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## Spotlight: Romantic Heirs and Inheritors

Reviews


In his essay in this volume, Paul deGategno describes the potential scale of James Macpherson’s literary achievement, at least as it appeared to allies among the Enlightenment literati: ‘This young man of talent, who with the proper guidance and encouragement might carry off a magnificent feat of securing for the Scots a distinctive cultural identity’ (16). In a half-decade of activity encompassing *Fragments of Ancient Poetry* (1760), *Fingal* (1761/2), *Temora* (1763) and a collected *Works of Ossian* (1765), this Ruthven writer, it seemed to many of his supporters then and since, had no less than reshaped the idea of Scotland. Macpherson’s prose-poems, orated by the ancient Celtic bard Ossian and dealing with the martial achievements of a fading race of warriors, were a legitimate pan-European sensation fifty years before Walter Scott’s Waverley Novels. Today, the richness of scholarship on eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Scotland has helped to re-establish a degree of public interest in Scott. The same cannot (yet) be said of Macpherson or his Ossianic texts. Still, this *International Companion* adds weight to a view of the Ossian phenomenon as a central – perhaps even the central – instance of what continues to be a staple critical fascination with this period in Scottish culture: the relationship between Enlightenment and Romanticism. A major textual output of the Scottish Enlightenment in both thematic and contextual terms, it is not ridiculous to credit the Ossian poems with the invention of literary Romanticism, at the same time ushering in a new perspective on national culture across Europe.

Moore’s volume has an appropriate sense of itself as a canon-making device, covering many of the key aspects of Macpherson’s work, summarizing the extant critical debate while introducing new developments. It will make a valuable teaching aid, while there is also plenty here to exercise experts in the field. Moore’s introduction builds on his previous work in the area to offer an erudite overview, particularly contextualising interest in *Ossian* within the ‘four nations’ tendency in the academy. He suggests that a reluctance to make a ‘contributionist’ case for Scottish literature has limited a proper analysis of Macpherson’s place within the British public sphere, whereas on the continent his full ‘role within national literary cultures’ has been confronted (8). Whether or not that is true, the essays here develop a picture of a versatile, politically engaged writer. DeGategno’s analysis of the correspondence sketches the canny manoeuvrings of a man who operated as a government propagandist. Robert W. Jones attempts a preliminary look at Macpherson’s historiography, which mounted an attack on an opposition politics of despair that sounds ironically Ossianic in tone (131). Moore’s own ambitious contribution on Macpherson’s translation of the *Iliad* complicates the link between this project and the Ossian material, suggesting that the engagement with Homer failed (or was at least flawed) because of a tension at the heart of Enlightenment primitivism that had animated Macpherson’s more celebrated work. The primitive past, Moore observes, had to be both alien and familiar, distant and universal, and if this was generative for *Ossian*, it was more simply problematic for Macpherson’s *Iliad*.

Much of the existing literature on Macpherson has focused on the question of authenticity which surrounded the polite-primitive Ossianic texts from their first reception. This volume manages to address that component without allowing it to become overwhelming, the theoretical motif of ‘translation’ offering a way to move beyond what is a potential cul-de-sac. In this context, Cordula Lemke develops ‘nostalgia’ as a central topos of Macpherson’s work and indeed of the ambivalent energy of cultural Scottishness. Though it is not without
imperfections, readers might want to approach Lemke’s piece before the previous one by Gauti Kristmannsson, which develops a sophisticated argument about Macpherson’s place in the history of translation, rendering accusations of fraud or forgery trite. Continuing the motif of translation, Lesa Ní Mhunghaile writes a telling polemic on Ossian’s relationship to the extant Gaelic tradition in Ireland and Scotland, Robert Rix focuses on the ‘Gothic’ or ancient Germanic tradition, and Murdo Macdonald lists connections with visual art that merit more theoretical consideration.

There is a familiar argument that Macpherson offered a ‘vacated Highland’ landscape devoid of detail, which for critics like Peter Womack served the ultimately imperialist tendency of his work – invested in a safe, defeated Scotland. In this volume, Sebastian Mitchell finds instead an interplay ‘between the specific and the general’ in a symbolic landscape capable of varied rhetorical effect (65). Certainly Macpherson’s Ossian poetry, as rendered in these essays, demonstrates the ideological instability that has attracted critics to this period in Scottish culture. The series editors preface the book with the comment that it is both ‘timely and welcome’ (vii) – a bold declaration to put inside a front cover, but it is hard to disagree.

Gerard Lee McKeever
University of Glasgow


Concluding his radical Spenserian epic, *Salisbury Plain* (1793-94), a young William Wordsworth threw caution to the wind, launching into a rousing paean to the ‘Heroes of Truth’ remaking the world with ‘Reason’:

Heroes of Truth pursue your march, uptear
Th’ Oppressor’s dungeon from its deepest base;
High o’er the towers of Pride undaunted rear
Resistless in your might the herculean mace
Of Reason

By decade’s end, however, after the Terror and with Europe embroiled in conflict, a number of writers we now call Romantic appeared to lose their faith in Reason, turning instead to examine what Timothy Michael describes as the ‘governing idea’ of this fascinating, philosophically accomplished, and beautifully produced book: ‘the promise of enlightenment after revolution and terror – that is, the idea that one can impose some small measure of order on an often violent and chaotic world through the assertion of human reason’ (1).

Subjecting this ‘promise’ to searching critique, these writers were likewise putting ‘Reason’ on trial, a process Michael identifies as key to ‘much of the literature at the heart of British Romanticism […] a critique of reason in its political capacities and of the kinds of knowledge available to it’ (2), an important modification of the still-influential narrative of Romanticism as the product of political apostasy and despair. Rather than despair, Michael discerns in this inward turn a ‘critique’ in the Kantian sense (‘the self-grounding of reason, the determination of its own scope and limits’), proposing ‘a revitalized version of Kantian Romanticism […] as an extension of transcendental self-criticism: an assessment of what can be rescued from Enlightenment models of rationality’ (3). Romanticism, Michael claims, is the
combined result of Kant’s ‘Copernican’ revolution interacting with the spectacularly dashed hopes of the French Revolution.

The book is broken into three distinct sections. Part one, ‘The Rhetoric of Hurly-Burly Innovation’, examines the status of ‘political reason’ and a priori political knowledge in the Pamphlet Wars of the early 1790s. In a series of bravado readings of Edmund Burke, Mary Wollstonecraft, and William Godwin, Michael works to demonstrate that the rhetoric of these writers is at least as telling as their opinions. So it is that, in a sympathetic and intelligent reading of Burke’s speech on Fox’s East India Bill, perhaps the book’s best, Michael persuasively outlines Burke’s use of hypotaxis as performing ‘the principle of subordination at the root of his social, political, and philosophical thought’ (63), a subordination, in this case, to experience rather than reason. The account of paradox in Burke’s infamous Reflections is less convincing, but neatly sets up the subsequent chapter on Wollstonecraft’s ‘association of reason with emancipation’ in A Vindication of the Rights of Men, rescuing language and political thought from slavish, gothic accretion, and championing ‘rational freedom’ through ratiocination (85).

Godwin inevitably follows, recommending, in Political Justice, ‘the power of discourse’ and free intellectual inquiry as the ‘proper and becoming methods of operating changes in human society’ (104), a position he defends in his intervention in the Treason Trials of 1794, Cursory Strictures. Curiously, Michael makes little mention of Godwin’s next pamphlet, Considerations on Lord Grenville’s and Mr. Pitt’s Bills, Concerning Treasonable and Seditious Practices, and Unlawful Assemblies. In it, Godwin distances his own properly ‘philosophical’ activities from the London Corresponding Society and the lectures of John Thelwall, both ‘well deserving the attention of the members of the government of Great Britain.’ Just how a commitment to individual judgement translates into the suppression of collective education would have made a fascinating and challenging contribution to Michael’s central thesis.

Indeed, the absence of Thelwall and other radical, democratical thinkers is one of several odd gaps in the book. In part two, ‘The Literature of Justice and Justification’, after a lively discussion of Kant’s influence on Coleridge, Michael’s otherwise excellent account of Wordsworth’s radical prose is limited by the absence of Thomas Paine, and an over-reliance on Godwin as the source of Wordsworth’s radical politics. Michael sometimes fails adequately to justify his parameters; his choice of texts can seem curiously arbitrary. It is strange, for instance, to read a study on Wordsworth and political reason that makes no mention of The Borderers. In part three, ‘Poetry and the Poetics of the Excursive and Unbound Mind’, discussions of Wordsworth’s Recluse and Shelley’s Prometheus Unbound, while competent and often illuminating, struggle to connect with the book’s central thesis. I mention these flaws not to discourage potential readers, but rather because, armed with this knowledge, the reader is best placed to appreciate Michael’s real strengths, which seem to me to lie in his wonderfully responsive readings of political prose. British Romanticism and the Critique of Political Reason is a partial achievement, but nonetheless a brilliant one.

Those who study Scott’s letters, or his home at Abbotsford, are amazed by the constant intrusions on his time and goodwill. Admirers show up from Melrose to America, sometimes bearing just an eager assurance that the author is accessible and welcoming. Missives pour in from friends, colleagues, business contacts and optimists convinced that Scott can somehow meet their needs. Remarkably, Scott often rose to the occasion.

Scholars have long benefited from the trove of Scott’s letters referenced by Lockhart for his memoir of his father-in-law, from Grierson’s collected volumes, and from Corson’s index. Millgate’s Union Catalogue has made letters to Scott searchable. Today, letters to and from Scott are recognized for the resource they are, both by his cultural-studies-minded critics, and by scholars of his period. Robert Mayer uses these letters as his primary resource to interrogate contemporary “fame.”

Scott’s archive is extensive. With the example of Byron’s memoirs (posthumously destroyed), and the need to recoup Scott’s finances after his death, Scott’s family, together with the Advocates’ Library, and now the National Library of Scotland, have proved trusty stewards of the author’s correspondence. Mayer ranges through these letters, tracking writers and recognizing through their exchanges Scott’s “ intimates,” “colleagues,” “clients,” and “fans.”

Among the intimates are friends like J. B. S. Morritt and Lady Louisa Stuart. Author colleagues include Southey, Wordsworth, Baillie and Edgeworth. “Clients” number lesser authors seeking support or recognition, such as Thomas Pringle (from neighbouring Blairlaw, editor of Blackwood’s first journal, and secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society in London). “Fans” include eccentrics like Macdonell of Glengarry and absolute nonentities—people who beseech recognition in material form or simply by virtue of the contact they presume they have established with greatness. Lady Abercorn, alternately posing as patron and supplicant, insider and needy outsider, points to a weave of relationships constantly under negotiation.

Mayer’s book, then, is a trove of information. But more, it engages issues of value within publishing and personal relations of the time. By tracking Scott’s exchanges with Wordsworth and Southey against those with Baillie and Edgeworth, Mayer demonstrates Scott’s concern with the book trade in its full extent, and the role of the writer on the cusp of industrial and social change. We can appreciate the rarefied aesthetic of a Wordsworth or a Southey alongside the moral responsibility recognized by a Scott who considered poets to have obligations not just to their art but to their families. Comparison also brings out the rivalries between male poets and sets them against the collaborative and collegial relation between Scott and women authors. Baillie, Edgeworth and Scott form a society of mutual appreciation and criticism, of professional support, not competition. And through such cases, Mayer provides important insight on established arguments. Ina Ferris’s The Achievement of Literary Authority comes into sharper focus when we consider Scott’s unusual recognition of and support for women writers; Romantic claims on an audience that is fit, though few, look self-serving when we consider the necessity of funds to meet family responsibilities.

A new Scott, one with an eye to the needs of publishers and readers, and also to writers in their human context, appears through Mayer’s research. A more thorough understanding of the shifting relations between readers, texts and authors emerges. Scott begins to look modern—significant in the move to a financial and social economy of print. This book, then, adds to the scholarship of publishing dynamics, and to recent work on literary celebrity.

Of course, a Scott scholar will want to know the role Scott’s sort-of anonymity played in the negotiation of these relationships—how it affected his value in the discourse of exchange. We might wonder about a limit-case like Thomas Carlyle, who notoriously did not manage to
negotiate his way close to Scott. There is more, too, to be made of the King’s visit to Edinburgh, when Scott solicited numerous clans to participate using the same flattering language to each. But such queries speak to the extent of Scott’s archive, the materials and questions that remain to pursue on the basis Mayer provides.

The strength of this book is its appreciation for and study of relationality around the circumstance of fame. In addition, viewed through his exchanges with the few and the many, Scott stands forth as an even more significant mediator of the contemporary cultural conversation. Indeed, study of Scott’s correspondence changes our understanding of his period. Yet even as our understanding of fame shifts, it becomes evident that we are pursuing a general case on the basis of a unique circumstance. There was only one Scott. Moreover, archives like Scott’s, capacious to begin with and carefully maintained today, are few to find. Still, Mayer’s intriguing book inspires us to realize that the work on Scott’s archive can yield rich results, and has only begun.

Caroline McCracken-Flesher
University of Wyoming


Saree Makdisi’s latest volume opens with a bold assertion: he is ‘not sure that William Blake would have liked the idea of this book’ (1). From the very outset, it is evident that Makdisi is not only well-versed in Blake’s words and works, but that he is acutely attuned to his infamous spirit of defiance – especially in relation to the suggestion that Blake explicate his works. On 23rd August, 1799, Blake had penned a letter to the Reverend Dr John Trusler in which he had declared: ‘That which can be made Explicit to the Idiot is not worth my care’. As Makdisi rightly emphasises, Blake ‘certainly thought his work needed no explanatory introduction’ (1).

Yet, on the contrary – and, even, in the spirit of Blakean contraries – Makdisi also highlights the fact that Blake’s works and ideas have a ‘reputation for difficulty’ (1). I have certainly encountered high numbers of university students (and, indeed, several tutors) in recent years who are wary of attempting to write about or to teach Blake’s works in a formal context. Finding a foothold in Blake’s rich, dense, colourful and complex mental landscape can easily feel like an impossible task. As such, Makdisi’s book offers an invaluable resource: a clear, accessible, friendly tour through Blake’s world and words, structured by seven key concepts.

I am taking care, here, not to use the word ‘guide’ in relation to Makdisi’s book. He emphatically declares that ‘What I want to offer in the present volume…is neither a guide or companion to specific poems, images, books or other works by Blake’; it is ‘absolutely not a decoding manual claiming to provide the definitive reading or explanation of this or that character, line, image, or reference in Blake’s work’ (2). Rather, Makdisi advises the reader that ‘the discussions I provide here are intended to help you develop your own readings and interpretations of Blake’s work’ (2). The discussions that follow are framed in seven thematically-focused chapters: ‘Image’, ‘Text’, ‘Desire’, ‘Joy’, ‘Power’, ‘Time’, ‘Making’.

One of the main strengths of Makdisi’s book – and a key reason as to why its approach is so clear and effective – is that the parameters of the project have been so carefully chosen. Makdisi anchors each of the chapters in a close reading of a poem from Songs of Innocence and of Experience, given that it is ‘both accessible and widely available – and is also by far the most likely text with which any student of Blake will begin’ (5). Additionally, Makdisi notes that ‘the book is devoted specifically to Blake the author and printer of illuminated books (and
to some of the major themes running through the latter’ rather than to ‘Blake the painter of watercolours and temperas, or Blake the intaglio engraver of his own masterpieces’ (2).

This is not to say, though, that the boundaries between the chapters themselves are distinct, and with good reason. Almost all of the chapters include copies of Blake’s plates, and the interdisciplinarity of Makdisi’s approach exemplifies a key skill that is required in order to access Blake’s works. Makdisi’s discussion of ‘harmonious symmetry’ (116) in Blake’s works in relation to the poet’s method of printmaking with copper plates is particularly fascinating. Moreover, while the Songs are understandably the primary focus of the volume, Makdisi artfully manages to tease out connections with and discussions about Blake’s wider corpus. I was especially delighted to see that The Marriage of Heaven and Hell is afforded considerable attention. Makdisi goes as far as to describe this text as ‘the single most emphatic expression of the mode of reading and textual politics with which all of Blake’s works experiment to a greater or lesser degree’ (48). Even some of Blake’s densest works—his ‘prophetic books’, such as Milton and Jerusalem—are discussed lucidly and in some detail in Makdisi’s short book.

Personally, I would be eager to read a subsequent volume which adopts a similar approach to Blake’s longer works. It is entirely understandable—and effective—that Makdisi has elected to focus upon Songs in the first instance for the purpose of acquainting his readers with Blake’s key concepts and approaches. I for one, though, would be very keen to see how Makdisi goes about approaching Blake’s densely mythological works and prophetic books. In the meantime, though, I will certainly be including Reading William Blake on my reading lists for students.

Katherine Fender
University of Oxford


This book is a welcome addition to the growing number of studies on Romantic-era caricature. Its major strength is that it is the first book-length investigation of French satirical prints produced during that brief but world-historical period of the first half of the 1790s, a moment when the relaxing of ancien regime censorship allowed France, in this respect, to imitate its neighbour and enemy across the English Channel. Caricature was often viewed as an index of free speech and liberty, so it is ironic that it was the Directorate and later Napoleon who suppressed graphic satire in the name of the revolution. It was not until the final overthrow of the Bourbons in 1830 that French caricature re-emerged with Daumier and Philipon. If the latter names, and some of their images (such as a pear morphing into the visage of Louis Philippe) are well known, the earlier phase is much less widely studied, making this book and its images historically valuable (and in part the book is a plea for the ‘centrality of the image in the eighteenth century’ [8]). Indeed, the book began life as a PhD investigation of a large collection of French prints belonging to the Rothschild family and housed at Waddesdon Manor in Buckinghamshire. This provenance gives the book a robust scholarly depth and also some limitations of scope, as explained below.

As we might expect, French revolutionary leaders soon latched onto and exploited the propaganda value of satirical prints, though a lingering Enlightenment distaste for the carnivalesque may explain why there was no sudden inundation of scurrilous images or (disappointingly) the rise of a cohort of professional caricaturists with the talent of Gillray, Rowlandson and the Cruikshanks. Unlike in Britain, there was no flourishing tradition of
graphic satire to draw on, and the majority of the prints examined in each chapter are by anonymous artists. But if there were no rising stars in this new visual firmament, there was nevertheless a healthy supply of irreverent images aimed at a wide audience, including the lower classes who could appreciate visual humour even if illiterate. Though prices are hard to come by (unlike in Britain, there was no legal requirement to publish bibliographical data on the print), Trévien is interested in the demotic appeal of caricature, the way it ‘enabled an accelerated takeover of the “higher” strands of art’ (16). Hence chapters 2-4 cover the relationship between the satirical prints and four popular themes: the street song, the theatre (which is also a focus throughout), scientific display, and the afterlife. Chapter 2 crosses into the terrain of print culture studies as it discusses cheap broadside ballads and reiterated popular songs (sometimes with new, revolutionary tunes, including the co-opted Marriage of Figaro, which was hugely popular), all of which carried small, woodcut images. My favourite is ‘La Mort du Patriote Marat’ (67) which shows Charlotte Corday plunging a dagger into the Jacobin martyr above a set of lyrics set to a tune from Figaro: as Trévien argues, this musical allusion worked in conjunction with the visual image to produce a complex range of interpretations including sympathy for female agency or sublime love of the hero. Furthermore, hand-coloured versions (sadly not reproduced here) used vivid red to draw charged affinities between revolutionary and counter-revolutionary passion. The cult of secular martyrdom is also explored in Chapter 5 which contains some of the book’s most arresting and original images depicting the afterlife. Uneasy with orthodox Christian iconography (meaning that, unlike in Britain, Miltonic allusion is conspicuous by its absence), artists resorted to classical and mythological settings to depict both reward and punishment: heroic revolutionary death inspired a new sub-genre in both the theatre and visual arts as the question of fate, destiny and legacy occupied the public. Until Gillray showed Napoleon in the Valley of Death, there was nothing quite like this imagery in Britain, even though the thorny question of the infidel afterlife was a convenient dart to throw at Deists or infidels such as Tom Paine. Trévien shows convincingly how satirical artists drew on new optical technologies such as the phantasmagoria to achieve their diabolical effects, and this theme overlaps with Chapter 4 on ‘spectacular science’ (117) and quackery which were used as mock-epic tropes to debunk aristocratic authority. Scholars of British prints will be interested in ‘Lanterne magique républicaine’ (150) which shows a sansculotte projecting an image of the guillotine to a startled George III and William Pitt, reversing the usual hierarchy in which the masses are duped by elite spectacle. Threaded through all such images is the theatricality and sprightly visual banter of popular entertainments such as the commedia dell’arte, the subject of Chapter 2. What in the British context might be called ‘illegitimate’ theatre was a locus of irreverence, though all tropes could be harnessed by the conservative political opposition, as some images demonstrate.

This is a rewarding book and I only have two small quibbles related to the exclusive focus on France: the untranslated quotations and the absence of any dialogue with British caricature. Although the war with Britain depleted the trade in prints, Trévien’s determination to bring out some of the artistic qualities of the images would have been enhanced by some reference to the flourishing caricature scene in Britain. Indeed, Satire, Prints and Theatricality in the French Revolution has convinced this reviewer that there was a productive iconographical dialogue between British and French satirical prints in the Romantic period, and that this history has yet to be written.

Ian Haywood
University of Roehampton

Byron’s life can be metonymically described with a single word: ‘experience’. To his mother he wrote in 1808: ‘It is from experience, not from Books, we ought to judge of mankind’ (p. 36), showing how an empiricist principle informs his Weltanschauung, and how in his creative writing flights of the poetic imagination will always coexist with reality itself. Byron’s own life experiences were of course of the most disparate kind – from his upbringing in Scotland by an eccentric family to his travels throughout Europe and Turkey, his failed marriage, exile to Italy and death in revolutionary Greece – and they are fully set out in Leslie A. Marchand’s colossal and authoritative 12-volume edition (1973-1982) of the poet’s letters and journals. In 1982 Marchand provided Byron readers with a more manageable edition of Selected Letters and Journals. So what are the reasons and rationale of this OUP ‘New Selection’ edited by Lansdown? In other words what does its ‘novelty’ consist of?

As a well-known Byron scholar (he authored the 2012 Cambridge Introduction to Byron), Lansdown explicitly acknowledges his indebtedness to Marchand by stating that his 1957 biography of the poet is ‘still the best that has been published; perhaps it will not be improved upon’ (p. 512). By the same token, he reprints about 10% of the 3000 letters and a few extracts from Byron’s five journals exactly as they appeared in Marchand’s extended edition, introducing only some minor formal revisions, as clearly specified in the philologically accurate ‘Notes on the text and short titles’ section. However, from what he asserts in the Introduction, Lansdown succeeds in presenting still another new portrait of Lord Byron through a subjective selection of the poet’s prose orchestrated according to a guiding structural principle of identifying key-experiences, -figures and -places in his life. Lansdown convincingly argues that Byron’s letters and journals provide ‘one of the three great informal autobiographies in English, alongside Samuel Pepys’s diary and James Boswell’s journal’ (p. xi), while, at the same time, offering us unique (self-)critical insights into his creative processes and output, all singularly marked by the overlapping and intermeshing of life and art, fact and fiction. Hence the clearly outlined design in the New Selection.

The fine introduction, helpful notes on the text and ‘Biographical Bibliography’ (referring to fundamental source texts providing knowledge about Byron’s life) are followed by 12 chapters including the selected letters and journals (arranged both chronologically and according to a specific thematic focus), and a final Afterword fascinatingly shedding new light on the aftermath of Byron’s death, and particularly on how his most intimate acquaintances survived or thrived without him. The chapters, each preceded by a useful headnote, present specific focuses, which, as eloquently suggested by the titles, revolve around three main topics: the main phases and turning-point experiences in Byron’s life (e.g. 6. Exile); the places mostly impacting on his life and works (e.g. 7. Venice and Rome); and particular works associated with particular women (e.g. 8. Don Juan and Teresa Guiccioli). Unobtrusively, Lansdown seems to suggest three precise Ariadne-like threads to guide us through the labyrinth of experiences (existential, cultural and artistic) emerging from Byron’s most personal writing.

Following these three interlaced paths, readers arrive at more than a taste of ‘this singularly magnetic individual’ (p. xxiii) – essentially of Byron’s ethnographic eye, searching for empirical as well as sensory (or sensual) engagement with foreign (especially Italian) places and people; of the constant dialogue between life and art in everything he wrote, ‘for’, as he said, ‘truth is always strange, stranger than fiction’; of his ‘antithetical mind’ (p. xx), or mobility and inconsistency endorsed as existential principles, and consequently affecting his style in its idiosyncratic combination of the colloquial with the high-flown, the worldly with the metaphysical, wit with Romanticism; and finally, of Byron’s cosmopolitan spirit, his
shifting personae and porous identity, selecting and absorbing aspects of the Other wherever he was.

Considering his eccentricities, not everybody will agree with Lansdown that Byron was ‘an everyman’, yet nobody can deny that ‘his letters and journals [still] speak to us all’ (p. xxi), especially to our own sense of finiteness counterbalanced by that ‘desire of the moth for the star’ (in P. B. Shelley’s words) which seems so often to define the Romantic moment. Byron experienced first-hand the restlessness of a dialectical mind, so from Rome he wrote to Murray: ‘where there is much to be grasped we are always at a loss – and yet we feel we ought to have a higher and more extended comprehension’ (p. 271). Lansdown’s edition of Byron’s letters and journals, being a selection and not including the letters to which the poet was responding, cannot provide a full understanding of Byron’s personality and genius. However, this is not a flaw. Like Byron in Rome, perhaps the reader may sometimes ‘feel at a loss’, because there is so ‘much to be grasped’ – in what Byron writes as well as in what he doesn’t write, as evinced by his elliptic dashes. Thus, what apparently may seem to be a limited and limiting approach (with its three distinct foci) may have the positive effect of arousing our curiosity to explore Byron’s intimate prose more thoroughly, or to direct us, as it were, towards Marchand’s magisterial edition.

Gioia Angeletti

University of Parma, Italy


For the better part of the current century Brycchan Carey has maintained an open-access Olaudah Equiano website that features, among much else, an ever-growing bibliography that both catalogues the various editions of The Interesting Narrative (from 1789 onward) and offers a full critical history. Few scholars are better positioned to prepare a new edition of The Interesting Narrative, and while Norton, Bedford, Penguin, and Broadview all have editions in print, even in this crowded field Carey has produced what may well be the best edition of Equiano’s text for students and general readers.

A few strengths of Carey’s edition warrant special notice. First, his introduction laudably balances general overview and scholarly detail. Especially helpful for readers new to Equiano is Carey’s structural account of The Interesting Narrative as a work that falls roughly into ‘five phases,’ each corresponding to a significant period in Equiano’s life (vii-xvi). Some readers will want to nuance the lines of this textual map, but it nonetheless offers a helpful starting place for understanding this deeply protean work. The pedagogical impulse on display here is also at work in Carey’s distillations of the complex political and ideological coordinates of The Interesting Narrative in his introduction. Here, for instance, is Carey on the timing of the book’s initial publication:

The Interesting Narrative was a deliberate and timely political act. It appeared in the late spring of 1789, about two weeks before the British Parliament opened its long-awaited debate into the future of the slave trade, giving Members of Parliament and the electors they represented enough time to read the book, but not long enough that they would forget the horrific details about the Middle Passage and Caribbean slavery that its author had witnessed. (ix)

And here is his sharp précis of the knotty status of capitalism within the text:
As *The Interesting Narrative* had made so eloquently clear, Equiano was the man who had secured his own freedom through ‘commercial intercourse,’ [and] who had proved his own value to the interests of Great Britain […] the book itself is a carefully structured argument in support of the one great thesis that free trade was both morally and economically superior to trade based on slave labour. (xvi-xvii)

Such lucid synopses promise to make Carey’s introduction of great service to students and general readers alike.

This edition also offers an innovative handling of the complicated contextual terrain of *The Interesting Narrative*. Because several of the people, places, and events mentioned by Equiano recur throughout the text, rather than simply footnoting the first appearance and moving on, Carey supplies an ‘Index and Guide’ that serves as a glossary for readers to consult as they wish. With much of the contextual information thus consolidated, the annotations themselves remain admirably efficient, briefly glossing archaic words, biblical allusions, lesser-known historical episodes, and so on, without encumbering the reading experience.

Accompanying this host of strengths, however, are a few curious decisions about the selection and handling of the copy text. Since, as Carey explains, Equiano himself supplied corrections and additional materials for the ninth edition (1794), which was the last published in his lifetime, and since Carey does not suggest that this edition is corrupted in a way that would make the uncorrected first edition of 1789 preferable, his reasons for using the earlier text are not entirely clear. A related complication emerges when Carey points to the care with which Equiano revised *The Interesting Narrative* for each issuing. Such revisions, he writes, show that ‘Equiano took a close interest in the progress of his book through the press, and reiterate to scholars the importance of specifying not only which edition but also which copy is being used when providing quotations’ (xxvi). Sensible enough, but after specifying the exact copy of the 1789 edition that he is using, Carey notes that he decided to supply an unspecified number of unnoted changes: ‘I have quietly corrected some obvious errors, particularly those corrected by Equiano himself in later editions, and I have likewise quietly incorporated the sixteen errata Equiano supplied at the end of the Goldsmith’s copy’ (xxvi). Most of the questions raised by these editorial choices would quickly vanish if the ninth edition were used as the copy text.

These editorial decisions will not hinder most readers from learning a great deal from Carey’s otherwise instructive and resourceful presentation of *The Interesting Narrative*. It is also worth mentioning that this new edition features an overdue correction: rather than using the c.1760 portrait (now thought to be of Ignatius Sancho) that is found on the covers of other modern editions of Equiano’s work, Carey’s edition rightfully features the author himself on the cover, in an engraving of a portrait that Equiano commissioned from the London artist William Denton. A small gesture, perhaps, but an important one: from his own lifetime to the present day Equiano has been subject to attempts to conform (and at times deform) his image to meet certain expectations or determinations. Just as Carey’s edition features Equiano’s actual portrait on its cover, so too does it present his work to readers without some of the tendentiousness and idiosyncrasy that have hampered other editions. Carey’s edition of *The Interesting Narrative* is sure to become a standard classroom text.

*John Bugg*

*Fordham University*

The eleven essays in this volume felicitously confirm the interest and relevance of research into the numerous interactive and shifting terrains that link the writer and the country. The central twofold question, namely, how Byron Byronised Italy and how Italy Italianised Byron, is appropriately considered in the context of the poet’s transnational poetics and cosmopolitan identity, both of which developed within a rapidly changing post-Napoleonic European milieu.

Nicholas Halmi opens with an astute essay about the ways in which Byron exploited the figures of Italian writers Tasso and Dante to fashion his supra-national poetic identity. The characteristically perceptive close reading of The Prophecy of Dante allows us to see how the poet invents and reinvents himself as alternately Italian and English in his efforts to interpret or mediate Italy’s contemporary political aspirations. Confronting the issue of Byron’s Anglo-Italian identity from a different perspective, Gioia Angeletti proposes that the letters and journals Byron wrote in Italy showcase his keen ethnographic eye as they relish in the ‘contingent and transient “living truth”’ (54) of the country emerging in anecdotes, local episodes and individual stories. But while these ethnographic-like texts perform immersion, Angeletti explains, they also exemplify distancing and disenchantment with Italian society. Our understanding of the poet’s multiform and fluctuating identity is further enriched by Jonathan Gross’s engaging chapter which argues that Byron’s Scottish identity became more pronounced while in Italy because of his identification with the mercenaries of Walter Scott’s fiction who embodied military heroism in the midst of the Italian uprising.

Byron’s engagement with Italy’s geographies is another crucial aspect of his engagement with the country. Using as his case study Childe Harold IV, and adopting a ‘topoanalytic’ approach, Mauro Pala scrutinizes Byron’s depictions of landscapes and reads them as mindscapes: ‘complex, heterogeneous and personal negotiations with real places and their attendant histories’ that turn the ‘observing consciousness [into] an essential element of place’ (90). Moving on to the intriguing issue of Byron’s connection to Italian art, Jane Stabler’s inspiring chapter suggests that the mosaic icons of Ravenna which the poet saw (but doesn’t mention) during his stay must have had an impact on the form of Byron’s Cain, and goes on to show how the inescrutable, unfamiliar, ‘rugged’ nature of mosaic matches the rhythms and tones of his medieval mystery play. Stabler’s speculative piece invites us to wonder if and how Byron’s imbibing of a variety of art forms in Italy or Greece might have informed his poetic gaze. Bernard Beatty’s wide-ranging chapter on Byron’s relationship with Catholicism expertly shows the poet’s progressive shift in his appreciation of it. The poet’s increasing knowledge and experience of Catholic Italy ‘made Byron more precisely and variedly theological’ than his quasi-Calvinist assumptions (117). In the next essay of the collection, Arnold Anthony Schmidt discusses the political implications of Byron’s stylistic choices within the revolutionary climate of the early Risorgimento. Taking The Two Foscari as his case study, and comparing it to Alessandro Manzoni’s Il conte di Carmagnola, Schmidt argues that Byron’s adherence to the dramatic unities compromises his pro-revolutionary agenda as it reveals his ‘uncertainty about social and political change’, while Manzoni’s deliberate violation of the unities in his play ‘pointedly inspires patriotic activism’ (145).

The remaining chapters of the book offer delightful readings of the major literary works that Byron penned in Italy or/and have an Italian topic. Peter W. Graham insightfully demonstrates how Parisina and Mazeppa are ‘displaced narratives’ (150) complicating the role of ‘being there’ in Byron’s poetic method and evolving Anglo-Italian identity. Next, Alan Rawes helps us to re-appraise Byron’s lyric mode in Childe Harold IV by comparing and contrasting it to two European texts that had a huge influence on the Romantic perception of Rome and Italy: de Staël’s Corinne and Goethe’s Italienische Reise. Departing from the
autobiographical and fictionalised attitudes exhibited by de Staël and Goethe, Byron’s lyricism, according to Rawes, is the product of the persona’s radically sustained ‘attentiveness’, one that re-imagines Rome in a unique way (182). Mirka Horová’s chapter argues eloquently that Byron’s disturbing rendering of Italian history in *Marino Faliero, The Two Foscari* and *The Deformed Transformed* is a synecdoche for all human history which is dominated by violence, death and ‘political game-playing in which ethics are altogether absent’ (205). Focusing on *Beppo, Don Juan* and the prose fragment ‘An Italian Carnival’, Diego Saglia’s closing essay illuminatingly employs the theatrical concept of parabasis to discuss how these works instantiate a ‘simultaneous turn towards and away from Italy’ (211).

*Byron and Italy* is a most welcome contribution in the field which offers fresh approaches on current debates and opens new investigative paths by posing searching, original, and timely questions.

Maria Schoina
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

---


In ‘Once a Jacobin Always a Jacobin,’ published in the *Morning Post* in October 1802, Samuel Taylor Coleridge objects to the indiscriminate use of ‘[t]his charitable adage … in the ministerial circles,’ accusing ‘Mr. Pitt himself, in one of his most powerful speeches,’ of giving it ‘every advantage that is derivable from stately diction.’ ‘Jacobin,’ Coleridge argues, along lines that resonate with contemporary critiques of political rhetoric, ‘has either has no meaning, or a very vague one.’ As Pitt employed it, ‘“Once a Jacobin always a Jacobin,” signifies no more … than such a one is a man, whom I shall never cease to hate.’ The phrase is, as Coleridge claims and Lily Gurton-Wachter observes in her excellent book *Watchwords: Romanticism and the Poetics of Attention*, ‘a blank assertion.’ First used among government ministers and then weaponized by the reactionary press, it is an example of the class of ‘floating and obscure generalities’ that engender and sustain ‘[p]arty rage’ and ‘fanatical aversion.’

Coleridge’s response to rage and fanaticism is to give the demonized and divisive term ‘Jacobin’ a degree of nuanced and desynonymizing attention that diffuses its talismanic power. Gurton-Wachter does something similar with ‘attention’ itself throughout this absorbing study, which examines attention’s many registers and meanings in the Romantic period. The book’s broad argument is that in its engagement with a diverse range of wartime discourses of attention, Romantic poetry participated in ‘a volatile interdisciplinary moment in attention’s history’ (2) in a way that exemplifies ‘an interdisciplinary thinking that understands itself as constituted by modes of attention that it also criticizes’ (3). Alongside close readings of Romantic texts, Gurton-Wachter surveys contemporary attempts in various fields to understand and mobilize attention. Chapter 1 reads William Blake alongside accounts of the physiology of reading. Chapter 2 examines poems by William Cowper and Coleridge in the context of the politics and poetics of alarm. Chapter 3 argues that Wordsworth’s poetic encounter with revolutionary France, and his conception of the intersection of poetry and history, is inflected by his thinking about the relationship between attention and inattention. Chapter 4 provocatively suggests that Charlotte Smith’s attention to the experience of ‘just’ watching during wartime in *Beachy Head* ‘both undermines the militarization of attention during the period and causes the prospect poem to come undone’ (112). Chapter 5 turns to John Keats, reading his ‘Hyperion’ poems as a meditation on a painful form of attention also explored in
Scottish moral philosophy, medical literature, responses to the Elgin Marbles, and accounts of epic (as well as modern) warfare. An afterword, ‘Just Looking,’ traces the afterlife of a distinctively Romantic method of ‘reading as a minimal mode of mere attention’ in Simone Weil, Emily Dickinson, and Paul Celan (180).

This brief synopsis cannot do justice to the careful construction of Gurton-Wachter’s readings or the elegant clarity of her prose. Nor does it reflect the breadth of her references to such fields as aesthetics, theology, rhetoric, and military propaganda. Finally, it leaves out the book’s compelling insights about other Romantic writers, including Joseph Priestly, William Collins, Anna Barbauld, William Godwin, Erasmus Darwin, and many others. Part of the interest of attention as a subject is its multiplicity. Watchwords makes it clear that attention does not merely take a variety of forms in the Romantic period; it also names conflicting or even antithetical qualities or states.

The multifarious nature of the book’s subject (and Gurton-Wachter’s intellectual and critical flexibility in attending to it) is one of its many strengths. But it is occasionally a shortcoming as well. Because attention means so many things, it is sometimes difficult to tell exactly how it signifies in a particular instance. Like ‘reading’ and ‘self-referentiality’ in deconstructive criticism, ‘attention’ is for Gurton-Wachter at once a powerful analytical tool and a capacious analytical category. In general, however, Watchwords is a provocative and stimulating study; it tells a compelling story about attention in the Romantic period and opens avenues of inquiry which suggest that there are many other stories to be told. When Gurton-Watcher observes, for example, ‘we say that we pay attention for the same reason we pay anything: to pacify our creditors’ (24), her claim suggests that we might also be understood to ‘pay attention’ in the same way that we ‘pay money.’ And the idea that attention becomes a powerful form of cultural, political, and poetic currency in the Romantic period is one of the key insights of Gurton-Wachter’s enlightening study.

Andrew Franta
University of Utah


E. J. Clery’s passionate and well-researched study on Eighteen Hundred and Eleven is the work that Anna Barbauld’s long neglected 334-line poem deserves. Efforts initiated by her niece Lucy Aikin long perpetuated the myth that John Wilson Croker’s attack in the Quarterly Review (the critic said to have ‘killed’ Keats) ended Barbauld’s poetic career. Clery begins her study by categorically refuting this reading, suggesting that not only did Barbauld continue to publish, but that her poem was intended as a provocation against Parliament’s economic policies of trade blockades that precipitated economic crisis (6). Clery calls Croker one of the poem’s best readers as his attack indicates his recognition of its power as a catalyst for political change including negotiated peace and parliamentary reform (228). Clery’s conviction that Barbauld’s poem is a ‘deliberate act of courage’ (226) corrects the idea that she is a native idealist discouraged by criticism and creates the thesis for the monograph.

The book is divided into two sections with an appendix containing the poem. The main section, ‘The Making of Eighteen Hundred and Eleven’, offer seven chapters, carefully parsing contexts of the years 1811 and 1812 and how they are reflected in the poem. The chapters are given allusive and punning chapter titles and follow the chronology of the poem with impressive scholarship: ‘Economic Warfare’, ‘Writing for the Enemy’, ‘Commercial Dissent’,
‘Stoic Patriotism’, ‘The Prophet Motive’, ‘Ruin: Doing the Policy in Different Voices,’ and ‘Lady Credit’. Clery begins with a consideration of the economic crisis caused by the disruption of trade within the contexts of contemporary poetic works, which protest war. Barbauld’s poetic intervention is connected with Naomi Klein’s *Shock Doctrine*. In chapter two Clery pronounces the poem a Juvenelian satire, which changes the nature and import of the poem (38) as addressing the ruling class. An innovative linkage to the writings of William Roscoe in the third chapter brings the poem into a public sphere of Dissenting public intellectuals whose forms of commerce takes a Stoical cast of enlightening and liberating the mind (64). Stoicism also informs her sense of patriotism, the subject of the fourth chapter, which makes allegiance to community rather than nation state and can be traced in her earlier poems and prose tracts as well as those of her brother John Aikin. Loss within her Stoic perspective is a catalyst for heroic action (76) and enables her to ‘keep faith with her political principles’ (85). Clery’s punning phrase ‘Prophet Motive’ considers the poem’s vision of Britain laid to waste, reading her lines as a response to Coleridge’s *Poems* (1796). Barbauld’s ambivalence about ruins traced in Chapter 6 uncovers a ‘dialogic interdependence’ (130); Clery situates *Eighteen Hundred and Eleven* within complex contemporary discussions. The result is something she terms ‘sportive’ and ‘carnivalesque’, anticipating T. S. Eliot’s *The Waste Land* (137). The final chapter in the section considers the identity of the spirit in the poem, which Clery identifies as Public Credit.

Part II, ‘What Happened Next’, is briefer. ‘Publication to Vindication’ offers a chronology from January to June 1812 as the poem appears in octavo format on 12 February during a year of crisis. Its appearance was preceded by an attack on Barbauld by Coleridge in a public lecture on Milton and quickly followed by the Luddite Rising and the Frame Breaking Bill about which Byron (who was about to become famous through the publication of Childe Harold on 10 March) memorably made his maiden speech in the House of Lords and culminating in the *Anti-Jacobin’s* review of Barbauld’s poem in June. The final chapter considers the summer of 1812 beginning with the withdrawal of French blockades and evidence of the poem’s influence as well as its appearance in the United States.

Clery writes with conviction and verve; this is a work whose tone is *con brio* tracing the contexts of politics and economy in the years surrounding the writing of the poem, but its aims are more wide-ranging than this ambitious re-evaluation of one work might suggest. Clery makes a case for rereading women Romantic poets’ work as something other than ‘narratives of defeat and disappointment, compromise and constraint’ as well as recognizing that they wrote in ‘collaboration and dialogue’ with men (230). In the concluding paragraphs Clery explains that the poem is recognizable in an era of neoliberalism in the aftermath of the 2008 economic crisis and following the model of Naomi Klein suggest that in 1812 ‘a more progressive and democratic variety of liberalism prevailed’ (232). E. J. Clery’s excellent book is highly recommended.

Lisa Vargo

*University of Saskatchewan*

[Editorial Note: The final paragraph of this review was amended on 10th August 2018 with the reviewer’s agreement to clarify E. J. Clery’s critical position.]


When C. P. Snow delivered his famous lectures on ‘The Two Cultures’ in 1959, lamenting what he saw as an insurmountable cultural divide between the sciences and the humanities, he did not anticipate a volume like this one. Beth Lau’s edited volume of ten essays bravely
bridges persistent divisions between the humanities and the sciences by helping to refine the nascent field of cognitive literary studies.

Lau’s volume is focused on key concepts in cognitive theory, cognitive science, literary neuroscience, and neuro-aesthetics. Many of these concepts may be new to readers without training in cognitive science: ‘Theory of Mind’ (the ability to determine one’s own and other people’s thoughts or emotions), embodied cognition (the idea that many aspects of cognition are shaped by the whole body or organism), social minds (shared cognition or responses among certain groups of individuals), and meta-representation (confusion over the source of information that one has collected) are a few of the prominent concepts in the volume. ‘Confirmatory bias’, for example, the tendency to interpret information in a way that confirms a preexisting hypothesis, can be a useful term when referring to many of Austen’s more imaginative heroines, who are overly confident in their ‘Theory of Mind’.

One might ask why Austen is such a popular choice for this emerging area of ‘cognitive literary studies’? Lau, for example, refers early on to the ‘special congruity between Austen’s novels and cognitive science’ (2). Literary scholars in particular may wonder whether the conjunction between Austen and sciences of the mind is as beneficial to literary studies as it may be for the cognitive sciences. Authors in this volume, however, describe mutual benefits with some success and justify the cross-disciplinary connection in at least six different ways, which I sketch below.

**Austen helps science:** Whether stated explicitly or not, Austen is most often used in this volume as providing case studies to test cognitive theories because of her characteristic psychological astuteness. Alan Richardson makes a very interesting qualification: Austen is useful because scientists tend to assume that all behavior is adaptive in evolutionary terms, whereas Austen generally is more interested in the maladaptive—or in the failures of communication (70). This lends additional credence to Patrick Colm Hogan’s claim that Austen’s scenarios, despite being fictional, are actually ‘more ecologically valid’ than the highly artificial laboratory experiments common to studies of Theory of Mind (180).

**Austen is surprisingly contemporary:** There is a common refrain of surprise that Austen is ‘in synch with current neuro-scientific and psychological research’ (2). One example embodied cognition, or the connections between body and mind (26); while describing contemporary studies, Richardson also notes that many of the cognitive models ‘would not have been news to Jane Austen’ (59).

**Austen reflects the psychological ideas of her day:** Addressing the critique that it is anachronistic to apply 21st-century models to Austen’s works, Lau asserts that the similarity between 18th-century associationist thinking and 21st-century cognitive models shows that the two types of interpretation are not at odds (5). This unusual argument does provoke other questions: it made this reader feel that more cognitive psychologists should perhaps also be reading David Hume, John Locke, and especially Adam Smith’s *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, which is not cited in any of the studies in this volume, even those (such as Natalie M. Phillips et al.’s) who take Austen’s intellectual context into account. Other authors such as Wendy S. Jones take a more overtly universalist approach and say that the reason mind-brain sciences can shed light on Austen is because our engrained physiology doesn’t change over time (76).

**Austen is a scientist:** While no author in this collection directly claims that Austen was a scientist, at least three studies explicitly try to explain Austen’s theories of cognition: Kate Singer constructs Austen’s ‘affect theory’ (7); Kay Young seeks to understand Austen’s notion of ‘elasticity of the mind’; Richardson probes Austen’s understanding of the interaction of imagination and memory (71), and Jones recreates Austen’s ideas about the ‘neurobiology of love’ (85).

**Science helps us understand Austen:** All the essays in this volume in one way or another claim that cognitive studies can help literary studies, whether in understanding trends in Austen
criticism (William Nelles), the author herself (Lau), the characters’ psychologies (Kate Singer), or the role of play in Mansfield Park (Bethany Wong). Although Wong does not name it, the use of reader-response theory in her essay is particularly promising in relation to cognitive sciences.

Science helps us understand reading: Some of the studies cast a wider net with many promising ideas for future study. Lau’s essay, for example, considers the psychological requirements of fiction more broadly, hypothesizing that in order to enjoy fiction, readers need a competent ‘Theory of Mind’. Young speculates on the degree of ‘imaginative-cognitive energy’ readers spend on various types of text (216).

Reading the volume, I was searching for a unifying methodology for cognitive literary studies. I did not find one, but this may actually both represent the nascent stage of this field of study and also contribute to the utility of the volume. While much of this cross-disciplinary study is (understandably) engaged in taxonomy, it seems that the strongest studies involve some combination of the rigor of the scientific method, nuance of literary analysis, and knowledge of intellectual history. A few authors coming from outside the field of literature occasionally misinterpret (or under-interpret) Austen by misunderstanding levels of irony in her texts. Irony, in addition to her focus on failures of communication seem to be most difficult for the current state of cognitive literary studies to account for. In contrast, quantitative laboratory experiments and newer tools (such as the ones demonstrated in Phillips et al’s original experiment) pose exciting new opportunities for understanding the behavioral and psychological aspects of reading. Thanks to this new volume, cognitive literary studies has progressed one step further.

Inger S. B. Brodey
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill


The choice of Jane Austen as the portrait on the Bank of England’s new ten pound notes (introduced last year to coincide with the bicentenary of the author’s death) was more appropriate than the bank probably intended, for not only has Austen been widely recognized (and, by W. H. Auden, satirized) as a novelist peculiarly alert to ‘the economic basis of society’, but £10 was a significant sum in the history of her authorship. Had she had access to £10 in 1809, Austen would have been able to purchase back the copyright to her novel Susan, bought but not published by Benjamin Crosby six years before, and her career in print might have started sooner.

Also, as E. J. Clery points out in this engaging and informative study of the Austens and money, there has been an ‘Austen’ ten pound note before, issued in the early years of the nineteenth century by one of the private banks in which Jane’s ambitious older brother, Henry, had an interest. Henry Austen was the most social and worldly of the siblings, an important facilitator of his sister's career and her first biographer; as such, he has attracted the scholarly attention of T. A. B. Corley, Clive Caplin and Deirdre le Faye (among others), but this is the first full-length book to look in detail at his character and career in relation to that of his famous sister, and to link the two through their economic histories. The juxtapositions are original and illuminating.

Clery invites us to see the siblings as individuals closely matched by nature and nurture but starkly divided by circumstance: Henry male, sexually active and licensed by society to pursue self-interested life-strategies (legal or not); Jane, virginal, poor and powerless except in
the field of fiction. Henry was instrumental in getting Jane’s novels published, but was in some ways an odd choice as agent; Clery sees him as ‘the early nineteenth-century embodiment of the “animal spirits” identified by John Maynard Keynes as the mainspring of capitalism’ (8), whose risk-taking temperament and preference for abrupt action couldn’t have been less like his sister’s. He was bemused by her desire to put aside money against the possible failure of Sense and Sensibility (which she published on commission, sharing both costs and profits with the publisher) and significantly undersold the copyright of Pride and Prejudice out of impatience. When, during Henry’s long illness in 1816, Jane was forced to manage some of her own dealings with John Murray, she found that she not only enjoyed acting on her own behalf, but was possibly better at it than her brother.

Clery compares ideas of market worth, risk, exchange and depreciation in the different worlds of the banker and the novelist, weaving them together deftly. Speculation was what powered Henry through his careers in the army, in finance and, one might even say, in his final calling to Holy Orders; speculation on her own talent, unrecognized for decades, was how Jane Austen tried to control her own fate and property, intellectual and otherwise. It is perhaps no joke when Lady Bertram (in Mansfield Park) remarks of the card game Speculation, ‘Very entertaining indeed … I am never to see my cards; and Mr Crawford does all the rest’.

Under scrutiny, Henry’s charm is less obvious than his instinct to self-preservation. As Receiver for Oxfordshire, he was allowed to use land and income taxes before remitting them to the government, but ran up late payments as well as large profits. His association with the ‘confidential agent’ of the Earl of Moira, a shadowy figure called Major Charles James, involved him in enormous debts and illicit financial practices, at the edges of which were instances of blackmail and his bank partner’s possible suicide. Henry tried to ride the downturn that peace brought after 1815, but went bankrupt in 1816, owing £44,000 to the Crown. Two of his guarantors, his brother Edward and Uncle James Leigh-Perrot, had to repay this huge sum on his behalf, while small investors, like his sisters Cassandra and Jane, lost their savings. He ruined the whole family.

Jane remained loyal publicly, but Clery detects some reaction against Henry’s values in her deliberately uncommercial determination to make Emma into ‘a heroine whom no one but myself will much like’. Jane clearly resented the obligation to dedicate Emma to the Prince Regent, a man she hated, and resented also having to endure an acquaintance with the Regent’s pompous librarian, James Stanier Clarke, because of her brother’s need to keep in with the Carlton House set. She tried, as Clery recognizes, to protect him from her disapproval, bearing the shame and chagrin of his bankruptcy as well as she could, and it seems that Henry, with his breezily optimistic nature and willingness to write off failure, never understood how much she suffered. In an age of profound economic instability, his was the character more fit to survive.

Claire Harman
Durham University


Wordsworth Before Coleridge has both a negative and a positive agenda. Its negative argument, which I find wholly convincing, is against the critical view of Coleridge as Wordsworth’s key philosophical mentor, shaping his thought in the years between 1797 and 1805. Bruhn shows that key principles of Wordsworth’s philosophy – actually, his metaphysics and aspects of his psychology (ethics remain tangential to this study, though not to Wordsworth) – were in place
by 1797, before his close collaboration with Coleridge. Those key principles are the ontological dualism of mind and matter; the ‘one life’ that animates ‘the great system of the world’ (102-11, 130); and the ontological ‘fitness’ between mind and nature (112, 130).

From where did Wordsworth derive these principles? Bruhn’s positive argument unfolds as source study, and it can be insightful and persuasive. At the top of his ‘Conclusion,’ Bruhn clearly rehearses his main points, which I quote with commentary. ‘Wordsworth profited from more than a decade of philosophical preparation prior to the advent of Coleridge’ (129): agreed. ‘A student in the higher geometry at Hawkshead Grammar School and Cambridge University, Wordsworth was exposed…to a philosophical discourse that insisted upon the qualitative difference between the material ideas generated by the senses and the immaterial deductions of the abstract intellect’ (129). This is something Wordsworth tells us himself in The Prelude (6.135-59), but Bruhn’s Chapter 1 elaborates the point against scholars ‘increasingly prone to emphasize and valorize Wordsworth’s representations of the embodied and environmentally situated mind’ (27). Chapter 1 also contains provocative side-glances at Wordsworth’s possible debts to Plato and Descartes.

Bruhn’s next points, corresponding to his book’s middle chapters (2-4), are less persuasive. Wordsworth’s 1794 ‘Corrections and Additions’ to An Evening Walk allegedly respond to Pope’s Essay on Man, which allegedly ‘arraigned the passions along with the senses for embodied offenses against the dictates…of reason’ (129). Pope is, through Chapter 2, labeled ‘antipathetic’ (47, 54). Bruhn presents several lines from Wordsworth’s Prelude (1.353-5) as ‘an explicitly contra-Popean view of man’ (48): ‘There is a dark / Invisible workmanship that reconciles / Discordant elements,’ including passion and thought. But Wordsworth should rather be seen as concurring with the optimism of An Essay on Man, in which Pope proclaims: ‘All Discord, [is] Harmony not understood” (1.291); ‘REASON, PASSION, answer one great aim’ (4.395). Pope belongs to an eighteenth-century near-consensus (compare Addison, Mandeville, Hume, Akenside, Fielding, Sterne) about the mutual dependence of reason and passion: as Pope puts it, ‘On life’s vast ocean diversely we sail, / Reason the card [mariner’s chart], but Passion is the gale’ (2.107-8).

Because of Bruhn’s crucial misstep with Pope and the eighteenth-century literary tradition, his following two chapters, 3-4, which trace Wordsworth’s liberation from that (caricatured) tradition, are largely unnecessary. In 1794 Wordsworth did not need ‘to work out a non-oppositional metaphysics in which sense, feeling, and intellect cooperate to moral purpose’ (129): the 1700s had amply achieved this. Bruhn sees Wordsworth as transformed by reading Dugald Stewart’s Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind shortly after its 1792 publication, but I can find nothing particularly original in this work, at least from the quotations that appear in this study.

After its disappointing middle section, Wordsworth Before Coleridge arrives at a substantial and rewarding fifth and final chapter, ‘The Finishing of Wordsworth’s Philosophical Education, 1795-1797’ (101-128). For Bruhn, Wordsworth’s ‘one life’ and mind-nature ‘fitness’ derive ‘in all likelihood directly from Ralph Cudworth’s True Intellectual System of the Universe [1678], which he had at hand through the entirety of his tenure at Racedown Lodge,’ September 1795-June 1797 (130). Bruhn has the discretion to add that even if Wordsworth didn’t read Cudworth, ‘Cudworth’s thought pervaded the English philosophical and poetic traditions’ through intermediaries including Shaftesbury, Pope, and Thomson, all of whom are aptly quoted via secondary works by Abbie Findlay Potts and Duncan Wu (118-20). Bruhn then introduces Friedrich August Nitsch, a German-born Kantian (perhaps influenced by Cudworth as well) who moved to England in 1794 to offer lecture series on Kant which were soon thereafter revised and published. When Wordsworth speaks of ‘that most apprehensive habitude’ of the Infant Babe (Prelude 2.286), his terminology seems almost certainly derived from Nitsch’s Kantian lectures (123-25). However, Bruhn finds Nitsch’s
‘science of morals’ altogether alien to ‘Wordsworth’s mature philosophy’: ‘our will is pure,’ writes Nitsch, ‘when it is determined by necessary and universal rules and laws,’ not by ‘feelings’ (126). But this Kantian ethics would surface in Wordsworth’s Ode to Duty and his later, Stoic-inflected compositions, which are not considered here.

In sum, while Bruhn advances the case for Wordsworth’s philosophical maturity before his collaboration with Coleridge, Wordsworth Before Coleridge is not consistently reliable as a source study of what influenced, or constitutes, that maturity. Nonetheless, its first and final chapters, on dualism and mind-nature fitness, are recommended.

Adam Potkay
The College of William & Mary


These two books both attempt to deal with Coleridge’s multi/interdisciplinarity in striking different but equally profitable ways. Ewan Jones aims to consider ‘the philosophy of poetic form’ in order to engage with ‘the specifically formal, sensuous or conventional elements of Coleridge’s verse’ because, he contends, ‘poetry should be able to argue its own necessity’ (2) – which is to say, Jones considers how Coleridge’s various philosophical engagements enrich his verse and extend and explore his philosophical concerns. Poetry is the primary partner in the relationship, and the argument is played out substantially through prolonged, erudite and compelling readings of the conversation poems, Christabel, ‘Limbo’ and The Rime of the Ancient Mariner. That Jones sticks to major canonical poems (with the exception of ‘Limbo’, of course) is part of his project: recasting them in and examining them from a philosophical perspective reveals something new about them, because ‘the more nuanced account of Coleridge’s philosophy that we now possess enables us to re-examine many presuppositions that apply to his poetry; but also, and just and pertinently, the extent to which that poetry shared or anticipated his philosophical concerns’ (4). A central concern here is that ‘Coleridge’s verse thought philosophically through its expressive repertoire, through the sum of its historical conventions, and through the nature of its sensuous embodiment’ (4) and the chapters are accordingly focused on instances where Coleridge’s verse ‘thinks philosophically in a manner that philosophy proper cannot (or could not for Coleridge)’ (5).

The first chapter assesses the role of interruption in the conversation poems by teasing out the ways in which ‘the hemistich or ‘broken’ line, which the caesura or other graphic punctuation produces, mak[es] a unit that is divided yet which remains in some sense integral’ (13), as well as how this formalistic feature explores tension between materialism and idealism (the former ‘interrupts’ and anticipates the latter). Jones concludes that the conversation poem ‘concedes’ that ‘a non-reactive passivity’ is ‘necessary for the material world to feel like a world at all’ (55). The second chapter concentrates on poetic metre and the principle of affect. Jones traces ‘contemporary debates over the relation between metrical form and feeling’ before offering a succinct genealogy on the transformation of passion across the eighteenth century. An extensive reading of Christabel (‘Coleridge’s fullest realization of the relationship between affectivity and poetic form’ (73)) is then offered along with a fascinating reassessment of
Coleridge’s late theory of ‘Life’ in light of his short essay ‘On the Passions’, which Jones contends reveals that ‘any dynamic conceptualization of organic form must also be affective’ (87).

The third chapter revives the marginalized poem ‘Limbo’ as the centerpiece of an argument about how ‘Coleridge’s conceived a philosophical significance for the pun that would sublate (if not necessarily transcend) the comic’ (108), which involves placing him ‘within [the] less familiar context’ of satirical verse (109). After a history of the pun (including Pope, Heidegger, Joyce, Lacan and others), Coleridge’s engagement with it is discussed in relation to his ‘attempt to recover a pre-tradition of sacred paronomasia’ (116). The pun is then read in relation to ‘the mode of allegory’ – which Jones argued can be ‘intentionally defective’ – and the ‘formal tradition of witty couplet writing’ (120) which leads to a reading of Limbo, as a poem incorporates aspects of both. The final chapter traces ‘Coleridge’s attempt to conceive linguistic coincidence in a more emphatically positive sense’ by discussing tautology and the Coleridgean symbol. First, how ‘tautology comes to represent an epistemological threat’ and a ‘potential resource’ to Kantian and post-Kantian philosophy is explored, considering Coleridge’s concept of ‘tautegory’ and his neglected Logic. A fascinating account of Coleridge’s influence on Hyman Hurwitz and Hebrew poetics gives way to a persuasive reading of the The Rime of the Ancient Mariner, which argues that the poem inherits ‘Kant’s modern epistemological dilemma: that knowledge would be but an adumbration of its own precepts, in the course of which the subjective encounters only itself’ (169).

Michael Tomko addresses Coleridge’s almost infamous aesthetic concept of the suspension of disbelief that has long since been converted into a cliché. It is an odd critical deficit of Coleridgean scholarship that, given its ubiquity, the idea of ‘our acceptance in art of the most fantastic worlds whose premises, actions or outcomes we would question or reject in reality’ (1) has not been fully explored. Tomko argues that ‘the “suspension of disbelief” in tandem with “poetic faith” means much more than its current connotation of a begrudging toleration of the fabulous’ (2). Building on recent scholarship that has placed Coleridge in a theological context, he discusses a ‘“postsecular Coleridge” who offers a literary theory that fully engages the human faculties of both faith and reason and thus enables a rich aesthetic encounter while remaining politically responsible’ (3).

The first chapter argues that the ‘willing suspension of disbelief’ is such a necessary and vital concept because ‘avoiding or banishing literature’s wondrous effects would lead to a life devoid of affect and insight’ (19, 20). Tomko traces memorials, ornamentalism and monumentalization in the Romantic ‘culture wars’ as a context for reading Shelley’s ‘Ozymandias’ as a poem that ‘defuses a potent aesthetic encounter before its effects can take place’ (30); he then considers the work of Jerome McGann’s and Terry Eagleton as a way of assessing the implications of ‘critical iconoclasm’ (33) and the need for ‘critical vantage’ (37), with a brief discussion of Tolkien and recent New Historicism critics as a potential solution to the problem of ‘maintaining aesthetic effects in the face of a critical methodology designed to circumvent those effects’ (41). Coleridge’s theory offers a true solution, for ‘a volitional relaxation of the faculties that are concerned with judging what is true and what is good’ allows for an ‘engaged’ aesthetic experience ‘that remains at liberty’ (49). However, there are
limitations: it is ‘overly passive and accords lethargy of the always right, ever-justified customer’ (58).

The second chapter posits that the resolution to these limits is itself found in the concept of ‘poetic faith’, initially through a lengthy consideration of Coleridge’s thoughts on Shakespeare and in light of Richard McCoy’s book *Faith in Shakespeare* (2013), contending that the concept is ‘active’, ‘collaborative’ and ‘produces a desirable, vital influence’ (69). Tomko then succinctly sketches out Coleridge’s ‘fiduciary epistemology’ (85), discussing how faith is aligned with the ‘form of reason itself’ (82), and that it ‘supersedes belief’ (84). Coleridge’s thoughts on hermeneutics is used to argue that poetic faith ‘allows for an aesthetic experience of “intuitively beholding” a work as within a dramatic model of reading in which audience members actively engage all their faculties to fully enter into its experience’ (96, 97). Finally, the third chapter argues that Coleridge’s aesthetic maxim ‘does provide a model for continued rational query and challenge even as a full investment in the aesthetic illusion is made’ (112, 113). After discussing the relationship between faith and doubt in theology and literary theory, Tomko argues that ‘the reader or inquirer must proceed as if he had faith in the writer’ (121), which can be figured as a ‘willing resumption of disbelief’ that ‘remains a power within the reader’ (123). Coleridge’s review of Charles Maturin’s play *Bertram; or The Castle of St. Aldobrand* (1816), in which Coleridge fails ‘to follow through with his own method of dramatic criticism’ (126) is examined, and the chapter is brought to a close with a complex consideration of how Tolkien addresses the power and potential duplicity of rhetoric, asserting that ‘discerning when to resume disbelief requires a step beyond literary theory’ (140). Both of these books demonstrate the sheer range of Coleridge’s reach – Jones concentrates on his investment in the history of philosophy; Tomko on the implications of his aesthetic ideas for literary theory – and improve our understanding of just how subtle and essential Coleridge’s interdisciplinarity is for anyone who wishes to engage thoroughly with his thought.

*Philip Aherne*

*King’s College London*


Gerard Manley Hopkins once lamented a friend’s failure to realise that ‘the style of prose is a positive thing and not the absence of verse-forms’. It’s comforting to think of oneself as being in a position to share Hopkins’s impatience, but who in practice doesn’t warrant its censure? How many readers, faced with an anonymised passage of prose, would be able not only to suggest who wrote it but to justify their choice? Certainly, little time is devoted to prose style in contemporary university courses; it is hard to teach – it requires the training of sensibility rather than the imparting of ideas. And yet a commitment to considering the how as well as the what of the words on the page is perhaps the closest thing to a unifying principle that literary study has. If reading goes on with little sense that it matters that the work being read is made out of words, then it begs the question why limit one’s focus to literature at all. *Thinking through Style* is to be welcomed for its demonstration of the centrality and amplitude of style as a critical concern. It furnishes an advanced and eloquent education in the kinds of thinking and attention involved in a literary study of prose.

The collection gathers perspectives on twenty writers of non-fiction from the Romantic period to the early twentieth century. The ‘through’ of the title indicates that it is concerned with how style works – with what style means and how it operates for the writers in question;
and that it is preoccupied in particular by the fusion of style and ideas (the book’s special interest, say the editors, is in the way words ‘shape, refine, or generate’ thought). It is engaged with the life in writing and the role of writing in life. Everywhere contributors think ‘through’ style to the world with which it engages and the mind it reveals. The essays are refreshingly sensitive to matters of literary expression, but they also illuminate the ways of knowing, understanding, apprehending the world that literary expression enables.

The book is abundant with demonstrations of how style, in Vernon Lee’s words, makes available a writer’s ‘temperament’ – how it subdues the ‘Reader into living for the moment […] in modes of life which are the Writer’s’ (294). James Williams, for instance, conducts an imaginative and richly-informed enumeration of the ‘theological virtues’ of ‘faith, hope, and charity’ alive in Darwin’s prose. The point is not to recast Darwin as an unwitting Christian but to amplify our understanding of the workings of those virtues and to locate in Darwin’s style an exemplary suppleness and resilience of mind and manner: his voice ‘finds its shape in pressing against’ (158) the ideas it opposes. Adam Phillips shows how the principle of ‘incessant growth’ that animates Emerson’s style (‘every sentence fraught with the burden of progressing towards an unknowable destination’ (139)) embodies his responsiveness to the dilemmas of the ‘American need for the new’ (136). Dinah Birch finds in the ‘fluid relations between clarity and vagueness’ (176) that characterise George Eliot’s writing a model blend of humility and authority central to its educative power: ‘she pays her readers the compliment of assuming that they will value the opportunity to benefit from what she has learned’ (180).

A conception of writing as the medium rather than the ‘dress’ of thought is one hallmark of the Romantic imagination; and while of the twenty writers included here only four are firmly planted in the period, there remains a good deal for readers primarily interested Romantic matters to get their teeth into. James Engell gives a nimble and magisterial survey of the ‘expansive, unformulateable’ (15) quality of Coleridge’s prose, illuminating what Woolf called the ‘androgyne’ of Coleridge’s styles as they ‘play a game of perpetual leapfrog’ (11) with his thinking; he extols Coleridge’s prose writings as a record of ‘how rich, devastating, triumphant, and trying one life is’ (21). Matthew Bevis tours the signature combinations of wit and seriousness through which Charles Lamb keeps his reader on their toes; the verve and acumen of his essay bears out its proposition that style for Lamb ‘is a type of behaviour, rather than a property; or better, it’s a kind a contract or relationship’ (41). Michael O’Neill inhabits the ‘drama of mind and heart’ (79) animating Shelley’s prose, demonstrating with unmatched bite and sensitivity its mobility as an agent of Shelley’s agile, wittily self-aware thinking. Freya Johnston responds to the nervous, turbulent immediacy of Hazlitt’s manner in prose which, as it describes the way Hazlitt’s writing ‘both gathers and unleashes itself in long, snowballing constructions that gain in mass and momentum in their observant, restless career’ (61), answers in its movement and visual power to that of its subject. It would be nice to see equivalent attention trained on the looping, self-adjusting arguments of Wordsworth’s ‘Preface’, say, or the cut and sparkle of Byron’s letters.

In his essay on Coleridge, Engell ventures a distinction between prose writers who ‘achieve closure’, who ‘tamp down’ and ‘brace with logical trains and qualify with crisp statement’, and those who, in a spirit of ‘openness’, ‘inquire and expand as they declare’ (27). The distinction itself is sketched in prose which, in its branching categories, preserves ‘openness’ even as it seeks to establish principle. It is a characteristic moment in a volume which both in its arguments and style of arguing affords bountiful instruction in the appreciation of prose style as ‘a positive thing’.

Andrew Hodgson
University of Birmingham
Spotlight: Romantic Heirs and Inheritors


The thriving area of Atlantic literary studies investigates spatial convergences around migration, race, gender and sexuality, ecologies, and other significant ideological crossovers in the Atlantic world. Scholars in this field have, recently, expanded their geographical scope beyond the North Atlantic to encompass the mass movements of peoples, ideas, and reform campaigns; indicative of a determined effort to open up the field beyond the well-trodden paths of Anglo-American studies pioneered by Robert Weisbuch’s Atlantic Double-Cross (1989) and Richard Gravil’s Romantic Dialogues (2000). Juliet Shields’s Nation and Migration: The Making of British Atlantic Literature, 1765-1835 deepens our understanding of the Atlantic world by confronting the engrained habit of taking Britain to be synonymous with England, and foregrounding instead Scotland, Ireland and Wales and their complex relationships with America in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Andrew Hook and Susan Manning have already provided crucial insights into Scottish-American relations (Scotland and America: A Study of Cultural Relations, 1750-1835 [1975]; Fragments of Union: Making Connections in Scottish and American Writing [2002]) but Shields’s book covers new ground and marks out the differing cultural traditions that Scots, Irish and Welsh migrants brought to the American colonies and, likewise, the influence of discourses around US liberty on the efforts of asserting national distinctions, for those nations, from England itself.

This remapping of the British Atlantic, focusing on writing by and about migrants from Ireland, Scotland and Wales, lends Nation and Migration a curious but effective structure, with chapters 2 through 4 offering accounts of Irish, Scottish and Welsh migration through a literary-critical approach cushioned with helpful historical detail. Chapters 1 and 5 frame these literary connections by suggesting that what unites literary accounts of Irish, Scottish and Welsh migration to the US has been their second-tier status in transatlantic studies until now. Chapter 3 presents an unexpected comparative study of Samuel Johnson’s Journey to the Western Isles of Scotland (1775) and J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur’s Letters from an American Farmer (1782) to examine accounts of Scottish migrants’ departure from the Highlands and Islands and arrival in the American colonies. Next the chapter examines James Fenimore Cooper (known as the American Scott) and The Last of the Mohicans (1826) to contemplate the neglected Scottish decent of primary non-Native American characters. Chapter 4 focuses on the twelfth-century Welsh Madoc myth. For Shields, ‘Wales offered British migrants the legend of Prince Madoc, who, in the twelfth century, left his home in war-torn Wales and sailed to the Gulf of Mexico, where his people subdued, and in some tellings, mixed with, native tribes’ (91). Given the small populace, Shields does concede that the idea of a Welsh diaspora in North America is debatable, but gives rewarding attention to the circulation of the Madoc myth in the Atlantic world.

Perhaps, the most original part of Nation and Migration comes in chapter 2, on the Irish uncanny and the American gothic, which reinvigorates gothic studies. Shields reminds us that Irish sympathies lay with the Patriots in Britain’s war against the colonies and brings into focus those Irish-American political connections: many Irish worried that the economic restrictions that Britain were placing on the US could be extended to Ireland. Shields observes: ‘the success of the American Revolution inspired the United Irishman to seek the reform, if not the end, of British rule of Ireland’ (41). This chapter brims with important historical detail about the connections and differences between Irish radicals and American Patriots: Shields offers
nuanced accounts of US and Irish writers’ persistent use of ‘the language and conventions of the Gothic novel to represent Irish migrants’ (43) to examine American fears about Irish immigration. Just as Irish radicals were travelling to the US in the 1790s, Americans began to ‘express anxieties about political radicalism and distrust of foreigners’ (41) in the wake of the French Revolution. Shields glosses this by recalling Irish belief in liberty and opposition to British rule (like their American Patriot counterparts) and the simultaneously threatening and Othering of Irish Catholicism. Skillfully probing readings of Charles Brockden Brown’s Wieland (1798) and Edgar Huntly (1799) follow as examples of the earliest American Gothic novels concerned with Irish uncanniness, where the presence of Irish migrants in rural Pennsylvania coincides with occult events. This is finally bolstered by an original comparison with the Munster Cottage Boy by Irish novelist Maria Regina Roche (1820).

This is an ambitious project and, consequently, there is potential for the reader to lose sight of the overarching connecting narrative. Shields’s achievement lies in identifying many varied literary relationships that further scholarly work will almost certainly develop. Nation and Migration is an inventive and, at times, impressively original study that advances the burgeoning field of Atlantic literary studies, which will have broad appeal to scholars of nineteenth-century British and American literature.

Clare Elliott
Northumbria University


In Archaeologies of the Future, Fredric Jameson observes that, classically understood, ‘Apocalypse includes both catastrophe and fulfilment, the end of the world and the inauguration of the reign of Christ on earth, Utopia and the extinction of the human race all at once.’ As Anahid Nersessian notes in the provocative opening of her monograph, Utopia, Limited, one could make the case that, emerging from a moment of political crises, revolutionary transformations, and – as many have argued – the industrial dawn of “the Anthropocene,” such an intensified connection between destruction and regeneration is precisely what defines the literature of the Romantic century.

‘That is not the argument of this book,’ however (2). Instead, Nersessian gleans from Romantic practices of composition an ethic and aesthetic of ‘adjustment,’ which would enable ‘human beings to accommodate themselves to the world by minimizing the demands they place upon it’ (3). In contrast to conventional ‘unlimited’ utopias of perfect fulfilment, this limited utopianism of ‘doing-with-less’ reconfigures loss ‘as an ontologically positive entity integral to the material makeup of the world’ and to the possibility of a better one (3, 5). Taking her cue from Blake’s conception of ‘the bounding line,’ Nersessian outlines a Romanticism of loss-bound abbreviation – or what she calls ‘Rsrm,’ reimagining the abbreviation used by Northrop Frye in his notebooks on Romantic aesthetics and utopian philosophy as their ascetic synthesis.

As Nersessian acknowledges with her second chapter on Wordsworth and phenomenology, adjusting to the limitations of the present world is essentially a form of realism. Indeed, Rsrm is defined by ‘secular realism,’ which refuses apocalyptic transcendence for ‘an entanglement with ordinariness’ that nevertheless, through aesthetic experiences and poetic making, can recuperate something ‘slightly greater’ within the world-as-it-is (60-1). Yet as well as such utopian banality, Nersessian also addresses a less ordinary Romantic literature in what is the highlight of the book, her discussion of free love and Shelley’s The Revolt of
Islam. Moving beyond a crass sexual calculus, Shelley evokes utopian love as an ‘eroticized dispossession,’ articulating ‘an idiom of renunciatory attachment’ in the poem’s protracted metrical form and self-estranged similes (82). Though this likening of loss to love renders limited utopia ‘eerily similar’ to the famine that strikes the revolt, this is precisely Shelley’s – and Nersessian’s – point: ‘a truly utopian definition of equality must be predicated upon the universalization of scarce resources’ (106-7). As a realist project, limited utopia does not promise a paradise of plenitude, but rather a radical redistribution of deprivation.

Regrettably, the following chapter on ‘bad taste’ and colonialism in Irish Romanticism is the weakest part of Nersessian’s book. While her discussion of the two forms of bad taste that operate under empire – ameliorative liberal sentimentalism and disruptive anticolonial bathos – is quite engaging, the broader argument about Romantic utopianism ironically becomes rather scarce. Though this extraneousness is ‘intended to perform a transhistorical and transgeneric pastiche’ (110), reproducing the very bad taste being discussed, it seems to point to a more general difficulty of accounting for excess within a limited Rsms, and of reconciling Rsms with the Romanticism it omits – such as the uncompromising nativism of Irish anticolonial literature. Indeed, Nersessian’s transhistorical discussion of Irish agrarian precarity reduces it to a consequence of ‘ecological imperialism,’ ignoring the fraught historical debate about the Great Famine’s status as a ‘colonial genocide’ and its appropriation as a nationalist myth (111, 177).

However, the final two chapters address a deeper tension in Nersessian’s account of limited utopia: what distinguishes renunciatory realism from bourgeois liberalism, and adjustment to limitation from Malthusian austerity? Through a fascinating discussion of free indirect discourse in Harriet Martineau’s Illustrations of Political Economy, Nersessian distinguishes between Rsms’s limited utopia of universal subsistence and capitalism’s ‘pseudo-utopia’ of unequal limitation, ‘where the poor are invited to starve and the rich to exhaust the earth’ and where adjustment is always a ‘cruel’ conformity to market regulation (177-8). While John Clare’s ‘politicized localism’ is one counterpoint of limited utopian practice (199), Nersessian ends with another in Keats’ “Ode to Psyche,” which ‘does not triumph over loss so much as rethink plenitude as a condition that participates in extinction’s irreparability’ (201).

Nersessian is hardly alone in her attention to forms of limitation, adjustment, and minimal impact in Romantic literature. Recent studies of Romanticism have likewise emphasised its models of ‘recessive action’ (Anne-Lise François) and ‘dispossessed’ subjectivity (Jacques Khalip), and her recuperation of form participates in the ongoing theoretical debate about anti-formalist critique. Utopia, Limited will be of enormous interest to scholars of Romanticism, ecology and literary form for a long time to come. It is a provocative book, brilliantly if sometimes unevenly argued, and it offers a powerful articulation not only of how to make a better world with less of it, but also of what the formalist study of Romantic literature can achieve.

Christopher Geary
University of Toronto


In his important new study Romantic Mediations, Andrew Burkett sets out to explore the implications of William Gibson and Bruce Sterling’s The Difference Engine (1990), stating that ‘there might be some grain of truth in [the novel’s] claims about the connections among media, technology, and British Romanticism.’ (2) The key question being: ‘what, if any, role
did the Romantics play in the history of media and other technologies?’ (2) This question is very well justified, because the majority of historical media studies tend to focus on later historical periods, beginning with the invention of photography, the phonograph, and film in the second half of the nineteenth century, as ‘the modern notion of a ‘medium’ as a technological channel of communication was a concept introduced only late in the Victorian period.’ (3) The Romantics, by contrast, were the last generation never to be photographed and whose voices were never recorded. Far from delivering a pre-history of modern media, Burkett maps out the possibilities of a thorough media-theoretical investigation of British Romanticism. His state-of-the-art theory, developed in the introduction of the book, takes into account the most important developments not only of a media theory of literature, but also of recent developments within Romantic studies. Burkett, however, shies away from writing the media theory of Romantic literature and culture, focusing on mediation, remediation, and network theory instead. In doing so, his media archaeology refers to such important contributions by the likes of Clifford Siskin and William Warner, John Guillory, Celeste Langan, Maureen McLane, and Lisa Gitelman, whilst also taking into account theorists as diverse as Niklas Luhman and Gilles Deleuze.

The book’s chapters focus on four key Romantic writers – Lord Byron, John Keats, William Blake, and Mary Shelley – as well as four different historical phases and technologies of mediation. Through his sophisticated approach Burkett carefully avoids writing a history of progress. Rather, he takes posterior adaptations and remediations as his starting point for his revisionary readings of Romantic literature from a media-theoretical perspective. In his first chapter, ‘Photographing Byron’s Hand,’ Burkett investigates a picture of a handwritten manuscript of Byron’s Ode to Napoleon, taken in 1840 by William Henry Fox Talbot, and its implications for the ‘literary phenomenon and system known as Byronism.’ (29) Burkett plausibly describes the process by which ‘[o]ne form and phenomenon of mass mediation (‘Byronism’) thus helps to create part of the conditions for the possibility of the emergence of another (photography).’ (37) The general implication here is that ‘new’ media never bring about revolutions or paradigm shifts, but are introduced into a network of already existing forms of mediation. The second chapter moves from vision to the aural sense, but also enhances the historical gap by moving into the twentieth century, investigating a phonograph recording of John Keats’s ‘Ode to a Nightingale’ by F. Scott Fitzgerald. This chapter draws a connection between the sense of hearing as a topic in Keats’s ode, the influence of Laennec’s introduction of the stethoscope – which Keats might or might not have come across during his medical education – and the technology of sound recording, showing how such remediations ‘participate in the posthumous life of Keatsian verse.’ (67) The third chapter moves even closer to the present day by investigating William Blake’s prophetic illuminated books in the context of film – Jim Jarmusch’s Dead Man (1995) and the experimental film The Vision of William Blake (1958) by Guy Brenton. Providing a tour de force-overview of Blake studies, Burkett analyses Blake’s nonlinear works not as singular narratives but as establishing a complex and flexible network. Applying phenomenology and vitality studies, Burkett makes a strong point arguing that ‘his images must be recognized and investigated as “moving”.’ (90) With the investigation of Frankenstein in the fourth and final chapter, Burkett rounds up his outline of Romantic mediations, arriving at the present day with hypertext editions of Mary Shelley’s novel as a starting point. This most persuasive chapter starts out by asking why it is Frankenstein in particular that lends itself to digital adaptations and remediations. The answer is as original as it is utterly plausible: the cybernetic conception of information – abstract (Victor) and embodied (the creature) – that Burkett traces back to Leibniz’s monad system and is, in turn, mirrored in the novel’s complex narrative structure through which ‘Shelley is urging her readers to recognize the simulacrum of “real information” that the text itself purports to be.
Frankenstein thus ultimately directs readerly attention to the virtuality of the novel’s narrative form and structure in its desire to become transparent.’ (131)

Andrew Burkett’s book is a masterful study of the possibilities of a media theory of Romanticism. With media archaeology at its centre, Burkett maps out the entire theoretical field, while at the same time providing thought-provoking and striking new insights into specific Romantic writers, their preoccupations, and practices.


Apropos of ‘Romantic literature’s intense ‘aesthetic and psychic investment’ (32) in the child, this book takes on the moot ontological question of what being a “‘child” of Romanticism’ (xv) might mean. Turner focuses on the writerly voices of four such children in both a ‘literal and literary’ (1) sense: Coleridge’s children, Hartley and Sara, and Godwin’s children, Mary Shelley and William Godwin Jr. The book shines a critical spotlight on the bulk of these children’s literary production through 1820-1850, in terms of their unpicking of their ‘close implication in their fathers’ texts’ (4).

This enquiry proceeds through the governing metaphor of ‘writing back’ (2), signifying ‘the appropriation of linguistic power’ (3), in a phrasal borrowing from writer Salman Rushdie’s battle cry for the radical imperative of decolonisation. Turner contends that the four children write back to concurrent – if seemingly antithetical – formations of Romantic-era childhood – the ‘totemic’ (25) Romantic child exemplified by Coleridge, and the older Enlightenment child associated with Locke, predicated on the conception of the infant’s mind as a *tabula rasa*. Hartley appears to perform a ‘willed rejection’ (57) of Coleridge’s tendency to prize his firstborn when ‘passive, silent, and written or read’ (59) as in ‘Frost at Midnight’; Hartley’s poem ‘To a Deaf and Dumb Little Girl’ can be read as an exposé of the ‘representational violence’ (88) in poetising a subject unaware of the hermeneutic politics enacted. Sara’s (mostly unpublished) poetry presents a narrative of an active and athletic girlhood, mirroring Wordsworth’s ‘imaginative ownership’ (121) of the landscape. Turner postulates that the Godwin children interrogate their father’s (Lockean) privileging of the family constituted through ties of sympathy rather than feudal ‘claims of blood’ (17). Turner scrutinises the novels *Matilda* (1819), *Lodore* (1835) and *Falkner* (1837), where Shelley varies a basic plot pattern of daughters educated by fathers in circumstances of social isolation. Such pre-scripted roles lead to the disastrous incestuous dynamic in *Matilda*, while the daughters in *Lodore* and *Falkner* escape similar fates only through their marriages and ‘creation’ (172) of a new ‘biological nuclear family’ (174). Contrapuntally, ‘blood calls to blood’ (191) in the fiction of Godwin Jr.; in the posthumously-published novel *Transfusion: or, the Orphans of Unwalden* (1835), Turner reads the orphaned brother’s performance of a quasi-spiritual process of transfusion on his sister as a Romantic incest fantasy, framing this within the ambient biomedical discourse and proprietorial politics of blood transfusion, as paralleled in emergent vampire literature.

Theoretically, Turner’s treatment of ‘writing back’ reconsiders Harold Bloom’s psychosexual model of the anxiety of influence, hypothesising that these Romantic children respond to ‘an anxiety not of influence but of reproduction’ (4) of the overweening author/father, and are troubled by the ‘absence’ of the ‘maternal creative impulse’ (219).
Hartley’s self-portraits in his poetry are structured through profoundly mortifying ‘images of littleness, frailty, and reproductive failure’ (58), he is ‘the loved abortion of a thing designed’ (79). Sara lays claim to a paternal inheritance through a bodily self ridden, like Coleridge’s, with perpetual ill health. This moment of Romantic hypochondria layers Sara’s poetry addressed to her children: her poem ‘Poppies’ boldly eulogises the plant’s analgesic properties in the form of opium, making for a ‘darkly confessional’ (97) poetics redolent of Sylvia Plath. In reading Shelley’s novels, Turner couples Freud’s ‘theory of repetition as the manifestation of repressed trauma’ (158) with Judith Butler’s conception of ‘performativity’ (158) to voice the ‘static and all-consuming mutual focus’ (173) between fathers and daughters.

Turner’s analysis of the ‘writing-back gesture’ (8) also yields affordances in the field of life writing, in view of the children’s intriguing failure – or unvoiced refusal – to produce expected biographies of their fathers, in the emergent ‘two-volume ‘life and letters’ format’ (149) of the time, which Turner ascribes to their scepticism towards the purposes of Romantic-era biography as ‘celebratory memorials’ (37). Turner highlights a sonnet by Hartley on his father he enclosed in a letter, and compares this to the version published in Poems (1851), pointing to Hartley’s dimming of Coleridge’s ‘celestial fire’ in the first version into one merely ‘imputed’ (74-75). Attributing the incomplete status of Shelley’s biographical memoir of Godwin partly to her unwillingness to raise controversy, Turner highlights Shelley’s short essay ‘Life of Godwin,’ appended to the 1831 edition of Caleb Williams, which characterises the still-living Godwin oddly as a ‘monument of the last generation’ (135), indicating his ‘obsolescence’ (3) to her own later generation.

The vignettes of the four Romantic children make for a compelling study: William Godwin Jr., particularly, comes across as a writer who deserves appreciation, ‘at the very least,’ for his ‘powerful, pacy Gothic narrative (214). At times, however, the book seems to segue to Judith Plotz’s Romanticism and the Vocation of Childhood (2001), which proceeded along the notion of a ‘totemic’ (25) Romantic child created by canonical male writers – a notion that has been teased apart in counter-narratives elsewhere.

Malini Roy
Independent Researcher


Tom Mole’s startlingly original new book asks what the Victorians made of Romanticism. Mole offers his book as a protest against the dominance in critical studies of what he terms ‘punctual historicism’, the notion that a literary work is best understood in relation to the moment of its composition or publication. But he is not the first student of Romantic afterlives. It is the aggressively materialist framing of the question that indicates the crucial difference between this and earlier studies of the reception of the Romantics in the later nineteenth century. Mole is not interested in tracing the influence of the Romantic poets on the work of their successors or in tracing the vagaries of their critical fortunes. He is interested instead in how the Romantics were accommodated within Victorian cultural practices. He is not concerned with how Walter Scott influenced the development of the Victorian novel but in how he was commemorated in a grandiose Edinburgh monument, and how that monument was itself reproduced not just in engravings but on postcards and cigarette cards.

Mole pursues his enquiry in four areas, only the last of which has been the subject of earlier critical attention. He examines Victorian illustrated editions of Romantic poets, the
Victorian effort to Christianize candidates as unlikely as Byron and Shelley, who feature with surprising frequency in the sermons of Victorian evangelicals, the physical monuments to the Romantic poets erected by the Victorians, and the representation of the Romantic poets in Victorian anthologies. Victorian anthologies have been discussed before, but Mole in a prodigious display of the scholarly energy that characterises the whole volume, has examined 210 of them published between 1822 and 1900. His book opens up a new scholarly field and inevitably leaves much of it uncultivated. He looks at four areas, and others will immediately suggest themselves: references to the Romantics in Royal Academy paintings, in commercial advertisements, and so on. His is a book that achieves much and it will prompt still more.

I have some minor caveats. Mole supposes that the Victorians and the Romantics were separated by a generation gap to which the Victorians responded by incorporating Romantic poets into Victorian technologies, by the production, for example, of a volume of photographs designed to illuminate Wordsworth’s poems. In Mole’s terms the Romantics retained their cultural vitality only by being ‘remediated’. But Shelley and Keats, even Jane Austen, were little known in their lifetimes and only became culturally prominent in the Victorian period, and Blake was scarcely known until Gilchrist’s 1863 biography. Mole supposes that the Romantics were encountered by their contemporaries in the volumes that they published, and this may be true of Scott and Byron, but not of many others. When Byron asked James Kennedy whether he had read Shelley, Kennedy admitted that he had never seen any of his writings but had encountered some ‘extracts’ in the Quarterly Review. One of Jane Austen’s characters remarks that Wordsworth had the ‘true soul’ of poetry, but it would be rash to infer from this that Austen had ever held in her hands a volume of Wordsworth’s poems. Most of the work we now think of as Romantic was not just encountered by the Victorians ‘remediated’ in some other form. It had been encountered like that by the Romantics’ contemporaries.

In his analysis of Victorian anthologies Mole employs a ‘quantitative methodology’ in order to call into question the ‘exemplary’ method more usually employed by literary critics, but in the rest of the book Mole is an extravagant exponent of the exemplary method that he here holds under suspicion. He includes a discussion of the relationship between frontispiece and title page, the two pages often separated by a page of tissue paper, in illustrated editions of Byron and Hemans. In the frontispiece a portrait, often neoclassical, monumentalises the author, whereas the title page features a vignette that evokes the author’s living presence. The two pages work together to satisfy the two contradictory demands that Victorian readers made of the literature of the past. The discussion shows Mole at his most brilliant, and it is based on three volumes, two of them from the same series. When Mole works quantitatively the discussion seems by contrast somewhat staid. The practices of Victorian anthologists turns out to have been almost exactly what one had always supposed. It is something of a relief when Mole reverts to the exemplary method in a sparkling coda that shows the process of remediation ongoing in the twenty-first century. Taxis in the Olympic closing ceremony were papered with fragmentary and scarcely decipherable quotations from ‘Ozymandias’ and ‘She walks in beauty like the night’, and Byron’s lyric also provided the text for the graffiti artist Arofish’s slinky pedestrian stencilled on various London buildings outside the stadium. What the Victorians Made of Romanticism is a major achievement.

Richard Cronin
University of Glasgow

Although there has been a steady increase in scholarship on Mary Butts (1890-1937), especially since the publication of Patrick Wright’s landmark chapter in *On Living in an Old Country* (1985), the Dorsetshire author remains something of a neglected figure, perhaps even ‘the most obscure of major modern writers’, as Andrew Radford suggests in this strikingly rich and erudite survey of her work (53). The reasons may lie, to some extent, in her tendency to defy classification: while undeniably modernist in style and technique – Radford notes, for example, Butts’s ‘lexical tactics of radical juxtaposition and the disruptive arrangement of narrative cadences or pastoral motifs’ (177) – she is equally drawn towards Romanticism, particularly the mystical visuality of William Blake. This connection, evident in the allusive title of Butts’s childhood memoir *The Crystal Cabinet* (1937), is unsurprising, given that she was the great-granddaughter of Blake’s principal patron Thomas Butts. She thus finds herself caught between the experimental verve of modernism and the potent sense of spirituality and place that she discovers in both Blake and Wordsworth – the latter of whom she describes as ‘the highest order of mystic’ in an essay quoted by Radford (16).

As its title makes clear, this study aims to reconcile these two strands of Butts’s writing by reading her as part of the ‘intertwined historical and aesthetic experiences, practices and routines’ that Raymond Mortimer designated as ‘neo-romanticism’ (vii). This approach has the advantage of emphasizing two central (and related) aspects of her work: its mystical identification with a ‘universally vital and animated’ rural landscape, and its powerful visual sense of this environment (5). Radford thus aligns her with neo-romantic artists such as Paul Nash and Kit Wood, arguing that these figures are engaged in a collective project to re appraisal the ‘interrelations between art and the fluctuating destines of “place”’ (viii). This imaginative reengagement with the earthworks and chalk uplands of southern England in the interwar period, Radford suggests, is a central pillar of Butts’s approach, which seeks to express the numinous, entrancing qualities of these sites through the medium of a ‘recondite modernism’ that posits ‘the act of writing as a gateway to pantheistic, ecstatic, monistic or paranormal experience’ (3). As a neo-romantic, Butts attempts to use the literary innovations of her era to generate new forms of engagement with the histories, mythologies, folklore and mystical power of the Dorset landscape.

This situation of Butts within the neo-romantic context occupies a lengthy opening chapter, before Radford goes on to summarize existing scholarship. Singed out for particular praise here is Jane Garrity, whose *Step-Daughters of England* (2003) disentangles the feminist qualities of novels like *Armed with Madness* (1928) from their reactionary elements, such as the ‘eroticized sensuality of Butts’s topographical images’, which reinforce associations of the rural landscape with the passive female body (76). Radford’s lucid lexical precision enables him to survey a significant swathe of criticism with nuance and concision, before proceeding through a series of chapters that analyse Butts’s novels, memoir, journals and short stories. Although it was her final book, *The Crystal Cabinet* is analysed in the first of these chapters, enabling Radford to emphasize the Romantic and proto-environmentalist qualities that are most marked here: as he notes, certain passages align her with ‘a tradition of environmental protest imbuing the civic-nationalist critiques of a polluted urban modernity’ (112). His survey of Butts’s work, here and in subsequent chapters, is also laudable for its focus upon several of the short stories, which have sometimes been neglected.

*Mary Butts and British Neo-Romanticism* offers sympathetic readings of Butts’s fiction, but Radford does not evade the problematic political elements of her work, which go beyond the gender issues discussed by Garrity. As he notes, Wright’s analysis of these questions
remains compelling: she emerges from *On Living in an Old Country*, he suggests, as a ‘Janus-faced, deeply conflicted and embittered dissident who hovers on a cultural fault-line’ (66). The tension between modernism and Romanticism that we find in her work is connected to a contradiction between the ‘interrogative impulse of her maverick heightening style’ and her ‘wistful thematics’, which are drawn towards a reactionary essentialism (217). Butts’s experimental style seems to lend itself to a progressive politics, insofar as it expresses queer, cosmopolitan and marginal qualities, yet the explicit rhetoric of the texts – particularly in works such as *Death of Felicity Taverner* (1932) – is often exclusionary, representing coastal Dorset as a world sealed off from urban interlopers, who are unable to correctly ‘read’ the landscape. Ultimately, Radford argues, this ‘patrician nativism’ should caution us against readings of neo-romanticism that seek to connect it harmoniously with the industrial and socio-cultural developments of modernity (218). His study thus successfully incorporates an emphasis upon the neo-romantic elements of Butts’s work with a balanced and insightful assessment of its political implications.

*Sam Wiseman*

*University of Erfurt*