that combine an intimate, ordered community with outreach to a troubled world. There is very little travel, if any, in these later utopias—new lands are not discovered; travelers do not return with exemplary tales of utopian alternatives. However, the educational, political, and religious projects in the later utopian novels are anticipated in these earlier imaginative geographies. The book concludes with brief mention of a later moment in utopian writing, as the genre turns toward outer space.

Brenda Tooley Monmouth College


For Heraclitus, it was “not possible to step twice into the same river . . . or to come into contact twice with a mortal being in the same state.” Such considerations of the individual as a being always in flux reemerge in the eighteenth century as one of many strategies for articulating new concerns about the nature of the self and individual identity. Hume, for instance, reprises the fluvial metaphor to argue that personal identity is a fiction that we impose on our ever-flowing impressions: much as “a river consists in the motion and change of parts,” though shifting content “hinders not the river from continuing the same during several ages,” neither is our belief that it is the selfsame river hindered nor that we are consistent selves capable of such persisting beliefs.

The “masquerade” also arises as a complementary metaphor within our period, as writers like Terry Castle have shown, adding complexity to questions of fiction and the self by focusing less on internal fluidity than on external mutability. With differing emphases on the external and internal, a number of recent scholars have offered models that inquire into the relationship between the eighteenth-century self and its fictions, among whom Michael McKeon, Deidre Lynch, Charles Taylor, Dror Wahrman, and Nancy Armstrong are the most often invoked. But models, however robust, are not necessarily truths, particular or universal, and especially not when it comes to the delicate matter of how persons identify and define their “selves.” It is in this slippage between the metaphoric modeling and the materials they claim to represent that my reservations about Mr. Lipski’s work begin to emerge.

He discusses eighteenth-century selves and fiction by placing complete trust in Wahrman’s historical model of the masquerade in his formulation of the ancien régime of identity, and then applying this metaphor alongside yet another metaphor of self-discovery, the “journey,” to literary characters. For Wahrman, we recall, the eighteenth-century English experienced a shift in how they linked self and identity: around 1780, a “new” modern regime conceived of identity as personal, interiorized, and linked with an authentic self, while the previous ancien régime regarded identity as entirely mutable, external, and dispensable. Mr. Lipski positions Fielding and Sterne as bookends of this ancien régime as he develops a historical depiction of the quest for the self in novels: Fielding plays the part of reactionary or precursor to the regime; Smollett is its picaresque representative; and Sterne dramatizes the unraveling of the ancien régime as it gives way to the modern. As this list of authors suggests, the selves that Mr. Lipski regards are decidedly male, with female authors pushed to the margins and female characters entering into his discussion as tools for articulating the development of the male
protagonist. This is in part the result of the authors he chooses, but also of his choice to focus on Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones, for example, but not Amelia, as well as the literary criteria for the “quest of the self” he lays out early in his argument.

Mr. Lipski focuses on the tension between a character’s participation in “the masquerade of the world” and a “struggle to determine who they really are.” While this may sound like a broad outline of any number of works by women novelists in the century (Burney’s Evelina particularly comes to mind), Mr. Lipski argues that the “quest for identity, inherent in the masquerade metaphor, finds its most accurate realization, as it always has, in the narrative of the road. Hence the journey, understood literally and metaphorically, does not serve as an arbitrary category narrowing the scope of the book but principally as a paradigm akin to the masquerade in its concern with identity.” His approach to studying identity in novels, therefore, “is based on the conviction that both of these two paradigms”—the masquerade and the road—“constitute the discourse of the self—underpinning a number of eighteenth-century novels.” Novels emphasizing women or written by them, however, are not of that number. Whether heroines wander London streets, dare compromised coach rides, or are great walkers like Austen’s Elizabeth Bennett, no self awaits at the end of the line; rather, that journey and its roads are limited to the tradition of classical, heroic odysseys and the grand tours of men who read and emulate them. That the odyssey may be undertaken by aristocrat, rascal, or parson; or by remise, ferry, or foot is thus of less consequence to the quest of the self than the shared gender of those who undertake it.

But gender is where much of the sharing ends in this study insofar as Mr. Lipski freely adapts his key terms “road,” “journey,” “masquerade,” “identity,” and “self” for each of the authors he reads, giving the first two-thirds of his work the feeling of independent meditations on Fielding and Smollett, each with his own theoretical investments. Both authors, he explains, employ journeys as narrative devices, but Fielding’s journeys are domestic affirmations of the privileged structuralist binary of home against the world in which Joseph and Tom adopt or are ascribed a series of masks as they move through time and space to uncover their true identities (which are often diametrically opposed to the masks they are given or socially ascribed). Smollett, however, reimagines the grand tour in the register of the picaresque, casting the protagonists of Roderick Random and Peregrine Pickle as enthusiastic participants in the protean pageant of contemporary culture who embrace masks and mistaken identities as situational selves, if not self-serving strategies. In short, selves in Fielding, though often misconstrued, are always immutable and essential, while Smollett’s characters have no stable self to speak of.

Mr. Lipski’s tidy symmetry comes at a price: key features of each author and his works are overlooked, such as Fielding’s moral pedagogy, wherein true interest lies in the pursuit of virtue and imprudence leads to moral decay, and Smollett’s interest in national character. Teaching “good men to be wise” or at least to avoid going bad, seems to suggest some possibility of change. Similarly, the selves of Smollett’s characters, as Mr. Lipski himself notes, are immutably imprinted by “Englishness” (Peregrine) and “Scottishness” (Roderick), which suggests that some parts of our selves cannot change. Thus, while the antithetical models of Fielding and Smollett may prove good geometry, the critical re-
sult is more restrictive and reductive than evocative or representative. The logic of this framework unfolds in Mr. Lipski’s presentation of Sterne’s *A Sentimental Journey*, in the claim that the narrating parson has an unstable, vexed identity and is unable to find a self in identity régimes past or present, thus positing a Bakhtinian double-voiced discourse that heralds dialectical transcendence into modernity. Alas, like many fans of Yorick, I thought I knew him, but it may well be the case that when models and metaphors are given critical priority, we readers rarely encounter the same Yorick twice.

*Melanie Holm Indiana University of Pennsylvania*


Ms. Stahl surveys a broad range of crimes committed against women: “I use the terms aggression, violence, and abuse interchangeably to account for a wide range of behaviors that female characters experience and that are portrayed as victimizing, such as sexual coercion, physical assault, forcible confinement, and verbal attacks.” By expanding her definition of sexual violence to include seduction, physical and verbal abuse, and female imprisonment, however, Ms. Stahl has diluted the focus of her short volume. While each of these topics is worthy, Ms. Stahl never fully acknowledges the many ways in which early modern understandings of rape differ in fundamental ways—legally, socially, culturally—from early modern understandings of domestic violence or emotional abuse. That Ms. Stahl relies frequently for support on studies of modern psychology—“My approach has been influenced by a body of work appearing in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century”—also limits her study’s effectiveness; too heavy a reliance on contemporary social science creates anachronism and elides recognition of the ways in which early modern psychology may be foreign to our own. Ms. Stahl’s volume would be improved by deeper engagement with prior scholarly work on the eighteenth century.

In her first chapter, Ms. Stahl contrasts the Charlot and Delia episodes of Manley’s *New Atalantis*, both of which feature women preyed on by male guardians. While Charlot dies loving her rapist, “a testimony to the self-destructive nature of a woman’s naïve and passive devotion to the whims and caprices of an abusive, inconsiderate, and inconstant lover,” Delia takes control of her destiny and becomes a writer who “survives and thrives.” Comparative readings of the two characters are not especially new, and Ms. Stahl overlooks, for example, Ellen Pollak’s work on familial incest. Additionally, Ms. Stahl does not adequately acknowledge the differences between the two situations. Delia is undeniably victimized by Don Marcos, but she is the victim of sexual deceit, not rape, and early modern cultural narratives surrounding rape differed from those surrounding seduction and bigamy. Attention should have been paid to the political nature of the text.

In her second chapter, Ms. Stahl turns to Jane Barker’s *Exilius*, calling Clarinthia remarkable for ignoring the patriarchal expectation that women be silent and for publicizing her father’s incestuous assaults. Later, in forgiving her father, Ms. Stahl argues, Clarinthia plays out one of the “fantasies of forgiveness” common among