One of the most significant contributions to the category of general Romanticism this year is Mary A. Favret’s War at a Distance: Romanticism and the Making of Modern Wartime. War at a Distance is a consistently insightful consideration of the connections between wartime and everyday life—how the pain and suffering of soldiers is experienced and processed by their family and friends, the people who are left behind. As Favret points out, the effects of the spectral presence of war felt at a distance, so graphically demonstrated in the televised images of the US-led invasion of Iraq early in this century, have a history. That history begins in Britain in the Romantic era during the twenty-year battle with France, when writers and artists attempted to give creative expression to the already mediated violence of war. Favret’s illuminating study makes a convincing case that the British Romantics who grappled with the idea of life in wartime are the patterns for how we continue to think and feel about war at a distance.

Rather than building on the more typical scholarship on Romantic war as a sublime event Favret takes a refreshingly new perspective, focusing on the Romantic-era literature that captures the everyday, domestic acts of citizens during wartime. Not surprisingly, two of her first case studies are Coleridge’s ‘Frost at Midnight’ and Wordsworth’s ‘The Ruined Cottage’, two of the best-known poems on wartime that she reads alongside a less well-known text, Hazlitt’s essay ‘The Letter Bell’, revealing how all of these works are indebted
to Cowper’s *The Task*. As Favret notes, Cowper’s poem was integral to the understanding of war at a distance for these and other writers, and provided the materials and techniques for this next generation of writers to think through the implications of wartime. Part I, ‘Modern Wartime: Media and Affect’, begins by tracing the human consequences of war at a distance, thinking through wartime as ‘war time’, or how our understanding of time itself changes during a period of war. This section explores the temporal structure of wartime as a ‘zone of affect which troubles what we can know and especially what we can know of history’ (p. 12), concluding with an analysis of Romantic-era prophecy as a means of addressing the uncertainties of time at war. The chapters in Part II, ‘Invasions’, take up the different ways in which distant war invades and disrupts the most familiar forms of the everyday. The first chapter in this section discusses the metaphors of weather that bring home the effects of distant war in works such as Anna Barbauld’s ‘Eighteen Hundred and Eleven’ and Amelia Alderson’s ‘Ode on the Present Times, 27th January 1795’. The next chapter explores the ways in which Wordsworth, Jane Austen, and other Romantic writers probe the silent suffering of the everyday as the consequence of the trauma of wartime. The concluding section, ‘War in the World’, discusses other representations of war in the Romantic era, focusing in particular on depictions of India under siege in the 1790s, and thus reminding us that this was a war that spilled beyond Europe’s borders. *War at a Distance* is a book that was ten years in the making, and every page bears witness to Favret’s willingness to dig deeper into this large and important subject than anyone before her. The result is a substantial book that is equally dense and accessible, timely and thought-provoking.

Another excellent book published this year in the category of general Romanticism is Samuel Baker’s *Written on the Water: British Romanticism and the Maritime Empire of Culture*. This study explores the connections between the development of the idea of culture and ocean imagery in Romantic poetry. Baker argues that Raymond Williams’s influential and groundbreaking work on the ways in which industrialization in Britain fundamentally changed the dynamic between the country and the city has, somewhat paradoxically, contributed to a lack of scholarship on the vital importance of the sea and Romantic maritime culture in the history of the idea of culture. *Written on the Water* addresses this need by tracing the many ways in which the sea was deployed in Romantic poetry to think through the implications of the transformation of England into a modern commercial society. Part I, ‘Oceanic Fables of Culture’, provides an overview of the principal oceanic fables of Romantic culture. Baker convincingly dispels the longstanding belief amongst scholars that Wordsworth’s poetry had little or nothing to do with the sea. In fact, as Baker demonstrates, Wordsworth consistently used sea imagery throughout his career to describe his relationship to his craft, his public life, and his legacy. The first chapter reads the most famous sea poem of the Romantic era, Coleridge’s *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, alongside Wordsworth’s ‘The World is Too Much With Us’, revealing how both poems use the image of the sea to represent an anxious modernity, emblematic of the hopes and fears associated with a maritime empire of culture. This chapter lays the groundwork for the next chapter’s exploration of Coleridge’s maritime
figures, positing a fluid dynamic between what Baker describes as ‘absolute culture’ and ‘the cultural absolute’ (p. 21) that is illuminated by a reading of Herder’s ideas of cultural cohesion and their influence on the Lake poets.

Part II, ‘The Wordsworth Circle’s Modes of Insular Empire’, reveals how the Lake poets projected the norms of the georgic, pastoral, and epic onto the horizon of maritime empire. Chapter 3 argues that the idea of culture was reconfigured by these writers in a maritime georgic, expanding the georgic’s concern with an agricultural way of life to include the commercial, industrial, and military efforts at sea as well as on land. Chapters 4 and 5 go on to explore how the modes of the pastoral and epic, along with the georgic, correspond to a triad of modalities of power relations described by Michel Foucault—discipline, pastoral power, and conquest. As Baker argues, for the Lake poets as well as Foucault these modes can only work through continually breaking down, which introduces an idea of culture that both accommodates and resists this failure. In Part III, ‘Culture’s Midland Waters: Coleridge, Byron, Arnold, America’, Baker explores the preoccupation of the Romantic imagination with the Mediterranean and how the Lake poets, Byron, and, later, Matthew Arnold expanded and expatiated on the idea of culture within the framework of international geopolitics. *Written on the Water* is a compelling study that dispels the myth of the insular, landlocked imaginations of the Lake poets, repositioning them and their works in the maritime culture of the first half of the nineteenth century.

Scholars who enjoyed Susan J. Wolfson’s *Borderlines: The Shiftings of Gender in British Romanticism* [2006] will be delighted with her most recent publication: *Romantic Interactions: Social Being and the Turns of Literary Action*. In *Borderlines* Wolfson suggested that scholarship on gender and Romanticism has, in recent years, become constrained by an overly schematic approach that limits our understanding of the complex negotiations of the gender divide engaged in by both male and female writers during this period. Like *Borderlines*, *Romantic Interactions* points to provocatively new and refreshing ways of interpreting the works of a wide-ranging community of Romantic writers from the 1780s to the 1840s. *Romantic Interactions* argues that what was truly distinctive about the Romantic period was how deeply interactive this community was—and how the intense dialogue with each other and each other’s works helped to shape the diverse group of writers we call Romantics. The underlying argument is that ‘authorial self-recognition takes shape as a reciprocal formation in a society of formations, that it is continuously challenged by this field, and that it is best revealed not in categorical rhetorics, but in specific sites and textual reflections of complex interaction’ (p. 8).

*Romantic Interactions* provides three very different case studies to illustrate this point. The first section examines how the political perspectives of Charlotte Smith and Mary Wollstonecraft in the 1790s were shaped by their lively engagement with male literary traditions and male authorial voices. As Wolfson reminds us, these interactions did not bring about an anxiety of influence; on the contrary, the strong and confident authorial voices of these two women authors were the result of their unblinking feminist critique of, and critical alliance with, the male literary tradition. In *The Emigrants* Smith
assumes a traditionally masculine epic authority to point out that women are throughout history repeatedly victimized by war, and that victims compel figuration as female. Wollstonecraft’s critical reading of the language of male poets in A Vindication of the Rights of Woman enables her, like Smith, to point out the pernicious influence of the male literary canon in perpetuating the myth of women’s innate inferiority. Interestingly, however, this does not prevent Wollstonecraft from consciously using this canon to strengthen and define her own authorial identity. The next section continues to trace the gendered aspects of Romantic interactions through a close reading of the creative dialogue between William and Dorothy Wordsworth. Going beyond the familiar critique of their working relationship as a one-way street, Wolfson provides a nuanced reading of Dorothy’s experimentation with alternatives to her brother’s solipsistic perspective as an inspired male ‘Poet’, emphasizing Dorothy’s interest in female social experience. Romantic Interactions concludes with an incisive analysis of the interactions between Byron’s starry-eyed fans and ‘Byron’ the celebrity and icon who inspired a fervent ‘Byronism’ (a term coined during the poet’s lifetime) in authors such as Walter Scott, but also, intriguingly, in a series of women authors including Felicia Hemans, Elizabeth Barrett, Letitia Landon, M.J. Jewsbury, Emily Brontë, Lady Blessington, Caroline Norton, and Harriet Beecher Stowe.

Another good book published this year, Real and Imagined Women in British Romanticism by Gaura Shankar Narayan, builds upon Susan Wolfson’s recent work on gender and Romanticism. Whereas Wolfson’s Borderlines and Romantic Interactions are more generally concerned with the dialogue between male and female authors and their texts, Narayan’s study focuses more specifically on Romantic-era feminism and the representation of women in the poetry and prose of the time. Another difference is Narayan’s use of feminist theory, including Judith Butler’s articulation of the concepts of social gender and Julia Kristeva’s analysis of the multi-gendered potential of poetic language. Not surprisingly, the contemporary figure that looms largest in Real and Imagined Women is Mary Wollstonecraft. The first chapter probes the gendered terms of the relationship between Keats and Wordsworth, exploring how it was shaped and defined by the cultural context of Wollstonecraft’s radical feminism and ideology. Wollstonecraft herself is the subject of the next two chapters, which establish her pivotal role in challenging the gendered politics of her day through her forceful critique of the gendering of sensibility. While some of this covers familiar ground, Narayan includes a very interesting analysis of the influence of David Hume’s idea of sympathy and Adam Smith’s idea of the impartial spectator on Wollstonecraft’s denigration of the sentimental novel and her assertion of the necessity of a disengaged reading practice amongst female readers. The second half of the book returns to Wordsworth and Keats, considered separately, with close readings of the ways in which each poet engages with a female aesthetic in his poetic works.

Another very good book that explores the construction of Romantic identity is Elizabeth A. Fay’s Fashioning Faces: The Portraitive Mode in British Romanticism. Fashioning Faces situates the increasing interest in portraiture and ‘portraitive practices’ (p. 4) in the Romantic era within a broader cultural
context, including fashion and consumption, the rise of celebrity culture, personal collections, house museums, and travel literature. As Fay persuasively argues, the tremendous popularity of portraiture during this period was the result of social and political pressures that called into question the idea of a central, unified ‘I’. *Fashioning Faces* explores the myriad ways in which Romantics experimented with, and tested the differences between, the ideas of inner experience and social identity. Fay’s study is exemplary in its range, and truly interdisciplinary in its choice of case studies. After an introduction that underscores the ways in which the rise of portraiture, like the rise of the novel, paralleled the eighteenth-century development of a cultural consciousness in the middling social ranks, the second chapter, ‘Making Faces’, traces the representational impulse as it emerged in the late eighteenth century, when ‘reading’ practices extended beyond narratives and portraits to ‘reading’ individuals in a social setting. Included in this chapter is a fascinating discussion of portrait gallery volumes, and Hazlitt’s critique of portrait galleries in his *Spirit of the Age*. Chapter 3, ‘Consuming Portraits’, discusses the innovative ways in which well-known entrepreneurs such as Josiah Wedgwood and less well-known entrepreneurs such as the miniature portraitist Richard Cosway used their art to express the self-reflective sense of identity during this period. In a similar fashion, John Boydell’s Shakespeare Gallery and Rudolf Ackermann’s arts shops introduced the mechanical reproduction of fine prints that enabled consumers to imaginatively encounter and negotiate their anxieties regarding the instability of social and political power in a new modern age. The next chapter, ‘Practicing Aesthetics’, focuses on the aesthetics of art collection, examining in particular the collections of Sir William Hamilton, British consul to the king of Naples; Horace Walpole; the house museum of architect Sir John Soane; and the poetic fancies collected by John Keats. Here Fay points to the ways in which Romantic house museums underscore the self-aware nature of portraiture within a domestic space that enabled collectors to project their own sense of identity through their collections. The final chapter, ‘Living Portraits’, provides an illuminating analysis of two of the most famous shape-shifters of the Romantic period—Mary Robinson and Byron—revealing how these two writers exemplified the commodification of identity in their performances of self, reflecting ‘a cultural form of narcissism’ or a ‘self-projection of the cultural imaginary’ (p. 193). *Fashioning Faces* is an important work of interdisciplinary scholarship that will appeal to many scholars of the Romantic period.

Readers interested in the connections between Romanticism and modernity will be similarly engaged by another good book published this year. Matthew Rowlinson’s *Real Money and Romanticism* is an innovative study of the representation of money in the works of Walter Scott, John Keats, and Charles Dickens. As Rowlinson demonstrates, the British monetary system and the economy itself went through a remarkable change in the early nineteenth century, when the modern systems of paper money and intellectual property were established. This had a tremendous impact on the business relationships and transactions between writers and publishers during this time. Rowlinson’s study explores the symbolic identity of capital—what it incorporates and what it excludes as its remainder—in the poetry and prose of
writers in the first half of the nineteenth century. The first example that Rowlinson discusses is Scott’s Waverley novels, which constitute a body of capital, with formal characteristics that help to deepen our understanding of the historical context of its symbolic identity. More specifically, Rowlinson suggests an analogy between the anonymity of the novels (and their seriality) and Marx’s description of capital as an effect of serial self-reference and self-disguise. As Rowlinson persuasively demonstrates, this concern with anonymity permeates the novels as well, with protagonists who are literally disguised, unaware of their true identity, or discovered by the reader to be the celebrated historical figures only after their story is well under way. The next chapter of *Real Money and Romanticism* takes up the question of labour in Keats’s writings, arguing that his letters, poems, and financial debts all circulate in an open-ended system of obligation in which no given element has a determinate value. The final chapter reads Dickens’s fourth novel, *The Old Curiosity Shop*, as a meditation on the relation between materiality and value that was occasioned by his own experience of the valorization of his writing. This book will be of interest to many scholars of Romanticism, particularly those who wish to learn more about Romantic conceptions of character, material culture, and labour.

Several other excellent books were published this year in the area of general Romanticism. *British State Romanticism: Authorship, Agency, and Bureaucratic Nationalism* by Anne Frey provides a nuanced exploration of the literary efforts of late Romantic authors, which have often been dismissed by scholars of the period as reactionary or, even worse, a fall from the heady revolutionary fervour of high Romanticism into mediocrity. Frey’s study does not deny the conservative turn in the late careers of Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Southey. What it does, however, is deepen our understanding of how these writers, as well as novelists such as Walter Scott and Jane Austen, used their written works to think through the nature of state authority and explore the conditions of agency and subjectivity in an era of centralizing state power. As Frey convincingly argues, these authors accept the conditions of the consolidation of state authority in the early nineteenth century while also suggesting ways in which literature can share in the state function of shaping individuals and the communities in which they live. The first chapter investigates how Coleridge’s late work, including *On the Constitution of Church and State*, considers the interrelationship of Britain’s regions by transposing his model of organic form from poetry to politics. The second chapter argues, through a reading of *Ecclesiastical Sonnets*, that the late Wordsworth recalibrated his aesthetic in order to enlist poetry as an accessory to state authority. Scott’s novels are the subject of the third chapter, which argues that Scott uses the genre of the historical novel to suggest that non-governmental agents who know the regions were better equipped to disseminate British law amongst the populace in remote regions such as the Highlands of Scotland. The fourth chapter offers a penetrating analysis of Austen’s novel *Persuasion* as an effort to explore ways in which women could become members of state professional organizations by joining the professions of their husbands. Anne Elliot marries a naval man and this provides her with a national identity and a community that exists outside the social structures
created through primogeniture and the laws of inheritance governing landed property. The final chapter of *British State Romanticism* discusses Thomas De Quincey’s essay, ‘The English Mail-Coach’, as De Quincey’s effort to locate himself and his writing at the centre of English nation formation by imagining the British mail system as an organ spreading British national identity across the country, and representing his own participation, as he rides on and writes about the mail coaches, as integral to this movement. *British State Romanticism* provides a much-needed reassessment of the literary efforts of the late Romantics, and is essential reading for all scholars of Romanticism.

Another book that scholars of the period will want to read is Alexander Regier’s *Fracture and Fragmentation in British Romanticism*. Regier’s study argues that fracture and fragmentation are two categories that are integral to any discussion regarding language and thought during the Romantic period as well as our own. As Regier notes, ‘Romanticism is central to us, and fragmentation is central to Romanticism’ (p. 3). This statement underscores the two aims of this study: to trace the significance of fracture and fragmentation in Romantic texts and to argue for the relevance of Romanticism today to our own contemporary critical enquiry. The first chapter takes up the image of the Tower of Babel to explore how fragmentation plays itself out in eighteenth-century literature in general, and more specifically in Wordsworth’s poetry and prose. The next chapter contextualizes Wordsworth’s attempts to negotiate the fracture between the human civilization and the natural world within the late eighteenth-century preoccupation with theories of the origin of language. The eyewitness accounts of the 1755 Lisbon earthquake and their invocation of Burke’s description of the sublime in his *Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* [1757] are discussed in the third chapter, which reveals how fragmentation was an integral category in Burke’s influential treatise on aesthetics. The next case study is Wordsworth’s *Prelude*, which enables Regier to extend his discussion of fragmentation to Romantic autobiography. Chapter 5 probes the idea of fragmentary self-construction in an analysis of Keats’s letters. The fracturing power of citation in Thomas De Quincey’s critical writings on Wordsworth is the subject of the following chapter. The final chapter points to the significance of linguistic fracture in Paul de Man’s recent work on the construction and theorization of Romanticism. *Fracture and Fragmentation in British Romanticism* is clear and persuasive, and provides a fresh way of thinking through the importance of Romanticism then and now.

Alan Richardson’s *The Neural Sublime: Cognitive Theories and Romantic Texts* is an excellent and decidedly different addition to the several very good studies of Romanticism and science that have been published over the past few years. Richardson’s book uses recent work in cognitive neuroscience to think through several key debates in Romanticism today. The first issue that *Neural Sublime* takes up is the oft-discussed notion of a distinctively ‘Romantic’ sublime. Moving away from the more typical exploration of the sublime within the context of Kant’s influential theory of the sublime, Richardson argues that the Romantic sublime is best understood through a materialist, brain-based conception of mind. As Richardson points out, the tendency of the Kantian
sublime to privilege the mind and the abstract over and above the brain and the empirical was a movement away from Burke’s theory of the sublime, which was much more familiar to the Romantics than the Kantian version. The *Neural Sublime* shifts the discussion to the rhetorical figure of apostrophe over the next two chapters, reconsidering the Romantic imagination in relation to the cognitive neuroscience of mental imaging. Building upon Elaine Scarry’s analysis of literary imagery in *Dreaming by the Book*, Richardson suggests a correspondence between visual perception and the Romantic imagination that reveals the relationship between visual sense and ‘visionary’ experience in canonical Romanticism. Next, what cognitive psychologists and autism researchers call ‘Theory of Mind Theory’ is applied to Jane Austen’s narrative descriptions of consciousness: ‘Placing her characters in situations that force them to guess and guess again at one another’s intentions, beliefs, and emotional states, Austen shows how pervasively they rely on social-cognitive strategies’ (p. 81). These strategies, Richardson argues, are analogous to those studied by cognitive neuroscientists as Theory of Mind, or the capacity to understand what other people know, think, or feel. The last two chapters use new work on incest avoidance in evolutionary biology to think through Romanticism’s romance with incest, and explore language acquisition, mother–infant relations, and the origins of poetic speech—three major thematic concerns of canonical Romanticism—from a cognitive, neuroscientific, and evolutionary perspective. One of the strengths of this book is its accessibility: *The Neural Sublime* is recommended as a very readable, lively, and smart introduction to the interpretative possibilities of cognitive historiography for Romantic studies.

Rebecca Cole Heinowitz’s *Spanish America and British Romanticism, 1777–1826: Rewriting Conquest* is also highly recommended to scholars of the Romantic era. Heinowitz’s study traces the impact of Spanish America on the Romantic literary and political imagination. Chapter 1 reads Helen Maria Williams’s epic romance *Peru* [1784] against the historical backdrop of Britain’s economic and political involvement with Spanish America, arguing that *Peru* is as invested in asserting Williams’s sentimental, patriotic, and British subjectivity as it is in advocating the liberation of Peru from Spain. Chapter 2 examines the textual intersections between the patriotic rhetoric of Richard Brinsley Sheridan’s tragedy *Pizarro* [1799] and the *Lettre aux Espagnols-Américains* by the Creole patriot Juan Pablo Viscardo y Guzmán, published the same year. The next chapter points to the very different political climate in which Robert Southey published *Madoc* [1805], and describes how Southey used this poem to mount a defence of reformed British colonialism. As the fourth chapter reveals, during the Peninsular War (1808–14), British writing about Spanish America, such as Felicia Hemans’s *England and Spain* [1808] and Walter Scott’s *The Vision of Don Roderick* [1811], tended to conceal Britain’s continued interest in establishing commercial dominance in Spanish America. Chapter 5 reconstructs Byron’s knowledge of the emerging republics of Spanish America and his motivation for his aborted attempt to relocate to Venezuela through an analysis of his letters of 1819–23, his anti-imperialist poems *The Island* and *The Age of Bronze* [both 1823], and the later sections of *Don Juan*. The last chapter examines the often conflicting ways in which
British literature, periodicals, and popular entertainments gave rise to, and critiqued, the British infatuation with Spanish America between 1822 and 1825. *Spanish America and British Romanticism* tells a story that has not been told before of the ways in which British writing about Spanish America reflected the anxieties, ambivalences, and contradictions that underwrote Romantic imperialism.

Several very good editions were published this year in the category of general Romanticism. *English Romantic Writers and the West Country*, expertly edited by Nicholas Roe, explores Romanticism in relation to the landscape, literature, and history of England’s West Country. The fifteen essays in this collection, written by leading scholars in the UK, US, Canada, and Japan, provide a wide-ranging and rich discussion of English regional identity. The first part, ‘Landslips and Legends’, includes an essay by Joanne Parker, “‘More wondrous far than Egypt’s boasted pyramids’: The South West’s Megaliths in the Romantic Period” (pp. 15–36), which reveals how the proliferation of literary texts on British prehistory from 1785 to 1835 played an active role in the development of tourism to the south-west. Nick Groom’s “‘Al under the willow tree’: Chatterton and the Ecology of the West Country” (pp. 37–61) provides a reassessment of Chatterton’s poetry, revealing how his vernacular English poetry emerged from his intimate knowledge and experience of West Country fauna and topography. The second part, ‘The Bristol School: Cottle, Coleridge, and their Circles’, traces the diverse network of poets and poetry that comprised the new Bristol school. In ‘Joseph Cottle and West Country Romanticism’ (pp. 65–78) Richard Cronin offers a new reading of Cottle’s ‘grand project’ to establish a Bristol school of poets united in their opposition to the war. Paul Cheshire’s ‘William Gilbert and his Bristol Circle, 1788–98’ (pp. 79–98) offers a fascinating glimpse into the life and works of this Bristol poet, barrister, journalist, traveller, and astrologer, placing him within the Methodist network in Bristol’s culture of dissent. ‘S.T. Coleridge, Joseph Cottle, and Some Bristol Baptists, 1794–96’ (pp. 99–114) by Timothy Whelan reveals the connections between Cambridge and Bristol dissent that enabled Coleridge to reinvent himself as a Bristol lecturer, journalist, and poet. Peter Kitson’s ‘Coleridge’s Bristol and West Country Radicalism’ (pp. 115–28) points to the ways in which Coleridge’s dissent was influenced by his West Country background. In ‘Radical Bible: Coleridge’s 1790s West Country Politics’ (pp. 129–51) Anthony John Harding points to the West Country context of Coleridge’s 1790s Unitarian radicalism.

The third part, ‘Imagining the West Country’, includes an essay by Carol Kyros Walker, ‘Wordsworth’s 1793 Journey to the West Country and Wales’ (pp. 155–75), which analyses the influence of Wordsworth’s encounter with the West Country in his poetry. Graham Davidson’s ‘Coleridge in Devon’ (pp. 176–200) traces the continuities between Coleridge’s unhappy childhood experiences in Devon and in London that are reflected in his early poetry. In ‘Southey’s West Country’ (pp. 201–17) Lynda Pratt reminds us that before Southey became a Lake poet he spent thirty years in Bristol, and that his experiences in the West Country shaped the poet who would later be identified, more famously, with the Lake District. Damian Walford Davies’s ‘Romantic Hydrography: Tide and Transit in “Tintern Abbey”’ (pp. 218–36)
argues that this poem is crucially conditioned by tidal action, literally and figuratively. Whereas Wordsworth and others found poetic inspiration in the Wye Valley, as Tim Fulford argues in ‘The Road Not Taken: Robert Bloomfield’s Wye Valley and the Poetic Imagination’ (pp. 237–54), Bloomfield’s poetical self emerged in the largely unpoetic east of England. The concluding section, ‘In Pursuit of Spring’, opens with Michael O’Neill’s ‘“The Quest of Life”: Shelley, Hazlitt, the West Country, and the Revolutionary Imagination’ (pp. 257–70), which links Hazlitt’s 1798 ‘First Acquaintance with Poets’ to Shelley’s Lynmouth-based explorations in the summer of 1812. In ‘“Over the Dartmoor Black”: John Keats and the West Country’ (pp. 271–88) Nicholas Roe speculates on how Keats’s poetry may have been shaped by the possibility of the family’s West Country ancestry. The final essay in this collection, Saeko Yoshikawa’s ‘Going Westward: William Wordsworth, Thomas Hardy, and Edward Thomas’ (pp. 289–301), uses Wordsworth’s return to the West Country in 1841, and the rich interplay between Wordsworthian creativity and memory, to read the influence of the West Country on the two early twentieth-century poets, Hardy and Thomas.

Romanticism, Sincerity and Authenticity, edited by Tim Milnes and Kerry Sinanan, investigates Romanticism’s preoccupation with authenticity and sincerity. The first part, ‘Forging Authenticity’, probes the paradoxical nature of authenticity. Margaret Russett’s ‘Genuity or Ingenuity? Invented Tradition and the Scottish Talent’ (pp. 31–57) points to a genealogy of Scottish Romanticism that was very different from the ‘authentic’ English Romanticism. In ‘“A Blank Made”: Ossian, Sincerity and the Possibilities of Forgery’ (pp. 58–79) Dafydd Moore discusses how contemporary commentary on James Macpherson’s The Poems of Ossian [1761–3] capitalizes on the ambiguous status of these poems as literary forgeries. ‘Authenticity among Hacks: Thomas Chatterton’s “Memoirs of a Sad Dog” and Magazine Culture’ (pp. 80–93) by Daniel Cook probes the connections between sincerity, authenticity, and antiquarianism in the work of the notorious forger Thomas Chatterton. Part II, ‘Acts of Sincerity’, examines the new concept of an ideal sincerity that emerged at the end of the eighteenth century. Angela Esterhammer’s ‘The Scandal of Sincerity: Wordsworth, Byron, Landon’ (pp. 101–19) examines two distinct discourses of ‘sincerity’ in Romantic literature, reflected in the differences between Wordsworth and Byron. As Esterhammer notes, while both poets associated sincerity with spontaneity, Wordsworth asserted that sincerity was the antithesis of acting whereas Byron explored the performative aspects of sincerity and spontaneity. In ‘Making Sense of Sincerity in The Prelude’ (pp. 120–36), Tim Milnes argues that Wordsworth’s epic poem gestures towards an alternative discourse of communicative rationality, in which sincerity is connected to the pragmatics of communication and intersubjectivity that underlie truth and interpretation. Kerry Sinanan’s ‘Too Good to be True? Hannah More, Authenticity, Sincerity and Evangelical Abolitionism’ (pp. 137–61) challenges critical assessments that cast the abolition efforts of Hannah More and the ex-slave trader John Newton as conservative by examining the correspondence between these two within the framework of a complex exchange between abolitionism, sensibility, and evangelical discourse. In ‘Sincerity’s Repetition: Carlyle, Tennyson and
Other Repetitive Victorians’ (pp. 162–81) Jane Wright discusses the function of sincerity and repetitive language in the works of several Victorian writers, emphasizing how the perceived oppositional relationship of sincerity and repetition provides a way in which to appreciate the ineluctable relationship between methods of writing and sincerity in Victorian literature.

Part III of Romanticism, Sincerity and Authenticity, ‘Marketing the Genuine’, explores the fascination with sincerity amongst Romantic-era readers in connection with an increased interest in bibliographical authenticity. ‘By Its Own Hand: Periodicals and the Paradox of Romantic Authenticity’ (pp. 185–200) by Sara Lodge looks at two examples of early nineteenth-century writing—Charles Lamb’s Elia essays in the London Magazine [1820–5] and the literary annuals of the 1820s and 1830s—that simultaneously gesture towards the quest for authenticity during this period and the paradoxes inherent in its pursuit. John Halliwell’s ‘Acts of Insincerity? Thomas Spence and Radical Print Culture in the 1790s’ (pp. 201–18) investigates the role of radical print culture in challenging the authenticity of key symbols, forms, and modes in the political discourse of the 1790s. Part IV, ‘The Case of Austen’, addresses different aspects of Austen’s exploration of sincerity and authenticity in the Regency period. In ‘Austen, Sincerity and the Standard’ (pp. 221–37) Alex J. Dick discusses the connection between anxiety over trust and sincerity and the instability of the new finance. The final essay of the collection, Ashley Tauchert’s ‘Facts are Such Horrible Things! The Question of Authentic Femininity in Jane Austen’ (pp. 238–59) examines Austen’s ‘romancing’ of reality, arguing that her work should be considered as a powerful and authentic form of feminine epistemology.

Romanticism and Pleasure, edited by Thomas H. Schmid and Michelle Faubert, explores pleasure from a range of somatic and psychological perspectives, tracing its cultural implications and effects in the Romantic period. The first essay, Richard C. Sha’s ‘Byron, Polidori, and the Epistemology of Romantic Pleasure’ (pp. 17–37), questions how pleasure can lead to knowledge for Romantic writers, and the connections between pleasure and moral behaviour. In ‘Pleasure in an Age of Talkers’ (pp. 39–59) Betsy Tontiplaphol analyses the sensuous ‘fullness’ in Keats’s poetry in the context of the Burkean sublime and the tendency towards abstraction in conversational ideals of the day as critiqued by William Hazlitt in The Spirit of the Age. Joel Faflak’s ‘Was it for this?: Romantic Psychiatry and the Addictive Pleasures of Moral Management’ (pp. 61–82) argues that psychiatry in the Romantic period linked mental governance to social utility, reflecting the communal idealism of subjects empowered by their ability to plumb the depths of the psyche. ‘John Ferriar’s Psychology, James Hogg’s Justified Sinner, and the Gay Science of Horror Writing’ (pp. 83–108) by Michelle Faubert deepens our understanding of the influence of Ferriar’s theory regarding the psychological nature of horror writing on Hogg’s novel. Clark Lawlor’s ‘It is a path I have prayed to follow’: The Paradoxical Pleasures of Romantic Disease’ (pp. 109–32) discusses the idea that illness can paradoxically give pleasure to the sufferer as well as the beholder, in a reading of the poetry of Mary Tighe and the American Davidson sisters, Lucretia and Margaret. In ‘Taking a Trip into China’: The Uneasy Pleasures of
Colonialist Space in *Mansfield Park*’ (pp. 133–48) Jeffrey Cass examines the ways in which Fanny Price takes pleasure in the ‘proper’ use and manipulation of space, a pleasure that is dependent upon the ‘colonialist paradigm’ that Mansfield upholds. Samantha Webb’s essay, ‘Exhausted Appetites, Vitiated Tastes: Romanticism, Mass Culture, and the Pleasures of Consumption’ (pp. 149–66), challenges the critical association of Romantic novels with unhealthy literary consumption, and explores literary consumption in the context of radical tracts on working-class literacy, experience of scarcity, and frugality, revealing how books were represented as necessary to life as food, and were, therefore, a healthy pleasure. In ‘“Diminished Impressibility”: Addiction, Neuroadaptation, and Pleasure in Coleridge’ (pp. 167–86) Thomas H. Schmid applies the findings of recent neuroscientific research on the effects of addictive drugs to the experience of pleasure in a reading of dysphoria in ‘Dejection: An Ode’. *Romanticism and Pleasure* concludes with Kevin Hutchings’s ‘Nature, Ideology, and the Prohibition of Pleasure in Blake’s “Garden of Love”’ (pp. 187–207)—an essay that explores this poem as a critique of the dualism between material pleasures and spiritual renunciation that tends to demonize both sensual expression and the physical world in which it takes place.


Finally, Nicole Reynolds’s *Building Romanticism: Literature and Architecture in Nineteenth-Century Britain* was not received in time for review this year, so will be covered with material from 2011.

2. Prose

The different genres of non-fiction Romantic prose continue to provide a fruitful and innovative field of critical enquiry. Numerous studies are underpinned by, and explore the implications of, the growth of different forms of print media beyond the novel and poetry. One distinctive form of Romantic Prose that continues to receive attention is the essay;
Simon P. Hull’s *Charles Lamb, Elia and the London Magazine: Metropolitan Muse* is a valuable and nuanced study that explores the metropolitan character of the Elia articles that Charles Lamb wrote for the *London Magazine*. Hunt analyses Lamb’s essays, and the fashioning of his authorial identity as it was influenced by the acutely metropolitan character that the periodical created for itself, seeking to embody the energy and variability of London life. Between 1820 and 1825 forty-four of the fifty-three essays, written under Elia’s name, appeared in that magazine. Attempting to rethink aspects of the role of the city in Romantic writing, Hull argues for Lamb’s position ‘at the vanguard of a Romantic metropolitanism which includes also Pierce Egan, Leigh Hunt, Thomas De Quincey and Hazlitt himself’ (p. 4). His study carefully draws out the implications of the initial publication of Lamb’s Elia essays within the new miscellany of the *London Magazine*, claiming that ‘Elia’s desultory observations and fragmentary or disjointed narrative style, as an articulation of the essay form itself, therefore capture the very dynamic of urban spectatorship’ (pp. 6–7). Individual chapters position the Elia essays alongside the essays of De Quincey, Hunt, Hood and Hazlitt, covering topics such as theatricality, the flaneur, social reform and the Great Wen. For example, the first chapter, ‘Consuming the Periodical Text: Hunt, Hazlitt and the Anxiety of Cockneyism’ analyses Lamb’s periodical contributions in the context of a more general disquiet regarding the commercial growth of the periodical press, and anxieties over the literary value of the ephemeral essays that periodicals encouraged.

An article that similarly considers the authorial persona created through the periodical press is Julian Knox’s ‘Coleridge’s “Cousin-German”: Blackwood’s, Alter-Egos, and the Making of a Man of Letters’ (ERR 21[2010] 425–446). Mapping Coleridge’s use of writerly personae across the modes of epistolary writing, poetry, translation and periodical publication, this article focuses on the way the use of different personae reflects a conscious working through of the politics of literary identity. Knox pays particular attention to the 1808–1809 *Friend* and to Coleridge’s troubled yet productive relationship with *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*, arguing that through his negotiations of literary identity, Coleridge articulates a balance between the totalizing impulse of the Romantic ‘I’ and the diversity or multiplicity of which this ‘I’ is, after all, constituted.

The intersection of gender and print media, and in particular women’s role in producing different forms of non-fictional prose, continues to receive significant attention in scholarship on the Romantic period. A collection of essays, *The History of British Women’s Writing, 1780–1830*, edited by Jacqueline Labbe, has a general scope that covers all forms of women’s writing, but has several chapters that set out their engagement with non-fictional genres. Although it overlaps with the category of General Romantic Literature, some of its chapters are of particular relevance to Romantic Prose. Michelle Levy offers an extremely useful overview emphasising the thousands of women who ‘participated directly in print culture as authors, editors, and translators, though much of their work is entirely forgotten’ (p. 29). Levy seeks to draw attention to the heterogeneous ways in which women participated in print culture, not just as authors of fiction but also as
writers of anonymous reviews and prolific contributors to newspapers and periodicals. Katherine Turner offers an equally broad-ranging analysis of women’s travel writing as one of the key genres that has ‘opened up global vistas onto women’s experience’ (p. 47). As well as effectively reviewing the scholarly development of the field, Turner sets out useful possibilities for future research which will be further explored in some of the works reviewed in this section.

Women and print culture is also the subject of Joanne Wilkes’s *Women Reviewing Women in Nineteenth-Century Britain: The Critical Reception of Jane Austen, Charlotte Brontë and George Eliot*, which is a valuable contribution to the study of female authorship in the context of the nineteenth-century periodical press. Focussing on women’s non-fictional writing about other literary women for a wide range of nineteenth-century periodicals, and drawing extensively on letters, memoirs and manuscripts, Wilkes offers fresh insight into the role that their literary criticism played in canon-formation and debates about professionalization in relation to and against which they constructed their authorial identities. In spite of the expectations that its subtitle builds, this meticulously-researched book is not primarily about the critical reception of Jane Austen, Charlotte Brontë and George Eliot. Rather, by examining how these three leading female authors were read and reviewed by their contemporaries and antecedents, this book refocuses critical attention on the careers of overlooked women ranging from Sara Coleridge, Maria Jane Jewsbury and Julia Kavanagh to Hannah Lawrance, Jane Williams and Anne Mozley, not to mention the better-known Margaret Oliphant and Mary Augusta Ward.

Wilkes’s in-depth analysis of the role that these female literary critics, who (with the exception of Oliphant and Ward) remain at the margins of Victorian studies, played in the canonisation of leading novelists like Austen, Brontë and Eliot is the most notable aspect of her monograph. Their grouping together in four chapters enables Wilkes to show what is distinct about the way in which they build upon and refer to each other’s work. In so doing, Wilkes challenges assumptions about homogeneity in terms of female reviewers’ contribution to the development of literary criticism and, to a further extent, to the writing of women’s literary history. Feminist revisioning also drives the collection of essays, *Woman to Woman: Female Negotiations during the Long Eighteenth Century*, edited by Carolyn D. Williams, Angela Escott, and Louise Duckling. Contributing to the recent growth of scholarship on female literary networks and sociability, the essays flesh out the picture of women’s co-operative activity and their rich variety of ‘domestic, social and literary alliances’ (p. 2). Organized in three parts, the different sections focus on blood ties and family relationships; female sociability, including relations between female friends and companions; and, finally, readings of individual historical figures and events that highlight the collaborative activity of women. Individual essays range across fiction and non-fiction, such as an interesting essay, co-authored by Marie Mulvey-Roberts and Joanna Goldsworthy, on the way two famous literary daughters, Mary Shelley and Rosina Bulwer Lytton, negotiated their literary inheritance. Other relevant essays include Judith Slagle on Joanne Baillie’s
correspondence with her older sister, Agnes, and Julie Peakman on
the friendship between Emma Hamilton and Queen Maria Carolina of
Naples.

The study of letter-writing and travelogues is complemented by Teresa
Barnard’s ‘“The Excellencies of the Female Character”: Anna Seward’s
Censored Sermon’ in Literature Compass: Romanticism, which explores the
writing and publication history of a number of sermons by Seward. Towards
the end of her life, Seward, made meticulous preparations for the publication
of her complete works of poetry. The volume was also to include a range of
autobiographical correspondence and prose writings, but did not include a
collection of sermon written for her father, Thomas, who was the canon of
Lichfield Cathedral, and for his parish curates in Derbyshire and
Staffordshire. The sermons were removed from the planned publication by
Sir Walter Scott, her literary executor, and by her family, because they were
seen as being too subversive to be published by a female author. Barnard
explores the religious implications and literary constructions of Seward’s
sermons, as well as the implications of women intervening in the masculine
preserve of the Anglican Church.

The ideological construction women’s public image in the long
nineteenth century is a growing scholarly area which offers possibilities for
innovative explorations of Romantic Prose. Katherine Halsey’s ‘“Gossip”
and “Twaddle”: common readers make sense of Jane Austen’ (in A Return to
the Common Reader: Print, Culture and the Novel 1850–1900) discusses the
Victorian after-life of writing about Austen, while Jennie Batchelor’s book-
length study, Women’s Work: Labour, Gender and Authorship, 1750–1830 is a
major contribution to existing scholarship on the nature of female labour
as a material reality and philosophical concept. Women’s Work explores the
relationship between manual, domestic and intellectual labour in the writing of
Sarah Scott, Charlotte Smith, Mary Wollstonecraft and other neglected
women writers who contributed to the popular press in the second half of the
eighteenth century, during which the domestic household and the labour
market were reconfigured, as she puts it in her introduction, through the
practice and conceptualization of the most precarious of occupations,
authorship. Although this book focuses on the novel, its four case studies of
the careers of women writers during the period 1750–1830 are thoroughly
contextualised in such a way as to point out to the contiguities between the
production of Romantic prose and the novel. In addition to the introduction,
which makes an argument about the historical absence of women’s work from
our studies of women’s fiction of the period, the one chapter that is of
particular relevance to the category of Romantic Prose is Chapter 4 on women
applicants to the writer’s charity, the Literary Fund. This chapter provides a
largely neglected, seam of texts from the popular press, which reveals how
women participated in debates about the gendered division of labour and
provides us with an insight into how they negotiated the friction between
domesticity and professional work, which continue to dominate the nine-
teenth-century periodical press.

The 2010 contribution to the scholarly area of Romantic women’s writing
continues through the editorial work of Donatella Badin, Julia Banister,
Catherine Dille, Betty Hagglund and Annie Richardson of the second part of the multi-volume *Women’s Travel Writings in Italy*, which can help reconsider the role that the travel industry played in female authorship. All the travel writings in volumes 5–9 describe Italy in the years immediately following the fall of Napoleon, and have the potential to foster further scholarship in the ways that women reacted to, and drew inspiration from cultural exchange with different parts of Italy and to a further extent Southern Europe. More precisely, Volume 5 consists of Maria Graham’s romanticised descriptions and drawings of a troupe of local bandits during her three-month travel in 1819 in the mountains east of Rome, which were well off the beaten tourist trail. Volumes 6–7 make accessible Sydney Owenson’s, alias Lady Morgan, 1821 travelogue which was used by generations of Anglophone visitors as a stimulating guidebook to post-Napoleonic Italy. As Susan B. Egelnof has pointed out in her book chapter, ‘The Role of the Political Woman in the Writings of Lady Morgan (Sydney Oweson)’ in A Companion to Irish Literature, ed. Julia M. Wright, Lady Morgan ascribed a political function to her writing. Her travelogue became controversial because it was read as part of her political writing. Her anecdotal Italian history and controversial statements about England’s role in Restoration Europe prompted the King of Sardinia, the Emperor of Austria and the Pope to censor it. Finally, Volumes 8–9 cover *Protestant Vigils, or Evening Records of a Journey in Italy* (1829) by the middle-class English Protestant Harriet Morton, whose anti-Catholic prejudices were in conflict with the architectural and artistic sites she encountered in Italy.

More generally, *The Chawton House Library: Women’s Travel Writing* series promises to help us critically assess the way in which Europe served as a vehicle for Romantic women not only to rethink themselves as foreign bodies but also to inscribe their otherness at home anew within narratives about their travels, the study of art, salon life and friendships. The republication of Romantic women’s travel writing reflects the emerging interest in women, intellectual exchange and Europe. It can help to explore the consumerist aspects of travelling and become more aware of the issues involved in the ethics, politics, and aesthetics of European travelling that are inflected in the following questions: What does travelling offer literary women? What role does her work play in the formation of coterie cultures? Why is studying abroad important to women? How do rootedness and detachment develop into ethical or political virtues in Romantic women’s writing? What is the function of the ties – friendships, sisterhoods – they developed with their European counterparts?

The imaginative appeal of Europe in the Romantic period is also evident in Diane Long Hoeveler’s monograph *Gothic Riffs: Secularizing the Uncanny in the European Imaginary, 1780–1820*, which offers a fresh perspective on Romantic poets such as William Wordsworth as well as the chapbook author Sarah Wilkinson during a period which has been seen as the ‘first wave’ of Gothic writing. Although Hoeveler’s emphasis on ‘Gothic’s riffs’ (opera, gothic drama, melodrama, ballads and chapbooks) makes her book relevant to the categories of the Novel, Drama and Poetry, it is equally relevant to the category of Romantic Prose. This is because of her ambitious aims to read
early Gothic texts as part of a wider European phenomenon which helps us to rethink theoretical concepts such as the uncanny and the imaginary. For instance, in Chapter 1, Hoeveler offers a fresh reading of the eighteenth-century cult of sensibility by looking at contemporary adaptations of Shakespeare, such as Amelia Opie’s *The Father and Daughter* (1801) and Fernando Pear’s 1809 opera *Agnes de Fitzhenry*. In so doing, we are invited to rethink of sensibility not merely as a middle-class ideology but also as a discourse of emotional excess and secular virtue. Chapters 3 and 4 are equally fascinating because of the way in which they explore the joint histories of gothic fiction with the legacy of screen practices and the history of light which is very prominent in today’s scholarship because of the emphasis on visual culture and inter-art-criticism.

Two other important contributions to the study of literary sociability is Elizabeth Eger’s *Bluestockings: Women of Reason from Enlightenment to Romanticism* and a collection of essays, edited by Lucy Morrison and L. Adam Mekler, *Mary Shelley: Her Circle and Her Contemporaries*. Eger’s monograph explores the cultural history of women’s literary and intellectual activity in Britain between 1750–1812. In the course of four chapters, Eger explores the role that the Blue Stockings Society played in shaping an evolving canon of national literature. Having as her starting point Richard Samuel’s 1779 painting *The Nine Living Muses of Great Britain* which painted the nine leading Bluestockings (Elizabeth Montagu, Elizabeth Griffith, Elizabeth Carter, Charlotte Lennox, Elizabeth Linley, Angelica Kauffman, Catharine Macaulay, Anna Barbauld and Hannah More) as the nine muses, Eger uses this iconography to highlight, especially in Chapter 2 ‘The Bluestocking Salon: Patronage, Correspondence and Conversation’, how women forged a sense of community through their innovative use of patronage, conversation and correspondence. As Eger points out in Chapter 3, ‘In the bluestocking salon these arts were developed to new levels of moral significance and provided the basis for women’s involvement with the formal literary genres of their time, including Shakespearean criticism and poetry.’ The Bluestocking Legacy in the Romantic period is important because it can help to rethink the rising individualism of a new generation of male Romantics as being symptomatic of a growing cultural anxiety caused by the success of these women in the public sphere of letters. Morrison and Mekler’s series of essays on Mary Shelley’s intellectual and literary circles includes useful chapters by Lisa Vargo on writing for the *The Liberal* and by Zoe Bolton on the collaborative authorship of *History of a Six Weeks’ Tour* (1817).

The wealth of publications on women and print culture is counterbalanced with a study on the masculine genre of the military memoir. Neil Ramsey’s *The Military Memoir and Romantic Literary Culture, 1780–1835* is an enterprising and revealing study of the memoirs and autobiographies of British soldiers. Ramsey explores the commercial and cultural success of this particular prose form, and its role in mediating warfare to the reading public during and immediately after the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. As Ramsey shows, the military memoir achieved widespread acclaim among the reading public of the late Romantic era, and his study locates the form in relation to Romantic culture’s wider understanding of war writing, autobiography, and
authorship. Ramsey identifies the publication of nearly 200 titles by British soldiers who served in all theatres of the Napoleonic Wars and which were published during the Romantic period, between 1792 and 1835. While the genre has been recognized by military historians, it has been neglected by literary critics. Ramsey argues that the military memoir ‘responded to and enabled elements of a modern culture of war to function through the specific deployment and rhetorical construction of the soldier’s suffering’ (p. 3) While the focus on suffering established in part a lasting strand of anti-war writing in memoirs by private soldiers, such stories also helped to foster a sympathetic bond between the soldier and the civilian that played an important role in developing ideas of a national war and functioned as a central component in a national commemoration of war.

Other publications that focus on the non-fiction prose by male writers include Timothy Webb’s article in *Studies in Romanticism*, ‘After Horsemonger Lane: Leigh Hunt’s London Letters to Byron (1815–1816)’. Webb details the exchange of letters between Byron and Hunt during 1815 and 1816, after Byron visited Hunt in Horsemonger Lane Gaol in London. Webb argues that conventional critical understanding of Hunt as a principal correspondent needs to be refigured given the fact that Byron also wrote regularly to Hunt. Webb explores the contents of their epistolary exchanges and reprints several letters from their correspondence. Whereas Webb and Ramsey examine a neglected genre of popular late Romantic writing, the political functions of prose in the public sphere from 1780–1830 is an important subject in Alex Benchimol’s *Intellectual Politics and Cultural Conflict in the Romantic Period*. Building on previous work by Jon Klancher, Jon Mee and Kevin Gilmartin, as well as theories of the public sphere deriving from Habermas and his interlocutors, Benchimol maps the intellectual formation of English plebeian radicalism and Scottish philosophic Whiggism over the long eighteenth century and examines their associated strategies of critical engagement with the cultural, social and political crises of the early nineteenth century. Benchimol compares the social criticism of the *Edinburgh Review*, particularly contributions from Francis Jeffrey, Henry Brougham and Thomas Carlyle, with the writing of their English radical counterparts Thomas Spence, T. J. Wooler and William Cobbett, in order to ‘highlight two competing intellectual responses to the new cultural order produced by—and later identified as—industrialism’ (p. 12).

Benchimol argues that the cultural conflict between the *Edinburgh Review* group and English radical intellectuals ‘underlines the complexity of Britain’s political and cultural modernity one hundred years after the Act of Union’ (p. 13). Benchimol’s study is a valuable contribution to the study of the Romantic public sphere and the competing role of national cultural formations in understanding Britain’s industrial modernity. The role of prose in the formation of Romantic national identity is also an element in another publication: Juliet Shields’s *Sentimental Literature and Anglo-Scottish Identity, 1745–1820* intervenes in recent debates over the Romantic emergence of nationalism to argue that, in the century following the Union, Scottish writers appealed to sentiment, or refined feeling, to imagine the nation as a community. Writers such as Tobias Smollett, Adam Smith, Walter Scott,
James Hogg, Christian Johnstone and John Galt ‘responded to Scotland’s loss of independent sovereignty by seeking in sentiment, or virtuous feeling, a compensation for political dispossession’ (p. 1). These writers tested the scope and limits of defining a nation as a ‘community united by sympathy rather than shared blood or common political and economic interests’. Shields’s study ranges across poetry, fiction and prose in order to demonstrate the important ways that, for Scottish writers, sentiment influenced the idea of nationhood and inclusive national community.

On a much more global scale is Hsuan L. Hsu’s Geography and the Production of Space in Nineteenth-Century America, which explores the way nineteenth-century texts often engaged in ‘marked shifts in point of view to make cognitive and emotional sense of the vast geographical transformations of their era’ (p. 1). Hsu explores the way that readers were encouraged to identify with spatial scales such as the home, region, city, nation and globe. Most of Hsu’s book engages with fiction, particularly Edgar Allan Poe, Henry James, Harriet Beecher Stowe and Charles Brockden Brown. Chapter 3 though examines writing by and about women missionaries working among the Chinese so as to explore the intersection between domestic fiction and missionary discourse. It is another impressive contribution to contemporary scholarship on the role prose played in the shaping of cultural geographies of gender within nineteenth-century America.

April London’s detailed study, Literary History Writing, 1770–1820 [reviewed here by Eliza O’Brien] presents us with a valuable account of the writing about literature in the Romantic period, at a time when our understanding of canon-formation is continually, and fruitfully, being undermined and complicated by the increasing recovery of the history of print. London explores changes in both print culture and political culture and situates her enquiry into literary history writing within these interconnecting spheres, choosing from them ‘representative instances of cross-generic negotiation that knot together central elements in contemporary thinking about the role and meaning of literary history’ (p. 3). The study is divided into four sections. Section I, ‘Writing and Rewriting Lives’, discusses Addison’s literary criticism, the effects of both Johnson’s Lives of the Poets and the revolutionary debates upon biographical writing, with a detailed consideration of Godwin’s Lives of Edward and John Philips, his indirect biography of Milton. Section II, ‘Literary History and Books’, turns to antiquarianism and bibliomania, focusing upon the work of Southey and Campbell as historians of poetry, and exploring the wider cultural concern about history writing that creates history as it seeks to represent it. Section III, ‘Isaac D’Israeli and Literary History’, provides a detailed examination of An Enquiry into the Literary and Political Character of James the First, conservative literary politics and the roles of opinion and anecdote in history writing. Section IV, ‘The Genres of Literary History’, broadens the terms of the study again, expertly moving across a variety of literary genres for a thorough examination of the ways in which attitudes towards audience shaped the evolution of something approaching a distinct genre of history writing into a more discrete subject.
3. The Novel

In this section Eliza O’Brien covers material on Walter Scott: all other works are covered by Felicity James.

It was rewarding to see a broad range of Romantic novels tackled in this year’s crop of criticism: forgotten authors of historical fiction were placed alongside Austen and Scott, and Mary Hays also received special attention. Another welcome turn—although not, perhaps, for a *YWES* editor—is that it has become increasingly difficult to separate work on Romantic prose fiction from work on Romantic poetry, as the boundaries between the two begin to break down in criticism, and the two genres are placed in dialogue.

A nice example of this move was offered in the collection of essays edited by Jacqueline M. Labbe, *The History of British Women’s Writing, 1750–1830*, volume 5. This roved across genre and period, setting a chapter on Anglophone Welsh women’s poetry alongside one on the mid-century novel, asking what Sarah Fielding might contribute to our understanding of Romanticism, and exploring the Victorian legacies of Romantic women’s writing. The introduction alone represents a key moment in our understanding of women’s writing and how it has been read in the last decades: Labbe provides an important and thoughtful overview of the current state of scholarship, showing how criticism has worked to produce a ‘complex understanding of women’s writing as a conglomeration of differences’ (p. 8). The essays that follow continue to complicate and deepen our understanding of women’s role in literary culture, and the production and consumption of Romantic prose fiction. Michelle Levy’s cogent discussion of ‘Women and Print Culture, 1750–1830’ argues for a larger conception of women’s engagement with the material world of print. Drawing on the data garnered by James Raven and Peter Garside in *The English Novel 1770–1829* [2000], Levy shows how we need to bear in mind not only women’s Romantic writing but also their roles as publishers, sellers, printers, distributors, and critics. Of particular note for this section, too, are the chapters by Stuart Curran, Devoney Looser, and Olivia Murphy. Curran’s ‘Charlotte Smith, Mary Wollstonecraft, and the Romance of Real Life’ explores the connections between Smith and Wollstonecraft, tracing the development of their realist style, and the transgressive power of their prose fiction, in terms both of theme and of linguistic experiment. The ‘literary (and linguistic) realism’ (p. 205) of these two novelists (but particularly Smith) shapes the social landscape and the style of Scott and Dickens, argues Curran. The strong sense of connection between Romantic and Victorian writing visible in Curran’s chapter is developed by Looser’s contribution, ‘The Porter Sisters, Women’s Writing, and Historical Fiction’, which reminds us of the relevant achievements of Jane and Anna Maria Porter. Anna Maria’s precocious *Artless Tales* [1793] and Jane’s best-sellers, *Thaddeus of Warsaw* [1803] and *The Scottish Chiefs* [1810], are deeply significant for any construction of the genealogy of the historical novel in Great Britain, and Looser uses these novels as a case study as she argues for a better understanding of the genre (and gender) of historical fiction writing. In part, Looser’s plea is answered and echoed this year by Anne H. Stevens’s *British Historical Fiction before Scott*; as Looser points out,
however, women such as the Porters are still being fully assessed, and we lack any book-length study of these remarkable sisters. Partly, as Murphy shows in her chapter, ‘Jane Austen’s Critical Response to Women’s Writing: “A good spot for fault-finding”’, this is down to the canon-formation at work in the early nineteenth century. Murphy thoughtfully uses Austen’s novels alongside her reading to show how she functions as a creative critic, seeking to question and define the legitimacy of the novel as a genre through her very subtle layering of literary allusion.

Jennie Batchelor’s Women’s Work: Labour, Gender, Authorship, 1750–1830 also explores the same issues of describing, and contextualizing, women’s textual labour. Her study, too, looks closely at authors’ ‘self-conceptualization as women and as literary professionals’ (p. 4) in the period, analysing the ‘squeamishly genteel’ ways in which work is often treated by women writers. Attuned to the ‘ideologies that have historically rendered women’s work invisible’ (p. 11), Batchelor offers a perceptive and comprehensive account of the ways in which critics have begun to discuss the relationship between gender, genre, work, and writing in the period. She then focuses on some close readings of the subject and nature of work by specific writers. Of particular interest for this section are her chapters on Charlotte Smith and Mary Wollstonecraft; these are informed in very intriguing ways by Sarah Fielding and Sarah Scott, providing us with new insights into relationships between writers and, importantly, between eighteenth-century and Romantic fiction. Batchelor shows how Smith’s presentation of literary labour—often of a ‘menial and debased kind’ (p. 68)—has shaped and overshadowed her reputation. The familiar critical narrative relating to Smith’s work (now, admittedly, beginning to be challenged—see Curran, above) sees her poetry as expressing her true creative genius, while her novels have often been viewed as hack-work, necessary labour. Batchelor, by contrast, sees Smith’s repeated emphasis on ‘writing as work’ as a crucial strategy, ‘an attempt to break down the barriers that prevented women writers from laying claim to the new models of literary professionalism that were being cemented in this period’ (p. 70). Through analysis of the novels, with a particular focus on Marchmont, Batchelor shows the complexity of her accounts of work, and also emphasizes the important personal dimension the debate contained for Smith. This is continued in the chapter on Wollstonecraft: Batchelor’s concern is to show how professional writers such as Wollstonecraft and Smith interrogated the role of female author in the period, and to set this in the context of their personal and intellectual contributions to the debate on women’s work. Her study brings together sensitivity to style and form with historical specificity. Alongside her close attention to the literary portrayal of work, and the self-portrayals of particular women writers, for example, she investigates external influences such as the role of the Literary Fund: this combines to provide interesting new perspectives on women’s writing, and on the Romantic novel as a whole.

Anne H. Stevens, in British Historical Fiction before Scott, offers another strong study of the continuities and connections across eighteenth-century and Romantic fiction. This was both, Stevens begins, the historical age and the novelistic age, and she convincingly outlines the codification and formalization
of the historical novel as a genre long before the publication of *Waverley* [1814], emphasizing, in an engaging way, that she sees no socio-historical explanations for its emergence: its story is ‘too fascinating, messy, and unfamiliar’ to be reduced in this way (p. 14). This is an good rereading of the genre: Stevens clearly situates her work in relation to earlier critics, from Lukács to Fleishman, and complains that even in more recent work there has been a persistent tendency to taxonomize the historical novel according to generic conventions established by Scott. Instead, Stevens urges us to watch ‘the literary field unfold rather than making sense of it retrospectively’ (p. 9). To enable this, she examines canonical texts in the context of many little-known works, following Franco Moretti’s call for scholars to attempt a ‘distant reading’ which takes account of large patterns amid the massed rabble of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century texts. First, Stevens looks at a broad range of fiction from mid- to late eighteenth century, setting Horace Walpole alongside Thomas Leland, and rereading Clara Reeve and Sophia Lee in the context of forgotten novels such as Agnes Musgrave’s *Cicely; or the Rose of Raby* [1796], a ‘blatant copy’ of Lee’s *The Recess*. In the second half of the book, she looks at the years 1784–1813, reading Sydney Owenson, Maria Edgeworth, and William Godwin alongside a fascinatingly diverse selection of texts such as John Agg’s *Edwy and Elgiva* [1811], and the perhaps deservedly neglected *The Anglo-Saxons; or, the Court of Ethelwulph* [1806] by Leslie Armstrong, which Stevens herself admits is ‘unintentionally comic’ (p. 86). This open-minded attention to a broad range enables Stevens to trace broad generic developments, informed both by a conceptual discussion of genre, drawing on film theory, and by a close concern with historically specific detail of literary culture: book production, sales, circulation, reviews, and audience. Chapter 3, for instance, gives an account of the importance of the circulating library to the development of the genre, analysing a range of catalogues to show canon-formation in process, and there is also a chapter devoted to the role of the critical review in shaping perceptions of the historical novel. The book closes by reading *Ivanhoe* [1819] in the light of this huge body of historical fiction which preceded it, showing Scott’s generic innovations in their proper context.

Another type of engagement with the past was offered by Jonathan Sachs in *Romantic Antiquity: Rome in the British Imagination, 1789–1832*, which genuinely broadens our understanding of Romanticism. It is a confident, authoritative examination of the uses to which Rome was put in Romanticism: how the legacy of the Roman republic was debated, manipulated, and fought over, and its relevance to concepts of nation and political ideology. Although the study is underpinned by a detailed knowledge of the classical sources of Romanticism, it is not enough, argues Sachs, ‘to say that the Romantics know the classics or even to point to the places where they refer to them; the more important question is, What is the meaning of that use?’ (p. 37). That question has particular interest for those studying Romantic prose fiction because Sachs shows how the genre of the Jacobin novel was used to ‘update classical historical models and produce a progressive vision of commercial society’ (p. 76). Sachs’s reading of Mary Hays’s *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* [1796] is typical of the ways in which he unpacks the difficulties and ambivalences of
the classical presence in Jacobin fiction. Emma has a diet of Plutarch prescribed by her father to counteract her devouring of fiction (probably drawn from Rousseau’s account of his boyhood reading). But it is to Rousseau’s La Nouvelle Héloïse that Emma returns when she is shocked at the ‘corrupt, luxurious, licentious, perfidious, mercenary’ aspects of Greece and Rome: this is no straightforward struggle between classical reason and contemporary passion. Sachs also points out the significance of the name Augustus: as Emma turns away from Augustan corruption, and the ‘pernicious ambition of an Augustus Caesar’ she paradoxically embraces Augustus Harley, ‘both versions of Augustus show great but squandered potential’, writes Sachs, ‘much as Emma presents herself’ (p. 89). The Jacobin novel is not afraid to critique its classical inheritance, therefore, and indeed, frequently reworks classical history to put forward its own version of republican values, weighted towards public-spiritedness and ‘civic virtue’ rather than warmongering and imperialism. At the same time, this reuse of classical history might be seen as a tool in the ongoing battle to define the right sort of sensibility and reading practices, as the Jacobin novel seeks to defend itself from accusations of emotionality and self-indulgence. Sachs goes on to trace this debate through Godwin, Holcroft, and Inchbald. His reading helps to unlock the wider significance of Jacobin fiction, and to show how its innovations must be understood as part of a dialogue with the past.

James P. Carson’s Populism, Gender, and Sympathy in the Romantic Novel also opens with an evocation of the classical world: the striking image of the ‘ear of Dionysius’, the huge ear-shaped cave which the ancient tyrant used to eavesdrop on the conversations of his enemies. Carson discusses the fascination which this ‘superhuman sense organ’ held for Romantic travellers as well as novelists such as Scott: like Bentham’s Panopticon, this is an ‘important instrument of knowledge and power’. Carson uses the image as a way into understanding the vast topic of voice in the Romantic novel, in several different contexts: narrative voice, phonocentrism, auditory surveillance, oral literature, and voices from the dead, to name but a few. Above all, however, the book is concerned with changing attitudes to sympathy and the crowd in the period—how, for instance, writers in the period sought to make themselves heard, and to instil the ‘inner voice’ which might transform a crowd into ‘disciplined, autonomous individuals’ (p. 8). Carson investigates attitudes to individualism and the crowd, and the relationship between the solitary self and collective action. The cave, which might at first appear to be associated with Romantic solitude, ‘proves to have been an ancient mechanism for the production of knowledge and political control through eavesdropping’ (p. 25): a way of listening in to the crowd. Carson then sets about listening in to crowd scenes across the period. In the first chapter, he sets Gothic and Romantic visions of crowds alongside one another to suggest the ways in which Gothic fiction, with its multiple identifications and doublings, seeks to accommodate the crowd. He then traces crowd-scenes through the fiction of Scott, Matthew Lewis’s The Monk [1796] and Journal of a West India Proprietor [1834], and the works of Charles Maturin before closing, in his final chapters, with a discussion of Godwin and Mary Shelley, with particular attention to Valperga [1823] and Lodore [1835]. The book moves across an impressive range of
writing, attentive to repetitions and echoes, and forgotten voices in the period—at times, there is so much in play that the complexity of the book becomes overwhelming. This is, however, an insightful book which reflects a larger critical interest in the nature of the crowd and collective action in the period, and maps it carefully on to the form and imagery of the Romantic novel.

Tilottama Rajan, *Romantic Narrative: Shelley, Hays, Godwin, Wollstonecraft*, offers one of the most significant recent works on Romantic prose fiction and, like many others this year, her study also probes the relationship between genres. The book responds to twentieth-century identifications of Romanticism with lyric poetry and seeks to refocus attention on the ‘poetics of narrative as it emerges in Romantic prose fiction’ (p. xiii). This also serves to remind us that many critical conceptions of the Romantic novel have been filtered through a Victorian lens, as a ‘sociopolitical institution that developed through the nineteenth century’ (p. xii), which privileged plot as the key feature of narrative. As such, it has much to teach us about the relationship between poetry and prose in the period, and the definition of Romanticism itself. Foregrounding Scott and Austen in our stories of Romantic fiction imposes a Victorianized perspective: we need to break away from this retrospective patterning and look more closely at Romantic prose on its own terms. Rajan therefore turns away from more obvious texts of the period, and brings to centre stage four authors who use narrative in different ways—Percy Shelley, Mary Hays, William Godwin, and Mary Wollstonecraft. *Alastor* is read alongside Wordsworth’s *Ruined Cottage* and Keats’s *The Fall of Hyperion*, as well as the novels of Mary Shelley; chapter 2 takes Shelley’s juvenilia seriously, setting *Zastrozzi* and *St Irvyne* in the context of Shelley’s Promethean narrative, specifically *Prometheus Unbound*. Thus, Rajan seeks to disrupt classifications, both of genre and of period. She then moves back, to look at Mary Hays, and what she terms the ‘autonarration’ of *Memoirs of Emma Courtney*—that curious work of self-narrativization, where life and fiction seem to inform one another. This leads into a discussion of Godwin, using *Political Justice* and comparing it with Kant’s *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Godwin’s work is a critique of judgement, she argues, ‘at the site of practical reason in its intersection with institutional rationality’ (p. 342), and she goes on to work through the ways in which this critique might function, before moving on to discuss the novels. Their notorious refusal of neat conclusions and satisfying endings connects with Godwin’s interest in the process of judgement. It is not simply Caleb Williams who is put on trial, but the whole genre of the novel as judgement: Godwin, writes Rajan, is asking us to question ‘the very reaching of a moral decision formalized by “deciding” the plot’ (p. 344). In her book, Rajan extends this idea through a larger exploration of Romantic prose: seeing Godwin in the context of Shelley, too, helps to further this idea of the genre
under question. Chapter 5 of *Romantic Narrative* sees Rajan exploring the disciplinarity of the novel, through a close reading of *St Leon*, and continuing productively to set Godwin in the context of Kant. In her final chapter, Rajan considers Godwin as editor, showing how he presents Wollstonecraft’s *Wrongs of Woman*. Rajan’s intention is not to criticize Godwin’s editorial interventions but to critique them, and to understand the narratives which emerge from his editing, narratives which help to give more insight into the poetry in Romantic prose.

The questions of judgement and ethics raised by Rajan and Carson are placed in a wider context of social agency in Anne Frey’s *British State Romanticism: Authorship, Agency, and Bureaucratic Nationalism*. Frey argues that authors such as Wordsworth, Coleridge, Scott, Austen, and De Quincey were actively exploring ‘whether literature could carry out any of the state’s tasks’ (p. 2), and the ‘relationship between authorship, the state, and individual agency’ (p. 3). Yet they were also aware of the ways in which literature ‘might lack power’ (p. 14), and were keen to investigate the capacity and limits of the novel. Frey responds to recent criticism on community, nation, and imperialism, and expands it. Like Karen Fang’s work on Romantic-era periodicals, Frey asks us to ‘rethink both literature and authorship during a period of imperial expansion, rising nationalist sentiment, and increasing bureaucratization’ (p. 3). Her study also responds to and furthers the work of Katie Trumpener: Frey, too, is interested in understanding regional identity, but urges us to think again about *English* regional identity. Another interesting and independent-minded aspect of Frey’s work is her careful consideration of late Romanticism. Rather than presenting the conservative turn of Wordsworth and Coleridge as straightforwardly reactionary, Frey urges us to reread the relationship in their later work between aesthetics and the state. These late Romantics become in Frey’s formulation ‘State Romantics’, rethinking ‘agency and aesthetics in the context of a state that increasingly penetrates individual lives’ (p. 16), and are used as a backdrop for her exploration of Scott, Austen, and De Quincey. Frey argues that in Scott we see the importance of non-governmental individuals penetrating Scotland and bringing British order to Scotland. Similarly, she shows how Austen exhibits a keen interest in alternative forms of community and national identity: witness her preoccupation with the navy as an institution. Frey emphasizes Austen’s range of current, political reading—Clarkson, Buchanan, Pasley—and suggests that *Persuasion* [1816] argues for a form of ‘military governance’, that the novel encodes a ‘vision of nation that foregrounds government bureaucracies and agencies’ (p. 118). Frey makes a valuable contribution to our readings of Romantic novel and nation, suggesting that prose fiction in this period has an important part to play in this exploration of the role and function of the nineteenth-century British state.

Other investigations of national—and transnational—consciousness in relation to the novel included Robyn L. Schiffman’s ‘A Concert of Werthers’ (*ECS* 43[2010] 207–22). Schiffman examines the frequent appearance of *Werther*—both novel and character—in literature of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, focusing on the British literary
tradition but also looking to Continental and American novels. She shows how British Romantic-era novels recast and claimed Werther ‘literally as one of their own’, sometimes violently disputing the authorship of ‘this Dr. Goethe’ in the words of a character from Elizabeth Tomlins’s A Victim of Fancy [1787], who is convinced that it must have been penned by ‘some son of Britain’. As late as Cranford [1853], Gaskell’s Mr Holbrook insists on pronouncing Goethe ‘strictly in accordance with the English sound of the letters’. Meanwhile, authors such as Godwin and Mary Shelley found their own ways to appropriate and change Werther. Schiffman gives a good account of this Anglicization in literature and culture of the period, showing the translating and incorporating urge of the British novel. In ‘Is There a Bull in This Nation? On Maria Edgeworth’s Nationalism’ (SiR 49[2010] 79–104) Amit Yahav discusses the ways in which Edgeworth’s national tales have been read in recent years, and aims at a new reading of her nationalism, emphasizing its coherence and significance. Edgeworth’s nationalism, Yahav contends, should be seen less as a question of cultural heritage, and more in ‘terms of citizenship’ (p. 81). This form of ‘civic nationalism’ may be traced, suggests Yahav, from the Essay on Irish Bulls [1802] into the novels Ennui [1809] and The Absentee [1812]. The nation which emerges from these different works is based on a community of debaters and interpreters, rather than on a set of national characteristics—it privileges collaboration and conversation rather than consensus, and allows a range of different voices to be heard. A ‘bull’—a ‘laughable confusion of ideas’, according to the Essay on Irish Bulls—therefore has no place in this conception of the nation. Above all, the ‘interpretive community of debaters’ that is Edgeworth’s nation takes seriously the claims of all its members’ (p. 84).

Katarina Gephardt’s ‘Hybrid Gardens: Travel and the Nationalization of Taste in Ann Radcliffe’s Continental Landscapes’ (ERR 21[2010] 3–28) reads the portrayal of landscapes in Radcliffe’s novels as an index to changing nationalist sentiment. The revision of continental landscapes which happens through the course of her novels might usefully be set ‘in the context of discourses that promote national standards of taste’ (p. 5), as Gephardt shows through her careful illustration of post-revolutionary landscape aesthetics, from Payne Knight to Repton, using the paintings of William Marlow among others to add depth and colour to her readings of Radcliffe’s picturesque.

Gephardt’s approach has some parallels with Deidre Shauna Lynch’s ‘“Young ladies are delicate plants”: Jane Austen and Greenhouse Romanticism’ (ELH 77[2010] 689–729). Lynch builds on two interesting aspects of Romanticist criticism: the interest in botany and natural science, and a reading of Austen which sees her as a naturalist alongside Darwin—such as Peter Graham’s Jane Austen and Charles Darwin: Naturalists and Novelists [2008]. Our understanding of ‘green Romanticism’ has become more nuanced as we understand the plurality and complexity of Romantic-era perspectives on nature: is it time, Lynch asks, for the concept of ‘greenhouse Romanticism’, an idea which reflects Romantic interventions in nature, bringing together nature and artifice, organicism and culture? Roving from the Universal Botanist and Nurseyman and The Florist’s Directory to the lush engravings of The Temple of Flora and Gillray’s ‘Nature Display’d’ (accompanied by lovely
illustrations of ‘The Indian Reed’ and the ‘auricula stage’ among others), Lynch builds up a detailed and revealing account of the horticultural discourse of Romanticism, before moving into the literary hot-house, and showing its effect on novels, poems, and plays, including Polwhele, Wollstonecraft, Smith, Edgeworth, and Cowper. This proves a rich grounding for Lynch’s discussion of Austen’s ventures into the garden. The novels, she shows, are crowded with specimens of Austen’s interest in gardening and floristry—from General Tilney’s pinery to Fanny Price’s geraniums—and, equally, reveal a persistent interest in the ways in which artifice and nature (‘stylization and naturalism’, as Marilyn Butler puts it) may be balanced. Austen, Lynch shows, is a perfect example of a ‘greenhouse’ Romanticist.

Lynch’s fascinating article set the tone for an excellent crop of Austen essays in *ELH* this year—not exactly related, but all addressing issues of readership and narrative strategy in illuminating ways, and, like Lynch, bringing out the different contexts against which Austen might be read. Peter W. Graham, ‘Falling for the Crawfords: Character, Contingency, and Narrative’ (*ELH* 77[2010] 867–91), takes as his starting point the persistent attraction which the Crawfords exert over readers of *Mansfield Park*—sometimes at odds with the pallid, self-restraining Fanny Price. Graham’s article analyses the charm of the Crawfords, characteristics such as their ‘candidly acknowledged mobility’ (p. 869) and their verbal dexterity. As he points out through a series of engaging readings, the Crawfords are an equivocal pair, and Austen is well aware of their potential attractiveness. Mary’s playful wit is surely a recasting of Elizabeth Bennet’s liveliness, and Henry, despite his flirtatiousness, displays a winning empathy, and comes to love Fanny ‘rationally, as well as passionately’. Discussing the mixed characteristics of the Crawfords, Graham concludes that Austen deliberately allows her readers to consider an alternative ending: ‘the complex moral and narratological contingencies’ of Austen’s narrative, he concludes ‘allow readers to imagine and perhaps prefer another conclusion’ (p. 890). Following this, Rae Greiner’s ‘The Art of Knowing Your Own Nothingness’ (*ELH* 77[2010] 893–914) offers a different reading of sympathetic response in and to Austen’s novels through the concept of ‘the case’, borrowed from James Chandler’s *England in 1819*, and further refined through the arguments of Lauren Berlant, who suggests that ‘when executed conventionally, the case study is a claim about realism’ (p. 893). Greiner seeks to explore and further develop Berlant’s contention. She does so by tracing nineteenth-century realism to its roots in eighteenth-century sympathy, and the article has a special focus on *Persuasion*, suggesting that ‘the cases central to that novel are rooted in a Smithian account of sympathy’ (p. 894). She therefore begins with a reading of Adam Smith, before moving on to show how Austen borrows his principles to endow her realist representations with sympathy—showing how the case is the novel’s ‘key exemplifying technique’, from Anne thinking through her early love affair to Wentworth discussing his hazelnuts. Anne’s way of case-making, argues Greiner, ‘proves central to both her growing ethical sensibility and her potential for plot’ (p. 902). An influential twentieth-century reading of Austen’s perspective on sympathy was tackled by Wendy Anne Lee in ‘Resituating “Regulated Hatred”: D.W. Harding’s Jane Austen’ (*ELH* 77[2010] 995–1014). This looks
back at the profoundly influential Austen constructed by the 32-year-old Harding in his 1939 lecture to the Literary Society of Manchester University: the lecture which would become his Scrutiny piece. Harding, as Lee puts it, ‘opened the door to a misanthropic Austen’ (p. 996), pushing amiable ‘Dear Aunt Jane’ out into the cold. However, Lee suggests that some of Harding’s implications—not least the sense of Austen as political figure—have been obscured: first by the editing which went on when the piece was first published in toned down form in Scrutiny, and then by the host of dark, embittered, antisocial Austens which appeared in criticism in the wake of Harding’s essay (Lee looks particularly at the vicious spinster of Marvin Mudrick’s work, and then at D.A. Miller’s more recent account of her as a defensive, hostile stylist). Lee’s point is not to dispute particular accounts of Austen, but to reread Harding more fully. She therefore returns to his seminal essay and re-evaluates its importance for current Austen criticism, restoring Harding’s original ‘delineation of a writer fundamentally engaged in the political sphere’ (p. 997). 

She does this partly through absorbing contextual work in the Harding archives held by Emmanuel College, Cambridge, going back to the drafts of the essay and working through the changes made to it to show Harding’s developing thought. She deftly suggests the influence of wartime on Harding’s criticism, and outlines the analyses of social relations offered in his other work (such as The Impulse to Dominate [1941] and Social Psychology and Individual Values [1953]). The result is an essay of vital importance for current Austen criticism: we all think we know the Austen which emerges from ‘Regulated Hatred’, but Lee shows a much more subtle and nuanced version of Harding’s approach. Austen’s fiction became, in his reading, ‘a survivor’s guide or strategist’s playbook for handling the most precarious and hostile situations’ (p. 1010). Finally for this issue of ELH, Michelle Levy’s ‘Austen’s Manuscripts and the Publicity of Print’ (ELH 77[2010] 1015–40) provided a new account of Austen’s use of manuscript culture alongside printed publication. On a general level, she suggests, we overlook the important influence of manuscript culture on Romanticism at our peril, since it gives us a valuable perspective on ‘the ongoing contest over the identity and authority of print’ (p. 1016). While suggesting that the project has importance for many Romantic authors, Levy uses Austen as her primary case study, arguing that we are perhaps too ready to accept the idea of her easy transition from juvenile manuscript work to mature publication, from amateur scribe to professional author. Instead, through close reading of the tactics adopted in her manuscripts, as well as the portrayal of scribal culture in the printed novels, Levy shows Austen as self-consciously reflecting on the freedoms, and the limitations, of manuscript culture. Harriet’s book of riddles, for example, ridiculed for its trifling nature, may show Austen’s ‘awareness of the limits of a feminized manuscript culture’ (p. 1030), with its emphasis on collection and transcription rather than creativity. Yet that book of riddles might also bear witness to Austen’s gleeful and subversive authorial practices, since the ‘courtship’ charade seems to hold a sardonic allusion to the ‘Prince of Whales’, her revenge, perhaps, on the book’s dedicatee. The private confidences of manuscript, Levy suggests, may thus be glimpsed surviving in print form, and she shows other ways in which we might see manuscript practices at work in the printed novels. This article
should be essential reading alongside the online resource, Jane Austen’s Fiction Manuscripts: A Digital Edition (covered in YWES 90[2011]), to better inform our understanding of the layers of ambivalence and secrecy these manuscripts encode and their complex relationship with the novels. Austen’s manuscripts do not simply inform her printed works in a purely developmental way—they instead, Levy convincingly argues, reveal her ambivalence to print itself, and her carefully guarded approach to publicity.

Levy’s very thoughtful analysis of the early work, and her serious discussion of the juvenilia, find an echo in Gillian Russell’s ‘‘‘A Hint of It, with Initials’’: Adultery, Textuality and Publicity in Jane Austen’s Lady Susan’ (WW 17[2010] 469–86). Russell offers a new reading of Lady Susan in the context of adultery trials in the 1780s and 1790s, and particularly contemporary adultery trial literature. Austen was always keen to observe the details of adultery—witness the comment to Cassandra, ‘I am proud to say that I have a very good eye at an Adultress’—and yet her representation of the topic has received little attention in criticism. This is perhaps related to a larger failure to appreciate Austen’s lively engagement with print culture in the late Georgian period as a whole. Russell discusses the ways in which the adultery trials permeated print culture, from pamphlets and collections of Trials to respectable publications, The Times and Monthly Review. She shows how Austen was well able to read the tropes and conventions of such reports, and how they made their stealthy way into her fiction in Lady Susan and, subsequently, Mansfield Park. Like Levy, Russell is alert to Austen’s stratagems of concealment in the juvenilia; the development of ‘a style based on indirection, the strategic detail, the nod and wink of a hint’ (p. 483), and Russell’s argument gains productively from being read in the wider context of Levy’s investigation of manuscript culture. So too does Freya Johnston’s discussion of the juvenilia, ‘Jane Austen’s Past Lives’ (CQ 39[2010] 103–21). ‘Oh! Dr. Goldsmith Thou art as partial a Historian as myself!’ commented Austen on the family copy of his History of England from the Earliest Times to the Death of George II [1771]. Austen’s sharp response finds fullest expression in her juvenile work, History of England from the reign of Henry the 4th to the death of Charles the 1st [1791], which Johnston terms a ‘self-possessed rampage’ through history. Johnston’s article—itself rather self-possessed, and disarmingly readable—looks at Austen’s juvenilia to make a serious point about the way Austen tackled history throughout her writing life. How should we understand this ‘partial, prejudiced, & ignorant Historian’? Partly, Johnston shows, by taking its partiality and prejudices seriously, and investigating Austen’s knowing narrative strategies. The early work, full of jokes, gore, and absurdity, reveals ‘a lifelong interest in the way that history affects our ethical make-up and actions in the present’ (p. 109). Austen’s ruthless spoofs, after all, are based in an affectionate, intimate, thorough knowledge of history and its uses and abuses: Austen knows her Goldsmith, her Hume and Robertson, and her later reading of Pasley and Robert Henry shows her continuing interest in the writing of history. Johnston gives an excellent account of the ways in which this alertness to the conventions of historical writing may be glimpsed in Austen’s early writing. Reading the History of England alongside Love and Freindship and Catharine, or The Bower, with an eye to the later novels, she
reveals the nuances of Austen’s style. An exercise ‘in diminution’ such as the life of Lady Jane Grey, for example, is beautifully analysed: ‘it is partly the gerunds’, Johnston muses, ‘which make the episode shudder with brutal humour’ (p. 116).

Another good reading of Austen, this time from a specifically linguistic background, is offered by Massimiliano Morini. ‘The Poetics of Disengagement: Jane Austen and Echoic Irony’ (L&L 19[2010] 339–56) focuses on a close discussion of her irony. To talk of Austen’s irony is a commonplace, whether from a radical or a conservative viewpoint, yet what, exactly, do we mean when we employ the term? It’s a more difficult idea to grasp than we often acknowledge, suggests Morini, and we need ‘to make sure that it does not end up casting an ironic light on the critic looking for a simple explanation of irony’ (p. 341). Morini aims, therefore, to discuss the linguistic complexities of Austen’s style, and does so in a detailed yet accessible way. He uses the formulation put forward by Sperber and Wilson (for example, in Relevance: Communication and Cognition [1986]) of ‘echoic irony’ and explores what this tells us about the function and purpose of irony. Yet he contends that the term does not really leave room for Austen’s different narrative strategies: a better way of expressing it might be ‘perspectival disengagement’ (p. 340), which widens the scope of Sperber and Wilson’s concept, and allows us to see how a ‘conflation/conflict of engaging points of view can be created’ in Austen’s fiction (p. 352).

Just what is Louisa Musgrove doing tumbling from the Cobb? Tackling a scene which persistently puzzles critics—not to mention my students—John Morillo argues that this awkward fall is part of a larger project in the fiction both of Austen and of Inchbald to ‘edit Eve’ and rewrite the story of the fallen woman. In ‘Editing Eve: Rewriting the Fall in Austen’s Persuasion and Inchbald’s A Simple Story’ (ECF 23[2010] 195–223) he contends that both novels present literal and figurative scenes of falling to underscore their attempts to rewrite the biblical plot. They do so in order, Morillo argues, to ‘advance the comic romance novel as a forum for feminism’ (p. 198). However, he suggests, Inchbald’s is the bolder and more explicit revision of Eve, as she passes the responsibility for narrative choice on to the reader. ‘What we are all left to surmise about the daughter’s fate’, concludes Morillo, ‘supplies the knowledge needed to rethink problems of carnal knowledge, since it allows for a better understanding of the mother’s fate as its precondition’ (p. 223).

Another angle on such accidents is offered by Erika Wright’s ‘Prevention as Narrative in Jane Austen’s Mansfield Park’ (SNNTS 42[2010] 377–94). Wright tackles the well-known narrative trajectory from sickness to cure in Austen’s novels, obsessed with broken limbs, ailing bodies, haggard complexions, and fevers. This preoccupation with illness and cure has intrigued many critics: what if, argues Wright, we shift the emphasis to prevention, rather than cure? ‘What would a novel built around prevention look like?’ (p. 379). Very like Mansfield Park, argues Wright, who shows how Fanny’s frequent warnings—‘you will tear your gown—you will be in danger of slipping into the Ha Ha Ha!’—encourage the reader to think about preventative action, to develop patience and to turn away from the seductive power of the ‘crisis-recovery trajectory’. Setting the novel alongside the ways in which physicians at the time, such as
William Buchan or Thomas Beddoes, urged the ‘PREVENTION of mischief’, Wright interestingly shows how *Mansfield Park* might be seen as ‘the period’s best instruction book in narratives of prevention’ (p. 377). Another reading of *Mansfield Park* is offered by Jeffrey Cass, ‘“Taking a Trip into China”: The Uneasy Pleasures of Colonialist Space in Mansfield Park’ (in Faubert and Schmid, eds., *Romanticism and Pleasure*, pp. 133–48). Cass brings a fresh eye to post-Saidian debate over Mansfield Park. He opens by reminding us of the ‘grinding between the aesthetics and the politics of pleasure’ evident in Said’s work—his childhood enjoyment of the Oriental/Arabic cliché, for instance. This aesthetic pleasure Said takes in Austen is the starting point for a rereading of the link between ‘colonial pleasure and shame’ underlying the novel (p. 145).

The philosophical uses of Austen were discussed by a number of critics this year. James Lindemann Nelson, in ‘How Catherine Does Go On: Northanger Abbey and Moral Thought’ (*P&L* 34[2010] 188–200), explores the ways in which Austen has been ‘particularly congenial’ to philosophers, from Gilbert Ryle to Alice Crary. Nelson’s article has a special focus on Crary’s *Beyond Moral Judgement* [2007], and seeks to expand Crary’s findings through a close reading of *Northanger Abbey*. He is interested in the range of social practices which Austen’s characters are forced to negotiate, and the ways these underlying circumstances might shape moral codes. Crary, he says, ‘needs to be more alert to how practices that install our sense of what is natural and what deviant help disturbing features of experience slip that grasp’ (p. 199).

Karen Valihora, in *Austen’s Oughts: Judgement after Locke and Shaftesbury*, focuses on the tiny, discriminating nuances implied by Austen’s use of the word ‘ought’. There is a world of difference, she points out, between the resentful self-reflection of Emma when she hears that Jane Fairfax is coming to Highbury for three long months—‘To be always doing more than she wished, and less than she ought!’—and the narrator’s comment to the reader when Emma does, finally, recognize and respond to her love for Knightley: ‘What did she say?—Just what she ought, of course. A lady always does.’ Valihora describes Austen’s use of ‘ought’ as ‘a minutely calibrated key to the demands of moral judgments conceived in aesthetic terms’ (p. 16), and shows how we might understand it through Austen’s careful experiments with perspective, first- and third-person narratives, and points of view. She sets this investigation in the wider context of eighteenth-century intellectual debate over standards of morality, taste, and propriety. Beginning with the philosophical background—Shaftesbury, Locke, Smith—Valihora very interestingly moves on to show the importance of Sir Joshua Reynolds’s *Discourses on Art*. It’s no coincidence, she suggests, that Darcy’s housekeeper is Mrs Reynolds: showing off the picture of her master, she enlarges Elizabeth’s view of Darcy, and assists in her rereading and revision of her moral code. Valihora devotes two striking and original chapters to the discussion of the interplay between Reynolds and Austen, showing how both understand, and translate, ‘the moral dimensions of Shaftesbury’s aesthetic agenda’ (p. 235). Vivavans Soni also seeks to set Austen’s approach to judgement in a larger intellectual context. In ‘Committing Freedom: The Cultivation of Judgment in Rousseau’s *Emile* and Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*’ (*ECent* 51[2010] 363–87), Soni shows
the way both texts seek to understand the acquisition of judgement. Both show crises of judgement, intimately connected with modernity. But Rousseau, argues Soni, replicates the crisis: Austen shows us a way to resolve it. *Pride and Prejudice*, in Soni’s reading, insists ‘simultaneously on the revisability and finality of judgment’ (p. 371) with its emphasis on rereading, revising, and, importantly, moving towards a conclusion. In some ways, Soni’s rejection of the critical tendency to emphasize indeterminacy in Austen is paralleled by Joyce Kerr Tarpley’s *Constancy and the Ethics of Jane Austen’s Mansfield Park*. Austen’s ethics may be understood, Tarpley argues, through a close reading of her presentation of constancy, focused on a single novel. The starting point for Tarpley’s study is that we should approach constancy as the most important virtue in Austen’s fiction, a central, unifying ideal: a concept similar to Plato’s justice in the *Republic*. Therefore, she begins with a definition of the word, and its ethical implications, before discussing its development through the character of Fanny Price, and her behaviour in particular situations—for example, her attitude to leisure, when she appears as the only one of Austen’s characters to use the freedom of her leisure constructively, or her response to beauty in nature. Tarpley argues strongly against indeterminacy and ambiguity in the novel: her reading emphasizes the philosophical coherence and Christian ideals of Austen’s fiction.

J.A. Downie, in ‘Rehabilitating Sir Thomas Bertram’ (*SEL* 50[2010] 739–58), sets out a lucid thesis: ‘Jane Austen is a satirical novelist’ (p. 739). Have we forgotten this, in the rush to emphasize the progressive aspects of her writing? Downie turns resolutely away from recent readings of *Mansfield Park* as feminist, liberal, or subversive: we need to think of Austen in a conservative satirical tradition, he urges, and position her in the tradition of Jonathan Swift and Samuel Johnson. To do so, he offers a reconsideration of Sir Thomas and his ‘solemn kindness’. This oxymoron shows us the conflicts at work in his character, in which his authoritarianism mingles with what Austen describes as ‘a general wish of doing right’, so that it is very hard to work out which emotion is uppermost when, for example, he offers Maria a way out of her engagement to Rushworth, or forcibly encourages Fanny into marriage with Crawford. There’s not much question, however, in Downie’s reading, which comes firmly down on the side of Sir Thomas’s generosity, and on Austen as carefully balancing his strengths and weaknesses. The idea of Austen as subverting Sir Thomas’s moral principles, states Downie, is hard to maintain, ‘for no other reason than that…these are the very principles that Edmund and Fanny also wish to uphold’ (p. 756), and this is further supported by the rehabilitation of Sir Thomas at the close of the novel. Downie’s is a calm and confident reading, supported by close readings of Austen’s narrative voice, and it acts as a useful counterpoint to the villainous Sir Thomas (advanced by, for example, Patricia Rozema’s film). However, as Downie admits, moments of ‘rhetorical reticence on Austen’s part’ meant that ‘critics are of course free to interpret Mansfield Park as an attack on paternalistic values if they wish’ (p. 755), and it is this reticence which is at the heart of Austen’s fiction, and which allows continually productive reinterpretations.

Some of these are discussed by Dianne F. Sadoff, in ‘Marketing Jane Austen at the Megaplex’ (*Novel* 43[2010] 83–92), in which she demonstrates the many
uses to which Austen’s life, as well as her fiction, have been put, to please a cinema-going audience. Sadoff calls our attention to the knowing ways in which the Austen brand has been created, and its transnational reach. This is the canonical novel as product—‘Hollywood’s premier pre-sold product’, no less—accompanied by enticing sounding spin-offs such as the Jane Austen Action Figure (‘Weapon of Choice: Character Study’). A particularly interesting development in recent years has been the ways in which Austen’s biography has been co-opted, especially in Becoming Jane, where Anne Hathaway plays the girlish author sighing over Tom Lefroy. On its release in 2007, Sadoff notes, the film ‘took in just under $1 million at 100 US and £650,000 at 325 UK screens in its first weekend—nothing to compare, on the following weekend, with Superbad’s US opening of $31.2 million’ but still impressive for a ‘heritage biopic’ (p. 84). That ‘weapon of choice’ is still a powerful one, it seems. Kristel Thornell, in ‘Film Adaptations of Emma between Agency and Submission’ (Mosaic 43[2010] 17–33), also examines the consumer power, and the gender implications, of Austen film adaptations. In her lively reading of Clueless, Amy Heckerling’s 1995 Valley-girls take on Emma—still, surprisingly, going strong as a student favourite—Thornell compares it with Douglas McGrath’s Emma [1996] to show how we need to consider ‘the nuances of cultural products’. Both films might appear to endorse conservative values and patriarchal authority, yet both also accommodate tensions and uncertainties, suggesting the ‘turbulence within the representation of “femininity”’. Thornell’s is an engaging reading; one question it invites, yet does not wholly address, is the length of time which has elapsed since the release of these films, and their 1990s context (implied but perhaps not fully explored). The films are certainly still very relevant, but might we now see their representations of Regency femininity slightly differently, in light of the recent marketing of Austen which Sadoff, for one, documents?

Patricia Meyer Spacks’s Pride and Prejudice: An Annotated Edition is a beautifully produced version of the novel. It is informed by a wealth of knowledge on eighteenth-century literature and culture, with an eye, too, to popular readership of the book—Spacks’s introduction moves easily between Pride and Prejudice and Zombies, flogging in the eighteenth-century militia, and the films referenced by Sadoff. When we turn to the text of the novel there is an immediate shock in seeing such a forest of footnotes that they push the prose to one side of the page. But Spacks’s notes are far from pedantic: it is rather like holding a conversation with an ideally informed friend, ready to point out that a chaise and four rather reminds one of the ‘great many Carriages’ Austen recalled featuring in the juvenile work Memoirs of Mr Clifford (p. 30), or that Lizzy’s self-reproach, ‘I could not have been more wretchedly blind’, might be usefully compared to Lady Delacour’s speech in Edgeworth’s Belinda (p. 249). Just worth mentioning in relation to editions of Austen, too, is the very substantial review article offered by Janet Aikens Yount, ‘Jane Austen Scholarship: “The Richness of the Present Age”’ (ECLife 34[2010] 73–113). This is a thorough and useful—although not uncritical—guide to recent scholarship and editing of Austen.
Joanne Wilkes’s *Women Reviewing Women in Nineteenth-Century Britain: The Critical Reception of Jane Austen, Charlotte Brontë, and George Eliot* is a detailed discussion of such processes in the nineteenth century, exploring reviewing by and about women writers. Wilkes offers insights into canon formation and reception through the nineteenth century, showing how and why Austen, Brontë, and Eliot were compared. One fine example to show Wilkes’s overall approach is her treatment of the first review of Austen by a woman writer, Maria Jane Jewsbury. Wilkes shows how Jewsbury herself carefully negotiated the demands of literary and domestic life. Her 1831 review in the *Athenaeum* shows her ‘awareness of one way a woman writer might choose to deal with the constraints on female expression’ (p. 33) and her understanding of the caustic side of Austen’s wit, concealed in her fiction. However, subsequent treatment of her review edited Jewsbury’s perspective on Austen out of history: it was doctored and softened by Henry Austen, and, still worse, misattributed to Richard Whately by G.H. Lewes. This study takes pride in restoring and properly contextualizing such forgotten critical judgements. Jewsbury’s readings are set alongside those of better-known literary figures such as Sara Coleridge and Margaret Oliphant, and those by more neglected writers, such as Hannah Lawrance, Jane Williams, and Anne Mozley. Together they suggest new ways in which we might read the reception of Austen, and her nineteenth-century legacies.

One sad event this year was the death of B.C. Southam, whose precise and careful historical and critical contextualization of Austen will continue to have an impact on Austen studies. The 2010 issue of *Persuasions* was dedicated to his memory, and contains the introduction from the book on which he was working when he died, on Jane Austen and the seaside, a land-bound successor to his work on *Jane Austen and the Navy* (‘Jane Austen beside the Seaside: An Introduction’, *Persuasions* 32[2010] 167–72). It promised to look at *Sanditon* as a resort novel, suggesting the ‘challenging and enigmatic’ direction of this final work. A further extract from Southam’s book will be published in the following issue. As a whole, *Persuasions* this year explored *Northanger Abbey* from a number of angles, and I will just mention a few of the highlights from the volume. Juliet McMaster, in ‘‘A surmise of such horror’’: Catherine Morland’s imagination’ (Persuasions 32[2010] 15–27), explores Catherine’s reading education alongside Romantic interest in the ways in which reading might be channelled. Her intense engagement with Gothic novels, suggests McMaster, might be compared to contemporary teenagers discovering Austen through film: ‘Let’s not throw Udolpho on the fire, or Austen movies either!’ Gillian Dow’s ‘Northanger Abbey, French Fiction, and the Affecting History of the Duchess of C***’ (Persuasions 32[2010] 28–45) offers a new source for our understanding of the reading going on in the novel, through a discussion of Austen’s allusion to Stephanie-Félicité de Genlis’s 1782 novel *Adèle et Théodore*, translated as *Adele and Theodore* in 1783. The interpolated tale of the cruel imprisonment of the Italian Duchess of C*** in this novel is deliberately used by Austen, argues Dow, who guides us expertly through the significance of Genlis to *Northanger Abbey*: the article shows how a better knowledge of Austen’s myriad sources helps us understand the layers of her fiction and place it in a larger European context. An equally interesting—and
rather gruesome—source for *Northanger Abbey* was investigated by Janine Barchas, who shows how the history of Farleigh Hungerford Castle might hold the key to the horrors Catherine expects from Northanger (‘The Real Bluebeard of Bath: A Historical Model for *Northanger Abbey*, *Persuasions* 32[2010] 115–34). One unforgettable parallel is offered by the sixteenth-century murder of John Cotell, who was burned in the kitchen furnace; as Barchas drily comments, this gives a certain perverse twist to the General’s preoccupation with renovating ‘the ancient kitchen’ complete with ‘stoves and hot closets’. As ever, Barchas’s eye for local knowledge shows us the rewarding allusions which remain to be discovered in Austen’s work.

Elsewhere in the journal, Elaine Bander explores more literary underpinnings to the novel, from Charlotte Lennox to Samuel Richardson (‘Reading Mysteries at Bath and Northanger’, *Persuasions* 32[2010] 46–59), Stephanie Barron sets it in the context of the mystery and detective story (‘Suspicious Characters, Red Herrings, and Unreliable Detectives: Elements of Mystery in Jane Austen’s Northanger Abbey’, *Persuasions* 32[2010] 60–7), and Stephanie M. Eddleman and Kathy Justice Gentile explore the interplay between gender and the Gothic from different angles (Eddleman, ‘Henry Tilney: Austen’s Feminized Hero?’, *Persuasions* 32[2010] 68–77; Justice Gentile, ‘“A forward, bragging, scheming race”: Comic Masculinity in *Northanger Abbey*, *Persuasions* 32[2010] 78–89). Miriam Rheingold Fuller, in ‘“Let me go, Mr. Thorpe; Isabella, do not hold me!”: *Northanger Abbey* and the Domestic Gothic’ (*Persuasions* 32[2010] 90–104), reminds us that Austen was utilizing an older function of the Gothic, its mode of instruction and entertainment. Mary Hafner Laney examines fashion in the novel (“I was tempted by a pretty coloured muslin”: Jane Austen and the Art of Being Fashionable’, *Persuasions* 32[2010] 135–43), and in ‘Northanger Abbey: Money in the Bank’ (*Persuasions* 32[2010] 144–53) Sheryl Craig gives a timely contextualization of Austen’s works in terms of economic anxiety. Another aspect of contextualization is offered by Celina A. Easton, whose piece “The Probability of Some Negligence”: Avoiding the Horror of the Absent Clergyman’ (*Persuasions* 32[2010] 154–64) reads Henry’s behaviour in the light of contemporary debate about clerical negligence and the role of the clergy. Meanwhile, the two issues of *Persuasions On-Line* [2010] offered an excellent and very full range of perspectives on Austen—almost too many to mention individually here. However, the issue which really stands out is *Persuasions On-Line* 30:ii [spring 2010], ‘New Directions in Austen Studies’, edited by Gillian Dow and Susan Allen Ford, with introductory pieces by Isobel Grundy and Juliet McMaster. This collection of essays, which stems from the conference held to celebrate the bicentenary of Austen’s arrival at Chawton, offers an invaluable guide to contemporary response. A section on ‘Jane Austen Today’ features Laurie Kaplan on *Lost in Austen*, Juliette Wells on Austen’s appearances in US fiction (1996–2006), Marilyn Francus on the therapy offered to contemporary readers by books such as *The Jane Austen Book Club*, and Diana Birchall defending Mrs Elton. This is followed by some outstanding explorations of Austen in her cultural and literary contexts. Natasha Duquette in ‘“Motionless Wonder”: Contemplating Gothic Sublimity in *Northanger Abbey*’ shows the rich interplay between the novel
and Burkean aesthetics of the sublime; her exploration is enhanced by the online publication, which features engravings by Gilpin alongside an extract from the 2007 ITV adaptation of the novel. This Romantic contextualization is further developed by Jacqueline Labbe’s article, ‘What Happens at the Party: Jane Austen Converes with Charlotte Smith’. Labbe shows what can be gained by reading Charlotte Smith’s _Celestina_ together with _Sense and Sensibility_, showing the creative interaction between the authors, and the way in which Austen ‘cooperates with Smith in moving the novel into a modern mode’. Gillian Dow and Katie Halsey’s piece, ‘Jane Austen’s Reading: The Chawton Years’, reminds us of the great range of Austen’s reading experiences, garnered from allusions, references in her letters, and quotations, and is richly illustrated with images of the books which survive, their inscriptions and annotations. The section which follows offers some additional cultural context for understanding the novels: Eric C. Walker investigates adoption practices and attitudes towards adoption in the later eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Erin J. Smith looks at the Regency waltz, and Helena Kelly’s article carefully shows the significance of enclosure to Austen’s work. Global perspectives on Austen are reflected in the section on reception and adaptation, which features Valerie Cossy exploring French readings of her work, and a revealing overview of Jane Austen in Japanese literature by Ebine Hiroshi, Amano Miyuki, and Hisamori Kazuko, showing the innovative and experimental uses she has been put to by Japanese readers and writers. Elizabeth Bankes, meanwhile, investigates the increasing interest in parallels between Austen and Charles Darwin. The issue closes with a section on ‘Prelude and Postlude’, where her juvenilia and early novels are explored by Lesley Peterson, Annette Upfal, and Christine Alexander, Deirdre Le Faye points out the work still to be done in investigating new biographical leads (through, for example, neighbours and local families, tradesmen’s order books, banking accounts, and the treasures of local Record Offices), and Alice Marie Villaseñor echoes her interest in the family archives, calling for new attention to the feminist consciousness of Fanny Caroline Lefroy and her ‘germinal texts’.

As work this year by Rajan and Sachs demonstrates, one of the most exciting aspects of the patient scholarship done by Gina Luria Walker and others to recover the work of Mary Hays has been the routine, and perceptive, discussion of her as a Romantic-period writer; her status as an experimental and innovative novelist is now fully recognized. Louise Joy’s ‘Novel Feelings: Emma Courtney’s Point of View’ (ERR 21[2010] 221–34) continues and furthers this consideration of Hays as an experimental stylist and philosopher. Joy shows that Hays’s novels get to the parts philosophy can’t reach, exploring positions in a more complex way than her philosophical writing allows. By emphasizing the ways in which Emma and Francis cannot understand one another’s language, Hays’s first-person narrative of subjective emotion shows the limits of objective philosophy, and thus challenges the views about affections and reason she herself had put forward in her earlier, more abstract, writing. Through careful readings of the close-packed prose in _Emma Courtney_, Joy makes a compelling case for Hays’s novelistic ability; my only quibble would be that we perhaps therefore lose sight of some of the
experimentalism of the early writing. In *Letters and Essays*, too, Hays is experimenting with voice, using a range of genres, incorporating autobiographical allusion—Rajan’s ‘autonarration’—and in so doing is challenging the representation of emotions. This early writing thus goes beyond its drily didactic frame. Similarly, the love-letters she exchanged with Eccles (although unpublished, these circulated in manuscript form) might also seem to support Joy’s argument about her representation of passion. However, the very fact that one wants to extend and develop Joy’s thesis shows the power of her case: this is a welcome addition to Hays studies.

Other work on Hays this year included Margaret Kathryn Sloan’s chapter ‘Mothers, Marys, and Reforming “The Rising Generation”: Mary Wollstonecraft and Mary Hays’ (in Lee, ed. *Mentoring in Eighteenth-Century British Literature and Culture*, pp. 225–44). Mentor relationships, intellectual and affective, are central to Wollstonecraft’s and Hays’s ideas of reform, argues Sloan. This chapter continues the work done by Julie Carlson to uncover Wollstonecraft’s investment in alternative models of the family; Sloan’s emphasis on mentorship reconceptualizes the idea of mother–daughter relationships, moving them away from biological relations to intellectual or affective ones. She powerfully reads Maria’s relationship with Jemima as one such mentoring model, which also shows Wollstonecraft engaging with a larger social sphere. Moreover, the posthumous publication of *Wrongs of Woman*, alongside Wollstonecraft’s unfinished *Lessons*—a non-fiction version, in a way, of Maria’s life-story for her daughter—reinforces this highly personal vision of mentoring and teaching. Sloan then goes on to link the ways in which Wollstonecraft’s reimagining of mentoring might be echoed in Mary Hays’s second novel, *The Victim of Prejudice* [1799]. Echoed—but extended, since Sloan does not fall into the trap of seeing Hays as a second-rate Wollstonecraft, but instead shows how *Victim of Prejudice* actively responds to Wollstonecraft and develops her writing. Hays, argues Sloan, uses *The Wrongs of Woman* to revise the approach evident in her first novel, *Emma Courtney*, a project she continues in the volumes of her *Female Biography* [1803], which in its portraits of women from different ages and spheres of society shows a recurrent interest in female achievements outside the domestic sphere. Both works bear traces of the important mentoring relationship Hays herself had enjoyed with Wollstonecraft, and which Mary A. Waters has discussed so sensitively. Both women writers, Sloan shows, ‘express repeated faith in future generations’ abilities to learn from narratives of experience, and both authors locate mentor relations as central to this project’ (p. 241).

Mary Beth Tegan’s ‘Mocking the Mothers of the Novel: Mary Wollstonecraft, Maternal Metaphor, and the Reproduction of Sympathy’ (*SNNTS* 42[2010] 357–76) also addresses Wollstonecraft’s images of family relationships, asking what ‘the maternal metaphors employed by Wollstonecraft and other late eighteenth-century critics have to tell us about sympathy and female readers of popular romance’ (p. 359). She addresses the ways Wollstonecraft is engaging with the novel as a genre, beginning with her vehement criticisms in the *Analytical Review of The Happy Recovery: a Sentimental Novel by a Lady*. Tegan uses close readings of these early reviews to understand Wollstonecraft’s views on sympathy and sensibility, calling
attention to ‘a thinly veiled antagonism toward mothers that surfaces in her mockery of the sentimental language she abhors’ (p. 359). But by the time *Wrongs of Woman* is written, Wollstonecraft’s attitude has changed and softened, shows Tegan, suggesting that she ends by reconfiguring the maternal metaphor, alongside a more sympathetic approach to sentimental fiction. Janice H. Peritz, in ‘“Necessarily Various”: Body Politics and Discursive Ethics in Wollstonecraft’s *The Wrongs of Woman*’ (*ERR* 21[2010] 251–66), situates Wollstonecraft’s novel in its immediate historical context, calling for its relevance to contemporary politics to be more fully recognized: specifically, its ‘commitment to a radical politics of communication that in the end, constitutes not just a historical but an ethical alternative to the bellicose, anti-democratic polemics of Burke’s *Two Letters on a Regicide Peace*’ (p. 252). She examines Wollstonecraft’s concept of the political potential of fiction through the ways in which communication is imagined in the novel—crying and singing, letter-writing, tale-telling, autobiographical stories, gossip, and argument—and the numerous voices in the novel. These find their culmination in the courtroom scene at the close of Godwin’s published version of the novel, when Maria writes the statement which will defend Darnford, finding her voice as a result of the enlightening conversations she has had through the course of the novel with Darnford and with Jemima. The novel, then, calls for a ‘democratic politics of communication’ (p. 261) which continues to have relevance; Peritz likens its feminist politics to those urged today by human rights activists such as Rosalind Petchesky.

Scholarship on Godwin combined alertness to narrative style with larger explorations of philosophical and historical context. Quentin Bailey’s ‘“Extraordinary and Dangerous Powers”: Prisons, Police, and Literature in Godwin’s *Caleb Williams*’ (*ECF* 22[2010] 525–48) shows how Godwin’s interest in imprisonment and in the relationship between literature and criminality may be linked to contemporary discussions about penal and police reform post-Gordon Riots. Godwin’s novel has often been discussed in the context of the government’s suppression of radical sympathizers in the 1790s, but Bailey refocuses the debate on earlier preoccupation with the rising crime rate and the role of the state, such as William Pitt’s London and Westminster Police Bill (1785), which emphasized ‘vigilance and prevention’ and called for the introduction of a system of stipendiary magistrates and police commissioners. Although the Bill was withdrawn, it fed into the 1792 Middlesex Justices Act, which allowed the arrest of ‘divers ill-disposed and suspected persons’ and their imprisonment. Bailey reminds us that Caleb is viewed as a ‘vagabond and suspicious person’ by the justice who deals with him when he is trying to flee to Ireland. Caleb’s repeated bouts of incarceration, and the surveillance he is subject to, help us understand how ‘the novel relentlessly demonstrates the pervasiveness of the “mysterious and undefined” power that the state was in the process of constructing in the 1790s in order to ensure its control of the populace’ (p. 548). Bailey’s thorough and substantial article shows that we should also see it as a product of the 1780s. Charlie Bondhus, in ‘“An Outlandish, Foreign-Made Englishman”: Aristocratic Oppression and Ethnic Anomaly in Caleb Williams’ (*ECF* 23[2010] 163–94), explores the ‘text’s large stake in questions of ethnic anomaly and deracination’, linking this to
larger questions about national character and race in the 1790s (p. 164). Both Caleb and Falkland are in some ways ‘anomalous’ Englishmen: it is Falkland’s ‘Italian sense of honour’ which prompts him to pursue Caleb, who then must disguise himself as an Irish beggar, and as an Ashkenazi Jew (p. 165). This is Bondhus’s starting point for a discussion of the ways in which ethnicity is destabilized and questioned in the novel; he looks closely at the different implications of the Italian, Irish, and Jewish identities evoked by Godwin. Like Bailey’s, Bondhus’s careful historical contextualization also brings out Godwin’s interest in events of the 1780s, such as George Gordon’s conversion to Judaism, his libel trial, subsequent flight to Holland (itself mirrored in Caleb Williams), and rearrest. Both articles actively engage with the concept of Godwin’s novel as ‘fictional representation of English Jacobin values’ (p. 194) and show how it is being reinterpreted in new ways. Meanwhile, Eric Lindstrom’s ‘Imagining Things as They Are’ (SiR 49[2010] 477–506) places the novel in a wider context of literature, theory, and politics—both eighteenth- and twentieth-century. The article begins with an epigraph from Wallace Stevens and ends with Philip Larkin, a nice illustration of the wider aims Lindstrom has in mind. Although his starting point is a discussion of the ‘unresolved fusion of literary romance with Godwin’s late-enlightenment republican political philosophy’ (p. 477) found in Caleb Williams, he is bent not so much on a reading of the novel as on an investigation of its subtitle. While a good deal of work has been done on ‘things as material objects’, writes Lindstrom, ‘the effort has not yet been undertaken for the more astringent, jointly metaphysical/political term, “things as they are”’ (p. 481). Lindstrom’s journey to explore the ‘genealogy of the phrase’ and its implications begins with Godwin and the troubled 1790s, but then opens out to show how the phrase might help us understand the transition from Jacobinism to Romanticism and beyond.

Alison Lumsden’s ambitious new book, Walter Scott and the Limits of Language, is situated within the author’s work on the Edinburgh Edition of the Waverley novels and evolves from the linguistic recovery which that project has made possible. Scott’s languages, vocabulary, and erudition form the focus of this enquiry. It opens with a brief overview of the dominant trends in the last twenty years of Scott studies: writing and orality, internal and external colonization, national identity, subversion, and authority. Lumsden then begins to construct a searching analysis of Scott’s use of language within a clear theoretical framework which draws upon the idea of reflexivity in Scott’s work and is informed by Wittgenstein, within wider Enlightenment concerns over rhetoric, virtue, language, and meaning. Her central argument is that Scott is intensely aware of the ‘provisionality of all linguistic construction’ (p. 6), and that by attending to and exploring the textual and linguistic variants we can recover Scott’s intertextual use of his early work in the later novels, as well as uncover the wider sense of language as self-reflexive throughout Scott’s fiction. Chapter 1 examines Scott’s narrative poems, but chapters 2 to 6 offer a very substantial analysis of Scott’s major novels: Waverley, Guy Mannering, The Antiquary, The Heart of Mid-Lothian, Ivanhoe, Redgauntlet, and Chronicles of the Canongate. Chapter 4 also contains a discussion of The Fortunes of Nigel and Peveril of the Peak, and chapter 6
explores *Count Robert of Paris*, the rare *Reliquiae Trotcosienses*, and *Castle Dangerous*.

Richard J. Hill’s *Picturing Scotland through the Waverley Novels: Walter Scott and the Origins of the Victorian Illustrated Novel* reads well alongside Lumsden’s study of Scott’s language because it develops a parallel concern with the limitations of language; with illustrations, something can be shown, rather than solely being described. What Hill investigates here is the extent of what Scott was able to show by means of illustrations in the Waverley novels, and his direct involvement in the production and selection of these illustrations. Hill’s main concern is with Scott’s awareness of the market and popular, mass-produced novels. Illustrations themselves were a novelty in an affordable novel, beginning in 1821 with the London publication of *Kenilworth*, itself following on from Archibald Constable’s anthology of Waverley illustrations in 1820 in Edinburgh to supplement the previous novels, and later to see the full illustration of the *magnum opus* by Scott’s Edinburgh publisher Robert Cadell. Rather than affect or supplement the novelist’s art, the illustrations for the Waverley editions affected the public reception and valuation of these novels as commodities, as well as bearing testament to the changing role of the engraver in the 1820s. Hill’s analysis of the role of illustrations is supplemented by a catalogue detailing all the illustrations approved by Scott in Edinburgh and listed under ‘illustration title/subheading’, ‘novel/volume’, ‘artist’, and ‘engraver’. The text includes illustrations by Edward Landseer, William Allan, Abraham Cooper, and Alexander Nasmyth.

A detailed analysis of *The Antiquary* and *Tales of the Crusaders* features in Matthew Rowlinson’s *Real Money and Romanticism*, where the text becomes a form of commodity. In chapter 3, ‘Curiosities and the Money form in the Waverley Novels’ (pp. 55–99), Rowlinson explores the sale of the copyright of Scott’s books, their monetary value as well as their cultural value, and the ways in which Scott’s novels may be thought of as ‘a body of capital’ (p. 57). The idea of exchange is central to Scott’s work, in relation to the production and circulation of texts between the author and his readers; Rowlinson is interested in how this exchange develops, examining not only the novels themselves but Scott’s letters and contracts, arguing that ‘the boundary between paratext and text proves permeable because the exchanges described and enacted by the one turn out to reach into and structure the other’ (p. 58). James P. Carson, in a chapter entitled ‘Popular versus Legitimate Authority in Scott’s *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*’ (pp. 45–74), examines the significance of cross-dressing men and the uses of disguise in relation to Scott’s problematic presentation of popular authority in opposition to the legitimate authority of Hanoverian rule, and problems with novelistic authority more broadly. Carson situates this exploration within a wider debate on the power of the crowd and popular disturbances within Scott’s fiction, and also provides an interesting reading of cross-dressing in Edgeworth’s *Belinda*.

Now to the journal articles: Tom Bragg, in ‘Scott’s Elementals: Vanishing Points between Space and Narrative in the Waverley Novels’ (*SNNTS 42* [2010] 205–26), examines the irrational characters who people Scott’s fictional explorations of rationality and Enlightenment and considers the ways in which these disruptive characters serve the narrative’s wider concern with

A significant publication this year was the collection of essays edited by L. Adam Mekler and Lucy Morrison, Mary Shelley: Her Circle and Her Contemporaries. It reflects recent critical interest in Shelley’s wider career and in her interdisciplinary work, setting Frankenstein in the context of History of a Six Weeks’ Tour [1817], her writing for The Liberal, and Perkin Warbeck [1830] to offer a fuller picture of Shelley’s creative life. The distinguishing feature of the collection, moreover, is its willingness to look beyond Shelley the individual to suggest the ways in which she ‘influenced others and was herself influenced by the part they played in her life’ (p. 5), and to reflect the importance of family, friends, and different collaborators to her work. Thus Zoe Bolton, in ‘Collaborative Authorship and Shared Travel in History of a Six Weeks’ Tour’, emphasizes the work’s co-authored dynamics, and reads it as ‘a constructed mosaic of writings that are already vitally connected before they are included in the edition’ (p. 13). We have to acknowledge the importance of collaboration fully to appreciate either of the Shelleys. The melding and blending of influences is also an important theme in Stefan Esposito’s ‘Communicating Life: Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein and Romantic Organicism’, where through a reading of Coleridge’s Theory of Life [1817] and Percy Shelley’s On Life [1812–18] Esposito seeks to emphasize the ‘problematic inter-relationship of social, political, and scientific aspects of existence’ imagined in the novel (p. 41). L. Adam Mekler, in ‘Hideous Progenies: Mary Shelley, John Polidori, and Incest in the Godwinian Novel’, takes a new perspective on the links between Godwin’s St Leon [1799] and Frankenstein, triangulating the relationship between the books via Polidori. Mekler does not focus on The Vampyre, however, but instead on Erneetus Berchtold; or, the Modern Ædipus [1819], opening up interesting issues of literary surrogacy, progeny, and incest. Another insight into Godwinian links is offered by Nathaniel Leach, ‘Mary Shelley and the Godwinian Gothic: Matilda and Mandeville’, who suggests that both ‘Godwin and his daughter present versions of the Gothic that exceed the containment of generic convention’ (p. 73).

Rachel Mann examines overlaps between the Shelleys in their treatment of drama in ‘Speaking Bodies and Fe/Male Discourses in Proserpine and The Cenci’, and Meilee D. Bridges, ‘Ruining History: The Shelleys’ Fragments of Rome’, explores their travel writing, filtered through Gibbon, De Staël and Byron. Lisa Vargo, in ‘Writing for The Liberal’, gives a welcome reassessment
of Mary Shelley’s contributions to the periodical, beginning with her first, ‘A Tale of the Passions’, which is itself an adaptation of J.C.L. de Sismondi’s *History of the Italian Renaissance in the Middle Ages* [1807–18]. Again, we see how Shelley’s creativity shaped itself in response (and challenge) to others, an idea which Vargo further develops through her analysis of Shelley’s reading, with specific reference to Rousseau, among others. Shelley, argues Vargo, not only offers up her own reading in *The Liberal* but also provides a guide to reading, encouraging a ‘general spirit of individual inquiry’ among her readers. Shelley’s intertextuality is not limited to literature, as Lucy Morrison shows in her ‘Listen While You Read: The Case of Mary Shelley’s *The Last Man*’, which traces the influence of music on the novel, and lays bare its ‘important soundtrack’ (p. 152), including Haydn and Mozart. Morrison allows us to listen in to the dynamics of the novel in a new way. Rebecca Nesvet, in ‘Like the Sultaness Scheherazade’: *The Storyteller and the Reading Nation in Perkin Warbeck*, suggests that this often overlooked novel might be read as a retelling of the Scheherazade story, calling on the reading nation to prove itself. ‘White Papers and Black Figures: Mary Shelley Writing America’, by Erin Webster Garrett, closes the volume with a transatlantic perspective on its subject, showing Shelley’s ambivalence towards America, torn between interest in ‘American self-sufficiency, simplicity and possibility’ and mistrust of American attitudes. The broad canvas of the whole collection nicely reflects the current range of critical preoccupations relating to Shelley.

Frances Ferguson’s ‘Generationalizing: Romantic Social Forms and the Case of Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*’ (PAns 8[2010] 97–118) asks us to reconsider the idea of the Romantic ‘generation’, now somewhat obscured by the changing fashions in recent criticism: ‘shifting tides’ which have left the concept stranded. But Ferguson deftly shows why, in this new era of reconsidering community and connection, as well as our continuing interest in periodicity, we might want to return to it, re-examining and reimagining the familial tropes of Bloomian analysis. She sets the concept of the generation, instead, in the context of school education, and the ways in which classes began to be correlated with age as the modern age wore on, with special attention to the schemes put forward by Andrew Bell and Joseph Lancaster. She suggests that there might be a connection between such schools, with their strong political and ethical purpose, and *Frankenstein*, both encouraging group social conscience and pointing out the shortcomings of individual judgement. Ferguson thus moves on the discussion around concepts of the Romantic family, showing how we might supplement it with other ways in which generations are produced. Suparna Banerjee, in ‘Beyond Biography: Re-Reading Gender in Mary Shelley’s *The Last Man*’ (ES 91[2010] 519–30), is also interested in concepts of family and individual. Banerjee begins by critiquing the ways in which Shelley’s use of biography has been read before moving on to show how *The Last Man* explores the inequality of gender relations, and, particularly, the pressure these place on Shelley’s utopian ideal of the family. Criscillia Benford, in ‘“Listen to My Tale”: Multilevel Structure, Narrative Sense Making, and the Inassimilable in Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*’ (Narrative 18[2010] 324–46), begins by discussing the different figures used to describe the multilayered narrative of the novel: Russian dolls,
for example, or Chinese boxes. These ‘nested’ images, argues Benford, impose a particular view of the narrative, suggesting that it must conceal a message—one specific resolution concealed inside for the painstaking reader. This article instead puts forward a concept Benford terms the ‘inassimilable’, which she describes as the character or element in a text which makes us realize the way in which these narratives do not connect: ‘that calls attention to a text’s constructedness by simultaneously activating two or more competing, yet equally plausible, sense-making frames’ (p. 325). She works through this idea in relation to *Frankenstein*, suggesting that a recognition of the ‘inassimilable’ points to the inadequacies of containing the narrative within one single frame, and thus calls for greater reader involvement. Finally, Leanne Maunu’s ‘The Connecting Threads of War, Torture, and Pain in Mary Shelley’s *Valperga*’ (*ERR* 21[2010] 447–68) adds to the growing corpus of work which rereads Romanticism and war in different ways. Maunu reminds us that violence is at the heart of *Valperga*. From battle scenes, through the dreadful recounting of Beatrice’s torture, to Castruccio’s cruel tyranny, the novel repeatedly dwells on pain and atrocity. This goes beyond Shelley’s pacifism, argues Maunu, who reads *Valperga* [1823] not simply as an anti-war novel, but as a deliberate exploration of our views on violence and war. She takes as her ‘touchstone’ Beatrice’s descriptions of her pain, and the sexually charged, Sadean aspects of her torture, setting this alongside Elaine Scarry’s *The Body in Pain* [1985] to analyse its unsettling aspects for the reader. Ultimately the novel asks us, individually, to question violence; scenes such as Beatrice’s torment bring forth ‘our shifting allegiances to the power that violence possesses over each of us, whether victim or witness’ (p. 464).

Two essays explored the confusion of narratives in the work of James Hogg. Michelle Faubert, in ‘John Ferriar’s Psychology, James Hogg’s Justified Sinner, and the Gay Science of Horror Writing’ (in Faubert and Schmid, eds., pp. 83–108), shows how Romantic-era psychologist James Ferriar may have inspired Hogg’s open-ended narratives. Hogg’s novel reproduces mental confusion in readers in ways which suggest a deliberate experimentation with Ferriar’s views. Daniel Stout, in ‘Castes of Exception: Tradition and the Public Sphere in *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*’ (*ELH* 77[2010] 535–60), takes issue with two broad readings of Hogg’s novel—the idea that it is a satire of Calvinism, and the idea of Hogg’s romantic nationalism. He points out that these two readings might seem to contradict each other, and shows how they might profitably be put together if we read *Justified Sinner* rather as a ‘diagnosis of—rather than an advocate for, or even, more neutrally, an instance of—the romantic nationalism that it has been seen to valorize’ (p. 538). Calvinism becomes Hogg’s example of a representative identity ‘that consistently undervalues the present moment in relation to a historically disparate one’ (p. 539). Stout shows the way in which tradition, and nationalism, are interrogated in Hogg, and in Scott, particularly in relation to the complex narrative strategies of *Justified Sinner*.

Charlotte Sussman, in ‘Time Wandering: Problems of Witnessing in the Romantic-Era Novel’ (*Novel* 43[2010] 140–7), discusses the scary problem of immortality and unchanging human bodies in Romantic literature, which is so often interested in characters coming alive, or living beyond their years.
Sussman suggests that such narratives ‘raise both formal and epistemological questions about the nature of the novel’ (p. 140); when the suffering and ageing of the human body is interrupted, moral epistemology in the novel may be similarly disrupted, ‘suggesting that sympathy has its own temporality, perhaps one tied to the human body’ (p. 141). She discusses this intriguing suggestion in relation to St Leon and Maturin’s Melmoth the Wanderer [1820]—both novels, she argues, challenge us to reconsider the relationship between time and moral development.

4. Poetry

In this section David Stewart covers general work on Romantic poetry and work on poets from A to J; Christopher Machell covers poets from K to Z. Blake is covered by Jason Whittaker.

Fiona Stafford’s Local Attachments: The Province of Poetry offers a thoughtful and wide-ranging discussion of what she calls the ‘Romantic discovery of local attachment’ (p. 295). The book begins with Seamus Heaney’s Nobel lecture. Heaney is, for Stafford, a key inheritor of a tradition that begins with Wordsworth and Burns and which sees local detail and felt experience as the source of literature’s claim to permanence. This is ‘not a poetry of retreat or exclusion, but rather a kind of art more capable of reaching out to audiences at home and abroad’ (p. 11) precisely on account of the weight it accords to localities. Such poetry depends on personal contact with a known landscape, but it emerges only, in Heaney’s terms, when a poet’s ‘roots’ cross with his ‘reading’. If poets are nurtured by places, they are also nurtured by other poets. Wordsworth is, as might be expected, a dominant figure. Wordsworth teaches his readers that insignificant things can take on significance ‘for those capable of seeing properly’ (p. 52). An abandoned sheep-fold or a mountain daisy becomes the source of poetic power but also a source of hope that connections with a ‘nurturing’ (p. 92) community can be re-established. Wordsworth in turn goes on to inspire others, like Keats and Heaney, but Stafford insists also on the inspiration he took from Burns. Indeed, for Stafford, Wordsworth’s ‘whole direction as a poet had been redeemed by Burns’ (p. 124). Burns’s praise for his native Ayrshire reveals a regional pride, as does Walter Scott’s praise for the border region, the subject of another chapter. And, like Scott, Burns’s poetry of place is fostered by his reading. Burns is not a fountain bursting unbidden from a local source: ‘his talent was like a more mature river, into which numerous tributaries flowed’ (p. 208). A final chapter argues that even in London local places can become ‘bound with emotional ties and associations’ (p. 279) as the examples of Lamb and early Dickens suggest. There is little space for Byron’s ironic, cosmopolitan manner, and some may not welcome as much as others terms of approbation like truth, power, stability, beautiful, and lasting. But Local Attachments makes for an elegant defence of Romantic provincialism.

One of the more enjoyable and refreshingly ambitious books published this year is Eric Reid Lindstrom’s Romantic Fiat: Demystification and Enchantment in Lyric Poetry. The book records a debt to recent books by Simon Jarvis
[2007] and Paul Fry [2008] on Wordsworth, and it shares with both an interest in weighty conceptual, linguistic, and philosophical matters that is combined pleasingly with a light wit and a sure touch when discussing poetry. The book is concerned to investigate the notion of fiat in Romantic lyric poetry. At the heart of this discussion is the question of whether the creation of poetry commands the creation of a world. For Lindstrom Romantic poets provide such an important addition to thinking on this topic because they are not quite sure. As he puts it, ‘romantic writings weigh an alternative between the assertively sovereign mode of “let there be”, and a quietist, ontologically charged ethic of “let be”’ (p. 4). Much of the book concerns philosophers, from Kant and Hume to de Man and Badiou, so it is bracing and a little surprising that a large part of its argument depends upon a historicized account of debates over paper money and government credit. The move from fiat (which imposes order upon language) to credit (which exists as a shared fiction) is for Lindstrom an extension and expression of the ‘modernity’ embodied by lyric. Wordsworth is at the centre of the study. The ‘turn to Dorothy’ at the end of ‘Tintern Abbey’ offers a strange kind of command: ‘let the moon shine on thee’. This is a kind of poetic making, but also, as Lindstrom puts it, a ‘useless fiat’ (p. 95) or a kind of benediction. This concept is explored in a fine chapter on ‘The Old Cumberland Beggar’, a poem at once excessively didactic and curiously reserved. Other chapters look at Coleridge’s relation with Hume, Byron, and credit and Shelley’s Peter Bell the Third, but the book is remarkable for the range of poets and philosophers it considers. Romantic Fiat offers a powerful, lively extension of recent work on philosophy and language in Romantic lyric poetry and it will be of interest to any student of the period’s poetic philosophy.

Terence Allan Hoagwood’s From Song to Print: Romantic Pseudo-Songs offers a compelling and fascinating application of the recent focus in Romantic studies on print culture. As the popularity of publications like Byron’s Hebrew Melodies, Scott’s ‘Lay of the Last Minstrel’, Moore’s Irish Melodies, and Lady Morgan’s Lay of an Irish Harp suggests, readers in the period enjoyed songs that they experienced typographically. The writers of this period, as Hoagwood demonstrates brilliantly, made such mediation internal to their creations. They wrote ‘pseudo-songs’ that made ‘a theme of their own simulative status’ (p. xii). The book discusses these popular writers alongside poorer sellers like Wordsworth, Keats, Shelley, and Blake, but for all of them an awareness of the commercial market as a mediating influence structures the act of creation of their textual songs. Scott’s characteristic combination of uneasiness and playfulness about such mediation makes his Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border a central work for Hoagwood. Scott wrote for an elite audience (it cost a guinea) but celebrated the ballads’ origins amongst the illiterate peasantry. The collection is an expression of nostalgia for a lost culture that the typography cannot even echo, but it is also, as Hoagwood argues, an act of imperialism that claims that territory for Scott and his readers. Scott is so useful a figure for Hoagwood on account of his contradictions. Sydney Owenson (Lady Morgan) (for Hoagwood ‘more Anglo than Irish’, p. 45) is similar in mobilizing a ‘contradictory’ expression of ‘rhetorical passions’ (p. 70) in printed song that tends to undermine her
nationalist claims by commercializing them. But contradiction can also be creative. Moore’s *Irish Melodies* receive a fine treatment in which Hoagwood explores their thoughtful exploration of their own ‘surface-depth contradictions, in which the human voice disappears beneath (false) appearances’ (p. 73). Byron’s *Hebrew Melodies* (neither Hebrew nor melodies, as one reviewer put it) make similarly creative use of their odd status. The question of figuration, Hoagwood argues, permits a unique politics and a self-reflexive poetic investigation of the creation of poetic illusion. The book ends with a thoughtful reading of Letitia Elizabeth Landon’s ‘retail project in false impressions’ (p. 139). Such projects sound disillusioned, but they also, as this insightful book suggests, offer a self-aware embrace of illusion.

Daisy Hay’s *Young Romantics: The Shelleys, Byron and Other Tangled Lives* offers a group biography of Byron, Mary and Percy Shelley, Keats, and their friends, wives, lovers, and associates. Although he is not mentioned in the title, the central figure of the book is in many ways Leigh Hunt. Hay’s decision to write a group biography is driven by the recent focus in Romantic studies on sociability and coterie creativity that has been offered as a corrective to the solitary Romantic poet. This is the ‘Cockney’ group that took its political and cultural cues from Hunt’s *Examiner*. Politics and poetics both play a prominent part in the book, but as Hay puts it, ‘the story of their tangled communal existence is, in many ways, as dramatic and surprising as anything they ever wrote’ (p. xix). It is an entertaining story and Hay’s scholarship is sure-footed and lightly worn. The Romantic poets, from Hunt’s dalliance with his sister-in-law to Byron’s with his half-sister, do not always come out of this treatment glowing. But Hay writes with verve and wit and the book is likely to have a substantial appeal for scholars and general readers.

There were a number of articles of general interest on Romantic poetry. The relationship between Charles Darwin and Romanticism was considered in a collection of articles published in *The Wordsworth Circle*. Gillian Beer’s ‘Darwin and Romanticism’ (*WC* 41[2010] 3–9) provides an excellent overview. Darwin returned from his first voyage on the *Beagle* in 1836 and in that time he read the Romantic poets, especially Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley, and Scott. The ‘enlarged insight available through the medium of the ordinary’ (p. 8) and the value of intensive investigation of small things was something the scientist shared with and partly learned from poets like Wordsworth. Yet, as Robert M. Ryan points out in ‘Wordsworth’s Response to Darwin’ (*WC* 41[2010] 10–13), the wider public’s love of Wordsworth made it harder for Darwin’s ideas to gain acceptance later in the century. In a strange, though not un-Wordsworthian way, Ryan argues that Wordsworth rose up from the dead to challenge the rise of Darwinism. Peter W. Graham’s ‘Three Aspects of Darwin’s Ethical Practice’ (*WC* 41[2010] 18–22) continues the discussion, though without much reference to Romantic poetry. An innovator in most things, Darwin was, Graham argues, pretty conventional as a moralist.

Robert Mitchell’s ‘Cryptogamia’ (*ERR* 21[2010] 631–51) offers an important reorientation of ecocritical approaches to Romantic studies. The Romantic period’s interest in plants was not, Mitchell argues, really an ‘interest’ (which implies a critical distance) but a ‘seduction of the human by vegetable vitality’ (p. 632). Building on new developments in literature and science, Mitchell
reimagines the work of poets such as Keats, Clare, Wordsworth, and Shelley. The relation between Romanticism and the city was considered by Tim Fulford in ‘Prophecy and Imagination in the Romantic City’ (WC 41[2010] 52–60). The Romantic period was full of prophets informing the world that its end was nigh. Fulford offers the striking and original argument that such activity was prompted by the ‘new and bewildering kinds of social experience’ (p. 52) London produced. But such visions also ensured the end of such prophecies and the emergence of a split between poetry and prose, country and city. Miranda Burgess’s impressive and ambitious article ‘Transport, Mobility, Anxiety, and the Romantic Poetics of Feeling’ (SiR 49[2010] 229–60) offers a fascinating conceptual overview of theories of affect and anxiety. Burgess uses the transport metaphors used by Romantic poets, especially Wordsworth and Coleridge, to open up the psychic and poetic spaces of subjectivity that anxiety produces. Burgess places her discussion in a very broad and complex philosophical history (drawing on the pioneering work of Thomas Pfau), but she also considers the relation between transport, anxiety, and affect in historical context. It was an age of mobility, and the Romantic suspicion of metaphor (a mode that produces a movement between concepts) suggests a connection to anxieties about technologies of mobility. Nancy Yousef’s ‘Romanticism, Psychoanalysis and the Interpretation of Silence’ (ERR 21[2010] 653–72) offers a thoughtful and complex discussion of intimacy and sympathy that she sees as a link between Romantic poetry and psychoanalysis. Silence is a conversational absence and yet also a sign of sympathetic (or even polite) presence. It can suggest passivity or active listening. Yousef traces the ways in which silence offers itself for contrary interpretations in post-Freudian psychoanalytic writing, Coleridge’s ‘conversation poems’, and Wordsworth’s ‘Resolution and Independence’.

One does not associate Romanticism with the epic. The assumption has, however, been challenged in recent years. Joseph Crawford continues this work in ‘Milton’s Heirs: Epic Poetry in the 1790s’ (SiR 49[2010] 427–43). Crawford remarks upon the ‘extraordinary flood of epics’ (p. 432) which followed Britain’s war with revolutionary France, a flood that transcended the political divide entrenched in those years. All of them are in the shadow of Milton, but they all, unlike their great forebear, tend to focus more immediately on national concerns. Michael O’Neill’s ‘Romantic Re-appropriations of the Epic’ (in Bates, ed., The Cambridge Companion to the Epic, pp. 193–210) offers a fine overview of the subject. Epic, as he notes, appealed to the Romantic poets in part by virtue of its ‘virtual unattainability in its purest form’ (p. 193). Poets like Southey, Shelley, Coleridge, Keats, Wordsworth, and William Hayley valued the place of epic at the same time as they contorted its conventions to other and diverse ends. O’Neill considers subtly the ways in which these writers challenged, affirmed, and moved beyond the epic conventions to which they were all drawn. In her chapter ‘Romanticism’s Errant Allegory’ (in Copeland and Struck, eds., The Cambridge Companion to Allegory, pp. 211–28), Theresa M. Kelly provides a thoughtful overview and analysis of Romantic poetry’s manipulation of the allegory. Whereas neoclassicists preferred allegory to be as immobile as possible, Romantic writers, including Hunt, Hazlitt, and Blake, imagined a
‘proximity of allegorical shapes to real people and events [which] corrodes the barrier between the general and the particular’ (p. 212). Kelly discusses a wide range of Romantic allegories and theories of allegory by, amongst others, Hegel, Coleridge, and Mary and Percy Shelley. For her, Romanticism’s engagement with allegory ‘persistently exceeds the measure of fixed abstractions’ (p. 228).

Francesca Crocco’s ‘The Colonial Subtext of Anna Letitia Barbauld’s Eighteen Hundred and Eleven’ (WC 41[2010] 91–4) discovers a hitherto unsuspected political conservatism in Barbauld’s famously liberal poem. Most of her contemporaries, like most of her recent critics, saw in the poem an anti-war critique that marked Barbauld as something of a radical. But the poem, for Crocco, ‘reifies colonial ideology’ (p. 91): the British empire may fail, but British ideology will live on in her colonies. Lissette Lopez Szwydky presents an unpublished letter of Barbauld’s to Mrs Greg in ‘Barbauld and Byron: New Affinities and an Unpublished Letter’ (KSJ 59[2010] 26–9). This letter, from 1822, contains some surprisingly mild criticisms of Byron’s irreverence in Cain and more generally suggests Barbauld’s interest in contemporary literary culture.

Sarah Haggarty’s Blake’s Gifts: Poetry and the Politics of Exchange was one of the most sustained and sophisticated publications dealing with Blake’s work in 2010, considering how Blake approached gift-giving as a philosophical and economic alternative to commercial economic exchange with his art. Organized around five broad and ambitious themes—economy, patronage, charity, inspiration, and salvation—Haggarty moves beyond a relatively narrow critique of gift-giving within economic contexts (important as that is) to draw upon Blake’s own concepts of the gift within his writings. Thus while gifts can be thoroughly material for Blake—a book or print, rendered up willingly to a friend—they may also be intellectual (as through solidarity with a friend) or spiritual, which she considers ‘a gift utterly incompatible with exchange’ (p. 4). While the spiritual, even agonistic, relations that appear within Blake’s concept of the gift are somewhat peculiar to the considerations of his day, however, Haggarty is far from insensitive to the cultural contexts of gift-giving in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries: thus the chapter on patronage, which provides considerable insight into and detail of Blake’s own troubled relations with his various patrons and commercial sponsors, draws on social historians to provide the background for the minute particulars of Blake’s difficulties.

Haggarty’s theoretical discussions of the gift are more generally informed by Marcel Mauss’s The Gift, unsurprisingly, as well as Pierre Bourdieu’s distinctions between objective exchange and subjective gift-giving as a creative act, which she uses to inform a phenomenological perspective that is in turn informed by Derrida’s observation that gift-giving is ‘familiarly foreign’ to concepts of exchange. Haggarty provides more than a few surprises in Blake’s Gifts, not least in her chapter on charity, which uses Blake’s parody of Thornton’s new translation of the Lord’s Prayer to express the artist’s opposition to voluntary almsgiving. This is one of those points where Haggarty’s argument, while always sophisticated, does run a danger of missing some of the contradictions elsewhere in Blake’s writings: charity, from the
revisionary attitudes expressed in the Songs of Experience version of ‘Holy Thursday’, was always something open to critique in Blake’s work, but his own contrary vision was always capable of perceiving it as an innocent act as well. This is not by any means to detract from Haggarty’s thought-provoking work, however, which makes subtle and pertinent arguments at all times, with the chapters on artistic inspiration as a gift and Christian salvation being particularly potent in terms of offering a complex understanding of the Blakean gift, one in which Blake did not simply anthromorphize the divine but understood spiritual gifts as part of the ‘Eternal Great Humanity Divine’ in which he refused ‘to countenance the divine donor as wholly other’ (p. 171). Thus acts of spiritual donation are, perhaps literally (and certainly in artistic acts) those moments when man is at his most divine.

Another detailed and theoretically intriguing title, though one that is not as original as Haggarty’s in its conception, is John H. Jones’s Blake on Language, Power and Self-Annihilation. Again providing a historical backdrop for some of Blake’s conceptions of the uses of language combined with Bakhtin’s theories of language as dialogic discourse (a theoretical framework that has appealed to Blakean critics from time to time), Jones concentrates on five major texts by Blake—Songs of Innocence and of Experience, The Marriage of Heaven and Hell, The [First] Book of Urizen, Milton, and Jerusalem to explore how Blake problematizes relations between authorial power and self-annihilation. The conversational nature of much of Blake’s writing immediately lends itself to deconstructions of fixed authority, a feature often noted by critics, and Jones is correct to point out how more recent studies of Blake’s language moved away from attempts by early critics such as S. Foster Damon and Northrop Frye to ‘normalize’ Blake’s ideas for a twentieth-century audience. Instead, drawing on eighteenth-century linguistic theory, children’s literature, and contemporary biblical interpretation, Jones places Blake’s notions of inspiration and self-annihilation (an increasingly important concept as his work progressed) thoroughly within the contexts of his day.

While the dialogic exchanges of the Songs and The Marriage of Heaven and Hell provide plenty of opportunities for Jones to demonstrate how Blake undermines any fixity of interpretation, to link these to self-annihilation as a vehicle for new evaluations of power relations between author and reader is a little problematic. Jones correctly points out that Blake only came to a clear understanding of the term in Milton and Jerusalem, but certainly his search for ‘the dialogic ideal’ led him to employ ‘multi-voiced genres’ (p. 213), from lyric and Menippean satire to those strange epics that frequently leave the reader struggling to find anything remotely resembling a traditional authorial centre. Jones concludes by questioning the success of Blake’s enterprise—and if instability alone is a criterion of success, then he is perhaps correct in granting Blake complete fulfilment of his ambitions. Yet the fact remains that in Jerusalem and Milton Blake was not engaging in an avant-garde project for art’s sake alone—his failure to achieve anything remotely resembling a widespread readership for these epics somewhat undermines Jones’s final assertion that his dialogic goals were ‘inclusive’: this may be so on a theoretical level, but Blake also desired a vivid and engaged community for his art that,
until his final friendships with the Shoreham Ancients, appeared to evade him for long periods of his life.

Very different in many respects to both Haggarty’s and Jones’s books is Sybille Erle’s *Blake, Lavater and Physiognomy*, a detailed study of an often neglected figure who was immensely influential on Blake’s early work. Blake not only annotated Lavater’s *Essays on Physiognomy* and *Aphorisms on Man* but was hired as an engraver to produce plates for the English translation of the *Essays* and considered Lavater to be one of the most important thinkers of his day. As well as offering a scrupulous and exacting reading of Blake’s relations with Lavater’s ideas (particularly through his friendship with Fuseli), Erle offers a compelling and convincing account of how ideas of physiognomy that have since fallen into disfavour informed Blake’s conception of the creation and formation of man. Thus the ‘good copies’ made in art and in the human form are not merely superficial indicators of moral or criminal propensities on the part of men and women, but are interpreted by Blake in a much more profound aspect insofar as they reflect the work of creation on a spiritual level for Blake. Erle deserves great credit for returning the role of Lavater to Blake studies—especially as Blake’s interests in physiognomy remained with him all through his life, surfacing again in his late Visionary Heads—and her chapter on the editing that took place in transforming the *Physiognomische Fragmente* into the *Essays on Physiognomy* is a superb piece of scholarship on this often neglected text.

Of other monograph studies of Blake, R. Paul Yoder’s *The Narrative Structure of William Blake’s Poem Jerusalem: A Revisionist Interpretation* concentrates, unsurprisingly, on Blake’s final great epic. This is one of a surprisingly small number of critical works that deal with *Jerusalem* as a complete text, in this case arguing that the poem does possess a narrative structure, in contrast to typical readings in recent years that have concentrated on what Yoder refers to as a ‘synchronic’ structure in which events occur simultaneously. In particular, this is the outline offered in Fred Dotort’s *The Dialectic of Vision: A Contrary Reading of William Blake’s Jerusalem* [1998], and Yoder takes issue with Dotort’s additional layers of complexity that ignore significant events within the text.

A number of collected essays on Blake were also published in 2010, the most prestigious being that edited by Karen Mulhallen. *Blake in Our Time: Essays in Honour of G.E. Bentley, Jr* brings together many of the leading scholars of Blake criticism, including Robert N. Essick, Joseph Viscomi, Morton Paley, and Mary Lynn Johnson, as well as a number of emerging scholars pursuing important work, such as Mark Crosby and Angus Whitehead. As the subtitle of the work indicates, this collection offers essays that draw upon the close bibliographical and biographical work undertaken by Bentley, with the essays being divided into three sections dealing with materials, friends and patrons, and architecture and industry. The latter is probably the most original addition in terms of developing Bentley’s own work in new directions, with the first two sections exploring well-understood areas that were pursued by Bentley in works such as *Blake Records* and *Blake Books*. Mulhallen’s introduction is particularly valuable for those researchers wishing to discover more about Bentley himself, discussing how he moved from interpretative
studies to assembling those careful records of facts for which he has become rightly famous in Blake studies. More touching, however, as well as very apt, is the recognition of Bentley’s role within that ‘ideal community of scholars’ (p. 5) in which he has always played a most important role.

Of the subsequent essays, in the section on materials Joseph Viscomi, Joyce H. Townsend, and Bronwyn Ormsby provide dedicated close examinations of particular aspects of Blake’s art and reception (Viscomi returning to two posthumous Blake forgeries), but it is Essick’s essay on ‘Collecting Blake’ that is the most fascinating in terms of the insights it offers both into the history of Blake collectors beginning with his great lifetime patrons Thomas Butts and John Linnell through to Essick’s (and Bentley’s) own activities. While Essick occupies a rare position—there are few scholars to whom the phrase ‘collecting Blake and understanding Blake go hand in hand’ (p. 31) apply—he offers a useful coda explaining how the future of Blake studies will develop in part by concentrating on particular periods and aspects of Blake’s career where new treasures keep coming to light. Butts and Linnell also feature in the second section on Blake’s friends and patrons, which concentrates more on biographical details of Blake’s life, for example information presented by David Bindman on his earliest patrons, the Reverend A.S. Mathews and his wife Harriet. Blake’s early entry into salon culture was very different to the more intensive, but also more troubling, patronage offered by William Hayley and examined by Mark Crosby, as well as the long-lasting friendship that came from Thomas Butts, a figure worthy of much more intense study as explored in Mary Lynn Johnson’s essay. The most original essay in the collection, however, is probably that by Morton Paley, dealing with the influence of Chichester’s architecture on Blake’s poetry and art, which also makes the suggestion that his conception of Golgonooza drew on Chichester’s urban layout.

Editing and Reading Blake, edited by Wayne C. Ripley and Justin Van Kleeck, brings together a number of essays by those involved in producing editions of Blake’s works, such as David Fuller, W.H. Stevenson, and Mary Lynn Johnson, as well as scholars interested in the impact of new technologies on Blake’s works, or in more traditional areas such as reading and understanding the complex manuscript comprising The Four Zoas. Blake has long presented particular problems for editors, and in his introduction Ripley covers those problems in detail, not least the effects of relief etching but also considering his wide-ranging media experiments throughout his career which have then been remediated—as letterpress editions, print facsimiles, and digital archives—in forms that mean readers today encounter Blake in a wide variety of formats that transform their relations with and perceptions of him.

The essays by various editors of Blake concentrate on particular issues or problems with regard to presenting him to a wider public, particularly when transferring the illuminated texts into letterpress format. David Fuller’s essay on ‘Modernizing Blake’s Text: Syntax, Rhythm, Rhetoric’, starts from the very reasonable assumption that despite easier access than ever to Blake’s illuminated works via the Blake Archive, it still remains easier to read him in conventional letterpress. If such a fundamental act of remediation takes place, Fuller makes the equally reasonable assertion that differences in punctuation
between texts, as well as Blake’s general carelessness in such matters, mean that while modernizing the text creates losses it also provides gains in terms of helping with understanding Blake’s rhythm and syntax. Stevenson’s essay is more impressionistic, though again concerned with the minutiae of punctuation, while Johnson provides a hard-headed and extremely valuable insight into the economics of editing (in this case producing the 2008 Norton edition of Blake’s works).

Of the other pieces included in Editing and Reading Blake, Rachel Lee and J. Alexandra McGhee offer an account of some of the experimental decisions that can feed into producing online digital editions, notably Morris Eaves’s concept of ‘x-editing’, a break with the conventions of print editing whereby constant variability produces the possibility of ever-editable, always in beta texts—something that is not without its problems for readers requiring stable, scholarly editions. The apparent near-impossibility of producing anything stable from Blake’s complex manuscript for VALA/The Four Zoas is the subject of Justin Van Kleeck’s essay. Wayne Ripley concludes the volume with an assessment of the role of Blake’s illustrations to other writers, a chapter that emphasizes Blake’s role as a reader of other writers’ texts.

Finally, of collected editions of essays on Blake published in 2010 probably the most innovative in its approach was Queer Blake, edited by Helen P. Bruder and Tristianne Connolly. Building on Christopher Z. Hobson’s 2000 book, Blake and Homosexuality, Queer Blake offers various readings of Blake either in the context of homosexual and homosocial relations of his time, or as queer readings in relation to subsequent reception and Blake’s own artistic practice. Of the fifteen essays comprising the collection, Keri Davies, Susan Matthews, and Mark Crosby provide accounts of how Blake’s work may be placed within homosocial contexts of his day, whether it is sapphic book-collecting or the darker extremes of homophobia in reaction to William Hayley. Reactions to queer receptions of Blake are provided by Jason Whittaker in his essay on post-war artists using Blake, and Helen Bruder in her article on Blake and Grayson Perry. A substantial number of articles also deal with more general aspects of queer theory and Blake’s work, most notably Christopher Z. Hobson’s ‘Blake and the Evolution of Same-Sex Subjectivity’, in which Hobson argues that Blake seeks the ultimate ideal of ‘an affectional model involving more or less egalitarian relations not differentiated by gender roles or subjectivity’ (p. 28). Of various other readings, Martin Myrone offers a very effective queer reading of Blake’s powerful biblical painting of The Blasphemer, while the most entertaining in the collection is Elizabeth C. Effinger’s ‘Anal Blake: Bringing up the Rear in Blake Criticism’, one that not only deconstructs the anal imagery frequently evident in Blake’s art but also the anal-retentive blockages in Blake criticism that so frequently prevent such aspects of his art from being perceived.

Articles published in Blake: An Illustrated Quarterly began with a detailed and rich account of two neighbours of the Blakes at South Molton Street by Angus Whitehead, ‘Mark and Eleanor Martin, the Blake’s Fellow French Inhabitants at 17 South Molton Street, 1805–21’ (Blake 43[2009/10] 84–95). An example of the type of microbiography that Whitehead has excelled in over recent years, this article adds to the reconstruction of the Blakes’ time at South

A special issue of *Interfaces: Image Text Language*, entitled ‘Blake Intempestif/Unruly Blake’, includes several essays on Blake’s art. Martin Myrone discusses the difficulties surrounding the presentation and, indeed, survival of some of Blake’s art drawing on his one-man exhibition of 1809 as a special case in point in ‘Blake’s Unruly Art History’ (*Interfaces* 30[2010] 7–20), while Michael Phillips returns to some of the arguments surrounding Blake’s printing techniques that had led to a controversy between him and Robert Essick and Joseph Viscomi in ‘printing in the infernal method’ (*Interfaces* 30[2010] 21–34). Of the other essays included in this volume, two notable ones are a call by Andrew Lincoln to pay particular attention to Blake’s conception of innocence in its own terms in ‘Blake’s Innocence Reconsidered’ (*Interfaces* 30[2010] 35–46) and Christian La Cassagnère’s exquisite reading of his poem ‘The Tyger’ in ‘The Sublimity of The Tyger’ (*Interfaces* 30[2010] 75–84). Also worth noting was the collection of Tate Papers curated in response to Tate Britain’s display based on the 1809 exhibition and published in 2010 at http://www.tate.org.uk/research/tateresearch/tatepapers/10autumn. Including papers by Martin Myrone, Philippa Simpson, and Konstantinos Stefanis, these papers offer a critical insight into Blake’s much-neglected one-man exhibition, particularly as a response to the British and European art world of the early nineteenth century.

Of other articles that did not appear in collections during 2010, Dennis M. Welch’s ‘Essence, Gender, Race: William Blake’s *Visions of the Daughters of Albion*’ (*SiR* 49[2010] 105–31), begins with a problematic in critical interpretations of Blake’s popular 1793 text that tend to reduce Oothoon to an essential representation of female resistance to male oppression that in turn may overlook other contentious issues within Blake’s illuminated book. Robert Rix’s ‘Magnetic Cure in William Blake’s *The French Revolution*’ (*Expl* 68[2010] 167–71) continues some of Rix’s previous research into the arcane cultural practices and contexts that affected Blake’s writings, in this case how the craze for mesmerism in the eighteenth century could be seen to influence the actions of the characters of Blake’s unfinished prophecy.

The year 2010 was a busy one for the William Blake Archive, beginning with the publication of Copy D of *Milton, A Poem*, to which were added editions of *Visions of the Daughters of Albion* (Copies E and I), *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* (Copies B and E), and *An Island in the Moon*. Perhaps most significant among the new additions, however, was the inclusion of a number of the tempera and watercolour paintings illustrating the Bible that Blake...
produced for Thomas Butts in the early nineteenth century, making these works of art available to a wider public in a critical context for the first time.

Robert Burns and Pastoral: Poetry and Improvement in Late Eighteenth-Century Scotland by Nigel Leask will change the course of scholarship of both Burns and Romanticism. Much recent work on the period has focused on reshaping the relationship between Romanticism and the Enlightenment, and Leask’s book will in turn reshape that discussion significantly. The book offers readings of all Burns’s major poems and some of his songs. It focuses especially on the period following the publication of the first two editions of his Poems up to Burns’s abandonment of agriculture in 1792. Central to the book is Leask’s claim that Burns’s intellectual, poetic, and social existence was defined by its relation to the Enlightenment discourse of ‘improvement’ which radically modernized farming practices as well as political and aesthetic thought. Burns was, for Leask, ‘a creature of the enlightenment’ (p. 23). Adam Smith’s work is discussed frequently, and Leask draws a ‘contrapuntal relationship’ (p. 14) between these two, narrowing the gap between them and also making a very significant claim for the centrality of Smith’s subtle and complex thought to the period. The other key aspect of the study is poetic: Burns’s status as a ‘pastoral’ poet. Leask moves away from the ‘naïve pastoral’ beloved of the Burns cult to complicate the genre by attending to its classical, eighteenth-century, Scottish and English manifestations. Leask identifies a specifically Scottish version of pastoral that emerged ‘as a rival to the neoclassical and Parnassian variety that continued to permeate English poetry and song culture high and low’ (p. 62). Scottish pastoral is associated especially with Allan Ramsay and Robert Fergusson. Burns’s relationship with this genre opens up a remarkably broad range of social, cultural, and intellectual contexts which Leask explores in formidable detail. Burns’s social class cannot be understood apart from his status as a tenant farmer, and Leask is especially good at exploring such contexts as the runrig farming system and animal husbandry. But such detail enables rather than inhibits Leask’s subtle readings of the poetry. A fine example is ‘The Death and Dying Words of Poor Mailie’. Burns did indeed learn a lesson in ‘improved animal husbandry’ from the death of his sheep: ‘pedigree sheep should be allowed to graze free, not tethered to a post’. But, Leask discovers, ‘Burns the farmer is lost in the poet, who now aspires to the sentimental credit of a fashionable bereavement’ (p. 153). Leask is attentive to the farming and poetical contexts, but the analysis his book offers is so valuable because it suggests that these two areas were in fact intertwined. Such ‘sentimental credit’ derives from Adam Smith, and it connects Burns with the horizontal community of fellow bardies but also, as critics have been less keen to grasp, ‘on the vertical level, to an audience of polite patrons’ (p. 83). Burns’s relation with patronage is one example among many of the connections his verse displays to the cultural milieu of the period. Leask also explores Masonic, religious, and other sociable institutions in Enlightenment Ayrshire, and debates about poor relief, the taxation of alcohol, and the role of women in popular politics. He suggests just how local and intricate were Burns’s political positions, particularly in the 1780s, and considers a wealth of other no less vital contexts. It is especially pleasing that one of these is his situation in a rich poetic history, and that
Leask’s work does so much to suggest the brilliance of Burns’s formal engagement with it. He ends with a discussion of Burns’s most important early biographer, James Currie, and one of his most influential enthusiasts, William Wordsworth. It is a suggestive conclusion. Burns’s relationship with British Romanticism requires further attention, and Leask’s book will surely become the focal point of that discussion for some years.

There were a number of useful additions to the trove of Burnssiana this year written for a general audience that continue to represent a significant aspect of his literary afterlife. They will be of interest to scholars concerned with his contemporary reputation. But with Burns more than most poets, scholarly and popular reputations are entwined. Especially characteristic of Burns’s ongoing marketability is Robert Burns in Time and Place by Frances Jarvie and Gordon Jarvie published for the National Museums of Scotland. It is a well-illustrated book which skirts over the key facts and contexts to his life and work, including slavery, politics, farming methods, and song culture. It is intriguing to note that all of these topics have been the subject of recent critical debate. Bronwen Hosie’s Robert Burns: Bard of Scotland is an enjoyable and well-researched telling of the familiar tale of Burns’s life for children. Burns’s story lends itself to such treatment, and Hosie tells it with verve and sensitivity. The book also includes a generous selection of the major poems. George Davidson’s elegantly presented collection of Burns, The Classic Poems, offers a wide range of poems, songs, and, what is less usual, prayers. It is illustrated colourfully and annotated lightly (though accurately). The introduction concludes that ‘he is certainly not forgotten, nor will he ever be’ (p. 11). If the prophecy is to come true, then it will be partly on account of popular collections like these.

Paul Stock’s thorough, thoughtful, and compelling The Shelley–Byron Circle and the Idea of Europe offers a significant redevelopment of recent theories of place and nation in Romantic studies. It is a fine book and it ought to have a substantial influence. Romanticists have considered both the local and the national in recent years (books by Nigel Leask and Fiona Stafford, discussed above, are two prominent recent examples); a counter-movement to this has been a Romantic cosmopolitanism which stresses the universal rather than the local. Stock is attracted to the cosmopolitan view, but he is wary of a term he sees as imprecise. Instead, he offers the Shelley–Byron circle’s consideration of the idea of ‘Europe’ as ‘a term rich with analytical possibilities: it can evoke totalizing narratives of common history or identity and also express a range of competing political and ideological systems’ (p. 2). He places the writing of this circle (including Byron, Mary and Percy Shelley, John Cam Hobhouse, Thomas Love Peacock, and Leigh Hunt) in the context of a Europe-wide reshaping of the ideas of Europe and the nation following the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars. Stock offers fresh readings of texts such as Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage, A Defence of Poetry, and Hellas. The Shelley–Byron circle is especially useful to Stock because its members engaged with and were aware of the variety of debates that focus around ‘Europe’. Stock is sensitive enough to recognize that the circle members’ shared classical heritage and radical politics make them anomalous rather than representative, but they are no less significant for that. Byron in Childe Harold
and Hobhouse in his accompanying travel writing frame Italy as a kind of symbol for Europe. Italy becomes a location which focuses the combination of the ‘locally specific’ and ‘shared histories and traditions that cross local boundaries’ (p. 65). Figures like Peacock and Hunt joined the Shelleys in developing an idea of Europe in contact with ‘others’ such as Asia and America. America is, for the circle, both an ‘other’ and also a revolutionary ‘more ideal version’ of Europe (p. 100). A final section looks at Byron’s active political life in Greece.

Arnold Anthony Schmidt’s _Byron and the Rhetoric of Italian Nationalism_ offers a continuation of Stock’s focus on place and a significant development of studies of Byron’s afterlife. Schmidt’s focus is on Italy, the country Byron made his own between his self-imposed exile and his death in Greece. Byron loved Italy, and Italy reciprocated. Schmidt marshals a very impressive number of (usually hitherto untranslated) engagements with Byron from right across the political spectrum written between 1818 and 1948. He was, according to Schmidt, referred to by Italians in these crucial years more often than any other non-Italian poet. Schmidt quotes Garibaldi describing a military chaplain who went into battle with a copy of Byron close to his heart. For many figures involved in the Risorgimento Byron appealed on account of such a combination of the romantic and the political. Schmidt begins with a sensitive and carefully contextualized reading of Byron’s active engagement with Italy both in his poems and in his political activities there. His remarkably broad knowledge of Italian political life makes this account valuable for Byronists and for all students of European nationalisms in the nineteenth century. Byron’s subsequent death in Greece allowed Italians to narrativize his life in a way that was importantly distinct from that adopted in Britain in the same period. Perhaps a little surprisingly, Byron’s republicanism was read as an expression of ‘that most British of qualities: a love of liberty’ (p. 58). Yet Byron’s reception by Italian nationalists was not simple. Indeed Catholic nationalists turned to Byron’s Venetian tragedies, _Marino Faliero_ and _The Two Foscari_, as part of an attempt to de-secularize the sceptical poet. Schmidt’s account of _Marino_ concludes that it ‘fails to endorse rule by the one, the few, or the many’ (p. 119). Yet such political inconsistency did not appear to affect the ability of Italian nationalists to adopt him as an emblem of their own struggle. A final chapter looks at _Don Juan_ as a reworking of Italian _conversazione_ culture. The conclusion rounds off the book nicely by pointing to two very different afterlives: the melancholic wanderer beloved of Gabriele d’Annunzio, and the Byronic hero as Superman who appealed to Marinetti and Mussolini.

The relationship between Romanticism and Judaism has gone from being a neglected byway to something of a thoroughfare. The change is attributable principally to the endeavours of Sheila A. Spector. Her latest book, _Byron and the Jews_, is an important addition to the field that will be of interest to Byronists and the increasingly large body of Romanticists interested in the relation between literature and religion. Spector begins with a fine discussion of Byron’s relation with contemporary Jewish writers. Byron’s work with Isaac Nathan on _Hebrew Melodies_ forms an important part of this discussion, but Spector also discusses his links with Isaac d’Israeli. D’Israeli shared
with Byron an interest in the figure of the genius as one connected less with ‘geographical specificity’ and more with ‘intellectual elitism and moral integrity’ (p. 23). With Nathan Byron developed a form of ‘religious skepticism’ (p. 52) that would later be adopted by generations of Jews. The book is also a fascinating contribution to studies of the afterlife of Byron and his appropriation by an astonishingly wide range of groups and individuals from every part of the world. The succeeding three chapters track Byron’s adaptation by three very different cultural movements: the Maskilim, the Yiddishists, and the Zionists. Spector’s sure understanding of these movements allows her to develop a complex series of arguments about how Byron was adapted and translated throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The book closes with an appendix containing in Hebrew a range of different (and often, according to Spector, contrasting) translations of Byron’s poems. The book as a whole offers a telling and thoughtful meditation on the slippery nature of cultural translation. Indeed, as she suggests, the ‘Jewish interpretive community . . . exposed the possibility of as yet unexplored, if not entirely new, meanings for the texts’ (p. 171). It is precisely this mutability that makes Byron’s ongoing cultural legacy so richly rewarding.

Denise Tischler Millstein’s ‘George Eliot’s Felix Holt, the Radical and Byronic Secrets’ (in Pionke and Tischler Millstein, eds., Victorian Secrecy: Economies of Knowledge and Concealment, pp. 135–48) offers a valuable extension of considerations of Byron’s literary afterlives, one of many treatments of Byron’s legacies published this year. George Eliot had little time for Byron, but, as Tischler Millstein suggests, she nonetheless draws on both the man and the work extensively in Felix Holt. The characters use allusions to Byron as an esoteric code, but, ironically, Eliot must depend on her readers understanding that code for the novel to function. Ernest Hemingway shares little with George Eliot, but he too was both drawn to and ambivalent about Byron, as Richard Hishmeh’s ‘Byron: Romantic Posturing in the Age of Modernism’ (Hemingway Review 29[2010] 89–104) explains. Both writers exploited and critiqued the potential slippage between life and art. Such ‘posturing’ was somewhat out of place in the modernist era, but as Hishmeh shows, mimicking Byron remained a lucrative commercial strategy. Byron was very proud to claim that he was the first ‘white man’ to visit Albania, but he was not the last, as Shobhana Bhattacharji’s ‘‘I Like the Albanians Much’: Byron and Three Twentieth-Century British Travellers to Albania’ (ByronJ 38[2010] 39–48) makes plain. This scholarly piece considers three early twentieth-century travellers (Peter Quennell, Patrick Leigh Fermor, and Harold W. Tilman) who followed Byron to Albania and whose experiences of it were very much shaped by their poetical forebear. In ‘Two Byron Forgeries and a Manuscript Poem by Violet Fane’ (ByronJ 38[2010] 119–24) Andrew Nicholson considers the activities of the entertaining Major George Gordon De Luna Byron and some Byronic lines by the Victorian poet ‘Violet Fane’. Nicholson has printed the forgeries in the article. Byron’s afterlife in Russia was considered by Svetlana Klimova in ‘Russian Byronism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century’ (ByronJ 38[2010] 157–67). In the period between the 1880s and the 1910s, Russian Byronists considered the metaphysical insights to be discovered in Byron’s poetry and drama. Byron was
seen as offering insight into a pessimistic modern ‘individualism’ while also offering a rather disturbing cure in a ‘superhuman’ ‘divine humanity’ (p. 165). Elizabeth Roberts, in ‘Freedom, Faction, Fame and Blood: British Soldiers of Conscience in Greece, Spain and Finland, considers both Byron and Shelley with reference to the Greek War of Independence. George Finlay, a Scottish philhellene, felt by Byron to resemble ‘Shelley’s ghost’ (p. 16), is offered as a representative figure for the ‘discernible confederacy of shared political assumptions’ (p. 18) amongst British soldiers of conscience in Greece. Roberts considers Byron and Edward Trelawney’s adventures both as an instance of and a model for the particular type of self-fashioning that being a soldier of conscience permits. Byron’s Mediterranean jaunt of 1809–11 was the tour that made Byron Byron. In Joy Unconfined! Lord Byron’s Grand Tour Re-Toured Ian Strathcarron, himself an intrepid adventurer, describes how he followed in Byron’s footsteps. Byron, of course, met his share of kings, governors, and adventurers, and Strathcarron impressively and rather daringly does the same. There is no Ali Pasha to meet these days, but Strathcarron did take tea with King Leka I of Albania. Strathcarron emphasizes the development of Byron’s affection for Greece and his growing interest in the independence struggle that would flower in a subsequent visit. The book is an entertaining addition to the still-growing collection of Byroniana.

It has not been usual to think of Byron as a thinker, and certainly not one engaged except negatively with the philosophical legacy of the Enlightenment. That view is likely to change with the publication this year of Emily A. Bernhard Jackson’s The Development of Byron’s Philosophy of Knowledge: Certain in Uncertainty. Bernhard Jackson makes a claim for Byron as a serious epistemologist who considered knowledge as being subjective (a ‘knowledge-claim’) rather than objective truth. The most important conclusion that Bernhard Jackson takes from this is that Byronic irony is not simply destructive. His philosophy may suggest a final disorder, but the relativism his poetry develops is, for her, ‘liberating and empowering’ (p. 6) because he hands to the readers of his poems the opportunity to make of the world his poems present what they will: ‘its destruction is only that which precedes rebirth’ (p. 180). Bernhard Jackson takes very seriously Byron’s philosophical looseness, and the consequences for a reading of his poetry are hugely rewarding. She begins with an overview of philosophical scepticism in the British tradition, touching on George Berkeley, William Drummond, and Thomas Reid but focusing especially on John Locke and David Hume. Much recent work in Romantic studies has sought to collapse the distinction between Romanticism and Enlightenment, and this is an intriguing and unexpected addition to the field. Childe Harold cantos I and II represents the beginning in which he ‘persistently [subverts] the ideas and assertions’ (p. 32) the poem seems to advance. There is a welcome chapter on Lara, a poem of ‘mystery, absence and illusion’ (p. 80). Other chapters consider The Giaour, Childe Harold canto III, and Manfred before the study reaches an appropriate conclusion with Don Juan. The chronological approach permits Bernhard Jackson to make the remarkable and only partly paradoxical claim that Byron’s understanding of relativistic epistemology is developed continuously across his career. That the claim is made with such intelligence makes this a
book likely to have a substantial impact on the way scholars consider Byron’s brain.

Peter Cochran’s *Byron and Bob: Lord Byron’s Relationship with Robert Southey* builds on suggestions made by Cochran in *Byron—and Romanticism* (reviewed last year) that two such great enemies as Byron and Southey were so opposed to each other because they shared so much. Indeed, as Cochran suggests with his customary brio, Byron was afraid he might turn into Bob. The book is written with Cochran’s usual rather catty wit: ‘Byron often took risks’ but ‘Southey was reported by Wordsworth never to be without his umbrella’ (p. 1). Such oppositions between the two go deeper but they also, and it is an especially revealing insight for both poets, tend to suggest an affinity. It is a brilliant idea, so it is a shame that Cochran seems as wary of Southey as was Byron. Southey is for him a ‘stupid’ (p. 10) writer, an incompetent versifier, and a figure incapable of having even historical significance. The book does, however, go on to provide a useful account of a relationship characterized from the first by inconsistency. In *Don Juan*, Byron wants to ‘empathize’ with Southey (and even to mimic him) but also to ‘objectify and reject him’. Such moments, for Cochran, suggest ‘an extraordinarily intimate obsession’ (p. 67). Southey’s *A Vision of Judgment* was attacked by Byron in *The Vision of Judgment*, but Cochran also shows how much Byron drew on Southey’s *Curse of Kehama* in doing so, ‘attempting a subtle critique of his enemy’s work as a whole’ (p. 119). Cochran’s work is especially valuable for showing just how saturated *The Vision* is with Southeyan allusions. The book ends with discussion of these poems and their reception, and prints both as an appendix. Unfortunately Cochran’s *Byron and Hobby-O: Lord Byron’s Relationship with John Cam Hobhouse*, also published this year, was not made available for review.

There are several teaching editions of Byron available at present. The question of selection is one that arises with Byron more than with most poets. Alice Levine’s *Byron’s Poetry and Prose: A Norton Critical Edition* is a very large volume (over 1,000 closely printed, well-annotated pages), and it distinguishes itself in the market by virtue of the range of its coverage. Complete texts of *Childe Harold*, *The Giaour*, *Beppo*, *Manfred*, *The Vision of Judgment*, and (more unusually) *The Prisoner of Chillon* are included, alongside a small number of well-known shorter poems and sections of most of the major poems. The most difficult decision must have been to truncate *Don Juan*. Six cantos are presented in full, with selections from eight of the remaining eleven. The two most distinctive features of this edition are the inclusion of a very generous selection of letters and journals and (as is standard with Norton editions) a section of criticism. The selection of Byron’s prose is especially welcome. Byron’s prose is amongst his most lively and entertaining work, and Levine’s decision to present it alongside the poetry in chronological sequence will help change perceptions of Byron the gloomy egotist. Levine includes a helpful collection of contemporary views and reviews, including Henry Brougham’s attack on *Hours of Idleness* and Robert Southey’s on the ‘Satanic School’. The inclusion of more positive reviews (for example John Wilson on *Childe Harold* IV) would have made this section slightly more rounded, but it is very useful nonetheless. The choice of
secondary criticism is superb. We get Byron and politics, Byron and the theatre, Byron the postmodernist, and Byron the cross-dresser, as well as a range of other seminal articles. Levine’s annotations to the primary texts strike the right balance: they are helpfully detailed without overwhelming the text. This quality, allied with the selections of prose by and about Byron, allows this edition to advance a substantial claim to be the new standard teaching edition.

A number of articles considered Don Juan. Nicholas Halmi’s excellent ‘The Very Model of an Epic Poem’ (ERR 21[2010] 589–600) offers an important new reading of the poem. Halmi considers the poem’s occasionally frustrating movement between traditional form (the epic) and a radical formal openness. He places this mixture in the context of debates over the condition of modernity and the possibility of a representation of reality. Peter Cochran’s ‘Why Did Byron Envy Thomas Hope’s Anastasius?’ (KSR 24[2010] 76–90) continues his sterling work on Byron’s often antithetical relations with the best-sellers of his age. Hope’s novel [1819] has been little commented upon, but it prompted in Byron a tell-tale combination of disdain and fascination. Cochran’s account of it is compelling, and he suggests just how much of it Byron appropriated in Don Juan. Daniel Hitchins’s ‘“Full many a line undone”: Why Misprints Matter in Don Juan’ (ByronJ 38[2010] 135–44) takes issue with those like Hazlitt who see Byron’s attitude to poetry as indifferent or cynical. Instead Byron’s anxiety about textual minutiae and misprints in Don Juan suggests a deeper concern, for Hitchins, with the way in which language serves a memorializing function. The complex publishing history of his last poem only served to heighten this anxiety. Don Juan was also considered by Daniel Gabelman in ‘Bubbles, Butterflies and Bores: Play and Boredom in Don Juan’ (ByronJ 38[2010] 145–56). Gabelman’s sprightly essay looks at the odd proximity of the ludic and the boring in the English Cantos of Don Juan. Being bored, he tells us, is a post-Victorian state but, as Gabelman suggests, the idea bubbles beneath the surface of Don Juan. But the state also permits a playfulness brought on by a state of vacancy, as Gabelman’s discussion of the butterfly in the poem suggests. Rodney Stenning Edgecombe’s ‘An Allusion to Gray in Byron’s Don Juan’ (Expl 68[2010] 13–14) notes that an allusion to Gray’s ‘Elegy’ in canto III of Don Juan is to a suppressed stanza of Gray’s poem.

Jacques Khalip’s ‘Arendt, Byron, and De Quincey in Dark Times’ (ERR 21[2010] 615–30) begins with a reading of Hannah Arendt’s Men in Dark Times to offer De Quincey’s ‘Dark Interpreter’ passage and Byron’s ‘Darkness’ as ways into thinking about the Romantic period’s ‘resistant ways of thinking’ (p. 618) about disaster. Gabrielle Poole’s ‘The Byronic Hero, Theatricality and Leadership’ (ByronJ 38[2010] 7–18) considers the curious combination of egotistical dominance and theatricality in the way Byron uses the Byronic hero to interact with his audience. The relation between Byron the public personality and his heroes was two-way because Byron the personality was exhibited to the public in the same way as he created his characters. Madeleine Callaghan’s ‘The Struggle with Language in Byron’s Cain’ (ByronJ 38[2010] 125–34) offers a re-evaluation of the poetry in Byron’s play. Cain’s language ought, she argues, to stumble because he is engaging in a heroic tussle with language itself. By means of some subtle close reading Callaghan
offers a convincing argument for the aesthetic function of fragmentary prosody in the play. In ‘‘She Walks in Beauty’ and the Theory of the Sublime’ (ByronJ 38[2010] 19–27), Howard Needler argues that, unlike Byron’s longer poems, the first half of ‘She Walks in Beauty’ presents a daring and unusual application of Kant and Burke’s theories of the sublime to the woman to whom the poem is addressed. The second half of the poem offers an uneasy contrast, representing a conventional use of natural imagery to praise human beauty. It is an engaging and thoughtful discussion of a famous if critically neglected poem. Emily Bernhard Jackson’s ‘Least Like Saints: The Vexed Issue of Byron’s Sexuality’ (ByronJ 38[2010] 29–37) discusses a topic that is vexed indeed. But Bernhard Jackson avoids the debates about the category to which Byron belongs by suggesting that any sexual category is inadequate. This attempt not to ‘solve’ but to ‘anatomize’ (p. 29) the issue is fruitful precisely in its refusal to come to clear conclusions about Byron’s protean desire. In ‘The Mysterious Dwyer: An Unpublished Note by Byron’ (ByronJ 38[2010] 49–58), Timothy Webb considers a short, previously unpublished, note by Byron. It was likely written around 1822. Its main attraction is its obscurity: it may (or may not) have been addressed to Leigh Hunt, and it mentions a ‘Dwyer’ whom even Webb cannot finally pin down. In ‘Who is King of the Cats? Byron, Shelley and the Friendship of Poets’ (CQ 39[2010] 61–75), David Ellis considers the mixture of competitiveness and friendliness that marked the relationship between the two poets. The two writers shared much in common, but equally had a great many differences, and Ellis skilfully maps this mix during their period of greatest closeness in Geneva and Italy. J. Andrew Hubbell takes issue with Romantic ecocriticism in ‘A Question of Nature: Wordsworth and Byron’ (WC 41[2010] 14–18). Byron tends not to fit most models of Romantic ecocriticism, and that, for Hubbell, is to the detriment of ecocriticism. The focus on nature and dwelling that such criticism develops valorizes a Wordsworthianism that Hubbell wishes to correct. Byron is the better eco-writer because he deconstructs the ‘false binary, nature-culture, and [replaces] it with the more inclusive “environment”’ (p. 15). It is a bracing and provocative challenge to critical conventions.

Daniel Cook’s ‘Authenticity among Hacks: Thomas Chatterton’s “Memoirs of a Sad Dog” and Magazine Culture’ (in Milnes and Sinanan, eds., pp. 80–98) considers the complex issue of the ‘authenticity’ of Chatterton’s works by considering his ‘Memoirs of a Sad Dog’, published just before his death. The perverse notion entertained by his early critics is that the Rowley forgeries were taken as Chatterton’s primary achievements, whereas his ‘modern’ works were treated as hack work. The idea assumes that the genius was led astray by commerce, revealing a faith in originality that Cook critiques cleverly.

R.S. Attack’s short book John Clare: Voice of Freedom provides an account of the poet designed for the popular market that is principally political. The book is primarily biographical but it also includes readings of the poems. Attack knows a great deal about economics and uses that knowledge to frame Clare’s response to enclosure as an unusual, clear-sighted insight into the injustice caused by the Acts. One worries about a book that begins with a quotation from Khalil Gibran, but the fervour of her political drive and the
readiness with which she claims Clare’s continuing significance as a political philosopher are refreshing. In his splendidly entitled ‘Ruins, Radicals and Reactionaries: John Clare’s Enclosure Elegies’ (JCSJ 29[2010] 37–50) Andrew Smith picks up on the difficult issue of Clare’s political commitments. Whether or not Clare intended his enclosure poems to be radical is, for Smith, beside the point: the way in which they were positioned in the literary market meant an inevitable alignment with political radicalism. Smith’s article is particularly significant for the seriousness with which it takes Clare’s attitudes to enclosure. Clare’s literary afterlife is the subject of Eric H. Robinson’s ‘John Clare’s Words and Their Survival in America’ (WC 41[2010] 94–8). The very complexity of Clare’s language is significant, but so is the fact that Clare was ‘rooted in English traditions that were being rapidly destroyed’ (p. 95). It is, then, especially interesting, as Robinson demonstrates, that words Clare used (sexual words as well as common names for plants and animals) survive in America. Sam Ward’s ‘‘To list the song and not to start the thrush’’: John Clare’s Acoustic Ecologies’ (JCSJ 29[2010] 15–32) continues the recent work on Clare’s interest in sounds in his poetry and journals both of which so carefully record the sounds he heard in Helpstone. Ward is also keen to emphasize, in line with the dominant trend in Clare studies, the complex ways in which such fidelity to nature engages with the literary tradition, all combined in a thoughtful consideration of Clare’s poetry of place. Jennifer Orr’s ‘‘No John Clare”: Minute Observation from the Ulster Cottage Door 1790–1800’ (JCSJ 29[2010] 51–68) considers the political and religious contexts relevant to an understanding of vernacular Ulster poets in the 1790s, especially Samuel Thomson (who wrote in a variant of Ulster Scots). Orr refutes the usual assumption that these poets had no especial interest in nature, discovering a fascinating precursor of Clare in the north of Ireland.

In ‘The Reception of Hartley Coleridge’s Poetry, from 1833 to the Present’ (Romanticism 16[2010] 25–42), Nicola Healey offers an extremely useful reception history of a poet of increasing interest to scholars. The bad angel here is his brother Derwent, who published an infantilizing memoir that tied Hartley to his father and found his verse ‘fragmentary and derivative’ (p. 26). Yet Healey also identifies another strain of criticism that finds the opposite to be true. The story is interesting in itself, but it might be hoped that critics will start to follow the alternative critical path that Healey draws to our attention.

The publication of Coleridge’s Play of Mind by one of the most important Coleridgeans of his generation, John Beer, will be welcomed by Coleridgeans and indeed all scholars of Romantic poetry. The crux in Coleridge’s development as a thinker, for Beer, is this question: ‘How far could the demands of scientific investigation and logical thinking be allowed to take precedence over the need for free play of mind and body?’ (p. 1). To explore the question’s implications Beer offers a kind of intellectual biography. The question of a ‘One Life’ that persists in and is not wholly contradicted by the existence of the multitude of living things became central to his thinking as a poet and a philosopher and help explain ‘why he was so interested in mental phenomena’ (p. 16). But the attempt to produce such a vast reconciliation was far from easy. Human sympathy was vital to his thought and his politics, but this did not preclude ‘evidences of occasional dyspathy’ (p. 38), as a fascinating
chapter on Coleridge’s relationship with James Mackintosh brings out. In a
different way, sympathy had its problems, as in his hopeless love for Sara Hutchinson, Wordsworth’s sister-in-law, or his attempt to produce an
extension of his patron Tom Wedgwood’s theory of mind. Beer also considers
Coleridge as a journalist, a politician, and a literary critic. An important
discussion of Coleridge’s accounts of Shakespeare (‘supremely a man of play—
in all connotations of that word’, p. 161) considers further Coleridge’s
attraction to a ‘passionate’ extra-rational free play and a tendency to moralize.
At Highgate Coleridge did not simply slump into sagacious musings and an
intellectual death. Rather, an ‘urgent sense of the necessity to keep alive’
meant an ‘unregenerate Romantic liveliness leavened his final conclusions’
(p. 237). This sounds like a celebration of Coleridge, and in most ways that is
what the book offers. Beer writes with clarity and care, gently prising apart
knotty problems without recourse to jargon. The book’s most characteristic
feature is the playful pleasure it describes and imparts. The result is one of the
best introductions to Coleridge’s poetry and thinking yet published that is also
a significant advance in Coleridge scholarship.

A great deal of scholarship in recent years has considered the afterlives of
Romantic poets. Alan D. Vardy’s Constructing Coleridge: The Posthumous
Life of the Author is a thoughtful addition to and reflection on such criticism.
There have been, as Vardy’s book makes plain, many Coleridges: the opium
addict, the plagiarist, the visionary poet, the Tory Sage, and the Unitarian
Radical, to name a few. All of them are the product of the acts of public
positioning performed by Coleridge himself and his editors, admirers, critics,
and biographers. Vardy begins with two chapters which consider Coleridge’s
attempts to construct his own personal image: first in the 1790s and second in
the 1820s. The ‘careful forgetting and active rewriting’ (p. 4) in which
Coleridge himself engaged in presenting a public version of ‘Coleridge’ is a
pattern that repeats itself after Coleridge’s death. Following De Quincey’s
notorious essays in the 1840s, Henry Nelson and Sara Coleridge’s biograph-
ical, editorial, and (in the case of Henry’s authorship of his uncle’s Table Talk)
fictional efforts sought to resist the multiplication of Coleridges. Vardy claims
Sara Coleridge is the most influential figure in this story. Following her
husband Henry’s death she produced the meticulous, scholarly, and
well-informed edition of Biographia Literaria. This is, for Vardy, her own
attempt to put her father’s philosophy into practice. It is Sara’s method, with
its attendant problems, which Vardy analyses fairly and in detail, that set the
standard for the huge Collected Coleridge which was finally completed in 2002.
Vardy is not (thankfully) motivated to offer a ‘true’ Coleridge, but rather to
investigate why it is that so much is invested in the construction of these
different versions of the author and to tell the story of how they came to be
constructed. As such the book speaks to an audience wider than Coleridgeans.
Vardy’s larger claims about the way in which intellectual history is a matter of
‘lines of force’ rather than the inheritance of ideas (p. 3) are significant for the
many critics currently considering the posthumous lives of authors.

A number of articles continued this work on the construction of Coleridges.
Chris Murray, in ‘Coleridge, Yeats, and the Sage’ (ColB 36[2010] 23–31), notes
that Yeats dates Coleridge’s transformation into a sage much earlier than
most: to 1807. Murray uses this as a beginning for an argument that emphasizes ‘how self-consciously, and over how great a period, Coleridge constructs the sage’ (p. 23). Grant F. Scott’s ‘The Many Men So Beautiful: Gustave Doré’s Illustrations to The Rime of the Ancient Mariner’ (Romanticism 16[2010] 1–24) provides some welcome critical attention to Doré’s very well-known illustrations. These illustrations represented a central part of Doré’s creative life, but they also represent a substantial rereading of the poem against the standard nineteenth-century grain. Scott demonstrates that Doré’s vision is far bleaker than the common view of it as a tale of redemption. But the ‘sensuous collective body of the ship’s crew’ also suggests, for Scott, Doré’s identification of a ‘covert homoeroticism’ (p. 4) that has only very recently become a part of readings of Coleridge’s poem. The influence of The Ancient Mariner on polar exploration received further attention from J. Andrew Hubbell in ‘‘It was an Ancient Mariner’: Sir Ernest Shackleton Rewrites the Romantic Quest’ (MLQ 71[2010] 271–95). Hubbell argues that Shackleton’s memoir South rests on a fictive method dependent on his ‘orchestration’ (p. 273) of earlier narratives, chief among them Coleridge’s poem of endurance. Shackleton transforms ‘internal quest romance into Edwardian triumphalism’ (p. 295). It is well known that Coleridge based The Ancient Mariner on his reading of Captain George Shelvocke’s A Voyage Round the World [1726]. Robert Fowke’s ‘The Real Ancient Mariner’ (ColB 35[2010] 65–75) traces the life of Simon Hatley, the seafarer described by Shelvocke who provided the model for the mariner himself. In ‘Contemplate Unamuno: S.T. Coleridge’s ‘Musings’ in Miguel de Unamuno’s Poetics’ (CCS 7[2010] 41–65) Cristina Flores argues that Coleridge and Romantic poetry more generally were more important to the Spanish writer Miguel de Unamuno’s (1864–1936) thinking than poetry from any other European tradition. They offered a ‘counterpoint to contemporary avant-garde literary trends, which he considered artificial’ (p. 41), especially via Coleridge’s theory of imagination. Sara Coleridge received further welcome attention this year in Shirley Watters’s ‘Airy Dreams of Father and Daughter’ (ColB 35[2010] 1–14). Watters focuses on the concept of home for both Sara and Samuel. As Sara began to edit her father’s work following his death in 1834, a shared interest in dreams produced a mutually sustaining creativity.

Barry Hough and Howard Davis’s Coleridge’s Laws: A Study of Coleridge in Malta presents a side to Coleridge that some may find surprising: the propagandist. In 1805 Coleridge was Public Secretary to the British Civil Commissioner in Malta. The authors have spent a great deal of time in archives in Kew and (especially) Rabat and Valletta in Malta, and their research sheds fascinating new light on accounts of the direction of Coleridge’s development as a political and legal thinker. Britain had in 1798 assumed rule of Malta from Napoleon, who had himself ousted the Knights of St John. The editors suggest that Coleridge’s activities were far from mundane; rather, they played a crucial role in winning over an at times reluctant populace to the view that the British administration was ‘selfless, benign . . . and acted merely to ensure the well-being’ of the Maltese (p. xii). The book is remarkably detailed. It offers a comprehensive overview of the Maltese constitution, its laws, and British imperial institutions. It provides the first English translations of the
laws Coleridge drafted (in an appendix). Michael John Kooy provides an excellent introduction which suggests how the material might fit into our ideas about Coleridge as a poet, philosopher, and political thinker. As Kooy puts it, the book makes for ‘disturbing reading. There is goodwill in the governor’s palace, but also political naïveté, administrative incompetence, and a fairly persistent disregard for the rule of law’ (p. xvi). The situation (visionary poet as colonial legislator) suggests material for a farce, but Coleridge knew a great deal about the law from his time at *The Morning Post*, and his role in Malta was substantial. That means the administration’s frequent failings implicate Coleridge. Such experiences may also help scholars rethink Coleridge’s politics. As Kooy suggests, ‘Coleridge’s willingness to assist in weakening the Rule of Law... constitutes a disturbing departure from the liberal idealism he espoused both before and after’ (p. xxiv). It’s not a promising topic, but the book may well have a substantial impact on Coleridge studies.

Anya Taylor considers Coleridge’s attack on Pitt’s policies in north-west France in the 1790s in ‘Coleridge’s “Fire, Famine, Slaughter”: The Vendée, Rage, and Hypostasized Allegory’ (*ERR* 21[2010] 711–25). Taylor offers a compelling reading of allegory that brings to life a remarkable poem that is a key point in the development of Coleridge’s political thinking. Marianne Van Remoortel’s ‘An Unknown Reaction to Coleridge’s Higginbottom Sonnets’ (*ANQ* 23[2010] 163–5) notes the discovery of an early response to Coleridge’s 1797 parodic sonnets that was printed in the *Monthly Visitor*. Four sonnets were published, and Van Remoortel suggests that the most likely candidates for authorship are Charles Lloyd and Charles Lamb. Van Remoortel continued her work on Coleridge in ‘A Catalogue of Coleridge’s “Great Circulating Library”’ (*N&Q* 57[2010] 210–11). Coleridge mentions in a notebook entry a Cheapside circulating library he frequented as a Christ’s Hospital boy. Van Remoortel has discovered the catalogue. It is likely to prove a great source of information for Coleridgeans interested in his intellectual development. In ‘A Poem Wrongly Ascribed to Johnson and to Coleridge’ (*N&Q* 57[2010] 211–13) Van Remoortel shows that the poem ‘To Delia’ (which had been ascribed to Coleridge and to Samuel Johnson) was in fact written by the satirist John Wolcot. Timothy Michael’s ‘The Coleridge–Johnson Agon’ (*ColB* 36[2010] 18–23) explores Coleridge’s violent contempt for Samuel Johnson, a contempt that obscures ‘a more complex relationship’ (p. 20) based on a disagreement about the origin of evil and a shared debt to Leibniz. In ‘Time to Retire? Wordsworth and Coleridge Go to Work’ (*WC* 41[2010] 23–9) Paul H. Fry looks at the idea of poetry as vocation and profession in the conversations of Wordsworth and Coleridge. Both were uneasy about the idea at a time when poetry was not really a job. Coleridge is drawn to a Wordsworthian poetic vocation but takes most of his life to concede ‘the poetic value of retirement in natural surroundings’ (p. 29). Anne C. McCarthy’s ‘Dumbstruck: *Christabel*, the Sublime, and the Willing Suspension of Disbelief’ (*RCPS* [2010] 39 paras.) considers the stupor that reading *Christabel* can often occasion to mount a thoughtful rereading of the notion of suspended disbelief. Such moments in the poem are attempts to evoke a sublime experience in which the reasoning powers are suspended to the
extent that verbal explanation of it becomes impossible: ‘a sight to dream of, not to tell’.

Justin Shepherd’s ‘“Where I first sprang to light”: Coleridge’s Autobiographical Reflections 1797–98’ (ColB 35[2010] 15–32) looks at Coleridge’s developing ideas of home and family by examining the differences between the first and second editions of his Poems published by Joseph Cottle leading up to their most significant manifestation in the Fears in Solitude poems of 1798. Shepherd illuminates these ideas by placing them in two contexts: an emergent ‘sentimentalizing’ of family life and the focus on home developed as a result of the Burke/Paine Revolution controversy. Lynda Pratt’s ‘Bristowa’s Citizens? Coleridge, Southey and Bristol’ (ColB 35[2010] 33–42) offers Bristol as a kind of home for both poets, but it is the ambivalence of their response to the city that most interests Pratt. It was a location central to both and yet they seemed to have had an especial aversion to mentioning it in writing. Their objection may have been, Pratt argues, to the city’s association with commerce, perhaps because it was an association both poets shared with the city. Andrew Keanie, in ‘Toxic Distillation and Crystallizing Eloquence: Some Coleridgean Home Truths’ (ColB 35[2010] 43–54), picks up on the characteristically Coleridgean mix of unity and variety in readings of a suitably vast range of Coleridge’s writings, especially the Notebooks and ‘The Nightingale’. It is a rich, suggestive, and rather Coleridgean essay. Dometa Wiegand’s ‘Glass, Man and Frost in George Herbert and Samuel Taylor Coleridge’ (ColB 35[2010] 55–64) is an intriguing and subtle reading of Coleridge alongside George Herbert. Wiegand uses their common use of the metaphor of glass to illuminate both poets’ understanding of the way the language of the material world can approach the divine. Richard S. Peterson’s short piece, ‘An Unnoticed Motif in Coleridge’s “This Lime-Tree Bower My Prison”’ (ColB 35[2010] 77–81) notes that lime trees have a ‘metaphorical resonance’ (p. 79) in love poetry: limed branches were used to trap birds, just as Sara was ‘limed by domestic confinement’ (p. 81). Anya Taylor’s ‘“A Sylph Beguiled”: The Riddle of “The Pang More Sharp Than All”’ (ColB 36[2010] 1–7) considers Coleridge’s strange late poem ‘The Pang More Sharp Than All’. Taylor argues that the poem’s grief can be attributed to the loss of Sara Hutchinson rather than his estrangement from his son, Hartley. But the main purpose of this sensitive article is to consider Coleridge’s intricate analysis of sorrow. Nick Powell’s ‘Spontaneous Overflows on the High Seas: Motion and Emotion among the Voyagers to Hamburg in 1798’ (ColB 36[2010] 32–40) provides a fascinating account of Coleridge’s sea voyages in 1798. Julian Knox’s impressively detailed ‘Word, Image, History: Coleridge and the Fine Arts’ (ColB 36[2010] 49–61) adds to recent work on Coleridge’s experience of art on his Italian tour. Knox proposes that his reflections on these images ‘are crucial to his thinking on memory itself, and more generally to the philosophy of history he develops in later works’ (p. 49). Coleridge’s thinking on visual art, as Knox demonstrates ably, should be considered an aspect central to his thinking about aesthetics more generally.

Anna Seward and Erasmus Darwin have both become much more prominent in the eyes of Romanticists than their former status as ‘minor poets’ suggests. The publication of an edition of Anna Seward’s Life of
Erasmus Darwin by Philip K. Wilson, Elizabeth A. Dolan, and Malcolm Dick is accordingly especially welcome for the light it sheds on both. The biography was first published in 1804, two years after Darwin’s death. Both were residents of Lichfield, but both also, as the editors demonstrate, shared a great deal in common as poets and thinkers. The biography is especially valuable to literary scholars because Seward is drawn more to the poetical than the medical side of Darwin’s legacy. Seward was clearly impressed by Darwin’s detailed accounts of the natural world, though she did depart from his celebration of industrialization. A large part of the biography is devoted to lengthy analysis of poems like The Botanic Garden. Seward proves an adept literary critic, conscious of Darwin’s allusions to the literary past and sensitive to his use of metre and sound patterns. The editors have supplied a very thorough introduction which explains the medical, poetic, philosophical, and political contexts which both writers shared. They also remedy Seward’s neglect of medical matters by expanding on this context in the editorial apparatus. The biography is annotated in remarkable detail with notes explaining matters of fact and also offering links to recent scholarship in the field. It is a careful, sensitive biography that has been extremely well edited. It reveals much about both poets.

The Irish poet Thomas Dermody received welcome attention in R. Stephen Dornan’s ‘Thomas Dermody’s Archipelagic Poetry’ (ERR 21[2010] 409–23). Dermody’s output is so valuable, Dornan argues convincingly, because its use of ‘culturally nationalist’ (p. 410) Irish influences alongside Scottish and English influences embodies the uneasy combination of geographical centre and margin that defines what Romanticists have recently termed the period’s ‘archipelagic’ literary culture. Dermody’s connections with Coleridge provide a suggestive conclusion to the essay. Another neglected poet who received welcome attention this year is Joseph Fawcett, best known as the inspiration for Wordsworth’s Solitary. Brian Folker’s ‘“A huge colossal constable”: Liberalism and International Law in Joseph Fawcett’s Art of War’ (SiR 49[2010] 153–68) moves the focus away from Wordsworth to illuminate a fascinating dissenting voice whose war poetry, as Folker convincingly demonstrates in a wide-ranging article, continues to resonate with debates over modern liberalism.

‘Glorification of the Lowly in Felicia Hemans’s Sonnets “Female Characters of Scripture”’ (VP 48[2010] 559–75) by Anne Nichols provides a thoughtful consideration of a sonnet sequence included in Hemans’s last published volume. That Hemans is ambivalent about religion, a source, for her, of ‘mediated agency’ (p. 559), allows Nichols to mount an insightful critique of scholarship which has seen religion as being simply either revolutionary or compensatory. Hemans’s occupation of the middle ground is a complex but no less empowering act. In ‘Felicia Hemans’s Boy on the Burning Deck: Sentimental or Subversive?’ (Cithara 50[2010] 26–31) Lauren P. Matz asks for a reconsideration of Hemans’s most famous and most parodied poem. We ought, for Matz, to appreciate fully the sincerity of Hemans’s manner. But it is also striking for her that the martial bravery Hemans celebrates is performed not by a garlanded hero, Nelson (whom Hemans mentions only once in verse), but an insignificant boy. On the basis of this
Matz concludes the poem is subversive. Rodney Stenning Edgecombe continued his fine work on Hemans in ‘Byron, Wordsworth, and Hemans’s Modern Greece’ (Expl 68[2010] 172–3). Here he explores the different types of calm found in The Giaour, ‘Sonnet composed upon Westminster Bridge’, and ‘Modern Greece’. Hemans, as Edgecombe points out, owes a debt to both Byron and Wordsworth. Timothy Webb continues his excellent archival work on Leigh Hunt’s letters in ‘After Horsemonger Lane: Leigh Hunt’s London Letters to Byron (1815–1816)’ (Romanticism 16[2010] 233–66). The discovery is important in part because scholars were once keen to place as much distance as possible between the two. As Webb shows, however, their friendship was far more substantial than this. Webb discusses twelve new letters written between Hunt’s release from prison in 1815 and Byron’s departure for the Continent in 1816. The letters suggest for Webb the ‘strengths which held [their relationship] together in the face of such potentially damaging centrifugal forces’ (p. 263) as Hunt’s dislike of Pope and Byron’s of Wordsworth. This article follows three others on Leigh and John Hunt’s letters which Webb published last year and which were missed from the review. ‘Leigh Hunt’s Letters to Byron from Horsemonger Lane Gaol: A Commentary’ (ByronJ 37[2009] 21–32) considers the eight letters Hunt wrote to Byron that Webb published in 2008. Hunt’s letters are suggestive of the strange mixture of social uncertainty and poetic and political fellow-feeling that developed between the two. Webb’s research sheds fascinating new light on Byron’s opinions of Napoleon. This sterling work on the Hunt circle is extended in two pieces: ‘John Hunt to Edwin Atherstone: Seven Letters’ (KSR 23[2009] 56–81) and ‘John Hunt to Edwin Atherstone: Seven Letters’ (KSR 23[2009] 56–81). The first prints the letters, the second discusses them. John Hunt, publisher of The Examiner, The Yellow Dwarf, and the later cantos of Don Juan, was a powerful and courageous figure, well deserving the glowing dedication to him of Hazlitt’s Political Essays. It is pleasing to see him beginning to return to some prominence. Hunt was imprisoned twice for his publishing activities, and the letters describing his time in prison, as Webb puts it, suggest ‘the painful and vivid complexities of a man who was both resolute and vulnerable, stoical and long-suffering’ (p. 57).

Criticism of Leigh Hunt’s poetry and poetics is still relatively rare, so Flemming Olsen’s Leigh Hunt and ‘What is Poetry?: Romanticism and the Poetry of Purpose’ is a welcome sight. Olsen is not Hunt’s most generous critic, but he does wish (refreshingly) to make a claim of a sort for Hunt’s literary criticism. The book provides a light overview of Hunt’s career, but the bulk of the discussion focuses on the essay ‘What is Poetry?’, which appeared in Imagination and Fancy in 1844. It is a manifesto for Hunt’s conception of poetry that formed in the Romantic period, though it also bears the marks of the changes in Hunt’s attitude to verse that date from the end of his first attempt to establish himself as a poet in the 1810s. It’s a shame, though, that Olsen’s account of it is so frequently qualified with doubts about Hunt’s powers of thought. Olsen’s cut at the ‘terminological imprecision which is a characteristic . . . of virtually everything that Hunt wrote’ (p. 17) is a rather catty cavil that ignores the appreciation of the ‘impressionistic’ quality of
Hunt’s poetry that critics like Nicholas Roe have recently developed. It is disappointing that Olsen could not take Hunt’s methods more seriously or place them in the intellectual and cultural traditions with which they are in dialogue. But the emphasis on subjectivity that Olsen notes as a feature of Hunt’s poetical theory seems valuable precisely because it does not ‘spoon-feed the reader’ (p. 41). For occasional insights like this and for drawing attention to this important, neglected document in late Romantic poetics, Olsen deserves credit.

There were no individual monographs on Keats this year, but he featured substantially in many general monographs and edited collections. Relationships and poetic connections have undoubtably been a major theme in scholarship this year, but Alexander Regier’s monograph, *Fracture and Fragmentation in British Romanticism* provides a welcome counterpoint to that theme. Rather than arguing that fragmentation prevents us from understanding Romanticism as a unified genre, Regier argues that the fragmentation within Romantic texts provides ‘a meta-critical pattern in connection with fragmentation’: it is the fragmentary nature of Romantic texts, Regier implies, that connects them as such (p. 13). In chapter 5 he examines Keats’s letters, arguing that Keats’s ‘epistolary poetics relies on an economy of fracture and reciprocal movement . . . this dynamic of exchange parallels the condition of a linguistic predicament of brokenness’ (p. 119). The analysis of Keats’s letters is particularly forceful here, not least because, as Regier himself points out, a letter is inherently fragmentary: it forms only one link in a chain of dialogue between correspondents. Regier concludes this chapter with the suggestion that Keats is symbolically kept alive, almost in a form of stasis, ‘by a fragmentary piece of writing, never to be answered . . . In their brokenness and failure they ensure his survival’ (p. 140). Michelle Faubert and Thomas H. Schmid present a fascinating series of studies of the conceptualization of pleasure in their volume *Romanticism and Pleasure*. In chapter 2, entitled ‘Pleasure in an Age of Talkers: Keats’ Material Sublime’, Betsy Winakur Tontiplaphol discusses Keats’s debt to William Hazlitt as a poet of pleasure. Tontiplaphol argues that ‘In conversations dedicated to pleasure in Romantic literature, John Keats . . . is a more likely subject than Hazlitt . . . but there is also something of Hazlitt in Keats’s oft-cited preference for “a Life of Sensations rather than of Thoughts”’ (p. 40). Tontiplaphol situates Keats’s poetry as part of a developing Romantic tradition of sensuality practised by writers such as Coleridge and Hazlitt, positing that that ‘By the early months of 1818, Keats had rejected Wordsworthian “joy,” but he proved no less critical of Hunt’s tendency to cloy . . . Keats’s notion of pleasure diverged quickly and profoundly from that of his early mentor’ (p. 46). Tontiplaphol’s analysis ultimately settles on Keats’s *Lamia*, wherein she highlights the text’s generic instability ‘as both tragedy and comedy’ (p. 57).

Several works highlighted poetic connections between Keats, Shelley, and others. As A.V.C. Schmidt rightly points out in the opening sentence of his article, ‘Texture and Meaning in Shelley, Keats, and Yeats’ (*EIC* 60[2010] 318–35), ‘texture’ as a term in literary criticism is metaphorical, and has a tendency to over-use. Schmidt’s aim is to analyse how texture, particularly rhyming texture, functions primarily in Shelley and Yeats, but also in Keats. Phillip
Anderson provides a fascinating study of three Romantic poets in his article ‘A Romantic Disciple: Shelley, Keats, and Thomas Wade’ (Philological Review 36[2010] 1–12), in which he aims to exhume the works of the ‘virtually forgotten’ Wade in the context of Shelley and Keats’s influence on Romanticism (p. 1). In the light of recent scholarly challenges to the Romantic canon, Anderson’s essay is a particularly refreshing and engaging examination of a marginalized Romantic poet.

As well as co-editing Romanticism, Sincerity and Authenticity, also reviewed in this year’s YWES, Tim Milnes brings us a new monograph, entitled The Truth About Romanticism: Pragmatism and Idealism in Keats, Shelley, and Coleridge. Milnes’s study surely ranks among the best of this year’s output, and with a title as bold as The Truth About Romanticism does not disappoint. Milnes seeks to redress what he views as a failure of modern scholarship to properly conceptualize Romantic notions of ‘truth’, arguing that ‘modern criticism...has fixated upon and internalized the romantic idealization of truth to the exclusion of historical and alethic alternatives’ (p. 1). Milnes’s study is particularly successful at challenging a characterization of Romanticism that is very much at the heart of much Romantic scholarship, while remaining both accessible and immensely readable. Chapter 3, for example, analyses Keats’s correspondence, suggesting that in a December 1817 letter to his brothers the poet questions ‘the literal foundation of meaning and the factual status of belief [and in doing so] undermines an empirical topos whereby correspondence is held to be the key relation underpinning meaning and truth’ (p. 66). Milnes’s central argument here is that ‘there is a form of rationality in Keats’s writing that has escaped both formalist approaches and the suspicions of postmodern and New Historicist approaches’ (p. 67). This is followed in chapter 4, which examines Shelley’s philosophical conflicts, with the assertion that ‘Like Keats, Shelley finds that the intellectual milieu of Socratic empiricism associated with the culture of dissent to which he adheres harbours an ambiguity’ (p. 106). It is perhaps this chapter that best summarizes Milnes’s argument throughout the study, no better exemplified than in his suggestion that ‘Shelley’s later work continues to hesitate between two concepts of truth: one based on ideal correspondence, the other on the pragmatics of communication’ (p. 111). It is surely this concern that is at the heart of Milnes’s study, one which is rich with new ideas, and new directions for Romantic scholarship to take.

A number of articles also appeared on Keats. In ‘Ekphrasis and Adaptation: Keats’s Grecian Urn in Modern American Poetry’ (FLS 32[2010] 26–39), Joan Qionglin Tan examines the ways in which Keats’s ‘Ode on a Grecian Urn’ ‘is reworked in modern American ekphrasis and what aesthetic principle is involved in the process on adaptation’ (p. 28). Elsewhere in Keats studies, Rodney Stenning Edgecombe posits that ‘One of Keats’s great poetical projects was the recapturing of a pre-Christian, spontaneous reaction to the natural world’, in his article, ‘Inverted Christian Images in Endymion, book 3’ (ExpL 68[2010] 96–100). Lauren T. Elmore’s essay, ‘The Implications of Immortal Grief in Shelley’s Adonais and Keats’s The Fall of Hyperion’ (ExpL 68[2010] 15–18), presents a new perspective on Adonais, an essay that she herself admits ‘has been thoroughly canvassed for allusion’ (p. 15). Further,
Elmore then draws parallels with Keats’s *The Fall of Hyperion* in a brief but engaging analysis of both poems. In her article, “‘Give me that voice again… Those looks immortal’: Gaze and Voice in Keats’s *The Eve of St. Agnes’* (SiR 49[2010] 353–73), Daniela Garofalo figures Keats’s poetry as part of a growing culture of commercialism and consumption. What makes Garofalo’s argument particularly interesting, however, is in her careful assertion that while engaging with this culture, Keats did not fully accept it, seeing ‘a more critical edge in Keats’s work’ than other scholars have allowed him (p. 354).

A new volume, *Romanticism, Sincerity and Authenticity*, edited by Tim Milnes and Kerry Sinanan, provides a varied and fascinating series of essays that focus on the concerns of sincerity and authenticity in the developing print culture of the Romantic period. In their introduction Milnes and Sinanan posit that ‘The Romantic period saw a heightened awareness of this dissemination [of print], a concern that focused on the authenticity of the selves who wrote such works as well as the sincerity of the feelings they expressed’ (p. 2). In Part II of the volume, Angela Esterhammer gives a fascinating account of the relationship between authorial intent and sincerity (pp. 101–19). Esterhammer begins her analysis with a discussion the concept of intention, drawing on Shoshana Felman’s 1980 study *The Scandal of the Speaking Body*. She paraphrases Felman, suggesting that ‘The body, as the inalienably organic and material component of action, ensures that acts… are never pure representations of spiritual or mental intention’ (p. 103). Esterhammer then moves her discussion to Wordsworth, Byron, and Letitia Elizabeth Landon, where she posits that ‘Byron and Landon develop a paradoxical notion of performative sincerity that is at least latent in Wordsworth’. Moreover, Esterhammer argues that ‘both the “essential” and the “constructed” sincerity that critics have associated with Wordsworth and Byron… form part of a more deliberate and sustained Romantic analysis of sincerity’ (p. 105).

In the following chapter, ‘Making Sense of Sincerity in *The Prelude*’ (pp. 120–36), Milnes argues that ‘the idea of “sense” undergoes a radical transformation in significance and normative power during the Romantic period’ (p. 120). Furthermore, Milnes suggests that previous readings of ‘the relationship between “sense” and “sincerity” in Wordsworth’ often misrepresent the ‘nature’ of that relationship (p. 122). Milnes’s chapter is meticulously structured, with the first section closely analysing the etymology and various meanings of the words ‘sense’ and ‘sincerity’ before situating sincerity within the context of ‘postmodern historicism’ (p. 125). Milnes concludes his chapter by building neatly towards a discussion of *The Prelude*, specifically the section with the ‘Blind Beggar’, ably exploring the relationship ‘between truth and interpretation, subjective (ap)perception and intersubjective norms’ (p. 130), that he argues is central to the discourse of the Blind Beggar sequence in Book VII.

Rounding off the examination of specifically Romantic-era poets in this section is Sinanan’s chapter, ‘Too Good to be True? Hannah More, Authenticity, Sincerity and Evangelical Abolitionism’ (pp. 137–61), in which she explores ‘the ways in which understanding more about the historical
specificities of both sincerity and authenticity is crucial for how we inflect our critical analyses’ (p. 137). In this chapter, Sinanan compellingly reappraises More’s evangelical abolitionism, which she argues should be viewed ‘as part of a historically specific, cultural shift when the anti-slavery movement of the Romantic period, as [Charles] Taylor argues, blended “theistic and secular moral sources”’ (p. 139). Finally, Part III of the volume contains an interesting chapter by John Halliwell, entitled ‘Acts of Insincerity? Thomas Spence and Radical Print Culture in the 1790s’. Halliwell’s chapter can be read as part of the resurgence of scholarly interest in satire and popular print culture that has been growing over the last decade, and it is both refreshing and interesting to see a study like this incorporated into a volume on wider Romantic literature. As Milnes does in his earlier chapter, Halliwell begins his discussion by offering an etymological examination of ‘authenticity’ and its link with ‘authority’. Halliwell’s focus is on the content of Thomas Spence’s radical periodical Pig’s Meat, and most intriguingly provides an analysis of Spence’s parodic poem ‘The Progress of Liberty’. Here, Halliwell notes the inversion of meaning in Spence’s parody of ‘Rule Britannia’ by using it to attack English, rather than French, despotism. Halliwell concludes his discussion by suggesting that ‘Spence succeeded in opening out the closed language of political discourse to a wider audience: in doing so Spence may have reshaped authenticity as a status authorized...by the authority of the plebeian public sphere’ (p. 216).

This year yielded some fascinating essays on Shelley, not least of which was Matthew C. Borushko’s fine analysis of non-violence and aesthetics in Shelley, in his study, ‘Violence and Nonviolence in Shelley’s Mask of Anarchy’ (KSJ 59[2010] 96–113). Borushko’s piece gives a useful overview of previous scholars’ work in this area, before offering his position, well substantiated, that ‘The role of aesthetic experience in fostering thoughts with the potential to dethrone Anarchy can be understood only through the poem’s crucial distinction between an aesthetic of nonviolence and an aesthetic of Anarchy’ (p. 108). In addition, T.S. Miller provides some enlightening comments in his essay ‘The Proliferation of Duality in Shelley’s Alastor’ (Expl 68[2010] 219–22), arguing that Alastor explores the metaphysical complications and limitations of duality. Colin Jager’s article ‘Shelley After Atheism’ (SiR 49[2010] 611–31) focuses on Shelley’s Mont Blanc, but does not, as Jager forewarns, focus on the content of the poem, because, in part, ‘a great many intelligent things have already been said about it’ (p. 611). Instead, Jager uses the poem as a jumping-off point for his bold and intriguing argument that despite Shelley being an atheist, he is able to transcend ‘the radical enlightenment...because he is able to leave its atheism behind’ (p. 612). In ‘“Unentangled Intermixture”: Love and Materialism in Shelley’s Epipsychidion’ (KSJ 59[2010] 78–95), Andrew B. Warren examines Shelley’s poem in relation to the rest of his work, stating that, ‘As scholars have long acknowledged, Epipsychidion is a rewriting of Shelley’s previous work’ (p. 79), and positing that ‘Epipsychidion advances on The Cenci by posing the play’s central problems’ (p. 81) and, finally, ‘extends and complicates the conclusions of Alastor’ (p. 95). Barbara Judson examines the self and consciousness in Shelley in her article, ‘A Sound of Voices: The Ventriloquial Uncanny in
Judson argues that ‘Shelley drew explicitly on [Charles Brockden Brown’s novel] Wieland for his exploration of the Promethean mind in thrall to passion’, setting her analysis of Shelley’s poem within the context of Brown’s novel, and his exploration of the uncanny.

Alastor proved a popular work this year, with Shelley’s poem finding itself the subject of the first chapter in a new book by Tilottama Rajan, entitled Romantic Narrative. Opening the chapter with the claim that ‘Labyrinths, weavings, and related figures are ubiquitous in Shelley’s texts’ (p. 1), Rajan presents a view of Alastor that blurs the boundaries between narrative, prose, and poetry. Rajan argues that ‘Alastor stands at the cusp of a turn from a poetry identified with lyric and its cognates to a narrative that crosses the categories of both prose and poetry’ (p. 3). Rajan follows this analysis with an examination of Prometheus Unbound in her second chapter, in which she compares that drama to Shelley’s novel, St. Irvyne. Noting the similarities of location and character in the texts, Rajan then suggests that Prometheus Unbound most resembles St. Irvyne ‘as an assemblage that finally disassembles itself—a kind of monster made of bits and pieces’ (p. 49). Concluding her chapter by figuring ‘Shelley’s radical sense of poetry as a creative faculty rather than a genre’, Rajan ties her analysis to the wider concerns of her study with the assertion that Shelley’s ‘cannibalized bits of poetry...make prose as the narrative of particular facts an unsettled, heterogeneous genre open to poetry’ (p. 81). In doing so, Rajan’s study provides some of the most detailed and intriguing analyses of Shelley’s texts this year.

Laura Wells Betz was interested in Prometheus Unbound this year, examining the poem in her article ‘ “At once mild and animating”: Prometheus Unbound and Shelley’s Spell of Style’ (ERR 21[2010] 161–81). Betz argues that Shelley uses language in his dramatic poem ‘as a form of poetic spell-casting...language is treated as a physical action’ (p. 161). Perhaps most interestingly, however, Betz acknowledges that her analysis of Prometheus Unbound’s language is not new; rather, she recasts the physical aspects of Shelley’s poetry as a crucial part of Shelley’s rhetoric and not merely a crude weakness in his poetry.

In Illustrations, Optics and Objects in Nineteenth-Century Literary and Visual Cultures, Luisa Calè and Patrizia Di Bello have given us an excellent collection of essays ‘concerned with objects and practices of reading, viewing and collecting in the nineteenth century’ (p. ix). Visual cultures of the nineteenth century have recently experienced a growth in critical interest, and the studies in this volume represent compelling examples of this trend in nineteenth-century scholarship. In their volume, Calè and Di Bello aim to ask ‘What happens to the objects that make up a “literary and visual culture” when we try to imagine them not only through our minds, but also through our bodies and our senses?’ (p. 1). This question is amply addressed in Sophie Thomas’s chapter, entitled ‘Ekphrasis and Terror: Shelley, Medusa, and the Phantasmagoria’. Thomas opens her chapter by positing that despite being ‘a central Romantic icon...what she might tell us about the act of looking itself, about the fear of sight, with all its generative anxieties and its relationship to Romantic discourses of visuality’ (p. 25) is often overlooked.
Addressing this gap, Thomas analyses Shelley’s poem ‘On the Medusa of Leonardo da Vinci in the Florentine Gallery’ with Medusa’s appearances in ‘contemporary visual spectacles’ (p. 25). Arguing that ‘The figure of the Medusa functions as a link ... between two interrelated discourse of visibility’, Thomas analyses the inherent, Janus-like instability of the image of Medusa. Perhaps one of the most intriguing aspects of Thomas’s discussion is her linking of the Greek myth and eighteenth- and nineteenth-century phantasmagoria: when Perseus confronts Medusa, ‘at the moment of Perseus’ attack, neither of them is actually looking. And yet the look is, and becomes everything ... reflection and representation become the same thing’ (p. 27).

Thomas ties the simulacra of Medusa to the development of the phantasmagoria, a ghostly slide-show born out of the magic lantern shows of the eighteenth century, and finally to Shelley’s poem on Medusa, which Thomas argues emphasizes the Medusa’s contradictory qualities of vitality and entropy: ‘Visually, all is contrast, opposition and change. Shelley’s poem is intriguingly phantasmagoric in its images, which transform the dark canvas ... into a screen across which all manner of terrifying lights and apparitions pass’ (p. 36).

Heather Tilley follows Thomas’s chapter with her examination of the relationship between Wordsworth’s trachoma and his poetry, in ‘Wordsworth’s Glasses: the Materiality of Blindness in the Romantic Vision’. Tilley points out that ‘Figures of blindness haunt Wordsworth’s writing, from blind Herbert in The Borderers to “Lines Written a Few Miles Above Tintern Abbey” ... However, little critical attention has been paid to the poet’s experience of visual disorders’ (p. 44). Interestingly, Tilley pays close attention not only to Wordsworth’s eye disease, but also to the spread of an Egyptian strain of trachoma brought back to England by soldiers returning home from the Napoleonic Wars (pp. 46–7). Tilley’s study follows a trend that has been growing in eighteenth-century and Romantic studies for some time, that of science and literature, last year exemplified by Michelle Faubert’s Rhyming Reason: The Poetry of Romantic-Era Psychologists. Tilley furthers this growth in scholarly interest of the relationship between science and literature by suggesting that Wordsworth’s trachoma significantly contributed to his poetry. In doing so, Tilley quite elegantly combines literal and metaphorical readings of ‘vision’ in Wordsworth’s poetry, and her hope ‘to have begun to suggest a new way of thinking about the experience of vision in his [Wordsworth’s] poetry’, is indeed a welcome one.

Regier’s Fracture and Fragmentation in British Romanticism, discussed above, contains specific discussion of Wordsworth in chapter 4. Regier examines fragmentation in The Prelude, using that poem to suggest that ‘fracture weaves itself into Wordsworth’s texts syntactically’ (p. 95). Focusing on parentheses in Wordsworth’s text, Regier argues, quite convincingly, that Wordsworth’s use of brackets breaks the fluidity of his thought and language. Moreover, this chapter aims to show that ‘attending to’ Wordsworth’s parentheses ultimately enriches our understanding of Romanticism, in the context of previous scholarship which has focused on Wordsworth’s ‘editorial’ decisions (p. 97). Here, Regier quickly establishes that if we accept that parentheses are important in Wordsworth’s texts, then those parentheses...
contribute significantly towards Wordsworth’s formation as a Romantic poet. Moreover, this speaks to Regier’s wider concerns over the significance of fractured and fragmented thought and language in Romantic poetry.

Stuart Allen offers an excellent new study in *Wordsworth and the Passions of Critical Poetics*. Allen’s monograph addresses some of the key areas at the heart of Wordsworth’s poetry, asking, as Allen posits in his introduction, ‘What happens to the theories of affect debated in the prose writings of Whig aestheticians when they enter Wordsworth’s lyric and narrative poetry? What difference does it make to say that a poem *is* feeling rather than simply the vehicle of a feeling that “belongs” to author or reader?’ (p. xi). Allen situates his study against a body of scholarship that ‘resists emptying art into history, ideology or gender, and that instead engages with the *literary* nature of the object of criticism more fully’, but suggests that ‘a fertile, yet still under-represented, resource for developing an alternative to prevailing modes of literary explication can be found in the work of Georg Lukács, Theodor Adorno and J.H. Prynne’ (p. xii). Allen argues that ‘In establishing poetry as a relatively autonomous counter tradition, Wordsworth discovers that he has separated his art from the society it would address’ (p. xxiii). This concern finds itself echoed most resolutely in chapter 4, in which Allen suggests that ‘As a number of critics have observed, Wordsworth’s assumptions about place, nature and emotion translate well into Burkean terms’ (p. 72). Here, Allen argues that Wordsworth’s poem ‘Michael’ can be ‘easily characterized’ (p. 76) as a Burkean text. This is seen most clearly in Wordsworth’s handling of the concept of tradition and ancestry; themes that were very much at the heart of Burke’s own work. What makes this chapter especially fascinating is in Allen’s assertion that Wordsworth’s concerns lie not simply with a Burkean sense of paternalism, but also with ‘The bonds of affection between people that, he believes, are assured by place’ (p. 77). Chapter 5 follows this discussion, beginning with the suggestion that Wordsworth’s materialism often ‘condemns’ his poetry to reaction: ‘defined in opposition to fixed modes of thought and feeling, it cannot imagine anything else and has little substantive identity of its own’ (p. 97). However, the central argument of this chapter is actually that Wordsworth does manage to break free of his reactionism to achieve a more ‘positive’ poetry. Allen’s analysis of this conflict in the politics of Wordsworth’s poetry demonstrates his deft ability to balance what might otherwise seem like a contradiction in the development of Wordsworth’s conception of poetry.

Sally Bushell presents a fascinating and innovative study in her extensive paper, ‘The Mapping of Meaning in Wordsworth’s “Michael”: Textual Place, Textual Space and Spatialized Speech Acts’ (*SiR* 49[2010] 43–191). Bushell uses Wordsworth’s poem ‘Michael’, a text that was itself quite popular this year, ‘to explore the multiple ways in which the space and place of the literary work bear upon meaning’ (p. 43). Bushell constructs an original and engaging thesis, postulating that ‘Textual space extends across different versions of the draft text, into its manifestation as a final published work ... It is theoretically boundless, but in practice our experience of it is always delimited, in different ways’ (p. 48). Elsewhere in Wordsworth studies, Francesca Cauchi presents an analysis of Shelley’s *Alastor* that follows Paul Mueschke and Earl L. Griggs’s
study, ‘Wordsworth as the Prototype of the Poet in Shelley’s Alastor’, in her article, ‘A Rereading of Wordsworth’s Presence in Shelley’s Alastor’ (SEL 50[2010] 759–74). The dialogic relationship between Romantic poets and poems has been a recurrent theme this year, and Cauchi undoubtedly contributes to this in her assertion that ‘This paper endeavors to show that Wordsworth’s loss of poetic vision is caused by an encroaching idealism... a necessary connection between idealism and the death of a true poetic sensibility is central to an understanding of Alastor’ (p. 759).

Poetic relations are again examined, this time in a brief but enlightening article by Paul H. Fry entitled ‘Time to Retire? Coleridge and Wordsworth Go to Work’ (WC 41[2010] 23–9). Fry begins his discussion by noting that ‘In the 18th century the arts were just starting to seem a suitable pursuit for those who needed to make a living’, before examining the ‘vocational geography’ that was ‘inherited by Wordsworth and Coleridge’ (p. 23). In his new article, ‘Intimations of Neoteny: Play and God in Wordsworth’s 1799 Prelude’ (P&L 34[2010] 112–30), Scott Harshbarger examines childhood in Wordsworth’s poetry, focusing, as he puts it, ‘on Wordsworth’s down-to-earth accounts of childhood’ (p. 112). Intriguingly, Harshbarger claims that the 1799 Prelude contains a psychological exploration of childhood that becomes extended into adulthood, and his study successfully combines an accessible history of evolutionary psychology with an enlightening analysis of Wordsworth’s poem. Joshua King discusses the way in which sympathy becomes coercive in Wordsworth, in his article ‘ “The Old Cumberland Beggar”: Form and Frustrated Sympathy’ (WC 41[2010] 45–52), suggesting that in Wordsworth’s poem, sympathy becomes ‘a test rather than a motive for concern’ (p. 45).

Elsewhere in The Wordsworth Circle, Peter Larkin examines Wordsworth’s use of the phrase ‘spots of time’ in his article, ‘Wordsworth’s Maculate Exception: Achieving the “Spots of Time” ’ (WC 41[2010] 30–5), opening his discussion with the intriguing suggestion that ‘Wordsworth’s “spots of time” occupy a fault-line between trauma and aspiration, between the struggles of existence and the pathos of any wishing to be’ (p. 30). David Mulry’s article, ‘ “A Voice, a Mystery”: Wordsworth’s Cuckoo’ (Expl 68[2010] 5–8), is a brief but welcome contribution to this year’s Wordsworth studies. Mulry examines the symbolic significance of the eponymous bird in Wordsworth’s ‘To the Cuckoo’. Perhaps Mulry’s most interesting point is in the links he draws between the cuckoo and Keats’s nightingale, noting that the two birds are ‘often paired in folklore’ (p. 6). James Phillips has provided one of the year’s most interesting papers in his ‘Wordsworth and the Fraternity of Joy’ (NLH 41[2010] 613–32). Beginning, as with many studies this year, on literary relationships, Phillips focuses on William’s relationship with his sister Dorothy before moving on to eloquently posit, which surely forms the crux of his argument, that ‘The radiance and happiness in Wordsworth’s poetry is knowledge’s raw condition of possibility—a naked manifestation of the world’s will to be known’ (p. 618). Robert M. Ryan’s short but interesting article provides a valuable insight into the relationship between science and literature. In his ‘Wordsworth’s Response to Darwin’ (WC 41[2010] 10–13), Ryan frames Britain’s introduction to Darwin’s Origin of Species as one following Wordsworth’s sustained influence on British society, positing that
Wordsworth was ‘an important resource in an effort to preserve the moral meaning of nature’ (p. 11).

In a new volume entitled *Teaching Romanticism*, edited by David Higgins and Sharon Ruston, Sally Bushell contributes a chapter on how to teach Wordsworth, entitled ‘Teaching Wordsworth in the Lakes: The Literary Field Trip’. Bushell’s chapter focuses on how the Lake District can be used as tool to enhance the teaching of Wordsworth’s poetry, and indeed, in a poet so uniformly identified by his sense of place, Bushell’s study offers an intriguing proposition. Bushell grounds her suggestion in the context of past scholarship which has tackled ‘place and the problem of representation’ (p. 106), citing critics and writers as diverse as Seamus Heaney and Jonathan Bate, before moving on to analyse the problematic purpose of ‘field trips’. Here, Bushell suggests that ‘a literary field trip is... concerned with the layering of imagined, represented, textual and actual experiences of a site for both writer and reader’ (p. 109). Bushell’s discussion is both a welcome and novel addition to this year’s collection of Wordsworth studies, and provides a valuable insight into the significance of the environments in which we read, analyse, and consume literature.

Daniel Robinson has provided us a highly accessible and useful textbook on Wordsworth, entitled *William Wordsworth’s Poetry: A Reader’s Guide*. Aimed at a lay and student readership, Robinson’s work introduces Wordsworth thematically, beginning in chapter 1 with historical and political contexts, followed by broad textual analyses of his works, and finally finishing with a bibliographical chapter dedicated to suggestions for further reading. Robinson’s choice to begin his discussion with an overview of Wordsworth’s contexts is particularly helpful for student readers, and foregrounds well the subsequent, closer readings of Wordsworth’s texts. The opening chapter places Wordsworth very much at the centre of Romanticism and wider literature, with Robinson claiming that ‘Byron, Robert Browning, Wilde, T.S. Eliot... had to define themselves in relation or in opposition to what it means to be Wordsworthian’ (p. 1). Boldly, Robinson posits that Wordsworth is ‘the English poet to have had the greatest impact on literary history after Milton; in terms of a popular conception of poetry, he is undoubtedly more important than Milton’ (p. 1). And indeed, here Robinson speaks directly to the popular reader and student, and by placing Wordsworth so firmly at the centre of poetry and Romantic literature he depicts the Romantic movement with quite broad brush strokes. Robinson does, however, succeed in teasing out some of the nuances of Romanticism while retaining his book’s broad appeal, pointing out, for example, that Wordsworth did not enjoy popularity or commercial success for the majority of his career as a poet. The second chapter in this study furnishes the reader with the fundamentals of Wordsworth’s poetry, claiming that ‘Wordsworth largely is responsible for changing the idiom of poetry from deliberate artificiality to something more like the way people actually speak’ (p. 18), while setting this in the context of ‘Wordsworth’s contemporary critics [who] saw his style as a degradation of literature’ (p. 19). In short, Robinson’s new study is an invaluable resource for the interested reader and student alike.
Last but not least, Romantic women poets, including Charlotte Smith, Helen Maria Williams, and Ann Yearsley, continued to engage critical attention. Jacqueline M. Labbe’s edited volume, *The History of British Women’s Writing, 1785–1830*, contains some intriguing essays on women writers. The volume is the last in a five-volume collection on British women’s writing. In chapter 6, Kate Davies discusses Helen Maria Williams in her essay, ‘The Poem that Ate America: Helen Maria Williams’s *Ode on the Peace* (1783)’ (pp. 125–49). Davies posits that Williams’s poem typified the political and literary landscape of Britain in 1783. By setting Williams’s work firmly within its context Davies both strengthens her argument and creates a greater understanding of the poem. Davies’s lively discussion of *Ode on the Peace* is simultaneously entertaining and enlightening, and peppered with some wonderful examples of contemporary graphic satires, but perhaps the finest part of Davies’s analysis is in the final section, in which she compares Williams’s poem with Joshua Reynolds’s painting *Ugolini*. This has the dual effect of both enlivening and strengthening Davies’s argument, as well as providing a new perspective from which to view *Ode on the Peace*. Elsewhere in the volume we find two essays that discuss Charlotte Smith. In chapter 9, ‘Charlotte Smith, Mary Wollstonecraft, and the Romance of Real Life’ (pp. 194–206), for example, Stuart Curran assesses the cultural and political relationship between Smith and Mary Wollstonecraft. Curran’s discussion centres around the single meeting that Smith and Wollstonecraft had in July 1787, but Curran posits that ‘Even if these two writers had no further personal contact than what is noted here, such a shared, deeply felt, and ultimately transgressive concern with the vulnerability of women suggests the cultural ties that bind them’ (p. 196). Chapter 10 follows Curran’s examination with Harriet Guest’s ‘Charlotte Smith, Mary Robinson and the First Year of the War with France’ (pp. 206–32). Where Curran compares the political and poetic concerns of Wollstonecraft and Smith, here Guest discusses the way that Smith was keen to distance herself from Robinson, ‘whom I have no passion for being confounded with’ (p. 207). Guest points out that Robinson was probably quite happy with being paired with Smith, as she had previously expressed admiration for Smith in several of her works. Guest develops this discussion of the poets’ relationship with an intriguing analysis of both poets’ output in the early years of the 1790s, offering her readers a nuanced, original, and fascinating discussion which sits nicely alongside the many other studies on relationships in Romanticism that this year has produced.

Freedom’. Crisafulli examines the contribution of female writers and commentators on the abolitionist movement, noting that ‘10 per cent of the financial support to abolitionist societies of the time came from women, and in areas such as Manchester women contributed up to half the total amount’ (p. 110). An important and exciting element of Crisafulli’s study is the way she challenges the tendency in scholarship to dismiss the contribution of women writers such as More and Yearsley to abolition as a mercenary tactic for selfish political ends. Crisafulli rightly points out that ‘it is by no means evident that women’s open dissent and firm opposition to the trade of human beings…were without public risks or private consequences’ (p. 113). Crisafulli’s essay is a very welcome, highly readable, and refreshing contribution to this year’s scholarly output. Finally, Monica Smith Hart presents a new study of Charlotte Smith, following in the wake of a renewed interest in Romantic women writers. Hart’s article, ‘Charlotte Smith’s Exilic Persona’ (PAns 8[2010] 305–23), offers one of the best and most refreshing articles on Smith for some time, questioning whether we should use Wordsworth’s ‘legitimizing’ assessment of Smith as a way of rehabilitating her back into scholarship.

Several works published in Romantic poetry this year were not available for review, and will be reviewed in next year’s volume. These include Stephen Behrendt’s Percy Bysshe Shelley, and Harold Bloom and Blake Hobby’s edited collection The Sublime.

5. Drama

In a very productive year for Romantic drama studies, David O’Shaughnessy’s work on William Godwin’s plays was especially notable. William Godwin and the Theatre argues convincingly for the importance of Godwin’s activities as a playwright during the years around the turn of the century when his public status was at its height. The reason, for O’Shaughnessy, is not the intrinsic merit of his four dramas. ‘Rather, the point is to acknowledge the impact of Godwin’s theatrical efforts and interests on his wider literary and political project’ (p. 5). Stage tragedy was politically useful for the breadth of its influence and its power to instruct, and Godwin’s plays were by no means dashed off as money-making exercises (as has sometimes been suggested) but absorbed much of his intellectual effort. Here O’Shaughnessy’s editorial work on Godwin’s diaries is crucial. He can show, for instance, that Godwin ‘spent more time on Antonio than Caleb Williams, The Enquirer, St Leon, [or] Fleetwood’ (p. 94). O’Shaughnessy draws on Foucault for his understanding of the Romantic theatre: its apparent unruliness only disguises its effectiveness as a site for the production of disciplinary power, and Godwin perceived and valued its tendency subtly to regulate rather than to liberate the energies of the crowd. The book investigates the place of theatricality in Godwin’s shift away from his belief, held at the time of Political Justice, that political truths must be worked out by an elite and then disseminated prescriptively, towards the more conversational and interactive model of truth-seeking associated with The Enquirer.
Taking the plays in turn, and drawing out the parallels between them and Godwin’s novels, *William Godwin and the Theatre* reads *St Dunstan* as a heavily didactic study of church and state that reflects the influence of the Dissenting networks of sociability, organized around the campaign against the Test and Corporation Acts, among which Godwin moved during its composition in 1790. An early treatment of the concerns of *Political Justice*, with an ending anticipating that of *Caleb Williams*, *St Dunstan* raised problems too intractable for resolution in a drama. The third chapter, on *Antonio*, is a highlight of the book, a compelling account of the collision between the Drury Lane audience’s love of spectacle and Godwin’s purposely austere and demanding script. The play is no neglected masterpiece, and its calamitous single performance was the consequence of Godwin’s hubris as well as his bravery, but this was an effort to create ‘an entirely new type of theatre’, a ‘revolutionary’ invitation to collaborative rationality (p. 103). The final chapter shows how Godwin pursued his major tragic theme—the fatal consequences of the ‘absence of sincere and meaningful dialogic exchange’ (p. 123)—first in *Abbas, King of Persia*, where a densely researched oriental setting was intended as a concession to the popular demand for visual splendour, and then in *Faulkener*, which resigns itself to the inclusion of gratuitous spectacle and after six years in development was rewarded with a three-night run.

O’Shaughnessy’s monograph appears alongside his scholarly edition of the four dramas. *The Plays of William Godwin* takes its copy-texts from Godwin’s manuscripts. For *Antonio* and *Faulkener* this means preferring the initial (Larpent) versions, ‘unsullied by the input of the audience’, to the published texts that incorporate revisions made after performance, a decision that ‘derives from [O’Shaughnessy’s] thesis that Godwin’s plays are of primary importance in charting his intellectual and literary development’ rather than as documents of theatre history (p. lviii). The variants in the published editions, however, are all recorded. The three surviving acts of *Abbas, King of Persia* are printed with the annotations made to the manuscript by Coleridge and Charles Lamb. The lengthy introduction lays out the plays’ sources and plots systematically, but is otherwise largely a condensation of the accompanying book. While the two volumes are intended mainly as a contribution to Godwin studies, together they also add significantly to our understanding of the strong Romantic tradition of the metatheatrical drama of ideas, the tradition whose greatest exponent was Joanna Baillie.

The second volume in the *Great Shakespeareans* series, *Garrick, Kemble, Siddons, Kean*, edited by Peter Holland, provides a lively and authoritative introduction to the careers of its four subjects. The only surprise is that Sarah Siddons is given somewhat less space than her peers. Peter Holland’s essay on David Garrick combines cultural history with vivid psychological analysis. Garrick as bibliophile was at the heart of the social networks of Shakespearian textual editing, but Garrick as actor could be celebrated for an intuitive understanding of character that set scholarly pedantry at defiance. Complicating this picture further, Holland writes of how ‘Garrick’s sociable nature…is also part of his work as an actor’ (p. 31). It was Charles Macklin and not Garrick, Holland notes, who pushed the historicist staging of
Shakespeare further than audiences were yet willing to accept, even as Garrick, still working with heavily adapted texts, made fidelity to the Bard a triumphant advertising strategy. The book’s outstanding chapter is Michael Dodson’s witty portrait of John Philip Kemble as ‘the supreme Platonist of the English Shakespearean tradition, committed to making visible in performance the ideal forms which for him were only imperfectly embodied in the plays’ printed texts’ (p. 62). Kemble’s managerial style could be megalomaniacal, but for Dobson his preoccupation with the total stage effect of his productions is perhaps his principal legacy. Gently teasing but sympathetic, Dobson argues that Kemble was placed in an impossible position during both the 

Vortigern 

and the Old Price fiascos. There was something Procrustean about the way he fitted many of his major roles to a single favourite template, ‘but right to the end Kemble would yield to nobody when it came to wearing a toga, declaiming blank verse, and looking like a monument’ (p. 99).

Russ McDonald’s chapter weaves together ‘Siddons the Shakespearean actress, Siddons the sovereign of the London stage, and Siddons the cultural icon’ (p. 108). Surveying the responses she generated over the course of her career, he cautions us to remember that her contemporary fame rested less on what we now consider the great Shakespearian roles than on high-strung tragic parts in plays long since dropped from the repertory, and, when playing Shakespeare, on characters such as Constance and Queen Katherine. McDonald describes Siddons’s ‘talent for rejecting the familiar, for making [her] lines seem both new and self-evident’ (p. 123), and interprets her most of all as a figure in transition between neoclassical and Romantic styles of acting. Peter Thomson’s concluding chapter on Edmund Kean has something of his subject’s own style about it, his discussion focusing heavily on Kean’s explosive first few weeks at Drury Lane as the key moment that illuminates his whole career. The dominant theme in Thomson’s analysis is his argument that Kean’s upbringing gave him an ‘intuitive fellow-feeling’ (p. 163) with brilliant outsiders finally beaten down by the establishment into which they had wormed their way: hence his triumphs as Shylock and Richard III, as Othello and Sir Giles Overreach.

The fourth volume in the same series, edited by Adrian Poole, covers the ‘great Shakespearians’ Lamb, Hazlitt, Keats. The keynote of Felicity James’s study of Charles Lamb is the trope of a ‘familiar’ Shakespeare, a national poet who is both ‘deeply known’ and ‘domesticated’ (p. 13). James traces this emphasis from Lamb’s negotiations with 1790s radicalism all the way to Elia, who ‘stands up for a sociable, popular Shakespeare’ (p. 40). She devotes much attention to Lamb’s notorious pronouncement that Shakespeare’s plays are not calculated for stage performance, locating it within his broader argument that Shakespeare invites a particular kind of sympathy best reached through sociable acts of reading. Specimens of English Dramatic Poets combines an expansion of the Elizabethan and Jacobean canon with unabashed bardolatry and scorn for clichés about Shakespeare’s untutored irregularity, while Tales from Shakespear is seen in terms of a dialectic between wild imagination and the enforcement of propriety. William Hazlitt’s Shakespeare, as described by Uttara Natarajan, is in a sense the opposite of Lamb’s, in that for Hazlitt Shakespeare is above all unfamiliar, an exception to his theories that the
creative imagination is predicated on ‘gusto’ and a powerful sense of self. The fact that for Hazlitt ‘the very essence of [Shakespeare’s] genius is otherness’ (p. 81) is missed when Hazlitt is filtered through Keats, who makes Shakespeare’s kind of genius the default one. Natarajan gives most attention to *Characters of Shakespear’s Plays*, valuable for its emphasis on the internal coherence of Shakespeare’s texts, but looks as well to Hazlitt’s reviews of Kean and to the familiar essays where intensive quotation from Shakespeare becomes a kind of political shorthand. Beth Lau’s chapter on Keats makes the case that more emphasis should be placed on John Hamilton Reynolds, alongside Benjamin Haydon, as an influence on Keats’s love of Shakespeare. While working through the place of Shakespearian negative capability in Keats’s thought, Lau also looks quizzically at the extent to which Keats received Shakespeare as a poet of isolated ‘beauties’ or discrete moments of sensuous versification, and stresses that his feelings of affinity were partly due to his sense that both writers were social upstarts. A lengthy final section makes a compelling case for the importance of *Antony and Cleopatra* to Keats’s work, as an open-ended meditation on the competing claims of romance and duty, or sensations and thoughts.

Jacqueline Mulhallen’s *The Theatre of Shelley* makes a provocative contribution both to Shelley studies and to Romantic theatre history. Mulhallen’s contention is that all of Percy Shelley’s dramas and dramatic fragments were written with stage production prominently in mind, and that each shows evidence that he was an instinctive theatrical craftsman. *The Cenci* is much less generically distinctive within Shelley’s corpus than has been believed: *Hellas, Prometheus Unbound*, and *Swellfoot the Tyrant* all ‘were, and are, performable’ (p. 239). Ingeniously argued even when it is not fully convincing, Mulhallen’s work will undoubtedly stimulate considerable debate—the more so because it is published by Open Book, meaning that it is available in a universally free online edition as well as in print. After an introductory summary of current trends in scholarship on Romantic drama, the first chapter offers a wonderfully engaging portrait of late Georgian theatre spaces and practices, stressing their blend of intimacy and spectacle and their ‘exuberance and popularity with a large cross-section of society’ (p. 51). The second chapter, supplemented by a useful appendix, marshals the evidence concerning Shelley’s play-going and opera-going—Mulhallen arguing throughout that he visited the theatre with more enthusiasm than has usually been thought—and discusses his debt to A.W. Schlegel. Subsequent chapters deal in turn with *The Cenci, Charles the First, Prometheus Unbound, Hellas*, and *Swellfoot the Tyrant*. Mulhallen doubts that Shelley ever decisively abandoned *Charles the First*, and describes minutely how its extant scenes might be performed. *Prometheus Unbound* is compared fruitfully to ballet, opera, masque, pantomime, and melodrama, although the argument that it would succeed better when staged than read involves some elision of its aesthetic and philosophical commitments. *Hellas* is seen more straightforwardly in apposition to Aeschylus, and *Swellfoot* through the lens of Aristophanes. In taking a polemically commendatory view of all his dramas, *The Theatre of Shelley* occasionally downplays the artistic struggles that Shelley underwent. In making suitability for staging and ‘dramatic tension’ its
overriding aesthetic criteria, it sometimes simplifies the nuances of his poetry. The work represents, however, a significant, urgent, and closely researched intervention in the study of Romantic drama.

A substantial collection of essays edited by Lilla Maria Crisafulli and Keir Elam, *Women's Romantic Theatre and Drama: History, Agency, and Performativity*, demonstrates the extent of the modern scholarly reawakening to the work of female dramatists of the Romantic era. Under the auspices of a large-scale Italian research project, the volume brings together leading North American and British critics with their Italian counterparts. A first group of five essays deals with historical drama. Female Romantic playwrights registered the scars of history and turned to the theatre as a way of constructing modern liberal subjects, often explicitly feminized, who were free to detach themselves from aggressive masculine politics. Thus, Gary Kelly (pp. 85–99) shows how Felicia Hemans’s dramas reworked Friedrich Schiller’s myths of liberal nation-building in more gender-conscious terms, while Greg Kucich (pp. 21–41)—considering Baillie’s *Constantine Paleologus* and Mary Russell Mitford’s *Rienzi*—describes how women writers could engage in historical revisionism in order to turn the theatre into a national school for moral education. Baillie and others ‘conceive[d] of a “new” kind of history that [would] recover the poignant inner lives of individuals’ (p. 32). Other contributions in this section explore Elizabeth Inchbald and Hannah Cowley, Hannah More and Ann Yearsley, and siege drama.

A highlight of the subsequent chapters is the late Jane Moody’s incisive discussion of the importance of looking beyond the Examiner of Plays when considering censorship in the period, in ‘Inchbald, Holcroft and the Censorship of Jacobin Theatre’ (pp. 197–211). ‘[T]heatrical censorship needs to be understood as a series of practices and judgments, taking place both in private and in public, involving spectators, critics, theatre managers, and performers’ (p. 211)—as well as playwrights themselves, as Moody shows by drawing out the subtlety of the political allusions in Inchbald’s *Such Things Are* and *Next Door Neighbours*. Thomas Holcroft’s *Knave or Not?*, however, was ‘direct, uncompromising, and doctrinaire’ in its class politics (p. 206). This year coincidentally saw another study of the censorship of that play, Amy Garnai’s ‘“A Lock Upon My Lips”: The Melodrama of Silencing and Censorship in Thomas Holcroft’s *Knave, or Not?*’ (*ECS* 43[2010] 473–84), which shows at more length how Holcroft tried to reconcile his radical politics with his commercial ambitions. Garnai is able to track the changes between the Larpent manuscripts, the play-text as amended during the run, and the final published version, and to show that Holcroft found the Drury Lane audience more censorious even than the Examiner of Plays. Elsewhere in *Women’s Romantic Theatre and Drama*, Claudia Corti (pp. 229–48) notes how much of the vocabulary of Romantic-period theatre criticism was borrowed from that of painting, in a study of the relationship between the star system and the theatrical portrait that concentrates on Siddons. Catherine Burroughs (pp. 103–21) argues for the ‘erotic charge’ of Baillie’s *The Bride* and for the incestuous implications of Fanny Kemble’s *An English Tragedy*. Diego Saglia (pp. 123–45) explores late Romantic networks of creative sociability, centred on the elderly Baillie and marked by professional rivalries that exposed the
limits of female solidarity. Vita Mastrosilvestri’s discussion of Inchbald’s work as a translator (pp. 159–68) is also worth noting, while a chapter by Franca Dellarosa (pp. 147–58) is one example of the rush of interest this year in the 125 prefaces that Inchbald provided for the plays collected in Longman’s multi-volume anthology *The British Theatre*.

Dellarosa’s essay is complemented both by several brief discussions and by another extended analysis. Nora Nachumi’s ‘To Write with Authority: Elizabeth Inchbald’s Prefaces to *The British Theatre*’ (in Nelson and Burroughs, eds., *Teaching British Women Playwrights of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century*) stresses the historical importance of this early example of dramatic criticism by a woman, and Inchbald’s attention to how plays’ affective force differs between page and stage. The collection to which Nachumi contributes is discussed fully in Chapter XI, section 4, above, but several chapters are relevant here. Betsy Bolton demonstrates the inventiveness and radicalism of Cowley’s critique of gender in ‘Hannah Cowley, Gender Identity, and *A Bold Stroke for a Husband*’ (pp. 161–73). While men are feminized, female unity provides the play’s solid moral grounding—but a paradoxical one, because female identity is nothing if not mutable, performative, and unreliable. Gillian Skinner’s ‘Class, Gender, and Inheritance in Burney’s *A Busy Day* and *The Woman-Hater*’ (pp. 237–46) summarizes the two comedies of its title with reference to Burney’s class position and politics, while Anna Lott (pp. 247–60) discusses the theme of tyranny in Inchbald’s *A Case of Conscience*.

Other chapters are more explicitly concerned with pedagogy; it is with teaching in mind that Victoria Myers’s ‘Joanna Baillie and the Theme of Trial’ (pp. 187–200) explores Baillie’s staging of moral, scientific, and legal trials. Students could be invited, for instance, to reach a verdict on De Monfort’s crime with reference to William Blackstone’s discriminations among types of homicide. Daniel O’Quinn’s ‘Scarcity and Surplus: Teaching Inchbald’s *Every One Has His Fault*’ (pp. 398–408) describes a way of analysing Inchbald’s play that stresses its concern with military trauma and the scarcity of cheap bread, and that encourages students to investigate for themselves the scarcity and complexity of the reception evidence through which they might expect to be able to decide on a stable reading of the text. Elsewhere, Thomas C. Crochunis makes a powerful case for the teaching of Romantic theatre within undergraduate courses. ‘Romantic Theatre’ (in Higgins and Ruston, eds., *Teaching Romanticism*, pp. 24–37), draws attention to the increasing dramatical interest in Romantic drama, and describes how introducing students to late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century plays can ‘invite discussions of Romantic-era perspectives on social performance and spectacle, on imagination and interpretation, and on the political valences of public theatre’ (p. 31).

Baillie’s ‘Introductory Discourse’ remains a seemingly inexhaustible topic of debate, and a key point of reference for all discussion of her plays. Despite the preoccupation with public executions in both the ‘Discourse’ and the plays themselves, Baillie teasingly avoids ever representing an execution on stage. In exploring why this is so, Julie Murray, in ‘Joanna Baillie’s *Rayner* and Romantic Spectacle’ (ERR 21[2010] 65–76), associates Baillie with a Romantic reorientation from ‘a strictly visual or scopic economy to a dynamic interplay
between visual and imaginary registers’ (p. 65). Reflecting on Adam Smith, Edmund Burke, and late eighteenth-century penal practices, Murray shows how on-stage audiences in Rayner turn public executions into occasions that invite self-understanding even as they render it impossible. The ritual makes manifest ‘the constitutive alienation of the individual subject from the knowledge of itself possessed by an impenetrable other’ (p. 74). A second essay by Murray, ‘At the Surface of Romantic Interiority: Joanna Baillie’s Orra’ (RaVoN 56[2009] 17 paras.), takes up the question of the supposed opposition between eighteenth-century personification and Wordsworthian deep subjectivity. Murray describes the medical influences on Baillie’s thinking, and diagnoses Orra’s pathology as an ‘incapacity to differentiate herself from the objects of her fear’ (para. 12). Her subjective interiority ultimately produces her as Fear personified. The Baillean sympathetic observer, too, is often ‘besieged—not enabled—by passion’ (para. 7). Betsy Bolton’s ‘Joanna Baillie’s Emblematic Theatre’ (in Labbe, ed., The History of British Women’s Writing, 1750–1830, pp. 254–67) turns to Walter Benjamin’s analysis of the Trauerspiel to find a precedent for Baillie’s privileging of allegory over symbol, emotional cruelty over action, and slow readerly attentiveness over theatrical effect. A detailed reading of The Election describes Baillie’s comedy as in part ‘a commentary on the furore created by Inchbald’s [Lovers’ Vows]’ (p. 264).

A reading of The Dream takes up most of Christine A. Colón’s ‘Joanna Baillie and the Christian Gothic: Reforming Society through the Sublime’ (in Nelson et al., eds., Through a Glass Darkly: Suffering, the Sacred, and the Sublime in Literature and Theory, pp. 129–42). Brooding Gothic stage-effects encourage Baillie’s audience to sympathize with the murderer Osterloo by making them share in his mood of guilty horror. The same Gothic mode subordinates individual criminality to the corruption of society at large. Judith Bailey Slagle’s ‘Margaret Holford, Joanna Baillie, and the “Terrible Beauty” of William Wallace’ (KSJ 59[2010] 114–30) considers Baillie’s construction of Scottish cultural identity in her narrative poetry. ‘William Wallace’, the first of her Metrical Legends of Exalted Characters, idealizes its hero and stresses his patriotic longing for justice, in contrast with the pro-English retelling of the Wallace legend published by Holford a decade earlier. Lilla Maria Crisafulli weaves together many of the crucial dramatic theories of the period in her account of ‘Dramatic Illusion and Sympathetic Curiosity in Romantic Drama’ (in Mason Vaughan et al., eds., Speaking Pictures: The Visual/Verbal Nexus of Dramatic Performance, pp. 164–78). Baillie—credited as the source for Shelley’s dramaturgy in The Cenci—is finally the key figure, but Crisafulli also draws on Burke, on the treatment of the passions in eighteenth-century acting manuals, and on Charles Lamb and Coleridge. Lamb’s dubiety about the legitimacy of staging Shakespeare is contrasted subtly with Coleridge’s belief that drama is of all arts the one most embedded in reality.

Susan Valladares discusses the influence of the Peninsular War on Coleridge’s rewriting of Osorio as Remorse: ground also covered in an essay by Diego Saglia noted here two years ago. ‘“He that can bring the dead to life again”: Resurrecting the Spanish Setting in Coleridge’s Osorio (1797) and Remorse (1813)’ (in Almeida, ed., Romanticism and the Anglo-Hispanic
Imaginary, pp. 133–55) is distinctive for its analysis of the plays’ treatment of Catholicism, and of the valences of the word ‘remorse’ itself. In the same volume, Jeffrey Cass, ‘Fighting Over the Woman’s Body: Representations of Spain and the Staging of Gender’, examines how female dramatists could use plays with Spanish settings to explore the contradictory demands placed upon women (pp. 233–48). Cowley’s A Bold Stroke for a Husband arrays romantic relationships in martial rhetoric. In Sophia Lee’s Almeyda; Queen of Granada women find themselves punished for ‘attempts to construct an appropriate language for their feelings’ (p. 243) and the sovereignty of the play’s heroine is undermined by her gender. Felicia Hemans shows in The Siege of Valencia that maternal affection can destabilize the social order rather than offering reconciliation.

Frederick Burwick’s ‘Faust Translations of Coleridge and Shelley on the London Stage’ (KSJ 59[2010] 31–42) describes the first English stage production of Goethe’s Faustus, a hit for Henry M. Milner at the Royal Coburg Theatre in the summer of 1824. The production is notable for Burwick because Milner’s script was principally an adaptation of the Faustus translation that Burwick has attributed controversially to Coleridge. Moreover, its Walpurgisnacht scene is taken from the translation by Percy Shelley. The chief value of the play lies in the extent to which it ‘preserved the language of Coleridge and Shelley’ (p. 41); a melodrama for a working-class audience rather than a tragedy, it takes every opportunity to bring in spectacular production effects, and arranges an emphatically moral denouement. In ‘Victor Hugo’s Notre-Dame de Paris on the Nineteenth-Century London Stage’ (ERR 21[2010] 469–87) Lissette Lopez Szwydky shows that the tradition of transforming Hugo’s novel into a love story with a happy ending began as early as 1834. The prolific Edward Fitzball’s melodrama Esmeralda at the Surrey Theatre domesticated and depoliticized the text in a fashion that would culminate in the 1997 Disney adaptation. Marjean D. Purinton’s ‘The City as Portal: Late Georgian Women on the Stage and in the Public Sphere’ (WC 41[2010] 171–3) notes the theatrical qualities of urban space and ‘the commodification of women in Georgian London’ (p. 172) with reference to comedies by women writers, among them Cowley’s The Belle’s Stratagem and Elizabeth Griffith’s A Wife in the Right.

With ‘Creative Spectacle: Hunt, Hazlitt and De Quincey’ (ERR 21[2010] 143–59) Melynda Nuss makes a significant contribution to theories of Romantic stage aesthetics. Where Edmund Burke, Thomas Paine, and William Wordsworth represent an influential tradition of suspicion towards mass-market spectacle, an alternative tradition that unites Leigh Hunt, Thomas De Quincey, and William Hazlitt welcomes a mode of the sublime that flirts with vulgarity. This kind of sublimity—valued partly as a way of shaping popular consciousness—is couched by Nuss in terms of the ‘unassimilable’. Hippodramas like George Colman’s Blue Beard, reviewed by Hunt, present unassimilable reality on stage in the form of live horses; De Quincey describes how the audience of a Greek tragedy is enraptured by ‘something absolutely outside itself, absolutely other’ (p. 151); Hazlitt’s bafflingly adept Indian Jugglers play an ambivalent role in his search for a humanizing, individualizing sublime. Hazlitt admired the multi-talented comic
entertainer Charles Mathews, whose repertoire included a gift for ventriloquism. In ‘Hazlitt and Ventriloquism’ (WC 41[2010] 104–9) Jon Cook explores the shifting valences of this art. At times an impressive but merely mechanical trick, ventriloquism can also manifest itself as the genius of Shakespeare, his power of inhabiting the voice of each of his characters. Indeed, Hazlitt’s own prose style is distinguished by his rapid transitions from one voice to another. Mathews is important, too, to James Mulvihill’s ‘Hazlitt on “Whether Actors Ought to Sit in the Boxes” ’ (WC 41[2010] 109–13). Hazlitt regrets that actors should appear prominently in propria persona among their audiences, but this is not quite an argument against theatrical celebrity or in favour of unbroken dramatic illusion. Mathews’s offstage appearances as ‘himself’ make more dazzling his craft as a performer, just as Kean’s anti-naturalistic ‘hits’ are fascinating even if objectionable. The confessional author of Liber Amoris ‘knew himself to be living in an age that was dramatic in ways that threatened to make drama itself inconsequential’ (p. 110).
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