

a point of reference that enables contrast with an alternate reality and thus as an exercise in perspective.

The book's final chapter explicates key ideas from Xavier de Maistre's *Voyage autour de ma chambre* (1794), whose narrative amounts to a parody of the *récit de voyage* genre through a detailed description of his cell. Unlike prison escape tales, here the escape goes inwards instead of outwards: the imagination is the prisoner's refuge and source of freedom. As Markovskaia eloquently puts it, "L'enfermement est donc double: celui de la cellule et celui de l'enveloppe corporelle, et le prisonnier doit rompre les deux pour atteindre le bonheur, ce qui correspond à une évasion vers l'intérieur" [Imprisonment is hence two-fold: there is that of the cell and that of the corporal envelope, and the prisoner must break off from both in order to attain his goal, which consists of an escape towards one's inner self] (255). This work, chronologically latest among those considered in *La Conquête du for privé*, enables the completion of the book's focus on the secularization and evolution of the memorial genre and its evolution. God is no longer the palliative of the individual's spleen but rather the cure comes from within.

Although there are perhaps too many vestigial elements from the dissertation upon which this book is based (excessive signposting and a good deal of repetition), this work is an original and welcome contribution to scholarship on eighteenth-century prison literature. It is a remarkably rich area of inquiry that too few *dix-huitièmistes* have investigated. Markovskaia's work does justice to the incredible importance of eighteenth-century prison memoirs as a lens for understanding not only the birth of modern autobiography but also the evolution of Enlightenment thought.

NOTES

1. Michael J. Mulryan, "L'embastillement de Marmontel dans ses *Memoires*: La marmontélisation d'une histoire vraie," *L'érudit franco-espagnol* 2 (2012): 107–16.

2. See John Renwick, ed. Jean-François Marmontel, *Correspondance*, vol. 2 (Clermont-Ferrand: L'Imprimerie Moderne, 1974) and John Renwick., ed. Jean-François Marmontel, *Mémoires*, 2 vols. (Clermont-Ferrand: G. De Bussac), 1972.

CLORINDA DONATO, *California State University, Long Beach*

Guillaume-Thomas Raynal, *L'Adresse à l'Assemblée Nationale (31 mai 1791) de Guillaume-Thomas Raynal: Positions, polémiques, repercussions*, ed. and annotated by Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink (Paris: Société française d'étude du dix-huitième siècle, 2018). Pp. 332. 32,00 €, paper.

There are few scholars who know the Guillaume-Thomas Raynal corpus better than Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink, whose valuable new edition and annotation of the address that Raynal delivered to the *Assemblée nationale* on May 31, 1791 includes a collection of the tumultuous reactions that it produced. The address was delivered at a critical moment in the years immediately following 1789, only a few short weeks prior to Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette's ill-fated flight to Varennes,

and this address, we might infer, was something of a harbinger of their dramatic arrest for its indication of a turning point in public sentiment against the monarchy that would eventually result in the guillotining of the king and the queen. Indeed, as Lüsebrink has surmised from his examination of the address itself and the many reactions to it, Raynal's defense of the monarchy rallied public sentiment against it in favor of the republican ideals that may have fueled Louis XVI's miscalculation of what he believed to be sympathy for the "plight" of the royal family post-revolution. For those who have been following the recent meteoric rise of Raynal in eighteenth-century studies through multiple volumes of scholarship on his most famous work, the encyclopedic *Histoire des deux Indes*, the *Adresse* adds a curious coda to a highly idiosyncratic career.

Before this review turns to an analysis of the address and of this edition of it, reminders are in order regarding Raynal's career. Raynal is perhaps the only eighteenth-century intellectual who can claim simultaneously the titles of both Jesuit and *philosophe*. His four-volume *Histoire des deux Indes*, first published anonymously in 1770, appeared in no fewer than 48 editions published between 1770 and 1795, in multiple languages. The last volume in the critical edition of the four-volume-plus *Histoire des deux Indes* that is being published by the *Centre international de l'étude du dix-huitième siècle* is slated to appear in 2021. There is no doubt that Raynal's *Histoire des deux Indes* is now having its moment, for scholars have discovered a wealth of post-colonial reflections on the Enlightenment in whose aftermath the entire fraught experiment of globalization can be recognized today. And while Raynal's rhetorical style might be likened to a rant, it was certainly a multi-authored rant, in that the *Histoire des deux Indes* references and includes excerpts from both well-known writers, including Diderot, Pechméja, Dubreuil, Saint-Lambert, Naigeon and D'Holbach, and any number of unnamed writers.

It is important to recall Raynal's status in France when he delivered his incendiary address. The *Histoire des deux Indes* was banned by Royal Decree on the book's publication in Amsterdam in 1772 (possibly a false imprint; current research suggests it was published in France), and it was listed on the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* in 1774. It was immediately attributed to Raynal, thus rendering him suspect as yet another adherent to the company of philosophes. When the third edition of the *Histoire des deux Indes* was published in 1780 with Raynal's name and portrait, his political woes escalated, even as his cachet in revolutionary circles grew. Exile in Prussia followed, but as revolutionary sentiment in France began to build, Raynal successfully returned to France in 1787, welcomed with reverential titles that had been stripped from him and cast, once again, as the "apostle of liberty," "tutor of the National Assembly," "great writer," "*grand philosophe*," "superstition's declared enemy," and "*historien philosophe*." Thus the Abbé Raynal who appeared on May 31, 1791 before the National Assembly to give his address had been restored to good standing as one of the most important voices extolling freedom, liberty, and the need for change. These expectations were thoroughly overturned by the address itself, which admonished the Revolution for having gone too far, for gloating over its power, and for neglecting to keep alive the positive elements of the monarchy in a more gradual transition. Its very first line made clear that expectations of "the apostle of liberty" would not be met that day: "J'ose depuis long-temps parler aux rois de leurs devoirs. Souffrez qu'aujourd'hui je parle au people de ses erreurs, & aux représentans du people des dangers qui nous menacent tous" [in my translation, "I have dared to instruct kings and queens about their duties; allow me today to speak to the people about their mistakes, and to their representatives about the dangers that threaten us all"]. Raynal proceeded

to denounce the rush to change: “Appelés à régénérer la France, vous deviez considérer d’abord ce que vous pouviez utilement conserver de l’ordre ancien, & de plus ce que vous ne pouviez pas en abandonner” [“Called upon to regenerate France, you had to first consider the ancient order of things, and especially, what could be salvaged”]. The outrage “on the left side” of the National Assembly was palpable as Raynal, the hero-philosophe who should have been celebrating the revolutionary results wrought by *philosophie*, railed, instead, against the violence and unrest that rocked the streets of Paris, laying the blame at the foot of the Revolution and its clubs, among which the Jacobins were prominent.

Lüsebrink’s edition of the 1791 *Adresse* is of great importance for the way that its inclusion of responses to the address makes it possible to understand both the shifts in Raynal’s political fortunes and the intensity of public response to his work in a more nuanced way than has been possible before. For the first time, those interested in post-revolutionary France in the French Enlightenment and/or in the “Histoire des deux indes” can examine in a single volume the tensions and fissures in the political fabric of this particularly fraught post-revolutionary moment and in this late stage of Raynal’s career, which finds the daring apologist of the most controversial and *outré* political thinking of the Enlightenment backpedaling in a nostalgic reverie that evokes the good old days of the monarchy. Thanks to Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink’s detailed introductory essay, it is possible to situate Raynal’s address both within the parameters of his own oeuvre as well as among the divergent voices of the politics of 1791. Along with a collection of reactions that includes the well-known figures of Robespierre, Brissot, Louvet, and Chénier, we also find those of a host of unknown pamphlet writers, whose response to Raynal is no less insightful. The volume’s skillful assembly of these responses give readers access to the pulse of a generation as it fiercely debated both the relationship between ideas and revolution and their forever-conjoined aftermath.

The volume is divided into three parts, with these headings: first, “*L’Adresse à l’Assemblée Nationale de G.-T. Raynal: Texte, Interventions, et Reactions des deputes*” [in my translation, “Raynal’s Address to the National Assembly, with the deputies’ responses”]; second, “*L’Echo dans la presse contemporaine: traces mediatiques d’un scandale politique*” [“Traces of political scandal in the periodical press”]; and third, “*La littérature pamphlétaire: positionnements et modèles d’explication d’une énigme philosophique et politique*” [“Pamphlet literature: positions and explanations of a philosophical and political enigma”]. Each section, illuminating in itself, works with the book’s other sections to allow readers to see the moment of the address’s delivery as a prism shaped by, and revelatory of, past and present political events and Raynal’s past and present views of them. Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink has offered a model of literary scholarship that reminds us of how important it is to fully map the reach of writings, in all genres, in which writers express their own views and respond to others’ views, privately, publicly and collectively. His introductory essay is required reading for any scholar who wishes to fully grasp the relationship between *philosophie* and revolution and its many nuances. Lüsebrink explains the unexpected relationship between the *Adresse* and the *Histoire des deux Indes*, discussing the more conservative and less forward-thinking passages about monarchies and governments that align themselves to some extent with the fears Raynal expressed in the *Adresse*, even as the innovative tenor of the *Histoire* remained dominant, with Raynal’s detractors wishing to attribute its authorship to Diderot and trying to wrest from Diderot’s daughter control of his manuscripts to this end. She firmly resisted such attempts on the part of her father’s detractors to keep her father from getting credit for having authored the

greatly-respected *Histoires des deux Indes*. This attempt to preserve her father's reputation was for naught, for the *Adresse* stopped in its tracks what had been the rising reputation of Raynal as a key figure in Enlightenment thought, thus denying the *Histoire des deux Indes* its place alongside the *Encyclopédie* as one of the most important works of the French eighteenth century.

JOCELYN HOLLAND, *California Institute of Technology*

Joan Steigerwald, *Experimenting at the Boundaries of Life: Organic Vitality in Germany around 1800* (Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press, 2019). Pp. 472. \$55.00 cloth.

Given that the focus of this book is an area of intellectual debate fraught with uncertainty, confusion, and—as is often stated—“blurred boundaries,” *Experimenting at the Boundaries of Life* is remarkable for its clear elucidation of such an unfocused epistemological terrain. Steigerwald shows in great detail how life, both as a positive concept and in its distinction from non-life, eludes definition for the numerous scientists and philosophers who devoted their attention to it during the decades surrounding 1800. In readings grounded in the numerous letters, journal articles, experimental records, essays and philosophical treatises that responded in various ways to the problem of life as “organic vitality,” Steigerwald affirms four key points, which form the cornerstones of her project. The first is that scientific experiments were essential to the debates about how to define organic life. Steigerwald writes that it was “through engagements with organic bodies and vital processes with shifting instruments and methods, that the domain of organic vitality was first suggested and subsequently shaped,” adding that this was particularly the case in the German context (6). The next point concerns the importance of tools, not only for shaping “subject apprehension” but also because “the object of inquiry was folded into the apparatus of experiments” (9). The third point, one that is of particular importance for its impact on the conceptual register of this study, is that a perception of “epistemic limits” or “boundaries of knowledge” (11). This perception, Steigerwald underscores, was influential for experimental practices and philosophical analyses, and also for German Romanticism’s critiques on the distinction between appearance and representation. A fourth point emphasizes the importance of figurative language and acts of the imagination. Collectively, these four points also help substantiate a broader, historical argument that questions Michel Foucault’s famous assertion that the new nineteenth century science of biology represented a radical transition away the eighteenth century, and that “life itself did not exist” prior to then (15). Steigerwald’s chapter on biology, by contrast, wishes to demonstrate “that texts introducing biology as a science do not mark a new epistemic formation reflecting a rupture with the eighteenth century but, rather, enact an ongoing process of transition” (38).

Steigerwald wryly comments in her acknowledgements that both historians of science and those more interested in philosophy and theory will find something to like—and to dislike—in her study, given that the readings run the gamut from more those more grounded in empirical detail, such as the discussion of late-eighteenth