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The English Enlightenment Reads Ovid: Dryden and Jacob Tonson’s 1717 “Metamorphoses” by Richard Morton

Review by Tanya Caldwell, Georgia State University

In the late seventeenth century and throughout the eighteenth, miscellany translation emerged as a major phenomenon that helped authors to experiment in generic form, particularly the novel. These miscellanies eroded traditional hierarchies and shifted emphasis from the lessons embedded in great works of the past to psychological motivation. Ovid was a favourite alike among the most eminent poets and the least capable, and many attempted translations. Richard Morton’s fine in-depth study of the traditions of Ovid translation in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries traces shifts in authors’ perceptions of the ancient and Ovid’s place in contemporary culture.

Morton first observes that the magnificent translation by various “Eminent hands” and embellished with plates became enshrined in the minds of the century as “Dryden’s Ovid’s Metamorphosis.” This was the victor in ongoing publishing wars that had begun as far back as Dryden’s Ovid’s Epistles in 1680 and culminated through a series of miscellanies in a competition between Garth and Curl in 1717. Like the Sandys Ovid it replaced, “Jacob Tonson’s Ovid’s Metamorphoses in Fifteen Books is one of the masterpieces of English book production” (xv). Tonson’s translation reflects the modish glamour of the new century. Morton stresses variety and female influence, while also highlighting Dryden on the modernity of translation with Dryden’s recognition of difference in approaches. What these miscellanies capture is mixed delights and an audience bent on entertainment rather than instruction. Ancient characters come to life, and the translation changes the presentation of the ancient world for posterity through its “humanizing realism” (xxv). Morton’s argument makes for compelling reading, though his contexts could have been better framed with Barbara Benedict’s extensive work on the miscellanies and their impact.

In his first chapter, Morton reviews the “Early Modern Ovid Moralisé” through Golding, Renouard, and Sandys. Horatian delight and instructive elements are taken very seriously in Golding’s Elizabethan translation. Golding warns of the evil involved in misreading the layers of allegory
in Ovid’s mythology. Renouard’s early seventeenth-century French prose translation moralizes Ovid with interpolated “judgmental asides,” going further than other translators in the ethical lessons he draws. Sandys prefigures hypertext and is an Ovid for his age.

As he directly addresses the 1717 Dryden Ovid, Morton points out that Dryden’s translations from Examen Poeticum and Fables Ancient and Modern make up the bulk of it. In contrast to the moralizing tradition of the earlier translators, Dryden makes Ovid “patently comic.” His prefatory essays engage in comparisons between authors, which was Dryden’s signature contribution to criticism and thinking. Morton remarks that Dryden’s intention, as it was increasingly in his translations, was “to identify common human sensibility” through the act of translation. Dryden’s greater emphasis on psychology than on morality would help shape the poetry of the century to follow him. Morton uses as an example of this influence Pope’s Rape of the Lock (1712), which features the kind of humour and psychology that Dryden was laying the groundwork for in these translations (25–26).

In his third chapter, Morton sketches the variety and styles of poets and playwrights who attempted Ovid and got caught up in the translation industry, as it had become. The more serious and classically oriented translations by Joseph Addison of books 2 and 3 of Metamorphoses feature in Poetical Miscellanies (1704), not in the 1717 edition with its focus on Ovid’s deficiency of “Words” (61). Addison’s goal is to sharpen imagery and heighten the universality of the ancient. Gay’s version of Arachne appears in the 1717 Curll Metamorphoses.

Nahum Tate, the playwright and, from 1692, poet laureate, supplies a version of book 7 of the Metamorphoses in Tonson’s 1717 edition as “the culmination of a long career” (89). As proof of how complex the translation culture had become, Tate’s version was later “shamelessly plagiarized in the 1717 complete Metamorphoses of Sewell and Curll” (91). The interplay between voices at the heart of these collections created a contemporary confusion (as Morton notes at the start, citing Henry Fielding) about attribution of original comments. The significance of translation, and translation of Ovid in particular, thanks to the Dryden-Tonson undertaking, is accentuated by the number of poet laureates who turned their hands to snippets of Ovid. Another of these was Nicholas Rowe, who, like Tate, was more remarkable as a playwright than a poet.

In chapter 4, Morton launches directly into a close reading of the translation by Samuel Garth, the general editor of the 1717 Tonson Metamorphoses, of book 14, the one he calls “The Little Aeneid” (97). Morton focuses on the psychological realism in Garth’s version of the mythical characters so that Circe becomes a complex human-like figure. As Morton notes, the “various metamorphoses in Book XIV provide occasion for
highly colored passages to which Garth typically adds epithets clarifying character or motivation” (111). The translators had begun to offer to readers many characters that were similar in personality to the novelists of the period: entertaining and psychologically complex characters whose fates are connected to their flaws. Morton points out that Garth adds “moral epithets” to guide readers in their responses (113). Morton completes his chapter with a romp through a series of minor translators, focusing on their highlights.

The book ends with a consideration of the shift of ancient poetry into another genre: drama. Morton guides us through Thomas Heywood’s five-act play The Golden Age, The Silver Age, The Brazen Age, and The Iron Age, Parts One and Two, demonstrating how they bring to life the stories of Ovid, Homer, and Vergil (his spelling). Morton argues that “similar humanizing changes” are made to Ovid in Pierre Corneille’s Andromede (1650).

Morton offers here old-fashioned scholarship. He celebrates Dryden and Ovid and the translations that helped to transform genre in the eighteenth century. Morton provides a methodical tour through examples of passages he deems crucial—indeed that are crucial—for their shifts from previous translations, their humour, and their psychological underpinnings as they shape the age to follow. He prefers close reading to examining the larger contexts that the translations grew out of and helped to shape. This book demonstrates passion for the primary materials and Ovid’s place in English literary culture as a result of the work spearheaded by Dryden and Tonson.

Tanya Caldwell is Professor of English at Georgia State University. She is the author of Virgil Made English: The Decline of Classical Authority (2008) and Time to Begin Anew: Dryden’s “Georgics” and “Aeneis” (2000), and the editor of Popular Plays by Women in the Restoration and Eighteenth Century (2011).

The Mind Is a Collection: Case Studies in Eighteenth-Century Thought by Sean Silver
Review by Marcus Tomalin, University of Cambridge

This stimulating and unconventional book is, in essence, a catalogue. It describes and contextualizes twenty-eight objects from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, all of which are on display in a virtual museum. As such, it is a guidebook of startling ambition. Each of the six chapters-cum-cases examines a specific theme—Metaphor, Design,
Digression, Inwardness, Conception, Dispossession—and Sean Silver, the affable author-cum-curator, encourages his readers-cum-visitors to reflect upon the philosophical and cultural implications of each exhibit. All the objects therefore constitute metaphorical and literal case studies. Taken as a whole, they certainly form an idiosyncratic and heterogeneous assortment. John Locke’s commonplace book, John Milton’s bed, a gritty pebble from John Woodward’s geological collection, the magnified full-stop in Robert Hooke’s *Micrographia* (1665), an ampulla containing the blood of Thomas Becket, two sketches of conception by William Hunter, a shilling piece, the skeleton of Jonathan Wild—these are just a few of the items showcased. In this curious museum, it is always best to expect the unexpected.

The format of Silver’s project may be unconventional, but he successfully avoids superficial gimmickry. This success is largely because his underlying purpose is such a serious one—namely, to show that the history of ideas is inextricably intertwined with the study of material culture. His museum has been designed specifically to demonstrate how deeply notions are grounded in things—and (crucially) vice versa. For several decades, the multifaceted relationships between the academic study of history, material culture, social structures, and cultural practices have been approached from a range of contrasting analytical and theoretical perspectives (for example, structuralist, hermeneutical, or post-modernist), and texts such as Christopher Tilley’s *Reading Material Culture* (1990) have become deservedly established as recognized classics. The founding of the *Journal of Material Culture* in 1996 occurred in direct response to a burgeoning cross-disciplinary interest in the social significance of artefacts, and scholars such as Harvey Green, Tony Bennett, and Patrick Joyce have all identified a distinctive “material turn” in the recent study of cultural history (Green, “Cultural History and the Material(s) Turn,” *Cultural History* 1, no. 1 [2012]: 61–82; Tony Bennett and Patrick Joyce, eds., *Material Powers: Cultural Studies, History, and the Material Turn* [Abingdon: Routledge, 2010]). Nonetheless, there remains a lingering conviction in some quarters that the history of ideas can be safely removed from the grime and particularity of specific corporeal entities, that ideas float above, untethered to concrete things.

Silver discards such simplistic assumptions, and he motivates his stance by examining certain representations of knowledge that became commonplace during the long eighteenth century—especially the recurrent trope that the mind is akin to a collection (whether of books, coins, pictures, plants, or anything else). His probing analyses of contemporaneous discourses based on this metaphor prompt a re-evaluation of several time-honoured dichotomies, such as the mind-body duality—an undertaking which, in turn, reveals the potent interdependencies
that exist between abstract notional schemas and corporeal, cultural, and political structures. To take one example, Locke viewed the mind as a cabinet, but he simultaneously deemed his own cabinet to be a repository of ideas, and these parallel tendencies initiate a self-reflexive to-ing and fro-ing from mind to matter, and from matter to mind. Such inverse associations destabilize the conventional unidirectionality of well-behaved conceptual metaphors, which usually map linearly from one cognitive domain to another (13, 31). Instead of the reassuring directness of a one-way analogical movement, Silver repeatedly confronts us with alluring entanglements, instances in which specific mental representations of knowledge both determine and are determined by the real-world objects figuratively connected with them. This intermingling is clearly apparent, for example, in the close associations Joseph Addison established between walking in a garden (an external spatial activity) and thinking (an internal cognitive activity). This associative habit of mind became so pervasive in his writings that (as Silver puts it) “it turns thought into a horticultural genre” (148). Accordingly, a walk through the landscaped grounds of Bilton Hall becomes simultaneously a ramble through Addison’s own ruminations.

Seeking to illustrate the distinctive nature of these reflexive quasi-Shandean interconnections, Silver makes effective use of the notion of a “cognitive ecology.” This kind of system (he emphasizes) is characterized by a constant “to and fro between models and minds, spaces of thinking and habits of thought” (x). Therefore, such ecologies standardly involve “a chicken-and-egg reflexivity of source and target” (14). While the phrase “cognitive ecology” has been current since at least the 1970s in several academic domains such as psychology and cognitive science, its requisition by the humanities is a relatively recent development. Yet it proves to be a useful analytical model here, since ecological forms of thought arise quite naturally when intellectual history and material culture are jointly assessed. As Silver notes, “models of mind [evolve] along with the environments in which they are entangled and embedded” (17). Armed with this epistemological framework, he discusses (among other things) the mysteries of artistic and biological conception, the relationship between originality and plagiarism, the porous boundaries between private and public domains, and the exchange economy of material possessions. This list catalogues dominant and abiding cognitive ecologies from the eighteenth century, and Silver archly classifies his own text as “an ecology of such ecologies” (ix).

While this thought-provoking catalogue reveals deep and significant interconnections between seemingly unrelated entities and phenomena, its strengths are sometimes also its weaknesses. Silver’s insistent focus on specific artefacts occasionally narrows the discussion to such an extent
that his more general conclusions are, at times, insufficiently grounded. As he is only too well aware, this is especially problematical when the six objects in the final case (Dispossession) are scrutinized. The “heavy task” (126) undertaken in this chapter’s scant forty-two pages is to destabilize the intricate arguments that have been elaborated with such painstaking care in the preceding 225 pages of the book. While Silver undoubtedly addresses, briefly, crucial topics central to historical trends in material possession in these sections (for example, social marginalization, ephemerality, and gender), his long delay in doing so is never explained. These are all subjects that should have been given much greater prominence from the outset, and, inevitably, his parsimonious discussion of these important matters lacks illustrative force. He rightly acknowledges that the poor, the marginalized, and the disenfranchised rarely acquired the kinds of collections (libraries, cabinets, galleries) so familiar to Hooke, Locke, Woodward, Samuel Pepys, Joshua Reynolds, and their peers. The disenfranchised and dispossessed were simply incapable of amassing assortments of objects that could develop symbiotically with their own thinking. Yet, confined as it is to a subsection of a single chapter, the discussion of Laetitia Pilkington’s now lost (and therefore only imaginatively recreated) account book struggles to shed its own synthetic particularity sufficiently to embody the kinds of potent generalities that Silver is seeking to discover within its form, content, and structure. The (nonexistent) account book is alone tasked with helping us appreciate how and why cognitive processes can be dispersed across diverse media, and how aide-mémoires form part of a more widely distributed cognitive environment. The rather frugal nature of the discussion means that this extremely important aspect of the cognitive ecology model remains frustratingly underspecified.

Another cause of (sporadic) concern is that, since Silver attempts to cover such a vast field of enquiry, he is sometimes over-reliant on existing studies, as evidenced by the fulsome references confined to the detailed endnotes. The sheer expansive scope of his undertaking means that his reading of the secondary literature can be worryingly devoid of incisive critical appraisal. Exhibit 16 in case 4 (“Two Calculi Cut and Mounted in a Small Showcase”) prompts a series of reflections on “the problem of time” (157), for instance, which in turn leads to a brisk summary of the thinking of Locke, Hooke, and Pepys about temporality and temporal measurement. This is appropriate enough, yet, given the notorious complexity of the technicalities of the horological revolution and the conflicting theories of subjective temporal perception propounded during the long eighteenth century (not to mention the huge body of literature about these subjects that has accumulated during the intervening centuries), a brisk and breezy overview can only ever underwhelm. The predictable
reference to Stuart Sherman’s “brilliant reading of the vectors of time in [Pepys’s] diary” (160) is insufficient, and there is no attempt to respond to the many important revisionist studies published in the two decades since Sherman’s *Telling Time* appeared in 1996. This lack of inquisitive rigour occasionally results in troubling fragilities: Silver’s own arguments are only as secure as the arguments he borrows (sometimes too uncritically) from the work of others. And given the centrality of these dependencies to his project, the absence of a free-standing bibliography is irksome.

These weaknesses, though, frustrate rather than invalidate. Silver’s book will undoubtedly beguile anyone with even a remote interest in the thought and culture of the long eighteenth century. Regardless of theoretical predilections or methodological allegiances, all such readers will find things here that will delight, disconcert, and disturb them. And it is possible to explore the objects extensively by visiting the virtual museum http://www.mindisacollection.org, to examine in depth the six cases displayed there. This supplementary resource avoids the inevitable constricting linearity of the written guide, since visitors can follow different routes through the space and can view the collection from a variety of contrasting perspectives. High-resolution colour images of the objects on show are accompanied by succinct passages of explanation that helpfully elaborate the broader intellectual, cultural, and historical contexts. Visitors are welcome to return as often as they wish, of course, and they undoubtedly will, since (like all the best museums) there is no admission charge. And if anyone wishes to learn more about any of the artefacts on display in the cases, then it is always possible to purchase a copy of the weighty catalogue—from the gift shop, of course.

**Marcus Tomalin** is a Fellow of Downing College at the University of Cambridge. He has written extensively about the literature of the long eighteenth century, and his research interests range from linguistic theory to horology. His most recent monograph is entitled *The French Language and British Literature, 1756–1830* (2016).

*The Enlightenment: A Very Short Introduction* by John Robertson

Review by Richard B. Sher, New Jersey Institute of Technology/Rutgers University–Newark

Writing an account of a phenomenon as complex and contested as the Enlightenment is a difficult task under any circumstances, but writing a “very short introduction” to the Enlightenment—in this case fewer than 120 pages of text, after allowances are made for illustrations, lists of sources and further reading, and the index—is a challenge that few scholars
could profitably meet. Fortunately, John Robertson is among those few, and he has given us a splendid little book. Robertson is aware that “what can be associated with Enlightenment has expanded geographically, socially, and intellectually, well beyond the initial associations of *lumières* and *Aufklärung*” (10), and, for this reason, a brief study like this one cannot cover everything. He therefore sets clear geographical, social, and intellectual boundaries. As a historian with expertise focusing on the northern and southern fringes of Europe (Scotland and the Kingdom of Naples), he is naturally inclined to view the Enlightenment as geographically capacious, though it “remains a phenomenon of the European world” (14). French and German thinkers are by no means neglected, but the attention paid to Scots and especially Italians gives this work a geographical range that is uncommon and refreshing.

Socially, too, Robertson's approach is expansive: one of the book's five chapters, titled “Enlightening the Public,” is devoted to the social world of the Enlightenment, including institutions that traditionally make up the social sphere, such as coffee houses, masonic lodges, salons, universities. This social chapter also deals with the emergence and spread of print culture and the growth of intellectual authority and public opinion in various national contexts. In covering these topics, the author ranges widely and often incorporates recent scholarship into his account. In regard to the role of women in French salons, for example, Robertson first discusses the “strong case” made by Dena Goodman to establish the “intellectual agency” (90) and leadership of the Parisian salonnières as a force for Enlightenment, but he then presents Antoine Lilti's counter-argument (newly available in English in a 2015 abridgment of the 2005 French original), stressing the salonnières' social subservience to the aristocracy and intellectual subservience to men of letters, with the result that “the salon was after all neither an institution of the public sphere nor a major instrument of Enlightenment” (91). The London Bluestockings are given the credit for empowering women in the cultural and intellectual sphere that is denied to their counterparts in Paris.

It is in the realm of intellectual life that the author trims his topic's sails, by conceptualizing the Enlightenment as “a distinct intellectual movement of the 18th century, dedicated to the better understanding, and thence the practical advancement, of the human condition on this earth” (13). Part of the meaning of this definition unfolds in a chapter titled “Engaging with Religion,” which deftly explores seventeenth- and eighteenth-century inquiries into the history of religion, the emergence of toleration—focusing particularly on Voltaire's *Traité sur la Tolérance* and “an exclusively this-worldly argument for toleration” based on manners rather than conscience—and new approaches to the tension between “the sacred and the civil” (42, 43) in the work of writers such as
Edward Gibbon and Pietro Giannone, author of a civil history of Naples published in 1723. In all these areas of inquiry, Robertson argues, Enlightenment thinkers sought to discover the historical foundations of religion as a means of bringing about an accommodation between the religious and secular worlds. This is decidedly not an Enlightenment characterized primarily by atheism or anti-clericalism, and the leading modern proponent of that interpretation, Peter Gay, is never mentioned.

The key to the author’s view of the intellectual life of the Enlightenment appears in “Bettering the Human Condition,” one of the book’s “three main chapters” (13), along with the two discussed above. Here, as in the chapter on religion, Robertson displays his virtuosity as an intellectual historian. The focus is on three fields of inquiry—moral philosophy, history, and political economy—and their confrontation with the historical foundations of human progress, presented as a kind of dialectical struggle. The struggle culminates in David Hume’s and Adam Smith’s sophisticated defences of “the transformative power of commerce” as the engine of progress, in opposition to “Rousseau’s critique of modern society” in the “Second Discourse” (79, 80). “Growth through commerce might have undeniable moral costs,” Robertson writes, “but it still bettered the human condition” (79). Thus, political economy emerges as “the key to understanding modern society and its prospects of further development; in effect, it became the new universal science of society” (80).

This book succeeds admirably in introducing the Enlightenment as an intellectual movement dedicated to this-worldly improvement through the liberalization of religion and the propagation of social thought, engaged in by individuals throughout Europe, and spread via print and other institutions of the public sphere. But why is the intellectual life of the Enlightenment defined so narrowly? At one point, Robertson makes a claim for privileging moral philosophy, history, and political economy because “it is in these fields, through intensive enquiry into the motives, causes, and prospects of human betterment, that the greatest originality of Enlightenment thought is to be found” (50). Intellectual originality in the service of human betterment is at best a subjective category, however. A good case can be made for arguing that there was more originality leading to human betterment in the eighteenth century from scientific, medical, and technological inquiries in areas such as smallpox prevention and agricultural innovations that increased food production than in the treatises of Rousseau and Smith. At the opposite end of the intellectual spectrum, the development of the novel during the eighteenth century was certainly original, and it would seem that many works of fiction also contributed to the improvement of the human condition, for example by instilling moral principles and by satirizing and exposing prejudices,
inhumane laws and customs, and other evils in contemporary society. Yet even *Candide*—a work of fiction that few would fail to recognize as a classic Enlightenment text—is absent from this volume. Robertson hints at the power of fiction when he briefly discusses Robert Darnton’s thesis about the influence on public opinion of best-selling “semi-pornographic novels” such as *Thérèse philosophe* and *Anecdotes sur Mme du Barry* in the run-up to the French Revolution. But since in his view “the Revolution was the antithesis of Enlightenment” (116), the implication is that fiction may have helped to undermine, but cannot help to define, the Enlightenment’s intellectual core.

Taken on its own terms, Robertson’s very short introduction stands tall among Enlightenment primers, suitable for advanced university students and general readers alike. This book successfully conveys the author’s belief that the Enlightenment was mainly concerned with innovative thought about society, and that “what is particularly interesting about Enlightenment thought was its willingness to engage with change in this world independent of the next, to think about what might constitute ‘progress’” (130).

Richard B. Sher is Distinguished Professor of History in the Federated History Department of New Jersey Institute of Technology and Rutgers University–Newark. His publications on the Enlightenment include *The Enlightenment and the Book* (2006) and *Church and University in the Scottish Enlightenment* (30th-anniversary edition, 2015).
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**Metaphors of Mind: An Eighteenth-Century Dictionary**

by Brad Pasanek


Review by Sean Silver, University of Michigan

When Alan Turing sketched out a research program for artificial intelligence, he began by peering into his own mind. What he found there was like “a notebook as one buys it from the stationers”; such a mind is “rather little mechanism, and lots of blank sheets” (“Computing Machinery and Intelligence,” *Mind*, n.s., 59 [October 1950]: 433–60). The moment is striking for the directions it points: at once summarizing millennia of cognitive models, even while setting out a development program for the modern computer. The mind, by Turing’s account, is either a blank page or a database—depending on how you look at it. He had named the very tools he used while thinking as the platform for a new generation of cognitive modelling. After Turing’s moment, a technology of writing would lurk at the heart of modern thinking machines.
I was recently reminded of Turing’s essay when reading Brad Pasanek’s book, which is itself a modern thinking machine. As Turing’s paper charted a way forward by summarizing a history, so *Metaphors of Mind* points in two directions. The book is a throwback, a dictionary of passages drawn from eighteenth-century print. It is an “eighteenth-century dictionary,” kin to the kind assembled by Pierre Bayle, Jean le Rond d’Alembert and Denis Diderot, and Samuel Johnson. But it is also a cutting-edge project, developed in the heady, experimental atmosphere that includes the Stanford-based Literary Lab. The brilliant and original essays refer continually to a painstakingly compiled database of examples (available at www.metaphorized.net); thus, the database, our moment’s key mnemonic metaphor, is put to work to mine metaphors of the past. Not the least of these is memory’s blank page, which Turing found somewhere within his skull, and which appears as the last entry in *Metaphors of Mind* (“Writing”).

The author is aware that he charts a difficult path between metaphor as subject and metaphor as method. Familiar structure is one of his resources. Like any dictionary, *Metaphors of Mind* is organized alphabetically. Each of its eleven essays addresses a constellation of related metaphors, beginning with “Animals,” and ending with “Writing.” Readers are invited to consult it as they please, dipping into it like any reference work. But the reference genre partially masks an underlying structure of argument, and astute readers will recognize that the book anticipates being read straight through. A generous introduction prepares the way, slyly including a discussion of history’s many dictionary readers. Moreover, the book’s first two entries explicitly and pointedly address fundamental issues of method: “Animals” discusses key procedural questions, while “Coinage” explores ways that metaphors make differences in the world (coinage “as a metaphor for metaphor” [52]). It is only then (in “Court”) that the book shelves a primary interest in technique, allowing itself instead to explore the contours of a metaphor of mind that will be familiar to most readers: the mind as a space presided over by one or another faculty.

Because book and database are alike constructed with keywords in their literal context, each cuts across traditional ways of doing critique or intellectual history. A literalist treatment of metaphor justifies this approach, which leans on half a century of developments in poststructuralism. One mainstream theory would treat metaphor as the asymmetrical yoking of ideas to objects: a quality of some notional thing is mapped onto a putatively real subject. Pasanek’s approach, in the tradition of Max Black, Donald Davidson, and Roger White, argues instead for metaphor as the provisional, symmetrical overlap between two parallel statements. The approach is literalist because it offers no extra-discursive ground from which to judge a metaphor; it is egalitarian because it offers...
no way to judge the priority of subject or object, tenor or vehicle. Viewed this way, metaphors are relentlessly linguistic phenomena, the stuff of discourse. Tracing them demands the exhaustive charting of networks, for virtually any claim about the nature of mind or its many metaphorical partners can shed light on the way people made sense of mental life. This is the mandate that the author accepts—the dual task of painstakingly compiling a relational database, followed by tracing, in that database, the lines of force that its metaphors illuminate.

Notably absent from Metaphors of Mind is recent work in cognitive linguistics and the emerging disciplines of embedded, embodied, or otherwise extended cognition. While these fields explore the various ways in which metaphor structures mentation, this book and database prefer the careful charting of metaphors in their own textual territory. They leave the contested ground of cognitive philosophy to eighteenth-century pioneers like John Locke, George Berkeley, and Thomas Reid. Approaching a history of cognition in this way, as the effect of historical metaphor, leads to some powerful and counterintuitive conclusions; it also provisionally traces modern penchants for metaphorizing to eighteenth-century sources. When Locke, for instance, observes that English words for naming mental processes (“apprehend,” “comprehend,” etc.) draw from embodied experiences, we should wonder how he knows to give embodied sensation priority. Moments like these, of what the author calls “figurative empiricism,” are to be positioned as “episode[s] in a longer history of category mistakes” (253). Such a history offers a link from Locke to Turing—for it is just such a productive chain of category mistakes that would underwrite the transformations of the computer age.

As the author hints in “Fetters,” metaphors of mind are the technical achievements of their moments. Like all technical accomplishments, Metaphors of Mind negotiates a dialectic between technique and tool. As the author puts it (borrowing from John Wesley), at times the horseman rides with tight reins; at others, the animal finds its own path. When the database is given its head, Metaphors of Mind offers the richest exploration to date of the period’s metaphors. These wide-ranging, eclectic sections hunt figural patterns that sometimes bear upon mind, but might also bear upon emotions, feelings, beliefs, or other aspects of experience. Perhaps more exhilarating is when the author takes the reins himself. Here, the book is critically incisive, with glimpses of what is possible when the database is brought to bear on well-known orthodoxies. Metaphors of Mind, for example, takes aim at M.H. Abrams’s The Mirror and the Lamp (1953), offering compelling evidence that the argument for a general, mostly smooth transition of metaphorical regimes (from mirror to lamp) seriously underestimates the complexity of the period’s competing metaphorical systems.
Pasanek concludes by reminding us that the book is “a paper surrogate for a digital artifact” (259). (Actually, it ends with a “page ... intentionally left blank,” an artful gesture, one imagines, to the metaphor historically underwriting mind and database alike.) I suppose we are meant to think of the database as the place where the real work has occurred. But the book’s own argument should give us pause. Any database, Turing might have noted, is already a digital surrogate for a paper artefact—each the metaphor for the other. This database, even more than others, was clearly composed with its surrogate always in mind. In short, it would be a mistake to take Pasanek at his word. This is clearly an accomplishment to reckon with: a database bold in its conception and painstakingly compiled; a book elegantly written, dauntingly original, and insightful to the point of disorientation. Together they offer a wide-ranging account of the mind’s metaphors even while composing, in trailblazing fashion, a trailblazing argument. Metaforized.net might or might not belong in your bookmark folder, but Metaphors of Mind belongs on the shelf of every student of eighteenth-century literature and culture, those interested in the history of cognition, and scholars working in and through novel approaches to history. No doubt we will be discussing this work for some time.

Sean Silver is Associate Professor of English at the University of Michigan. He curates www.mindisacollection.org, an online museum, and he is the author of its catalogue, The Mind Is a Collection: Case Studies in Eighteenth-Century Thought (2015), which was awarded the 2016 Kenshur Prize.

Imperfect Creatures: Vermin, Literature, and the Sciences of Life, 1600–1740 by Lucinda Cole

Review by Melissa Bailes, Tulane University

According to James Boswell, a group of eighteenth-century literary lights, who had gathered at Joshua Reynolds’s house one evening to hear James Grainger read from his poem The Sugar-cane (1764), burst into laughter when the poet began a new stanza, “Now, Muse, let’s sing of rats.” Although her book does not travel so far forward in literary history, Lucinda Cole’s Imperfect Creatures offers fascinating contexts for understanding the presence and importance of “vermin” in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century British literature, with implications even for our present time. Cole’s focus on often undervalued species, such as rats, fleas, and frogs, sets Imperfect Creatures apart from most other texts in animal studies, which generally focus on “more perfect” mammals (including
horses, dogs, apes, and cats) and their similarities with humans. Instead, Cole’s study complicates such identifications and delights in the differences highlighted by “imperfect” creatures, demonstrating how these species can both challenge and help explain early modern subject/object, human/animal distinctions.

Examining both well-known and lesser-known early modern literary texts and scientific theorists, this book comprises five chapters, an introduction, and an afterword. While “vermin” proves a difficult and unstable category to define, Cole variously categorizes these species as small, noxious, vile, and, perhaps most interestingly and important to her project, associated with rapid reproduction and with threats to food supplies, and thus to agricultural and sociopolitical orders. Her introduction presents especially illuminating analyses of the flea in literature and art, explaining that John Donne’s poem “The Flea” succeeds in producing humour and eroticism, rather than disgust and anxiety, because the flea is singular (one flea) and not a tormenting, disease-spreading multitude. In this vein, Cole additionally explores the genre of “Flea Searcher” paintings. Although she does not link these images to eighteenth-century literary texts, many relevant works spring to mind, so that her study may provide a framework for understanding some poets’ uses of fleas, especially in association with women, in this era. Focusing on vermin’s relationship to climate and disease, Cole’s first chapter is particularly intriguing for its examination of contemporary notions of miasmatic theory, in which air is responsible for contagion. As rats die of plague, their fleas must find new hosts, thereby spreading the disease, while decaying rodent corpses contribute to the noxious, diseased air. Cole convincingly links this idea of rats spreading plague and foul air to her reading of William Shakespeare’s Macbeth, in which she shows that the play’s witches evoke ideas about their ability to transform into rats and frogs as depicted in contemporary art, science, and superstition. As Cole reveals, such associations between rats, witches, and the Devil desensitized English populations to the idea of likewise exterminating Turks and Jews as another form of “plague”-producing vermin who were dangerous to the body politic. Technologies developed to decimate vermin made possible certain modern abilities to conceive and perform acts of genocide. As emphasized in chapter 2, a key motivation in discovering technologies to control vermin populations was the preservation of food supplies. The threat of famine after vermin destroyed crops haunted the early modern English imagination and received literary treatment in poems such as George Wither’s Britain’s Remembrancer (1628) and Abraham Cowley’s “The Plagues of Egypt” (1656). Authors’ biblical references commonly imbued such literary texts with physico-theology and held the sinful human populations
responsible for divine punishments of vermin infestations leading to plague and famine.

Chapter 3 provides a close reading of Thomas Shadwell’s comedy *The Virtuoso* (1676) and usefully points out ways in which the play satirizes the Royal Society, both in its pursuance of Francis Bacon’s idea that the nature of things is best perceived in small things, as later exemplified in Robert Hooke’s work in microscopy, and in its goal of clear and concise language. Demonstrating the play’s tactic of collapsing differences between a frog and the character of a natural philosopher, Cole raises questions about the Cartesian “beast-machine.” While her exploration of seventeenth-century neuroanatomy is admirable, some readers may wish for further explanation in this chapter of the assertion that “British natural philosophers rejected the Cartesian beast-machine metaphor,” since this metaphor arguably can be traced through the eighteenth century to figures such as Erasmus Darwin and beyond (93). However, Cole succeeds in displaying how natural philosophers, including Thomas Willis, complicated Cartesian notions by adhering to something closer to animism through theories of animals’ corporeal soul, as opposed to humans’ additional possession of an incorporeal or rational soul. Willis also separates different living creatures through their “blood,” but ultimately distinguishes humans from other hot-blooded creatures only through their use of culture and technology.

Cole employs chapter 4 to demonstrate that dogs, generally characterized as “more perfect” creatures, containing the potential to be dangerous, were also sometimes viewed as vermin. In the early modern era, images of dogs begging often served as an emblem of flatterers, and thereby parasites. As Cole explains, dogs could be seen as potential sources of affection or affliction, and their famed presence in Charles II’s court became an easy symbol of flatterers and parasites feeding on the king and the nation. This chapter particularly investigates Thomas Shadwell’s *Timon of Athens* (1678); poetry by John Wilmot, the second earl of Rochester; and John Gay’s “The Mad Dog” (1730). One must bring a strong stomach to the book’s reading of Rochester’s misogynistic “A Ramble in St. James’s Park,” a poem collapsing differences between female dogs and human women, and portraying women as verminous eaters of men. Cole additionally examines Gay’s antifeminist and anti-Catholic poem “The Mad Dog” as a means of discussing rabies, providing useful historical background on the disease.

In the final chapter, examining Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) and *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1719), Cole discusses the potential for transported vermin to disrupt native ecologies, and she wonders what happens to the rats aboard Crusoe’s ship, which seem to disappear when the ship runs aground. Intriguingly, she suggests that
in the absence of vermin, more perfect creatures may become vermin themselves. In the absence of rats, birds and cats fill this role of vermin, and Crusoe must fend them off to ensure food security. Ultimately, Cole acknowledges that humans are not “perfect,” but one of many invasive species that signify a plague for other animals, and thus encourages “humane and responsible” interactions with other creatures (178). A pleasure to read and an excellent contribution to the field, Imperfect Creatures will appeal to anyone interested in early modern literature and the history of science, as well as ways in which the past relates to present environmental concerns.

Melissa Bailes is an assistant professor of English at Tulane University, specializing in British literature of the long eighteenth century, the history of science, transatlantic and transnational studies, and women’s writing.

Prose Immortality, 1711–1819 by Jacob Sider Jost
Review by Daniel Cook, University of Dundee

There is a remarkable, unprecedented directness in Jacob Sider Jost’s monograph Prose Immortality, 1711–1819. The opening paragraph is so short it can be quoted in full: “How do writers memorialize and preserve the dead? When John Dryden died in 1700, poets wrote elegies. When Samuel Johnson died in 1784, biographers wrote lives. This book is about what happens in between” (1). With such brevity of expression, this is a print version of what MLA-bound scholars call the elevator pitch. And as far as elevator pitches go, it is compelling. But it does not do justice to what unfolds: a genuinely witty, intelligent study of eighteenth-century literary history that agilely links the history of fiction with journalism, theology, and philosophy. For eighteenth-century authors, this book suggests, the rhythms of everyday life were too rich to be distilled into verse, and so prose genres such as the periodical paper, novel, memoir, essay, and biography offered a new kind of lastingness that responded to the challenges and opportunities of Enlightenment philosophy and evolving religious thought. The area of research seems so obvious, so necessary, when put so thoughtfully into those terms.

Despite the title, really the book ends in the 1790s—appropriately enough, in terms of the scope, and in line with the elevator pitch. The epilogue, “Keats Imagines the Life of Shakespeare,” jumps ahead to the late 1810s, which explains the quirkiness of the dating in the book title. This is not to suggest that the final section is misplaced. On the contrary, the author quietly and cannily revisits themes and figures addressed in
the body of the monograph. Like Laetitia Pilkington, we learn, Keats “has inscribed Shakespeare’s language within the book and volume of his brain, to the point that his appropriation of phrases and even individual words goes beyond allusion to what can only be called deep influence” (178)—the guidance of the Harvard school of book history can be keenly, pleasingly felt. Sticking with the author’s stated aims, we certainly find some important, clear-sighted thinking: in “the age of prose immortality,” here loosely defined as the period from Joseph Addison to James Boswell, “writing is imagined as a way of immortalizing not only heroic acts or transcendent beauty but also the rhythms and events of daily life” (2). Across well-balanced and wide-ranging chapters, Sider Jost outlines different ways in which writers first used a documentary approach to preserve a particular individual’s personality and life history in sufficient detail so that the historical personage seemed to survive beyond their earthly death. Boswell’s *Life of Johnson* is here not the inaugurator of the Great Man tradition but rather the culmination of an emergent interest in the quotidian—that works for me. As a history of literary form, moreover, this study expands upon Stuart Sherman’s influential *Telling Time* (1996), wherein we learn about the extensive manner in which the new chronometry of the period influenced narrative time.

Sider Jost’s book also nestles within the Pocock school of thought, which has examined the strong connections between theological thinking and the literary imagination as understood within the period under scrutiny—or so the author notes. Rather, I think Sider Jost makes a striking advance on that well-worn approach, not least of all because he studiously avoids teleology (or, at least, he asks us to be duly wary of the arbitrariness of teleology). Few poets die at convenient times for literary periodization, he quips, though Dryden is an obliging exception. The gag is a good one, the point it raises about our reliance on literary periodization a salient one.

*Prose Immortality* will be of interest to anyone working on eighteenth-century prose in any form, not merely the memoir or the biography (as one would expect), but also the novel. Is *Clarissa* a religious novel? asks Sider Jost. Among scholars, the question has long been a vexed one, despite Richardson’s inaugural yes (“The Author ... imagined ... he could steal in, as may be said, and investigate the great doctrines of Christianity under the fashionable guise of an amusement” [quoted, 78]). It is also a question that raises further questions about the role of fictional works in a larger culture of print. Sider Jost places the novel in the tradition of eighteenth-century Anglican letters, calling the novel an heir to Addison’s *Spectator* and Young’s *Night Thoughts*, and a counterpart to the tenets of Butler and Warburton. Such an approach is useful, if surprisingly less edifying than one might think. Many of Richardson’s readers would have
been familiar with the works of Addison and Young, especially the latter. Rather than attend in any sustained detail to intellectual connections between those works, the chapter at hand largely focuses on the theory and practice of imaginative expansion (to use David Brewer’s phrase); as useful as this material is, it does not quite convince me in its current form. Good books raise good questions, though.

Perhaps the book is too clever for me. Certainly, for all of the author’s impeccable writing, an unfortunate film of pomposity sits atop it (“The literal-minded reader might register a protest here” [14]). And there are needless jabs at other scholars: Marshall Brown “sniffs,” the author says, when relaying that critic’s infamous critique of Boswell. A product of an astute and learned thinker, Prose Immortality confidently outlines a compelling case for a shift of focus when thinking about the ways in which people have tried to capture in print the habits of everyday living. The closing remarks of Sider Jost’s introductory chapter will look a little pat to some eyes, but its sentiment is surely to be increasingly welcomed: “We, of all people, are the literary afterlife that they have. They have given us so much, and we owe it to them and to ourselves to understand what their wishes and desires were” (17).

Daniel Cook is a Senior Lecturer in English at the University of Dundee. He has published widely on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century fiction and poetry, including a recent essay collection (edited with Nicholas Seager), The Afterlives of Eighteenth-Century Fiction (2015).

Reflections on Sentiment: Essays in Honor of George Starr, ed. Alessa Johns
Review by Kirsten Hall, University of Texas at Austin

This festschrift honours the academic career of George Starr, who is currently a professor at the University of California, Berkeley. Starr has published two monographs, Defoe and Spiritual Autobiography (1965) and Defoe and Casuistry (1971), and a number of articles that have made significant contributions to the study of Daniel Defoe and sentimental literature. As Johns points out in her introduction, during his career of more than fifty years, Starr has done much to “elucidate the role of sentimentalism in what was once reductively termed an age of reason and realism” (1). This collection of essays aims to demonstrate not only the scope and depth of his work but also its continuing influence on the field. For the most part, the essays in this collection, some of which engage more directly with Starr’s scholarship than others, achieve this goal. The
topics in the nine essays are wide-ranging and take a number of critical approaches, including affect theory, animal studies, and gender theory.

The collection is divided topically into three sections. Part 1, “Sympathetic Identification and Narrative Sociality,” is a trio of essays, and each shares a broad interest in how the sensation and feeling of the individual engages in or relates to social ties and social meanings. The first essay, Alison Conway’s “Defoe and the Challenge of Mixed Marriage,” responds directly to Starr’s scholarship on Defoe, his courtship texts, and conduct manuals, while also providing a broad range of other primary materials and meticulously researched historical background. While the focus of this essay is religious and familial sociability and the controversy of mixed religion marriages during the Enlightenment, the final note about “the sociability of communication itself that comes to stand for the habits of mind required for mutual recognition” serves both as an appropriate introduction to the rest of the collection and as an evaluative measure for the book as a whole (24). It reminds us that this book is as much a tribute to the collaborative nature of intellectual communities as it is a tribute to Starr and his scholarship. Looking at the broad questions Conway’s essay raises about toleration and cooperation, it seems natural to ask how the essays in a book about sentiment and sociability succeed in conversing and communicating with each other. Thus, in assessing Reflections on Sentiment, I have settled on this set of criteria: how well do these essays speak to common concerns within the field of literary studies? How much do these essays complement and resonate with one another? Finally, how do these inter-essay conversations enhance an audience’s experience of reading this collection?

If Conway’s essay draws attention to the sociability of intellectual life, Joanna Picciotto’s essay reminds us of its pedagogical nature, paying special tribute to the ways in which Starr’s typological analysis of Defoe’s earthenware pot has played a role in her own classroom. “Circumstantial Particulars, Particular Individuals, and Defoe” is one of several essays in the collections that attest to Starr’s generosity as an instructor and mentor. This essay also rounds out Conway’s interest in religious, historical, and narratological interpretation of Defoe’s work by focusing not on conduct manuals but on his novels. Both essays share a concern for the controversy surrounding experiences of belief, the shared human experience of faith, and the relationship between God and the individual.

James P. Carson’s essay on “The Sentimental Animal” stands thematically apart from the first two essays in this section, departing from Defoe and expanding the narrative of sentimental sociability to the animal world. Like its companions, one of the greatest strengths of this essay is its emphasis on historical context. Carson charts the history of animal
rights and anthropomorphic feeling in everything from Immanuel Kant to children’s literature. “The Sentimental Animal” responds in compelling ways to scholarship’s recent interest in animal studies and works well as a survey of eighteenth-century animal studies, making this an excellent introduction for scholars and students interested in pursuing topics in this area.

From the collection’s second part, “Sentimental Family Politics and the Novel,” two essays stand out as especially worthy of comment. Barbara M. Benedict’s “The Sentimental Servant” is a fascinating look at the psychology of the destructive servant/mistress relationship between Roxana and Amy in Defoe’s *Roxana* (1724). Benedict runs with Starr’s insight that *Roxana* was meant as a repentance narrative, and, more specifically, as a failed repentance narrative. A second essay, “The Abyss of Friendship in *Caleb Williams*” by George E. Haggerty is an excellent complement to Benedict’s piece since it also explores the failure of sentimental, homosocial bonds—this time not between a female servant and her employer but between two men. In fact, the organization of this second section into interlocking pairs of essays is particularly effective as a way of encouraging a reader to think about the conversations happening between all four essays. Haggerty’s and Benedict’s pieces share thematic concerns while Amy J. Pawl’s “Only a Girl” and Geoffrey Sill’s “Only a Boy” form a natural pairing.

Interest in the philosophy of friendship blossomed during the eighteenth century, and there was a particular desire to reconcile the classical tradition with new notions of friendships. Haggerty’s essay begins to trace this inheritance (incidentally, it is curious that while his footnote includes Cicero, Montaigne, and Plato’s treatments of friendship, it omits Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* and *Nicomachean Ethics*), but he ultimately chooses to base his analysis not on Cicero or Aristotle but on Derrida’s analysis of friendship as a politically unstable relationship. Haggerty’s interrogation of the destructive side of friendship is a worthwhile approach but also left me wondering how the gothic tradition more explicitly responds to the idealized view of friendship seen in ancient philosophy.

*Reflections on Sentiment* finishes in the third part, “Professing Literature in a Changing Marketplace,” on an unexpected but welcome note with John Richetti’s “Passion in Declamation and Dialogue.” It is the only essay to discuss verse and Augustan poets like Swift and Pope. Thus, Richetti’s contribution bookends a collection of essays that does justice to the richness of eighteenth-century genre, including the gothic, the novel, realism, didactic literature, children’s literature, philosophy, and satire. At the same time, Richetti’s essay satisfyingly finishes a trajectory that began by looking at the social possibilities of sentiment, turns to expose its dark underside, and ends by looking at the way sentiment itself is crafted. “Passion in Declamation” is a thought-provoking examination of
the rhetoric of sentiment and the artificiality of a mode that would seem to demand authenticity.

The contributors to the volume have succeeded in balancing a broad range of theoretical approaches and topics, including Defoe as well as both canonical and non-canonical texts and authors. Another strength was the concerted effort to include at least one image in every essay—a touch Starr himself would appreciate, given his own scholarly work on art, architecture, and design. Yet, as comprehensive as this volume is, I missed an essay responding to Starr’s work on Defoe and China. There is much that could be said about sentiment and its relation to British imperialism, exploration, and global literature and culture. Reflections on Sentiment is, all in all, a worthy tribute to Starr’s legacy. The cohesiveness of the essays and their careful arrangement underscores the sense that this volume is both a celebration of Starr’s career and a celebration of how such a legacy can proliferate into a vibrant community of scholarship and fellow thinking.

Kirsten Hall is a graduate student in the University of Texas at Austin PhD program. She has recently published on George Eliot’s reception of Apuleius, and her current research looks at Ciceronian influence in the novels of Frances Burney.

Romanticism: Keywords by Frederick Burwick
Review by Karen Hadley, University of Louisville

Frederick Burwick’s Romanticism: Keywords comes as the latest in the ongoing Wiley-Blackwell series Keywords in Literature and Culture, and, moreover, it functions as part of a recent cluster of Romantic period–related volumes by this publisher. Influenced by Raymond Williams’s iconic work, this text is remarkable for its authoritative voice and vast knowledge of the field of Romantic studies. The volume represents seventy-three keywords both traditional and new to the period and as they appear in context: for example, Abolition, Gothic and Grotesque, Medievalism, Mesmerism, Negative Capability, Revolution and Reform, Romantic Irony, Sensibility, Women’s Rights. Burwick focuses on British writers, with some attention to the Germans (Goethe, Kant, Schelling, Schiller, Schlegel) and less frequently the French (Rousseau). The introduction proposes broadly to address the “events of the age”—the Industrial Revolution, the French Revolution, colonialism, and the slave trade,” insofar as they brought “new themes into literature,” and the volume measures up handily (ix).
This volume appears as one of three recent Wiley-Blackwell Romantic period–based books. A number of the keywords here, for instance, are “elucidated more fulsomely,” “complementing, rather than repeating” commentary in Burwick’s *Encyclopedia of Romanticism* (2012)—a volume which, for reasons unknown, he refers to as the *Encyclopedia of Romantic Literature* (xii). Where he includes a number of seldom-unacknowledged women writers (xi–xii), Burwick likewise cites the influence of Duncan Wu’s *Romanticism: An Anthology*, also released by Wiley-Blackwell (4th ed., 2012). As such, these three volumes could well be employed jointly or in various permutations in the classroom. Given its emphasis on clarity over complexity and minimal reliance on contextual knowledge, this volume accompanying the anthology would work particularly nicely for undergraduates.

Wu’s influence in the inclusion of women writers is welcome, and yet nowhere does Burwick give them the same attentiveness that is offered the canonical male poets, who maintain a solid foundation throughout. Blake, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats, Shelley, and Byron, along with an ample measure of De Quincey, provide grounding for the volume, as is evident in a brief glance at the index—in which particularly the first two and De Quincey each receive several columns of references. Inevitably, this raises the question of the volume as representative introduction to the field: if indeed it seeks to draw a college-level audience, students might well lose perspective in a field where a great deal of study has shifted to formerly marginalized writers and texts.

Where the Wiley-Blackwell Keywords series is indebted to the work of Raymond Williams, it proposes to introduce keywords as cultural analysis, “taking the reader beyond semantic definition to uncover the uncertainties, disagreements, and confrontations evident in differing usages and conflicting connotation” (ii). The author likewise proposes to “distinguish changes in meaning that have emerged subsequent to the Romantic period as well as differences in usage during the period” (xii). This volume could devote more attention to such uncertainty, disagreement, and confrontation, particularly in the context of a field that has been confronted in recent decades with the uncertainty inherent in deconstructive and New Historicist readings. A missed opportunity, for example, appears early on when Burwick, noting that Williams introduces “many isms among his Keywords,” follows up later in the keyword entry Romanticism by devoting three paragraphs to the debate among New Critics over the plurality of “Romanticisms,” on the origins of Romanticism in romance, and the “intertwin[ing]” of the two (271).

Though representing an eighteenth-century movement that has evolved over the past two centuries, the volume appears to situate itself ideologically within the mid-twentieth-century debate among the New
Critics. Where the Hegelian dialectic serves as a structuring device for central highlighted concepts, M.H. Abrams’s foundational studies come to mind, particularly The Mirror and the Lamp (1971) and Natural Supernaturalism (1973). Abrams devotes the latter to the German influence on Romantic poetry, for example, the Hegelian dialectic as it provides a model for the journey of Romantic “becoming,” particularly in iconic texts such as Wordsworth’s Prelude. Likewise, in Burwick’s Keywords, canonical poets like Wordsworth and Coleridge are used to anchor key entries such as Imagination, Illusion, and Dialectics: Imagination is devoted to the first generation of canonical poets; Illusion primarily to seven paragraphs addressing the works of Coleridge; and Dialectics primarily to fourteen paragraphs’ discussion of Wordsworthian canonical works, including “Tintern Abbey,” The Prelude, and the preface to Lyrical Ballads.

The author’s introduction proposes a “necessary conceptual understanding of Romantic aesthetics,” and certainly real fluency in Kantian concepts is evident, particularly where it is translated from the German. This becomes clear in the discussion of fundamental Romantic tenets: Coleridge’s key distinction between the primary and secondary imagination is traced to Kant’s Critique of Pure Reason and likewise shown to have had profound influence on Coleridge’s close friend Wordsworth. Aesthetics as such, however, earns no keyword entry, though to be accurate, Kant’s third Critique receives numerous informative references, along with Edmund Burke’s Philosophical Enquiry, a paragraph on Coleridge’s “notes on ‘Aesthetic Problems’” (128, pub. 1813), and—curiously, given the omission of aesthetics itself as an entry—a full entry given over to Vampire Aesthetics (338ff).

This tendency towards cross-referencing, or “interweaving,” as it is referred to, can make for a puzzling structural device for the reader seeking out topics that appear in neither index nor table of contents. While there is no keyword entry for slavery or the slave trade—and only two index references to it appear in the general introductory comments—one might well follow the indexical directive to Abolition, where appear a number of native (white) English figures associated with the abolition movement: men receive the bulk of the analysis (including one page of four devoted to Wordsworth), along with references to women writers (More, Edgeworth, Opie).

As with all such efforts, this volume omits some more recently evolved subdisciplinary fields such as transatlantic studies (although reference may be found, as the introduction suggests, in the companion volume, Burwick’s Encyclopedia). No index entries appear for more traditional fields such as empire, imperialism, or natural history. And where the author’s introduction promises exploration of the “social
and cultural climate” of the period, the relatively extensive attention given drama within this category overshadows artistic and musical offerings (though see the Fuseli entry in the index [367] and reference to Boydell’s exhibition, 1789–1805 [29]). Likewise, the entry Reform provides a nicely detailed overview of contemporary social conditions leading to political reform. And yet, a complementary entry on history and the birth of political economy in the period would have served usefully as counterpart, with references to Ricardo and Adam Smith and to the rise of the bourgeois, the emerging conditions of industrial labour, and the alienation of the labouring masses. Where the two indexed references to Adam Smith fall under the Keywords entries of Imitation and Sympathy, no reference is made to his influential Wealth of Nations (1776) and his subsequent influence (with Hegel and the Hegelian dialectic) on Marxist dialectical materialism.

Such quibbling should not detract from what is an impressive body of work representing Burwick’s breadth of scholarship and his decades of teaching in the field. Students and scholars should find his Keywords to be a valuable reference tool, for both its detailed discussion and the “suggested readings” concluding each entry. Though the ideological bias noted here is material, it serves only to invite more such commentary within the continuing expansion of the field.

Karen Hadley is Associate Professor of English at the University of Louisville. Her current projects address botanical imagery in William Blake’s Visions, and the aesthetics of ugliness in Frankenstein.

Écrire la frontière: Walter Scott ou les chemins de l’errance
par Céline Sabiron
Review by Paul Barnaby, University of Edinburgh

Céline Sabiron’s highly original study of border-crossing in the Waverley novels follows Franco Moretti’s example in adopting a spatial approach to Walter Scott’s fiction. Focusing on the “Scotch Novels,” especially those set after the Act of Union (1707), this monograph is divided into two parts, devoted to geopolitical and symbolic border-crossing respectively.

The first part shows how Scott establishes apparently immutable national and regional boundaries, only to reveal how they can be breached, merged, superimposed, or dissolved, with the aim of creating an “état d’entre-deux parfait” (21). The opening chapters of the study chart how, after the first Waverley novels (Waverley itself, Guy
Mannering, The Black Dwarf), the Anglo-Scottish border gradually loses its political significance. Slowly transformed from a “frontière-limite” to a “frontière-seuil” (73), its status as a genuine frontier is transferred to the Highland Line, depicted as the frontline of internal colonial expansion. Scott is careful, however, not to present Scots or Highlanders as unambiguous victims of colonialism. Sabiron shows how in Guy Mannering, he layers images of the Anglo-Scottish conquest of India over images of the English annexation of Scotland and the Lowland “pacification” of the Highlands. In a particularly persuasive reading of The Pirate, she analyses how Scott achieves a dizzying Chinese-box effect in his portrayal of colonized spaces, suggesting that England’s relationship with Scotland is mirrored consecutively in those between Scotland and the Northern Isles, Orkney and Shetland, and the southern and northern halves of Mainland Shetland. Scott transcends binary oppositions between centre and periphery, metropolis and colony, in order to posit a viable middle ground.

The second part of the study shows how border-crossing in Scott also becomes a transgressive journey of initiation. Sabiron charts how national, geopolitical borders gradually lose the sacral power they possess in Scott’s early novels (showing, for example, how the title character of The Black Dwarf is humanized and degraded from feared liminal spirit to eccentric object of curiosity). Once again, such power is transferred to the Highland Line, where the boundaries between male and female, human and animal, and animal and vegetable are perpetually blurred. The potentially deadly crossing of the Line means a destabilization of the self and a confrontation with the Other. Accompanied by a guide, or equipped with a passepartout, Scott’s characters embark upon a transgressive wandering (or “wavering” in Scots), which not only breaks moral and sexual taboos, but, in terms of the Scottish Enlightenment’s stadial theory of human progress, runs counter to the flow of time. This destabilized or multiple self is manifested in Scott’s many scenes of transvestitism, disguise, and masquerade, but is only a temporary stage in a formational journey. After the revelatory encounter with the Other, the boundaries of the self are re-established and its limits reaffirmed (hence Scott’s heroes’ sudden loss of interest in alterity at the end of each novel).

The restabilized self nonetheless remains problematic. Sabiron sees Scott as prefiguring Victorian literature in blurring and dissolving certain boundaries in the name of progress and knowledge, while preserving others in the name of social order, even when these, as he increasingly hints, may be arbitrary or unjust. The resulting juste milieu is a shifting and precarious place, where the effort to maintain a fragile equilibrium leaves his characters prey to political, social, and sexual schizophrenia. Thus female characters such as Jeanie Deans (The Heart of Mid-Lothian)
and Diana Vernon (Rob Roy) are granted agency in his novels, emerging from the domestic sphere to breach sexual taboos, but they must submit to the Law of the Father at the end of their journey. Similarly, the depiction of an emerging middle class hinges on a vital but elusive distinction between modest and merited social climbing (Jeanie Deans) and reprehensible arrivisme (Effie Deans).

In her concluding chapter, Sabiron argues that Scott’s strategy of obfuscating borders ultimately fails. His readers retain the enticing mythical images of fixed and immutable borders without observing that Scott problematizes and deconstructs them. In a conclusion that draws somewhat too uncritically on Hugh Trevor-Roper’s Invention of Scotland thesis, Sabiron argues that Scott unwittingly “deteriorialized” Scotland, freezing it in a semi-mythical past marked by impenetrable spatial and temporal boundaries, while paradoxically opening it up to tourists.

A particular strength of Sabiron’s study is its alertness to the symbolic power of Scott’s language (perhaps following in the wake of Alison Lumsden’s Walter Scott and the Limits of Language [2010]). This results in a number of audacious but compelling close readings that show, for instance, how the Solway Firth in Redgauntlet is portrayed in terms reminiscent of a battlefront or how Edward Waverley’s and Francis Osbaldistone’s penetration of the Highlands is depicted as an incestuous union with a mother(-country) resulting in symbolic rebirth. Similarly persuasive is the analysis of the French Revolution as a spectral presence in Scott’s novels. Never directly represented, it is evoked, for example, in assaults on prisons in Guy Mannering and The Heart of Mid-Lothian, both of which clearly restage the storming of the Bastille. More insidiously, it “contaminates” Scott’s language, which abounds with references to mechanical and celestial revolutions: a way, Sabiron suggests, of semantically exorcising the “chimera” of the Revolution by emptying it of political sense and reducing it to a rhetorical figure.

If the study has a weakness, it is the relatively narrow range of novels discussed. Sabiron convincingly explains her decision to limit her survey to the “Scotch” novels, where border-crossing is, clearly, a politically and symbolically fraught theme. It is notable, however, that she privileges novels with a relatively modern setting (particularly Guy Mannering), while the absence of the medieval “Scotch” novels, The Monastery, The Abbot, and the late Castle Dangerous—all of which pivot around the Anglo-Scottish border—is both conspicuous and unexplained. Similarly, no mention is made of Scott’s earlier exploration of border-crossing in narrative poems such as The Lay of the Last Minstrel, The Lady of the Lake, and Marmion, or, indeed, in his Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border. Admittedly, a broadening of the discussion to include these works would simply have reinforced rather than complicated Sabiron’s thesis.
It might, nonetheless, have been useful to cite Mary’s flight to England in *The Abbot* as a case of deadly border-crossing, or the White Lady in *The Monastery* and the goblin page in *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* as examples of supernatural liminal spirits.

These are minor quibbles. *Écrire la frontière* represents both a landmark contribution to French-language Scott studies and, in its attention to Scott’s orchestration of narrative space and to the symbolic force of his language, it is a significant advance for Scott studies as a whole.

**Paul Barnaby** is editor of the Walter Scott Digital Archive at Edinburgh University Library. He has published on French translations of Walter Scott, on the international reception and translation of Scottish literature, and on the Italian reception of French Naturalism.

---

**L’Orientale allégorie: Le conte oriental au xviiié siècle en France (1704–1774)** par Jean-François Perrin

Critique littéraire par Sylvette Larzul, Institut des mondes africains (IMAF)

Après avoir édité plusieurs textes appartenant au corpus du conte oriental à la française et avoir publié maintes études s’y rapportant, notamment dans la revue *Fééries* dont il fut le cofondateur en 2003, Jean-François Perrin propose aujourd’hui un ouvrage orienté vers la synthèse, une étude du genre, menée depuis sa naissance en 1704 avec *Les Mille et une nuits* d’Antoine Galland, jusqu’en 1774, date de la publication du *Taureau blanc* de Voltaire.

Dans son introduction, l’auteur insiste sur la dichotomie du corpus. Une veine didactique, où s’illustrent notamment Pétis de La Croix, Bignon et Gueullette, est fondée sur l’imitation des *Contes arabes* de Galland et tire son information et son inspiration du savoir orientaliste disponible (Bibliothèque orientale de Barthélemy d’Herbelot, relations de voyage, traductions des « Jeunes de langues » déposées à la Bibliothèque royale) comme de la tradition littéraire européenne dont on sait qu’elle avait d’ailleurs depuis le Moyen Âge intégré des récits orientaux; une seconde lignée, représentée au premier chef par Hamilton et Crébillon fils, s’ancre dans le registre parodique; cette veine ironique et satirique, où perce l’esprit des Lumières, cultive l’allégorie: d’où le titre d’« Orientale allégorie » donné à l’ouvrage par l’auteur, qui emprunte l’expression à Hamilton (14); un procédé dont usent également, selon lui, « en mineur », les écrivains se conformant au modèle fourni par Galland. Perrin tient aussi en introduction à se démarquer assez nettement de la thèse d’Edward W. Said qui, dans un célèbre ouvrage, proclama
que l’Orient dont s’occupaient les orientalistes était une fabrication de l’Occident, une accusation s’appliquant mal à des écrivains soucieux de transmettre une connaissance bien documentée sur un monde qui échappait alors presque totalement à la domination européenne.


La deuxième partie propose une étude des questions de « Poétiques » à travers l’examen successif d’œuvres de quatre auteurs différents. Remettant en cause la féérie orientale, l’ironie pratiquée par Hamilton trouve son origine dans des collages réintroduisant l’antique dans le moderne alors en faveur, tout comme dans la requalification burlesque des protagonistes des Mille et une nuits: Schahriar n’a rien d’un parangon de virilité et Scheherazade ne débite qu’un fatras de contes ennuyeux. Gueullette, quant à lui, réussit le montage et l’hybridation de scénarios tirés de matériaux divers et variés, notamment d’une documentation didactique et savante. Son œuvre témoigne de « l’émergence d’un nouveau public avide de l’Autre et de l’Ailleurs, affamé de sciences, de savoirs et de techniques [...] mais partagé pour longtemps encore entre crédulité et incrédulité à l’égard des merveilles et des curiosités qu’on lui conte » (157). D’une grande sophistication, Tanzaï et Néadarné de Crébillon combine habilement la subversion de la féérie (et de sa morale idéaliste), la satire politico-religieuse et un discours métافيçãonel entrant en écho avec la réflexion des romanciers de l’époque comme
Marivaux. Écrit en 1754 par Rousseau, *La Reine fantasque*, conte « sans polissonnerie » mettant en scène une reine singulière qui « revendique quasi politiquement, si l’on peut dire, son droit de procréer le sexe de son choix » (185–86), tire habilement parti d’un demi-siècle d’expérimentations portées par le genre.

Intitulée « Problématiques », la troisième et dernière partie présente des questions originales parfois en résonance directe avec nos préoccupations contemporaines. Les récits à métempsycose—thème présent au xviie et xviiie siècles tant dans les relations de voyage que dans les écrits philosophiques, ceux de Locke notamment—placent au cœur de leurs scénarios, chez des auteurs comme Moncrif et Crébillon en particulier, la question cruciale de l’identité personnelle confrontée à une expérience de soi comme multitude. Quelques contes dans lesquels un sujet masculin fait temporairement l’expérience du féminin (*Le Sopha; Histoire véritable de Montesquieu*) mettent en scène « l’inquiétude sur la réalité de la différence des genres et sur la hantise—ou le désir—d’une neutralisation » (249). Plus marginalement, chez Tiphaigne de La Roche, les fictions incluses dans son petit traité sur le sommeil et les songes, *Visions d’Ibraïm* (1759), traduisent une pensée antiphilosophique qui, pointant les dangers d’éduquer le peuple, cache mal la nostalgie de l’ancienne République des Lettres peu soucieuse de diffuser hors de soi la culture.


Kate Rumbold analyzes the function of quotations from William Shakespeare in the novels of Samuel Richardson, Henry Fielding, Sarah Fielding, Laurence Sterne, Ann Radcliffe, Jane Austen, and others. Stating in her introduction that “Shakespeare appears in the mid-century novel chiefly through direct quotation, most often delivered by character[s],” Rumbold argues that critics usually judge the significance of these quotations either by the “sustained, thematic resonance” they evoke with “the original” Shakespeare play or as a sign of the novelist’s literary cultivation—as “outward emanations of the texts that inhabit the author’s mind” (6–7). The aim of her book, by contrast, is to show that the importance of these quotations lies “not [in] the original context of the borrowed words, but [in] the act of quotation itself” (7), which becomes a “sophisticated tool for characterization” (8). Rumbold begins by disputing “the story of the eighteenth-century ‘rise’ of Shakespeare” (5), contending that his reputation was still in flux, just as the novel’s reputation as a valid form of literature was not yet fully recognized. Rumbold complicates these two narratives of progress—the rise of the novel and the rise of Shakespeare—and argues that they inform one another: “Shakespeare and the eighteenth-century novel mutually construct each other as morally and emotionally valuable, and help to establish each other as dominant cultural forms” (4).

Chapter 2, “Quotation Culture,” lays a thorough groundwork for this argument, as Rumbold tracks the developing practice of “quotation by character” (17) from the late seventeenth century and catalogue the different literary and cultural sources that may have influenced its manifestations in the mid-eighteenth-century novel: “printed plays, anthologies, the spiritual autobiography, periodicals, performances and polite conversation” (16). The deftness with which Rumbold handles the wide net she casts offers an early indication of her book’s success, displaying what her subsequent chapters also showcase: a comprehensive knowledge of her subject, a sensitivity to the dynamics of intertextuality, and a nuanced approach to the implications of cultural cross-over between literature, popular entertainment, and social practices.

The central chapters are particularly strong. Chapter 3, “Shakespeare’s Novel Authority,” argues that the fictional characters who quote Shakespeare invest him with moral and emotional authority by doing so. They
treat the words of his plays “as his own insightful utterances,” thereby “embody[ing]” him as “a personal advisor” with whom they feel a “direct, emotional relationship” (51–56). Novelists turn his words of wisdom into “precepts” (70) by showing how their characters perceive these words to be a means of insight into their own personal circumstances. Rumbold persuasively argues that eighteenth-century novelists both benefit Shakespeare’s reputation by, and derive benefit from, portraying him as “advisory, insightful, even morally searching” (68): “In a genre concerned with proving its own foundation in truth and nature,” Rumbold concludes, “the novelists praise Shakespeare’s knowledge of human nature, and are praised in turn for theirs” (75). In chapter 4, “Theatrical Shakespeare,” Rumbold tackles the complex issues of politeness versus sincerity and outward behaviour versus inner nature in her consideration of the theatre, performance, and character. She asserts that, even as eighteenth-century novelists “reclaim and rehabilitate Shakespeare’s theatricality” to “align themselves with ... naturalistic forms of acting” (93), their characters’ quotations sometimes introduce into their narratives “the disruptive power” (99) of the theatre, an intensity that “escapes the physical restrictions of the auditorium” (103) to “open up imaginary vistas in the mind of the reader” (99). The virtuoso close readings that underpin the book are especially impressive in this chapter, as Rumbold ties together an eye-witness account describing David Garrick’s famous performance as Hamlet, an essay on elocution, and passages of Laurence Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy* (1759) to demonstrate how eighteenth-century novelists make dual use of Shakespeare’s theatricality: they draw on the mimetic realism of staged Shakespeare as a method of characterization, but they also use its “memorably vivid gestures” and “dramatic, disruptive quotation” (104) to locate Shakespeare “in the imagination, above both stage and novel” (103).

Chapter 5, “Banal Shakespeare,” examines eighteenth-century novelists’ interest in Shakespeare’s cultural overexposure, as his increasing popularity begins to entail a certain amount of “banal quotation and mindless admiration” (106) that evacuates meaning from some of his most admired or repeated passages. Rumbold convincingly argues that novelists use Shakespeare quotations to engage with him directly, but also to engage with popular culture and “the vivid associations attached to scraps of Shakespeare’s language” (107). In this way, novelists comment on but also “contribute to the phenomenon of ‘banal Shakespeare,’” as “their frequent quotations nudge some phrases ... into popularity, along with the habit of quotation” (107). Throughout the book, but in chapter 5 particularly, Rumbold brings the reader into the equation. She maintains that all of the ways in which eighteenth-century novelists use Shakespeare quotations model, by example or by contrast,
the ways in which readers should engage with him, and with texts in general. Chapter 6, “Ann Radcliffe’s Gothic Epigraphs,” and chapter 7, “Jane Austen and Eighteenth-Century Shakespeare,” offer more limited case studies, but they are still compelling, and perceptively show the influence of eighteenth-century quotation practices on the novels of the early nineteenth century. These chapters therefore segue neatly into chapter 8, “Conclusions,” which, at three pages, is more of a coda than a chapter, but it effectively summarizes the implications of the book’s central arguments for our understanding of the symbiotic relationship between the novel’s development and Shakespeare’s reception and reputation.

Rumbold’s book is an intricate, thoughtful contribution to Shakespeare studies and criticism of the novel. As an elegant fusion of literary analysis and cultural history, it will also appeal to scholars interested in reception theory and cultures of reading. Its interdisciplinary approach and subtler lines of argument might be better suited to advanced students or specialists, but its lucid, lively style and original insights must recommend it to everyone; it is as entertaining and thought-provoking as the novels it so vibrantly discusses.

Megan Taylor is a PhD candidate in the Department of English and research co-ordinator of the Burney Centre at McGill University. Her work has appeared in Lumen and Eighteenth-Century Fiction.

Margot la ravaudeuse par Fougeret de Monbron, trad. et éd. Édouard Langille
Critique littéraire par Jacqueline Chammas, Université de Montréal

Les traductions anglaises de la littérature libertine du xviiième siècle français se sont enrichies d’un nouvel ouvrage: Margot la ravaudeuse de Fougeret de Monbron. L’heureuse initiative provient d’Édouard Langille qui, avec son introduction et ses notes explicatives, remet à portée de tout lecteur anglophone la verve de Monbron. Insoumis, rebelle, l’auteur fut incarcéré à deux reprises pour ses écrits érotiques. Premier traducteur du roman de John Cleland sur la prostitution—Fanny Hill—Fougeret décide de se frayer un chemin et se faire un nom dans la République des Lettres; il publie ses propres textes libertins, dont Margot la ravaudeuse (1750), traduit en plusieurs langues européennes (5).

L’intérêt de ce court roman réside moins dans son intrigue que dans les thèmes exposés, représentatifs de ce courant de liberté qui envahit petit à petit le xviiième siècle. Le lecteur suit les diverses péripéties de
Margot dans son métier de prostituée. Pour en finir avec une enfance misérable, la jeune fille s’enfuit du taudis familial. Après un bref passage, sorte de noviciat, dans une maison de prostitution dirigée par Mme Florence, elle vit quelque temps avec un chanoine de Saint-Nicolas avant de se retrouver chez Mme Thomas, une entremetteuse qui entretient un commerce clandestin avec un frère quêteur de l’ordre séraphique de St-François. Ce frère Alexis sera à la fois le directeur de Margot, son amant et son proxénète: il la fait admettre dans la troupe des filles de l’Opéra, source de revenus si l’on y agit adroitement. C’est cette « protection » du frère Alexis, dit-elle, qui la tirera de la poussière et sera sa première source d’opulence. En effet, grâce à quelques amants soigneusement choisis parmi les habitués de l’Opéra—financiers, membres du clergé, juges, diplomates—Margot amassera une coquette somme et connaîtra, de ce fait, une ascension sociale; elle finira par s’installer à son compte comme courtisane et tirera même sa mère de la déchéance.

Langille explique, dans son introduction, ce libertinage érotique voire pornographique et montre l’influence d’autres écrits de l’époque, notamment celle de Fanny Hill de Cleland et de Thérèse philosophe de Boyer d’Argens (8–11). De ce fait, Margot la ravaudeuse assurait une sorte de trait d’union entre les littératures libertines anglaise et française (11). Il expose aussi le caractère mercantile de la prostitution dans le roman, l’objectif de Margot étant de sortir de la misère dont elle est issue et de se forger un avenir meilleur. En effet, plus la jeune fille peut escroquer ses amants et soutirer leur fortune, plus elle joue la comédie de l’amour; parce que ses relations charnelles selon le bon plaisir de vieillards libidineux, obsédés par des jouissances obscènes variées, sont en réalité dénuées de tout sentiment, sinon de l’aversion pour ses partenaires. « Unconstrained by moralising, Margot speaks the language of commerce, not love » (12).

Margot a également ceci de particulier: contrairement au schéma classique de la prostituée prise dans l’étouf de sa condition—Monbron innove en ce sens—Margot décide d’arrêter la profession dès qu’elle réalise la somme nécessaire qui lui assurera un niveau de vie respectable. La recherche de sa mère, lorsqu’elle aura un chez-soi, et le resserrement de ses liens familiaux agiront en société comme un facteur supplémentaire d’honorabilité. Monbron fait de Margot une femme « serene, happy, and rich » (12).

Ce genre littéraire, rappelle Langille, après avoir été longtemps interdit de lecture ou encore vendu sous le manteau, a été réhabilité et réédité seulement dans les années 1980. Loin d’être les seuls en cause, les ouvrages de Monbron s’inscrivent dans un ensemble de fictions à caractère pornographique parues dans les cinquante années qui ont précédé la révolution française (6) et qui ont contribué à l’histoire des
idées; en effet toutes s’attaquent aux interdits sociaux et religieux et proemuevent une philosophie basée sur la liberté individuelle d’agir et de penser (7).

Signalons ici, dans le cadre de cette liberté individuelle, la problématique d’une transgression que Fougeret de Monbron—à l’instar de plusieurs autres écrivains de son temps—met de l’avant, à savoir la sexualité des gens d’église, connue alors sous l’appellation d’inceste spirituel (voir à ce propos le chapitre sur l’inceste spirituel chez nombre d’écrivains dans J. Chammas, L’inceste romanesque au siècle des Lumières, de la Régence à la Révolution [1715–1789], [Paris: Honoré Champion, 2011], 353–98). Il faut savoir que leurs actes sexuels relèvent de transgressions sévèrement punies par les lois civiles et religieuses. Monbron profite de son roman pour non seulement dénoncer leurs excès mais aussi afficher son approbation de cette idée de nature valorisée au xviiiᵉ siècle et qu’on oppose à la religion et à la loi: la société, constate Margot, est tout à fait convaincue que les passions ne sont pas moins vives chez les prêtres que chez les autres hommes, mais on passe à l’homme du siècle ce que l’on ne passe point à l’homme d’Église (50). Ce dernier n’a plus qu’une solution pour accéder à la liberté de jouir de son statut naturel d’homme: la théâtralisation de sa vie sociale. Il lui suffit, dit-elle, de respecter ce pourquoi il est payé; « to appear a true Christian in the eyes of the world » (50); bref, sauver les apparences et afficher une attitude au-dessus de tout soupçon. En exiger davantage, poursuit-elle, ce serait demander l’impossible et contrecarrer les intentions de la nature; et de conclure: Du reste, laissez-le jouir en paix (50). (Cette phrase—ce serait demander l’impossible et contrecarrer les intentions de la nature—pourtant essentielle dans le raisonnement que Monbron fait tenir à Margot est escamotée par Langille, ce qui en détourne le sens. Version originale: Qu’il fasse sa principale étude de fasciner chrétiennement les yeux d’autrui; il a rempli ses devoirs: en exiger davantage, ce serait demander l’impossible, et contrecarrer les intentions de la nature. Traduction: « His principal cunning lies in his ability to appear a true Christian in the eyes of the world and to thwart the designs of nature » [50].)

L’introduction de Langille est suivie d’explications sur la technique de traduction: titres divers, vocabulaire, géographie, monnaie, etc. (13–14). Il est à noter la complexité de traduire les dictons et autres expressions figées, aussi les transcriptions littérales ont été évitées pour une meilleure compréhension du lecteur anglophone. Pour l’exemple, « The apple does not fall far from the tree » (18) est la traduction de: Les bons chiens chassent de race. (Il eût été probablement intéressant de mentionner en note et à titre comparatif, la traduction littérale.) Les caprices du premier venu deviennent « Fantasies of Any Tom, Dick
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or Harry » (27); ou encore À corsaire, corsaire et demi traduit en « Set a thief to catch a thief » (49). La richesse et la qualité des notes en fin d'ouvrage sont remarquables. Langille ne laisse aucun nom propre ou expression complexe lui échapper. Tout est expliqué en abondance ce qui fait de cette version anglaise de Margot la ravaudeuse une lecture attrayante pour un lecteur bilingue.