne.stevens@unlv.edu

Eighteenth-century writers often struggled to reconcile their literary practices with inherited terms, systems, and hierarchies created for very different circumstances and societies. In literary studies' recent reopening of questions of historicism, periodization, poetics, and especially close attention to “form,” we feel that scholars should also revisit the concept of “genre.” Genre is indispensable for the discussion of form, because it represents a mid-level category that is socially recognized and applied over time, and in ways that go beyond individual instantiations. As such, genre has received powerful recent theorizations in the work of John Frow and Wai-Chee Dimock, which have engaged the rhetorical, geographic, and temporal dimensions of genre, respectively. This panel therefore solicits proposals offering either theories or histories of eighteenth-century genres that allow us to move from case histories to broader questions about larger scale systems or networks of genres. To facilitate better discussion among participants and audience, we are asking for brief (under 300 words) proposals for 10-12 minute presentations. We encourage a wide variety of historical, theoretical, DH, or quantitative approaches, with the proviso that the examples or case histories be selected for their ability to provide insight into some larger aspect of 18c genre-systems.

83. **“Beyond Explaining the Jokes: Teaching Eighteenth-Century Comedy” (Roundtable)** Heather Ladd, University of Lethbridge; heather.ladd@uleth.ca

The purpose of this roundtable is to share and discuss innovative and effective ways of teaching the comedy of the long eighteenth century. Some of the questions this pedagogical session seeks to answer: How do you teach specific comedies? What texts have worked? Which have been a struggle? Have you found certain texts work particularly well together? How do you help your students develop an understanding and appreciation of the humor in these plays without simply explaining the jokes to them? If you have taught a course on eighteenth-century comedy, how do you organize your material: chronologically? thematically? What aspects of eighteenth-century performance and theatrical culture do you emphasize? What forms of assessment do you use other than the traditional essay? What innovative activities and assignments have you successfully incorporated into your course? How can an acting element be introduced to English majors with no stage experience? What anthologies and secondary material have you used? Do you teach any primary texts without a modern edition? Do you make use of electronic resources like Eighteenth-Century Collections Online?

84. **“Sociability beyond the Coffee-House Model”** Markman Ellis, Queen Mary University of London; m.ellis@qmul.ac.uk

The coffee-house has offered an important paradigm for public sociability in Britain and France in the eighteenth century. The coffee-house was polite, urban, accessible, egalitarian and conversational, in this view, but was also conventionally not open to women and the poor, and was given to forms of exclusivity and specialization (whether stock-jobbers, insurance brokers, men of science, army officers). This panel seeks papers addressing specific locations or spaces that offered distinct models of public sociability, such as assemblies, clubs, salons, institutions, pleasure-gardens, tea-tables, taverns, dining societies, and other hybrid forms of sociability in the eighteenth century. Papers may address what makes these places of sociability distinctive, and to what extent might they propose a critique of extant concepts of sociability, especially in relation to questions of discourse, gender, status, or the public sphere.

85. **“The Politics of Memory in the Long-Eighteenth Century” (Roundtable)** Erin Peters, University of Gloucestershire, AND Cynthia Richards, University of Wittenberg; epeters@glos.ac.uk and crichards@wittenberg.edu

Many theorists of memory have pointed to the so-called Age of Revolutions as “a period of change so breathtaking that it forever changed people’s perceptions of the relationship between past, present and future” (Deseure and Pollmann, 2013), yet scholars who point to the nineteenth century as a unique moment of “memory crisis” have failed to consider evidence from the period before 1800. Taking a strongly interdisciplinary approach, we propose a roundtable discussion that explores narrations of “memory crisis” from the long-eighteenth century, as well as papers that explore the strengths/limitations of applying the study of memory to the long-eighteenth century. What new understandings do we gain through the perspective of cultural memory? What are the politics of remembering in a discipline that records one of the most traumatic periods in history yet can forget just how disruptive that history is to naming its significance?

86. **“Number, Weight, or Measure: Numerical Eighteenth Centuries” (Roundtable)** Rachel Seiler-Smith, Indiana University, AND Ryan Sheldon, The State University of New York at Buffalo; rseiler@indiana.edu and ryanshel@buffalo.edu

This panel invites papers that engage with the ascendance of numeracy in the long eighteenth century. We are particularly interested in contributions that survey the emergence of logics and forms typically associated with activities like accounting and arithmetic in literary, philosophical, and artistic works. Historians of science like Lorraine Daston, Mary Poovey, Ted Porter, and William Lynch have offered robust interrogations of the “objectivity” of probabilistic, statistical, and arithmetic modes of knowledge making. In the spirit of their inquiries, we ask: what are the rhetorical and aesthetic effects of enumerating, (ac)counting, and arithmetizing in the eighteenth century? How did eighteenth-century thinkers understand these endeavors? What did it mean to count and organize persons and things before (or shortly after) the inception of formal censuses? Who – and what – gets counted? Who doesn’t? How might this history inflect or challenge established understandings of biopolitics, financialization, and capitalist development at the turn of modernity? Paper topics might include, but are not limited to: finance and economics; history of science and mathematics; population studies; ecocriticism; race, colonization, imperialism; gender, sexuality, reproduction, and futurity; big data and digital humanities; Enlightenment and Romantic epistemologies; and biopolitics.

87. **“The Aesthetics of Land Use”** Erin Drew, University of Mississippi, AND Christopher Loar, Western Washington University; cfloar@gmail.com and eedrew@olemiss.edu

Eighteenth century thinkers are fascinated by land: its utility, its habitability, its aesthetic merits. Land offers resistance and potential; it can be put to use by farmers, settlers, projectors, improvers, miners, foresters. What role do aestheticized forms of representation (visual, poetic, prosaic) play in the imagining of land use? What work do aesthetic categories do in discourses of land use? How does eighteenth-century writing or art respond to changes in the way land is conceptualized, valued, evaluated, and transformed? How do verse, narrative, or painting (for example) understand the difference between waste and useful land? Possible topics might include pastoral and georgic verse; landscape poetry or painting; visual aesthetics of land; spatialization and natural history; poetics and economics; agrarian aesthetics; poetics of urban space; soil, landscape, agriculture, drainage, and improvement. Papers in English treating topics from Britain, Ireland, the European continent, the Caribbean, and the Americas are welcome.

88. **“German-Language Networks Transformed”** Birgit Tautz, Bowdoin College; btautz@bowdoin.edu

This panel examines networked relations across Europe, along the Atlantic rim, and across the oceans, as they manifest in German-language texts and “cultural products,” as well as importations into German culture. The panel investigates and presents methods and approaches that decidedly move away from a national focus and the dominance of national authors/canons. Instead, it is interested in multi-directionality and patterns of resonance, rather than causal impacts. Papers therefore chronicle obscure and often diffuse traces of the global that surface regionally and locally and across a range of media. Contributions may include but are not limited to artists networks and networks forming around certain writers; orality v. literacy in the salon; fake and real translations; traded/stolen/adapted texts; religious repercussions/structures in secular text; tourism and explorations.

89. **“Eighteenth-Century Terrors”** Celia B. Barnes, Lawrence University, and Brett D. Wilson, College of William & Mary; celia.b.barnes@lawrence.edu and bdwils@wm.edu

This panel seeks papers on poetry, prose, drama, the arts, and material culture of the long eighteenth century with the goal of uncovering the anxieties—cultural, racial, political—that terrifying texts are meant to awaken. Topics might include, but are not limited to, the provocations of the monstrous, grotesque, apparitional, nightmarish, scary, and strange, both inside and outside the Gothic mode and Graveyard School; reflections on the aesthetics and pleasures of awe, sublimity, and fearful response; representations of the fears and traumas associated with rape and sexual violence; depictions of terrors and persecutions inflicted by authorities on resistant or vulnerable subjects; creative expressions in any medium of fears of indigenous peoples, the enslaved, migrants, criminals, dissenters, and/or rebels.

90. **“Enlightenment Censorship”** Theodore E. D. Braun, University of Delaware; braun@udel.edu

Censorship was an international phenomenon during the long eighteenth century (identified here as 1650-1850), not only in Catholic countries or by the Inquisition, but in all nations worldwide. Its targets varied but usually included interpretations of the dominant religion, attacks against the reigning monarch or the political establishment, pornography, varying moral judgments, and the like. This panel seeks three papers on censorship within this period and from more than just one nation or language group. Besides major authors censored it will be of interest to see less-known figures who were likewise censored, and what the results of the censorship were (suppression in part or in entirety of a work? imprisonment or even torture and/or death of the author involved? or other consequences, such as loss of patronage or of an office?).

91. **“Slavery, Slave Trading, and Enslavement before 1700”** Laura Rosenthal, University of Maryland; lrosent1@umd.edu

Discussions of slavery, the slave trade, and enslavement have tended to focus on the later part of the eighteenth century, overlooking the range of such practices in the earlier period. This panel seeks proposals for papers on these topics in the earlier part of the period (preferably before 1700) from any discipline and with attention to any part of the world, with a particular interest in discussions of works, issues, events, and artistic representations that have tended to escape notice and/or have not been previously recognized to be entangled in or representing these topics. In imagining early histories of slavery and its consequences, what have we left out and what have we failed to fully consider? How did enslavement abroad shape cultural practices, economics, and political conflicts at home?

92. **“Epistolary Women of the Enlightenment: New Conversations on Old Correspondence”** Peggy Elliott, Georgia College & State University; peggy.elliott@gcsu.edu

In her 1994 text, *The Republic of Letters*, Dena Goodman writes that “through the circulation of letters, philosophes and salonnières established a network of intellectual exchange which was the first circle of expansion beyond the walls of the salon.” In France, several such women come to mind: Françoise de Graffigny, Emilie Du Châtelet, and Germaine de Staël. Elsewhere, we have the letters of such notables as Queen Christina of Sweden, Catherine the Great, and of course Lady Mary Wortley Montagu who all sought to examine Enlightenment ideas and ideals with their contemporaries. We must wonder, however, if aristocratic women represent of all those who were part of enlightenment epistolary activity. This panel seeks new perspectives on these and other female philosophes and authors engaged in the exchange of letters across Europe and beyond. Some of the questions to consider: With whom did they correspond? What topics engaged their writings and why? How were their conversations viewed during the eighteenth century, and

what do they say to us today? Papers on all aspects of female letter writing in the early modern period will be considered, including philosophy, the fine arts, the sciences, government, literature, and beyond.

93. **“Daring Not to Know: Consuming Otherness and Making the Familiar in Asian-European Exchanges”** Emily Kugler, Howard University, AND Samara Cahill, Nanyang Technological University; emily.kugler@Howard.edu and sacahill@ntu.edu.sg

This panel examines the ways that Asian-European interactions shaped both cultures. This includes how the importation of Asian (encompassing East, South, Southeast, and Near East) intellectual and material culture shaped Europe, as well as how Asia re-interpreted the “Far West.” In the case of the latter, this may encompass examples of travel accounts of Europe, the Asianization of Jesus by South Asian theologians, or the interpretation of European culture seen in export market porcelain. Building on the works of scholars such as Ziauddin Sardar, Yu Liu, Eugenia Zuroski Jenkins, Chi-ming Yang, Daniel Goffman, Donald F. Lach, Edwin J. Van Kley, and David Porter we examine the issues of European desire in the reception of Asian intellectual and material imports. Sardar defines Orientalism as composed of “what the West wishes to know, not of what can be known,” and we are interested in both which desires are illustrated by these interactions and the ways that those exchanges resulted in hybrid forms of knowledge. The aim is not to ignore histories of European colonialism and exploration, but to attempt to push back on a Eurocentric view of global interactions.

94. **“The Post-Critical Eighteenth Century” (Roundtable)** Joseph Drury, Villanova University; joseph.drury@villanova.edu

Has critique run out of steam in the eighteenth century? Or does it still have a place in our reading and scholarly practice? This panel invites responses to Rita Felski’s provocative argument that literary study today is and ought to be increasingly “post-critical.” Instead of the “hermeneutics of suspicion,” critics now practice “weak theory”; rather than trying to debunk and undermine texts, they focus on what texts build and what they make possible; and instead of attributing their workings to a singular ideology or discourse, they focus on the variety of pleasures they afford and effects they produce. Is this a helpful description of how eighteenth-century studies has evolved in the last two decades? Did critique ever dominate our field in the way it did others? Does it matter that, according to Simon During, the machinery of critique has its origins in the eighteenth century? Pedagogical reflections are also welcome: Does critique still have a place in the classroom in the age of fake news? Or do students no longer respond to the “charisma” of critique as they once did?

95. **“Towards an Intersectional History of the Book”** Emily Friedman, Auburn University; ecfriedman@auburn.edu

Building upon (and in some ways, expanding) the goals of Rare Book School’s 2017 “Bibliography Among the Disciplines” conference, this roundtable seeks to foster a more diverse conversation on book history in the long eighteenth-century. The study of book production and circulation, like ASECS itself, prides itself on joining many disparate disciplines together under one umbrella. Also like ASECS, the field has allowed this multiplicity to obscure the ways in which many voices are still not present in both the objects of study and its practitioners. This roundtable is convened in order to craft a more comprehensive, intersectional book history. To that end, presenters will be asked to take no more than 8 minutes to present a question, methodology, or pedagogical practice that reconceptualizes book historical practices. This could be how book historical practices can be brought to bear on works not traditionally considered through such a lens; the recovery of participants in the book trades who are still understudied; or how other methodological or theoretical lenses can interact with the study of the circulation and production of books. Contributions are sought both from self-identified book historians and bibliographers as well as from scholars who do not typically identify as such.

96. **“Thomas Hammond, or, The Stableboy Discovered”** George Boulukos, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; Boulukos@gmail.com

Danny O’Quinn observes that “once every generation a new text, recovered from obscurity, challenges how we think about the received wisdom that defines multiple fields of inquiry.... *Memoirs on the Life and Travels of Thomas Hammond, 1748-1775* is precisely such a text.” Hammond, by turns a hapless orphan, a stableboy and jockey, a servant to French nobles, and an itinerant circus rider, offers frank accounts of sexuality, violence, and religion among the lower orders in his *Memoirs*. During his adventures, Hammond becomes entangled with Iberian innkeepers, pranksters, the inquisition, officious politicians, highway robbers, and a quack doctor. The *Memoirs*, initially drafted using the Greek alphabet, and later copied to imitate a printed

book, offer a remarkable example of the materiality of life writing and bio-bibliography. Hammond's writings and illustrations offer a rich source for scholarship in many areas: art history; servants & service; the emergence of the modern self; the intersections of fiction and autobiography; eighteenth-century animals; horse-racing, bullfighting, the early circus and the culture of sport; incipient celebrity culture; "The commercialization of gentility"; and English and European popular culture. Hammond's *Memoirs* are now being published, for the first time ever, by the University of Virginia Press.

97. **"Non-monogamy in the Eighteenth Century"** Zoe Eckman AND Rachel Gevlin, Duke University; zoe.eckman@duke.edu and rachel.gevlin@duke.edu

We invite papers that explore representations of non-monogamy and the social or legal repercussions that result from transgressive forms of partnership. In a century preoccupied with shaping legal and cultural definitions of monogamy – from the domestic novel to Hardwicke's Marriage Act to *Marriage A-la-Mode* – a great deal of attention has necessarily been paid to the institution of marriage. But what forms of non-marital relationships (between two or more parties) occurred during the period, and how were they represented? Do these representations act as critiques of specific types of marriage or of the marital institution as a whole, or are they rather imagining new forms of partnership? Taking the term "non-monogamy" in a broad sense that includes both its legal (e.g. remarriage or divorce) and illegal (such as adultery or polygamy) forms, what characteristics or concerns might eighteenth-century discussions around these terms share? Might we also include celibacy -- another sexual path that transgresses the seeming ideal of conjugality or devoted coupledness -- as a form of non-monogamy? We are open to submissions of all genres (literary, historical, legal, artistic, or otherwise) and are particularly interested in those that address the implications of non-monogamy for both women and men.

98. **"The Aesthetics of Time"** Sarah Eron, University of Rhode Island AND David Alvarez, DePauw University; sarah_eron@uri.edu and davidalvarez@depauw.edu

This panel explores aesthetic conceptions of time in eighteenth-century literature and philosophy. We are particularly interested in work that touches on haptic (e.g., anti-representational) models of aesthetic perception, that addresses the temporal construction of aesthetic experience, or that engages with new materialism criticism in eighteenth-century studies.

99. **"Soft Materials"** Timothy Campbell, University of Chicago; campbellt@uchicago.edu

This session will focus on the large question of materiality in eighteenth-century studies with specific reference to the place of soft materials within this broader landscape. In place of our usual outsized attention to the readier remainders of the hard—porcelain, architecture, metal ware, sculpture, etc.—we will foreground the alternate material landscape of the soft—the delicate and ephemeral states of the liquid, the granular, the organic, the consumable, etc. Proposals problematizing this binary division, exploring the liminal ground between hard and soft (as with materials like paper, paints, and textiles), or taking up the other side of the equation (i.e., by imagining hard materialities that might be productively juxtaposed to soft materialities) are all welcome. This session will be organized either as a roundtable or as a traditional panel depending on the nature of the proposals received; and all submissions will receive full consideration.

100. **"Goethe and the Visual Arts"** Matthew Feminella, University of Alabama; mfeminella@ua.edu

Goethe's fascination with and commitment to the visual arts remains an enduring feature of his oeuvre. From painting and sculpture to architecture and the performing arts, Goethe's theoretical works engage with a remarkably wide array of visual media, and these art forms also make frequent appearances in his novels and plays. This panel seeks new responses to Goethe's intervention in discourses on the visual arts. While we invite contributions from scholars working within German Studies, we particularly welcome contributions that address this topic comparatively, as well as from the perspective of other disciplines (including but not limited to history, art history, philosophy, design, etc.) With this panel, we seek to expand upon the discussion initiated by the Goethe Society of North America in a recent special section of the Goethe Yearbook.

101. **"Uses and Abuses of the *Encyclopédie*"** Dena Goodman, University of Michigan; goodmand@umich.edu

One of the best known and most studied texts of the French Enlightenment is Diderot and d'Alembert's *Encyclopédie* (1751-1772); one of the least known and studied is Voltaire's *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* (1770-1774). In 2018, the Voltaire Foundation will publish the final volume of the first complete critical edition

of the *Questions* since the eighteenth century. This seems like a fitting time to reflect on Voltaire's text and the larger phenomenon of the critical engagement with the *Encyclopédie* in its own time, both in France and abroad. We welcome papers that deal with Voltaire's text specifically or the larger phenomenon more generally.

102. **"Whither Rape in the Study of Eighteenth-Century Sexuality?"** Greta LaFleur, Yale University; greta.lafleur@yale.edu

In Susan Brownmiller's 1975 *Against Our Wills*, we find a statement that would become a culturally axiomatic account of the motivation behind sexual violence: "rape is about power," Brownmiller wrote, "not sex." Oft repeated, this idea cleaves violence from the realm of sexuality, insisting on an understanding of sex distinct from power, and a vision of rape distinct from sex. Scholars who study gender, sexuality, colonialism, and racialization during the eighteenth century, however, know that this functional cordoning off of "rape" from sexuality does not always (or usually!), in fact, hold. And despite the fact that some scholars (Godbeer, Block) have debunked this separation, this distinction between sexual violence and sex "itself" has nonetheless influenced how we've conceived of "sex" during this period. This panel invites papers that return to the political, methodological, and archival questions that attend our studies of rape, coercion, and seduction in the eighteenth-century. How might our understanding of the structuring questions and archives of the history of eighteenth-century sexuality change if we center the experience of violence or coercion—arguably *the* constitutive experiences of eighteenth-century sex— instead of histories of pleasure or consent? What historical or hermeneutic narratives might attend this shift in focus?

103. **"Fiction and the Supernatural" (Roundtable)** Jessica Leiman, Carleton College; jleiman@carleton.edu

As we know, the eighteenth century was not merely an age of reason, but also an age of Gothicism, wonder, and enchantment. This roundtable invites participants to explore this conjunction by considering the relationship between fiction and the supernatural in literature of the period. How does the use of supernatural elements shape audiences' experiences of fiction? What is the significance of invoking patently unreal phenomena—the animated statues of Horace Walpole, the spirits of Monk Lewis, the witches in eighteenth-century adaptations of *Macbeth*—within genres that rely on artifice to convey an illusion of reality? We invite participants to consider a wide range of fictional forms—plays, verse, and periodical accounts, as well as novels. Ways into the topic could include, but are not limited to: re-theorizations of the gothic novel; theatrical displays of magic or apparitions; supernatural interventions, in a variety of literary forms; the animation of inanimate objects; periodical accounts of seemingly supernatural events.

104. **"Teaching Eighteenth-Century Satire: Why, How, and Why Now?" (Roundtable)** Sharon Smith, South Dakota State University; sharon.smith@sdstate.edu

This roundtable seeks presentations that explore approaches to and present methodologies for teaching eighteenth-century satire. Participants are encouraged to share their experiences with and/or plans for both teaching specific examples of satire and promoting students' understanding of the mode in general. Of particular interest are presentations that consider how learning about eighteenth-century satire equips students to better understand and navigate their cultural moment. For example, at a time when students struggle to separate real news from fake news; distinguish among opinions, facts, and "alternative facts"; and detect bias, illogic, and manipulation, how might the study of eighteenth-century satire promote information literacy? In a social media environment characterized by "filter bubbles" and "echo chambers" that limit exposure to ideas different from their own, how can the study of eighteenth-century satire raise students' awareness of a broader range of ideas? In a politically divided culture, how might the study of eighteenth-century satire encourage students to confront the difficult and complex issues that structure this division, including—perhaps especially—those related to race and gender?

105. **"Cultural Materialism, Materialism and Culture"** Julia Simon, University of California, Davis; jsimon@ucdavis.edu

Philosophical materialism in the eighteenth century has ramifications for metaphysics, epistemology, social and political theory and ethics, to name a few of the most important areas that have received significant scholarly attention. This session seeks to explore the implications of materialism for cultural productions, including the realms of aesthetics and material culture broadly understood. How does philosophical materialism influence the understanding of objects in the cultural world of the eighteenth century?

Submissions are invited from all national traditions and a variety of disciplinary backgrounds, including but not limited to literature, art history, museum studies, music, theatre and history.

- 106. “Maker’s Knowledge in the Eighteenth Century”** Ruth Mack, SUNY Buffalo, AND Sean Silver, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; ruthmack@buffalo.edu and srsilver@umich.edu

“Knowledge is of two kinds,” Samuel Johnson once opined. “We know a subject ourselves, or we know where we can find information upon it.” To be sure, the eighteenth century witnessed the organization of knowledge into content held by institutions like libraries, encyclopedias, museums, and modern universities. But what of Johnson’s first kind: How do we “know a subject ourselves”? This panel focuses on what the Renaissance knew as “maker’s knowledge” in its eighteenth-century incarnations. We aim to address the state of the field during the broad current realignment sometimes called the “re-enactive turn,” the recent emphasis on knowledge as something done rather than something created, stored, or distributed. What room did the Age of Reason leave for modes of knowledge that are centered in doing rather than thinking, acting rather than reasoning? And how was this knowledge denigrated or privileged in the new empiricist worldview? Proposals on philosophical texts are welcome, as are those that address these ideas as they make their way into other forms of writing.

- 107. “Countermovements: Negotiating Immigration and International Scholarship in an Age of Walls”** Manushag N. Powell, Purdue University; mnpowell@purdue.edu

As the worsening mess of U.S. travel and immigration policy (and related boycott of the 2017 ASECS by many Canadian scholars) attests, ours is hardly a moment in which we can rest assured that porous borders will nurture international and global scholarship. This panel seeks information, reflection, and potential solutions to such issues as: uneven global international access to scholarly resources, how to support international graduate students and graduate students who need to work internationally, and how to push back against the closing of scholarly borders and Western-centric work. Connections to similar moments of war, migration, immigration, and exile in the eighteenth century are especially welcome: can we deploy what we know about our archival then to mend our academic now?

- 108. “Digital Publishing, Digital Journals and Eighteenth-Century Studies”** Mona Narain, Texas Christian University; M.Narain@tcu.edu

What is the role of digital publishing and digital journals in eighteenth-century studies and how might we chart their specific role in sustaining and building eighteenth-century scholarship in the near future? This interdisciplinary roundtable invites scholars working in digital humanities, editors of digital journals, and the audience to explore this question. As university presses’ publication of digitally born or digitally enriched books, such as the University of Michigan Press’s digitalculturebooks series, and digital open access journals such as ABO and Digital Defoe demonstrate, publishing in digital formats is reshaping scholarship in eighteenth-century studies. Susan Schreibman, Laura Mandell and Stephen Olsen have contended that digital technologies not only require “new ways of thinking but also new ways of being.” In a similar vein, Laura Runge has argued that “the desire to see print and online journal as equivalent actually undermines the potential of online publishing.” What new forms of scholarship should we create and be attentive to as digital publishing increasingly makes its mark on the scholarly landscape? The roundtable will include 4-5 panelists presenting ideas for approximately 8 minutes each, followed by a robust conversation between the audience and panelists on the session topic.

- 109. “The Age of Artfulness: Eighteenth-Century Intersections of Representation and Ethics”** Margaret Tucker, Washington University in St. Louis; mtucker@wustl.edu

In the eighteenth-century, the term “artful” – defined by the OED as both “dexterous, clever” and “cunning, crafty, deceitful” – steadily rose in popularity. An n-gram diagram reveals that it reached a peak saturation in printed books in 1788 before falling out of favor. This panel seeks to ponder this phenomenon, and to situate it both within and against ongoing conversations about the nature and ethics of aesthetic representation during the period. Catherine Gallagher’s “The Rise of Fictionality” identifies a mid-century divergence between the aesthetic and the deceptive, arguing that the realist novel only arose when the term “fiction” ceased to be synonymous with “lie.” Edmund Burke’s assertion that “No work of art can be great, but as it deceives,” however, implies that eighteenth-century thinkers, writers, and artists remained aware of the beguiling power of the aesthetic. This panel welcomes submissions that speak to the eighteenth century as an “age of artfulness” – one in which the aesthetic and the deceptive were simultaneously entangled and pulled apart.

What developments, in addition to the rise of realist fiction, seem implicated in this concern for the deceitful qualities of art? How did artists, across forms and media, imagine the ethical stakes of their work?

110. **“Men of Parts and Parts of Men: Rethinking Eighteenth-Century Masculinity”** Mary Beth Harris, Purdue University; harri239@purdue.edu

The masculine seems to sit defiantly at the center of eighteenth-century culture. It is the normative, the rational, the canonical, and the supposedly invisible de facto subject through which all other identities emerge in binary contrast. It has long been the patriarchal neutral on a spectrum of the queer and the feminine. Over the past several decades, feminist recovery projects, cultural studies, gender and queer theories, and more have opened up new channels for analyzing eighteenth-century gender. This panel seeks to explore how these new frameworks—recovery, revision, or resistance—allow us to rethink the sources and structures of eighteenth-century masculinity. Is masculinity—even normative masculinity—performance: gendered, textual, sexual, or otherwise? How does making these performances visible allow us to renegotiate traditional binary structures? How do women, authors of color, or queer authors create the contours of masculinity in unexpected ways? In what ways do male bodies become texts or genres? How do material culture, art, music, geography, or space create masculinity? Proposals from all disciplines welcome.

111. **“Inventing the Modern Stage in Eighteenth-Century France”** Laurence Marie, Columbia University; lau.marie@gmail.com

This panel will explore how and to what extent the modern stage was invented in the eighteenth century by examining new conceptions of illusion, of the relationships between the dramatist and the stage, the character and the actor, as well as the audience, the stage, and the reality the drama imitates or expresses. Particular attention will be given to the ways these poetic and aesthetic innovations relate to the other arts (dance, opera, painting, sculpture, music) through a global evolution from classicism to romanticism. We will welcome papers extending the perspective to the neighboring countries that influenced France or were influenced by it, in a century when the borders are permeable and the exchange of ideas free and open.

112. **“The Body Aged: Performance, Disability, and Aging in the Long Eighteenth Century”** Ian Sullivan, Fordham University AND Melanie Zynel, Wayne State University; isullivan7@fordham.edu and mealnie.zynel@wayne.edu

This panel continues the work started by the "Ecology of Ageism in the Long Eighteenth Century," a panel at ASECS in 2016 that focused on the constructions of age in the eighteenth century. Not only a reflection of genes or time, aging is a cultural discourse that affects the interpolation of identity and the power dynamics of privilege. "The Body Aged: Performance, Disability, and Queer Aging in the Long Eighteenth Century" seeks to expand the discussion of aging by connecting age studies to work in performance theory, disability studies, and queer studies. Topics might include characterizations of the young, the middle aged, or the elderly in literary and non-literary texts; life cycle and life narratives; generational rivalries for socioeconomic power; commercialization of aging in newspapers and in health spots like Bath; the body and age expectations; gendered assessments of age cohorts; problematizing narratives of decline; female sexuality after motherhood; disability simulation through aged simulation; disability communities and life cycle; queer interpretations or interventions or readings of old age and embodiment; and reassessments of authors in the later periods of their lives.

113. **“Educating Enlightenment Children: Texts, Methods, Sites”** Lisa Maruca, Wayne State University; lisa.maruca@wayne.edu

It is commonplace to think of the eighteenth century as the peak period for didactic literature, but it is also a key period in the newly developing and professionalizing field of education. Religious demands and socioeconomic shifts led to a rise in literacy instruction, especially for women and the laboring classes. While compulsory education did not emerge until the next century, new institutions such as Dissenting Academies offered schooling for young men that focused on preparing them for middle-class careers by privileging practical writing and the modern languages. Other methodological changes included a Lockean emphasis on pleasurable learning, the evolution of elocution as a key component of rhetoric, the development of literary appreciation, and the rise of the modern disciplines. Printers, booksellers, authors, pedagogues, and other entrepreneurs rose to meet these new markets with educational materials meant to be used in homes or schools and designed for tutors, governesses, schoolmasters, parents, or children themselves. The works encompassed plans for schools, examples of lessons, and of course, a plethora of new textbooks. This

panels seeks papers analyzing these products, texts, methods, and multiple sites of education. Special consideration will be given to papers showing cross-cultural influences and the global export of education.

114. **“The New Eighteenth-Century Ireland” (Roundtable)** Rebecca Anne Barr, National University of Ireland, Galway; rebecca.barr@nuigalway.ie

Given Brexit’s dramatic reshaping of political and intellectual boundaries, this roundtable seeks to reflect and reassess the current state of eighteenth-century studies on Irish subjects, broadly conceived. The past decade has seen great activity in the field of eighteenth-century Irish literature, history, and politics. Panelists are invited to reflect upon how seminal works or trends in the last decade have transformed our understanding. These might include: the Irish and European culture; the Cambridge Swift; Vincent Morley’s *The Popular Mind in Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (2017); poetic networks; Ireland and the fiscal military state; the renovated Irish Enlightenment; material culture; Edmund Burke; the book trade; the Irish Song Project; the resuscitation of Oliver Goldsmith; the Early Irish Fiction series; ‘Four Nations’ history; Ireland pre- and post-Union. Participants are also invited to reflect critically on lacunae in the field or respond to the following prompts: theorizing eighteenth-century Ireland; Ireland: archipelagic, transatlantic, and transnational; Gender, politics, and history; Interdisciplinarity and eighteenth-century studies in Ireland; The eighteenth century as Gaelige: academic non-engagement; Renovating the Irish canon: who’s hot, who’s not? Lively and up-to-date position pieces are encouraged followed by a full and frank discussion between panelists and audience.

115. **“Metaphor, Metonymy, and Other Eighteenth-Century Problems”** Kate Thorpe, Princeton University AND Jess Keiser, Tufts University; kthorpe@princeton.edu and jess.keiser@gmail.com

In a seminal 1956 essay, the linguist Roman Jakobson described two ways discourse can develop: it may use metaphor, based on similarity of concept, or metonymy, based on contiguity. He hypothesized a correspondence to different literary periods: metaphor with the Romantic lyric and metonymy with nineteenth-century formal realism. While Jakobson found reflections of his linguistic concepts in the nineteenth, even a quick glance at some of the key problems and concerns of the eighteenth century reveals a period grappling with the metaphor-metonymy pairing. For instance, how did the metaphor-metonymy pair function in early scientific thought (which sought to limit metaphor in its writing but wholeheartedly embraced metonymy in its physico-theological speculations)? How does the pairing function in contemporary political theory (where a metonymic or synecdochic logic makes individual subjects stand in for the whole polis, as in Hobbes’s famous frontispiece)? What role does it play in philosophy of mind (how, for instance, do associative mental processes map onto this pairing) or in literary practices and genres? Do Jakobson’s terms apply to this earlier, pre-Romantic period of literature and thought and, if not, how might we theorize metonymy and metaphor, and their relationship to each other, in a distinctly eighteenth-century context?

116. **“The Profession Roundtable 1: Scholarship, Community, and Retirement” (Roundtable)** Kevin Joel Berland, Pennsylvania State University; bci@psu.edu

There is a need for open discussion of professional concerns in our field. As the profession evolves, many of us ourselves in a liminal state. We first experienced Liminal Land as graduate students with little experience or power, and now on the verge of retirement, or having already retired, we may lack an institutional home, travel funds, and a professional identity. We risk estrangement from current scholarship and missing the energy of the classroom. Still, we recognize that as we slow down, we can pick up. We may learn new tasks and habits, and, moreover, we can take charge of what becomes of us in retirement. The Profession Roundtables will discuss important issues for our profession, focusing on people who do scholarship, research, and teaching. This year, presenters will discuss challenges of research, scholarship, conference-attending after retirement, and benefits of retirement (reviving ideas long set aside, completing long-term projects, and even teaching). Topics could include strategies for access to research resources, libraries and archives, opportunities for collaboration, reading circles, time management, unofficial mentorship, grants, etc. To continue these roundtables at ASECS conferences, it could be useful to form a Professional Caucus to organize, choose topics, and convene a session annually.

117. **“Objects of Pleasure or The Pleasure of Objects”** Enid Valle, Kalamazoo College; valle@kzoo.edu

Notions of decoration, order, taste, imagination, meaning, commerce, and cultural exchanges, may be gleaned from objects that provide pleasure to all of society whether they be from the aristocracy or from the merchant classes. Material objects that can be found in royalty’s quarters, commercial outfits, and private residences, may reveal cultural appropriations, and creative designs such as the chinoiserie. Objects of pleasure can also

be found in textual and visual representations, such as those that appear in newspapers, commercial documents, traveler logs, testaments and wills, letters, biographies, diaries, narratives and paintings. In both the public and private spheres, objects of pleasure are displayed, collected, hidden, bought, sold, exchanged, but most importantly are acquired and consumed. This session welcomes interdisciplinary proposals that weave together notions of aesthetics, business, consumerism, history, narratives and politics in order to explore the impact of these objects of pleasure.

- 118. “Creeds, Confessions, and Conversions: Enlightenment Contact Zones Revisited”** Hazel Gold, Emory University; hgold@emory.edu

While the Enlightenment has commonly been associated with the drive toward religious liberalism and secularism, conflicts among religious belief systems continued to exert significant influence over individuals and their societies: either through the existence of multiple religious communities within the nation state or as the result of religious encounters that occurred through travel in an increasingly global eighteenth century. This panel invites papers that consider anew how individuals, churches, and governments negotiated engagements that arose in Enlightenment contact zones where differing structures of religious belief (or non-belief) interacted in contexts of largely asymmetrical power relations. Based on specific instantiations – Catholic-Protestant rivalries; debates between followers of Deism and traditional Christianity; Christian interactions with Jews or Muslims; Western exchanges with indigenous religions, among other possible examples – what were favored strategies for expressing or repressing dissent by religious minorities? Did these encounters ever conclude in rapprochement or only in unresolved polemic or outright, sometimes violent containment? In an environment of multiconfessional rivalry, what role did conversion play? More generally, how might scholars rethink the place of religious enthusiasms in the political, cultural, or moral life of Enlightenment societies?

- 119. “Non-Human Encounters in the Eighteenth-Century”** Catherine Chiabaut, Yale University; catherine.chiabaut@yale.edu

The binary opposition between human and non-human is both a fundamental and a tenuous one. It is a distinction on which both political inclusion and religious salvation depend, on which the right to life and to dignity is premised. It is, also, a locus of difference constantly displaced, challenged by issues of gender, race, and speciesism, by metaphysical and medical questions. This session will explore the ways in which the line between the human and the non-human was both drawn and blurred throughout the eighteenth century. Topics to be discussed include but are not limited to: How are the “human” or “humanity” defined in the eighteenth century? Who or what is excluded from “humanity”? What are the consequences of this exclusion? How does it, in turn, affect the definition of the non-human: its rights, its citizenship, its value? How is the “human” defined across genres (literary, scientific, and philosophical)? Humanity and speciesism – where do animals fit in? How do the questions of the “human” and of gender intersect? How is the question of the “human” articulated within the discourse on race and colonialism? Anatomy and aesthetics – how is the human visually represented?

- 120. “Revolutionary Crossings”** Andrew Dicus, University of Central Oklahoma; adicus@uco.edu

Eighty years after the publication of C. L. R. James’s seminal book, *The Black Jacobins* (1938), and nearly twenty years after Susan Buck-Morss’s “Hegel and Haiti” (2000), comparative, postcolonial, and trans-Atlantic scholarship on revolutionary agency remains a robust and ongoing project of eighteenth-century studies. This panel seeks to continue to explore concepts of revolutionary agency and change as they reflect global contexts. How do ostensibly universalist principles of liberty and equality aspire to accommodate the historical specificity of travel narratives and first-hand accounts of the American, French, and Haitian Revolutions? How do representations of revolutionaries, such as sans-culottes and practitioners of Obeah, function to consolidate (or to oversimplify) various tenets of revolutionary principle? How does travel literature beyond revolutionary contexts (like the Scandinavia of Mary Wollstonecraft’s letters, or the Inquisition of Anne Radcliffe’s *The Italian*) reflect back on prevailing ideas about revolutionary change? Interdisciplinary approaches are especially welcome.

- 121. “Sacred Celebrity”** Jeffrey Galbraith, Wheaton College AND Alex Hernandez, University of Toronto; jeff.galbraith@wheaton.edu and alex.hernandez@utoronto.ca

The histories of religion and theatre converge in what Joseph Roach terms the “secularization of charisma” over the long eighteenth century. Celebrity re-catheted energies once reserved for the sacred body of the monarch, casting fame and desire in new lights. Yet forms of charismatic presence continued to migrate

between pulpit and stage throughout the period, bringing theatricality into close contact with modes decidedly more devotional, even occasionally ecstatic. From the magnetism of popular preachers, to seductive forms of public intimacy, to transcendent encounters with the famous, celebrity has long been a means of re-enchanting the world. This panel seeks to mine this convergence further, inviting papers that explore charisma/celebrity broadly as it intersects across theology, literary and material cultures, and theatrical life. Papers might address the way preachers harnessed fame for the work of conversion. Or think about displays of personal piety in terms of performance and theatricality. Can theological notions help us understand theorizations of the actor's imagined presence and availability? Others might think about the celebrity encounter as transcendent, evoking quasi-religious states of wonder at public figures. But this is only a partial list and related topics will gladly be considered for inclusion.

122. **“ASECS and V21” (Roundtable)** Katarzyna Bartoszyńska, Monmouth College AND Eugenia Zuroski, McMaster's University; kasiab@gmail.com and zugenia@gmail.com

Launched in 2015, the V21 Collective aims to invigorate the field of Victorian Studies by calling for more “speculative and synthetic methods”; new formalisms and presentisms; and a willingness to theorize. Critiquing the tendency towards positivist historicism, V21 urges a renewed engagement in the question of how we relate to the past. It also interrogates the forms of institution that structure the field, modeling alternative approaches to collective thinking, by, for instance, assembling Book Collations in place of the standard book review. This roundtable asks whether C18 studies are in need of a similar movement, inviting us to take stock of our own disciplinary habits and formations. What is our relationship to historicism, to form, to theory? What kinds of institutional frameworks and platforms do we use? Do C18 studies share the problems that V21 finds in Victorian studies, or do we model alternative approaches? Which commitments—disciplinary, theoretical, political, methodological—are we prepared to renew, and which to rethink? We invite brief reflections to initiate a discussion of how we understand the affordances of C18 scholarship in the 21st century. We strongly encourage PhD candidates and junior scholars, as well as more senior colleagues, to submit abstracts.

123. **“Letting the Cat out of the Bag: The Cultural Work of Eighteenth-Century Pets”** Joanna M. Gohmann, The Walters Art Museum, AND Karissa Bushman, University of Alabama Huntsville; jgohmann@thewalters.org and keb0025@uah.edu

Despite scientific, philosophic, and social efforts to define and preserve a clear boundary between humans and animals, eighteenth-century pets, like our modern-day companions, defied this categorization. Madame du Deffand's cats, William Hogarth's pug, and the Duchess of Alba's bichon frise were integral to expressions of their owner's identity. Owners indulged their creatures in human luxuries like miniaturized human furnitures, porcelain dishware, fancy outfits, and pricy jewelry, which firmly embedded the creature within the owner world. In *Histoire Naturelle*, Buffon explains that animals embody their masters' traits, stating: “the dog is ... haughty with the great and rustic with the peasant.” But, what do animals do for the owner? Do masters adopt traits of the pet? What cultural work do pets perform? Responding to such works as Martin Kemp's *The Human Animal in Western Art and Science* (2007), Jacques Berchtold and Jean-Luc Guichet's edited volume *L'animal des Lumières* (2010), and Louise Robbins's *Elephant Slaves and Pampered Pets* (2002), this panel seeks to deepen the dialogue of Animal Studies by considering pets' agency and impact on the material and historical world. This panel seeks to address a diverse array of domesticated, companion animals from many cultures and invites participants from all disciplines.

124. **“(Re)Thinking Sex: New Unhistoricism and Eighteenth-Century Sexuality Studies”** Jodi Schorb, University of Florida; jschorb@ufl.edu

What impedes our understanding of sexuality in the past? Valerie Traub tackles this question directly, weighing queer theory's challenges to alterist historiography and reassessing the value of historicism as a method [*Thinking Sex* (2016), “The New Unhistoricism in Queer Studies” (2014)], and by Greta LaFleur, who confronts blind spots in contemporary methodology, including our tendency to misperceive eighteenth-century sex and gender formations as “unconventional” that were “precisely conventional” in [their] own day” [“Sex and Unsex,” *EAS* (2014)]. What is most productive in the ongoing debates between alterists and continuists over how to “do” the history of sex? What can recent work (emerging from the temporal turn, the aesthetic turn, affect studies, Atlantic studies, etc.) offer as far as productively opening up new texts or new possibilities? What have we overlooked when analyzing ways of knowing sexuality in the past? With a title adapted from Traub's most recent work, *Thinking Sex with the Early Moderns* (2016), this panel invites work that explores with new epistemologies of sexuality, engages with recent debates in the historiography of sexuality, or

proposes new ways that critical theory can infuse 18th century American, British, Caribbean, French, texts, imaginative literatures, or other primary archives with new possibilities.

125. **“Savages and Sacrifices in the Global Eighteenth Century”** Sophie Gee, Princeton University; sgee@princeton.edu

I'd like to assemble a 3- or 4-person panel on animal and human sacrifice and other “savage” rituals, real or imagined, performed during the eighteenth century, anywhere in the world. Work on the hermeneutics and/or representation of sacrifice is especially welcome. I'm interested in Judeo-Christian as well as non-Christian “savage” acts and rituals; this is a pretty open call for ideas.

126. **“Historical Poetics on the Cusp of the Historicist-Formalist Divide”** William Levine, Middle Tennessee State University AND Theresa Covich, University of California, Santa Barbara; william.levine@mtsu.edu and tmruss@gmail.com

The session will explore the possibilities for both a critical genealogy and a coherent theoretical basis for Historical Poetics (HP), an emergent but also divergent methodology for positioning approaches to literary works in the aesthetic and cultural constellations of their time. The main purpose of the session is to identify productive overlapping, divergences, residual and redirected questions from earlier formalist and historicist methodologies among the cluster of current critics and theorists who operate under the banner of HP. Among these inherited methodologies are post-Marxist, Foucauldian, micro- or tunnel historicisms; the “social philology” and “socio-poesis” of the early millennium’s “return to formalism”; and recent revisitations of Veselovsky and Russian Formalism. The session will address some of the following concerns: How does HP allow for more specifically contextualized or historically grounded approaches to the relation between literary history and broader models of social history or cultural studies? Given that literary histories of genres, forms, and techniques are accorded a certain degree of aesthetic autonomy, how does the making of such formalist histories among those practicing HP correspond to divisions of periods, accounts of continuity and change, and explanations of agency or conditioning in a wider map of cultural and materialist history?

127. **“Eighteenth-Century Fairytales in the Twenty-First Century” (Roundtable)** Alice Villaseñor, Medaille College; amv68@medaille.edu

This panel proposal is inspired by the conference location as well as the desire to extend conversations from the four panels on children’s literature that took place at ASECS 2017. One topic that connected many of the children’s literature panels was the question of relevancy: how do we engage twenty-first-century students with eighteenth-century literature in a variety of courses (e.g., children’s literature classes, eighteenth-century seminars, literature surveys, and general education courses)? This session provides an opportunity to extend these conversations about pedagogy as we consider reiterations of eighteenth-century fairy tales in multiple contexts (including, but not limited to, the twenty-first-century classroom). The recent release of Disney’s revised adaptation of Jeanne-Marie LePrince de Beaumont’s “Beauty and the Beast” highlights the importance of film adaptations, but this roundtable seeks papers on the reception of eighteenth-century fairy tales in a wide variety of twenty-first-century genres, including textbooks, translations, performance art (including cosplay), television shows, video games, and (especially given the conference location) theme parks.

128. **“Race and Revolution in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World”** Jamie Rosenthal, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; jrosent@email.unc.edu

The eighteenth-century Atlantic world saw numerous slave revolts, culminating with the Haitian Revolution and the establishment of the first independent black republic. As scholars such as Michel-Rolph Trouillot and Sibylle Fischer have argued, the Haitian Revolution was unthinkable and unspeakable within the framework of Western thought; yet literary and archival sources reveal that the Haitian Revolution and other slave revolts had a profound impact on the transatlantic cultural imaginary. This panel seeks papers that examine representations of slave resistance and rebellion in the Caribbean or elsewhere in the Atlantic world. Papers may address a variety of questions, including the following: How are real or imagined slave revolts represented in fictional texts, newspapers, archival sources, or visual images? Where and how did these representations circulate? What rhetorical strategies did writers employ to invoke fears or hopes of black liberation? What do literary, historical, and archival sources reveal about the relationship between gender, sexuality, race, and revolution? What do these sources suggest about the relationship between forms of everyday resistance and organized rebellion?

129. **Beyond Perdita: New Perspectives on Mary Robinson**” Jennifer L. Airey, University of Tulsa; jennifer-airey@utulsa.edu

While much excellent critical work has been published on Mary Robinson the actress and celebrity, less sustained attention has been paid to her work as poet, dramatist, essayist, and novelist. Over the course of her literary career, Robinson wrote seven novels, three plays, numerous poems published both in standalone volumes and the periodical press, and a series of essays on topics ranging from gender equality to the state of literary production in England. This panel therefore invites papers that move beyond Robinson’s work as an actress- beyond Perdita - to examine her work as an author. Of particular interests are papers that consider Robinson’s literary reactions to contemporary politics, her relationship to the periodical press and the publishing industry, and her relationship to the burgeoning Romantic movement, but papers on other aspects of Robinson’s corpus are most welcome.

130. **“The Woman of Color in the Eighteenth Century”** Regulus Allen, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo; rlallen@calpoly.edu

The republication of the 1808 novel *The Woman of Colour, A Tale*; the debut of *Belle*, a film inspired by the 1779 portrait of Dido Elizabeth Belle; the reissue of the 1767 text *The Female American*; and work by scholars such as Lyndon Dominique, Felicity Nussbaum, and Sarah Salih have facilitated a greater focus on eighteenth-century representations of women of color, and have indicated that such depictions are more prevalent and complex than the criticism has previously suggested. This panel invites papers from all disciplines as we consider verbal and visual depictions of women of African, American, or Asian descent and their impact on eighteenth-century culture and society.

131. **“Visualizing Travel”** Lacy Marschalk, University of Alabama in Huntsville; lsm0015@uah.edu

In recent decades, scholars have become increasingly interested in analyzing and recovering eighteenth-century travel writing, but the visual side of travel texts is often ignored. By the time the word “scrapbook” entered the English lexicon in the 1820s, personal, visual travel records had long existed and circulated in other forms, including the album, the illustrated journal, and the commonplace book. These forms typically contained less of a chronological narrative than written travelogues, but they presented a highly curated, interactive, and, in some cases, tactile experience for their viewers. Many published travel narratives also sought to make the reading experience—and armchair traveling—more authentic and immersive by including illustrations of the places described. This session invites participants to consider what happens when we decenter writing and instead contemplate the visual side of travel texts. Do travel albums present a more complicated vision of eighteenth-century travel than published travelogues? Does including illustrations in a published travel book enrich, contradict, or problematize the author’s narrative in unexpected ways? Papers on obscure scrap albums by unknown women and on engraved illustrations by well-known artists are equally welcome.

132. **“Including Indigenous Texts in British Literature Surveys: A Teaching Workshop”** Laura M. Stevens, University of Tulsa AND Robbie Richardson, University of Kent; laura-stevens@utulsa.edu and R.Richardson@kent.ac.uk

While slavery, abolition, and empire have become central to eighteenth-century British literature courses in recent years, texts composed by indigenous peoples, even when spoken, heard, written, published, and read in the British Isles, have received relatively little attention. This session will prepare teachers of Restoration and eighteenth-century British literature courses to devote some of their class time to the study of indigenous texts. Our focus will be on writings related to two visits of indigenous peoples to Britain: the Haudenosaunee embassy to London in 1710 (colloquially known as the “Four Indian Kings”), and Samson Occom’s preaching tour of Britain in 1766-68. The discussion will be highly focused and pragmatic, with recommendations for background reading, audio-visual aides, web sites, and strategies for introducing these texts to students at a variety of levels. Up to two other presenters with scholarly and/or teaching expertise in this area would be welcome in coordinating this workshop.

133. **“Literary Form and Legal Belonging”** Carol Guarnieri, University of Virginia; ceg4b@virginia.edu

This session investigates connections between eighteenth-century literary forms and legal forms. Topics might include: Now that the link between the fortunes of the early novel and contemporaneous political philosophies of the self-governing liberal subject has been decoupled, can innovative critical approaches to novel

subjects/selves/characters help us think differently about legal personhood and political belonging in the eighteenth century? How does the status of formal legal fictions connect to changing conceptions of fictionality, from Catherine Gallagher to Nicholas Paige? Do evidentiary rules help us understand the kinds of 'realism' assembled by eighteenth-century novels? At a time when compendious legal treatises by the likes of Coke and Blackstone are systemizing the laws of England—and traveling overseas to the colonies—how does legal authority overlap with new ideas about literary authorship and intellectual property? What can eighteenth-century literature teach us about the inability to separate 'natural'/'discovered' law from created law? And following Jonathan Lamb, how is selfhood represented differently in both literature and the law under the conditions of empire? This session aims to be interdisciplinary; thus, papers representing varied and diverse scholarly approaches are encouraged; in addition to standard format papers, jointly-written papers and other forms of collaborative thinking are welcome.

- 134. "Passion, Affect(ion), Emotion: Concepts in Dialogue" (Roundtable)** Joel P. Sodano, University at Albany, SUNY; jsodano@albany.edu

Throughout the eighteenth century—from the cult of sensibility (in Britain and on the Continent), to moral sense philosophy; from Charles LeBrun's character studies of "the passions," to Joanna Baillie's plays on the same subject—passions, affections, and emotions were both the stuff of human experience and the subject matter of serious aesthetic and philosophical inquiries. Going back to Brissenden's *Virtue in Distress* and Doody's *A Natural Passion*, contemporary studies on this subject have been nearly as plentiful as their primary sources, and judging from the 2017 ASECS program, which featured six panel sessions dealing explicitly with "affect," "affection," "passion," or "emotion," it's safe to say that the conceptual problem of affective experience continues to shape our field today. As such, this roundtable seeks to foster a conversation among scholars whose work intersects with the constellation of concepts in its title. The purpose is two-fold: 1) to clarify scholarly usage of ubiquitous terms by comparing historically-specific meanings and/or theoretical interpretations 2) to generate a cross-disciplinary discussion, open to all archives and traditions of eighteenth-century culture, that highlights similarities and differences across contexts. Participants should submit a brief description of their work and its relevance to the topic.

- 135. "J. G. Herder, Ecology, and Late German Enlightenment's Search for Nature"** Christina Weiler, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; weilerc@purdue.edu

This panel invites papers on the work of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) with a broad focus on any aspect of ecology in the long eighteenth century. Herder precedes the present-day field of environmental humanities by two centuries. His writings nevertheless open up challenging questions about humankind's relationship toward the environment. The panel welcomes scholars from all backgrounds. It seeks to encourage an interdisciplinary debate of different aspects of ecology in Herder's work in the context of the late German Enlightenment's search for nature and the development of Romantic ideas. Possible topics might include, but are not limited to humankind's place in the planetary ecology, the relationship between humankind and animals, the environment and the senses, the divine in nature, empathy towards other organisms, environmental ethics, ecological hierarchies, and organic organization and harmony. Papers on any of Herder's own texts as well as illuminating comparisons to his contemporaries are welcome.

- 136. "Innovative Course Design Competition"** ASECSoffice@gmail.com

ASECS invites proposals for a new approach to teaching a unit within a course on the eighteenth century, covering perhaps one to four weeks of instruction, or for an entire new course. For example, participants may offer a new approach to a specific work or theme, a comparison of two related works from different fields (music and history, art and theology), an interdisciplinary approach to a particular social or historical event, new uses of instructional technology (e.g., web sites, internet resources and activities), or a new course that has never been taught or has been taught only very recently for the first time. Participants are encouraged to include why books and topics were selected and how they worked. Applicants should submit five (5) copies of a 3-5 page proposal (double-spaced) and should focus sharply on the leading ideas distinguishing the unit to be developed. Where relevant, a syllabus draft of the course should also be provided. Only submissions by ASECS members will be accepted. A \$500 award will be presented to each of the participants, and they will be invited to submit a twelve-page account of the unit or course, with a syllabus or other supplementary materials, for publication on the website.

137. **“The British Navy and the Fashioning of British National Identity” (Cultural Studies Caucus)** Jeremy Wear, University of Montevallo; jwear@montevallo.edu

This panel seeks papers that examine the ways that the navy helped to reshape ideas of British national identity during the long eighteenth century. We welcome papers with a wide variety of approaches, from studies of the accounts of individual sailors or ships’ officers; to the economic, military, and ideological investments in specific naval expeditions (for example, Anson’s voyage, or any or all of Cook’s voyages); to the ways that naval practices (impressment, the navy’s involvement in the slave trade) qualified or undermined Britain’s self-identification as a bastion for the principles of liberty; to fictional or poetic representations of the navy or naval characters in literature.

138. **“ASECS: Secret Histories” (Cultural Studies Caucus)** Robert Markley, University of Illinois; rmarkley@illinois.edu

The recent special section of *Eighteenth-Century Studies* on the thirtieth anniversary of *The New Eighteenth Century*, edited by Laura Brown and Felicity Nussbaum, offered some interesting but necessarily limited takes on an important moment in the history of the field. This panel seeks proposals from both established scholars active in the 1980s and 1990s and younger members of the profession. Possible topics may include the ways in which ASECS responded to challenges posed by feminist, postcolonial, queer, and disability studies; changing editorial practices in the major journals in the field; the relationship of ASECS to other learned societies, including the Group for Early Modern Cultural Studies, the History of Science Society, the Society for Literature, Science, and the Arts, etc.; the effects of new digital and archives technologies on ASECS; and so on.

139. **“Tools for Corpus Analysis in the Study of the Long Eighteenth Century” Part I (Roundtable) (Digital Humanities Caucus)** Shawn W. Moore, Florida SouthWestern State College; shawn.moore@fsw.edu

The ASECS Digital Humanities Caucus seeks individual or team submissions for an alternative-format roundtable session leading participants through hands-on introductions to tools for corpus analysis. Instead of a traditional roundtable, we envision an alternative format that will focus on separate instructional workstations led by panelists. The purpose is to provide a hands-on how-to for participants and to explore methods of practice in quantitative analysis. Each panelist or team of panelists will be asked to bring computers with tools pre-loaded and ready to go with data sets that they can showcase and lead participants through during the session. (For example, if you’re using Mallet for Topic Modeling then you will have Mallet loaded with a data set ready to walk participants through how the tool works, what it can and cannot do, and have examples loaded that will allow participants to engage with the tool.) We are seeking panelists willing to lead participants in a short amount of time. Thus, submissions should outline a workshop style presentation while clearly indicating the tool and the data that will be used during the session.

140. **“Tools for Corpus Analysis in the Study of the Long Eighteenth Century” Part II (Digital Humanities Caucus)** Cassie Childs, University of South Florida; cassiechilds@mail.usf.edu

For this panel, we seek individual or team submissions focused on literary or historical work using digital tools for corpus analysis. We invite papers that cover various aspects of computer-assisted textual analysis, whether in research or in the classroom. Questions might include: What are the risks and benefits of computer-assisted textual analysis? What are the advantages and disadvantages of having students “screw around” with texts in this fashion? What does it mean to derive significance from a text or a corpus of texts through quantitative means? How might texts be interpreted and interrogated through specific methods and techniques? What pedagogical strategies have you implemented? What successes or defeats have you encountered with computer-assisted textual analysis in your research or in the classroom? What methodological and analytical questions drive corpus analysis? What are the roles of quantitative tools in supporting quantitative analysis? What are the difficulties of implementing topic modeling tools/toolkits, and what do these difficulties highlight about the nature of data in text or corpus analysis? Submissions that also highlight the problems with making techniques and data reusable are encouraged. This panel invites interdisciplinary perspectives. Please send 250-500 word abstracts.

141. **“Theorizing Eighteenth-Century Disability” (Roundtable) (Disability Studies Caucus)** Travis Chi Wing Lau, University of Pennsylvania AND Madeline Sutherland-Meier, University of Texas at Austin; laut@sas.upenn.edu and madelinesm@austin.utexas.edu

This panel continues a conversation that began at the 2017 ASECS Disability Caucus panel, “Crip Futurities.” As Chris Mounsey has suggested, disability studies has long depended on the nineteenth-century concept of the norm. Yet how do we theorize disability before it has become, to put it in Vin Nardizzi’s words, “the master trope of human disqualification”? We invite papers to theorize disability from the eighteenth century. Papers may consider representations of disability and disability writing in the eighteenth century and/or conceptualize a disability studies method from an eighteenth-century standpoint. How might the eighteenth century offer antecedents to the concepts of the normative or compulsory able-bodiedness? How do disabled writers like William Hay provide models of disability thinking and identity that might challenge more presentist understandings of disability that currently dominate disability studies methodologies? How do eighteenth-century representations of bodily variability help to better nuance histories of disability?

- 142. “Race and Disability” (Disability Studies Caucus)** Travis Chi Wing Lau, University of Pennsylvania AND Madeline Sutherland-Meier, University of Texas at Austin; laut@sas.upenn.edu and madelinesm@austin.utexas.edu

Felicity Nussbaum’s *The Limits of the Human: Fictions of Anomaly, Race, and Gender in the Long Eighteenth Century* (2003) connected the history of race with what she termed the “anomaly,” or the “variety of irregularities or deviations from that which is presumed to be the natural order of things.” This panel welcomes papers that similarly think through the relationship between race and disability as anomalous forms of bodily difference. How might the eighteenth century help us think more intersectionally about race and disability, whose histories are intertwined? How do racialized and disabled bodies shape or resist notions of normative embodiment during this period? Can eighteenth-century theories of race modulate how we might conceptualize disability?

- 143. “Race in Eighteenth-Century Queer Studies” (Roundtable) (Gay & Lesbian Caucus)** George Haggerty, University of California, Riverside; george.haggerty@ucr.edu

This roundtable will seek to identify and explore the ways in which race has been—and might be—addressed within queer eighteenth-century scholarship. How might queer studies beneficially advance an interrogation of race? What new directions might be opened at the intersections of race studies and sexuality studies? What concepts might need to be reframed? How might whiteness be deconstructed within the specific framework of queer thought? Five-minute talks should address one or more of these questions through specific texts, emerging ideas, or pedagogical practices.

- 144. “Queering Burney” (Gay & Lesbian Caucus)** Declan Gilmore-Kavanagh, University of Kent AND Ula Klein, Texas A&M International University; d.kavanagh@kent.ac.uk and ula.e.klein@gmail.com

No novelist includes more characters and situations that might be of interest to those of us in Queer Studies than Frances Burney. Her novels abound with questions of queer embodiment, queer affect, queer time, and queer epistemologies, while her non-fiction often touches on issues of embodiment, material histories, and female same-sex relationships. What happens when we consider Burney’s life and works through the lens of queer studies? We solicit papers of fifteen minutes’ duration that reconsider Burney’s works (as well as her life, her relationships, non-fiction, and authorial afterlife) by adopting queer methodological, pedagogical, or theoretical approaches.

- 145. “Models of Solidarity in the Long Eighteenth Century” (Graduate Student Caucus)** Kristin M. Distel, Ohio University; kd484114@ohio.edu

In her book *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, Chandra Mohanty provides a definition of solidarity that marks many of the communities and friendships in the literature of the long eighteenth century. Rather than assuming an enforced commonality of oppression, the practice of solidarity foregrounds communities of people who have chosen to work and fight together. Diversity and difference are central values here—to be acknowledged and respected, not erased in the building of alliances (7). This panel solicits papers that explore solidarity in all its forms, including but not limited to: formal groups, such as the Bluestockings; fictional communities, as in Scott’s *Millenium Hall*; proposed communities, as in Astell’s *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies*; sororal relationships or friendships, such as Elizabeth and Jane Bennet or Clarissa Harlowe and Anna Howe. Panelists are encouraged to explore the role of solidarity in real and fictive communities, as well as the ways in which eighteenth-century solidarity is mediated through race, gender, and social status. In what ways do these relationships build (or destroy) alliances? What forms do “work[ing] and

fight[ing] together” take in friendships and communities? In what ways do these groups of women address (or elide) difference among them?

146. **“A Sentimental Journey through Job Searches: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly” (Roundtable) (Graduate Student Caucus)** Michelle Lyons-McFarland, Case Western Reserve University; hml32@case.edu

This panel is aimed at exploring the intricacies of the modern job search in ways that give those either on or coming onto the market an informed perspective. What are the trends in funding positions? What does a red flag look like in a job listing? How loaded is the decision to take a non-tenure-track position? How does my focus on the eighteenth century impact my chances? What should I absolutely do/not do as I set out toward the land of gainful academic employment? This roundtable session will focus on questions such as the ones above in an effort to give guidance to ASECS-affiliated graduate students a leg up as they embark on the job search. Scholars with recent hiring/application experience are particularly welcome, as are active graduate student mentors. The format will be five-minute introductions/general advice, moving onto an active discussion and Q&A section for the remainder of the period. All areas of eighteenth-century scholars are welcome.

147. **“Irish Writing in the Early Atlantic” (Irish Studies Caucus)** Scott Breuninger, University of South Dakota; Scott.Breuninger@usd.edu

During the eighteenth century, Ireland’s position within the emerging British Empire was fraught with tension. The nation’s economy faced a number of internal and external challenges that hampered the growth of national wealth and the social and religious inequalities codified into the legal system governing the island raised serious problems of political representation. These issues shaped the popular and literary imaginations of Irish writers, especially among those men and women who left Ireland to seek their fortunes within the Atlantic World. Moreover, those Irish that remained in the country or emigrated elsewhere were galvanized by the political change in the Atlantic world. This panel welcomes papers that explore Irish writing within the social, literary, economic, and/or political contexts of the eighteenth-century Atlantic World (especially North America), as well as proposals that address the nature and dissemination of Irish books during this period.

148. **“The Irish Enlightenment X” (Irish Studies Caucus)** Scott Breuninger, University of South Dakota; Scott.Breuninger@usd.edu

Over the past decade, Enlightenment scholars have increasingly recognized the contributions of different national traditions, such as those of Ireland, to broader strands of eighteenth-century thought. This research has spawned an impressive number of essays, books, and conference panels, illustrating the vitality of debate concerning the Irish dimension of the Enlightenment and collectively helping to define the nature of the Irish Enlightenment. This panel welcomes participants whose work focuses on Irish thought and/or its relationship to the Enlightenment world, especially papers that either utilize new methodological approaches to the study of intellectual history or seek to address the current state of Irish Enlightenment scholarship.

149. **“Health and Medical Practitioners in Eighteenth-Century Italy” (Italian Studies Caucus)** Clorinda Donato, California State University, Long Beach; Clorinda.Donato@csulb.edu

The illustrious medical tradition of Italian universities and the training they provided to medical students and professionals throughout Europe continued unabated in the eighteenth century. Italian medical practitioners engaged in the most salient health and scientific debates of the long eighteenth century, from vaccination to vegetarianism to reproduction, with experimental methods and procedures that resonated in all forms of print culture across multiple languages. This session seeks contributions that explore the role, reception, and representation of Italian medical practitioners and their ideas during the long eighteenth century. Possible topics include: the impact of Italian science on eighteenth-century medicine; health beliefs and medical practices in eighteenth-century Italy; exchanges of Italian medical practitioners with colleagues, friends, grand tourists, artists, writers, and musicians; the representation of medical professionals and practices in the literature and aesthetic production of the period.

150. **“The Ingenuity and Influence of Muratori and Vico” (Italian Studies Caucus)** Rebecca Messbarger, Washington University in St. Louis; rmessbar@gmail.com

Ludovico Antonio Muratori (1672-1750) and Giambattista Vico (1688-1744) each conceived a new, monumental historical methodology and historiographical approach informed by their expansive knowledge of

literary, philological, philosophical, political, sacred and legal texts from ancient times to their own day, as well as by their religious convictions. Living at the transformational moment between the Counter Reformation and the burgeoning Enlightenment, Vico and Muratori engaged ardently in dominant contemporary intellectual, cultural and moral debates. Yet their work, still undervalued in eighteenth-century studies, is seen to have held greatest sway after they lived. This session invites papers on any aspect of the work and influence of Vico and Muratori, considered individually or together.

- 151. “The Eighteenth Century and the Present Crisis” (Roundtable) (Race and Empire Studies Caucus)**
Sal Nicolazzo, University of California, San Diego; snicolazzo@ucsd.edu

Scholars of race and empire will recognize in today’s political moment an intensifying of ongoing structures of violence and expropriation long subject to critical analysis. How can scholars of race and empire bring their critical capacities to bear on the present political moment, at the most local level of our work as teachers and scholars? We may understand the narratives of “Western civilization” employed by fascists, white supremacists and nationalists, but what can we do about it? We may recognize the interplays of race, empire and capitalism underpinning the modern nation-state system, but what do we do when we, our students and our colleagues are targeted by anti-immigrant violence, state-sanctioned or otherwise? How might the texts, objects or histories we teach become sources of hope, resilience and even of a capacity to imagine a radically different future? This panel asks how we put our collective insight to work in our classrooms, campuses, and public spheres. We welcome practical roadmaps for action, lessons learned in organizing or teaching, critical/theoretical interventions in pedagogy, analytical insights that can mobilize, inspire, or caution us in our political work, and more. The format will be 7-8 minute flash talks that aim to stimulate discussion.

- 152. “Life and Death, in and across Race and Empire” (Roundtable) (Race and Empire Studies Caucus)**
Tony Brown, University of Minnesota; tcbrown@umn.edu

Building on recent work concerned with biopolitics (Agamben, Esposito, Butler) and social death, afro-pessimism and necropolitics (Hartman, Sexton, Mbembe), this roundtable asks: What purchase does the bio- or necro-political have in approaching questions of race and empire? We especially welcome proposals attending to empire beyond the Anglophone world (such as the Spanish, Portuguese, French, German or Dutch) or beyond the Western (such as the Algonquin, Mexica, Kalinago or Khoikhoi).

- 153. “Water” (Science Studies Caucus)** David Alff, University of Buffalo; dalff@buffalo.edu

This panel invites proposals on all aspects of water in the eighteenth century, from its natural-philosophical definition as Aristotelian element and later chemical compound to its industrial and colonial applications on land and at sea to its metaphorization within art and literature. Papers could tackle many questions: what did residents of the eighteenth century think water was exactly and what frameworks did they harness to conceptualize it? How did writers represent water as a site of contact zones, and thus of modernity and globalization? How did experimenters understand water’s different physical states (ice, liquid, vapor), and how did such understandings facilitate and impede technological projects like the steam engine and land improvement initiatives such as fen drainage? What criteria allowed people to discern potable from impotable water, and how did such tests evolve in response to the outbreak of disease and the growth of cities? We welcome presentations that address both scientific inquiry into the nature of water as well as the knowledge-making enterprises that water enabled, from the exploration of overseas plants, animals, weather, and geography, to the channel-spanning correspondence networks that linked British astronomers and mathematicians to their counterparts on the continent and beyond.

- 154. “Eighteenth-Century Environments” (Roundtable) (Science Studies Caucus)** Danielle Spratt, California State University, Northridge; Danielle.spratt@csun.edu

How did eighteenth-century science reimagine, reshape, and define the environment? In what ways did the field help transform our cultural understanding of the concept of “environment” from one bound by ideas of “surrounding,” of geographic place and space, into our current usage of the term, which considers the complex interactions between organisms and their surroundings? This panel continues the innovative work found in the winter 2016 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Studies* by considering the intersections between natural philosophy and the natural world: we invite talks that discuss subjects including (but not limited to) the Anthropocene, air, atmosphere, ecology, conservation, the cold intervals of the so-called “Little Ice Age” (~1650 and 1770), and other environmental events (volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, tsunamis, etc.).

155. **“Theatre, Performance, and Slavery” (Theater and Performance Studies Caucus)** Jeffrey Leichman, Louisiana State University; jleichman@lsu.edu

The rise of early modern European empires saw a parallel dissemination of theatrical culture and chattel slavery throughout the world. Just as the eighteenth-century expansion of political and economic dominion based on bodies designated as property belies narratives of social progress, the Enlightenment also marks a particularly crucial juncture in the shifting relationship between freedom and performance that has been a central problem of the Western theatrical tradition since its inception. This panel seeks contributions exploring the impact, representation, and legacy of slavery in theatre and performance of the long eighteenth century. How did the colonies perform slavery, both on formally designated stages and in dance, song, and theatricalized behaviors that adhered to non-canonical poetic and/or regulatory codes? Circuits of influence are multi-directional; in what ways did performances of slavery define metropolitan identity, and how were performance protocols mobilized in imperial centers to underscore, efface, or sublimate the metropole’s implication with human bondage? Interventions that treat textual, corporeal, architectural, and musical intersections between slavery and performance are welcome. In keeping with the Theatre and Performance Caucus’s commitment to global eighteenth-century scholarship, we encourage submissions from researchers working in a variety of national and linguistic traditions.

156. **“Theatrical Translation and Adaptation” (Theater and Performance Studies Caucus)** Daniel Smith, Michigan State University; smit2030@msu.edu

This panel proposes analysis of the role of translation and adaptation in eighteenth-century theatre and performance, in a variety of genres, modes, and national traditions. What is gained by considering adaptation and translation together? Indeed, are they discrete terms or is all translation a type of adaptation? Possible case studies might include Garrick’s French adaptations, Marivaux’s appropriation of *commedia dell’arte*, continental translations of Shakespeare, or Madame Dacier’s scholarly translations of classical theatre. How did eighteenth-century theatre practitioners theorize questions of translation and adaptation within translated/adapted texts and in paratextual materials? This session welcomes approaches to translation and adaptation that move beyond linguistic and literary concerns to consider issues of translation and adaptation in performance. How might the voice and body of the actor be construed differently in translation? What happens to a source text when it is adapted or translated into dance?

157. **“Mansplaining in the Eighteenth Century” (Roundtable) (Women’s Caucus Scholarly Panel)** Hilary Havens, University of Tennessee; hhavens1@utk.edu

Mansplaining is a colloquial term that refers to a man explaining something to someone, typically a woman, in a condescending manner. Admittedly anachronistic, the term can readily be used to characterize the patriarchal under/overtones of texts written throughout the eighteenth century, including but not limited to, *The Spectator*, poems by Alexander Pope, conduct books, novels from Defoe and Richardson to Burney and Austen, and other works of various genres containing didactic themes. This panel will discuss appearances of mansplaining in eighteenth-century texts in order to illuminate networks of power and patriarchy hidden in various structures and forms. And conversely, the panel will ask, what can the eighteenth century tell us about mansplaining that we have yet to learn? At a time when women’s individual rights are threatened by ideologies couched in dangerously patronizing language, the need for a panel on mansplaining is particularly acute.

158. **“Thinking Alt-Ac: Exploring Alternatives outside Academia, Creating Access Within” (Women’s Caucus) (Roundtable)** Nora Nachumi, Stern College for Women/Yeshiva University AND Pamela Plimpton, Warner Pacific College; nachumi@yu.edu and pplimpton@warnerpacific.edu

This session explores alternatives to traditional academic careers in and outside of the university. What kinds of professions outside the academy offer opportunities to people with PhDs in the humanities? How does the PhD serve those seeking employment in related fields outside of academia proper? What alternatives to traditional academic careers are possible within the academy? What options exist for those committed to teaching and research who are not on the tenure track? We seek a diverse group of speakers. Participants may work in or outside of the traditional venue of the college or university. They may be teaching and doing research on a non-tenure-track line; mentoring PhDs who are considering alt-ac careers; or in the process of choosing a career path for themselves. Participants may decide to define or redefine what the term means or to whom it applies. Proposals that suggest ways alt-ac might re-imagine career options, scholarship and professional development outside and /or within academia are especially welcome.

159. **“Borders, Boundaries and Barriers” (New Lights Forum: Contemporary Perspectives on the Enlightenment)** Jennifer Vanderheyden, Marquette University; jennifer.vanderheyden@marquette.edu

In what manner have these concepts changed or informed the twentieth and twenty-first centuries? This panel seeks a dialogue that discusses either one aspect or all three from a variety of interdisciplinary approaches, including sexual, geographic, literary, artistic, political, and philosophic. For example, are there corollaries between the Marquis de Sade’s crossing of sexual boundaries and the desensitization of sexual violence and the current violation of these same boundaries through internet pornography? The New Lights Forum encourages discussions of Eighteenth Century issues as viewed from twentieth or twenty-first century perspectives.

160. **“La Haine / Hatred” (Society for Eighteenth-Century French Studies)** Pierre St. Amand, Yale University; pierre.saint-amand@yale.edu

This panel invites papers to explore the wide variety of forms of hate: individual (personal), collective, national. Hate speech and other symbolic avatars of hatred can also be investigated.

161. **“Description d’une personne...ou de toutes sortes d’objets: Portraits in the Eighteenth Century” (Society for Eighteenth-Century French Studies)** Elise Urbain Ruano; elise.urbain@outlook.com

The eighteenth century is passionate about portraits, the depiction of physical and moral features, of feelings and actions, whether in visual arts or in literature. These genres are intimately bound: in the *Encyclopédie*, the name of portrait is said to be common to Poetry and Painting. But the art of portraiture is subjected to tensions. Painted portraits are torn between the nobility of academic painting and their economic purpose. Moreover, whereas individuality should define it, it is often a serial practice. Literary portraits raise the issue of how accurate and personal a portrait can be. Marmontel says that comedy is the portrait, not of one man, but of a species of men in society. So where does the individuality lie, from the introspection of memoirs and self-portraits to the celebration of the “great men” and the collections of portraits? Is it possible to redefine portraiture through the century? This panel seeks interdisciplinary papers that explore this highly creative genre, and especially the links between pictures and texts, for example in the study of engravings, or portraits of the authors used as ornament in their books. The panel welcomes papers on all aspects of portraits and in all artistic media.

162. **“Rediscovering Adam Ferguson” (Eighteenth-Century Scottish Studies Society)** Mike Hill, University at Albany, SUNY; mhill@albany.edu

In recent years Adam Ferguson—professor of moral philosophy at the University of Edinburgh and a leading social thinker of the Scottish Enlightenment—has been the subject of renewed scholarly interest and new interpretations. This panel seeks to reconsider Ferguson in regard to issues such as martial virtue versus commerce; political conflict versus order; individual versus group interests; Highland versus Lowland identity; moral philosophy versus history; ethics and religion; historical and scientific method; Greek and Roman influences; Jacobitism; literary connections; and comparative analysis of Ferguson’s major works in regard to his consistency and the evolution of his thought over the course of his life. Proposals will also be welcome which address reevaluating Ferguson as an Enlightenment figure, in relation to Adam Smith, David Hume, and others.

163. **“Rediscovering Boswell’s *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson (1785)*” (Eighteenth-Century Scottish Studies Society) (This panel is dedicated to the memory of ECSSS, EC/ASECS, and ASECS member John B. Radner (1939–2017)).** Richard B. Sher, New Jersey Institute of Technology/Rutgers University, Newark, and Executive Secretary, ECSSS; sher@njit.edu

Samuel Johnson died in December 1784. Less than ten months later, on 1 October 1785, James Boswell published in London *The Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson, LL.D.*, the forerunner of the famous Life of Samuel Johnson that would appear six years later. The purpose of this panel is to reconsider Boswell’s first effort at Johnsonian biography as a book—a topic that has received remarkably little scholarly attention. How did Boswell’s handwritten journal (most of which Johnson read during the 1773 tour itself) differ from the published book? What roles were played by the editor Edmond Malone, the bookseller Charles Dilly, the printer Henry Baldwin, and Boswell himself in this transformation from journal to book? How was the book received? What sorts of revisions were made in the second (1785) and third (1786) editions, in response to the

reactions of critics, sympathetic readers, and offended parties? What was the importance of this book for understanding perceptions of the Scottish Highlands and the Ossian controversy, Boswell's career as an author, Johnson's reputation, and the relationship between Boswell and Johnson that John Radner analyzed so perceptively in his award-winning 2012 book *Johnson and Boswell: A Biography of Friendship*?

164. **“Writing Time: Temporality of the Journal in the Eighteenth Century” (German Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies) (Deutsche Gesellschaft für die Erforschung des 18. Jahrhunderts) (DGEJ)** Petra McGillen, Dartmouth College AND Nora Ramtke, Ruhr-University of Bochum, Germany; Petra.McGillen@Dartmouth.edu and Nora.Ramtke@rub.de

This DGEJ session aims to investigate eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century journals and related periodical publication forms, such as magazines, newspapers, or moral weeklies, in light of their relationship to time. One obvious mode in which time enters into these media is periodicity: journals typically appear at intervals, a quality that is constitutive to their production and reception. Moreover, journals and their contributors actively “write time” (Sean Franzel) — for example, by commenting on current events; by archiving the present in structures of repetition and duration (e.g. rubrics); and by developing aesthetic strategies of temporality. Our panel invites case studies of journals, authors, literary texts, and periodical genres that shed light on the many ways in which periodicals “write time.” How did authors, editors, or journals respond to the temporal conditions of periodical publishing? How did they render history, revolution, and ‘newness’? Which aesthetic, material and medial features did periodicals develop in order to create their own, internal temporalities and archive time? And how do these journal-specific temporalities map onto other temporal modes, such as historiography? By exploring these and similar questions, our panel seeks to discuss the potential of “writing time” as a new approach to periodical history.

165. **“The Critique of Empire: J. G. Herder and His Contemporaries” (International Herder Society)** Lynn Zastoupil, Rhodes College; zastoupil@rhodes.edu

This panel will address the prescient critique of empires, colonialism and cultural domination found in the work of J. G. Herder. Familiar to Herder scholars, this critique has recently been addressed in new fashion by John Noyes (*Herder: Aesthetics against Imperialism*, 2015), Sonia Sikka (*Herder on Humanity and Cultural Difference*, 2011), and Anne Löchte (*Johann Gottfried Herder*, 2005). These and other studies have established Herder's theory as important for postcolonial theory and multicultural studies.

This panel will also link Herder and his eighteenth-century context to recent debates in philosophy, literature and cultural studies. Paper topics could include Herder's perspective on the Roman Empire; Christian missionaries in European colonies; William Jones and early Orientalism; the German Baltics; Latin or French linguistic/cultural influences in Germany; Hungarian resistance to Joseph II's German-language decree; or mission civilisatrice as an emerging leitmotif in European thought. Other papers might explore parallels in contemporary critics of empire such as Burke, Diderot, and Montesquieu, examine Herder's debt to travel literature or literary texts made possible by colonialism (e.g., British translations of Sanskrit works), or trace Herder's influence on later analyses of multiculturalism/critiques of imperialism such as Dipesh Chakrabarty's *Provincializing Europe* (2000).

166. **“Women and Their Publishers” (The Aphra Behn Society for Women in the Arts, 1660-1830)** Kate Ozment, Texas A&M University; kateozment@tamu.edu

Women's writing found its way into print through a variety of methods: intentionally, accidentally, erroneously, illicitly, and posthumously. In almost all scenarios, publishers were necessary partners in the creation of a material book, and this panel explores these relationships as an essential foil to our rhetorical tradition of women's writing. This panel investigates: How did women writers choose a publisher or bookseller to finance and disseminate their work? Is gender a factor when women writers collaborate with male publishers and printers? How did publishers market or advertise women's writing, perhaps compared to their male counterparts or based on generic conventions? And, how were women's commercial personas mediated or influenced by publishers' desires and economic motivations? Proposals are welcome that explore any of these questions or their implications, including publishers handling of women's work posthumously. Please send 250-word abstracts.

167. **“The Old and the New: Bibliographical Methods and Projects Using Modern and Innovative Research Tools” (The Bibliographical Society of America)** Catherine M. Parisian, University of North Carolina Pembroke; Catherine.parisian@uncp.edu

This panel invites participants from all disciplines to present research that employs new research tools and/or innovative methods to study books or other textual artifacts in traditional or emerging formats. We hope to foster an interdisciplinary discussion that brings together older and newer methods and texts in a variety of formats.

168. **“Musical Burneys” (The Burney Society)** Linda Zionkowski, Ohio University; zionkows@ohio.edu

Even in a culture that prized musical talent, the Burney family was exceptional: the patriarch Dr. Charles Burney, author of the monumental *History of Music*, was a renowned teacher and musicologist; his children Esther and Susannah Burney were highly accomplished performers; and his daughter Frances portrayed music and musicians throughout her fiction and drama, most notably in *The Wanderer* (1814). We invite papers on any aspect of music in relation to members of the Burney family. Topics might include but are not restricted to: Charles Burney as composer, music educator, musicologist; the *History of Music* and its influence; fictional treatment of music, musicians, and sites of musical performance in the works of Frances Burney; Burney family members and the role of amateur musicians; musical culture in late Georgian London and the Court of George III.

169. **“Political Opinion and Popular Thought” (Daniel Defoe Society)** Kit Kincade, Indiana State University; kit.kincade@indstate.edu

This session invites papers on late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century magazine, periodical, and/or pamphlet dissemination of items deemed to be news, whether real, fake, gossip, or speculation. Topics can include newspaper and periodical culture, specific events, and reception and reader theory. We encourage a wide range of subject matter; topics need not be specific to Defoe studies.

170. **“Slavery in the Caribbean: Archives and Representations” (Early Caribbean Society)** Kelly Wisecup, Northwestern University; kelly.wisecup@northwestern.edu

The past decade or so has seen the creation of new digital repositories and platforms for representing the literatures of the Caribbean, slavery, and slave rebellions, such as the *Early Caribbean Digital Archive*; *The Digital Library of the Caribbean*, and the maps associated with the “Slave Revolt in Jamaica” web page. These new media and digital archives offer a useful context in which to reconsider representations of slavery in the Caribbean and their archives. Paper proposals are invited about the forms of representation for depicting enslavement in the Caribbean; about the archives in which these representations reside; and about the ways that these archives shape scholarly work on slavery and its representations. Papers on all forms of archives and representations-- digital, print, scholarly, community, in the US and in the West Indies--are welcome. The Early Caribbean Society encourages proposals representing various disciplines, including history, literature, and the visual arts; it also welcomes proposals from both established and early career scholars.

171. **“The Fate of Popular Literature within and beyond the Goethezeit” (Goethe Society of North America)** Christopher Chiasson, Indiana University, AND Anita Lukic, University of Pittsburgh; cchiasso@indiana.edu and alukic@pitt.edu

Responses to Ian Watt's *The Rise of the Novel* and work by Robert Darnton and Peter Brooks have directed attention to best-selling literature in Britain and France, but the topic remains understudied in other contexts. The German case is particularly relevant for exploring Franco Moretti's contention that readers decide what becomes canonical, as the divergence between eighteenth-century popularity and current canonicity could hardly be greater: Iffland and Kotzebue were the most popular dramatists of the Goethe Era, not Lessing, Goethe, or Schiller; authors such as Pestalozzi, Salzmann, and Lafontaine wrote novels that out-sold Moritz and Wieland. Popular poets such as Johann Gleim and Wilhelm Müller have only remained canonical insofar as composers set their poems to music, in contrast to Novalis or Hölderlin. Moreover, canonical authors often enjoyed their greatest popular successes in genres that are now held in low esteem. Does Moretti's thesis need to be revised given this disjunction? Can Darnton, Brooks, or Catherine Gallagher contribute to our understanding of German best-sellers? Papers addressing maligned or peripheral authors, works, or genres are encouraged, as well as those considering the institutions of canonization. So-called “minor” literatures and comparative perspectives are also welcome.

172. **“Anne Schroder New Scholars' Session” (Historians of Eighteenth-Century Art and Architecture)**
David Pullins, The Frick Collection; dpullins@gmail.com

This is an open session intended for advanced graduate students and early career scholars in the art and architectural history of the eighteenth century.

173. **“Back to Black: Goya and Color” (Ibero-American Society on Eighteenth-Century Studies (IASECS))**
Elena Deanda, Washington College; edeanda2@washcoll.edu

Taking the Black Paintings by Francisco de Goya as a point of departure, this panel will investigate the role played by color (or its lack thereof) in his work and/or the works of other eighteenth century painters and artists. From darkness to lightness passing through the whole gamut of colors, we welcome papers that explore the intersections of philosophy and color; morals, ethics, and color; psychology and color; and color and other disciplines, as they were expressed primarily in eighteenth century painting but also in other artistic expressions. As light became the central trope that defined a whole century, emanating from the seminal work by Sir Isaac Newton called *Opticks*, written in 1704, to the *Theory of Color* by Goethe in 1810, we will ponder the value and performance of light and darkness, chromaticism and perception, with the goal to better understand a unique dimension of *el Siglo de las Luces*.

174. **“Samuel Johnson, His Circle, and the Self Observed” (Samuel Johnson Society of the West)**
Myron Yeager, Chapman University; yeager@chapman.edu

Across Johnson's canon we see the definition of identity achieved through observation, or self-observation, especially in spatial terms. From “London” to *Rasselas*, from “The Vanity of Human Wishes” to *A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland*, we can see the process of observation situating the individual in spatial terms to define identity and to understand human morality. This session, sponsored by the Samuel Johnson Society of the West, invites papers that explore how observation and spatial definition serve to form identity or assess human morality in works by Johnson, Boswell, and their circle.

175. **“Lessing's Theatre Reform in the Light of Cultural Transfer” (Lessing Society)** Monika Nenon, University of Memphis; mcnenon@memphis.edu

This session will explore Lessing's reform of theatre. Whereas the purpose of the old school of theatre was to convey a moral message, Lessing's intention in his plays and his theory of drama is to stir emotion and evoke sympathy with the purpose of bettering human beings. This session would like to focus on French, Italian, and English debates on the role of theatre and the art of acting and ask which role these debates played in the development of Lessing's reform of the theatre. Papers on all aspects of the theatre such as specific plays, questions of genre, theory of acting, and translations from other cultures are welcome.

176. **“Mozart the Wunderkind in Context” (Mozart Society of America)** Laurel E. Zeiss, Baylor University; Laurel_Zeiss@baylor.edu

The extraordinary compositional and performing skills demonstrated by W. A. Mozart while still a child have loomed large in his biography and in the reception of his music. This session will place “Mozart the Wunderkind” into a broader context. Topics might include concepts of “genius” and “prodigy” during Mozart's time (especially in relation to music and childhood), the early travels and exhibitions of skill by the Mozart children, Leopold Mozart's educational and promotional strategies with regard to his children, other child prodigies (musical and otherwise) during the eighteenth century, and artistic display by and exploitation of child performers in pre-modern times. Musicians and other personalities encountered by the Mozart children during their early travels could also be addressed.

177. **“Current Research on Rousseau” (Rousseau Association)** Ourida Mostefai, Brown University; Ourida_Mostefai@brown.edu

This session will be devoted to recent scholarship on Rousseau. Proposals from all fields are welcome, including literature, philosophy, political science, art history, history, theater and musicology. Papers may be in English or in French.

178. **“Music Intersections” (Society for Eighteenth-Century Music)** Douglass Seaton, Florida State University; dseaton@fsu.edu

The Society for Eighteenth-Century Music proposes a session planned to feature intersections of music and issues that will interest scholars of the period generally. The call for papers seeks studies that situate music in culture, apply to musical subjects methods or materials adapted from other disciplines, pursue transmedial relationships between music and other arts. Examples would include, but are not limited to, the following: women and gender in music and musicking; music in material culture and the bourgeois home; music reflecting and critiquing politics and religion; music and drama – on the stage and beyond; music of empire and colony; music in literature and publishing; music within nature and gardens.

179. **“Novels, Newspapers, and Magazines as New Media: Print Novelties in the Eighteenth- Century Marketplace” (Society for the History of Authorship, Readership & Publishing (SHARP))** Colin Ramsey, Appalachian State University AND Eleanor F. Shevlin, West Chester University; ramseyct@appstate.edu and eshevlin@wcupa.edu

This panel invites papers that explore how novels, newspapers, and magazines were the new media of their day. Such forms were especially connected to the expansion of print, though they also sometimes mimicked manuscript forms, like the earlier hand-written “news letters,” or, the personal letter, as in the epistolary novel. They thus both expanded the marketplace in reading material and provided new opportunities for authors. Specific papers might address (but need not be limited to) the following: the ways novels, newspapers, and magazines described their own novelty, and the implications of those descriptions for our understanding of eighteenth-century reading habits and/or the literary marketplace; considerations of literary content in newspapers and/or magazines, and the impact of that placement in such media; the ways advertisements and news items found in magazines and newspapers were sometimes themselves remade into fictional forms, including novels; how relations between newspapers, magazines, and novels helped give the latter its aura of “newness,” and/or, how the novel supported the value of reading the “new” periodicals; the opportunities such media provided for authors to adapt, package, and repackage material from other ephemeral sources, such as political satirical pamphlets, broadsides, handbills, trade-cards, etc.

180. **“Colloquy on Ramesh Mallipeddi’s *Spectacular Suffering: Witnessing Slavery in the Eighteenth Century British Atlantic*” (Roundtable) (Society of Early Americanists)** Dennis Moore, Florida State University; dmoore@fsu.edu

Rather than presenting a paper, each participant in this interdisciplinary roundtable—including Ramesh Mallipeddi of the University of Colorado, the author of *Spectacular Suffering: Witnessing Slavery in the Eighteenth-Century British Atlantic* (Virginia, 2016) -- will make a four- or five-minute opening statement laying out a specific issue or question related to this book. That selfless brevity on the part of these panelists frees up time for lively, substantive discussion that engages members of the audience as well as panelists; this format liberates the book’s author from having to serve as the Respondent.

181. **“Factual Fictions and Fictional Facts” (North West Society for Eighteenth Century Studies) (NWSECS)** Marvin Lansverk, Montana State University; lansverk@montana.edu

Papers invited on the presence of the factual within fictional forms, and the presence of the fictional within factual forms. Thus, papers welcomed on the boundaries between fact and fiction, on eighteenth-century epistemologies, on the rise of the novel and the rise of journalism and their mutual interaction.

182. **“Recent Research on Voltaire” (The Voltaire Society of America)** Jack Iverson, Whitman College; iversojr@whitman.edu

This session will continue the tradition of dedicating one open session at the annual meeting to work on or related to Voltaire. Proposals from all fields are welcome. In past years, contributors have included specialists in French literature, philosophy, art history, history, and German Studies.