

My Helsing har ett elegant och ledigt språk. Ställvis saknar man mer skärpa, djup och nyans i definitionerna av begrepp, liksom även i själva analysen. Gällande språket bör det påpekas att så gott som alla citat i avhandlingen är översatta från franskan, som helt dominerar källorna. I sitt källkritiska avsnitt, som är rätt så deskriptivt till sin karaktär, kommenterar Helsing emellertid inte hur översättningarna gjorts. Man undrar varför, ty översättningarna är ställvis långt från exakta. Någon gång har ord utelämnats (artikel II, s. 112), ibland har centrala begrepp översatts rakt av utan att problematiseras trots att detta hade kunnat ge resonemanget ytterligare en dimension. Ett exempel på hur sådant med fördel kan göras är diskussionen på s. 46–47 angående termen *journal*.

Att översätta är inte bara att automatiskt ge en svensk eller annan version; det innebär också begreppsmässiga förskjutningar som översättaren bör vara medveten om och uppmärksamma läsaren på, i fall det gäller citat som analyseras i en vetenskaplig text. Kanhända i strävan att finna en elegant motsvarighet hänvisar definitionen av ordet "krets" (*cercle*) i den franska sammanfattningen överraskande nog till en annan auktoritet (*Trésor de la langue française*) än den svenska texten, som endast hänvisar till SAOB. Detta sker åter utan problematisering. Varför har inte själva huvudtexten, eller åtminstone det källkritiska avsnittet, försetts med ett resonemang kring eventuella skillnader eller likheter mellan de svenska och de franska begreppen?

De enskilda artiklarna visar på god förmåga att bedriva självständig forskning och presentera resultat på ett tilltalande sätt. Slutsatserna är klara och tydliga, men de hade fått större tyngd genom att perspektivet öppnats en aning och forskningsresultatens betydelse bedömts i ett större sammanhang, som nått utanför de aristokratiska sfärerna och det svenska hovets politiska praktiker. Exempelvis artikeln om "Hertiginnan, hovet och staden"

påvisar tydligt att Helsing har förmåga att anknyta till större sociala, politiska och kulturella kontexter. Då ämnet är fascinerande, källmaterialet rikligt och författaren framträder som en stilistiskt säker, effektiv och ambitiös skribent får man hoppas att hon tålmodigt fortsätter på de spår hon i avhandlingen dragit upp, för det finns en hel del kvar att utforska.

Charlotta Wolff

Tommi Kakko, *Failures by Design: The Transparent Author in English Satire from Marprelate to Pope*, Acta Universitatis Tamperensis 1821 (Tampere: Tampere University Press, 2013). 282 pp.

If any single literary genre or mode can ever be said to characterise a historical period, satire is arguably the one that defines the age in English literature stretching from the middle of the seventeenth century till the 1750s. A glance in most literary anthologies will testify that this era saw the publication of some of the most memorable (if not greatest) satires ever written. For any student of satire, this century must necessarily be of particular interest.

Tommi Kakko is a scholar with precisely such an interest and his doctoral dissertation *Failures by Design: The Transparent Author in English Satire from Marprelate to Pope* sets out to increase our understanding of satires written largely during this period. I say 'largely' because Kakko emphasises the importance of looking back to an earlier period in English literature to get a more complete picture of a satiric tradition which culminated in the first half of the eighteenth century. The thesis begins in the Renaissance with the Marprelate Controversy, a discussion which also focuses on the satires of Thomas Nashe (Chapter 2). It then proceeds chronologically dedicating a chapter each to some of the most significant

satirists of the period: John Dryden (Chapter 3), Daniel Defoe (Chapter 4), Jonathan Swift (Chapter 5) and Alexander Pope (Chapter 6). These more analytical chapters are preceded by a theoretical introduction (Chapter 1) and it is all rounded off with a brief conclusion (Chapter 7).

For scholars embarking on a study of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century satire, it is hard not to agree with John Sheffield (1647–1721), first duke of Buckingham and Normanby, who, in *An Essay on Poetry* (1682), hedged his discussion of the genre with the couplet: “’Tis hard to write on such a Subject more, / Without repeating things oft said before.” (ll.9–10) A plethora of modern studies exists on the topic of satire in general, and the period Kakko has chosen to tackle is perhaps one of the most studied. This does not mean, of course, that one should be deterred from trying to throw new light on the genre and the period, but it does require individual scholars to pay particular attention to defining their place within the scholarly tradition.

Kakko’s interest is in satire’s generic properties as much as in the individual satirists and their works. His conception of satire as a genre is broad: he makes little to no distinction between satires written in different literary forms, and even though the discussion mainly focuses on prose texts it also includes a number of poems. This does not mean, however, that Kakko attempts to write a general history of satire or that he wishes to draw any overarching conclusions about satire as a genre or mode of writing. His aim is rather to identify “a number of rhetorical practices that characterize the satirical writing of the period under examination” (pp. 32–33). In other words, his study has a distinct historical focus and, although he uses part of his concluding chapter to make links with contemporary literary practices, his view of satire is characterised by an emphasis on situating his material within their social and cultural context.

More specifically, Kakko has chosen his material because, as he says, they “best illustrate the development of the satirical use of the trope of the author” (p. 25). To put it slightly differently, he focuses on a group of satirists whose rhetoric, in one way or another, draws attention to the shifting relationship between themselves (as the real author) and their texts’ author persona and various other voices. Here Kakko follows scholars such as Howard D. Weinbrot in distancing himself from Bakhtin’s emphasis on the carnivalesque aspect of satire. Further, Kakko rejects the traditional view of the satirist who writes against a moral ideal or a utopian backdrop. He maintains instead, and rightly so, that it is highly questionable whether satirists can ever be said to have a moral message, and emphasises the importance of examining how satirists deliberately transgress or circumvent contemporary moral standards. The satirists in question, he argues, all made use of a transgressive and ambiguous rhetoric which had the particular aim of transferring authority and agency from author to readers. In other words, they sought to shift the interpretative responsibility, the creation of meaning, away from themselves and on to the readers.

The roots of this rhetorical strategy Kakko finds in the satirical tracts published during the so-called Marprelate Controversy (1588–1589) and in two texts by Thomas Nashe (c. 1567–c. 1601), *The Anatomy of Absurdity* (1589) and *The Unfortunate Traveller* (1595). Martin Marprelate was a pseudonym used by a group of English Presbyterians as cover for publishing a number of pamphlet attacks on the established church. While it is still unclear who precisely belonged to the group, it is certain that the satires they produced developed out of a growing frustration with a lack of ecclesiastical reform. The Marprelate-writers, Kakko argues, were pivotal in the development of a new character-based form of satire in England. Perhaps the first mock-critic in English

literature, the Marprelate-character or persona represents a radical shift away from traditional Puritan calls for transparency in moral argumentation. Marprelate's style, Kakko continues, was anything but transparent. Marprelate was a protean character whose equivocal rhetoric proved virtually impossible for opponents to respond to without exposing themselves.

Thomas Nashe was a so-called 'anti-Marprelatist'. In other words, he was recruited by the established church to attack the Marprelate writers. Despite being on the other side of the controversy, Kakko points out that Nashe showed a similar interest in manipulating a character-based satire. The creation of a fictional persona such as Jack Wilton (cf. *The Unfortunate Traveller*) allowed Nashe to develop a satirical argument, which was characterised by a high level of ambiguity and polysemy. According to Kakko, this resulted in a shift in agency of the sort described above. The open-ended nature of Nashe's satires, their incoherence and lack of closure, challenged readers actively to interpret the flawed arguments in an attempt to find the author's true intentions.

In Kakko's analysis, the character-based satire instigated by the Marprelate-writers and Nashe eventually received a more formal, theoretical outline in the work of John Dryden (1631–1700). Dryden was an extremely prolific writer, excelling in poetry, criticism, translation and drama, and remembered for being the only English poet laureate to have been stripped of his title. His satires are central to his *oeuvre* as is the influential essay *Discourse concerning the original and progress of satire*, published as the preface to his translations of Persius and Juvenal in 1692.

The *Discourse* is pivotal to Kakko's overall argument. He reads the essay not only as a piece of scholarly criticism but also as a prescriptive text with the clear socio-critical function of initiating a new satirical tradition. An essential part of Dryden's project, Kakko argues, was to formalise the notion of the character of the

author. In other words, through the *Discourse*, Dryden wished to make a character-based satire central to the genre. There was nothing new in this, Kakko claims, because such satires had been familiar to the English since at least the Marprelate Controversy. The interesting aspect of Dryden's argument is instead that the English tradition remains unarticulated in the *Discourse*. Bypassing its English roots, Dryden installed the playwright Livius Andronicus (c. 284–c. 204 BC) as a central character in the history of the genre, not only as the crucial link connecting Greek and Roman satire but also as the classical original for the type of character-based satire he wished to advocate. There might be nothing unusual in Dryden's wish to authenticate his claims through a discussion of classical origins, but, as Kakko says, it also helped Dryden create the impression that he was initiating something new. Furthermore, any attempt to highlight that such satire had its roots in a domestic ecclesiastical controversy, with a group of Presbyterians as its main exponent, would probably have been an ill-fitting argument for the classicist and Catholic Dryden.

The influence of Dryden's *Discourse*, and of his *oeuvre* as a whole, can hardly be overestimated, but, as Kakko says, the impact is hard to pin down and often reflected in broader critical developments. Daniel Defoe (c. 1660–1731) is not a writer often associated with Dryden, or with the satirical tradition of the Renaissance, and Kakko does not emphasise any closer connection besides asserting that in Defoe's work we find a further development in character-based satire.

Certainly most famous today for *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), Defoe also wrote a number of influential and controversial satires, the most noteworthy arguably being *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters* (1702) which forced him into hiding and eventually in to Newgate prison. It is perhaps slightly surprising then that Kakko chooses to focus the greater part of his discus-

sion on *A Journal of the Plague Year* (1722), a text which is not always seen as a straightforwardly satirical work. In the *Journal*, Defoe responded to debates about the causes of the plague that emerged following an outbreak in Marseille in 1720 by letting a fictional character (the saddler “H. F.”) describe his experiences in London during the last major outbreak there in 1665. The discussion focuses specifically on a scene in the *Journal* where H. F. is confronted with a crowd which claims to see an avenging angel, an instance of collective hallucination. In Kakko’s reading, the scene is satirical. Through a rhetorical emphasis on the grotesque, he argues that Defoe sought to criticize the “wild inductive methods” (p. 168) of the new empiricism for spreading fear among the people while at the same time promoting a more tempered approach, as exemplified in H. F. and advocated by more traditional Galenic or humoral approaches to medicine. At the end of this chapter, however, it is not easy to discern from Kakko’s argument how the *Journal* links up with the overall discussion. It is clear that the use of a character, or narrator, is central to the satiric thrust, but the overall argument could here have benefitted from a more detailed comparison with the preceding chapters.

Next the thesis proceeds to deal with one of the most famous satirists of all time, Jonathan Swift (1667–1745). Kakko focuses his discussion exclusively on *A Tale of a Tub* (1704). Constructed of several disparate texts, including *The Battle of the Books* and *The Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*, the *Tale* is often considered Swift’s most complex work. Another distinguishing feature, adding to the *Tale*’s complexity, is the plethora of characters to whom Swift granted a voice. The roots of this particular emphasis on character, Kakko finds in Dryden. Swift was often critical of Dryden, frequently parodying his argument, but, in Kakko’s view, there are traces in Swift’s writing which show that he adopted and devel-

oped Dryden’s emphasis on character for his own purposes. The concept of character remains peripheral to Kakko’s discussion, however, as he moves on to emphasise the effects of Swift’s satire on the reader.

Swift’s relationship with his readers is notoriously complicated and his texts can often be highly exasperating in their failure to generate any sort of closure. Kakko is fully sympathetic towards such complexities, but emphasises that it is a crucial part of Swift’s peculiar rhetoric to lead readers into interpretative impasses. In other words, it is in some respects impossible to read a text such as the *Tale* in any conventional sense, a fact many scholars have had to learn the hard way. *The Battle of the Books*, for example, is testament to the pointlessness of modern scholarly criticism, but Swift’s manipulation of his scholarly readers goes beyond the playfulness of mock-epic satire. As if to generate a kind of perverse symbiosis, Swift constructed the *Tale* so it would need scholarly annotation to be understood while at the same time openly mocking the very scholarly activity the *Tale* required to sustain itself. The challenge for Swift’s readers, Kakko argues, lies in assuming interpretative agency and, ultimately, in transcending the futility of scholarly debates.

Alexander Pope (1688–1744) was a long-time friend of Swift. Both members of the famous Scriblerus Club, they collaborated on several projects and, generally, held similar views on the problems facing eighteenth-century society and culture. The relationship between Pope and Swift is one of the most studied aspects of eighteenth-century literary culture, but, interesting as it is, Kakko should be commended for not over-emphasising the connection and attempting to read the work of both men in a different light.

Kakko begins by emphasising the paradox between Pope’s criticism of contemporary critical practices and his own use of scholarly annotation in his translations of Homer and

his edition of Shakespeare. The greater part of the discussion, however, is dedicated to a study of satire and the sublime in the *Peri Bathous* (1728) and *An Essay on Man* (1734). Often seen as a strategic precursor to *The Dunciad*, the *Peri Bathous* (or, as it was also called, *The Art of Sinking in Poetry*) is perhaps one of Pope's least studied major texts. Told by Martinus Scriblerus, the mock-critic persona developed by the Scriblerus Club, the *Peri Bathous* is a satirical inversion of Longinus' classic treatise *On the Sublime*: instead of inspiring poets to aim for sublimity, Scriblerus encourages them to focus on man's alleged natural preference for bathos, or the profound. Instead of rising, they should sink. Following Christopher Fanning's work on the Scriblerian sublime, Kakko argues that Pope's treatise creates a tension between satire and the sublime; a tension which, essentially, suggests to readers that a good deal of scepticism is needed in the act of interpretation. Agency, Kakko argues, is transferred to readers, who are left on their own to construct meaning out of a disintegrating text.

The discussion of Pope's great quasi-philosophical poem *An Essay on Man* leads to a similar conclusion, which seems to be reached, however, via a slightly different path. Like in the *Peri Bathous*, the transfer of agency also comes about through Pope's use of "ironic sublimity" (p. 249), but, Kakko argues, the means by which Pope's own authorial persona drifts into the background is of equal importance. The disappearance of Pope's authorial voice imbues the argument with an air of universal validity, but also leaves readers alone to dig their way through the morass hidden beneath the smooth philosophical maxims. Kakko's discussion of the *Essay* is compelling but also slightly frustrating. As he readily admits (p. 258), the *Essay* is not a straightforward satire (if indeed it is satire at all) yet he uses it as the concluding example in a discussion of a distinct satirical practice. This is not to say, of course, that we should not look for

satirical traits in what is normally considered non-satirical texts, but the *Essay* does seem a peculiar choice given the amount of satirical material available to students of Pope. Kakko does not clarify why the *Essay* warrants special attention and one is left to wonder why it is preferred over other more obvious satires in Pope's canon.

It is obvious that Kakko has read extensively and his knowledge of the period and the secondary literature shines through on every page. His ability to discuss the satires within an appropriate social and cultural context is a strong point of the thesis. For example, his detailed discussion of the medical and scientific background to Defoe's *Journal* is highly illuminating. Arguably one of the most original aspects of the thesis is his emphasis on the influence of a domestic Renaissance tradition on eighteenth-century satire and he should be applauded for exploring a different path than the traditional focus on the classical tradition. Here, however, it would have been good if he had spent more time on explaining why the tradition he traces does not have a classical predecessor. In other words, what precisely is it about Renaissance satire that sets it so much apart from classical satire that we can begin to talk of a set of distinct rhetorical practices? A detailed comparison with Greek and Roman satire would have strengthened the argument.

It would also have been preferable if Kakko had been clearer about his motivations for choosing the specific satires in question. As already noted, both Defoe's *Journal* and Pope's *Essay* are somewhat peculiar choices and one also wonders why, for instance, Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (a work which in so many respects seems ideally suited for the discussion) is left unmentioned. On a similar note, Kakko does not place any specific emphasis on summarising his argument. The greater part of the concluding chapter, for example, is spent on drawing links to twentieth-century liter-

ary practices, and, however compelling such a discussion is, it would have been a service to the reader if greater weight had been placed on highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the discussion, and how the various texts come together to form a distinct and developing satirical tradition.

That said, it must not be forgotten that Kakko has written a good and enjoyable thesis, relevant for anyone with an interest in the development of authorship, rhetorical literary practices and satire in the early modern period.

Adam Borch

Jani Marjanen, *Den ekonomiska patriotismens uppgång och fall: finska hushållningssällskapet i europeisk, svensk och finsk kontext 1720–1840* (Helsingfors: Helsingfors universitet, 2013). 304 s.

Jani Marjanen har oförfärat tagit sig an ett vittomfattande ämne. Det inkluderar en kartläggning av ekonomiska och patriotiska sällskap på europeisk nivå – deras uppgång och fall. Den här formen av reglerad sällskaplighet är framför allt ett 1700-talsfenomen. Men det hade sin upprinnelse något tidigare och avklingade senare. Antalet sällskap är nästan omöjligt att exakt bestämma. Författaren anför en forskningsöversikt som hittat över 230 patriotiska sällskap i Europa, och en annan som uppdagat drygt 560 ekonomiska sällskap, och kalkylerar själv att även den senare siffran förblir en underskattning av det verkliga antalet.

Marjanens studie avhandlar exakt det som bokens titel uppger. Förankringen av Finska hushållningssällskapet i en allmän europeisk händelsekedja framstår som lika viktig som undersökningen av sällskapets egen organisation och förvandlingar. Finska hushållningssällskapet grundades i Åbo 1797, inte långt efter den franska revolutionen och under en

svensk statsmakt som vid denna tid i allmänhet inte såg välvilligt på medborgarinitiativ.

Författaren gestaltar sin undersökning ur ett så kallat begreppshistoriskt perspektiv, där sällskapens retorik, självförståelse och namnformernas metamorfoser får en avgörande betydelse – detta i medveten metodisk opposition mot en historieforskning som tolkar historiska skeenden genom att anpassa dem till en senare förståelse av ett händelseförlopp, och då inte sällan genom att inordna skeendena i en nationell konception av nationens födelse och framväxt. I sina resonemang värjer sig författaren exemplariskt mot anakronismer och teleologiska felsslut. Marjanen är alltså metodiskt medveten – inte bara i inledande metoddiskussion utan genom hela avhandlingen.

Avhandlingen faller tydligt i två delar, för det första en allmän europeisk bakgrundsutredning, mycket lång och koncentrerad på det begreppsliga, de olika sällskapens namnskick och ofta brukade honnörsord, och därefter en andra del som följer Finska hushållningssällskapets olika faser, där begreppen fortfarande är viktiga men där också många andra rön och iakttagelser tillåts spela med. För det begreppshistoriska har författaren låtit sig inspireras av historieforskningens så kallade *linguistic turn* på 1960-talet och av historiker som Quentin Skinner. Vad beträffar en teoretisk diskussion av associationsväsendet och dess förvandlingar i Finland anknyter författaren ofta till Henrik Stenius. Vad gäller kännedomen om Finska hushållningssällskapet på dokumentnivå har författaren haft stor nytta av en räckta publikationer som genom åren utgivits av Lars Ziliacus framom andra.

Inte minst intressant är Marjanens behandling av begreppet "patriotism", i synnerhet mot bakgrunden av hur begreppet har korrumperats eller getts annan innebörd efter 1800-talsnationalismens genombrott (detta särskilt på anglosaxiskt håll, där skillnaden mellan "patriotism" och "nationalism" mer eller mindre har utplånats). Denna diskussion