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When I wrote this review in 1991, I celebrated “our period’s traditional strengths, great sophistication in historical analysis, and an often brilliant ability to locate and employ primary texts and raw data” and predicted a continuation of the growing sophistication in applying theoretical and methodological tools (SEL, 31, 3 [Summer 1991], 569–614, 605–6). These strengths persist, and the best work this year is also theoretically informed (even if the author denies it); contextually presented; rich in evidence, including archival; and committed to revisionary explications of texts.

The absorption of theory and especially the triumph of cultural studies in our field has complicated writing this review. I imagine the reviewer of thirty years ago, happily muttering, “not literature, not literature” and tossing aside books that seem unproblematic to literary specialists today. Certainly the interdisciplinary maturity in many books tests the reviewer in new ways, and I confess my comfort level and expertise varied as I read, for instance, Stefani Engelstein’s Anxious Anatomy: The Conception of the Human Form in Literary and Naturalist Discourse, Margaret R. Ewalt’s Peripheral Wonders: Nature, Knowledge, and Enlightenment in the Eighteenth-Century Orinoco, and David Mazella’s The Making

More than in 1991, however, I found shared themes, topics, approaches, and even texts, and, although it may frustrate the authors skimming for the few words devoted to their books, I have tried to foreground trends by bringing some of them together in more than one place.

Organizing this review is always a challenge, always artificial, and always personal. Mine begins with categories that seem to embody the way we practice lit. crit. today and then moves through categories designed to represent trends and comparative methodologies. Some of these categories are familiar (“Poetry”) and others contemporary necessities (“British Nations and the Global Eighteenth Century”). None are pure; for example, two books in “Poetry” could just as well be located in “British Nations.”

COLLECTIONS, COMPANIONS, GUIDES, AND ANNUALS

The collections received are wide-ranging, almost uniformly excellent, and current. Queer People: Negotiations and Expressions of Homosexuality, 1700–1800 edited by Chris Mounsey and Carolina Gonda, for instance, includes Thomas A. King’s “How (Not) to Queer Boswell,” a chapter in volume two of his Gendering of Men, 1600–1750 (reviewed later), and thirteen other essays. Attention to language is assumed, but unexpected is the revisionary work on women writers including Penelope Aubin, Frances Burney, Ann Yearsley, and Mary Leapor. This book, again like most of the collections, provides a good introduction to the state of the field and its issues and methodologies. Queer People sets its essays up as available tests of social constructionist and historical essentialist approaches, but most, like Bridget Keegan’s “Queer Labor,” draw freely from both. In singling out pastoral poetry as “where sexuality of any kind is most likely to be found in laboring-class poetry” (p. 211) and styling it a metaliterary mode, she finds “queer labor” expressing desires for both literary and sexual emancipation as she moves seamlessly between the material conditions in which the poets wrote and what might be taken as expressions of the internal.

As Queer People does, many collections center on topics characterized by debate, recent re-formulation, or cutting-edge methodologies. As Michèle Lamont points out in her recent How Professors Think: Inside the Curious World of Academic Judgment (Harvard, 2009), literary study has been significantly destabilized by interdisciplinarity, by suspicion regarding the printed and especially “canonical” text, and by theoretical movements such
as poststructuralism (pp. 70–9). She concludes that even people within English studies perceive the field as divided over such things as the value of theory and the significance of disciplinary boundaries. Collections overcome these divisions, bringing scholars together who are engaged with the same issues and providing a safe space for high-level debate. Many of the essays in *Refiguring the Coquette: Essays on Culture and Coquetry*, edited by Shelley King and Yael Schlick, are about performativity, privilege, and abuses that masquerade as kinds of power. The essays discuss in various ways the coquette as a site for moral commentary, for understanding emerging consumer culture, and for gender constructs. They demonstrate that the term was used in different ways and the people who practiced or represented coquetry had a variety of motives; regardless of the differences, they agree that the coquette was a powerful gendering force for both sexes. *Beyond Douglass: New Perspectives on Early African-American Literature*, edited by Michael J. Drexler and Ed White, assembles essays on recently discovered texts to argue that there is a newly established African-American canon that is premature both in its content and the methodologies it enshrines. Essays such as Phillip M. Richards’s “Anglo-American Continuities of Civic and Religious Thought in the Institutional World of Early Black Writing” with their striking quotations argue that setting these powerful exhortations and memoirs beside the Federalist papers and the writings of Edmund Burke, Adam Smith, and Thomas Paine would create a fuller picture of the long arc of Enlightenment and Revolutionary thought. The impact of these writers on the Abolition movement is unknown in spite of the fact that African-Americans such as John Marrant spoke to large audiences in England. Incidentally, he left a memoir that includes an account of his captivity by Native Americans within a spiritual autobiography. One of the most arresting suggestions is that these documents be studied as part of a contemporary panorama of styles of manhood appropriate for the times (p. 74), and certainly the fact that these writers were participating in public debate all over North America (Canada figures large), Great Britain, the West Indies, and Africa challenges rigid categories of national literatures.

The concept of “public sphere” is another topic being actively critiqued, redefined, and adapted, and the collections of essays suggest that some paths of inquiry are too well trod and others ripe for new explorations. In the first section of *Literary and Cultural Intersections during the Long Eighteenth Century*, edited by Marianna D’Ezio, the contributors illustrate the usefulness
of recognizing blurred boundaries in essays on texts such as *Tom Jones* and *The Female Quixote*. The last essays depart from the public and private and in very conventional ways discuss "intersections" in, for instance, James Thomson’s *The Seasons* (Winter, 1726) and William Hinchliff’s *The Seasons* (1718). *Everyday Revolutions: Eighteenth-Century Women Transforming Public and Private*, edited by Diane E. Boyd and Marta Kvande, makes special contributions to our understanding of women's work as always complicated by its liminal status vis-à-vis the public and private. Both collections foreground intersections and permeable borders, while *The Culture of the Gift in Eighteenth-Century England*, edited by Linda Zionkowski and Cynthia Klekar, draws out the complexities of public gestures, especially those born in the private. The introduction acknowledges theories of benevolence and the controversies that arose in the eighteenth century regarding appropriate recipients, and the first three essays explain these issues. The rest of the essays use specific cases to illustrate anxieties, subtexts, and consequences. For instance, treating education of the poor as a gift, Dorice Elliott brings to the fore Sarah Trimmer’s and her contemporaries’ fears about the poor’s possibly ungrateful—even rebellious—use of the gift. Robert Markley’s fascinating “Anson at Canton, 1743” is a timely preview of his in-progress book on European-Asian relations in the second half of the century. One wonders, however, if his essay, the inclusion of Thomas A. King’s essay in *Queer People*, or Kristina Straub’s “The Making of an English Audience: The Case of the Footmen’s Gallery” in *The Cambridge Companion to British Theatre* will lead to sales of *The Gendering of Men* and Straub’s *Domestic Affairs* or if collections are responses to print overload and will begin to serve as scholarly *Readers’ Digest Condensed Books* that foster the illusion that we know all we need to from the essays.

Some of the collections bring together specialists in unusual topics. *Science and Spectacle in the European Enlightenment*, edited by Bernadette-Vincent Bensaude and Christine Blondel, is about public demonstrations of science in a time when there were competitions to invent scientific instruments and public participation in amateur science was widespread. Revising the literary criteria “instruct and delight” into “entertainment and utility,” this international group of contributors mix lively descriptions of experiments and audience responses with sound accounts of shops, labs, exhibition halls, and the rise of academic scientific education. The circulation of scientific ideas depended upon the-
metrics and, in many cases, commercial motives. Ordinary people liked to participate—to feel electricity or operate flax beaters.

Roger L’Estrange and the Making of Restoration Culture, edited by Anne Dunan-Page and Beth Lynch, is overdue. L’Estrange was an important figure who left a lasting imprint on the political and literary worlds, and yet he is seldom studied. These essays give a good introduction to the kinds of things he contributed, and the annotated bibliography prepared by Geoff Kemp is an eye-opener. Another collection that brings a particular kind of specialist together is The Age of Projects, a collection of essays from Clark Library lectures edited by Maximillian Novak. Only one essay, Kimberly Latta’s “Wandering Ghosts of Trade Whimsies”: Projects, Gender, Commerce, and Imagination in the Mind of Daniel Defoe,” is on Novak’s favorite projector, for the collection stretches the identity of projectors, and there are essays on science, the Enlightenment, the “project” of preserving the past, political economy, the dreams for Westminster Bridge, and even “Living Forever in Early Modern Europe: Sir Francis Bacon and the Project for Immortality” (by David Haycock). Because of its title and miscellaneous nature, it is likely to be overlooked, and it should not be.

Companions flow from Cambridge University Press, and a variety of other guides to scholarship join them. The Cambridge Companion to Daniel Defoe edited by John Richetti has essays by well-known scholars on topics that reflect their strengths. No one writes better about the Tour thro’ the Whole Island of Great Britain than Pat Rogers; Srinivas Aravamudan is a sure elucidator of “Defoe, Commerce, and Empire”: “Defoe and London” by Cynthia Wall has insightful sections on “the prosperous city” and “the dangerous city,” and Deirdre Lynch builds on her Economy of Character: Novels, Market Culture, and the Business of Inner Meaning (1998) with “Money and Character in Defoe’s Fiction.” This volume is unusual in that it considers Defoe’s poetry carefully; not only does Paul Hunter contribute an entire essay on it but John McVeagh works extensively with it, and other contributors, including myself, draw important evidence from it. Palgrave Macmillan’s Daniel Defoe: “Robinson Crusoe” / “Moll Flanders,” edited by Paul Baines, is styled as “A Reader’s Guide to Essential Criticism,” and Baines has read carefully. He writes with personality and independence. About one of the simmering controversies, he writes, “The psychoanalytic interpretation of Defoe’s life and works by Leo Abse, and John Martin’s shock-horror detection of Defoe’s bizarre sex life as (supposedly) allegorised by the novels,
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seem unlikely to disturb the monolith unduly” (p. 127). Any outsider critic has experienced the monolithic Defoe, Henry Fielding, and Dr. Johnson mafias, and it does take a lot to disturb them. Controversies seem to cross the ocean from Great Britain, which, after all, bred Defoe in almost every sense of the word. I still get harassing mail about Alexander Selkirk and his goats (my hobby horse is Robert Knox’s *History of Ceylon*, but no one notices), and the canon controversy came from those distinguished John Bunyan (W. R. Owen) and E. M. Forster (P. N. Furbank) interlopers from across the water. Baines says calmly that their work “substantially refocused the Defoe canon” and that much of what they de-attributed “was fairly peripheral in the first place.” Baines is right; just use another text by Defoe on the same topic if there are reservations about authorship. Baines also recognizes some excellent critics, such as Ian Bell and Lois Chaber, but the attention to the “monolith” sometimes squeezes out important work, such as Sandra Sherman’s. Both of these books have wretched indices, and Baines’s has no bibliography. As good as these companions are, the exciting event in Defoe criticism is how his work is being integrated into large, ambitious studies (see later). Twenty years ago, famous men told me they were afraid of Defoe; perhaps the whittling of the canon did “refocus” Defoe studies by making him seem manageable.

Brian Corman’s *Women Novelists before Jane Austen: The Critics and Their Canons* is a valuable book that surveys historical accounts of the novel. He begins with some brief passages from the eighteenth century, proceeds through the familiar (of Ernest Baker’s ten-volume history: “Embedded in it are most of the objections . . . to women novelists” [p. 214]) and the forgotten (of B. G. MacCarthy’s two-volume history: “the most comprehensive and important study of women novelists in this period—and in my [Corman’s] study” [p. 227]). He ends with Ian Watt’s *Rise of the Novel* and Alan D. McKillop’s *Early Masters of English Fiction*. He describes, discusses, and quotes each. This is one of those books whose value is much greater than the appreciation he will get, and that is too bad.

Nearly forty years ago, the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies (ASECS) established the annual *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, now edited by Linda Zionkowski and Downing A. Thomas. Then advertised as representing the best papers from the national and regional conferences, the series editors now demand carefully revised contributions and usually organize the volume into coherent themes. The essays in volume
37 (2008), as the editors say, “share a common concern with investigating Enlightenment categories of historical understanding and determining how these categories helped shape Enlightenment culture” (p. vii). The interdisciplinary strength of ASECS is on full display, as the British, French, Spanish, Native Americans, and African-Americans are featured in essays on subjects ranging from theology to history, education, print culture, and sociology. The editors pay tribute to the two-hundredth anniversary of the abolition of the slave trade and the election of Barack Obama by opening volume 38 with papers from “Colloquy with the Author: Vincent Carretta and Equiano, the African.” There are groups of essays on the arts (strolling players, costumes, waltzing), neglected women (Anna Laetitia Barbauld and Elizabeth Thomas), and canonical literature (Sir Charles Grandison, Wealth of Nations). Lumen: Selected Proceedings from the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies is the less well-known Canadian series and prints consistently learned, high-quality work. This year’s edition, volume 26 for 2007, edited by Marc André Bernier and Suzanne Foisy, features the papers from the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies meeting held in Québec in 2005, and all but four of the fifteen essays are in French. Bernard Andrès’ “L’invention du XVIIIe siècle canadien” is original and entertaining, and Katherine M. Quinsey’s “Nature, Gender, and Genre in Anne Finch’s Poetry: ‘A Nocturnal Reverie’” is a careful, revisionary, eco-feminist piece that relocates this important and much-anthologized poem as transcending “the trajectory from seventeenth-century to Romanticism.” Compared to those from the United States, the Canadian essays seem more leisurely, more detailed, and more committed to teasing out nuances and unusual connections. Because of the greater lag to publication, however, the scholarship is not as current. Compared to the detail, scope, and scholarly contributions of these essays, this is a quibble.

Sometime after taking over the distinguished Philological Quarterly bibliography, AMS began annuals, including The Age of Johnson, now edited by Jack Lynch: 1650–1850: Ideas, Aesthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era; Eighteenth-Century Women: Studies in Their Lives, Work, and Culture, edited by Linda Veronica Troost; and, unrepresented in the books sent to me, The Eighteenth-Century Novel. Like those in Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture, these essays, which range from the slight to the importantly revisionary, can be hard to find, as they are unevenly included in online bibliographies. These volumes often show the editor’s preferences, and the essays tend to be lighter than journal
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articles. 1650–1850, edited by Kevin L. Cope, often has essays on science, philosophy, rhetoric, and male authors on the order of Joseph Warton and Andrew Marvell. It carries a large number of well-written, somewhat out-of-date book reviews, as does The Age of Johnson (most reviews are of books published in 2005–06). Troost uses the Editor’s Preface to Eighteenth-Century Women for a tribute to the late Betty Rizzo who published the first part of her edition of Frances Greville’s letters in the journal. The first essay, Haskell Hinnant’s “If Folly Grows Romantic: Allegorical Portraiture and the Restoration Court Beauty,” relates the portraits of Barbara Villiers, King Charles II’s “chief mistress,” and Frances Stuart, who was pursued unsuccessfully by the king, to the immediate political, social, and personal situations in which they were produced. Noting both the nationalities of the painters and the English tendency to read rival ideologies into representations, Hinnant brings to our attention the seldom-noticed meaning of details in allegorical paintings. The Age of Johnson is dedicated to the late Paul Korshin, the founding editor of the journal. The essays are by Paul’s friends, colleagues, and former students, and there are also tributary recollections that bring him back to life. Some of the essays have an amusing, informal style, as Howard Weinbrot’s does with its collection of anecdotes about awkward meetings with royalty. Weinbrot’s deep learning and life-long engagement with Johnson animates a conclusion that encapsulates the qualities Johnson exhibited in his meetings with George III and in life: “There must be presence of mind, and a resolution that is not to be overcome by failures” (“Meeting the Monarch: Johnson, Boswell, and the Anatomy of a Genre,” p. 145). “Great Man” projects are unfortunately prone to insularity, and the essays in Age of Johnson are no exception. James Gray, for instance, writes on David Garrick and Denis Diderot without incorporating any of the evidence and analysis in Joseph Roach’s The Player’s Passion (1993), and Lisa Berglund’s “Hester Lynch Piozzi’s Anecdotes versus the Editors” ignores almost all recent scholarship.

EDITIONS

One of the best guides to where the discipline is today is in editions. The most impressive is a beautiful edition of the 1797 English translation of Emer de Vattel’s The Law of Nations, or Principles of the Law of Nature, Applied to the Conduct and Affairs of Nations and Sovereigns; it is the first publication in the Liberty
Fund series, Natural Law and Enlightenment Classics. A beautiful book with and without the cover, it has generous margins, a ribbon page marker that harmonizes with the cover, and sells for only $20.00. *The Law of Nations* was a monumental contribution to international law and to political economy. Vattel developed a theory of the cultural, political, and economic conditions necessary for a viable system of international justice, and his principles of how civilized nations should conduct themselves toward other nations and their citizens provide essential contextualization for eighteenth-century thought. The decision to reprint the 1797 translation rather than provide a new one might be questioned, but it reads well, retains the section numbers and guides in the margins, has several kinds of notes as well as translations of Vattel’s Latin citations, and stands up well to the new translations of three of Vattel’s essays that are included in the volume. The 1797 prose is true to Vattel’s highly reasoning and reasonable style and displays the best features of polished eighteenth-century prose. Here is an example from the section “Duties of a nation for the preservation of others”:

For the same reason, if a nation is afflicted with famine, all those who have provisions to spare ought to relieve her distress, without however exposing themselves to want. But if that nation is able to pay for the provisions thus furnished, it is perfectly lawful to sell them to her at a reasonable rate; for they are not bound to furnish her with what she is capable of procuring; and consequently there is no obligation of gratuitously bestowing on her such things as she is able to purchase.

(p. 263)

In contrast to *The Law of Nations*, the now familiar, black-spined Broadview paperback books, often with strange nineteenth-century cover illustrations on eighteenth-century books, seem what they are—serviceable. Priced at between $18.00 and $26.00, they are certainly affordable. Books in the University Press of Kentucky Eighteenth-Century Novels by Women series, priced the same, are slightly larger books with more generous margins, space at chapter breaks, and full collations of editions. Each published novels by Charlotte Lennox, *Sophia, Euphemia* (Broadview) and *Henrietta* (Kentucky), leaving only her *Eliza* unavailable in modern editions (the other novels are available from Oxford, Penguin, Kessinger, and Fairleigh Dickinson). Certainly scholarship
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and teaching have benefited immeasurably from the availability of these inexpensive, carefully edited books. Lennox’s *Female Quixote* has been taught since the 1970s, and these editions are overdue. The introduction to *Henrietta* (Kentucky) by Ruth Perry and Susan Carlile is concise and ranges authoritatively through the history of the novel as it provides essential biographical information and positions Lennox and her literary career. Oddly it omits mention of Eliza Haywood’s *Betsy Thoughtless* (1751) in discussion of this 1758 novel; the effect is to invoke the old canon of Fielding and Samuel Richardson without Haywood. The introduction to *Euphemia* is indicative of what I fear is a decline in the quality of Broadview introductions. By Susan Kubica Howard, it is somewhat rambling and disorganized and summarizes too much of the plot. The scholarship from which Howard draws varies from excellent to suspect, and “Works Cited” are mingled with “Recommended Reading” and inconveniently located at the back of the book. Howard argues that *Euphemia* is unusual because of its concentration on the experience of marriage, but the novel had increasingly moved from courtship to marriage before this as is evident in *Betsy Thoughtless*, Fielding’s *Amelia* (both 1751), and other novels.

In addition to its commitment to women’s texts, Broadview seems dedicated to publishing texts about diverse peoples. *Euphemia*, like Frances Brooke’s *History of Emily Montagu*, constructs trenchant accounts of the heroine’s encounters with other European settlers and Native Americans and adds African Americans. Like Defoe’s *Colonel Jack*, *The History of the Life and Adventures of Mr. Anderson* by Edward Kimber, edited by Matthew Mason and Nicholas Mason, is the story of a man kidnapped, taken to the American colonies, and forcefully indentured (enslaved). The novel’s forthright discussions of slavery, Native Americans, and life in the colonies complement and expand upon texts now receiving considerable attention. Other notable Broadview books for the year are Laura J. Rosenthal’s useful edition of five narratives, *Nightwalkers: Prostitute Narratives from the Eighteenth Century*, and Francis Coventry’s *The History of Pompey the Little; or, the Life and Adventures of a Lap-Dog*, edited by Nicholas Hudson. As Hudson says, the revisions of this story of a dog’s experiences with a variety of owners offers a complex social history and an example of an author courting different kinds of readers. It also anticipates the later outpouring of books advocating humane treatment of animals. The introduction is based on an outdated and incomplete history of the novel: it is not, for instance, as Hudson asserts,
“the first so-called ‘it-narrative’” (p. 10); there were many others stretching back well into the seventeenth century and including coin, corkscrew, and even insect narrators. The Broadview editions provide reliable texts, and the appendices increasingly supply useful, interesting contextual material. Rosenthal, for instance, provides a bibliography of prostitute narratives and Matthew and Nicholas Mason include maps and four thought-provoking appendices, including one on Kimber’s other writings on slavery and North America and another with selections by John Locke, Mary Barber, and others on “Slavery and Servitude.”

A new edition of British Literature, 1640–1789: An Anthology, edited by Robert DeMaria Jr., may be the best anthology on the market. Among the changes since the second edition are a rearrangement of authors to conform strictly to the birthdates of the writers, a chronology, a thematic table of contents, and some useful additions of texts. The anthology, unlike all others, makes clear how many excellent women writers there were and who their contemporaries were, thus illustrating the literary landscape on which both sexes worked. As with any anthology, some users will applaud or lament certain decisions, such as adding John Wilmot, second Earl of Rochester’s Ramble in St. James’s Park and Alexander Pope’s Eloisa to Abelard, always a student favorite, and omitting the selections by Charles I and Milton on “the calling in of the Scots,” readings out of the ordinary, illustrative of the inseparability of politics and literature in the period, and also fascinating to students. DeMaria has largely freed himself from the lamentable habit of trying to find poems that respond to each other, which is especially detrimental to women and lower-class poets. His selections for Lady Mary Wortley Montagu are fatally flawed by this tendency (why not Hymn to the Moon or Constantinople?), but for Finch, Leapor, and others he has brought together nicely representative selections of their poems. He has dared to replace the selection from Lucy Hutchinson’s Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson with two cantos from Order and Disorder, thereby making her a fine poet writing in a fashionable form rather than an appendage of her husband. For the next daring step taken, I would like to see The Way of the World replaced by Fielding’s Author’s Farce or Pasquin; after all he was the most original playwright of the century.

The essay was a major genre in the eighteenth century, and readers today enjoy the form, which dominates in magazines. In response to the neglect in research and teaching, G. Douglas Atkins has produced Reading Essays: An Invitation, a collection
of twenty-seven of his essays on essayists and the form. John Dryden, Pope, Jonathan Swift, and Johnson each have an essay, and the collection stretches from Michel de Montaigne and Francis Bacon through the twentieth century. As he goes, the book becomes more inclusive, as women and African-Americans are finally included. An interesting accompaniment is *The Great Age of the English Essay: An Anthology*, edited by Denise Gigante. The essays are carefully chosen and some of the groupings quite imaginative. For Joseph Addison’s contributions to the *Tatler*, she has several characters, Tom Folio, Ned Softly, the Upholsterer, and Nicholas Gimcrack (characterized by Addison’s fictional will for Thomas Shadwell’s famous character in *The Virtuoso*). She includes Johnson’s *Rambler* essay “On a Virtuoso” and a number of his essays on genres. In both, I would have liked to see some selections from Frances Brooke’s *Old Maid*.

Two rather different but strikingly adventurous anthologies round out the editions sent by publishers. *French Women Poets of Nine Centuries: The Distaff and the Pen*, selected and translated by Norman R. Shapiro, gives copy-texts of the poems in French facing the highly readable, metrically pleasing English translations. Shapiro calls himself a professional translator and is a member of the Academy of American Poets; the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century section of the book is introduced by the distinguished scholar Catherine Lafarge. Rich in fables, madrigals, and witty salon poems, this book contributes to our ability to understand cross-channel cross-fertilization but should not be taken to represent the kinds of poems women were writing. Alastair Fowler’s *New Oxford Book of Seventeenth-Century Verse* was originally published in 1991 and is unrevised; I had hoped for a new introduction commenting on the changes in poetry reading and study. The intelligence and even daring of his selections make this a valuable book for some of us but probably discourage course adoption. One of Nahum Tate’s attempts to demonstrate that the Psalms could be more musically rendered for singing, *While Shepherds Watched Their Flocks by Night*, Thomas D’Urfey’s wonderful *The Fisherman’s Song*, and Thomas Ken’s remarkable *A Morning Hymn*, one of the pre-Isaac Watts, ground-breaking hymns he wrote for Winchester College, are but three of the surprising, insightful selections. There is an unusual amount of theater verse; among the few selections for Dryden are prologues and excerpts from several plays, including *Mercury’s Song to Phaedra* from *Amphitryon*. Because of the nearly nonexistent notes, one would never know the significance of these selections, but if
people still read poetry for enjoyment, this would be a treasure for them.

INTELLECTUAL HISTORIES

As social historians and cultural studies specialists have demonstrated, once you study enough five-year periods closely you are ready to make revisionary observations about movements and change. The number of intellectual histories may be this year’s preeminent harbinger of the future. That they are published by presses not established as eighteenth-century powerhouses reinforces the sense that this is a movement. Mazella’s *The Making of Modern Cynicism* is an ambitious study stretching from Diogenes to modern politics. His engaging introduction sets the stage for a challenging examination of “cynicism” that embraces its contradictions and humankind’s ambivalences toward it. Christa Knellwolf King’s *Faustus and the Promises of the New Science, c. 1580–1730: From the Chapbooks to Harlequin Faustus* begins with the sixteenth-century figures who traveled Europe under the name of Faustus and the oral tales about them. She moves forward linking Faustus stories to the culture’s fascination with the borderline between the metaphysical and the secular. King uses Thomas Browne’s *Religio Medici*, which she describes as “the period’s most eloquent interrogation of a Christian believer’s approach to scientific investigations” (p. 23), as a foundational text, moves to Bernard de Fontenelle’s dialogue about the possibility of other worlds, and somewhat unsuccessfully concludes with Defoe’s *History of the Devil*, Shadwell’s *Virtuoso* (in which she compares Gimcrack to Faustus), and a group of other plays, including harlequin pantomimes. With these last texts, the lack of popular culture theory is crippling. Faustus began as folk culture, and the plays she uses are part of the birth of modern popular culture—art appealing across classes that exercises and then contains anxieties (Harlequin Faust does usually end up in hell).

The first chapter of Engelstein’s *Anxious Anatomy* begins, “The question of how living beings replicate themselves not only formed the most pressing issue for natural history in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, but captivated European culture at large” (p. 23). The human desire to “replicate themselves” unites three intellectual histories. This one, Jenny Davidson’s *Breeding: A Partial History of the Eighteenth Century*, and Lisa Zunshine’s *Strange Concepts and the Stories They Make Possible: Cognition, Culture, Narrative*. The tones and conceptual frameworks are very
different, however. Engelstein draws upon the developing disciplines of natural science (including philosophy), medical illustration, and aesthetics and traces the process that created the norm for the human form. Her method follows cultural studies practices based on Clifford Geertz’s thick description, especially those that use reinforcing discourses in literary and history of science studies, and she concentrates on a set of interwoven debates about “the creation, maintenance, and reproduction of the human form” (p. 9). She sees these debates united by theoretical problems that literary and naturalist writers throughout Europe debated and that resulted in the conception of the body as simultaneously animal, mechanical, and constitutive of the human itself. Davidson begins by pointing out that the word “breeding” elides the blood vs. education controversy, allowing listeners to pick their own proportions of nature-nurture, but also continues to encapsulate a continuing, passionate debate. In contrast to Engelstein’s careful argument, Davidson succeeds in making her “pages a sort of parliament, an auditorium in which the voices of actors in and commentators on the story of heredity in the eighteenth century can be heard” (pp. 7–8). Such a purpose obviously involves the same conception of reinforcing discourses from a variety of modern disciplines, and Davidson explains her method with references to Geertz, Raymond Williams, and Roland Barthes. Uninterested in the centrality of the “preformation” and “epigenesis” scientific debates that are prominent in Engelstein’s book, she speculates on Humphry Clinker as “Raymond Williams country.” Making their work complementary and doubly illuminating are, among others, the shared treatment of family resemblances, reproduction, mutilation and regeneration, Carl von Linné’s system, and even Johan Blumenback’s ideas on race. Zunshine is also interested in essence and function, parentage, cyborgs, human identity, and Frankenstein. In Strange Concepts, she argues that key concepts from cognitive science are translated into our thinking and bring apparent but often false clarity and sophistication. Using the developmental psychologist Susan A. Gelman’s work, she helpfully defines essentialism as a belief that human beings tend to apply to natural things rather than artifacts, which they identify by function. The implications she demonstrates include how important personal appearance is and how dissonant cognitive similarities and cultural differences can be perceived to be even as human beings cling to what they think the fixed properties are that define the “whatness” of a living being. Throughout the book she uses Dryden’s Sosia in Amphitryon as a touchstone, but it is telling that
the only other eighteenth-century example she uses is Barbauld’s *Hymns in Prose for Children*. In our period, even ordinary people were actively questioning what was natural and what “custom,” what the “essential” characteristics of men and women were, and had neither the experience with, for instance, reattaching severed human limbs or the modern cognitive evolutionary anthropology that we have. Engelstein’s and Davidson’s books are as important for today’s understanding of human nature and cultural conflict, but they are more consistently concerned with historical processes, social organizations, and ethical implications. For example, the final part of Engelstein’s book is “Legibility,” “the dangerous political potential of a teleology focused on the body’s surface characteristics” that are taken to give access to essential truths, and Davidson succeeds in illuminating inculturated attitudes toward heredity and human nature and why we cling to them, regardless of their social and even moral consequences.

Thomas A. King describes his *The Gendering of Men, 1600–1750. Volume 2: Queer Articulations* as an investigation of “the historical production of queer/male bodies,” the genealogy of bodily practices that have come to identify Anglo-American men as queer (pp. 7, 12). In a carefully crafted, dialectical introduction, he points out the limitations of approaches other than performance studies, which strives for an understanding of the *totality* of a performance, an analysis that includes competing and overlapping concerns. In each of his case studies, he creates a dynamic field based upon the play among residual, dominant, and even pre-emergent traces drawn from a wide variety of practices. Performance studies methodologies, especially those based in anthropology and Marxism, are productively expanded. For example, he schematizes print culture as Bruce McConachie did the historical relations of theatrical production (“Historicizing the Relations of Theatrical Production,” *Critical Theory and Performance*, ed. Janelle Reinelt and Roach, 1992). Aware, then, of both as social practices, he shows how writing, producing, distributing, consuming, and interpreting texts appear to overwrite differences such as class even as they actually interpelle differential identities. This method generates productive questions such as “How is any one performance simultaneously located in multiple social spaces?” (p. 22). Using literary, popular, legal, graphic, and especially theatrical documents, he demonstrates how a broad range of discourses generates new meanings. For example, he uses portraits, acting manuals, physiognomy, prints, and performances to demonstrate that the akimbo arm began as...
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a sign of authority, became one of perverted authority, and then, especially in Garrick’s performances, a sign of the friabble, the effeminate man who joins young ladies in flaunting knowledge of and admiring fashions and their popular pastimes. He sees performance, “the reuse of the linguistic trace in the flow of time” (p. 19), as a potential form of agency. This is a familiar argument in a variety of cultural studies methodologies including popular culture and Habermasian counterpublic theory, but King’s case studies demonstrate the complexity of appropriative actions and how accurate he is to describe queer bodies as performance spaces. His chapter on James Boswell, perhaps one of the most complex (and ridiculed) performative personalities in history, unfolds as an example of a body marked by the earlier economy of pederasty (identified as a sociopolitical relationship that put the subservient partner close to power and, therefore, conferred it) and patriarchy but striving toward and often representative of modern masculinity. What traces of the residual remain become sources of resistance, just as queerness resisted such forces as heteronormativity and gender complementariness.

One of the most ambitious intellectual histories is Mary Poovey’s *Genres of the Credit Economy: Mediating Value in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Britain*. She continues the argument begun in *A History of the Modern Fact* that economic writers are central to our definitions of knowledge. She argues that both literary and economic texts described the new credit economy and helped readers understand it even as they produced the values they embraced. The book is driven by the “problematic of representation,” an engagement these discourses shared as they led other disciplines in recognizing that old systems of representation no longer worked. Crises, such as the 1797 Restriction Act when the Bank of England ended redeeming paper notes with gold, she argues, make the problematic of representation visible and pressing. Chapter two uses Defoe, who wrote both economics and fiction, to elucidate her methodology and complex argument. She concludes the chapter by explicating the overlaps among James Steuart’s *Inquiry into the Principles of Political Economy*, Fielding’s *Tom Jones*, Adam Smith’s *Wealth of Nations*, and *The Adventures of a Bank-Note*. She points out that both forms of writing blur fact and fiction, produce a continuum, and finally divide as critics and economists seek professional prestige and develop different value systems. The result is a division between critics and general readers that parallels the separation between economic mathematical theorists and “economic journalists” who
use anecdotes and a more benign view of the credit economy. The implications of these divides are, in her opinion, that in the nineteenth century formalism distanced literature from reality, rendering it less economically precise and helpful and, therefore, less useful in generating models of value.

LOW LIFE

The perfect book to introduce the group of low-life books is Emily Cockayne’s *Hubbub: Filth, Noise, and Stench in England, 1600–1760*, with its chapters jauntily titled “Ugly,” “Itchy,” “Mouldy,” “Grotty,” and more. Gillian Russell in *Women, Sociality, and Theatre in Georgian London* (reviewed later) mentions the noise and smells that issued from the various elite leisure sites, and Cockayne begins, “This book is about how people were made to feel uncomfortable by other people—their noises, appearance, behaviour, proximity and odours” (p. 1). Something of a romp through the topics, the book is nevertheless exhaustively researched in places such as the Greater London Record Office, the Bath Record Office, and the Southampton Court Leet Records. Her account of what walking down any city street was like would enrich any reading of city experiences. She also notes that few of the various laws and Improvement Acts designed to control and reform nuisances had much effect. Against the absolute tsunami of grit, grot, noise, and mob, how could they?

Especially in the port cities, press gangs made people uncomfortable, and the mood of Nicholas Rogers’s *The Press Gang: Naval Impressment and Its Opponents in Georgian Britain* is completely different. Rogers gives us the kinds of facts and numbers we have come to expect from the best social historians; this is a useful background and contextualizing book for literary scholars. The size of press gangs and the violence of the fighting, the actual uses made of slaves on the ships, the alienation of seaman through the Napoleonic Wars, and the lingering consequences of the naval mutinies of 1797 are highly pertinent information. Rogers explains the laws and the various constitutional arguments made against impressment, then addresses the still-vexed questions of the frequency of impressment, amount of resistance, and how much of a social and political issue it was. His anecdotes illustrate the reality of the human, economic, and moral costs, and his close work with mendicity reports and especially with Liverpool, where press gang members were strangers to the community, and Bristol, where press gangs tended to be made up of locals,
documents a “manpower problem” created by an effort to solve another (need for seamen). The details are arresting. Anyone who worked around or even with water, including oystermen and tanners, were vulnerable, and fifty-year-old, prosperous tradesmen became “nearly useless” captive seamen. Charts and analysis clearly represent attitudes to various wars through records of “affrays” (confrontational resistance).

Kristina Straub rightly says that servants were integral parts of the early modern family. Anyone who reads conduct books such as Defoe’s *Religious Courtship* will be reminded of this fact and how “masters” felt free to advise, discipline, pray with, and cast off their servants. *Domestic Affairs: Intimacy, Eroticism, and Violence between Servants and Masters in Eighteenth-Century Britain* begins appropriately with the conduct and polemical writing about servants, which she uses as foundation and touchstone. She argues that this literature creates a semiotics of servants’ sexuality that is both the result and stress point of the dichotomy of contractural (economic) and personal affective (loyalty) bonds. She finds that portrayals of servant relationships were responsive to and formative of changing economic and social conditions and even developed into structures of feeling, the traces of which remain in, for instance, our conceptions of autonomy, class, and sexuality. She provides revisionary readings of major novels including *Pamela* (discussed with the Elizabeth Canning case), *Roxana* (with the Elizabeth Brownrigg one), *Joseph Andrews*, *Humphry Clinker*, and *Caleb Williams* (with the footman John Macdonald’s *Memoirs*). Finding synergy rather than oppositions in key categories including labor and love, identity and role, and problem and opportunity, Straub nevertheless uncovers shocking violence and finally homosocial bonding. The most valuable part of her book (and this is saying something) is on footmen, because, as she says, unlike the companionate marriage, modern ideas of children, and the sexuality of female servants, the sexuality of male servants has not been analyzed as possibly formative of the modern identities of sexuality, gender, class, and the family (p. 110). Bringing into the light of day their threatened masculinity and the simultaneous homosocial intimacy and sense of heterosexual entitlement, she posits the naturalization of menservants’ masculinity that unites master and manservant. That naturalization seems sobering. Scene after scene in plays suddenly look very different, and all of the women tricked into marriage with servants seem to be part of quite different plots. Reflection highlights the number of masters who have been complicit in the trickery that did, indeed, “invite” male servants to be “English husbands”
(quoted words from p. 131). Rather than punishing lascivious or greedy widows, for instance, these resolutions certify male virility and the destiny built on homosocial bonding that marriages affirm. Are masters bawds for their male servants? Countering women’s newly won ability to reject marriage partners? No wonder Elizabeth Hands’s *The Death of Amnon* (1789) is about rape, male bonding, and dangerous master–servant relationships. In retrospect, Straub’s choices of the Miss Lucy plays by Fielding and Garrick seem problematically benign, but her book certainly opens the way for further studies, studies we now see that we urgently need.

A number of gender studies look closely at class, especially relationships among and passing from one to the other. In *Rakes, Highwaymen, and Pirates: The Making of the Modern Gentleman in the Eighteenth Century*, Erin Mackie unites the different kinds of “aristocratic” authority that polite gentlemen, rakes, highwaymen, and pirates—all identified as prestigious masculine figures—were assigned and, therefore, wielded. How tangled these figures are, and how formative of masculinity, is illustrated in a number of unanticipated juxtapositions. For instance, she argues that Macheath “is not simply Boswell’s model for manly elegance but also for the very instability, the highs and lows, of his own psyche” (p. 91). Relating his fucking (the only appropriate word) of a prostitute on stately Westminster Bridge, his impersonation of Macheath by taking two prostitutes into a tavern, his attendance at the execution of the gentleman highwayman Paul Lewis whom he calls “a perfect Macheath,” and his disguising himself as a blackguard while abusing women, she concludes that the “outcome” is reinforcement of Boswell’s sense of himself as a gentleman (p. 95). Of course, Boswell is an especially sick case, but Mackie makes her point. The privileges and abuses of elite masculinity were expressed through the performativity of the roles, as Sir Clement Willoughby is an aristocrat, a rakish would-be rapist, and a brutish highwayman, acting out an actionable criminal offense against Madame Duval with Captain Mirvan, just as Boswell felt his status of gentleman would protect him from the consequences of his actions on the London streets.

**BRITISH NATIONS AND THE GLOBAL EIGHTEENTH CENTURY**

Scotland, Wales, Ireland, England—the Caribbean, India, Hawaii, Africa, Persia, China, Spanish America. The mutual interests and unreconcilable conflicts of the global eighteenth century run
through all of the sections of this review. And, to extend an idea of Kate Flint’s in the first chapter of her *Transatlantic Indian, 1776–1930*, iconic images are central to conceptualization of whole continents and individual peoples (p. 2). Because we live in a global world unlike any time in history and also in a world of unprecedented ethnic assertiveness, these books hold special interest for us as they explain where we have been and, sometimes, what the lingering legacies are. Authoritatively weaving together the histories and literatures of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, John Kerrigan consistently stimulates new insights about the past and present in his mammoth *Archipelagic English: Literature, History, and Politics, 1603–1707*. An example of his unexpected and fruitful combinations is the section on Sir Walter Scott’s *Works of Jonathan Swift* (1814). Language and linguistics create distinctions that shape national identities, perceptions of the Other, and yet destabilize Enlightenment geographies. On a smaller scale, Penny Fielding’s *Scotland and the Fictions of Geography: North Britain, 1760–1830*, with its clear understanding of the way Robert Burns “drew attention to the place of Scotland in the national cultural geography” even as his work personified “forms of the local” and made “the Doon, the Lugar, the Ayr” as familiar as some English rivers, serves as commentary on some of Kerrigan’s arguments (pp. 40–1). Working with geographic theory, Fielding uses Burns’s career to set the local in global structures. Because Scotland could be used to assert the deficiencies of northern languages, and Burns, like Carolina Nairne and others, employed both Scots English and “standard” English, he makes a good case study. For Fielding as for Kerrigan, “North Britain” is a powerful concept, a major cultural identity with mixed ancient and modern associations. Another narrative waiting to be foregrounded is in these books. Kerrigan refers to Burns’s description of the Union as “the date when the Scottish people were bought and sold . . . for English gold” and identifies Culloden rather than the Union as the event causing the pivotal change in Scotland. Perceptively, Kerrigan brings out the subtlety of the Union debate and the divisions in Scotland after Culloden in such texts as John Home’s *Douglas*. Although *Archipelagic English* concludes that a new, comparative, socio-cultural account of the British past is needed, these books circle rather than deeply grasp the writers such as Burns; Carolina, Baroness Nairne (ignored); James Hogg; and others who reclaimed pre-Culloden, pre-Union Scotland in a variety of ways while “civilizing” this heritage to make it both modern and attractive to a new generation of aspiring Scots and

A fascinating and very different book is a collection of essays derived from a speakers’ series and symposium at Penn State University, Europe Observed: Multiple Gazes in Early Modern Encounters, edited by Kumkum Chatterjee and Clement Hawes. In it “Europe” is a “belated” construct, and its gazers range the globe. Arranged in chronological order by topic, they roughly trace one empire superseding another. Iberia and the Dutch give way to France and then Britain, and colonial commodities emerge and fade. In representatively revisionary essays, Sanjay Subrahmanyan notes that sailors from India accompanied Vasco da Gama back to Portugal (“On the Hat-Wearers, Their Toilet Practices, and Other Curious Usages”), and Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink in an essay that intersects with the publication of Charles de Rémusat’s play (reviewed later) presents a kaleidoscope of texts that give global communities new urgency (“The Rediscovery of Europe: Latin American and Haitian Intellectuals in Late Eighteenth-Century Europe”). Archipelagic English and Europe Observed represent the poles of the studies: nation-making strains at home and global encounters that would dictate the economic, political, and moral future. These books testify to the maturity of global studies. Even the introduction to Broadview’s new edition of The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia (edited by Jessica Richard) begins with an allusion to Arabian Nights and collections of tales translated from Arabic, Persian, Turkish, and other near-Eastern languages. A collection of essays with a scholarly introduction and a concluding bibliography, “The Arabian Nights” in Historical Context: Between East and West, edited by Saree Makdisi and Felicity Nussbaum, claims the tales “changed the world on a scale unrivalled by any other literary text.” It makes its case through essays on translations, Dinarzade in English fiction, portrayals of Christians, popular Orientalism on the London stage, Vathek, and more.

These scholars can finally take for granted basic familiarity with many of the places, people, and texts that are their subjects. Harriet Guest, for instance, can build on studies of Captain James Cook to write a searching book, Empire, Barbarism, and Civilisation: James Cook, William Hodges, and the Return to the Pacific. She works primarily with the art of Hodges, the young painter chosen to replace Johann Zoffany on Cook’s second voyage. Contextualizing Hodges’s work with the journals kept by Cook, Johann
Forster, and others, she is actually driving toward new theories about the influence of the Scottish Enlightenment and British attempts to conceptualize progress and civilization at a time when these constructs were challenged repeatedly by experience. The book is organized by the progress of Cook’s second voyage beginning with the Society Islands; it is not an account of the voyage but rather the story of a series of encounters that reverberate in the minds of the travelers and the English who read about them and then saw Hodges’s work. The eighty-four illustrations, more than half in brilliant color, will themselves spark further work as different specialists contemplate, for instance, the portraits by Sir Joshua Reynolds and by Hodges of the Raiatean islander brought to London by Cook (Plates 6.1 and 6.2). This is a mature book; because of her and others’ work, Guest can weave together and sustain sophisticated discussions of collecting and of the permissions given by the opinion that curiosity is a sign of advanced civilization. Nuanced treatment of tensions are well-handled, as in recognition that native women were important in commercial exchanges but also described as tests of the Enlightenment belief that the treatment of women is a key index of civilization.

Margaret E. Ewalt’s Peripheral Wonders intersects with some of the eco-critical books and, as Guest’s and many other books do this year, identifies Enlightenment ideas and their influence, in this case through Joseph Gumilla’s El Orinoco ilustrado and other books by Jesuit missionary naturalists. Contributing to understanding the way Europeans were articulating the intersections of religion and science, of commerce and idealism, and of sentiment and reason, Ewalt places Gumilla’s writing within the Jesuit tradition of applying knowledge and methodologies from their rigorous education with fieldwork and firsthand descriptions of people and nature. The account of the Jesuit missionaries’ encounters with and opinions about the Amerindians is a thought-provoking companion to Guest’s descriptions of the British with the South Pacific islanders. The Atlantic Enlightenment, edited by Susan Manning and Francis D. Cogliano, raises a number of significant questions with unusual breadth. Essays such as “The Atlantic Enlightenment and German Responses to the American Revolution, c. 1775–1800,” “Transatlantic Cervantics,” and “Enlightenment Historiography and Cultural Civil Wars” are but three examples. Several essays, including Charles W. J. Withers’s “Where was the Atlantic Enlightenment?—Questions of Geography,” see the Enlightenment as a dynamic process with unfixed national boundaries and explored spaces as testing ground for
ideas (p. 37). Withers develops an intriguing survey that treats the Pacific world and the Atlantic as chief sites for philosophical and commercial study, a nice read beside Guest’s book.

The British do seem to be more inclined to collect and display. Even as Flint argues that “the Indian is touchstone for a whole range of British perceptions concerning [the transatlantic world and] America . . . and plays a pivotal role in the understanding of cultural difference” (p. 2), she fills *The Transatlantic Indian* with illustrations and accounts of Native Americans brought to England. Using a creative range of sources, she reveals how representations in newspapers, battle accounts, captivities, and imaginative literature were complicated by Native Americans who came to England as tribal representatives and for other reasons. Flint opens chapter two with Joseph Wright’s painting, “The Widow of an Indian Chief Watching the Arms of Her Deceased Husband,” a painting that captures images of the Romantic and the indigenous Indian, as she mourns and wears both a feather and a classical drape (pp. 26–9). Flint discusses similar eighteenth-century images in poetry as well as painting and the fact that abolition themes were often joined with “indignation against the policies toward Indians” (p. 40). In this book, as in many others in this section, the degree to which the British saw other peoples as “consumer and curiosity” explains a great deal about our social and political histories.

One small but intriguing sign of the structure of feeling that produced these books is unprecedented attention to Defoe’s *Colonel Jack*, a novel about a displaced person who was kidnapped, became a slave overseer in North America, visited France and Scotland, made a fortune in the Caribbean, and feared being enslaved by the Spaniards. In *Archipelagic English* Kerrigan rightly begins by pointing out that Defoe “intervened across the whole field of the union debate” and was engaged with the most important issues even before 1705 (p. 330). He moves *Colonel Jack*, seldom associated with Scotland, into the argument by pointing out how frequently Jack’s Jacobite identity and Scotland and Scots (including groups of rebels whom Jack deserted) figure in the novel; he contextualizes it with *Caledonia*, tracts and other poems by Defoe, and the writings of Scots such as Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun, and, as is typical in this remarkably capacious book, shows how it points toward Darien. In contrast, Mackie uses *Jack* with Defoe’s *Compleat English Gentleman* as illustrative of her thesis: that the discourses about gentlemen and certain kinds of criminals work together to produce a conception of ideal mascu-
linity. Mackie points out that Jack resists both the image of the gentleman highwayman and the “gentleman-thug”; in a circuitous manner he serves as a serious critique of a major value system by positing what a modern gentleman might be and from what discourses he might be created. In a strange chapter in The Grateful Slave: The Emergence of Race in Eighteenth-Century British and American Culture titled “The Origin of the Grateful Slave: Daniel Defoe’s Colonel Jack, 1722,” George Boulukos argues that Jack’s “aspiration to whiteness is entirely successful within the terms of the novel” (p. 76). This claim can only be made if it is forgotten that there were many slaves, including white British people, in Mediterranean nations (Robinson Crusoe is such a slave and encounters slaves in other places) and if kidnapping, indenturing, and transportation systems are treated in inaccurately general terms. Court documents record that people kidnapped or transported felt their rights as free-born English citizens were violated and occasionally compare these practices to slavery; these have been quoted by Defoe specialists. Boulukos cites many secondary sources, but, as in this case, he sometimes misses the most pertinent material and lumps together studies that actually have quite different and sometimes irrelevant approaches. Nevertheless, Colonel Jack deserves to be studied in books such as this on literature’s place in developing attitudes to slavery, theorizing slave management, and in literary representations of the slave system. Boulukos’s larger argument is useful for understanding the shaping of abolition rhetoric, rhetoric that, as Jack’s does, foregrounds similarities between blacks and whites but also sharply calls attention to the construction of racial difference and its serious consequences.

PERFORMANCE AND THEATER STUDIES

The concluding essay in The Cambridge Companion to British Theatre, 1730–1830, edited by Jane Moody and Daniel O’Quinn, begins, “Over the past two decades, scholars of British theatre in the long eighteenth-century have produced some of the most imaginative and exciting work in contemporary cultural studies” (Jonathan Mulroony, “Reading Theatre, 1730–1830,” p. 249). This is true, and this collection of essays makes the point and is a fitting introduction to the books in this category. It bucks the trend toward “companions” that are really collections of highly specialized, critical essays rather than helpful introductions and state-of-the-field essays, and each contributor is well-chosen. We
have John O’Brien, author of Harlequin Britain, on pantomime; Daniel O’Quinn, author of Staging Governance, with “Theatre and Empire”; and Helen Burke on Irish theater. The collection opens with Peter Thomson’s “Acting and Actors from Garrick to Kean,” which puts the collection firmly in the performance studies camp and focuses readers on one of the most important changes in the theater of the time. The second essay challenges the assumption that theater history is London theater, and the third describes the coming of performance spaces characterized by “detailed scenic representations of other worlds involving sophisticated theatrical processes and techniques” (p. 43).

The best book in this group is Russell’s Women, Sociability, and Theatre in Georgian London. By concentrating on the decades 1760–1780 and a few prominent and very lively women, Russell organizes a complex case for a zone of highly theatricalized and thoroughly feminized social identification that she calls “domiciliary sociability.” The opening is brilliant: “In 1773 one of the most prominent society women in Britain, Elizabeth Seymour Percy, Duchess of Northumberland, noted with some satisfaction in her diary that there was ‘certainly no deficiency or want of public entertainments this Year.’ She went on to list 134 forms of entertainment in London” (p. 1). Teresa Cornelys, mistress of Carlisle House, which Russell argues was a model for the Pantheon, is the subject of a chapter that sets the book up well. Cornelys illustrates many of Russell’s major contentions. Print culture and the rise of the gossipy periodical press are constitutive elements in domiciliary sociability, and Cornelys finds ways to convert advertisements into news and puffs that develop a distinctive, genteel voice. Without acknowledging it, Carlisle House became display rooms for elite businesses, thereby illustrating the advantageous commercial relationship between the luxury trades and aristocrats. Illustrating domiciliary sociability are the homes of the prominent, including Catharine Macaulay’s, which showed Cornelys’s influence. One of the most provocative, original themes of this book involves gender relations. Women, including Lady Elizabeth, were investors in Carlisle House, but the early efforts of the successive groups of men who invested in the Pantheon were farcical. And the Pantheon, which Russell says may have finally driven Carlisle House out of business, was beleaguered by another featured woman, Sophia Baddeley, an actress and Russell’s representative demi-rep (a courtesan who was able to hold a place in fashionable society because of her [or her lover’s] wealth). In spite of advertising itself as a genteel gathering place,
as Cornelys’s had, the Pantheon was rapidly sucked into a highly visible press and gossip frenzy over attendance of the sex workers and Baddeley in particular. David Garrick’s *Clandestine Marriage* and his Shakespeare Jubilee are presented in a chapter on Frances Abington as attempts to exploit domiciliary sociability and “meet the challenge of entertainments such as the music concert and the masquerade and sites such as Carlisle House” (p. 137). Like Carlisle House, the Jubilee helped the luxury trades, as it inspired extravagant wedding celebrations. The book concludes with chapters firmly centered on the theater and on the legacies of these two decades when women had so much influence in social and political life.

Louise H. Marshall’s *National Myth and Imperial Fantasy: Representations of Britishness on the Early Eighteenth-Century Stage* actually covers 1719–1745, and develops what we learned about historical plays in Christine Gerrard’s groundbreaking *The Patriot Opposition to Walpole: Politics, Poetry, and National Myth, 1725–1742* (1994). Marshall is interested in both the domestic issues associated with Sir Robert Walpole’s career and the anxieties and ambitions arising from British imperialism. She divides the book by groups of plays and the dominant themes within that group. We are probably most familiar with those in the first chapter, “Ancient Britons and Liberty,” which includes James Thomson and David Mallet’s *Alfred* and is about national myths and heroes. Chapter four, “Britain, Empire, and Julius Caesar,” begins serious treatment of Britain abroad. The image of Caesar as a patriot colonialist is markedly different from the Caesar in poetry. The final chapter, “Turks, Christians, and Imperial Fantasy,” looks at a few plays in depth and argues that comparisons to the Ottoman Empire are actually searching critiques of British policies that begin the questioning of Britain’s dedication to liberty and religious tolerance. This book really does fill a gap in drama scholarship.

Shortly after the performance of Garrick’s adaptation of *Hamlet* on 18 December 1772, Richard Cumberland sent him a critique, wittily titled *An Impromptu, by way of epilogue after the play of Hamlet*. In it, the gravediggers complain of being cut from the play and ask Garrick what he wants done with the “ready-made Grave,” since “you don’t like to have property lie dead.” Several uses for it are suggested, but they are interrupted by the ghost of Shakespeare. Garrick greets him, “Hail, much-honour’d Name,/ Friend of my life and Father of my fame.”1 In spite of his revisions, Garrick is widely credited with transforming Shake-
speare from just one of the popular “old” playwrights into the National Bard. Marshall’s middle chapter treats adaptations of Shakespeare’s history plays as an engine pulling efforts to prove British historical and literary superiority. Cambridge University Press published three books on Shakespeare and eighteenth-century drama, and all of them treat the adaptations in some way. Vanessa Cunningham in *Shakespeare and Garrick* deftly introduces Garrick’s multivalent reputation as an expert on Shakespeare, cuts through myths about what he did, and demonstrates that in his lifetime “few important Shakespeare-related projects could happen without his involvement” (p. 5). Within these three books, she alone accurately uses Michael Dobson’s *The Making of the National Poet* (1992) to place Garrick within the bardolotry movement already underway, and her work with reviews of performances and Garrick’s letters and preparation copies of plays allows her to argue that Garrick should be accorded the status of an editor, one who, like his contemporaries, believed in a duty to contemporary tastes and interests. Her work with Garrick’s *Hamlet*, for example, is scrupulously scholarly and persuasive; by identifying his preparation copy and considering the versions he inherited from Thomas Betterton, Robert Wilks, and others she demonstrates how restorative and radical his alterations were (pp. 139–58). She compares his practices, including his respect for language and plot, by working closely with six plays from different stages of his career. Like Marshall, she is interested in gender in the adaptations, and among her findings are that he “confines” Lady Macbeth’s part “to three widely separated sections of the play” (pp. 55–6) and reduces Octavia in *Antony and Cleopatra* to a “walk-on” (p. 101).

*Representing Shakespearean Tragedy: Garrick, the Kembles, and Kean* by Reiko Oya focuses on Garrick’s Lear, the Kembles’ (John Philip and Sarah Siddons) *Macbeth*, and Edmund Kean’s Hamlet. The book includes discussions of major contemporaries’ responses: Johnson’s and Elizabeth Montagu’s (author of *An Essay on the Writings and Genius of Shakespeare*) to Garrick’s performance, William Hazlitt’s to Kean’s. This book brings together familiar material and sometimes does not use a secondary source that I consider essential. The book is, however, a productive way to overlap intellectual history, as the chapters move from Enlightenment thought through the sublime movement (Reynolds and Edmund Burke are part of the Kemble chapter) to Romanticism, where plays by Samuel Taylor Coleridge and John Keats are related to Kean’s revision of the part of Hamlet.
Oya uses some of the same illustrations that Stuart Sillars does in his *Illustrated Shakespeare, 1709–1875*, which has sixteen color plates, most from extra-illustrated copies of eighteenth-century editions of the plays, and 150 other illustrations. Oya acknowledges that the illustrations should not be taken to represent actual performances, and judiciously uses them and the Elisha Kirkall engraving from the 1709 Rowe edition to good effect with the ghost controversies surrounding *Macbeth*. Her comparison of Reynolds’s and Henry Fuseli’s depictions especially enrich contextualization. Sillars argues that since Nicholas Rowe’s *Works of William Shakspeare* in 1709, illustrated editions of Shakespeare’s plays have had a central place in the ways people experience and imagine the plays and that they constitute a “tradition” in their own right, one that “reinvents both itself and the Shakespeare that it offers to readers” (p. 4). He points out that few illustrations mediate between the performance they might be taken to represent and the reading experience. He carefully points out unlikely and unproducible details in illustrations and helpfully explains the conventions of visual art, such as cultural symbols, emblems, or even allusions to earlier paintings that made the illustrations readable by their contemporary audiences. Sillars continually develops evidence demonstrating that illustrations elicit responses innate to the printed page and quite different from theater experiences.

The foreword by Christopher Murray to Desmond Slowey’s *The Radicalization of Irish Drama, 1660–1900: The Rise and Fall of Ascendancy Theatre* cuts right to the heart of Irish drama by identifying its great subjects as ownership, identity, colonialism, justice, and power. By the Ascendancy, Slowey means the Old English and native Irish who converted to Protestantism and the New English colonists, whom he says consolidated their power in a permanent shift in the early Restoration. Most of us know how important the Smock Alley Theatre was, but Slowey fills in details and, more significantly, continues the project of rescuing it from the opinion that it was a kind of apprenticing or summer theater for London companies. Slowey follows several strands through the book. One is the development of physical spaces. Who knew John Ogilby opened the first purpose-built theater in Great Britain? He fought the powerful William Davenant for the patent and opened Smoke Alley (soon known as Smock, meaning “chemise” because of the sex trade it attracted). Another theme is the audience, which includes a collapse of an over-crowded gallery and, later, the cultivation of a new audience that led to
the Gentlemen’s Quarrel and riots of 1747. A third focus is the creation of distinctly Irish-theater characters beginning with Marfissa in *Landgartha* who wears brogues, tucks her Irish gown up, and dances the whip of Dunboyne while the royal couple perform a stately court dance. Sir Jowler Kennel, the Irish theater’s first hunting squire, comes from Charles Shadwell’s play *Irish Hospitality* (Dublin, 1717), notably set in Fingall. Slowey writes with a sure sense of history, which includes a keen awareness of when the Irish were treated most like colonial subjects and how the theater was a site of struggle and even of conscience for the Irish. He notices the times when most of the Irish characters are servants and records other landmark plays such as William Philips’s *St. Stephen’s Green* (London, 1699; Dublin, 1700), the first portrayal of Irish Ascendancy society.

Arriving with these books was Norman R. Shapiro’s translation of Charles de Rémusat’s *The Saint-Domingue Plantation; or, the Insurrection*. While Ireland’s revolutionary history is long, that of Saint-Domingue was short and idealistic. The background is the slave uprising that began in August 1791 during which 100,000 slaves revolted. The protagonist, Léon, in spite of his belief in the French Revolution’s ideals of liberty, rapes the runaway slave Timur’s beloved Hélène, further motivating him to rebel. Thus, Léon’s theory and Timur’s experience define the conflict within the raging slave rebellion. The play was published in 1825, after the brilliant black general Toussaint Louverture ruled all of Hispaniola under his influential, democratic constitution and after he had surrendered to Napoleon in 1802.

Performing “lady” and learning to do so from the theater is the subject of Nora Nachumi’s *Acting Like a Lady: British Women Novelists and the Eighteenth-Century Theater*. She uses Elizabeth Inchbald, Burney, and Austen as examples of women who understood the performativity of lady, had some knowledge of theories of acting, and wrote divergent portrayals of the theater. These are good choices, for, as Nachumi says, each aspired to write like a lady, albeit as somewhat different kinds of ladies. Among the most valuable sections are the discussions of how women novelists employed theatrical images in subversive ways and of Burney’s engagement with controversies over theories of acting, although there should have been much more attention to her specific treatment of them in *The Wanderer*. The appendix of 382 women novelists with their connections to the theater is worth the price of the book (readers will have to sort out for themselves which are fiction and which plays).
The relationship between pressures to conform to the ideal of the accomplished, middle-class lady and musical performance is the subject of Leslie Ritchie’s *Women Writing Music in Late Eighteenth-Century England: Social Harmony in Literature and Performance*. Rather than allowing the free expression of poetry or painting, music provided a means of imposing discipline. Chapter one notes that instructional books for women tended to be aimed at “focused, diligent, progressive study” on an instrument (p. 45), and chapter two includes the strict rules for performing at social gatherings (one should never refuse, and, my favorite, hostesses should not frame their performances by those of the inept). Countering the confining uses of music to some extent are a brief mention of Cornelys’s opportunistic catering to musical tastes, the records of women registering copyrights at Stationers Hall, and their productions of pastorals. This is a valuable book and a worthy companion to Richard Leppert’s *Music and Image: Domestic Ideology and Socio-Cultural Formation in Eighteenth-Century England* (1988).

**READING AND TRANSLATION STUDIES**

Sillars outlines how the locations of illustrations in Shakespeare editions drew upon and created new reading practices, as did new kinds of illustrations placed as frontispieces or on the verso or recto pages. Reading studies are important this year. David Allan opens *A Nation of Readers: The Lending Library in Georgian England* with the perfect sentence: “Reading may safely be described as one of the great collective obsessions of eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century English society” (p. 1). The common denominator for these books is attention to developments in reading practices that can be implicated in important social changes. Allan draws upon a wealth of primary evidence, much of it from outside of London, as he devotes chapters to book clubs and reading societies, subscription, circulating, and public libraries, and other places that loaned or made books available such as Dissenting libraries, cathedrals, parish churches, literary and philosophical societies, and mechanics’ institutes. Roger Chartier’s learned *Inscription and Erasure: Literature and Written Culture from the Eleventh to the Eighteenth Century* is a decided contrast. His work with *Don Quixote* and especially Richardson enriches the ideas in other books published this year, such as those on translation and on the public sphere. Chartier, who has often considered the question of what kind of “reading revolu-
tion” occurred in the eighteenth century, returns to it here and argues against a history of two styles of reading, one intensive (studious, respectful of textual authority) and the other extensive (rapid, consumerist). He uses Diderot’s *Éloge de Richardson* as springboard and focuses on devices that “abolish” “every distinction between the world of the book and the world of the reader” (p. 111) to argue a different reading revolution. Chartier posits the reader as spectator and a literary fiction beyond the text, specifically that the reader was projected into the work of fiction where s/he internalized its truths and a “new figure of the author” had “quasi-religious status” (p. 123).

Chartier notes that reading was medicalized in the eighteenth century and the danger or excessive reading was “most severe when the reading was of a novel and the reader a woman withdrawn into solitude” (p. 113). *Silent Reading and the Birth of the Narrator* by Elspeth Jajdelska has a simple, obvious thesis: “The structure and style of earlier prose imply a reader who read aloud to an audience . . . The structure and style of later prose imply a silent reader.” Within these two sentences, however, is another, transformative change; the physical presence of the reader of earlier prose “acted as an orientation point for time and space in the text,” while the reader of later prose “conceives of himself or herself as the hearer of an internal voice, that of the notional writer” (p. 3). Jajdelska’s purpose is to document the consolidation of a critical mass of silent readers. Independently, she creates Chartier’s new dynamic between reader and imagined writer, one influenced by diary writing and the “ideology” of polite conversations. A skilled linguist, she has the vocabulary to describe stylistic changes such as connectives that matter but have been superficially treated (dashes deserved more attention). Whether readers will appreciate the much-discussed Addison and the almost-unknown Ralph Thoresby as her major case studies remains to be seen, and poetry would probably be a challenging test of her argument.

A common theme in these books is the anxieties aroused by new conditions of authorship and the proliferation of print. As in *Inscription and Erasure*, the “consumerist” audience and casual (rather than studious) reading seem especially threatening. Eric Rothstein writes of an audience “who will look to literature to give them information rather than, or as well as, remind them of truths that they already ought to know” (*Gleaning Modernity: Earlier Eighteenth-Century Literature and the Modernizing Process*, p. 224, reviewed later). In *Memory, Print, and Gender in England,*
Recent Studies

1653–1759. Harold Weber provides four case studies of authors concerned about their place in cultural memory. He uses their writings about print, reading practices, and what Weber posits as their pre-emergent recognition of modern memory. The backdrop is Horace’s description of his *Odes and Epodes*: “I have finished a monument more lasting than bronze and loftier than the Pyramids’ royal pile” (p. 2). To modern ears, this sounds, at first reading, ridiculous, but upon contemplation as the chapters progress through Milton’s *Paradise Regain’d*... *To which is added Samson Agonistes*, Pope’s *Dunciad*, and Richardson’s *Clarissa* it becomes gripping and sends the reader back to the first chapter, which is on Margaret Cavendish’s *Poems, and Fancies*. Immortality is both made possible and threatened by the new print culture, and Weber’s is a history of what becomes a dual awareness. Cavendish’s faith in “future Ages, for which I intend all my Books” (quoted, p. 52) and Pope’s greater anxieties trace the movement of print history and the place of individual authors within it. Weber argues convincingly that Pope constructed the *Dunciad* to demonstrate his preeminence by providing a dense context of insignificant contemporaries and, as a kind of *coup de grâce*, points out that the *Dunciad* was a great canon-maker that “remains an important component in the ideology that determines the content... of *The Norton Anthology*” (p. 131).

Harold Weber reminds us that the frequent use of “history” in the titles of novels suggests the period’s longing for memorial stability and transmits an emergent conception of history. Ruth Mack in *Literary Historicity: Literature and Historical Experience in Eighteenth-Century Britain* highlights the fact that the past is a form of experience and argues that eighteenth-century people understood literature as a way of thinking about and making sense of “the reality we all attach to the past” (p. 1). Contributing to the still-lively discussion of how the uses of narrative in history writing affect truth telling, Mack looks for philosophies of history and discussions of the nature of historical knowledge in novels, literary criticism, and their prefaces. There is no question that the relationship between history and experience is a major aspect of the turmoil-torn century, but she begins with Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke, and Johnson, not with Defoe who wrote a number of history books, experimented with historiography, and whose fiction and nonfiction are obsessed with what she calls “historical personhood” (p. 29). In fact, the discussion of Bolingbroke’s *Letters on the Study and Use of History* will remind specialists that Defoe’s model of history (past and future) and the
new political economy rivaled Bolingbroke’s and triumphed, and that before Tom Jones’s encounters with the Jacobite rebellion there were Defoe’s Colonel Jack and the Cavalier in Memoirs of a Cavalier and Richardson’s Lovelace. Mack’s book, however, is valuable for its description of the rising sophistication of the eighteenth-century philosophies of history.

For years I’ve tried to get a succession of graduate students to work on the importance of translation to the English novel. That book is yet to be written, but translation studies are being written in new ways, albeit about old subjects. Paul Davis’s Translation and the Poet’s Life: The Ethics of Translating in English Culture, 1646–1726 centers chapters on, respectively, the translations of the classics by John Denham and Henry Vaughan, Abraham Cowley, Dryden, and Pope. Studies of these are familiar, but Davis’s project is to defend the fact that translation is imaginative conduct. (My choice of “fact” and his 324-page book suggest our differing opinions.) Davis reminds us of some of the insults poked at translators, and then goes on to locate a metaphor for translators in each chapter. A little history of the changing attitudes toward translation, Denham gets “exile,” Dryden “slaves,” and Pope (what else?) “trade.” Biographies are being written in new, highly imaginative ways, and Davis contributes to that movement by using each chapter as an experimental literary biography, one that pushes toward understanding what translating meant and its lasting effects. His approach allows him to examine common opinions about the poets closely. He considers claims that Dryden, the most serious theorist of translation, should be credited with liberating English translation from slavish “metaphrase,” and his conclusions, both about Dryden’s beliefs and practices and what Dryden could explore in translation more freely than in his other writings, come from considerations of what Dryden chose to translate and a number of things including the impact of the death of John Oldham. Julie Candler Hayes’s Translation, Subjectivity, and Culture in France and England, 1600–1800 begins with neoclassical translation theory, features Dryden, and, as other critics should have done, gives Anne Le Fèvre Dacier, translator of Anacreon, Sappho, the Odyssey, and many other texts and an editor of the prestigious Delphin series, her due. Hayes’s aims are quite different from Davis’s, as she tests common opinions about translators’ attitudes and, therefore, representations of ethnicity, gender, and other favorite cultural studies topics. Moreover, she is a comparativist and moves gracefully between France and England and is more conscious of translation’s part in forming
national identities, especially in relation to those imagined as Other. Unlike Davis’s prose, hers is rather flatly declarative. But her treatment of controversies is sharper, as when she writes, “We also sometimes lose sight of the subtler forms of rudeness of [Dacier’s] interlocutors” (p. 129) and goes on to explicate what was at stake in national, literary, and gender terms with a learned reading of Dacier’s 1712 preface to the *Iliad*.

THREE CONTRASTING BIOGRAPHIES

Ashgate’s welcome “Performance in the Long Eighteenth Century: Studies in Theatre, Music, Dance” series published as its second book *The Incomparable Hester Santlow: A Dancer-Actress on the Georgian Stage* by Moira Goff. A perfect subject for the series, Santlow was a beautiful actress most admired for her dancing. Written in a rather wooden style, the book brings together impressive archival material and still manages to recreate her dances and harlequin performances. There is a wealth of new information about Santlow and the theater of her time, and the illustrations testify to Goff’s impressive research. *The Bard: Robert Burns, A Biography* by Robert Crawford is an accessible, not especially scholarly, biography, which pays more attention to Burns’s early interest in song than other biographies have and prints some new material, including song fragments and accounts of conversations (see pp. 395–6, 404). Crawford claims that he intends to restore Burns’s political and erotic power, qualities he feels English biographers have diluted, but these aspects are well-known and documented in secondary literature (which, in what I take to be an effort to avoid the “clogged” result of James MacKay’s “750-page . . . tome” [p. 9], he seldom cites but clearly knows). Many quotations from Burns’s commonplace books, letters, and poems and from contemporaries’ letters, reviews, memories, and other documents do strip away some of the overgrowth. Crawford’s balanced account of the beauties and rigors of Dumfries when Burns, the exciseman, moved into a tenement there is useful stage setting. He balances a description of hard times and food shortages in 1796 with the kinds of tales we associate with Burns; at one point, he notes Burns’s easy access to “confiscated booze” (p. 352). Crawford’s occasional uses of “booze” or, worse, “Pole-axed by the death of his daughter” (p. 392) sometimes distract at unfortunate moments. He goes beneath the surface, though. He tells a possibly apocryphal story of Burns sending carronades captured from a smuggler to the revolutionaries in France. Rather
than making it a Burns prank, Crawford puts it in the context of Burns’s serious political sentiments and notes that Burns himself led one of the assault teams against the ship.

A standard recommendation for those who would write a literary biography is that they should read everything the subject wrote in chronological order. William McCarthy, co-editor of two collections of Barbauld’s poetry, is exceptionally qualified to write her life. His preface to *Anna Letitia Barbauld: Voice of the Enlightenment* is a concise summary of her place in literary and social history that includes some remarks on the revival of interest in her work. “March 1790,” a prolegomenon, dramatizes one of the many unsuccessful efforts to repeal the Corporation and Test Acts while her writing of *An Address to the Opposers of the Repeal* articulates the ironic thanks she directed to the M.P.s who defeated it. The preface lays the foundation for many of the major themes in the book, including Barbauld’s consistent alertness to moments when she could contribute to Dissenters’ campaign for equal rights, her courageous opposition to Edmund Burke, and her own well-developed sense of citizenship. Perhaps *An Address* reveals as much about her as anything she ever wrote, as Dissent—evaluative thought and conscientious *public* responses to events going back at least as far as Defoe’s *Original Power of the Collective Body of the People of England*—is an honorable duty, even a patriotic one that often calls the nation to attend to its ideals. “You have set a mark of separation upon us, and it is not in our power to take it off, but it is in our power to determine whether it shall be a disgraceful stigma or an honourable distinction,” she wrote (quoted, p. 276), and she had already lived through the time when mobs marched chanting, “Damn Priestley . . . Damn the Presbyterians” (p. 307). *An Epistle to William Wilberforce* was also written soon after reading a published House of Commons debate, and McCarthy rightly describes it as a dialogue with the debate and “also an occasion to take up her unfinished business with Edmund Burke” (p. 294). One of the tests of a literary biography is whether the life or literary criticism appears like barnacles on what should be a smooth surface. McCarthy weaves together contextualizing material, pure biography, contemporary responses from a variety of sources such as reviews and letters, and well-chosen quotations, often illustrative of Barbauld’s aesthetic powers, from her writings. He has a sense of both her developing voices and her consistent opinions and even a nice sense of irony, as he quotes one reviewer in advance of the publication of *Epistle to William Wilberforce* hoping for more of “Mrs. Barbauld’s” “sweet flowers”
when what they got was “the voice of a mature moralist qualified to pass judgment on the nation and its leading men” (p. 295). This is an old-fashioned, magisterial biography, and a number of other studies of Barbauld testify to the timeliness of it.

Some lives intersect with the major events and movements of a time; Barbauld is such a figure. She has been found so in large and small ways. She deserves the epithet of “Voice of the Enlightenment” that McCarthy’s subtitle bestows. Then and now she has also been held up as a symbol of “the narrowing of possibilities for political intervention on the part of female authors” with reactions to her “anti-war masterpiece, *Eighteen Hundred and Eleven*,” held up as incontrovertible proof (Michelle Levy, *Family Authorship and Romantic Print Culture*, p. 21). As Levy recounts, some people lamented her “descent” (Johnson’s word) into educational writing while others tried to drive her there. In Levy’s book, which also has chapters on, among others, Coleridge, the Shelleys, and books for working families (not including Hannah More’s), she uses Barbauld’s *Lessons for Children* (1778–79) and *Evenings at Home* (1792–96, both written with her brother John Aikin) to contribute to the evidence that Barbauld’s understanding of woman’s relation to the state differed from that of those constructing a maternal, moral authority. Reminding us that *Civic Sermons* came out in the same year as the first volume of *Evenings at Home*, Levy finds Barbauld’s understanding of the family with “multiple perspectives and interests” as the locus for effective national reform (p. 29).

It is fitting to conclude this section with *Women Writers and Old Age in Great Britain, 1750–1850* because Devoney Looser is one of the best at bringing together biographical evidence, sophisticated theory, and literary sensibility. Looser begins by interrogating what “old” meant and then studies the late activities of Austen (the most famous old maid in English literature), Burney, Maria Edgeworth, Catharine Macaulay, Hester Piozzi, and Jane Porter and reactions to them and their works. The chapter on Porter, incidentally, breaks new ground in its unsparing account of her moderately successful attempt to live comfortably on her former fame as an author through her creative maneuvers within transition print and celebrity cultures. Looser sees Barbauld’s editorial, biographical, and literary critical activities beginning in 1790 as a commitment to literary history, perhaps laying the foundation for the future treatment of her own work (p. 121). She demonstrates Barbauld’s acumen in her recognition that texts describing manners increase in value. Of the *Spectator*, Barbauld writes that they
“are already a great source of information, and five hundred years hence will be invaluable,” as they are (p. 130). Looser concludes, “Traditional versions of her late life—Barbauld the happy-go-lucky old lady, Barbauld the silenced prophetic poet, or Barbauld the accidental editor/critic—do not hold much water” and points us to nonliterary activities and Barbauld’s continued publication of poems and reviews (p. 139).

Looser points out that critics compared their responses to *Eighteen Hundred and Eleven* to earlier opinions of her work and often styled it “peevish” and “joyless,” characteristics “supposedly typical of female old age” (p. 134). Stephen C. Behrendt writes that it was not so much the “content of women’s writing as *the gesture itself*” that aroused resistance. Calling her a consistent moral voice on the great issues of her time, he patiently identifies the things that she wrote in the poem that were widely held opinions and closes with an explication of Anne Grant’s poetic answer (*British Women Poets and the Romantic Writing Community*, pp. 18, 70–7, reviewed later). Even Barbauld’s opponents are a barometer of the time as she counters Edmund Burke’s patriarchal family with her thinking one, and Sarah Trimmer accuses her of breeding discontented citizens. Tellingly, almost all who criticize her complain that she could have done more, done better, devoted herself to more significant causes or genres.

**PUBLIC SPHERE STUDIES**

Uses and refinements of the concept of the Habermasian public sphere continue, and this year studies of women in the public sphere increased. Anthony Pollock’s *Gender and the Fictions of the Public Sphere, 1690–1755* treats the “disreputable” Delarivière Manley and Haywood with Mary Astell. Unusually attentive in such a study to Tory and Whig discourses and rhetorical strategies, he devotes the first half of the book to “Models and Countermodels of English Public Discourse, 1690–1714” and brings Addison, Richard Steele, Manley, Bernard de Mandeville, Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, and Haywood, especially as periodical essayists, together in the same landscape. The second half of the book, “Tory Feminism and the Gendered Reader, Astell to Haywood,” ends with a chapter on Haywood and the *Spectator*. “In a powerful passage from Book V of the *Female Spectator* . . . Haywood draws attention to the central figure underwriting all of Addison and Steele’s periodical work, what she calls the ‘scrutinous’ gaze of the male spectator,” Pollock writes.
(p. 147), and this is a nice encapsulating of Haywood’s fascination and frequent writing about the gaze. She tries to disrupt forms of patriarchal power by exposing or subverting it. For example, about the incident in *Invisible Spy* in which Exploralibus tries to produce a neutral voyeuristic spectator, Pollock concludes that Haywood consistently produces, as in this example, “an authoritative, reformist spectatorial periodical on the Addisonian model” that also functions “as a satirical commentary on the voyeuristic male narrator-position from which that periodical derives its cultural power” (p. 170).

In *Outward Appearances: The Female Exterior in Restoration London*, Will Pritchard depicts how men reacted to women’s appearances and how the stakes in this looking changed as women appeared more frequently in public places where they seemed to be engaged in display or even performance. Considering 1650–1700 means his work provides background for Russell’s book (reviewed earlier). He argues that men wanted “legible” bodies, bodies that they could read reliably to reach the “true self.” He teases out ways that viewing women was legitimated, how scientific “advances” encouraged belief that seeing leads to knowing, and surprisingly how women at the New Exchange aroused less suspicion because of the “legitimate” business of commerce there. He cleverly devotes the central chapter of the book to the theater, one of the primary spaces in which women of many sorts were on display and which raised this question: at the moment some women become actresses, was it true that all women were actresses? (p. 27). By ending this chapter’s section on playwrights at 1680, he cheats—he does not have to deal with Catherine Trotter, Mary Pix, Manley, and the mysterious Ariadne, a mixed group of women with obviously different possibilities for display (or lack of it). Rivaling the chapter on the New Exchange in originality is the one on parks, where actual parks and play settings are mutual influences and St. James Park became “King Charles’s theatrical court” that encouraged his court’s licentiousness (p. 144). One public space “where women appeared prominently” that Will Pritchard does not cover is the criminal court room.

Nicola Lacey says that half a century after *Moll Flanders*, writing a novel about “a sexually adventurous, socially marginal property offender” would have been “next to unthinkable” (quotations from book jackets). Pritchard could have added a chapter on the court room, another place where women displayed themselves and were on display, and, in fact, Lacey is looking at a historical space, too, and seeing a time when the self is exterior
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and outward. She draws upon the law, literature, and social and economic history to argue that the sensibility movement drives a radical shift from criminal responsibility based on externally manifested character to an “internal, capacity based sense.” Her *Women, Crime, and Character: From “Moll Flanders” to “Tess of the D’Urbervilles”* is highly readable and provides a useful review of legal research (reasons assigned for women’s crimes, percentage of women among the imprisoned) and debates (reasons for lighter sentences for women). This history is not unfamiliar, of course, and literary scholars have long used the work of Barbara Shapiro and others and benefited from books such as Dana Rabin’s *Identity, Crime and Legal Responsibility in Eighteenth-Century England* (2004), which also attributes major changes to sensibility. Lacey’s book, however, corrects studies that do not give due respect to the lingering authority of external markers. *Joseph Andrews* and *Caleb Williams, Roxana* and *Cecilia*, and others demonstrate a transition time during which contrasting opinions about capacity-based notions of responsibility led to differing applications of the law.

Perhaps most obviously and significantly the public and private intersect at the deep structural level with religion. In *The Fringes of Belief: English Literature, Ancient Heresy, and the Politics of Freethinking, 1660–1760*, Sarah Ellenzweig works within the poles of belief and doubt that seem inseparable in the century. She begins with chapters on Rochester and Aphra Behn in order to demonstrate that libertine skepticism had more theological complexity and was more important to eighteenth-century freethinking than has been recognized. The next two chapters are on Swift, and the conclusion ties her argument together through Pope’s *Essay on Man*, which she locates as an important text in the European Enlightenment. This is a deeply learned book, as the attention to concepts such as “pious fraud” indicate, and its influence should go beyond the texts studied. After reading this book, consider the greater impact, intellectual and emotional, of Eloisa recognizing herself as “Pious fraud” in Pope’s *Eloisa to Abelard* (line 150).

Elizabeth Kraft’s *Women Novelists and the Ethics of Desire, 1684–1814: In the Voice of Our Biblical Mothers* rightly takes for granted that biblical texts about women were part of the collective consciousness, which is inseparably public and private. Her focus is on heterosexual desire, and she follows Ros Ballaster and others in treating fiction by Behn, Manley, and Haywood as part of the prehistory of the “bourgeois novel” represented here.
by Sarah Fielding, Burney, Charlotte Smith, and Inchbald, all chosen to my delight because they express strong antibourgeois ideas and, like the three foremothers, resist hegemonic domesticity. Kraft does extended readings, often with glosses from Talmudic or other biblical scholars, of passages about women in the Bible. She uses well feminist literary critical strategies now common in feminist theology such as amplification and reading against the grain, but the results vary. Hagar, Sarah’s surrogate who was banished when Sarah finally had a son, emerges as a captivating figure, but neither Roxana nor some of the fictions by women such as Manley’s “Physician’s Stratagem” and Jane Barker’s A Patch-Work Screen in which servants are forced into a man’s bed by their mistresses are discussed, and the Sarah/Hagar connection to Smith’s Young Philosopher seems tenuous indeed (pp. 137–44). This is a less openly neutral inquiry than most, as Kraft makes unequivocal statements like these: “I believe that the central concern of all significant narrative is to explore and articulate the ethics of human behavior” (p. 5) and “The voice of the woman crying in the wilderness of pain, of exile, of barrenness, of despair is a voice that can be heard and that has been heard—by the men who love them and by the God they love” (p. 155). Even her description of Sarah’s “laughter of love and pleasure, it turns out, is also the laughter of faith” (p. 20) could be revised to “is also the laughter of class power.”

THE OLD CANON

I received only six books devoted to canonical male writers, three of which are collections of essays. For purposes of characterizing eighteenth-century studies today, I decided to treat them with one other book as a group. The most scholarly and original is Eric Rothstein’s Gleaning Modernity. It is carefully structured, clearly defines terms, and meticulously builds cases. Although at points the book appears to be an application of Mikhail Bakhtin’s theory of reaccentuation, it is far more than that, and just to raise the challenge, much of the book is devoted to writings that seem resistant to modernity even in their own times: Gulliver’s Travels and Pope’s later poetry. Rothstein argues that because readers “glean” and have a consumerist attitude rather than study what they read, “modernity” sifts painlessly into their lives. He explains modernity at length as scalar, aggregate, narratable, and pointing toward a future in which people can cope with risk, change, heterodox values, and instability and believe in options. He is never
far from the texts, and the parallels he develops between Harlowe Place and Mrs. Sinclair’s house in *Clarissa* are but one way that he illustrates Richardson’s boundary-keeping system, his logic of Clarissa’s psychology, and the novel’s principle of continuity (see p. 161). At another point, he reminds us that Max Weber’s three kinds of legitimation are tradition, law and rationality, and charisma, then notes that *Clarissa* depends on charisma for legitimacy and works by “the personalism of charismatic norms.” He says that this model rarely existed before *Clarissa*, but as Geertz and other theorists of charisma note, this is not so. However, unlike Geertz’s kings with their rites and images, *Clarissa*’s is a very modern, hypnotic kind of charisma. And this is why Rothstein’s Pope projects a principle of self, uses the self in ways that are characteristic of political Modernity.

Jack Lynch assembles material from ballads, diaries, fiction, court records, and ephemeral publications to study debates over hoaxes and frauds in *Deception and Detection in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. The intellectual histories discussed in this review suggest reasons for the period’s obsession with frauds and how they might protect themselves. It is no accident that one of their greatest characters is “Gulliver.” Thus, Lynch’s decision to focus on the debates the hoaxes triggered is a good one, even if his engagement with larger philosophical and scientific contexts is less than desirable. At times the primary texts brought to bear on a case are impressive, but they are uneven. For instance, Lynch uses Aaron Hill’s writing on Elizabeth Canning well but does not seem to know Haywood’s important ruminations on the part print culture played in the lingering debate. His failure to use highly relevant secondary work also limits the contextualization and theorizing that might have resulted. No one should write on Ossian without attention to Howard D. Weinbrot’s *Britannia’s Issue* (1993). On motive, for instance, I missed especially Rabin’s book and Alexander Welsh’s 1992 study, *Strong Representations: Narrative and Circumstantial Evidence in England* (used by Straub to good effect).

In sharp contrast, Melinda Alliker Rabb’s *Satire and Secrecy in English Literature from 1650 to 1750* draws fully on secondary literature and analyzes the ways satire participates in clandestine strategies of attack in a culture perceived to be withholding information and even harboring threatening secrets. As she says, at times Behn, Dryden, Manley, Swift, and Pope lived “lives of stealth.” Her intent is to develop theoretical and critical paradigms that integrate women and postmodern theories of language into
studies of satire. Clearly recognizing that the satirists about whom she writes loved to take a “stunned victim” by surprise (stealth) and render him ineffectual (p. 2), she repeatedly explains how this works with, for instance, sustained attention to the secret history, a form she rightly traces to Procopius of Caesarea, author of the mammoth *History of the Wars*—and *Anecdota*, translated into English in 1674. “Here was a paradigm of heroic action transformed into a mock-heroic world of fools and knaves,” she writes (p. 73), and then goes on to point out how secret histories, the story behind the official story, proliferated. To some extent French romances had been offering these intimate behind-the-scenes stories throughout the seventeenth century, and the influence can be seen on Manley’s *Memoirs of Europe* and other texts. Rabb’s third chapter, which includes original and fascinating arguments about the secret histories of Queen Elizabeth and the Don Juan figure, is complemented by her chapter on autobiographical satire by Manley, Swift, and Pope. As she says, *A Tale of a Tub*, *Gulliver’s Travels*, and Pope’s late satires do look different when read beside Manley; the secret histories embedded in the men’s major satires reveal themselves and deliver their stealthy, stunning blows at adversaries.

Lana Asfour in *Laurence Sterne in France* helpfully begins with two chapters on French reviews, first of *Tristram Shandy*, 1760–77, and then later reviews of it and *Sentimental Journey*. She explains theories of translation, pointing the reader to the discussion of it in the *Encyclopédie* and *Supplément*. Her account of the translators’ frustrations with *Tristram* is entertaining and informative. It took, she reports, three different translators and twenty years to publish all nine volumes. She turns finally to *Sentimental Journey* and the “substantial body of imitative fiction” (p. 87) that followed its translation. One puzzling aspect is that there were many French readers fluent in English, and their responses to the texts and the translations are not part of the book. *Tobias Smollett, Scotland’s First Novelist*, edited by O. M. Brack Jr., is a festschrift for Paul-Gabriel Boucé, who died in 2004 (take heed all procrastinating festschrift contributors). Some of the essays, such as Allan Ingram’s “Dear Dick: Matthew Bramble and the Case of the Silent Doctor” follow some of the ground-breaking lines of Boucé’s scholarship. The best thing about the collection is its stretch to encompass Smollett’s less-studied contributions to literary history. There’s Elizabeth Durot-Boucé, “Fathoming the Gothic Novelists’ Indebtedness to Smollett,” Leslie Chilton’s “Smollett as Professional Translator,” and two on Smollett’s writing of
history, including James May’s valuable bibliography of authoritative editions of The Complete History of England. Swift’s Travels: Eighteenth-Century British Satire and its Legacy’s editors, Nicholas Hudson and Aaron Santesso, play on “travels” to emphasize the number of essays that look at Swift’s legacies, and the final set claim Swift’s influence on Pope, Austen, Samuel Beckett, and, in Ronald Paulson’s essay, William Hogarth, Francisco Goya, and Domenico Tiepolo. A group of essays contribute new understanding of Swift’s and Pope’s complicated relationships; among the best is Pat Rogers’s “Swift and the Poetry of Exile.”

Henry Fielding (1707–1754): Novelist, Playwright, Journalist, and Magistrate, edited by Claude Rawson, is a collection of uniformly excellent papers from the Yale University conference honoring the 250th anniversary of Fielding’s death. The essays are divided into four sections, “Plays and Novels,” “Relationships and Collaborations,” “Law, Politics, and Ideas,” and “Afterlife.” It is clear that Rawson built this conference to capture the most significant dimensions of Fielding’s work and to bring together those who consistently push in new directions. The volume opens rather daringly with “Fielding from Stage to Page” by Thomas Lockwood, who did important early archival work with Fielding’s plays, and “The Uncreating Word: Silence and Unspoken Thought in Fielding’s Drama” by Roach, a powerhouse in performance studies. Lockwood gives an excellent overview of Fielding’s dramatic career and, among other things, reminds us that Fielding did produce plays after the Licensing Act. His original contribution is to link the parts Fielding wrote for Kitty Clive to Shamela and “that dazzlingly unregenerate lowlife,” Laetitia Snap, “who is the most visible and engaging female character in Jonathan Wild” (p. 34). Lockwood ends his essay with a sentence that captures what all drama people poignantly long for: evidence that Fielding “gets back to the plays in the novels” (p. 37). Roach’s essay explains more about how Fielding’s plays work theatrically than anything I have ever read and, incidentally, explains exactly why George Bernard Shaw said that Fielding was “the greatest practising dramatist, with the single exception of Shakespear, produced by England between the Middle Ages and the nineteenth century” (quoted, p. 42). This essay, like Rawson’s own (“Avatars of Alexander: Jonathan Wild and the Tyrant Thug, from Voltaire to Brecht”), is capacious. Roach points out telling details such as the context of “gibbering Bedlam of the uncreating word,” cites Jean Racine, Constantin Stanislavki, and Harold Pinter, and notes that George Orwell understood what Fielding did with the language of
recent studies

modern politicians. More of the essays deserve serious treatment, but I will only observe that Fielding scholars often have trouble with women—Fielding’s characters and feminist critics. Linda Bree’s wise and generous “Henry and Sarah Fielding: A Literary Relationship” brings together texts not usually discussed and makes a persuasive case for varied and productive collaborations between the siblings.

POETRY

Wide recognition of the place of poetry in British life and the discovery of the vivid relating of national, social, and personal emotions characteristic of many eighteenth-century poems has given poetry new interest. Ron Broglio’s Technologies of the Picturesque: British Art, Poetry, and Instruments, 1750–1830 and M. M. Mahood’s The Poet as Botanist are two of the books that link poetry to science and allied philosophical and literary movements. Broglio is a teacher of animal studies, and his chapters on cattle remind us that cows are an important element in the picturesque. He draws upon a number of discourses: William Gilpin, who compared the picturesqueness of horses and cows, and Robert Bakewell, “the father of modern animal breeding,” figure prominently. He says that Bakewell “crafted cattle according to our human values of what we find beautiful and pleasing in an animal” (p. 162). The recognition that the sounds are made by a cow is reassuring in Finch’s beautiful Nocturnal Reverie, and poets such as Thomas Gray include them as part of picturesque scenes. Cows are modern; sheep are pastoral. Broglio does not go back that far, of course. His comparisons of Thomas Gainsborough’s, John Constable’s, and Joseph Turner’s cattle are both entertaining and informative, especially in the way he includes scientific information. He notices that one of Turner’s paintings “focuses on the eighteenth-century innovation of using turnips to fatten cattle in the winter” (p. 165). He brings together the use of lines and surfaces to evaluate breeding animals with the painter’s craft and authoritatively traces the association of beef with Englishness as he demonstrates when he discusses Smollett’s affection for Hogarth’s Gate of Calais. Broglio has no interest in women writers, but you have to wonder what he would say about Ann Milne’s chapter on Hands’s mad heifer. Women poets have not entered Mahood’s consciousness either, and omitting Charlotte Smith’s close attention to botany in major texts such as Flora, a carefully constructed epic, is a serious oversight. The chapter of
most interest to us is the second in which she discusses Erasmus Darwin’s various writings in relation to Linné.

For most of the last 100 years, the United States has been at war, thereby putting it in the unenviable position of England in the eighteenth century. H. George Hahn writes in *The Ocean Bards: British Poetry and the War at Sea, 1793–1815*: “Their vast production of poems appeared in the last century of public poetry, when verse still addressed large issues of state, and every newspaper and magazine printed it, a time before subjectivity, introspection, and private life as subjects narrowed and finally eliminated popular readership” (p. 31). His book and James Anderson Winn’s *The Poetry of War* represent the contrasting responses war calls forth. Hahn’s book concentrates on the period of the British resistance to the French, beginning with the first invasion attempt in 1796 and covering the time during which Napoleon had planned nine more invasions and assembled 167,000 men as his “Army of England.” Winn, drawing upon perhaps unequalled knowledge of war poetry, ranges from, as the cover of his book says, “Homer to Bruce Springsteen,” but concentrates on Great Britain and America. Hahn’s research and reading seems encyclopedic; the book is filled with facts and moves authoritatively between the canonical poets and the “Ocean Bards,” whom he characterizes as “good bad poets.” He continues, “what is constant in the popular naval poems is a national involvement and downrightness and righteousness against the French threat”; “unashamed loyalism,” and verse as “flatly uniform as the personality of the sailors in their poems” (pp. 20, 23, 25–6). “In exigent times,” he writes, “sophistication is no rhetorical virtue, subtlety no positive value” (p. 39). His concentration is on patriotic expressions, especially the kinds made by the “Ocean Bards,” while Winn, who was in the Army during the Vietnam War, writes, “The war poets I most admire enlist the forces of memory, meter, and irony to help us confront, in all its contradictory power, the terrible beauty of war” (p. 11).

Both authors assert that war poetry is men’s work, and Hahn even says “although some women were publishing verse, poetry, like battle, was still the traditional province of the man” (p. 24). Maybe it was and maybe it wasn’t. Cavendish, who witnessed battles wrote three pages like these lines in “A description of the Battle in Fight”:

Some with sharp Swords, to tell, O most accurst,
Were above halfe into the bodies thrust:
From whence fresh streams of blood run all along
Unto the Hilts, and there lay clodded on.

(Poems and Fancies, 1753, p. 173)

An essay of mine surveys the kinds of war poetry women in the
eighteenth century wrote (“Hanging On and Hanging In: Women’s
Struggle to Participate in Public Sphere Debate,” in Everyday
Revolutions, reviewed earlier). Repeatedly, I was struck by how
much better my work would have been had I been able to read
Hahn’s book (I was privileged to read Winn’s in manuscript) and
how well Hahn’s categories fit the women’s poetry. Susannah
Centlivre wrote as good a naval “dare” poem as any Hahn cites:
“Safer thou might’st in Lakes of Sulphur sleep, / Than brave
these dreadful Masters of the Deep” (An Epistle to the King of
Sweden from a Lady of Great Britain, 1717). Anne Bannerman’s
Verses on an Illumination for a Naval Victory (1800) certainly cap-
tures Winn’s vision of the contradictory power of war, and, in a
strangely modern way, explicitly questions the impact of religion
and civilization on humankind, just as T. S. Eliot and the Great
War poets do.

The theme of “The Cause of Liberty” (one of Winn’s chapter
titles) figures large in both, and both develop the legacy of inher-
ited attitudes toward war, often citing the same poets but seldom
the same lines. Hahn thrills to John of Gaunt’s death speech in
Shakespeare’s King Richard II, while Winn refers to Shakespeare’s
gentler lines, such as Prince Henry’s “For he to day that sheds
his blood with me / Shall be my brother” (p. 16). Although Winn
writes eloquently about the Greeks and Romans, his work with
Enlightenment thought is most provocative. He asserts

The continuing power of Enlightenment ideals as mo-
tives for warfare reflects not only the philosophical and
political appeal of liberal principles, but the eloquence
of eighteenth-century poets, who honored Liberty as a god-
dess and gave her stirring words to speak.

(p. 183)

Juxtaposing texts by Addison, Woodrow Wilson, and George W.
Bush, Winn claims that eighteenth-century poets such as James
Thomson created “the myth of Liberty as we now know it” and
gave it classical roots (p. 188). Hahn notes that Pericles called the
loss of young men in war, “Like the spring taken out of the year,”
and he, too, ends his book with evidence of the long stretch of eighteenth-century moralisms about war and warriors.

Behrendt begins the second chapter of his *British Women Poets and the Romantic Writing Community* with the same fact with which Hahn opens his first chapter: from 1793 to 1815 Britain was almost continually at war. He quotes Winston Churchill, who, fearing a German invasion, invoked “our Empire beyond the seas, armed and guarded by the British Fleet, would carry on the struggle” and observes “Romantic-era Britons saw the issues in virtually the same way” (p. 79). Both books also give the astounding number of men in the military and home guard. Behrendt’s book shares the historical specificity of Hahn’s and, in examining women’s poetry, has a subject almost as unfamiliar as Hahn’s findings in the *Naval Chronicle*. Behrendt, too, is writing about nationalism, but in a completely different way. His final two chapters are on Scottish and Irish women poets, and they serve to illustrate the creativity of women, their oscillating relationships with communities of writers, and the strains on united nationhood. He is working within what is now often called the revolution period, 1770–1835, and he continues the endeavor to relocate women in the literary, political, and social landscape. His first chapter demonstrates how women’s writing gave philosophical and moral weight to radical ideals of social and political justice. To see the empowered women of the late eighteenth century determined to *intervene in* rather than merely represent public events and movements is accurate and leads to new insights about the auditory, rhetorical, and pictorial aspects of the poetry. He also gives consistent attention to the turn inward, the need for strength and resilience that came to be, he argues, drawn from the individual rather than the group. The balance between this awareness of inner strength and the drive to intervene, educate, and change the world is addressed in the second chapter, “Women Poets during the War Years,” with its attention to poems that treated the situations of women and families. Poems by women dating from the 1730s highlight the imprisonment for debt of returned fighters and of widows, and such protests continue, he proves. Like ripples in an enormous lake, the poetry extends its implications. He writes that Charlotte Smith’s *Emigrants* is “a remarkable and powerful meditation on war and the human condition, made all the more poignant because of the immediacy of experience it embodies both for Smith as its author and for its readers who in 1793 were surrounded by the mounting evidence of man’s relentless inhumanity to man” (p. 167). Behrendt dares
to compare poetry by male and female poets, and his conclusions record differences. The idea that Britain had a special relationship with God, one that was both conferred and earned, comes to increasing prominence, and more women question whether Britain has forfeited it. The sympathy for humankind—French, Polish, African—grows in women’s poetry, and the glorification of war and victory that continues in male poetry fades. Behrendt remarks that “only recently” have we begun to recognize “the engaging and accessible poetic forms in which they wrote,” “the sophisticated rhetorical strategies they employed in their poems,” which, among other skills, “demonstrates the considerable literary skills they brought to their task” (p. 114). We can only hope “recognition” moves to more “appreciation,” and teaching these poems will, I think, inevitably lead to this advance. I love Pope, but it is more of Finch’s poems for which my students ask. What seems crucial to me, however, is that close work with these poems frequently brings us to see what Behrendt and other critics explicate: with scrutiny, the smooth surface opens to a depth, a snap, that is startlingly artful.

Another major book on poetry is Maureen N. McLane’s Balladeering, Minstrelsy, and the Making of British Romantic Poetry. A deeply theoretical book, it is still accessible and even lighthearted. Among the chapter titles is “How to Do Things with Minstrels.” She argues that ballads and songs “are equally constitutive of poetry of the Romantic era” (p. 7), and she does finally move fully into Romantic thought and practice. Nevertheless, this book along with the special issue of The Eighteenth-Century: Theory and Interpretation edited by Ruth Perry (Summer/Fall, 2006) has transformed the field and should be required reading. She begins in 1760 with the publication of James Macpherson’s Ossianic Fragments. Her subject is poiesis defined as “the making of poems, poetics, poetic apparatus, historical essays and ethnographic reveries on poetry” (p. 7) and how poiesis reckons with its historical situations. Aware that poets, antiquarians, ethnographers, linguists, folklorists, and more consider ballads their property, she draws upon all and does an admirable job of sorting among them. Her mastery of her subject and method surface time after time, as when she repeatedly shows how editors produce ballads and yet demonstrates that with ballads “the radical authority of deep, extended, ‘authentic’ subjectivity” and “the elaborated authority of editorial objectivity” must always be considered together and as a relationship of authoritatives. Somehow she manages to foreground a key term (here “border”) and encompass her subject
without diminishing parts of it: “Let us first touch down on the border via ‘The Battle of Otterburn’: the border between Scotland and England, the border between oral tradition and literary culture, between Thomas Percy and Scott, between tunes and texts, objects of inquiry and technologies of mediation,” she writes (p. 97). She brings to life literary rivalries, such as that between Scott and Hogg, and just to be sure this book cannot be mistaken for an old-fashioned ballad study, she gives in-depth treatment to Mungo Park’s “Negro Song,” styled an Afro-Scottish border ballad, and to “Cherokee Death Song.” The paths she traces with them are too good to spoil by telling you; read the book.

NATURE STUDIES

Almost every trend in eighteenth-century studies is apparent in the books in this category.

Globalism: Principles of Chinese gardening “cross-pollinated” horticulture, literature, philosophy, and art, Yu Liu asserts in Seeds of a Different Eden: Chinese Gardening Ideas and a New English Aesthetic Ideal. Liu begins by presenting denials of Chinese influence on English gardens beside contradictions and then documents how specific gardening ideas were transmitted, beginning in the sixteenth century with Christian missionaries and continuing with gardens such as William Temple’s. Liu assigns blame for the erasure of Chinese influence primarily to Horace Walpole, whose On Modern Gardening was inordinately influential and whom he labels a hypocrite because of his youthful reading of Description geographique . . . et physique de l’Empire de la Chine by Jean Baptiste du Halde. Countering Walpole in this account are Temple, William Chambers, and, especially, Shaftesbury’s The Moralist. These writers and works openly admired Chinese gardening principles and extrapolated moral and aesthetic ideas from them. The turn away from formal, geometrically laid out gardens to carefully calculated “naturalness” including fake wildernesses is well-known, as is the late century emphasis on creating prospects modeled on painted landscapes, but the project of identifying the multiple structures of feeling influencing the changes is a work-in-progress to which this book, if sometimes overargued, contributes.

Genre Studies: Inger Sigrun Brodey parallels the landscape architecture of the English garden with the form of the novel of sensibility in Ruined by Design: Shaping Novels and Gardens in the Culture of Sensibility. Specifically, the decline of a reliable
narrator, the dissociation of authorial control from narrator voice, and the reliance upon fragments are signs of the “rhetoric of ruins” borrowed from garden fashions. Rather than virtue being normalized as natural, as the movement unfolded it became more fragile and in need of cultivation. Sterne and Henry Mackenzie, of course, figure prominently, but so do Austen and Mary Wollstonecraft. In Austen Brodey finds the recognition of the necessity of victims that affirm the moral superiority of spectators. In this chapter, gardens all but disappear and, as in other places, recent and excellent scholarship, such as Julie Ellison’s, is not used. Nevertheless, Ruined by Design adds dimensions to our understanding of how structures of feeling are created and expressed in literature. Brody’s method and results are clear in her description of Austen’s creation of style built on and moving beyond the tensions inherent in sensibility with a narrative voice that telegraphs both authority and an apparent “authenticity of uncensored individual experience” (p. 166).

Animal Studies: What Animals Mean in the Fiction of Modernity is another history of structures of feeling. Philip Armstrong begins with an extended comparison of Robinson Crusoe, who comes across as a sensitive pet owner, and Gulliver, who is a pet more often than not. Noting that Enlightenment terms such as compassion, kindness, sympathy, and even humanity are implicated in the understanding and treatment of animals, Armstrong’s conclusions are intriguing. In his descriptions, Crusoe’s dogs are the modern creatures that communicate by companionate accompaniment, yelps, and even places by the table, and his sympathy for a goat or two, one he “grieves over” and one he makes into a pet, is an allegory for the passage “from prey to domestic stock to companion animal,” a “compressed history of human progress” (p. 41). That the goat is tamed as the slaves are by Jack is not, I think, supposed to come to mind. Defoe, Armstrong concludes, anticipates the kinds of feelings central to the novels of sensibility and, incidentally by extension, the kinds of tensions Brodey identifies. The book considers other appropriate texts, such as Frankenstein, as examples of human-animal relationships that reveal an era’s structures of feeling, and his final chapter collects texts such as Yann Martel’s Robinsonade, The Life of Pi (Pi and a Bengal tiger survive a shipwreck), that continue his history and have at least peripheral relationships to the earlier novels.

Ecocritism: In Lactilla Tends Her Fav’rite Cow: Ecocritical Readings of Animals and Women in Eighteenth-Century British Labouring-Class Women’s Poetry, Ann Milne studies the representation of
domesticated animals in the poetry of Mary Collier, Leapor, Hands, Yearsley, and Janet Little, all laboring class poets. Something of an experiment, Milne self-consciously uses “an explicitly ecocritical perspective” with an emphasis on the ways the women poets position themselves in relation to nature within a context of “interlocking oppressions” that includes sexism and “speciesism” (pp. 24–5). In each chapter, she includes a close reading, a nonliterary discourse, focus on an animal, and an example of an ecocritical method. A good example is the chapter on Leapor’s *Man the Monarch*, which relates the poem’s themes to major texts such as John Locke’s *Two Treatises of Government* and Georges-Louis Leclerc, Comte de Buffon’s *Histoire Naturelle*. Leapor is in dialogue with these texts, and she extends their ideas about enslavement and the connection between man’s tyranny over nature and tyranny over women into, Milne says, domesticating forces including class. The chapter on Hands’s *Written, originally extempore, on seeing a Mad Heifer* identifies the possibilities of the heifer’s condition through Thomas Topham’s *Treatise on Cattle* as a distemper or, more pertinently, a “refusal to take the bull” (p. 77), which was sometimes treated by getting the cow drunk. Milne demonstrates through both the deep ecology assumption of identification and ecofeminist interlocking oppressions that Hands constructs a dynamic between animal and woman that resists a representation of the village as successfully pastoralizing laboring women and domestic animals. This chapter, like the others, effectively demonstrates the “in-betweenness” of laboring class poets, like animals suspended between wildness and enslavement, natural genius (instinct) and agency.

**TRENDS—BY WAY OF SUMMARY**

The subject rather than traditional periods determines the perimeter years considered. Books such as McLane’s *Balladeering, Minstrelsy, and the Making of British Romantic Poetry*, which makes 1760–1830 its boundaries by necessity, has to take into account the eighteenth century’s revival of the ballad, often dated to Addison’s essay on *Chevy Chase*, but she moves quickly to revisionary conceptualizations that depend upon treating this time period as what it was—a time of drastic change in what she calls “the situation of poetries” (p. 11). In such books, breaks that used to be *de rigueur* for topics, forms, and individual authors are bridged seamlessly, often without comment. The “long eighteenth century” is taken for granted, and the “revolution period,” ca.
1770–1835, is becoming well-established, although the rhetoric of book titles suggests there is a longing to see the last decades of the eighteenth century as the old "pre-Romantic." "Enlightenment" has become at best a catchall and at worst a meaningless term. Undefined and unsituated, it is used to unify at least three collections of essays and a new series of books, appears in at least five book titles, and is a key concept for critics as different as Guest, McCarthy, Kerrigan, Armstrong, and Ellenzweig. Surely there is not one simultaneous Enlightenment for every European country, and have we decided if England really participated in the Enlightenment? At least Withers asks, "Where was the Atlantic Enlightenment?"

Cultural studies and interdisciplinarity reign, and canonicity seems no longer an issue. Print culture is treated as an essential context. Science is big. Critics are pushing eco-criticism firmly back into our century. Theories of all kinds have been absorbed and are seldom acknowledged but serve as powerful tools for analysis. A counterexample is performance theory, for those who use it consider it new enough to offer extended explanations of methods and terms. Its wide application in books such as Thomas A. King’s, however, suggests that it will soon be as taken for granted as Bakhtinian carnivalesque. But what of feminist criticism? It seems absorbed and weakened by cultural studies. Certainly feminist methodologies are well-applied and great attention is given to women in dozens of these books. It is confounding, however, that these studies universally reinforce cultural studies closures rather than extend into core feminist concerns. I miss, for instance, attention to women’s textual resistances to power, attempts at more coherent theories of literary value, and conclusions that reveal the consequences of the intersections of sex, race, and class.

Enlightened globalism has never been higher. Intellectual history is back. Rhetoric and philology are back. Poetry is on the upswing. Hogarth prints, especially Gin Lane, are favorite cover illustrations (expand your horizons, folks). Compared to the vitality of studies of outlaws, rakes, servants, projectors, harlequins, and rabble, studies of canonical male writers are anemic. We still have no authoritative edition of Defoe’s works. Male and female writers are far less often enshrined in separate chapters and books, a practice I lamented in SEL in 1991: “Those [books] that ignore [women] often seem quite old fashioned and dangerously incomplete, but the resistance is tangible and occasionally angry” (p. 603). Today the resistance is more sulky and skulking than
open, and many recognize that the work we are beginning is to re-integrate women writers, reviewers, and readers in a more accurate literary landscape. Although there is some progress, even when some of the writers and texts that need to be taken into account seem obvious, it is not happening fast enough.

As I identified themes, I could not ignore a paradox: In spite of the sophistication about access to publication, types of publication, modes of production, cost, and books as material culture in the eighteenth century, we have given little thought to how access to publication has shaped our field. Year after year, university presses at Cambridge, Johns Hopkins, Delaware, Bucknell, Chicago, and a few others publish important books in eighteenth-century studies, and we can recall when the University of Georgia Press and Kentucky did. The strength of Yale’s and Stanford’s lists came as a pleasant surprise. The sheer number of books published by Ashgate and Palgrave Macmillan is something of a thing of wonder. Ashgate’s are decidedly of more uneven significance and soundness, but some stand with the best. But how should the books sent to SEL be interpreted? as the best books being published in our field? as a representative sample of books? a quite skewed group dictated by presses that know and respect SEL and by those, like Oxford, that generally scorn U.S. academic reviewers and even prizes? Yet SEL is an index of our specific publishing milieu. It tells us which presses might be interested in our manuscripts and how those books might look and be marketed; it offers a record of how fluctuations in press personnel and financial resources act upon the field. Certainly it holds up a mirror to the way we practice our discipline and, if we look hard enough, to largely unrecognized external shaping factors.

NOTE

1 Richard Cumberland, The Plays of Richard Cumberland, ed. Roberta Borkat, 6 vols. (New York: Garland, 1982); plays are sequentially paginated within volumes, 2:1–2.
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