Spatial Identities, Online Strategies, and the Teaching of Britain's "Long Eighteenth Century"

Timothy Jenks
East Carolina University

ONLINE TECHNOLOGIES are frequently criticized for their unmediated presentation of course content, perceived lack of personal interaction, and apparent inconsistency with the goals of a liberal arts education. However, many who have taught these courses have discovered that the altered learning experience of the online environment can also present opportunities.[1] This article explores those opportunities as they present themselves in courses covering Britain's so-called "long eighteenth century" (1688-1832). I will discuss my experiences teaching an upper-division seminar course in a traditional face-to-face setting, and re-designing a "long eighteenth century" survey course for delivery online. Both courses hinged on the ability to re-construct two very different eighteenth-century reading spaces—namely, those of the Cambridge common room and the country house library. The article thus explores spatial strategies in both face-to-face and online courses, and suggests ways in which they can be particularly exploited in the case of Britain's long eighteenth century. But on a wider level, it is offered as a reflection and critique upon course design and, specifically, on how online technologies can be used to re-think the historical

conceptualization of space. What I mean to offer are not so much concrete tips for use in British courses, as hints towards ways in which historical space can be profitably re-imagined in almost any area history course.

In the summer of 2013, I taught my first online class. I found myself in the position of taking an existing face-to-face course on Britain's long eighteenth century and restructuring it for online delivery. A simple enough task, I reasoned. And my expectation was that the challenges I would face would be primarily technical (computer-savvy I am not). The flyer that I created to advertise the course perfectly encapsulated how ignorant I was in this respect. "Study the 18th century the 21st-century way," it boldly proclaimed. Teaching an online course turned out to involve much more than pouring old wine into new bottles. It actually turned out that to a significant degree, the students ended up studying the eighteenth century in a uniquely eighteenth-century way.

It is probably best if I begin by explaining how I had come to use a historicized sense of space in my existing face-to-face courses. The course concerned was an eighteenth-century course (title: "Britain, 1688-1832"), so the development of print culture was a major theme, and the course had long incorporated lectures on the particular kinds of reading privileged or enabled in particular kinds of eighteenth-century spaces, whether they be the country house library, the subscription library, or the coffee-house.[2] Naturally, the course featured regular class discussions, and it took no great imagination to model them on the rational interactions of the coffee-house. In 2010, my institution acquired access to two important online databases—*British Newspapers 1600-1950* and *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*—and it was a simple enough matter to start assigning eighteenth-century pamphlets and newspaper articles for these discussions. So, rather than using readings set forth in published collections of primary sources, the readings (and associated homework assignments) depended upon an absorbed and comparative course of reading in eighteenth-century newspapers and pamphlets. Of crucial advantage here was that I had almost unlimited freedom in choosing course content and was no longer prisoner of the content choices made by editorial teams. But equally, this design feature allowed the discussions to more closely approximate the experience of the coffee-house itself.

At around the same time, in order to explain the complexity of eighteenth-century voting rights, I had developed an active-learning exercise that assigned each student a unique eighteenth-century identity. Students were randomly assigned an eighteenth-century identity whose relationship to the parliamentary franchise they were tasked to uncover (for example: a leaseholder renting a farm and house for £8 a year; a shopkeeper in a provincial town; a countess; a curate; a widow occupying her deceased husband's house; a lieutenant in the Royal Navy, etc.) In its initial iteration, the exercise emphasized the degree to which voting rights in the period were heavily filtered through conceptions of gender and property (but not always landed property). The exercise was soon translated into a permanent feature of the course, as I began to ask students to participate in subsequent coffee-house discussions from the perspective of their eighteenth-century persona. These discussions were not managed as active role-playing exercises—students discussed their identities from a third-person perspective and with scholarly distance. Although avoiding the element of "play," which Mark C. Carnes has identified as crucial in his "Reacting to the Past" model, and not nearly as immersive, the approach seemed to work.[3] What was novel to me as an instructor was the experiential verisimilitude that was being approximated during an exercise initially designed to apply practical content knowledge.

This was all taking place in the context of a lecture course, taught to around thirty students per semester, during the same time that I was also regularly offering an upper-level eighteenth-century seminar. By happenstance, the first time I taught the seminar, it was scheduled in a particularly luxurious room (ordinarily reserved for faculty meetings), complete with plush carpet and comfy leather chairs. But the idea of using the seminar to re-create the reading space of the eighteenth-century Cambridge common room, or tutor's quarters, really only took hold once I decided upon William Paley's *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy* (1785) as the central text. Paley's text was, for many years after its publication, essentially Cambridge University's textbook on how to be a propertied gentleman, and it formed a central part of the university curriculum for the elite men of property who attended university at that time.[4] *Principles* is based on the lectures and lessons Paley himself gave while a Fellow at Christ's College from 1766-1776, and I decided to use it as a text

read in common for the seminar. Perhaps unusually for a seminar, the class met for one hour, three times a week, on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. This was a deliberate choice on my part. On Monday, I provided background material and set up the topics to be discussed at the Wednesday class, when readings from the secondary literature in the field were discussed in the usual seminar manner. Fridays, however, were set aside for the collective reading of chapters from Paley. As a brief survey of its chapter titles readily indicates (e.g., "The Question, *Why I am Obliged to Keep My Word?* Considered"; "Of Property"; "Charity—The Treatment of Our Domestics and Dependents"; "Slavery"; "Dueling"; "The Rights of Parents"; "The Duties of Children"; "Of the British Constitution"; "Of Crimes and Punishments"; etc.), there is a certain "great books" quality to Paley's work. As a result, the seminar discussions were pretty wide-ranging, replicating the ethical-political-philosophical content that would have characterized Paley's Cambridge teaching.

   Where are we now in regards to space? Well, at this point, I was really just exploiting a simulacrum: a classroom discussion can be like a coffee-house, especially when you ask students to filter their participation through a gendered identity ripped from the eighteenth-century social hierarchy. And a seminar is a privileged reading space, analogous perhaps to the colleges of early modern Cambridge. In both cases, the respective spaces were being used to model a certain kind of communication. In an effort to enhance the educational insights of the exercise, I drew the students' attention to the two spaces, though at the moment, this was being done in independent courses, and the role-play was neither highly immersive nor directly experiential. I enjoyed what I was coming to see as the spatial aspects of my two courses. And when I decided to offer courses online, I initially thought that they were an aspect of my teaching that I was going to have to jettison. For, although I was about to take up online teaching, I had concerns. These were concerns that I, like many critics of online learning, held to derive from the absence of a collective classroom space. In the event, space turned out to have great significance for the experience of the learning environment. Once I discovered this, the online course had an increased capacity to teach about the historical dynamics of space.

   Online teaching involves significant differences from face-to-face teaching. A difference of the highest order is the change in space:

distance education students are "distant." As a result, significant social dimensions of their learning experience are absent.[5] They lack a common classroom, the opportunity to interact with each other, direct personal interaction with the instructor, etc. This marks a significant change in the sociability of the learning environment.[6] Online learning can become highly individuated and enclosed, and so in the last decade, a good number of online learning technologies (discussion boards, web-conferencing technologies, virtual classrooms, adaptations of *Second Life*, etc.) have been developed to address (and overcome) this central fact.[7] However, a great piece of advice I received when adopting online instruction was to not go too quickly into unfamiliar technological environments. Consequently, my first foray into online teaching made me even more aware of the spatial dimensions of the communicative environment than I might have been otherwise if I had hastily adopted the technologies designed to diffuse them. I kept things simple and avoided technologies that were highly interactive (such as simultaneous lecture delivery systems like Saba Meeting, etc.) or that presented what I considered to be steep learning curves (ditto). Although I initially avoided these in order to prevent having my course hamstrung by technological snafus, the result was a course that was pretty much reproducing fundamental reading experiences associated with particular spaces of the eighteenth-century world.

In my first online offering of this eighteenth-century survey, then, beyond utilizing my institution's mandated course management system (Blackboard), I relied on one instructional delivery technology and three kinds of assignments. I provided pre-recorded lectures through Tegrity, a lecture capture software, by which one is able to easily produce what are essentially pre-recorded, narrated PowerPoint presentations. The assignments were 1) quizzes on the content of those lectures, 2) a take-home mid-term and final, and— most crucially—3) a weekly series of homework assignments derived out of the *British Newspapers 1600-1950* database (see **Figure 1** and **Figure 2** for sample homework assignments).

These homework assignments mandated immersion in an archive of newspapers, developed research skills, actively engaged with course themes and topics, and required written answers. And there were aspects of this that were uniquely eighteenth-century. First, there was the content. Students were assigned readings

Homework Assignment #3

Homework #3 is an active-learning exercise that requires you to use the *British Newspapers* database in order to answer the following questions. Homework should be between four to five pages, using one-and-a-half line spacing.

1. Locate and read the court case heard at the Kingston Assizes in the *Whitehall Evening Post or London Intelligencer*, August 18, 1750 - August 21, 1750 (Issue 706). What type of law, and understandings of property, clashed in the case described?

2. Locate and examine the *Times* (London), May 2, 1794. Examine the issue thoroughly.

   a. Britain was at war during 1794. Exactly how many of the items in the paper relate to the fact that Britain was at war? Make a list and briefly explain.

   b. On the front page, at the top of Columns B and C, are two advertisements for meetings to be held in London at St Alban's Tavern. Both relate to parliamentary politics—but how do both illustrate the concept of "virtual representation"?

3. Using the search engine, find a newspaper account of a riot between 1715 and 1832. Include the citation to the item. Explain what happened in this riot, and explain how you feel it relates to what we have learned about the politics of riots and crowds thus far in the course.

Figure 1: Homework Assignment #3

contemporary to the period. Second, there was the practice of comparative reading across newspapers, a practice that has been held to particularly characterize the coffee-house. Third, it was the kind of individually experienced reading that came to predominate in the period, in contradistinction from oral performance or group reading. Fourth, this reading was regular and periodized—another hallmark (if not invention) of the era. And fifth, the responses were written, effectively epistolary. In short, the student in their dorm room (or bedroom) regularly completing these assignments and composing written responses was participating in a set of reading and writing practices similar in structure to those that characterized the eighteenth

---

Homework Assignment #4

Homework #4 is an active-learning exercise that requires you to use the *British Newspapers* database in order to answer the following questions. Homework should be between four to five pages, using one-and-a-half line spacing.

1. Locate an item, in a newspaper published between 1715 and 1815, in which a servant was accused of a crime by their master. Provide the citation, recount the essentials of the case, and comment on what you feel it reveals about servanthood, the criminal justice system, and class relations in eighteenth-century Britain.

2. In Lecture 14, we viewed the mastheads of three Newcastle newspapers. Locate a masthead for an English provincial paper published between 1715 and 1832. Comment on what you feel the devices, symbols, images, and mottoes used are intended to convey to the reader, both about the paper, and about the community.

3. What activities appear to have been central to the eighteenth-century coffee-house? Support your answer, with reference to four different items selected from *British Newspapers* between 1715 and 1832.

4. Locate the *St. James's Chronicle or British Evening Post* (London, England), February 1, 1781 - February 3, 1781 (Issue 3109). Examine the advertisements on page 3. How many of them can you relate to themes, issues, and events that we have covered so far in the course? Make a list and briefly explain.

5. Chapter 9 of Willcox, "The Age of Aristocracy," contains a discussion of enclosure and canal-building. Find an article published between 1740 and 1820 that relates to either an act of enclosure or the construction of a canal. Explain and describe your item.

6. Page 3 of *Jackson's Oxford Journal* (Oxford, England), Saturday, February 27, 1802 (Issue 2548), Pembroke College, Oxford, advertises for a scholarship. What conditions appear to have been attached to this particular scholarship?

7. *Jackson's Oxford Journal* (Oxford, England), Saturday, March 16, 1805 (Issue 2707), contains an advertisement for a scholarly publication by Richard Laurence. How does this item relate to what the lecture on Oxford identified as one of the fundamental purposes of the university in the eighteenth century?

Figure 2: Homework Assignment #4

century. The exercise replicated aspects of the communicative world of the propertied gentleman: the country squire, in his well-appointed country house library, reading his weekly newspapers, synthesizing information from the world, responding in letters or diary entries.[8]

The "provincial isolation" (as I came to term it) of this learning experience was, of course, only inadvertently enhanced by the absence of the charismatic instructor/professor. As the instructor, I was practically invisible to the students, because the lectures were basically voiced-over PowerPoint presentations laden with juicy visual images and the most colorful maps I could find. I had been advised that students receive very little "value-added" in viewing footage of the instructor simply speaking. And so I had not included any. Moreover, in order to make my first foray into online learning as convenient for students as possible, I had opted for an asynchronous course format (i.e., no "real-time" or live lectures; students viewed the pre-recorded lectures on their own time). The result was that my voice—literally in the case of the lectures, metaphorically in the case of my textual Blackboard presence—was all of me that was present.

This was an instructional design choice with great significance, and one that seemed to present a glass jaw to proponents of interaction and defenders of face-to-face. What had my pre-recorded lecture become? Ignoring, for the moment, the degree to which the lecture was, of course, digitally enabled, it now shared some strong similarities with another central literary form of the eighteenth century—namely, the Anglican sermon. Like the sermon whose delivery-platform was the pulpit of the established church, my lecture was an authority-based pronouncement of knowledge. It was not at all interactive, and so, like the Anglican parson, I could not be interrupted. I became like William Paley again, when he left the confines of Cambridge and took up a rural living in the Church of England; the mediator of orthodox truth, espousing the central absolutes of my discipline to individuals in local nodes of learning and experience, channeling a shared orthodoxy of narrative to which individuated reading and learning was to be (ideally) attached.[9] I didn't see this as an instructional strength (nor necessarily a weakness)—just a reality. But it was a reality that, again, was reflective of the world of the propertied eighteenth-century gentleman, and, thus, in the context of this course, it was an exploitable reality that could be brought to the notice of my students.

Technology, of course, offers the opportunity to address the absence of interaction in my delivery of the course content. But the existing configuration of the online course has an advantage, for the reified aspect of the lecture delivery was another opportunity to teach students about the contours of the eighteenth-century public sphere—and to underline to them the unique conventions that apply in different conditions of speech-making.[10] An eighteenth-century parson was certainly unlikely to be interrupted in the course of his weekly sermon—and only parishioners of a certain status would have been welcome to contest his views later at the church door, or over sherry in the vicarage. Again, my strategy would be to make students aware of the conventional borders that operated historically for their eighteenth-century personas, to ask them how it felt not to be able to challenge my views "in class," and then ask them to reflect on whether their eighteenth-century identity would have been able to challenge similar views, whether they found them expressed in an eighteenth-century sermon or lecture. Once again, online learning had unexpectedly provided an opportunity not just to make a particular teaching point, but it had also provided a mechanism for the students to experience that point themselves.

In critiques of online learning, much is made of the loss of personal contact. There is much work to be done here, on the effect of this for retention rates, student satisfaction, indeed, for the very idea of a university. (And it is my suspicion that many of the answers to these questions will turn out to be institution-specific.) But what I discovered the first time I taught online was that the reduction of the instructor's personality interface equally permits students a more direct and unmediated relationship with the course material. It has been my observation that instructors who are most committed to the deployment of charisma in the classroom are frequently those who are most resistant to the adoption of online learning technologies. I have always been suspicious of the deployment of professorial charisma, so for me, the inability to use it was actually a somewhat liberating aspect of teaching online. I was able to let the course material speak for itself, and draw students into an appreciation of it on its own terms. And I was perhaps more able to do this because of the particular type of eighteenth-century reading and spatial experiences that the material was bringing forward. My epiphany was when I realized that this

---

Sample Discussion Board Prompts

Week 1

For full credit in the forum, you are required to submit one post in answer to questions 1 and 2 below, as well as one comment on the post of one other student (as described below). Answer after having viewed the lectures on "Sorts of People: The Structure of Society" and "Electoral Politics."

Questions for the post:

1. Briefly introduce your identity. Do you think you would have qualified for the parliamentary vote? What role, if any, in the political system do you feel you might have had?

2. How geographically mobile do you think you would have been?

Instructions for the comment on other posts:

1. Identify at least one other student's identity that you feel you would have met or come into contact with during your life in the eighteenth century.

Week 2

For full credit in the forum this week, you are required to submit one post in answer to the following question. Answer after having viewed the lectures on "Literacy" and "Print Culture."

1. What use—if any—do you think your eighteenth-century persona would have made of the newspaper?

Figure 3: Sample Discussion Board Prompts

direct and unmediated relationship was very similar to a unique reading experience—or space—of the eighteenth century.

The second time I taught the course was during a regular spring session (rather than in the compressed summer session), which required me to add some assignments. One was an eighteenth-century novel, *Roderick Random*, by Tobias Smollett. I don't have too much to say here, except that, of course, novel-reading is an intrinsically eighteenth-century activity, and I have assigned them in classes for years. But now that I was more confident using online learning technology, I added the Discussion Board feature of Blackboard to encourage interaction. Initially, I was motivated by the sense that—by 2014—it was unthinkable to construct a course (whether

face-to-face or online) without some form of class interaction. But the interactive element, again, led in an unexpected direction. These discussion boards developed the identity exercise I had used previously in my face-to-face course, made it more formal, and rooted it more deeply in relation to what we were learning about print culture (see **Figure 3** for sample discussion board prompts). Students were asked to participate in the discussion boards from the perspective of their assigned eighteenth-century identity. And once again—contrary to my expectations or even design—the significance of space was articulated as the discussion unfolded. As Lisa Lane has observed, in online discussion boards, "the social feature seems to dominate"—and in my case, this led to an unexpected effect.[11] My instructions to the students were relatively benign, but what ended up happening was that a few of them began to reply to my prompts *in character*. This was interesting for several reasons. First, it speaks to the student desire for "play" in learning, a concept around which the methodology of "Reacting to the Past" is based.[12] Second, these posts raised issues that the eighteenth-century historian would immediately recognize as quintessential to the masquerade.[13] I had not designed my discussion board with this intent. But the postings of the students, whose "false" eighteenth-century identity was presented to the class, while their "real" identity as persons remained effectively anonymous, revealed the dynamic to be there nonetheless. This, moreover, had wider implications. It is currently held that social presence is crucial to student engagement and learning.[14] And in this context, embedding a masquerade-centered identity exercise into a course on the eighteenth century could become more than an exercise in experiential learning: it can address a paradox of efforts to foster social presence. A recent study that examined the effects of using student-created personal profiles in online learning communities found that while some students considered the exercise helpful in building a sense of online community, a significant number of students objected due to concerns for privacy.[15] Privacy, though, is not an issue when students adopt a historical identity, and thus the exercise offers the opportunity to foster the intimacy necessary for social presence.

Contrary to my initial expectation that the switch to online would result in experiential losses for the students, my experience was that online learning technologies permitted the enhancement of this particular course. Understandings of space, which I had

initially explored in a face-to-face lecture course (and perhaps most powerfully, in a face-to-face seminar), were not necessarily intrinsic to the face-to-face learning environment. In fact, they were discernible, and could be powerfully realized, in an online learning experience.

Course design—teaching itself—is an ongoing process, so this article is unfinished in the sense that I still have some way to go in further developing the spatial strategies that I have been discussing.[16] At the moment, I have course content and particular reading experiences that map onto each other quite effectively. In future versions of the course, I plan to draw the students' attention to these issues much more explicitly than has been the case thus far. I intend a more constructivist engagement, by getting students to explore space more experientially and reflectively. I am trying to think of assignments—or practices—that might have students reflect on the different types of reading they are being asked to do (ideas include blogs designed as diary entries, discussion boards that are more truly epistolary, etc.).[17] I envision this as a development that would facilitate their understanding of the historicized nature of space and reading, something that had become particularly palpable in this course on the eighteenth century. That said, online learning currently embraces—and will embrace in the future—so many technologies, that reading space is likely not to be the only experience for which a re-design would enable such significant re-thinking.

The crucial thing I have learned is that online learning technologies enable a re-thinking of many of the communicative patterns and practices which, in face-to-face courses, we simply take for granted. In the case of this course on eighteenth-century Britain, that awareness turned out to be exploitable in the direction of the course content. It enabled an existing content focus on reading spaces to be further developed in an experiential manner. Would this be true of any area course, or period? Possibly not in as direct a manner as has been highlighted here. The online practices mentioned above might well be dependent on the broader dynamic within the development of print culture, in which case they would be pertinent to different national histories at different times in global history. Certainly, it seems like they could easily enough be transported into a course on the eighteenth-century Atlantic world, colonial America, or the early national period. Indeed, a recent re-casting of the latter by

Trish Loughran has argued, "there was no 'nationalized' print public sphere in the years just before and after the Revolution, but rather a proliferating variety of local and regional reading publics scattered across a vast and diverse geographical space."[18] And it is certainly possible to conceive of online technologies that would assist students in the actualization of these historicized reading spaces. Online learning makes you aware of boundaries and borders that you didn't always grasp—and an awareness of that can be usefully exploited in future course design.

Notes

1.   Adam Elias, "It's Not Just About Teaching Online. It's about Teaching Period." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 15 April 2016, B24.

2.   For which see, John Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000), Chapter 4.

3.   See Mark C. Carnes, *Minds on Fire: How Role Immersion Games Transform College* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014); Mark C. Carnes, "Inciting Speech," *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 37, no. 2, (March/April 2005): 6-11; Mark C. Carnes, "Dewey's 'New Education' and an Alternative: Reacting to the Past," *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 14, no. 4 (October 2015): 583-588.

4.   William Paley, *The Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy* (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 2002), xi-xxvii.

5.   The challenges of teaching "geographically distributed learners" were pioneered in Britain in the early years of the Open University. See Daniel Weinbren, *The Open University: A History* (Manchester, United Kingdom: Manchester University Press, 2015), 16-17.

6.   Social presence is the measure of interactive sociability in online environments, and it is explored in a large literature. For a recent survey, see Murat Oztok and Clare Brett, "Social Presence and Online Learning: A Review of Research," *Journal of Distance Education (Online)* 25, no. 3 (2011): 1-10.

For the challenges posed to distance education in the era prior to the arrival of the Internet and its associated technologies, see Weinbren, *The Open University*, Chapter 4.

7.   Teaching strategies, too, address this. See Alisa Stern, "Bridge the Gap: Replicating the Interactivity of the Physical Classroom in an Online Environment," *The History Teacher* 48, no. 3 (May 2015): 483-504. See also, more generally, the views on the relationship of social presence to student engagement, sense of community, and collaborative learning presented in Rena M. Palloff and Keith Pratt, *Building Online Learning Communities: Effective Strategies for the Virtual Classroom* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2007); and Shirley Bach, Philip Haynes, and Jennifer Lewis Smith, *Online Learning and Teaching in Higher Education* (Maidenhead, United Kingdom: Open University Press, 2007).

8.   The gendered nature of these reading spaces—and of the eighteenth-century public sphere generally—was a major theme of the course.

9.   James E. Crimmins, "Paley, William (1743–1805)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2004).

10.   For an introduction to which, see James Epstein, *In Practice: Studies in the Language and Culture of Popular Politics in Modern Britain* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003), 9-10, 67, and 109-111.

11.   Lisa M. Lane, "Constructing the Past Online: Discussion Board as History Lab," *The History Teacher* 47, no. 2 (February 2014): 197.

12.   Carnes, *Minds on Fire*, 37-62.

13.   On the centrality of the masquerade in eighteenth-century Britain, see Dror Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), 157-165.

14.   Bach, Haynes, and Smith, *Online Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, Chapter 5 and *passim*; Palloff and Pratt, *Building Online Learning Communities*, especially pp. 25-43.

15.   Karen Kear, Frances Chetwynd, and Helen Jefferis, "Social Presence in Online Learning Communities: The Role of Personal Profiles," *Research in Learning Technology* 22 (2014), article no. 19710.

16.   And what I am ultimately moving towards is importing these technologies into a face-to-face course, or "hybrid" course.

17.   It also remains for me to link the spatial exercises to the course's assessed learning goals. In prior years, the course was not selected for assessment in my department's rotating assessment schedule.

18.   Trish Loughran, *The Republic in Print: Print Culture in the Age of U.S. Nation-Building, 1770-1870* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), xix.