Recent studies in the field of literature and science have begun to revise a long-standing model of mutual influence towards one of mutual constitution. The historicist and interdisciplinary work of much eighteenth-century scholarship has helped to unearth unexpected interconnections between literature and science, too often presumed to be separate enterprises: shared rhetorical strategies, epistemological structures, and circulating networks. Rather than anachronistically presuming the coherence and stability of the categories “literature” and “science,” The Experimental Imagination inhabits a “context that is in flux” where both domains are entangled in processes of becoming (9). This critical strategy of “acknowledg[ing] the peculiarity between then and now” and “hold[ing] that peculiarity as simultaneously disorienting and illustrative” yields for Tita Chico the key framework for her book: the “experimental imagination” captures the intellectual and aesthetic qualities of scientific inquiry that was beginning to define itself by and against literary knowledge (9). For Chico more polemically, science itself was “a form of figuration, a kind of literary act” (5).

Chico traces how natural philosophy depended on the “imaginative impulses available within a literary framework” to produce its objects of inquiry and the subjects capable of engaging with them—“modest witnesses” who could carefully martial the imagination towards rational, scientific ends (10). Through a mobile set of tropes, natural philosophers constructed their own authority by imagining new forms of evidence, learning, and observation. Crucial to this act of self-legitimacy is the deep reliance on literature’s speculative capacities to realize what is under the microscope, as in the case of Robert Hooke’s Micrographia (1665). To “experiment” was necessarily to engage in metaphoric thinking that then provided the vocabulary for representing and making sense of natural phenomena. This reframing of science as an epistemological endeavour that was deeply dependent on sustained imaginative, literary acts is one of The Experimental Imagination’s most “radical revelations” (13).

Emblematic of the book’s method of refusing the “teleology that sees science as a winner of history and literature as its debased sibling, scamper-
ing to catch up” is its extensive archive of literary and scientific texts ranging from translations of scientific dialogues to Restoration drama. The fluidity with which Chico connects seemingly disparate elements from scientific treatises and novels, for instance, works to challenge our assumptions about how we might define the “literary” or the “scientific” in each case. Literature served as a persistent reminder of the sociality of science as a set of discourses and practices—its enmeshment within a web of social relations. From the perspective of method, Chico powerfully models how literary texts are central to understanding the history of science despite the field’s historical resistance to the literary. We simultaneously encounter the literary qualities of science and scientific qualities of literature. This is particularly evident in her provocative arguments about the antitheses of the “modest witnesses” of the Royal Society. As figures of “immodest” failure and “bad science,” the gimcrack and the coquette reveal the performative nature of natural philosophy: well into the nineteenth century, for example, public science was characterized by dramatic visual spectacles. Such examples raise provocative questions about the roles of other “immodest” figures in the eighteenth century like the “idiot” incapable of becoming a reasoning, modest witness or the quack doctor who is dissembling similarly to the gimcrack.

Another critical intervention made by *The Experimental Imagination* is Chico’s theorizing of how affect operates in the eighteenth-century culture of experiment. As much as scientists wanted to portray themselves as figures of reason, underpinning that reason was desire and feeling. In Chico’s understanding, feeling is a form of scientific epistemology despite its disavowal. The ubiquity of the gimcrack and the coquette throughout eighteenth-century literature underscores the pervasive cultural anxiety around scientific desire and object choice gone wrong—when modesty becomes wholly immodest as in James Miller’s *The Humours of Science* (1726) or Susanna Centlivre’s *The Basset-Table* (1705). Scientific aspirations towards consensus and credibility feel particularly precarious as they always “run the risk of being only mechanism[s], variously, for self-interest, sexual pleasure, and the accumulation of wealth” (74). Chico’s framework of affective epistemology opens new avenues for thinking about the unique role of feeling in histories of science: affect simultaneously animates the scientific endeavour yet threatens to undermine it entirely.

Attention to affect enables Chico to draw an unanticipated connection between scientific knowledge-making and the seduction plot, which was a mainstay of the eighteenth-century novel. Among the many pliable tropes it employed, natural philosophy following Francis Bacon frequently represented scientific inquiry as a heteronormative act
of erotic conquest. Chico extends her argument about affective epistemology by demonstrating how gender and sexuality come to frame scientific education. Female writers like Aphra Behn and Elizabeth Carter translated Bernard Le Bovier de Fontenelle and Francesco Algarotti precisely to expose the dynamics of power and feeling built into the scientific pedagogical encounter that converts ignorance into knowledge. Chico draws on the long tradition of feminist and queer scholarship in eighteenth-century studies to illuminate the embedded cultural values within natural philosophy; the “experimental imagination,” she shows, is a gendered project that persists in contemporary science.

Through its defamiliarization of what constitutes the historical relationship between literature and science in the eighteenth century, *The Experimental Imagination* ultimately makes a bold defence of the literary: “Literariness does not merely facilitate the practice and conceptualization of natural philosophy but also contains within it a hidden reciprocity with science ... In this story of the British Enlightenment, literary knowledge lays claim to being the most reliable and most authoritative mode to apprehend the world around us” (133). At a cultural moment in which the humanities and the sciences seem increasingly divided, Chico offers a history that “testifies to the profound indebtedness” science has to literature, and she reconfirms literature’s enduring capacity to imagine new ways of knowing the world (103).

**Travis Chi Wing Lau** is a postdoctoral teaching fellow at the University of Texas at Austin and specializes in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century British literature, the history of medicine, and disability studies.

*Making Love: Sentiment and Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century British Literature* by Paul Kelleher
Review by Julie Beaulieu, University of Pittsburgh

Among the hallmarks of heterosexual hegemony is its perceived timelessness. Heterosexual erotic sentiment, much like heterosexual desire, is sustained as dominant, normal, and natural via its taken-for-granted or axiomatic status, to borrow from Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick. Leaving hetero-erotic passion and culture unquestioned makes it challenging to see both small and large changes in heterosexual culture (or to recognize heterosexuality as cultural in the first place); it also conceals systemic oppression under the pretext of the natural and the normal. As a result, the literary history of heterosexuality can
be incredibly difficult to see, document, and theorize. And yet, the history of sexuality tells us that heterosexuality, and our modern understanding of sexual identity more broadly, has a rather short history, emerging as a new conceptual framework around the end of the nineteenth century. Reading with this chronology in mind, the literary history of sexuality before the nineteenth century—or the literary history of sexuality before sexuality—presents readers with a tremendously different orientation towards what looks like heterosexuality in early texts. More directly, the history of heterosexuality brings into view subtle yet critical distinctions between developing ideas and already circulating beliefs; in particular, what we read as emblematic of heterosexuality is transformed from tried-and-true hetero logic to a fledgling and unstable symbol or idea. The expert theorist and historian of sexuality moves readers to see heterosexuality with a broader critical and historical clarity, not just when reading texts that technically predate heteronormativity. Readers are newly able to see what was there all along—the massive amount of labour performed to create and to uphold hetero hegemony—especially in the present.

Examining the literary history of heterosexuality in eighteenth-century literature presents at least two predictable challenges. First, heteronormative ideologies mask the prescriptive as natural (even, or especially, when challenged), preventing us from seeing what we might call the scaffolding of heterosexual hegemony. And second, the very process of reading for heterosexuality—looking for a developing idea that has more recently crystallized into a structure of power—can inadvertently harden an idea into accepted fact when it might be better judged as a provisional, variable, or entirely new way of thinking. Paul Kelleher presents a forceful and rich road map for unearthing the hidden history of heterosexual sentiment in eighteenth-century literature and philosophy. *Making Love* provides a literary history of heterosexual desire and sentiment by exploring how heterosexuality became a qualification for “moral goodness and ethical sociability” in the first place (2).

In asking this question, Kelleher engages with a broad set of thinkers in sexuality studies who have asked equally compelling questions about abstractions, including the presumed goodness of heterosexual desire, and structures of feeling, such as the assumption that sexual desire is linked to social and historical “goods” (be they moral or material). Historians of heterosexuality, including Jonathan Ned Katz, have argued that hetero-erotic desire is not universally or transhistorically good (or acceptable, or even possible); consider, as an example, Katz’s assertion in *The Invention of Heterosexuality* (2007) that early twentieth-century U.S. heterosexuals had to “come out,” an act of solidarity in defense
of an emergent hetero-erotic culture, one characterized by pleasure and the freedom to choose how to do human sexual contact. I am also reminded of Alan Bray’s *The Friend* (2006), another ground-breaking text that historicizes the shifting meanings of friendship in the early-modern period; Kelleher, like Bray, is masterful in his capacity to enable readers to re-see something immensely familiar, and to locate a set of texts in a newly transparent history, the history of hetero-erotic sentiment.

I note the contributions of *Making Love* to the history of sexuality at length because, as invested as Kelleher is in eighteenth-century literature and philosophy, this project fills a set of theoretical and methodological gaps in existing scholarship on the history of sex and sentiment. Kelleher notes Michel Foucault as his central interlocutor, but this research would speak strongly to a broad range of scholars interested in the methods required to carefully and convincingly document and theorize discursive shifts in longstanding symbols and institutions, including but not limited to heterosexuality. Historians and theorists in feminist and gender studies should also take notice because Kelleher’s research demonstrates how the turn to sentimental heterosexual desire, a collective affect that we might wrongly suppose leads to improved conditions for women, may have in fact deepened already existing structures of gender inequity, obscuring them with moral feelings and pleasures.

The analyses of literature and philosophy in this monograph will be of strong interest and use to eighteenth-century scholars working on a wide range of topics precisely because of the broad impact of Kelleher’s central thesis. If we are suddenly invited, indeed irresistibly compelled, to read the eighteenth century through the lens of an idealized and emergent model of hetero-erotic desire and sentiment, then we are guided to rethink the majority of works that we have read. Laurence Sterne’s tongue-in-cheek musings on sexual longing in *A Sentimental Journey through France and Italy* (1768) are newly emblematic of a specific thread of thinking; they represent not simply the wedding of pleasure and morality, but part of a larger discursive attempt to elevate men’s heterosexuality “to monopolize the domain of morality” (Kelleher, 3). Scholars invested in the problem of the individual, self-interest, and morality, specifically as it unfolds in Western philosophical inquiry, will find new ways to interrogate the works of Shaftesbury, whose influence on the cult of sensibility and eighteenth-century conceptions of the self is widely noted. The works of Eliza Haywood and Samuel Richardson take a dramatically different shape when read as part of a specifically hetero-erotic archive. Kelleher’s research concludes with an analysis of
Henry Fielding’s playful depiction of male hetero-erotic passion in *Tom Jones* (1749), demonstrating how the problem of desire can be easily fixed by marking the problem itself as “good.” It may seem dramatic to suggest that *Making Love* changes everything, but given Kelleher’s rich lessons, together with the massive reach of heterosexual hegemony, I am convinced that it does.

**Julie Beaulieu** is a Lecturer in the Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies Program at the University of Pittsburgh. Beaulieu’s research explores the literary history of sexual health, including the queer history of sex and love addiction.
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**Art and Celebrity in the Age of Reynolds and Siddons**
by Heather McPherson

Review by Laura Engel, Duquesne University

For those of us who are familiar with Heather McPherson’s scholarship on the inextricable relationship between visual art and the theatre in eighteenth-century England, it is a thrill to see her impressive new volume, a majestically illustrated and beautifully researched analysis of the emergence, growth, and nuances of celebrity culture, particularly in the 1780s. McPherson envisions celebrity as “a dynamic sociocultural phenomenon produced by a multidirectional matrix of factors, evolving over time but also possessing a period specific, culturally identifiable footprint” (7). This interdisciplinary and wide-ranging approach allows her to move through an array of materials (portraits, prints, caricatures, accessories, letters, diaries, biographies, memoirs, and various theatrical ephemera) in support of compelling new ways to think about how and why certain figures became public icons. Throughout the book, McPherson is particularly attuned to the ways in which the mechanisms of visual culture work to resurrect the ephemeral performances and embodied presence of actors and actresses. As her opening epithet by William Hazlitt speculates: “What would the actors say to it, if, by any spell or necromancy, all the celebrated actors, for the last hundred years, could be made to appear again on the boards of Covent Garden and Drury Lane, for the last time, in all their most brilliant parts?” (1). McPherson suggests that it is art that brings us closer to performers from the past, and paying close attention to the history and reception of portraiture in particular gives us a way to chart how spectators reacted and related to significant theatrical figures.

The book has five chapters that follow a roughly chronological narrative through the second half of the eighteenth century. Chapters 1 and 3
focus on specific individuals—David Garrick, Joshua Reynolds, and Sarah Siddons—while the remaining chapters are thematic and include a broader range of examples. McPherson’s first chapter on Garrick and Reynolds traces the overlapping nature of their careers and legacies. Both the actor and the artist rose from humble origins to become consummate professionals and experts at their craft. McPherson purposefully begins her analysis by emphasizing the relationship between the studio and the stage in order to highlight her claim that although scholars have written about the connections between art and the theatre in the eighteenth century, the extent and complexities of the overlaps between the two genres has yet to be fully explored. McPherson explains: “this is primarily due to the difficulties in defining and theorizing a relationship that is both direct and metaphorical, in which intangibles such as visual effects, virtuoso display, and performance, in particular, are thematized” (18). Using Garrick and Reynolds as case studies, McPherson underscores important parallels between the rise of the theatre as a thriving commercial enterprise and theatrical portraiture, public art exhibitions, and the emergence of Shakespeare as a national icon. Reynolds’s and Garrick’s successes and weaknesses (McPherson points out that both “craved the spotlight and public acclaim and were accused by detractors of relentlessly promoting their careers” [25]) are emblematic, she argues, of the paradoxical nature of a culture simultaneously obsessed with theatricality and authenticity. She underscores this idea in a wonderful reading of Reynolds’s famous painting “Garrick Between Tragedy and Comedy” (1760–61), where she suggests that the divided nature of the portrait mimics Reynolds’s “anxieties about the relationship between portraiture and the stage” (33).

Chapter 2 explores the importance of exhibitions and exhibition spaces in thinking about the politics of representation and public display. McPherson argues that the late eighteenth-century cultural preoccupation with individuality and self-fashioning encouraged spectators to view portraits as “reflexively staged performances” (56). Because painting titles were mostly anonymous, “Identifying the portraits at the Royal Academy became a sort of parlor game that emboldened spectators, encouraging them to indulge in speculation and gossip about the sitter” (58). Tracing reproductions of Johann Heinrich Ramberg’s spectacular painting of “The Exhibition of the Royal Academy 1787,” McPherson highlights the idea of spectatorship as a gendered activity and the fascinating translation of exhibition images through various media including decorative fans. The end of the chapter focuses on the intertwined relationship between portraits of actresses and aristocratic women, particularly Sarah Siddons, Eliza Farren, and Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire. A great
reproduction of Downman’s portraits of Siddons, Farren, and Georgiana (known as “The Richmond House Heads” because they were made particularly for the private theatricals at Richmond house) on the same page mimics how the portraits may have been viewed together as a set of images in conversation with one another. The interchangeable costumes and expressions make the figures look like pin-up girls. Ironically, the only sitter that stares straight out at the viewer is Sarah Siddons, perhaps an indication of her role as the most “legitimate” celebrity in the group. Although images of Siddons and the Duchess of Devonshire have been written about extensively in discussions of women and the public sphere, McPherson also includes female artists Anne Damer and Maria Cosway in her analysis, figures who deserve more attention.

In the subsequent chapter, “Siddons and Tragic Pallor,” McPherson highlights connections between Siddons’s celebrity and her majestic performances, with theories of melancholy, face paint and aesthetic practices, and ideologies of tragedy. She brilliantly demonstrates how Siddons may have used strategies for elevation that capitalized on the specifics of the stage environment and how these particular motifs may have been captured on canvas. McPherson’s supposition that eighteenth-century stage lighting may have made Siddons appear incandescent and sculptural provides a new way to read Reynolds’s famous image of Siddons as “The Tragic Muse.” In a short epilogue, she proposes that the effect of Siddons’s pallor on audiences may have been “supernatural” and “uncanny” (126), a sensation translated into a wax effigy of her at Madame Tussauds on display through the nineteenth century. Extending her discussion of reactions to Siddons as actor and Siddons’s afterlife in images, the fourth chapter “Targeting Celebrity” includes as an illustration a stunning caricature of Siddons entitled *Theatrical Jealousy – or – The Rival Queens of Covent Garden* (1816), which looks like an exaggerated version of Lawrence’s 1804 portrait of the actress come to life. Like the public nature of the Royal Academy exhibitions and the theatre itself, McPherson reminds us that graphic satire “empowered ordinary spectators, providing an opportunity to mock and/or revel in the foibles, tribulations, and sexual peccadillos of public personalities” (137). Highlights of this chapter include McPherson’s discussion of caricatures of Boydell’s Shakespeare Gallery by Gillray and Cruikshank’s satire of the 1812–1813 Covent Garden Christmas Pantomime. Throughout her careful analyses she underscores the idea that caricatures provide “counter images” that unsettle prevailing views of history. In the late eighteenth-century satiric views of theatrical culture focused on the decadent nature of public display as well as the threatening idea of permeable boundaries between high and low art, cultural and political realms, and the possibility of movement among social spheres.
In a final chapter on “Artistic Afterlives and the Historiography of Fame” McPherson juxtaposes the visual afterlives of Reynolds and Siddons in order to emphasize her overall argument about the importance of tracing the multimodal origins of celebrity and its transmission back to the eighteenth century. Her discussion of Margaret Dicksee’s portrait fantasy of Angelica Kaufman visiting Reynolds’s studio (1892) echoes her analysis in the first chapter of William Quillar Orchardson’s imagined portrayal of “Mrs. Siddons in the Studio of Sir Joshua Reynolds” (1903). The idea that turn-of-the-century artists would wish to restage fictional encounters from the world of art and the theatre a hundred years earlier speaks to the enduring power of Siddons and Reynolds as celebrated figures. As McPherson points out, it matters less that these depictions are not real, and more that they exist as examples of desire on the part of spectators to conjure the bodies and performances of the past. These retrospective painted tributes allow us to participate in artistic encounters that transmit the effects of fame across time. In McPherson’s view, “the study of celebrity and its apparatus in eighteenth-century London is a sort of palimpsest—a multilayered time-based historical canvas that continues to evolve as we view it” (192).


Poétique romanesque de la mémoire avant Proust, t. 1. Éros réminiscent (xviiie-xviiiie siècle), par Jean-François Perrin
Critique par Christophe Martin, Sorbonne Université

Ce beau livre s’inscrit dans la lignée de travaux plus anciens de Jean-François Perrin, en particulier Le Chant de l’origine: la mémoire et le temps dans Les Confessions, publié en 1996 (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation), ainsi que de plusieurs autres études qui se sont échelonnées au fil des années (depuis une étude séminale sur « La scène de réminiscence avant Proust » parue dans la revue Poétique en 1995). C’est dire que cet essai sur la poétique de la mémoire dans le roman d’Ancien Régime repose lui-même sur une réflexion ancienne et sur une longue fréquentation des œuvres, autrement dit sur une profonde mémoire de cette littérature:
en témoignent non seulement une connaissance extrêmement précise de romans dont certains sont sinon oubliés, du moins souvent plus évoqués que véritablement lus, mais une aptitude remarquable à les faire résonner les uns avec les autres. Cette mémoire des œuvres et cette ample culture romanesque, que Perrin souligne notamment en Rousseau (215 et suivant), joue ici un rôle essentiel: elles permettent d'éclairer le détail des textes tout en les inscrivant dans une longue durée. L'une des hypothèses fortes de ce livre est en effet que « la conjonction des temps par une scène—ou une série de scènes—de ressouvenir est peut-être immanente à l'art narratif » (11). Loin de proposer une lecture téléologique, recherchant dans le roman d'Ancien Régime des éléments précurseurs qui annonceraient la réminiscence proustienne, Perrin montre que le motif du ressouvenir et de la rêverie remémorative, en tant qu’il relève d’une poétique compositionnelle, remonte aux origines mêmes de la littérature européenne. L’introduction insiste en effet à juste titre sur les « racines épiques » du motif (de l’Odyssée au roman de chevalerie), ainsi que sur le rôle du modèle hellénistique, en particulier des Éthiopiques d’Héliodore dont on sait l’influence déterminante sur le développement du roman héroïco-galant et au-delà. Une utile enquête lexicographique sur les notions de ressouvenir et de réminiscence est l’occasion d’insister sur un autre arrière-plan fondamental: la tradition millénaire des « arts de la mémoire » et des imagines agentes. Une autre hypothèse centrale du livre est en effet que cette tradition de l’ars memoriae, entendu avant tout comme un « art de la composition » (Perrin s’appuie ici en particulier sur les travaux de Mary Carruthers) et qui s’est éteinte à l’aube de l’âge classique, n’aurait pas disparu sans laisser de trace: les imagines agentes auraient fait l’objet d’une appropriation par la culture littéraire et en particulier romanesque des XVIIᵉ et XVIIIᵉ siècles. L’hypothèse se révèle féconde, mais les analyses mêmes de l’auteur suggèrent assez nettement que, pour le XVIIIᵉ siècle du moins, le roman dialogue sans doute plus directement encore avec l’intense travail de théorisation contemporaine sur la mémoire (chez Malebranche, Locke, Condillac, Diderot, Rousseau).

Étant donné ce cadrage historique, l’ordre chronologique adopté dans le livre est parfaitement cohérent: Perrin explore d’abord les racines de la topique du ressouvenir amoureux dans l’univers de la « haute romancie », de L’Astrée à Clélie, puis dans La Princesse de Clèves dont il souligne à la fois la modernité d’approche et la fidélité distanciée aux motifs du grand roman baroque. La deuxième partie met en lumière les liens entre ressouvenir et reconnaissance dans deux œuvres qui héritent toutes deux d’une topique épique et hellénistique, mais qui en font un usage diamétralement opposé: alors que la Zayde de Mme de Lafayette...
se structure autour d’un processus de reconnaissance qui triomphe de tous les obstacles, « l’Histoire de Tervire » dans La Vie de Marianne s’ordonne autour d’un phénomène inverse: celui d’une résistance d’un sujet (Mme Dursan) à tous les indices mémoratifs qui s’accumulent pourtant autour de lui. Sans remettre en cause la pertinence de cette analyse, on pourrait souligner que, dans le roman de Marivaux, ce phénomène fait système avec l’évitement de la scène de reconnaissance dans l’histoire de Marianne, laissant percevoir une ironie visant à la fois cette topique traditionnelle et le mythe de la voix de la nature. La partie suivante est consacrée aux intermittences de la mémoire, successivement examinée à partir de la longue amnésie de Marianne dans la 7e partie du roman de Marivaux, et des oscillations entre mémoire et oubli chez le Meilcour des Égarements du cœur et de l’esprit de Crébillon. Un nouveau diptyque structure la quatrième partie autour de dispositifs fictionnels visant à provoquer artificiellement un phénomène de mémoire en forme de ressouvenir, d’abord dans Ab quel conte! de Crébillon, puis dans le livre V d’Émile, Perrin proposant une très fine analyse de la manière dont le précepteur du jeune homme et les parents de Sophie travaillent de concert pour « que chacun reconnaisse en l’autre une image mentale du conjoint idéal » (160). La cinquième partie porte sur Cleveland de Prévost et montre le rôle central de la mémoire affective à la fois dans la narration et le récit, le brouillage de la frontière entre mémoire volontaire et involontaire, ainsi que les effets de « surimpressions floues » qui caractérisent la psyché d’un héros méconnaissant la réalité de son désir et ne sachant « aimer autrement que par réminiscence » (188). L’avant-dernière partie est consacrée à La Nouvelle Héloïse et met en valeur les liens entre genre épistolaire et poétique de la mémoire, l’importance capitale de la scène de ressouvenir provoqué, ainsi que la cohérence d’une composition romanesque musicale et en miroir, « tout entière ordonnée par la chaîne du ressouvenir » (218). La dernière partie s’intéresse enfin à l’héritage de La Nouvelle Héloïse chez les romancières du tournant du siècle et à leur attention élective aux circonstances infîmes et obscures de la vie morale et amoureuse par le prisme de la scène de ressouvenir. Ce dernier chapitre aurait pu toutefois souligner que ce phénomène ne procédait sans doute pas entièrement du roman de Rousseau, puisqu’on en trouve trace dès les Lettres d’une Péruvienne de Mme de Graffigny (voir en particulier la lettre 40), ainsi que dans des romans de Mme Riccoboni antérieurs à Julie.

C’est peu dire que ce livre fourmille d’analyses passionnantes. Si l’on osait ajouter au mot de l’interprète, on pourrait seulement regretter que les analyses sur Marivaux n’accordent pas une plus grande importance à un phénomène récurrent de réminiscence amoureuse, et
qui aurait pu conduire à une dimension essentielle de la poétique du ressouvenir au siècle des Lumières. Dès le Pharsamon ou les Nouvelles Folies romanesques (1712), Clarinette s’enchante de la ressemblance de Pharsamon avec Oriante, son tendre amant mort d’un coup de fusil en tentant de la délivrer, et l’incite à le remplacer dans son cœur. À l’ouverture des Effets surprenants de la sympathie (1713), la mère de Clorante se console du départ de son époux grâce à la ressemblance que lui offre son fils. Plus tard, la jeune Mistie est enlevée par un inconnu en raison de sa « ressemblance prodigieuse » avec Ostiane. Dans Le Télémaque travesti (1714), conformément à une suggestion de Fénelon, l’attirance que Mélicerte-Calypso éprouve pour Brideron-Télémaque est intimement liée à sa ressemblance avec M. Brideron le père-Ulysse, qui l’a abandonnée. Celui de la ressemblance entre un personnage et un amant mort ou disparu. Dans Le Paysan parvenu, le motif s’épanouit au point peu-être d’en épuiser la richesse aux yeux de Marivaux: non seulement Jacob ressemble « comme deux gouttes d’eau à défunt Baptiste », que Catherine, la cuisinière des sœurs Habert, a « pensé épouser » mais, pour peu qu’il revête la robe de chambre du défunt mari de Mme d’Alain, il semblera à celle-ci « le voir lui-même »; et Mme de Fécour, à son tour, affirme qu’il ressemble « tout à fait » au « premier homme pour qui [elle a] eu de l’inclination ». À l’évidence, ce motif est inspiré à la fois de la scène de l’aveu à Hippolyte dans la Phèdre de Racine (« Toujours devant mes yeux je crois voir mon époux / Je le vois, je lui parle; et mon cœur [...] je m’égare ») et du trouble de Calypso devant le fils d’Ulysse dans le Télémaque de Fénelon. Or, de telles rêveries « palimpsestueuses » (pour reprendre un mot forgé par Philippe Lejeune) ne sont nullement réservées aux personnages de Marivaux. On les rencontre dans de nombreux romans de la période chez Crébillon, chez Prévost (Perrin en propose d’ailleurs de fines analyses dans son chapitre sur Cleveland) ou encore chez Mme de La Guesnerie, et elles ne sont pas même réservées à la fiction, comme en témoignent les étranges effusions dont le père de Rousseau (inconsolable après la mort de sa femme) accable Jean-Jacques dans la scène fameuse de la lecture des romans à l’ouverture des Confessions (« Il croyait la revoir en moi »). Une prise en compte plus systématique de ce motif aurait pu conduire d’une part à dissocier plus nettement la scène du ressouvenir et de l’« Éros réminiscent » d’un arrière-plan idéaliste ou platonicien qui semble un peu surévalué notamment chez Rousseau (chez qui l’influence de Locke et du sensualisme ne doit pas être minorée); et d’autre part à s’interroger sur les raisons historiques de cette récurrence: le siècle des Lumières n’est-il pas celui de la découverte d’une zone d’intersection entre le registre de l’affect familial et celui de l’amour, faisant surgir de nouvelles
inflexions dans la topique du ressouvenir? Quoi qu’il en soit, cet essai remarquable fera date dans les études sur le roman des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles tant la question abordée est essentielle et tant les pistes explorées sont nombreuses et suggestives.

Christophe Martin est Professeur de littérature française du XVIIIe siècle à la Faculté des Lettres de Sorbonne Université, et membre du CELLF (UMR 8599).

The Publishing and Marketing of Illustrated Literature in Scotland, 1760-1825 by Sandro Jung

Review by Lisa Maruca, Wayne State University

The lack of a catchy title on this volume is reflective of the straightforward nature of its content. This is not a popularization, or a work asserting a large, all-encompassing thesis, but a deep dive into Scottish literary illustration in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Out of the Lehigh University Press’s prestigious yet still newish Studies in Text and Print Culture, with luminaries such as Margaret Ezell and James Raven on the advisory board, this monograph works as a follow-up to Jung’s last book, James Thomson’s “The Seasons,” Print Culture, and Visual Interpretation, 1730–1842 (2015), which was the first entry in the series. While The Publishing and Marketing of Illustrated Literature in Scotland, 1760–1825 is in many ways a recovery project, bringing the labour of engravers, printers, and booksellers to our attention as important agents in the marketing of Scottish literature and the creation of Scottish literary culture, it is also a work that resonates with larger scholarly contexts: literary canonization in the eighteenth century, the Scottish Enlightenment, visual culture and media studies, and the history of book design and illustration.

Jung clarifies early on that this is not an interpretive project. Yet in showing how illustrations, especially those accompanying works by Burns, Ramsay, Macpherson, Thomson, and even Shakespeare were used to market a specifically Scottish nationalist literature to consumers both in Scotland and England, he cannot completely bypass visual analysis. He highlights representational trends in the use of local scenery or, more mythically, classical busts of Burns that help create a distinctive Scottish sensibility. However, more typical is his focus on booksellers’ strategic pricing and marketing as a way to promote Scottish works as worthy of significant investment. He also examines in rigorous detail their methods—work practices, creative economics, and
legal circumventions—for developing the cultural capital necessary for positioning their publications as luxury objects of exchange.

Jung has combed through hundreds of pages of trade records, legal documents, and newspaper ads—not to mention dozens of reprints with only slight changes among them—to tease out patterns of activity that help us understand the collaborative work of booksellers with engravers. Above all, it is clear that by late in the eighteenth century, illustrations sold books. Yet it is more complicated than that. For example, he traces illustrations that appear, reappear, and sometimes disappear in single-author collections, anthologies, and periodicals, explaining why specific illustrations were sometimes recycled by a bookseller, sometimes copied directly from other booksellers, and sometimes strategically altered. Editions that violated copyright might be sent out as a trial balloon, but were an expensive mistake when discovered. Booksellers also used illustration and design formats to consciously create “branded” sets of collectible books—a material form of canon formation—even when years separated the publication of individual volumes or when the connection was simply spurious (as when a publisher tried to set up a linkage in readers’ minds between his new releases and another’s popular collection). Subscriptions were a way to defray risk and fund the high costs of engravings; savvy publishers portrayed this as a patriotic gesture. Marketing removable prints as decorative furnishings was still another effective strategy. As this list may indicate, a minor complaint is that the accretion of detail, quantitative data, and the large number of print agents named, described, and historicized can sometimes drown out key arguments. Then again, Jung is clear that his goal is not to claim any one type of text, artwork, or business practice as representative, but to show that booksellers utilized illustration in many disparate ways.

Despite this explicit focus on print agents and activities, a book on illustration would be remiss if it did not showcase the visual works themselves. Jung’s monograph obliges with eighty illustrations in barely more than two hundred pages, all of which come from his own personal collection. As Jung notes, publishing these examples “brings together an archive of printed visual culture with which late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Scottish book-buying readers would have been familiar but which very few scholars will ever have encountered in one place” (xxvi). This gathering alone is an important contribution. The many illustrations not only expand scholars’ understanding of the visual-textual landscape of the period—one that was, as Jung notes, entirely legible to its original consumers—but allows these scholars to draw on the images for their own future work. In other words, this “archive” begins to fill a gap that has not yet been sufficiently addressed.
despite the growing number of digital resources: the lack of access to the period’s visual media. He outlines the problems with using ECCO images as well as the shortcomings in the metadata of other digital repositories that make it difficult to ascertain with any certainty the history of specific illustrated editions. It is hoped that Jung will consider remedying this problem by moving beyond monographic forms of analytical bibliography and into the digital humanities.

Despite these important contributions, it should be noted that there is one striking absence in the book. While a woman—and an angry one—features prominently on its colourful cover (a 1796 illustration of a scene from Allan Ramsay’s *The Gentle Shepherd* [1725]), there is no mention within these pages of women as engravers, booksellers, or printers. Because this is such new research, it is difficult to verify the accuracy of this omission. According to Alastair Mann, women represented ten per cent of the identifiable Scottish trade in the early modern period; however, he also explains that numbers declined later in the eighteenth century as standards about women’s roles became more rigid and new models of business developed in the trade (Mann, “The Lives of Scottish Book Traders, 1500–1800,” in *Scottish Life and Society: The Working Life of the Scots, A Compendium of Scottish Ethnology, Volume 7* [Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2008]). It thus may be that the gap in Jung’s work merely reflects the work practices of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Nonetheless, even if this is the case, Jung should have explained it as such. We are past the time when we take for granted an all-male workforce.

Even with this concern, *The Publishing and Marketing of Illustrated Literature in Scotland* must be lauded as a solid work of book history, noteworthy for marshalling reams of examples that highlight the importance of materiality and (too-often invisible) labour practices in creating a national canon. While it is probably too detailed and narrow in focus to work well in most classrooms, the collection of engravings alone makes this a useful monograph. It is sure to provide researchers into Scottish literature, publishing history, and book illustration important primary sources, key methodologies, and sound historical information about business practices for a long time to come.

Walter Scott and Fame: Authors and Readers in the Romantic Age
by Robert Mayer

Review by Ian Dennis, University of Ottawa

This study explores the correspondence between Walter Scott and his readers as part of the history of fame and celebrity. Using Jane Millgate’s “monumental” (3) Union Catalogue of letters to and from the author and such collections as that held in the National Library of Scotland, Robert Mayer firstly develops a set of classifications: those writing to Scott on literary matters are “intimates, colleagues, clients” or “fans” (9). In chapters devoted to each, he then interprets the exchanges within these groupings of letters, working to identify the motives, assumptions, and rhetoric on both sides, and from these observations to develop broader cultural and literary-theoretical implications.

“Intimate” correspondents are further sub-divided into “mentors” and “confidants” (27), with a somewhat opaque category of aspirational but unaccepted confidants in addition. The first two groups offer Scott useful support, especially such confidants as Louisa Stuart and George Ellis, whose letters form “a key chapter in the history of the reception of Scott” (54), and help him shape his own authorial character. The last group seems solely represented by Anne Abercorn, in whom we are to discern various roles, and in whose effusions we begin to see “the powerful emotional link that can exist between the modern celebrity and a fan” (58). Scott “ceded” (59) these roles to such correspondents, as they allowed him to adopt a desired persona, but this in turn advanced the relative empowerment of readers, one the study’s main themes.

The discussion of “colleagues” brings out another central idea: a distinction between William Wordsworth’s “commitment to a relatively ascetic form of existence in the name of poetry” (73) and Scott’s “more commercially-minded version of literary professionalism” (71). Some space is given also to a partially parallel gender binary and Scott’s substantial and respectful correspondence with Joanna Baillie and Maria Edgeworth, and to the anomalous example of James Hogg, who complicates the schema by being both colleague and client. In the end, though, the difference between the poet laureate with his confidence in future fame, and the “Author of Waverley” and his vast contemporary readership, seems to matter most. Indeed, “after the age of Scott and Wordsworth there are two powerful models for the great writer” (102). And Scott’s model, “the form of fame that accepted the author as very much the creature of his audience” was “the more modern” (103), the way of the future.
Although reference is more than once made to Alexander Pope’s “Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot”—a text that even seems to shadow the study—Mayer links the presence of “clients” to the rise of celebrity, perhaps in part because, in contrast to his predecessor in literary fame, Scott is generally polite, even actively helpful and encouraging to those who solicit him for various kinds of material benefit. He cultivates them, rather than fleeing from them as Pope does. But clients are always readers, we are reminded, and then often are or seek to be authors themselves, and for this class of petitioner Scott exhibits particular sympathy, frequently figuring himself as a mere fellow-practitioner. Here again, “the historical importance of the letters between Scott and his clients lies in the fact that in them we find not only newly assertive members of the reading audience, but also, in Scott, an author who made room for those ambitious readers” (137). The point is later strengthened with evidence of the ways in which Scott allowed his correspondents “to take issue with the author’s fashioning of his own text[s]” (183) and to contribute directly to them, at times, especially in the magnum opus editions.

“Fans” are more unambiguously features of the world of celebrity, of course. Fans, even more than clients, “throng” Scott (107)—Mayer adopts the term from P. David Marshall’s *Celebrity and Power* ([Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997], 6)—and Scott for his part “is a modern celebrity because he responds to those who thus approach him in a way that legitimizes their pressing him” (140). In the fan letters, we can distinguish “veneration,” “tribute,” “fetishes,” and testaments to the “boon” provided their writers (141, 146, 164). Scott in turn “indulges” his fans and “validates their needs, and more generally, the status of the fan” (170). Together, author and fans are “participating in the creation of a modern culture of celebrity” (172).

Some of the ostensible complexities discovered in these analyses—such as those in the cases of Abercorn or Hogg—are perhaps as much a product of the system of distinctions as they are of what is actually in the letters. Still, what is culled from the letters is always worth hearing about and often discussed with real insight. While Scott’s rhetorical and professional purposes therein are plausibly framed in cultural and historical terms, it is hard not also to be struck by his individuality, the generosity and courtesy revealed in these exchanges, even when we know him to be understandably impatient with the endless importunities of his letter-writing public. Such restraint, of course, might also mark him as a modern man, modelling the more respectful public manners—that would they had endured—that would replace the obscenities and slashing ad hominem attacks of the exuberant eighteenth century.
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The study’s larger claims with regard to the history of fame and celebrity do tend to resolve themselves into a couple of fairly familiar dichotomies, to which we rather insistently return. Wordsworth and Scott represent contrasting attitudes towards contemporary readers and consumer culture, one courting posterity, the other happily laying waste his powers. Byron is aloof, alone, and disdainful (or anxious) in celebrity; Scott is social, accommodating, even collaborative, and as such, represents an enduring counter-example for the celebrated from Dickens and Hardy through Rilke and Hemingway to, a bit oddly, the actress Jessica Chastain. In the somewhat cursory treatment of these later figures, we find them again and again confronting and balancing, or choosing between, “two views of fame” that are, it seems, finally those of high and “popular culture” (200). While this is a useful enough approach, and is bolstered here and there with reference to such scholars of fame and celebrity as Marshall, Leo Braudy, and Michel de Certeau, it has the limitations of any binary heuristic. A more unified theory of the desires that animate cultural history—such as that of the “originary” human “scene” developed by Eric Gans, and exemplified by his discussion of the Romantic aesthetic in *Originary Thinking* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993)—might yield further insights in the study of such material. Nonetheless, this is an interesting and valuable monograph, contributing measurably, as Mayer rightly claims, to the “spade work of basic empirical research” called for by William St. Clair, the “quantification, consolidation [and] scrutiny of primary information, upon which both narrative history and theory ought to rest” (*The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004], 9–10).

**Ian Dennis** is Chair of the Department of English at the University of Ottawa and the author of *Nationalism and Desire in Early Historical Fiction* (1997), *Lord Byron and the History of Desire* (2009), and four novels.
This critical edition of Samuel Richardson’s works and life illuminates his importance to eighteenth-century culture, the novel, and book history. As stated in the editors’ preface, their aim was to create a resource for the undergraduate student and the experienced scholar alike. The thirty-seven chapters are written by leading scholars who have published on Richardson, the history of the novel, or eighteenth-century life, including Toni Bowers, Howard D. Weinbrot, Margaret Anne Doody, Albert J. Rivero, and Bonnie Latimer. The editors provide undergraduates and graduates with essays from key figures in the field as an introduction to the ongoing academic conversation on Richardson, while also providing a multitude of perspectives for the advanced researcher.

The collection, although organized into six parts, seems to be divided into two halves. Parts 1 through 4 focus on situating Richardson within book and print history, while parts 5 and 6 place his novels within certain literary traditions, genres, and subjects. The undergraduate student would benefit from the first four sections, since they provide the necessary context in order to criticize Richardson’s works effectively. Chapter 7, “Critical Reception to 1900,” written by Brian Corman, establishes the differences between Richardson and Fielding and their influence on the novel, which is useful for the undergraduate scholar. In addition, Rivero details the various important scholarly publications on Richardson, his novels, and his life, which for the more advanced student functions as a proto-bibliography to orient themselves within the immense amount of eighteenth-century scholarship in chapter 8, “Critical Reception since 1900.”

Those interested in book history, the rise of the novel, and print culture will especially value parts 1 through 4. Although the first section is titled “Life and Works,” it does not present a biography of Richardson. The section begins with a portrait of Richardson as an author and businessman. Since there are many biographical works on Richardson, this critical edition omits his personal biography and chooses to focus on a particular aspect of his life. Although a chronology is provided for those interested, the editorial decision to omit a biographical chapter puts more of an emphasis on the novels, their creation, and the social, intellectual, and material culture than on the personal life of the author.
Nevertheless, the reader still learns about Richardson’s personality in “Reputation,” “Editions,” and “Authorship.” The authors of these chapters present a detailed and complex Richardson, riddled with anxiety and virtuous ambitions. Simon Dickie points out Richardson’s uses of humour through a close examination of his novels, especially Lovelace’s character in *Clarissa*, which presents an “unexpectedly detailed commentary on eighteenth-century humour and its power to help bold, clever, handsome men get away with so much” (219). Dickie’s chapter, “Humour,” is especially relevant to modern students with its exploration of Clarissa’s story, her rape, and her refusal to prosecute Lovelace.

April London’s chapter, “The Novel,” positions Richardson’s novels, especially *Pamela* and *Clarissa*, within the rise of the novel. She examines his writing techniques, motifs, and rhetorical devices that appear in the works of other authors, such as Jane Austen. In regard to a variety of literary works from Frances Burney’s *Evelina* to Eliza Fenwick’s *Secresy*, London argues that “the indebtedness to Richardson embodied in such works can be seen across the period,” which allowed authors like Sarah Fielding, Charlotte Lennox, and Austen to reimagine and challenge Richardson’s heroine (149). London, while clearly stating that later authors are indebted to Richardson, also suggests these authors were not necessarily imitating but rather responding to his works.

There is a noticeable technical shift from part 4, “The Book and Its Readers,” to part 5, “Literary Genres and the Arts,” that may be jarring for the less experienced reader. The chapters become much more specific and specialized, which is beneficial to understanding the complexities of Richardson’s novels, but could prove challenging for the undergraduate student. For example, the authors mention works outside of the immediate canon to support some of their claims, which makes it less digestible for a portion of the target audience. However, this could be a teachable book in a variety of classes because there is something for every type of reader and every interest ranging from grammar to medicine to politics. In addition, this book not only describes Richardson and his works, but also presents essential details and information about the eighteenth century that a learner at any level could find helpful. Some chapters seem to finish rather abruptly, but in a thirty-seven-chapter book, it is understandable that there may not be room for more in-depth analysis.

The editors present an informative collection that will surely inspire further research. Peter Sabor and Betty A. Schellenberg did achieve their goal in creating a digestible book for all levels of scholars. If a reader knew nothing about Richardson, the novel, and the eighteenth century, this would a good place to start learning. Although some under-
graders may need help navigating this text, it is an excellent resource for educators in eighteenth-century studies. Moreover, the further reading section (conveniently organized by topic) and the bibliographic information in each chapter provide crucial information for graduate students and early-career scholars looking for inspiration or research ideas. Ultimately, this edition paints Richardson as a key influential figure of the eighteenth century who shapes our understanding of the novel, writing, and reading.

Danielle Menge is a PhD student at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas; she is studying British literature of the long eighteenth century, specifically with regards to breastfeeding, motherhood, and food consumption.

_Sade dans tous ses états. Deux cents ans de controverses_, ed. Armelle St-Martin
Review by Olivier Delers, University of Richmond

_Sade dans tous ses états_ collects thirteen essays first presented at a conference of the same name in 2014, which was organized by Armelle St-Martin to commemorate the bicentenary of Sade’s death. The volume brings together some of the most prominent Sade scholars (Michel Delon, Béatrice Didier) and a number of younger scholars eager to push the field of Sade studies in new directions. As one would expect, one of the goals of this book is to take stock of the scholarship that has shaped our understanding of the Marquis de Sade, from the early debates between André Breton and George Bataille to the biographical discoveries of Maurice Lévy or the public interventions of Jean Paulhan and Simone de Beauvoir in the 1950s and 1960s. _Sade dans tous ses états_ serves as a reference guide of sorts, revealing how far research on Sade has come in the past fifty years and how his writings continue to be relevant to different fields of investigation adjacent to literary studies: critical theory, film studies, art history, or even economics. Sade’s unique position as a member of the old elite, a direct witness to the Terror that followed the French Revolution, and a social outcast locked in a mental asylum means that he can help us see eighteenth-century cultural phenomena in a new light. At the same time, his writings have inspired paradigm shifts in our conceptions of power, sexuality, and subjectivity. And it is clear that Sade continues to challenge the established order in the twenty-first century, whether it be through his writing style, the content of his stories, or his anti-Enlightenment philosophy.
There is still much to learn about what might have influenced Sade’s writings. *Sade dans tous ses états* contains two essays that provide new information on Sade’s relation to his contemporaries. A newly discovered letter written by Honoré-Gabriel Riqueti de Mirabeau makes it possible to compare the strategies used by the two authors to imagine tableaux of incest and libertine excess. The letter reveals how they subvert the codes of sensibility by using tears as a way of showing the cruelty and lack of emotions displayed by their libertine characters. Sade and Rétif de la Bretonne both had difficulties getting their works published during the Revolution. A comparative analysis shows the extent to which they borrowed from each other and how Rétif’s attempt to challenge Sade’s pornographic imagination was unsuccessful, in large part because he never managed to infuse his own writings with the kind of universal drive that characterizes Sade’s. The influence of religious thought and imagery on Sade also remains understudied. One essay fills the gap by noting that the Marquis was likely exposed to paintings representing scenes of crucifixion as a child and later borrowed the codes and organizing principles of these images to create highly visual literary scenes, especially in his short stories. For atheists like Sade or Denis Diderot, Christian myths functioned as a reservoir of stories from which novelists and painters could draw. Sade was clearly influenced by early modern materialist philosophers, but as Tamako Suzuki points out in her essay “La Violence sadienne, la nature et l’homme,” it is important to understand that he often elaborated on those theories through the philosophical reflections of his libertines. For example, Sade was familiar with Spinoza’s conception of nature, but he also found ways of condensing and radicalizing the concept for his own purposes.

Several essays explore Sade’s legacy beyond the eighteenth century. *Justine* (1791) was a major influence for Matthew Lewis’s *The Monk* (1796), but also for Frenetic Romanticism. In 1933, Maurice Heine was the first to suggest a lineage between Sade’s gothic imagery and the roman noir. The surrealists were fascinated by what they saw as a peculiar form of the “merveilleux” brought out by the simultaneous repulsion and fascination for the inhuman urges displayed by Sade’s characters. The eleven issues of the journal *Minotaure* show a progressive radicalization in how Sade was perceived in surrealist circles. While Heine’s essays in particular were neutral at first, they increasingly fictionalized the author and his writings, in an attempt to bring Sade’s ideas closer to Heine’s, but also as a way of rejecting Bataille’s reading of the Marquis and of taking sides with Breton in the quarrel that divided the two men. In the 1970s, Pier Paolo
Pasolini found in Sade an ally to think of new forms of resistance for fighting against neo-fascist ideas, and his film *Salò* belongs to the rich iconography developed around Sadean motifs over the past hundred years. Sade’s nihilistic philosophy continues to be a source of transgressive and subversive political behaviour, and, as Jean-Pierre Dubost hyperbolically puts it in his essay, “Kant avec Sade, encore une fois,” “all of the history of mankind resembles Sade’s fiction” (179).

Two essays stand out for their originality. Anne Coudreuse’s “Les Traces de l’univers sadien dans le roman contemporain” interrogates the extent to which a neo-Sadist movement can be identified in contemporary French literature. For someone like Sade who has been read primarily by philosophers and critical theorists, it is important to think about how he has influenced other novelists, often intertextually. Coudreuse concludes that no one really seeks to adapt Sade directly, but that authors like Hervé Guibert, Gabrielle Wittkop, or Jacques Chessex pay homage to his unique phantasmatic universe and sometimes rewrite his philosophical arguments in very deliberate ways. In “Lire Sade comme symptôme du partage économique de la jouissance,” Dominic Marion reminds us that Sade stands at the crossroads of feudal modes of thinking and liberal economics and prefigures Marx in presenting the relation between economic power and the use and abuse of the bodies of the disempowered. Marion’s masterful analysis spans all of Sade’s oeuvre. It shows that one of the goals of Sade’s fiction is to explain how the ancien régime functioned economically while at the same time defining what succeeds it, republicanism, as a systemic urge to subsume social acts into the imperatives of sexual exchange.

**Olivier Delers** is Associate Professor of French and Chair of the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures at the University of Richmond. Recent publications include “Adapter Sade en bande dessinée: de l’intermédiaire au transmédia” (forthcoming in *Transmédiaité – Adaptation*), “Whimsical Pornography: Albert Dubout’s Illustrations for Sade’s *Justine*” (*New Perspectives on the Eighteenth Century*), and “Du mythe au dialogue: Sade et l’érotisme surréaliste” (*Mélusine*).
Jane Austen's Transatlantic Sister: The Life and Letters of Fanny Palmer Austen by Sheila Johnson Kindred

Review by Juliette Wells, Goucher College

At the “New Directions in Austen Studies” conference held in 2009 at Chawton House Library, the distinguished scholar and editor Deirdre Le Faye called on researchers to return to the archives, where, she declared, much about the Austen family remains to be discovered. Sheila Johnson Kindred’s illuminating new book makes exactly the kind of contribution that Le Faye envisioned. Kindred, who has previously published on Austen’s naval brothers, restores to view one of the lesser-known members of the Austen family: a naval sister(-in-law) whose brief life encompassed extensive travel, as well as wifehood and motherhood.

Fanny Palmer Austen (1789–1814), born and raised in Bermuda, married Austen’s brother Charles in 1807 and accompanied him on his postings in both North America and England. In addition to building a comprehensive, nuanced portrait of Fanny and placing her life in historical context, Kindred makes a careful, compelling case for how Fanny’s varied experiences furnished Austen with insight into the lives of naval women, crucial material for Persuasion (1817) in particular.

Jane Austen’s Transatlantic Sister is the fruit of years of dedicated investigation in libraries and archives, enriched by the author’s personal travels to and knowledge of relevant locations. As a resident of Halifax, Nova Scotia, Kindred is well positioned to evoke Fanny’s difficult summer in that city in 1810. Kindred draws on an impressive range of under-recognized material, from the twelve extant letters written by Fanny (housed at the Morgan Library and Museum) to Charles’s diaries and logbooks (held by the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich), and more. Committed to presenting Fanny as much as possible in her own voice, and as the “narrator” (6) of her own story, Kindred includes the full text of Fanny’s surviving letters—never previously published—adding unobtrusive glosses and comments. Furthermore, in the mode of feminist historians such as Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, Kindred evokes, from Fanny’s personal correspondence, a multidimensional woman.

Kindred has uncovered rich and wide-ranging visual material too: contemporary images of people, places, and ships that vividly enhance her account. The most stunning illustration is certainly the oil portrait of Fanny, now in private hands, that graces the dust jacket. McGill/Queen’s University Press is to be commended for funding the reproduction of the majority of the illustrations in full colour, a rarity in academic books at this affordable price point.
Kindred's impressive achievement is to integrate all of these sources into a well-crafted narrative that is fully accessible to not only Austen scholars but also anyone with an interest in this time period, in the British navy, or in the lives of historical women. To a degree that is unfortunately rare in monographs, Kindred has deeply considered her audience's likely prior knowledge, which she meets through clear explanations in the main text, in extensive end-notes, and in very useful appendices that track the provenance and contents of letters by and about Fanny, plus her family genealogy. Kindred’s lively handling of naval facts and details is especially welcome.

Worthy of commendation is Kindred’s delicate handling of the necessary speculation involved in any project of this nature. In the hands of a less conscientious author, the unavoidable “woulds,” “coulds,” and “surelys” can begin to grate. Not so here. (A minor exception is Kindred’s evocation of Charles’s death, long after that of his beloved Fanny, which edges into the fanciful.) As well, Kindred takes great care to delineate Fanny’s influence on Austen’s subject matter in terms of possibility, not certainty. Those readers who like their academic arguments forthright and strong may judge Kindred to be insufficiently assertive. To my eye, however, Kindred strikes a fine balance between under- and over-stating her case. In the absence of sources to explicitly prove that Austen drew on Fanny’s experience, such inspiration must always, as Kindred rightly notes, “be conjectural” (206).

Kindred is more direct, appropriately so, in redressing prior scholarly wrongs done to Fanny, including those of both commission and omission. Kindred does not hesitate to point out where biographers have simply invented: for example, she demonstrates that David Nokes’s “lurid” description of the birth of Fanny’s fourth and last child in “a stinking between-decks cabin” (173) does not match the actual circumstances of the ship on which Fanny and Charles were then living. Kindred’s most significant contribution is to unsparingly delineate the extent to which Jane Austen’s naval knowledge has been assumed to derive only from her brothers, as if men’s experiences were all a novelist would need to know about in order to invent such vivid, individualized characters as Mrs Croft, Mrs Harville, and Anne Elliot. In her final chapter, Kindred establishes resonances between Fanny and Austen’s female characters with respect to experiences of health and loneliness; ideas and attitudes that we would now identify as feminist; and the use of, as Kindred puts it, a “naval vocabulary within the context of everyday speech” (198). Furthermore, Kindred highlights the importance of Fanny’s familiarity with “the nuanced complexities of the slavery system” (203), a system that, as Kindred shows, varied considerably in brutality from Fanny’s
natal Bermuda to the West Indies in which *Persuasion*’s Mrs Smith is trying to recover property.

*Jane Austen’s Transatlantic Sister* contributes to a fast-growing area of Austen studies: histories that add to our understanding of the knowledge and references upon which Austen may have drawn. In contrast to some other recent titles, which seem chiefly to showcase their authors’ powers of digital searching and speculation, *Kindred* presents only material that is truly pertinent to her reconstruction of Fanny Palmer. This labour of love brings into view a young woman whose life, while eventful, was fundamentally ordinary, unlike that of her genius sister-in-law. As *Kindred* sensitively portrays her, Fanny holds our interest in her own right, not merely because she met Austen and may have influenced her novels. In addition to shedding new light on Austen’s naval women in *Persuasion*, *Kindred’s* biography will fascinate all those interested in the Austen family, in women’s lives at the turn of the nineteenth century, and in British naval history.

**Juliette Wells** is Elizabeth Conolly Todd Distinguished Professor of English at Goucher College. She is the author most recently of *Reading Austen in America* (2017) and the editor of a new edition of Jane Austen’s *Persuasion* (2017).

*The Invention of Northern Aesthetics in 18th-Century English Literature* by Yvonne Bezrucka

Review by Ruth Knezevich, Hamline University

The title of Yvonne Bezrucka’s monograph suggests the reader will encounter new close readings of the beautiful and the sublime in English literary works, like Thomas Gray’s poetry and Thomas Percy’s *Reliques* (1765), set against a backdrop of contemporary philosophies of beauty and artistic merit. Although these works are nodded to in the text, the focus is on eighteenth-century thought, specifically on how the alternately “Celtic,” “Gothic,” “Saxon”—and sometimes the collective “Northern”—mythology rose to prominence over the course of the eighteenth century, and how these aesthetics were defined, understood, and advocated for by key thinkers as reacting against contemporary neoclassicism. Bezrucka presents this North-South dichotomy in no weak terms, characterizing neoclassical aesthetics as a “cage,” “prison,” or “yoke” (46) from which the English needed to be freed through acts of authorial rebellion (225). She offers the useful term “Northern aesthetics” as a way of defining what she argues is a distinctly English
adoption of the picturesque and sublime as a way to distinguish the cultural, historical, political, and religious identity of the English nation from those of the Continent. However, this project only minimally advances its oft-repeated argument—that English intellectuals sought “to produce the aesthetic emancipation of the English nation” by focusing on “their autochthonous common Celtic identity core, which provided them with the opportunity to highlight their different aesthetic, political and religious stance, i.e. different from the values provided in the previously adopted classic Southern mythology and aesthetics” (176, x)—owing to the occasionally unclear boundaries for the scope of the project, the extensive lists of titles that do not lead into a close engagement with supporting evidence, the lack of thorough copy editing, and the missed opportunity to engage with twenty-first-century scholarship on this topic.

To bolster her argument, the author illustrates the development of regionalism and essentialism pervading British and European thought from the sixteenth through nineteenth centuries. The works of Bernard Mandeville, Joseph Addison, David Hume, Edmund Burke, and Germaine de Staël receive considerable attention, but poetry and novels, which are identified in the introduction as key evidence in the argument, are primarily assessed with broad and general strokes. Exceptions are found in close readings of Northern aesthetics in William Shakespeare’s _A Midsummer Night’s Dream_ (ca. 1595/96) and Emily Brontë’s _Wuthering Heights_ (1847)—both notably not from the eighteenth century. Despite the fluidity of Bezrucka’s timeline, I could accept the study’s general eschewal of almost all imaginative eighteenth-century literatures, were it not for how the title implies a purposeful and narrow focus on English literature. I am bothered in particular by the book’s unacknowledged reliance on Scottish authors to supply evidence for a canon of “English” literature, including authors who themselves often sought to create a unified sense of “Britishness” by inventing a shared cultural history throughout the historic kingdoms united in Great Britain.

Throughout the book, the author routinely alternates between the terms “English” and “British” in referring both specifically to England and to Britain’s post-1707 multicultural identity. As a scholar who has engaged extensively with what the author has usefully termed “Northern aesthetics” in the long eighteenth century, I actively avoid collapsing the distinction of “English” and “British” in order to pay heed to the complex negotiations of political and cultural power structures. I recognize that in making these choices in my own work, I am perhaps hyperaware of others’ opting not to. However, this is not
the only example of conflicting terminology. At various places in the text, the author uses the term “Gothic” as a substitute for “Romantic” and vice versa (82, 185–90). Similarly, she periodically equates “Celtic” with “Saxon”—and both of these with “Gothic” (83, 95, 196–97, 204). In its ahistorical collapse of such distinctions, I fear that the prose falls into the same patterns of essentializing that the author identifies in her argument about the fabrication of a collective or pan-Northern ideology.

Such use of terminology has historical precedents in nineteenth-century historiography, but modern scholars need to be more cautious in their distinctions of ethnic groups, political systems, and cultural productions. This adoption of anachronous historiographical practices can perhaps be explained through the book’s bibliography. A real strength in the project lies in the author’s wide foundation in primary texts and the situation of ideas within contemporary philosophies offering multiple perspectives and arguments for and against internal regionalism and aesthetic pleasures (46, 85–86, 117). Yet, this breadth of primary texts is contrasted by a surprisingly minimal engagement with current scholarship. With its argument that Britishness is an invented ideal—a patchwork of cultural and political histories—I would expect at least a nod to Linda Colley’s *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (1992) or Leith Davis’s *Acts of Union: Scotland and the Literary Negotiation of the British Nation, 1707–1830* (1998).

A professional editor could have helped the flow of the language in this book immensely. For example, primary sources of historical or ecological theory are often wielded with the same rhetorical intention as modern scholarship. Non sequiturs are too abundant, sometimes appearing as provocative claims that are offered for thought but immediately abandoned, and other times as digressions on unrelated topics, such as modern suicide rates (92). Some sentences fill an entire paragraph, and some names of scholars and authors are misspelled.

Nevertheless, the central premise within the monograph is exciting and reinforces the need for more conversations about the genre of works offering forth a Northern aesthetic perspective. As this project reminds us, there are meaningful ways to read works like Percy’s *Reliques* and James Macpherson’s *Ossian* (1760s), other than as simply Romantic “fakelore”; we might better understand these works within the framework of an emerging “Northern aesthetic” ideal that invents and promotes a sense of unity by manipulating Britain’s rich layers of cultural history.

**Ruth Knezevich** is a Lecturer of English at Hamline University in St. Paul, Minnesota. Her research in paratexts explores the relationships among the material page and ideas of history, geography, and national and cultural identity in eighteenth-century Britain.
The Interesting Narrative by Olaudah Equiano,
ed. Brycchan Carey
Review by Cassander L. Smith, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa

Since the 1960s, a number of editions of The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa, the African, Written by Himself have appeared from a variety of publishers, among them Penguin, Bedford/St. Martin’s, Broadview, and Norton. The editions focus on various aspects of the text: slave narrative or autobiography, political propaganda to help end the British slave trade or Black Atlantic literature, among others. Oxford University Press is the latest to publish the narrative, in its World’s Classics imprint. Edited and with an introduction by Northumbria University’s Brycchan Carey, this newest edition succeeds as a highly readable text for an undergraduate student or general reader.

First published in 1789, The Interesting Narrative was immensely popular in the decades immediately following its publication because of its vivid depictions of the horrors of the transatlantic slave trade. Within five years, it went through ten editions in Britain and the United States, plus several translations, including into Dutch and German. Equiano’s account describes in expressive detail his natal origins on the west coast of Africa. He recounts his experience of being ripped away from the loving embrace of parents and forced to endure the traumas of the middle passage and enslavement. Eventually, he gained his freedom, learned how to read and write, converted to Christianity, and rose to prominence in British circles. His narrative took centre stage in British debates about the slave trade in the 1790s. Once England banned the transatlantic slave trade in 1807 and emancipated those enslaved in its colonies several decades later, Equiano’s narrative lost its cultural appeal. The Interesting Narrative remained an obscure eighteenth-century text until the mid-twentieth century when several scholars, among them the Harlem Renaissance writer Arna Bontemps, made the narrative the subject of critical literary study.

Unlike other editions that mostly target scholars and advanced students, this edition contains a critical apparatus that contextualizes Equiano’s story, covering all the basics, without overwhelming the reader. Carey’s introduction, for example, is a concise seventeen pages. In that space, he provides one access point—through the Atlantic slave trade—to help readers enter the narrative and begin to understand its cultural work. He also addresses the book’s more technical features
related to genre, style, and language, and makes what is by now an obligatory reference to the debate regarding Equiano’s birthplace. Since the 1980s, questions have circulated about whether Equiano was actually born in West Africa, as he claims, or whether he fabricated those chapters of his narrative. In 1995, documents materialized, including a baptism record, that list his birthplace as South Carolina, forcing scholars to think through what this discovery might mean in terms of how we read Equiano’s narrative as a historical document and as a literary one. With the edition’s targeted readership in mind, Carey offers only a cursory discussion of the debate, concluding that “the birthplace controversy may perhaps never be resolved, but Equiano’s outstanding contribution to the cause of freedom should never be doubted” (xxii). In addition to an accessibly written introduction, the front matter includes a chronology of key moments in Equiano’s life. Also, the back matter, as one would expect, includes end-notes and an “index guide” that functions more like a glossary explaining some of the narrative’s people, places, and nautical terms. Even with all the critical accompaniments, the edition is a relatively short 250 pages from cover to cover.

The edition benefits from Carey’s sound, commonsensical editorial choices, with only a few minor exceptions. As part of the front matter, Carey includes a “Note on the Text” that explains some of the hows and whys of his edition and his transcription decisions. The details, largely unintelligible to the average reader, are for the benefit of practised scholars. In addition, because the introduction is concise and limited in scope, seasoned Equiano scholars might be tempted to second-guess some of Carey’s rhetorical moves in that section of the edition. There is, for example, no discussion of Equiano’s narrative as a response to Enlightenment thinking that deemed Black Africans incapable of intellectual pursuits, such as writing. Also, besides a brief reference to the slave narrative, there is little that contextualizes Equiano in terms of other Black Africans writing (in Britain and elsewhere) in the late eighteenth century, which could limit students’ ability to understand Equiano’s cultural significance beyond the slave trade debate. Such criticism is a reminder, ironically, of why the edition succeeds. Carey and Oxford University Press have managed to create an introductory guide to Equiano and his life that is informative—the index is particularly useful—but not pedantic and cumbersome.

Cassander L. Smith is an Associate Professor of English at the University of Alabama. Her teaching and research focus on representations of Black Africans in early Atlantic literature.
Ingénue Saxancour, or The Wife Separated from Her Husband
by Rétif de La Bretonne, trans. Mary S. Trouille

Review by James A. Steintrager, University of California, Irvine

The story of the titular heroine of Ingénue Saxancour, first published in 1789, is compellingly sordid: coaxed into marriage by a combination of unscrupulous and misguided relatives and acquaintances—and against the wishes of her father—a young woman discovers that her spouse is both impecunious and far from pleasant. While Ingénue’s name implies naïveté, it would have been difficult for her to divine just how odious her husband would turn out to be. She soon learns that Moresquin has a past of criminal violence, including several involuntary and voluntary homicides, and financial disarray. She also discovers that her life will entail constant, outrageous mental and physical abuse. A loathsome libertine lowlife rather than a witty rake, Moresquin beats her, molests her in front of his shabby coterie, subjects her to various humiliating torments, trades on her charms to gain employment, feigns jealousy to justify his vile comportment, and eventually acts as her pimp. As the alternate title of the novel intimates, Ingénue eventually manages to separate herself physically and legally from her abuser, even if her escape is ultimately short-lived.

Ingénue Saxancour is a thinly veiled account of the unhappy marriage of Rétif’s daughter Agnès to a tax collector named Augé, her eventual flight from the doubtless harrowing relationship, and the subsequent dissolution of their union. The novel or roman à clef was seemingly written not only to expose Augé’s enormities and to steer ingenuous young women away from similar fates—a customary justification for novels and plots of the sort—but also to profit from family scandal and to exonerate the author and father of neglect and worse. Indeed, Augé had been circulating accusations that Agnès had engaged in an incestuous relationship with her father, and, as the author’s journal confirms, such a relationship had been consummated. Rétif’s journal also indicates that this thwarting of taboo was not lacking in coercion, at least psychological, on the father’s part. This is only the most egregiously squalid complication in the larger tale of the work and its immediate familial context.

Rétif’s oeuvre is enormous and wide-ranging. It includes lengthy sentimental novels in a Richardsonian vein, projects for the organization of prostitution and reform of the legal system, another project on the socialization of women, semi-factual descriptions of nocturnal
Paris, autobiography, and proto—science fiction. The last item aside, *Ingénue Saxancour* touches on all of the above genres and interests, while not falling neatly into any category. It is at best distant kin to the licentious libertine fiction penned by Rétif’s contemporaries such as Andréa de Nerciat and Honoré-Gabriel Riqueti de Mirabeau and their philosophically minded precursors from the middle of the century. Its sexual descriptions, often shocking, are not overtly graphic. Sensationally salacious, its mode is not erotic but gritty, grungy, and voyeuristic. In its portrayal of violence and cruelty, we might catch a glimpse of the Marquis de Sade, who had begun to pen—although not yet to publish—his licentious works within the confines of the Bastille when *Ingénue Saxancour* appeared. Later, in a lurid and explicit attack on Sade’s literary endeavours dubbed *L’Anti-Justine* (1798), Rétif ostensibly set out to criticize Sade’s marriage of sex and violence, but ended up largely mimicking his target. He also sang the praises of (consensual) incest. *Ingénue Saxancour*, while less graphic in its depictions than *L’Anti-Justine*, is equally ambiguous in its morality. Are the intimations that Moresquin forcefully sodomizes his wife, for example, intended to repel the reader and disparage the villain or to titillate? Or both? It is a work where express intentions and ulterior motives—either conscious or unconscious—are hopelessly muddled.

For his part, Sade in his “Idée sur le roman” from 1800 assessed Rétif and his writings as follows: the author “floods the public”; “he needs a printing press on his bedside table”; his style is “low and slithering”; his works are full of “repulsive adventures, always sourced from the worst company,” and ultimately have “no merit ... other than that of prolixity.” Sade surely had a point both in terms of content and form, even if we might find some of his criticisms ironic. Rétif wrote copiously, quickly, and as he became more desperate to turn a quick profit, the quality of his prose suffered accordingly. *Ingénue Saxancour* is narratively clunky at times and not particularly stylish. Mary S. Trouille’s translation admirably renders the feel of the original, does not embellish, and gives the English reader access to the source with a minimum of stylistic anachronism. Her many notes guide the reader through the historical specifics of, for example, the tax farming system, the relative purchasing power of monetary amounts mentioned in the text, and so forth. The book is also graced with numerous illustrations, largely taken from elsewhere in Rétif’s oeuvre, but apposite to scenes from the novel. *Ingénue Saxancour* was not illustrated, but many of Rétif’s other writings were, and the author had a strong and longstanding relationship with the engraver Louis Binet, whose work is well represented in this volume.
Trouille’s ample introduction provides a thorough and thoughtful account of the historical and legal context of the work, its place within Rétif’s writings and contemporaneous European literature, and crucial elements of the author’s biography. There is an understandable tug to make the book speak cogently of sexual violence and domestic abuse. Rétif thus provides “insight into the psychodynamics of dysfunctional families,” all the while shaping “the reader’s judgment” of the odious Moresquin and, by inference, his son-in-law Augé. Trouille similarly evinces an appreciation of Rétif’s unvarnished realism, “unprecedented in the literature of the period,” but does not disconnect this from the work’s sometimes shocking dose of sensationalism. She appreciates Rétif as a pioneer who reveals and imaginatively argues for “the need for changes in attitudes and laws regarding spousal abuse,” yet recognizes the deep tensions between—and entanglement of—the seemingly admirable aspects of Rétif’s endeavour and the more problematic ones. To be sure, Ingénue Saxancour speaks not only to our contemporary concerns about sexual consent, sexual violence, and domestic abuse but also to the matter of who is voicing these concerns and of how the claims of justice and morality can be instrumentalized, commodified, and otherwise contaminated. As such, it is a fascinating and often harrowing read.
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