How might the restoration in 1660 of Charles II, who had assimilated perceptions and practices from France during the interregnum and who then disseminated his valuation of female beauty and theatricality during his reign, have affected attitudes about cosmetics, for instance?

When Dolan discusses "arguments that license the practice [of face painting] under certain circumstances," she describes them as "[*b*]*etween* the outright attacks . . . and the defenses" (232; emphasis mine)—meaning, it would seem, that these arguments take a middle ground when they endorse cosmetics as remediation for physical defects. But Dolan's supporting quotations (from 1640 and 1653) also fall *chronologically* between the dates of her other examples. Does her "between" include this historical sense? If so, how might she explain that an era of (increasing) Puritan hegemony seemed more comfortable with cosmetics—according to the examples given—than did the period of Elizabeth and James? Once again, I am not calling into question Dolan's interesting thesis; I simply see the need for some historicizing in the light of the unacknowledged dating patterns inscribed in her text.

CRYSTAL DOWNING
University of California, Los Angeles

Reply:

I agree that my essay charts a narrative of change that I might have articulated more explicitly; I also agree that it would be fascinating to relate that narrative to other narratives of change regarding the seventeenth century. My project in this essay, however, was to show the surprising *continuities* in the constructions of female agency even across a century characterized by extraordinary social, economic, and political transformation. I find that the periodizations traditionally used by literary critics—"Renaissance" and "Restoration"—obscure patterns of change and continuity in the seventeenth century. Rather than thoughtlessly conflate two periods, I consciously chose the periodization used by historians—"early modern"—as more helpful in enabling me to attend to similarities in gender constructions from the late sixteenth century to the end of the seventeenth. In much of my work, I have discovered that the sweeping view permitted by the category "early modern" facilitates study of the groups—such as women, domestic servants, and laboring men—who were not necessarily included in or influenced by events like the Renaissance and the Restoration. Although my own concerns and commitments led me to focus my essay as I did, I find Crystal Downing's questions provocative and urge her to pursue them.

FRANCES E. DOLAN
Miami University, Oxford

Whiffs of *Das Parfum*

To the Editor:

I found Richard T. Gray's article, "The Dialectic of 'Enscentment': Patrick Süskind's *Das Parfum* as Critical History of Enlightenment Culture," redolent with suggestive details (108 [1993]: 489–505). I would like to make four minor points of criticism, however.

First, it is possible that Süskind's portrait of Jean-Baptiste Grenouille bears an uncanny resemblance to the comte de Saint-Germain, arguably one of the most "gifted abominations" (491) of the Enlightenment period.

Second, the stench associated with European hygienic squalor is brilliantly conveyed in Smollett's *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker*, particularly in Jery Melford's digression on the Dutch word *stinken* (Penguin ed., 45 ff.) and in Bramble's London diatribe, "I breathe the steams of endless putrefaction . . ." (151 ff.). Perhaps Gray could have included this reference in his discussion of Grenouille's "olfactory imagination."

Third, Gray's claim that Grenouille "has no essence" (499) is a reminder of Camus's *La chute*, in which Jean-Baptiste Clamence suffers a collapse from illusory self-aggrandizement into wretched despair.

Last, Gray overlooked the opportunity to develop the rich connotation associated with *parfum*, which also means "flavor" in French.

ROBERT FRAIL
Centenary College

Reply:

I thank Robert Frail for suggesting further possible allusions relevant to Süskind's *Das Parfum*; they help to confirm the thematic richness and allusive texture of this novel. It was by no means the intent of my

https://doi.org/10.2307/463018 Published online by Cambridge University Press