Book Reviews/ Critiques de livres

Failures of Feeling: Insensibility and the Novel by Wendy Anne Lee

Stanford University Press, 2018. 248pp. $55. ISBN 978-15036-0680-7.

Review by Stephanie Insley Hershinow, Baruch College, CUNY

What are scholars of the Age of Sensibility to make of the "insensible," the flinty unfeeler who does not respond with the blushes and sobs of legible emotion? In *Failures of Feeling*, this figure is prismatic, illuminating the literature and philosophy of the long eighteenth century in new and compelling ways. Most simply, Wendy Anne Lee demonstrates how generative the insensible is for narrative, an "unmoved mover" who provokes intense feeling precisely through their own refusal of feeling. But to summarize the book in this way is to understate the range and extent of Lee's insights. *Failures of Feeling* plaits together a remarkably complex series of arguments about affect theory, the bourgeois marriage plot, Enlightenment philosophy (from Hobbes, Descartes, and Locke to Hume and Smith), and theories of sovereignty. Making connections between these levels of argument can at times demand more from the reader than might the typical monograph in our field, but that extra work yields significant rewards.

Lee tackles a figure that, given what we know about the eighteenth-century culture of sensibility, should be aberrant, but—in her deft analysis—comes to seem ubiquitous. Charting a literary history that ranges from the late seventeenth-century figure of the Prude, through early masterpieces of the psychological novel (Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa*, Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility*), to Herman Melville's Bartleby, Lee shows how "it is the impassive, nonresponsive, inscrutable subject of fiction who generates narratives of penetrating interiority and hauntingly intense relation" (2). With occasional forays across genres, the book focuses its intervention primarily on an energizing array of novels.

Centring gender from the outset, Lee begins her study with the figure of the Prude, the paradigmatic insensible woman and the historical starting point for her analysis. A stock character in popular fiction and ballads, the Prude becomes entangled with the salon fixture *la précieuse*, exemplified in Mme de La Fayette's *La Princesse de Clèves* (1678). For Lee, the Prude is a queer figure, aligned against not just love or sex, but heterosexual marriage specifically. A destroyer of "conjugal norms," her legacy enables followers "to stay the course of nonconjugality" (63). From here, Lee moves quite logically to Richardson's Clarissa, who is accused by friend and foe alike of being unnaturally cold, impossibly non-relational. Lee brings unusual (and refreshing) attention to the second half of the

Eighteenth-Century Fiction 33, no. 1 (Fall 2020)
ECF ISSN 0840-6286 | E-ISSN 1911-0243 | doi: 10.3138/ecf.33.1.119
Copyright 2020 by Eighteenth-Century Fiction, McMaster University

book, notably Clarissa's life as an urban rape survivor. Openly sharing her experience, Clarissa insists that she has nothing to hide, no hidden depths to plumb. For this reader, the chapter on *Clarissa* is a highlight; readers of the article version should be sure to check out the considerable revisions here. But my sense that the Clarissa chapter is the (stony) heart of the book is not simply a matter of predilection: another way of describing the entire book's project is as something of an anatomy of "Richardsonian fiction"—not a story of development, but an examination of the ways in which the novel thickens and distends around this "limit-case of character" (1).

If the move from chapter 1 to 2 seems expected, the third chapter is anything but. Lee pulls the book's trajectory back to baffled responses to Charles I's insensibility in the face of his deposal and execution, linking the monarch's performance of impassivity to the comedy of Oliver Goldsmith, which finds in sovereign laughter a model for theatrical insensibility (and a path away from the Richardsonian novel). The book then turns to *Sense and Sensibility*, less to identify Elinor Dashwood as an insensible than to consider Austen herself (and her impersonal narrator) as finding new possibilities in unfeeling—notably "nonexpression as care" (130). Throughout, the book grounds its readings of fictional narrative in philosophical thinking, from Cartesian dualism to Lockean "indifferency," but the Austen chapter is especially invested in using the novel to open up an original account of the moral philosophy of Hume and Smith. Lee moves deliberately through her argument, taking the time to elucidate key terms (resemblance, contiguity, causation). In its care with concept and explanation, this chapter has a not-unwelcome pedagogical bent, methodically dismantling the charge of repression so often lobbed at the novel. While the book's arguments are complex, Lee's prose is sharp. She is a gifted (and often quite funny) close reader throughout, though at certain moments I found myself impatient to move through the careful review of scholarship in order to get to the good stuff. The conclusion's take on George Eliot's *Daniel Deronda* (1876)—or, more precisely, on the canary-strangling Gwendolyn Harleth—is a joy not least because its comparative skirting of existing scholarship on that novel opens up space for Lee's own reading to breathe.

Failures of Feeling clearly finds its home in eighteenth-century studies, but it also models the kind of transhistorical work that promises to invigorate our field. I hope and expect that this book will also inform scholars of affect outside of eighteenth-century studies, who have (as a rule) tended to regard Enlightenment theories of emotion as underdeveloped and of limited use. "Every philosopher of the Enlightenment was also a theorist of affect," Lee observes (4), and the alert reader would be hard pressed to disagree. A significant contribution to the study of both eighteenth-century philosophy and novel theory, *Failures of Feeling*—like its central figures—will no doubt generate significant response. It is the rare monograph that I feel the need—but also the willingness—to reread upon finishing, but I am certain that returning to Lee's text will only reveal new connections and depths.

Stephanie Insley Hershinow is Associate Professor of English at Baruch College, City University of New York. She is the author of *Born Yesterday: Inexperience and the Early Novel* (2019).

Gender, Pregnancy and Power in Eighteenth-Century Literature: The Maternal Imagination by Jenifer Buckley

Palgrave, 2017. 300pp. €103.99. ISBN 978-3-319-53834-1.

Review by Marilyn Francus, West Virginia University

The maternal imagination—the idea that a pregnant woman could shape the child in her womb through her thoughts and feelings—has a long and wondrous history, filled with tall tales and more than a bit of gender bias. Jenifer Buckley traces that history in eighteenth-century Britain and challenges the claim that the concept of the maternal imagination lacked cultural currency by the end of the period.

Buckley's volume is a most welcome addition to the scholarship in the field, which tends to analyze pregnancy through the history of medicine, as in Lisa Forman Cody, *Birthing the Nation: Sex, Science, and the Conception of Eighteenth-Century Britons* (2005) and Roy Porter's many works, or through histories of monstrosity, such as Marie Hélène Huet, *Monstrous Imagination* (1993) and Dennis Todd, *Imagining Monsters: Miscreations of the Self in Eighteenth-Century England* (1995). Buckley's text fills an important niche among these foundational works. Her analysis is more literary than Cody's; she covers a broader time span than Todd, who focuses on the Mary Toft incident and related satires from 1726 to 1742; and she offers a more specific cultural reading than Huet, who provides a wide-ranging discussion of Europe from the Renaissance through the nineteenth century. Buckley's attention to discourses of pregnancy rather than child-rearing also adds to eighteenth-century analyses of British motherhood, which tend to focus on domestic ideology and family dynamics in literature, such as Toni Bowers, *Politics of Motherhood: British Writing and Culture, 1680–1760* (1996), Christopher Flint, *Family Fictions: Narrative and Domestic Relations in Britain, 1688–1798* (1998), and Ruth Perry, *Novel Relations: The Transformation of Kinship in English Literature and Culture, 1748–1818* (2004).

After the introduction, Buckley revisits Mary Toft, who convinced the medical establishment in 1726 that her craving for rabbits enabled her to give birth to rabbits. Buckley is fortunate that the benchmark case of maternal imagination is one of the most delightful hoaxes of the century. The Toft story highlights the primary issues of maternal imagination, which Buckley excavates beautifully: the vulnerability of the maternal body; pregnancy as performance, with the associated concerns of women acting and lying; maternal power, and questions of whether and how mothers wield power over their bodies and their children; the maternal imagination, and questions of whether and how mothers control their imaginations; the ability to read the maternal body, and to discern the truth about its workings, particularly by doctors; and the social and cultural anxiety about mothers, their power, and children, with the related desire to contain, if not control, maternal power.

The elements of the Toft case provide a template for the discourse of the maternal imagination, and, for Buckley, this discourse "diversified and was subject to adaptation" (9) throughout the century and beyond. One strand of the discourse is pursued in the chapter on *Peregrine Pickle* and *Pamela's Conduct in High Life*, which shows how pregnant mothers gained power, as the desire for a healthy baby—and the fear of what the maternal imagination might do to the unborn child—empowered women during gestation. Late eighteenth-century poems by women to their unborn children suggest a different discourse of the maternal imagination: despite the pressure to protect her unborn child, there was a cultural recognition that a mother could not control her pregnancy, nor should she be blamed for miscarriage or infant loss.

The chapter on *Tristram Shandy* presents yet another discursive turn, as Walter Shandy's paternal imagination appropriates, and in some instances, subsumes, the maternal imagination. For me, this chapter raises the question: if a father appropriates the maternal imagination, is it still maternal? Clearly there is a case for including *Tristram Shandy* in this analysis, since the discourse of maternal imagination runs throughout the novel, even though Elizabeth Shandy is displaced for most of the narrative. (I am not convinced by Buckley's argument for Elizabeth Shandy's canniness and shadow power in the novel, but for the sake of argument, I am willing to concede it.) If Walter Shandy's paternal imagination can be considered a form of maternal imagination, then what becomes of the narratives of women's agency, autonomy, and power that Buckley has been tracing here? The power of the pregnant woman seemingly evaporates, as it is overtaken by men—or, more precisely, the terms of the maternal imagination are separated and distributed across a gendered distinction of capabilities, in which women are relegated to biological productivity while men are imaginatively productive. In effect, *Tristram Shandy* gives birth to the Romantic imagination—an argument often used to support the claim that the maternal imagination disappeared by the end of the eighteenth century.

That claim is precisely what Buckley is arguing against. To combat it, Buckley turns to *Frankenstein* to make the case that the maternal imagination remains central to the cultural discourse at the end of the eighteenth century and beyond. It is impossible to dispute the ongoing cultural power of *Frankenstein* (James Whale's 1931 film gets a nice shout-out here, and Kenneth Branagh's 1994 film version does as well), or the centrality of motherhood and imagination in the novel. Yet here, too, it is difficult to ignore the patriarchal appropriation of the maternal imagination in *Frankenstein*: Victor piecing together his creature in his lab is certainly cognate with a mother's thoughts of shaping her child inside her womb, but his actions and those of his creature repeatedly undermine women's agency, autonomy, and power. Mothers and mother figures have a disturbing tendency to die in Shelley's novel, which raises the spectre that the maternal imagination in its original, powerful sense disappears, superseded by its masculine adaptations. I prefer my maternal imagination to be more feminocentric, but Buckley's case for an ongoing, diversifying discourse of the maternal imagination is nonetheless clear.

There is much more in this volume than can be covered in this space. A book review cannot do justice to the range of medical texts, gynecological manuals, and literary texts that Buckley refers to, and from which she builds the world of the maternal imagination. Happily, there is more than sufficient room to observe that Buckley has done a splendid job recuperating the history of the maternal imagination in eighteenth-century Britain through its many lenses—medical, literary, social, and cultural—and through its many permutations.

Marilyn Francus is a Professor of English at West Virginia University. She is the author of *Monstrous Motherhood: 18th-Century Culture and the Ideology of Domesticity* (2012) and the editor of the *Burney Journal.*

Didactic Novels and British Women's Writing, 1790–1820, ed. Hilary Havens

Routledge, 2017. 224pp. $49.95. ISBN 978-0367175689.

Review by Lisa Wood, Wilfrid Laurier University in Brantford

Didacticism in fiction has, until fairly recently, held an uncomfortable place in literary studies of the Romantic period. Like an elderly chaperone at a masquerade, scholars have acknowledged it was there, but generally preferred not to interact with it. As Morgan Rooney suggests in this volume, this discomfort "is perhaps a testimony to the enduring legacy of what Jerome McGann labelled 'the Romantic ideology'" (21), which resisted literature with an overt didactic agenda. The literary recovery project of the past several decades has reintroduced some of the main authors of didactic novels, such as Hannah More, Jane West, Mary Brunton, and Elizabeth Hamilton, and done the vitally important work of contextualizing their works in their social, political, and historical contexts, without necessarily taking didacticism as a primary focus of analysis. This collection of essays makes an important contribution by reading didactic novels seriously, not in spite of their pedagogical agendas, but because of them.

As Hilary Havens observes in her informative introduction, the increasing importance of women as educational authorities in their own homes in the eighteenth century provided an avenue for women writers to enter print culture, through conduct books, educational treatises, and didactic fiction. The "feminine genre" of the didactic novel, she argues, "enabled women to engage with concurrent ideologies despite their invisibility in more public forums" (1–2). The ten essays in this collection study a range of writers whose works span the turbulent period between 1790 and 1820, and who used the genre to carry out a reformist agenda. The roughly chronological organization of the essays works to demonstrate the changes in focus and literary form over the period and the shifting concerns of women writers in relation to their social and political contexts.

Taken together, the essays in the first half of the collection help to break down the rigidity of the conventional Jacobin/anti-Jacobin opposition by showing the overlapping didactic concerns in texts by women of varying political positions as well as the complexity of the political and social ideologies of individual authors. In a chapter on Jane West's narrator Prudentia Homespun, for example, Megan Woodworth carries out an insightful analysis of how Homespun's "anti-Jacobin ideology is routinely undermined by the actual events of the stories she narrates" (39). Rather than reading West's novels simply as a "loyalist endorsement of the status quo" (41), Woodworth argues that the tension between the narrator and the "tendency" of the narrative as a whole encourages readers to learn to "decode what they encounter and, through reflection, make the correct choices based on that information" (40).

Perhaps because of the extensive existing scholarship focused on the 1790s, I found the later essays in the collection to be particularly rewarding. By positioning Maria Edgeworth's *Moral Tales for Young People* (1802) in the field of what we would now call young adult literature, for example, Andrew O'Malley shows that the unstable historical context of war demanded "an understanding of a new kind of childhood," one that needed assistance to "navigate the dangerous waters of republican ideals and revolutionary sentiments" (125). With particular attention to two tales of young idealists, "Angelina; or, L'Amie Inconnue" and "Forester," O'Malley's analysis demonstrates how an imagined audience shapes narrative form and strategies, and how Edgeworth's tales intervene in social and cultural politics without overtly invoking the dangerous territory of revolutionary ideology. Teri Doerksen makes an innovative contribution to the field in her careful analysis of the intersections of nationalism and didacticism in the writings of Mary Brunton and Susan Ferrier. Doerksen foregrounds the nuanced ways that Brunton and Ferrier responded to and represented the difficulties and possibilities of a developing British, rather than regional, identity. Brunton's *Discipline* (1814) and Ferrier's *Marriage* (1818), Doerksen argues, "use the discourse of didactic and domestic fiction to produce multivalent portraits of a British coming of age" (181). The strength of Doerksen's argument lies in the way she shows how this national Bildungsroman is embedded and intertwined in the plot, characters, and generic practices of didactic fiction, and how it "maintains its didacticism while at the same time it reflects many of the complexities of the nation it represents" (186). Doerksen's argument is just one example of the fruitful combination of genre theory and historical positioning that is evident in many essays in the volume, notably those by Jonathan Sadow, Sharon M. Setzer, and Patricia Demers.

One of the benefits of dedicating a volume to the didactic novel as a genre is the opportunity to expand the boundaries of its conventional definition, but this benefit also raises questions that are not criticisms but points for pondering. Havens's introduction traces the development of eighteenth-century didactic fiction from the conduct books of the previous century, in which the "lesson" is typically an overt and unambiguous statement. How subtle, or "cautious" to use Sadow's term (86), can a text's didacticism be for it to remain didactic fiction? In terms of conventional generic distinctions, how do we understand the relationship between didacticism and satire, or didacticism and critique, as in Charlotte Smith's attack on "Burkean adherence to history-as-inheritance" (21)? More broadly, is there a distinction between a novel with a "message" and a didactic novel? There are cross-pollinations and interactions among these that are worth further exploration. On a lesser note, the suggestion in the afterword that didactic novels by radical writers have not "heretofore been recognized" (199) is surprising, as their existence has been previously acknowledged in my own work and others.

Didactic Novels and British Women's Writing provides a valuable reconsideration of didactic fiction by women writers at the end of the long eighteenth century. It is a useful resource for scholars of didactic novels, as well as any reader interested in developing a more nuanced understanding of literary production and genre during the period. Its theorization of didactic fiction and attention to the generic innovations of women writers are long overdue, and compellingly show that the didactic novel is not formulaic, dull, or constricting, but a complex and multifaceted literary form that is worthy of closer examination.

Lisa Wood's research interests include Evangelical and didactic fiction of the late eighteenth century. She is an Associate Professor of English and Youth and Children's Studies at Wilfrid Laurier University in Brantford.

Writing to the World: Letters and the Origins of Modern Print Genres by Rachael Scarborough King

Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018. 272pp. $44.95. ISBN 978-1-4214-2548-1.

Review by Shang-yu Sheng, University of Tokyo

In *Writing to the World*, Rachael Scarborough King reads printed letters in newspapers, periodicals, biographies, and novels to highlight the "in-between media status" of eighteenth-century epistolarity, showing how it "self-reflexively bridged speech, manuscript, and print" (4) in the historical formation of the four genres. King follows the efforts of previous scholarship, notably Gary M. Schneider, *The Culture of Epistolarity: Vernacular Letters and Letter Writing in Early Modern England, 1500–1700* (2005) and Clare Brant, *Eighteenth-Century Letters and British Culture* (2006), in extending our purview beyond familiar letters to examine letter writing in both manuscript and print, across private and public spheres. Extant studies on the eighteenth-century letter have largely remained historicist and focused on providing rich descriptions of its varieties, whereas *Writing to the World* breaks conceptual ground by adopting the framework and language of media studies, claiming that letters in the eighteenth century acted as "interpretive guideposts" (3) to help readers bridge the communicative demands of different—familiar and emerging—media.

Perhaps the most important contribution of this book lies in its ambitious revision of eighteenth-century literary history through adopting a media-focused vocabulary. While previous scholars have explored the intertextuality of early modern letters (James Daybell) or the overlap between scribal publication and print (Harold Love; Margaret Ezell), King describes the status of the letter in turn as "intermedial," "multimodal," "media mixing," "multimedia," and "in-between media." Phrases such as "media environment," "media sphere," and "media regime" replace conventional discussions about reading publics; terms like "media shift" and "media event" refer to the evolutions of print cultures; key figures like Daniel Defoe and Samuel Richardson are now characterized by their "media-centric interest" (67) or "media-sensitive vocabulary" (71). This suggestive language offers a fresh take on well-rehearsed conversations regarding eighteenth-century literary production, but also provokes unanswered questions. Besides brief references to Marshall McLuhan and John Guillory in the introductory chapter, King does not elaborate on the definition of media, nor its relationship to form and genre. At times, the term appears so expansive in meaning that it seems as if everything and anything is media, leading this reviewer to wonder about the ultimate efficacy of media/medium as a conceptual framework.

Despite this quibble, I find King's media narrative for the central role of epistolarity in the period both brilliant and convincing. She explains that the significance of the letter as a "bridge genre" is conveniently made manifest in the historical landmark of the old London Bridge: not only a pathway but itself the site of bustling print shops, bookstores, and public houses. It did not simply connect two shores, but was itself a point of arrival, "offer[ing] multiple directions of access, simultaneously spanning and dividing—drawing attention to similarity as well as difference" (51). Likewise, the letter acted as a "framing device for communication across media" (6), orienting eighteenth-century readers—or, to use King's sometimes preferred term, "consumers"—in a new media landscape of shifting hierarchies and practices.

The chapters follow chronological order, although King, like any responsible media scholar, stresses that they do not constitute a developmental history. Each chapter focuses on a moment of "media negotiation," seeking to show how different uses of epistolarity highlight the continuous relationship between manuscript and print. This point is made most successfully in the first two chapters, which demonstrate the epistolary nature of newspapers and periodicals in the early century. With the development of a centralized postal system, letters, ranging from government missives to courtship correspondence, connected ports across Europe and the emerging British Empire. King shows how the first mass news publications simply magnified in scope and scale the "function, form, and perception" (37) of regular epistolary exchange. Writers, editors, and readers alike self-consciously viewed letter writing as the means by which a person could become a part of "the World"—a metonymic space corresponding to the vast newsgathering network, centring on the capital of London, that reached as far as a letter could travel.

While historians have long studied the network role of letters (Lindsay O'Neill, *The Opened Letter: Networking in the Early Modern British World* [2014], comes to mind), literary critics still tend to emphasize its personal, domestic, and introspective character, particularly with regard to the development of eighteenth-century fiction. To my knowledge, *Writing to the World* is the first monograph to consider the exchange and evidentiary functions of epistolarity with an eye to the evolutions of literary forms. King asserts that early news media was structured on a "cyclical and communal version of authorship and readership" (59), using letters in print to model a logic of exchange as well as act as proof of fact. The latter point about letters as "key evidentiary mechanism" (118) continues in chapter 4, which focuses on the evolution of biography from John Aubrey's *Brief Lives* to James Boswell's *Life of Johnson*. Over the course of the century, King notes, "letters became historical sources rather than textual performances" and "began to lose their bridging function, no longer actively drawing together media systems but rather serving a nostalgic or reified purpose" (153).

As often happens, then, even non-progressive histories must reach a satisfactory conclusion. Similarly demonstrating the dominance and decline of the letter as a bridge genre, chapters 3 and 5 provide a media explanation for the fate of the epistolary novel. King discusses how, in the mid-century, Richardson struggled to maintain authorial power over *Pamela* and *Clarissa* when faced with readers who saw the novel as "an open system of epistolary exchange" (89) whose meaning was up for negotiation. In contrast, later novel writers including Frances Burney, Maria Edgeworth, and Jane Austen rejected the inherent narratological instability of epistolarity in favour of a more controlled third-person narration, thus separating the novel from the world of open epistolary exchange and in effect asserting "the primacy of novels over oral, embodied, and written entertainments" (156). These discussions illuminate yet another meaning of King's titular "World": the London media environment, referring not only to a reading community, but also to the various forms of urban entertainment, explored in Burney's and Edgeworth's early works, that competed with the novel for the attention of "content consumers" (22).

Elegantly written and methodically researched, *Writing to the World* makes a powerful case for the centrality of epistolarity to the development of eighteenth-century literature. For those interested in genre and form, the book inspires exciting lines of inquiry regarding the period's experiments in literary production. It is an excellent contribution to scholarship in periodical studies and book history and will appeal in particular to readers who seek new, reconceptualized literary histories of the eighteenth century.

Shang-yu Sheng is an Assistant Professor at the University of Tokyo. Her research focuses on genres of life writing as public rhetorics, from the long eighteenth century to our contemporary times.

4E Cognition and Eighteenth-Century Fiction: How the Novel Found Its Feet by Karin Kukkonen

Oxford University Press, 2019. 272pp. $99. ISBN 978-0190913045.

Review by Collin Cook, Woosong University

With their interest in exploring the relationship among reading, the felt experience of reading on the readers' body, and the materiality of the text, eighteenth-century novels serve as fruitful opportunities to theorize what exactly reading does. As Karin Kukkonen notes in this study, however, the conceptual work that eighteenth-century novels perform is still often occluded by critical tendencies that read these texts as preparations for the novels of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. As an alternative to such anachronistic readings, Kukkonen engages the vocabulary of 4E cognition to open up new ways of thinking about the theoretical work that eighteenth-century novels perform, particularly in relation to their preoccupation with exploring how fiction works on the minds and bodies of readers.

Through readings of works by Eliza Haywood, Charlotte Lennox, Sarah Fielding, and Frances Burney, Kukkonen offers an intriguing alternative to histories of the novel that read eighteenth-century fiction in terms of what Kukkonen calls "the curse of realism" (11), or the tendency to assume that fiction from this period aspired to reproduce characters' experiences with mimetic fidelity. Focusing on the ways in which Haywood, Lennox, Fielding, and Burney foreground reading, the body, and the materiality of their texts, Kukkonen argues that those four writers sought to attune readers to the felt and embodied nature of the act of reading. Rather than reading these four authors as attempting to render subjectivity with mimetic accuracy, and thus reading eighteenth-century novels as inferior anticipations of nineteenth-century realist novels or modernist depictions of interiority, Kukkonen insists that these texts encourage readerly participation, thus bringing their enactive nature into focus. The central terminology of 4E cognition, which Kukkonen references by the terms "embodied, embedded, extended, and enactive" (197), serves as an implicit conceptual background throughout, enabling Kukkonen to focus on and theorize the participatory aspects of eighteenth-century novels.

Kukkonen's argument for an enactive rather than a mimetic understanding of the eighteenth-century novel recasts the text as a "lifeworld technology," a "cultural and material artefact," that the "embodied reader" uses to navigate their world (4). By reframing the analysis in terms of how readers use novels to understand their world, Kukkonen aims to provide an account of the eighteenth-century novel that "embeds the embodied reader in the eighteenth-century lifeworld—its media, material context, practices, and intertextual references" (4). With these concepts, Kukkonen uses the theoretical back-drop of embodied cognition to reconsider the preoccupation with figuring bodies that swoon, heave, and collapse in moments of passion.

By situating this study within 4E cognition, Kukkonen reads such moments of passional excess through the lens of "embodied language" (12), rethinking the conceptual work that these representations of feeling perform. One noteworthy achievement of Kukkonen's study is its attention to the ways in which these writers deploy the language of embodied excess to enable readers to think about the felt experience of reading. This approach recovers a Haywood who carefully crafts her fictions so that readers become aware of the ways in which "embodied experience" is "evoked and shaped through language, writing, and the mediation of thought in letters and theatrical speech" (68). While Haywood's fictions encourage readerly participation, such participation becomes an opportunity to think about and reflect on, rather than lose oneself in, moments of passional excess. Turning to Lennox, Kukkonen attends to the ways in which Lennox fuses the language of emotional excess to formal aspects of her texts in order to create a participatory mode of reading, so that Lennox "develops the novel and its guided joint attention as a model for how to navigate the world of knowledge and its different mediated forms" (106). Sarah Fielding's experimental novels, meanwhile, deploy formal strategies and "embodied language" to create works that "facilitate absorptive and reflective reading" (118). As with Haywood and Lennox, Kukkonen's argument is that Fielding's novels are relentlessly self-reflexive: when reading Fielding's works, readers "are taught, both implicitly and explicitly, how to relate themselves to the reading process itself" (150). When Kukkonen turns to Burney, she considers the ways in which Burney's journals, letters, and fiction blend together, creating a kind of "meta-life-writing" (186), in which Burney self-consciously uses characters and quotes from literary texts to navigate her life.

Kukkonen claims that the resources of 4E cognition enable us to reconsider the eighteenth-century novel apart from "the curse of realism." And while Kukkonen certainly offers an intriguing alternative theorization, I would add that her deployment of terminology from various theorists working in philosophy of mind and cognitive science offers an alternative way to theorize another phenomenon that she does not address: sentimentality. Given this study's interest in how Haywood, Lennox, Fielding, and Burney use linguistic and textual strategies to create increasingly nuanced meditations on the embodied aspects of reading, a consideration of 4E cognition in relation to how these writers work with the tropes of sentimentality would also seem to be suggestive.

That omission does not detract in any way from Kukkonen's insightful use of the concepts defined by theorists who work in the interdisciplinary field of 4E cognition. Rather, it illustrates Kukkonen's larger theoretical point: the conceptual resources of 4E cognition offer nuanced and alternative ways of understanding a range of eighteenth-century literary and cultural phenomena. This study will be of particular interest to scholars working in the history of the novel and the history of emotions. The engagement with extended mind theorists will also be helpful for scholars interested in theorizing how the novel relates to other technologies that were emerging in the eighteenth century. Kukkonen's skilful interweaving of the participatory nature of eighteenth-century fiction, the theoretical tools of embodied cognition, and the particularities of the "eighteenth-century media ecology" (90) demonstrates some of the ways in which scholars can use concepts from 4E cognition to produce insightful readings of eighteenth-century engagements with the body, with formal experimentation, and with the materiality of literary texts.

Collin Cook is an Assistant Professor at Woosong University. His research investigates explorations of embodiment in British literature from the long eighteenth century.

The Politics of Parody: A Literary History of Caricature 1760–1830 by David Francis Taylor

Yale University Press, 2018. 320pp. $50. ISBN 978-0300223750.

Review by Holly Kruitbosch, University of Nevada, Reno

The content of David Francis Taylor's book will appeal to scholars in varied fields, including art, literature, politics, and humour. His interdisciplinary approach allows him to explain comprehensively how "parodic caricatures work to excavate the formal and historical contours of literary genre and to apply pressure to the supposed unity of the texts they take up" and to argue that graphic satires "fostered and sequestered" high culture in a significant manner (xi). A generous collection of seventy-six black-and-white illustrations enhances the appeal of *The Politics of Parody*.

Taylor begins by explaining his methodology as "a literary critical approach to a visual archive ... locat(ing) graphic satire within a variety of intersecting cultural matrices" (xi), which he expands in chapters 1 and 2. He then investigates numerous graphic examples, all visually invoking *The Tempest, Macbeth, Paradise Lost,* or *Gulliver's Travels* in chapters 3–6. The final chapter explores how and why Napoleon receives completely different graphic satire coverage than the earlier examples. In effect, this wide tableau offers an eighteenth-century nexus between authors like Shakespeare, Milton, and Swift; political leaders such as George III, William Pitt the Elder, and Henry Fox; and graphic satirists like Thomas Rowlandson, James Gillray, and Isaac Cruikshank. In order to accomplish the aim of the book, Taylor surveys three complex fields that require extensive artistic, literary, and historical knowledge. An appendix, "Dramatis Personae," provides short biographical notes. A link between appendix and text would have been helpful to guide the reader. With such broad and complex subject matter, the lack of a conclusion tying the entire book together seems a missed opportunity.

Chapter 1, "The Literariness of Graphic Satire," examines the form as a literary medium. Taylor states that the literariness lies in "its syntactical and narrative structures ... the enmeshing of images and words, the appropriation and parody of literary scenes and tropes, and often-dense networks of allusions to other cultural texts, practices, and traditions" (4). This definition spotlights the diverse places satirists found their material, indicating that different types of viewers could find meaning through different channels. Throughout the book, however, Taylor destabilizes his own definition of graphic satire by arguing that "it is part of satire's work ... to sequester the literary from the popular, the commercial, and the everyday" (248). The isolation of the literary, and "satire's part in this broader cultural program to fortify literature and art against" (35) the common people is Taylor's main thesis. He argues that "graphic satire is not a 'universal language,' and it invites not the glance but the educated gaze" (24). Taylor contends that in order to understand the political message of the illustration, viewers needed a "deep and ready knowledge of the English classics" (26). The argument's premise—that "the distinction between understanding and not understanding will always be binary" (32)—seems problematically rigid. Yet Taylor troubles his own argument, providing illustrations showing people of all ranks viewing the satires, like in Piercy Roberts's *Caricature Shop* (1801) and James Gillray's *Very Slippy-Weather* (1808). Graphic satires were displayed in print shop windows for all to see, and often garnered a large crowd of viewers from all backgrounds. At home, the "aspiring middle classes" could enjoy "lending folios of caricatures for the evening" (42). And though understanding classics was helpful to comprehending the art, Taylor also states that "satirical prints mined a fairly narrow range of literary works" (16). These were quite popular literary works, ones invoked, alluded to, or paraphrased in puppet shows, chapbooks, and sermons. Though the limitations on the understanding of graphic satire are argued to have "fostered and sequestered high culture" (xi), they clearly democratized that culture as well.

Much of the strength of Taylor's book lies in the detailed contextualization of the artwork he analyzes. He brings together literary, political, historical, and theatrical details to create a vibrant background against which to view the satire. For example, current stage productions often dramatize the Weird Sisters of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* in a terrifying light, but Taylor explains that the play was often thought of as comedic in the eighteenth century. It was not uncommon for the sisters to be played by men, portrayed as clownish. This reclaiming of theatre history makes a difference in the analysis of a graphic satire that employs this scene, as do several from the period. Taylor makes the intriguing point that looking at the way the sisters are depicted through the years also provides perspective on genre identity and how that changes over time.

The final chapter represents a departure from the previous ones. Taylor hypothesizes why graphic satire frequently depicts Napoleon as Harlequin, the main character of pantomime shows. The English Harlequinade became popular in the seventeenth century, and by the eighteenth century included some spoken dialogue. Taylor begins the chapter questioning why Napoleon was not more commonly cast as "either a Shakespearean or Miltonic protagonist" (210). After advancing a few possibilities, he provocatively concludes that the graphic satirists "worked to sequester British literary culture from the problematically protean and charismatic figure of Napoleon … The integrity of the

English literary canon depended on Bonaparte being kept well away from it" (233). This claim would have been strengthened by more direct evidence, given the other explanations in play. Graphic satirists may well have chosen to portray Napoleon as Harlequin because, as Taylor also points out, they both have French origins, both have popular appeal, and both seem to defy expectations. Additionally, as Taylor writes, this satire functioned as war propaganda, and there was great value in "translating war into the comfortingly everyday registers of popular entertainment" (219).

Ultimately, *The Politics of Parody* is a learned and rich text, provocative in its claims and analyses. Taylor's arguments should inspire an enlivened critical conversation about the audience and effect of eighteenth-century parodic graphic satire.

Holly Kruitbosch is a PhD candidate at the University of Nevada, Reno. She works on book illustration and political poetry.

Born Yesterday: Inexperience and the Early Realist Novel
by Stephanie Insley Hershinow

Johns Hopkins University Press, 2019. 192pp. $49.95. ISBN 978-1421429670.

Review by Katarzyna Bartoszyńska, Ithaca College

One frequently hears academic writing praised as brilliant, forceful, lucid, but rarely is it described as funny: *Born Yesterday: Inexperience and the Early Novel* is all of those things. The book is a genuine pleasure to read, with witty, sparkling prose. Stephanie Insley Hershinow deftly lays out an argument that is both straightforward and dazzlingly complex, and which opens out onto myriad aspects of novel studies, from the complex ways that eighteenth-century fiction combines a drive toward mimetic realism with a tendency to idealize, to more fundamental questions of how we understand the relationship between plot and character.

Born Yesterday centres on the figure of the novice—the innocent, guileless protagonists of early realist fiction, most of whom are adolescent girls—and examines how the novel represents their curious immunity to experience, and what it means for our understanding of what early realism does. It is not that scholars of the novel have failed to notice that many eighteenth-century fictions feature characters who are naive or unknowing. The affordances of such personages for the novel's projects are clear—they present an opportunity to provide detailed explanations of the social world and how it works, and they allow for a potential critique of that world in the process. But, as Hershinow points out, novel theorists consistently resort to the notion of *Bildung* in order to describe these mechanics. Our ideas of both plot and character thus seem harnessed to a framework of development and change. We struggle to account for consistency of character and generally see it as a kind of failure, to be explained, at best, by generic constraints (as a flaw of romance), or, at worst, simply as inept characterization. Hershinow argues that we should instead read the persistence of inexperience, through the figure of the novice, as one of the novel's signal innovations during the eighteenth century. The way that Hershinow unfolds this argument is so compelling, so persuasive, that it starts to appear almost obvious—how can we have missed this for so long?

One of the things that I found most intriguing about Hershinow's readings is that they seem to read both with and against the grain of the novels they examine. For instance, in the first chapter, which discusses Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa*, we observe that Clarissa is not changed by her experiences; rather, the novel documents her repeated refusal to change, her stubborn insistence that she possesses a "higher" knowledge. Her way of knowing is akin to that of the novel form itself, which claims a knowledge that transcends factual truth: it is "a nonreferentiality that could be seen as a greater referentiality" (37). Thus, there is crucially no development in the text; yet the ending of the novel, Hershinow acknowledges, creates the illusion of change, one that seems intended to belie the very fixity that the novel relies on (58). Richardson's text both generates a radical new epistemology for the novel genre, and shies away from it, seemingly resorting to more conventional paradigms. That the novel apparently retreats to those familiar forms, against the whole point of its central character, suggests that to some extent it masks its own innovations.

Similarly, as the second chapter explains, Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones* is built around the illusion of a picaresque plot (66). The rakish adventures of the titular Jones are rendered irrelevant: the narrative spins out different possibilities for his character, only to foreclose them by concluding in a marriage to Sophia, who accepts him precisely because she insists that he has not been changed. This is not the recognition of constancy, Hershinow argues, but the creation of it: Tom's identity becomes fixed by his marriage. Along the way, the chapter highlights a gendered aspect of *Bildung*, or its lack, that continues to resonate today: that the adventures of wild-oat-sowing young men are figured as cathartic rather than formative, "something you get out of your system rather than something that makes you who you are" (62). But here, too, we see that the entire structure of the novel is a kind of ruse, one that many readers have fallen for, and one that it seems to want us to fall for, even as the point is ostensibly to teach us otherwise.

The third and fourth chapters similarly turn on such illusions, though they are not explicitly described as such. In chapter 3, it is the illusion of disenchantment, as Hershinow uses the figure of the novice to bridge the apparent gap (I say apparent, because it is one that is increasingly questioned) between the realist novel and gothic fictions, noting that the gothic literalizes the realist novel's exploration of alternate possibilities, and deepens its underlying scepticism of empiricism, through readings of *The Castle of Otranto* and *Romance of the Forest*. In chapter 4, it is the illusion of responsibility under the law, as Hershinow uses Frances Burney's *Camilla* to demonstrate how legal formalism renders adolescent experience structurally meaningless. And, perhaps, the chapter also reveals the illusion that it is the protagonist who must be educated, rather than a minor character. As Hershinow hilariously demonstrates, the plot of *Camilla* can be read as the story of Marchmont learning that the lessons he has drawn from his experiences are not only invalid, but actually harmful to others (121). This neatly dovetails with the heroine's lack of experience—who needs experience?—but certainly goes against what readers think they have been witnessing all along.

What does it mean, I wondered, that these novels both advance and conceal these profound insights about plot and character? To what extent were these various "illusions" necessary—and did they become less so, over time? Hershinow convincingly traces the continuities of the logic of inexperience into today's YA fiction. I suspect they could also be fruitfully brought to bear on the plotless novels of modernism, with interesting results; which is to say that although this work is focused on eighteenth-century literature, the ideas it contains are so generative that *Born Yesterday* should certainly be read by scholars working in other periods.

This exciting and invigorating work of scholarship will doubtless prove beneficial both to researchers and to teachers, for its economical, spirited chapters lend themselves beautifully to classroom use. *Born Yesterday* gives us new frameworks to think about the texts it examines, but it also invites us to revisit our ideas of character, plot, and adolescence in powerfully creative ways.

Katarzyna Bartoszyńska has worked at Monmouth College and Bilkent University, and is currently an Assistant Professor at Ithaca College, in the Department of English and the Program of Women's and Gender Studies.

Disease and Death in Eighteenth-Century Literature and Culture: Fashioning the Unfashionable, ed. Allan Ingram and Leigh Wetherall Dickson

Palgrave, 2016. 298pp. €103.99. ISBN 978-1-137-59717-5.

Review by Noelle Dückmann Gallagher, University of Manchester

This splendidly morbid collection is one of several products from a Leverhulme-funded research project on "Fashionable Diseases" undertaken by staff from the English Department at Northumbria University and the History Department at the University of Newcastle. While the interdisciplinary nature of the project is not clear in this particular volume—all of the contributors work in English departments and all approach their subject matter from a broadly literary perspective—the essays constitute a very welcome addition to work in the eighteenth-century "medical humanities." The emphasis on literature also has the advantage of giving *Disease and Death* a clear methodological and thematic coherence, a focus that is reflected in a well-stocked collective bibliography. Readers will quickly see that certain themes, texts, and writers recur throughout: poetry by Jonathan Swift is cited in essays treating subjects as varied as venereal disease, impotence, and madness, for example, and Alexander Pope's *The Rape of the Lock* is mentioned in the context of both consumption and ennui.

As the editors explain in their introduction, the volume is divided into four sections, each highlighting a specific condition or disease. Allan Ingram and Leigh Wetherall Dickson advise that the sections are organized from "the most to the least fashionable" (3), and, while a reader might quibble over whether it is really possible to rank conditions like the plague or death as more or less "fashionable," the topic of fashion adds interest and nuance to many of the best essays, with contributors often addressing both the fashionable and unfashionable aspects of their chosen topic. Indeed, when considered as a whole, *Disease and Death* provides a surprising indication of how many loathsome or dangerous medical conditions were considered to have a certain prestige at some point during the eighteenth century.

The first section focuses on the rather vague condition known as "ennui." Essays by Heather Meek and Jane Taylor neatly introduce one of the major stumbling blocks of eighteenth-century medical investigation—diagnosis—as both authors problematize the definition and treatment of this fashionable complaint. Meek's essay approaches ennui from the perspective of the mind-body problem, pointing out the difficulty of understanding the condition solely on the basis of its physiological symptoms. Taylor's account addresses problems of terminology and translation, asking what is at stake in pathologizing "boredom" by using a highly emotive, and ultimately untranslatable, French term.

Both Meek and Taylor note that perceptions of time play a crucial role in the experience of ennui, and notions of time provide an elegant point of connection with the next section, focused on “Diseases of Sexuality.” A thoughtful and suggestive analysis of syphilis as “the à la mode disease” opens this section, as Emily Cock explores the tensions inherent in identifying a progressive illness like syphilis as a “disease of the moment.” Using William Hogarth’s *A Harlot’s Progress* and *Marriage à-la-Mode* to illustrate her claims, Cock argues that syphilis became an important narrative device, enabling artists like Hogarth to tell a cautionary tale of “wasted time” (58). As this summary suggests, Cock’s analysis makes deft and sensitive use of wordplay, marshalling medical texts like Daniel Turner’s *Syphilis* (1717) to illustrate broader claims about the changeability of both disease and fashion. The other two essays in this section make for equally enjoyable reading, with Hermann Real provocatively arguing for reading Swift’s portraits of poxed prostitutes as sympathetic pleas for social justice, and Kirsten Juhas examining the surprising complexities of the impotent male “fumbler.” Both Real’s and Juhas’s essays make extensive use of Swift, but Juhas also brings in a welcome selection of Restoration poetry, taking this collection’s historical remit back into the 1660s and 1670s.

The third section—on “Infectious Diseases”—is perhaps the most varied in subject matter, with essays treating the plague, smallpox, and consumption (tuberculosis). In this section, the theme of “fashionable disease” begins to give way to broader discussions about how diseases were “fashioned” by the literature and culture of the day. An essay by Hélène Dachez examines how Daniel Defoe’s *Journal of the Plague Year* “fashioned the unfashionable” in its treatment of the 1665 epidemic, and essays by Allan Ingram (on smallpox) and Clark Lawlor (on consumption) explore the complex interplay between fashionable and unfashionable elements of infectious disease. Ingram’s account mines the rich archive of literature on smallpox, while Lawlor’s offers a fascinating counterpoint to prior scholarship on tuberculosis—including Susan Sontag’s *Illness as Metaphor* (1978) and Lawlor’s own 2006 monograph, *Consumption and Literature: The Making of the Romantic Disease*—by reminding us that consumption had an unfashionable side even at the height of its “social and cultural cachet” (165).

In the final section, “Fashioning Death,” contributors address the potentially fatal consequences of madness, smallpox, and sociability, with essays examining the portrayal of death across a range of literary and historical materials. Kelly McGuire returns to the topic of smallpox with an insightful demonstration of how the debates surrounding inoculation may have contributed to the medicalization of death. Wetherall Dickson’s essay uses some of the fascinating and harrowing eighteenth-century accounts of suicide in a new reading of the pitfalls of sociability in Georgiana Cavendish's *The Sylph*. The final essay in the collection strikes a fittingly post-mortem note, as Helen Deutsch explores the fashions and hazards of retrospective diagnosis: returning to the issue of the mind-body problem, Deutsch asks how and why nineteenth- and twentieth-century scientists, physicians, and phrenologists attempted to gain new insight into Swift's madness by examining his skull (unearthed in the 1835 flood of St. Patrick's Cathedral).

Deutsch's essay ends by quoting Swift's grim last words—"I am a fool"—but there is much food for thought in this volume, and several contributions seem intended to serve as catalysts for further research. Among the many intriguing themes raised in multiple essays, but not treated in great depth, are some that could easily form the basis of future monographs; these include histories of specific conditions not discussed in this collection (such as fever or cancer), broader issues like the portrayal of victimhood in medical and literary representations of the ailing, and the relationships between various diseases and the emotions. While many such topics have yet to be explored, *Disease and Death* has the welcoming feel of a book designed to open new areas of enquiry and invite further research; one can only hope such interests will prove infectious.

Noelle Dückmann Gallagher is Senior Lecturer in Eighteenth-Century Literature and Culture at the University of Manchester.

Systems of Life: Biopolitics, Economics, and Literature on the Cusp of Modernity, ed. Richard A. Barney and Warren Montag

Fordham University Press, 2018. 280pp. $35. ISBN 978-0823281718.

Review by Kristina Booker, University of Oklahoma

The aim of this volume, the result of a 2012 conference at The Huntington, is to use the concept of *system* "to articulate a framework in which to grasp the complex relations among biological knowledge, economics, and politics in Europe and its colonies from the mid-eighteenth century to the mid-nineteenth" (2). In other words, how can system "help specify all the more concretely the ways that the 'bio' was articulated in relation to the 'political' in the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century biopolitics, with 'economy' serving as a useful mediating term between them" (2)? Alongside system, biology, politics, and economics, the editors include "aesthetic production" as another element in the framework: What is "the relevance of aesthetic production—whether poetry, fiction, comedy, or visual art—to the deployment of economic values in relation to both biological and political spheres" (2)?

Certainly, there are a lot of terms at play here, and the scope of the text only seems to grow with the necessary explorations of the various and evolving signification of these terms throughout the period. The editors note the definitional slipperiness of even their central term, a slipperiness they describe as "the decidedly unsystematic history of the word 'system'"; on the contrary, they write, "there is something systematic about the *ambiguities* of the word system, as if its history as word and concept is marked by the paradox according to which 'system' cannot accede to the condition (of systematicity) it designates" (13, emphasis added). Their response to this paradox is indicative of the volume's larger approach: rather than attempt to impose systematicity on "system," the editors argue it may be "more productive" to find "a few points at which meanings cluster or clump," which they identify as the work of Thomas Hobbes, Jonathan Swift, and Adam Smith (14). Similarly, the collection does not attempt to impose systematicity on its discussion of system. If it feels difficult to get one's proverbial arms around the text, the best way to read this volume is to keep in mind its genesis as a set of conference papers. In that sense, the collection gathers a diverse and provocative group of thinkers and approaches to the question at hand. At their best, the essays in *Systems of Life* meditate on two or three of the volume's five concerns in ways that are productive and revelatory—they are themselves points at which meanings cluster or clump. Taken collectively, the essays make a lot of progress toward building that "framework in which to grasp the complex relations among biological knowledge, economics, and politics" (2).

As with the best conference panels, a few themes emerge in the collection that connect the individual essays in interesting ways. The most striking of these is radicalism, which tends to stand on the fringes of systems with the goal of transforming or destroying them. However, in their introduction, the editors point to the "particular importance" of "whatever inevitably resists or opposes systems, including, for example, chance, empirical singularity, the variable, and the nonconformist" (11). This resistance informs what was, for me, one of the highlights of the volume: James Edward Ford III's discussion of Phillis Wheatley's "resistance to the law-founding violence along the coasts of Africa" in "Niobe" (1773), as part of his argument that scholars have failed to fully capture Wheatley's radicalism (57). (Ford's essay was one of only three that discussed non-white, non-male, or non-Western writers, and I found myself wishing that the scope of the contents more fully reflected the stated embrace of that which stands outside established systems.) Ford argues that Wheatley's poem counters Kant's political theory and anticipates Walter Benjamin's later critique of mythical violence, "all under the signs of race and maternity" (57). Wheatley's poem withholds the expected conclusion of the Niobe narrative—she does not turn to stone—and, in doing so, embodies a radical refusal that opens the possibility of regeneration.

As the previous example already indicates, maternity, generation, and vitalism constitute a second major theme in the collection. Annika Mann and Amanda Jo Goldstein offer fascinating discussions of poetic meditations on embryology and generation located in the mother's body, but vitalism as politico-economic metaphor is a more prominent concern in the volume. For example, Richard Barney's chapter on John Thelwall's radical politics argues that Thelwall's theory and practice are based on a particular conception of life "as vital organism" (118). As a result, Barney argues, Thelwall calls for "a profoundly open political arrangement, which depends on a general economy producing a cycle of both systemic failure and recalibrated animation" (118). Condemning the status quo in Britain at the end of the eighteenth century, Thelwall's "solution was not system's elimination, but its recalibration as an open network able to implement what could be called a politics of susceptibility" (123). In this chapter, Barney's discussion of Thelwall makes concrete the abstractions lucidly explored in the preceding pieces by Christian Marouby (on the metaphor of economic "growth"), Pierre Macherey (on Rousseau's conception of pity and its connection to vitalism), and Catherine Packham (on Adam Smith's use of organic metaphors in his construction of economic systems).

Another feature of the text that renders concrete the many abstractions at play is the use of visuals, whether plates from William Blake's *Urizen* (1794), engravings of goose embryo preparations, or haunting photographs of famine victims in nineteenth-century India. The interdisciplinarity of the text is striking, and discussions of visual art bring freshness to the exploration of how aesthetic production engages the values of the economic and political registers. Goldstein's essay on Blake's engagement with competing theories of generation opens with the aforementioned goose embryos to illustrate the theory of epigenesis—that "shapeless, homogeneous seminal materials visible in a fertilized egg were capable of forming into the intricate body of a nascent chick ... by serial differentiation"—which challenged the idea that "the finished form had obviously existed, imperceptibly, from the start" (164). This opening visual comes back to the reader's mind later in the essay upon viewing plate 7 of *Urizen*, in which the protagonist floats, arms spread, in what appears to be fluid—an image of embryogenesis, perhaps. Pairing the images enforces Goldstein's investment that we should "take seriously ... Blake's minute engagement with reproductive science" (166) and exemplifies the volume's approach to cultural production as a vital site where meanings cluster.

While, alongside visual art, there are insightful discussions of poets like Wheatley, Blake, and Anna Barbauld to justify the inclusion of "literature" in the title, *Systems of Life* will be most attractive to scholars interested in economic and biopolitical theory. The editors are staging a particular intervention in "the current stage of biopolitical analysis," seeking to both expand upon and move beyond the work of Michel Foucault, Giorgio Agamben, and Robert Esposito (6). The volume is certainly successful at expanding upon those theorists' sense of the importance of economics to biopolitics. As one of the editors' goals is "to make Adam Smith a more central part of biopolitical analyses of the period" (6), the volume will be of particular use to Smith scholars and those who use Smith's ideas as a framework for reading the culture and literature of the late eighteenth century and the nineteenth century. If there is an overarching thread, it is Smith (though Rousseau and Malthus play significant supporting roles). However, it is the larger framework with its many touchpoints that constitutes the intellectual contribution of the volume and the delight in discovery generated by its often unexpected couplings. In its willingness to hold multiple registers in tension, *Systems of Life* models how these kinds of collections can continue to expand our analyses of the relationships between disciplines, cultures, and aesthetic traditions.

Kristina Booker is the author of *Menials: Domestic Service and the Cultural Transformation of British Society, 1650–1850.* She teaches at the University of Oklahoma.

Literature, American Style: The Originality of Imitation in the Early Republic by Ezra Tawil

University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018. 266pp. $75. ISBN 978-0812250374.

Review by Melissa Gniadek, University of Toronto

Literature, American Style stages an argument about the paradoxically transnational origins of fantasies of national originality in late eighteenth-century American literature. It revises the "Anglophobia thesis" once associated with literature of this period, while also distinguishing its argument from other departures from that thesis, including Leonard Tennenhouse's analysis of transatlantic circulation and British diaspora within American literature, and Elisa Tamarkin's exploration of antebellum "Anglophilia" as a way of accessing national experiences of affection rather than revolutionary rejection. In his contribution to this ongoing scholarly discussion, Tawil examines what he calls the "double logic by which an emergent U.S. literary culture at once asserted its continuities with, and its radical departures from Britishness—abjecting and incorporating it at once" (17). The result is a review of texts that will be familiar to many who research or teach late eighteenth-century American literature. Yet, while this book does not add to our archive of early American literature, it provides helpful ways to think anew about the relationships between familiar texts.

The book's main intervention, as its title suggests, is to claim that a fantasy of literary Americanness manifested itself in this period through style. While now well-known critical essays arguing for a kind of American literary exceptionalism did not appear until the mid-nineteenth century, American literature of the late eighteenth century, Tawil argues, is essentially self-theorizing. Alterations in style—word choice and word arrangement—allowed authors to do something new while still using the English language and, often, the same generic traditions as the British literature that they were both imitating and adapting. Style offered the opportunity for a "modal revision" (24) through which authors could assert ideas of authenticity, simplicity, and directness in opposition to notions of British or European excess or disguise, in some cases paving the way for claims that America would provide a space for true Englishness to be realized.

Tawil explores these claims first in a chapter on Noah Webster and debates about orthographic reform. His readings offer a linguistic analogy for the types of literary stylistic changes he explores in later chapters. Those later chapters read Crèvecœur's *Letters from an American Farmer* (1782), Charles Brocken Brown and the gothic, and American seduction plots. *Literature, American Style* distinguishes itself and complicates our thinking about the familiar territory of these texts in part through its attention to deep histories of rhetorical and stylistic practices. For example, the chapter on Crèvecœur situates *Letters from an American Farmer*'s well-known epistolary form and Farmer James's anxieties about his ability to correspond with the educated Englishman "Mr. F.B." alongside another well-known contemporary text: Thomas Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia* (1785). But it then traces the yeoman farmer's claim of a simple, transparent style and his frequent deployment of humility conventions through aspects of Virgil's *Georgics*, Boccaccio, Montaigne, and Rousseau. Qualities of the Jeffersonian yeoman farmer that we often associate with Revolutionary-era ideas about the civic voice of the people within Crèvecœur's text are shown to be conventions with long histories within European letters. Through these conventions, Crèvecœur "deliberately constructs a narrative voice that is supposed to mark a particularly American way of writing ... authentic and substantial" (107).

This is just one example of how Tawil situates this late eighteenth-century material and questions of style in relation to much longer literary traditions, alerting us to transatlantic conversations about aesthetics within the late eighteenth century and to how those literary engagements are embedded in deeper literary conventions and conversations across time. Tawil helpfully encourages us not only to look forward toward the nineteenth century when writers like Walt Whitman would instantiate some of the qualities of earthy, open transparency (if not claims of humility) being established in literature of the early Republic, but also to look to earlier European sources. Tawil thus provides a temporal reorientation as much as a transnational one. By probing the deep and multilingual literary histories behind aspects of some of the texts that he reads, Tawil offers new ways to think about US literary traditions and their transformations. Recognizing that claims of humility or simplicity are not only ways to emphasize what America is not (it is not Britain with its learned ornateness and falsity), but that those rhetorical moves also have deep histories across European literatures, helps us to resituate notions of American literary exceptionalism in relation to other histories of cultural debt and long histories of imitation and reappropriation. To continue to be English but in different ways, late eighteenth-century writers, even an Anglophilic French gentleman like Crèvecœur, appropriated and altered European conventions to develop fantasies of "Americanness."

In another compelling move, the book's final chapter harnesses a focus on plain style within the sentimental novel of seduction to gesture both forward and backward temporally. Taking a subgenre whose significance is often consigned to the early national period in which it was popular, Tawil repositions it, and its cultural contribution, within the development of plain style as a feature of later, twentieth-century prose (a literary story that he gleans from a posthumously published Perry Miller essay). In this chapter, his focus on an aspect of style allows him to reconfigure a narrative about the development of an American literary tradition by telling a different story about an important subgenre.

Given the capaciousness of the concept of "style," it is not always easy to track the deployment of this term across the chapters. Even a concept like plain style is imprecise, as Tawil notes, and the relationship between style on the level of word choice and arrangement and style's effects on a narrative's substance and setting is sometimes unclear. This is the case in the chapter on Charles Brockden Brown, where discussion of *Edgar Huntly*'s landscapes as the sites of Brown's gothic becomes central in a way that overshadows claims about style. Furthermore, the very nature of the "double logic" of the book's argument—that an emerging US literary culture both borrowed from and altered Britishness to create something that fostered an idea of a US literature with distinct qualities—means that the book is continually bumping up against the idea of the national that so much recent work has troubled. While its readings are inherently transnational, the book refuses to give up the national, instead exploring the paradox that transatlantic conventions can produce texts said to have particularly American aesthetics. This can sometimes leave arguments in a tautological bind. And while no monograph can or should try to do everything, one wonders whether and how these questions of style played out in writers of colour in the period or other writers whose relationship to "Americanness" and "Englishness" might be differently fraught. Given Tawil's previous work on race and slavery, one might expect more consideration of such issues within this discussion. Phillis Wheatley, for example, seems like she might be part of this conversation. Such inclusions would further complicate a book that provides a nuanced account of the transatlantic origins of fantasies of American originality and reminds us that the negotiation of indebtedness and novelty was certainly not a new challenge at the end of the eighteenth century.

Melissa Gniadek is an Assistant Professor in the Department of English at the University of Toronto, where her teaching and research focus on late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century American literature and culture.

Freedom on the Move: A Digital Archive

Cornell University, University of Alabama, University of New Orleans,
University of Kentucky, Ohio State University
https://freedomonthemove.org/index.html | fotmproject@gmail.com
Review by Elizabeth Hopwood, Loyola University Chicago

> *ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS REWARD — Ran away from the undersigned, about the 1st of December last, negro boy HARRISON, belonging to S.B. Smith aged about 25 years, 5 feet 11 inches high, dark complexion, with a scar high up on his forehead; speaks only English; is very polite in his address; plays the violin; had a violin in his trunk when he left; and is a very good carpenter …*
> https://app.freedomonthemove.org | https://tinyurl.com/Harrison1854

The archive of American "runaway slave" ads reveals a multi-storied history of chattel slavery: the first is a history of capture. These ads employed the reach of newspapers and the reading public as a way to control and account for humans as commodities. The above ad for a young man named Harrison, from Freedom on the Move, describes one such man who risked his life in pursuit of freedom. Like many such ads, the ad that seeks Harrison reveals the name and contact information of the enslaver, their location, reward amount, and a description of the fugitive in terms of appearance, clothing, language, and skill sets. Self-liberating "runaways" might be described by enslavers as stolen commodities, but careful attention to the ad's rhetorical structure demonstrates the formerly enslaved individual's savvy ability to create and recreate identities within a racially ambiguous terrain. And herein lies a second history of chattel slavery that runaway slave ads reveal: stories of resistance, mobility, and adaptability within a disenfranchised community. Scholars have increasingly turned their attention toward a re-reading of the genre as one that reveals the mechanisms and movements of former bondsmen and women. David Waldstreicher, perhaps most famously, has argued for a reading of eighteenth-century runaway slave ads of the mid-Atlantic as early slave narratives, showing how the men and women who ran to freedom displayed a keen understanding of their own movement and identities through public and private spaces. Although the ads reveal only snippets of life as narrated by an enslaver, Waldstreicher's reading demonstrates the unique rhetorical position of these ads: in order for an ad to be effective, the enslaver must describe the enslaved man or woman as distinct—in appearance, talents, occupation—while simultaneously disavowing any credit for their talents and knowledge. These ads are an unwittingly rich source of histories of resistance for scholars of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Freedom on the Move, which describes itself as "a database of fugitives from American slavery" centres these stories for scholars, students, and citizen historians through a digitization and curation of thousands of ads. The site characterizes itself as a database, but it is so much more. Freedom on the Move is an ambitious project that effectively illuminates some of the most exciting aspects from current digital humanities research and methodology: open access to an understudied archive, crowdsourcing capability, and a critical intervention into historical and literary research. The site is a model of some of the best work that can come out of collaborative, cross-institution scholarship: it was conceived of and built by an interdisciplinary team from Cornell University, and also credits support from several centres and institutions, including Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research, Cornell University Library, and others listed above. Additionally, it was awarded grant funding by the National Endowment for the Humanities, National Archives, and Cornell Institute for the Social Sciences.

The interface is beautifully designed, with a clearly stated mission that underscores the ethos of the project and the intervention that it makes across fields of history, literary and textual studies, and digital humanities. This intervention responds to Waldstreicher's earlier imperative to consider a rereading of runaway slave ads as moments of resistance: "We are compiling thousands of stories of resistance that have never been accessible in one place. Created to control the movement of enslaved people, the ads ultimately preserved the details of individual lives—their personality, appearance, and life story. Taken collectively, the ads constitute a detailed, concise, and rare source of information about the experiences of enslaved people." The site's authors emphasize not the enslavement of these individuals, but their move toward freedom. This emphasis is embedded within the look and feel of the site design (for instance, the home page features a moving constellation of networks atop dozens of stitched-together newspaper ads), as well as in its messaging, such as the subtitle: "Rediscovering the Stories of Self-Liberating People." This is an important shift in how we consider the genre as one created by oppressors while also making visible the means through which enslaved and formerly enslaved people resisted their capture.

The site is easy to navigate, offering multiple pathways through. Users can explore the project mission and team or jump immediately to "Crowdsource & Search Ads." This link brings visitors to a page that explains how they can use the site: either by searching or by contributing. The search interface is comprehensive: ads can be accessed by date, location, name of newspaper, ad language, and more. But perhaps most exciting—particularly for citizen historians and pedagogical use—is the crowdsourcing feature, in which users can contribute to the creation and usability of the site. After a simple account registration, users can either extract data from the ads by transcribing directly onto the site, or they can identify and mark advertisements that have been published multiple times. Once a transcription has been made, several options of reading and accessing it become available: the text is displayed side by side with the digital facsimile of the original ad. The data from the ad is also compiled as a table, so that one may view and search by physical characteristics, age, sex, clothing, known languages, vocation, and other skills. This data can also be exported as a CSV or JSON file. Having the text available as datasets is incredibly useful for scholars looking to run queries on the ads, to research via topic modelling, or perform any number of large-scale text analyses.

Creating a DH project that is public facing and useful to scholars and educators is a difficult feat in design. But this site responds to multiple users and audiences with a clean, simple lay-out, an easy-to-use transcription tool, and a generous search interface. It lends itself well to classroom instruction, where students can make real-time contributions to a historical dataset. Freedom on the Move is an exemplary and important public digital humanities project, one which will undoubtedly lead to critical scholarship about print culture during American slavery and the men and women whose stories it at once concealed and revealed.

Elizabeth Hopwood is the Acting Director of Loyola University Chicago's Center for Textual Studies and Digital Humanities. She is also a Lecturer in the English Department, and the Graduate Program Director of the Masters in Digital Humanities program. Her research interests include textual representations of food and eating within the long nineteenth century, digital pedagogy, and design.

Writing in Public: Literature and the Liberty of the Press in Eighteenth-Century Britain by Trevor Ross

Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018. 301pp. $54.95. ISBN 978-1-4214-2631-0.

Review by Hannah Doherty Hudson, Suffolk University

> The People's Voice is odd,
> It is, and it is not, the Voice of God.
> —Alexander Pope (quoted in Ross, 21)

Midway through the introductory chapter, Trevor Ross quotes Alexander Pope's satirical description of the "People's Voice." Both illustrative and entertaining at its first appearance, the quotation's relevance grows clearer as *Writing in Public* progresses. Ross draws on meticulous and wide-ranging primary source research to illuminate the fundamental contradictions at the heart of eighteenth-century conceptions of the public, in order to show how these contradictions ripple out into both law and literature.

Ross begins his account with the 3 May 1695 non-renewal of the Licensing Act and politician Thomas Babington Macaulay's declaration that, from that point on, "English Literature was emancipated, and emancipated forever, from the control of the government" (1). Ross outlines the ways in which literature was freed, or at least rendered freer than before, by new legal developments over the course of the long eighteenth century. He also makes it clear that the removal of one kind of constraint entailed the development of many others. "This book is about what the liberty of the press entailed for literary writing," Ross writes early on, and immediately expands his argument: "I am concerned ... with what happened to literature once certain forms of discourse came to be perceived as public and entitled to be free of state or private control. The liberalization of public expression ... necessitated a redefinition of literature's social functions" (2). Ross explores this "redefinition" in a series of interrelated chapters. The first two focus on copyright, and how key legal cases determining copyright's purpose and limits related to beliefs about originality, literary style, and the public's right to new knowledge. Chapters 3 and 4 change the focus to defamation, drawing on fascinating examples to explore literature's "publicizing" function (112). The final chapter turns to the issue of seditious libel, considering how changing conceptions of different kinds of speech and their public impact in turn influenced legal definitions of libel and the courtroom practices through which these definitions were tested and defined.

One way to understand Ross's argument—as the Pope quotation hints—is as an exploration of a group of central, and ultimately unresolvable, ambivalences and paradoxes. In his discussion of seditious libel in chapter 5, for instance, Ross identifies the central tension in the ongoing debates as "a conflict between irreconcilable and largely unexamined beliefs about the effect of speech on the public's judgment" (175). In a discussion of style in chapter 2, he writes, "that thought and discourse are both invented and determined, both free and not free ... renders the status of style deeply ambivalent in modern democracy" (103). And in the discussion of literature's publicizing function in the third chapter, Ross suggests that "literature, it seems, expresses without publicizing; it is and is not public" (112), adding that treating imaginative works differently from "utilitarian speech ... exempts the aesthetic on grounds that are beyond rational interrogation and thus implicitly acknowledges that the norms governing speech cannot be made fully coherent" (115). Over the course of the eighteenth century, Ross shows, both the precise nature of the role of literature in public life and conceptions of the public itself were fundamentally shifting and were increasingly impossible to define: "the modern notion of the public as an agent of change is marked by irresolvable ambiguity," in that "with popular sovereignty, the public acts with supreme authority, but in setting protocols of speech for itself, it paradoxically limits its authority in the very act of exercising it" (6). Literature, Ross concludes, works in the modern democracy in a way that is paradoxical, "helping to define a people while at the same time purposely serving no definable function in public life" (3).

To say that literature's function is no longer definable is explicitly not to suggest that its importance declined over the eighteenth century, as Ross clearly shows in a provocative epilogue. "Unacknowledged Legislators" traces literature's shift from a reinforcer of social norms, which "establishes and preserves social order," to a forward-looking "promot[er of] social progress" (228). The idea of the poet as a radical, visionary outsider in the Shelleyan model, the epilogue shows, is not only a departure from earlier norms but also inseparably tied to emerging ideas about literature's power to affect the public's sense of self. Ross invites us to think of "literature's indeterminacy" as "a kind of projection" that allows individuals at once to imagine the experiences of others *and* to maintain freedom from the ideological claims of those others (236–37).

Writing in Public makes an ambitious argument with ramifications both for our reading of eighteenth-century literature and our contemporary understanding of literature as a form of public speech. One key strength of Ross's book is the way that highly specific examples are engagingly narrated and then open out into broad historical claims. The account of *Carr v. Hood* in chapter 4, for example, relates the case of a popular but undistinguished travel writer, John Carr, who filed a lawsuit against the publishers responsible for a pamphlet that rudely parodied one of Carr's works. The resultant case (which Carr lost) not only raises questions about reputational vs. financial damage and visual vs. textual satire, but also becomes the occasion for a broader assertion of the right of critics to comment freely on published works. Ross shows that this "right" ties directly to the emerging idea that critical freedom provided a crucial benefit to society, and thus must be supported by the law.

Writing in Public is not a book one can read quickly; the structure of the chapters and the high level of detail require careful attention in order to follow the argument thread. The density of the prose, and the careful attention to the subtle ramifications of language, occasionally made me wish for more moments of big-picture perspectival shift, pulling the critical lens back from the specific subtleties of a case to remind the reader of its larger stakes. At the same time, the specific intricacies of the legal questions that Ross addresses in such detail require a considerable amount of close explication to explore with precision, and the book repays the attention it requires with countless fascinating insights. Perhaps the most exciting payoffs of Ross's book are the moments in which his carefully explained examples suddenly coalesce to reveal the contingent and constructed nature of a literary phenomenon that we tend to take for granted. The many legal cases Ross explores, any one of which, as he makes clear, could—even should, in some cases—have been decided differently, have had permanent and frequently unacknowledged effects on our understanding of issues ranging from literary style to the role of the literary critic. I look forward to returning to this book in my own future work, and I anticipate that scholars in all areas of eighteenth century studies, as well as historians of free speech and the law, will find it a valuable resource.

Hannah Doherty Hudson is an Assistant Professor of English at Suffolk University. Her research focuses on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century British print culture, popular fiction, and periodicals; her current book project is entitled "Novel Excess: Fiction in the Minerva Press Era."

Jane Austen's Women: An Introduction by Kathleen Anderson

SUNY Press, 2018. 320pp. $85. ISBN 978-1-4384-7225-6.

Review by Natasha Duquette, Our Lady Seat of Wisdom College

Kathleen Anderson's comprehensive and wide-ranging study of women in Jane Austen's six novels maps out thematic patterns and character types in an almost encyclopaedic manner. The resulting juxtaposition of Austen heroines with each other, as well as with more minor and often overlooked characters, brings to light uniquely Austenian techniques of character development. This thorough analysis of the relations among Austen's women, across different novels, emphasizes how Austen's novels contain intertextual links to each other. The result is a deeply contextual interpretation of each heroine in community, so to speak, with the other Austenian women, rather than solely in relationship to the man she will marry. Anderson's methodology is unique and sophisticated in a way not immediately evident from the seemingly straightforward and modest title *Jane Austen's Women: An Introduction*.

There is a tension between the monograph's title and the table of contents, which does not contain a list of heroine's names, as one might expect from an introductory survey of Austen's women. In fact, not one woman's name appears. This absence could disorient a university student, or any reader not yet familiar with Austen, upon first picking up the book. The chapters are instead titled with quotations from Austen's novels, which the seasoned reader of Austen will recognize. Once immersed in Anderson's argument, the reader sees that these chapter titles indicate a sort of typology or categorization of women into groups with shared commonalities. Anderson groups the heroines into categories, such as the empathetic truth-speakers, the unfeeling pragmatists, the village managers, and the nature lovers. These categories are interesting, and at times provocative, but they only emerge as the argument progresses and are not clear from the beginning. The organization, up front, appears more thematic, with the chapters grouped into three sections on women's bodies, psyches, and environments. The book appears to have two purposes, which are somewhat at odds: first, to survey and categorize Austen's women; and second, to delve into larger philosophical, theological, and social questions arising from her novels.

The first section contains two chapters on Austen's women as embodied, creaturely beings formed by a "Creator" (3). Anderson rightly notes how Austen pushes back against ridiculous portrayals of feminine frailty as beautiful, but does not provide examples of such portrayals from eighteenth-century sources. A brief citation of Edmund Burke's *Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful* (1757, 1759) or John Gregory's *A Father's Legacy to His Daughters*

(1761) would have strengthened her argument by illustrating what Austen implicitly critiques. Considering accessible resources such as Janet Todd's collection *Jane Austen in Context* (2005) and the excellent appendix material within the Broadview editions of Austen's novels, Anderson's argument is somewhat light on historical references. She does, however, emphasize the importance of women's solitary walking as an indication of independent spirit and mind in Austen's novels. This emphasis places a firm focus on the appeal of women's physical robustness. In this first section on embodiment, Anderson successfully illustrates how Austen's women collaboratively present an appealing and empowering model of feminine physical freedom and well-being.

Gathering together chapters on women's psychological, intellectual, and spiritual natures, the second section of *Jane Austen's Women* focuses on less apparently physical concerns. Chapters 3 and 4, which focus on emotional balance and feminine intelligence respectively, cover ground already familiar in Austen scholarship. It is in chapter 5, with her bold attention to women's monasticism and religious vocation, where Anderson strikes out into new, fresh ground. Anderson acknowledges the important critical work already done to explore Austen's Anglican context and then fascinatingly considers various Austen women as reflecting the traditional Catholic roles of nun, spiritual director, or abbess. This is the strongest and most original aspect of Anderson's monograph. Her presentation of Fanny Price in *Mansfield Park* (1814) as a "contemplative spiritual advisor" (121) is both compelling and backed with persuasive textual evidence. Anderson draws a clear parallel between medieval women who eschewed "an unwelcome marriage" (128) and Fanny Price's adamant resistance against familial pressure to marry Henry Crawford. In Austen's narrative, Fanny is exiled to Portsmouth, where, as Anderson convincingly shows, she founds with her sister Susan a small women's community of study amidst poverty. This observation adds to Roger Moore's recent argument for Austen's Catholic sympathies in *Jane Austen and the Reformation* (2016). Anderson's consideration of the penitence of Elizabeth Bennet and Emma Woodhouse calls to mind C.S. Lewis, who made parallel points in his "Note on Jane Austen" (1954). Overall, Anderson's attention to religious imagery and diction in Austen makes an important contribution to growing critical attention to Austen's highly ecumenical, if not outright Catholic, spirituality.

The spatial configurations—environmental, communal, and imaginative—of Austen's women are the focus of the final three chapters. These chapters do not cohere as smoothly as those of the previous groupings, and so this section does not have the same internal unity or integrity. That said, in chapter 6, Anderson's attention to what she terms "eco-affinities" provides a welcome bridge between Austen's heroines and twenty-first-century environmental concerns. Deploying an almost phenomenological approach, Anderson illustrates how Fanny Price, Elizabeth Bennet, Emma Woodhouse, and Anne Elliot admire a reality outside of themselves as they connect to the land with "feminine conservationist zeal" (155). Like the chapter on women's religious vocations, this chapter is both rigorous and fresh. Perhaps Anderson could have tied her observations on women and nature more explicitly to her previous chapter's attention to women's monasticism through integration of eco-theology. The final two chapters, treating Austen's paradoxically wise fools and quietly heroic women, are interesting but do not fit well in this section on Austenian spaces; rather than building on the strengths of the section's first chapter, they appear tacked on. The book also does not include a separate conclusion, ending abruptly.

Ultimately, *Jane Austen's Women* does provide a clear typology of Austenian characters, classifying the women in Austen's novel into various categories, with some unexpected results. One delightful outcome is the greater worth placed on overlooked older women in Austen's novels, from Mrs Jennings to Sophia Croft. This invites an extension of Anderson's approach to the Austenian juvenilia, such as *Lady Susan*. Anderson also compellingly draws our attention to representations of women's contemplative practices in Austen's novels, whether through solitary walking, communal reading, or ecological conservation. Her typological approach would have been even more successful had she oriented her reader to this categorical system explicitly from the beginning. A distinct conclusion, providing an overview of the various women in Austen's novels, according to Anderson's creative and playful categories, would also have helped to draw together the book's valuable insights for the reader.

Natasha Duquette Academic Dean and Professor of Literature at Our Lady Seat of Wisdom College.

Affect Theory and Literary Critical Practice: A Feel for the Text, ed. Stephen Ahern

Palgrave Macmillan, 2019. 274pp. €96.29. ISBN 978-3-319-97267-1.

Review by Aleksondra Hultquist, Stockton University

Literary critics are late to the affect game. This is strange since literature, among other delights, makes us feel; but then, traditionally, literary criticism was a way to make literature important beyond (sometimes in spite of) the feelings it evokes. Not so for our sister subjects: history, sociology, psychology, and anthropology have been doing affect much longer than we. And so we are faced with a plethora of theories from which to choose, many of which were not developed for written language. There is a lack of systematic methods for unpacking affect specifically in literary texts. Addressing this need, Stephen Ahern's collection *Affect Theory and Literary Critical Practice: A Feel for the Text* adds to an increasing body of critical essays, including *Affect Theory and Early Modern Texts*, ed. Amanda Bailey and Mario DiGangi (2017) and *Writing Emotions*, ed. Ingeborg Jandl, Susanne Knaller, Sabine Schönfellner, and Gudrun Tockner (2017), that take up the specific problem of feeling and text. Ahern's collection covers English language texts—Chaucer to contemporary literature—and provides examples of how text and affect can be used to unpack how a text might "feel." This "feel" covers many ideas: wonder, materialism, narrative, social implications, the body, Otherness, animals, sense, memory, listening, and nature. Ahern's introduction lays out the question of what insights from affect theory can do for a text. The stated goal is to "help develop for literary critical practice methods in which to apply the many discourses of affect" (7). While we no longer need to argue that affect is worth studying, argues Ahern, the literary critic still faces the challenge that literature "is embodied in language only" (8). How, in other words, does something constituted in words "feel"? And when it makes the reader feel, what is the best way to unpack that feeling as a mode of theoretical intervention? Certain critical voices loom large in existing discussions of affect: Sara Ahmed, Gilles Deluze, Brian Massumi (lots of Massumi), and Eve Sedgwick (which for non-specialists of affect theory are obvious choices). But there are lesser known approaches that warrant closer inspection. While the aforementioned critics' presences are felt, the collection provides other approaches and disciplines as well, delivering a variety of examples of how to get a feel for a text.

The collection is primarily focused on familiar authors and works—an analytical move that makes sense for showing how new approaches generate new ways of seeing texts and authors with which we are already conversant. As a collection, it is well balanced: it includes readings of

English-language literature from early modern to contemporary, by a respectful mix of established critics and emergent scholars. The essays show an interest in using contemporaneous works on emotion and affect to better understand how feelings work in a text—for example, Tara MacDonald uses Charles Darwin to read Wilkie Collins. Other essays turn to more recent modes of criticism to read both backward and forward: Wan-Chuan Kao explores Chaucer's queerness and futurity; Neil Vallelly plumbs Shakespeare's thingness through new materialism. Ahern has done an admirable job of establishing an inclusive collective voice for affect theory in literature that offers multiple paths for moving forward.

Chapters 3 through 6 will be of most interest to *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*'s readers, where there are affective examinations of Samuel Richardson, Jane Austen, and Percy Bysshe Shelley. In order to unpack narrative intensity in the eighteenth-century sentimental novel, Joel Sodano uses David Hume to read Richardson and Austen. Hume's framework allows Sodano to argue that "when novels attend to the intensity of affective events they interrupt the process of meaning making to describe the forms of experiential becoming that reside between preestablished knowledge and a knowledge yet to come" (67). A narrative, Sodano claims, is a participant in the philosophies of "emotion intensity" which work through the ways that it describes "radical potential that resides within the mundane" (67). For Sodano, interruptions in stories that reflect on feeling create narrative meaning. Affect theory proves a crucial means of approaching the wordless—that which eludes or exceeds language—within a text.

Carmen Faye Mathes's discussion of disappointment in Austen's *Northanger Abbey* (1817) is grounded in Baruch Spinoza's concept of the passions, which she points out is the basis of Massumi's approach. Affective methods, Mathes argues, allow disappointment to work in social contexts as a method of offering "multiple encounters with solidarity" (86). She points out that affect theory can actually move us back toward what eighteenth-century literature thought it was about—thinking about affect, in other words, makes us think historically. The turn to affect is in fact "a return to eighteenth and nineteenth century understandings of the physical and metaphysical world" (86).

Affect is an especially useful approach in drama, as the words are only half of what gets communicated. Arguably the dramatic form requires a heavier hand with affect theory, as the most prominent part of a play—the feelings that the actors evoke—is non-textual. Merrilees Roberts analyzes Shelley's *Cenci* (1819) through Massumi's concept of pre-personal affect and Silvan Tompkins's discourse of shame in order to account for the "disruptive moments" in the narrative of rape recounted by the play's protagonist, Beatrice. The intensity of the play, Roberts argues, comes from what is unsaid, which opens the potential of feigning a truth. Shame, Roberts offers, is an affective strategy for exploring feelings for the signs of emotional consciousness. Beatrice's feelings are real, even if they cannot be spoken. Roberts shows how affect can work with text to account for the feelings that are unwriteable.

Ahern's collection points out that the delight, and frustration, of using affect theory for literary works is that, rather than describing an object or phenomenon, we are trying to describe a process. The authors here do this well, as they try to account for the inventory of shimmers, the in-betweenness of feeling (as Seigworth and Gregg have put it in *The Affect Theory Reader* [2010]). Affect, claims Ahern, "enkindles a sense of potential, of promise, of something profound in play beyond the narrow confines of the self, something that baffles bare recognition, let alone full comprehension" (8). And isn't this what literature does best? Many of us who have chosen to delve into literary studies have done so because of how texts makes us feel; some work, some author, has reached us via an inventory of shimmers evoked and transmitted through text. This collection helps us to begin to make sense of these intangibles by guiding our approach to the sometimes baffling ways that texts make us feel.

Aleksondra Hultquist is an Assistant Professor of Critical Thinking at Stockton University; she writes about women authors of the long eighteenth century and the history of emotion in literary texts.

Everywhere and Nowhere: Anonymity and Mediation in Eighteenth-Century Britain by Mark Vareschi

University of Minnesota Press, 2018. $25. 230pp. ISBN 978-1-5179-0407-4.

Review by Lee Kahan, Indiana University South Bend

There is much to learn from Mark Vareschi's informative book, which examines the literary forces that defined anonymity and attribution throughout the eighteenth century. Vareschi fruitfully combines two methodologies currently in vogue: digital humanities and actor-network theory. He provides a wealth of convincing data to demonstrate the ubiquity of anonymous publishing throughout the period, thereby challenging the prevailing assumption that the author function had solidified its hold by the end of the century. Instead of asking why authors chose to publish anonymously—a question that makes no sense if anonymity was the rule rather than the exception—Vareschi explores how anonymous publishing derived its meaning from literary and cultural networks of people, practices, and things, and how those networks ultimately shaped modern assumptions about anonymity and attribution.

What distinguishes *Everywhere and Nowhere* is its attention to how these networks were largely genre-specific and therefore dealt with anonymity differently, even as they collectively set the stage for the modern author function. For example, while poetry miscellanies turned "Anonymous" into a "fictive person whose motive and thereby interior life may be guessed at" (39), the theatre aligned print with the named author and performance with anonymity, thereby effacing the playwright's earlier stature as part (and not the most important part) of the theatrical network. Vareschi synthesizes an impressive array of source material to establish these networks and offers particularly rich interpretations of paratextual and cataloguing texts that often receive scant attention. A primary highlight of this monograph is his analysis of circulating library catalogues and their frontispieces to show how circulating libraries detached the value of books from their material form and turned them into "abstractions" that were "interchangeable and exchangeable"—a precondition for the author to function as an abstract principle of categorization (131). I particularly enjoyed Vareschi's readings of visual media, such as the engravings he uses to show the playwright's marginal position in the theatrical network.

I question, however, whether these readings constitute the kind of surface reading that Vareschi often claims to be doing in *Everywhere and Nowhere*. While he is certainly right that focusing on authorial motive promotes the kind of symptomatic or suspicious reading that leads us away from the text, the often impressive interpretive gymnastics of Vareschi's own readings do not justify the claim that getting away from motive enables us to uncover intention "as it is made manifest in the text" (160). As the passive voice here suggests, this claim that meaning is "in the text," available to anyone unprejudiced by the bias of motive, seems at times to eliminate the literary critic (or more properly literary criticism) as mediator, which is somewhat ironic in a text about mediation. The strength of the book is its use of manifold sources to position literary texts within a dense web of "interlocking contexts," but it is those contexts that produce the meanings Vareschi sees in the literary works he analyzes rather than "mak[ing] visible the connections already present" in them (156). Indeed, while the meaning of a single passage might lie on the surface, "connections" are the product of mediation—the filtering of a text through an interpretive apparatus. Without attending to literary criticism as a form of mediation, we consign it to the same "everywhere and nowhere" status that Vareschi associates with anonymity.

While *Everywhere and Nowhere* offers a thorough, nuanced account of the discourse surrounding anonymity and attribution, along with a compelling argument about its impact on the modern author function, Vareschi's argument about mediation never feels quite as central to the book as its inclusion in the subtitle suggests. He makes a convincing case that the categorizing function of authorship and many of the ideas we associate with it come about through the mediation of texts like library and play catalogues. However, it is perhaps an overstatement to claim that "the immediacy of mediation is never more apparent than in the absence of the authorial name" and that it is only through its "categorical instability" that the "processes of mediation finally become visible" (11). Recent scholarship like Christina Lupton's *Knowing Books* (2011) has suggested that the workings of mediation were hardly invisible to eighteenth-century writers, who engaged with it in very self-conscious ways. Clifford Siskin and William Warner (2010) have even gone so far as to make mediation the defining concept of the Enlightenment, and their collection shows how engagement with questions of mediation pervaded all areas of knowledge at the time. It is never quite clear, then, why mediation would be "more apparent" in anonymous works than in the spate of self-reflexive novels that explicitly interrogate various processes of mediation or in scientific works that puzzle over how to mediate experiments for the general public.

This reader would need to see more engagement with recent scholarship on mediation to be convinced that anonymity deserves the privileged place in the history of eighteenth-century mediation that Vareschi ascribes to it. Instead of engaging with such scholarship, Vareschi often positions his argument in relation to works of book history, some of which feel a bit dated. For example, the chapter on Daniel Defoe engages with Pat Rodgers (1972) and P.N. Furbank and W.R. Owens (1988) when there is a growing body of work on Defoe and mediation, such as Paula McDowell's *PMLA* essay, "Defoe's *Essay upon Literature* and Eighteenth-Century Histories of Mediation" (2015). That said, I think the book's analysis of how anonymity and attribution functioned in the eighteenth century is insightful without recourse to mediation as a framing concept for the entire book, though it plays an important role in certain chapters.

Perhaps the book's greatest contribution is to make visible how persistent our emphasis on the author function remains even in the wake of New Historicism. In theory, New Historicism unsettles traditional schemas of literary value by reducing all texts to discourse, thereby situating meaning in the circulation of a body of texts (taken in the broadest sense) rather than in an individual text or author. Arguably, New Historicism did result in more attention being paid to anonymous texts, and I question Vareschi's insistence that we remain unaware of their ubiquity in the period (an ignorance hard to maintain in the face of the online database ECCO) and that we continue to ignore these texts because of our bias toward attribution. Instead, that bias betrays itself in the subtler ways that we often *use* anonymous texts. Even as it defines anonymous and attributed works as part of a shared discourse, criticism often cordons them off from one another by making anonymous works serve as examples of a discourse that then warrants a more extensive reading in the attributed text. By drawing attention to the literary networks in which anonymous publication was enmeshed, *Everywhere and Nowhere* convincingly illustrates how much we miss about the eighteenth century when we treat anonymous works as second-class citizens.

Lee Kahan is Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and Associate Professor of English at Indiana University South Bend.

Miniature and the English Imagination: Literature, Cognition, and Small-Scale Culture, 1650–1765 by Melinda Alliker Rabb

Cambridge University Press, 2019. 250pp. $120.95. ISBN 978-1108425834.

Review by Chloe Wigston Smith, University of York

Melinda Alliker Rabb takes a delicious dive into the curious, strange, and arresting world of the miniature. For Rabb, miniatures mediate between small- and large-scale events, the old and the new, and she stresses that the decades between 1660 and 1765 represent a peak of ingenuity and inventiveness in their production, from books to toys (for adults), ship models, and soldiers. Their implications reverberate beyond the eighteenth century in how they "provide a kind of virtuality, a kind of alternative semblance of the real" (5) that Rabb pulls forward to our current moment of ever more invisible technologies. Over an introduction and five chapters, Rabb covers a tantalizing collection of objects, including doll-house furniture, coins, medals, scientific instruments, and many others. Throughout, her examples push back against the gendering of the miniature and material culture as feminine, offering plenty of evidence of men's attraction to and also scepticism of small things (every author whose work is discussed in detail is male).

The book sits comfortably within the material turn in eighteenth-century studies, bringing the framework of science studies to bear on objects that, despite their small size, find an ample foothold in the inner workings of the mind. Rabb makes the case that, unlike other objects that have fascinated scholars (such as Mark Blackwell's and Lynn Festa's sentient things in it-narratives or Crystal B. Lake's vibrant artifacts), miniatures “remain steadfastly inanimate” (6). At the same time, Rabb seizes on their potential to calm and contain human sadness and loss. She sees the upsurge in the making and selling of miniatures in the 1650s as emerging from the wreckage and ashes of the Civil Wars, and the bubonic plague that wrought further losses in the 1660s. In this turn away from the emotional and psychological valences of miniatures in favour of their cognitive functions, Robert Hooke and John Locke remain touchstones, but Rabb is more interested in drawing tighter analogies with recent cognitive science to study how miniatures embody ideas about representation; how they look like their referents (or do not); how they distort scale (which we tolerate); and how they allow us to navigate physical space (in the case of maps).

Rabb pins her claims about the significance of “the fascination with downsizing” (2) to theories of aesthetics and cognition, which she engages most explicitly in the opening chapter, where, unsurprisingly, Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* (1726) serves as an ideal case study. Rabb links Gulliver’s descriptions of Lilliputian objects to the merchandise for sale at London toy-shops. More surprising is how she contextualizes Gulliver’s encounters with scale within the use of miniatures by cognitive scientists, where they feature in studies about how humans (in the experiments, child subjects) grasp material representations of the world. In this reading, then, Gulliver’s eventual madness is ultimately the result of a crisis of representation over what “is knowable and how it can be known” (53) that finds expression in Gulliver’s interactions with miniatures. In reading the insights of cognitive science back into Gulliver’s perceptions of the disorienting places he visits, Rabb understands Swift’s miniatures not as the objects of satiric fantasy, but rather as real things that contribute, in more serious and less funny ways, to human cognition. The following chapter chases the influence of Swift on mid-century writers, primarily focusing on Samuel Johnson’s parliamentary reporting in the *Gentlemen’s Magazine* (of whose authorship James Boswell was confident), in which he reworks Swift through “Gulliver Junior,” *Rasselas*, and three actual miniatures. In Johnson, Rabb spots ample scepticism toward miniatures and their seductive power to distract us from intellectual thought, but also curiosity about how they might mirror the expansion and contraction of immaterial ideas. She writes movingly about the small, golden touch piece that was gifted to the two-year-old Johnson by Queen Anne, which he wore from a ribbon around his neck well into adulthood, and the watch that he nestled in his pocket. Johnson’s own miniatures appear to contradict his public writing, edging him closer to Swiftian crisis.

Chapter 4 moves back in time to the satiric writing of Alexander Pope (*The Rape of the Lock*, 1712–17), John Gay (*The Fan*, 1713), and Robert

Dodsley's little known play *The Toy-Shop* (1735). These pieces share an interest in, even an obsession with, the wares of the toy-shop. Over the course of her book, Rabb moves between miniatures and their textual and visual representations (with more attention paid to their appearance in word and image), and here she glides over actual toys, opting to concentrate on their visual representation in trade cards. In Pope's mock-heroic verse, Rabb identifies the visual clutter of trade cards, finding a new source of commercial inspiration for Pope's satire, but one that would benefit from further details about the dating of exemplary trade cards. In contrast to the visual emphasis on toys, Rabb mines the material qualities of fans, particularly their ability to open and close on their painted scenes. Fans are small objects, rather than miniatures that reduce bigger things. But Rabb locates a miniaturizing effect in how fan-designs scale down political and historical events, which in Gay's hands creates an uncanny space for harm and violence that may be trimmed in size, but could be reopened at any time.

Despite the book's general celebration of the miniature's commercial success and aesthetic variety, more poignant discussions emerge across the study that call attention to the work humans make small things do. In addition to Gulliver's madness, Johnson's touch piece, and Gay's gestures of violence, the miniature's ability to negotiate and contain domestic and military conflict is addressed most prominently and arrestingly in chapter 5, where Rabb applies spatial theory to analyze the model soldiers that occupy characters like Uncle Toby in *Tristram Shandy* (1759–67). Although Rabb seeks to extend the miniature's place beyond its emotional or psychological meanings, her forays into its relationship to loss remind us, in evocative ways, of its human potential. The miniature's emotional capacities and indeed the miniature itself are less discussed in the final chapter, where Rabb addresses scientific models and neatly revisits many of her main players, to discuss broader issues of scale.

Rabb's chapters brim with fascinating reconstructions of the market for miniatures, how and where people shopped for them, and what they thought of them in their public and private writings. Overall, she delivers on what she sets out to accomplish, to make the case that miniatures "demand and reward scholarly attention" (32), while managing to preserve, in satisfying ways, something of their magic and mystery.

Chloe Wigston Smith teaches at the University of York and her publications include *Women, Work, and Clothes in the Eighteenth-Century Novel* (2013) and the *ECF* article "Bodkin Aesthetics: Small Things in the Eighteenth Century" (2019).

Nature and the New Science in England, 1665–1726
by Denys Van Renen

Voltaire Foundation, 2018. 266pp. $99.99. ISBN978-1786941374.

Review by Megan Kitching, University of Otago

Published as part of the Oxford University Studies in the Enlightenment series, this compact monograph reflects the varied and volatile literary culture of its period. The title may mislead: *Nature and the New Science in England* touches only briefly on the history of science; resists the reification of nature with a capital "N"; and concludes with a chapter on James Thomson's Scotland. The back cover describes the book as a "cultural history of ecological exchange," pursued through readings of a range of Restoration and early eighteenth-century texts. Van Renen has chosen lesser-studied works by Marvell, Dryden, and Defoe, and brings together unlikely pairings such as Behn and Milton. His book's "guiding claim" is that during these decades, these authors' "attention to the physical environment triggers new approaches to fostering cross-cultural exchange and to reconfiguring sociopolitical assemblages" (13). Across five chapters and a coda, Van Renen homes in on moments where the boundaries between human subjects, animals, and their environments are destabilized, challenged, or broken down. In his view, this period saw a uniquely dynamic relationship with nature, as domestic upheaval, contested European borders, and above all encounters with New World and Eastern environments stimulated fresh reconceptions of British subjects and their national ideologies. This reinvigoration was brief; by the 1720s, Van Renen sees divisions reinforced as Indigenous and non-human influences are subsumed into the commercialized natural sublime of proto-Romanticism.

Nature and the New Science is perhaps best characterized as ecocriticism, which raises a key question: how could the encounters it explores take place? At first glance, the answer is contained in Van Renen's aim to "recover the natural ontologies that seventeenth- and eighteenth-century authors attempt to represent" (17). To do so, however, he applies an array of feminist ecocritical approaches that rest upon moments of embodied contact, and an ethics of non-human agency, and thus refer to a reality beyond representation. In discussing *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1719), for example, he often elides Defoe's narrative strategies in order to interpret Crusoe's interactions with wild animals in terms more applicable to accounts of direct experience. The challenge of reconstituting contact with the natural world at a historical distance is central to ecocriticism as a field. It would therefore have been helpful to see the introduction address it in more depth, to elucidate how current theoretical concepts such as Stacey Alaimo's "trans-corporeality" might be integrated with more historicist approaches to this period's literature.

One strength of this book, that nevertheless makes such a theoretical grounding more important, is that it expands beyond the well-trodden territory of British Romanticism and covers texts that exhibit little explicit engagement with the natural world. Marvell's *Last Instructions to a Painter* (composed in 1667) is a densely topical poem on English naval losses to the Dutch. As Van Renen's environmentally attuned reading explores the elaborate systems of signification deployed in Marvell's verse, it also exposes the difficulty of coming into meaningful contact with the land and waters via those systems. Granted, his claim here is that the poet seeks new aesthetics to replace moribund modes such as the Renaissance pastoral. However, the book also seeks to show how the "cognitive theories, cultural practices and aesthetic discourses" deployed by these authors "emerge out of the natural world and reinforce the dynamic coevolution of matter" (8). The term "coevolution" is Donna Haraway's and refers to a closely symbiotic interdependence that deliberately collapses hierarchies, insisting that culture is not merely built upon or defined against nature, but develops in association with it.

British literature during this period developed in a global environment, and a major thread of this book considers cross-cultural interactions. Two core chapters explore how Behn and Dryden (in his heroic dramas) represent Indigenous figures, particularly women, as a way to recuperate royalist relations with the land and enable successful English settlements overseas. Van Renen complicates the argument that the New World and Eastern women of plays such as *The Indian Queen* (1664) function as empty sites for the inscription of colonial desires. Rather, he argues that they embody relatively more coherent, land-based national identities that challenge and attract the foreigners who lack such identities. The ability of Behn's or Dryden's characters to represent Indigenous perspectives is more limited than these readings sometimes suggest. At any rate, Van Renen contends that by the time of writing *Aureng-Zebe* (1675), Dryden had accepted that theatre could not control nor substitute for the imperial and mercantile ventures that were transporting many English people into these new-to-them parts of the world.

Perhaps the book's most satisfying chapter concerns one such traveller. Between 1716 and 1718, Mary Wortley Montagu famously crossed war-torn Europe into the Ottoman Empire. Montagu is the ideal candidate for this study because her cosmopolitan outlook and conscious self-fashioning through her correspondence directly interrogate the boundaries of selves, genders, and nations. The tripartite movement that Van Renen draws from her letters does indeed reinforce his accounts of Behn and Dryden's English colonists: frustrated with the territorial ambitions and nationalistic fashions of Europe, Montagu welcomes Turkey's hybrid population and freeing versions of femininity. However, when the women of North Africa reinscribe limits on her tolerance for the other, she retreats to a Eurocentric perspective.

The subsequent chapter sees Defoe's Crusoe enact a similar movement of identification with, then recoil from, the lions of Africa and the wolves and bears of Europe. Drawing on animal studies, this chapter tackles several uneasy episodes toward the end of Crusoe's adventures. His destruction of an animal idol, Van Renen concludes, fails to "reestablish a hierarchy between himself and natives/animals," because the vandalism is an irrationally inhuman act, and because it exposes the way the human depends on (the erasure of) the animal (222). This illuminating reading of these puzzling episodes exemplifies the way the grounds of this book's argument seem to shift within and between its chronologically ordered chapters. The coda on James Thomson's *The Seasons* leaves us with a more familiar account of a writer celebrating both the landscape and the commercial activity which threatens that environment. We seem to have travelled some distance from Milton and Marvell, yet these were eventful decades. If *Nature and the New Science* generates contradictions, it does so partly to emphasize the dynamic multiplicity of the longer Enlightenment.

Megan Kitching is a research assistant and tutor in English at the University of Otago, New Zealand; her research interests include eighteenth-century and contemporary poetry and the natural sciences.

Reading Smell in Eighteenth-Century Fiction by Emily C. Friedman

Bucknell University Press; Rowman & Littlefield, 2016. 208pp. $93.
ISBN 978-1-61148-752-7.

Review by Rebecca Tierney-Hynes, University of Edinburgh

Emily C. Friedman presents an enormous wealth of information about smells, fair and foul, addictive and absent, in the long eighteenth century. Sampling texts ranging chronologically from Daniel Defoe's *Journal of the Plague Year* (1722) through Jane Austen's juvenilia, she traces scents and the reactions they provoked across a huge number of novels and plays, setting them carefully in their richly evoked historical context.

Outlining the difficulty of approaching such an evanescent thing as scent in literary texts, let alone the challenge of recovering its long-ago significance, Friedman explains both the inevitable incompleteness of her recovery of eighteenth-century smells and the importance of her attempt. Her stated aim is to explore "the collection of meanings that accreted around scents in the period, and how those meanings formed a vocabulary that writers could draw on" (4). In the end, she finds no consistent thread of meaning around particular smells, and thus no coherent vocabulary for scent. The nature of the project seems to have precluded a focused argument about the significance of smells, driving the book instead toward an exploration of instances of smells and smelling gathered together under general rubrics. In themselves, these instances are often funny, charming, or revealing, but the absence of an overarching narrative detailing the cultural meaning of eighteenth-century smells felt a little unsatisfying. Friedman's excellent concluding argument about the middle-class gentility of scentlessness seemed to suggest the possibility of an argumentative thread that did not quite make a clear appearance earlier in the book.

Chapters on tobacco, smelling-salts, body odour, and sulfur—"Clouds of Smoke, Huffs of Snuff," "Running to the Smelling-Bottle," "The Smell of Other People," "The Age of Sulfur"—gather illuminating examples of eighteenth-century stinks. Passing readily beneath the critic's radar, these instances of smells, when brought together, grant us an enriched understanding of how powerful a role they played in the newly sensual and tactile worlds of eighteenth-century fiction. Friedman's survey of tobacco-use crosses class and gender lines, as she assesses the varied cultural responses to this new and "new-world" commodity. Smelling-bottles, so closely associated with feminine fragility, are revealed not simply to have their more obvious affiliation with affectation and over-refinement, but also to have medicinal uses as plague preventatives. Friedman shows that smelling-bottles were often used as smell-blockers, interrupting the relationship of fictional characters to their over-scented worlds. Her chapter on personal stinks, focused appropriately on Jonathan Swift and Tobias Smollett, explores the class associations of particular bodily odours. Friedman notes acutely that Swift associates Gulliver's disordered "olfactory categories" (74) with his loss of reason: "Gulliver's loss of mental stability and identity is at last a failure of his most instinctive sense: his sense of smell" (73). Next, a chapter on sulfur, the smell of which is the brimstone of hell, explains its further associations with the industrial revolution and with the spectacularly destructive Lisbon earthquake of 1755. The book's conclusion, "The Great Unscenting," offers readings of Samuel Richardson and Austen, suggesting the virtues of cleanliness and the unscented domesticity of new middle-class values.

The orderliness and care with which Friedman has gathered this immensely important body of evidence makes for a pleasurable read. This illuminating topic, so timely in its address to the importance of the senses and the role of material experience in literary historical writing, has been treated with great sensitivity. The range and depth of Friedman's reading, and the context she has brought to bear, make the value of this material eminently clear. The book's wide and thorough survey, supported by solid historical detail, owes its methodology to cultural studies. And, perhaps inevitably, it shares the feature sometimes associated with this school of criticism: it has a tendency to fall short in the depth and nuance of its analysis in favour of presenting a greater volume of data.

Rebecca Tierney-Hynes is a lecturer in the Department of English at the University of Edinburgh. She writes primarily on eighteenth-century fiction and drama.

Mother Goose Refigured: A Critical Translation of Charles Perrault's Fairy Tales, ed. Christine A. Jones

Wayne State University Press, 2016. 228pp. $51.25. ISBN 978-0-8143-3892-6.

Review by Bronwyn Reddan, Deakin University

Taking the classic figure of Mother Goose as her starting point, Christine Jones's critical edition of Charles Perrault's *Histoires ou Contes du temps passé* offers new perspectives on Perrault's tales and their cultural legacy as titans of the fairy tale canon. The eight tales featured in this volume are (to use their common titles) Sleeping Beauty, Little Red Riding Hood, Blue Beard, Puss in Boots, The Fairies, Cinderella, Ricky with the Tuft, and Hop o' My Thumb. The tales were first published in French in 1697 after circulating in a handwritten manuscript with the iconic title *Contes de ma Mère l'Oye* from 1695. As Jones's careful reconstruction of the publication history of *Histoires ou Contes* shows, Perrault's tales have not suffered from a lack of attention from translators, publishers, or readers, so why publish another edition of the Mother Goose tales? The answer lies in the quality of Jones's translations and commentary on interpretation of the tales, their author, and their place in fairy tale history.

Mother Goose Refigured seeks to unburden Perrault's tales from "the weight of [their] celebrity" by asking, "What would the stories look like if they were relieved of the great responsibility to be classics?" (79). Jones's response is to give the tales a modern facelift designed to remove the signs of ageing left by their three-hundred-year-old history. Her translations use a modern English idiom to present the tales as "innovative relics" (79) that are at once "foreign and familiar" (87) to fairy tale readers. In doing so, Jones does not shy away from difficult semantic decisions. Her facelift is a radical one as it revises deeply ingrained conventions of the anglophone reception of Perrault's tales, including character names and, therefore, tale titles. For example, "Little Red Riding Hood" becomes "The

Little Red Tippet," with Jones using the name of a part of the Renaissance headgear denoted by the term *chaperon*, the scarf (*tippet*), rather than the traditional hood or cap. This metonymic descriptor is not capitalized in the text in line with the 1697 edition, which does not identify "le petit chaperon rouge" as a proper name. The title "Sleeping Beauty"/"La Belle au bois dormant" becomes "The Beauty in the Slumbering Woodland," a translation that is grammatically closer to the French while also restoring agency to the heroine as an active figure by removing sleep as a defining characteristic. The most dramatic change sees Cinderella/Cendrillon renamed Ashkins, a diminutive derived from a play on the words "ash" and "ass" in place of the French *cendre* and *cul*, which sees the crude nickname of *Cucendron* translated as "Ashwipe," a choice that illustrates the cruelty of the insult for a modern audience. While both ash and cinder are synonyms in English, the change to Cendrillon's anglophone nomenclature is a striking example of Jones's intent to allow readers to see Perrault's tales with fresh eyes by "shak[ing] them loose from inherited patterns" (87).

These lively, readable translations speak to the success of Jones's mission. Her versions of Perrault's tales evoke the playful and innovative aesthetic that Perrault used to comment on the power dynamics of life in the court of Louis XIV. They emphasize the wry humour and irony in stories that Jones argues ought to be read as a guide to negotiating the politics of courtly life and seventeenth-century courtship rituals rather than as didactic tales for children. This interpretation of Perrault's authorial intent problematizes the long-standing association between his tales and the nursery rhyme figure of Mother Goose. In the first part of the introduction, Jones reintroduces Princess Elisabeth Charlotte de Bourbon d'Orléans, the collection's dedicatee and Louis XIV's niece, as a figure deserving of equal billing to Mother Goose in the framing of *Histoires ou Contes* as a composite of oral and literary poetics. Jones reads the dedication addressed to the princess by Perrault's son, Pierre Darmancour, a text often omitted from modern editions, as an invitation to readers to look beyond the surface of the simple plots and engage with the subtleties of their deeper meanings. The subsequent sections of the introduction, which examine Cinderella's reception in North America and Perrault's literary biography as a modern author and court historiographer, further develop Jones's contention that proper attention to the cultural context calls us to "read the tales against themselves" (43). The section following the introduction, "Notes on Editions, Translations, and Interpretations," shows how the hegemonic modern interpretation of the Mother Goose tales has been shaped by decisions made by its many publishers and translators.

In restoring the historical context of Perrault's plots and language, *Mother Goose Refigured* makes a significant contribution to the project of, to use Jack Zipes's term, fairy tale "de-Disneyfication." But Jones's text wears its history lightly. The morals rendered in verse illustrate the humour and irony of Perrault's ambiguous conclusions, and the annotations to the text provide insight into the challenges of translation and the thoughtful nature of Jones's editorial choices. This collection also reinstates other elements of the 1697 edition, including the dedication to Princess Elisabeth Charlotte and the original tale order. Moreover, Jones foregrounds the volume as the product of its own time in a discussion of translation methodology that is valuable to fairy tale and translation scholars alike. For this reader, the only thing missing is a bibliography of the secondary sources cited in the notes, but if this was omitted for the sake of the excellent annotated bibliography of the translation and publication history of the *Histoires ou Contes*, it was a worthy sacrifice.

From the striking cover art to the contemporary prose of the translated tales, *Mother Goose Refigured* challenges anachronistic readings of Perrault's fairy tales as childish stories and reinvigorates them for twenty-first-century readers. Jones has produced a critical edition that is likely to become a classic reference for fairy tale scholars and readers.

Bronwyn Reddan is the author of *Love, Power, and Gender in Seventeenth-Century French Fairy Tales* (University of Nebraska Press, 2020).

The Fortunate Foundlings by Eliza Haywood, ed. Carol Stewart

MHRA, 2018. 280pp. €13.99. ISBN 978-1-781882-67-2.

Review by Matthew J. Rigilano, Penn State Abington

The plot of *The Fortunate Foundlings* begins in 1688, and the majority of the action occurs in the first decade of the 1700s. Contemporary readers of this novel published in 1744 were encouraged to connect the surge in Jacobite energy in the 1740s to the uprisings earlier in the century. I imagine this juxtaposition produced an uncanny sensation in readers, as these parallel but distinct potentials came in and out of focus. I would suggest that today's first-time readers of Eliza Haywood's narrative might expect to experience something similar: the novel, like a political event, arrives as something new, and yet is coloured by the vicissitudes of history. It evokes the romance of *Love in Excess* (1719), the intrigue of *Fantomina* (1725), and the epic scope of *The Adventures of Eovaai* (1736)—all well-known Haywood texts with recent critical editions. But it also relies, somewhat uncharacteristically, on the reformist ideology of Samuel Richardson, whose *Pamela* (1740) had made a recent splash, and it features a foundling plot made famous five years later by Henry Fielding in *Tom Jones* (1749). In short, there is something strangely familiar about the novel, even as it pursues its own singular path.

The Fortunate Foundlings tells the story of Louisa and Horatio, twins abandoned on the estate of Dorilaus, who generously provides for and educates them in aristocratic fashion. Horatio decides to seek glory in the British army overseas. Despite his role as fatherly benefactor, Dorilaus falls in love with Louisa and makes an attempt on her virtue, forcing her to flee. Louisa becomes Melanthe's companion on a Grand Tour of the continent, and Horatio, after being captured by the French, ends up serving as a gentleman of the bedchamber to the Old Pretender in exile. In Venice, Louisa falls in love with the gallant M. du Plessis, who will eventually fend off her would-be ravisher, Bellfleur. Horatio falls in love with Charlotta, a maid of honour to the French princess. Charlotta's father disapproves of the match, so Horatio joins the military campaign of Swedish King Charles XII. Louisa takes refuge from the predatory world in a convent while du Plessis is away at war. Dorilaus discovers that he is the twins' real father and seeks to reunite with them. Louisa escapes the convent, and Horatio, who was languishing in a St. Petersburg prison, is eventually released. Their two marriages take place on the same day.

Given the relatively dense historical context, Carol Stewart's new edition is of exceptional value. The volume is consistently and expertly footnoted. Historical personages are briefly identified, and likely references are offered. More importantly, Stewart's introduction provides a brief but clear historical summary, a useful contextualization of the text in Haywood's oeuvre, and a thoughtful analysis of the novel's key features. The political and military history of this period is complex and likely unfamiliar to many readers who would not be expecting such an elaborately drawn back-drop. Even with Stewart's helpful guidance, some readers might need to consult sources on the Great Northern War, the War of Spanish Succession, and the history of Jacobite uprisings. Stewart's perspicacious analysis explains connections between Haywood's aesthetic, moral, and political choices. For example, Stewart shows how the novel's continental setting suits Haywood's distinctly French romance ideology, which adheres to strict codes of courtship that tend toward empowering women, and thus forces a comparison with the Whig tradition of domestic conjugality that was dominant in England. This ideology is, however, in tension with the novel's decidedly moralizing tone and its conspicuous absence of overtly erotic scenes. The introduction concludes by identifying Haywood's clear Jacobite sympathies in *The Fortunate Foundlings*, as evidenced in her heroic characterizations of the Stuart heirs and the Swedish king, who was thought of as a Jacobite ally.

Like many novels of this period, *The Fortunate Foundlings* is primarily driven by the conflict between merit and providence, between virtue and unaccountable chance. At every turn, the siblings demonstrate their unwavering moral principles in the face of persecution or temptation. Yet the action of the novel is often propelled by the whims of fortune: discoveries are made “by the strangest accident that perhaps ever was,” fortunes are “precarious,” fates are “cruelly capricious,” and all events seem decided by “that fickle goddess,” fortune (101, 107, 138, 204). This tension is synthesized in the moral takeaway provided by the narrator in the final paragraph: “By these examples may we learn, that to sustain with fortitude and patience whatever ills we are preordained to suffer, entitles us to relief, while by impatient struggling we should but augment the score, and provoke fate to shew us the vanity of all attempts to frustrate its decrees” (236). Indeed, Horatio and Louisa do suffer their misfortune patiently throughout and are rewarded with substantial relief by the conclusion. But we might rephrase the maxim in more paradoxical terms: through merit and virtue we can retroactively convert accident into providential necessity. Deprived of a title or name, the luckless foundlings must, through their own deeds, earn the title that they eventually discover was theirs all along. Well, almost: the children were conceived illegitimately, and Dorilaus, while rich, is not in possession of his ancestral title. The basic ideological compromise is common enough in the eighteenth-century novel—as writers negotiate between middle-class and aristocratic ideals—but, in Haywood’s text, this compromise takes on political overtones: Will the Stuart line be restored? How? Through an accident of history or through necessity? Will the present moment succeed where the earlier event failed? This edition of the novel will be of enormous value to scholars pursuing these sorts of questions.

While *The Fortunate Foundlings* does not centrally feature any actual historical figures, it certainly should be considered an early species of historical fiction. It might seem far removed from that much more famous novel interested in Jacobitism, Walter Scott’s *Waverley* (1814), but Haywood’s text is, in its own way, an experiment in historical thinking, a way of processing historical desires in fiction. Stewart includes in this edition Haywood’s *A Letter from H—— G——g, Esq.* (1750), a fabricated report of Prince Charles Edward Stuart’s departure from France after the Treaty of Aix-la-Chappelle. The pamphlet’s epigraph is from Juvenal: *Victrix fortunæ sapientia* (Wisdom is the conqueror of fortune). Will the wisdom of the exiled prince conquer his royal family’s misfortune? Haywood is ambiguous on this point, but it is precisely this ambiguity that provides her fiction with a certain interpretative openness and the reader with the conviction that perhaps, in the end, it is to fiction itself that Haywood pledges her allegiance. This volume presents a new and fascinating glimpse into Haywood's political imagination. It is a further testament to Haywood's status as a key figure in the history of the novel—and of the novel of history.

Matthew J. Rigilano is an Assistant Teaching Professor of English at Penn State Abington.

Fiction without Humanity: Person, Animal, Thing in Early Enlightenment Literature and Culture by Lynn Festa

University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019. 350pp. $69.95. ISBN 978-0812251319.

Review by James P. Carson, Kenyon College

Fiction without Humanity is a dauntingly learned book, in which Lynn Festa deploys and contributes to such diverse fields as thing theory, animal studies, art history, the history of science, folklore, rhetoric and grammar, and Peircean semiotics. Festa has two main aims: (1) a literary historical aim of redefining the early novel in relation to non-mimetic genres with impersonal narrators and (2) a philosophical and theoretical aim of tracing "the emergence of humanity" as a socio-political category (4). Festa finds continuity between minor genres and the novel, arguing that riddles and it-narratives permit "a third-person entity" to present itself in first-person narrative (164). If "the riddle offers an anthropomorphizing narrative without a human to anchor it" (138), so the novel (in a phrase borrowed from Virginia Woolf's *The Waves*) "strives to 'describe the world seen without a self'" (252). Festa participates in a revised account of the rise of the novel in which individuality, interiority, "psychological depth," and "continuous action" are de-emphasized in favour of flat, minor, even non-human characters, and episodic structures (138). She situates the book within "the body of recent work that has questioned the nature of the individual whose emergence has been so central to eighteenth-century literary history" (3).

The paradox Festa explores is that "discourses of inalienable human rights and humanitarian sensibility" (3) arose in the Enlightenment even though at that time the boundaries of the human were profoundly uncertain. The *human* was not "a known quantity" anterior to artistic and literary representation but rather something—intertwined with animal and thing—that needed "to be defined and produced through literature and works of art" (1). This intertwining means that the human is constituted not through opposition, but through relationships with animals and things. Festa does not conflate human, animal, and thing but maintains that the blurring of boundaries precipitates an anxiety for the definition of categories. The book focuses not on how humanity is defined thematically and formally but rather on how it is constituted performatively: "Writers and artists *produce* humanity by requiring their readers or beholders to enact qualities that define them as such" (6). This performative constituting of the human results in what Festa terms a "'processual' model of humanity" as opposed to a "fixed" template of humanity based on an essence or the possession of specific traits (31). Festa clarifies this processual model when she considers whether Robert Hooke's prosthetic enhancement of the sense of sight by means of the microscope counts as a restoration of the prelapsarian faculties of Adam or as a future-oriented perfectibility of human capacities. Hooke's model of humanity is grounded not in essence but in function, "not in a master template that delimits what humanity *is*, but in a historical anthropology that involves the progressive transformation of the capacities of the species—what humanity *can do*" (106). Festa believes that this alternative model of humanity would address many of the critiques of human rights. The uncertain boundaries of the human imply the extension of community, of rights, and of the ethical realm beyond an illegitimately universalized definition of *man*—indeed, beyond the human species. Festa aims "to provide the formal means to imagine the activity and interests of the nonhuman as a constitutive part of humanity" (39). Ethics in connection with the non-human surface briefly when Festa claims that animal fables explore "the boundaries of the ethical community," imagining obligations beyond our own kind, toward a living being "not already established as our neighbor" (195). In a book concerned with rights, Festa, however, de-emphasizes animal rights. Apart from a passing reference to Hooke's "ghastly vivisection experiments" (114), she ignores the history of animal experimentation.

Like other scholars in animal studies, Festa dismisses the long list of properties that define humanity and affirm human exceptionalism. However, she identifies several capacities that early Enlightenment authors regarded as uniquely human, even if today we see these differentiae and the concept of humanity as fictions. For example, for John Locke, the capacity to abstract and the possession of general ideas distinguish human from beast. Hence, the undefinable abstraction whose history Festa traces paradoxically reveals the essence of the human: "The very ability to conceive of 'humanity' is a token of being human" (25). Or, in the chapter on Hooke's microscope, humanity may be defined by a lack that must be compensated for by education, by clothing obtained from other animals, and by prosthetic devices to enhance deficient senses and powers of mobility (a theme Laurie Shannon analyzes in her 2013 book, *The Accommodated Animal: Cosmopolity in Shakespearean Locales*). Two other capacities—the ability to recognize and to be absorbed by fiction and the "capacity to apprehend the world from a point of view not our own" (13)—lie at the heart of Festa's argument. Humans are the animals capable of appreciating made-up stories. Humans are the animals who are capable of imaginative sympathy, who possess a theory of mind that they extend beyond their own species, or who arrive at self-knowledge through the anthropomorphizing of other creatures and things.

Art and literature for Festa do not mimetically reflect society or history but instead help to constitute cultural institutions and political concepts. Such a constitutive function holds out the possibility of beneficial social change. Thus, Festa suggests that the "utopian element" in her book resides in her identification of "the potential ... in art and literature—the humanities—to (re)shape our understanding of the human" (38). She makes the counter-intuitive claim that the "lofty abstraction" *humanity* comes to be defined through low genres and forms: "the riddle, the fable, the still life, the trompe l'oeil, the experiment, and the novel" (9). But is there an overly great disjunction in discursive register between low genres like the riddle and the high theoretical field of human rights in the work of Étienne Balibar, Reinhart Koselleck, and Jacques Rancière? Festa herself seems to fear that there is when she advises those "principally interested in the eighteenth-century contexts" to skip the final eight pages of her introduction (31). In this book and elsewhere, Festa makes valuable contributions to both eighteenth-century literary history and human rights discourse. However, the problem of dual audiences is more acute with those inclined to skip 250 pages rather than 8. A similarly disjunctive moment occurs when Festa turns from the crushing of the flea in the fable "The Man and the Flea" to a pun on Giorgio Agamben's *homo sacer*—"a kind of *pulex sacer*" (201)—and to Judith Butler's concept of "grievable life." Festa seeks to obviate the objection that she grants excessive significance to the trivial: "All this may seem to drop a portentous load on the back of a tiny flea" (202). Can Festa persuade contemporary theorists of the importance of the fable, rebus, riddle, or trompe l'oeil—even if her interpretations of trompe l'oeil paintings brilliantly reveal the absence of a "human point of view" (76); even if her reading of Swift's riddles makes these little-known poems more complex and teachable than Swift's frequently anthologized descriptive poems and scatological verse?

James P. Carson, the author of *Populism, Gender, and Sympathy in the Romantic Novel* (2010), teaches at Kenyon College. His current scholarship deals with animals in the Romantic period.

Eighteenth-Century Manners of Reading: Print Culture and Popular Instruction in the Anglophone Atlantic World by Eve Tavor Bannet

Cambridge University Press, 2017. 306pp. £75. ISBN 978-1108419109.

Review by James Raven, University of Cambridge

We are fortunate in having several distinguished studies of eighteenth-century reading which, in various ways, pursue reading practices (and their representation) as complex interactions between texts and their perusal: that is, between the intellectual *and* material forms of texts and their reception according to the abilities, preferences, and motivations of different readers (or, indeed, of the same readers on different occasions). What this stimulating and finely researched book does, however, is to extend our understanding of the ways in which reading was taught in eighteenth-century Britain and the British Americas, and what, as a result, were common—and elite—expectations of reading procedures and consequences. In five illuminating and subtle chapters, Eve Tavor Bannet recovers six differently defined (but fascinatingly interdependent) "manners" of reading, greatly refining our understanding of prevailing reading perceptions, prescriptions, and presumptions. She convincingly presents these manners of reading as multiple strategies effectively to connect and reassociate the separateness (or, as she puts it, discontinuities and disconnections) of myriad texts, words, and letters.

Together, the chapters remind us of how self-reflective reading was and how self-conscious were readers, their auditors, and those writing to be read in particular ways. Ang Lee and Emma Thompson's 1995 film of *Sense and Sensibility* strikingly offered modern audiences a reminder of Edward Ferrars's performative failure to live up to Marianne's expectations of romantic reading (to Elinor's disguised amusement), as well as Marianne's contrasting reception (post-Willoughby) of the sensitive reading of an otherwise apparently unromantic Colonel Brandon. Bannet presents an extensive history of how families like the Austens came to understand what reading was and might be for, and how Austen's readers, after a century of accumulated reading instruction and discussion, might have interpreted her passages about reading and readings (and many others like them in many different texts).

Despite being downplayed in the introductory section to this book, religious and clerical reading, pulpit oratory, and associated reading and auditory skills are given very welcome attention. But in exploring the many different practices and techniques involved in reading, Bannet also ranges across practices based on grammar and comprehension, oral performance and its discussion, advanced study methods (both learned and neo-classical), material selection and attempts to counter discontinuous reading, and instruction in concealing or negotiating subversive meanings. She is particularly illuminating on the approaches taken to segmentary and fragmentary reading, and on the intervention of editors and material producers (despite confusion between printers and publishers without presses of their own [26]). The breadth of her treatment makes discussion of novel reading all the more fascinating, even though this reader did yearn—perhaps unreasonably—for greater attention to the advance of the epistolary novel. In novels written in series of letters, fragmentation and segmentation by both writer and reader are to the fore, and the voicing—the impersonation—of the different correspondents presented opportunities and challenges to any affective reading performance.

"Print culture" is a problematic term and one, I have argued, that should be avoided, or at least not bandied about without careful consideration of what exactly is meant. Without precise definition, "print culture" is not only lazily elusive but misleading. To have it in a book title might therefore be a particular hostage to fortune. This study, however, offers a rare, triumphant justification of the use of the term "print culture" by exploring exactly what a culture of print might be to its eighteenth-century participants engaged in instruction about and the practice of reading printed matter. In so doing, of course, the book invites further thought about comparative reading of manuscripts and written letters. Future dialogue between Bannet and Susan E. Whyman (author of *The Pen and the People: English Letter Writers, 1660–1800* [2009]) would be very instructive.

Exactly because this is a book about reading practice and guidance, the reader is inevitably drawn to the presentation of its text. It is a beautifully produced book with handsome type and layout that makes it a pleasure to read. Equally, however, the standard of proofreading and copy-editing becomes all the more apparent—and it is lamentable. The author cannot escape all responsibility, of course, but Bannet is a remarkably productive scholar who is therefore more than normally worthy of professional support from her publisher. Her press editor, Linda Bree, who has so brilliantly championed eighteenth-century studies during her career, also deserves better. How can it be, for example, that two of our most distinguished contributors to the history of publishing and reading are misspelled throughout the main text, notes, index, and bibliography as "Adrian John," and, more extraordinarily perhaps, "Alberto Mangel"? We also encounter "Michel Cohen" among others who might be a bit cross. Of primary authors and materials, Bubb Dodington is variously spelled (even on the same page), and we read of Malachy "Postlewayt" (*thw*arting a consonantal challenge for vocal readers). La Bruyère is deprived of his *grave* cadence (among other accent omissions) and "Sallus" appears among classical writers. Given digitization, it does not take many minutes to verify references. The full context of the Lewis Maidwell quotation, for example, is fascinating—once found. A proofreader or copy editor checking the (prefatory) section and page reference would have helped this reader. Paul Langford's observations about the extension of manners to "innkeepers and boots" puzzles. And how, when reaching the section "Reading Novels," does the reader (particularly on the British side of the Atlantic) voice "*Adventurer* #4" or "*Rambler* #4"? CUP: *caveant auctor et lector*.

Perhaps there is room for further thought here. The reading of this finely modulated and engrossing book, with its elegant typeface and setting, was interrupted, for this pedantically academic reader, by its small but irritating spelling errors. Is there more to say about eighteenth-century frustrations in reading? We have surviving dyspeptic letters by authors to printers and publishing booksellers, and further letters from booksellers to printers complaining of poor-quality work. The book also invites at least one further consideration. One of its obvious strengths is its insistence on the "Anglophone" world. All chapters benefit from the inclusion of North American reception (usually of London products) and publication. It makes us ready for more ambitious comparisons—French and German especially.

James Raven FBA is a Fellow of Magdalene College, University of Cambridge, and Professor Emeritus of Modern History, University of Essex. His most recent book is *What Is the History of the Book?* (2018). His edited *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Book* was published in August 2020. A book on the history of the novel in the eighteenth century is in progress.