

**Call for Papers**  
**52<sup>nd</sup> ASECS Annual Meeting**  
**Baltimore MD**  
**March 31 – April 2, 2022**

**Session Program Guidelines**

Abstracts or proposals should be sent directly to session organizers no later than September 17, 2021. Session organizers are reminded that all submissions received up to that deadline **MUST** be considered. Completed panels will be submitted using an online form; a link to this form will be sent to session organizers in mid-September. In the meantime, contact the ASECS Business Office with any questions – [asecsoffice@gmail.com](mailto:asecsoffice@gmail.com).

All breakout rooms at the Annual Meeting will be equipped with a screen, projector, and wifi. Additional room configuration or technology requests must be submitted by the session organizer on the online form. Session organizers will be required to confirm that all equipment requests are essential to the purpose of the session. Equipment requests or changes made after September 30, 2021 may not be accommodated. It may not be possible to fulfill all special requests.

**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, a respondent, a workshop facilitator, or a roundtable, seminar, or workshop participant, but they may not present a paper at sessions they chair. No member may appear more than twice in the program (excluding sessions sponsored by ASECS).**

No individual may submit paper proposals to more than two panels. Since you can present only one paper at the meeting itself, you must notify both panel chairs if you are submitting two proposals for papers, whether or not the proposals concern the same topic. You must also notify both panel chairs if you are proposing both a paper and a roundtable version of the same material, since paper and roundtable versions of the same presentation may not be given at the conference.

All participants must be members in good standing of ASECS or of a constituent society of ISECS. Membership must be current as of December 1, 2021 for inclusion in the program. Join or renew your ASECS membership at <https://asecs.press.jhu.edu/membership/join>.

**PROPOSED SESSIONS**

- 1. Presidential Session: Venice, Real and Imagined** Irene Zanini-Cordi, Florida State University, [izaninicordi@fsu.edu](mailto:izaninicordi@fsu.edu)

Venice, hovering above its lagoon waters, was dismissed by Chateaubriand as a “city against nature” after his first visit, but defended by the Venetian salonnière Renier Michiel as “a city above nature.” This difference in perceptions, speaks to the fascinating protean quality of the city. Its beauty, traditions, architecture, culture and diversity have mesmerized and puzzled grand

tourists, and have attracted artists, writers, singers, and actors from all over the world. This session welcomes papers focusing on any aspect of eighteenth-century Venice, both real and imagined. Submissions should be sent to Irene Zanini-Cordi: [izaninicordi@fsu.edu](mailto:izaninicordi@fsu.edu)

- 2. Presidential Session: New Horizons in Enlightenment Studies (Roundtable)** Meghan Roberts (Bowdoin College), [mroberts@bowdoin.edu](mailto:mroberts@bowdoin.edu) and Daniel Watkins (Baylor University), [daniel\\_watkins@baylor.edu](mailto:daniel_watkins@baylor.edu)

Twenty years after Keith Baker and Peter Hanns Reill published *What's Left of Enlightenment?*, the Enlightenment is in the news. Voltaire's *Treatise on Tolerance* became a bestseller in the wake of the 2015 attacks in Paris. David Hume's racist statements in *Essays, Moral and Political* drew widespread notice and condemnation, resulting in Edinburgh University renaming David Hume Tower in 2020. In 2021, conservative talking heads claimed that Benjamin Franklin fought against "cancel culture." The heritage of the Enlightenment is up for grabs. As Christy Pichichero has convincingly argued, it is necessary to complicate pristine notions of the Enlightenment and "make transparent the aspirations and the drastic omissions in Enlightenment 'philosophie.'"

We propose a roundtable that addresses the complicated and contested status of the Enlightenment in our current historical moment and contemplates new paths forward for Enlightenment teaching and scholarship. Among many possible questions, what is new for Enlightenment studies, and why does it matter? What does it mean to speak of Enlightenment in global and colonial contexts? Has studying race, gender, and Enlightenment changed in our moment of #MeToo and #BlackLivesMatter? We hope to represent a wide array of perspectives and particularly encourage graduate students and early career researchers to apply. Panelists working on any facet of the Enlightenment, broadly defined, are welcome. Please send a brief (no more than 250-word) description of the topics you would discuss to [mroberts@bowdoin.edu](mailto:mroberts@bowdoin.edu) or [daniel\\_watkins@baylor.edu](mailto:daniel_watkins@baylor.edu).

- 3. Presidential Session: Undergraduate Research in the Eighteenth Century (Roundtable)** Rachael King, University of California, Santa Barbara, [rking@english.ucsb.edu](mailto:rking@english.ucsb.edu)

This roundtable invites considerations of the role that undergraduates play in research into the eighteenth century. As major requirements and undergraduate interest are changing at many universities, many ASECS members are not teaching primarily, or at all, in the field of eighteenth-century studies. But at the same time, cross-rank research groups in fields such as the digital humanities, book history, and critical making are increasingly common, a trend that can attract undergraduates to the field. How is the move toward undergraduate research initiatives affecting our work? How can we encourage more undergraduate research? Presentations by or including undergraduate researchers are particularly welcomed.

- 4. Innovative Course Design** [asecsoffice@gmail.com](mailto:asecsoffice@gmail.com)

ASECS invites proposals for a new course on eighteenth-century studies or a new unit (1-4 weeks of instruction) within a course. Proposals may address a specific theme, compare related works from different fields (music and history, art and theology), take an interdisciplinary approach to a social or historical event, or suggest new uses for instructional technology. The

unit/course should either have never been taught or have been taught recently for the first time. Applicants should submit a 750-1500 word proposal that focuses sharply on the leading ideas distinguishing the unit/course. The proposal should indicate why particular texts and topics were selected and (if possible) how they worked; ideally, a syllabus will be provided. The competition is open to current members of ASECS. Up to three proposals will be selected for presentation during the Innovative Course Design session at the Annual Meeting; a \$500 award will be presented to each of the participants, who also will be asked to submit an account of the unit/course, a syllabus, and supplementary materials for publication on the ASECS website.

**5. Wikipedia Edit-A-Thon (Workshop) [Digital Humanities Caucus]** Collin Jennings, Miami University, [jenninc@miamioh.edu](mailto:jenninc@miamioh.edu)

The ASECS Digital Humanities Caucus invites proposals for supporting a Wiki Edit-A-Thon focused on creating and expanding Wikipedia entries for marginalized figures and groups of the eighteenth century. Proposals may come from either scholars with experience editing Wikipedia entries or from scholars with plans for expanding particular entries. Speakers will prepare brief presentations (~5 minutes) on best practices or plans for editing Wikipedia entries, and the majority of the session will consist of attendees contributing to eighteenth-century entries. Although the Edit-A-Thon during the session will be relatively short, we will also set a goal for the number of entries to be created or expanded over the course of the entire conference. Please send brief proposals, including your experience in editing Wikipedia entries or plans for expanding particular entries, to Collin Jennings ([jenninc@miamioh.edu](mailto:jenninc@miamioh.edu)).

**6. Centering Marginalized Voices in Digital Humanities Projects (Roundtable) [Digital Humanities Caucus]** Mattie Burkert, University of Oregon, [mburkert@uoregon.edu](mailto:mburkert@uoregon.edu)

How can scholars use digital tools, ranging from databases, to digitization, to visualization, to center marginalized voices of the eighteenth century? To what extent can new methods produce new perspectives on the figures and groups of the period? We seek proposals describing DH projects that have foregrounded marginalized voices of the eighteenth century. The projects can be at any stage of development, from planning to completion, but the speakers should be able to share concrete steps they took for centering underrepresented groups in their projects. These might include using digital research techniques for discovering under-researched figures, or they might entail using publication and exhibition platforms for representing projects designed around such figures. Please send brief proposals, describing what aspect of your project you would like to present in a roundtable format, to Mattie Burkert ([mburkert@uoregon.edu](mailto:mburkert@uoregon.edu)).

**7. Disability Performances [Disability Studies Caucus]** Annika Mann (Arizona State University) [Annika.Mann@asu.edu](mailto:Annika.Mann@asu.edu) and Emily Stanback (University of Southern Mississippi), [Emily.Stanback@usm.edu](mailto:Emily.Stanback@usm.edu)

This panel seeks to investigate disabilities, bodyminds, and performances in the long eighteenth century. How do we recover an archive of disability performance, broadly speaking? How might disability performance render new insights about the formation of disability as a socially constituted and contested identity? What insights can eighteenth-century archives offer about the performativity of the everyday when thinking through diverse bodyminds?

By “performance” we hope to signal not just theatre, the playhouse, and the repertoire, but also larger moments that feel “performative.” As Tracy C. Davis, Willmar Sauter, and Judith Butler theorize, performance time, performance events, and performative self-making raise concerns about layered temporalities, polychronicity, repetition, hiccups, ruptures, and revisions. Tobin Siebers calls attention to the multiple offstage performances like passing, masquerading, and other ways to navigate the social. How can eighteenth-century performances extend, complicate, or reshape our understanding of disability performance? We invite 250-word abstracts about these or related topics on disability performance in the long eighteenth century. Please send abstracts to [Annika.Mann@asu.edu](mailto:Annika.Mann@asu.edu) and [Emily.Stanback@usm.edu](mailto:Emily.Stanback@usm.edu).

**8. Crip Time / Crip Forms (Roundtable) [Disability Studies Caucus]** Annika Mann (Arizona State University) [Annika.Mann@asu.edu](mailto:Annika.Mann@asu.edu) and Emily Stanback (University of Southern Mississippi), [Emily.Stanback@usm.edu](mailto:Emily.Stanback@usm.edu)

How are crip temporalities and experiences of non-normative embodiment expressed formally in text? We invite 250-word proposals for short papers (5-7 minutes) that explore this question from a range of angles. Papers may, for example, address questions of poetics, narrative form, authorial embodiment, canon creation, book history, and non-”literary” textual forms (e.g. gravestones, notebooks, commonplace books, ephemera). We also welcome papers that seek to reflect on the stakes of crip formalism and crip temporality in 18th-century studies. Please send abstracts to [Annika.Mann@asu.edu](mailto:Annika.Mann@asu.edu) and [Emily.Stanback@usm.edu](mailto:Emily.Stanback@usm.edu).

**9. Trans\* Before Trans\* in the Eighteenth-Century Archive [Gay & Lesbian Caucus; Queer & Trans Caucus]** Margaret Miller (University of California, Davis), [mamill@ucdavis.edu](mailto:mamill@ucdavis.edu)

As attention to transgender phenomena continues to increase, the need for thoughtfully conceived and ethically executed trans\*archival practices becomes all the more pressing. Yet the very basis of this undertaking relies on a daunting definitional and epistemological challenge (which Eva Hayward and Claire Colebrook have previously taken up): in the context of archives, what counts as transgender? While some historians have rejected the category of transgender to speak of experiences before the mid-twentieth century, others have laid claim to those living gender-non-conforming lives before our contemporary era. What might we find if we look for trans\* before trans\*? We invite shorter papers that offer insights and discussions of methodologies, epistemological delineations, and archival practices that tend to what counts or should count as trans\* within the long eighteenth century. Please send proposals of no more than 250 words as well as a brief biographical statement.

**10. Unsettling Sexuality in the Eighteenth Century (Roundtable) [Gay & Lesbian Caucus; Queer & Trans Caucus]** Jeremy Chow (Bucknell University), [j.chow@bucknell.edu](mailto:j.chow@bucknell.edu)

This roundtable imagines other queer worlds, outside of a British or continental home, to better flesh out global explorations and conceptions of queerness (as gender, sex, sexuality, etc.). How might we resist notions of colonialism’s sexual hegemony--as Joseph Massad, Valerie Traub, Qwo-Li Driskill, and Jasbir Puar teach us--in favor of exploring how other geographies, peoples, and cultures may further develop our grasp of eighteenth-century queer studies? And how might

these worlds invite radical reconsideration of the canons and archives we teach and write within? Please send proposals of no more than 200 words as well as a brief biographical statement.

**11. Publish or Perish? Perspectives on Publishing in Grad School (Roundtable) [ASECS Graduate Student Caucus]** Ziona Kocher, University of Tennessee, [zkocher@vols.utk.edu](mailto:zkocher@vols.utk.edu)

All graduate students are familiar with the advice that publishing your research is the path to success, but with the multitude of pressures placed upon grad students, publishing can easily get shoved to the back burner or become a source of unsurmountable anxiety. In mentoring events hosted by The Doctor Is In, publishing is one of the number one topics that mentors are asked about, so we are clearly all thinking about it.

This roundtable welcomes proposals from a wide range of perspectives and topics relating to the dilemma of “publish or perish.” Is this a helpful mentality? Are there alternative options to the traditional journal article, such as Digital Humanities projects? What are the pros and cons of Open Access? What do you do when you’ve been rejected? And how do grad students feel about all of this pressure? Moving beyond “tips and tricks to getting published” (though those are certainly welcome too!) this session aims to help grad students position themselves within the world of publishing in a way that leaves them feeling empowered and prepared. We welcome proposals from a wide range of areas, including but not limited to mentors, directors of graduate studies, editors of publications (both traditional and non-traditional), and early career scholars and graduate students with diverse publishing experiences.

Please submit a short bio and a proposal of approximately 250 words to [zkocher@vols.utk.edu](mailto:zkocher@vols.utk.edu).

**12. Reimagining the Long Eighteenth Century: Page, Stage, Screen [Graduate Student Caucus]** Dylan Lewis, University of Maryland, [dplewis@umd.edu](mailto:dplewis@umd.edu)

With popular films and tv shows such as *Bridgerton*, *Outlander*, *The Great*, *Lady J*, *Mademoiselle Paradis*, *Emma*, *Portrait of the Young Lady on Fire*, and *The Favourite*, all of which that have appeared in just the past few years, audiences around the world have been transported into filmic adaptations of the long eighteenth century like never before. Similarly, *When We Have Sufficiently Tortured Each Other: Twelve Variations on Samuel Richardson's Pamela* and the wildly popular musical *Hamilton* have brought modern takes on the eighteenth century to the stage. But adaptation of eighteenth-century material was also an important aspect of print and performance cultures throughout the period via translation or remediation. This panel welcomes papers that explore, praise, or problematize ‘reimaginings’ of eighteenth-century material, either in the period or today. We seek submissions from a broad range of disciplines and approaches, both in research and in teaching. Potential objects of inquiry include paintings and engravings, translations, remediations, music, television and film, and contemporary theater. Additionally, we welcome submissions from scholars in and outside of academia at any stage in their program or career. Please submit a short bio (2-3 sentences) and abstracts of 250 words or less to [dplewis@umd.edu](mailto:dplewis@umd.edu)

**13. Irish Writing in the Early Atlantic [Irish Caucus]** Michael Griffin, University of Limerick, [Michael.J.Griffin@ul.ie](mailto:Michael.J.Griffin@ul.ie)

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 the 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.

**14. Irish Legacies of the 18th Century [Irish Caucus]** Scott Breuninger, Virginia Commonwealth University, [breuningersc@vcu.edu](mailto:breuningersc@vcu.edu)

During the eighteenth century, Ireland faced a number of internal and external challenges that were exacerbated by the social inequalities codified into the legal system governing the island. These issues shaped popular and literary understandings of civility, sociability, and associational life within Ireland and helped frame how those across the Irish Sea viewed the Irish. Furthermore, the position of Ireland in the emerging British Empire, especially following the 1707 Act of Union, also called into question the nature of Irish identity and community. While faced with these circumstances, many Irish figures took actions and positions that left an indelible stain upon their legacies within Ireland (and beyond). This panel welcomes papers that explore the social, literary, economic, and/or political legacies of eighteenth-century Irish figures in the current day, paying particular attention to how our understanding of these figures has changed within recent scholarship.

**15. Diversity in Italy in the 18th Century [Italian Studies Caucus]** Adrienne Ward - University of Virginia, [aw7h@virginia.edu](mailto:aw7h@virginia.edu)

More than most other geo-political entities in Europe and the Americas, the Italian peninsula embodied diversity in its very makeup: 11+ different states over the greater part of the eighteenth century. This panel explores all forms of (human) diversity in the Italian states, and the degrees to which difference was or wasn't valued. Diversity may be construed in terms of sovereign allegiance, religious affiliation, social rank, gender belonging, profession/trade, and racial category. Political/national diversity abounded as Italian states were subject to different ruling factions or influence (French in Parma, Austro-Hungarians in Lombardy and Tuscany, Spanish in Naples) and as Grand Tourists (British, American and Italians themselves) and others crisscrossed Italy in the travel rage. The worship of encyclopedic knowledge-structuring led to elaborate systems of human classification and categorization; readers of all stripes consulted treatises that articulated intricate typologies of inner character. How did individuals and collectives differentiate the beings around them and how did they regard the idea of variety or mixture in their constituents and/or in society? Which institutions held fast to entrenched divisions and hierarchies, and which showed greater tolerance of or even desire for variance, intermingling and inclusion? Papers welcome that consider attitudes toward diversity in its

many manifestations, e.g. in marriage, faith congregations, any and all marketplaces and kinds of commerce, slavery and servitude customs, and literary/artistic realms.

**16. Opera, Theater, Women, and Celebrity in Eighteenth-Century Italy [Italian Studies Caucus]** Margaret Butler - University of Wisconsin-Madison, [mrbutler@wisc.edu](mailto:mrbutler@wisc.edu)

Recent work in celebrity studies has taught us much about the networks that undergirded eighteenth-century celebrity culture: the dialogue among social groups, modes and conventions of spectatorship, and mechanisms of publicity, to name a few key components. While we are gaining a clearer understanding of these systems as they pertain to Enlightenment-era England and France, in particular, we have but a hazy view of their Italian counterparts. With regard to opera, apart from studies on the castrato and his public, our view is dimmer still. How did women in Italian opera and spoken theater contribute to eighteenth-century celebrity culture, in terms of performance, creation, reception, patronage, or other modes of production or consumption? Do women's roles and functions in Italian spoken theater intersect with those of opera in this period, and if so, how? This session seeks contributions that interrogate the roles of women in eighteenth-century Italian drama, whether sung or spoken, the meanings of those roles, and what implications those roles might have had for the understanding—and creation—of celebrity as a concept on the part of listeners, readers, and other communities.

**17. Transformation, Idealization, Animation: Contemporary Perspectives on the Pygmalion Myth [New Lights Forum]** Jennifer Vanderheyden Marquette University, [jennifer.vanderheyden@marquette.edu](mailto:jennifer.vanderheyden@marquette.edu)

The Walters Art Museum in Baltimore holds Falconet's renowned sculpture Pygmalion and Galatea. According to the museum's website, "This statue is very likely the one exhibited by the artist at the Salon of 1763 (in Paris). Pygmalion is depicted in rapturous amazement at the feet of his love object, a nude sculpture, just at the moment when it is given life by Venus, the goddess of love." This panel invites interdisciplinary proposals that consider the enduring influence of the Pygmalion myth from a contemporary perspective. In all disciplines one encounters love and its idealization, disappointment of imperfections, animation of the inanimate, transformations of the allegory, the aesthetics of mimesis... to name only a few. For example, in his Salon of 1763, Denis Diderot praises Falconet for his animation of Pygmalion, but continues with a critique and proposal of another version of the statue that would be even more lifelike. Diderot's theories of this animation (including his proposal that one can consume marble by pulverizing it, mixing the powder with soil and compost, then sowing vegetables that will be consumed) continue to engage dialogue, as do other reworkings of the Pygmalion story.

**18. Eighteenth-Century Adaptations (Roundtable) [New Lights Forum: Contemporary Perspectives on the Enlightenment]** Adam Schoene, University of New Hampshire, [adam.schoene@gmail.com](mailto:adam.schoene@gmail.com)

This roundtable examines research and teaching approaches to eighteenth-century studies through contemporary adaptations. *Adapting the Eighteenth Century* (2020), edited by Sharon Harrow and Kirsten Saxton, illuminates the pedagogical potential of adaptation as a tool for teaching eighteenth-century studies, examining how it might work across disciplines and levels

as a point of entry into both historic and current issues of race, gender, sexuality, and other subjects. Adaptation could be considered within the context of art, film, literature, music, theater, or additional realms, and from a range of different theoretical perspectives. How might the emergence of new adaptations or forms of adaptation serve to broaden the audience, accessibility, and scope of eighteenth-century studies?

**19. Teaching the Eighteenth Century (Poster Session) [Pedagogy Caucus]** Linda Troost, Washington & Jefferson College, [ltroost@washjeff.edu](mailto:ltroost@washjeff.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 conversation. Participants in panels or roundtables are also welcome to participate in the poster session. Posters will remain on display throughout the conference and then be placed online.

**20. Aiding the Anxious: How Non-Specialists Can Navigate Teaching about Race and Empire (Roundtable) [Race and Empire Caucus]** Kimberly Takahata (Villanova University), [kimberly.takahata@villanova.edu](mailto:kimberly.takahata@villanova.edu)

Building on the series of Presidential Sessions including “Concepts in Race and Pedagogy for 18th-Century Studies (2021), Teaching Race in the 18th Century in the 21st-Century Classroom (2019), and Addressing Structural Racism in the 18th-Century Curriculum” (2018), this session invites facilitators for a discussion and workshop for non-specialists of critical race and anticolonial studies on integrating matters of race and empire into the 18th-century classroom. Pushing past strategies of syllabus “inclusivity,” this session asks: how can we center race and empire as critical paradigms across a variety of courses in eighteenth-century literature, culture, and history? What strategies can expand and deepen our engagement with race and empire in the classroom? In particular, this conversation will be interested in techniques that are helpful for early career, sessional, and adjunct instructors.

**21. Eighteenth-Century Studies in Dialogue with the Work of Dionne Brand, Saidiya Hartman, and Christina Sharpe (Roundtable) [Race and Empire Caucus]** Eugenia Zuroski (McMaster University), [zuroski@mcmaster.ca](mailto:zuroski@mcmaster.ca)

At this moment of intensified calls across “traditional” academic fields for more sustained engagement with antiracist frameworks, decolonizing movements, and Black life and liberatory thought, how might eighteenth-century studies of race and empire better think with and learn from work in Black and African/African Diasporic studies? This roundtable invites participants to focus on the writing and scholarship of Dionne Brand, Saidiya Hartman, and Christina Sharpe—three thinkers whose work on ontologies, geographies, and narratives of Black life since the eighteenth century seems more crucial than ever to any scholarly approach to the long eighteenth century. Papers may focus on one, two, or all three writers, and should call attention to how a specific text, figure, concept, or method from these scholars’ work generates possibilities for future approaches to the study of race and empire.



**22. Eighteenth-Century Science and Affective Experience [Science Caucus]** Al Coppola,  
John Jay College, CUNY, [acoppola@jjay.cuny.edu](mailto:acoppola@jjay.cuny.edu)

In *Leviathan and the Air Pump* (1985), Simon Schaffer and Steven Shapin influentially theorized the “modest witness,” the ostensibly objective scientific practitioner whose dispassionate observations and disinterested accounts allowed the modern fact to speak for itself. At least since Barbara Benedict’s *Curiosity* (2001) and Jessica Riskin’s *Science in the Age of Sensibility* (2002), scholars of eighteenth-century science have reconsidered this idealization and analyzed how embodiment and affective experience have shaped knowledge production. Recently, scholars such as Tita Chico and Julie Park have discussed the role of wonder in scientific practice. Building on that conversation, this panel seeks papers that explore 18c science practitioners’ engagement with a wide range of affects, both positive, like wonder, and negative, like fear, anger or disgust.

**23. Comic Science: Or, the Eighteenth-Century Ig Nobel (Roundtable) [Science Caucus]**  
Leah Benedict, Kennesaw State University, [lbenedi2@kennesaw.edu](mailto:lbenedi2@kennesaw.edu)

The infamous Ig Nobel award recognizes “achievements that make people LAUGH, then THINK.” In the words of the organizers, the prizes “celebrate the unusual, honor the imaginative — and spur people’s interest in science, medicine, and technology.” This roundtable solicits brief presentations that explore the comical, the surprising, or the absurd in eighteenth-century science writing.

**24. Quarrels of Inoculation [SECFS, Society for 18<sup>th</sup>-century French Studies]** Pierre Saint-Amand, Yale University, [pierre.saint-amand@yale.edu](mailto:pierre.saint-amand@yale.edu)

This panel invites papers on the controversies surrounding the question of inoculation in the eighteenth century. To what extent is inoculation an ideal locus for reexamining the question of Enlightenment and its heritage? Perspectives may be historical, medical, literary and may involve different voices: the opposing camps of partisans and anti-inoculists, savants and uninformed voices, doctors and patients. Topics that might be considered include the various myths associated with the experimental procedure: debates around science and progress, enlightenment and superstition. The question of inoculation opens up global considerations involving European and the colonial populations as well as a politics of health, perceptions of death, human survival, and life.

Ce panel invite des présentations sur les controverses qui ont entouré la question de l'inoculation au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. L'inoculation est-elle d'ailleurs un lieu idéal d'interrogation des Lumières et de son héritage. Les perspectives peuvent être historiques, médicales, ou littéraires et impliquer les camps opposés: partisans et anti-inoculistes, savants et mécréants, médecins et patients. Les sujets peuvent considérer les mythes associés à la fameuse opération, les débats impliquant la science et le progrès, les lumières et les croyances. La question de l'inoculation s'étend à une perspective globale qui prend en considération les populations européennes et coloniales, ainsi qu'une politique de la santé concernant la vie, la mort, et la survie des humains.

**25. Visions of Empire: An Interdisciplinary Roundtable / Visions de l'Empire: Une Table Ronde Interdisciplinaire (Roundtable) [SECFS Society for 18<sup>th</sup>-century French Studies]**  
Christy Pichichero, George Mason University, [cpichich@gmu.edu](mailto:cpichich@gmu.edu)

The Society for Eighteenth-Century French Studies invites proposals for a roundtable discussion interrogating our scholarly approaches to envisioning French empire during the eighteenth century. What have recent studies and methodological innovations allowed us to visualize regarding the different dimensions of the French imperial project and the experiences of imperialized peoples in the Americas, Africa, South Asia, and elsewhere? What limitations in scholarly approaches—theoretical, disciplinary, linguistic, archival, etc.—must be overcome and how might we foster progress? How can these considerations regarding visions of empire inform and enhance our teaching? Perspectives engaging African diasporic studies, Indigenous studies, South Asian Studies, digital humanities, the performing arts, art history, the history of science, material, military, economic, political history, and other fields of inquiry are most welcome.

La SECFS sollicite l'envoi de propositions pour une discussion des approches scientifiques à la visualisation de l'empire français au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Qu'avons nous appris des recherches récentes, des innovations méthodologiques, qui nous permettent de mieux visualiser les dimensions du projet impérial français ainsi que les expériences des « impérialisé.e.s » en Amérique, Afrique, l'Inde, et ailleurs ? Quelles sont les limitations—théorétiques, disciplinaires, linguistiques, archivistiques, et autres—que l'on doit surmonter pour mieux visualiser les phénomènes de l'empire? Comment ces considérations sur la visualisation et l'empire peuvent-elles façonner et enrichir l'enseignement? Nous encourageons des perspectives sur la visualisation venant d'autres disciplines comme par exemple l'étude de la diaspora Africaine, des Premières Nations/Amérindien.e.s, des Indien.ne.s, des humanités numériques, des arts du spectacle, des beaux-arts/arts plastiques, l'histoire scientifique, matérielle, militaire, économique, et d'autres champs d'enquête.

**26. Women Performing Empire [Theatre and Performance Caucus (TaPS)]** Angelina Del Balzo (Bilkent University) [angelina@bilkent.edu.tr](mailto:angelina@bilkent.edu.tr) and Willow White (McGill University), [willow.white@mail.mcgill.ca](mailto:willow.white@mail.mcgill.ca)

Female playwrights and performers in London capitalized on the popularity of dramas set in the East and the so-called New World. Featuring spectacular set designs and elaborate costumes, these plays provided an opportunity for innovations in stage technologies. Productions such as *The Siege of Rhodes* ramped up the status of the actress and evoked a sense of the global eighteenth century. Off stage, women adopted turbans and other eastern ornamentations for portraiture, subversively presenting themselves as cosmopolitan citizens of the empire even as they were denied citizenship at home. How did the empire function as an imaginative and political opportunity for English women? How did women's performances of empire contribute to developing racist visual vocabulary of Orientalism? In what ways do we see continuities between eighteenth-century feminist Orientalism and white feminism in performance today?

**27. Animals and Other Non-Human Performers [Theatre and Performance Caucus (TaPS)]** Fiona Ritchie (McGill University) [fiona.ritchie@mcgill.ca](mailto:fiona.ritchie@mcgill.ca) and Diana Solomon (Simon Fraser University), [diana\\_solomon@sfu.ca](mailto:diana_solomon@sfu.ca)

This panel will consider the rich history of non-human performance on the eighteenth-century stage. From William Penkethman's dancing dogs at Bartholomew Fair in 1707 to the elephant on stage at Covent Garden in 1812 to the equestrian displays at Astley's Amphitheatre, animals were regular performers in both popular entertainment venues and patent theatres. Non-sentient performance developed in conjunction with advances in mechanical computing, natural history, and theatrical technology and against a backdrop of empire that pursued the acquisition and display of the exotic. While Samuel Foote and Charlotte Charke brought satire to London audiences through puppetry, complex automata such as Pierre Jaquet-Droz's "Writer" and Wolfgang von Kempelen's chess-playing "Turk" thrilled the courts of Europe. In many cases, these non-human actors achieved their own celebrity status. Papers are invited that explore the non-human performer in conjunction with other topics, such as science, education, entertainment, and/or colonialism.

**28. Administration: Meaningful & Material Feminist Leadership [Women's Caucus]** Mary Beth Harris ([harrismb@bethanylb.edu](mailto:harrismb@bethanylb.edu)) and Nicole Aljoe ([n.aljoe@northeastern.edu](mailto:n.aljoe@northeastern.edu))

As a continuation of the Women's Caucus' investment in making service and labor visible, this panel will consider how to use service, specifically administrative work, in meaningful ways. How can we use administrative work, often seen as onerous or distracting, as a place to make structural change and advocate for underrepresented groups among our faculty, research communities, and students? This is work we feel is incredibly necessary, but which is not often discussed or represented enough at our annual meetings.

**29. Exhausted Women: Female Fatigue in the Eighteenth Century (Roundtable) [Women's Caucus]** Hannah Doherty Hudson ([hhudson@suffolk.edu](mailto:hhudson@suffolk.edu)) and Vivian Papp ([vpapp@fordham.edu](mailto:vpapp@fordham.edu))

This roundtable invites short papers that engage with the relationship between gender and exhaustion in eighteenth-century literature, art, music, and history. We hope to explore issues including (but not limited to) work and overwork; gender, labor and advocacy; disability; gendered expectations and (de)valuation of different kinds of work; parenting and caretaking; prejudice and discrimination; and emotional labor.

**30. Sylvia Wynter's 18th Century (Roundtable)** Tita Chico, University of Maryland, [tchico@umd.edu](mailto:tchico@umd.edu)

The philosopher Sylvia Wynter (1928-) has a monumental corpus that variously challenges the idea of "the human." Wynter, as Kandice Chuh observes in *The Difference Aesthetics Makes* (2019), "has insisted on taking Western humanism and its manifestations in the practices of racial colonialism as objects of knowledge." Through "knots of ideas and histories and narratives that can only be legible in relation to one another," Wynter's philosophy urges intellectual paths that undo, as Katherine McKittrick argues in *Sylvia Wynter: On Being Human as Praxis* (2015), "systems of racial violence and their attendant knowledge systems that produce this racial violence as 'commonsense.'"

“Sylvia Wynter’s 18th Century” centers the work of this major philosopher and invites considerations of her theories of humanness in reimagining eighteenth-century studies—its archives, practices, objects, methodologies, subjects. How might Wynter’s work bring into focus what Lisa Lowe, in *The Intimacies of Four Continents* (2015), calls “intimacy” with modern, Western liberalism and the global conditions upon which it depends, dividing modern liberal subjects from those “that are forgotten, cast as failed or irrelevant because they do not produce ‘value’ legible within modern classifications”? How does Wynter’s philosophy open paths for the ethical questioning and radical undoing of “systems of racial violence and their attendant knowledge systems that produce this racial violence as ‘commonsense’” (McKittrick)? In what ways, and in what moments, might Wynter’s philosophy allow us to apprehend how race, location, and time together inform what it means to be human, and what this might signify for eighteenth-century studies?

**31. Queer and Now (Roundtable)** George Haggerty, University of California, Riverside, [gehaggerty@yahoo.com](mailto:gehaggerty@yahoo.com)

In her book *Tendencies*, Eve Sedgwick reminds us that queer can refer to “that open mesh of possibilities, gaps, overlaps, dissonances, and resonances, lapses, and excesses of meaning when the constituent elements of anyone’s gender, of anyone’s sexuality aren’t made (or can’t be made) to signify monolithically.” Sedgwick goes on to describe our “experimental linguistic, epistemological, representational, political adventures” in Queer Studies. In roundtable format, let’s consider the Queer and Now of the Eighteenth Century, and its own experimental linguistic, epistemological, representational, and political adventures. Let’s also consider what it means to re-deploy Sedgwick’s terminology, in our own almost “post-queer” moment, to queer the acts, objects, and people of the eighteenth century.

**32. Why the Women Were So Exhausted: Patriarchy in the Eighteenth Century**  
(Roundtable) Manushag N. Powell, Purdue University, [mpowell@purdue.edu](mailto:mpowell@purdue.edu)

Inspired by the Women’s Caucus sponsored roundtable, this complementary roundtable seeks short presentations on the ways that male inaction—or, just as often, malicious, inappropriate, or misguided male action—created additional labor and labor complications for women both historically and in cultural forms such as theatre, art, literature, music, and history. From the Mr. Bennets to the Sir John Hawkins: as unhelpful patrons, hardheaded fathers, exploitative employers, how did men make not just work, but more work, for women?

**33. The Enlightenment and the Shadows of the Occult** Benjamin Hoffmann, The Ohio State University, [Hoffmann.312@osu.edu](mailto:Hoffmann.312@osu.edu)

The age of reason and Voltairean skepticism was also a time of wonder-seeking and marvels, during which a broad range of supernatural practices and beliefs—such as alchemy, astrology, divination, prophecy, rejuvenation, spiritism, and transmigration—were passionately explored and debated. This panel seeks to examine the cultural origins and development of an occult tradition during the eighteenth century and its complex interplay with the unfolding of rationalism. Papers could address occult beliefs and practices as they were represented across a variety of literary genres in eighteenth-century literature (novels, philosophical tales, plays, memoirs...), or they

could investigate how the discourse of occultism was engaged in eighteenth-century social and political debates. Participants are also encouraged to consider the intellectual itinerary of historical figures such as Cagliostro, Casanova, Cazotte, Court de Gebelin, Mesmer, and Saint Martin. To propose a paper, please email a 250-word abstract and a c.v. to [hoffmann.312.osu.edu](mailto:hoffmann.312.osu.edu).

**34. Curious Taste: The Transatlantic Appeal of Satire** Nancy Siegel, Towson University, Towson, Maryland; Allison Stagg, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Germany, [nsiegel@towson.edu](mailto:nsiegel@towson.edu)

Satirical prints, whether published in Britain, Europe, or America during the long eighteenth century were widely consumed, circulated, and collected. Displayed and presented in various formats for a growing consumer audience, these works from the “golden age of caricature,” demonstrate the manner in which print culture functioned as a disseminating voice for satirists who used comedic and often bawdy imagery to express criticism and dissent during the turbulent end of the eighteenth century and beginning of the nineteenth century. Giving visual form to critiques and commentaries on current events, contemporary affairs, public figures and politicians, satire gave voice to the body politic. Through explorations of how the visual culture of satirical prints functioned in the long eighteenth century, we invite papers from scholars at all ranks, affiliated and independent, that address inquiries such as how were collections amassed, to whom did satirical prints appeal, and what characteristics contributed to their enduring popularity? By what means were prints advertised, displayed, and discussed? Further, what was the role of the print seller? What was the market for such prints? While there is little dispute over the enduring popularity of eighteenth and nineteenth-century satirical prints and caricatures, this session considers the role of the collector and collecting and what is known of individual collectors. Often dismissed or relegated to a caption or footnote, these individuals, for whom such artistry or content was eye catching, are largely responsible for the existence of the satirical impressions found in museum collections today.

**35. The Eighteenth-Century Last Will and Testament** Pamela Phillips, Department of Hispanic Studies, University of Puerto Rico-Rio Piedras, [phillips.pamela@gmail.com](mailto:phillips.pamela@gmail.com)

The last will and testament is a legal document that can tell a lot about the testator, such as how he or she lived, what was important to them, and their personal relationships. The study of wills and estate inventories offers a point of entry to probe and uncover aspects of the legal structure, daily life, and material culture in the eighteenth century. The details left in writing can range from financial legacies and burdens, burial choices, marriage and family traditions, valued possessions to possible surprises hidden amongst the bequests. This interdisciplinary panel invites papers that explore the eighteenth-century last will and testimony, both real documents and their fictional treatment. Panelists may consider the intersection of eighteenth-century estate planning with issues of race, gender, class, economics, culture, and politics. All approaches and disciplines are welcome.

**36. Lady Anne Barnard (1750-1825): Life, Writing, Art, Archive** Greg Clingham, [clingham@bucknell.edu](mailto:clingham@bucknell.edu)

This panel aims to generate interest in the little-known yet fascinating Lady Anne Lindsay Barnard (1750-1825), someone whose literary and artistic corpus is large, interesting, distinguished, mostly unpublished, seldom discussed, and yet variously implicated in cultural, social, literary and artistic features of the late 18th and the early 19th centuries. Born to an ancient Jacobite Scots family, the Earls of Balcarres, and raised under the auspices of the Edinburgh literati, Anne Lindsay traveled to Paris during the Revolution (1785 and 1791) and to the Cape of Good Hope (1797-1802) with the 1st British administration under George Macartney, where her husband, Andrew Barnard, was colonial secretary. She produced not only the anthologised ballad “Auld Robin Grey” (written 1772, published by Scott in 1825) but also letters, diaries, travelogues, a memoir, romances, poems, drawings and watercolors that reveal a penetrating, informed, historically aware, and witty mind of remarkable range and sympathies engaged with important political and cultural issues—from domestic policy to London society to the French Revolution to the Irish “question” to slavery to racial and cultural difference and to the problematics of empire, including India (where two brothers served, one dying, the other imprisoned), Jamaica (where another brother was governor), and the Cape. Papers on any aspect of Lady Anne Barnard’s life, writing, art, and archive are invited, or on any of the social, cultural, literary, historical, bibliographical, or archival contexts in which she and her work are located that might be illuminating.

**37. Decolonize This! The Practice of Everyday Eighteenth-Century Studies (Lightning Talks)** Kathleen Wilson, Distinguished Professor of History, Stony Brook University, Mita Choudhury, Professor of English, Purdue University Northwest, [choudhur@purdue.edu](mailto:choudhur@purdue.edu)

The economic and expansionist imperatives of eighteenth-century British institutions are inextricable from early capitalist instruments of exclusivity and exclusion, exploitation of labor and manipulation of nature, scientific discovery and speculative globalism. Focusing on the foundational principles of, for instance, the Royal Exchange, the Bank of England (financial institutions), the East India Company, and The Royal African Company (corporations), this panel might consider questions such as the following: Is it possible to separate history or story telling from the imperial matrices and racial capitalism that have for so long produced these registers? Can we discover ways to decolonize our categories such as gender, race and class, identity and alterity, north and south, center and periphery and other time/space grids of geopolitics? How can we question our still dichotomized modes of knowledge acquisition while continuing to write history “as we know it”? Or do we necessarily have to adopt a view from the global south—which has come to represent the perspective of dispossessed actors across nations and cultures? What is the future, if any, of pluriversality? Panelists will submit their short papers in advance (date TBD), be prepared to participate in lightening talks, and engage in discussion/Q&A.

**38. Complaint: Institutions, Power, and other Problems** Allison Cardon, University at Buffalo, [allison.l.cardon@gmail.com](mailto:allison.l.cardon@gmail.com)

This panel invites papers that examine how the dynamic of complaint surfaces during the long eighteenth century. How did writers think about complaint? How do different types of complaint--official legal complaint, unofficial, satirical complaint, personal, private, popular, or

public complaint--map out and respond to new political relationships, identities, and contests throughout the century?

Sara Ahmed has argued that as soon as one makes a complaint about an institution, one becomes a problem to be addressed, managed, and disciplined. What is the relationship between complaints and political and cultural institutions in this period? What role does literature play in the elaboration, justification, or disavowal of complaints? Do complaints affirm rights? Do they help us to imagine new ones? Do they undermine or consolidate institutional power? What does complaint allow writers to understand about institutional power and what does it obscure? How do different complaint traditions interact with their legal and political forms? What can eighteenth-century accounts of complaint teach us about critiquing and consolidating institutional power?

**39. Race and On-Screen Imaginings of the Long Eighteenth Century (Roundtable)** Lillian Lu (UCLA, [LLU71@ucla.edu](mailto:LLU71@ucla.edu)) and Miranda Hoegberg (UCLA, [mhoegberg@g.ucla.edu](mailto:mhoegberg@g.ucla.edu))

This roundtable seeks papers that discuss the narrative and cultural ramifications of contemporary filmic representations of the eighteenth century and their relationships to race, gender, sexuality, and power. What does it mean for the long eighteenth century to be such a popular site of alternative-historical reimaginings, especially for romance? Wildly popular contemporary shows such as *Outlander* (2014-present), *Harlots* (2017-2019), and *Bridgerton* (2020), feature characters of color in crucial roles, more and more frequently as romantic interests. However, these reimaginings are conscious to varying degrees of historical context and audience reception, and they present problems of their own. By bringing together the eighteenth century and the twenty-first, we will ask questions such as: How do these cultural objects and representations of the eighteenth century construct and/or trouble whiteness? In including characters of color and writing alt-historical narratives, how do they work to destabilize, critique, or endorse empire, slavery, and the project of Orientalism? How do these filmic representations negotiate their relationships to the eighteenth century and to the contemporary moment--and, to what end?

**40. Poetry's Problem with the "Bartleby Problem"** Carmen Faye Mathes, University of Regina Dept of English, [mathesca@gmail.com](mailto:mathesca@gmail.com)

"I believed the quirk that made novelists novelists was an ability to say no to the world. But as a poet, I couldn't break the habit of trying to make the world and thus my lived life into an art object" (85) – Billy-Ray Belcourt, *A History of my Brief Body*

"Nothing incites the passions like dispassion." So says Wendy Anne Lee, whose work on the "Bartleby Problem" in eighteenth century literature focuses on characters who would prefer not to, and on the intense feeling that their unfeeling provokes. In James Noggle's recent book on Enlightenment insensibility, unfeeling affects too serve the purposes of plot, helping female protagonists get from "point A" (dispassion) to "point B" (passionate, amorous attachments) without losing their virtue. Yet when dispassion appears in forms and genres other than the novel, how might its paradoxical engine of refusal drive relational dynamics beyond or beside those of narrative and plot? This panel invites papers on the "Bartleby Problem" in poetry or, perhaps, on poetry's problem with the "Bartleby Problem." Across a long-eighteenth century that includes Romanticism, papers might consider the relationship between unfeeling and poetic

form; the possibility of the unfeeling poet (can such a figure exist?); or other questions about refusal, recalcitrance, radical passivity, etc. Papers might also examine the history and politics of poetry that provokes such dynamics of feeling and unfeeling.

Please submit a short bio and abstracts of 250 words or less to [carmen.mathes@uregina.ca](mailto:carmen.mathes@uregina.ca)

**41. Mozart and Salzburg** Bruce Alan Brown, University of Southern California,  
[brucebro@usc.edu](mailto:brucebro@usc.edu)

In a letter to Abbé Joseph Bullinger, written on August 7, 1778 from Paris, Mozart states bluntly, “Salzburg is no place for my talent!” He then goes on to enumerate all the ways that he felt Salzburg was inadequate: the court musicians don’t have a good reputation; there is no theater or opera; there are no singers; the orchestra is “rich in what is useless and unnecessary—and very poor in what is essential”; there is not even a decent kapellmeister. Nevertheless, Mozart spent most of his first twenty-five years composing and playing in the Salzburg court orchestra and at the Cathedral. Of course, Mozart was supposed to resume his duties in Salzburg after visiting Vienna in the spring of 1781, but he only returned to his home town for a few months in 1783. Ahead of the joint international conference of the Mozart Society of America and the Society for Eighteenth-Century Music, to be held in Salzburg, May 26–29, 2022, this panel will explore all aspects of Mozart and Salzburg, including Wolfgang’s early education and travel, especially to the nearby court at Munich; the music of Leopold Mozart, Michael Haydn, Giacomo Rust, as well as the other singers and instrumentalists at the Salzburg court; traveling opera troupes, especially Emanuel Schikaneder’s residence in Salzburg in 1780; and finally the works that Mozart wrote for Salzburg: his chamber music and serenades, symphonies and concertos, masses and other church music, and operas. All relevant topics will be considered. Presentations by graduate students and junior scholars are warmly encouraged.

**42. Performing the Eighteenth Century Today** Ellen Welch, University of North Carolina,  
Chapel Hill, [erwelch@email.unc.edu](mailto:erwelch@email.unc.edu)

This session considers dance, drama and music from the global eighteenth century through the lens of reconstruction and performance. What makes a work interesting, relevant, or even acceptable to a contemporary audience? To what extent can production choices (staging, casting, etc.) expand the limits of the performable and encourage audiences to see both past and present differently? How can performance allow us to engage critically with eighteenth-century ideologies of race, ethnicity, gender, and class from a twenty-first-century perspective? Can we imagine new lives in performance for works considered “ephemeral”—either because that were designed for settings that are foreign to today’s performing arts environments, or because they relied on knowledges and techniques no longer widely in use? How can approaching the performing-arts archive as a repertoire for future performance inspire new ways of doing research on the eighteenth century?

This panel seeks submissions from scholars in or outside academia at any career stage, as well as from performing-arts professionals. Contributions informed by the experience of staging (or planning to stage) an eighteenth-century work are especially encouraged. Performance-as-Research approaches are also particularly welcome.

Please submit a 300-word proposal and a short bio to [erwelch@email.unc.edu](mailto:erwelch@email.unc.edu)



**43. Literary Play in Eighteenth-Century France and its Colonies / Jeux littéraires au XVIIIe en France et ses colonies** Gemma Tidman, University of Oxford,  
[gemma.tidman@mod-langs.ox.ac.uk](mailto:gemma.tidman@mod-langs.ox.ac.uk)

‘On joue beaucoup aujourd’hui dans le monde’ (Diderot, ‘Jouer’, Encyclopédie).

Scholars have shown the prevalence of play across early modern French society, from gambling, to sport, to playful art. Yet, French literary play often remains associated with modern movements such as OuLiPo. This panel invites papers exploring the eighteenth-century history of literary play in France and its colonies. What did literary play look like in this period? Who engaged in it, how, and to what ends? The panel welcomes papers in English or French and from all disciplinary angles, potentially addressing: literary play in visual or material culture, pedagogical games, playful literary genres, word play, theories or criticisms of literary games, ludic practices of diverse publics. Please send 250-word abstracts + brief bio.

La recherche a démontré l’omniprésence des pratiques ludiques dans la France moderne, tels les jeux d’argent, du sport, ou de l’art enjoué. Pourtant, les jeux littéraires restent souvent associés à des mouvements contemporains comme OuLiPo. Ce panel invite des présentations sur l’histoire des jeux littéraires au XVIIIe siècle, en France et ses colonies. À quoi ressemblaient les jeux littéraires pendant cette période? Qui s’engageait dans ce type d’activité ludique, comment, et à quelles fins? Nous encourageons des communications, en anglais ou français, de toutes perspectives disciplinaires, qui peuvent considérer: les jeux littéraires dans la culture visuelle ou matérielle, jeux pédagogiques, genres littéraires ludiques, jeux de mots, théories ou critiques des jeux littéraires, pratiques ludiques de publics diversifiés. Veuillez envoyer des propositions de 250 mots + courte biographie.

**44. Smollett's Bodyminds (Roundtable)** Jason Farr, Marquette University,  
[jason.farr@marquette.edu](mailto:jason.farr@marquette.edu)

A trained physician, Tobias Smollett often narrated the unruliness of the body and mind in his fiction, and his characters reveal how profoundly interconnected body and mind are (hence, the use of "bodymind" in this panel’s title). As Aileen Douglas notes, Smollett is known generally for the “physicality of his writing” and for representing “the body at risk.” From the 1960s through the present, his fiction has been examined in interdisciplinary scholarship ranging from the history of health and medicine to gender, queer, and disability studies. With these critical traditions in mind, this panel seeks papers that address any of the following in Smollett’s fiction or biography: the history of health/medicine, disability, illness, pain, gender, sexuality, queerness, race, aging, pregnancy, humoral theory, sensibility, and other relevant topics.

**45. Women and the Law (Seminar discussion of pre-circulated papers)** Stephanie Insley Hershinow, Baruch College, City University of New York, [stephanie.insley@gmail.com](mailto:stephanie.insley@gmail.com);  
Kelly Fleming, Kenyon College, [fleming1@kenyon.edu](mailto:fleming1@kenyon.edu)

This seminar invites work by scholars exploring any facet of legal studies that highlights the role of women. Participants may share research on specific laws (e.g., the legal doctrine of partus sequitur ventrum, the Hardwicke Marriage Act, Acts of Union) or on more theoretical legal issues (e.g., copyright, libel, personhood, property, sexual violation). We invite work from across disciplines and national traditions, and from scholars working at any career stage and any type of

institution or affiliation. We are hoping to gather together both veterans of work on eighteenth-century legal matters as well as newcomers to the subfield, exploring legal questions for the first time.

This session will take the form of a seminar-style discussion of pre-circulated works in progress, inspired by the successful adoption of this model at the Shakespeare Association of America and the German Studies Association, as well as the occasional prior use of this model at ASECS. We hope to attract around 10 participants, who will be asked to circulate work in progress of around 15-20 pgs. in advance of the conference (likely around late February). For inclusion, please send a brief abstract of 250-500 words and a short bio to Stephanie Insley Hershinow ([stephanie.hershinow@baruch.cuny.edu](mailto:stephanie.hershinow@baruch.cuny.edu)) and Kelly Fleming ([kf5jz@virginia.edu](mailto:kf5jz@virginia.edu)).

Before the conference: The organizers will arrange pairs or small groups of participants, who will be expected to read each other's work in advance and provide targeted feedback. Participants will be able but not required to read all of the papers. We will also encourage further optional participation in advance of the session, including the creation of a suggested reading list and collaboratively-written questions for the group.

During the conference: The organizers (having read all of the contributions) will moderate a group discussion of the major themes, issues, and methodologies represented by the papers. While only those participants who precirculate work will be prepared to contribute to the session's conversation, we also will also invite interested auditors to attend and will set aside time at the end of the session for questions and contributions from auditors.

After the conference: The organizers will encourage post-conference collaboration, including fostering co-authorship opportunities, supporting future peer-reviewed publication, and seeking out venues for sharing work with a larger audience.

#### **46. Trial by Combat: Paper, Pen, or Pistol** Yvonne Fuentes, [yfuentes@westga.edu](mailto:yfuentes@westga.edu)

Feuds and quarrels caused by rivalry, jealousy, envy, or political opposition were not uncommon in the eighteenth century, and often led to "combat" in the form of duels with swords, pistols or cudgels as in Goya's mural painting, or duels with words. The controversies between Voltaire and Rousseau, Fielding and Richardson, Forner and Iriarte, or the proliferation of satirical pamphlets and scathing polemics, as well as the number of fictional duels (*El delincuente honrado*, *Manolo*) and real duels (Hamilton and Burr, Gwinnett and McIntosh), for example, reveal a time of deep divisions and seemingly irreconcilable differences. We invite papers that explore the causes and outcomes of conflicts that were dealt with by weapon or word. Please send a 250-word abstract and a short 1-page cv to Yvonne Fuentes at [yfuentes@westga.edu](mailto:yfuentes@westga.edu)

#### **47. The Gender Non-Binary Eighteenth Century (Roundtable)** Ula Lukszo Klein, [kleinu@uwosh.edu](mailto:kleinu@uwosh.edu)

Up until recently, academic work on non-heterosexual and gender nonconforming people in the eighteenth century came under the heading "queer." "Queer" has served as the go-to word for critical enquiries into non-normative desires, bodies and practices, as well as a discursive tool for questioning normative assumptions about time, space, landscape, capital, and even aesthetics and knowledge. Discussions about persons or representations of gender non-binary individuals also used the term queer, or, increasingly, trans. Recent debates about how to understand Anne Lister and her secret diaries in which she details her affairs with women and declares her love of the

“fair sex” have drawn attention to a plethora of terminology that expands our understanding of gender and sexual non-conforming individuals. What happens when we consider a person like Anne Lister or the Chevalier d’Eon to be genderqueer or gender non-binary? Or if we think about Charlotte Charke as gender fluid and her partner Mrs. Brown as pansexual?

This session solicits speakers who will address the idea of gender non-binary identities, persons, and representations in eighteenth-century literature and/or the usefulness of considering eighteenth-century persons/characters as gender non-binary, gender fluid, genderqueer, or other similar terms current in today’s society but not used, as such, in the eighteenth century. Also of interest are the people who desire gender non-binary individuals, whether on the page, on the stage, or in the historical record. How might our understanding of their desires and relationships read differently in this context—as bisexual, pansexual, or something else entirely?

**48. Crafted Lives** Chloe Wigston Smith, University of York, [chloe.wigstonsmith@york.ac.uk](mailto:chloe.wigstonsmith@york.ac.uk); Jennie Batchelor, University of Kent, [J.E.Batchelor@kent.ac.uk](mailto:J.E.Batchelor@kent.ac.uk)

We invite proposals that address the teaching and making of needlework by women and girls in the transatlantic eighteenth century. In recent years, the "material turn" has generated new approaches to material culture and maker's knowledge in eighteenth-century studies. Yet skills such as needlework and embroidery often remain underestimated, falling under the collection of "female accomplishments" perceived, then and now, as symptomatic of the undereducation and oppression of women and girls. "Crafted Lives" seeks to reorient attention to the transfer of knowledge, aesthetics and techniques that circulated back and forth across the Atlantic. We're especially keen on proposals that make visible the politics of needlework and the complexities of women's handicrafts and their experiences of learning, making and teaching needlework over the lifecycle. How did material literacy intersect with or diverge from textual literacy? How did needlework forms articulate their makers' emotions and their cultural, religious and political beliefs? How did some of these material contributions engage debates about abolition, empire and women’s rights? How did 18th-century craft knowledge circulate within/between classes, households and institutions, the provinces and the metropole, and within colonial spaces? We welcome abstracts from across the disciplines represented by ASECS members, as well as abstracts that draw on a range of archives. Please send abstracts of 250-300 words to Chloe Wigston Smith at [chloe.wigstonsmith@york.ac.uk](mailto:chloe.wigstonsmith@york.ac.uk) and Jennie Batchelor at [J.E.Batchelor@kent.ac.uk](mailto:J.E.Batchelor@kent.ac.uk).

**49. The Costs of Contagion: Gender, Race, Disability, and the Uneven Impacts of the Pandemic (Roundtable)** Pichaya (Mint) Damrongpiwat, Cornell University, [pd358@cornell.edu](mailto:pd358@cornell.edu)

This roundtable invites scholars to reflect together on the costs of the pandemic’s many contagion(s), which includes, but is not limited to, health and illness, child and family care, emotional labor, “essential” labor, financial insecurity, and job precarity. In particular, this roundtable wishes to highlight how labor is embodied in gendered, racialized, and/or disabled ways, all of which pose additional burdens to scholars of all ranks during the pandemic. It also reflects on the ways that the pandemic has invoked longstanding forms of anti-Asian racism as another kind of “cost” or toll exacted unevenly on people of color within the context of systemic racism in society at large, calling attention to both present and historical forms of anti-Asian

racism such as the “Chinese virus” and Yellow Peril. In thinking through ideas of “contagion” in the eighteenth century and at present, this roundtable also invites perspectives from the medical humanities and/or science & technology studies.

**50. Teaching Austen and Intersectionality (Roundtable)** Kit Kincade, Indiana State University, [kit.kincade@indstate.edu](mailto:kit.kincade@indstate.edu)

Given the sweeping changes being made to curriculums, students are seeking a more diverse approach to traditional canonical texts, and currently Austen and late eighteenth-century literature and cultural studies have been in the forefront. With popular programs such as *Bridgerton* and *Sanditon* not just being popularized in the media, but being dissected and causing serious reevaluations of how we discuss presentation and representation, students want to engage with literary and historical studies that situate conversations in areas that have been neglected and under-represented in the classroom. Representations of BIPOC, disabilities, and gender identities both in literary and historical figures are emerging in new critical discourses. How these conversations play out in both our evolving understanding of Austen and her period and/or how we are seeing these conversations unfold in current media, have repercussions for students and faculty moving forward. This panel seeks papers, discussion of exercises, pedagogical suggestions, and real-world experiences in helping us be better educators in these fields for our students.

**51. Royal Scandals** Linda Zionkowski, Ohio University, [zionkows@ohio.edu](mailto:zionkows@ohio.edu)

From the warming-pan baby to the affair of the diamond necklace, scandals involving royal families in Britain and on the Continent riveted public attention throughout the long eighteenth century, principally by means of their depiction in printed material and visual images. Whether involving financial, political, sexual, or dynastic matters, scandal increasingly carried the danger of destabilizing the foundation of royal authority: as the spectacle of real or fabricated transgressions both amused and alarmed the public, royal personages found themselves exposed to critiques whose intensity, scope, and virulence proved difficult to contain. This panel will focus on the cultural and social significance of royal scandals: examining printed and/or visual texts, papers might investigate the means by which scandals were fashioned (or “discovered”) and disseminated; the range of public reactions to perceived scandalous behavior; the intersections of scandal and celebrity; and the damaging reflections on the legitimacy of royal prerogative that scandals encouraged.

**52. How We Read Then: A Seminar with a Common Text (Seminar)** James Mulholland, North Carolina State University, [mulholland@ncsu.edu](mailto:mulholland@ncsu.edu) / Courtney Weiss Smith, Wesleyan University, [csmith03@wesleyan.edu](mailto:csmith03@wesleyan.edu)

What were the principles by which poetry was read in the eighteenth century? How did authors and readers adjudicate among competing claims for where poetry came from and what roles it could play in society?

This session proposes an innovative format to investigate the intersections of historicist and formalist reading. It will be organized as a seminar with each participant taking an active

role in the discussion of a single pre-circulated common text. This is inspired by successful common text seminars at Historical Poetics workshops.

The common text for this inaugural gathering will be the rich, complicated, controversial James Burnett, Lord Monboddo's *Of the Origin and Progress of Language* (1773-92). Selected excerpts will include his discussions of the relationship between human and animal sounds, his primitivist understandings of indigenous poetry and society, and his account of English verse and music. We will also consider the relations between and among these topics. Against the always-tempting tendency to read in anachronistic ways, this gathering will grapple with the complex methods of one influential eighteenth-century reader.

Details about the special format: This format is uniquely horizontal and inclusive, allowing many voices to all engage together. The entire session is premised on conversation rather than presentation. Anyone interested is welcome to participate in the discussion. There is no need to write up a formal proposal--please just fill out [this linked form](#), so we can contact you before the conference with the shared readings. We would like particularly to encourage graduate students and early career scholars, who will have as key a role in the discussion as any one else in the room.

### **53. Affect Theory and 18th-Century Studies: Taking Stock, Looking Ahead (Roundtable)**

Stephen Ahern, Acadia University, [stephen.ahern@acadiu.ca](mailto:stephen.ahern@acadiu.ca)

Emerging of late has been an approach to the culture of feeling that draws on the insights of affect theory to bring to light previously unnoticed aspects of the affective life and art of our period. This roundtable aims to take stock of work done so far, and to ask where this new field of study might go next. Key questions for participants to consider include:

What is the utility of applying an affect theory approach to the study of our period? Is such an approach amenable only to the Age of Sensibility, or of relevance to the long eighteenth century conceived more broadly? Are different aspects of affect theory particularly relevant to different disciplines? What contributions can an affect theory approach make that differ from histories of emotions? Are there drawbacks to an approach informed by recent affect theory? Once the operations of affect have been noted in eighteenth-century cultural productions ... in what directions might research on affect go next?

Participation welcome from scholars whose take on affect theory is enthusiastic, or skeptical, or somewhere in between; the goal is to have an open debate about the contributions of such work to study of our period, and more broadly to assess the legacies of an "affective turn" whose impacts have been playing out for two decades now.

Please send a brief statement providing an overview of the topic(s) you'd like to address, along with a brief bio, to Stephen Ahern at [stephen.ahern@acadiu.ca](mailto:stephen.ahern@acadiu.ca).

### **54. Arts of the Table in Global Perspective Sarah R Cohen, University at Albany, SUNY, [scohen@albany.edu](mailto:scohen@albany.edu)**

For elite and middle-class consumers in the eighteenth century, dining entailed a variety of forms of artistry: in addition to food preparation itself, elaborate attention was often paid to tableware, rituals of consumptive performance, as well as written texts that alternately prescribed, described and imagined the process of consuming food and drink as physical and material enactment. All of these arts were moreover often global in scope, whether one took the perspective of diners in

Europe or of those in other parts of the world; through international commerce, colonization, travel, and curiosity food and its consumptive arts manifested multiple points of intersection, exploitation and even hybridization among countries and cultures. This panel seeks papers that address any aspect of the arts of dining, viewed through the lens of an increasingly globalized eighteenth-century world.

**55. Transplanted Lives and Foreign Presence: The Visual Culture of Immigrants in Eighteenth-Century Europe** Marina Kliger, Metropolitan Museum of Art; and Thea Goldring, Harvard University, [Marina.Kliger@metmuseum.org](mailto:Marina.Kliger@metmuseum.org)

During the long eighteenth century, established commercial networks, expanding empires, political conflicts, and economies of slave labor contributed to the growing presence of foreign individuals and communities within Europe and the British Isles. These voluntary and forced transplants from the East and West Indies, the shores of the Mediterranean, and from across Europe itself became part of the urban fabric of increasingly cosmopolitan cities like London, Paris, Marseilles, Venice, and Amsterdam. Building on the work of Denise Murrell and Ian Coller on France and Beth Fowkes Tobin, Rozina Visram, and Jennifer Germann on Britain, this panel considers the visual representation of these immigrant groups in Europe, as well as their own artistic practices within their host societies. Following recent scholarship that foregrounds the negotiation of difference within and the global character of Enlightenment culture, we ask: How did images of eighteenth-century Europe's foreign residents contribute to constructions of cultural difference and competing notions of cosmopolitan and national identity? How did these portrayals shape such communities' lived experiences? Conversely, how did foreign individuals exert agency through visual representation and negotiate their new societies through artistic practice? Finally, considering both the gaps and biases of the visual archive, what are the limits and dangers of using images as evidence of the historical presence of these groups in Europe? We particularly welcome papers that seek to recover the identities and lived experiences of persons represented in exoticizing studies, unidentified portraits, cosmopolitan city views, artist sketches, and the like.

**56. Time and Temporality in the Long Eighteenth Century** Helena Yoo Roth, The Graduate Center at the City University of New York, [hyoo@gradcenter.cuny.edu](mailto:hyoo@gradcenter.cuny.edu) & Alexandra M. Macdonald, The College of William & Mary [ammacdonald@email.wm.edu](mailto:ammacdonald@email.wm.edu)

In recent years there has been a growing interest across multiple disciplines in histories of time and temporality. Our current temporal moment has made questions of how we measure, mark, and engage with time feel especially salient. The pandemic has reminded us that time is fluid, constructed, and complex. Drawing inspiration from a recent Past & Present forum, we see the history of time and temporality as inherently interdisciplinary, highlighting the interconnections between "mingled pasts, presents and futures, of rhythms and tempi, of old and new, young and old." This panel welcomes papers on the topic of time and temporality in the eighteenth century. We are particularly interested in the many ways time and temporality were felt, embodied, and enacted across a variety of media and by people from across the social spectrum. We seek papers from a broad range of disciplines and approaches including, but not limited to, art history, material culture studies, literary studies, print culture, and social, cultural, and political history.

Additionally, we welcome submissions from scholars in and outside of academia at any stage in their program or career.

**57. It was Aliens: The Plurality of Worlds and Extraterrestrials in Eighteenth-Century Narrative** Ari Margolin, Syracuse University, [amargoli@syr.edu](mailto:amargoli@syr.edu)

This panel will explore the rich, albeit problematic tradition of the plurality of worlds and intelligent life narratives, from Voltaire's satirical conte *Micromégas* (1752) to Marie-Anne Robert de Roumier's *Voyages de Milord Céton dans les sept planètes* (1765-66). As Michael J. Crowe and Frédérique Aït-Touati have noted, early-modern plurality of worlds narratives generally served two purposes. On one hand, they were used to explain difficult scientific theories for a curious and often skeptical Republic of Letters. On the other hand, they were a subversive tool to criticize political, religious, and philosophical institutions. This dichotomy of institutionalizing scientific theories while subverting the traditional order is singularly expressed through the ultimate other within the plurality of worlds narrative: extraterrestrial, often humanoid creatures who frequently present the skeptical or opposing viewpoint. During the long Enlightenment in particular, extraterrestrials are depicted as either superior in their wisdom and intellect or the running punchline in a satirical joke. At the same time, writers and philosophers ran the risk of becoming "lunatics" in the eyes of the public for endorsing 'fantasy' and blasphemy with respect to serious science and scientific narrative, thus giving plurality of worlds a certain notoriety within the Republic of Letters and religious institutions. We welcome papers examining the dichotomous nature of extraterrestrial life during the Enlightenment as well as those which trace the evolution of the plurality of worlds narrative throughout the period.

**58. Women and Work in the Global Eighteenth Century** Elizabeth Franklin Lewis, University of Mary Washington, [elewis@umw.edu](mailto:elewis@umw.edu)

This session seeks contributions on eighteenth-century women and work from a variety of national, cultural, racial, and class perspectives. Some of the questions addressed in presentations might be: How did eighteenth-century women contribute to home, regional, or national economies with their work? How did eighteenth-century women view their work? How did their male counterpoints view women's work? How was women's work differentiated by class or race?

**59. Forging the Nation: British Union Identities in the Long Eighteenth Century** Phineas Dowling, Auburn University, [pwd0002@auburn.edu](mailto:pwd0002@auburn.edu)

As this year marks the 30th anniversary of Linda Colley's pivotal *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837* (1992), it seems fitting that we (re)consider the figure of the Briton in the eighteenth-century. This panel welcomes papers on literary, artistic, and material culture and history of the long eighteenth century with the goal of exploring the formation of British Union identities and "Britishness"—through artistic, cultural, national, martial, political, and many other discourses. Some questions the panel seeks to explore include: What does it mean to be British/Anglo-Scottish/Anglo-Irish/Anglo-Welsh or a subject of British imperialism/colonialism and if/how that meaning changes throughout the century? What role do racialized national, ethnic, and religious identities in this definition? How do the British characterize British identities (and how

might that be shaped by region, class, gender, etc.)? How do “non-British” Others (the French, Americans, enslaved Africans, indigenous peoples, etc.) characterize British identities? How are British Union and identities impacted by moments of political or military crisis, such as the Acts of Union, the Jacobite risings, or the American Revolution? Topics might include, but are not limited to, literary representations of British national, regional, gender, or political identities; material culture of Britons and/or the Union; cultural memory; depictions or commentary of key figures or events; the political or social beginnings, aftermath, or ramifications of the Union. Authors are welcome (and encouraged) to explore intersections with diverse methodologies and disciplines (e.g., disability studies, gender/queer theory, performance theory, and more). The panel also welcomes alternative presentation methods and styles.

**60. Floating Islands; or, Saikaku's Eighteenth Century** Katarzyna Bartoszynska, Ithaca College, [kasiab@gmail.com](mailto:kasiab@gmail.com)

Following the various calls for a more global perspective on the eighteenth century at ASECS 2021, this panel seeks papers on the work of Japanese author Ihara Saikaku (1642-1693). In her 2016 book, *The Age of Silver*, Ning Ma discusses Saikaku as the most significant representative figure of the “stories of the floating world” that, she argues, should be seen as an emergence of realist fiction. A bestseller in 17th and 18th century Japan, Saikaku’s work fell into obscurity until a revival of interest in the late 19th century, when he became known as “Japan’s realist”. Yet he remains relatively unknown in the US, even within the field of 18th century studies, a problem that this panel seeks to alleviate. Saikaku’s playful eroticism — both straight and queer — and sympathetic examination of social class and urban life have much to offer for an enriched understanding of the global eighteenth-century.

Potential topics could include, but are by no means limited to: Discussion of any of Saikaku’s works; Comparative studies of Saikaku and other 18th century authors, British or otherwise; Examinations of the representation of sexuality in Saikaku’s fiction; Discussions of “floating world” narratives and the emergence of realism; Pedagogical approaches to teaching Saikaku’s work.

If there is sufficient interest, there will be a reading group organized around Saikaku’s *Five Women Who Loved Love* before the conference.

**61. How “Byzantine” was the eighteenth century? New insights on the Christian Orthodox art and architecture of the late Ottoman Empire** Nikolaos Magouliotis, PhD Candidate ETH Zurich/gta; Demetra Vogiatzaki, PhD Candidate Harvard University, [vogiatzaki@g.harvard.edu](mailto:vogiatzaki@g.harvard.edu)

The most common term used to describe Christian Orthodox art and architecture produced in Ottoman territories during the early modern period is “post-byzantine.” While Byzantine elements did persist long after the Fall of Constantinople, the referentiality of the term falls short of the increasing aesthetic variation of architectural monuments, decorative objects and artworks produced by the Christian communities of the Empire. As recent scholarship has highlighted, particularly from the eighteenth century onwards, the eastbound expeditions of missionaries, merchants, diplomats and antiquarians, the establishment of Ottoman embassies in the West, and the privileges granted to the Christian millet had a significant influence on the local culture; from



Jerusalem to Istanbul and from Anatolia to the Balkans, regional idioms merged with metropolitan Istanbulite fashions and Western influences.

This session seeks papers that investigate the evolution of the artistic and architectural expression of Eastern Orthodoxy in the long eighteenth century. How cohesive was the aesthetic production of the Christian millet? How did it mirror the contemporaneous intra-confessional collision and coalescence within the Empire? What was the influence of European travelers and Ottoman cosmopolitan elites? We encourage close studies of situated artifacts (ie. buildings, artworks and devotional objects), itinerant people (such as pilgrims and craftsmen) and objects (from holy relics, to print media) that illustrate or complicate the deviation from the Byzantine tradition. Contributions that seek to challenge or revise the terminology used to describe Christian Orthodox art and architecture in the eighteenth century are particularly welcome.

**62. The Poetry of Nature** Margaret Koehler, Otterbein University, [mkoehler@otterbein.edu](mailto:mkoehler@otterbein.edu)

Eighteenth-century England sees a proliferation of poetry exploring the natural world, a poetry of ethical imperatives that shares many concerns with what today we call ecological or sustainability studies. This panel invites proposals for papers that analyze the poetry of nature in an ecological framework, whether focusing on a particular case or offering a broader hypothesis or argument. Questions related to this topic might include: What are the ethical dimensions of the poet's choice of models (e.g., religious, political, philosophical, literary, or pre-scientific) and poetic forms in representing the relations between human and nonhuman nature? How do choices in poetic form relate to the poet's understanding of nature's forms? What are the relationships between the era's poems of nature and works about the nature of poetry? In what ways does the era's poetry counter anthropocentrism? What can studies of the Restoration and eighteenth-century poetry of nature contribute to a longer history of poetry's ecological cares, a history that may offer neglected but important approaches to the future? John Sitter (Professor Emeritus, University of Notre Dame) has agreed to serve as respondent for this panel.

**63. Decolonizing the Pedagogy of Eighteenth-Century Music [SECM, Society for Eighteenth-Century Music]** Kimary Fick (Oregon State University, [kimary.fick@gmail.com](mailto:kimary.fick@gmail.com)); Matteo Magarotto (University of Miami Frost School of Music, [mxm193267@miami.edu](mailto:mxm193267@miami.edu))

The Society for Eighteenth-Century Music (SECM) invites contributions from scholars and performers on pedagogical approaches that challenge the hegemonic white-Euro-American canon and decenter its narrative. Western literate music is still central to the curriculum of most music schools and conservatories. However, recent calls for a "decolonized music curriculum" have emphasized how the canonic narratives often embedded in history courses and performance studies reinforce notions of white-male-European supremacy and erase or marginalize Indigenous musical cultures, particularly cultures oppressed by European colonialism. This session is meant as a way to envision, collectively, a critical approach to de-colonizing and de-canonizing the history and practice of eighteenth-century music. We are interested in papers addressing the broad philosophical framework, performance projects, course design, or specific lesson plans or assignments for undergraduate or graduate music history courses. Possible topics and approaches include, but are not limited to: cross-historical or global approaches; anti-racist pedagogies; Indigenous musics; oral musical traditions; music's relationship with the slave trade;

course design that favors historiography over works; practical demonstrations of teaching activities, including readings and learning outcomes; or diverse methodologies for teaching a decolonized history of eighteenth-century music and its legacy. Proposals for presentations including a brief performance component will also be considered.

Please send proposals (up to 250 words) to both Kimary Fick ([kimary.fick@gmail.com](mailto:kimary.fick@gmail.com)) and Matteo Magarotto ([mxm193267@miami.edu](mailto:mxm193267@miami.edu)).

**64. Seeing Empire Near and Far** Daniel O'Quinn, University of Guelph, [doquinn@uoguelph.ca](mailto:doquinn@uoguelph.ca)

This panel aims to explore how formal hybridization allowed metropolitan and colonial subjects to conceptualize empire across a wide range of visual media in Britain and its colonies including panoramas, phantasmagoria, theatrical scenography, raree shows, wonder cabinets, collections of ephemera, and embroidery samplers. The extreme differentiation in scale and purpose of these cultural artefacts is important to the overall argument of this panel for it contends that similar formal procedures could be adapted to the most public visualizations of empire and to the most private acts of colonial resistance. The desire here is not to suggest that everyone sees empire in a similar fashion, but rather that the changing structure of the world could be addressed in the formal spaces where disparate cultures meet. Using familiar visual tropes and strategies—i.e. that which was close at hand--the makers of these objects were able to broach unfamiliar social scenarios that encompass the vast global networks that were transforming the flows of populations and commodities in the long eighteenth century.

**65. Théâtre et guerre/War and Theater in the French-Speaking World (Roundtable)** Logan J. Connors (University of Miami) and Pierre Frantz (Sorbonne Université), [logan.connors@miami.edu](mailto:logan.connors@miami.edu)

This bilingual (French/English) roundtable welcomes presentations about the diverse relationships between war and theater in the French-speaking world. Possible topics include (but are not limited to): plays depicting soldiers, battles, and military concerns; particular theatrical performances for members of the military; soldier-authors; performances in war/occupied zones in Europe, the Caribbean, and North America; plays about the role of women and gender relations in armed conflict; history of policies that encouraged/discouraged soldiers to attend the theater; criticism of battle plays and military involvement in theatrical life; other topics combining theater, performance, war, and the military in eighteenth-century French-speaking locales.

**66. Geographical Frontiers in the Eighteenth-Century World** Matthew Gin, Northeastern University, [matthewgin@gmail.com](mailto:matthewgin@gmail.com)

The term “frontier,” when used in a geopolitical sense, describes a territorial division or edge condition that separates one entity from another, the known from the unknown. But unlike borders, which are rigid and clear-cut, frontiers are more porous and difficult to pin down. Such in-between zones abounded in the eighteenth century, especially as European projects of empire produced new liminal spaces of encounter and conflict across the globe. In the absence of firm lines of demarcation, natural features, like the Appalachian Mountains or the Pacific Ocean, often marked the ambiguous limits between cultures. These frontier spaces, unsurprisingly, were

frequently sites of contestation as political actors of all kinds competed through violence and mapping projects to establish firm claims over territories, resources, and peoples. This panel invites papers that address geographical frontiers either directly or obliquely. Among the questions to be considered are: How were frontiers established, tested, or traversed? What overlooked histories of dispossession or transgression might frontiers tell? How did artists, cartographers, and writers represent the space of the frontier or envision alternative geographies? What do frontiers, as sites of exchange, reveal about histories of empire, diplomacy, or commerce? Papers that take an interdisciplinary or global approach to these and other pertinent questions are especially welcome.

**67. What's Race Got to Do with It?: Interrogating the Norms of Domestic Space, Race and Gender in the Eighteenth-Century Novel** Karen Lipsedge, University of Kingston (UK); Victoria Barnett-Woods, Loyola University Maryland, [vabarnett-woods@loyola.edu](mailto:vabarnett-woods@loyola.edu)

Over the last decade, eighteenth-century studies have used the reissues of multiple intersectional works, including *A Woman of Colour* and *The Female American*, as platforms for new readings from an interdisciplinary perspective. One area that tends to be overlooked, however, is how concepts of the home and domesticity can shed light on readings of gender, race and the cartographies of domestic space in the long eighteenth-century novel.

When one considers the inclusion of these novels, which invariably interrogate the formation of the socially mobile and privileged white heroine, it becomes apparent that it is often the intersectional, non-normative subject who establishes the criteria for those norms (as she notes her exclusion from them). By reading *A Woman of Colour*, *The Female American* and *Zelica the Creole* for example, in light of novels like Richardson's *Pamela* (1740); Haywood's, *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless* (1751); Burney's, *Evelina* (1778) and Austen's *Mansfield Park* (1814), scholars gain insight into how a broader critique about the normalized structures of the feminine subject and the gaze of the 'Other' resurfaces to re-establish existing notions of normative whiteness.

Although eighteenth-century domestic fiction does the important work of considering the intersection of social class and gender, this panel asks its participants consider how the social gatekeeping of women's upward mobility privileges notions of whiteness. While the focus of this panel will be on the genre of domestic fiction, participants are welcome to discuss any novel of the long eighteenth century that challenges (or problematically upholds) racialized hierarchies in the private sphere.

Please send abstracts of 200 words to Karen Lipsedge ([K.Lipsedge@kingston.ac.uk](mailto:K.Lipsedge@kingston.ac.uk)) and Victoria Barnett-Woods ([vabarnett-woods@loyola.edu](mailto:vabarnett-woods@loyola.edu))

**68. Jane Austen and Her Contemporaries, Ten Years Later: A reflection and workshop on an NEH seminar (Roundtable)** Danielle Spratt, California State University, Northridge, [danielle.spratt@csun.edu](mailto:danielle.spratt@csun.edu)

Curious about applying for external support, like an NEH seminar? This panel looks to Devoney Looser's 2012 NEH summer seminar, "Jane Austen and Her Contemporaries," as a case study: both to reflect on the outcomes of seminar participants ten years later and to offer practical guidance and tips, including a mini-workshop, on how to apply successfully to host a seminar or to participate in one. This session is affiliated with The Doctor Is In and is inspired by

a prevailing concern expressed in our previous sessions by ASECS members at all stages of their careers: given the chronic underfunding of higher education, academics are increasingly called on to seek external resources to fund their teaching and research, a situation that further increases inequities in our fields, especially for ECRs and those experiencing employment precarity. We hope that this panel addresses these matters by offering resources that demystify some elements of the world of external grants. The panel will consist of all original seminar participants and will be shaped by questions that we will solicit from attendees prior to the seminar (as well as during the seminar). We hope to offer productive models of how to use seminar opportunities to advance professional research and pedagogical goals and to create a supportive academic community. Participants include: Devoney Looser, Toby Benis, Andrea Coldwell, Bridget Draxler, Jenni Frangos, Erin Goss, Hannah Doherty Hudson, Olivera Jokic, Lisa Kasmer, Misty Krueger, John Leffel, Andrea Rehn, Daniel Schierenbeck, Danielle Spratt, Laura Thomason, Cheryl Wilson, and Jodi Wyett. Those who wish to sign up for the workshop in advance can send their information, as well as any questions they would like covered, to [danielle.spratt@csun.edu](mailto:danielle.spratt@csun.edu) (a solicitation for further questions and concerns will be circulated before ASECS as well).

**69. Reading Controversies and Controversies about Reading in the Long Eighteenth Century** Drew Starling (University of Pennsylvania) [standrew@sas.upenn.edu](mailto:standrew@sas.upenn.edu)

In his 2018 *A Literary Tour de France: The World of Books on the Eve of the French Revolution*, Robert Darnton remarked that, “[a]lthough we have not solved the problem of how people read, we can know what they read,” referring to previous efforts to reconstruct reading practices as a series of “case studies” that, while “masterful,” “do not draw on enough evidence to sustain a general interpretation” (302). During the eighteenth century a number of popular controversies drew the attention of readers and led to the production of large numbers of texts. These readers often left behind traces of their readings, and the controversies themselves produced debates about reading practices. By focusing on controversies such as these, this panel hopes to examine not just what eighteenth-century readers read, but how they read and what they thought about reading. Papers may consider how eighteenth-century readers read works of controversy, controversies as a whole, or controversial works. They may examine how new readers, new forms, new content, and new ways of reading led to controversies about reading itself, raising questions concerning who had the right to read, what could be read, and how texts were supposed to be read. Finally, papers may also reflect on the extant historiography of reading and methodological approaches to the history of reading in the long eighteenth century. Please send an abstract of 250 words and a brief biography to [standrew@sas.upenn.edu](mailto:standrew@sas.upenn.edu)

**70. Under-read Eliza Haywood Texts** Catherine Ingrassia, Virginia Commonwealth University, [cingrass@vcu.edu](mailto:cingrass@vcu.edu)

The title of this panel refers to a dual, inter-related pattern of “under-reading” the work of Eliza Haywood: primarily the continued focus on the same dozen or so texts (e.g. *Fantomina*, *Love in Excess*, *Adventures of Eovaai*, *Betsy Thoughtless*) from the more than 72 in her oeuvre, and, secondarily, the habit, until the work of the feminist recovery project, to under-interpret or “under-read” the meaning of her texts. Haywood studies is a rich body of scholarship. However, expanding the range of Haywood texts under consideration and exploding the facile

characterization of her as primarily an author of amatory prose fictions enriches scholars' understanding. That act reveals how deeply Haywood's work centrally engages empire, race, and enslavement in the Caribbean and North America (to name but a few social and political issues she addresses); how frequently it experiments with form and narrative style; how fully it functions as a force in popular culture; and how often it simultaneously shapes and critiques print culture.

This panel seeks four papers that discuss Haywood texts that have received little scholarly attention or too much familiar attention. It invites papers and approaches that defy the oversimplifications and still-persistent assumptions about Haywood and her career. It looks for papers that take on infrequently discussed Haywood texts in any genre (prose fiction, drama, poetry, periodical, conduct book) and explore how such texts or innovative approaches can complicate, challenge, or revise our understanding of Haywood's work and further advance Haywood studies.

**71. Natural History, Ecology, and Imperialism in Oliver Goldsmith** David O'Shaughnessy, National University of Ireland Galway, [david.oshaughnessy@nuigalway.ie](mailto:david.oshaughnessy@nuigalway.ie)

According to Roy Porter, Goldsmith's *History of the Earth, and Animated Nature* (1774) was "the most popular work of natural history in Enlightenment Britain." Emerging from the Enlightenment project to classify and record, natural histories illustrated the preconditions for how things show up as life. Goldsmith's last major publication relied on widely accepted concepts of the Great Chain of Being to inform his views on animals and people from different nations and regions, often depicting racialized stereotypes. Yet, his representations of animals were indicative of the ecological tensions of domesticating wildlife and the adverse effect of imperial pursuits, a familiar theme found in Goldsmith's better known works. This panel intends to widen the scope of conversation around *History of the Earth, and Animated Nature* and link that text to broader themes and issues within Goldsmith's oeuvre and within larger enlightenment discourses of race, difference, and empire.

Proposals should engage with Goldsmith or his natural and historical writing. Topics might include, but are certainly not limited to: Conceptions of race and nation in the later eighteenth century; The relationship of natural history to poetic and other representations of race and difference; Animal representations and societies; Early environmental studies; Visual prints and natural history; Domestication and animality; Natural history writing (empirical, scientific, popular); Print culture and hack-writing; References to *Animated Nature* in later works: *The Mill on the Floss*, *Typee*

**72. Gods and Human Beings: The Study of World Religions in the Age of Reason** Anton Matytsin (University of Florida) [anton.matytsin@gmail.com](mailto:anton.matytsin@gmail.com)

While the Enlightenment is often portrayed as being antithetical to organized religion, critics of revelation often displayed nuanced understandings of the many complex roles that religious beliefs and practices played in ancient and modern societies. The study of different religions around the world became a new science, as eighteenth-century thinkers tried to reexamine pagan mythologies and to make sense of the startling variety of religions they encountered in historical texts and travel accounts. Comparative analyses of religions allowed for the exploration of both the diversity and the structural similarity of past and present beliefs. Nuanced understandings of

the content and form of different religions also had dramatic implications for eighteenth-century attitudes toward religious toleration. This panel seeks to examine the different ways in which Enlightenment thinkers approached the study of the world's religions both in antiquity and in more recent times. Papers might address the studies of religions in Asia, Africa, the Americas, or Europe and explore how such examinations contributed to the emergence of new histories and chronologies. They might also discuss how these studies shaped attitudes towards Christianity in eighteenth-century Europe. Finally, papers might also comment on the emergence of the concepts of "religion" and "world religions" and on the development of a new field of religious studies in the long eighteenth century.

Please send an abstract of 250 words and a very brief biographical statement to [anton.matytsin@gmail.com](mailto:anton.matytsin@gmail.com)

**73. Demystifying the Book Proposal (Roundtable)** Srividhya Swaminathan, St. John's University [swaminas@stjohns.edu](mailto:swaminas@stjohns.edu)

This interactive roundtable will focus on writing and pitching a book proposal. Angie Hogan of UVA Press has confirmed her place as a respondent, with other editors, including Kat Lecky (series editor at Bucknell University Press), and Laura Engel (series editor at University of Delaware) offering to serve as participants in this important roundtable discussion. These editors will share practical advice and strategies for developing a proposal with confidence. This roundtable also welcomes individuals who are at all stages of their book proposal development to share their experiences and their strategies for writing (particularly important in our current climate). This roundtable addresses ways we can cope with rejection, revision, and the reluctance to let a project go.

It's all too often the case that members of marginalized groups feel less welcome or less emboldened to approach editors and pitch their work; this session aims to rectify such imbalances by demystifying the proposal process and offering an inside view of what commissioning and series editors look for in submissions. The roundtable will feature short, 5-7 minute papers that could pitch project ideas, frame specific questions about the proposal process, discuss writing challenges, and/or to reflect on successes / failures in proposals that may have been pitched. Comments will be submitted in advance of the roundtable to our respondents from the publishing field so that they may prepare targeted remarks. This roundtable's co-chairs invite 150-200 word abstracts from individuals who are willing to share their strategies and struggles in demystifying the book proposal.

**74. Skin & Bone: Animal Substrates in the Eighteenth Century** Sarah Grandin, The Clark Art Institute, [sgrandin@clarkart.edu](mailto:sgrandin@clarkart.edu)

Eighteenth-century Europe saw technological improvements in the manufacture of a variety of smooth materials, from paper to porcelain. And yet alongside the use of these highly processed substances, those of animal origin continued to be deployed for their unique receptivity to marks and incisions. Artists and artisans continued to prize animal supports the world over, from Paris, to Manila, to Dakar, to the Labrador peninsula, using ivory in portrait miniatures, vellum for botanical illustrations, teeth for scrimshaw trophies, tusks as religious figurines, and caribou skins for coats. As studies in technical art history have articulated, such surfaces were valued for their physical properties, from their capacity to retain or repel ink, to the glow imparted by

collagen, to the organic translucence of polished bone. The import of maritime, missionary, colonial, indigenous, and local economies from which these substances emerged in the eighteenth century has only recently begun to be explored.

This panel invites speakers to consider the observable qualities of animal substrates in relation to their origins. How did practitioners and viewers think about the copresence of liveliness and death caught up in these materials, which were extracted from animal bodies, and often at great cost to the humans who hunted them, slaughtered them, prepared them, and were even exchanged against them? Did working on tissue illicit moments of sympathy, repulsion, or identification? Through a focus on animal substrates, this panel encourages participants to investigate how materials' geographic and anatomical sources were understood, overlooked, and elided in the eighteenth century.

**75. The Poetics of Natural Disaster: William Falconer and Others** Bridget Keegan, Creighton University, [BridgetKeegan@Creighton.edu](mailto:BridgetKeegan@Creighton.edu)

Uncontrollable or unprecedented catastrophes challenge the human imagination, not only to find moral or scientific meaning but also to represent that meaning and to give creative form to events which destroy or resist form – whether physical or intellectual. Discussions of literary depictions of hurricanes, floods, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, shipwrecks and plagues (among other disasters) tend to focus primarily on the deployment of the sublime. However, eighteenth-century artists also supplement the language of the sublime with other discursive choices. William Falconer, for example, experiments with georgic strategies and “terms of art” to contain the storm at sea, while other engage techniques from scientific discourse to confront hostile climates and hazardous conditions. In particular, the boundless oceanic environment, celebrated in writing about global exploration and featured in Falconer’s best-known poem, presents a further challenge to conventional poetic and literary forms. This panel seeks to explore the literary and poetic modes through which authors engage with destructive natural phenomenon, in particular those who might challenge or eschew theological or eschatological tropes. Papers devoted to natural disasters associated with the oceans, global exploration and colonial expansion are of particular interest.

**76. Art for Raising Arms** Paula Backscheider, English, [pkrb@auburn.edu](mailto:pkrb@auburn.edu)

Great Britain was at war for more than half of the long eighteenth century, and crises requiring massive recruiting of fighting men occurred periodically. Rather than about individual texts such as the much-reproduced "Female Volunteer" engraving, we need to turn to sustained patriotic efforts or propaganda in a genre, a specific time period, a war, or a campaign. Britain fought on five continents, and this fact should lead to global themes. For some recruiting, artists, poets, playwrights, or other kinds of writers might have been recruited or united by a venue.

**77. Women Writers and Music** Jennifer Keith, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, [jmkeith@uncg.edu](mailto:jmkeith@uncg.edu)

While scholars have explored the importance of music as a theme in works by women writers such as Burney and Austen, little attention has been given to how Restoration and earlier eighteenth-century women writers have represented music in their works. From elite

performances, to street ballads and domestic entertainments, music shaped women's lives in ways that often remain unremarked although frequently exposed by women writers. This panel invites proposals from literary scholars, historians, and musicologists, pursuing any geographical or cultural foci, that consider fundamental questions about women writers and music, broadly construed. Possible questions might include but are not limited to the following: How do women write about music or use music in their literary works? What relationships exist among women writers, composers, and performers? How do women represent the affective powers—including their relationship to virtues or vices—of music in their writing? What patterns emerge in the use of music in various literary genres? How do women writers articulate the relationship between music (its creation, performance, or appreciation) and contemporary norms of gender, race, or social status? What are music's associations with moral, sexual, economic, or political consequences in women's writing? In representing the power of music, how do women writers articulate its capacities to affirm or transform contemporary values defining so-called domestic politics or, indeed, imperial ambitions?

**78. Do We Still Need the Human? (Roundtable)** Wolfram Schmidgen, Washington University in St. Louis, [wshmidg@wustl.edu](mailto:wshmidg@wustl.edu)

At the end of *The Order of Things*, Michel Foucault suggested that another discontinuous historical break was near. If it occurred, he was willing to “wager that man would be erased, like a face drawn in sand at the edge of the sea.” In the fifty years since this sentence was written, the posthuman or nonhuman have become increasingly urgent areas of research in the humanities and in eighteenth-century studies. Today, this can be seen in the objects we study--from things to animals to the environment--and it can be seen in the currency of such theoretical approaches as Actor Network Theory, New Materialism, or Object Oriented Ontology. 300 years ago, human difference was a prized possession, an achievement that helped articulate ideas of human rights and human dignity. In academic circles and elsewhere, those ideas seem now deeply compromised. This roundtable invites eighteenth-century scholars to meditate on the status of the human in their work. Questions we might ask include: what are the affordances of the posthuman? What are its limits? What does a posthuman literary history look like? How do current debates about the way we read (surface/ depth, distant/close) interact with the question of the human? How might a posthuman ethics affect our pedagogy? What is meaning in a posthuman world?

**79. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Anne Finch: A Roundtable Exchange on New Directions for Research* (Roundtable)** Laura Runge, University of South Florida, [runge@usf.edu](mailto:runge@usf.edu)

Although Anne Finch continues to feature in the British literary canon, she has remained relatively obscure due to the lack of a scholarly edition of her works. This roundtable is occasioned by the publication of the two-volume *Cambridge Edition of the Works of Anne Finch, Countess of Winchelsea* from Cambridge University Press (2019–2021), edited by Jennifer Keith with Claudia Thomas Kairoff, which finally remedies that lack. The editors will participate in the session with the aim of facilitating an exchange of ideas and helping forge paths for future studies of Finch in light of the edition's new authoritative texts and commentary. Topics addressed might include new theoretical approaches that illuminate Finch's works; studies of



Finch's varied genres from lyric to drama and fable; and Restoration and early eighteenth-century contexts of her work including manuscript culture and print publication, politics, religion, or her relationships with other poets.

**80. Bad Feelings on the Eighteenth Century (Roundtable)** Michael Genovese, University of Kentucky, [michael.genovese@uky.edu](mailto:michael.genovese@uky.edu)

Critical studies of affect have begun to move into the extensive range of feelings that intertwine with literary experience, and this roundtable aims to look into the ugly feelings (to borrow Sianne Ngai's phrase) of the eighteenth century. The goal is to put aside the generalities of sympathy and passion and look at specifics such as rage, disgust, anticipation, irritation, etc., especially when those feelings exceed the parameters of sympathetic identification that Adam Smith establishes. Work on fiction, poetry, and drama is welcome, and of special interest will be papers that break the boundaries of Great Britain to examine the range of feelings that characterize global encounters. Accounts which tie ugly feelings to eighteenth-century aesthetic judgments that range beyond the beautiful and the sublime and accounts that tie ugly feelings to eighteenth-century political forms that can be tied literature are also particularly welcome. As in keeping with the roundtable format, this panel aims to provide a range of perspectives that will lead to lively conversation rather than focus on any one affective response in particular.

**81. Queerness as Contagion in Western Literature** Mehl A. Penrose, U of Maryland, [mpenrose@umd.edu](mailto:mpenrose@umd.edu)

Mary Elizabeth Perry (1990), Michael Solomon (1999), and Cristian Berco and Stephanie Fink Debacker (2010), among others, have explored the notion of queerness as contagion and disease in Iberian societies during the late medieval and early modern periods. Reflecting upon their scholarship as a starting point, how and why did Iberian, Latin American, and other Western societies regard queerness as an illness and as a contagion in the long eighteenth century? How did the embodiment of metaphoric as well as real contagions and diseases allow non-normative people to resist and/or triumph over societal impositions regarding gender expressions/roles, sexual anatomy, and sexuality? This panel invites papers on the notion of queerness as contagion and disease in Western literature during the long eighteenth century, especially those that interrogate the intersections of race, gender, class, religion, and sexuality. Please send proposals of no more than 250 words as well as a brief biographical statement to [mpenrose@umd.edu](mailto:mpenrose@umd.edu) by September 17, 2021.

**82. Hidden Gems from Grub Street: New Perspectives on Non-Canonical and Popular Eighteenth-Century Literature** Brian Tatum, Tarrant County College, [brian.tatum@tccd.edu](mailto:brian.tatum@tccd.edu)

Beginning with the pamphlet wars during the Restoration and ending with authors serving as critics to one another's writings in the Romantic period, the eighteenth century was rife with debates about how to define and identify good literature. Authors such as John Dryden, Alexander Pope, Thomas Gray, William Wordsworth, and many others served as adjudicators of good literature by chastising others' work in their prefaces, poetry, pamphlets, and mock epics. Theater history and book history, however, tell us that some of the works of these dunces were

widely popular and important in their own right—regardless of how derided they were by their peers. For example, elite writers of the day said that no one read Oliver Goldsmith, who was elsewhere described to be one of the most prolific writers of popular periodicals.

The purpose of this panel is to interrogate the claims of the dominant writers of the day, reexamining poetry, novels, life histories, essays, plays, etc. that served as the butt of jokes and satires of the day and striving for a fresh perspective on these writings. In doing so, we can slough off the ideologies and prejudices that wrote the literary history of the eighteenth century.

**83. Space and Time Unbound** Lindsay Emory Moore, Collin College, [LEMooore@collin.edu](mailto:LEMooore@collin.edu)

During the eighteenth century, a growing number of philosophers began to describe the universe as spatially and temporally infinite. Perceiving the universe as the embodiment of God's imagination, philosophers such as Edward Young, Thomas Wright, and Anna Barbauld all explore connections between the universe's infinite expanse and limitless possibility. For instance, the unexplored regions of the universe become the spaces not only for astronomers like Wright to argue that extraterrestrial beings might inhabit, but also for poets such as Barbauld to argue that social hierarchies might be arranged differently. Furthermore, by connecting the mapping of space with the mapping of knowledge, these texts often locate both anxiety and optimism in the unknown.

The purpose of this panel is to investigate the effect of removing spatial and temporal boundaries during the eighteenth century. Papers in this panel will explore this fertile ground by investigating epistemological, ontological, and other instabilities across the blurred disciplinary boundaries of this century.

**84. Out of the Shadows: Other Gothic Visions** Kathleen Fueger, Independent Scholar/Chapter 3 Copyediting & Translation, [kmfueger@gmail.com](mailto:kmfueger@gmail.com)

The broadening scholarship in Gothic studies reflects the multiple interpretive possibilities of the field, including its transgeneric, transhistorical, and, certainly, transgressive aspects. Fewer studies have explored the Gothic as a transnational mode. In many foundational British works, regions such as southern Europe, Asia, or the Middle East are seen principally as socially, politically and religiously oppressive places from which the protagonists must escape lest they fall prey to the maleficent and backward cultures and institutions in which they find themselves. Gothic works created in these regions are too often seen as non-existent or derivative and rarely considered in their own right. In recent decades, scholars have recovered and studied examples of Gothic cultural production from a broader selection of global voices. For instance, the recent work of Miriam López Santos and Xavier Aldana Reyes has dispelled the notion that the Gothic mode was not produced in Spain. This latter critic explores a body of work that “both draws from foreign models and develops them in nationally-specific ways,” allowing us to see the Spanish Gothic as a truly “transnational mode” (Spanish Gothic 10). This panel invites presentations that bring these lesser-known works out of the shadows and explore literary, artistic, historical, musical, kinetic, or material manifestations of the Gothic from regions or cultures with which it is not typically associated. Please send abstracts of approximately 250 words to Kathleen Fueger at [kmfueger@gmail.com](mailto:kmfueger@gmail.com).

**85. Worlds and Worldmaking in the Eighteenth Century** Allison Turner (Indiana University-Bloomington); Thomas Manganaro (University of Richmond), [tmangana@richmond.edu](mailto:tmangana@richmond.edu)

What is a “world” in the eighteenth century? What is to be gained by understanding the category of “world” beyond its connotation of “the global” (as in “world literature”) and towards a more abstract conception—that of a discrete bounded reality to be juxtaposed with other “plural” or “possible” worlds? How might we understand the eighteenth century as a period of worldmaking? Across what domains can we see this practice? How does worldmaking produce boundaries and exclusions from worlding relations? How are worlds built at the expense of others? How might the notions of world and worldmaking animate or complicate Enlightenment universalisms?

This panel aims to interrogate notions of “world” and “worldmaking” capaciously with respect to the eighteenth century by bringing together papers that address these categories from a wide range of discourses, potentially including analytic philosophy, infrastructure studies, Black studies, indigenous studies, formalism, structural linguistics, video game studies, and new materialism. Possible topics for papers might include: “world” as totalizing framework (economic, scientific, imperial, geospatial) and its necessary exclusions; “world-building” as it relates to both fantastical and “realist” narrative; world unmaking through colonization, genocide, ecocide; worlding relations understood with respect to racialized subject positions; the production of “possible worlds” (modal realism) as one way of characterizing the art of eighteenth-century fiction; monist vs. pluralist conceptions of worlds; “virtual” worlds; world-building through serial narrative, sequels, spin-offs, or expanded universes.

**86. Thinking the human/animal divide across the Globe: Comparative frames** Gabriela Villanueva, National Autonomous University of Mexico, [gabrielavillanueva@filos.unam.mx](mailto:gabrielavillanueva@filos.unam.mx)

Following on from last year’s ‘Global Animals’ panel, papers are invited that continue to pursue more farflung, geographically diverse alternatives to previous exclusively British or French focused investigations of animals in cultural history. Once again, the panel seeks to address how animal studies might avoid the “methodological nationalism” (Ulrich Beck) of the traditional Humanities that Rosi Braidotti critiques in *The Posthuman* in order to “unthink Eurocentrism and anthropocentrism” with animals. How did other literatures and worldviews outside the imperial and metropolitan centers of Europe respond to the animal question and engage in the debate concerning the human/animal divide during the eighteenth century? How did other cultural forms of human/animal intermingling across the Globe (property rights, kinship, consumption, work division, domination) trouble the human/animal distinction endorsed by the Enlightenment? This time around, the hope is that not only different geographical areas, such as the Hispanic empire (in its interaction with diverse indigenous peoples), Africa, and Asia, be investigated, but that some comparative dimension be introduced. Presentations from all fields (art history, history, literature, political theory) that provide an overview of how methodological and/or theoretical approaches might expand the national focus of animal studies, case studies which situate a text, event, or figure in a global context, or which investigate animals in underrepresented national or indigenous literatures or histories are all equally welcome. Please send abstracts of no more than 250 words.

**87. North and South: Mapping the 18th-Century Idea of Europe** Hazel Gold, Emory University, [hgold@emory.edu](mailto:hgold@emory.edu)

How did Europe theorize itself during the 18th century? Whether it viewed itself as a geopolitical constellation or an imagined space whose unity, philosophically and culturally, was rooted in a value system based on concepts of universality, rationalism, and civilization, this question animated debates in the 18th century surrounding how Europe should be mapped. Notions of center and periphery emerged, based on geography, politics, religion, culture, even climate, as Montesquieu argued. While Europeans had long identified themselves in opposition to ‘exotic’ others (Muslims and Jews; Chinese, Turks, and Persians) along an East-West axis, by the Age of Enlightenment they had also begun to define themselves against an internal other: the Mediterranean South, represented especially by Italy and Spain. How do hegemonic Enlightenment discourses characterize and appraise the European South? What is the countervailing view from Europe’s marginal(ized) inside? That is, what alternative accounts of Europeanness are offered by Mediterranean intellectuals? This panel invites contributions that examine how Europe became conceptualized by historians, philosophers, literary authors, and artists in the 18th century along a North-South axis whose legacy persists to the present day.

**88. British Women Satirists in the Long Eighteenth Century (Roundtable)** Amanda Hiner, Professor, Winthrop University; and Elizabeth Tasker Davis, Professor, Stephen F. Austin State University, [taskerea@sfasu.edu](mailto:taskerea@sfasu.edu)

This roundtable will introduce new arguments about British women satirists of the long eighteenth century, which are forthcoming in an edited collection from Cambridge University Press in 2022. The aim of the edited collection and the panel is to dismantle the assumption that eighteenth-century British women writers rarely engaged in the practice of satire and to theorize the many ways they contributed to satire’s development as a literary form and practice. Panelists will present on a variety of women satirists, from the famous to the lesser known, who engaged in a diversity of imaginative, witty, and pointed social critiques purposely delivered from exaggerated, absurd, and often ironic stances. The discussion will explore women who ventriloquized Horatian, Juvenalian, and Menippean forms; challenged gendered conventions of authorship, sociability, and the literary public market; and innovated feminine-centric satire in verse, fable, fiction, conversation, drama, the periodical essay, and other genres. As the panel will show, women’s contributions to satire throughout the long eighteenth-century stand as a body of literature in its own right and as also deeply integrated within the established canon of the masculine satiric tradition.

**89. Citation: Method, Archive, Extraction, Relation** Sal Nicolazzo, UCSD, [snicolazzo@ucsd.edu](mailto:snicolazzo@ucsd.edu)

In *Dear Science and Other Stories*, Katherine McKittrick writes: “I am not interested in citations as quotable value. I want to reference other possibilities such as, citations as learning, as counsel, as sharing” (26). The eighteenth century offers many examples of citation as claims to value or ownership, such as James Grainger’s expansive footnotes offering expropriated Black and Indigenous botanical and medical expertise to readers of *The Sugar Cane* (1764). At the same time, we might also trace other, more insurgent forms of citationality across the eighteenth-

century archive: Phillis Wheatley's complex resignification of the classical tradition, for instance, or her extended citation of Scipio Moorhead, which embeds her poetry in a relational network of Black artists in late eighteenth-century Boston. Meanwhile, many of the citational practices that we use in our scholarship have their roots in eighteenth-century forms of knowledge-production: antiquarianism, comparative philology, natural history, and more.

This panel considers citation as method, relation, and site of responsibility. What might reading for citation, past or present, teach us about eighteenth-century modes of relational knowledge-making? Who do we cite and why? Who don't we cite, and who should we be citing more? How have these patterns of citation and non-citation marked the borders of "eighteenth-century studies?" What does it mean to cite, and what might be the limits of our current methods of claiming, naming, or extracting knowledge? How might we write relationally in ways that resist extraction, ownership, and colonial/patriarchal epistemologies?

**90. Materials of Global Trade: Networks, Mobility, and Transformation** Jennifer Germann, Ithaca College, [jgermann@ithaca.edu](mailto:jgermann@ithaca.edu)

This panel will explore the abundance and variety of materials that travelled the globe during the long and wide eighteenth century and the different modes of transformation and appropriation they experienced when they reached their destinations. Such materials include natural resources (e.g., silver, cacao, and minerals) and botanical and zoological specimens, among others. This panel is interested in how such materials could be modified or transformed to create novel types of material goods or be the inspiration for creating new objects. Some questions to consider include: how were materials adapted and transformed? In what ways were artistic traditions shaped by these contacts with a diverse range of material goods and things? How were these materials and products beneficial in promoting innovation and experimentation? How did they facilitate the creation of new customs and in what ways did they combine with (or hinder) pre-existing ones? What meanings were generated in different cosmopolitan centers around the world, especially port cities that played an essential role in the dissemination of goods on a global scale? Topics that explore regions outside of Europe and North America and interdisciplinary approaches are encouraged, as are graduate students and early career scholars.

**91. Eighteenth-Century Counterfactualism** Jesse Molesworth, Indiana University, [jmoleswo@indiana.edu](mailto:jmoleswo@indiana.edu)

In her recent history of the counterfactual, *Telling it Like it Wasn't* (2018), Catherine Gallagher locates the origins of counterfactual thought with the long eighteenth century. More specifically, according to Gallagher, the idea of possible historical worlds emerged within Leibniz's philosophical thought and within philosophical discussions of Providence before being repurposed by military historians, especially in the context of the Napoleonic wars. This panel solicits proposals examining further examples of counterfactual thinking and plotting across various genres and disciplines—drama, prose fiction, poetry, law, art, history, scientific writing, biography and autobiography, travel writing, etc. For what reasons did those living in the eighteenth century seek to understand events as having occurred contrary to known evidence? For what reasons did they engage in the central question of counterfactual thought: what if...?

**92. Annotation Across Media** Jeanne Britton, University of South Carolina,  
[jbritton@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:jbritton@mailbox.sc.edu)

Eighteenth-century book use, reading practices, and multi-media objects suggest a long history of active engagement with aesthetic and material production that crosses lines between media, genres, and experiences, between print and script, image and text, and reading and looking. This panel is meant to take advantage of the interdisciplinary membership of ASECS by intentionally seeking papers from any and all disciplines and languages. It aims to contribute to the Annual Meeting a broad discussion about media and genre by looking at a range of annotated, multi-media, and reader-enhanced works from any linguistic, national, or generic tradition.

Papers are invited that consider texts and images that bear the marks of annotation or use, whether by an artist, author, publisher, or reader: architectural or scientific illustrations with captions, philosophy with footnotes, poetry with marginalia, indexed commonplace books, and grangerized volumes. What is the relationship between word and image in an annotated illustration or illustrated text? What modes of reading are at play in the production of marginalia in different media, from pencil scribbles and inked doodles to paint stains? Presentations on digital projects that make use of annotation are also invited. Open to all conference attendees. Julie Park (NYU) will serve as a respondent.

**93. Religious Ceremonies in a Global Frame: New Research Horizons** Margaret Mansfield, University of California Santa Barbara; and Luke Freeman, University of Minnesota  
[ljfreema@umn.edu](mailto:ljfreema@umn.edu)

This panel seeks to further scholarly discussion of the manner in which 18th-century Europeans mined the topic of religious ceremonies as an area of intellectual inquiry and then deployed it as central to the study of human societies on a global scale. At one time, "ceremonies" included both civic and religious ceremonies, but after the 1723 publication of the first three volumes of Bernard and Picart's *Ceremonies and Religious Customs*, the topic became increasingly focused on religion as a global phenomenon. We welcome papers that grapple with the conceptualization of ceremonies as a topic of inquiry through which Europeans represented and evaluated other cultures globally. This includes the Rites Controversy, the relationship between Jewish and Christian ceremonies, with myriad Protestant sects, with Islam, and especially material represented by travelers' and missionaries' accounts of ceremonies in Asia, the Americas, and Africa. We are especially (though not exclusively) interested in work that employs Digital Humanities methods to make use of digital collections of images, objects, and text.

**94. Supporting Women Writers: Coterie as Feminist Praxis (Roundtable)** Karenza Sutton-Bennett, University of Ottawa, [ksutt076@uottawa.ca](mailto:ksutt076@uottawa.ca)

Eliza Haywood represents *The Female Spectator* as part of a coterie that acts as "several Members of one Body, of which [she is] the mouth." Through this writing club, Haywood encapsulates the important role that such coterie played in circulating women's writing in the long eighteenth century. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu circulated her travel writing for feedback in a letter-book within a close circle of friends and family members. This correspondence between women represented an opportunity to share work in a safe space. Co-writing groups remain a safe space and an essential resource for women to share work today.

While digital writing groups are not traditionally thought of as coteries, both are communities that offer opportunities to share social connections and co-work in a safe space. The global pandemic has created a need and space for additional, virtual sources for community and collaboration--modern-day coteries. The recession triggered by Covid-19 measures has been dubbed the “sheecession” due to its disproportionate effect on women. What can we learn from the fictional and non-fictional representations of coteries from the eighteenth-century and beyond? How can modern-day coteries help women move forward in their writing? To open up possibilities for understanding women’s engagement in these groups as feminist praxis, this panel seeks proposals that take a trans-historical and intersectional feminist approach.

**95. Political Animals** Bryan Alkemeyer [bryan.alkemeyer@balkemeyer.com](mailto:bryan.alkemeyer@balkemeyer.com)

While Aristotle famously counted bees, wasps, and cranes as “political animals,” Michel Serres in *The Parasite* goes so far as to claim that animals, “relative to us,” “are geniuses in politics.” The eighteenth century is a particularly rich source of animal-political exemplars. For example, James Thomson and Alexander Pope explicitly proposed that nonhuman animals were fellow “peoples” from whom humans could usefully learn political lessons. Meanwhile, Jonathan Swift’s scourging of British society’s imperial and scientific ambitions climaxed in a satirical species inversion, whereby a superior equid people (the Houyhnhnms) dominate, exploit, and consider exterminating their hominid inferiors (the Yahoos). What can these or other eighteenth-century texts contribute to our rethinking of politics in multispecies—or “cosmopolitical” (Isabelle Stengers)—ways? The panel invites proposals for papers investigating animals and politics, broadly conceived. Presentations from all fields (art history, history, literature, political theory, etc.) and national and cultural traditions are equally welcome. Please send abstracts of no more than 250 words to [bryan.alkemeyer@balkemeyer.com](mailto:bryan.alkemeyer@balkemeyer.com).

**96. The Paper Ceiling: Women, Eighteenth-Century Periodicals, and the Literary Canon**

Kelly Plante, Wayne State University, [kellyjplante@wayne.edu](mailto:kellyjplante@wayne.edu)

For decades, eighteenth-century periodicals have been readily available in countless digital databases--Google Books, the Burney Newspapers Collection, Adam Matthews Eighteenth-Century Journals, Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Collections Online, --simultaneously, feminist literary scholars have been recovering previously ignored eighteenth-century women writers. While scholarly journals and as a result, classrooms, have included more women writers into the literary canon, the critical bias of novels and poetry over periodicals, fiction over nonfiction, remains. And while male writers such as Addison and Steele have long transcended this bias, given the unquestionably canonical status of the *Spectator*, still, women writers who likewise dabbled in periodical and aesthetically “higher” forms, such as Charlotte Lennox and Eliza Haywood, are predominantly taught and written about in terms of their fictional works: the *Female Quixote* and *Fantomina* remain favored over the *Lady’s Museum* and the *Female Spectator*. The first comprehensive study of women’s magazines periodicals in Britain in the long eighteenth century did not appear until 2018 (Jennie Batchelor and Manushag N. Powell’s *Women’s Periodicals and Print Culture in Britain, 1690-1820s: The Long Eighteenth Century*). Thus, only in the past four years has a comprehensive study of eighteenth-century women’s magazines and periodicals existed. This panel seeks papers that supply a further basis for including certain, previously overlooked periodicals by/about women into the literary canon; that

demonstrate the importance of previously overlooked periodicals to women as writers or readers; and/or that illuminate the previously obscured roles women writers played in developing the periodicals that played an integral role in shaping eighteenth-century British culture.

**97. Beyond Metal: More Hardcore Heroines in the Long Eighteenth Century (Roundtable)**

Bethany E. Qualls, University of California, Davis, [bequalls@ucdavis.edu](mailto:bequalls@ucdavis.edu)

Penelope Aubin's Maria tears out her own eyeballs to preserve her virginity in *The Noble Slaves*. Actress Mary Ann Yates rages on London's eighteenth-century stages as Medea, Zara, and Dido, then later manages King's Opera House with Frances Brooke for five successful years. Mary Prince leverages the British imperial system to ultimately gain freedom from enslavement. Catherine the Great stages a coup of her husband and takes the Russian throne in 1762; she then takes over screens in 2019's eponymous miniseries (played by Helen Mirren) and 2020's revisionist "The Great" (played by Elle Fanning). Throughout the eighteenth-century there are heroines who will stab, swashbuckle and take (no) prisoners; they might also create new artforms like Mary Delany, govern like Badshah Begum of the Mughal Empire, or successfully live outside the law, like Ching Shih, a Chinese pirate who defeated the British and Portuguese Navies. Who are they and where do we find them? How do these narratives, of both fictional and real women, expand our notions of dedication and personal convictions, perhaps to an uncomfortable degree? What is so attractive about women who appear to resist conforming to norms? How do interpretations of canonical novels by Samuel Richardson, Maria Edgeworth, or Jane Austen change if considered through this lens? What changes when these women are remediated in twenty-first-century media? This roundtable seeks to juxtapose women from a range of geographical and historical locations, exploring makes them so intense no matter the century. Proposals focused outside the Anglo-American tradition particularly welcome.

**98. How to Write Publishable Articles (Workshop)** Cedric Reverand II (University of Wyoming) and Michael Edson (University of Wyoming), [medson@uwyo.edu](mailto:medson@uwyo.edu)

This proposed workshop responds to the call for innovative formats and complements recent ASECS sessions offering guidance on publication, including the journal editor roundtables and the publishing roundtables hosted by the ASECS Grad Caucus. Open to graduate students as well as independent and early-career scholars, this workshop invites potential participants to submit full-length draft articles for feedback from Cedric Reverand II and Michael Edson, who serve as the Editor and Associate Editor for the Duke UP journal, *Eighteenth-Century Life*. While the annual roundtables featuring journal editors provide tips about getting published, they do not give feedback on actual articles. This proposed workshop would provide such feedback. After putting out a call for submissions from ASECS members fitting the above criteria, Reverand and Edson would select three or four of the submitted articles and facilitate a discussion with the authors in front of a live audience at the 2022 ASECS conference. Articles would be selected for illustrating effective approaches or common problems in articles that the conference audience would benefit from discussing and learning to recognize. Selected articles could be circulated to the audience in advance of the discussion, if the authors wished to share. In addition, the first fifteen articles received, even if not selected for live discussion at ASECS, would receive constructive, written feedback from the editors.



**99. The Mobile Manuscript (Roundtable)** Rebecca Wilkin (Pacific Lutheran University); and Geoffrey Turnovsky (University of Washington, Seattle), [gt2@uw.edu](mailto:gt2@uw.edu)

This roundtable panel proposed to explore the manuscript as a site of processes and relations not always visible in the printed text(s) that may -- or may not -- result from it. Through a focus on manuscripts, papers will explore the mobility of text in relation to its setting in movable type. Such mobility might encompass the circulation of manuscripts prior to and after print, including reuse and appropriation; the creative or composition process; the (dis)organization of the text from manuscript to print (and back to manuscript); mobilities of language: grammar and spelling; and the particular temporalities represented by the manuscript: the destruction of manuscripts following printing and the post-print lives of manuscripts, as objects of preservation and/or commodities in collectors' markets. The panel looks to manuscripts to further reveal the social character of textual production and circulation by foregrounding collaborations and hierarchies (secretarial work; gift copies; posthumous curation and circulation) that printed books tend to obfuscate.

**100. What is Unseen** Jessica Leiman, Associate Professor of English, Carleton College, [jleiman@carleton.edu](mailto:jleiman@carleton.edu)

“A studious blind man, who had mightily beat his head about visible objects . . . bragged one day, that he now understood what scarlet signified . . . It was like the sound of a trumpet.” This anecdote in John Locke’s *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* marks one of the many ways in which the long eighteenth century grappled with the questions and possibilities of “what is unseen.” How could a blind man understand color? How do science and art evolve once the microscope (or telescope) makes visible what was previously unseen? How does society respond to the discovery of heretofore unseen qualities comprising the workings of everyday life? This was a period of optical revelations—and one fascinated by what still eluded the literal and figurative limits of human sight. For example, the novel, the genre that famously emerged during this period, is predicated on the illusion of embodied, unseen referents beyond the margins of the text and the ability to stir readers’ desire to “see” people who do not exist. This panel asks participants to consider the figurative and literal dimensions of “what is unseen”: how did eighteenth-century writers, artists, and philosophers acknowledge and engage this category?

Ways into the topic could include: treatments of invisibility, visibility, and qualities of sight; representations of/cultural approaches to blindness; literary and artistic representations of unseen forces, ghosts, and spirits; eighteenth-century discussions of ekphrasis; scientific developments related to sight; literary genre; formal conventions that evoke expectations of seeing or not being seen

**101. Asia in the Eighteenth Century** Susan Spencer, University of Central Oklahoma (Emerita), [sspencer@uco.edu](mailto:sspencer@uco.edu)

Asia in the long eighteenth century was a dynamic place. Widespread social and political upheaval, along with efficient, affordable new avenues for the dissemination of written material and household goods, created a ready market for novel commodities and fresh genres in art and literature. An increasingly affluent merchant class demanded luxury goods and commodities that

reflected their own needs and interests rather than catering exclusively to the courtly tastes of the entrenched aristocracy. The age also produced written works that diverged from convention and are now valued as cultural treasures: the rising popularity of operatic musical theater, subversive collections of ghost tales, and domestic novels in China; Japan's reinvention of haiku as performance art, sophisticated puppet theater and richly illustrated ukiyozōshi narratives of the rising merchant class; Vietnam's national epic, *The Tale of Kiều*, with its graphic account of sexual trafficking from the victim's perspective; and, in Korea, underground protest poetry and a firsthand description of the corruption of courtly values in the *Memoirs of Lady Hyegyong*. How did the creations of Asian artisans, artists, and authors question—or fail to question—traditional expectations for class and gender? How did they challenge aristocratic values charged with assumptions that privilege rank, property, and patriarchy? This panel welcomes reflections on these and other developments in eighteenth-century Asia.

**102. Corresponding Worlds: the Networked Life of Maria Edgeworth (Roundtable)**

Susan Egenolf (Texas A&M University), [s-egenolf@tamu.edu](mailto:s-egenolf@tamu.edu); and Jessica Richard (Wake Forest University) [richarja@wfu.edu](mailto:richarja@wfu.edu)

To celebrate the 2022 launch of the Maria Edgeworth Letters Project crowdsourced transcription initiative in Zooniverse, we invite papers treating any aspect of correspondence in Edgeworth's fiction and life. In Edgeworth's fictions, correspondence figures prominently, from the epistolary exchange of Caroline and Julia in her *Letters for Literary Ladies* (1795) to Cecilia's packet of amorous correspondence that becomes misattributed to Helen with dire consequences in *Helen* (1834). In her personal life, Edgeworth cultivated an extensive network of local and global correspondents, including her nearby Aunt Ruxton in County Meath, Ireland, her sister Anna in Bristol (wife of natural philosopher Thomas Beddoes), and her brother Michael Pakenham in India. She corresponded with a wide range of contemporary authors, including Jane Austen, Fanny Burney, Sir Walter Scott, Elizabeth Inchbald, and the Swiss political writer Étienne Dumont. Edgeworth also engaged in a multi-decade exchange of letters and material objects with the Jewish-American educator Rachel Mordecai Lazarus.

The panel will explore the complexity of Edgeworth's networks revealed in her substantial fictional and biographical correspondence. Her letters range through the topics of gender construction, national identity, education, empire, science and politics (Anglo-Irish and beyond). Panelists might also discuss their work on the manuscript letters, the challenges of remediation, or the biographical constructions of Edgeworth in Frances Beaumont Edgeworth's *A Memoir of Maria Edgeworth: With a Selection of Her Letters* (1867) and Augustus Hare's *The Life and Letters of Maria Edgeworth* (1894). Please send 250-word abstracts to both organizers, Susan Egenolf ([s-egenolf@tamu.edu](mailto:s-egenolf@tamu.edu)) and Jessica Richard ([richarja@wfu.edu](mailto:richarja@wfu.edu)).

**103. The Global Eighteenth Century and Religion** David Alvarez, DePauw University, [davidalvarez@depauw.edu](mailto:davidalvarez@depauw.edu)

This panel seeks papers that consider the politics of European Enlightenment conceptualizations of "religion" as a universal category. Secularism studies has argued that the concepts of the secular and the religious are, in the words of anthropologist Saba Mahmood, "interdependent and necessarily linked in their mutual transformation and historical emergence." How might analyzing the historical co-formation of the secular and the religious in the long eighteenth

century help us better understand the genealogies of cosmopolitanism, imperialism, and other Enlightenment global projects?

**104. Unusual Contracts** Rachel Gevlin, Birmingham-Southern College, [ragevlin@bsc.edu](mailto:ragevlin@bsc.edu)

The long eighteenth century marked a pivotal era in the history of contract theory and contractual regulation of both the public and private spheres. Institutionalized contracts, such as those forwarded by Hardwicke's Marriage Act, worked to standardize what does (and, crucially, does not) constitute an acceptable agreement between two or more parties. This panel seeks papers that explicate "unusual contracts"—out-of-the-ordinary arrangements, agreements, or negotiations made either in private or under the purview of the law. Papers might explore a wide range of topics (including but not limited to: criminal justice; commerce; publishing or artistic patronage; sex, marriage, or divorce; child-rearing or guardianship; etc.), but should take as their subjects someone(s) who pushed back against established contractual norms--or who might even reframe what we view as standard agreements to begin with. Any and all disciplines welcome.

**105. Aesthetics and Affects** Karen Valihora, Associate Professor, York University, Toronto, Canada., [valihora@yorku.ca](mailto:valihora@yorku.ca)

How did the eighteenth century think about affect? Attention to the foundational categories of pleasure and pain structures much of the period's aesthetic theory, as well as its understanding of moral or conventional experience. In the Dictionary, Johnson defines affect as "affection, passion, sensation," and cites Bacon's Natural History, "the wrists have a sympathy with the heart; we see the affects and passions of the heart and spirits are notably disclosed by the pulse." Affects are the marks of nature on the body. Attention to affect structures the period's works of art: the appeal to and forging of sensibility in the novel and in the theatre, for example. Poetry is transformed altogether, shaped by the intensity of feeling and interiority associated with the romantic period. This panel seeks papers that address the roles of affect in eighteenth-century aesthetic theory, moral philosophy, and art. How do new "structures of feeling" emerge alongside and within the period's interdisciplinarity, generic innovation, and adaptation across modes and genres? Are affects waiting for us in the novel and in poetry, ready to come to life for every new reader? Were specific affects the inventions of art as much as they were a fact of life? What are some of the concerns in the representation of affect? Of particular interest is the cross fertilization that occurs, how the sensibility and/or sentimentality of the early novel, for example, make its way into the philosophy and theory of everyday life and social convention.

**106. Collaboration, Collectivity, Conflict-Resolution (Roundtable)** Katie Stallsmith, Carnegie Mellon University, [mstallsm@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:mstallsm@andrew.cmu.edu)

This roundtable explores various forms of and possibilities for collaboration among scholars of the eighteenth century, whether in an academic or other professional/political context. We seek insightful narratives about successful and unsuccessful efforts at collaboration, coalition-building, solidarity, and symbiosis. We are particularly interested in collectivity among scholars, across subject positions, as a catalyst for disciplinary and institutional change. We also seek successful and unsuccessful narratives about conflict resolution. How do we address the institutional barriers to collaboration that are endemic to the humanities? What are the risks and

rewards of collaborative instruction? Of collaborative research? Which strategies have a proven track record of uniting scholars toward a common goal? How might collaboration and its corollaries achieve activist goals that other approaches might not? What are the pitfalls in efforts to collaborate? In efforts to resolve conflicts? How might we call upon university and other administrations to implement and incentivize collaboration and conflict resolution, as a means of effecting longed-for change?

**107. Johnson and Pope: Agon or Admiration Society?** Timothy Erwin, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, [timothy.erwin@unlv.edu](mailto:timothy.erwin@unlv.edu)

At the 2020 meeting in Toronto a speaker suggested that Samuel Johnson and Alexander Pope engaged in "a lifelong agon." The idea deserves sustained discussion. When the unknown Johnson published "London" (1738), he entered willingly or not into a competition with Pope, whose "One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight: A Dialogue" appeared about the same time. Pope was impressed, saying of the anonymous author that his identity would soon be known. Late in life Johnson wrote a critical biography of Pope describing him as the Augustan poet par excellence. "If Pope be not a poet, then where is poetry to be found?", he asks.

At the same time there are real differences between the two, even perhaps some dislike. In the "Life of Pope" Johnson the earnest moralist clearly has little patience with the borrowed ethical system of the "Essay on Man." It's easy to read between the lines of Johnson's "Life of Savage" to find that Richard Savage, who depended on Pope for moral and financial support, was abandoned on his deathbed. This roundtable invites a shared consideration of the careers of Pope and Johnson as they intersect in any number of ways, from common themes to differences in social and political attitudes.

**108. Chesapeake Writing before Jefferson** Amanda Louise Johnson, [amandajohnson1983@gmail.com](mailto:amandajohnson1983@gmail.com)

Before Thomas Jefferson emerged as a public writer in 1774, texts written from or about present-day Maryland and Virginia already existed in varied genres, included exploration narratives (i.e. Thomas Harriot's *Briefe and True Account* [1588]), promotional pamphlets (i.e. John Hammond's *Leah and Rachel, or the Two Fruitful Sisters of Virginia and Maryland* [1656]), and mock-epic accounts (i.e. Ebenezer Cooke's *The Maryland Muse* [1744]). While these texts illustrate a cultural self-consciousness that manifests in multiple registers, however, they were long marginalized in British literature as well as American literary studies. The greater salience of Transatlanticism, Global Southern Studies, and American Hemispheric studies, however, has re-introduced many scholars to these long-out-of-print texts, which digital archives now make far more accessible to students as well. With such in mind, this panel welcomes presentations on Chesapeake writing before Jefferson that address any of the following questions: How do such texts reveal colonial innovations or subversions of metropolitan literary forms? Or, how do they reflect the influence of Indigenous cultures? Do these texts present as "Southern" and thus complicate Early American literature's traditional emphasis on the Northeast, or, do they trouble the notion of a North-South division altogether? Given how these texts originated from white settler writers, can we read them against the grain for Black or Indigenous perspectives? If not, how do we discuss these texts in Early American or transnational Eighteenth-Century syllabi

without revisiting historical trauma upon our BIPOC students? Finally, how can emergent virtual learning methods bring such texts to life?

**109. Reframing Rousseau's *Lévite d'Ephraïm*: The Hebrew Bible, hospitality, and modern identity (Roundtable)** Karen Sullivan, Queens College/City University of New York, [karen.sullivan@qc.cuny.edu](mailto:karen.sullivan@qc.cuny.edu)

*Le Lévite d'Ephraïm* is one of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's lesser-known works, considered by some to be tangential importance for the understanding of Rousseau's oeuvre. But although unpublished in his lifetime, Rousseau called the *Lévite d'Ephraïm* his favorite work. It marks a turning point for him both professionally and personally, and relates in complex ways to many of the themes in his writings.

In re-imagining an ancient biblical text, in the *Lévite d'Ephraïm*, Rousseau explores the psychological and communal implications of violence and, through them, the social and political context of humankind. These connections have remained largely unexamined and thus Reframing Rousseau's *Lévite d'Ephraïm*: The Hebrew Bible, hospitality, and modern identity (Oxford University Studies in the Enlightenment series) explores new ground.

Rousseau's rewriting of a Biblical narrative reflects his vision of language, human nature and the fragility of community bonds while offering unique insight into Rousseau's understanding of human psychology, hospitality and marginalization, and the dynamics of scapegoating and civil unrest.

What are the implications of the questions raised, both implicitly and explicitly, by *Le Lévite d'Ephraïm*? How do Rousseau's writings -- particularly *Le Lévite d'Ephraïm*-- speak to a 21ST-century world fractured by demonization and alienation? In this roundtable discussion, the co-editors and authors of Reframing Rousseau's *Lévite d'Ephraïm*: will address how their multidisciplinary approach offers a more complete understanding of the polysemic complexity of Rousseau's writings.

**110. Power and Pedagogy (Workshop)** Regulus Allen, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, [rlallen@calpoly.edu](mailto:rlallen@calpoly.edu)

The classroom has become a critical focal point of debates regarding antiracism, diversity, equity, inclusiveness, and accessibility, and the eighteenth century is often integral to discussions of democracy, liberty, equality, and rights as well as histories of racism, oppression, and exploitation. This workshop aims to foster discussion and the sharing of strategies as we face a growing number of structural issues relating to power and pedagogy in our institutions. How can we navigate policies that restrict what we do in the classroom, from bans on teaching Critical Race Theory to pressures to adhere to traditional and exclusionary visions of "the canon" or "the Enlightenment"? How can we create decolonial courses and curricula in institutions that, explicitly or tacitly, eschew these approaches? Is teaching a form of activism and/or resistance and if so, how do we negotiate the possibilities of retaliation from students, colleagues, and administrations? How do teachers of eighteenth-century studies uphold or challenge power structures regarding race, class, gender, sexuality, dis/ability, religious affiliation, and intersectionality? What are the curricular vehicles--university distribution requirements, core courses for majors/minors/MAs/doctorates--in which teaching eighteenth-century studies constitutes a pathway toward change? The workshop organizers are seeking facilitators

specializing in different fields of eighteenth-century studies to help lead discussions and to facilitate a breakout group. Please send a 250-word abstract describing the question/theme relating to power and pedagogy that you'd like to address and how you might facilitate a small group activity based upon it.

**111. Performing Cultural Pastiche in the Eighteenth-Century Theatre** Natalya Baldyga (Phillips Academy, Andover), [nbaldyga@andover.edu](mailto:nbaldyga@andover.edu)

Theatrical tastes in the eighteenth-century were hardly pure, much to the dismay of ardent nationalists. Due to the circulation of texts, performers, and theory, theatrical feasts for the eye and ear were often a pasticcio of cultural ingredients. Italian opera infiltrated England, exasperating critics such as Steele and Addison. Goethe happily borrowed the fairy-tale comedy of Carlo Gozzi for early experiments in Weimar. In Paris, the Nouveau Théâtre Italien combined Italian performance styles and French comedy, bringing a hybrid Arlequin to life in the plays of Marivaux. In the theoretical realm, John Hill's *The Actor; or, A Treatise on the Art of Playing*, a heavily adapted translation of Pierre Remond Sainte-Albine's *Le Comédien*, was translated back into French as *Garrick; ou, Les Acteurs Anglois*, leading Diderot to draft what would become *Le Paradoxe sur le comédien*. This panel seeks papers that explore the rich infusions of cultural exchange that permeated the theatrical world of the global eighteenth century. In particular, we welcome submissions that explore underexamined cultural adaptations, flavorings, blendings, or distillations, and unexpected meetings of geographies and genres.

**112. Travelling for Work: Eighteenth-Century Narratives of Geographic and Economic Mobility** Amanda Springs and Heather Zuber, [heather.zuber@qc.cuny.edu](mailto:heather.zuber@qc.cuny.edu)

Last year, our limited geographical mobility called attention to the imbrication of the ability to travel and economic security. *Robinson Crusoe*, *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin*, *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano*, *Moll Flanders*, and Samuel Johnson's "The Life of Sir Francis Drake"--the eighteenth century is rife with narratives that highlight the connection between geographic and economic mobility. These narratives chronicle the lives of men and women--fictional and real--that were shaped by economic opportunities that demanded mobility, local and global.

Recent work in mobility studies, such as Charlotte Sussman's *Peopling the World: Representing Human Mobility from Milton to Malthus* (2020), Ingrid Horrocks's *Women Wanders and the Writing of Mobility: 1784-1814* (2019), and Chris Ewers's *Mobility in the English Novel from Defoe to Austen* (2018), explores literary representations of mobility and argues for their reading in the context of cultural developments in the fields of science, labor, urban development, and the transport revolution within the British Empire, but do not explicitly interrogate the relationship between physical/geographical mobility and individual economic opportunity.

This panel seeks shorter papers that explore the nexus between economic mobility (upward and downward) and geographic mobility in eighteenth-century narratives. We welcome papers that approach this topic from any field or combination of fields, and especially those that employ various modes of analysis--historic, economic, digital, quantitative, literary, etc.

**113. Sight and Seeing in Eighteenth-Century Fiction** John Han, [jshan111@gmail.com](mailto: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 as metaphor. What do fictional accounts of sight tell us about the relationship between sight and imagination, ocular proof and illusion, material visibility and internal subjectivity?

**114. Hispanists Here to Help! Integrating Spain and Latin America into Your Eighteenth-Century Courses (Roundtable)** Adela Ramos, Pacific Lutheran University, [ramosam@plu.edu](mailto:ramosam@plu.edu)

This roundtable continues the call to build “Everybody’s ASECS” and “to stimulate interdisciplinary and cross-cultural conversations” by helping to create classroom spaces where the many languages and literatures that constitute the Enlightenment come together. Proposed in response to the enthusiastic support the session received at ASECS 2021 and offered in connection to Plan Your Survey Course: Workshop on Backwards Design, it has a twofold goal: we aim to continue providing dieciochistas from all corners of the globe with ideas for how to integrate the literatures of Spain and Latin America to their courses, and with opportunities to reflect on, discuss, and even revise our pedagogical frameworks. We invite proposals from scholars that offer innovative ideas for including the Hispanic world—perhaps a separate unit or in a comparative framework—in courses on the eighteenth century and/or the Enlightenment offered by departments of English, French, American Studies, Women and Gender Studies, History, Art History, and Music. We also welcome proposals that consider the broader implications of rethinking the traditional pedagogical parameters that have tended to marginalize the Hispanic eighteenth century for our understanding of issues such as empire, race, slavery, science, and commerce.

**115. Forms of Speech** Katherine Charles, Washington College, [KATIEGCHARLES@GMAIL.COM](mailto:KATIEGCHARLES@GMAIL.COM)

Twenty years after Susan Wolfson called for a New Formalism, form still operates as a hot topic, though current debates largely eschew claims to newness or formalism. In the context of method war, some critics have turned to the concept of form and the practice of formal analysis as a bulwark of disciplinarity. This panel considers what might be gained by combining a method-forward approach to form with a media studies approach to speech, thereby emphasizing what Helen Deutsch has called the “voiceness of texts”. Speech, we propose, offers a useful category

both in its conceptual linkage with the body and the difference-making used to sort groups of bodies, but also as an invocation of orality from within the forms of print culture. Recent work by Cynthia Wall and Abigail Zitin has productively explored the ways that literary form can be organized around visual perceptions and arts—what might we find by switching our focus from sight to sound, and in particular, to the ways that written texts can be organized around speech? Relevant topics might span from explorations of historical context like elocution practices and vocal disability to analysis of formal techniques like speech bubbles and interpolated tales and even to interrogations of the absence of speech in ellipses and silence. Approaches to and commitment to form may vary.

**116. Drunk in the Eighteenth century** Jared Richman (Colorado College),  
[jrichman@coloradocollege.edu](mailto:jrichman@coloradocollege.edu)

This panel invites meditations on the cultural meanings and historical contexts of alcohol use in the Long Eighteenth Century with particular emphasis on representation in print (textual or visual) and on the stage. It seeks to gather papers that examine how early modern cultural norms and stereotypes around alcohol shaped British domestic and imperial policies and practices and how such renderings reflected and codified social attitudes towards alcohol with special emphasis on pleasure, humor, delight, sex, wealth, sociability, isolation, disease, and death. This panel particularly welcomes those papers that engage critical and theoretical frameworks emphasizing how ethnicity, race, religion, gender, ability, sexuality and socio-economic background shape the representation of alcohol, its social function, its political contexts, and its various stigmas.

**117. Colony/Calumny: Disaggregation and Persistence of Colonial Gestalt (Roundtable)**  
Rebecca Shapiro, City University of New York, [rebecca.alice.shapiro@gmail.com](mailto:rebecca.alice.shapiro@gmail.com)

Despite apologists' claims that colonization benefited the colonized as well as enslaved or displaced people forced to "colonize" with access to education or financial stability, others had their wealth stolen from them.

Colonization was never a purely positive or negative outcome for people and groups on whose land European countries settled, for those people who came to the colonies, and those in the diasporas who left colonized countries for the colonizer's country (Windrush). The keyword "colony" presents as disparate ways with often dramatically different outcomes.

This roundtable considers how groups experienced "colony" and what it meant: Caribbean and American life for Jews or Moravians; Quakers in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Massachusetts; Jamaican Maroons; Lenni Lenape; enslaved Africans in French Guiana versus enslaved Africans elsewhere; South Asians in the Indian subcontinent or the Caribbean; evangelical lexicography and conversion; Irish indentured exiles; women slaveholders; Scots in ceded islands.

Each demographic--by choice or by force—often intersected and were affected by the European colonial enterprise. While it is important to understand what happened to those people, it is likewise important to examine what they brought with them: culture, spirituality, social networks, language, shifting notions of empire. Conceived of generationally, the degree of harmfulness of "colony" depends on the subject studied.



Erving Goffman's "gestalt" is helpful, as there was no one unifying colonial experience and "colony" persists in current political and social discourse. We should disaggregate "colonial experience" into "colonial gestalt," as there is more than one central question of colony or imperial enterprise.

**118. "Ungovernable Regions"** Brett D. Wilson, William & Mary, [bdwils@wm.edu](mailto:bdwils@wm.edu)

Across the long 18th century, imperial powers developed and imposed new techniques of subjection; in the face of these efforts, subaltern peoples struggled for, maintained, and forged distinctive forms of autonomy and governance. In the "ungovernable regions" at the limits of Eurocentric notions of sovereignty, who rules, and how? This session seeks papers addressing the representation of resistances and alternatives to modes of metropolitan and settler sovereignty in our period. Contributions invited from scholars working both inside and outside of the English-speaking world, the Americas, and the British Isles.

**119. Jonathan Swift and his Circle XV (in memory of Donald Mell)** Sean Moore, University of New Hampshire [Sean.Moore@unh.edu](mailto:Sean.Moore@unh.edu)

Current scholarship on Swift and his Circle. 250-word abstracts should be sent to Sean Moore. The registration fees of accepted panelists for this session will be covered by a generous donation from Prof. Mell's family.

**120. Fictions of Dominion** Mladen Kozul, University of Montana, [mladen.kozul@mso.umt.edu](mailto:mladen.kozul@mso.umt.edu)

At the end of the 17th century, Pierre Bayle, like other early Enlightenment thinkers, reflected upon the enigmatic dominion exercised over others, the foundation of power and authority. But the submission to the authority of the Ancients, of the Church, or prejudices, is not abstract. Institutions in fact exist only because of humans. Literature and theater have been at the forefront of the exploration of this dominion in power relations. From Moliere's *Tartuffe* to Voltaire's *Mahomet*, from the libertine heroes of Crébillon fils to those of Laclos, from the man to the woman and colonizer to the colonized, literature examines, dismantles, and denounces the dominion over others. If it concerns above all the political and religious spheres, it cannot be separated from mechanisms of desire which, admittedly or not, distribute the roles of dominator and dominated. This panel welcomes literary, theatrical, philosophical and/or interdisciplinary approaches to the complex relations of dominance in the Age of Enlightenment. The papers may be in English or French.

**121. Who Run the World? Girl Culture in the Long-Eighteenth Century** Maura Gleeson, Valencia College and Lauren Walter, University of Florida, [Mauragleeson@outlook.com](mailto:Mauragleeson@outlook.com)

Enlightenment thinkers such as Locke and Rousseau identified childhood as a period of innocence and vulnerability that required protection and care from parents, and mothers in particular. The question of how to define a female child, however, was complicated by social expectations of women to fulfill their 'natural' roles as wives and mothers. By 1780, the *Dictionnaire critique de la langue française* identified childhood and adolescence as an important

stage on the path to ‘womanhood.’ This panel seeks papers that examine the politics, problematics, parameters of defining “girls” and “girlhood” during the long eighteenth century in Europe. Girl culture was explored as its own social category through conduct manuals such as the *Conseils à une amie* (1749), *L’Ami des filles* (1761), and *Instructions to Young Ladies* (1774). Educational treatises and etiquette manuals argued for teaching subjects such as basic arithmetic and the domestic arts that would train them for womanhood, wifedom, and motherhood. While these pedagogical tools give us insight into cultural expectations for girls, other perspectives of girl culture can be unveiled when we look closely at how the girls performed these tasks. In what ways did gendered practices such as embroidery, amateur drawing and painting, or fashion consumption provide a space for girls to perform as themselves, and in their own terms, in a society that refused them intellectual agency? What social, intellectual, or economic parameters contributed to the experience of girlhood in Europe? In what ways was ‘girlhood’ exploited, defined, or undermined by visual culture? How has it been overlooked?

**122. Redesigning Eighteenth-Century Britain** Mike Goode, Syracuse University,  
[mgoode@syr.edu](mailto:mgoode@syr.edu)

This session asks participants to attend to the conceptual frameworks through which eighteenth-century British artists, craftspeople, gardeners, engineers, philosophers, and/or politicians talked about medial, ecological, structural, formal, or aesthetic design, with an especial emphasis on how they thought about \*redesigning\* as an activity, process, and mode. Papers might ideologically critique specific eighteenth-century languages of, or material instances of, redesign to unpack the work they accomplish (the example comes to mind of how debates over "revolution" and "reform" sometimes played out as conversations over how best to "renovate" or "remodel" the state). But the impetus for the session comes just as much from current interest in so-called “post-critical” approaches to eighteenth-century Britain, like new materialism, new formalism, and actor-network theory. Such approaches often encourage thinking about objects and forms both as designs and as designing agents, and they also sometimes leverage conceptual vocabularies imported from design theory (affordances, capabilities, allowances, etc.). To what extent are any of these new approaches drawing upon or redesigning eighteenth-century terms or conceptual lenses? Might any eighteenth-century intellectual frameworks or terms for thinking about design generally, or about specific designs or instances of redesign, be used to enrich or critique new scholarly approaches that rely upon design concepts and vocabularies? The goal of the session is to promote a richer understanding of the intellectual history of eighteenth-century British design while also reflecting on the theoretical possibilities and limitations that various design concepts might hold for studying eighteenth-century texts and cultures.

**123. Talking with the Dead (and the Living): Dialogues des morts et des vivants in Enlightenment-Era France (Roundtable)** Charlee Bezilla, Northern Virginia Community College, [cmredman@terpmail.umd.edu](mailto:cmredman@terpmail.umd.edu)

Throughout the long eighteenth century in France, authors including Fontenelle, Fréret, Crébillon fils, Diderot, and Delisle de Sales put into conversation deceased (and sometimes long dead) historical figures and characters and occasionally personages from their own time. We find in *La Philosophie de la nature of Delisle de Sales*, for example, dialogues between Rousseau’s

Wolmar from *La Nouvelle Héloïse* and Socrates, between Descartes and Newton, Socrates and Pascal, Leibniz and Charles XII. The characters of Diderot's *Le Rêve de d'Alembert* are named after himself and his friends, but he originally conceived it as a dialogue between Leucippus, Democritus, and Hippocrates. In making such characters speak posthumously and/or with living or fictional persons, writers engaged in varied literary, philosophical, political, and scientific debates. This roundtable seeks to explore how the repurposing and recycling of characters (both from anterior periods and the eighteenth century) complements the goals of the dialogue philosophique or scientifique. To what purposes do Enlightenment-era authors put these characters? What aesthetic, philosophical, political, or moral perspectives do they make possible? What can they reveal about the importance of vraisemblance as a literary tool (or prescription)? In the decades following the polemics of the querelle des Anciens et des Modernes, how does repackaging this popular genre from the Classical period serve authors' agendas? What issues of "ownership" and originality are implicated in the coopting of historical figures and other authors' characters? Might thinking of these dialogues as "fan-fictions" be useful? Submissions from graduate students and early career scholars are welcome.

**124. Agricultural Knowledge and Practices in the Eighteenth Century** Sarah Benharrech, University of Maryland, [sbenharr@umd.edu](mailto:sbenharr@umd.edu)

This panel seeks to interrogate literary, cultural, and pictorial representations of agriculture in Europe and in the world with a focus on divergent views on the exploitation of nature. We are interested in papers exploring/questioning the physiocratic imperative of progress, the modernization of agricultural and horticultural practices, by shedding light for instance on the conflicts between traditional praxis and the proponents of rationalized, quantified, scalable knowledge. We invite contributions that investigate the forms of resistance to innovation, the authority of abstract science over empirical knowledge, and the proliferation of treatises on horticulture and gardening that have until recently received little scholarly attention. We also welcome papers examining ways of reconfiguring the ecologies of human/nonhuman relationships in the context of food production.

**125. Visualizing Eighteenth-Century Urban Spaces (Roundtable)** Molly Nebiolo, Northeastern University, [nebiolo.m@northeastern.edu](mailto:nebiolo.m@northeastern.edu)

How can we see the spaces of the past? How did cities fit into early American landscapes? In what ways do digital tools and the digital humanities inform our understanding of space and place in eighteenth-century early America? These are just a few questions that can be addressed, pondered, and answered in this panel. Images of the period, from colonial maps to city plans, give us one way to imagine early American cities. Narratives around place, or the travelogues of those moving between cities and colonies, provide us with another avenue for "seeing" the past. With digital tools and programs, we can move closer to a more comprehensive narrative of early urban spaces. GIS mapping, 3D modelling, VR, and other digital platforms create a larger, interdisciplinary narrative around eighteenth century spatial history and the way different populations moved, belonged, and occupied urban spaces. We welcome a variety of interpretations of urban space, place, and ways of understanding both, digitally or otherwise. The session investigates the ways in which humanists are able to visualize the past, and it exemplifies the significance of urban space to the eighteenth century.

**126. The Subversive Body** Heather Heckman-McKenna, University of Missouri,  
[hmhbb9@umsystem.edu](mailto:hmhbb9@umsystem.edu)

How does the eighteenth-century body respond to oppression? And how does literature and art portray such responses? Given that oppression's core resides in controlling human bodies and the spaces those bodies are permitted to inhabit, the body has to have a role in the means through which the oppressed create agency and eventually manifest power. In this panel, we might consider women's bodies, trans bodies, African bodies, bodies of people of color, and transnational bodies, amongst others. How are eighteenth-century oppressed bodies seen, valued, or allowed? And how do people use their bodies to counteract the restrictions placed on them? So too we can consider contemporary places where women's bodies are oppressed, and the ways in which eighteenth-century studies can inform current events. One might think, for instance, about current stands on abortion, or of the ways in which trans bodies are continually endangered.

**127. Rival Texts: Collaboration and Conflict in the Eighteenth-Century Publishing Industry** Sarah Carter, McGill University, [sarah.carter@mail.mcgill.ca](mailto:sarah.carter@mail.mcgill.ca)

The printed book has long been a site of negotiation. Books draw together the creative labour of authors, editors, translators, designers, draughtsmen, engravers and printers. In the eighteenth century this division of labour promoted collaboration and innovation, but also incited conflict and compromise between contributors. In instances of translation, linguistic and cultural difference as well as distance could further complicate production. In addition to the diverse, behind-the-scenes cooperation that empowered this thriving industry, bound volumes also contained rival modes of communication. Embedded in the "ut pictura poesis" and "sister arts" debates, text and images shared valuable space but solicited the reader/viewer in different ways—complementary and contested. This interdisciplinary session invites papers that 1) examine the working relationships that supported eighteenth-century publishing ventures; 2) consider instances of rival editions (or translations) of the same text; or 3) revisit the rapport between word and image in eighteenth-century books.

**128. Thinking Enlightenment Medialogically** J.B. Shank, University of Minnesota,  
[jbshank@umn.edu](mailto:jbshank@umn.edu)

New media are often accused of undermining the fundamental ground of Enlightenment modernity. Be it websites like QAnon undermining the facts secured by authoritative print, or Twitter, Snap Chat, and Tik Tok destabilizing the literacy essential to democratic politics, or even the way that new streaming audio and video (podcasts, YouTube, Netflix) remake literature and the arts by unseating traditional forms like the novel, the theater, and the visual arts: everywhere, new media is routinely situated as an antagonist of established Enlightenment cultural order. Yet viewed historically, the advent of Enlightenment was itself the consequence of a new media revolution. The novel was nothing if not a genre born of a new relation between writing and public print media (newspapers; pamphlets; periodicals). The visual arts were also transformed by the explosion of reproducible print images after 1650, and the new multimedia interactions between pictures and texts that print made possible. In all these ways and more, the

eighteenth-century was a moment mediologically akin to our own, not its opposite, and this panel proposes a mediological exploration of Enlightenment culture as a way to reflect on the relation between history and our own media contemporaneity. Papers focused on the role of new media, or innovative re-makings of the old in the creation of Enlightenment are encouraged, along with inquiries into the media-shaped and even media-determined way that Enlightenment circulated as a cultural phenomena. All manner of mediological exploration with any and all forms of Enlightenment media and mediation are acceptable.

**129. Let's Get Small: Micro-Art Histories of the Eighteenth Century** Melissa Hyde,  
University of Florida, [mlhyde@ymail.com](mailto:mlhyde@ymail.com)

A by now thoroughly established trend in art history and in accounts of eighteenth century culture has oriented us towards questions of sweeping global scope and ambition, and the charting of vast and complex international networks and Empires in art and culture. This history, rich in insights, is nevertheless sometimes gigantesque in its claims for art as well as in its scope. This session takes a different tack, and proposes instead to explore little histories, micro-histories, local histories and microscopic histories of art, understood either as histories of small or marginal things or as 'little histories', geographically confined, fleeting, circumscribed, particular, even anecdotal. What can intense scrutiny of local specifics, concentration on seemingly small-scale or unnoticed events works or networks of art tell us? And what are the pleasures, as well as the profits, of paddling the backwaters and trawling the pond for all that is teeming, singular, vibrant but hard to see? I welcome papers from "microscopists" of eighteenth-century art history on any aspect of the period that ask big questions about small things.

**130. Performance, Communication, and Power in the Long 18th Century** Carolyn  
Eastman, Dept. of History, Virginia Commonwealth University, [ceastman@vcu.edu](mailto:ceastman@vcu.edu)

This panel explores some of the ways that the performance of power, legitimacy, and authority during the long 18th century was altered as a result of changes in styles and modes of communication. We seek to explore not only innovations in the rhetoric and appearance of the printed word, but also within the performance of the spoken word and the enactment of printed visual items—styles of communication that sought new ways of persuading readers, listeners, and viewers to embrace new ideas. It was during this era that the imperative to sway public opinion came to appear increasingly vital for people in power, as social and political leaders faced redoubled challenges to hereditary or aristocratic authority. In addition, it was during this era that people previously considered social and political outsiders found new means, and new forums, for their ideas. Moreover, the vogue for anchoring new ideas about communication to new ideas about politics and power would continue to have radically important effects long into the nineteenth century. The subjects we hope to explore have wide interdisciplinary interest, for they bring together scholarship from history, literature, religious studies, rhetoric, communication, political science, and theater history.

**131. Spreading the Image: European Print Culture of the Eighteenth Century** Susanne  
Anderson-Riedel, University of New Mexico, [ariedel@unm.edu](mailto:ariedel@unm.edu)

The session invites new scholarship on the publishing, commerce, and distribution of prints to investigate the close net of international collaborations within the European and Global print markets in the long 18th century. Market interactions highlight the role of prints in facilitating aesthetic, intellectual, and cultural dialogues of the Enlightenment.

**132. Jane Austen's Known and Suspected Predecessors (Roundtable)** Rachel Carnell, Cleveland State University, [r.carnell@csuohio.edu](mailto:r.carnell@csuohio.edu)

Since Frank Bradbrook penned *Jane Austen and her Predecessors* in 1967, scholarship on eighteenth-century writers has blossomed to include many more authors who may have influenced Austen. Olivia Murphy added to our understanding of Austen as a reader and a writer in her 2012 *Jane Austen the Reader*, and many other scholars have explored how Austen moved from what she read to what she wrote. In addition to those works touched on in the thoughtful scholarship in this area, it is likely that Austen—as avid reader—was drawing on many other works not yet identified. Have you long suspected that she must have read a certain novel or text not traditionally acknowledged as an influence? Have you come up with a new interpretation of how she drew on otherwise acknowledged influences? Your scholarly hunches would be most welcome on this roundtable, which will feature up to seven seven-minute presentations.

**133. European Spectacle behind the curtain: décor, machines, and special effects** Elisa Cazzato - Università Cà Foscari (post-doc) - NYU (visiting research fellow), [elisa.cazzato@gmail.com](mailto:elisa.cazzato@gmail.com)

This panel promotes a discussion on artistic practices behind the creation of spectacle in 18th-Century Europe. The worlds of stage design, machinery, and popular attractions are inherently transient and contingent and often leave few traces. During this period, moreover, a host of stage decorators, machinists, fireworks technicians, circus performers, and foreign entertainers circulated across Europe, spreading ideas and practices that were frequently appropriated and standardized while their origins or creators went unacknowledged. These influential artists and performers, often lacking strong institutional affiliation, have not been given the same critical attention paid to visual artists, musicians, or dramatists.

This panel encourages a behind-the-scenes look at such artistic practices that can expand our view and understanding of 18th-century spectacle and its varied constituents. For example, how did artists involved in ephemeral or peripheral activities exert their individual personalities? In what ways did certain attractions like wax statues and dioramas, cabinets d'optique, and Wunderkammer inform and overlap with science and technology? How might we account for the status of the marvelous within an era of so-called "Enlightenment" rationality? How can we appreciate décor and other special effects not only as artistic products, but also as autonomous cultural phenomena?

The session seeks to foster interdisciplinary dialogue on performance creation, stage-settings, and the circulation of artists and ideas. It welcomes submissions from scholars at any career stage, as well as from arts professionals in or outside academia. Contributions informed by the experience of staging (or planning to stage) an eighteenth-century work are especially encouraged.

**134. Representing “Arabia” in the Long Eighteenth Century** Ileana Baird, Zayed University, [ileana.baird@zu.ac.ae](mailto:ileana.baird@zu.ac.ae)

This panel invites papers on eighteenth-century texts or visual art that engage with, provide accounts of, or create Orientalist fictions about “Arabia.” The growing interest in the Orient and orientalia fueled by eighteenth-century travelers to the Near East and by translations like Galland’s *A Thousand and One Nights* (1704-1717), rendered in English as the *Arabian Nights Entertainments* (1706-1721), produced a large corpus of works that often used “Arabia” as an umbrella term that described not one location, but many. How did these texts represent “Arabia” and the “Arabs” and what sets of images or cultural stereotypes about the place and its people emerged at the time? How are the “Arabs” and “Arabia” rendered in the eighteenth-century visual satire and to what effect on the viewers? How can such texts or repertoire of images be used to teach the global eighteenth century and notions of otherness, the subaltern, transculturation, and/or cultural cross-pollination to our students? Please send brief proposals to [ileana.baird@zu.ac.ae](mailto:ileana.baird@zu.ac.ae).

**135. Fairy Tales in the Eighteenth Century** Rori Bloom, University of Florida, [ribloom@ufl.edu](mailto:ribloom@ufl.edu)

While the production of literary fairy tales in France may have reached a peak in the 1690s, this genre continued to be practiced throughout the eighteenth century despite Enlightenment interest in oriental and philosophical tales. Scholars have certainly evoked a second wave of fairy tales in eighteenth-century France, with some fairy-tale authors (often women) adhering closely to seventeenth-century models and others (often libertines) parodying their predecessors. This session is interested in examining fairy tales of the Enlightenment as alternately nostalgic and innovative, as a reflection on the previous century and a break from it. Moreover, while scholars of the seventeenth-century fairy tale have already defined the genre as less oral than textual and its audience as less childish than sophisticated, analyses of the eighteenth-century fairy tale might further explore its evolution in relation to a larger and more diverse reading public. At the same time, examinations of this genre’s persistence in the Enlightenment might give rise to analyses of the persistent interest in the marvelous in a period of supposed disenchantment. Although inspired by the phenomenon of the fairy tale in French literature, this panel is open to studies of the genre in other languages and fields.

**136. Media, Techniques, and Practices from the Mezzotint to the Daguerreotype** Megan Baker, University of Delaware; Joseph Litts, Princeton University, [mebaker@udel.edu](mailto:mebaker@udel.edu)

Numerous novel artistic techniques were developed over the long eighteenth century. Following recent process-driven art history, including research by Ewa Lajer-Burcharth or Matthew Hunter, we are interested in interrogating the politics and possibilities within artistic media, techniques, and practices. Artists, regardless of their culturo-geographic positioning, faced choices and material limits; beyond simple lack of access, they innovated and deliberately blurred the lines between different media. How did they navigate these choices and what are the non-iconographic visual ramifications? Can materials have a politics? Is there a materiality of settler colonialism? Is there a materiality of resistance to settler colonialism?

We especially encourage submissions from scholars at all stages who are looking at materials beyond traditional oil painting or sculpture, particularly including: drawings, pastels, watercolors, reproductive prints, miniatures, photographic processes before the daguerreotype, period techniques for ageing and/or conserving works of art, wax, relationships between makeup and theatrical productions, decoupage, souvenirs, or silhouettes. We are interested in approaches that consider inter-media and inter-material approaches to the history of art, as well as process-driven research centering innovative artistic techniques and new materials in the eighteenth century.

**137. Re-Activating the Repertoire: Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Drama on the Twenty-First Century Stage** Lisa A. Freeman, University of Illinois at Chicago, [lfreeman@uic.edu](mailto:lfreeman@uic.edu)

The Restoration and Eighteenth-Century dramatic repertoire offers both opportunities and challenges for the Twenty-First Century stage. While the opportunities to revive works that have not been seen for a long time are clear, challenges with respect to the ways in which the repertory is implicated in the consolidation of imperial ideologies and in the structuring and representation of racialized, gendered, classed identities are central concerns for the newly formed R/18 Collective, which seeks to foster the scholarship of performance by collaborating and supporting theatre makers. Papers are invited that engage the significance of this dual legacy of opportunities and challenges for imagining contemporary productions and bringing them to life on the stage. Questions that papers could address include: How might we conceive of Restoration and eighteenth-century plays as part of our living repertoire? In what sense are they vital for this moment? What is their performative potential in the present? How might we think about the work of engaging contemporary audiences and contemporary concerns? What types of issues and challenges might arise when we think about casting and staging practices?

**138. Conversations across the Arts: Adaptations in the Long Eighteenth Century**

Daniella Berman, New York University, [daniella.berman@nyu.edu](mailto:daniella.berman@nyu.edu); Ashley Bender, Texas Woman's University, [abender@twu.edu](mailto:abender@twu.edu)

When we talk about the eighteenth-century and adaptation, we frequently talk about adaptations of eighteenth-century literature and art, often into film. Yet adaptation was a common practice during the eighteenth century as well. From Nahum Tate's 1681 adaptation of Shakespeare's *King Lear* to William Hogarth's 1731 representation of a scene from John Gay's *Beggar's Opera* (1728); from Henry Fuseli's images inspired by, and William Blake's illustrations for, *Dante's Divine Comedy* to the numerous adaptations of Samuel Richardson's *Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded* (1740), eighteenth-century artists, writers, and composers regularly adapted works of their contemporaries and predecessors into new genres (e.g., novel to opera) and across media (e.g., novel to oil painting), creating what Giuseppe Mazzotta has called a "conversation among the arts." Drawing on the distinctions Julie Sanders makes between adaptation and appropriation (*Adaptation and Appropriation*, 2006), we invite papers that explore these phenomena across the long eighteenth century. We welcome papers on any kind of adaptation in the period, with a particular interest in adaptations across the arts. Please submit abstracts of approximately 300 words to Daniella Berman ([daniella.berman@nyu.edu](mailto:daniella.berman@nyu.edu)) and Ashley Bender ([abender@twu.edu](mailto:abender@twu.edu)).



- 139. Sir Charles Grandison: The Poly Digital Edition (Workshop)** Emily Friedman, Auburn University, [ecfriedman@auburn.edu](mailto:ecfriedman@auburn.edu)

Scholars have long known about the influence & richness of Samuel Richardson's final novel *Sir Charles Grandison*. Gerard Barker's *Grandison's Heirs* traced its impact on the depictions of male heroes for a century thereafter, Adele Kudish has described the novel's epistemology of love, and Bonnie Latimer has considered it in light of the "Jew Bill" of 1753.

Even though the novel was a favorite of classroom staple *Jane Austen*, it has been difficult to incorporate Richardson's novel into the classroom. An abridgment seems both necessary and enormously challenging.

This workshop will gather together those interested in creating a collectively-annotated and tagged digital edition of *Grandison*. Tagging the novel can create an edition that allows for multiple abridgments for different use cases. It continues in the tradition of abridgments and "beauties" that were part of Richardson's own publication practice, as well as the larger world of 18th century reading practices.

This edition aims to be "poly" in its final form in order to honor the way the novel itself is "poly" in several senses: in its awareness of the wide spectrum of desire in the novel (including arguably a polycule at novel's end), and the polyvocal nature of the epistolary narrative.

- 140. Dans le vif du combat : la Lettre à d'Alembert / In the Heat of the Fight: Rousseau's Letter to d'Alembert (Roundtable)** Rudy Le Menthéour, Bryn Mawr College, [rlementheo@brynmawr.edu](mailto:rlementheo@brynmawr.edu)

Vilipendée ou célébrée, *la Lettre à d'Alembert* n'a cessé de faire couler de l'encre depuis sa publication en 1758. Par sa virulence polémique, elle force la critique à envisager la pensée de Rousseau en situation, dans le vif du combat. Cette table ronde bilingue aura pour objectif de prendre cette dimension polémique au sérieux, c'est-à-dire de considérer la façon dont cette œuvre transforme le champ polémique dans lequel elle fait intrusion et d'envisager ses effets jusque sur la théorie théâtrale. Parmi les questions que nous pourrions nous poser : qui combat Rousseau ? Comment lui réplique-t-on ? Quels sont les enjeux politiques en France et à Genève ? Quels sont les effets à court et à long terme de cette lutte ? Quel débat à mi-mot s'engage entre Rousseau et Diderot ? Où réside la nouveauté de l'éloquence polémique déployée par la Lettre ? Comment éditer un tel palimpseste polémique ?

Either criticized or celebrated, Rousseau's *Letter to d'Alembert* has spurred strong reactions since its publication in 1758. By displaying such polemical power, this work forces scholars to consider Rousseau in the middle of his fights. This bilingual roundtable will fully acknowledge this polemical dimension by exploring the effects the Letter had not only on the long-standing debate between pro-theatre and theaterphobic writers, but also in other fields, including drama theory. Among possible topics: who is fighting Rousseau? How? What about the political implications both in France and in Geneva? What are the short- and long-term effects of this fight? What kind of debate emerges between Rousseau and Diderot? Can we define Rousseau's new polemical eloquence? How could a scholarly edition pay respect to the complexity of this polemical palimpsest?

- 141. 18th century Portraiture in the Americas** Emily K. Thames, Florida State University, [ekt13@my.fsu.edu](mailto:ekt13@my.fsu.edu)

This panel calls for papers that examine portraits created during the long eighteenth century from any geographic, political, or cultural context in the Americas (North America, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean), and it endeavors to generate scholarly discussion about the trends and themes that emerged in the practice of portraiture across the hemisphere during this time. The topic of portraiture has received much attention in recent decades in eighteenth-century art historical studies - how can we “rethink” portraiture, specifically in the Americas, to consider new methods of inquiry or interpretation? What unique meaning or use do such portraits possess within their local milieus? What roles do portraits play in the creation and/or reification of colonial or imperial narratives? With the expansion of colonial networks and the shifting of imperial boundaries throughout the century, what cross-cultural exchanges can be addressed through portraiture? This panel particularly encourages papers that consider portraits or portraiture traditions from understudied regions in the Americas or portrait artists from underrepresented communities.

**142. Christopher Smart at 300** Fraser Easton, University of Waterloo, [easton@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:easton@uwaterloo.ca)

65 years ago, Northrop Frye put Smart at the centre of his age. 25 years ago, Karina Williamson and Marcus Walsh completed the Clarendon edition of his poetry. Now Smart himself is turning 300. How should this versatile, elusive, and nuanced author be understood? Is he a creature of his time, as Min Wild's and Clement Hawes's work suggests, or is he best understood as anticipatory, whether of romantic or even modernist poetry, as suggested by Denise Gigante (romanticism) and Williamson (20th-century poetry)? A work like *Jubilate Agno*, which scholars such as Geoffrey Hartman saw as exceptional, is now increasingly seen as normative within his corpus. And yet: can Smart ever be summarized or summed up? How can we reckon with this author of comic fables, madcap stage shows, pious Christian verse, hymns, translations of Pope (into Latin) and Horace (into English prose and verse), and some of the first literature for children? Grub street hack, visionary madman, political radical, pious hymnist--who is Christopher Smart? Misogynist, imperialist, Protestant bigot? Egalitarian, gender fluid, post-humanist? Was Browning right to rate him alone of his age with the "superhuman poet-pair" of Milton and Keats? Is Smart really the most representative or significant poet of the period of his ascendancy (c. 1750 to 1770)? And just how important is Smart today? Should his influence on Ginsberg, Roethke, Sexton, and Cope, to name a few, be a part of that conversation? Proposals for papers addressing these or other questions about Smart's work are welcome.

**143. Castrati: Science, Surgery, and Sexuality (Roundtable)** Clorinda Donato, California State University, Long Beach, [Clorinda.Donato@csulb.edu](mailto:Clorinda.Donato@csulb.edu)

The vocal mystique of the castrati, immortalized in the celebrity of Farinelli, has been the subject of important monographs by Martha Feldman, as well as novels, such as Helen Berry's *The Castrato and His Wife*. Throughout Europe, the talents of the castrati were praised to the same degree that the means of achieving their vocal excellence were decried. These decried means and their outcomes in terms of sexuality and gender identity constitute the topic of this roundtable, which seeks short presentations on the science and surgery of castration in the interest of shedding new light on this form of sexual surgery and its outcomes related to the castrato's sexuality, identity, and gender. The presentations may also engage the topic transnationally to

discover whether the loci of surgery were always Italian, and whether young boys from outside of Italy were sent to Italy for surgery, including how those trips were arranged and negotiated. Treatises on the science and surgery of castration as well as existing translations and their reception might also be addressed in this session. Topics exploring how the science of sexuality in the twenty-first century informs our understanding of castrati in the eighteenth century are also sought for this roundtable.

**144. Representing Slavery in French Enlightenment and Revolutionary Cultures** Masano Yamashita, University of Colorado Boulder, [masano.yamashita@colorado.edu](mailto:masano.yamashita@colorado.edu); Scott M. Sanders, Dartmouth College, [scott.m.sanders@dartmouth.edu](mailto:scott.m.sanders@dartmouth.edu)

This panel explores the visual and rhetorical tropes deployed in representations of enslavement in the French-speaking world. From Voltaire's *Candide* to Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's *Paul et Virginie*, many canonical French texts describe encounters with enslaved people in vivid tableaux. In addition to narrative depictions, colonial newspapers documented the marks of torture that transformed enslaved bodies into visual histories of brutality. While in novels, these encounters are often moralized as moments of pity and indignation, in historical documents, they objectify the enslaved as property.

We seek proposals that explore the tableaux representations of novelists, playwrights, travel writers, memoirists, artists, and illustrators, who faced the task of confronting French and/or colonial audiences to the shock of slavery. Of particular interest to our panel are papers that recover the voices and agency of the enslaved, analyze the circulation and translation of ideas regarding slavery from one medium to another, take up questions of gender and slavery, or assess the social taxonomies of slavery and servitude. This panel additionally aims to include various voices of French diasporas across the globe.

Titles and abstracts (250-300 words) should be emailed to both [masano.yamashita@colorado.edu](mailto:masano.yamashita@colorado.edu) and [scott.m.sanders@dartmouth.edu](mailto:scott.m.sanders@dartmouth.edu).

**145. Edward Said, the Eighteenth Century, and the World (Roundtable)** Ala Alryyes: Dept. of English, Queens College, CUNY, [alryyes@gmail.com](mailto:alryyes@gmail.com)

As we near the 20th anniversary of the death of the most globally influential engaged intellectual and cultural critic, thoughtful reflections are invited on the importance of the eighteenth century to Edward Said's literary and political writings (on Palestine and other subjects). Can the eighteenth century help to remap Said's diverse texts and cross-cultural interests, even as Said's work has fundamentally remapped the eighteenth century? Diverse and imaginative approaches encouraged, including thinking with the eighteenth century about Palestine/Israel.

**146. Transatlantic Ties** Leah Thomas, Virginia State University, [lmthomas@vsu.edu](mailto:lmthomas@vsu.edu)

Much of print and literary culture of the long eighteenth century that was connected to or located in the Americas was not isolated in the Americas but was published and circulated across the Atlantic in Europe and elsewhere just as texts from other countries were transported across the Atlantic to the Americas. Thus, transatlantic networks existed among writers, readers, publishers, and even within texts themselves, hence the "transatlantic text." For example, a portion of Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko* takes place in Suriname, a place to which she may have traveled. Her *The*

*Widow Ranter* takes place in Virginia. Charlotte Lennox's *The Life of Harriot Stuart* and *Euphemia* are partially set in New York, where Lennox lived as an adolescent. Likewise, some of Daniel Defoe's novels are partially set in the Americas. Susanna Rowson, born in England and a British writer, became an American writer. Phillis Wheatley, John Marrant, Olaudah Equiano, Paul Cuffe, and other African Americans published their work in England. Samson Occum traveled to England and Scotland. This panel explores transatlantic ties that created transatlantic texts and these ties within transatlantic texts. Proposals that discuss transatlantic texts, travel, and/or networks of African Americans (Paul Gilroy's *The Black Atlantic*, 1993), Native Americans (Jace Weaver's *The Red Atlantic*, 2014), and/or women—including characters in transatlantic texts—are especially of interest.

**147. The Unproductive** Amit Yahav, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities,  
[ayahav@umn.edu](mailto:ayahav@umn.edu)

This panel seeks papers that draw on eighteenth-century examples to consider the capacity of the arts not so much to please as they teach, but to afford breaks from an overbearing regime of productivity and growth. While the eighteenth century has been implicated in instrumentality of all sorts, it also promoted idlers, ramblers, airy fictions -- emblems of inefficiency and uselessness. How might we conceive of ephemerality, vacuity, or inaction as in and of themselves worthy conditions? How might we make the case for the value of reading materials, musical pieces, or decorative arts that leave little enduring marks on mind or heart? And how might instances of eighteenth-century embracing of futility help us craft defenses of current humanistic studies, defenses that do not rely on the humanities' serviceability to a social machinery which privileges productivity, efficiency, utility, and growth? Proposals examining arts and literatures of all languages, media, and genres are welcome. Please send abstracts (300 words) to [ayahav@umn.edu](mailto:ayahav@umn.edu).

**148. Restoration and 18th-Century Drama Now (Roundtable)** Kristina Straub (Carnegie Mellon University), David Taylor (University of Oxford), [david.taylor@ell.ox.ac.uk](mailto:david.taylor@ell.ox.ac.uk)

Recent years have seen a number of notable productions of Restoration and eighteenth-century plays, including Vanbrugh's *The Provok'd Wife* (2019), Otway's *Venice Preserv'd* (2019), and Behn's *The Rover* (2016) and Mary Pix's *The Beau Defeated* (2018) at the Royal Shakespeare Company; Congreve's *The Way of the World* (2018) at the Donmar Warehouse; and Sheridan's *The School for Scandal* (2017) and Lessing's *Nathan the Wise* (2019) at Ontario's Stratford Festival. This roundtable will consider what we can learn from such productions and the place of long-eighteenth-century drama on the 21st century stage. It will bring together academics and theatre makers to explore the questions around race-conscious casting, staging the history of sexuality, and the mediation of empire that are at stake in reviving the Restoration and eighteenth-century repertoire today. We invite both scholars and practitioners to consider how to intervene in that history with productions of problematic plays like *Oroonoko*, politically significant plays like *Cato*, or popular plays like *The Rover*, all of which present hard problems around race, empire, gender, and sexuality for any contemporary performance. Short interventions around the praxis of staging the repertoire are welcome as a prelude to conversation about 21st-century theatrical productions and the expository work they might do.

**149. Colonial Enlightenments or Enlightened Colonialisms** Elena Deanda,  
[edeanda2@washcoll.edu](mailto:edeanda2@washcoll.edu)

The relationship between the Enlightenment and colonialism has been the subject of debate among generations of academics who have argued, on one side, the anti-colonial stance of many 18th century writers and on the other, those who denounced what Michèle Duchet has called the "humanity of conquest" or a predatory capitalism launched in the same period. This table invites scholars who would like to discuss each, both, or the liminal space between these positions. We invite people who work in different regions, the Americas (especially the Portuguese and the Circum-Caribbean worlds), Africa, Asia, and of course, the hegemon, Europe. We would like to interrogate both the ideological breakthroughs of the Enlightenment in terms of citizenry, liberalism, science, and emancipation, and the shaping of our modern notions of race, sexuality, deviancy, and progress.

**150. Toward an Ecocritical Book History: Material Texts, Environmental Impacts, Local Communities (Roundtable)** Lisa Maruca, Wayne State University, [lisa.maruca@wayne.edu](mailto:lisa.maruca@wayne.edu)

We know that the rise of print and related media shaped the construction of knowledge, birthed new genres, helped spread social movements and sparked revolutions—but the making, distributing, selling, and privileging of material forms of communication also made an environmental impact. While ecocritical perspectives have helped us understand eighteenth-century literature, it has been less influential on scholarship on our period's textual technologies. Today, for example, we are aware of the ways that mining materials for iPhones or supporting massive server farms harms the world's most vulnerable communities. But what were the environmental and community effects of the eighteenth-century media explosion, especially on the poor and racialized groups? Given that our period covers the development of the industrial revolution and the rise of an increasingly paper-based capitalism, the eighteenth century can offer particular insights into consumption, waste, and other toxic consequences of print culture and its associated media. This panel thus welcomes short presentations on the environmental cost of the making of books, educational materials, ephemera, engravings, newspapers and other print products and the distributing of these around the globe; thoughts on how the understandings of land and nature particular to print discounted the knowledge and communications forms of indigenous communities, transported Africans, and other groups marginalized by European imperialism; and the sharing of new interdisciplinary methods that shed light on how eighteenth-century material texts and technologies are implicated our own environmental predicament.

**151. Objects and the making of Enlightenment selves** Joelle Del Rose (College for Creative Studies) Detroit, Michigan; and Mary Peace (Sheffield Hallam University, UK),  
[m.v.peace@shu.ac.uk](mailto:m.v.peace@shu.ac.uk)

This panel will ask how the acquisition and accumulation of material objects in the eighteenth century brokered modern ideas of the self and new cultural forms. Novel commodities flooded the mental and physical worlds of eighteenth-century men and women, changing their perception of self and others. Now in the twenty-first century as we are forced to confront limits of the material world and the sustainability of material acquisition, it's timely to return to the origins of this material accumulation. The panel solicits papers which to ask how the arrival and

manufacture of new commodities – furniture, sugar, coffee, tea, fabrics, and architectural spaces, etc. choreographed ideas of the self and new cultural forms such as the conversation piece and the novel. The panel is interested also in soliciting papers which consider how the symbolic meanings of these material objects are forged and contested in contemporary representation. We solicit papers of 15 minutes duration to be circulated in advance to facilitate an extended discussion period.

**152. Forging Forgeries: Material Imitations in Eighteenth-century Visual Culture J.**

Cabelle Ahn, Harvard University, [cabelle.ahn@gmail.com](mailto:cabelle.ahn@gmail.com)

This panel invites papers that examine visual technologies of material mimesis. There has been recent scholarly attention on “fakes” or imitation materials in early modern Europe such as Pamela Smith’s Making and Knowing Project’s recreation of a recipe for imitation coral, as well as studies on the roles of artists, collectors, and amateurs and how their intentional forgeries advanced the development of connoisseurship. The eighteenth century continued the Renaissance interest in material substitutions sometimes in order to meet market demands and to cut production costs—this in turn gave rise to original materials or methods of production. The panel hopes to unearth understudied examples of imitation and how these technologies contributed to the evolving discourse on connoisseurship, metamorphosis, and artisanal intelligence in this period. Examples include James Tassie’s glass paste that imitated antique cameos, Piet Sauvage’s paintings that imitated marble bas-reliefs (which he frequently exhibited in the Salon), manuals on how to forge gemstones by coloring glass and crystals, the vogue for “japanning” which imitated east Asian lacquer work, wooden furniture and architectural interiors painted to resemble porcelain or marble, as well as various printmaking technologies that not only reproduced different drawing media but also modes of printmaking. Submissions may thus consider specific case studies of artworks, manuals, objects, or sites, and the panel invites papers on all geographies across the long eighteenth-century, particularly submissions outside of the Eurocentric context.

**153. Reproduction and Futurity** Chelsea Phillips, Villanova University; and Jane Wessel, United States Naval Academy, [wessel@usna.edu](mailto:wessel@usna.edu)

What is our investment in the world that comes after us, and what is the world we wish to create? What sort of futures did inhabitants of the eighteenth century imagine? This panel seeks papers that engage with the idea of futurity, particularly how eighteenth century writers, artists, scientists, and others turned to reproduction as a way of investing in the future.

That reproduction might be biological. A work like the Earl of Chesterfield’s *Letters to His Son on the Art of Becoming a Man of the World and a Gentleman* -- or, more generally, conduct manuals of the period -- suggest a strong investment in shaping the sociability and manners of the next generation. Yet the idea of reproduction as a way of shaping the future goes far beyond parents and children. Reproduction can also describe non-biological modes of creating a legacy, furthering knowledge, or replicating ourselves. Papers might consider the reproduction and alteration of plant species; reproducing results as a component of the scientific method; piracy and mimicry as modes of reproduction in print and performance; memory as a form of internal reproduction; transmedia reproductions of art or literary works; etc.

To reproduce is to bring into existence again, to further the presence of an original (in some form) into a future time. Does the “again” suggest a continuous flow or a serial bubbling up? In linking “reproduction” and “futurity,” we ask how conceptions of the future were tied to the eighteenth century’s understanding of itself.

**154. Imagining Knowledge: The Epistemic Imagination** Nicole Horejsi, Associate Professor, Department of English, California State University, Los Angeles, [nhorejs@calstatela.edu](mailto:nhorejs@calstatela.edu)

In light of growing philosophical interest in epistemic uses of imagination, this panel invites papers theorizing the role of the imaginative faculty as a powerful tool for epistemological inquiry. It is particularly interested in “alternative epistemologies” and welcomes papers from all disciplines. The central question of this panel is: By historicizing the potential epistemological value of the imagination, what do we gain in considering the imaginative faculty as a source of potential knowledge (factual, modal, conditional, recognitional, introspective, etc.) in the Restoration and eighteenth century, a period of significant cultural change, including changing attitudes toward the imagination itself?

In facilitating knowledge about the self, society, and the world, imagination plays a central role in human cognition. It both enables the mind to conjure an idea in the “mind’s eye” and also, at the metacognitive level, encourages reflective and affective processes that have the potential to deepen and complicate self and social understandings. Questions of interest might therefore include: How might epistemologies driven by imaginative agency and/or experience complicate understandings of perception, processes of interpretation, and knowledge production in the period? How do discourses of rationalism and empiricism shape ideas about the power of the imagination and its role in learning and understanding? In what ways does the imaginative faculty become an important epistemological tool in the context of major social and political developments? As the eighteenth century becomes increasingly global, what is the role of the imaginative faculty in bridging potentially competing (i.e., Western and non-Western) epistemologies?

**155. Publishing Women in the long 18<sup>th</sup>-Century** Jan Blaschak, Wayne State University and Adrian College, [eb7549@wayne.edu](mailto:eb7549@wayne.edu)

In the past few years, we have begun to pay more attention to the many ways in which women authors, have “networked” in the past, and the varied forms that took. Friendship networks and broader social networks and societies, (such as the Bluestockings), have been analyzed more often and more deeply than in the past, both for their impact on the work and careers of individual authors, as well as for how the networks themselves interconnected to spread ideas and offer avenues of agency to women authors in areas we may not have previously acknowledged, (or been aware of). New network analysis tools are helpful in these efforts.

However, the impact of publishing networks has been given somewhat short shrift. This panel seeks to correct this, by inviting papers which discuss how women authors in the long 18th century interacted with the publishing networks around them. How did they connect with their publishers, (and other authors through these publishing connections)? How did they influence and were influenced by their publishers (directly or indirectly), and how did that, in turn,

influence the publishing and authorial networks these women were involved in? How did their own publishing efforts, (in print or in manuscript prior to print), influence the publishing world?

**156. Unruly Nature, Rambunctious Women (Roundtable)** Elizabeth Giardina, University of California, Davis, [egiardina@ucdavis.edu](mailto:egiardina@ucdavis.edu)

As we experience the consequences of anthropogenic climate change in increasingly frequent and violent ways—including the 2018 Camp Fire or the 2020 Midwest derecho storm—we must also increasingly recognize nature as unpredictable and uncontrollable. As Carolyn Merchant writes in *Autonomous Nature: Problems of Prediction and Control from Ancient Times to the Scientific Revolution* (2016), the history of natural philosophy is undergirded by two conflicting and gendered conceptions of nature—"the eternally existing, uncreated creator, or male God of Christianity and the female, sometimes unpredictable and vindictive Earth Mother." Though natural philosophy sought to yoke an unruly, feminized nature under a masculine, predictable order, nature has remained ever "rambunctious." Works including Finch's "Upon the Hurricane" (1703), John Dalton's poetry (1770), Wheatley's "To a Lady on Her Remarkable Preservation" (1773), and Wollstonecraft's *Letters Written in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark* (1796) adopt and revise this intellectual history to differing ends: they depict nature as subservient to God's "righteous Will," as a feminine and threatening "womb of night," as mercifully saving a woman's life from its own destruction, and as an influence on women's sympathetic education. This roundtable asks how literature and art of the eighteenth century negotiates the relationships among femininity, nature, and chaos as well as how these negotiations might influence or illuminate twenty-first-century responses to climate change, including geoeengineering, legislation, and political protest. We welcome short papers (no more than ten minutes) from scholars from diverse and interdisciplinary backgrounds. Please send 250-word abstracts to Elizabeth Giardina ([egiardina@ucdavis.edu](mailto:egiardina@ucdavis.edu)).

**157. Deconstructing, Dismantling, Decolonizing: Current Scholarship on the Arts of the Colonial Americas (Roundtable)** Caroline Culp, Stanford University; Philippe Halbert, Yale University, [philippe.halbert@yale.edu](mailto:philippe.halbert@yale.edu)

We invite proposals for a roundtable discussion on current and future directions in scholarly approaches to the arts of the colonial Americas, including North, Central, and South America and the Caribbean. What trends have emerged in recent years that prompt new ways of interpreting hemispheric circulations of art, ideas, and materials? How have methodological and theoretical innovations shaped more inclusive perspectives on "American" art and identity? In the wake of ongoing calls for decolonization, what role can art historians working in this area play in nuancing larger historical narratives? Short talks offering insight into postcolonial, queer, and gender- and race-related topics are especially welcome as we come together to consider the state of the field.

**158. Embodied Rhetorics in the long Eighteenth Century (Roundtable)** Miriam Wallace, New College of Florida, [mwallace@ncf.edu](mailto:mwallace@ncf.edu)

Where and why do we find examples of "embodied rhetoric" in the eighteenth century? We might think of Defoe's description of Friday's gesture placing his head beneath Robinson



Crusoe's foot signifying voluntary servitude and its relation to the supplicating figure of "Am I not a Man and a Brother" emblem, memorialized by Wedgwood. Or we might consider Trim's gesture with his hat in *Tristram Shandy* describing how we pass from life to death, and onwards to Gilbert Austin's *Chironomia* as a handbook for speaking gesture (building upon Bulwer's *Chirologia*) as figures for something like "embodied rhetoric" or an emphasis on gesture and persuasive or signifying postures. How do we think about literary descriptions, elocutionary training, satirical prints, theatrical portraits, or historical paintings as exemplifying and figuring rhetorical delivery and effective speaking? How was 'rhetoric' in the sense of performed speech or persuasive writing divorced from or dependent upon embodiment? Which bodies were 'speaking bodies' and under what conditions? Presentations that engage literary works, visual images, or ekphrastic moments are invited to help us think about the relation of embodiment to persuasion and effective representation.

**159. Clothing and Empire – Dress and Power in the Long 18th Century** Kristin O'Rourke, Dartmouth College, [kristin.orourke@dartmouth.edu](mailto:kristin.orourke@dartmouth.edu)

This session hopes to explore the knotty connections between fashion and power in the long eighteenth century, particularly in relationship to the military, financial and racial politics of empire. Over the past several years, art history, fashion studies, and material history have made clear the importance of examining the details of dress, accessories, cosmetics, furnishings, and behaviors in visual imagery in order to understand social status and power relations over time and across geographical and national boundaries. From Napoleonic history paintings to elite portraiture to graphic satire throughout Europe and in relation with European colonization, we can read dress as a curated self-representational device as well as an unconscious sign of power or powerlessness. This panel would welcome individual case studies as well as broader theoretical or historical discussions surrounding both the stuff of dress and its political effect.

**160. Disaster, Survival and Worldmaking in the Long Eighteenth Century** Konstantinos (Kos) Pozoukidis, University of Maryland College Park, [kpozouki@umd.edu](mailto:kpozouki@umd.edu)

In the aftermath of Covid-19, the Long Eighteenth Century reminds us that disaster, in its various forms, constitutes an indispensable element of the political, social and historical discursive practices of modernity. From Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, where the protagonist survives in a seemingly deserted island that resembles those post-apocalyptic narratives that follow in its wake, to Defoe's *A Journal of the Plague Year*, the Long Eighteenth Century produces a considerable amount of disaster narratives. These include poems from the Lyrical Ballads, where several of the protagonists, like the female vagrant, or Michael, suffer from social and historical disasters that relate to the advent of the market economy. To these we need add those nonfiction narratives that relate to the slave trade in the Black Atlantic, including the slave narrative of Olaudah Equiano, and the *Thoughts and Sentiments of Quobna Ottobah Cugoano* that elaborate on the disaster of slavery, the struggle for survival and the attempt towards establishing a world beyond the imperatives of racial capitalism. This session invites contributions that focus on forms of disaster and survival in the Long Eighteenth Century that relate to history, social change, slavery and the transatlantic trade. How does disaster and/or survival inform our understanding of labor and temporality? How does it relate to (non)productivity and (non)reproductivity, materially and ideologically? Are there forms of female, queer and/or

passive resistance that complicate our understanding of survival and worldmaking? How does disaster and/or survival affect the texts they inhabit formally and narratively? What is the relation that survival forms with Blackness or disability during that period?

**161. Digital Approaches to intertextuality in 18th century France (Roundtable)** Clovis Gladstone, ARTFL Project, University of Chicago, [clovisgladstone@uchicago.edu](mailto:clovisgladstone@uchicago.edu)

The Intertextual Hub ([intertextual-hub.uchicago.edu](http://intertextual-hub.uchicago.edu)) is an experimental digital reading environment which was built around an extraordinarily broad set of text collections with specific focus on the 10 years of the French Revolution and more generally on 18th-century French resources. This platform was built to address a long standing issue in the Digital Humanities space: the integration of distant and close reading in a functional, intuitive, and flexible environment. By situating specific documents in their broader context of intertextual relations, whether in the form of direct or indirect borrowings, shared topics with other texts or parts of texts, or other kinds of lexical similarity, the Intertextual Hub aims to help scholars understand how different types of discourses evolved throughout the Enlightenment and the Revolutionary period, all within the larger cultural context of 18th-century intellectual traditions. Participants to this roundtable will discuss how they have used the various components of this platform for their research, the new avenues of research it opens, and more broadly how the question of intertextuality is central to our understanding of 18th-century intellectual history.

**162. Is there (or should there be) an eighteenth-century "realism"?** Helen F. Thompson, Northwestern, [hthompson@northwestern.edu](mailto:hthompson@northwestern.edu); Ruth Mack [ruthmack425@gmail.com](mailto:ruthmack425@gmail.com)

We hope to center a discussion of eighteenth-century "realism" around two sets of questions. First, how do we work with structuralist and Marxist theories of realism that often take nineteenth-century novels as exemplary of this descriptive mode? Is there a distinction to be made between the "appearance of reality" (Walter Scott's words for Defoe) in long eighteenth-century texts and its later manifestations? How does emergent long eighteenth-century verisimilitude or vraisemblance relate to, or how might it disturb, critical analyses of realism whose default reference is the nineteenth-century novel? Second, we are interested in the future of the term "realism" for eighteenth-century studies. What should happen now to emergent eighteenth-century realism's supposedly stable basis in the objective premises of scientific empiricism asserted by Ian Watt? Can recent archival, historical, and speculative recoveries of the history of slavery address or redress its normative repression in the realist novel? Should interrogations of the "real" from science studies and Black studies lead us to redefine the term, or to jettison it entirely?

**163. Eighteenth-Century Port Cities** Karen Stolle (Emory University) [kstolle@emory.edu](mailto:kstolle@emory.edu); Valentina Tikoff (DePaul University) [VTIKOFF@depaul.edu](mailto:VTIKOFF@depaul.edu)

Sites of both cosmopolitan gatherings and the tragic trafficking of human life, port cities in the eighteenth century were critical nodes in networks of commerce, culture and politics, places where local concerns were inevitably entangled with global ones. As a unique sort of border zone, they were places where people, products and knowledge converged, and where maritime and terrestrial cultures overlapped, or clashed. Tied to the 2022 ASECS conference location in

one important eighteenth-century port city, the proposed session seeks papers that explore aspects of port cities from multiple disciplinary perspectives and in a range of geographical contexts that include Europe and the Americas, the Atlantic world and the Pacific world.

The panel chairs especially invite papers that explore: the paradox of port cities as places of both surveillance and freedom; the mingling of different languages and cultures in port cities; the fixity and/or fluidity of class and gender roles in port cities; and port cities as places where local and global cultures intersected and shaped one another.

**164. Practical strategies for reading against the archival grain (Roundtable) [American Antiquarian Society]** Ashley Cataldo, American Antiquarian Society, [acataldo@mwa.org](mailto:acataldo@mwa.org)

Taking a cue from Marisa Fuentes' *Dispossessed Lives*, this roundtable will discuss strategies for reading against the archival grain. We will reach out to participants such as Caylin Carbonell (William and Mary PhD, 2020), Wendy Bellion (University of Delaware), and Urvashi Chakravarty (University of Toronto) to engage in discussion by drawing on their own research into early American servants' reading practices, the study of critical race theory and archives, and the material culture of popular entertainment. We invite additional submissions from scholars that discuss how their work relies on reading sources against the grain. This roundtable will provide real strategies for researchers to explore unheard voices in existing archives in both early America and England.

**165. Before Homophobia: Queer Desire in the Restoration [Aphra Behn Society]** Carrie Chanafelt, Fairleigh Dickinson University, [carrie\\_shanafelt@fdu.edu](mailto:carrie_shanafelt@fdu.edu)

This panel seeks papers which offer critical or creative engagement with Aphra Behn's works, or that of her contemporaries, wherein queer desire is expressed, explored, or developed, or where queerness or queer theory enlighten our understanding of desire as represented in works (textual, visual art, musical expression, material culture, print culture and more) of the Restoration (appearing globally). Explorations of the work of Aphra Behn, Katherine Phillips, or others might feature here—on any genre, but especially in poetry and drama, and liberal arts. Early career scholars are especially encouraged to apply. Please send queries or applications to moderator Carrie Shanafelt at [carrie\\_shanafelt@fdu.edu](mailto:carrie_shanafelt@fdu.edu).

**166. Tangible Bibliography in Intangible Times (Roundtable) [Bibliographical Society of America]** Benjamin Pauley (Eastern Connecticut State University), [pauleyb@easternct.edu](mailto:pauleyb@easternct.edu)

The Bibliographical Society of America defines bibliography as “a branch of historical scholarship that examines any aspect of the production, dissemination, and reception of handwritten and printed books as physical objects.” For much of 2020 and 2021, however, scholars' and students' access to physical books was severely curtailed as libraries and archives were forced to close to visitors. As libraries and archives gradually reopen to researchers, it seems fitting to reflect on the lessons of a period when the materials we study were physically inaccessible.

1. How have book historians, print culture scholars, and bibliographers adapted their research and pedagogical methods when their access to physical artifacts was limited? 2. What purposes do digital surrogates fulfill or not fulfill? Has increased reliance on these surrogates

exposed any gaps in digital collections coverage, or highlighted previously overlooked institutional digitization priorities? 3. What aspects of the physical text become more evident in its absence? 4. What kinds of things will we now rush gratefully back to doing as before? 5. What opportunities do we now see for approaching bibliographical research and teaching differently?

In keeping with the priorities of the BSA's 2020 Equity Action Plan (EAP), we encourage presentations exploring these questions from members of under-represented groups and from scholars with a strong professional practice of engaging with materials created within under-represented communities. BSA strives to assemble panels that demonstrate and uphold the Society's values of equity and inclusion in bibliography. For more information, see the EAP at [bitly./bsa-eap](https://bitly./bsa-eap).

**167. The Burneys and Labor [Burney Society]** Laura Engel, Duquesne University; Cynthia Klekar Cunningham, Western Michigan University, [cynthia.klekar@wmich.edu](mailto:cynthia.klekar@wmich.edu)

This panel seeks papers on the topic of The Burneys and Labor. We define the term labor broadly as a form of work related to tangible practices, intangible actions/performances, and/or affective strategies/efforts. Papers may consider forms of labor associated with the Burney family such as: writing, musical composition, drawing, painting, watercolor, scrapbook composition, collecting, etc.; the emotional labor of familial, political, theatrical, social, and/or economic ties; or intangible labor associated with illness, insecurity, public performance, isolation, and exile. Papers may also tackle representations of labor and/or the invisibility of various forms of labor in the writings, art, and music created by the Burneys. Finally, we also welcome presentations on academic labor connected to editing, collecting, and publishing on the Burneys. What kind of work do we need to do to move the Burney legacy forward in accessible and expansive ways?

**168. Pedagogy Roundtable: The Indigenous Eighteenth Century (Roundtable) [CSECS, Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies]** Mary Helen McMurrin, University of Western Ontario, [mmcmurr2@uwo.ca](mailto:mmcmurr2@uwo.ca)

This session aims to build on ASECS's commitment to include Indigenous scholars, knowledge, and perspectives at the annual conference. Sessions at previous ASECS conferences, as well as at SEA conferences, and exemplified by the *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* (Winter 2021) roundtable on the "Indigenous Eighteenth Century," have acknowledged that colonialism is embedded in education and its institutional structures, and seek to reform our practices as researchers, instructors, and citizens. This roundtable will aim to center Indigenous peoples in our understanding of the eighteenth century as a matter integral to our pedagogy. Part of this endeavor is to teach in ways that foster a "sustained consideration of Indigenous people as agents and authors" as Alyssa MT. Pleasant, Caroline Wigginton, and Kelly Wisecup have written (EAL 2018). Following the advice of Indigenous scholar, Robbie Richardson, we invite contributions that broaden our archives and consider materials and methods beyond the scope of the traditional text-based classroom. Contributions and presentations in any format are welcome.

**169. Isolation and Eighteenth-Century Studies [The Defoe Society]** Dr. Stephen H. Gregg (Bath Spa University), [s.gregg@bathspa.ac.uk](mailto:s.gregg@bathspa.ac.uk) and Professor Laura Stevens (University of Tulsa), [laura-stevens@utulsa.edu](mailto:laura-stevens@utulsa.edu)

Isolation is arguably the zeitgeist of the year of COVID-19. Remote working, online learning, shielding, stay-at-home orders, social distancing--all involve some form of isolation, whether enforced or self-imposed. This inescapable theme, then, seems particularly appropriate for an author whose works insistently probe the meanings of isolation. Defoe's fiction, for example, obsessively returns to the relationship between individuation, civil community, and isolation beyond *Robinson Crusoe*: Roxana longed for isolation; Captain Singleton made halting attempts to overcome it; and, as evidenced by many journalistic and mass media pieces, *A Journal of the Plague Year* resonates with our current pandemic. Moreover, the differences among isolation, solitude, and loneliness also have a political dimension. As Hannah Arendt argued, isolation is the prerequisite for totalitarianism; by creating division and destroying the "public realm of life," isolation radically disempowers collective action and communal agency. Defoe's works also examine the politics of isolation, whether articulated via national culture or party politics (think about the anti-isolationist True-Born Englishman, or Legion's Memorial). This panel seeks short papers or other explorations of isolation in eighteenth-century writing and culture: what it means, its costs, its benefits, its resonance today.

Please send abstracts to Dr Stephen H. Gregg ([s.gregg@bathspa.ac.uk](mailto:s.gregg@bathspa.ac.uk)) and Professor Laura Stevens ([laura-stevens@utulsa.edu](mailto:laura-stevens@utulsa.edu))

**170. Early Caribbean Currents (Roundtable) [Early Caribbean Society]** Kerry Sinanan, University of Texas at San Antonio, [kerry.sinanan@utsa.edu](mailto:kerry.sinanan@utsa.edu)

New work in the Early Caribbean in the long 18thc has been prolific in recent years: *Slavery At Sea* (Sowande M. Muskateen), *Saltwater Slavery* (Stephanie E. Smallwood), *They Were Her Property* (Stephanie E. Jones), *Imperial Intimacies* (Hazel Carby), *Wicked Flesh* (Jessica Marie Johnson), *Caribbean Literature in Transition 1800-1920*, and *The Apocalypse of Settler Colonialism* (Gerald Horne), are just some of the important works to come out in the fields that constellate around the Caribbean. These works challenge the boundaries of nation states, periodization, and disciplines to include ocean spaces, to cross centuries, to blend history and literary studies, and to center the Caribbean as a central site of the long 18thc. This roundtable will consider the importance of fully reckoning with new works and the strands of theoretical and critical enquiry they gather: collectively, they insist on the Caribbean as the space in which so many ideals associated with the long 18thc-- including resistance, freedom, and humanism--were articulated. The roundtable will pay particular attention to the ways in which new work on the 18th-century Caribbean challenges the assumptions of the Enlightenment, and offers ripostes to whiteness and systems of racialization inaugurated by slavery.

**171. Race, Empire and Eighteenth-Century Scotland (Roundtable) [Eighteenth-Century Scottish Studies Society]** Leith Davis, [leith@sfu.ca](mailto:leith@sfu.ca)

Contributions are invited to a roundtable on "Race, Empire and Eighteenth-Century Scotland" which investigate this topic from a variety of perspectives such as: the participation of Scots in British imperial projects, including the transatlantic slave trade; the creation of racialized

representations in texts of the Scottish Enlightenment; Scottish encounters with indigenous peoples. Participants will offer short presentations, followed by a discussion involving audience members.

**172. Racial Classification and Human Rights in the Transatlantic Order: Popular Literature and Journals in eighteenth-century Germany [German Society for Eighteenth Century Studies (DGEJ)]** Sigrid G. Köhler, Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, [sigrid.koehler@uni-tuebingen.de](mailto:sigrid.koehler@uni-tuebingen.de)

The trade triangle between Europe, Africa, and the Americas, which underpinned the transatlantic order in the eighteenth century, was not only based on slave trade but also created new European consumption habits. The latter increasingly depended on luxury goods imported from overseas. Through the demand for ‘Kolonialwaren’ and the export of manufactured goods to Africa, the old German Empire formed an active part in the intricate semiotic and material transatlantic networks. Highly aware of these entanglements, eighteenth-century German journals and popular literature and culture inserted themselves into pertinent political debates by exposing the inhumane aspects and by explicitly questioning the lawfulness of the slave trade and slavery itself. These intellectual interventions often lead to highly ambivalent texts and ambiguous aesthetic representations that did not correspond with enlightened narratives and teleologies of human progress.

The panel will explore the contradictions and problems which surround legal deliberations and racial classification in these media. We invite papers that 1) analyze how racial stereotypes or racial classification featured in the texts and how these notions were squared with the idea of universal human equality and basic rights; 2) that examine whether these texts showed an awareness of the fundamental interdependency of the capitalist world order and the institution of slavery; or 3) that pay specific attention to the representational strategies, plot conventions, scopical regimes, semantic fields, lexis etc. which the formats under scrutiny employed. The panel seeks contributions on – mainly but not exclusively – German popular culture and media of the long eighteenth century.

**173. Anne Schroder New Scholars Session [HECCA, Historians of Eighteenth-Century Art and Architecture]** Dipti Khera, New York University, [dipti.khera@nyu.edu](mailto:dipti.khera@nyu.edu); Aaron Wile, National Gallery of Art, [A-Wile@nga.gov](mailto:A-Wile@nga.gov)

This is an open session for advanced graduate students and early career scholars in the art and architectural history of the long eighteenth century around the globe. We especially encourage submissions from underrepresented scholars; those who work in universities, museums, and para-academic institutions outside of North America and/or in adjunct employment positions; and those who define their stakes, topics, and temporal frames for the eighteenth century through visual/material/spatial analyses in relation to histories of enslavement, colonization, and the racialization and discrimination of bodies, knowledge, places, and objects.

**174. Territoriality, language, and power in the 18th-Century Ibero-American world [Ibero-American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies]** Catherine Jaffe, Texas State University, [cj10@txstate.edu](mailto:cj10@txstate.edu)

Nobel Prize winner and 20th-century poet Czeslaw Milosz famously wrote that “language is the only homeland.” In the eighteenth-century Iberian world, a world made by European imperialism and colonialism in Africa, Asia, and the Americas, language had a complex relationship to home and homeland. It both made community for people who found themselves far from their birthplaces and excluded from that community the overwhelming majority of colonial populations. This panel invites papers from all fields that interrogate the relationship between language, land (space, place, belonging), and territoriality (sovereignty, possession, ownership) in the lands governed by Spain and Portugal in the long eighteenth century, including language minorities in the Iberian peninsula (Catalonia, Andalucía), Latin America (Indigenous, bozal, and creole languages), and the United States, where Spanish operates in different spaces and contexts as a colonizing and colonized language. 200 word abstract & brief CV to [cj10@txstate.edu](mailto:cj10@txstate.edu).

**175. Herder, Physiognomy, and the Typology of Human Beings and Peoples**  
[International Herder Society] Johannes Schmidt (Clemson University),  
[schmidj@clemson.edu](mailto:schmidj@clemson.edu)

With the Sculpture essay, Johann Gottfried Herder seems to have concluded his reproach of Lavater’s ideas regarding the possibility of deciphering character traits and human beings’ likeness to God. Herder’s elevation of the sense of touch along with his objections to Lavater’s methodology that reduces the multiplicity of living existences to a few variations of an intellectual and spiritual (here Christian) type not only suggests a vastly different understanding of God’s revelation through humans beings and in nature; it also reveals Herder’s distinctive approach to aesthetics, his evolving theory of perception, as well as his genre/media criticism and renewed emphasis on a subjective psychological sense-perception of the world. While Herder abandoned a Lavater-style physiognomy, he continued to advance ideas that are closely related to the reading, evaluating, and creation of shape (Gestalt) and character, with tremendous importance for semantic, epistemological, empirical, mnemonic, aesthetic and artistic, as well as theological and pedagogical problems, yet not without some serious—at that time problematic—implications for his view of plants, animals, and human beings. On the one hand, it is Herder’s enduring accomplishment to have emphasized the diversity and multifacetedness of cultures and peoples objectively and without judgment. And on the other, Herder also recognizes human typologies fraught with prejudice, condemnation, and Eurocentric biases.

This panel seeks papers that explore both Lavater’s and Herder’s positions critically as well as those of their contemporaries. Please send a one-page abstract to Johannes Schmidt ([schmidj@clemson.edu](mailto:schmidj@clemson.edu)).

**176. Johnson in Dialogue [Johnson Society of the Central Region]** Stephen Karian,  
University of Missouri, [karians@missouri.edu](mailto:karians@missouri.edu)

This panel seeks papers on Samuel Johnson paired with another literary figure, excluding James Boswell. Possibilities include: an author Johnson read, wrote about, or was influenced by; an author with whom Johnson socialized or corresponded; or an author whom Johnson influenced. The goal of the panel is to explore Johnson in literal or figurative dialogues with other authors, dialogues that might be contentious, accommodating, or a mixture of both.

**177. Teaching the Global Eighteenth Century (Roundtable) [Midwestern American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies]** Jeremy Carnes, Lindenwood University, [gcarnes@lindenwood.edu](mailto:gcarnes@lindenwood.edu)

For this roundtable, we seek presentations on any aspect of teaching the eighteenth-century within a global context. Presentations might focus on strategies for teaching transcultural and transnational encounters; travel, trade, or colonialism; eighteenth-century world literatures; or any text or set of texts—written, oral, visual, aural, or material—that “globalize” students’ engagement with the eighteenth century. We welcome presentations that offer strategies for teaching subject matter that exposes, interrogates, unsettles, decenters, or displaces a Eurocentric worldview. Send 250-word proposals to Jeremy Carnes, Lindenwood University, [gcarnes@lindenwood.edu](mailto:gcarnes@lindenwood.edu)

**178. Mozart in Context [Mozart Society of America]** Sarah Eyerly, Florida State University, [seyerly@fsu.edu](mailto:seyerly@fsu.edu)

In the later eighteenth century, Mozart’s music circulated on a global scale, with performances in places as far-flung as Labrador, Russia, China, and British North America, as well as throughout Europe. These broad networks of reception and transmission demonstrate Mozart’s cultural and social importance. For this session, we invite contributions that place Mozart and his music into broad geographical, intellectual, social, cultural, and political contexts. Contributions might discuss issues of place, geography, and environment; aesthetics; circulation of music and material culture; patronage and economics; artistic life; reception of Mozart and his legacy; and the diverse contexts in which Mozart’s music was performed and heard. We especially encourage proposals that reflect the vitality and breadth of existing scholarship on and around Mozart, and which point towards future research possibilities. Presentations by graduate students and junior scholars are warmly encouraged.

**179. What may we Hope? Answers to a Kantian Question (Roundtable) [North American Kant Society]** Andrew Chignell, Princeton University, [chignell@princeton.edu](mailto:chignell@princeton.edu)

Kant famously said that the question "What may I hope?" is one of the three most important questions in all of philosophy. Compared to "What can I know?" and "What should I do?," however, this question is radically under-discussed by both contemporary philosophers and historians of philosophy. Given the ominous possible futures that humanity currently faces, it seems worth returning to the question in earnest. The North American Kant Society proposes to host a roundtable at ASECS to discuss what Kant and other 18th-century authors might have to teach (and warn) us regarding hope, its benefits, and its risks. We will choose 3 or 4 brief presentations, which would be followed by general discussion.

**180. Serendipity in/and the Eighteenth Century [NWSECS, North West Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies]** Marvin D. L. Lansverk, [lansverk@montana.edu](mailto:lansverk@montana.edu)

The word "serendipity," or an “unplanned, fortunate discovery,” was brought into English by Horace Walpole, itself with a prehistory in science, exploration, and the arts. This wide-ranging panel takes this key term allusively, inviting papers on any aspect of fortunate discovery in our period: from discoveries in science, medicine, poetry, and the arts; to discoveries by characters



and figures "in" the literature of the period; to discoveries about the eighteenth century made "by" scholars. Papers welcomed that both make conceptual leaps, or that examine them.

**181. Reframing Richardson (Roundtable) [The Richardson Society]** Elizabeth Porter, Hostos CUNY, [eporter@hostos.cuny.edu](mailto:eporter@hostos.cuny.edu)

This roundtable seeks papers that explore the afterlives and remediations of Samuel Richardson's work. Recent scholarship on Richardson's *Clarissa* and white supremacy (Kerry Sinanan) and teaching Pamela in the age of #MeToo (Leah Grisham), for example, uses the grammars and vocabulary of the present to show the continuities between the eighteenth century and today. Papers that engage with or build on such interpretative frameworks are welcome. Also of interest are discussions of contemporary reframings and adaptations of Richardson's work, such as the "post-modern artist's book" take on *Clarissa* by Nicholas D Nace called *Catch-words* (2018) and Martin Crimp's play *When We Have Sufficiently Tortured Each Other: Twelve Variations on Samuel Richardson's Pamela* (2019). In considering the ways we reframe Richardson in the present, papers might also address the impact of social media on our reading practices and scholarly communities, as seen with the Twitter hashtag #Clarissa2020.

**182. Grievances in Rousseau / Doléances chez Rousseau [Rousseau Association]** Ourida Mostefai, Brown University, [Ourida\\_Mostefai@brown.edu](mailto:Ourida_Mostefai@brown.edu)

This panel invites papers on any aspect of the question of grieving in the works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. We welcome papers that explore the themes of injustice and restorative justice, affects of resentment and fear, the interrelation of forgiveness, memory and injury. Among topics to be considered: the voicing or silencing of grievances, responses to injury, and modes of protest. Panelists may include discussions of contemporary theoretical frameworks that shed light on the procedures and discourses of grievances in Rousseau. In keeping with the traditions of the Rousseau Association, papers in English and/or in French and approaches from all disciplines are welcome.

**183. Vast Early Eighteenth Century: Materials, Methods, Motives (Roundtable) [Society of Early Americanists]** Ana Schwartz, University of Texas at Austin, [ana.schwartz@utexas.edu](mailto:ana.schwartz@utexas.edu)

This panel brings together scholarship that focuses on literary and cultural production by individuals and communities beyond the North Atlantic littoral. This conversation is inspired by recent turns in the study of early American history, seeking out a "vaster" geographic scope than early Americanists have tended over the past century to favor. It's furthermore inspired too by the recent flourishing of Caribbean Studies, Hemispheric Studies, Black Studies and Indigenous studies as well as by the methodological autocritique that these fields have inaugurated. One reason the North Atlantic has been overrepresented in the scholarship on the long eighteenth century is because the Europeans who aspired materially to control the globe did so not simply through brute force, but also through generating powerful, but subtle epistemological norms—including, importantly, the elevation of the forms of writing of which they produced a great deal. But there were other ways to communicate ideas, both horizontally and through time. When we look beyond the conventional sites of eighteenth-century study, we find not only new modes of

being with other people, new modes of reading texts, and new modes of developing ideas, but we also find the opportunity to reassess and revise the disciplinary givens we bring to research, and perhaps, reassess our own relationships to these pasts. Participants are invited to share a text, a passage, or a historical problematic that invites speculation on how broader, vaster scopes of attention might upend and transform our disciplinary norms.

**184. Book History Beyond the Paywall (Roundtable) [SHARP, The Society for the History of Authorship, Reading and Publishing]** Kate Ozment, Cal Poly Pomona, [keozment@cpp.edu](mailto:keozment@cpp.edu)

Book history pedagogy has traditionally been associated with access to rare materials and expensive databases, which is a challenge for those who teach from institutions that have less funding or are geographically distant from robust special collections. This roundtable investigates pedagogical strategies for teaching bibliography, book history, and material culture without paywalled resources or trips to rare book rooms. Potential papers could explore using open-access resources, circulating library books, or textbooks from other courses. Papers might also detail building an inexpensive teaching library of eighteenth-century materials or even thrifted paperbacks or discuss how to structure critical making exercises with household items or easily obtainable objects. The goal of the roundtable is to examine how “book history on a budget” can still be a robust and engaging experience for students, and presenters are encouraged to center practical advice and replicable exercises. The roundtable format should allow for robust discussion of pedagogical strategies.

We encourage proposals from diverse constituencies including librarians, instructional faculty, book artists, graduate students, community college faculty, and ECRs. All disciplines and approaches to the teaching of material books are welcome. Proposers need not be members of SHARP to submit, but panelists must be members of both ASECS and SHARP to present. For questions about SHARP membership, please direct inquiries to Eleanor F. Shevlin, SHARP liaison to ASECS, at [eshevlin@wcupa.edu](mailto:eshevlin@wcupa.edu).

**185. Seen Here Making a Masterpiece: Rendering Artists, Musicians, and Authors in Painting, Poetry, Sculpture, and Prose [South-Central Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies]** Kevin L. Cope, Louisiana State University, [encope@lsu.edu](mailto:encope@lsu.edu)

Whether Edmund Waller’s address to a painter or Frances Burney’s account of the imaginary poet Macartney or Largilliere’s portrait of Voltaire or the Derby Porcelain Manufactory’s figurine of a poet, the long eighteenth century abounds with representations of artists and writers that were executed in media or genres other than those in which the depicted subjects specialized. Essayists write about artists, novelists tell tales concerning songsters, and sculptors portray architects at work. These media-crossing renderings often involve a significant change in tone. Engravers satirize elegists; composers change the tune of would-be lyric poets. This panel will feature papers exploring the presentation of artists dedicated to one medium or genre in another medium or genre. It will refresh acquaintance with the easily overlooked and frequently forgotten imagining of artists and artistry. The panel will raise questions about the purpose of such boundary-crossing representations while also probing Enlightenment ideas about the mutual affiliation of the arts and about the character, value, and social roles of modern cultural professionals. It will give new life to a puzzling genre, the representation of those who

represent, that both perplexes and peps up the neoclassical distinctions between art and nature, original and copy, and life and its artful immortalizations.

**186. The complete "Complete Works of Voltaire": impact, current uses and future directions [Voltaire Foundation]** Gregory Brown, UNLV, [gregory.brown@unlv.edu](mailto:gregory.brown@unlv.edu)

First begun in 1952 and launched formally simultaneously with the creation of the International Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies in 1967, the critical edition of the *Oeuvres complètes de Voltaire* is finally complete, with the publication of the final of the 203 volumes in 2021. Including his entire body of works in theater, lyric poetry, prose, historiography, and polemics as well as his notebooks, correspondence, and marginalia, this is by far the largest body of writing by a single author of the entire century. Papers are invited from scholars in any discipline or stage of their career which assess any of the wide range of issues raised by this project -- manuscript and textual studies, scholarly editing practice, literary and historical interpretation, the relationship of the OCV to other comparable editions of eighteenth-century writers, and how the OCV is impacting our understanding of the Enlightenment and its place in modern world history. Furthermore, as the OCV is re-imagined into a digitized version, with expanded access and more robust capabilities for research and analysis, how might our approach to this body of work change in the future?

**187. The Eighteenth-Century Anthropocene and Biodiversity (Roundtable) [Western Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies]** Aparna Gollapudi, Colorado State University, [Aparna.Gollapudi@colostate.edu](mailto:Aparna.Gollapudi@colostate.edu); Sören Hammerschmidt, GateWay Community College, [soren.hammerschmidt@gatewaycc.edu](mailto:soren.hammerschmidt@gatewaycc.edu)

Picking up on our inspiring 2020 conference theme, this roundtable seeks contributions on “The Eighteenth-Century Anthropocene and Biodiversity.” The eighteenth century is frequently proposed as marking the beginning of, or at least a significant acceleration in, the Anthropocene: the geological epoch in which human activity is taken as the dominant influence on the earth’s climate, ecosystems, and lifeforms. The long eighteenth century saw developments - such as the Industrial Revolution, urbanization, consumerism, and colonialism - that posed an unprecedented threat to the natural world and were recognized as such at the time, at least in some parts. At the same time, the period is also known for its fascination with and valorization of nature. Our current period of environmental crisis and activism makes such eighteenth-century studies particularly resonant. We seek scholars from a broad range of disciplines to offer brief presentations (no more than ten minutes) with most of the roundtable reserved for open discussion with all attendees. Short, 250-word proposals for such a brief presentation should be sent to BOTH roundtable organizers.

**188. Colloquy with Lindsay DiCuirci on *Colonial Revivals: The Nineteenth-Century Lives of Early American Books* (Roundtable)** Dennis Moore, Florida State University, [dmoore@fsu.edu](mailto:dmoore@fsu.edu)

Rather than presenting a paper, each participant in this interdisciplinary roundtable, including Lindsay DiCuirci, author of *Colonial Revivals* -- recipient of the 2020 *Early American Literature* Book Prize and of the 2020 First Book Award from the Library Company of

Philadelphia -- will make a four- or five-minute opening statement that lays out a specific issue or question related to this book. This approach liberates the book's author from having to serve as The Respondent; rather, the brief opening statements set off a lively, substantive discussion that engages members of the audience as well as panelists. Session organizer Dennis Moore, a past president of ASECS's Americanist affiliate, the Society of Early Americanists, and 2017 recipient of the Award for Excellence in Graduate Student Mentorship, has shamelessly appropriated this format from the Joyceans' "Living Book Reviews." In organizing dozens of panels along these lines, he has found it crucial to avoid two extremes: on the one hand, assembling a tableful of sycophants ready to drool on cue and/or the author, and, on the other, assembling a lineup that would include someone intent on an academic ambush: trashing author over her or his methods, conclusions, and maybe parents. No fan club, then, and no food fights. Serious inquiries about having a seat at the table to [dmoore@fsu.edu](mailto:dmoore@fsu.edu) by September 17th, please and thank you.