the colonies ship American rattlesnakes to London to balance their unwilling importation of British felons. I would have wished Messrs. Cervantes and Sill to include two contemporary publications often attributed to Defoe which, whether or not he wrote them, explore many of the same themes as *Colonel Jack*: the 1728 *Street-Robberies Consider'd* (they include just a snippet) and *Lives of Six Notorious Street Robbers* (1726). Room might have been made by omitting Robert Southey's 1797 Botany Bay eclogue ''Elinor,'' which belongs to a far different literary and geographical milieu than Defoe's novel. That quibble aside, Messrs. Cervantes and Sill have produced a scrupulous and richly annotated edition suited to both classroom and scholarly use. It is very good to have *Colonel Jack* back in circulation.

Hal Gladfelder *University of Manchester*

Approaches to Teaching the Novels of Henry Fielding, ed. Jennifer Preston Wilson and Elizabeth Kraft. New York: MLA, 2015. Pp. xii + 244. $24.00.

Back when I was preparing to teach one of my first upper-division courses, I asked an eminent senior scholar for advice on teaching *Tom Jones*. I was full of questions: How should I break it up and over how many class meetings? Did any threads go over particularly well? Any ideas for assignments that would encourage students both to keep up with the reading and to explore their own lines of interest? To my surprise, he told me that he had never taught the novel, certainly not to undergraduates. *Joseph Andrews*, sometimes paired with *Shamela*, taught so well, was much shorter, complemented *Pamela*, and introduced basically the same major concepts and ideas. His reasons were sound, but nevertheless I forged on and taught *Tom Jones*—figuring it out as I went along—and I am glad I did. My students loved it (or hated it with an engaged and well-grounded passion); the heft of the book anchored the course; and I received some of my best student writing on the questions it raised.

Still, I could have used this wide-ranging teaching companion, edited by Mss. Wilson and Kraft, back then—and I venture to add that my senior colleague would also have found it useful. One of the challenges of editing a volume in the MLA Approaches series is the diversity of its projected audience, which can include both new and veteran educators, scholars and generalists, faculty teaching surveys or thematically organized courses, and those preparing in-depth, even single-author, courses. The collection confronts this challenge admirably well, offering essays that cover a variety of methodologies and areas of focus across Fielding's fiction, organized into three sections: *Joseph Andrews; Tom Jones*; and *Shamela, Jonathan Wild*, and *Amelia*. This is straightforward, and the few questions I had (Might a more robust, stand-alone section on drama have been helpful? Should *Joseph Andrews* and *Shamela* be paired, since they are so often taught, and published, together?) were not pressing enough to detract from my appreciation of the collection.

As anyone who has read through a stack of teaching philosophies can attest, writing lucidly and engagingly about pedagogy is no easy task and one at which mounting professionalization rarely trains us to excel. The best essays in the collection are those that are specific and honest about the author's teaching choices, the motivations behind them,

and their results. Leigh C. Dillard's contribution on the book history context of Fielding's novels (focusing primarily on illustration) is exemplary in its inclusion of annotated assignment descriptions, as is Lisa Maruca's, which uses Fielding's contributions to the "*Pamela* media event" to encourage students to think critically about mediation both in their use of resources such as ECCO and in the production of their own multimodal resources. Pamela S. Bromberg makes a compelling case for defying chronology and beginning an eighteenth-century novel course with *Tom Jones*; similarly, Manushag N. Powell convinces with a rousing defense of *Jonathan Wild*'s flexibility across the curriculum. Even those essays that attempt to place us inside the classroom make explicit the careful choices involved in even the most open-ended discussions: Ms. Kraft's contribution deftly leads the reader through a classroom conversation about Fielding's critical views on governance, highlighting not only the key questions she asks and passages to which she draws attention, but also her sense of the pacing at which she aims. I also appreciated those essays (Stephen C. Behrendt, "Teaching Fielding's Idea of the Novel with *Joseph Andrews*," is a standout) that were most explicit in characterizing the author's institution and student body. This is not to say that when planning survey courses for the commuting nonmajors at my large, urban institution I cannot benefit from the insights of my colleagues teaching specialized courses in liberal arts schools, but such information is nevertheless useful in anticipating necessary adjustments.

Ms. Wilson's preface frames the volume by invoking Fielding as an "experimental writer"; this sentiment returns again and again in the essays, as contributors in the main capture a dynamic, even a shape-shifting, Fielding. Whether by editorial design or serendipity, some of the juxtapositions were amusing and quite energizing. Take Nancy A. Mace and Scott Black, whose back-to-back essays disagree emphatically on the utility of calling Fielding a "novelist." Mr. Black's animated essay also pairs nicely with Adam Potkay's on "*Joseph Andrews* and the European Novel": both offer thoughtful suggestions for reading lists that take Fielding to *Don Quixote* and beyond (both consider the influence on Milan Kundera, for example), providing some welcome defamiliarization for instructors wanting to vary their syllabi. It was also helpful to see multiple contributors tackle the same basic pedagogical question from different directions, for example, Anthony J. Hassall and Rivka Swenson, who reflect on ensuring that students do not skip the narrator's interpolated theoretical discussions in *Tom Jones*.

A minority of weaker essays take the form of compressed lectures, usually of a more historicist bent, with little attention to explicitly pedagogical concerns. This approach might be useful for some readers, especially those new to Fielding, but I found it largely misguided for this volume, especially since other introductory volumes (such as the *Cambridge Companion to Henry Fielding*) allow contributors more space and scope for providing context, background, and grounding in the substantial critical tradition. More detail about instruction would have better fulfilled the supposed purpose of a title in the MLA "Teaching" series. Indeed, most of the essays could have benefited from more concrete pedagogic specificity. How exactly do contributors who invoke that time-honored skill, close reading, actually guide students toward doing it well? And while many contributors connected Fielding's novels to those of other novelists and theorists, I found myself wanting more insight into their choices. For instance, Bakhtin comes up again and again (in different guises): do the writers have students read full essays (say, "Epic and Novel")?

Just excerpts? Or are Bakhtin's ideas introduced in lectures? No one picks up a teaching companion like this looking for a how-to manual, but I admit to a healthy fascination with my colleagues' strategies and tricks-of-the-trade. Distancing oneself enough from one's instructional methods to enable a careful description of them may be a first step not only toward guiding the teaching methods of others but also of improving one's own.

Overall, this volume will prove valuable to a range of scholars approaching the challenges of teaching Fielding's novels. The wide range of contributions means there is something surprising for even the expert instructor. It will more than repay a leisurely review while planning next semester's courses, but I also recommend keeping it on hand for those days when one might need a bit of pedagogical inspiration.

Stephanie Insley Hershinow *Baruch College, City University of New York*

MICHAEL GAVIN. *The Invention of English Criticism 1650–1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 2015. Pp. vii + 220. $30 (paper).

Michael Gavin offers an incisive study of a boundless concept: criticism. Where scholars usually take criticism to mean writing that evaluates literature, this account conceives of its topic broadly as the ''socially realized exercise of judgment.'' In seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England, criticism sprouted within and outside writing: in prefaces, prologues, and periodical essays, as well as coffee-house chatter, stage heckling, and coterie manuscript exchange. In addition, those who commandeered these outlets often addressed topics beyond belles lettres and became controversial arbiters for determining what qualified as literary expression in the first place. Drawing on the insights of book history, *The Invention of English Criticism* aims neither to redraw the boundaries of early modern critical discourse nor to contain criticism within catchy definitions, undertakings to which the field has proven historically resistant. Rather, the goal is to understand what critics actually did. Behind Dryden's idealization of criticism as a ''standard of judging well,'' Mr. Gavin reveals a world rife with personal quarrels, public skepticism, and self-doubt. English critics struggled to construct their authority to judge, and to answer questions that still haunt their modern counterparts: is criticism a true field of knowledge? What does it contribute to society? Why has critical enterprise seemed always so fraught, at once ''vitally important'' and ''horribly wrong''?

Mr. Gavin asks how criticism became ''recognized as a mode of writing,'' not how it graduated into a stable genre that helped solidify bourgeois English culture into a public sphere. As such, he revels in the messiness of criticism's origins without presupposing its eventual legitimatization as an authoritative discourse. Indeed, his account questions whether criticism ever achieved such a victory, arguing that the field's ''undisciplined past illuminates its ambivalent, contested, and never fully disciplined present.'' *Invention* rejects singular narratives of generic evolution to foreground a seventeenth-century ''media shift,'' through which a hodgepodge of speech acts and scribal forms converged on print as their primary vehicle. Mr. Gavin labels this shift the ''textualization of judgment,'' and argues that it held important ramifications for the public's perception of critics. Initially regarded as outspoken scolds, critics were later seen as polemic pamphleteers, and