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Blake’s Engravings for Lavater’s
Physiognomy: Overdue Credit to
Chodowiecki, Schellenberg, and Lips

BY MARY LYNN JOHNSON

From the 1770s on, the Swiss pastor and early body-theorist Johann Caspar Lavater (1741-1801) sought control over visual as well as verbal components of his physiognomical opus, in ways that sometimes put him in conflict with artists and publishers who had creative and commercial claims of their own. Lavater’s proprietary interests had a ripple effect on all versions of his work, including the deluxe three-volume edition of Essays on Physiognomy (1789-98) translated by Henry Hunter, to which Blake contributed four engravings. In what follows, I omit consideration of one of the four engravings by Blake, a full-plate portrait of Democritus, because its designer, Rubens, is duly credited in the inscription. My purpose here is to recover the original contextual significance of the three images signed only by Blake by tracing them to their long-forgotten sources. As a larger framework for Blake’s engagement with Hunter’s translation, I also touch upon the Physiognomy’s extraordinary publishing history from inception to English translation, focusing on Lavater’s complex dealings with his first English publishers.

A preliminary caveat: a vain search for parallels between Hunter’s translation and the more accessible near-contemporary translation by Thomas Holcroft, which follows a different order entirely, sucked me into the black hole of Lavater studies. In pursuit of Lavater’s original words, I came to realize that neither his unillustrated preliminary work Von der Physiognomik [On Physiognomics] of 1772 nor his fully illustrated large-quarto four-volume Physiognomische Fragmente [Physiognomical Fragments] of 1775-78 has ever been translated into English. Indeed, as Michael Shortland has noted, there is no “single Lavaterian text” from which all others descend. Instead, a loose and shifting corpus of chronologically overlapping Lavater-authorized material made its way from Switzerland and Germany (with a side trip to the Netherlands) through France, leaking intellectual property rights and potential profits at every turn, to become

1. For one-month fellowships in 1993, I am grateful to the Newberry Library in Chicago (American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies fellowship) and the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library of Yale University (John D. and Rose H. Jackson fellowship). I owe much to the expert librarians of these institutions and to those in the University of Iowa Libraries (Special Collections, Interlibrary Loan, John Martin Rare Book Room of the Hardin Library for Health Sciences), Houghton Library, Harvard University, the Yale Center for British Art, the University of Illinois Rare Book Room, the New York Public Library (Pforzheimer Collection, Rare Book department, and Berg Collection), the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center of the University of Texas, the Pierpont Morgan Library, and the British Library. For generous help via photocopies and e-mail, I thank Marlia Stählí, deputy director of the Manuscript Collection of the Zentralbibliothek Zürich, and Virginia Murray, administrator of the John Murray Archive in London. For further help, I thank Christa Sammons, Sibylle Erle, Ingrid Goritschnig, David H. Weinglass, Joan K. Stemmier, Robert N. Essick, Detlef Dörrebecker, G. E. Bentley, Jr., Ross Woodward, Andrew W. Greg, Joel Haefner, Ruedi Kuenzli, Kenneth M. Grant, and Sarah Jones. For encouragement of scholarly activity during my “other life” as special assistant in the President’s Office of the University of Iowa (1983-2000), I thank James O. Freedman, now president emeritus of Dartmouth College; Hunter R. Rawlings III, now professor of Classics and former president of Cornell University; and Mary Sue Coleman, now president of the University of Michigan. Finally, for much-needed moral boosts and for innumerable critical readings of my drafts, I thank my husband Jack (John E. Grant).

2. For informative surveys in English of Lavater’s life and times, see Tytler 3-81 (in my “Selected Sources”), and Karl Julius Fink, “Johann Kaspar Lavater,” German Writers from the Enlightenment to Sturm und Drang, 1720-1784, ed. James Harden and Christoph E. Schweitzer, Dictionary of Literary Biography 97 (Detroit, New York, London: Gale Research, 1990) 163-74. On the circumstances of writers in Lavater’s era, see also Martha Woodmansee, “The Genius and the Copyright: Economic and Legal Conditions of the Emergence of the ‘Author,’” Eighteenth-Century Studies 17.4 (1984): 425-48. German scholars tend to normalize the spelling of Lavater’s middle name with “K,” a variant used by Lavater himself for a time in the 1790s. Though many English-speaking scholars have adopted the French pronunciation of Lavater’s name, in 1830 Fuseli’s pupil Margaret Patrickson recalled that Fuseli (like German speakers today) “always pronounced Lavater with the accent on the first syllable” (Weinglass, Letters of Henry Fuseli 522).

3. See item 481 under “Engravings” in Bentley, Blake Books 593-95, and in his Blake Books Supplement 233-36; see also item 84 (with title page photos) in Weinglass, Fuseli: Catalogue Raisonné 96. Further, see Bentley’s astonishing account of back-dated 1817 reprints, “The Physiognomy of Lavater’s ‘Essays,’” to be supplemented by Andrew Greg’s not-yet-published bibliographical essay and checklist. The whereabouts of newly reported copies of the Hunter translation (1789-98, “1792,” and 1810) are regularly recorded in the annual listings in Blake of Robert N. Essick’s “Blake in the Marketplace” and Bentley’s “Checklist of Publications and Discoveries.” Scholars interested in the Hunter translation should be aware that articles in German often cite the spurious “1792” edition.

4. My terse account for Blakecentric purposes draws mainly on published sources, but I hope to present the whole juicy history, with archival documentation, in an appropriate journal.

5. For a modern text of the first part only, linked with Lavater’s posthumously published “Hundred Physiognomical Rules” and illustrations culled from other physiognomical publications, see Lavater, Von der Physiognomik, ed. Riba and Zelle, 9-62. For the text and an image of the title page, see <http://gutenberg.spiegel.de/lavater/physiogn/physiohn.htm>.

6. For further information see Weinglass, Fuseli: Catalogue Raisonné 34. A faithfully executed facsimile edition of the same title, with an afterword by Walter Brednow (Zürich: Orell Füssli, 1968-69), has the added interest of annotations transcribed by an early owner from Lavater’s own copy. Physiognomische Fragmente ... Eine Auswahl mit 101 Abbildungen, ed. Christoph Siegrist (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam Jun., 1999) is an excerpted pocket edition in modern typeface.

7. Shortland, esp. 305. See also notes 11 and 12 below.
1. Lavater's Many Physiognomies

**Von der Physiognomik**, 1772 (scientific emphasis)
First published *Hannoverischen Magazin*, 3, 7, 10 Feb. 1772 (unauthorized), ed. J. G. Zimmermann
From Lavater's unrevised lecture notes, Zurich scientific society, late 1771 or early 1772

**Aussichten in Ewigkeit** ("Views into Eternity"), 3 vol. 1768-72 (theological emphasis)
25 letters to Zimmermann; 16th letter, vol. 3: "Language in Heaven," 30 April 1772
on instantaneous, unmediated "physiognomical" communication among risen bodies

**Physiognomische Fragmente**, 1775-76-77-78
4 vol. quarto (never translated into English)
"And God created humanity in his own image" (theological theme)

**Over die Physiognomie**, 1781-84
4 vol. octavo, from abridged ms. by Lavater
Dutch trans. Johann Wilhelm van Haar; published Johannes Allert
1st vol. reissued at Lavater's insistence, 1784

**Essai sur la physiognomonie**, [1781]-83-86[87]
3 vol. quarto + posthumous vol. 4, 1803
trans. [La Fite et al.] from Lavater's reworked and enlarged ms.
Vol. 4 (6 Fragmente sections + "100 Physiog. Rules") not trans.

**Physiognomische Fragmente** (abridged), 1783-84-87; vol. 4 1830
3 vol. octavo; reorganized reduction by J. M. Armbruster
(ed. and condensed from Fragmente and Essai)

**Vermischte physiognomische Regeln** (pvt. circ. 1789)
(unauthorized, unillustrated publications: 1793, 1802)
Rev. (illus.) as *Hundert physiognomische Regeln*
in Gessner, ed., *Nachgelassene Schriften*, vol. 5 (1802)
Used to fill in vol. 4 of Essai (1803)
and incorp. in Holcroft (2nd ed.) 1804

**Holcroft trans., Essays on Physiognomy**, 1789
from Armbruster
3 vol. octavo; 1-vol. abr. 1792
2nd ed., 1804
(incl. excerpts from Gessner biog. and "100 Physiog. Rules")

**C. Moore (almost total piracy)**
*Essays on Physiognomy Calculated to Extend ...*
3 vol. closely following Hunter
[1793-94]; 1797
First published *Astrologer's/Conjuror's Magazine*, 1791-94

**George Grenville reprint**
The *Whole Works of Lavater on Physiognomy*
4 vol. octavo (old vol. 2 split into vols. 2-3)
minor typographical changes from Moore
[1797]

**Samuel Shaw piracy**
*Physiognomy; Or the Corresponding Analogy ...*
1-vol. abr. from Holcroft
[1792]

Chart by Mary Lynn Johnson
the work we know in English as Essays in Physiognomy (illus. 1). Still more confusingly, the five (putative) English translations published in Lavater’s lifetime stem from two different intermediate sources. One group derives from the first three volumes (only) of the large-quarto Essais sur la Physiognomonie ([1781]-83-86 [i.e., 87]), not translated from “the German Edition” but from “a Manuscript in which the Author has new moulded many passages of the Text, disposed his Materials in a different order, and added some new articles” (Hunter, Essays I: [CV]). The other set stems from a three-volume octavo abridged (“verkürzt”) redaction prepared at Lavater’s behest by his amanuensis J. M. Armbuster (1783-84-87). The five English editions—here identified only by their translators’ names, their earliest publication dates, and their sources—are 
(1) Henry Hunter, D.D. (first volume 1789, first fascicle January 1788), translated from Essai; (2) the Rev. C. Moore, L.L.D., F.R.S. (first volume 1793, reprinted 1797; first number in serial publication 1791), supposedly translated from Essai but actually dependent to the point of imitation on Hunter’s translation; (3) George Grenville, Esq. (1797), largely a reprint of Moore; (4) Thomas Holcroft (1789), translated from Armbuster’s German abridgment; and (5) Samuel Shaw (1792), a one-volume condensed piracy of Holcroft. In addition, the book-seller Joseph Johnson engaged Mary Wollstonecraft to prepare an abridged translation from the French in 1787—a project abandoned not because it was preempted by Holcroft’s 1789 translation from the German (as commonly thought) but because, as we shall see, Johnson joined forces with publishers of the Hunter translation.

In these murky bibliographical waters, where sources and analogues of Blake’s images may bob up without warning, there is no substitute for page-by-page, side-by-side comparisons among the books themselves. John Graham’s indispensable (though preliminary) 1961 checklist of Lavater’s physiognomical publications in various languages,11 a mainstay of Anglophone scholars, is based only “in part” on personal inspection; it sometimes lumps abridged and unabridged versions and even entirely separate editions under the same entry, and the incomplete accounts of title page wording, numbers of pages and plates, and physical dimensions cannot be properly correlated with bibliographical data in the National Union Catalogue, the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN), the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC), the Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue, or national libraries abroad. Since this article was accepted in 2001, a new historical-critical edition of Lavater’s collected work has begun appearing. In the edition’s Bibliographie volume, compiled and supervised by Horst Weigelt and edited by Niklaus Landolt, the section on Physiognomische Fragmente and its translations during Lavater’s lifetime (items 274 and 275), based on the holdings of Swiss and German libraries, largely supersedes Graham’s work but stops short of mapping relationships among the various preliminary, original, revised, reorganized, augmented, and/or condensed editions of the Fragmente in German, Dutch, French, and English, published under Lavater’s direct or indirect supervision.12

8. The third volume, dated 1786 on its title page, was actually delayed until 1787; the fourth volume, planned for 1788, was brought out posthumously (with Physiognomische changed to Physiognomy) by Lavater’s son Johann Heinrich Lavater in 1803, and never translated into English.
9. J. C. Lavater Physiognomische Fragmente zur Beförderung von Menschenkenntniss und Menschenliebe, ed. Armbuster, incorporates some new material from Essai. Each volume ends with Lavater’s dated endorsement, and the third volume notes the need for a fourth. According to the new standard Lavater bibliography, Bibliographie der Werke Lavaters, a fourth volume was published in 1787, but in all copies known to me this final volume is dated 1830, as reported also in Brigitte Thanner’s meticulously catalogue of Schellenberg’s work, Schweizerische Buchillustration.
10. Moore’s three-volume Essays on Physiognomy: Calculated to Extend the Knowledge and Love of Mankind ... Translated from the last Paris edition effaces the French edition’s true place of publication, The Hague, and masks its almost wholesale dependence on Hunter by strategic rephrasings throughout, especially at the beginnings of chapters. Most of this 1793-94-94 edition, including title pages, appeared serially, with directions for binding, in William Locke’s The Conjuror’s Magazine (August 1791-June 1793), continued as The Astrologer’s Magazine (July 1793-July 1794); in 1797, [Henry] D[elahoy] Symonds (also publisher of the 1792 Shaw and the 1804 2nd ed. of Holcroft) reissued the Moore translation in four volumes, by splitting the second volume into two physical volumes. At times, when Hunter’s fascicles fell behind Moore’s publishing schedule, Moore made his own translation directly from Essai. Lavater’s Whole Works of Lavater on Physiognomy (published by W. Butters and sold by W. Simmonds, 1797), also proclaiming the nonexistent “last Paris edition” as its source, is actually a new printing of Moore, under yet another non-Lavaterian title. Shaw’s Physiognomy: Or the Corresponding Analogy between the Conformation of the Features and the Ruling Passions of the Mind (London: H. D. Symonds, [1792]), is a one-volume collection of extracts pirated from Holcroft (“with a pair of scissors” [sic], according to Holcroft’s corrected abridgment of the same year, published by Robinson). In the mid-nineteenth century the remainder publisher William Tegg reprinted both the Holcroft translation and Shaw’s abridgment (the latter under the oxymoronic tertiary subtitle Complete Epitome). Moore’s publisher Locke went bankrupt in 1793, the same year that Shaw’s publisher Symonds began serving what became a total of four years in prison for publishing Paine and others (see public records summarized in Ian Maxted, The London Book Trades, 1775-1800: A Preliminary Checklist of Members [Folkestone: Dawson, 1977], continued in Maxted’s online project, “Exeter Working Papers in British Book Trade History,” <http://www.devon.gov.uk/library/locstudy/bookhist/>).
12. For a lively sense of the early publication and reception history of Lavater’s work, see Frey. For corrections of persistent misconceptions surrounding the first German editions, see Ohage.
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Sources of Blake’s Engravings

Let me quickly dispense with the thankless responsibility of throwing cold water on attractive hypotheses advanced in passing by two eminent scholars, G. E. Bentley, Jr., and Robert N. Essick. In 1972, in announcing the discovery of a previously unreported minuscule signature by Blake, Bentley proposed that Blake might have designed as well as engraved a vignette of gowned, long-bearded old men in Essays on Physiognomy (I: 127; cover illus.). And in 1980 Essick speculated that Blake “could easily have modified” the profile of a man identified as Spalding (Essays I: 225; illus. 2) “to look as much as possible like himself,” thereby creating “a witty prophecy” of his future appearance in middle age. Alas, the truth is otherwise: both engravings simply replicate designs by the popular Berlin-based Polish-French illustrator Daniel Nikolaus Chodowiecki (1726-1801). The vignette of the “Blakean” old gardeners, which Blake copied from an engraving in Essai sur la physiognomnie (I: 127), was originally designed and engraved by Chodowiecki for a different publication altogether, and the Blakelike profile of Spalding is copied from an engraving in Essai (I: 232), which in turn is copied from an engraving designed by Chodowiecki for Physiognomische Fragmente (III: opp. 342). The third among Blake’s three plates that do not credit a designer—a vignette of a hand holding a torch in Essays on Physiognomy (I: 206; illus. 3)—derives from an unsigned plate in Essai (I: 213), which is itself a re-engraving of an unsigned plate in Fragmente (IV: opp. 3).

In view of Blake’s intense involvement with Lavater-related projects in 1788–89, it is understandable that the possible thematic significance of his engravings has diverted attention from their merely replicative function. All four engravings for the Physiognomy, as recorded by Bentley, appeared in fascicles published between May 1788 and February 1789, the period of Blake’s closest association with Lavater’s boyhood friend Johann Heinrich Füssli, or Henry Fuseli. At this very time,

Blake had just finished a large profile portrait of Lavater for Joseph Johnson (proofed in December 1787)\(^{16}\) and was also working on a frontispiece after Fuseli for Lavater’s first publication in English, * Aphorisms on Man* (published by Johnson in May 1788).\(^{17}\) In the course of this latter commission, Blake not only recorded his responses to Lavater’s sayings in the margin but also expressed his general approval by signing his own name after the author’s on the title page and enclosing the two names in a heart. Little wonder that Blake’s readers feel justified in scrutinizing his engravings for an original graphic response to Lavater’s physiognomical text.

Disciplinary and national boundaries also tend to obscure, for English-speaking scholars, the Continental origins of the designs Blake engraved. Art historians specializing in the German and Swiss artists whose work Blake copied do not routinely cover English editions in recording secondary and tertiary engravings. And in the Blake community, where the commercial engravings are of interest mainly in relation to Blake’s development as an independent artist, scholars focus on his distinctive style as an engraver—the basis for attributing to Blake his unsigned plates (after Chodowiecki) for Mary Wollstonecraft’s translation of C. G. Salzmann’s *Elements of Morality* (1791)\(^{18}\) and the horrific “The Execution of Breaking on the Rack” for John Stedman’s *Narrative of a Five Years’ Expedition Against the Revolted Negroes of Surinam* (1796).\(^{19}\)

Even for such a pedestrian project as the crafting of replacements for worn-out plates for a new edition of Gay’s *Fables* (1793), as Geoffrey Keynes has shown, Blake re-envisioned the images assigned to him and made them his own.\(^{20}\) And so as enthusiasts of Blake we have drifted into a communal presumption of originality that extends even to commercial engravings, without sufficient attention to the constrictive working conditions emphasized by Essick:

> [R]eproductive engraving was dependent upon a rigorous division of labour and the subordination of individual expression to uniformity and repeatability. All illustrations in a book had to conform to its format, and this mechanical unity was extended to graphic style. If more than one engraver was employed, all had to practice compatible techniques. In spite of an engraver’s prerogative to “sign” his plates, the truly autographic tended to be submerged beneath the anonymity of a corporate and systematic enterprise.\(^{21}\)

In the Lavaterian enterprise, the “truly autographic” was very deeply submerged indeed. Lavater, with only limited facility in drawing but supreme confidence in his visual acuity and innate sense of design, was reluctant to grant the artists on whom he depended an appropriate degree of professional autonomy. Unlike other authors, who might express general preferences about illustrations or decorations but usually delegated day-to-day decisions to the publisher or to a master designer, Lavater personally commissioned all graphic work, bombarded his illustrators with detailed verbal descriptions of the images he wanted, ordered corrections at every stage, and in general demanded “subordination of individual expression” not only from engravers but also from designers. Not surprisingly, his efforts to micromanage his artist-collaborators met stiff resistance, especially from his old friend Fuseli, then studying in Rome. Although Fuseli often posted Lavater for money, he could not abide taking orders in return, and in May 1771, in response to a request for a head of Christ and other religious images for physiognomical study, he fired back a stinging rebuff:

> The biggest mistake that you make in all the subjects you have laid out before me is that you’re always minting things for me in advance. Understand that invention is the soul of the painter and without it a painter is in the shoemakers’ guild. Your imagination and mine may be the same, but if I am to execute your images they must flame up in my head, not yours.\(^{22}\)

On 4 November 1773—after Lavater had given up persuading Fuseli to help with *Physiognomische Fragmente* and had enlisted Chodowiecki in his stead—Fuseli reiterated his rejection of Lavater’s demands and mocked his friend’s choice of the comparatively tame Chodowiecki as his master designer:

> I find myself neither able nor in the mood (and I’m telling the truth) to draw physiognomies that fit nine on a quarter-sheet. I can’t draw the flail in a nutshell or paint Elijah’s chariot and horses on a gnat’s wing: I’ll leave that to the “most soulful” craftsmen in Europe [i.e. Chodowiecki,\(^{23}\)]

---

16. As first noted by Steimmel, the original designer was Johann Heinrich Lips. I must leave for another occasion a discussion of Lip’s primary design, which antedates the secondary Lips drawing in the Veste-Coburg cited by Steimmel and the derivative copy (unsigned) that served as Blake’s model. Lips’s design, probably in the version copied by Blake, also underlies engravings by William Bromley (1789), J. Chapman (1813), and William Holl (pre-1838), and J. W. Cook (1842), all noted in Robert N. Essick, *The Separate Plates of William Blake* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1983).

17. See Schroyer.

18. See Essick, “Blake’s Engravings in Salzmann’s *Elements of Morality*.”


22. *Heinrich Fissils Briefe*, ed. Muschg, 166. All translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own (original texts omitted for lack of space). Here the second-person-familiar verb “vormunzen”—which I take to stem from “vor” [before] + “münzen” (misprinted without the umlaut) meaning “to coin” or “to mint” (secondary older meaning: “to form”)—is apparently peculiar to Fuseli; in the next letter he makes a similar comparison between his original conceptions and paying “in meiner eigen Münze” [in my own coin], Mason (138), apparently considering the root to be “munden,” meaning “taste good,” translates the verb as “to matriculate in advance.” Alternatively, it may be intended to recall the noun “der Vormund,” meaning “guardian”; if so, Fuseli’s complaint is that Lavater is always acting as his guardian.
known as “painter of souls”). I need space, height, depth, length. Let whoever wants to raise a storm in a wineglass or weep over a rose; I can’t do it. (Muscg 167)

Fuseli goes on to complain that Lavater’s demands will reduce him to begging, “but I still might pay something, if possible in my own coin.” He boasts that if Lavater can show him an inexpensive way to ship a roll of drawings on parchment, “I’ll send you things that perhaps haven’t yet entered the head of Europe’s ‘most soulful’ draftsman” (Muscg 167). Nine months later, in August 1774, Lavater made a special concession to Fuseli: “Always draw me whatever you want to ... I was a fool ... I consider you the greatest painter in the world.” Somewhat mollified, Fuseli brought himself to contribute one design to the fourth volume of *Physiognomische Fragmente* (1778); after that, he was a prolific contributor to the second volume of *Essai sur la physiognomie* (1783). But he was so appalled by the resulting engravings that he made it his business to agitate for proper representation in an improved English edition.

In all publications that Lavater himself controlled, it was not the author’s practice to prepare a finished text and arrange for illustrations afterward. Instead, Lavater ordered drawings, at great cost, to his precise specifications; made a selection from the finished drawings of the images to be engraved; chose from the finished engravings the ones that interested him most (thereby losing his investment in the rejected work); wrote a running commentary on the prints in front of him; and only then sent his manuscript and the engraved plates to the publisher. But no matter how detailed his verbal instructions, Lavater was usually disappointed with the graphic results. Especially frustrating were his quests for an ideal image of Christ (a subject for another occasion) and physiognomically accurate likenesses of his friends, famous contemporaries, important historical figures, and various ethnic and personality types:

> I have procured a great number of drawings relating to my plan. I have examined and compared a variety of human figures of every class; and I have had recourse to my friends for assistance. The endless blunders committed by those whom I employed to draw and engrave, have become a plentiful source of enquiry and instruction for me. (trans. Hunter, *Essays in Physiognomy* 1: 11)

In engaging Chodowiecki as his chief designer, Lavater hitched his physiognomical wagon to a proven star—a self-made, self-taught “small master” whose charming portrayals of ordinary people in familiar domestic and workplace settings were a major selling point for the books he illustrated. As Graeme Tyler observes, “but for Chodowiecki, Lavater’s *Fragmente* might not have enjoyed quite the popularity that they did” (60). Unlike Fuseli, the workmanlike Chodowiecki stoically accepted the necessity of catering to difficult clients and attuning his output to the requirements of the publishing industry. Chodowiecki and his brother Gottfried, sons of a Polish father and Swiss-born French Huguenot mother, had been sent as teenagers from their native Danzig (Gdansk) to the Huguenot community in Berlin, three years after their father’s death, to work in their maternal uncle’s hardware and import business. Chodowiecki, who soon excelled in decorating such things as tobacco tins, learned enamel painting at 23 and taught himself etching at the late age of 33. In 1766, at the age of 40, he made his debut as a history painter with *Adieux de.*[Jean Calas], a touching portrayal of an unjustly accused Huguenot father’s last moments with his family before his execution. His large and small engravings of this subject sold well, but private commissions for oils on other subjects did not follow. “I want to be a painter,” he wrote his mother in 1770; “the public wants me to be an engraver.” He resigned himself to nineteen-hour days of “working like a galley slave” as an illustrator to support his immediate and extended family in the French community of Berlin, a group of dependents that expanded over the next decade to include two unmarried sisters, a mentally disabled brother, and his widowed sister-in-law and her children. When he discovered that his proofs and early states were being snapped up by collectors, he hiked up their value by introducing deliberate graphic variants. By the time Lavater approached Chodowiecki for help with the *Physiognomy,* he was, at 47, the most famous, most prolific, and best-paid illustrator in Europe. With a strong sense of proprietorship and justifiable pride in his name and his reputation, he insisted that his designs be properly credited, appropriately compensated, and competently executed. And as a protection against piracy, he scrupulously maintained a complete and well-documented file of his originals and proofs, and of engravings made by others after his designs.

23. Fragmentary ms. letter in the Zentralbibliothek Zürich; quoted (including ellipses) Allentuck 96.

24. For the early volumes of *Physiognomische Fragmente,* Lavater sent texts and engravings in installments to Goethe for further amplification and revision, and Goethe forwarded the revised manuscript to the publisher.

---
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Lavater's very first letter to Chodowiecki (10 July 1773) begins with a two-page set of instructions—something like directions to a police artist—for drawing a perfect head of Christ.26 The profile is to be of correct proportions for someone six feet tall; the light should fall from the upper left over loose hazelnut-brown hair, neither straight nor curly; the face should be neither thin nor fat, neither flat nor sloped; the breadth or length of the eyes the same as the breadth or length of the mouth in profile, with the upper eyelid a fourth of the length of the profile of the eye; eyebrows neither bushy nor sparse; the ear three times the breadth of the nose from the point to the end of the ear lobes; the nose straight; the upper lip slightly more protruding than the lower, neither laughing nor serious; the chin set back a little, and so forth. In this same letter Lavater also asks for a title page vignette and two other kinds of drawings: octavo-sized portraits of certain distinguished Berliners in profile or half-profile and whole figures of ideal character types. All sitters (with Chodowiecki himself and Spalding heading the list) are to be invited to pose in Lavater’s name, but “without giving away any part of the portrait beforehand” if possible, they are to be depicted “bald-headed—or at least without wigs or caps.” Lavater closes by apologizing for his bluntness and offering the assurance that “Everything I want on this job will be paid for in cash” (Steinbrucker 61).

Despite a backlog of other commitments and pressing deadlines, the good-natured and devoutly religious Chodowiecki did his best to accommodate Lavater’s order, beginning with a promise to undertake both the head of Christ and the title page vignette, with the mild caution that “what you have so beautifully described in words may not be possible to draw with a pencil. For I can think of an image of the divine, but my imagination shows me only what I can express in a human face.”27 He even agreed to engrave the head of Christ and other key designs himself (he preferred not to engrave after other artists). But in December 1773, as Lavater’s order continued to grow apace, Chodowiecki broke the news that the rest of the work would have to wait until the following Easter (the deadline for publishing books was to be exhibited at the semiannual Leipzig book fair). Meanwhile, Chodowiecki offered to look through his work for existing materials that might lend themselves to Lavater’s uses (Steinbrucker 64-65, 69). Over the next year and a half, frustrations mounted on both sides as Lavater sent the master designer’s finished work back for retouching, rejected engravers of Chodowiecki’s choosing in Berlin and Leipzig in favor of lower-paid Swiss engravers who would work under Lavater’s direct supervision, and usurped Chodowiecki’s prerogative of exercising financial and aesthetic control over engravings after his drawings. As Chodowiecki wrote in March 1774:

You complain about the engravings! Who has more reason to complain than I! When I get the prints I can hardly recognize my own invention any more. But this will remain an incurable evil as long as these gentlemen aren’t willing to learn how to draw. It’s no good without much, much drawing after nature. Please recommend this to our friend Schellenberg; tell him he has an incomparable manner with his insects, and I believe could do the same with human beings if he studied them as thoroughly.” (Steinbrucker 83)

Chodowiecki’s target is one of Lavater’s favorite engravers, Johann Rudolf Schellenberg (1740-1806) of Winterthur, who had learned drawing and etching from his father, Johann Ulrich Schellenberg (1709-1795). The elder Schellenberg had been trained as a painter and engraver by his future father-in-law Johann Rudolf Huber (1668-1748), a successful portraitist in Basel. The younger Schellenberg, after executing his first commission as illustrator of a major work on insects, took up insect painting as a specialty and even collected insects himself.28 By the time he undertook the physiognomical work in 1774, at the age of 33, Schellenberg must have felt that he could handle any subject. But it was all Lavater could do, in settling accounts with the high-priced Chodowiecki, to make sure Schellenberg received even the little that he was able to charge: “We will certainly understand each other about the price—You are more than reasonable—as Mr. Schellenberg is to you. We will always squabble about whether he is too reasonable” (Steinbrucker 87). In late January 1775, Chodowiecki renewed his complaints:

Oh! how much this printing has humiliated me, to see how few of my drawings sufficed for the engraver [Schellenberg] even to make something passable out of them. I don’t know whether you [Lavater] are satisfied with them, but in all events I’ve tried to correct them. I don’t know anything more to do, though, than to give them roughly the effect they should have [by pencil, marked over the proofs]. Whether the engraver is able to rework his plates this way, I very much doubt. ... [He] is not competent enough to work in black. It has to be worked up more extensively, because the narrow strokes rub out after several hundred impressions, and produce only gray flecks. (Steinbrucker 116)

Chodowiecki, ever mindful of his international reputation, also complains in a postscript that “in the things our Schellenberg has etched after me, and where he has set my name under them, I have seen that in Switzerland I am to be con-

26. Daniel Chodowiecki, ed. Steinbrucker, 58-61, No. 73. Steinbrucker’s “Vorwort”, 1-21, provides an invaluable context for the letters in relation to Chodowiecki’s life, his work, and his times.

27. Chodowiecki sent the drawing of Christ’s profile sometime in September 1773 (Steinbrucker 62) and the engraving of this subject on 27 September 1774 (Steinbrucker 99); Lavater received the title page vignette on 8 April 1774 (Steinbrucker 88).

28. Information in this paragraph comes from Thanner, “Johann Rudolf Schellenberg.” Almost twenty years later, Chodowiecki wrote to Schellenberg’s friend, the artist Anton Graff, “The man is so little known and so little esteemed; I think he’s because he works so cheaply” (quoted Thanner, “Johann Rudolf Schellenberg” 72).
tinually deprived of the last C in my name Chodowiecki ... you [Lavater] also do the same thing ...." (Steinbrucker, 118). Schellenberg’s engraving of Chodowiecki’s profile in *Fragmente* (I: 254; illus. 4; not in Lavater’s index) bears a still more egregious misspelling, incorporated into the design itself: “Codowiecki.”

The vignette of two old men gardening, designed by Chodowiecki and engraved by Schellenberg for *Essai sur la physiognomonie* (I: 127; illus. 5), belongs to the category of images that Chodowiecki had first prepared for his own purposes and then made available for recycling in the *Physiognomy*—though, in this case, the image was not used until 1781. The original design, engraved by Chodowiecki himself and signed by him alone as f[ecit] (“he made it”), first appeared as a vignette for the dedication page of Gellert’s *Leçons de morale* [Lessons on Moral Philosophy] (1772; illus. 6), inscribed “aux élèves du seminaire français de theologie à Berlin,” “to students of

29. As one of Chodowiecki’s admirers explained to another poor spell- er, “the c can’t be omitted; in Polish it . . . is pronounced as a z” (Stein- brucker 13n1). According to Paul Dehnert, Daniel Chodowiecki (Berlin: Rembrandt, 1977), the “Ch’ . . . is pronounced like the ‘ch’ in . . . ‘Sache,’ and . . . wiecki is pronounced like wietzki” (6); the English equivalent would be something like Khod-o-VYETZ-ki. On 24 February 1775, Lavater informed Chodowiecki that the plates had already been printed, without retouching, before the letter of corrections arrived (Steinbrucker 122).

30. No. 86 in Engelmann 63-64, now largely superseded by the illustrated but less bibliographically detailed catalogue by Bauer, where this plate appears as No. 148, p. 37; see also Bauer’s companion volume, the plate-by-plate (unillustrated) commentary of Elisabeth Wormsbächer, *Daniel Nikolaus Chodowiecki: Erklärungen und Erläuterungen zu seinen Radierungen: Ein Ergänzungsbuch zum Werkverzeichnis der Druckgraphik herausgegeben von Jens-Heiner Bauer* (Hannover: Kunstbuchverlag Galerie J. H. Bauer, 1988).


5. (left) [Old men gardening], engr. Schellenberg after a design by Chodowiecki. *Essai sur la physiognomonie* I ([1781]) 127; reused in Armbruster’s abridged J. C. Lavater’s *Physiognomische Fragmenten* I (1783) 33. 6.2 x 7.5 cm.; image 5.2 x 7.2 cm. Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
6. "DIEU DONNE L’ACROISSEMENT," engr. Chodowiecki after his own design. Dedication page, Gellert’s Leçons de morale (1772), 6.0 x 8.9 cm.; image 5.2 x 8.0 cm. Special Collections Library, University of Michigan.

The French [Huguenot] theological seminary in Berlin." The vignette is entitled "DIEU DONNE L’ACROISSEMENT," or "God gives the increase," an allusion (not previously identified) to Paul’s rebuke to competing factions in the church at Corinth: “I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase” (1 Cor. 3: 6-7). In the same year (1772), at the request of the founding director of the seminary (established in 1770), Chodowiecki engraved a variation of this design in upright format as a bookplate for the seminary’s library, omitting the background of buildings and water, and placing the word “Dieu” on a separate line at the center of a beaming sun (Engelmann 64, No. 87; Bauer 37, No. 149). In adapting Paul’s text for the seminary, Chodowiecki represents the “rising” students as trees and the teachers as gardeners who provide different but complementary services of cultivation and nourishment, while entrusting the seminarians’ full development to God. In the bookplate version Chodowiecki again signed his engraving as maker (both designer and engraver), and he donated both his labor and the printing of 3,000 bookplates as a gift to the seminary.

For the first volume of Essai sur la physiognomie, published in 1781, Lavater chose Chodowiecki’s image of the old men gardening as a tailpiece for a one-paragraph “Addition”—that is, a newly composed passage not present in Physiognomische Fragmente—to his fragment on the physiognomist. The paragraph concludes with a reiteration of Lavater’s often-repeated insistence on the incompleteness of both the emerging discipline and its leading practitioner: “...I am very far from being a Physiognomist [sic]. I am but the Fragment of one; just as the Work I present to the Public, contains not a complete Treatise, but merely Fragments of Physiognomy” (trans. Hunter, Essays I: 127). The image in its new location, rather than allegorizing the development

31. I have supplied the accent marks for “élèves,” omitted on the title page of Christian Fürchtegott Gellert, Leçons de morale ou Lectures académiques ... (Utrecht: J. van Schoonhoven, 1772), 2 vols.; originally published in German as Moralphische Vorlesungen (Leipzig: Wiedmanns Erben und Reich, 1770), 2 vols. in 1.

32. According to Andreas van Randow, "Chodowiecki und die Hugenottengemeinde in Berlin," Chodowiecki und die Kunst der Aufklarung in Polen und Preussen, ed. Hans Rothe and Andrzej Ryszkievicz (Cologne and Vienna: Bohlau, 1986), the sun represents God in imagery also associated with the Enlightenment; the clouds on the left (in the bookplate version of the design) show that God’s view is not always direct and that the realms of heaven and earth are distinctly separated. Without reference to 1 Cor. 3, van Randow suggests that the sage with the watering can “may be recognized without difficulty as Socrates”; the tree-planting sage “is probably the apostle Paul, who has a central role for evangelical believers as author of the most important biblical texts” (61-62). (The bookplate van Randow reproduces as fig. 4. p. 59, lacks the lines indicating sun and clouds which are clearly visible in Bauer 37, No. 149.) Chodowiecki later reused the bearded tree-planter, flanked by a female waterer on the left and a bare-chested young male digger on the right, as a title vignette for F. S. G. Sack’s Predigten, or Sermons (1781; Engelmann No. 404, Bauer No. 866). A preliminary drawing with the same motto, showing only one old man without gardening equipment in an orchard, hands clasped, looking toward the sun as it peeks behind a mountain in the background, is reproduced in Müller 172, No. 119; commentary on 100.

33. In about 1780 Schellenberg appropriated Chodowiecki’s design—signed only “Schellenberg” in reverse lettering—for a bookplate for the city library of Winterthur; reproduced as a frontispiece for Thanner et al., Johann Rudolf Schellenberg.

34. Schellenberg’s engraving for Essai I ((1781)) 127 (Thanner, Schweizerische Buchillustration I: 437; cat. 1082) was reused, without noticeable changes, in Armbruster’s abridged edition of Physiognomische Fragmente I (1783) 33, as the tailpiece for a chapter on the “truth” of physiognomy, a chapter that ends with a reaffirmation by Lavater himself, dated January 1783, of his opinion of “six or eight years ago.” In Holcroft’s translation of Armbruster the tailpiece is omitted.
of seminarians, is pressed into service to represent Lavater's history (and future expectation) of the ongoing development of both physiognomy and the physiognomist. So Bentley's speculation, endorsed by Essick, that the image of the old gardeners has something to do with the idea that incomplete or fragmentary books, like young trees, must be nourished, is not far from the mark (Bentley, "A 'New' Blake Engraving" 49; Essick, Blake's Commercial Book Illustrations 42).

Schellenberg slightly alters the dimensions of Chodowiecki's original engraving (from about 6.0 x 8.9 cm.—height is presented before width in this and all measurements—to 6.2 x 7.5 cm.) and reverses the design left to right.35 Such reversals, which of course saved engravers the extra step of reorienting the image to appear the right way around when printed, are by no means uncommon. Much less common, though, is Schellenberg's treatment of the inscription; instead of reversing it on the plate, in the normal way of engravers, he inscribed it directly, so that in the impression the two signatures "D. Chodowiecki" and "Schellenberg fec." appear backwards, right to left. Among the 179 signed engravings (in addition to many unsigned ones) that Schellenberg contributed to eleven volumes of Lavater's physiognomical publications in German, Dutch, and French, at least 81 are signed in this "Spiegelschrift," or mirror writing (each instance, but not the total, is noted in Thanner's plate-by-plate descriptions in her complete Schellenberg catalogue, which does not record duplicate imprints appearing in more than one edition).36 Thanner does not comment on the unusually high proportion of reversed inscriptions—more than 45 percent—in either her catalogue or her biographical essay, but perhaps there is a neurological explanation: in adolescence Schellenberg suffered a head injury that put him in a coma for a month, left him with a palpable crease in his skull, and forced him to relearn eating, walking, reading, writing, and everything except drawing "as if he were a baby" (Thanner, "Johann Rudolf Schellenberg" 21-22).

When Blake copied Schellenberg's engraving for Essays in Physiognomy I: 127 (cover illus.), he re-reversed the design, fortuitously bringing it back to the orientation of Chodowiecki's engraving. Although there is no reason to speculate that Blake had access to Chodowiecki's original, his engraving (6.1 x 8.4 cm.; image 5.2 x 7.2 cm.) improves upon Schellenberg's in clarity and sharpness of details. In Chodowiecki's engraving, one tree at the center is obviously dead; both Schellenberg and Blake soften this detail by adding more leaves (especially luxuriant in Blake's version) to the nearby tree. Blake also levels off the shoreline, makes the land-water distinction more obvious, strengthens the very faint indication of reflections on the water of the buildings on the distant shore, adds a bright rim to the top of the clouds, darkens certain clouds with almost mechanical-looking ruled lines, squares off the smaller tower on the round building across the water, simplifies the marshy estuary area, and makes a rounder hole for the tree-planter. On the tree-planter's side of the vignette, Blake reduces Schellenberg's six major projections of land to four, and on the other side he reduces Schellenberg's eight projections of land to seven. Blake adds bolder stipple effects to the bald gardener's head, the water pouring out of the can, and the lighter parts of the grass, and he makes the holes of the spout visible. Blake's tree-waterer has a longer beard than his counterparts in Chodowiecki and Schellenberg; his eyes focus on the trees rather than the can, and his toes are longer, more in the Mannerist style.

We turn now to the background for Blake's profile of Spalding (illus. 2). Lavater had known the Shaftesbury-influenced rationalist Lutheran theologian Johann Joachim Spalding (1714-1804) since 1763, when Lavater, Fuseli, and their friend Felix Hess spent eight life-changing months in Spalding's home in Barth, Swedish (or Nether) Pomerania, on the Baltic coast. The three young seminary graduates, newly ordained as Zwinglian ministers, were on a hastily arranged study tour in the aftermath of the "Grebel affair," the furor surrounding an anonymous public indictment (later acknowledged by Lavater and Fuseli) of a corrupt but well-connected city official. The opportunity to study with Spalding (and, for Fuseli, the freedom to sketch and paint)37 was the most significant and memorable part of a Wanderjahr that included meetings with

---

35. The imprint of Chodowiecki's engraving for Gellert's Lécons in my own collection—a half page with only the vignette—measures 6.0 x 8.9 cm. (distinct platemark, with rounded corners); the image area is about 5.1 x 8.0 cm.; Engelmann, No. 86, uses "Zoll und Linie des alt-französischen Maasses" or the old French pouce (= 2.706 cm.), divided into 12 ligne, for a measurement of 2"3" x 3"3/4" (= 6.088 x 8.905 cm.). In the copy of Gellert's Lécons reproduced here (illus. 6), the faint platemark, which appears no more than 5.9 x 8.4 cm., goes slightly into the gutter, but the image area is 5.2 x 8.0 cm. (cf. Bauer's measurements, No. 148, presumably for the image area: 5.5 x 8.6 cm.). For Schellenberg's engraving after Chodowiecki for Essai, reused in Armbruster, Engelmann's dimensions (platemark) are 2"3" x 2"9/16" (= 6.088 x 7.549 cm.); my own measurements, based on five copies, are 6.2 x 7.5 cm., while Thanner, Schweizerische Buchillustration, reports an absent platemark and an image area of 5.2 x 7.2 cm. (5.4 x 6.8 cm. in my own measurements). Not only do cataloguers differ in providing plate vs. image dimensions, but measurements may also vary because of differences in depth of platemarks, paper shrinkage after printing, and lengths of parallel sides (top and bottom, right and left). Engelmann measures bottom and left sides; my own practice has been inconsistent. Image areas reported in Essick, Blake's Commercial Book Illustrations, are measured across the largest dimensions, thus sometimes diagonally; mine record the greatest distances along horizontal and vertical planes parallel to the platemarks.

36. In the plate-by-plate descriptions of Schellenberg's engravings in Thanner, Schweizerische Buchillustration I: 698-897, I count 26 reversed signatures in Physiognomische Fragmente, 26 in the Dutch edition, 23 in the French edition, and 6 in Armbruster's abridged German edition; the total number of engravings actually signed by Schellenberg (in various capacities) can be derived from Thanner's figures on 708 and the chart on 720.

37. The pleasures of this protracted visit are captured in Fuseli's now-lost drawing (known only through an 1810 engraving) of Spalding, then a recent widower, and his children entertaining his friend Arnim von Suckow, Hess (standing up) and Lavater in the summerhouse, with Fuseli himself peeking from behind with his sketchbook; reproduced, inter alia, in Weinglass, Fuseli: Catalogue Raisonné 333, No. 289, and Jaton 26-21; Tyler 22 offers a different identification of the main figures.
such notables as Moses Mendelssohn, Friedrich Klopstock, C. F. Gellert, and J. W. L. Gleim. Lavater kept a detailed diary of his and Hess’s conversations with Spalding—for example, a two-hour discussion of Spalding’s hypothesis on the workings of the Holy Spirit on 13 August 1763—and even thirty years later, on a journey to Copenhagen, he fondly recalled those “nine blessed months” with Spalding. The idyll ended in early 1764 as Fuseli, now certain that he had no religious vocation, struck out alone to make a new life in England, while Lavater and Hess, en route to their homeland, accompanied Spalding to Berlin to begin an important ecclesiastical appointment. For the rest of his life, Lavater kept in touch with his mentor by correspondence, sometimes through their mutual friend the Swiss-born aesthetician Johann Georg Sulzer (1720-99) of Berlin, who himself was later the subject of a portrait ordered from Chodowiecki by Lavater.38

It was not until 6 May 1774, ten months after Lavater’s original request for portraits on 10 July 1773, that Chodowiecki finally mentioned Spalding among the learned gentlemen in Berlin who were to be depicted in medallion format (Steinbrucker 88). But he did not actually approach Spalding until 3 December 1774, via an introductory letter from Lavater, to request permission to draw the theologian along with his elder son Carl (Steinbrucker 110-11). When at the end of January 1775 Chodowiecki wrote that he had shown Lavater’s portrait to Spalding and his son (Steinbrucker 118), Lavater apparently assumed that Chodowiecki had also finished his drawings of that family and replied excitedly on 25 February 1775, “I am expecting Spalding’s portrait!” (Steinbrucker 122). At that time he also ordered a portrait of the younger son (Georg Ludwig) in the same size as the others (Steinbrucker 122).

Four months later, on 24 June 1775, and almost two years after his original order, Lavater was still waiting for a picture of Spalding, as he noted when acknowledging the self-portrait he had just received from Chodowiecki:

Finally, finally, finally at last a life-drawing of you! I didn’t know at all what to make of your long silence. Every post-day I wanted to write you and every post-day I thought I would receive a letter. Now finally the 23 of June the Kreuzer [a coin, apparently referring to the medallion style of Chodowiecki’s profile], with which in most respects I am very pleased. . . . But where are the rest of the things on order that have been so long in preparation? Where's the Spalding? etc., etc., etc. (Steinbrucker 131-32)

On 1 July 1775 Lavater sent Chodowiecki a drawing of a female friend that he wanted him to copy and improve in fifteen

38. Lavater informed Chodowiecki that, within a 100-mile radius of Berlin, he and Spalding were the only recipients of Lavater’s private monthly paper, Miscellaneous Thoughts, Manuscript for Friends (2 April 1774; Steinbrucker 87, No. 109). For further information on Spalding, see Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie (1893; rpt. Berlin: Dürcher and Humbolt, 1971) 35: 30-31; for Fuseli’s perspective on the study tour, his wrenching break from Lavater, and his envy of Lavater’s intimacy with Hess, see Mason 16, 88-89, 96-101.


specific ways, listed a through o, and turned up the pressure for his most-wanted drawing: “With the next post I expect whatever among your drawings you have ready, Spalding, etc.” (Steinbrucker 132-33).

On 14 July 1775 Chodowiecki at last enclosed nine of the previously ordered portraits, led by 1., “A lovely, gentle physiognomy, Mr. Provost Spalding,” 2., “an alert boy . . . his oldest son,” and 3., “a somewhat quieter one, the second. This one must have his nose a bit stopped up; he always holds his mouth open.” Presumably Chodowiecki’s original black chalk and pen drawing of Spalding’s profile within a larger rounded oval (15.1 x 11.0 cm.), now in the Berlin Print Cabinet, was the one sent to Lavater and later returned after engraving.39 For these nine profiles, “Spalding etc.,” Chodowiecki charged the shocking (to Lavater) price of 45 Thaler, or 5 Thaler per portrait (Steinbrucker 135). Chodowiecki was proud of the fidelity of the likenesses: on 2 September 1775, he named the portraits of Spalding and his sons among the most faithfully rendered of the group, and he passed along a compliment from Spalding himself: “[He] told me too that he found that of all portraits that have been made of him, this appeared to him to be the truest” (Steinbrucker 139-40). In Physiognomische Fragmente,

39. No. 116 in Müller, reproduced on 169, with commentary on 98. If this was an ur-drawing that remained in Berlin, perhaps what Chodowiecki sent Lavater was a set of the nine profiles copied in uniform format for the guidance of the engravers.
all three Spaldings, along with Sulzer, appear on one plate (III: opp. 342; illus. 7), labeled “SSSS,” for Sulzer, Spalding, Sohn [Son], and Sohn (or Sulzer, Spalding, Spalding, and Spalding). Apparently only the adults were asked to pose sans wigs.

For this full-page plate of four portraits, the engraver was Lavater’s youthful protégé Johann Heinrich Lips (1758-1817) of Kloten, near Zurich. Lips, the son of a barber-surgeon, exhibited so much talent while being tutored in Latin by his local pastor, in preparation for taking up his father’s occupation, that the son of the pastor encouraged him to copy old engravings, from which he soon progressed to life drawing. When Lavater saw the 14-year-old’s work in late 1772, he immediately took him under his wing, sent him home with art supplies and a set of written instructions on etching, arranged for the minister in Kloten to give him a two-day-a-week crash course in art history, religion, and classical mythology, and hired the boy to help him the rest of the week with physiognomical drawings. Although Lips’s parents would not pay for a two-year apprenticeship under Schellenberg in 1774, Lips managed to study etching with him for six weeks in 1775—the full extent of his formal training. In 1776, when Lips was only “in his seventeenth year,” Lavater elevated the youth to his gallery of celebrities and otherwise physiognomically interesting subjects by including an analysis of the boy’s engraved portrait in Physiognomische Fragmente (II: 222-24; illus. 8). In Lips’s facial structure, Lavater discerns indications of a natural artist with a good heart and a sharp eye who, without instruction, is growing in strength and genius every day, to the point that with further travel and acquaintance with other artists he may become “one of the greatest, if not the greatest engraver in the world,” in possession of physiognomical insights and creative powers that would make him, “in a few years, a second Chodowiecki” (II: 224).

In engraving Chodowiecki’s portrait of the distinguished theologian Spalding (III: opp. 342), Lips carefully replicates the features depicted in the black chalk drawing, which both Chodowiecki and Spalding had considered an excellent likeness, scaled down to 8.8 x 5.8 cm., to fit within an 11.3 x 10.2 cm. rounded oval, one of four within the same 24.2 x 21.3 cm. outer frame. But Lavater’s commentary on Spalding’s character, while generally approving, mentions neither the accuracy of the likeness nor the engraver’s fidelity to the original. Instead, Lavater complains that, except for the eyes, the portraitist (unnamed) has failed to capture the physiognomically striking features of his beloved former mentor:

Much more recognizable [i.e., than Sulzer’s face, which Lavater calls a “caricature”], and yet at best an adapted mask of truth. A face sound, noble, bright; in every opinion, not easily self-deceived. The outline of the forehead not pure, not bold enough. … Depth of insight is apparent in the transition from the forehead to the nose—and in the marvelous, almost unmistakable eyes. The eye in itself is eternally a firmer indication of sure and accurate understanding. The eyebrow is not strong enough. The nose honest and sound. The mouth extremely reflective and tasteful. It’s too bad that the lower part covers the upper part and is much too rounded off. The shape of the head in back is more sensitive than [Sulzer’s]. In the remaining shading I miss coherence and truth—Now isn’t this a cold, ice-cold way to write about the face of a man who is among those I love most? To whom I owe more thanks than to any other mortal? Whom I believe I know through and through; whose writings have the purest character of truth-loving and independent strength and elegance—and who is himself far more excellent than his excellent writings? (Fragmente III: 342)

This commentary, like many others by Lavater, says more about the writer than about his subject. Clearly, no matter how skillfully Chodowiecki may have rendered Spalding’s face from life, nor how accurately Lips copied the face in his engraving, it would have been beyond the power of any artist to capture the idealized mental image that Lavater cherished of

40. Lavater based his glowing physiognomical account of young Lips on a portrait by G. F. Schmoll, Lavater’s brother-in-law, and awarded the engraving assignment to Lips himself. The facts of Lips’s early life are derived from the “Biographie” timeline in Kruse 21-27, and from Goritschnig. Highlights of Lips’s mature life are depressingly few: in 1778-79, when Fuseli visited his homeland on his way back from Italy to England, Lips became enamored of his style and forever after reproached himself for his inability to break free to a bold and original style of his own. In the 1780s, he made study trips to Germany and Italy; in 1789-94 he worked in Weimar under the patronage of Goethe but returned to Zurich, where he remained under the influence of Lavater or the memory of Lavater for the rest of his life. For a succinct account in English, see Vaughan (a review of Kruse’s catalogue).
his teacher as he had appeared in 1763, still fresh in memory after twelve years of separation.

In *Essai sur la physiognomonie* I: 231, Lavater revised his commentary on Spalding, severely pruning his remarks on Chodowiecki's portrait to accommodate a new (bewigged) version of the head by Anton Graff, from a three-quarter perspective, in an outline engraving. Lavater places the two images of Spalding in sequence, greatly to Chodowiecki's disadvantage. His revised text indicates that he has discovered a new flaw in Chodowiecki's Spalding, whose nose had been described in *Fragmente* as "honest and sound." In *Essai* I: 231, "the drawing of the nostril is defective; it is too small, and the trait which forms it is indifferently marked" (trans. Hunter, *Essays* I: 225). Whether this is supposed to be Chodowiecki's fault or the engraver's we are not told. More than satisfactory, however, is the nose of the engraving in Lavater's profile, which is more distinct and clear-cut than in the original. Lavater considered this one of the most reliable features of the portrait, as it would not be affected by the engraving process. The drawing of the forehead is not sufficiently characteristic, but the nose expresses the most exquisite taste; further down the page, Spalding's mouth is said to be the "most ingenious" of the four silhouettes under review (Essays II: 187).41

Blake's immediate source, the unsigned engraving of Chodowiecki's Spalding in *Essai* I: 232, probably also by Lips (illus. 9), differs from the engraving in *Fragmente* mainly in representing the theologian alone, without Sulzer or his sons. In *Essai*, the head is 8.7 x 5.6 cm., virtually the same size as in *Fragmente*, on a plate measuring 13.1 x 10.7 cm. Because of the optical illusion created by the greater image-to-page ratio in the English *Essays*, Blake's copy (illus. 2), transposed from a predominantly stipple to a linear style, appears larger than its actual dimensions of 8.9 x 5.9 cm. on a 13.3 x 10.5 cm. plate; the image area, on the diagonal, is 9.5 x 6.3 cm. (Essick, *Blake's Commercial Book Illustrations*; see note 35). James Heath's


softer-lined engraving of Spalding’s profile (7.1 x 4.9 cm., in an oval of 8.8 x 7.3 cm.) for the Holcroft edition (I: following 66, illustrating text on I: 62; illus. 10) faithfully copies an unsigned engraving, probably also by Lips, in Armbruster (I: following 62; 8.6 x 5.5 cm. on 10.9 x 8.6 cm. plate, no oval); although the images in Essays (illus. 9) and Armbruster are virtually the same size, they are not identical and are not from the same plate. The resemblance between Blake’s and Heath’s engraved portraits of Spalding, despite their different styles and their use of different but equally skilled intermediary engravings as models, attests both to the strength and clarity of Chodowiecki’s underlying design, the black chalk drawing in Berlin, and to the accuracy and consistency of the Swiss copywork. John Barlow, engraver for the Moore translation, copied almost all his images from Hunter’s Essays rather than directly from Essays; his head of Spalding (9.6 x 6.2 cm., in an oval of 12.6 x 8.8 cm.) is rendered with a drastic coarsening of the linear net (first published Conjuror’s Magazine, Feb. 1793; bound in I [1793] opp. 198; illus. 11); this same plate, somewhat worn, is reused in Grenville’s edition. Furthermore, both Barlow and Heath, who subscribed as well as contributed to the Hunter edition, had ready access to Blake’s engraving of Spalding.

The third engraving that bears only Blake’s signature as engraver, an emblem of a hand holding a torch with insects nearby (illus. 3), is unsigned in both Essays and Fragmenta. Presumably, like most of the unsigned engravings in these editions, it is the work of either Lips or Schellenberg, the two biggest contributors to both projects, although neither the engraving nor its underlying design is claimed by Joachim Kruse, Lips’s cataloguer, or by Brigitte Thanner, Schellenberg’s cataloguer. (Thanner ascribes many other unsigned engravings to Schellenberg on the basis of documentary evidence.) The designer may never be known, but the occasion for the vignette’s creation has long been hidden in plain sight. The image first appeared at the beginning of the fourth and final volume of Lavater’s Physiognomische Fragmente (1778) and then migrated to volume one in the French Essays (1781), where it served as Blake’s model. Thus separated from the (never-translated) German text that it was designed to accompany, it became a puzzle to Essick as he searched for a connection with something in the English text, possibly “the ability to see things clearly” (Essick, Blake’s Commercial Book Illustrations 42, XIX.3). Focusing on the image of “flies hovering around a flame,” without reference to the hand and arm, Essick speculates that the design may “take its cue from the ‘female butterfly and the winged ant’” (Essays I: 202) and “persons who have eyes and the faculty of seeing when they open them to the light” (Essays I: 203), possibly continuing the thread of an earlier “reference to a time ‘when the bright shining of a candle doth give thee light,’” (Essays I: 117). Thus the torch would represent “the truths of physiognomy to which all should be attracted.” Essick cautions, however, that “A traditional emblematic meaning of these motifs—it is unwise to be attracted to that which can destroy you—seems inappropriate, or at least oddly contrary to the thrust of the text, in this context” (Essick, Blake’s Commercial Book Illustrations 42).

In its original physical and historical setting in the front matter of Physiognomische Fragmente IV, the image of the hand bearing the insect-surrounded torch aloft is an emblem of Lavater’s resolve in the face of his detractors. By the time this final volume of the Fragmente came out in 1778, Lavater’s physiognomical theories had come under severe attack, even ridicule—most notably by G. C. Lichtenberg—for their utter lack of scientific content.42 In a foreword “written 20 De-
12. (left) [Torch upheld by hand under attack from insects: the Physiognomist upholding the light of Truth despite the ridicule of his enemies], unsigned. Physiognomische Fragmente IV (1778) opp. 3; 12.2 x 6.0 cm. Orell Füssli facsimile (1968-69). Author’s collection.

13. (right) [Torch upheld by hand under attack from insects], unsigned. Essai sur la physiognomonie I ([1781]) 213; 14.1 x 10.0 cm.; image 10.9 x 6.0 cm. Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.

cember 1777” but prepared for press in spring 1778, Lavater proclaims with an air of quiet dignity his undaunted commitment to uphold the “truth” of physiognomy in the face of his critics’ disbelief and scorn. “What is, is,” he writes, and despite personal attacks he refuses to allow physiognomy to become the “butt of jokes.” According to Lavater’s son-in-law and biographer Georg Gessner, “His principle was as stated ... in a vignette where a hand holds a light firmly, in which several mosquitoes singe themselves in the flame, and one wasp stings his hand, as expressed in a little rhyme.”43 That rhyme appears, several pages before the engraving, at the end of Lavater’s introductory remarks:

hastily written article for his popular pocket almanac, Göttinger Taschen-
Calender, to which Lavater replied both in Deutsches Museum in April 1778
and in the long “First Fragment” of Physiognomische Fragmente IV: 3-38.

43. Johann Kaspar Lavater’s Lebensbeschreibung II: 148. In Gessner’s
text, the variant spelling “Gehirngen,” is normalized to “Gehirnchen,” or
“little brains.” Gessner’s recollection that the poem and emblem appear
in volume one is in error.

And even though the mosquito singes its wing,
Bursts its skull and all its little brains,
Light is still light,
And even though the most severe wasp stings me;
I still won’t let go. (Physiognomische Fragmente IV: viii)

The associated vignette appears at the end of the table of contents (IV: opp. 3; illus. 12), facing the first “Fragment” (or chapter) in the volume: a detailed response to Lichtenberg’s attack in his Göttinger Taschen-Calender for 1778, published at the end of 1777. As indicated in the poem, the torch represents the brilliant truth of physiognomy consuming its weaker antagonists while Lavater the torchbearer, the indefatigable truth-teller, stoically endures the torments of his harshest critic. The stinging wasp, though unnamed, is understood to represent Lichtenberg.

This is the only plate with which Blake—unaware of the image’s original meaning—allowed himself mild liberties in redesign (illus. 3), while remaining well within the constraints of replicative engraving. In Fragmente IV, the designer has made Lavater’s lower forearm clearly masculine, sturdy, almost beefy,
emerging from a loose sleeve. The clenched fist firmly clasps the torch; the stinging wasp is seen from the side as it lights on the fleshy pad under the thumb, while two flying insects (the noun is "Mücke," meaning fly, mosquito, gnat, or midge, but not moth) approach the flame. For the new location in *Essai* (1: 213; illus. 13), the engraver, probably the same one responsible for this subject in *Fragmente*, has kept virtually the same design, reversed so that the torch is held in the left hand. With this design for *Essai* as a model, Blake feminizes and slenderizes the arm (still a left arm, now shown from the back, bare to the elbow), improves the articulation of the wrist, and breaks up the clenched fist by extending the forefinger along the torch. He also adds an extra insect, gives more variety to the four insects' shapes, and rearranges them so that one lights on the torchbearer's third finger (without stinging) as another prepares to land on the forefinger.

In the French and English editions, the section for which this emblem serves as a tailpiece, "XIX Fragment. General Reflections on the Objections against Physiognomy," touches on some of the same concerns Lavater had expressed in his 1778 introduction to *Fragmente* IV: the difficulties of the physiognomist's disinterested regard for truth, as he advances a discipline still in its infancy, beset by self-contradictory and misguided counter-arguments and outright mockery. There being no explanation of the meaning of the design or the difference between the two kinds of stinging insects, however, the vignette is identified in English simply as "A Hand with a Torch, Finished" in the list of plates for the eighth fascicle, published in February 1789 (Bentley, *Blake Books* 594). In the comprehensive table of contents to *Essai* I, which replaced the separate contents sheets of the fascicles, a more detailed title specifies the sex of the torchbearer and attempts to relate the image to its new context: "Female Hand and Arm holding a Torch, emblematical of Science dissipating Ignorance, Vignette" (Essays I: iii).

How and why did Lavater's physiognomical work undergo such extensive changes in English as to alter the meaning of some images and render the Continental designers invisible? Only the most cursory answers can be provided here.

The Proliferation of Lavater's Physiognomical Texts and the Making of the "English Lavater"

The sheer number of editions and translations of Lavater's physiognomical writings, as reported by Graham, has given rise to the mistaken belief that the work enjoyed phenomenal success in the marketplace. In fact, editions that Lavater himself saw through the press tended to be commercial disasters—partly because of Lavater's personality and bad business judgment, partly because the project got off on the wrong foot from the start. In 1771, when Lavater suddenly realized that it was his turn to present a paper to the Naturforschende Gesellschaft, the natural philosophy society of Zurich—"and I didn't know what on"—he recalled having been complimented on his knack for face-reading, a talent he cultivated as a pastor as an aid to recognizing God's image in humanity. Having no other ideas for a topic of interest to devotees of science, he seized upon "physiognomics" for an exploratory lecture, written "God knows with what haste." The true instigator of the work was Lavater's friend Dr. Johann Georg Zimmermann (1728-95), who—after moving in 1768 from Brugg, Switzerland, to accept an appointment as court physician to the Elector of Hanover, George III of Britain—continued to pester Lavater to develop his physiognomical findings into something publishable. Lavater's 1771 lecture gave Zimmermann his chance. As Lavater reports in the opening section of *Physiognomische Fragmente*, "Mr. Klockenbring of Hanover [Friedrich Arnold Klockenbring, editor of *Hannoverschen Magazine*] asked me for the lecture for Zimmermann" (I: 10), and "I gave him in all their incompetenseness the unedited papers," never suspecting that Zimmermann would quickly edit the material and publish it without the author's knowledge or permission (as the work of an anonymous "youth") in Klockenbring's journal. Horrified to find himself thrust before the world as a "defender of physiognomics" (*Fragmente* I: 10; trans. Frey 72), Lavater made his own arrangements with his own publisher, Weidmanns Erben and Reich, to publish the lecture under his own name (eliminating Zimmermann's annotations), along with a second section outlining possible future topics. But Zimmermann's introduction to the work in book form (20 March 1772) expresses satisfaction with his magazine publishing coup of 3, 7, and 10 February 1772, and accurately predicts that this new publication, *Von der Physiognomik*, will launch a "Physiognomanie" [craze for physiognomy]. In a panicky response to popular demand for a follow-up, a full-scale illustrated study, Lavater besieged Zimmermann, Herder, Goethe, and many others to send him ideas, images, citations of authorities, character interpretations, and recommendations for illustrators.

From then on the project became a perpetual work in progress, chronically over budget and over length, always open to change. *Physiognomische Fragmente*, printed in a press run of 750 copies and sold by subscription, set the pattern: it turned out to be the most expensive book ever published by the Leipzig house of Weidmanns Erben and Reich (co-published by the newly formed Swiss firm Heinrich Steiner in Winterthur), and sales did not cover costs. In his original proposal (1 February 1773) for simultaneous publication of "my physiognomical work" in French and German, Lavater had undertaken to commission all engravings at his own risk

44. Most translations relating to the early history of *Fragmente*, as acknowledged parenthetically hereafter, are quoted verbatim from Frey—a superb rendering of the distinctive voices of Lavater and his collaborators into English. This episode, originally recounted in *Fragmente* I: 10-12, is rendered somewhat less vividly by Hunter in Essays I: 9-12.

45. Ohage 116m12 provides the first name and position of Lavater's "Herr Klockenbring," Lavater's *Aussichten in Ewigkeit* (1768-72), a series of letters to Zimmermann on eternity, describes unmediated physiognomical communication among risen bodies (16th letter, 30 April 1772, written after the Feb. 1772 publication of *Von der Physiognomik*).

46. According to Goldfriedrich 631n8, and Vollert 49; Thanner, *Schweizerische Buchillustration* (730) gives the print-run number as 700.
for a minimum of 24 full-page plates and at least 16 sheets of text (128 pages), in return for 600 ducats and 25 free copies. 20 in German, 5 in French (Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Lavater Family Archive, Ms. 578.25; quoted Thanner, Schweizerische Buchillustration 731). Between the first and second volumes, the selling price went up from 18 2/3 to 38 Reichsthaler, and at the end of the third volume the publishers noted that all volumes thus far contained at least 47 more sheets, 104 more full-plate engravings, and 127 more vignettes than planned, but they committed themselves to absorbing the loss to avoid reneging on the announced price. Again, at the end of the even larger final volume, they observed that although the price should be higher, they had decided "out of friendship to Mr. Lavater" to honor "a promise once made," once again sacrificing their expected profits and raising the price only for new purchasers of the last two volumes.47 There must have been few takers; the number of subscribers began dropping as soon as the first volume appeared (Vollert 39n46; Ohage 118-19n12), as if in response to Lavater's money-back guarantee (Fragmente I: a3v).

And so it continued. For Lavater personally, the greatest financial loss resulted from the French edition, an ill-conceived venture in self-publishing. Intending to save money—but without considering transportation costs and delays—Lavater had his reworked and expanded German manuscript translated and printed by members of the Huguenot community in The Hague, with Heinrich Steiner of Winterthur serving as distributor, and new engravings executed under his own eye in Zurich, partly to provide "work and with it, food" for the artists in his retinue whose fortunes "weighed on his soul" (Gessner II: 284n43). But as Gessner laments (II: 282-86), fewer subscriptions were sold than expected; the price of the book, at nine louis d'or for subscribers and twelve for new purchasers, was both too low to cover costs and too high for any but the largest libraries; a very considerable shipment to England sank in transit; and the fourth volume, just on the point of publication, was stalled by revolutions in both France and Holland. At the end of the third volume Steiner appended a public announcement (bound into some extant copies) dated 1 August 1787: instead of being complete in three volumes, as promised in the 1 October 1781 prospectus, six sections that had appeared in Fragmente will have to be carried over (gratis to subscribers) to a fourth volume, which (at a price) will be filled out by additional materials from Lavater (Essai III, unnumbered endsheet). The Dutch edition, Lavater's four-volume octavo abridgment Over die Physiognomie, translated by Johann Wilhelm van Haar (Amsterdam: Johannes Allert, 1781-84), had unforeseen expenses of a different sort: at Lavater's request, the publisher reissued volume one on better paper, at his own expense, to do justice to the engravings. Finally, the abridged three-volume octavo reduction by Armbruster (drawing from both Fragmente and Essai, which was coming out at the same time) ends by noting the need for a fourth volume (not issued until 1830; see note 9) that would, among other things, include more female faces. According to Gessner's biography, "a considerably large quantity of copies of this work," remained available for purchase in 1802 (II: 334n44).

On to Britain. As early as 1773, Lavater had included in his initial contract a provision for an English translation, at the discretion of his co-publishers Reich and Steiner (Thanner, Schweizerische Buchillustration 761). But when his plan for simultaneous publication of Fragmente in French and German fell through and he took over as self-publisher of the French edition, he soon realized that he should try to broaden its market to England. On 6 February 1782, as the first volume of Essai reached Switzerland, Lavater asked the help of his friend Johann Gottlieb Burckhardt (1756-1800), minister of the Marienkirche in the Savoy area of London, in checking for errors, in collaboration with Lavater's (recently widowed) friend and translator Madame La Fite (1737?-94), who now had a position reading aloud to Queen Charlotte of England. He also enclosed a letter for Fuseli, presumably on the same subject. In reply (13 March 1782), Burckhardt assured Lavater that La Fite had found no conspicuous errors and would promote the book at court, but he advised against Lavater's plan to handle sales himself to avoid paying commissions. The spring of 1784, the first two volumes of Essai had attracted attention in Critical Review, Burckhardt was preparing to show them to Benjamin West, and the book importer Peter Elmsley, as Lavater's agent, had sold 37 copies of each volume. Only Fuseli, appalled by the quality of engravings after his work in Essai, continued to insist on a new and corrected edition in English (5 April 1784; 4 May 1784), and in the end he had his way.48 By the time the third volume of Essai (dated 1786 but delayed until 1787) came out, two English translations were in prospect: an abridged one by Wollstonecraft (from Johnson, with Fuseli as intermediary), and an expansive one by Hunter (from Murray, also with Fuseli's help).

John Murray (the first), who took on the risk of producing the large-quarto lavishly illustrated edition, ran into financial complications so intricately convoluted that his first biographer, Samuel Smiles, and his second, William Zachs, writing more than a century later, reached opposite conclusions.49 Ei

47. For particulars of the per-sheet cost and selling price of the first two volumes, expressed in Thaler and Groschen, in relation to Lavater's steep honorarium (from which he paid for the engravings) and his "Doucet," or sweetener, see Goldfriedrich 631n8. For monetary equivalencies, see Franz Pick and René Sédillot, All the Monies of the World: A Chronicle of Currency Values (New York: Pick, 1971), and for other equivalencies and for comparative data on well-known authors' honoraria, book prices, and common wages, see Walter Krieg, Materialien zu einer Entwicklungsgeschichte der Bücher-Preise und des Autoren-Honorars vom 15. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert (Vienna: Herbert Stubenrauch, 1953) 27-32.

48. Before I had access to the microfiche archive of Lavater's unpublished correspondence in the Zentralbibliothek Zürich (see note 58), I worked from abstracts and quotations generously e-mailed to me by Ingrid Goritschnig from her own research notes.

49. Smiles 26-28; Zachs 69-70, 83, 239, 358-59. Zachs mentions Smiles's biography of the second John Murray (1) but not the fact that the first chapter deals with the first Murray.
ther "The Publication of 'Lavater on Physiognomy' in parts, a costly work, largely illustrated, resulted in a heavy loss" (Smiles 26) or it was "his most profitable publication" (Zachs 69). According to the 1789 title page, the book's "upwards of 800 engravings" (actually fewer than 600) were "executed by, or under the inspection of Thomas Holloway," the master engraver who receives top billing on the page; the text was "translated from the French by Henry Hunter, D.D.," and the work was "printed for John Murray ... H. Hunter ... and I. Holloway." In June 1787, a prospectus promised the first of an expected 40 fascicles on January 1, 1788 (delayed in a later prospectus to January 21?); the set, when completed, was to have made up "four magnificent Volumes in Quarto." But when publication ceased with the third volume in 1799, the work had spilled over into 41 fascicles and bulked so large that the three volumes had to be bound in five physical volumes. The announced price was 12 shillings per fascicle to subscribers, 15 to non-subscribers; one-guinea deposits were acknowledged by a receipt from the "Proprietors," who would appear to be the three gentlemen leading the list of those taking in subscriptions: Murray, Hunter, and Holloway.

But there were more participants than meet the eye, and their respective contributions and contractual obligations add to the difficulty of arriving at a bottom line. According to the anonymous memoirist who prefixed a "Biographical Sketch" to a posthumous collection of Hunter's sermons published by the Murray firm in 1804, it was Hunter who endeavoured in all companies to make converts to translate the work into English; and having communicated his ideas and his enthusiasm to Mr. Thomas Holloway, an eminent engraver of his acquaintance, that gentleman readily undertook to provide the necessary plates. Mr. John Murray, bookseller, had the care of the printing, and the work thus allotted, was begun by all parties with great ardour.

But according to a memoir of Holloway published anonymously in 1827 "by one of his Executors," the graphic artist took the lead: after "a great lover of the arts" suggested the project as a showcase for engravings, Holloway "in consequence engaged the Rev. Dr. Hunter in the translation; and forming a connexion with two publishers, had the courage to embark in a work containing seven hundred plates, and extending to five volumes imperial quarto." (The reference to "two" publishers will shortly become clear.) In the end, writes Holloway's executor, "[S]o balanced was the public favour between the translator and the artist, that some called the work Hunter's, and some Holloway's Lavater, which is the case to the present day" (20). Or perhaps, as claimed by Fuseli's biographer John Knowles, the real driving force was the "great lover of the arts" who put the bug in Holloway's ear: "Fuseli wrote the preface, or, as he modestly called it, the 'advertisement'; corrected the translation by Hunter; made several drawings to illustrate the work; and superintended the execution of the engravings."

Meanwhile, Fuseli's friend Joseph Johnson was planning an edition of his own, a modest octavo aimed at less affluent readers, to be translated by Mary Wollstonecraft. According to William Godwin's 1798 memoir of his wife, Wollstonecraft "improved herself in her French" in 1787, and in 1788 she "made an abridgment of Lavater's Physiognomy, from the French, which has never been published." A memorandum by Johnson confirms that her translation, made after "she entered upon her house in George Street at Michaelmas [late September] 1787," was "from the French." But about this time, Johnson's and Murray's projects became entangled. As Bentley has reported, Johnson's recently discovered office letter-book reveals that Johnson eventually became a silent backer of Murray's edition, and William Zachs's biography of Murray provides further details. From my own examination of the unpublished documents in the Murray Archive on which Zachs relies (correcting some of his transcriptions, especially on 246n52, and taking into account other documents Zachs does not cite), and from my interweaving of these materials with key letters from the still-unpublished bulk of Lavater's vast correspondence in the Zentralbibliothek Zürich, I have pieced together a loosely

50. The 800 figure is retracted in "Errata" at the end of "Directions to the Binder," which was issued with the final fascicle, No. 41, in March 1799.
51. For the full text, see Weinglass, Fuseli: Catalogue Raisonné 97-98.
53. ["Biographical Sketch"] in SERMONS, and other MISCELLANEOUS PIECES ... To which are prefixed, A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF HIS LIFE, and A Critical Account of his Writings (London: I. Murray et al., 1804) I: xix.

54. Memoir of the Late Mr. Thomas Holloway 17-18.
55. Life and Writings of Henry Fuseli i: 79.
58. More than 21,000 letters in the Zentralbibliothek Zürich (9,000 letters from Lavater and 12,000 to him) have recently become available on 1,843 microfiche in Lavater Correspondence, ed. Eggenberger and Stahl; see <http://www.idc.net>. According to Eggenberger's online note, "[A]n actual complete edition of Lavater's correspondence is not anticipated in the foreseeable future, if ever. Academic efforts are currently focused on the edition which is being supervised by the Johann Caspar Lavater Research Institute and the NZZ Publishing House in Zurich, "Johann Caspar Lavater, Selected Works in a Historico-Critical Edition" ("Johann Caspar Lavater, Ausgewählte Werke in historisch-kritischer Ausgabe"). The publishers make use of the correspondence and refer to it; however, even they do not know about all of the letters.
sequential narrative of Murray's and Johnson's dealings with Lavater from June 1787 to May 1788.

According to the Hunter-Holloway-Murray prospectus of June 1787, "The Translator and the Artist have already made considerable Progress in the Work," as confirmed by Hunter's memoirist:

Having translated sufficient to occupy the Printer and the Engraver for some time, Dr. Hunter determined upon paying a visit to Lavater at Zurich. . . . In August, 1787, he accordingly repaired to Zurich; but it does not appear that Lavater received his visit with that frankness and cordiality with which it was made. . . . [Lavater] considered this English translation as likely to injure the sale of the French edition in which he was concerned, and scarcely knew how to act. ("Biographical Sketch") xx-xxi [see note 53])

The memoirist reiterates that Hunter, who had made the visit solely to "prevent mistakes" and "to render the English translation as complete as possible," was shocked to find that "the pressure of indigence" had reduced "poor Lavater" to hear "with chagrin of an undertaking which might possibly diminish his profits from the sale of the French edition" (lxii-lxxiv). As previously noted, August 1787 was also the month in which Lavater's distributor Heinrich Steiner announced that Essai would not, after all, be complete in three volumes; to accommodate the six remaining sections from Fragment, a fourth volume would be necessary. On 8 October 1787—that is, shortly after Michaelmas 1787, when Johnson's memorandum states that Wollstonecraft moved into the home where she prepared her abridged translation—Murray urged Johnson, with whom he had a long history of co-publication and collaboration (Zachs 82-84), to join him in order to head off competition between their contemporaneous but dissimilar projects. After informing Johnson that Mrs. Hunter anticipated her husband's return (from abroad?) very soon, Murray urged a meeting:

It is therefore submitted whether in this stage you should take the steps you threaten. If you have patience, a meeting shall take place immediately upon the Doctor's Arrival. A coalition is what I have cordially wished for, if it can be accomplished upon principles of reciprocity. For it is no matter whose scheme here is the best; a public competition will infallibly hurt both. Obstinacy therefore should be avoided on both sides, & all of us should keep steadily in our Eye, what will tend most to the general interest. (Murray Archive, Box M 10)

The "steps" Johnson threatened might have included a public announcement that it was his project, not Murray's, that had Lavater's approval. But Murray's letter, probably followed by the proposed meeting with Hunter, appears to have nipped Johnson's plan in the bud, probably by the end of 1787. On 15 January 1788, only days before the first fascicle appeared, Johnson entered into an agreement with Murray, Hunter, and Holloway to produce "a Translation and Embellishments of Lavater Essays of Physiognomy" for "equal Shares and Proportions both for Profit and Loss"—a one-quarter stake for each partner. The roles of Hunter as translator, Holloway as graphics director (compensated separately for the costs of the engravings), and Murray as publisher are spelled out in the Articles of Agreement; Johnson's quarter share of responsibilities (unspecified) must have included his services as point person (with Fuseli's help) in correspondence with Lavater and the provision of additional capital. The partners were to meet quarterly to estimate the value of the work and their quarter shares; if one partner should die before completion of the project, the surviving partners were to buy out the deceased partner after settling accounts up until the time of that partner's death, and the property was to be divided equally among the surviving partners. In case of a dispute with representatives of the deceased partner, the outcome was to be settled by arbitrators chosen by each party, who in turn would name a third arbitrator.59

Unfortunately, Lavater did not date his copy of his own proposal to Johnson, which begins: "My esteemed Mr. Johnson, I have the honor to offer the English nation, through you, a work upon which I am willing to expend all my mental powers, and toward which I have already in stock a wealth of materials, before which I am often horrified" (Lavater Family Archive, Ms. 567.130; see notes 48 and 58).60 This sounds like yet another version of his text, with additional illustrations. Referring to previous communications through Fuseli, Lavater goes on to ask Johnson "once again" if the large folio format might not be "more excellent" than quarto—a sign, probably, that Johnson has abandoned the octavo idea and is now committed to the quarto edition. According to Knowles, Fuseli engaged in an "animated correspondence" opposing Lavater's desire for a folio edition and explaining "that the quarto size best pleased the British public." After Lavater reluctantly agreed, expecting his images to be "rather traced than imitated by the engraver," he insisted on "mak[ing] his drawings anew to suit the quarto size" (79). His price, according to the undated letter to Johnson, would be three guineas per sheet of text (each making eight pages in quarto format), one and a half guineas for each large outline drawing, one-half guinea for each small outline drawing, one guinea for each "shaded drawing" (not a silhouette but a more fully rendered portrait), and two and a half guineas for each full-page shaded drawing. The grand total—not counting "20 or 28 free copies," would be 1,060 (a mistranscription of 1,050) guineas for 800 pages of text, 400 outlines (200 large, 200 small), and 200 shaded

59. Although the agreement itself is not present in the Murray Archive, its date and terms are reiterated in the arbitrators' ruling of 11 January 1802 that settled John Murray's estate.

60. This document must have been sent before 27 July 1787, when Lavater's friend Laden Hoffham, a merchant in London, informed Lavater about Hunter's translation and his desire to visit Zurich, with the warning that "this will certainly do harm to Johnson," when he publishes the physiognomical work (Lavater Family Archive, Ms. 513.287).
drawings (100 large, 100 small), with all originals to remain in Lavater's possession. It appears that Lavater never quite understood that Johnson had teamed up with Murray and that a folio edition was out of the question. Even after the first few fascicles (in quarto) had rolled off the press, Lavater's Alsatian friend Gottfried Heisch, then living in London, wrote on 16 May 1788:

Between you, Fuesli and Johnson there are the most dreadful misunderstandings. God knows how they arose—I won't and can't investigate. You think Johnson will use English money and expend English generosity for your Physiognomy? [It doesn't seem so to me. From the first word, which has been continuously repeated up till now, this is what I heard: Lavater runs up a quantity of expenses, outlays, which we don't know anything about. We don't want anything except two sections of outline images and his text. What's the purpose of all the rest of this, all these drawings, etc.? [Who] has ordered them? By the way, every day he changes his opinion, starts new projects that we simply can't accommodate, and if we write to him about it, he doesn't answer, never stays on the point that we want to hold him to, and always gives answers that we don't want to know.

Here Lavater notes in the bottom margin, "This, by God, is not true." Heisch continues:

I must make two remarks to you from my heart. First: Don't make any more contracts by yourself . . . You are not at all able to manage making a contract. You don't know the world, because you judge and believe that everybody is like you and will do what is promised. What's the result? You're left sitting in excrement . . . Second: Be on your guard, even more than against Satan himself, from any thought that you might possibly publish the book yourself! You have been burned enough to fear the fire! You let something of these thoughts be glimpsed in your last letter to Johnson, and it made me very uneasy on your account.61

Lavater continued at least until August 1788 to allude to his initial offer, and as late as 29 November 1788 he wrote to a Mr. Tighe that he still hoped Johnson would produce a "larger work," for which purpose he was enclosing each month additional images for engraving.62 Johnson had already invested in Wollstonecraft's translation and owned both a large drawing of Lavater in profile and the engraving of it by Blake, first dated 26 December 1787 (possibly ordered with the Hunter translation in mind, but before Johnson quite realized that Holloway alone was in charge of all engravings and engravers). Whatever the timing may have been, after Johnson was actively allied with the other "Proprietors of the English Lavater" as a co-publisher of Hunter's translation of Essai, the only new material that he would have accepted from Lavater for possible inclusion in the English edition would have been whatever text and outlines may have already been under contract before he gave up his plan for an edition under his own imprint.

Despite all the misunderstandings, Fuesli continued to labor on Lavater's (and his own) behalf by writing a scathing two-part review of Holcroft's translation for Joseph Johnson's Analytical Review (5 [Dec. 1789]: 454-62; 6 [Apr. 1790]: 426-31). Dismissing Holcroft's reply (6 [Jan. 1790]: 110-12), Fuesli mercilessly exposed Holcroft's copy-text as Armbruster's abridged redaction, ridiculed his laments about the difficulties of the German language and Lavater's new coinages, and displayed Holcroft's most egregious blunders side by side with "our own" expert translations. Readers of this anonymous review of course had no way of knowing that it was the work of a native Swiss, a lifelong friend of the author, and a sponsor of a rival edition. Nor could they have known that the publisher of this hostile critique also had a financial stake in the project.

As it happened, Murray died on 6 November 1793, with three fascicles (39-41) still to be published and accounts among partners still up in the air, except for the 1788-93 quarterly share-value estimates based on each period's cash expenditures and sales. Of the 1000 copies printed (Zachs 359), the published list of subscribers (Essays I, front matter) accounts for 809 copies under 795 names,63 but not all subscribers completed their orders. And Holloway's out-of-pocket engraving expenses had to be subtracted before accrued profits and losses could be calculated. On 12 June 1795 Samuel Highley, the elder Murray's shopman and the younger Murray's partner, requested Holloway's account for engravings for fascicles 25-37, as well as a complete accounting for all numbers to date, along with the remaining prints needed to make up 1000 copies of fascicles 35-37 (Murray Archive, Box M 10), but Holloway did not present his comprehensive account—for the staggering sum of £2331-12-0—until sometime in 1806. By way of justification, Holloway noted that in addition to the time and expense necessary to do such things as oversee the work of in-house engravers (Holloway's students and assistants) and outside professionals, buy supplies, board visiting artists, make shipments, and arrange for printing and hot-pressing, he had more hands-on work than expected:

in spite of all his care & even expostulations with most of the Artists—the work they brought home was distressingly inaccurate—many plates were destroyed totally—and those which were the best executed were frequently so erroneous both in outline & expression that many parts were oblig'd to be ham-

61. Quoted by Finster. The full nine-page text is of great interest, and I hope, in collaboration with Syble Erle, to publish a transcription, translation, and annotation as a separate piece or as an appendix to a larger study (see note 4). The "outline images" may have led to Lavater's 1797 annotations (in French) of faces in outline, published as Physiognomical Sketches, engr. J. Luffman (London: R. H. Westley, J. Luffman, Murray & Highley, n.d. [50 plates, each dated 1802]).


63. By my tally; Zachs (359) counts 758 copies under 748 names.
Expenses Attending the Engravings of Lavater as well attending the Engravings herein specified during the year 1787 to 1799

Paid to Artists out of Doors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andries</td>
<td>273 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>111 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>39 19 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>12 1 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budge</td>
<td>18 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codger</td>
<td>11 18 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coe</td>
<td>3 18 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granger</td>
<td>2 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillman</td>
<td>6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>173 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now</td>
<td>35 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pack</td>
<td>26 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagg</td>
<td>25 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noght</td>
<td>30 11 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbe</td>
<td>14 13 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcides</td>
<td>29 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heap</td>
<td>79 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>101 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>15 18 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>高新 (Hsin)</td>
<td>51 7 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tang</td>
<td>18 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thewthwaite</td>
<td>108 14 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>65 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Gillman</td>
<td>240 17 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visners</td>
<td>34 1 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1859 12 6

1680 4 6

Paid by Artists in Door

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swiny</td>
<td>236 3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple</td>
<td>186 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tingle</td>
<td>39 7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>28 15 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>309 15 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>16 105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3585 17

14. "Expenses [sic] Attending the Engravings of Lavater ... Paid to Artists out of Doors" (c. 1800), prepared by Holloway for settlement of Murray's estate. Published by permission of John Murray (Publishers), 50 Albermarle Street, London W1X 4BD.
merd out & reproduced—a piece of work this the most pain-
ful & the most mortifying imaginable to TH.\textsuperscript{66}

Johnson reiterated in a letter to Highley of 19 December 1800 that Holloway “could not get a facsimile from any one of them, he told us he was obliged to work himself on every plate to make it what it should be . . .”\textsuperscript{66}

Murray’s executors objected to Holloway’s bill, especially to the interest added to outright expenses from the time of Murray’s death, and the case went to arbitration on 24 April 1800. On 12 August 1800, the arbitrators agreed that Murray’s estate was entitled to £150 for his “fourth share” of the copper plates remaining “and all subsequent Interest.” A comprehensive decision, which the arbitrator chosen by the executors refused to sign, was reached on 11 January 1802. The award was for £3571-8-5 to the surviving partners, with £943-8-5 to Hunter, £958-15-9 to Holloway, and the remaining £1669-4-8 to Johnson, plus “the further and additional” sum of £460 to Johnson for principal and interest on cash “advanced to John Murray in his lifetime” for production expenses. As none of these figures matches those in Holloway’s request, and the three surviving partners were entitled to equal one-third shares, I cannot explain why Hunter and Holloway received different amounts. But the payment to Johnson, not counting the reimbursement of his cash advances, indicates that he was the main financial backer.

Here, in this truncated account, we must leave matters. But one last factual tidbit offers insight into Blake’s relative professional standing in 1788-89. For all four of his engravings for Essays in Physiognomy, Blake received £39-19-6 from Holloway (illus. 14).\textsuperscript{66} It seems unlikely that Blake could have com-
mended a higher per-vignette price than Gillray, who was paid 6 guineas (6 pounds and 6 shillings) for his fine vignette after Fuseli (II: 291; reproduced Weinglass, Fuseli: Catalogue Raisonné 108). At this rate, Blake would have received 18 guineas, or £18-18-0 for his three vignettes, leaving the odd figure of £21-1-6. Perhaps for the full plate of Democritus, highly finished, Blake was able to charge as much as 20 guineas, or £21. But I still have no idea how he earned that last one-and-six!

Selected Sources

Primary texts
Hunter, Henry. Sermons, and other Miscellaneous Pieces . . . / To which are prefixed, A Biographical Sketch of his Life, and / A Critical Account of his Writings. London: J. Murray et al., 1804.
Lavater, Johann Caspar. Physiognomische Fragmente: Zur Beförderung der Menschenkenntnis und Menschenliebe. 4 vols. Leipzig:

---

64. From an undated four-page document, “Observations submitted to the Consideration of Doct. Hunter[,] Mr. Johnson—two of the propieters of Lavater—and the Execs. of the late Mr Murray,” Holloway also notes that

*Copying* is the most arduous as well as the most tedious of Engraving—but *Copying* from indifferent Engravings—incorrect in outline as well as in execution—requires double the time to execute. Also *Considerable* time was taken up in consulting the text & comparing the French & German Editions to see which Engravings were the most accurate & in making the necessary alterations. (Murray Archive, Box M 10)

It has not been known, until now, that Holloway worked from Fragmente as well as Essai. For a sampling of Holloway’s drawings for the Physiognomy, see the Wellcome Library’s online photo archive at <http://medphoto.wellcome.ac.uk>.


66. Thomas Holloway, “Expendes Attending the Engravings of Lavater as well as Sunday other Engravings herein specified A during the years 1787 to 1799—Inclusive”; half-sheet as page 1 of “Case of Mr T. Holl-
way” (written sideways at bottom of folded large sheet; four pages in all). Holloway’s section A refers to a deduction for (nonspecified) engravings for other purposes during the period. There is also a section B, referring to Holloway’s payments for “Numbers” and subscription deposits. Many other calculations and occasional errors in carryover to different pages make the reckoning extremely hard to follow (Murray Archive, Box M 10).


Memoir of the Late Mr. Thomas Holloway; by one of his Executors. London: Printed for the Author, sold by Samuel Bagster, 1827.

Other key citations


Smiles, Samuel. Memoir and Correspondence of the late John Murray with an account of the origin and progress of the house, 1768-1843. London: John Murray, 1891.


Reviewed by JENNIFER DAVIS MICHAEL

The past ten years have witnessed a wave of "green" criticism among Romanticists, reacting against both the Yale critics such as Harold Bloom and Geoffrey Hartman, with their emphasis on the imaginative sublime, and the new historicists and Marxists, some of whom, like Alan Liu, deny the existence of "nature" apart from human property and power relations (Liu 104). A primary function of ecocritical readings is to show that the Romantic poets, rather than escaping from history into an imaginatively constructed "nature," are demonstrating "how human culture can only function through links and reciprocal relations with nature": i.e., a nature that has an existence apart from that culture (Bate 103-04).

Blake's denunciations of "vegetated" nature and his well-known proverb that "Where man is not nature is barren" have made him an inconvenience, if not a stumbling block, for the ecocritical movement. While James McKusick makes a convincing case for Golgonooza as an "Ecotopia" of "human-scale technology" and offers an interesting reading of *Jerusalem* plates 18 and 19 as a warning against pollution (McKusick 102-05), he generally overlooks Blake's negative depictions of nature in order to claim Blake for the ecological cause. The other leaders of eco-Romanticism, Jonathan Bate and Karl Kroeber, largely avoid Blake.1

Kevin Hutchings' impressive book challenges and dissects the longstanding orthodoxy of Blake's hostility toward nature. *Imagining Nature* is at once a powerful rereading of Blake and an intervention into what Hutchings sees as the "dichotomy" in which ecocriticism sets itself above and apart from all other (i.e., social and political) ways of reading. On the contrary, Hutchings argues, environmental initiatives have always been shaped by social, political, and economic forces (he cites E. P. Thompson's account of the Forest Laws), and to pretend otherwise is both naive and dangerous. Hutchings hopes "to delineate an alternative, distinctively Blakean view of the relationship between humanity and nature" (3). The key to this view is a "doubleness" he finds in Blake's representation of nature and its objects. On one level they are ideal and infinite, the "world in a grain of sand." At the same time, they operate "discursively," meaning they are constructed through human perspectives and power systems.

Hutchings' argument, clearly aimed at specialists, has profound implications for the ways in which we read Blake's statements about "nature," and hence for our interpretation of Blake's overall vision. He suggests that Blake's suspicion of "nature" is directed not toward its material reality but rather toward the ways in which human beings have constructed, named, and exploited "nature." In other words, when Blake represents nature negatively, through a figure such as Vala or the Polyphemus, he is criticizing a discourse of nature, a construction of the human mind and society. This means that many of Blake's anti-natural statements are aimed at discourses of nature, not nature itself.

In order to substantiate his claim, Hutchings must first establish that there is a "nature itself" for Blake. In his first chapter, he challenges a series of factors that have contributed to Blake's reputation as "nature's Romantic adversary," beginning with Northrop Frye's *Fearful Symmetry*, which immediately overshadowed Mark Schorer's book, *William Blake: The Politics of Vision*, published the previous year. Whereas Schorer emphasized the contradictions in Blake's attitude toward nature, Frye not only insisted on the unity of Blake's philosophy

1. Mark Lussier's important article, "Blake's Deep Ecology," is a significant exception to this avoidance.

2. Claire Colebrook made a similar argument in these pages recently about Blake's anti-feminist rhetoric.
but fixed it in firm opposition to nature. Subsequent generations of Blake scholars have accepted without question Blake's contempt for the natural world, swayed not only by Frye's argument but also by the well-known marginalia in which Blake denounces "natural objects" in favor of imagination. Hutchings suggests that these off-the-cuff comments should not outweigh the affirmations of nature that appear throughout Blake's work. Neither Blake's self-proclaimed rejection of deism nor his apparent embrace of antinomianism, according to Hutchings, provides consistent evidence of his opposition to nature. Blake's biographical association with the city is also, he points out unnecessarily, insufficient evidence that he rejects the country.

Chapter two, "Nature's Economy and The Book of Thel," begins with a provocative discussion of anthropomorphism and the tendency for Blake's critics to read the Eagle and the Mole, for example, as "anything and everything but eagles and moles" (76). Hutchings makes a moral case for "attempting at least to imagine the needs of the non-human world" (77), in part by refusing to appropriate animals and plants for symbolic ends. While Blake's insistence emphasis on "the human form divine" makes his attitude toward such anthropomorphism less than clear, Hutchings cites "The Fly" as evidence that Blake could and did imagine a fly and a human being on equal terms—even having the man call himself "a Fly" at the end of the poem (83). In his reading of The Book of Thel, Hutchings echoes Helen Bruder's argument that the utilitarian philosophy articulated by the figures in Har is sharply delineated by gender, so that the Cloud's masculine "self-assertion" is set against the self-effacement of the Lily and Cloid. (One wonders if the female figures would be similarly condemned if they were to assert themselves.) Where Hutchings usefully expands this argument is in his contrast of Blake's poem with Erasmus Darwin's Economy of Vegetation. Whereas Darwin uses figurative language to naturalize "the gendered economy of human relations," Blake's allegory demonstrates and questions the ways in which our anthropomorphic discourse "can 'naturalize' the ideological interests of the status quo" (99). While I find this idea persuasive, as it helps to account for the fact that the poem seems to support entirely contradictory readings, I'm puzzled by Hutchings' assumption that the word "Har," "followed on two occasions by a grammatically unnecessary period" (not uncommon in Blake), must therefore be an abbreviation for some other word, a word he arbitrarily decides is "Harmony." (Why not "harvest," "harp," "heart," or "hard"?) A footnote acknowledges and dismisses the reference to Har as a character in Tiriël, contending that the unpublished poem would not be relevant to "Blake's small contemporary reading public" (224 n. 10). Hutchings' argument over the next few pages that Blake is making an ironic comment on natural "harmony" is rather hindered than helped by what he acknowledges is a conjectural association. Nonetheless, his conclusion that "Blake's Thel both celebrates and abhors" a holistic, interdependent model of life on earth offers new light on the ambiguity of the poem in the context not of Innocence and Experience (as it is usually read), but of nature and the constructions we put upon it.

Hutchings remains uneasy, however, about Blake's use of anthropomorphism. In his third chapter, "Milton's Environmental Poetics," he considers instances, both verbal and graphic, in which Blake seems to humanize the things of nature. For Blake, he says, "our encounters with non-human entities are always in some sense anthropomorphic encounters with ourselves," and yet those entities appear to resist our "disfiguring" gaze (117). This intractability of nature is crucial to Hutchings' reassessment of Blake's antipathy to Newton. Both Blake and Newton, he suggests, affirm the "otherness" of nature, but for Newton that reality is knowable through the laws and language of science, whereas for Blake the imagination yields a prophetic "common ground upon which all beings, human and otherwise, might meet in visionary interchange" (120).

Hutchings goes on in this chapter to complicate Newton's reputation among Blakeans as the epitome of "single vision," arguing that Newton in fact brought a previously abstract natural philosophy down to earth, so to speak, making science a "materially engaged praxis" (123). In this he was not entirely at odds with Blake, who abhorred the mystification of a priesthood keeping the secrets of the universe. Blake's attack on Newton thus has more to do with Newton's contemporary reputation and the uses to which his theories were put, as well as his emphasis on the laws of nature. Hutchings makes a generally convincing connection between natural and moral legalism, although the evidence he draws from Blake's color print "Newton" seems loose at best (Newton is sitting on rock; the Decalogue was carved in stone). He reads Milton as an "antinomian rejection of legalism in both its physical and moral manifestations" (129). The interdependence of time and eternity in this poem directly challenges Newton's absolute definitions of time and space.

"Jerusalem's Human Ecology" is the most compelling chapter of the book, arguing that Jerusalem is not the anti-natural poem that most scholars have assumed it to be. Its complexity, Hutchings argues, involves both essentialist and discursive or deconstructive modes of critique, aimed at challenging the discourse of "natural" religious and legal authority. His best example of Blake's strategy comes not from Jerusalem but from Milton, when Los states that "this mournful day / Must be a blank in Nature" (E 102). As Hutchings puts it, "Los erases the totality of nature's cultural inscriptions," leaving a tabula rasa, but that primitivist ideal appears only as a blank, an absence (155). The point seems to be not that nature has no objective reality, but that that reality cannot be known. Jerusalem then becomes not a critique of nature per se, but a critique of its constructions.

The argument in this chapter focuses especially on the figures of Vala and the Polyphus, both of which become destructive because they are products of "institutionalized discourses" (175). Hutchings makes the provocative suggestion that Vala's role is to some extent predetermined by the necessities of the epic form, and that "Blake condemns nature in advance
by making Vala occupy the structural space attributed to Satan or Hell in influential epics like The Divine Comedy and Paradise Lost. At the same time, however, since Blake has deconstructed the Heaven/Hell dualism in The Marriage, he "inadvertently encourages his readers to question the structurally similar Eternity/Nature dualism that haunts his own epics" (174-75). Hutchings goes on to point out that Vala's naming by others is an important part of her presentation, especially since the grossly unreliable sons of Albion, as well as the self-absorbed Albion himself, are the ones who identify her as "Babylon" and "our Mother! Nature!" (E 163).

At the same time, Hutchings reads the Polypos as Blake's critique of "deep ecology." Just as the Polypos threatens to absorb all things and beings into itself, "too much identification with the external world can, in Blake's thought, lead to a harmful annihilation of the identifying self" (197). The Polypos becomes "a figure for the indissociable human" (199); paradoxically, by identifying too much with our environment, we lose ourselves and thus our ability to see that environment. Albion deteriorates when he anthropomorphically projects himself onto his natural surroundings: this denial of otherness makes relationship impossible. But so does the loss of self in the absorption of the Polypos, which again is not a natural product but a dark construction of the human will.

In the "Coda: Blake's Apocalypse, Druidism, and the Humanization of Nature," Hutchings resolves much of the lingering ambiguity over anthropomorphism and whether "humanizing" nature is a positive or negative process in Blake. Certainly, as he acknowledges, self-interested and instrumental readings and discourses of nature are ultimately destructive both for human beings and for the rest of the environment. On the other hand, the mutuality that characterizes the end of Jerusalem depends on recognizing the independent value of all things, that they are worthy of "conversing" (though he does not draw on that particular term). Hutchings concludes with the suggestion that when "Lion, Tyger, Horse, Elephant, Eagle Dove, Fly, Worm, / And all the wondrous Serpent ... Humanize" on plate 98 (E 258), they not only become human (as most readers have concluded) but make others humane in a "profound ministry of reconciliation" (217).

In conclusion, Imagining Nature does more than fill a gap in Blake studies; it re-imagines nature in the context not only of Blake's work but implicitly of all human imagining. While a few points in the readings, as I have noted, seem stretched or loosely supported, the real value of the book rests not in such details but in its ability to see, as Blake would say, at once the Thistle and the Old Man. This book will change forever the way we read Blake's reading of nature.

Works Cited


Reviewed by CATHERINE L. MCCLENANAHAN

W ith this affordable edition of Visions of the Daughters of Albion, Robert Essick and the Huntington Library have made Blake's illuminated text and related visual material available in hard copy to a wide audience of Blake students, scholars and fans, and given easy access to one more copy to compare with those available on the electronic Blake Archive (copies a, A, C, J, F, G, and P). Based on the Huntington's copy (designated as copy E), this edition provides full-size color reproductions of all 11 plates, a printed version of this copy, bibliographic and textual notes, about 50 pages of detailed commentary that includes monochrome reproductions of pencil drawings from Blake's Notebook, and a bibliography of critical studies.

Visions could scarcely ask for a more experienced and informed editor. As Blake readers know, Essick is one of the world's experts on Blake's printing methods and visual designs and a noted scholar of Blake's writing. One of the editors of the Blake Archive, he has also edited or co-edited other illuminated books for the Blake Trust/Tate/Princeton series (The Early Illuminated Books and Milton), catalogues of Blake's separate prints and commercial illustrations, catalogues of the Blake holdings in the Huntington collection, and collections of essays on the relation of Blake's images and texts. Despite the relatively affordable price, there is nothing cut-rate about the look or feel of this volume: both are equally attractive, right down to the little motifs from the visual designs that are placed on the verso sides of pages that begin or end sections, the crisp, readable typeface of the printed sections, and the pleasurable feel of good paper stock.
Copy E compares interestingly with the copies available in the online Blake Archive, which vary significantly in color and color intensity from each other, even the four (a, A, C and J) published in the same year, 1793. The colors of this copy seem to include more blue and purple shades and sometimes more color shadings, as on plate 4, the first page of the poem proper. This edition makes it possible to see variations in Blake's script and ambiguities of punctuation marks, while the textual notes point out changes Blake made on the copperplate that would be hard to see in a reproduction. The printing is as clear as the low-contrast colors of ochre ink on buff pages can be, but since some of the lighter lines are hard to read, the inclusion of the printed text is helpful for less experienced—or just older—eyes.

Essick's inclusion of the related Notebook drawings in itself makes this edition worthwhile, not just for Blake students or scholars but to anyone interested in tracing the evolution of a visual artist's ideas. Modern technology has made it possible to digitize photographs from the British Library and then manipulate these to retrieve pencil drawings that were written or drawn over in ink years later and to erase words that covered parts of these pencil drawings, as we can see in Erdman and Moore's facsimile of Blake's Notebook. But this edition saves readers an extra research step by including illustrations such as figure 2, which not only shows a drawing of a ring of dancers related to those on plate 2 of VDA, but also the caption underneath, a quotation from Milton's Comus, that was written over in the Notebook but which sets up a thematic link between the two works.

The commentary begins with a short, lucid discussion of Blake's background as a printmaker: how he invented his unique methods of illuminated printing, how these contrasted with conventional methods, and the advantages and disadvantages of Blake's methods for an independent artisan. Essick also surveys the works of illuminated printing published before VDA, setting up thematic issues and links between this work and its predecessors. This leads to an overview of Blake's common rhetorical strategies and thus to Essick's own rhetorical position. Noting the focus in much recent criticism of VDA on "precursor texts," Essick points to the consequent danger of being "led away from the texture of Blake's poetic..."

In contrast, Essick proposes "a rather old-fashioned solution": to work through this text (i.e., the Huntington's) "from start to finish, line by line when necessary" (26). His commentary will take "brief excursions" into historical issues or earlier texts that Blake echoes "when they assist understanding" (26-27). Aside from a somewhat curmudgeonly swipe at "modern interpreters" who overlook Oothoon's speech in 5:23-6:20, Essick's emphasis is fair, relevant, and especially helpful to newer readers of Blake's unique composite art or simply of poetry. Stuart Curran complained 30 years ago about the tendency of some Blake criticism to "play for the big stakes and not fret about the pennies," imposing structures "on a generally resistant poem" (Curran 330), and while the critical paths we've followed in the meantime have been valuable, the complaint still has relevance. Essick's approach in this book enhances both aesthetic experience and intellectual analysis.

Readers who want more detailed historical, political and feminist approaches to VDA will find the bibliography a good place to start. Meanwhile, Essick's close attention to details can be as fruitful for experienced Blake readers as it is excellent training for newer ones. If one follows the commentary, flipping back and forth among its readings, the pencil drawings from the Notebook, and one or more plates of Blake's text, even a reader familiar with this work is likely to notice something new or reconsider an earlier idea. This process can spur new observations even when Essick isn't pointing to them. For instance, when I turned back from the commentary to look at plate 7 again (instead of following the syntax of the sentence that runs from plates 6-7 in a printed text), the first four words of plate 7 and their punning relevance to the design just above really stood out. "Wave shadows of discontent" lies just beneath the picture of Oothoon, curving in a wave form above a huddled figure refusing to look up. Read aloud, the words sound like another voice encouraging her complaints against Bromion, Theotormon and the various oppressive systems they embody, a positive note in an otherwise gloomy situation. Other design details reinforce the slight note of hope. The huddled figure who chooses to be deaf and blind to her efforts (so probably Theotormon) is a closed, rigid rectangle except for the curve of the bowed head.
Although Oothon arcs over him, apparently imprisoned in one of his "black jealous" waves (5:4), the shape of her body is a half circle that never closes, and the wave itself tapers to the beginning of a dynamic S-curve at its tip. So Oothon's persistence in her "discontent" and continued struggles to articulate it to herself and others lead her to new insights. As Essick notes earlier, Oothon is changing. Her language reaches "a new level of critical consciousness" and is "moving toward ... a philosophy of mind" in the "They told me ..." speech that begins at 5:30 (48, 49); Oothon learns from her own efforts, as the other characters apparently do not.

Readers may also find themselves taking the lines of Essick's argument beyond the commentary. He calls our attention to the way facing pages (Blake's arrangement) interact visually, for example, and deftly sets up the suggestions of "lesbian sexuality" and other "transgressive" elements in the text and design of plate 3, "The Argument." Noting a page later that the two prostrate figures at the bottom of plate 4 are hard to identify with certainty, Essick observes the way these two figures echo the woman in The Nightmare and Bottom in The Awakening of Titanio, two famous paintings by Fuseli. If Essick's observations on plate 3 are still in mind, however, a reader might also see the paired figures on both plates as female. Each design contains one small and one large human figure (arranged large, small, small, large). The sex of the larger figure in plate 4 is not definite in this copy, and its position is a near mirror image of the woman on plate 6 whose flesh is being rent by an eagle (Ortooon, presumably). Interestingly, the smaller female figure on plate 4 is attached to a vine-like curve that echoes the curve of the vine on plate 3 from which rise "Leutha's flower" and the nymph that Oothon alternately sees (4:6).

So while any user of this edition might multiply disagreements with Essick's readings in the commentary, the point is that he is not performing the kind of close reading that simply substitutes a critic's text for the author's or for a reader/viewer's. This edition assembles so much for its audience to use, and the commentary leads them to hold so many things in consciousness at once, that multiple interpretations and ambiguities should inevitably arise, whether the commentary points them out or not. Whatever readers' critical assumptions are, Essick's "old-fashioned" method can be productive and even exhilarating, since it really aims to stimulate and support their independent observations and interpretations. Individuals can use all the parts of this edition to help them experience this beautiful and provocative illuminated book in new ways that would be difficult or impossible without it. The Blake Archive is an invaluable resource for us now. At the same time, interacting with a work that can be held in the hands differs from interactions with a work online, whether sensually, aesthetically or intellectually. So given the relatively affordable price for one of Blake's works in illuminated printing, teachers may want to give their students this experience in a Blake course or one on British literature, Romanticism or poetry. If an instructor had to select just one work of illuminated printing to order, Visions of the Daughters of Albion could provide a valuable introduction to Blake's work, especially in the 1790s, but also to issues and problems of the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary period in England and Europe, or to trends and experiments in literature and the visual arts in the late eighteenth century. Others will want this edition for personal pleasure and use. Either way, it deserves a wide audience.
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Reviewed by Dena Bain Taylor

In two companion volumes—"Wonders Divine": The Development of Blake's Kabballistic Myth and "Glorious incomprehensible": The Development of Blake's Kabballistic Language—Sheila A. Spector traces Blake's use of kabbalistic myth and language from his early prose tracts to his late prophecies. She argues that he gradually appropriated kabbalistic mythemes and linguistic manipulation, and that this is what enabled him to effect the transition from a conventional to a mystical mode of thought. Though the two books are structured in much the same way and advance the same overall argu-
ment, I intend to review them separately, for what is likely the same reason that Spector chose to divide them—the material is simply too complex to deal with all in one go.

Spector applies the principles of historical scholarship first developed by Gershom Scholem and others to her analysis of the kabbalistic texts and mythos. She has been doing solid work in this area for decades. Indeed, I wish her magisterial *Jewish Mysticism: An Annotated Bibliography on the Kabbalah in English* (New York: Garland Press, 1984) had been available when I wrote my dissertation on Blake and Kabbalah in the early '80s, and I have followed her subsequent publications with interest.

"Wonders Divine" pursues three goals: to explore the role of kabbalistic myth in Blake's work as the obverse of the Calvinist myth of Milton; to frame the discussion within a definition of myth as the precursor of intentionality; and to establish the kabbalistic context within which Blake worked. My feeling is that with respect to the first two goals, the book is beautifully argued and of major interest to Blake scholars. Its limits lie in the kabbalistic context it establishes.

In an early article in *Blake,* Spector pointed out that "we cannot apply Jewish scholarship to Blake's Kabbalah" (90); and that "Blake . . . had no access to anything other than the distorted interpretations of the Latin kabbalists; so it is to them, or English renditions of their works, that we must turn if we wish to determine the extent of kabbalistic influence on Blake" (96). I kept wishing she had followed her own advice more closely. The context of Kabbalah she establishes is primarily a Jewish one, whereas Blake's context is that of a dissenting Christian whose Christian sources mediated between him and the original texts.

For the Christian Kabbalah, Spector relies on Mercurius van Helmont's *Adunbratio Kabbale Christianae.* I questioned why she would emphasize van Helmont, a Latin text scarcely available to Blake, when statements by Crabb Robinson and Tatham suggest that he owned Law's translation of Boehme, with its glorious alchemical/kabbalistic designs after Freher. Certainly Blake knew it well and was influenced by it. I also felt Spector should have placed more emphasis on the connection between the Kabbalah and the Druid revival, and more generally on what she calls the "English Esoteric" (25).

Following Scholem, Spector defines Kabbalism, in the most basic sense, "as a unique combination of three distinct elements: esotericism, mysticism, and theosophy . . . [thematically associated with occult interpretations of Creation and Ezekiel's chariot vision]" (11). In fact, Spector's primary focus is on the Creation myth rather than the Chariot visions. She begins by describing the role of kabbalistic esotericism within the Jewish context, as a study restricted by the Talmud to an intellectual elite of "those specially trained to delve into what were considered to be its perilous secrets" (11). She distinguishes Jewish Kabbalah from the "globalized form of esoterica" (11) in which earlier writers on Blake as a kabbalist, like Ellis and Yeats, placed it. It seems to me, though, that there are good reasons why Yeats and the other Golden Dawn writers responded so strongly to Blake—they recognized him as belonging to the same esoteric tradition they did, and correctly placed him within it.

Spector defines myth as "the structuring principle of intentionality" (19): "More than just a simplistic duality of right and wrong, myth is the vehicle through which the mind can organize the external world, a necessary prerequisite for any kind of thought or action" (56). She develops this definition deftly through the text, demonstrating how Blake, like the kabbalistic mystics, engaged in a "quest for a non-dual mode of existence [that] is structured by theosophical speculations about the secret life of the Godhead" (12).

The kabbalistic mythos is exceedingly complex, and it is greatly to Spector's credit that she explains its themes so clearly. She takes them from the writings of Isaac Luria, the sixteenth-century Jewish mystic. Luria consolidated the kabbalistic myth of Creation into a form that reached the Christian world through a comprehensive, two-volume Latin translation by Christian Knorr von Rosenroth (1636-89) entitled *Kabbala Denudata.* Knorr's work, which contains van Helmont's *Adunbratio Kabbale Christianae,* has served as the principal source for all non-Jewish literature on the Kabbalah until the present day. Spector describes the central elements of the Lurianic Creation myth in her second chapter (40-44), explains van Helmont's adaptation of them (44-46), and amplifies and applies them throughout the text:

1. *The Work of Creation:* In contrast to the Miltonic myth of Creation, Fall, and Redemption, the Lurianic myth revolves around the three basic concepts of contraction (Creation), the breaking of the vessels (the Fall), and restoration (Redemption). The Godhead, *Ein Soph,* existed in the form of limitless light, in a passive state of unrealized potential. Because the *Ein Soph* is without limit, when the volition to create grew within Him, He had to contract *His* Being in order to produce a space in which to effect Creation. Into the resulting vacu-
um He emanated the ten Sefirot, divine lights or emanations, which He then used to create the external cosmos. Unlike the emanations of the Gnostic and Neo-Platonic systems, the Sefirot are not regarded as separate spheres interpolating between God and the created universe. They are a dynamic part of the divine life, a process which takes place in God. To counter the natural tendency of the Sefirot to reunite with the Godhead, He placed them in vessels of dross. Unfortunately, the act of contraction created an imbalance between the sefirotic forces of judgment and love, causing the vessels to break and the shards to mix with the lights of purity. Restoration can occur only as a result of the actions of Adam Kadmon and Adam Rishon.

2. The Cosmic Man: As they were emanated, the Sefirot organized into several different configurations, the first of which was Adam Kadmon (primordial man). He was originally intended to serve as an intermediary between the Godhead and Adam Rishon (created man). But in the fallen universe, Adam Kadmon must “separate the shards” of the vessels so that the lights of purity can rise again back to the Godhead. Adam Rishon must, by performing the 613 commandments of the Hebrew Bible and by sexual love, purify the souls of the fallen world and end the exile of the Shekhinah.

3. The Shekhinah: Like Blake’s Jerusalem, the Shekhinah is personified as the female manifestation of the Divine Presence. She is a part of the Godhead, but was separated from Him as a result of the Fall. At the final restoration, she will return from exile and the two will reunite.

4. The Origin of Evil: Where the exoteric Christian myth locates the source of the Fall in man’s disobedience of God’s law, the Kabbalists locate it within the Godhead Himself. Evil originated within the Godhead as the dark, wrathful principle of stern judgment which was tempered by the contrasting principle of love. Because of the Godhead’s initial act of self-limitation, this dark principle broke away from its contrary and finally from God altogether. Adam’s sin is believed to have extended history; that is, had he not eaten the forbidden fruit, the cosmos would have been restored immediately, without the necessity for a 6000-year cycle of material existence. Man’s efforts are necessary, not only for individual salvation, but for cosmic restoration as well.

5. The Four Worlds: Kabbalistic cosmogony conceives of four distinct levels, or worlds: Emanation (Blake’s Eden), Creation (Beulah), Formation (Generation), and Fact (Ulro). With the breaking of the vessels, the entire tenor of the four worlds was altered, and our world became corporeal.

6. The Tree of Life: After the Fall, the fragmented Sefirot were reconfigured into a dialectical format consisting of ten spheres arranged in three “columns.” The masculine right side is characterized by the divine attributes of mercy or pity, and the feminine left side by the attributes of rigor or wrath. The central column provides the means by which the two extremes can achieve balance.

Spector’s central argument is that Blake was able to liberate himself from the restrictions imposed by the exoteric myth of Christianity only by adopting these kabbalistic modes of thought. She identifies his pattern of development in this way:

[1] In the early prophecies, Blake introduced kabbalistic archetypes to recontextualize particular aspects of Christianity. But then, as his intellect evolved, in the minor prophecies, he structured whole narratives around kabbalistic concepts, until by the major prophecies, he had completely marginalized the Christian myth, reducing what had once been the primary structuring principle of his thought to but a small phase in the larger cycle of existence. (36)

Spector first discusses the appearance of kabbalistic elements in Blake’s early works, which she labels “pre-mythic”: All Religions are One. There is No Natural Religion [a] and [b], The Book of Thel, Tiriel, and Visions of the Daughters of Albion. These, she says, are examples of Blake’s early syncretism, and “overtly manifest influences as varied as the Greek classics and Osian, the Bible and Neoplatonism, each of the texts reflecting a serious interest in the subject of myth” (47). His approach in the prose works is to argue “in favor of an ur-myth from which all extant myths purportedly derived” and, in the three poems, to create “mythic narratives that undermine the basic doctrines of Milton’s theology as adumbrated in Paradise Lost” (47). Identifying Milton’s Calvinist doctrines as Original Sin, Ransom, and Eternal Damnation, she shows how The Book of Thel subverts the doctrine of Original Sin; Tiriel, the Ransom Theory; and Visions of the Daughters of Albion, Eternal Damnation (48-58). She concludes that the real lesson Blake learns from this sequence is that myth controls thought (59).

The second group Spector discusses consists of The Marriage of Heaven and Hell, Songs of Innocence and of Experience, America, and Europe. Here, Blake “directly confronts the structural principle upon which the [Miltonic] myth had been predicated, attempting through his doctrine of contraries to transform Milton’s debilitating duality into an energizing dialectic” (59). She argues that the Marriage is the most successful attempt to substitute contraries for the negations of Milton’s system. It serves as the vehicle for articulating the theoretical base, where the other three works represent decreasingly successful attempts to apply the theory. Thus, in Songs, Blake uses the contraries as a means to supplant Milton’s Original Sin with an esoteric “fortunate fall” into intellect. America introduces Orc, the “human form divine” supposed to convert the Miltonic Ransom Theory into a “liberation theology.” But in Europe, the Christ-figure Orc is unable to replace the Calvinist concept of Eternal Damnation with Eternal Life, and Blake is forced to create Los to begin the search for a resolution to the problems with myth.

In her discussion of the Marriage, Spector quickly dismisses Swedenborg’s role in Blake’s satire, claiming that it functions only on the literal level (60), and she doesn’t consider Boehme at all. I’d argue, however, that Blake engages with the Swedenborgian myth at more than superficial levels, and clearly
plays Boehme off against both Milton and Swedenborg, not as Spector suggests, Luria against Milton.

Lurianic Kabbalah was enjoying widespread study among Christians in the religious and intellectual freedom encouraged in Germany and Bohemia during most of Boehme’s lifetime, by world-shapers such as Rudolf II, Elizabeth of Bohemia, and Christian of Anhalt. Jews were able to study in relative peace, to share their knowledge, most notably the Kabbalah of Isaac Luria and Moses Cordovero, with interested Christians. Boehme couched his theosophy in alchemical and kabbalistic symbolism derived from Paracelsus and a group of Paracelsist friends that included Balthasar Walther, personal physician to Christian of Anhalt. The link between alchemy and Kabbalah is a distinguishing feature of the Marriage. Boehme’s alchemical vision touched Blake, the engraver working with his own corroding fires, and it was Boehme’s kabbalistic contraries that gave Blake his energizing dialectic.

The relationship in the Marriage among Blake, Boehme, and Swedenborg is a complex one. Désirée Hirst amusingly described Swedenborg as being “like some strange spiritual red herring” for Blake and others. In Swedenborg’s heaven and hell, the societies, numbers and quarters correspond exactly. God’s purpose in this is to have the spirits of hell and the spirits of heaven keep man in equilibrium by acting on either side of him. As long as the two sides are exactly matched in number, weight and measure, man has the freedom to choose between them, even though he is destined to evil. Blake shatters this structure of negation, arguing instead for the Behmian quality of eternal unresolution that Blake associates with freedom.

Though I wished Spector had focused more on Boehme and Swedenborg, I was impressed by her argument that the contraries would prove inadequate for Blake as a structural principle. As she points out,

in the absence of a fully conceived dialectic, Blake has only been able to reverse the polarity, now identifying the erstwhile good angels as oppositional forces, and the presumptively evil Satan as the means of attaining the highest good, vision. His own thought processes still seem controlled by a duality of good and evil. (65)

Spector says that Songs fails to construct a new mythic structure that “rejects the anti-intellectualism of innocence in favor of the active intelligence required for survival in the world of experience” (65). I’m not convinced here that Blake doesn’t in fact establish a kabbalistic understanding of the necessity for both states, an attitude which, for me, has always made “The Tyger” the most representative of the poems in Blake’s developing mythic structure. Spector offers the conventional interpretation of this poem, that “one should recognize in the tiger the power of a Creator capable of creating both him and the lamb” (72). Yet I’ve always read Blake’s tiger as representing the essence of God—not as a creation separate from the Godhead but as a sefirotic power manifesting His dark nature. As Boehme said in the Law edition known to Blake, “The Darkness is the greatest Enmity of Light, and yet it is the Cause that the Light is manifest: For if there was no Black, then White could not be manifest to itself; and if there was no Sorrow, then Joy also would not be manifest to itself.”8 Boehme defines evil as the dark and negative principle of wrath in God, infinitely bound with the qualities of mercy and love. The tiger is a reminder that the contraries form a sacred whole as long as each maintains its proper relationship to the others—in other words, as long as the tiger kills individual lambs but doesn’t try to exterminate all of them.

Spector’s discussion of America begins from the idea that Blake had yet to develop a means of applying the theory of contraries developed in the Marriage. She links Urizen with the sefirotic archetype of judgment that has become occluded by the belief that it is supreme, but she feels that Orc fails to counteract the excesses of rigorous judgment: “Orc performs the negative function of eliminating the opposition … but he does not postulate a positive outcome for the conflagration” (77). As a result, in Europe Blake seems to recognize that the exoteric Christian myth must be abandoned and begins to explore “obversive explanations for the relationship between reason and vision in the corporeal world” (78) based on the kabbalistic myth and, in particular, on the kabbalistic Adam Kadmon.

Spector shows how the next group of prophecies, The Song of Los, The Book of Urizen, The Book of Alasthan, and The Book of Los, revolve around the relationships between the prophet and the fallen world. They question why the rational faculty has superseded the visionary, and how the visionary faculty can regain its proper level of importance. However, because Blake is using the kabbalistic archetypes to distinguish between the incarnate visionary faculty and the external savior, and to explore the full dimensions of the christological faculty, there is a profusion of Christ figures. The confusion that results, Spector suggests, was quite possibly a significant factor in the shift from Vala to The Four Zoas, and was not to be resolved until Milnor and Jerusalem.

Without doubt, Spector’s discussion of the major prophecies is the most rewarding section of the book. Here, she shows that the various kabbalistic motifs Blake had been experimenting with evolve into a complex, multi-faceted myth whose archetypal structure provides the means of reconciling the two dilemmas he had been grappling with: ...: the function


of Christ and the role of the prophet in the fallen world .... Blake finally generates a myth in which the two poles of duality share an obversive relationship with each other [and which is] used as the connecting link between an anagogical realm and the completely different everyday reality of South Molton Street. Through the myth, these two planes—along with ancient biblical and British history, as well as contemporary social and political events—merge into a universal vision of becoming. (107)

In Vala/The Four Zoas, Spector shows, Original Sin is transformed into the Fortunate Fall; in Milton, Ransom becomes self-annihilation; and in Jerusalem, Eternal Death is the passage towards Eternal Life (110).

Though Spector mentions the "quantum leap" (107) Blake makes into the realm of epic prophecy, and in the evolution of his kabbalistic system, she loses the opportunity to bring in the context that made the leap possible—his three-year sojourn in Felpham and access to the library of William Hayley, which contained a number of occult works and kabbalistic interest. Hayley owned Dr. John Everard's The Divine Pymander of Hermes Trismegistus (1650), the Fourth Book of Occult Philosophy (1665), which is attributed to Agrippa, and Albertus Magnus's De Secretis Mulierum (1669). He owned Dryden's Poly-Olbion (1622) and Evans's Specimens of the Poetry of the Antient Welsh Bards (1764), both of which speak of a Druidical Kabbalah. He owned two major kabbalistic source works, Guillaume Postel's Alphabetum Variarum Linguarum: Postellus de origine Hebraicae Linguae (1598) and Gaffarel's Unheard-of Curiosities, 2 vols. (1650). He owned Josephus's Works in two editions (1683, 1720); Lowth's De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum (Oxford, 1763); his Translation of Isaiah (1778); and Parkhurst's Hebrew-English Lexicon (1799), which Blake certainly used to learn his Hebrew. Finally, Hayley owned Enfield's History of Philosophy (London: J. Johnson, 1791) and Maurice's seven-volume Indian Antiquities (1793-1800), both of which contain discourses on the Kabbalah, as well as the History of Count Gabalis (1714) by Montfaucon, a classic work on elemental and on the Kabbalah. Also around this time, Francis Barrett, a leading figure in the London occult community, published The Magus, or Celestial Intelligencer (1801), which made easily available in English texts of occult and kabbalistic lore that either had never been translated into English or had been issued in the seventeenth century and were now rare.

Blake's heightened understanding, Spector shows, begins to bear fruit in Vala/The Four Zoas, in which he transforms Edward Young's rambling series of meditations on religious orthodoxies into a kabbalistic ascent through the nine Nights and the nine corresponding Sefirot (111-28). Spector explains how kabbalistic mystics elevate their consciousness through meditation on the Sefirotic Tree, beginning with the Sefirot of existence in the corporeal world and ascending sequentially until the soul/consciousness awakens to eternal life in the highest sphere (110). In the earlier versions of the poem, she argues, the emphasis on the four zoas doesn't allow Blake to resolve the conflicting archetypal patterns within the Christianized version of Lurianic Kabbalah; that is, the linear progress from Creation through Apocalypse conflicts with the kabbalistic cycle of exile and return focused on the individual's recognition of a past error. The introduction of Albion as the Christ-like symbol of humanity allows Blake to consolidate the zoas into a single figure, subordinating them to "the overall interaction between Los and Albion, Adam Kadmon and Adam Rishon, macrocosm and microcosm" (131), and enabling the final breakthroughs of Milton and Jerusalem.

In Milton, Blake consolidates the roles of "upper" and "lower" man: interlaced with Los's actions as Adam Kadmon are Milton's as Adam Rishon. Further, on the Lurianic base (the fall into division of Adam Kadmon/Albion and the eventual reunification with the Shekhinah/Ololon and Jerusalem) he superimposes Merkavah mysticism (i.e., the descent of Ololon, Milton's emanation, that enables the poet's final ascent).


10. Boehme's adaptation of the Lurianic base would have been worth Spector's attention in relation to Blake's development of Adam Kadmon. Volume 3 of Law's edition includes a set of engravings of human figures, which occur infrequently elsewhere in the books. These figures have a Michelangelesque quality of graceful musculature; likely Blake had them in mind when he said of the figures to the Law edition that Michelangelo could have not done better. Like all of the figures in the Works, they were engraved by an unknown but accomplished engraver after J. C. Leuchter. Leuchter in turn had adapted them from diagrams by the German Behmenist Dionysius Andreas Freher, who lived in England the last thirty years of his life. The Three Tables use the human body as an expression of the original androgynous state of the primordial Adam and man's return to this state at the Redemption. Each of the Tables has a series of flaps or "Vails" that lift to unfold the development of man's spirit. The First Table begins with the World and the "First Adam's State of Integrity," by which Boehme means the androgynous union of the primordial man and the Virgin Sophia, his name for the Shekhinah. The Vails lift to show the Unfallen Man and finally the Creator, the Mysterium Magnum or kabbalistic En Soph. The Second Table reveals man in his Fallen state, in spiritual darkness, and the Third charts man's struggle to Redemption, revealing his gradual transformation into the Virgin Sophia and unity of body and spirit. On Freher and his designs to Boehme, see C. A. Muses, Illumination on Jacob Boehme: The Work of Dionysius Andreas Freher (New York: Columbia University Press/King's Crown Press, 1951).
Spector offers an interesting discussion of the illustration usually identified as “Milton’s Track,” in which a line represents the poet’s descent through the vortices. She provides a context for Blake’s design in van Helmont, with a mention of similar illustrations in Boehme and Thomas Burnet’s [Sacred] Theory of the Earth, though I would argue that other sources, such as Basnage and Enfield, should also have been included.11

Jerusalem is, as Spector says, a perfect poem from the kabbalistic perspective. Its focal point is Jerusalem, the Shekhinah, symbolizing Divine immanence, whose position is usurped by Vala as the representation of spirituality in the fallen world (140). Vala prevents Albion from perceiving the Divine Vision, while Los, the active manifestation of Adam Kadmon, labors at his furnace, metaphorically separating the shards “to prepare a context in which Albion will be able to rise again” (141). The third male figure, the visionary Blake, not only frames the action but provides its locus: “the entire narrative [comprises] his fourfold vision of existence, combining biblical history and current events, along with kabbalistic and British myth” (142). Structurally, the poem adapts the four-part kabbalistic cosmogony into “a narrative form in which Los and Albion actualize the kabbalistic cycle of existence.” Finally, Spector interprets Jerusalem’s four chapters (143–68) according to van Helmont’s four stages of the cosmic cycle (the Primordial Institution, the State of Destitution, the Modern Constitution, and the Supreme Restitution on the spiritual plane).

Spector ends her discussion with Jerusalem. In her summary of the book’s argument, however, she concludes with the insightful observation that Blake seems to have strongly identified the pattern of his own life with that of Job. Like Job, Blake retained his faith in the face of trials and losses, and, having survived his Satanic test, he comes to praise God and all his works. She comments briefly on the last plate (plate 21) of the Linell series of Illustrations of the Book of Job (1825) as a reflection of the balance restored to the cosmos, in which Job’s happily restored family stands between the two extremes of judgment and mercy. Spector could have gone further with this, and looked at the ways in which Blake’s mature visual art unself-consciously incorporates both Tree of Life and Chariot themes.12

The section on Milton provides the book’s best discussion of Chariot mysticism as a theme in Blake’s work. Other uses of Chariot mysticism that Spector could have focused on include the Dante drawings and his very late drawings for the Book of Genesis and The Book of Enoch.13

Spector also misses the chance to show us the poet in fruitfully kabbalistic exchange with the dissenting and Druid groups of his own acquaintance, those who formed what Spector calls the “English Esoterica” (25). In the seventeenth century, the Kabbalah had been an integral part of the occult/political Rosicrucian movement. In Blake’s time, the old “sciences” in new guises were still attractive, and important in several circles with which Blake was connected: the English Behmenists and Swedenborgians14 occultists in secret societ-

11. Jacques Basnage’s History of the Jews, From Jesus Christ To The Present Time, translated by Thomas Taylor the Cambridge Platonist (London: J. Beaver and B. Linton; R. Knapsotch; J. Sprayt; A. Bell, R. Smith, and J. Round, 1708), was the most complete and accurate eighteenth-century history and commentary on the Kabbalah. In describing Merkavah mysticism, Basnage gives an account of the descent of Souls through the Vortex of the four worlds:

All the Souls, without excepting the Messiah’s, were created at the beginning of the World. The World in its original state was Diaphanous, and separated into many Vortices... The World, or this great Vortex, was divided into unequal parts; whereof one is called Aziluthical, another Briathical, the third is the Jasethical World, and the least of all is the Asiathical. All the Souls were at first included in the superior Aziluthick World, but they were clad with some kind of Body. These Souls were subject to various Revolutions, and were to pass into the four Vortices, or Worlds before mentioned. (187-2-188.1.)

In addition, William Enfield’s The History of Philosophy, from the Earliest Periods: Drawn up from Brucker’s Historia Critica Philosophiae (London: J. Johnson, 1791), which is based on Basnage and which Blake would have seen in Hayley’s library, provides an illustration similar to the one in van Helmont that Spector emphasizes. In Enfield, a line representing Adam Kadmon cuts through the ten sefirotic circles.

12. In the Job series, for example, the more restful balance represented in the final plate is the obverse of the dynamic representation of the Tree of Life in plate 2. In that plate, two contrary pillars of cloud and fire frame the central scene, in which a pillar of figures spiraling upwards is flanked by two pillars of rising figures. God occupies the highest position in the middle pillar, with Satan in the center, and Job at the bottom. An open book of Laws lies on God’s knees, and his right hand points downward to Job, who also holds a book of Laws. Satan’s limbs extend at the diagonal, a spiral dynamic that links and vitalizes the upper and lower spheres.

13. The Book of Enoch was one of the most important of the early apocalyptic Merkavah texts. Very little of the voluminous output of the Merkavah mystics was translated from the Hebrew or Aramaic and made available to Christian Europe, but in 1821 the first English translation of The Book of Enoch was published. The resurrection by Richard Laurence of what had been one of the most influential prophecies of the early Christian period created surprisingly little stir. Blake, however, responded to it with a series of vigorous preliminary pencil drawings, of which we have six. Even in their rough state, they show the enthusiasm he felt. The history of The Book of Enoch and the circumstances of its publication in 1821 are given in G. E. Bentley, Jr., “A Jewel in an Ethiope’s Ear,” Blake in His Time, ed. Robert N. Essick and Donald Pearce (London and Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978) 213-40; and Allan R. Brown, “Blake’s Drawings for the Book of Enoch,” The Burlington Magazine 77 (September 1940): 80-85; rpt. in The Visionary Hand: Essays for the Study of William Blake’s Art and Aesthetics, ed. Robert N. Essick (Los Angeles: Hennessey & Ingalls, 1973) 105-16. For details of the meager response to Laurence’s translation, see Bentley, “Jewel in an Ethiope’s Ear” 216-17.

14. In addition to his direct involvement with the Swedenborgian Church, Blake likely had associations through his friend William Sharp with a considerable variety of Behmenists and Swedenborgians. The Reverend Richard Clarke (1719-1802), for example, was a Hebraist and a student of the Kabbalah, and in addition had some serious acquaintance with alchemy. Clarke engaged in public controversy with Joseph Priestley and Thomas Paine. He was a very colorful character, and his concern for social justice made him a well-known figure in London among people interested, like Blake, in Boehme, Law, and Swedenborg. See Hirst 246-63, 271-76; E. P. Thompson, Witness Against the Beast: William Blake and the Moral Law (New York: The New Press, 1993) 47-48.
15. Though the religious solidarity and middle-class sensibilities of English Freemasonry would hardly have appealed to Blake, the remarkable surge in mystical Masonry of the late eighteenth century surely would. These groups sought a spiritual regeneration for the world through "true science and true reason," by which they meant alchemy, Kabbalah, mesmerism, Swedishborgian spirituality, and the Bible. See Clarke Garrett, Respectable Folly: Millenarians and the French Revolution in France and England (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975) 99. For example, the Aviron Society, an offshoot of mystical Masonry, supported Richard Brothers and believed in the regeneration of the world through revolution. They derived this belief from a system of kabbalistic numerology they called "the Holy Word" (Leslie Tannenbaum, Biblical Tradition in Blake's Early Prophecies: The Great Code of Art [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982] 17). William Bryan, who published testimonies of his belief in Richard Brothers, was a leader of the Aviron Society and at one time or another was interested in practically every aspect of late eighteenth-century occult, mystical and pseudo-scientific inquiry. He was close friends with William Sharp, through whom Blake could have met him, and with their mutual friend Thomas Duchsé, a talented painter and son of the Rev Jacob Duchsé (Garrett 176), whose sermons were influenced by both Boehme and Swedenborg, and whose Discourses on Various Subjects (1779) Blake owned (G. E. Bentley, Jr., The Stranger from Paradise: A Biography of William Blake [New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001] 126). Even if Blake did not come in contact with the Aviron Society through the tirelessly sociable Sharp, he could have read a denunciation of them in the Swedenborgian Church's New Jerusalem Magazine for April 1790, where they are derided as "the Antipodes of the New Church, erected on the very borders of Babylon."

16. Many groups of Dissenters mixed the same fervor for spiritual regeneration and belief in the esoteric with political radicalism, and Blake had definite affinities with antinomian millenialist groups. The Ancient Deists of Hoxton, for example, were actively involved with occult and mystical traditions, and spoke of conversations with angels and departed spirits (see William Hamilton Reid, The Rise and Dissolution of the Infidel Societies in This Metropolis Including The Origin of Modern Deism and Atheism; The Genius and Conduct of Those Associations; Their Lecture-Rooms, Field-Meetings, and Deputations; From the Publication of PAINE'S AGE OF REASON till the present Period [London: J. Hatchard, 1800]). Like Blake, too, many of these new converts to the dissenting sects were London craftsmen, whose training in the sects, with their egalitarian and rebelvist, Messianic rituals, led them to embrace Jacobin and radical political ideas at the outbreak of the French Revolution. See E. P. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class (1963; rpt. New York: Vintage-Random House, 1966) 51-53; and George Rudé, History of London: Hanoverian London, 1714-1808 (London: Secker & Warburg, 1971) 114. On Blake's affinities with these groups, see M. H. Abrams, Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1971) 51-55; Garrett 147; Christopher Hill, Milton and the English Revolution (New York: Viking, 1978) 467-69; A. L. Morton, The Everlasting Gospel: A Study in the Sources of William Blake (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1958) passim; Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class 41, 50-52; Thompson, Witness Against the Beast passim.

17. Writers like Thomas Maurice or any of the writers on the Druids found a primordial Christian Kabbalah at the heart of all the religious mysteries of the world. Numerous antiquaries held that the deepest Druidic mysteries were really the secret Kabbalah given to Adam by God. The Reverend Evan Evans, for example, spoke about a "Druidical Cabbala," in his Some Specimens of the Poetry of the Antient Welsh Bards (London, 1764) 18, and there was a copy of Evans's work in Hayley's library (Munby 119).

In sum, "Wonders Divine" offers a brilliant explication of the kabbalistic pattern of Blake's development: from his early use of Kabbalah to liberate himself from the restrictions imposed by the exoteric myth of Christianity to his full retelling, in the major prophecies, of Adam Kadmon/Albion's fall into division and eventual reunification with the exiled Shekhinah/Jerusalem. More, the book firmly establishes the Kabbalah as the structuring principle of Blake's cosmogony and theosophy, in which the Christian myth is transformed into only part of a larger cycle of existence. I believe, though, that the next step is to link Blake's Kabbalah more firmly with the Christian esoteric tradition.

There were several other antiquarian writers whose works on the Druids Blake would have known: Henry Rowlands, William Stukeley, Rowland Jones, Edward Williams, William Owen (Pughe), and Peter Roberts. Like Blake, they believed that the Druids and the Patriarchs shared a common kabbalistic religion and language.

From very similar designs in Rowlands (1723, 1766) and Stukeley (1740), Blake derived the visual context for his "Joseph of Arimathea among the Rocks of Albion," in which Blake made his Joseph into a Druid (see Dena Bain Taylor, "The Visual Context of Joseph of Arimathea among the Rocks of Albion," Blake/An Illustrated Quarterly 20.2 [fall 1986]: 47-48).

Edward Williams (Iolo Morganwg, 1747-1826), the indefatigable Welsh poet, lexicographer, and enthusiastic forger of both poetry and historical evidence, claimed to have documentary evidence of the original "Patriarchal Religion of ANCIENT BRITAIN." See Edward Williams, Poems, Lyric and Pastoral (London, 1794) II: 194; quoted in A. L. Owen, The Famous Druids (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962) 73. Williams was a close friend of Blake's friend William Owen (Pughe), and Blake may have attended Druid rituals on Primrose Hill with them both. (See Dena Taylor, "A Note on William Blake and the Druids of Primrose Hill," Blake/An Illustrated Quarterly 17.3 [winter 1983-84]: 104.)


Reviewed by KATHLEEN LUNDEEN

Nick Rawlinson reveals the impetus for William Blake's Comic Vision to be "a simple hunch" that he and other readers enjoy Blake, in part, because he is a comic writer (vii). Notwithstanding E. D. Hirsh's long-ago observation that Blake is the most humorous of the romantics, classifying the man behind the scaring eyes of the familiar portraits as a comic writer may seem a bit of a stretch. Rawlinson challenges any incredulity by showing the abundance of comedy in Blake and the significance of its function, and in so doing he allows us to hear Blake in a different key. His book proves to be more than an inventory of the comic elements in Blake.
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however. It is an intriguing argument that comedy is Blake's vehicle for vision.

Initially, Rawlinson situates Blake in the comic tradition by way of a particular definition of comedy. At the outset of his argument, he stipulates: "Comedy deflates pretensions, disrupts patterns, and lurks behind the façade of reality to prove that reality to be false. But it goes beyond deconstruction because it insists on a meaning even in meaninglessness—and 'always meaning' leads to God" (3). Fundamental to comedy is its role of unmasking imposters, as Rawlinson contends, but the reality it reveals is typically more literal and far less sublime than the one created by pretense. Comic elements often lead to mayhem rather than meaning, and to Godot instead of God. Nevertheless, as Rawlinson argues in this book, comedy in Blake's early poems has a serious function.

Rawlinson's study calls out of the shadows poems of Blake that are often bypassed for the "essential" Blake, the long, obscure prophetic works. Blake's early poems, ranging from the Poetical Sketches to the Songs of Innocence and of Experience, are well served by viewing them through a comic lens. Rawlinson deftly shows in these poems how Blake introduces comic elements to challenge everything from social structure to empiricism. He argues, for example, that "Tiriel is not just a generalized attack on tyranny but Blake's next attempt to offer a comic alternative to materialist aesthetics" (90); and of the Songs, he writes, "Characterized by a recurrent contrast between sentimental pastoral and satirical urban viewpoints and with a wealth of social voices, they display both wisefoolish and knavish readings of contemporary society" (172).

By foregrounding the comic and carnivalesque motifs in Blake, Rawlinson checks a tendency to read him as an austere mystic. One of the pleasures this study offers the reader is the opportunity to engage Blake's early poems in what seems to be their natural element. Within a comic context they appear unusually vibrant and substantial, so much so that some of the poems seem ekphrastic, as if Blake has breathed life into Hogarthian illustrations. Their affinity with eighteenth-century illustrations, according to this book, is not accidental. In a short history of comedy in England, Rawlinson shows how rich and various that tradition is in both its literary and graphic manifestations, documenting how Blake draws generously on the comic tradition: "By participating in the contemporary use of satiric imagery and style, Blake was able to de-mystify political, religious and social authority" (215). But he also shows how Blake exploits the tradition for nontraditional purposes: "Blake's use of carnival imagery is a challenge to the increasing inwardness and separation implicit in the work of Bacon, Newton, Locke, Hume, Hobbes and Descartes. It leads us, jokingly, back to the Divine Humanity" (216). Though most of the poems Rawlinson examines do not have a prophetic function, he contends that their teleology is vision, which he defines in Blakean fashion as "a matter of seeing beyond material existence to eternal truths" (13). He elaborates on this point, arguing that comedy, to Blake, was "a poetics of reading that was both an artistic and social practice." He then explains: "By using puns, wordplay and absurd humour he tried to disrupt the sense that language conveys a material reality (in the sense of a set of rules and laws external to the self) and to reinforce the importance of the reader in creating meaning" (215).

Earlier in the book Rawlinson elaborates on his call for "a new poetics of reading," arguing that it is necessary if we are to read the comic elements of Songs of Innocence and of Experience "in a spiritual, positive way" (171). In his commentary on the Songs, he proposes a specific way for reading those comic elements: "It is significant that carnival echoes appear at those moments in the Songs that critics have concentrated on as showing the positive elements of play and imagination. Carnival is also notably absent from some of the songs where the speaker's viewpoint seems hopelessly limited" (180-81). Though the simplicity of the Songs creates the illusion that they conform to symbolic and iconographic codes, two centuries of Blake criticism testify to their elusiveness. Rawlinson's binary sounds reasonable, but in practice it does not address the complexities of the Songs. In "Introduction" to Songs of Innocence, for example, Blake creates a carnivalesque scene of a piper and airborne child, but their imaginative play, arguably, leads away from vision. As the multi-talented piper/singer/writer "stain[s] the water clear," the poem itself gradually moves from the free-floating particules in the opening lines to rote, monolithic syntax. In his analysis of the Songs, Rawlinson further argues that "Wherever it appears, humour in the Songs is usually aimed at provoking an alternative reading" (181). Since humor in literature almost always provokes an alternative reading, one may conclude from Rawlinson's observation that Blake uses humor in the Songs in a mundane way—a conclusion that is counterintuitive to any reader of Blake. The sheer pervasiveness of the comic and carnivalesque in the Songs, which Rawlinson aptly notes, tantalizes one to inspect those features more carefully to see how they participate in those sly poetic epigrams.

Though most of Rawlinson's study addresses Blake's literary art, he devotes one chapter to his graphic art. In a move parallel to his analysis of Blake's poetry, he argues that Blake introduces comic elements into his visual art to serve both conventional and unconventional purposes. He points out that Blake, like many comic illustrators of his day, creates visual puns, caricatures, and carnivalesque motifs to satirize social and political institutions; but he further proposes that Blake incorporates comic elements to advance a larger vision. Sometimes these two objectives coalesce, as he demonstrates in his analysis of Blake's 1795 color printed drawing of Nebuchadnezzar. In the illustrations of other artists, the biblical king is presented as an epitome of all political leaders who are humbled by their own hubris. Blake's portrait carries that political dimension, but, Rawlinson contends, through Nebuchadnezzar's crouched posture and beastly claws Blake correlates his humiliating predicament to the doctrine of the
fearful sublime. “At a stroke,” Rawlinson states, “Blake has linked visionary and aesthetic failings with the dominion of oppressive kingship” (198).

Rawlinson’s most extensive analysis is saved for An Island in the Moon. His enthusiasm for the unpublished satire is almost evangelical: “[I]nside this apparently random concoction of prose, song and slapstick, with its eccentric mix of real and imaginary characters that read like the cast list of an absurd farce, lies an extraordinary, almost dazzling examination of the relationship between our habits of reading and the society they produce” (99). He further extols the work by declaring it “a masterclass in the development of the satirical style” (99) and “nothing less than a degree course in comic Vision” (100). An Island,” he writes, “is Blake’s attempt to produce a theatrical experience, a comic education in how to read. This marvellous text is so dense that perhaps the best way to approach it is to treat it as if it were a carnival procession; first having a look at the cast and then discussing each episode sequentially, before summarising the action as a whole” (104). And elsewhere he describes An Island as “an important and valuable work, an extensive comic education that explores the inter-relationship of language, society and God” and calls it “Blake’s first attempt to produce a new form of literary expression.

part playscript, part performance, part experimental novel” (161). Few critics have given An Island such a prominent place in Blake’s body of work, but Rawlinson’s argument is convincing (or his exuberance is contagious). An Island does, indeed, seem to be a culmination of Blake’s comic efforts, and, as Rawlinson’s rhetoric urges, it deserves to frequent more undergraduate syllab.

Rawlinson’s readings of Blake are by and large rewarding. His thesis is nevertheless problematic in one respect. Whether or not Blake is a comic writer and artist depends, naturally, on how one defines “comedy.” In Rawlinson’s study, “comedy” is a rather flexible term. As noted earlier, it is sometimes defined broadly as anything ironic or festive, while at other times it assumes a very particular definition, requiring a moral teleology. Running into problems of genre may be unavoidable since (in the words of a former professor of mine) Blake “displaces too much water” to fit comfortably into any literary tradition. Yet Rawlinson’s observation that Blake creates “a new form of literary expression” invites us to approach the problem in another way. Blake, in his contrary manner, produces proph- ecies that are carnivalesque and burlesque poems that have philosophical weight, each type of poetry gravitating toward the other. In effect, he deconstructs the profane/profane binary, opting for a hybrid genre in which that oppositional friendship might flourish.

Toward the end of his study Rawlinson invites other critics to examine the comic and carnivalesque characteristics in Blake’s prophetic poetry. If we extrapolate from the argument Rawlinson presents in this study, we might suspect that Blake introduces comedy into his prophecies also in the service of vision, perhaps giving it the specific function of critiquing the institutionalized ways of reading prophecy, which militate against visionary reception. Then, again, Blake is not above self-mockery, which suggests alternatively that he introduces comedy into the prophecies capriciously to check any essentializing tendencies. To discover whether Blake charges the carnivalesque characters in his later work with a prophetic function or simply enlists them to snicker on the sidelines would require us to take another critical journey—one that exceeds the itinerary of this study, but one for which Rawlinson has provided a topographical map of Blake’s comic terrain.