**Eighteenth-Century Fiction**

Volume 18 | Issue 2 Article 7

1-31-2006

# Review of: Frank Palmeri, *Satire, History, Novel: Narrative Forms, 1665-1815*

Monika Fludernik

Recommended Citation

Fludernik, Monika (2006) "Review of: Frank Palmeri, *Satire, History, Novel: Narrative Forms, 1665-1815*," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*: Vol. 18: Iss. 2, Article 7.
Available at: http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/ecf/vol18/iss2/7

Copyright ©2013 by Eighteenth-Century Fiction, McMaster University. This Article is brought to you by DigitalCommons@McMaster. It has been accepted for inclusion in Eighteenth-Century Fiction by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@McMaster. For more information, please contact scom@mcmaster.ca.

Review of: Frank Palmeri, *Satire, History, Novel: Narrative Forms, 1665-1815*

This article is available in Eighteenth-Century Fiction: http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/ecf/vol18/iss2/7

Frank Palmeri. *Satire, History, Novel: Narrative Forms, 1665–1815.* Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses, 2003. 356pp. US$62.50. ISBN 0-87413-829-9.

Frank Palmeri's highly readable and stimulating study of the waning of satire attempts to complement Ronald Paulson's thesis in *Satire and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century England* (1967) about the replacement of satire with sentimental fiction by a three-stage model of narrative epistemes that trace the transition from satire to history. By analogy with Foucault's three periods in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*—symbolized by similitude, representation, and organic man—Palmeri moves from the satire of opposing dichotomies as in Swift's work to the taxonomics of society represented in Fielding on to the *Bildungsroman* and historical novel as instances of organicism. This overall argument with due attention to Habermas and Gramsci is articulated with much clarity and elegance in the introduction and later illustrated in six successive chapters on the examples of a number of subgenres: the satiric almanac (chapter 1), the historical memoir-novel (Courtilz de Sandras, Defoe, Prévost—chapter 2), the development from satire to philosophical history to the historical novel (Swift, Hume, Scott—chapter 3), the development from satire to conjectural history to the *Bildungsroman* (Montesquieu, Rousseau, Wieland, Goethe—chapter 4), from satire to the novel and the public sphere writings (Fielding, Smollett, Voltaire to Sterne, Diderot, Wieland on to Manley, Lennox, and Inchbald—chapter 5), and finally the relationship of satire and Utopia in conjectural and philosophical history (Rousseau, Voltaire to Gibbon and Kant—chapter 6).

Such a sweeping schema cuts across a great number of traditional generic boundaries and rewrites accepted versions of eighteenth-century literary history; it also has the effect of making satire, clearly a central genre in neoclassical poetry, but one usually relegated to the margins in the history of the novel and of eighteenth-century drama, the centrepiece and unacknowledged ground of the rise of the novel. For these reasons Palmeri's book is an important contribution to eighteenth-century studies and one likely to be challenged for its revision of beloved notions about the history of eighteenth-century fiction. Palmeri's volume in its ambitious sweep of genre development from the late seventeenth to the early nineteenth centuries even reaches across the Channel to include developments in France and Germany, allowing for different accents and paces within the same sequence of changes in French and German fiction of the eighteenth century.

The main admirable facets of Palmeri's proposals concern the placing of satire within the overall context of eighteenth-century prose. Whereas most literary histories see satire as an important component in the *rise* of the novel, focusing on Swift and his influence on Fielding, satire in Smollett and Burney is frequently explained away as a subsidiary element of the picaresque novel

or the novel of manners. Palmeri's thesis that satire should be seen as a strand of eighteenth-century fiction that is subsumed into and displaced by the *Bildungsroman* makes a valid contribution to a reconception of eighteenth-century generic history. Second, by linking the importance of satire to the lack of a political public sphere in the Habermasian sense and the demise of satire with the expansion of such a sphere of public discussion in Britain, Palmeri explains the continuing popularity of satire in Germany and France, where absolutism hindered the establishment of free political discussion. Moreover, the sway of satire is shown to include philosophical works and not merely fiction. This, too, is a move that crosses traditional boundaries of argumentation and locates satire as a genre that affects much else besides the novel. Finally, Palmeri's proposal to see satire as evolving into the *Bildungsroman* rather than as dichotomous with sentimentalism, and to classify British sentimental novels as undermining satiric either/or schemata by focusing on ambiguity, vacillation, and eventually compromise (neither/nor) modifies traditional readings of sentimentalism in original ways. Thus, the usually emphasized prominence of the emotions in the sentimental novel and the centrality of the spectacle are replaced in Palmeri's account by a focus on the Utopian and tragic vision of sentimentalism as in *David Simple*.

While these modifications of the traditional marginalization of satire are entirely stimulating, the more specific groundwork of Palmeri's theses will evoke disagreement. Thus, already the definition of satire that Palmeri uses—the critique of two opposite behaviours (for example, the praise of excessive rationality of the Houyhnhnms in *Gulliver's Travels* and the criticism of excessive humanity in the Yahoos)—is an arguable one. Even Palmeri himself, when discussing Fielding and Smollett, seems to forget about the necessary dichotomization of satire: "The form that Fielding develops in *Joseph Andrews*, then, is predominantly comic, although it also includes much satire on hypocrisy, a few mock-heroic travesties, a centrally located utopian idyll, and a conclusion that follows all the implausible conventions of romance" (189). This sentence conceives of satire simply as a discourse criticizing *one* type of behaviour (hypocrisy). Likewise, a comment on the nonexistence of Utopia in Britain equivalent to Condorcet's history raises the question as to what extent the works of Holcroft, Godwin and Wollstonecraft should have been mentioned. Why is *Hugh Trevor* the only novel by Holcroft discussed and why does *Anna St Ives* not figure?

This takes me to a final query. Palmeri valiantly attempts to cover women writers (Manley, Lennox, Inchbald, and Burney) in his account of satire, although only a brief section of chapter 5 is devoted to them. Even granted that satire is perhaps a genre more conducive to political engagement, and that women did not belong to the public sphere, this rather niggardly inclusion of women is a weakness of the book. In fact, a good case could perhaps have been made thematically of the evolution of the woman-centred

*Bildungsroman* as superseding pro- and anti-feminist satire in the first half of the eighteenth century. Overall, the suspicion that the criteria used are too neat and that texts which do not fit the pattern have been elided does not easily die.

Despite these criticisms, Palmeri's study can be recommended as a thought-provoking contribution to the study of eighteenth-century satire outside neo-classical poetry.

Monika Fludernik
University of Freiburg, Germany

Charles A. Knight. *The Literature of Satire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. US$75. ix+327pp. ISBN 0-521-83460-0.

When, after many years of reading, thinking, teaching, and writing, a scholar leaves us a handsome record of what he has learned, we ought to be grateful. It is with such gratitude that we should welcome Charles A. Knight's *The Literature of Satire.* Knight has provided us with an elaborate account of the European literature of satire. Of the writers studied here only Nabokov lived for a long time outside Europe. Yet he never ceased to be European. Every work discussed in this book, therefore, is European in provenance or inspiration.

Beginning with a stimulating and comprehensive attempt to define the bases of satire, Knight goes on to chapters on "Satiric Nationalism," where eighteenth-century prose, such as *Gulliver's Travels, The Persian Letters,* and *The Citizen of the World,* are briefly examined, and "Satiric Exile," where *Pale Fire, The Book of Laughter and Forgetting,* and *Shame* receive more detailed analysis. In part 2 of this book, Knight presents a chapter on dramatic satire, in which he examines plays by Jonson, Molière, Ostrovsky, and Brecht. Next, under the chapter heading "Horatian Performances," Knight discusses Horace's satires and a number of works that owe their derivation to Horace, including Rochester's *Artemiza to Chloe,* Marvell's *Last Instructions to a Painter,* Pope's *Dunciad,* Swift's *Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift,* and Byron's *Don Juan.* In chapter 6, "Satire and the Novel," Knight examines *Roderick Random, Bouvard et Pécuchet,* some satires by Lucian, and Machado de Assis's *Posthumous Memoirs of Brás Cubas.*

Although the scope is diverse, the reader should also be prepared for glances at many other books. It is difficult to find a common denominator here beyond Knight's regarding all these works as satires. But an exception to this is chapter 7, which is more a work of historical scholarship than criticism. It details the French failure to demolish Dunkirk as required by treaty obligations. The focus is on Steele's journalism and on the responses of others to this issue. Knight's desire to include journalism as a legitimate form of satire is worthwhile, but this