

V&R Academic

Passages – Transitions – Intersections

Volume 1

Edited by Paola Partenza and Andrea Mariani

Paola Partenza (ed.)

Dynamics of Desacralization

Disenchanted Literary Talents

This is a peer-reviewed volume.

V&R unipress



Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISBN 978-3-8471-0386-8

ISBN 978-3-8470-0386-1 (E-Book)

This book is published thanks to F.A.R.S. funds of the Department of Modern Languages,
Literatures and Cultures, University "G. d'Annunzio", CHIETI-PESCARA.

© Copyright 2015 by V&R unipress GmbH, 37079 Goettingen, Germany

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this work may
be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including
photocopying, microfilm and recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system,
without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in Germany.

Printing and binding: CPI Buch Bücher.de GmbH, Birkach

Contents

Acknowledgements	7
Introduction	9
Guyonne Leduc “The Stylistic Desacralization of Man in Britain in the [Sophia] Pamphlets (1739–1740)”	13
Christopher Stokes Desacralizing the Sign: Tooke, Stewart and Romantic Materialism	37
Barbara M. Benedict Satire, Sentiment and Desacralization: The Relic and the Commodity in Jane Austen’s Novels	53
Paola Partenza Alfred Tennyson’s De-sacralization of the Afterlife	71
Roger Ebbatson Seeking “the Beyond”: Desacralising/Resacralising Nature in Richard Jefferies	91
John Fawell An Earthy Sacredness: Maupassant’s and Van Gogh’s Christianized Materialism	103
Simona Beccone Displacement-Distortion Theory and the Desacralisation of Aesthetic Categories: the Case Study of Hardy’s “Neutral Tones”	123

Jennifer Kilgore-Caradec

Geoffrey Hill's Serpents and Dragons 151

Esra Melikoglu

"Morpho Eugenia": The Individual Struggle for Self-Realisation and the
Question of Morality in a Darwinian World Without God 163

Notes on Contributors 177

Acknowledgements

In the process of collecting essays for this volume, which is the result of an international research which has involved distinguished scholars, I have accumulated numerous debts towards all those who have given me suggestions and support, and it is my pleasure to acknowledge them here.

I am especially grateful to all the contributors to this volume who have accepted to participate in it, and have waited patiently for it, and supported me during the long process of publication; to Prof. Andrea Mariani who, thanks to his extensive experience and culture, has given me precious suggestions for the realization of this enterprise; and to the colleagues of the Department of Modern Languages, Literatures and Cultures, who have accepted to publish this volume.

Paola Partenza

Introduction

The idea of *desacralization* has become almost commonplace, attributing to the word the rejection of what is sacred. One might think that it is strictly connected to theology and its system, or suppose that it implies the relationship human beings have with anything that can express a denial of the spiritual part of life. Martin Heidegger observes “Things are always open to becoming other than themselves, and always resistant to fixation, determination, definition, and therefore precisely because of the lack of a hardcore at their centre; vulnerable to appropriation, exploitation, desacralization”¹. The concept of desacralization therefore, has numerous meanings, either from a philosophical or a literary viewpoint. To desacralize implies challenging the sacred or traditional features of an institution, of tradition; it consists in bringing back to reality and historical truth, what had a religious significance, or what was not supposed to be cast in doubt; so we could talk about desacralizing the myth, the mysteries of religion, desacralize the biblical narrative, desacralize the *auctoritas* in a work of art or literature, desacralize the concept of propriety, and so on. The usage of the verb itself, “desacralize”, often expresses an attitude of generalized irreverence and disrespect toward ideas, opinions, institutions or people, though it is not always and necessarily based on an explicitly and rational denial of its intrinsic sacral character.

The theme is both ample and debated in literature and any form of art; if we try to give it a conceptual collocation we discover multifarious approaches and interpretations, but more importantly, a constant use of the topic by authors or artists.

As we might argue, the concept of desacralization recalls the idea of anti-sacred, something that authors, artists, philosophers have continuously tried to focus on in their works, with the purpose of changing a precise order, and the intention of creating something new, eversive but substantially open to the fu-

1 Martin Heidegger, *Poetry, Language, Thought*, New York: Harper Perennial Classics, 2001, p. 11.

ture, a future that must be questioned and investigated through their own works which appear distant from any form of conventionality. The writers, artists and poets analysed in this collection of essays, have become emblematic of a changed sensibility, of a reflection on nature, language and thought, documenting a sense of uneasiness and disillusionment for the world around them.

The idea of desacralization is the starting point to reconsider life and the role of man within a universe that, though fictitious, becomes expressive of political, social or religious macro-structures, which mirror the pain, uncertainty, deception and loss of faith which find their expressions in the critical evaluation of the world we live in. The disenchantment expressed by the authors is the impulse to re-position human beings' viewpoint in a perspective that might be new and revolutionary. It is a means through which the severe criticism the authors adopt serves to reverse all forms of reification or subordination which human beings are subjected to, creating a literary universe in which a sort of ideological antiphrasis becomes the real way to understand and decipher the world in which fictitious or non-fictitious characters live in. Again, in Martin Heidegger's words, I would ask: "What does the work, as work, set up? Towering up within itself, the work opens up a *world* and keeps it abidingly in force"².

The scholars' investigation of *Dynamics of Desacralization* has made this collection of essays rich and varied, revealing new *worlds* the different authors have created. What they do is to narrate various types of desacralization interrogating the nature of novels, poems or works of art; certain aspects of being are revealed through various expressions, engaging the multiple levels and the meaning of desacralization providing an articulation and interpretation of it.

Guyonne Leduc focuses her attention "on the long eighteenth century (1688–1815) defined as the golden age of patriarchy", in which "man's authority is reasserted and male domination is assumed in the family as well as in the state; thus man is thought of as a kind of sanctuary (*"sacer"*), an entity not to be questioned". Leduc shows how, "at the time of the revival of the *"querelle des femmes"* in mid-century Britain, a pamphlet by [Sophia], entitled *Woman Not Inferior to Man* (1739), was to become the epitome of prefeminist ideas of the time". Leduc explores the inner being of the female author showing how she refuses the limits of language in order to strive for more equality between the sexes, or at the very least, less inequality, through the desacralization of men.

Christopher Stokes explores two eighteenth-century attempts to complete and correct the work of John Locke by concentrating on a wholly materialist account of language. John Horne Tooke and John "Walking" Stewart "worked to undo a dualistic notion of language which bound the body of the letter to the immateriality of the idea." These accounts were fused with radical Enlighten-

² Ivi, p. 43.

ment ideas (that is, “anti-superstition, anti-metaphysics, anti-religion”), and as a result there is a desacralization of the sign. According to Stokes, Tooke and Stewart had very different approaches to analysing the language of Locke and yet they both show “the concrete, material movement of thought in the world and in history”.

Barbara M. Benedict’s positions spring from reading Jane Austen’s desacralization as one of the signs through which the author “satirizes the confusion of materiality and morality”. Benedict explores the way that Jane Austen, unlike other authors of sentimental fiction, viewed the contemporary interest in material culture as an “ominous tendency to fetishize objects: to transform material things into vessels of transcendent meaning, with power over the subject”. Benedict highlights the way Jane Austen reveals how eighteenth-century society was morally deteriorating and becoming increasingly materialistic and lacking values.

Paola Partenza shows how “the concept of Afterlife is desacralized in the poetry of Alfred Tennyson. Afterlife is seen as otherness which is conceived through traditional religious conceits of redemption and asylum, and which collides with Tennyson’s firm belief in natural process and genetic evolution. The motif becomes obsessive in his poetry showing an unrelieved tension between spirit and matter, imagination and existence. He is convinced that religion and its tradition had produced illusionistic perspective, prompting him to aspire to shape existence into the abiding form of poetry, trying to give optical truth to life on a scientific basis, and giving his suffering a sense of anguish and limitation to a secular mode of reality. Tennyson tackles the problems of the origin of life and the reasons for its stability and continuity. He tries to create a symbolic world as a counterpart of the misleading world of religion”.

Roger Ebbatson investigates “the life and work of the Victorian nature-writer Richard Jefferies (1848–87)”; he analyses the writer’s “progression of approach and thought away from a primarily realist descriptive mode”. Man’s relationship to the natural world is presented in a detached way by Jefferies, yet the language he deploys is based on a “non-religious resacralisation of the natural world in a philosophical project characterised as a quest for ‘soul-life’ or ‘sun-life’.” Ebbatson shows Jefferies’ desire to move away from the restrictive ‘circle of ideas’ and his search for “the sacred in nature” and a “non-Christian ‘fullness of life’”.

John Fawell shifts the topic discussion towards the relationship between art and literature, showing how “Vincent Van Gogh and Guy de Maupassant, despite their obvious differences, are quite similar in their attitude towards nature”. Van Gogh’s religious upbringing was rigid and yet both he and Guy de Maupassant “were devout materialists who responded with an almost pagan ardor to nature” and “both often drew from a Christian vocabulary to describe its ecstatic effect on them”. Fawell notes that “Maupassant and Van Gogh sublimate a lost

Christianity into a physical passion for this world, a kind of Christianized, ecstatic religion of the earth”.

Simona Beccone examines “two fundamental components in the phenomenology of aesthetic experience and categorization: the mutually opposite but complementary processes of ‘aestheticization’ (i.e. the turning of the non-aesthetic into the aesthetic, as a result of an individual/collective practice of cultural sacralisation) and of ‘de-aestheticization’ (i.e. the downgrading of the aesthetic into the unaesthetic, in this case as a result of a cultural desacralisation)”. Beccone’s work is based on the application of a theoretical framework (“Displacement-distortion theory”), which can be found “in a number of recent studies on visual perception and cognitive neuroscience”, and provides an incisive analysis of the complex “perceptual, affective and cognitive phenomena” which are intrinsically part of “our experience and subsequent categorization of the world in aesthetic/non-aesthetic terms”.

Jennifer Kilgore-Caradec analyses Geoffrey Hill’s poetry concentrating primarily on the question: “Why does Hill’s poetry consistently engage with images of serpents and dragons, from *For The Unfallen* (1952) to *Oraclau* (2010)? In a long first section, some recent discourses about secularization in Western culture are evoked. This is provided as a backdrop to Hill’s poetry, where images of serpents and dragons must be imagined as being linked to Biblical usage and dictionary definitions as well as other literary sources. The occurrences of serpents and dragons within Hill’s work are then examined individually, it emerges that the imagery shifts to allow for positive associations for the Dragon, which is a positive figure in Celtic myth and a symbol of Wales”.

Finally, Esra Melikoglu examines the issue showing how “Charles Darwin’s evolution theory dealt “a mortal blow” to teleology. In A. S. Byatt’s neo-Victorian novelette “Morpho Eugenia” (1992), Darwin comes back to life in the protagonist, the entomologist William Adamson (Todd 32), a butcher’s son. His story allows Byatt to reconsider the relevance of atheistic Darwinism to the emancipation of the modern individual from his/her bondage to the old regime, claiming to dictate God’s will to the masses, and the right to self-determination and self-realisation. Byatt explores the question of morality in a world without God. If God does not exist, and if religion’s main function is to sanction oppressive power; if the atheistic Darwinian man, in his struggle to survive and multiply in a world of natural selection, appears to be another predatory force”, then, the question of the possibility of “an altruistic ideal of morality” exists.

P. P.

“The Stylistic Desacralization of Man in Britain in the [Sophia] Pamphlets (1739–1740)”¹

In Britain the long eighteenth century (1688–1815) was the golden age of patriarchy as defined in Fletcher’s words, “the institutionalised male dominance over women and children in the family and the subordination of women in society in general.”² He traces its historical origins to “the institutions of English patriarchy, inherited from Hebrew and early Christian societies, [that] rested upon twin pillars: the subordination required of women as a punishment for Eve’s sin [...], and an understanding of men’s and women’s bodies [...] in terms of relative strength and weakness. Patriarchy was thus founded upon God’s direction and woman’s natural physical inferiority.”³ This double aspect is not even denied by two early prefeminists,⁴ Mary Astell (1666–1731) and Mary Wollstonecraft (1759–1797), who challenged patriarchal society with the ambition to give enlightened women a better and more equal place.⁵ In addition, the period was characterized, as the historian Bridget Hill puts it, by “the victory of individualism” which was “a victory for property, and wives by their very legal definition were propertyless,” which meant, she notes, “the reinforcement not

1 This contribution is based on Guyonne Leduc, *Réécritures anglaises au XVIII^e siècle de l’Égalité des deux sexes (1673) de François Poulain de la Barre: Du politique au polémique* (Paris: L’Harmattan, «Des idées et des femmes,» 2010) 383–420. Éditions L’Harmattan, 2010.

2 Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England 1500–1800* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1995) XV.

3 Fletcher XVII.

4 See the definitions given by Joan K. Kinnaird, “Mary Astell and the Conservative Contribution to English Feminism,” *Journal of British Studies* 19 (1979): 74 and Hilda L. Smith, “Feminism and the Methodology of Women’s History,” *Liberating Women’s History: Theoretical and Critical Essays*, ed. Berenice A. Carroll (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1976) 370. See to Ian Maclean, *Woman Triumphant: Feminism in French Literature 1610–1652* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1977) VIII and “Marie de Gournay et la préhistoire du discours féminin,” *Femmes et pouvoirs sous l’ancien régime*, ed. Danielle Haase Dubosc and Éliane Viennot (Paris: Éditions Rivages, “Rivages/Histoire,” 1991) 120.

5 See Leduc, “The Representation of Women’s Status in Domestic and Political Patriarchy in Mary Astell and Mary Wollstonecraft,” “Présentations, représentations, re-présentations,” dir. Antoine Capet, *Revue Française de Civilisation Britannique (RFCB)* 15.4 (2010): 11–28.

the weakening of the authority of husband and father.”⁶ Ruth Perry draws the conclusion that women were “the property of their fathers, husbands or masters.”⁷ Man’s authority was reasserted and male domination was assumed in the family as well as in the state; thus man was thought of as a kind of sanctuary (“*sacer*”), an entity not to be questioned.

However, at the time of the revival of the “*querelle des femmes*” in mid-century Britain, in response to lord Chesterfield’s article in *Common Sense ; or, The Englishman’s Journal* (14/01/1738, n°50), the anonymous [Sophia] published, on 22 November 1739, a pamphlet entitled *Woman Not Inferior to Man* (1739), which was to become the epitome of prefeminist ideas of the time, where she dismisses the idea of innate female inferiority and its corollary, male superiority (as Astell had done before and Wollstonecraft would do after her) and harshly criticizes men’s so-called usurped power over women. An anonymous answer was written by a male adversary in *Man Superior to Woman* on 20 December 1739, which, in turn, lead [Sophia] – the same author or another one hiding under the same name? – to write *Woman’s Superior Excellence over Man* in 1740. In Fielding’s periodical *The Champion*, the editor, Hercules Vinegar, refers to [Sophia] as “the *Championess* of the Sex” (n°87).⁸ Her two pamphlets were reprinted separately in 1743 by another publisher, Jacob Robinson, as was also the case of her adversary’s essay, reprinted in 1744 by Robinson, with a slightly different subtitle.⁹ The controversy was still active in 1751, when all three pamphlets were republished by Jacob Robinson, under a common title, *Beauty’s Triumph; or, The Superiority of the Fair Sex Invincibly Proved*. This edition respected the material division into three treatises, but used continuous page numbers.¹⁰ References will be made to the 1739 edition of [Sophia]’s first

6 Bridget Hill, ed., *The First English Feminist: Reflections on Marriage and Other Writings* (Aldershot: Gower Publishing Company, 1986) 21.

7 Ruth Perry, “Mary Astell and the Feminist Critique of Possessive Individualism,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 23.4 (1990): 452.

8 This column is not to be found in the Wesleyan edition of Fielding’s works. See *The Champion* (15 November 1739 – 12 February 1741). [Bodleian Library, shelfmark: Hope fol. 106. BP. A. 712].

9 The subtitle *A Vindication of Man’s Natural Right of Sovereign Authority over the Woman. Containing a Plain Confutation of the Fallacious Arguments of [Sophia], in Her Late Treatise Intituled, Woman [...]* becomes, in 1744, *The Natural Right of the Men to Sovereign Authority over the Women, Asserted and Defended, Being an Answer to That Celebrated Treatise Intituled, Woman [...]*.

10 What was reprinted in 1780 under the title *Female Restoration, by a Moral and Physical Vindication of Female Talents [...]*. By a Lady was not *Beauty’s Triumph*, as Felicity Nussbaum thinks, but a new and anonymous translation of Poulain’s *Égalité des deux sexes* entitled *Female Rights Vindicated* (1758). See Felicity Nussbaum, “II. Rhyming Women Dead: Restoration Satires on Women,” *The Brink of All We Hate: English Satires on Women, 1660 – 1750* (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1984) 8.

pamphlet republished in 1975, a currently available edition.¹¹ The page numbers of her adversary's pamphlet and of her second one will be those of the 1751 edition, entitled *Beauty's Triumph*.¹² The [Sophia] pamphlets will first be presented and questions asked as to the identity/ties of their author/s. Then her treatment of men and her attacks on them, first direct, then indirect will be considered before focusing on her treatment of women in order to attack men.

*

[Sophia]'s two pamphlets are defined as "Treatise[s]."¹³ The first one is also referred to as "my first essay" (S2 175), "my former Essay" (188) and the second as "my Enquiry" (S2 170). Her adversary's answer, *Man Superior to Woman*, refers to her first pamphlet as "that ingenious Essay" (A69) and defines itself as "this little treatise" (A94). In the 1751 edition which makes a comparison possible, the respective length of the three pamphlets increases from 63 pages (1 – 63) to 100 (67 – 166) to finally 138 (169 – 306). The addressor, [Sophia], does not conceal her sex or her social rank ("a Person of Quality") in the title of her first pamphlet, nor her young age in that of the second ("a young lady" [S2 177]). The addressees are men as well as women who are directly addressed to by [Sophia] since she knows her treatises will be of little importance and less consequence if they are not read by men. Her answer to her adversary is aimed at male readers as she wants to prove his partiality and error to them (S2 176). What is now known with certainty is that [Sophia] and her adversary were very widely influenced by the English translation of the Cartesian Poulain de la Barre's *Égalité des deux sexes* (1673) translated as *The Woman as Good as the Man; or, The Equality of Both Sexes* in 1677 by Archibald Lovell.¹⁴ Descartes demonstrates the separation of the body and the mind and, thus, the full autonomy of thought from the sexed body, an idea that Poulain de la Barre encapsulates in "*L'Esprit n'a point de Sexe*."¹⁵ As Perry writes, he "was probably the first thinker to apply

11 [Sophia], *Woman Not Inferior to Man; or, A Short and Modest Vindication of the Natural Rights of the FAIR-SEX to a Perfect Equality of Power, Dignity, and Esteem, with the Men* (London: Printed for John Hawkins, 1739) (London: Brentham P, 1975) 62 pp. Hereafter in the text Sx will refer to page numbers in this edition.

12 [Anon.], *Beauty's Triumph; or, The Superiority of the Fair Sex Invincibly Proved* (London: Printed for Jacob Robinson, 1751) 306 pp. Hereafter S2 x will refer to [Sophia]'s answer, *Woman's Superior Excellence over Man*, in this edition and Ax to her antagonist's essay, *Man Superior to Woman*, in this edition too.

13 "this little Treatise" (S10, S2 273, 205), "my former treatise" (S2 177, 275, 281, 283, 288).

14 François Poulain de la Barre, *The Woman as Good as the Man ; or, The Equality of Both Sexes. Written Originally in French, and Translated into English by A. L.* (London, 1677) XVIII + 185 pp. Hereafter Px will refer to the page number in this edition.

15 Poulain de la Barre, *De l'égalité des deux sexes* [1673], *De l'éducation des dames* [1674], *De l'excellence des hommes* [1675], ed. Marie-Frédérique Pellegrin (Paris: Vrin, 2010) 99.

Cartesian skepticism to the question of women.”¹⁶ In [Sophia]’s first pamphlet (63 pages) one finds borrowings from fifty-six Poulainian paragraphs; in the second one (138 pages), [Sophia] borrows from fifty-four paragraphs.¹⁷ [Sophia] takes up nearly the whole of Poulain’s *Woman as Good as the Man* in order to write her two pamphlets but the result is rather different from the source text or “hypotext” (to use Genette’s terminology)¹⁸ as she borrows from Poulain some innovative ideas but not all of them, in particular the inequality between ranks, between human beings and not only between men and women.

As to [Sophia]’s identity, it remains unknown. Some thought, yet without any proof, that it was a penname used by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (1689 – 1762) because she reacted to lord Chesterfield’s article in *Common Sense; or, The Englishman’s Journal* (14/01/1738, n. 50) and, ten days later, defended women whom she described as rational beings in her own periodical, *The Nonsense of Common Sense*.¹⁹ That hypothesis was mentioned by C. A. Moore in 1916: “Whether [Sophia] was really Lady Mary Wortley Montagu is a nice question; I think this supposition is probably correct, and that there is good evidence for it which has not been noted.”²⁰ In the 1975 edition of *Woman Not Inferior to Man*, the verso of the title page reads “the authorship has been attributed to Lady Mary Wortley Montagu”. And yet ten years later, in 1985, Moira Ferguson wrote that [Sophia]’s identity was still unknown,²¹ referring, without any reference, to Robert Halsband, the aristocrat’s biographer, who does not agree with the hypothesis.²² In 1987, Camille Garnier again mentioned a potential mask worn by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu.²³ In 1964, Myra Reynolds had echoed another

16 Voir Perry, “Chapter Three. The Self-Respect of a Reasoning Creature,” *The Celebrated Mary Astell: An Early English Feminist* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986) 71.

17 See Leduc, *Réécritures anglaises* 111 and 219.

18 See Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes. La Littérature au second degré* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, “Poétique,” 1982) 11.

19 *The Nonsense of Common Sense, 1737–1738*, ed. Robert Halsband, 1947 (New York: Northwestern U, 1970) 6 (24/01/1738): 24–28. That periodical is reproduced in Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, *Essays and Poems and Simplicity, a Comedy*, ed. Halsband et Isobel Grundy (1977; Oxford: Clarendon, 1993) 130–34.

20 C. A. Moore, “The First of the Militants in English Literature,” *The Nation* 102.2642 (1916): 196.

21 Moira Ferguson, ed., “Sophia fl. 1739–1741,” *First Feminists: British Women Writers 1578–1799* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1985) 266.

22 See Ferguson, ed., 46 (n. 74): “[Sophia]’s identity has never been uncovered. Although Lady Mary Wortley Montagu’s name is often suggested, Lady Mary’s biographer Robert Halsband concludes that it is impossible to tender proof either way.” See Halsband, *The Life of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1956) and Isobel Grundy, *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu: Comet of the Enlightenment* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999) 244–45.

23 See Camille Garnier, “‘La Femme n’est pas inférieure à l’Homme’ (1750): Œuvre de Madeleine Darsant de Puisieux ou simple traduction française?”, *Revue d’Histoire Littéraire de la France* 7.4 (1987): 711–13.

hypothesis suggesting that Lady [Sophia] Fermor (1721 – 1745), the daughter of Thomas, the Earl of Pomfret, and the second wife of Lord [John] Carteret, could be [Sophia].²⁴ Even if it is still impossible to settle the question of the identity or even the sex of the two writers, several questions can be asked: was the adversary a man? Was the second [Sophia], writing *Woman's Superior Excellence over Man*, the same person as the first [Sophia]? Was [Sophia] a woman? Doris Mary Stenton suggests that [Sophia] was a man: "unlikely that a woman who felt deeply about the exclusion of women from all professions would have written like the so-called Sophia."²⁵ Another possibility is that the three writers were one and the same person since at the time it was a rhetorical game to write on both sides of a question.

Two critics think that [Sophia]'s adversary and [Sophia] are one and the same person. On the one hand, Moore writes: "the Gentleman, too, was familiar with Poullain [...] Why, then, did the Gentleman not expose Sophia's plagiarism? I think there can be no doubt that the two are really one [...]"²⁶ She adds:

There is in this book, however, much more material than is to be found in Poullain [...] the satires on particular types of women are characteristic of a large body of literature fashionable at the time [...]; the historical material added to that found in Poullain was the stock in trade of the anti-feminists. In other words, the Gentleman's argument required no great labor beyond that of compilation [...] If Sophia produced the whole series, it is easy to explain why her opponent's logic is weak to the point of absurdity and plays so beautifully into the hands of her clever rejoinder.²⁷

The speed with which the pamphlets were written and the variety of the borrowings from Poullain, without repetition, could thus be accounted for: "Sophia must have enjoyed the situation keenly; she conducted an elaborate campaign and won a great battle for her sex with surprisingly little creative effort. When we consider the freedom with which she used her 'sources,' we need not be surprised by the voluminous information exhibited or the marvellous rapidity with which the debate proceeded."²⁸ Although Moira Ferguson quoted Moore's hypothesis, she did not develop it: "Once again, the author was probably [Sophia], who employed traditional misogynous arguments including Theophrastian-based, antifeminist character sketches."²⁹ It remains impossible to prove either

24 See Myra Reynolds, "Chapter III. Education," *The Learned Lady in England 1650–1760* (1920; Gloucester, MA: Smith, 1964) 315 referring to Medley, "'Sophia, a Lady of Quality,'" *Notes and Queries* 11 (1st May 1897): 348.

25 See Doris Mary Stenton, *The English Woman in History* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1957) 292–94.

26 Moore 196.

27 Moore 196.

28 Moore 196.

29 Ferguson, ed., 266.

that the author of the three pamphlets was one and the same person or to reveal [Sophia]'s and her adversary's identities.

*

[Sophia]'s treatment of men is dictated by two elements: her attacks are either to be found in Poulain's treatise and then developed in her pamphlets or they are to be read without the French philosopher's influence in the original passages of her texts.

When Poulain criticizes men – either openly or not –, and admits men's wrongs towards women, [Sophia] enhances his attacks using two devices in both of her pamphlets, that is substitution and addition, that either lexically or syntactically reinforce the content. [Sophia] uses them separately or simultaneously. In the case of substitution, she adopts Poulain's structures and introduces changes within them; in the case of addition, she inserts pejorative terms particularly in her first pamphlet. In the case of overt criticism, [Sophia] resorts to substitution. When, in the wake of Poulain, she refers to men as "judges and parts" in her first pamphlet, she replaces "interested" (P4) by "corrupted," a more polemical adjective.³⁰ Further down, when she refers to men's useless study of natural philosophy, she substitutes a derogatory verb, "waste whole years" (S42),³¹ to Poulain's more neutral verb "spend whole years" (P77). To reinforce the harshness of the attack of men's partiality against women's capacities, [Sophia] adds a past participle complemented by three nouns recurrent in Poulain's text ("biassed by custom, prejudice, and interest" [S7]), or a verb and an adverb ("have presumed boldly" [S7]) that add reproach or even aggressiveness to the original sentence ("if Men were more just, and less interested in their Judgements" [P4]).³² In her second essay, concerning the obstacles to women's education, [Sophia] inserts a relative clause making its meaning accurate (jealousy) – "without regarding the little reasons of the *Men*, whose jealousy is so industrious to divert them from the improvement they might thence gather" (S2 277) –; it was mentioned by Poulain ("the little Reasons [*sic*] of those who would undertake to divert them there from" [P131]). Substitution and addition are also combined in several cases. First, speaking of the prejudice concerning the in-

30 "if Men were more just, and less interested in their Judgements [...]" [my underlining] (P4), "if the Men were ever so little more just and less corrupted in their judgements than they really are [...]" (S7).

31 "They spend whole years, and some all their lives, at Trifles [...]" (P77), "We shou'd scarcely do like some *Men* who waste whole years (not to mention many of them who dwell for life) on mere *Entia Rationis*, fictitious trifles [...]" (S42).

32 "Nevertheless, the *Men*, bias'd by custom, prejudice, and interest, have presumed boldly to pronounce sentence in their own favour [...]" (S7–8).