

Radical Enlightenment: The Strange Power of Constantin de Volney's *Les Ruines, ou, révolutions des empires* (1791)

Alex Watson

Introduction: *Les Ruines*' Strange Power

In Constantin-François Chassebeuf de Volney's *Les Ruines, ou, révolutions des empires* (1791; English translation 1792) a narrator wanders through ancient ruins and comes across a 'Genius' who takes him into outer space, presenting him with a vision of all the peoples of the world rejecting religion in favor of 'the principles of individual happiness and of public prosperity'.¹ For contemporary readers, *Les Ruines* is an obscure, even strange work. In *The Gothic Sublime* (1994), Vijay Mishra labels it 'odd', adding that it is '[o]ne of the disturbing books of the revolutionary period'.² And a 2008 blogger described it as 'one of the strangest in the genre, and a good example of just how bizarre Revolution-era books could be'.³ In large part, *Les Ruines* consists of long-winded descriptions of massive ruined landscapes and bombastic philosophical disputation. Moreover, it is a bewildering collision of different genres: medieval dream vision; radical tract; atheist or deist polemic; travel-report; science-fiction novel; universal history. While it addresses the implications of the 1789 French Revolution, it is set in Palmyra, Lebanon in 1784. And, for 'a key text of "revolutionary atheism"',⁴ it is surprisingly evangelical in tone. As I will explain, particularly jarring is Volney's use of ruins — an eighteenth-century icon of mortality and civilizational decline — as a symbol of revolutionary utopianism.

Nonetheless, when the first English translation of the French original was published in 1792, it was a literary phenomenon. According to Robert Irwin, 'everybody read this book. It was a bestseller and talk of the salons, spas and gaming rooms'.⁵ The socialist British historian E. P. Thompson describes how,

‘during the mid-1790s . . . master craftsmen, shopkeepers, engravers, hosiers, printers . . . carried [*The Ruins*] around with them in their pockets’, adding that the republication of *Les Ruines* in cheap pocket-book form and single-chapter tracts ensured that it ‘remained in the libraries of many artisans of the nineteenth century’.⁶ The ‘Dialogue’ between the ‘People’ and the ‘Privileged Class’ featured in chapter fifteen was reprinted in extract by such well-known radicals as Daniel Isaac Eaton, the pseudonymous ‘Anthony Pasquin’ and Thomas Spence,⁷ and may even have influenced plate sixteen of William Blake’s *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* (1790–3).⁸ And the republication of this section was one of the charges for which the Scottish radical Thomas Muir was convicted for seditious treason and transported to Sydney Cove, Australia in 1794.⁹ Moreover, the impact of the English translation of *Les Ruines* is demonstrated by the significant number of titles dedicated to refuting it: William Cockburn’s *Remarks on a Publication of M. Volney called ‘The Ruins’* (1804); Frederick Nolan’s *Fragments of a Civick Feast, Being a Key to M. Volney’s ‘Ruins’* (1819); and William Anthony Hails’ *Remarks on Volney’s ‘Ruins’* (1825).¹⁰

Volney’s work also had an important influence on the politics and culture of the English-speaking world. His religious skepticism and his preoccupation with the decline of ancient empires led him to be compared frequently to the English historian Edward Gibbon, whose monumental six-volume *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776–88) traced the trajectory of Western civilization from the height of the Roman empire to the fall of Byzantium and challenged orthodox accounts of early Christian history. Volney and Gibbon were, for instance, described as a ‘double battery’¹¹ by the radical preacher Joseph Priestley. Moreover, as an outspoken revolutionary and a member of the French National Assembly (the representative body whose break with the king, nobles and clergy signaled the beginning of the French Revolution) Volney had an obvious appeal for British radicals. According to Marilyn Butler, ‘Godwin and Shelley were among Volney’s English followers; the poets Blake, Landor, and Savage established his impressive place in English poetry’.¹² In Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* (1818), *Les Ruines* is the book that Felix De Lacey reads to the Arabian Sophia in order to teach her his language, inadvertently also educating the Creature in the ways of mankind.

Volney's influence also spread rapidly to America, following his extended stay in the country between 1795 and 1797. The Founding Father Thomas Jefferson attempted a translation,¹³ and the text absorbed the young Abraham Lincoln.¹⁴ The American poet Walt Whitman acknowledged *Ruins* as a formative influence, describing it as '[one] of the books on which I may said to be raised'.¹⁵

In this article, I will show that, if we place the English translation of *Les Ruines* in its historical context, we can better appreciate why this peculiar text exerted such a powerful hold on the imaginations of so many different people. I will begin by sketching *Les Ruines*' status within eighteenth-century 'ruin' literature, before outlining its contribution to late-eighteenth century debates about politics and religion. In the conclusion, I examine the immediate reception of the English translation of *Les Ruines*, arguing that this strange text achieved considerable importance due to the ambivalent implications of Volney's use of ruins as a symbol for his own radical, skeptical, imperialist ideas.

Ruins, Radicalism and Religion

Les Ruines is perhaps best known as the literary culmination of the eighteenth-century vogue for ruins: Michael Makarius, for instance, claims that 'the idea of the ruin as a fecund source of meditation here [in *Les Ruines*] attains its most exhaustive expression'.¹⁶ During this period, it was common for English noblemen to construct artificial ruins in their gardens. Artists such as Giovanni Paolo Pannini, Hubert Robert and Giovanni Battista Piranesi created famous images of ruins. And, in the work of such 'graveyard poets' as Robert Blair, John Dyer and Edward Young, ruins were used frequently as sites for meditations on mortality and the folly of ambition. In keeping with this tradition, in *Les Ruines*, Volney describes a solitary figure traversing ancient ruins, taking an almost erotic delight in the saddening thoughts provoked by them. In the 'Invocation' at the beginning of the volume, he hails 'solitary ruins', claiming 'your aspect . . . excites in my heart the charm of delicious sentiments-sublime contemplations' (1). Where Volney innovates is in his use of these images of the mighty fallen as a stimulus for political theorising. He proclaims: 'I will ask of the ashes of legislators, *by what secret causes do empires rise and fall; from what sources spring the prosperity and misfortunes of nations;*

on what principles can the peace of society, and the happiness of man be established? (13)

As this comment suggests, for Volney, ruins are instruments of moral and philosophical instruction. He urges the reader: ‘interrogate these ruins! Read the lesson which they present to thee!’ (9). In Volney’s view, ruins have a demystifying effect, stripping the world bare and exposing the truths behind our illusions. By demonstrating that even the most enduring creations are destined for decay, ruins provoke questions about the meaning and value of all human endeavors. In particular, according to Volney, a close investigation of ruins teaches us how the once-great societies that created such awesome structures fell into a condition of disrepair. He asserts that ‘[i]f . . . an empire goes to ruin, or dissolves, it is because its laws have been vicious, or imperfect, or trodden under foot by a corrupt government’ (29). As physical embodiments of the self-defeating nature of tyrannical or corrupt political regimes, ruins demonstrate that only egalitarian societies can survive: ‘[w]hen the whole earth, in chains and silence, bowed the neck before its tyrants, you had already proclaimed the truths which they abhor; and confounding the dust of the king with that of the meanest slave, had announced to man the sacred dogma of Equality’ (1). As he implies in his capitalization of ‘Equality’, Volney is writing in favor of the French revolutionary calls for ‘*liberté, égalité, fraternité*’ that led to the fall of the Bastille and the passage of the *Declaration of the Rights of Man* in 1789. By presenting ruin as a radical symbol, Volney casts his own ideals as universal, almost scientific, principles, and imbues them with a sublime grandeur, as if he were seeking to overwhelm the reader into assent.

Perhaps the most notorious aspect of *Les Ruines* was Volney’s attack on religion. Volney echoes Gibbon in describing religion as a ‘holy indolence’ (40) enervating the commerce, military valor and sciences that allow societies to flourish. According to Volney, conventional religious ideas originate as failed attempts to make sense of the universe: ‘the whole history of the spirit of religion is only the history of the errors of the human mind, which, placed in a world that it does not comprehend, endeavors nevertheless to solve the enigma’ (161). Once these false ideas have developed into a coherent belief-structure, those who espouse them have a vested interest in rejecting other explanations, even if they are true: ‘every state had its college of priests, who, being by

turns auxiliaries or rivals, hastened by their disputes the progress of science and discovery' (148). Religion therefore not only holds an imperial control over the human mind, but also undermines societies by fostering contention and tyranny: it is 'an empire of mystery and a monopoly of instruction, which to this day have ruined every nation' (130). Volney's use of ruins places him in a dual relation to religion: as both witness to the social and mental ruin it creates and agent of its eventual ruination.

Most controversially, Volney presents Christianity as an example of these claims. For Volney, the long history of rivalry between different Christian sects demonstrates religion's propensity to create conflict. He describes these groups as 'distinct parties, persecuting when strong, tolerant when weak, hating each other in the name of a God of peace, forming each an exclusive heaven in a religion of universal charity, dooming each other to pains without end in a future state, and realising in this world the imaginary hell of the other' (80). Secondly, and more shockingly for readers of the time, Volney argued that Christianity was an invention. According to him, insufficient historical records remain to prove that Jesus was a real historical personage: '[t]here are absolutely no other monuments of the existence of Jesus Christ as a human being' other than an 'apocryphal' 'passage in Josephus', a 'single phrase in Tacitus . . . and the Gospels' (106). Instead, early Christianity was the result of Judaism mixing together with the diverse cultures that surrounded it. He claims that 'Christ' shared its derivation with the Indian 'Chrishna'; and 'Yesus or Jesus' was also 'the ancient and cabalistic name attributed to young Bacchus' (160).

By the end of the eighteenth century, exponents of the 'higher criticism' such as Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, had begun to put the scriptures in an empirically verifiable historical context, and 'syncretist' scholars such as Sir William Jones had used diverse sources to indicate the cultural, linguistic, and theological connections between East and West. Volney innovates both by fusing these two approaches together and by deploying them for the more radical purpose of challenging the New Testament's authenticity. In keeping with his attempts to test the Biblical record, Volney casts himself as a moral empiricist, insisting that 'morality is a physical and geometrical science, subject to the rules and calculations of the other mathematical sciences' (x). Far

from the intervening God of the Old and New Testaments, he presents a Deistic image of God that is difficult to distinguish from full-blown atheism: as ‘the hidden power which animates the universe’ (20). According to him, a quasi-scientific comparison of the history of different societies shows that ‘ignorance and cupidity . . . are the twin sources of all the torments of man’ (25). Ignorance blinds people to the ways they are oppressed by religious and political authorities, while ‘cupidity’ or the love of wealth causes them to exploit others.

In Volney’s view, the ultimate source of all human motivation and society is the morally ambiguous phenomenon of self-love. Like the cycle of civilizational rise and fall displayed by ancient ruins, self-love is both constructive and destructive. On the one hand, it fosters the desires for comfort, protection and recognition that lead human beings to seek relationships with others and establish communities: ‘the love of self, the moving principle of every individual, becomes the necessary foundation of every association’ (27). On the other hand, it is responsible for all human conflict, because it encourages people to try to assert their superiority over others: ‘self-love, impetuous and improvident, is every urging man against his equal and consequently tends to dissolve (27) society’ (27–8). By according self-love this foundational status, Volney departs significantly and controversially from Christian ethics. For him, rather than being dependent on a deity, human beings are totally autonomous: ‘man is made the architect of his own destiny’ (21). Volney’s liberal valorization of self-determination and the enlightened pursuit of self-interest, as well as his belief in re-establishing society on a new foundation, may be why he appealed to American figures, such as Jefferson, Lincoln and Whitman, who sought to define American national identity in similar terms.

Ironically, there is a clearly religious dimension to Volney rhetoric. While his scrupulous analysis of historical sources is designed to appeal to the reader’s rationality, his use of ruins as an emblem of his skeptical, revolutionary convictions involves overawing the reader into agreement. Moreover, his belief in a major transformation of society, after which everything will be changed, has more in common with the millenarianism of such contemporaneous ‘prophets’ as Richard Brothers or Joanna Southcott than with the Enlightened optimism of French *philosophes* like Anne-Robert-Jacques Turgot or Voltaire. In-

terestingly, Volney begins the book with an 'Invocation': a supplication or prayer. Moreover, when *Les Ruines* was first published in 1793, he entitled it 'The French Citizen's Catechism' (x), as if it were a doctrinal manual for the new Revolutionary values. At the end of the book, Volney even casts his own radical creed as a new kind of religion. He imagines the different peoples of the world crying out 'teach us, after so many religions of error and delusion, the religion of evidence and truth!' (176). As symbols of a greatness that no longer exists, ruins embody Volney's belief that religions represent a conspiracy against liberty of thought and action that must be eradicated so as to welcome in the modern age. At the same time, however, the contradictory status of ruins, undermines his argument, illuminating his paradoxical attempt to appropriate religious sublimity at the same time as stripping religion of its core beliefs and institutions.

Moreover, by using ruin as a metaphor for the shock of the new, Volney envisages revolution not as advance, but as trauma. Volney describes the world's populations meeting together and rejecting religion in favour of rationalism in surprisingly apocalyptic tones, labelling the crowd as 'a great tumult . . . a prodigious movement . . . a numberless people, rushing in all directions . . . [a] prodigy . . . [and a] cruel and mysterious scourge' (63). The 'Genius', informs the narrator that 'this reorganisation will occasion a violent shock in your habits, your fortunes, and your prejudices . . . you must indeed recur . . . to a state of nature' (69–70). Here Volney's belief in progress is contradicted by his representation of historical change as necessary violence that thrusts human beings outside convention and forces them to think and act in new ways. His choice of ruins as a revolutionary emblem embodies this ambivalence: in one sense, the ruins represent superseded stages of history; in another they embody the traumatic impact of the very modernisation he advocates.

Conclusion: Radical Enlightenment

Volney's transfiguration of ruin into a revolutionary emblem had considerable resonance in British radical rhetoric of the period. At the time, the radicals' conservative opponents used the image of ruin to suggest that unparalleled catastrophe had befallen France. For instance, in a 1794 issue of the

loyalist journal *The Looker-On*, an anonymous Anti-Jacobin writer claimed that '[t]he very elements of civilisation have been destroyed in a moment, and society itself disbanded'.¹⁷ By appropriating ruin as a token of radicalism, Volney suggested, on the contrary, that the society that existed before the revolution had ruined France, and the revolutionaries were the source of its regeneration. Volney's use of ruin in this way is echoed in Mary Wollstonecraft's portrayal of the fall of the Bastille as 'the overthrow of the tremendous empire of superstition and hypocrisy, [sic.] erected upon the ruins of gothic brutality and ignorance' in her 1794 *An Historical and Moral View of the Origin and Progress of the French Revolution*.¹⁸ Volney's idea reverberates also in Conrade's account of the 'pyramid of glory' that the Egyptians built '[o]er ravaged realms' in Robert Southey's radical poem *Joan of Arc* (1796);¹⁹ and in Percy Bysshe Shelley's famous description of the 'shattered visage' of the disintegrating statue of the Egyptian pharaoh Rameses II in *Ozymandias* (1816).²⁰

Perhaps unsurprisingly, it was Volney's attack on religion that did most to establish *Les Ruines*' immediate notoriety. Many early critical reactions scarcely rose above *ad hominem* attacks. The Anglican priest David Simpson, for instance, accused Volney of 'ignorance' 'rashness' and 'imbecility'.²¹ A more scrupulous early response was made by the aforementioned scientist, theologian and political theorist Joseph Priestley, who claimed that Volney's views were based on inadequate scholarship: 'had he been at all acquainted with the history of the times in which Christianity was promulgated . . . he could have no more doubt of the existence of Jesus Christ . . . than of that of Julius Caesar'.²² Priestley took particular umbrage at Volney's claim that 'self-love' was the source of human activity, claiming that society could not cohere on such a basis: '[t]here may be an assemblage of men, forced together by external circumstances, but this cannot be society; it will be only as a heap of sand, wherein every particle repels its neighbor with equal force'.²³ As a radical dissenting clergyman, Priestley might have been expected to be more sympathetic. However, given that Priestley's own controversial status caused a mob in 1791 to burn down his Birmingham house and church, forcing him to flee first to London and then to Pennsylvania, it is likely that Priestley saw in Volney a useful means of distinguishing his own views from more extreme forms of atheism. Certainly, Volney himself favored this explanation, accusing

Priestley of believing that ‘in attacking me as doubting the existence of Jesus, you might secure to yourself . . . the favor of every Christian sect’.²⁴

But it was to reactionaries, rather than radicals, that Volney was to prove the more useful straw-man. In his bestselling ultra-conservative annotated verse satire *The Pursuits of Literature* (1794–7), Thomas James Mathias claimed that ‘Mr. V. now wishes to convince mankind that every pretence [*sic.*] to revelation, in every age and in every country, is equally false and equally unfounded; and by a jargon of language, and antiquity, and mythology, and philosophy, he labours [*sic.*] to confound and blend *them all* in uncertain tradition and *astronomical* allusions; and all this is attempted to be done, that the world may be prepared for the French Revolution’. Here Mathias casts Volney as an epitome of the conservative thinker’s Edmund Burke’s claim that the Revolutionaries were ‘men of theory’: dangerous sophists whose universalizing principles were little more than disguised self-interest, and whose mechanistic models of society put in danger the intricate bonds that drew human beings together. Mathias accused Volney of severing people from their most dearly-held beliefs, claiming that ‘[t]he intent of this book is to attack every principle of religion in the heart’.²⁵ Volney’s shocking attack on religious orthodoxy played into the hands of such loyalists as Mathias, enabling them to portray his religious skepticism and political radicalism as an aggressive attack on the very fabric of society. While Volney argued ruin was caused by political tyranny, his reactionary opponents claimed that, on the contrary, Volney’s own radical ideas had brought ruin to France and threatened to do the same to Britain.

However, the dominant reaction *Les Ruines* inspired in readers was not indignation but disillusionment. When the Creature in Shelley’s *Frankenstein* overhears Felix reading Safie *Les Ruines*, he experiences a profound disenchantment, claiming ‘I cannot describe to you the agony that these reflections inspired upon me: I tried to dispel them, but sorrow only increased with knowledge’.²⁶ Such sentiments are echoed by a real-life reader, the poet and novelist Catherin Matilda Thayer, who described the ruining effect that *Ruins* had on her: ‘it completely ruined my principles, and eradicated every trace of moral sentiment that remained; and while it robbed me of every pre-conceived opinion, it substituted none in their place, but left me to wander in the

chaos of uncertainty'.²⁷ What such examples show is the destructive potency of *Les Ruines*. Far from inspiring conviction in the liberal, enlightened values Volney espoused, the text provoked in readers a far more interesting sense of alienation, as they mentally traversed a world of shattered ideologies.

Les Ruines' strange power, then, lies in Volney's selection of ruins as a symbol of his enlightened principles. By choosing this emblem, Volney unwittingly undermines the ideological totality he seeks to achieve, demonstrating that all societies and ideologies are subject ultimately to fragmentation. His positivistic, teleological view of history is subverted by the ruins' presentation of a scattered vision, in which the passing of time means not progress but disintegration. The incompleteness and ambiguity of ruins also underscores further contradictions within his own argument: his use of sublime effects to confound his reader into rationalism; or his advocacy of barbaric violence in support of the construction of a more civilized, fraternal society. As such, Volney presents modernity as a dialectical enterprise: rational and mythic, progressive and barbaric, generating new forms of liberation and oppression. Perhaps the greatest virtue of *Les Ruines*, is that, by creating a text of such manifest contradictions, and by positioning his readers as wanderers through the foreign land of modernity, Volney forced them to be independent and active in the face of disorientation and alienation. While he sought to ensure fidelity to his own radical enlightened convictions, Volney inadvertently provoked a different and more radical form of enlightenment.

Notes

1 Constantin-François Chassebeuf de Volney, *The Ruins, or, Mediation on the Révolutions of Empires: and, the Law of Nature*, Anon. (trans.) (1791; English translation 1792) (Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1991) p. 57. I have selected this edition because it provides the translation most commonly read in the by British readers in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century. Henceforth all references to this edition are provided in parentheses in the text.

2 Vijay Mishra, *The Gothic Sublime* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994) p. 165.

3 Grad Student Madness, <http://gradstudentmadness.blogspot.jp/2008/04/les-ruines-by-constantin-volney.html>. Accessed: 19 September 2013.

4 Martin Priestman, *Romantic Atheism: Poetry and Free Thought, 1780–1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) p. 22.

5 Robert Irwin, *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies* (London: Penguin, 2006) p. 135.

6 E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Random House, 1963) p. 99. Thompson describes *Les Ruines* as 'more positive and challenging, and perhaps as influential in English radical history, as Paine's *Age of Reason*'. E. P. Thompson, *Witness against the Beast: William Blake and the Moral Law* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 1993) p. 199.

7 See: Anon. [Daniel Isaac Eaton] (ed.) *Politics for the People*, vol. II, Number XV, London: D. I. Eaton, 1794; Anthony Pasquin, *A Cabinet of Miscellanies* (London: H. D. Symonds, 1794) pp. 20–2; Anon. [Thomas Spence] (ed.) *Pig's Meat; or, lessons for the swinish multitude* (London; T. Spence, 1795).

8 See: Thompson, *Witness*, p. 198–9.

9 See: Thomas Muir, *An account of the trial of Thomas Muir* (Edinburgh, 1793).

10 William Cockburn, *Remarks on a Publication of M. Volney called 'The Ruins'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1804); Frederick Nolan, *Fragments of a Civic Feast: Being a key to Volney's Ruins* (London: 1819); William Anthony Hails, *Remarks on Volney's Ruins* (London: Seeley & Son, 1825).

11 Joseph Priestley, *Letters to Mr. Volney, occasioned by a work of his entitled Ruins, and by his letter to the author* (Philadelphia: Thomas Dobson, 1797) p. 28.

12 Marilyn Butler, 'Plotting the Revolution: The Political Narratives of Romantic Poetry and Criticism' in Kenneth R. Johnston (ed.) *Romantic Revolutions: Criticism and Theory* (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1990) pp. 133–157, p. 145.

13 According to Chinard, Jefferson translated the Invocation plus the first 20 chapters of the 1802 Paris edition, before abandoning it, due to lack of time and fear that aligning himself with Volney's atheist convictions would endanger his 1800 bid for the American Presidency. See: Gilbert Chinard, *Volney et l'Amérique: d'après sa correspondance avec Jefferson* (Paris: Presses universitaires, 1923).

14 According to Herndon, at age 24 Lincoln 'began to read the writings of Paine, Volney and Voltaire', wishing exposing himself to religious skepticism. See: William H. Herndon [and Jesse William Weik], *Herndon's Lincoln: The History and Personal Recollections of Abraham Lincoln* (Chicago, New York and San Francisco, 1889, vol. I, p. 125).

15 Walt Whitman, *The Complete Writings*, Richard Maurice Bucke et al (eds.), (New York: Putnam, 1902) II, p. 45.

16 Michael Makarius, *Ruins* (Paris: Flammarion Editions, 2004) p. 112.

17 Anonymous, *The Looker-On*, 66, Saturday August 10, 1765, in reprinted in Simon Olivebranch [sic.] (ed. and author) *The Looker-On: A Periodical Paper* (London: G. G. and J. Robinson, 1795) vol. III pp. 251–66, p. 265.

18 Mary Wollstonecraft, *An Historical and Moral View of the Origin and Progress of*

the French Revolution; and the Effect it has produced on Europe (London: J. Johnson, 1794) vol. I, p. viii.

19 Robert Southey, *Joan of Arc: A Poem* (Bristol: T. N. Longman and Joseph Cottle, 1798) vol. 1, book V, lines 169 and 172.

20 Percy Bysshe Shelley, 'Ozymandias' in Percy Bysshe Shelley, *The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, Harry Buxton Forman (ed.) (London: Reeves and Turner, 1876) p. 376, line 4.

21 David Simpson, *An essay on the authenticity of the New Testament: designed as an answer to Evanson's dissonance and Volney's ruins* (Macclesfield: Edward Bayley, 1793) p. 77, p. 77, p. 88.

22 Joseph Priestley, *Letters addressed to the philosophers and politicians of France, on the subject of religion* (Philadelphia: Thomas Dobson, 1794) p. 19.

23 Joseph Priestley, *Letters to Mr. Volney, occasioned by a work of his entitled Ruins, and by his letter to the author* (Philadelphia: Thomas Dobson, 1797) p. 27.

24 Constantin-Francois Volney, *Volney's answer to Doctor Priestley* (Philadelphia: Benjamin Franklin, 1797) p. 7.

25 Thomas James Mathias, *The Pursuits of Literature, or what you will: a satirical poem in dialogue, Part the first* (London: J. Owen, 1794) lines 139 and 144, p. 18, p. 18.

26 Mary Shelley, *Frankenstein; or, the Modern Prometheus* (1818) (London: G. and B. Whittaker, 1823) p. 12.

27 Caroline Matilda Thayer, *Religion Recommended to Youth in a Series of Letters addressed to a Young Lady* (London: J. Mason, 1835) p. 15.

Bibliography (List of Works Cited)

Anon. [Daniel Isaac Eaton] ed. *Politics for the People*. II: XV.

Anon. [Thomas Spence] ed.. *Pig's Meat; or, lessons for the swinish multitude*. London; T. Spence, 1795.

Butler, Marilyn. 'Plotting the Revolution: The Political Narratives of Romantic Poetry and Criticism'. Kenneth R. Johnston, ed. *Romantic Revolutions: Criticism and Theory*. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1990.

Chinard, Gilbert. *Volney et l'Amérique: d'après sa correspondance avec Jefferson*. Paris: Presses universitaires, 1923.

Cockburn, William. *Remarks on a Publication of M. Volney called 'The Ruins'*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1804.

Courtenay, John. *Philosophical Reflections on the late revolution in France, and the conduct of Dissenters in England; in a letter to the Rev. Dr. Priestley*. Second edn. London: L. T. Becket, 1790.

Hails, William Anthony. *Remarks on Volney's Ruins*. London: Seeley & Son, 1825.

- Herndon, William H. [and Jesse William Weik] *Herndon's Lincoln: The History and Personal Recollections of Abraham Lincoln*. I. Chicago, New York and San Francisco, 1889.
- Irwin, Robert. *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies*. London: Penguin, 2006.
- Makarius, Michael. *Ruins*. Paris: Flammarion Editions, 2004.
- Makdisi, Saree. *William Blake and the Impossible History of the 1790s*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Mathias, Thomas James. *The Pursuits of Literature, or what you will: a satirical poem in dialogue, Part the first*. London: J. Owen, 1794.
- Muir, Thomas. *An account of the trial of Thomas Muir*. Edinburgh, 1793.
- Nolan, Frederick. *Fragments of a Civick Feast: Being a key to Volney's Ruins*. London: 1819.
- Olivebranch, Simon [sic.] *The Looker-On: A Periodical Paper*. III. London: G. G. and J. Robinson, 1795.
- Pasquin, Anthony [sic.] *A Cabinet of Miscellanies*. London: H. D. Symonds, 1794.
- Priestley, Joseph. *Letters addressed to the philosophers and politicians of France, on the subject of religion*. Philadelphia: Thomas Dobson, 1794.
- . *Letters to Mr. Volney, occasioned by a work of his entitled Ruins, and by his letter to the author*. Philadelphia: Thomas Dobson, 1797.
- Priestman, Martin. *Romantic Atheism: Poetry and Free Thought, 1780–1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism: Western Representations of the Orient*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein; or, the Modern Prometheus*. 1818. London: G. and B. Whittaker, 1823.
- Shelley, Percy Bysshe. *The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Harry Buxton Forman, ed.. London: Reeves and Turner, 1876.
- Simpson, David. *An essay on the authenticity of the New Testament: designed as an answer to Evanson's dissonance and Volney's ruins*. Macclesfield: Edward Bayley, 1793.
- Southey, Robert. *Joan of Arc: A Poem*. I. Bristol: T. N. Longman and Joseph Cottle, 1798.
- Thompson, E. P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. London: Random House, 1963.
- . *Witness against the Beast: William Blake and the Moral Law*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 1993.
- Volney, Constantin-François Chassebeuf de. *The Ruins, or, Mediation on the Révolutions of Empires: and, the Law of Nature*. Anon., trans. 1791; English translation 1792. Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1991.

—. *Lectures on history, delivered in the Normal School of Paris*. London: Wilson and Co, 1800.

—. *Volney's answer to Doctor Priestley*. Philadelphia: Benjamin Franklin, 1797.

Whitman, Walt. *The Complete Writings*. Richard Maurice Bucke et al, eds. New York: Putnam, 1902.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *An Historical and Moral View of the Origin and Progress of the French Revolution; and the Effect it has produced on Europe*. I. London: J. Johnson, 1794.