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Literature 1780-1830: The Romantic Period
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This chapter has four sections: 1. General and Prose; 2. The Novel; 3. Poetry; 4. Drama. Section 1 is by Maxine Branagh-Miscampbell; section 2 by Barbara Leonardi; section 3 by Matthew Ward and Paul Whickman; section 4 is by Omar F. Miranda.

1. General and Prose

Works focusing on political and philosophical writings of the Romantic period published in 2015 include both author-specific studies and broader studies of Romantic-era philosophy and its permeation in literary works. These works will be dealt with in the first part of this section. It will then move on to discuss recent work in the field of women’s writing, focusing on three longer works, and articles on Frances Burney, Mary Wollstonecraft, Felicia Hemans, Mary Tighe, and articles focusing on specific male writers. Finally, this section will deal with works in the field of material and print culture, which account for many of the general and prose works published in 2015.

Kevin Gilmartin’s book-length study of William Hazlitt, *William Hazlitt: Political Essayist* (OUP), joins Stephen Burley’s 2014 work, *Hazlitt the Dissenter: Religion, Philosophy, and Politics, 1766-1816* (PalMac) in the field, proving that, as Gilmartin argues in his introduction, ‘William Hazlitt has enjoyed a striking revival of interest among literary critics in recent decades’ (p. 1). Gilmartin’s book seeks to offer a better understanding of Hazlitt’s politics in order to ‘deepen our appreciation of the social and collective terms of his literary achievement, and of the wider relations between early nineteenth-century literary and aesthetic criticism and the British radical tradition’ (p. 35). The book is wide-ranging in its analysis of Hazlitt’s political writings. Gilmartin’s combination of careful close reading of Hazlitt’s ‘distinctive political voice’ (p. 25), focusing on style and form, while also situating
him in relation to the wider press culture in the period, offers a fascinating and important insight into Hazlitt’s contribution as a political writer within Romantic print culture.

Ulf Schulenberg’s *Romanticism and Pragmatism: Richard Rorty and the idea of a poeticized culture* (PalMac) asks ‘[w]hat role has Romanticism played for the development of pragmatism, and especially for the renaissance of pragmatism?’ (p. 4). Schulenberg seeks to answer this question through a study of the poet, Richard Rorty. However, the book’s focus on the significance of pragmatism in the Romantic period in general is probably most valuable for readers of this section. The analysis of Rorty’s writing in the first half of this work paves the way for a discussion of the relationship between pragmatism and Romanticism in the second half. The chapters in this second half focus on ‘how Romantic writers prepared for the establishment of a poeticized culture’ (p. 11) through a discussion of Thoreau, Emerson and Whitman in chapters four and five, and William James and John Dewey in chapters six and seven. This wide-ranging work offers a new perspective on the cross-over between pragmatism, humanism, anti-authoritarianism, and postmetaphysics.

Angela Esterhammer, Diane Piccitto and Patrick Vincent’s *Romanticism, Rousseau, Switzerland: New Prospects* (PalMac) is a collection of essays which seeks to position Rousseau in a Swiss context and offer new readings of his key philosophies in light of the recognition of the influence of Swiss philosophy, science and the Swiss landscape on Rousseau’s writings and the Romantic authors inspired by him. The work ‘engages with numerous approaches in contemporary scholarship to undertake a re-evaluation of the significance of Rousseau and Switzerland for Romantic studies’ (p. 16). The first essays in the collection focus on re-reading some of Rousseau’s major theories and their representation in Romantic-period works. These include his views on education in Enit K. Steiner’s chapter ‘Romantic Education, Concealment, and Orchestrated Desire in Rousseau’s *Emile* and Frances Brooke’s *Julia Mandeville*’ (pp. 21-37), and ‘the formation of the Romantic...
conception of suicide’ (p. 38) in Michelle Faubert’s ‘Romantic Suicide, Contagion, and Rousseau’s Julie’ (pp. 38-53). The next two essays offer different views of Rousseau’s interest in ‘organic and inorganic or mechanical life’ (p. 13), with Rachel Corkle’s essay ‘Seeing Jean-Jacques’ Nature: Rousseau’s Call for a Botanist Reader’ (pp. 54-67) arguing that Rousseau’s Lettres sur la botanique and Dialogues offer ‘a vision of the good botanist and of the good reader’ (p. 63) while Wendy C. Nielsen’s Rousseau’s Pygmalion and Automata in the Romantic Period’ (pp. 68-84) focuses on Rousseau’s fascination with ‘the artificial nature of society’ (p. 69). The essays in the second half of the book focus more on the influence of the Swiss landscape on Rousseau and Romanticism more generally, with topics including literary tourism (Nicola J. Watson’s ‘Rousseau on the Tourist Trail’ (pp. 84-100)) and alpine tourism more broadly (Simon Bainbridge’s ‘A ‘Melancholy Occurrence’ in the Alps: Switzerland, Mont Blanc, and an Early Critique of Mountaineering’ (pp. 150-67). Other essays in the collection also focus on the influence of Switzerland and the Swiss landscape on a variety of Romantic-period writers, both in Britain and in Europe, including ‘James Boswell and Rousseau in Môtiers: Re-inscribing Childhood and Its (Auto)biographical Prospects’ (pp. 101-16) by Gordon Turnbull, Pamela Buck’s ‘Prints, panoramas, and Picturesque Travel in Dorothy Wordsworth’s Journal of Tour on the Continent’ (pp. 117-31), and ‘Visionary Republics: Virtual Representations of Switzerland and Wordsworth’s Lake District’ (pp. 132-49) by Patrick Vincent. These essays offer a diverse range of new perspectives on Rousseau’s work and its impact on Romantic-period writing and thought, as well as the impact of the landscape of Switzerland both on his work and the work of a variety of Romantic-period writers.

the Romantic period by tracing connections between a variety of different writing forms by poets John Dyer and James Thomson, the letters and fiction of Laurence Sterne, Thomas Reid’s *An Inquiry into the Human Mind on the Principles of Common Sense* (1764), and in the works of Hogarth and Lord Kames. In ‘Hegel and the Prehistory of the Postracial’ (*ERR* 26 [2015] 289-99), Rei Terada examines Hegel’s theory of race in light of what the author terms the ‘post-racial’, which he defines, in two ways, as ‘the rhetorical erasure of an actually existing racialized violence’ and in a ‘*logical sense*, in that ‘non-raciality’ must carry assumptions about what ‘race’ is, and assume the responsibility for deciding what it looks like, in order to testify to its absence’ (p. 290; emphasis in the original). Finally, in “‘Wandering beneath the Unthinkable’: Organization and Probability in Romanticism and the Nineteenth Century” (*ERR* 26 [2015] 301-14), Arkady Plotnitsky argues that Romanticism, and the nineteenth century, ‘were characterized by their persistent attempts to find an effective *concept* of organization’ (p. 301; emphasis in the original). Plotnitsky approaches this through an examination of ontological thinking in the works of Hölderlin and argues that ‘the Romantics… introduced a new type of ontology’ (p. 304).

Three studies of women writers, pertinent to ‘General and Prose’, were published in 2015. Two of these are also covered in section 2 of this chapter. The first is Melissa Sodeman’s *Sentimental Memorials: Women and the Novel in Literary History* (StanfordUP). Sodeman aims to ‘put the history of the novel and women’s literary history in conversation with book history to better read the situation of later eighteenth-century women novelists’ (p. 3). Though focusing specifically on novelists Sophia Lee, Ann Radcliffe, Charlotte Smith, and Mary Robinson, Sodeman’s work takes a literary historical approach and is therefore also of use to the reader interested in the history of women’s writing, specifically the conditions under which women were writing and how they reflected upon these within their literary outputs. Each of the four chapters is devoted to one of the women writers named above and
‘aim[s] to show how these novels meaningfully respond to changes in the cultural status of literature, authorship, and sentimentality at the end of the eighteenth century, changes that stranded sentimental genres and left their mostly female practitioners on the margins of literary history (pp. 8-9). Of particular interest is Sodeman’s argument that these women novelists were responding to developments in literary history in sentimental novels themselves, ‘memorializing, quite self-consciously, the conditions of their writing’ (p. 13). Chapter One, which focuses on Sophia Lee, argues that her novel *The Recess; or, A Tale of Other Times* (1783-5) draws on the work of sentimental historiography by William Robertson and David Hume, who Sodeman terms ‘sentimental historians’ (p. 21), and lost antiquarian texts, specifically Macpherson’s Ossianic fragments. In so doing, Sodeman argues that Lee reveals how the ‘shared methods’ of these two approaches ‘come to characterize the uses of the past in late eighteenth-century print culture’ (p. 22). Chapter Two deals with Ann Radcliffe’s self-conscious reflections on reading practices of the late eighteenth century in her novels, especially *The Romance of the Forest* (1791). Sodeman argues that these reflections reveal Radcliffe’s anxiety about the ephemeral nature of her own literary output (p. 56), reflecting ‘the situation of women novelists at this time’ (p. 77). In Chapter Three, Sodeman goes on to deal with Charlotte Smith’s ‘sense of literary exile, her precarious relation to the literary marketplace and estrangement from Britain’s literary and intellectual circles’ (p. 81). She argues that this literary exile and Smith’s interest in it, is ‘inseparable from form’ (p. 81). In the final chapter, focusing on Mary Robinson, Sodeman argues that Robinson ‘seeks to guarantee the endurance of her literary fame’ with her novels serving as ‘literary memorials’ (p. 114). The combination of these four studies achieves what Sodeman sets out to do: to illustrate the extent to which the sentimental fictions of four women writers are self-reflective of, and act as memorials to, the challenges and insecurities of female authorship at the end of the eighteenth century.
The second work on women writers, also covered in section 2, is Charlotte Gordon’s *Romantic Outlaws: The Extraordinary Lives of Mary Wollstonecraft & Mary Shelley* (Hutchinson). This biographical work is the first to position these two women writers together in the same edition, as mother and daughter. In so doing, Gordon seeks to shed new light on both Wollstonecraft and Shelley by exploring the intersections between their lives.

An extensive work, the forty chapters alternate between focusing on Mary Wollstonecraft and Mary Shelley, with the final chapter drawing the two together. This section will focus primarily on Mary Wollstonecraft, while the section below deals with Mary Shelley. Despite being clearly written for the general reader; *Romantic Outlaws* does draw upon critical works, the writers’ own works, and published collections of letters. However, the lack of careful foot- or endnotes, or a full bibliography, are frustrating for the academic reader. The originality of this work lies in its structure. The alternating narratives make the parallels between these two writers’ lives, and the influence of Wollstonecraft’s legacy on Shelley, thought-provoking. The chapters focusing specifically on Wollstonecraft tend to center more on a dramatic retelling of her life rather than the works she produced. For example, in chapter eight, which deals with *On the Education of Daughters* (1786), there is little attention paid to the content and reception of the work itself with Gordon instead emphasizing Wollstonecraft’s feelings. This is however, less of a problem in the short chapter (twelve) devoted to *Vindication of the Rights of Men* (1790), and chapter fourteen, on *Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792) which give more attention to the reception of these two works.

Although nothing in Gordon’s work will come as much of a surprise to Wollstonecraft scholars, it is nonetheless an entertaining read, and one which cleverly draws together two extensive biographies and intertwines these in an interesting way.

The final work dealing with women’s writing included here is *The Cambridge Companion to Women’s Writing in the Romantic Period* (CUP), edited by Devoney Looser.
(some chapters reviewed in sections 2 and 4 of this chapter). This work includes a number of chapters of particular interest to readers interested in ‘General and Prose’, specifically Anne K. Mellor’s chapter on ‘Essays and political writing’ (pp. 44-57), which focuses on Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Hays, Hannah More, and Anna Letitia Barbauld ‘and the enduring contributions each made to political and cultural debates’ (p. 44). Also of interest is Elizabeth A. Fay’s chapter on ‘Travel writing’ (pp. 73-87), which gives a broad overview of the variety of travel writing written by women and argues that ‘[t]ravel writing provided the middle-class reader with an affordable, if imaginative rather than substantial, substitute for the elite experience of the Grand Tour’ (p. 73). Crystal B. Lake’s chapter on ‘History writing and antiquarianism’ focuses on the ‘diversity of women writer’s contributions to Romantic history’ (pp. 99-100) in the historical writing of Catherine Macaulay, first of all, but also in the novels, poetry and periodical writings by women in the period. As well as these chapters concentrating on specific modes of writing, this edition also includes chapters focusing on wider issues in Romantic-period women’s writing, including the global literary marketplace (Deirdre Coleman’s ‘The global context’ (pp. 129-43)), familial and literary networks (Julia A. Carlson’s ‘Social, familial, and literary networks’ (pp. 144-57)), the financial challenges these writers faced (Jacqueline M Labbe’s ‘The economics of female authorship’ (pp. 158-68)), the role of age and aging in the careers of women writers (Devoney Looser’s ‘Age and aging’ (pp. 169-82)), national identity (Fiona Price’s ‘National identities and regional affiliations’ (pp. 183-97)) and sexuality (Jillian Heydt-Stevenson’s ‘Sexualities’ (pp. 198-212)). This collection of essays sheds light on both well-known and lesser-known women’s writers in to order to create ‘more nuanced literary histories in the generations to come’ (p. xviii).

A number of articles were also published on women writers of the Romantic period in 2015. Harriet Kramer Linkin’s ‘Mary Tighe’s Newly Discovered Letters and Journals to
Caroline Hamilton’ (*Romanticism* 21[2015] 207-227) looks at a collection of 41 letters sent from Mary Blachford Tighe to her cousin and sister-in-law Caroline Tighe Hamilton between 1793 and 1808, which Linkin found in the Hamilton family papers at the National Library of Ireland. These letters ‘provide intimately detailed and seemingly unreserved accounts of Tighe’s feelings and activities’ (p. 207), including journal entries. Linkin argues that these letters reveal a great deal about Tighe’s biography and ‘offer rare glimpses of her composition practices and psychological development as a poet and novelist’ and more broadly they uncover new insights into ‘the permutations and power of female or ‘romantic’ friendships’ (p. 223). Cassandra Ulph’s ‘Frances Burney’s Private Professionalism’ (*JECS* 38[2015] 377-93) focuses on the role that the intellectual and artistic network of Burney’s father’s household played in the formation of her identity as a female author, which Ulph argues is a construct of ‘a hybrid blend of domestic privacy with public professionalism’ (p. 377). Through an examination of her correspondence and novels, Ulph argues that Burney creates a space which is ‘compatible with both her own fiercely guarded privacy and her sense of professional and creative integrity’ and in so doing, ‘maintains separate, and appropriately feminine, professional and social personas’ (p. 392). Elizabeth Edwards’s ‘“Lonely and Voiceless your Halls Must Remain”: Romantic-Era National Song and Felicia Hemans’s *Welsh Melodies* (1822)” (*JECS* 38[2015] 83-97) offers a close reading of Felicia Hemans’s song collection, *A Selection of Welsh Melodies* (1822), focusing on the paratextual elements of the collection, particularly the use of quotations in the songs’ footnotes. By making her sources explicit, Edwards argues that Hemans is ‘carefully resetting her sources in the new context of the national melody movement’ and ‘how both distant and recent myths and histories can be transformed via the cultural work of song’ (p. 94). Finally, Laura Kirkley’s ‘*Maria, ou Le Malheur d’être femme*: Translating Mary Wollstonecraft in Revolutionary France’ (*JECS* 38[2015] 239-55) focuses on Basile-Joseph Ducos’s translation
of *Maria, or the Wrongs of Woman* (1798) as a case study in order to examine the translator’s role in the reception of Wollstonecraft on the continent. Kirkley argues that ‘although the strategy of the translator… evinces sympathy for many aspects of Wollstonecraft’s Revolutionary feminism, his subtle but significant changes to the source text also elide some of its most controversial and pioneering elements’ (p. 239). Through a careful analysis of differences between the source text and the translation, Kirkley argues that by ‘drawing on a established lexicon of sentiment, [Ducos] undermines Wollstonecraft’s attempts to rework the familiar seduction plot into a narrative of feminist resistance’ which leads to French readers encountering ‘a diluted version of Wollstonecraft’s feminism’ (p. 252).

Three other articles deal with the works of specific male writers. Like Sodeman’s monograph discussed above, Alys Mostyn’s article in *Romanticism*, ‘Leigh Hunt’s ‘World of Books’: Bibliomania and the Fancy’ (*Romanticism* 21[2015] 238-49]) also addresses questions of authorial professionalisation. In this, Mostyn argues, through an examination of the aesthetic category of ‘the Fancy’, that ‘aspects of [Hunt’s] work suggest that he too [alongside Byron] was troubled by the possibility of being little more than a fanciful pretender to the title of author’ (pp. 238-239) and in so doing, aims ‘to chart previously underexamined connections between the discourse of the Fancy and issues of professionalisation in the period’ (p. 239). Katey Castellano’s ‘Cobbet’s Commons: Monastic Economies in a History of the Protestant “Reformation”’ (*ERR* 26[2015] 575-90) offers a reading of William Cobbett’s *History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland* (1829) which argues that it ‘has little to do with championing the Catholic religion’ (p. 575) and instead that the work is ‘countering the naturalization of private property through Malthusian discourse about the poor’ (p. 586). She argues that Cobbett contrasts ‘the medieval Catholic world to that of Protestant liberalism’ (p. 576) by representing Catholic monasteries as places which ‘[check] over-consumption and facil[ite] the distribution of
Finally, Ewan James Jones’s ‘John “Walking” Stewart and the Ethics of Motion’ (*Romanticism* 21[2015] 119-31) argues for a fuller consideration of John Stewart’s work. In so doing, Jones makes two wider claims: ‘that the span of “Walking” Stewart’s career, and the temper of his interests, permit us to unsettle the standard account of the transition from the Enlightenment to the Romantic period; and secondly, that one of the principle ways in which Stewart effects this unsettling – through his idiosyncratic application of a philosophy of “matter and motion” – both anticipates and challenges recent criticism in so-called “vibrant” or “radical” materialism’ (pp. 119-20).

A theme which pervades a number of the studies published in 2015 is that of material culture and its role in facilitating Romantic-period British culture’s understanding of its recent past. Emma Peacocke’s *Romanticism and the Museum* (PalMac) makes use of four case studies in order to argue that Romantic authors saw the museum space ‘as integral to a society in the throes of reform and reaction’ (p. 4). Each of the first three case studies focuses on representations of public museums in literary texts: Wordsworth’s *The Prelude* (1850), Walter Scott’s *Waverley* (1814) and Maria Edgeworth’s *Harrington* (1817). The final chapter focuses on the debate which occurred in the periodical press surrounding the British Museum’s purchase of the Elgin Marbles in 1816. Chapter one, focusing on *The Prelude*, states that ‘explicit engagement with a museum is at the heart of Wordsworth’s poetic opus’ (p. 17), which centres on ‘the displacement of *The Penitent Magdalene* from the Carmelite convent to the walls of the Louvre’ (p. 18). By focusing on this, Peacocke argues, ‘Wordsworth turned to the museum as a space that could comfortably accommodate opposing views of history in the making’ (pp. 55-6). Chapter two argues for the important symbolic role of portraits in Walter Scott’s *Waverley*, stating that ‘[t]hey are a part of the apparatus of the novel for investigating the past’ (p. 58), and that ‘[i]deas of the public gallery are essential to *Waverley*’s historiography, its contrast of the past and present’ (p. 58). Peacocke’s
examination of Edgeworth’s *Harrington* in chapter three argues that ‘galleries and museums provide a tool to dissect the national imaginary’ (p. 87) and that ‘[b]oth author and novel rejoice in images ensconced in one of the great British public museums, inspiring their viewers to re-imagine the national heritage’ (p. 111). The final chapter moves away from fictional accounts and portrayals of museum spaces in order to examine debates surrounding ‘propriotorship’ (p. 112) and ‘display strategy’ (p. 113) in Byron’s *The Curse of Minerva* published in the *New Monthly Magazine* in 1815 and Horatio Smith’s ‘The Statue of Theseus, and the Sculpture Room of Phidias’ printed in the *London Magazine* in 1821. These four chapters serve to illustrate the myriad ways in which Romantic authors conceptualized the museum space and how they ‘saw their nation’s and world’s past, present, and future in the emergent public museum’ (p. 15). Also focusing on antiquarianism and museums is Robert W. Rix’s “‘In darkness they grope’: Ancient Remains and Romanticism in Denmark” (*ERR* 26[2015] 435-51). Rix’s article explores the establishment and early development of the Nordic Museum of Antiquities, later the National Museum. This is achieved through an examination of ‘the desire for collecting ancient objects and for imaginatively transcending these same objects’ (p. 436) in Adam Oehlenschläger’s early poetry and the theological work of N.F.S. Grundtvig.

Neil Ramsey and Gillian Russell’s edited collection *Tracing War in British Enlightenment and Romantic Culture* (PalMac), meanwhile, brings together essays focusing on ‘the pervasive effects of war in Enlightenment and Romantic-period culture’ (p. 1) and takes an interdisciplinary approach in order to fulfil ‘the need for a critical war studies that problematises assumptions about the ontology of war by focusing on its multiple, divergent, and productive traces’ (p. 8). The collection covers the period from 1750 to 1850 and so this review will focus on those essays which fall more clearly in the Romantic period, and more specifically those that center on works which fall in the ‘General and Prose’ category. Three
of the chapters focus on Romantic-period art in relation to the representation of war. R.S. White’s chapter ‘Victims of War: Battlefield Casualties and Literary Sensibility’ (pp. 61-76) looks at engravings produced by the London print-seller Edward Orme depicting scenes from the Battle of Waterloo. He argues that ‘[t]he images belong not only with the art generated by war but also with the politics of sensibility’ (p. 62). In chapter eight on ‘Turner’s Desert Storm’ (pp. 151-70), Philip Shaw examines Turner’s The Army of the Medes (1801), a lost painting which, he argues, ‘responds to the culmination of the British campaign against the French in Egypt at the turn of the nineteenth century’, despite focusing on ‘the destruction of a military force in ancient Persia’ (p. 151). Finally, Thomas H. Ford focuses on the atmosphere of war in the paintings of David Wilkie and Turner, and the writing of Carl von Clausewitz, in ‘Narrative and Atmosphere: War by Other Media in Wilkie, Clausewitz and Turner’ (pp. 171-87).

Other essays in the collection focus on the representation of war in the public space of Romantic-period Britain. In chapter five, ‘Romantic Militarisation: Sociability, Theatricality and Military Science in the Woolwich Rotunda, 1814-2013’ (pp. 96-112), Gillian Russell argues that ‘[t]he Romantic period is a formative phase in the development of a modern militarised society based on the construction of credible fictions of knowledge about war’ (p. 97). Russell ‘trace[s] the phenomenon of Romantic militarisation, particularly the capacity of war to hide itself in plain sight’ in relation to the Woolwich Rotunda (p. 98). Neil Ramsay’s essay on ‘Exhibiting Discipline: Military Science and the Naval and Military Library and Museum’ (pp. 113-31) also argues that war became part of the public space in the Romantic period with the museum ‘creating an almost religious historical aura around the nation’s recent past’ (p. 114). In chapter seven, ‘Battling Bonaparte after Waterloo: Re-enactment, Representation and “The Napoleon Bust Business”’ (pp.132-50), Simon Bainbridge argues that ‘the war with Bonaparte remained a profound presence in British society, fought not only
through public re-stagings, representations, and re-enactments of Waterloo but also through the placement of cultural objects within the British domestic space’ (p. 133). The final essay in the collection, Nick Mansfield’s ‘Destroyer and Bearer of Worlds: The Aesthetic Doubleness of War’ (pp. 188-203) takes a slightly different approach and traces ‘the connection between Romantic aesthetics through Romantic era thinking about war to modern constructions of war in aesthetic terms’ (p. 188) though an examination of aesthetic discourse in Kant’s *Critique of Judgement* and Clausewitz’s *On War*. The essays in this edition work together to make a persuasive case for the pervasive impact of war on Romantic-period British culture.

Taking a material approach to Romantic-period print culture, Ina Ferris’ *Book-Men, Book Clubs, and the Romantic Literary Sphere* (PalMac) takes a fresh look at the liminal figure of the ‘bookman’, a book collector or bibliophile, and his relationships to book clubs. Ferris defines these as ‘in a literal sense book clubs in that they were organized around the book-object: formed to produce, sponsor, or obtain and circulate books’ rather than ‘reading societies’ or ‘reading communities’, and the wider literary sphere (p. 3). Ferris’ study is divided into two parts. The first looks at the ‘friction between book culture and the literary sphere by focusing on the debate over the bookman’s insertion of himself into the matrix of production’ (p. 6), using case studies of urban book clubs: the Roxburghe Club and the Bannatyne Club. Part two focuses on rural book clubs in order to argue that these ‘played a major role in the decentralization of literary culture and the fostering of regional consciousness’ (p. 12). Ferris distinguishes her study from the field of the history of reading by focusing on the exchange and collection of books as physical objects. Her study of the bookman and book clubs makes a key distinction between book culture and literary culture, and offers an important new insight into our understanding of Romantic-period print culture.
The special issue of *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* on ‘Networks of Improvement’ included a number of articles of interest. Timothy Whelan’s ‘Mary Steele, Mary Hays and the Convergence of Women’s Literary Circles in the 1790s’ (*JECS* 38[2015] 511-24) deals with the merging of two dissenting literary circles in the 1790s; that of Mary Steele of Broughton and Elizabeth Coltman of Leicester, and a London-based group revolving around William Godwin, Mary Hays and Crabb Robinson. Whelan argues that the coming together of these two groups, as revealed in life-writings and poetry, rather than through formal meetings, ‘produced a diverse, cross-pollinated coterie of men and women’ (p. 516). Jon Mee and Jennifer Wilkes’s article, ‘Transpennine Enlightenment: The Literary and Philosophical Societies and Knowledge Networks in the North, 1781-1830’ (*JECS* 38[2015] 599-612), investigates literary and philosophical societies in Manchester and Newcastle and argues that these form part of a wider ‘transpennine Enlightenment’ which should not ‘be understood only in terms of… “the science and technology interface”’ (p. 599), and that these societies ‘played a distinctive role in the Industrial Enlightenment’ (p. 600). Turning to rural Scotland, Mark Towsey’s article, ‘“Store their Minds with Much Valuable Knowledge”: Agricultural Improvement at the Selkirk Subscription Library, 1799-1814’ (*JECS* 38[2015] 569-84], examines ‘the circulation of ‘useful’ books’ in Selkirk in the Scottish Borders (p. 570). Through an examination of the Selkirk subscription library’s records, Towsey argues that ‘the library played a central role in the dissemination of new agricultural techniques in the town’s immediate hinterland’ (p. 570), and therefore in wider agricultural improvement, through ‘the sociable life of reading and writing’ (p. 582). Finally, Alexander Dick’s ‘“A good deal of Trash”: Reading Societies, Religious Controversy and Networks of Improvement in Eighteenth-Century Scotland’ (*JECS* 38[2015] 585-98), argues for an approach to studying rural reading practices in the eighteenth century, which takes into account both ‘covenantal reading’ (p. 588) and ‘emulative reading’ (p. 590) associated with
the Enlightenment, stating that ‘[i]mprovement did not kill controversy… both the improvement agenda and the controversial tradition operated within a broad network of practices employed by readers’ (p. 587).

Continuing on from works published in 2014, there has been a good deal of focus on women’s writing in the Romantic period and a continuation of the desire to include lesser-known women writers in the Romantic-period canon. There has also been a greater focus on material and print culture in the works published in 2015, which provides interesting new perspectives on Romantic-period culture with interpretations which move beyond the texts themselves.

2. The Novel

Literary criticism on the Romantic novel has been extremely prolific in 2015, with some single- and multi-author monographs of outstanding critical value. This section will begin by reviewing the monographs concerned with multiple Romantic novelists, it will then review the single-author monographs and edited volumes on Jane Austen, and will finally survey the articles and book chapters concerned with single authors, starting with the great bulk on Jane Austen, and then passing to Walter Scott, Ann Radcliffe, Frances Burney, Mary Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft, William Godwin, Charlotte Smith, Sydney Owenson, and Elizabeth Hamilton in this order. Generally, there is a tendency to focus on the legacy of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century novels on the twenty-first century, particularly regarding their written and screen adaptations. Also important is the discussion of gender issues stimulated by those debates exploring differences and similarity between the equality of female and male rights in the past and present time.

In An Empire of Air and Water: Uncolonizable Space in the British Imagination, 1750-1850 (UPennP), Siobhan Carroll explores the significance of places such as the poles,
the ocean, the atmosphere, and the subterranean in literary texts during the eighteenth and the
nineteenth centuries. As areas resistant to ‘cultivation and settlement’ (p. 6), and thus to
conversion into colonies because of their impracticable inhabitancy, such spaces came to
assume different meanings when used as literary chronotopes. These range from representing
sites of resistance to imperial dominion, as in the case of the poles, to spaces exhibiting the
technical maritime skills of the British Empire, as in the case of transoceanic navigation.
Carroll names these areas ‘atopias’ because ‘their intangibility, inhospitality, or
inaccessibility’ does not allow them to ‘be converted into the locations of affective habitation
known as “place”’ (p. 6). Carroll contends that these atypical spaces contribute to
constructing dialectically ‘the inhabited places of home and community, providing a contrast
to the familiarity, stability, and security implied by the idealized sites of dwelling’ (p. 6).
Carroll’s book explores the formation of British identity not only in opposition to ‘a
continental colonial Other’ but also ‘in relation to supposedly empty spaces’ (p. 11). In
addition, Carroll argues that if Romantic authors such as Wordsworth, Goldsmith, and Clare
turned to the local and rural landscape as a way to distance themselves from ‘the globalized
cityscapes of London and Manchester’ (p. 13), the contemporary fascination for distant and
abstract spaces served the same purpose. Carroll concludes by arguing that ‘atopias offered
authors opportunities to reflect on the role played by literature in British imperial expansion’
(p. 187). Her fascinating book contributes to diverting the reader’s habitual practice of
visualising the British Empire from a power measured in terms of cultivated and tamed land
to a power frustrated by inhospitable atopias that resist imperial conquest.

Drawing on eighteenth-century theory of music, the opera, and the ways in which
some musical instruments galvanized the collective imagination, Pierre Dubois’s Music in the
Georgian Novel (CUP) sheds new light on the significance of this art on the creative process
of the most important novelists of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Dubois’s
book ‘investigate[s] the various representations of, and allusions to, music in the novels of the Georgian period’ (p. 1), with the aim to clarify its significance in the novelistic creative process. Of interest to this section are the third and fourth parts of his book as these develop a noteworthy analysis of the influence of music on Ann Radcliffe’s re-elaboration of the sublime, and on the writing of female authors such as Jane Austen, Anne Hughes, Jane West, Maria Edgeworth, Elizabeth Inchbald, Sydney Owenson, and Frances Burney. In their novels, Dubois argues that music plays an important role in defining ‘female identity’ (p. 8). Dubois’s aim is to shed new light both on canonical and less known novels ‘that could equally testify to the reality of the broadly shared conceptions of music in the period under study’ (p. 7).

Another book of noteworthy interest to the development of the Romantic novel is the second volume of The Oxford History of the Novel in English series, entitled *English and British Fiction 1750-1820*, edited by Peter Garside and Karen O’Brien, particularly chapters 10 to 17 and chapter 21. These are ‘Early Gothic Novels and the Belief in Fiction’ (pp. 182-98) by Deidre Lynch, ‘The Novel Wars of 1790-1804’ (pp. 199-215) by Jon Mee, ‘The National Tale’ (pp. 216-33) by Claire Connolly, ‘Gothic and Anti-Gothic, 1797-1820’ (pp. 234-54) by Robert Miles, ‘Evangelical Fiction’ (pp. 255-72) by Anthony Mandal, ‘Jane Austen’s Domestic Realism’ (pp. 273-95) by Vivien Jones, ‘Historical Romance’ (pp. 296-311) by Ina Ferris, and ‘Walter Scott and the Historical Novel’ (pp. 312-31) by Ian Duncan. Of interest are also the last two sections of Clara Tuite’s chapter 21 ‘Celebrity and Scandalous Fiction’ (pp. 385-403), as they focus on the 1790s Jacobin, sentimental and Gothic scandalous novels, and on the Regency period’s Silver-Fork scandal and celebrity novels. The two editors in the introduction to the volume contend that despite ‘the large number of novels concerned with the themes of love, courtship, and marriage, this is not an inward or a nationally self-reflexive era for the novel, but one profoundly shaped by the
economic and political transformations of the time, encompassing decades of continental and imperial warfare’ (p. xviii). The aim of the volume is thus to ‘offer a collective account of the novel within this process of transformation’ (p. xviii). For the contexts related to the Romantic novel also part IV is of interest with three chapters shedding light on the historical events that influenced the novelistic writing process. These are Ruth Perry’s ‘All in the Family: Consanguinity, Marriage, and Property’ (pp. 407-23), Thomas Keymer’s ‘Fictions of the Union’ (pp. 424-41), and Deirdre Coleman’s ‘Imperial Commerce, Gender, Slavery’ (pp. 442-58).

Also discussed in section 1 of this chapter, Melissa Sodeman’s *Sentimental Memorials: Women and the Novel in Literary History* (StanfordUP) explores the position of late eighteenth-century women novelists in the literary canon by juxtaposing the history of the novel, women’s literary history and book history, in order to challenge the general assumption that sentimental novels of this period are not suitable for inclusion in the ‘august realms of literature’ (p. 3). Sodeman contends that ‘novels by Sophia Lee, Ann Radcliffe, Charlotte Smith, and Mary Robinson memorialize the literary-historical conditions of their writing’ (p. 3). This was a moment when sentimental novels were at the highest peak of their popularity, as well as very little respected as literary genre. Nevertheless, these female novelists ‘successfully navigated the professional marketplace’, though they also ‘struggled to position their works among more lasting literary monuments’ (p. 3). Sodeman’s book contributes to a re-evaluation of the late eighteenth-century sentimental novel written by women, and to the inclusion of this usually denigrated genre into the literary canon.

The second edition of Janet Todd’s *The Cambridge Introduction to Jane Austen* (CUP) is a lightly revised version of the first edition published in 2006, with the addition of a new chapter, ‘Austenmania: Jane Austen’s Global Life’ (pp. 142-51), which contends that ‘[l]ike Shakespeare’s, Jane Austen’s characters are archetypes in the collective imagination’
Yet, Todd explains, Austen’s legacy has travelled beyond Shakespeare’s, as her works have been rewritten as ‘zombies, sea-monsters, and werewolves’ (p. 142), with *Pride and Prejudice* as the most prolifically exploited both as written and screen adaptation, where its ‘filmic versions ... speak to previous adaptations as much as to the original novel’ (p. 145).

Sheryl Craig’s *Jane Austen and the State of the Nation* (PalMac) opens up by arguing that the image of Austen on the forthcoming £10 note depicts the author in a ‘calm’, ‘prosperous’ and ‘safe haven unaltered by time, war, and economic upheaval, exactly the way the Bank’s Board of Directors would like the public to think of their financial institution – solid as the Bank of England’ (pp. 1-2). However, Craig observes, Austen did not live in a financially comfortable situation and depended for the most part of her life on the generosity of her family’s male members. Indeed, ‘Georgian England and Jane Austen’s life were much more economically and politically unstable than the reverse of the Bank of England’s new £10 note indicates’ (p. 2). Craig contends that the regency period witnessed a series of awful economic disasters, hence ‘how writers referred to the economy, how they depicted the rich and the poor, and the solutions they offered for their characters’ economic problems were unavoidably politically charged’ (p. 7). Craig observes that each of Austen’s novels refers to the financial situation of England at the time when it was composed. Through close analysis of the economic context of each novel, Craig thus contends that considering Austen’s novels as a mere form of love story escapism means missing ‘the political message that would have been obvious to Austen’s original readers’ (p. 18). Her books focus not so much on ‘considerations of the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars, or the British Empire’ as on ‘English politics in the House of Commons and national economic policies in England’ (p. 19). Craig argues that Austen’s ‘concerns about the poor and the economic decline of her nation’ are still ‘relevant today as they were when they were written 200 years ago’ (p. 19).
James Thompson’s *Jane Austen and Modernization: Sociological Readings* (PalMac) draws on sociological studies such as Tönnies, Durkheim, Weber, Simmel, Parson, Goffman and Bourdieu to apply ‘a series of ideas from the first 60 or 70 years of professional sociological argument’ (p. 2) to his reading of Austen’s novels, engaging with both a deterministic, top-down ‘explanation of institutions and practices’ (p. 2) and a ‘bottom-up view that focuses on the ways in which the individual subject negotiates his or her way among groups and institutions’ (p. 2). Thompson contends that an interest in Austen’s novels was re-awakened at the same time as these sociological theories were elaborated, namely after the publication of her biography in 1870 by her nephew James-Edward Austen-Leigh, and after World War I when a ‘nostalgia for vanishing village life’ (p. 4) boosted the reading of her novels again. Thompson claims that Austen’s novels were revalued across this period because they provided a remedy for *anomie*, namely a model for ‘shared rituals that would bind separate individuals into a coherent whole’ (p. 5). According to Thompson, Austen’s character construction has always been analysed ‘in term of psychological depth’ (p. 7) but it is rather through the complexity of the relations established in the social milieu that Austen’s novel achieve ‘vividness and solidity’ (p. 7). Thompson contends that ‘Austen represents society as a web of obligations, with all its entanglements in legal, political, and religious discourse’ (p. 72).

Margaret Doody’s *Jane Austen’s Names: Riddles, Persons, Places* (UChicP) is divided into three sections entitled ‘England’, ‘Names’, and ‘Places’, offering a fascinating analysis of Austen’s subtle use of names in her works. Doody explains that Austen’s names are never casual but arbitrary, as they convey an additional layer of meaning related to character construction and to the historical significance of places. Doody contends that the ‘cultural forces that shape an English person include not only the social and financial status of the birth family, but also the place of birth’ (p. 11). Finally, places in Austen’s novels, ‘are
not permanent’, as ‘marriage, war, or financial fluctuations bring on change of location’. Such changes may indeed be either ‘a stress or a tonic’ to a character (p. 216). Doody concludes by arguing that ‘[t]hrough the language of names and the language of place, Austen shows how each person is already shaped by the culture and history of the birthplace’ (p. 389) and, with the only exception of Emma, Austen’s heroines are forced to move and change places, thus entering in contact with new and different cultures.

Kenneth R. Morefield’s *Jane Austen’s Emma: A Close reading Companion, Volume 1* (CamSP) follows chapter by chapter the first volume of Austen’s novel, providing a close reading through short synopsis with a descriptive title of the chapter’s content. The main argument is that Austen’s novel is more interested ‘in what the events reveal about the central character than in the events themselves’ (p. 79). The plot is formally linked to the development of Emma’s character: a lady who, being born with the privileges of beauty, cleverness, and wealth, is used to ‘having too much her own way’ (p. 1) and, for this reason, needs to learn humility in order to become emotionally mature for marriage. Men in Austen’s novels, on the other hand, need to be ‘financially independent (“settled”)’ (p. 96) in order to be good husbands. Another important topic explored by the novel is that ‘friendship and love are built on the same foundation’ (p. 3), a lesson that Emma still has to learn. Austen’s novel is also concerned with class mobility at a time characterised ‘by increasing fluidity in the class system and resistance to class change’ (p. 7). The first volume of this close reading of Austen’s novel concludes by assuming that while Emma’s ‘disposition to think a little too well of herself’ abates, her ‘power of having rather too much her own way’ does not, a flaw which may threaten her future happiness. Morefield’s publication of volumes two and three of *Emma’s* close reading are thus eagerly anticipated, to see if and how the eponymous character will deal with her second character flaw.
Peter Sabor’s edited collection of essays, *The Cambridge Companion to Emma* (CUP) is focused on the text and context of Austen’s *Emma* with a particular attention to the dedicatory and introductory sentences. The first four chapters are concerned with ‘the circumstances of the novel’s composition and publication, as well as with its literary, historical and economic context’ (p. xii). Chapters 6 to 10 treat Austen’s use of free indirect style, her portrayal of the heroine, the fictional setting of the novel, and the use of music and riddles. The last two chapters review a series of translations and adaptations of the novel up to the present day. Jan Fergus’s ‘Composition and Publication’ (pp. 1-16) contends that *Emma* is Austen’s most experimental novel, both in its composition and publication, as she moved from Thomas Egerton to John Murray II, ‘the prestigious London publisher of Byron and the *Quarterly Review*’ (p. 4). Walter Scott’s ‘thoughtful review’ of *Emma*, published in the *Quarterly Review* of March 1816, Fergus explains, ‘began the nineteenth-century canonisation of Austen as a novelist’ (p. 13), even though Scott’s positive review ‘did not result in a sold-out edition’ (p. 14) in Austen’s time. Bharat Tandon’s ‘The Literary Context’ (pp. 17-35) observes that Austen’s literary allusions in *Emma* are not always self-evident. Yet, one of the functions of intertextual reference is to give the reader a sense of the character’s personality. Jonathan Sachs’s ‘The Historical Context’ (pp. 36-51) points out that the visit to the poor by Emma and Harriet signals social inequalities in Austen’s time as well as ‘the connection between poverty and gender’ (p. 38). Though Austen’s novels have in general been judged by critics as little concerned with the historical contexts of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, Sachs contends that in *Emma*, ‘Austen’s relative silence might be read as a stronger, more subtle engagement with the pressing issues of her day’ (pp. 43-44). Robert D. Hume’s ‘Money and Rank’ (pp. 52-67) compares the value of the possessions of *Emma*’s characters with contemporary currency. Hume argues that ‘Austen’s families in *Emma* are not titled and do not seem terribly grand, but they are unquestionably
part of an economic elite’ (p. 57). The novel signals a world characterised ‘by socio-economic change and issues of class and gender equity that were not so much unresolved as simply unrecognised’ (p. 60). Edward Copeland’s ‘Contemporary Responses’ (pp. 68-87) maintains that Austen’s compilation of the ‘Opinions of Emma’, where she gathered comments of her friends, her family and completely strangers about her novel, is ‘an accurate snapshot of the issues that dominated discussions of Emma for the next fifty-five years, from 1815 to 1870’ (p. 69). Copeland also reviews a series of ‘fashionable novels’ published between 1825 and 1840 directly influenced by Austen’s Emma, and points out that by the 1850s Emma had come to be considered ‘as the touchstone of Austen’s excellence’ (p. 81).

Linda Bree’s ‘Style, Structure, Language’ (pp. 88-104) observes that Austen’s letters to her niece Anna Austen Lefroy, a novelist herself, show some insights into her preferences regarding plot construction, thus shedding some light on Emma. John Wiltshire’s ‘The Heroine’ (pp. 105-19) claims that through Emma’s character Austen certainly wanted to confront her readers’ expectations. This heroine is a complex character that unites snobbery with ‘strength of character’, ‘intelligence’, and ‘vivacity’ (p. 106), thereby making it hard for the readers to despise her completely. Janine Barchas’s ‘Setting and Community’ (pp. 120-34) observes that Emma is ‘the most parochial of Jane Austen’s novels’ (p. 120), as the heroine never travels farther than Highbury and Box Hill, thus ‘emphasis[ing] physical confinement of all sorts’ (p. 120). Her ‘exactitude about place in Emma compels readers to ... map her name-dropped locations and search for her interpretative purpose’ (p. 125). Yet, Barchas notices that such exactitude of place exposes the connections of its inhabitants ‘to the country’s larger economic and social grids, marking the towns active participation in the Regency’s trade economy and Britain’s national identity’ (p. 125). Ruth Perry’s ‘Music’ (pp. 135-49) observes that music in Emma’s novel ‘is used in a sophisticated manner to evoke class and gender status and as a pointer to moral character’ (p. 135). Music is also an
important element of ‘entertainment and solace’ (p. 139) in Highbury society. The novel itself shows a musical quality as ‘many of its chapters are staged like operatic scenes’ (p. 145), a fact that suggests some ‘contribution of music to the architecture of this novel’ (p. 147). Jillian Heydt-Stevenson’s ‘Games, Riddles and Charades’ (pp. 150-65) points out that riddles in *Emma* are an important device to question characters’ complacency and thus stimulate their deeper self-understanding. In addition, Heydt-Stevenson explains, in Austen’s novel ‘the riddle works at the literal and metaphorical levels, helping constitute the novel’s larger meanings’ (p. 151). Emma is not good at riddle-solving, but this does not seem to pose a problem for Austen as she considers this act as something to be done communally. Gillian Dow’s ‘Translations’ (pp. 166-85) states that ‘Austen’s posthumous reception on the Continent was affected by her inability to fit the idea of what a novel should be doing as the nineteenth century progressed’ (p. 169). Yet, this ‘did not prevent *Emma* from being translated’ (p. 169). The first translation was published in Paris in 1816 as *La Nouvelle Emma*, three months after Murray’s publication of its first edition. Its preface explains that a French audience would find Austen’s novel ‘problematic’ primarily for its lack of action. In the twentieth century, *Emma* has met more success with foreign audiences and it has been translated into Spanish, Czech, Dutch, Italian, and Chinese. Deidre Shauna Lynch’s ‘Screen Version’ (pp. 186-203) finally focuses on *Emma*’s screen adaptations, contending that ‘the Emmas of the past twenty years are ... a group who nowadays ... only intermittently appear to us in empire-line muslin gowns’ (p. 190), and sometimes she is ‘no longer self-evidently white’. Though all ‘this swerving from a familiar text can be disconcerting’ (p. 191) it, nevertheless, proves the influential capacity of Austen’s novel in the twenty-first century, two hundred years after its first publication.

Hanne Birk and Marion Gymnich’s collection of essays, *Pride and Prejudice 2.0: Interpretations, Adaptations and Transformations of Jane Austen’s Classic* (V&R) centres
on the legacy of Austen’s novel *Pride and Prejudice* in the twenty-first century, and on its adaptation not only in book forms but also in the plethora of new media that characterise the postmodern era. The famous 1995 BBC mini-series adaptation boosted a resurgence of interest in Austen’s novel, and the iconic ‘wet shirt scene’ performed by Colin Firth’s interpretation of Darcy helped to turn the focus on the female gaze. Darcy’s lake scene, which does not exist in Austen’s novel, has now entered into the twenty-first century collective imagination, catalysing female erotica re-writings of Austen’s novel centred on the fulfilment of Elizabeth Bennet’s sexual desire. In her introduction ‘200 Years of Reading Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*; or Where the Literary Canon Meets Popular Culture’ (p. 11-31), Marion Gymnich contends that this novel ‘is a literary text that has aged remarkably well; at the beginning of the twenty-first century … [it] appear[s] to be as popular as ever’ and this is proven by the fact that ‘[b]eyond intertextual and intermedial references to Austen’s novel in many movies, TV series and literary texts, there are several popular audiovisual adaptations, numerous sequels, rewritings and modernisations of *Pride and Prejudice*’ (p. 11). The success of Austen’s novel adaptations lies in the ‘intersection of the literary canon and popular culture’ (p. 12). *Pride and Prejudice* has encountered enormous success in different cultures because its ‘concerns … have been regarded as universal by many authors, readers and viewers’ (p. 17). Marie-Josefine Joisten’s ‘The Serious Business of Mrs Bennet and the Consequences of a Mother’s Fear’ (pp. 33-50) contends that Austen’s novel is primarily concerned with marriage and money, a fact that ‘contradicts purely romantic readings of the text’ (p. 33). Mrs Bennet’s over-preoccupation with marrying her daughters reflects a ‘general awareness of women’s options in nineteenth-century England’ (p. 35) who, as described by the subtitle of Deborah Logan’s book, could only ‘Marry, Stitch, Die or Do Worse’ (p. 35). Nadežda Rumjanceva’s “And she beheld a striking resemblance to Mr. Darcy”: Nineteenth-Century Illustrations of Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*’ (pp. 51-
76) notices that the resurgence of Austen’s success towards the end of the nineteenth century was due to the ‘luxuriously illustrated editions of Austen’s novels’ (p. 51), which ‘revived the humour and satire of Pride and Prejudice’ (p. 63). Elena Baeva’s “My name is Lizzie Bennet, and this is my [vlog]” – Adaptation and Metareference in The Lizzie Bennet Diaries’ (pp. 151-65) reviews the re-imagining of Austen’s novel in a web series of one hundred, 3- to 5-minute long YouTube snap clips which focus on similarities and differences in female concerns between young women in the nineteenth and twenty-first centuries, as well as on ‘the role of social media in today’s life’ (p. 152). The common denominator between the nineteenth-century novel and the modern media is ‘prejudice’: modern social media are biased because ‘vlogs, like any type of opinion piece, are highly subjective’ (p. 154). Stella Butter’s ‘Jane Austen Meets Bollywood: Forms and Functions of Transcultural Adaptations’ (pp. 167-85) argues that Austen’s heritage has gone beyond the British nation in a transnational movement that captures the ‘cultural imaginary’ of current Indian filmmakers who fancy Austen’s emphasis on the family, local communities, and ‘the socio-economic dimension of marriage’ (p. 167). Imke Lichterfeld’s ‘Mr Darcy’s Shirt – An Icon of Popular Culture’ (pp. 189-205) points out that the scene of Mr Darcy diving into the lake and then showing his wet shirt against his body in the BBC miniseries of Pride and Prejudice has turned this character into a pop cultural icon and raised great attention to Austen’s novel. The statue of Darcy/Colin Firth wearing the wet shirt in the Serpentine of Hyde Park, subsequently ‘moved to Lyme Park in Cheshire, where the Pemberley scenes were filmed’ (p. 191), celebrates ‘the rejuvenation of Austen’s popularity … fashioning a new, postmodern image’ (p. 191). Today, Pride and Prejudice is perceived through the lens of the BBC miniseries, and this is revealed by a subsequent ITV mini-series Lost in Austen (2008), ‘which is replete with intertextual and intermedial cross-references to Austen’s novel and to previous audiovisual version(s)” (p. 199). Gislind Rohwer-Happe’s ‘The Mr. Darcy Complex
The Impact of a Literary Icon on Contemporary Chick Lit’ (pp. 207-25) explains that the transformation of Darcy from a haughty and proud to a kind and gentle character has shaped a postmodern psychological complex which describes modern women’s hope in true love and in the possibility that bad guys may actually hide a good side under the cover. This type of character has become recurrent in contemporary Chick Lit ‘with about 200 novels available at the moment that feature the name of Mr. Darcy in the title’ (p. 209). The general plot of Chick Lit novels draw heavily on Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice* which can thus be considered as ‘the grandmother of Chick Lit, while Helen Fielding’s *Bridget Jones’s Diary* can safely be called the mother of Chick Lit’ (p. 209). Ulrike Zimmerman’s ‘Crime Comes to Pemberley – *Pride and Prejudice* Sequels in Contemporary Crime Fiction’ (pp. 227-44) portrays a series of crime novels arising from the contact with Austen’s novel and the 1995 BBC mini-series. These novels tend to ‘deal with characters’ lives after they were married off … or follow undeserving characters who would have been pushed unceremoniously off the scene in Austen’ (p. 232). Crime sequels are ‘part of the marketing strategies of the “Jane Austen” brand’ and, most importantly, they ‘cater to the readers’ narrative greed’ (p. 240), appealing to Austen’s readers’ desire to fill in the gaps in Austen’s novel, with ‘a noticeable urge to expose an underground world of Austen’ (p. 241). Hanne Birk’s ‘Gothic Fiction Bites Back – The Gothification of Jane Austen at the Beginning of the 21st Century’ (pp. 245-60) points out that Roland Barthes’s assumption of ‘The Death of the Author’ is not borne out by the constant reappearance of Jane Austen as ‘vampire protagonist’ (p. 245) in Gothic versions of *Pride and Prejudice* produced in the twenty-first century. As these novels are ‘highly successful’ and ‘widely read’, they ‘promise a considerable sociocultural “impact factor”’ (p. 246). *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies* (2009), for example, ‘has been turned into a video game, and a film adaptation is in progress and expected to be released in 2015’ (p. 246). Yet, Birk points out that in the latter Gothic adaptation, ‘no matter how resourceful and
professional … a woman possibly is’ marriage is still depicted as the ultimate objective for her full realisation (p. 253), thereby suggesting that ‘even for the best female zombie slayer a happy marriage is definitely preferable to enduring professionalism’ (p. 255), an aspect that ‘subverts any feminist reading of the text’ (p. 257). Silke Meyer’s “Spank me Mr. Darcy”: *Pride and Prejudice* in Contemporary Female (Hardcore) Erotica’ (pp. 261-73) contends that the contrast between the prudery and repressed passion of the Regency time period opens up a fertile territory for ‘female erotic rewriting of *Pride and Prejudice*’ (p. 263). Uwe Küchler’s ‘Participatory Transfer/mations: Inviting *Pride and Prejudice* Adaptations into the Foreign Language Classroom’ (pp. 275-90) argues that literary classics and their new media adaptations prove to be a ‘stimulating choice of material’ for the foreign language classroom because they enhance learners’ creativity via a recognition of similarities and differences between source and target text. The recent TV mini-series adaptation *Lost in Austen* (2008), for example, juxtaposes the nineteenth-century context of the novel’s production with the twenty-first-century context of text adaptation, making useful ‘intercultural juxtaposition(s)’, with the female protagonist’s time travel exposing the cultural clashes derived from the anachronisms and inconsistencies of the time-warp narrative expedient. Küchler contends that ‘[b]y creatively and intertextually transforming the original, the narrative material becomes accessible for a young generation: the digital natives’ (p. 289). The original, however, is kept alive and its themes are brought into comparison with modern themes, thereby highlighting the relevance of the classic to the twenty-first century. Hanne Birk and Marion Gymnich’s ‘Elizabeth Bennet: A Heroine Past and / or Present?’ (pp. 291-302) narrates their experience as university teachers of English literature and includes their students’ perspective of what studying *Pride and Prejudice* means today. Denise Burkhard and Simone Fleischer’s ‘Have a Fan-tastic 200th Birthday, Lizzy! – Elizabeth Bennet in recent Fan Fiction’ (pp. 311-22) points out that ‘[a] fandom that is lively and thriving is an
indicator of the topicality of a text’ and, since the internet is ‘the most dynamic and interactive medium today’, they have used online fan fiction to question ‘whether Lizzy Bennet is a heroine of our times’ (p. 311). Their aim was to see which features of Austen’s heroine have been adopted and which ones have been reshaped. Fan fiction re-adaptations of *Pride and Prejudice* tend to emphasize the passion of the love affair between Elizabeth and Darcy (p. 315). Gender roles and sexuality are also revisited and changed in order to modernise the character of Elizabeth who conforms to social rules only if these are in line with her own wishes. Birk and Gymnich’s collection *Pride and Prejudice 2.0* is an outstanding contribution to Austen studies because it focuses on the interactive relationship between Austen’s 200-year old text and contemporary media of communication. It also highlights the fact that some gender issues are still present today, as shown in the still prevalent double standard of female and male sexuality. In addition, the book considers gender issues in intersectional relation with race and class, thus entering into conversation with current post-feminist and post-colonial academic debates.

The essays arising from the Jane Austen Society of North America’s Annual General Meeting and gathered in *Persuasions* (37[2015]) explore the world of Austen’s contemporaries, providing important information about ‘practical’ and ‘village life, farming, beauty, fashion’ and women’s aging in Georgian England (p. 7). Some of the essays show a particularly considerate focus on the unstable financial condition of gentlewomen who, not allowed to work for their own support, depended on their husbands, fathers or brothers for financial support. Miss Bates in *Emma* thoroughly illustrates the case of a middle-aged and unmarried woman of originally high condition later sunk into poverty after her father’s death. Christine Alexander and Juliet McMaster’s ‘Children Writing in Jane Austen’s Time’ (*Persuasions* 37[2015] 13-29) explores the early writing of ‘young authors and their creative and professional ambitions’ (p. 13), focusing on both male and female writers like Hannah
More, Maria Edgeworth, Jane Austen, Anna Maria Porter, and Thomas Chatterton. They ponder how much aware these authors may have been of their writing. For example, Porter wrote love stories with cross-dressing heroines at the tender age of thirteen, drawing on the sentimental tradition for the source of life experience she did not have; while Austen’s early writing about love had a satirical tone that exposed the ‘mercenary motives for marriage’ (p. 20), a theme that she explored in her mature writing. Linda Slothouber’s “‘The Holders of Hay & the Masters of Meadows”: Farmers in Jane Austen’s World’ (Persuasion 37[2015] 30-44) depicts the British agricultural system that informs the setting of Austen’s novels. Farmers, who occupied the median position in the hierarchy, experienced an increased economic stability during Austen’s time, thus ‘renegotia[ing] their place in society and national affairs’ (p. 30). Austen depicts the controversial figure of the gentleman farmer in Persuasion through the Hayters and in Emma through Robert Martin, highlighting how possession of money blurred the boundaries between the gentry and these new rich farmers.

Sara Bowen’s ‘Village Life in Jane Austen’s World: The View from the Parsonage’ (Persuasions 37[2015] 45-64) gives an idea of ‘the atmosphere of Jane Austen’s village world’ to the twenty-first-century reader by exploring the letters and diaries of parsons and parsons’ wives (p. 45). Parsons not only dealt with spiritual issues but they also attended to the medical, educational, legal, and social needs of the community. Inger Sigrun Brodey’s ‘Making Sense of Sensibility’ (Persuasions 37[2015] 65-85) points out how the words of the title Sense and Sensibility are ‘qualities that generate the same adjective: sensible’ (p. 65), in that one can be both sensible ‘as in having sense’ and as in ‘responding emotionally to something’ (p. 65). Austen’s book is meant to re-evaluate sensibility ‘in its original philanthropic purposes and to teach her readers lessons about sympathy’ (p. 66), by promoting the kind of sensibility embodied by Elinor’s character: a sensibility that is ‘social and not selfish, hidden rather than demanding’ (p. 84). Rachel M. Brownstein’s ‘Character
and Caricature: Jane Austen and James Gillray’ (Persuasions 37[2015] 86-100) argues that Austen drew on her contemporary caricaturist James Gillray for the construction of some characters, in order to expose their moral flaws as, for example, in the cases of Mr and Mrs John Dashwood in Sense and Sensibility. Brownstein contends that Austen’s ‘satire on selfishness and greed’ is meant to expose the ‘social structure and institutions that shape, alter, and inflect human nature—marriage and the family, primogeniture, assumptions about gender and rank’ (p. 98). Jocelyn Harris’s ‘Jane Austen, the Prince of Wales, and John Thorpe’ (Persuasions 37[2015] 101-14) argues that though Austen has always been considered more ‘as an ironist rather than a satirist’, her ‘lacerating portrait of the Prince of Wales’ through the character of John Thorpe ‘speaks otherwise’ (p. 101), showing that Austen ‘based her patriotism on love of country, not loyalty to its rulers’ (p. 112). Alden O’Brien’s ‘Achieving an “Air of Decided Fashion”: How Austen’s Ladies Adapted the Latest from London’ (Persuasions 37[2015] 115-28) relates what in Georgian society defined the ladies with an ‘air of fashion’ as distinguished from the Bennet sisters who, nevertheless, could manage ‘to look fairly fashionable’ (p. 115). O’Brien contends that the difference was in the way dresses were cut as well as in the time that provincial ladies would take to catch up with the latest London fashion magazines. Stephanie M. Eddleman’s ‘Past the Bloom: Aging and Beauty in the Novels of Jane Austen’ (Persuasions 37[2015] 129-45) observes that women in Austen’s time were considered old earlier than men whose ‘physical signs of aging … were declining strength and a loss of physical ability’ (p. 141); indeed, ‘[m]any eighteenth-century writers are not kind to characters no longer in the bloom of youth, treating them as mere caricatures or as people whose only purpose in life is to guide the young’ (p. 130). Austen’s culture ‘privileges youth and beauty, especially for females, and her novels reflect this influence’ (p. 131), though she also shows ‘awareness of and resistance to this regrettable reality’ (p. 132), as in the portrayal of Anne Elliot in Persuasion, through which
Austen critiques society’s restrictions ‘of the joys of life only to the very young’ (p. 134). Amanda Vickery’s ‘No Happy Ending? At Home with Miss Bates in Georgian England’ (*Persuasions* 37[2015] 146-66) observes that ‘[a]s the unmarried daughter of a widowed mother, dependent on familial favour, Austen had much more in common with poor Miss Bates than with blessed Miss Woodhouse’ (p. 147). Austen lived in a familial nucleus composed of six women with her mother, sister, a friend and two female servants forming a type of household known as ‘the spinster cluster’ which has not been thoroughly investigated by historians, as they are usually more devoted to exploring the history of the family. Fictional works do not depict such realities either, as they are generally perceived with ‘a melancholy sense of blasted hopes and emotional failure’ (p. 147). Nevertheless, widows and spinsters, though financially unstable, sometimes formed clusters rich in emotional comfort. Interestingly and in ‘cruel contrast’ (p. 149), men between the age of thirty-five and fifty were viewed at the height of their manhood. Gillian Dow’s ‘Reading at Godmersham: Edward’s Library and Marianne’s Books’ (*Persuasions* 37[2015] 167-79) focuses on the libraries of two country houses, Godmershan Park in Kent and Chawton House, which belonged to Edward Austen, one of Jane Austen’s brothers. These libraries collected books on various subjects such as travel, history, religion, conduct literature, architecture, painting, science, medicine and dictionaries, reflecting the owner as aspirational and educated, a common feature that characterised many other country houses of the period. The Austens’ library differentiates itself by holding a significant collection of female-authored novels. In the ‘Miscellany’ section of *Persuasions*, Linda Zionkowski and Mimi Hart’s “‘Aunt Jane Began Her Day with Music’: Austen and the Female Amateur” (*Persuasions* 37[2015] 181-203) contends that defining Austen as a mere amateur of music does not do her justice as, for her entire life, she was committed to ‘collecting, transcribing, and playing’ (p. 182) music. Most importantly, though, music plays an important role in the development of Austen’s
characters as it ‘can both express and conceal [their] feelings’ (p. 200). Elaine Bander’s ‘Jane Austen’s World: Jane Austen’s Words’ (Persuasions 37[2015] 204-15) claims that the theme of the 2015 JASNA Annual General Meeting ‘Living in Jane Austen’s World’ inspired a vibrant discussion on ‘Austen’s life and time’ (p. 204). The focus on ‘Austen’s physical, social, and cultural world’ (p. 204) is enlightening with respects to the metonymic value of the words that Austen used to create the worlds of her novels. Bander contends that even the best film adaptation in costume would not be able to mediate the true experience of the world of Austen’s novels because it would be missing Austen’s characteristic narrative voice. Aoife Byrne’s “‘Very Knowing Gigs’: Social Aspiration and the Gig Carriage in Jane Austen’s Works’ (Persuasion 37[2015] 216-26) illustrates that carriages were not just means to facilitate motion but also a way to show the owner’s income and social status, ‘revealing characterizations and modulations on class’ (p. 216). In Austen’s novels, the gig in particular reflects social mobility and ‘its owner’s status as nouveau riche’ (p. 217). Lauren Wilwerding’s ‘Amatory Gifts in Sense and Sensibility’ (Persuasions 37[2015] 227-37) draws on gift theory to explore the significance of gift exchange in the shift from ‘economically motivated’ to ‘companionate marriages’, wondering whether in the latter case ‘women still function as gifts’ (p. 229). Patrick McGraw’s “‘The World Is Not Their’s’: The Plight of Jane Fairfax in Emma’ (Persuasions 37[2015] 238-46) contends that the words of the title pronounced by Emma when Jane Fairfax’s secret engagement with Franck Churchill becomes public mark ‘the unfairness of women’s financial and legal inferiority in Regency society’ (p. 239), in addition to showing Emma’s growth as a character. According to McGraw, Austen condemns ‘the social and legal conditions that restrict a poor woman’s choices to marriage, spinsterhood, the governess trade, or, in extremis, prostitution’ (p. 242), and her novel conveys ‘the idea that the world’s laws are un-Christian in their treatment of poor women’ (p. 245). Anthony Domestico’s ‘Close Writing and Close Reading in Emma’
Persuasion 37[2015] 247-57) draws on D. A. Miller’s Jane Austen, or the Secret of Style who renames free indirect style as ‘close writing’. Domestico contends that this is appropriate to a novel like Emma because, in addition to highlighting the fact that narrator and character collapse though remaining distinct, close writing also relates free indirect style to ‘close reading’, the careful analysis of the text. Domestico explains that in Emma, ‘characters attempt to read one another’s thoughts as if they were texts’ (p. 248) and on their own terms, a solipsism that like the close reading developed by New Criticism does not allow them to enter into a meaningful conversation with the other characters. Grace E. Miller’s “‘This Peace”: Naval Homecoming and Domestic Reintegration in Persuasion’ (Persuasions 37[2015] 258-65) relates the novel’s little attention to the emotional stability of naval officers returning home from war when compared to the far greater consideration that the process of soldiers’ reintegration receives in the twenty-first century by the British navy. Miller’s essay focuses on the ‘multiple interactions between the naval and the domestic’ (p. 258) in Austen’s Persuasion, arguing that Austen transfers the responsibility of the homecoming process to the ‘navy wife’ (p. 259). The final essay by Isis Herrero López, ‘Franco and Austen: Three 1945 Translations of Northanger Abbey and Their Gender Components’ (Persuasions 37[2015] 266-77) explains why Austen’s novels were not translated into Spanish until the twentieth century, when they entered the market because their restricted domestic environment was well suited to the type of subordinated woman endorsed by the Francoist regime. López compares three 1945 translations of Northanger Abbey based on a previous translation in 1925 by Isabel Oyarzábal, a feminist interested in women’s emancipation. The differences between the three 1945 translations based on Oyarzábal’s reveal different degrees of ‘influence of Francoist ideology on the representation of women in these translations’ (p. 267). Austen’s ironic rejection of the idealized heroine disappears, while emphasis is given to ‘the feminine roles of mother, virgin, and wife’ (p. 269).
The essays of the Jane Austen Society of North America’s Annual General Meeting collected in the volume of *Persuasions On-Line* (36[2015]) also explore Austen’s world. The first part focuses on marriage law, economics, religion, Austen’s material culture, disability, and Regency celebrities. The miscellanies look at further themes of Austen’s reality, providing details about Aristotle’s influence on her novels, the intertextualities with contemporary writer Sarah Harriet Burney (sister of Frances Burney), landscape description and the presence of women in the navy. Martha Bailey’s ‘The Marriage Law of Jane Austen’s world’ points out that if on the one hand in Austen’s novels ‘marriage for money alone is wrong … marriage without a fortune on at least one side is imprudent’ (para 2, ll. 5-6). Austen exposes the fact that the law of primogeniture, the purpose of which was to keep the family’s estate intact, had serious consequences on unmarried women in particular, who were left at the mercy of their brothers and were not allowed to work for their subsistence. Marriage was thus necessary for women’s survival, even though they would lose their legal personality because ‘at common law, husband and wife are one person, and that person is the man’ (para 8, ll. 5-6). Bailey’s essay also sheds light on how Austen’s novels engage with the consequences of pre-marital sex, marrying relatives, clandestine and underage marriage, and divorce in Regency England. Katherine Toran’s ‘The Economics of Jane Austen’s World’ helps the modern reader to translate the value of ‘a nineteenth-century pound into a modern dollar’ (para 1, ll. 5-6). Ann Buermann Wass’s ‘“I am the Neatest Worker of the Party”: Making and Mending the Family’s Wardrobe’ explains that women in Austen’s time were rarely idle, as they sewed and mended the garments of their family that showed signs of wear – an occupation that ‘allow[ed] women to be productive while they chatted’ (para 1, ll. 20-22). Buermann Wass observes that ‘[a]s most clothing could not, as Jane Austen noted, “be bought ready made” … the work of women’s needles was indeed an important contribution to the household’ (last para, ll. 7-9). Jill Ottoman’s ‘“A Woman Never Looks Better than on
“Horseback” explores the theme of women riding horses in Regency time. This activity, besides being excruciatingly expensive, put women’s life at serious risk as they had to ride ‘aside’ for reasons of propriety, as “[n]o woman who valued her reputation would ever attempt to ride astride” (para 5, ll. 11-12). Ottoman maintains that a woman on horseback in Austen’s novel is always a ‘telling device’ that informs the reader of both the negative and positive traits of a character (last para, l. 12). Jeffrey A. Nigro and William A. Phillips’s ‘A Revolution in Masculine Style: How Beau Brummell Changed Jane Austen’s World’ signals a change in male clothing style during Austen’s time, arguing that George Brummell ‘represents the zenith’ (para 6, l. 7) of the dandy style, a more sober and a less exaggerated attire than the Macaroni style, ‘an extreme form of appearance, exaggerated in costumes, cosmetics, and hairstyles’ (para 4, ll. 7-8) which Austen represents through the figure of Sir Walter Elliot in *Persuasion*. Nigro and Phillips point out that ‘[i]n place of outmoded displays of luxury and excess, Brummell emphasized the elegance and simplicity of the line and cut of clothes’ (para 17, ll. 1-2), thereby showing awareness of ‘the dandy’s desire to be noticed without drawing attention to himself’ (para 18, ll. 1-2). Sheryl Craig’s ‘Jane and the Master Spy’ contends that Austen draws on contemporary British spy William Wickham (1761-1840) to shape the duplicitous character of George Wickham in *Pride and Prejudice*. Robert Clark’s ‘Wilderness and Shrubbery in Austen’s Works’ investigates the depiction of wilderness gardens in Austen’s work. Clark points out that the wilderness’s woodland walk would connote ‘Christ’s wandering in the wilderness to understand his relation to God’, and Austen may have had this religious idea in mind ‘when representing the Sotherton wilderness in *Mansfield Park*’ (para 11, ll. 4-8). Here the wilderness represents a space of sexual temptation that can be governed by ‘moral rectitude’ (para 35, l. 4). Amanda Marie Kubic’s ‘Aristotelian Ethical Ideas in the Novels of Jane Austen’ maintains that, though there is no evidence that Austen read Aristotle, some of her works show awareness of this philosopher’s...
idea which Austen may have known through her reading of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century didactic works. Christopher Toner’s “‘With What Intense Desire She Wants Her Home’: Jane Austen on Home as Telos’ contends that in Austen’s novels the themes of ‘security, character’, and the ‘social comfort’ deriving from ‘participating in relationships based on mutual love and respect’ are elements constitutive of ‘a good home’ (para 1, ll. 12-16). The telos Austen describes concerns ‘the finding of one’s place in … marriage’ (para 1, l. 22), and characters achieve their happiness through ‘economic’ and ‘relational security’ (para 8, ll. 13-14). Carmen María Fernández Rodríguez’s ‘Another Mistress of Deceit? Jane Austen’s Lady Susan and Sarah Harriet Burney’s Geraldine Fauconberg’ investigates the figure of the ‘merry widow’ in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century literature. Rodríguez argues that Austen draws on the novel written by Burney for the character of Lady Susan, and this is shown by the fact that even though the anti-heroines in both novels are not good models of benevolent motherhood, nevertheless they both have a capacity of penetration of which no male character is capable. Gillian Ballinger’s ‘Austen Writing Bristol: The City and Signification in Northanger Abbey and Emma’ contends that the depiction of Bristol and the nearby landscape in both novels expose important traits of the characters that are connected to those places. Most importantly, Ballinger argues that not only does ‘[a] novelist’s topography [have] to be correct, but so does the portrayal of social behaviour within geographically-specific cultural groups’ (para 4, ll. 20-21). Austen’s ‘mimetic realism’ is thus visible in her use of names belonging to the real world for her characters like in Emma, where the connection of Mrs Elton to the Hawkins would enable Austen’s contemporary readers to view her as an enslaving character since the real Hawkins of Bristol were connected with the slave trade. Tsugumi Okabe’s ‘Jane Austen in Translation: On Sisterhood and Romance in Mochizuki Reiko’s Sense and Sensibility’ points out that the translation of Pride and Prejudice in 1926 by Natsume Sōseki and Sense and Sensibility in 1947 have contributed to
the Westernization of Japan. The more recent popularity of Austen’s novel, however, derives from the modern film adaptations of Ang Lee’s *Sense and Sensibility* and from Douglas McGrath’s *Emma*. This new revival has contributed to Japanese adaptations of Austen’s novels in manga, Japanese comics that target a female young audience. Okabe observes that Mochizuki Reiko’s graphic adaptation of *Sense and Sensibility* ‘simultaneously borrows and deviates from Austen’s novel to tell its own culturally relevant and original story’ (para 3, ll. 13-14). Haruko Takakuwa’s *Pride and Prejudice as Angels’ Ladder: Jane Austen’s Novel Become Takarazuka Musical Theater* investigates the adaptation of Austen’s work into a Japanese musical. This adaptation, too, promotes an idealised modern woman, ‘modest, upright, graceful and cheerful’, namely ‘fit’ to be a potential urban wife and mother of the middle class (para 5, ll. 15-16). Takarazuka’s adaptation shows the early twentieth-century ‘eagerness to embrace the Western world’ (para 6, l. 8). Penny Gay’s ‘A Hypothetical Map of Highbury’ sketches a conjectural map of *Emma*’s fictional world. Finally, Rowland McMaster’s ‘“I hate to Hear of Women on Board”: Women aboard War Ships’ provides a depiction of a wide range of women involved in the navy: from the ladies embodied by Mrs Croft in *Persuasion*, who experienced ‘the pleasure and comfort on an admiral’s man of war’ (para 9, ll. 14-15), to the wives of less socially prominent sailors who worked in the lower deck, through prostitutes allowed to access the ship when anchored in a port, up to women disguised as men who chose to serve in the navy.

*The Eighteenth Century* published a special issue in summer 2015 dedicated to ‘Jane Austen and Her Contemporaries’, edited by Devoney Looser (56[2015]). Notwithstanding the saturation of Austen studies, Looser argues that the relationship between Austen and her contemporaries needs a more in-depth analysis and the issue aims at covering this gap. Cheryl A. Wilson’s ““Something like mine”: Catherine Hutton, Jane Austen, and Feminist Recovery Work” (*ECent* 56[2015] 151-64) explores the relation between Hutton, a neglected
woman writer, and Austen, arguing that a comparative study of the two female authors sheds new light on the rules of the literary marketplace in the 1810s. Both authors established the growth of the domestic novel and comment on the literature of their time in their works. Erin M. Goss’s ‘Homespun Gossip: Jane West, Jane Austen, and the Task of Literary Criticism’ (ECent 56[2015] 165-77) contends that the marriage plot of two sisters in Jane West’s A Gossip’s Story (1796) provided some elements for Austen’s Sense and Sensibility. Goss suggests that in both Austen’s and West’s novels gossip functions as a social glue for the community and as a means of ‘surveillance of that community’ (p. 166). Toby R. Benis’s ‘The Neighborhoods of Northanger Abbey’ (ECent 56[2015] 179-92) explores the significance of geographical spaces in Austen’s novel in order to see the relation between the Abbey, a local estate, and the nation, a ‘geographical area whose inhabitants are unified by a shared cultural inheritance and religion’ (p. 179). Benis is interested in exploring the neighbourhood as this is a layer situated between the state and the local estate. Bath is a town without neighbourhoods as people come and go for a relatively short period of time, while the estate of General Tilney is deeply connected to its surrounding environs which he governs in ‘an authoritarian style’ (p. 180). Danielle Spratt’s ‘Denaturalizing Lady Bountiful: Speaking the Silence of Poverty in Mary Brunton’s Discipline and Jane Austen’s Emma’ (ECent56[2015] 193-208) observes that the female protagonists of both novels end up assuming not only the ‘normative domestic role as wife and mother’ but also ‘the more public role of Lady Bountiful’ (p. 193), a lady of the upper class who, by showing a paternalistic philanthropy for her tenants, also maintains class differences. Spratt claims that both Austen and Brunton ‘expose the mythological origins and the practical inadequacies of the Lady Bountiful model’ (p. 194), as neither Ellen nor Emma are able ‘to provide any true relief to the indigent who live in their communities’ (p. 195). Olivera Jokic’s ‘The Odds and the Ends: What to Do with Some Letters of Catharine Macaulay’ (ECent 56[2015] 209-25) investigates
this female historian (1731-91), discussing how an eighteenth-century woman’s professional reputation ‘is tied up to the status of her letters and her correspondents’ (p. 209). Jokic points out that Macaulay’s letters have had an important influence on ‘prominent figures in the history of feminism’ (p. 210). Yet, the politeness of her letters was also dictated by her gender as she never discussed personal matters with male correspondents. Laura E. Thomason’s ‘The Dilemma of Friendship in Austen’s Emma’ (ECent56[2015] 227-41) observes that the titular character, even though ‘handsome, clever, and rich’ (p. 227), never experiences deep and true friendship, as characters ‘are separated as much by social position as by difference in personality’ (p. 228). Emma’s ‘circumstances and personality form a vicious cycle that prevents her from being a friend’ (p. 233), and she can thus experience true friendship only in the companionate marriage with Mr Knightley. Misty Krueger’s ‘From Marginalia to Juvenilia: Jane Austen’s Vindication of the Stuarts’ (ECent56[2015] 243-59) explores Austen’s juvenile engagement with history-writing. In a parody of Oliver Goldsmith’s History of England (1771), Austen recuperates and idealises the historical figure of Mary Queen of Scots, ‘engag[ing] with the traditions of martyrology and vindication’ (p. 244). Krueger contends that before starting her History of the Stuarts, Austen drafted a ‘defence’ as shown in the marginal comments she wrote on the family’s copies of Goldsmith’s History of England and Knox’s Elegant Extracts. ‘Austen’s marginalia’, Krueger explains, ‘act as prologue to the dramatization that is her History of England’ (p. 250). Finally, Jodi L. Wyett’s ‘Female Quixotism Refashioned: Northanger Abbey, the Engaged Reader, and the Woman Writer’ (ECent56[2015] 261-76) maintains that in Northanger Abbey, Austen revalued the figure of the supposedly uncritical, novel-reading, female Quixote. Austen uses this trope ‘as a means of validating the intellectual labor of women readers and writers in Northanger Abbey’ (p. 266). For Catherine Morland, her
Quixotism is her only way to ‘understand her social world and the motives of those within it’ (p. 268).

Various other articles have been published on Jane Austen’s works, and some of them focus particularly on the re-adaptation of her novels in different media, and the success that such adaptations have conferred on Austen in the twenty-first century. Valerie Wainwright’s ‘On Being Tough-Minded: Sense and Sensibility and the Moral Psychology of “Helping”’ (P&L 39:1A[2015] A195-A211) explores the Lockean notion of ‘reasonable exertion’, namely the ‘rational assessment of one’s circumstances and objectives’ in explaining characters’ behaviour in Austen’s novel, arguing that not even so sensible a character as Elinor Dashwood is able to be ‘invincibly rational’ when pursuing her own interests (p. A195). According to Austen, Wainwright explains, even the most ‘tough-minded of women’ is vulnerable ‘to the effects of the most potent of desires’ (p. A197). Ashly Bennett’s ‘Shame and Sensibility: Jane Austen’s Humiliated Heroines’ (SiR 54[2015] 377-400) explores the shift in the perception of both the excess of sensibility and affected insensibility at the end of the eighteenth century. Not being able to command one’s feelings was considered shameful. Nevertheless, Bennett points out that ‘[a]cross her novels, Austen fashions shame as a valuable mediator between sentimental absorption and what she terms, in Northanger Abbey, “affected indifference”’ (p. 378). In her defence of the novel, Austen appears to place shame as a mediator between ‘critical distance’ and ‘impassioned investment’ for both the novelist and the novel reader (p. 380), as this feeling enables both the ‘recognition and relishing of … one’s own absorption’ (p. 388). Enit Karafili Steiner’s ‘Between Cohesion and Reform in Sense and Sensibility’ (WW 22[2015] 455-71) contends that in this novel Austen promotes a type of sociability derived from Addison’s Spectator while recognising, at the same time, the need to adjust this social behaviour to her post-revolutionary time. Austen’s way, Steiner points out, is a forerunner of ‘twentieth-century discussions of human interactions in the
public sphere of civil society’ (p. 455). Thomas W. Stanford III’s “What do I not owe you!”: An Examination of Gratitude in Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*’ (LogosJ 18[2015] 152-68) explores humility in Austen’s novel ‘as an antidote both to unjust pride and to the tendency to prejudice others’ (p. 152), posing ‘gratitude’ as ‘a sign and effect of authentic humility’ (p. 153) and as ‘the proper response to a gift’ (p. 154). David Sigler’s “‘It is Unaccountable”: Anxiety and the Cause of Desire in *Pride and Prejudice*’ (pp. 57-91) in his *Sexual Enjoyment in British Romanticism: Gender and Psychoanalysis, 1753-1835* (McG-QUP) argues that Austen’s novels comment ‘on sexual difference and its discursive, cultural, and economic implications, even as it trains readers to accept the inevitability and desirability of marriage’ (p. 58). *Pride and Prejudice*, Sigler observes, is the most heteronormative among Austen’s novels as Elizabeth Bennet can avoid choosing between ‘marriage for sexual pleasure’ and ‘marriage for financial interest’ because both options are embodied by the ‘wealthy-but-sensual’ Darcy (p. 58). Sigler contends that according to Austen, the ‘subject’s anxiety stems from … the restrictions on enjoyment that culture routinely imposes upon its membership’ (p. 73). Deirdre Le Faye’s ‘The Archaeology of *Pride and Prejudice*’ (pp. 263-73) in William Baker ed., *Studies in Victorian and Modern Literature: A Tribute to John Sutherland* (FDUP; covered fully in Chapter XIV) explores changes between the creation of *First Impressions* in 1797 and its later version *Pride and Prejudice* in 1812, noticing that the closing stages of the plot reflect changes in the historical context of the text’s production, thus nearing the action to the time of the 1813 readers. Brett Jenkins’s ‘I Love You to Meaninglessness: From Mortal Characters to Immortal Character Types in *P&P* Fanfiction’ (*JPC* 48[2015] 371-85) contends that by taking the form of either prequel or sequel, or by exploring the narrative gaps of the canonical text, the fans of fanfiction become ‘prosumers’, namely ‘both producers and consumers’ of the canonical text by creating stories based on the source text. This activity allows fans to improve their ‘social networking and community
building’ while also indulging their ‘identification with characters from a particular novel, film, cartoon, game, or comic’ (p. 372). However, the never-ending process of new character creation and plot extension empties the source characters of meaning, as ‘[t]he wholeness of the character is disrupted by supplementation and consequently a new whole and a new meaning is created’ (p. 376). Ben Dew’s ‘Rewriting Popular Classics as Popular Fiction: Jane Austen, Zombies, Sex and Vampires’ (pp. 282-95), in Christine Berberich ed., The Bloomsbury Introduction to Popular Fiction (Bloomsbury) observes that current novel adaptations of Pride and Prejudice tend to follow a pattern of ‘four narrative strategies sometimes used in isolation, sometimes in combination’ (p. 283). There can be an extension of the primary plot in the form of prequel or sequel; a ‘variation’ which changes an element of the plotline and re-imagines its consequences. A third type of novel adaptation is the change of focalization, providing the story from a different point of view. A fourth type is moving the action to a different cultural and historical context as in Helen Fielding’s Bridget Jones’s Diary (1996) which describes the titular character’s life in 1990s London. All types merge ‘Austen’s writing with a genre of popular fiction’ (p. 285) such as zombies, vampires, or soft-core pornography. Glen Creeber’s ‘Romance Re-Scripted: Lost in Austen’s Comparative Historical Analysis of Post-Feminist Culture’ (FeministMS 15[2015] 562-75) contends that the aim of the television series adaptation of Pride and Prejudice is to make a modern audience reflect on the important ‘social, cultural, and political changes that have taken place over the last two hundred years’ (p. 563), particularly concerning women’s freedom and emancipation. The time-travelling of Lost in Austen’s heroine is an excellent narrative strategy that allows the juxtaposition of women’s condition between the nineteenth and twentieth century, hence treating a contemporary amnesia among young women in relation to the battle of feminist movements. Lost in Austen, Creeber claims, asks important questions about our ‘increasingly hyper-sexualised culture, one that has cleverly re-
objectified the female subject’ (p. 564). Tammy Powley’s ‘Romance Fiction in Florida: The Crisscross of Jane Austen and Angela Hunt’ (pp. 123-32), in Tammy Powley and April Van Camp eds, Women of Florida Fiction: Essays on 12 Sunshine State Writers (McFarland) observes that Jane Austen’s work has developed ‘what is now a well-established formula for the perfect romance novel’ (p. 123), and one twentieth-century author who draws extensively on Austen’s formula is Florida writer Angela Hunt. Although academics tend to devalue contemporary commercial romance fiction, Powley argues that ‘indulging fantasies and emotional values … attract readers to romance fiction’; this aspect makes it not ‘that far removed from the classics and, therefore, worth exploring, at least in the sense of their relationship to one another’ (p. 124). Douglas Murray’s ‘Donwell Abbey and Box Hill: Purity and Danger in Jane Austen’s Emma’ (RES n.s.66[2015] 954-70) argues that though the often quoted passage of Emma describing the estate of Donwell Abbey is considered to be Austen’s tacit ‘contribution to the nation-defining discourse of the Napoleonic and post-Napoleonic era’ (p. 954), this description is also a strategy Austen exploits to reveal the character of Emma. J. P. C. Brown’s ‘Screening Austen: The Case of Emma’ (Adaptation 8[2015] 207-36) argues that some pages of Austen’s novels are well suited to filmic adaption. One example of this, Brown contends, is the scene ‘while Emma waits for Harriet to complete her purchase in Ford’s’ (p. 216) which ‘invites filming and editing according to the principle of montage’ with the juxtapositions of shots that show Emma’s reaction to selected details and the perception of reality through her eyes. Jeanine M. Grenberg’s ‘Self-Deception and Self-Knowledge: Jane Austen’s Emma as an example of Kant’s Notion of Self-Deception’ (Con-Textos Kantianos 2[2015] 162-76) addresses the Kantian notion of harmony, which a character can only achieve through the removal of self-deception as this is an obstacle to self-knowledge. Emma is an example of self-deception: ‘because she is frightened to lose her happy situation at Hartfield, she constructs a belief that she never wants to marry’ (p. 165).
Lauren Miskin’s ““True Indian Muslin” and the Politics of Consumption in Jane Austen’s Northanger Abbey’ (JEMCS 15:2[2015] 5-26) points out that the first flirtation between Henry Tilney and Catherine Morland brings about a conversation about muslin. Miskin intriguingly observes that Henry’s ‘fashionable taste’ for Indian muslin shows a new masculine identity based on the consumption of the products derived from the expansion of the British Empire, while ‘his interest in “true Indian muslin” indicates … his political allegiance to larger structures of imperial and patriarchal oppression’ (p. 6). Kate Nesbit’s ““Taste in Noises”: Registering, Evaluating, and Creating Sound and Story in Jane Austen’s Persuasion’ (SNNTS 47[2015] 451-68) contends that the way Anne Elliot engages with her ‘ingestion, evaluation’, and ‘creation of sound’ signals a transition in her character from ‘passive detachment’ to ‘critical engagement with the world around her’ (p. 452). Gregory Tate’s ‘Austen’s Literary Alembic: Sanditon, Medicine, and the Science of the Novel’ (NCL 70[2015] 336-62) explores Austen’s unfinished work, arguing that the period of illness during which she wrote it contributed to her ideas about the relationship between the novel and science. As voiced by the character of Sir Edward, Sanditon ‘promotes a view of the novel as an objective and professional articulation of knowledge’ (p. 338). Charlotte Brewer’s ““That Reliance on the Ordinary”: Jane Austen and the Oxford English Dictionary’ (RES n.s.66[2015] 744-65) compares Austen’s quoted material in the non-surviving successive editions (c. 1884-1928 OEDI and 1972-86 Burchfield’s Supplement) of the OED which have been preserved only in the OED Online. Brewer notes that Austen’s novels ‘have never been used, to any significant degree, to illustrate first use (or indeed any use) of morally or socially evaluative vocabulary, or, in general, vocabulary that is conceptual, aesthetic or “writerly”’ (p. 746). Nevertheless, Brewer argues, Austen was quoted quite significantly in the first edition of the OED. Brewer concludes by arguing that, in its quotations, the OED might still mirror gender and other types of biases ‘unconsciously
reproduced’ in the choice of its literary quotations. Finally, Barbara M. Benedict’s ‘Satire, Sentiment and Desacralization: The Relic and the Commodity in Jane Austen’s Novels’ (pp. 53-70), in Paola Partenza ed., *Dynamics of Desacrilization: Disenchanted Literary Talents* (V&R) argues that Austen never describes objects or clothes, and when she does, her lingering on the character’s obsession for materiality has the function of questioning her contemporary ‘increasingly and mercenary crass society’ and ‘the degradation of spiritual values in a culture of superficiality, materialism and self-indulgence’ (p. 53). Austen’s focus on the objectification of women and marriage, Benedict concludes, ‘portrays the transformation of what had been a sacred contract, marriage, into a mercenary calculation’ (p. 63).

*Home and Nation in British Literature from English to French Revolutions,* edited by A. D. Cousins and Geoffrey Payne (CUP) contains three chapters of interest to scholars of the Romantic novel. The central argument of the book, also discussed below in section 3, and in Chapter XII, is an overview of the significance of home and the nation in the period between the Glorious and the French revolutions, ‘a period when Britain fought an internecine war – with its devastating, traumatizing, effects of how Britons thought of the ‘nation’ and ‘home’ (p. 1). The book intends to draw attention to the actuality of such themes, in an epoch of ‘mass displacements and asylum-seeking’, when ‘a great many people are looking for “home” or struggling to establish the “nation”’ (p. 1). The chapters on the novel focus on how writers discussed the notion of home and on ‘how domestic economy mirrored that of the homeland’, thereby questioning how ‘the actuality of revolution – or fear of it – threaten[ed] the idea of home itself and ma[de] the domestic a microcosm of the debates over national concerns’ (p. 11). David Punter’s ‘Home, Homeland, and the Gothic’ (pp. 169-83), though focusing more on poetry, also explores the notion of home and the nation in the Gothic novel. The beginning of Ann Radcliffe’s *The Italian* (1796) refers to the European world as the
other, ‘so long subjected to tyranny’ (p. 176), which is doomed to increase in the aftermath of the French Revolution. The Gothic of the northern nations is viewed as ‘organic growth’ in opposition to the Gothic of Southern Europe based on ‘a set of impositions of a false order which condemn the inhabitants of those countries to repression and tyranny’ (p. 177). However, Punter contends that such fear is a cover for another enemy, namely ‘the radicals and supposed reductionists of the Revolution’ who really threaten home and the nation.

Matthew Lewis’s *The Monk* (1794), on the other hand, ‘positions England and the English as decisively superior to the benighted south’ (p. 178). Gary Kelly’s ‘Jane Austen and the Modern Home’ (pp. 219-33) explores the relation between home and the nation in Austen’s oeuvre. Considering the notion of home in the Romantic period as ‘the principal space for biological, cultural, and economic reproduction of the family’ (p. 219), Kelly explores how Austen supported the notion of modern home in her novels envisioned as a space of rational and social management, the improvement of which would provide material and physical comforts to its inhabitants. Dani Napton’s ‘Sir Walter Scott: Home, Nation, and the Denial of Revolution’ (pp. 250-65) points out that in both *Waverley* and *Redgauntlet*, ‘place, space, and landscape are fundamental to Scott’s depiction of the … Hanoverian monarchy’s consolidation of its political stature and stability’, while ‘rebellion is represented as delusional fanaticism’ (p. 251). In Scott’s novels, domestic harmony is only reserved to his ‘counter-revolutionary characters’ (p. 251).

Ten articles on Walter Scott were published this year. Maeve Adams’s ““The Force of my Narrative”: Persuasion, Nation, and Paratext in Walter Scott’s Early Waverley Novels” (*ELH* 82[2015] 937-67) focuses on the first three novels of the series and on how Scott built a rhetorical force to persuade his readers of their sense of ‘national consensus and community’ (p. 944). Christopher J. Scalia’s ‘Walter Scott’s “everlasting said he’s and said she’s”: Dialogue, Painting, and the Status of the Novel’ (*ELH* 82[2015] 1159-77) contends that
though Scott’s use of speech in his works has been extensively explored, scholars have generally neglected the passages where Scott ‘evaluates his approach to dialogues’ (p. 1160). Padma Rangarajan’s ‘History’s Rank Stew: Walter Scott, James Mill, and the Politics of Time’ (Romanticism 21[2015] 59-71) views Walter Scott’s The Chronicles of the Canongate ‘as a single narrative’ (p. 59) rather than separate stories. Rangarajan contends that these tales are united by the old Scottish neighbourhood, from which they ‘geographically and historically radiat[e]’ (p. 60). Tara Ghoshal Wallace’s ‘Historical Redgauntlet: Jacobite Delusions and Hanoverian Fantasies’ (Romanticism 21[2015] 145-59) argues that Scott’s construction of both narrative and characters are the result of historical forces, ‘even when both are fictional’ (p. 146). Wallace explains that ‘Scott’s fiction, though it depicts Redgauntlet’s aims as delusional and as a misreading of diffuse malaise, nonetheless grounds them in a potent set of socio-political institutional instabilities under Hanoverian rule’ (p. 153). Chad T. May’s ‘Sir Walter Scott’s The Monastery and the Representation of Religious Belief’ (SSL 41[2015] 191-208) observes that Scott’s use of the supernatural makes this novel quite different from the rest. Nevertheless, May explains that here Scott exploits the supernatural dimension in order to express the impossibility to explain ‘certain elements of the human condition’ (p. 191), particularly when they concern ‘the psychological or emotional conflicts’ that may overwhelm the individual before ‘any type of religious conversion’ (p. 205). Nancy Moore Goslee’s ‘Larder and Library: Revising Archives in Castle Dangerous’ (ScLR 7[2015] 63-73) maintains that if the episode of the Douglas Larder in Scott’s novel suggests ‘the collapse of romance’ and of ‘chivalric ideals’ (p. 65), and is a symbolic representation of thanatos, as the Scottish chief decides to destroy all provision rather than leave them in the hands of the English enemies; the tower library, on the other hands, ‘points towards an eros that might re-energise some form of ongoing civilization, though only if we acknowledge and recall the threat of its opposite’ (p. 66). Caroline
McCracken-Flesher’s ‘Anxiety in the Archive: From the Antiquary to the Absent Author’ (ScLR 7[2015] 75-94) explains ‘the anxiety that lies at the heart of any exercise in the archive’ (p. 76) which describes the impossibility of grasping all its contents, as ‘[i]t is the nature of the archive to be incomplete and thereby excessive’ (p. 89). Julie Watt’s ‘We Did Not Think That He Could Die: Letitia Elizabeth Landon and the Afterlife of Scott’s Heroines’ (ScLR 7[2015] 119-34) contends that Scott’s female characters are not well rounded, as the young heroines are usually idealizations while the older ones caricatures. Yet, when such characters are based on a real person, they are more believable. Caroline McCracken-Flesher’s ‘Sir Walter Scott: Life-Writing as Anti-Romance’ (WC 46[2015] 102-08) points out that ‘Scott excelled in ordinariness’ (p. 102) and that ‘Scott’s long career, from poetry through the novel and into prose constitute a life study in life-writing’ (p. 107). The final article on Scott is Robert Mayer’s ‘Scott’s Editing: History, Polyphony, Authority’ (MP 112[2015] 661-90), which focuses on Scott’s early editorial work of Border ballads and Dryden. Mayer argues that these early editions reveal important information ‘about Scott as an author’ (p. 662).

An issue of Women’s Writing gathers a series of articles on Ann Radcliffe. JoEllen DeLucia’s ‘Radcliffe, George Robinson and Eighteenth-Century Print Culture: Beyond the Circulating Library’ (WW 22[2015] 287-99) ‘reconsiders the gendered and generic hierarchies that have shaped studies of the circulation and reception of Ann Radcliffe’s work’ (p. 287). Radcliffe’s change of publisher and her experience of George Robinson’s cultural milieu, in which he surrounded himself with radical authors and dealt with a wide range of publications from translations to political works, positions Radcliffe in a wider cultural debate than the mere fashionable circulating libraries of London. Robert Miles’s ‘The Surprising Mrs Radcliffe: Udolpho’s Artful Mysteries’ (WW 22[2015] 300-16) contends that Radcliffe’s practice of rationally explaining the supernatural is not an easy way to solve the
plot but, rather, a device through which Radcliffe ‘artfully managed to build meaning’ (p. 300), as well as ‘a means of keeping antithetical possibilities in solution’ (p. 301). Andrew Smith’s ‘Radcliffe’s Aesthetics: Or, the Problem with Burke and Lewis’ (WW 22[2015] 317-30) argues that Lewis’s novel The Monk prompted Radcliffe to change her aesthetic of terror as she had elaborated in Udolpho, and that in her subsequent novel, The Italian, she would ‘conceal an all too self-conscious aesthetic of Terror’ (p. 318), thereby renouncing its ‘rhetorical construction’ (p. 320). Jakub Lipski’s ‘The Masquerade in Ann Radcliffe’s The Mysteries of Udolpho and The Italian’ (WW 22[2015] 331-42) contends that the masquerade scenes in both novels project an ambiance of ‘utopian fairyland’ while simultaneously acting as ‘a plot catalyst’ (p. 331). Marianna D’Ezio’s “‘As Like As Peppermint Water is to Good French Brandy’: Ann Radcliffe and Hester Lynch Salusbury (Thrale) Piozzi’ (WW 22[2015] 343-54) observes that though Radcliffe had never travelled to Italy, the Southern landscape is where she set her novels. In order to be able to depict a believable geographical setting, Radcliffe drew heavily on Hester Piozzi’s grand tour account Observations and Reflections Made in the Course of a Journey through France, Italy, and Germany (1789). D’Ezio claims that the two female writers mutually inspired each other’s work, and that Radcliffe secretly admired Piozzi’s non-conformist life experiences as a liberated woman. Another two articles and a book chapter on Ann Radcliffe explore the significance of materiality, death, and law in her novels. Yoon Sun Lee’s ‘Radcliffe’s Materiality’ (RCPS February[2015]) contends that ‘Radcliffe’s Gothic represents a certain materialist vision of the world’, and that The Mysteries of Udolpho (1794) is ‘a phenomenon of continuous material surfaces and folds, rather than … a reflection of consciousness or purposive ideological construction’ (para 3). Carol Margaret Davison’s ‘Trafficking in Death and (Un)dead Bodies: Necro-Politics and Poetics in the Works of Ann Radcliffe’ (IJGHS 14[2015] 37-47) observes that The Mysteries of Udolpho mirrors the cultural changes concerning the relationship between the dead and the
living in the late eighteenth century, a time which saw them ‘negotiat[ing] a new social contract reflective of national values’ (p. 37) that was ‘decidedly Protestant in its make-up’ (p. 40). Peter DeGabriele’s chapter ‘The Witness and the Law: Ann Radcliffe’s The Italian’ (pp. 111-38) in his book Sovereign Power and the Enlightenment: Eighteenth-Century Literature and the Problem of the Political (BuckUP) ‘look[s] at the intellectual origins of the regime of the sovereignty of the laws in the work of Montesquieu and William Blackstone’ while simultaneously exposing how Radcliffe’s peculiar treatment of the Gothic ‘manages to challenge the totalizing tendency of the law’s knowledge’ (p. 112), because ‘the law cannot contain the form of knowledge represented by testimony’ (p. 113). DeGabriele explains that by showing that ‘the origin of the subject falls outside the cognizance of the law’, Radcliffe’s novel The Italian ‘questions the law’s supposed immortality and omniscience’ (p. 135).

A series of eight articles and a book chapter focus on Frances Burney’s major novels Evelina (1778), Cecilia (1782), Camilla (1796), and The Wanderer (1814). Marcie Frank’s ‘Frances Burney’s Theatricality’ (ELH 82[2015] 615-35) explores the influence of the comedy of manners on the novel towards the end of the eighteenth century, focusing particularly on Frances Burney ‘who wrote plays alongside novels over the course of her career’ (p. 616). Frank claims that Burney’s modulation of distance between readers, narrator and characters, such as the use of free indirect style, derives from ‘the configuration of theater, shame, and narration in her oeuvre’ (p. 616). F. Mark Vareschi’s ‘Motive, Intention, Anonymity, and Evelina’ (ELH 82[2015] 1135-58) discusses the much debated literary notion of author’s intentionality in fiction by exploring anonymity in Burney’s Evelina. Vareschi aims at ‘reorient[ing] discussions of authorial anonymity from motive to intention’, and he wants to ‘recuperate intention … as a means of understanding the context of … textual production’ (p. 1136). Cassandra Ulph’s ‘Frances Burney’s Private Professionalism’ (BJECS 38[2015] 377-93) points out that Burney’s literary circle of friends at her father’s house in St
Martin’s Street, at Hester Thrale’s literary salon in Streatham, and of the bluestockings at Montagu House, all contributed to condensing a mixture of ‘domestic privacy’ and ‘artistic professionalism’ of which Burney would make use in her more mature works. In *The Wanderer*, for example, Burney supports ‘professional specialization’ in a domestic environment where ‘artistic virtuosity can be practiced without commodification’ (p. 388).

Hilary Havens’s ‘Omitting Lady Grace: *The Provok’d Husband* in Frances Burney’s *Camilla* and *The Wanderer*’ (*BJECS* 38[2015] 413-24) considers Burney’s use of Vanbrugh and Cibber’s theatrical performance of *The Provok’d Husband* (1728) in *Camilla* and *The Wanderer* as a ‘commentary on private theatrical traditions’ (p. 415). Havens contends that the different use of such performances in the two novels shows Burney’s changed view towards the figure of the ‘virtuous heroine’ (p. 415). Hilary Havens also published ‘Revisions and Revelations in Frances Burney’s *Cecilia* Manuscript’ (*SEL* 55[2015] 537-58), where she contends that after the successful publication of her first novel *Evelina*, Burney wrote *The Witlings*, a play where she satirized the famous bluestocking Elizabeth Montagu. Burney’s family, worried about the consequences this could imply, suggested that Burney write another novel instead. The *Witlings* play, Havens argues, is revived in *Cecilia*, a novel that shows a great deal of the sarcasm present in the play. However, the cuts she made to the ‘incisive satire’ in the manuscript draft of *Cecilia* held at the Berg Collection of The New York Public Library ‘confirm … that *Cecilia* was subject to the same social and familial forces that stifled *The Witlings*’ (p. 554). Meghan Jordan’s ‘Madness and Matrimony in Frances Burney’s *Cecilia*’ (*SEL* 55[2015] 559-78) notices that this work both ‘subvert[s] and preserve[s] the ideological dominance of marital bliss’ (p. 559). Burney, Jordan observes, revises the marriage plot by providing her heroine with ‘individualization and social restoration’ (p. 561), primarily because marriage fails to offer these things as, under its institution, women become invisible. The conclusion of the novel and the heroine’s madness ‘suggest that
married women are just as “shackled” as single ones’ (p. 567), and Cecilia’s madness stands as a symbol of ‘her cultural silencing … and of her rebellion in articulating her desire’ (p. 575). Carmel Murphy’s “the Stormy Sea of Politics”: The French Revolution and Frances Burney’s *The Wanderer* (WW 22[2015] 485-504) contends that both Scott’s *Waverley* and Burney’s novel respond to the consequences of the French Revolution; however, they had a very different reception: to *Waverley*’s success, Murphy counterpoises the failure of Burney’s novel, ‘as a result of its cosmopolitan agenda and Burney’s revival of revolutionary feminist concerns’ (p. 488). In fact, Murphy explains, *The Wanderer* ‘offered a nuanced exploration of the various social, economic and sexual injustices to which women of varying classes were subject’ (p. 490), in addition to critiquing ‘a dominant culture of militant nationalism and xenophobia’ (p. 493). Yih-Dau Wu’s “‘I suppose it is not sentimental enough!’: *Evelina* and the Power of Feeling’ (TkR 45:2[2015] 3-24) contends that feeling in *Evelina* is not intense enough to meet eighteenth-century standards for sentimental novels. While for Sterne and Mackenzie, ‘to feel intensely means to feel spontaneously’, for Burney ‘the virtue of feeling lies in its ability to cement interpersonal connections’ (p. 5). Heather King’s ‘Pictures of Women in Frances Burney’s *Cecilia* and *Camilla*: How Cecilia Looks and what Camilla Sees’ (pp. 45-59), in Peggy Thompson ed., *Beyond Sense and Sensibility: Moral Formation and the Literary Imagination from Johnson to Wordsworth* (BuckUP) contends that the illustration in the frontispiece of the first edition of *Evelina* reminds readers that ‘sentimental constructions of women’s morally influential beauty and virtue are built implicitly on women’s suffering’ (p. 46). King argues that in her following two novels, *Cecilia* and *Camilla*, Burney rejects this type of sensibility which reduces ‘the sight of suffering to an aesthetic object’ (p. 48) by removing the pain of women’s weeping from the reader’s sight, and turning women’s ‘gaze inward on their own moral development’ (p. 47).
Mary Shelley has also attracted a large number of publications, mainly focusing on her most famous novel *Frankenstein* (1818). Shelley’s lesser-known novel *The Last Man* (1826) has also drawn some attention, particularly for its concerns with the end of the world determined by geographical catastrophe and plague. Deanna P. Koretsky’s “Unhallowed arts”: *Frankenstein* and the Poetics of Suicide’ (*ERR* 26[2015] 241-60) argues that ‘the Romantic period was one of repressed sensuality, ineluctable destiny, and irremediable malaise’, all ‘strong emotions’ which ‘were often understood to have suicide as their final result’ (p. 241). Koretsky contends that suicide in *Frankenstein* functions as a trope through which Shelley critiques individualism and interprets ‘Romanticism’s interest in radical politics’ (p. 241), as ‘suicide may represent a political act’ (p. 243). Stephen Bertman’s ‘The Role of the Golem in the Making of *Frankenstein*’ (*KSR* 29[2015] 42-50) contends that there are some similarities between ‘the Golem of Jewish folklore and the Creature that inhabits Shelley’s novel’ (p. 46). Bertman suggests that both are gigantic figures brought into existence by ‘arcane knowledge’ who then become dangerous to others. However, there is a reversal of roles because while the monster in Jewish folklore is ‘an opponent of persecution’ in Shelley’s novel it becomes ‘a Jew-like object of persecution because of its inherent otherness’ (p. 46, emphases original). Zoe Beenstock’s ‘Lyrical Sociability: The Social Contract and Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*’ (*P&L* 39:2[2015] 406-21) observes that the predicament of the creature in *Frankenstein*, namely his condition as ‘an inherently sociable being who cannot be socialized’, invites us to think about ‘one of the major questions of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century political theory: whether individualism is compatible with sociability’ (pp. 406-07). The creature suffers rejection because he is ‘formed of individual parts that share no common background’ thus becoming a symbol of a ‘corporate social body that fails to cohere’ (p. 414). Erin Hawley’s ‘The Bride and Her Afterlife: Female Frankenstein Monsters on Page and Screen’ (*LFQ* 43[2015] 218-31) maintains that Shelley’s
failure to give birth to a female counterpart for the creature has stimulated a series of literary and screen adaptations, making the female monster ‘a cultural icon’ (p. 218). Hawley questions ‘why’ this female character has elicited ‘such cultural fascination’ and ‘how she operates in cultural narratives about monstrous and posthuman presence’ (p. 218, emphases original). Christina Schneider’s ‘Monstrosity in the English Gothic Novel’ (*Victorian* 3:1[2015] 1-11) argues that in *Frankenstein*, the ‘moral degeneration of the creature, which occurs because he is rejected for his deformity, represents society’s fear of the revenge of the outsider’ (p. 4). He is also a symbol of the “civilization” of colonized people … Once “civilized”, these people cannot be returned to their savagery and therefore pose a threat to societal order with their “purposeful immorality”’. Lydia McDermott’s ‘Birthing Rhetorical Monsters: How Mary Shelley Infuses Mêtis with the Maternal in Her 1831 Introduction to *Frankenstein*’ (*RhetRev* 34[2015] 1-18) observes that Shelley uses a maternal rhetoric called mêtis, in vogue from classical times until the birth of professional obstetrics in the nineteenth century. According to folkloric beliefs, women had ‘the power to deform their fetus’ through their imagination. McDermott argues that though this popular belief diminished the credibility of women, in some ways it also gave them ‘an important rhetorical power to “form”’ (p. 2). McDermott claims that in her 1831 Introduction to *Frankenstein*, Shelley describes her creative process ‘as distinct from the male Romantics’ birth descriptions and as inscribed with the maternal imagination’ (p. 10), thus reasserting her sole responsibility for the creation of the novel and establishing the correct contribution of her husband Percy to it. Donna Mitchell’s ‘“Being a Mother Is an Attitude, Not a Biological Relation”: Mother as Monster in Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*’ (*JDSt* special issue ‘Monstrous Shadows’ [2015] 39-51) also deals with motherhood in Shelley’s novel. Mitchell contends that *Frankenstein* challenges the traditional mother figure because Victor, the creator of the monster, takes on a matriarchal role which ‘subverts the family’s unity, and leads to social disorder as the mother
… is suddenly removed’ (p. 39), while Victor fails to perform his parental role towards the creature. Melanie Friese’s ‘The Monster’s Humanity: Racism and the Foreigner in *Frankenstein*’ (*STDR* 12[2015] 91-100) observes that if on the one hand Shelley’s creature ‘represents all types of foreigners by being the most extreme foreign entity’ (p. 95), on the other hand his articulate speech ‘does not correspond with British stereotypes of foreigners’ (p. 93). Jude Wright’s ‘Listening to the Monster: Eliding and Restoring the Creature’s Voice in Adaptations of *Frankenstein*’ (*JAFP* 8:3[2015] 249-66) provides an overview of the monster’s speech and/or silence in various adaptations of Shelley’s novel. There are three further book chapters that engage with Shelley’s *Frankenstein*. Charles E. Robinson’s ‘Percy Bysshe Shelley’s Text(s) in Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley’s *Frankenstein*’ (pp. 117-36), in Timothy Webb and Alan M. Weinberg (eds) *The Neglected Shelley* (Ashgate), fully reviewed in section 3 of this chapter, explores the real contribution of Percy B. Shelley to his wife’s novel, arguing that in addition to writing the Preface to the 1818 edition as well as a review of the novel which was not published until 1832, a comparative analysis with Percy’s literary works suggests that he may have ‘contributed 4,000-5,000 of his own words to the novel’ (p. 121). Sharon Ruston’s ‘Has Man “Paid Too Dear a Price for His Empire”? Monsters in Romantic-Era Literature’ (pp. 133-48), in Raul Calzoni and Greta Perletti eds, *Monstrous Anatomies: Literary and Scientific Imagination in Britain and Germany during the Long Nineteenth Century* (V&R; also covered in Chapter XIV) explores ‘literary and medical theories of monstrosity in the 1790s and 1810s that reveal a change in the way monstrosity is viewed’ (p. 133). Ruston explains that Edmund Burke’s use of ‘monstrous’ in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790) likens the threatening populace to ‘a healthy body politic, one that is animated by the vital principle of heredity’ (p. 134), while Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* shows that ‘monsters are … the responsibility of society’, the result of ‘[m]an’s attempt to conquer nature’ (p. 134). Finally, Jesse Weiner’s ‘Lucretius, Lucan, and Mary
Shelley’s *Frankenstein* (pp. 46-74), in Brett M. Rogers and Benjamin Eldon Stevens eds, *Classical Traditions in Science Fiction* (OUP) investigates the literary allusions to Lucretius’s and Lucan’s epic poems in Shelley’s novel, arguing that such intertextualities prepare the ground for both ethical and scientific questions. Weiner claims that Victor Frankenstein’s assemblage of body parts finds a correspondent in the atomism of Lucretius’s *De Rerum Natura*, where he ‘defines “monsters” as discordant assemblages of limbs’ (p. 52), while a second model for Shelley’s monster is to be found in ‘the Erichtho’s episode of Lucan’s *Bellum Civile*’ (p. 47), a ‘necromantic episode’ on which Shelley ‘bases the life cycle of the corpse reanimated by Frankenstein’ (p. 68). There are also two articles and a book chapter concerned with Shelley’s less popular third novel, *The Last Man*. Melissa Bailes’s ‘The Psychologization of Geological Catastrophe in Mary Shelley’s *The Last Man*’ (*ELH* 82[2015] 671-99) argues that Shelley critiques contemporary scientific theories of geology and of cataclysmic destruction such as Cuvier’s catastrophism, who ‘established extinction as incontrovertible fact’ (p. 672). To the various extinction theories, in *The Last Man* Shelley ‘assert[s] the primacy of her chosen hypothesis, demonstrated in futurity: plague’ (p. 682), thereby shifting the focus on to the individual rather than on a mass destruction comprehensive of all species. J. Jennifer Jones’s ‘The Art of Redundancy: Sublime Fiction and Mary Shelley’s *The Last Man*’ (*KSR* 29[2015] 25-41) contends that Shelley’s novel critiques the limits of Burke’s notion of the sublime, without however weakening the potential inherent in sublime fiction. Jones contends that the repetitiveness of the novel, for which it was ‘most viciously attacked’ (p. 27), represents its most important contribution, because through ‘the concept of repetition, Shelley provides an analysis of Burke’s theory of the sublime as well as an alternative to it’ (p. 27). Of relevance to this section also are two chapters entitled ‘Cruel and Unusual Romance: Beckford, Byron and the Abomination of Violence’ (pp. 24-61) and ‘Reasoning like a Turk: Indolence and Fatalism in
Sardanapalus and The Last Man’ (pp. 141-77), in Gerard Cohen-Vrignaud, ed., Radical Orientalism: Rights, Reform, and Romanticism (OUP), reviewed in greater depth in section 3 of this chapter. Cohen-Vrignaud argues that ‘Orientalism and the Gothic “monitor” the “abominations” of tyrants and enable readers to practice their moral sentiments’ (p. 33), while ‘licenses of Gothic villains depend on juridical inequality’ (p. 38), as shown in the novels Vathek (1786) by William Beckford and The Monk (1796) by Matthew Gregory Lewis. On the other hand, Shelley’s The Last Man ‘locates in the East a refusal to live by the “happier” code of self-endurance and moderation’ similarly to Byron’s Sardanapalus. The plague in Shelley’s novel originates in Turkey, thus playing on the Orientalist stereotype according to which ‘Muslim fatalists did not adequately protect themselves from infection’ (p. 160). Shelley’s Byronic hero, Lord Raymond, becomes ‘a sensualist unworthy of the family unit that offers economic and sexual security’ (p. 166). The plague thus acts as ‘an insuperable force that dismantles human fallacies’ (p. 170).

Three journal articles and one book chapter have been devoted to the fictional work of Mary Wollstonecraft. Laura Kirkley’s ‘Maria, ou Le Malheur d’être femme: Translating Mary Wollstonecraft in Revolutionary France’ (BJECS 38[2015] 239-55), reviewed in section 1, argues that Maria, or the Wrongs of Woman (1798) follows the same radical feminism of her Vindication of the Rights of Woman (1792) concerning both ‘legal equality’ and ‘women’s right to the experience and expression of sexual desire’ (p. 239). A special issue of Literature Compass (12 [2015]) ‘Romanticism and Suicide’ also appeared in 2015, where in the introductory essay (pp. 641-51) the two editors, Michelle Faubert and Nicole Reynolds, argue that ‘female suicide in the Romantic era emerges as a powerful trope through which a range of discourses – aesthetic, scientific, religious, philosophical, and political – converge to manage the culture’s most unknowable, recalcitrant subjects and bodies, women and subalterns chief among these’ (p. 641). Michelle Faubert’s ‘The Fictional
Suicides of Mary Wollstonecraft’ (*LitComp* 12 [2015] 652-59) contends that while William Godwin’s *Memoir* describes Wollstonecraft’s suicide attempts as ‘acts of passion’, in her letters and her two novels Wollstonecraft defends the notion of suicide as a rational choice through which women can assert their agency. Heather Klemann’s ‘How to Think with Animals in Mary Wollstonecraft’s *Original Stories* and *The Wrongs of Woman; or, Maria*’ (*L&U* 39[2015] 1-22) points out that in these works Wollstonecraft exploits animal metaphors because they ‘model the naturalness of maternal roles’ (p. 2). Klemann maintains that ‘[i]n both these fictional works animal tropes at once reinforce and redefine gender roles ... and at the same time educate readers on the seemingly irresolvable contradictions of gender equality’ (p. 4). Laura Kirkley’s “‘Original Spirit’: Literary Translations and Translational Literature in the Works of Mary Wollstonecraft’ (pp. 13-26), in Robin Truth Goodman ed., *Literature and the Development of Feminist Theory* (CUP) points out that Wollstonecraft’s feminist agenda is also visible in her ‘interventionist translation’ entitled *Elements of Morality for the Use of Young Children* (1790) of Christian Gotthilf Salzmann’s *Moralisches Elementarbuch* (1783), where Wollstonecraft ‘translates, both literally and metaphorically, the figure of the mother-educator, who, in her final incarnation in *Maria, or the Wrong of Woman* represents the most progressive stage in her revolutionary feminism’ (p. 13), as here she promotes the ‘rational mother who raises virtuous citizens’ (p. 16). Kirkley contends that ‘Wollstonecraft’s goal was to form individuals who, far from conforming to the status quo, would exercise their reason to recognize and resist injustice or tyranny’ (p. 20).

An article on William Godwin by Daniel DeWispelare entitled ‘Fugitive Pieces: Language, Embodiment, and the Case of Caleb Williams’ (*ECF* 28[Winter 2005-16] 345-73) claims that ‘fugitive advertising’ provided ‘a salient intertext for certain characterological and narrative strategies of the late eighteenth century novel’ (p. 345), and this is evident in Godwin’s *Things as They are; Or The Adventures of Caleb Williams* (1794). DeWispelare
contends that ‘Anglophone communities used fugitive advertisements to invent and propagate ideas of human difference as they related to embodied social interaction’ (p. 349), and that Godwin’s novel uses ‘a fugitive pursuit as a structural narrative element’ (p. 352). Lisa Ottum’s “‘Shallow’ Estates and ‘Deep’ Wild: The Landscapes of Charlotte Smith’s Fiction’ (TSLW 34[2015] 249-72) argues that in both her poetry and fiction Smith critiques ‘idealised images of rural England’. To the prospect view of the gentry’s gaze Smith counterpoises her ‘deep landscapes’, in order to ‘uncover the class and gender biases’ (p. 252) of the former. In Celestina (1791) and The Old Manor House (1793) ‘landscape bears witness to the existence of a history far deeper than tradition, a history that contests the status quo’ (p. 266).

Jacqueline Labbe’s ‘Romantic Intertextuality: The Adaptive Weave’ (WC 46[2015] 44-48) claims that the “‘adaptive weave” represents a network of allusive threads that, once plotted, enables an enhanced understanding of Romantic-period intertextuality’ (p. 44). For example, Charlotte Smith transforms ‘the standards male character of the novel of sensibility’ into an ‘inhabitant’ of a conflictual ‘modern world’ (p. 44) as is visible in the character of Orlando in The Old Manor House, while ‘Austen makes sustained use of most of Smith’s novels in all of her own’ (p. 46). Miranda Burgess’s ‘Sydney Owenson’s Tropics’ (ERR 26[2015] 281-88) notices that Owenson’s novel The Missionary: An Indian Tale (1811) is in line with ‘the emergent genre of writings on tropical medicine and tropical hygiene, which competed with the novel in attempting directly to regulate ... the British-Indian world, seeking to shape the practices of colonists ... and indigenous inhabitants alike’ (pp. 282-3, emphasis original).

Nicole Reynolds’s ‘Suicide, Romance, and Imperial Rebellion: Sati and the Lucretia Story in Sydney Owenson’s The Missionary: An Indian Tale’ (LitComp 12[2015] 675-82), an essay that is contained in the above-mentioned special issue ‘Romanticism and Suicide’, explores the politicization of the Hindu custom of widow burning in Owenson’s novel. Specifically, ‘by reading the attempted sati of Owenson’s female protagonist Luxima ... as an iteration of
the classical Lucretia story’, Reynolds explores ‘the novel’s posited links between female
chastity, inter-racial romance, and political community’ (p. 675). Karen Steele’s ‘Irish
Incognitos: Transnational Mobility in the National Tales of Maria Edgeworth and Sydney
Owenson’ (Éire 3&4[2015] 94-112) focuses on the ‘The Irish Incognito’, the penultimate
chapter of Richard Lovell and Maria Edgeworth’s An Essay on Irish Bulls (1802), on
Edgeworth’s Ormond (1817), and on Owenson’s O’Donnel (1814), in order to explore the
‘composite portrait of Irish men and women as cosmopolitan citizens of the world’ (p. 95).
Jeanne M. Britton’s ‘Fictional Footnotes, Romantic Orientalism, and the Remediated Novel:
Elizabeth Hamilton’s Translation of the Letters of a Hindoo Rajah’ (ERR 26[2015] 773-87)
points out that this heavily annotated epistolary novel performs a double function, as while
the titular character learns the British culture in the main text, the British learn Hindu
traditions in the notes. Britton explains that ‘the pedagogical aim of Hamilton’s notes
indicates the very present concern of empire’s intellectual and cultural ramifications’ (p.
781). Finally, a chapter entitled ‘The Stigma of Popularity’ (pp. 63-106), in H. J. Jackson
(Those Who Write for Immortality: Romantic Reputations and the Dream of Lasting Fame
(YaleUP) is of interest to the present section on the Romantic novel as, in exploring the
reasons behind the more durable legacy of some Romantic novelists than poets, this chapter
‘considers the careers and afterlives of Walter Scott, Jane Austen, and Mary Brunton in
conjunction with their ideas about literary fame’ (p. 63).

It is also worthwhile signalling Charlotte Gordon’s double biography Romantic
Outlaws: The Extraordinary Lives of Mary Wollstonecraft & Mary Shelley (Hutchinson).
Shaped through alternating chapters on both mother and daughter, this section will focus on
Mary Shelley while the chapters related to Mary Wollstonecraft are detailed above, in section
1. This is ‘the first full-length exploration of both women’s lives’, focusing on the influence
of Wollstonecraft on her daughter Shelley and on the latter’s ‘obsession with her mother’ (p.
xvi). Gordon maintains that the parallels between the two women are numerous as both ‘mother and daughter attempted to free themselves from the stranglehold of polite society, and both struggled to balance their need for love and companionship with their need for independence’ (p. xvii). Charlotte Gordon’s biography of Mary Shelley is intense, provocative, and thought-provoking. It depicts an incredibly passionate circle of friends who mused in each other’s company and who were deeply inspired by each other’s intellect. It certainly shows the accomplishment of a young female writer who well deserved her mother’s legacy.

3. Poetry

In this section, Matthew Ward covers work on Romantic poets from A to K; Paul Whickman covers poets from L to Z as well as general works on Romantic poetry.

There were a number of general works either on Romantic poetry specifically, or that predominantly featured Romantic poetry, produced in 2015. *Publishing, Editing, and Reception: Essays in Honor of Donald H. Reiman* (UDelP) is a case in point. Edited by Michael Edson, this is an excellent volume commemorating the career of Donald Reiman. The fact that of the twelve chapters in this *festschrift* eight consider the work of Shelley, the Shelley Circle or the practice of editing Shelley in particular, reflects Reiman’s most significant contribution to Romantic scholarship. Indeed, his influence is such that Michael Edson is right to say that his ‘lifelong editorial efforts [have] transformed the field of Shelley studies’ (p. xxiii).

*Publishing, Editing, and Reception* is primarily concerned with the multifaceted aspects of editing, particularly of Romantic poets. What is revealing is how these can influence a variety of critical approaches. To this end, the volume is arranged into four thematic units. The first two – ‘Romantic Publishing and Print Culture’ and ‘New
Perspectives on the Shelley Circle’ respectively – focus on Romantic-period ‘context’; the
final two – ‘Romantic Bards and Modern Editors’ and ‘Shelley’s Afterlives’ – instead
consider modern reception and editorship (with Michael J. Neth’s essay (pp. 215-44) an
interesting exception). What is evident from this collection, however, is that an approach to
Romantic writing or editing from the perspective of either temporal space cannot avoid the
other entirely. A number of essays on approaches to modern editions of Romantic poetry for
instance consider the vexed question of what the poets intended for their original readers and
whether, in fact, such an ‘intentionalist’ approach is appropriate at all. Although one may
invoke the ‘intentional fallacy’ in such considerations of intentionality in literary
interpretation, this is arguably less suitable when reflecting on typographical presentation,
punctuation or even the idiosyncratic spellings of the author. Investigating an author’s
publication intentions is complex however, and involves greater examination than simply
consulting manuscript drafts or first editions alone. This is the subject of both Hermione de
Almeida’s (pp. 3-24) and Alice Levine’s (pp. 135-52) essays on the relationship between
Byron and Murray. For Levine, Byron’s published poetry should almost be viewed as a
collaboration between poet and publisher, whereas de Almeida stresses Byron’s own
influence on Murray in championing poets such as Hogg. Similarly, David Greetham (pp.
153-70) explores what can be considered a ‘primary’ text in relation to the poetry of Shelley,
arguing that it is more slippery than many modern editors appreciate, particularly since many
poems exist only in a published form. Greetham also makes a convincing argument for
Shelley’s canonicity as being related to the editorial state of the various poetic editions
available throughout history and also how editorial and critical practice are very much inter-
related. Indeed, Michael O’Neill’s (pp. 77-96) and Stuart Curran’s (pp. 65-76) essays both
demonstrate how consideration of manuscript drafts can enrich or reformulate readings of
poetry. They both also remind us of how successful editors of poetry such as Reiman are also
required to possess ‘a good ear’ as well as a firm grasp of editorial principles. O’Neill’s essay for instance starts by relating Reiman’s noting of the subtlety of rhyme in ‘To Jane – The Recollection’ that O’Neill was responsible for editing at the time. From this, O’Neill discusses the sophistication and subtlety of Shelley’s rhyming, making superb and convincing readings, particularly of *The Triumph of Life* (1824).

B.C. Barker-Benfield and Michael J. Neth consider the role of the editor in regards to censorship (pp. 185-214, 215-244). Whereas the former considers this in relation to Lady Shelley’s contradictory completionist and censorious attitudes to Percy Shelley’s poetry after his death, the latter explores the oft-considered revisions to *Laon and Cythna* (1817), arguing however that many of these alterations were pre-emptive, and exist even in manuscript drafts to the poem. The posthumous legacy of Shelley was also explored in Nora Crook’s essay that relates, in a highly original way, Rudyard Kipling’s comedic ‘Steam Tactics’ [1904] to *Prometheus Unbound* (1820).

Timothy Webb (pp. 245-262) and Charles E. Robinson (pp. 25-42) offer essays that can be seen as exemplifying, besides editing, the other key unifying theme of the volume. That is, the questioning of concepts of single-author Romantic genius. Webb’s essay for instance, ‘Reading Aloud in the Shelley Circle’, considers literary composition – as well as simple experience – to be far more collaborative than is usually thought. He notes too that the oral/aural nature of much of the Shelleys’ literary experiences can in fact be observed in the surprisingly ‘oral’ nature of much of their written work. Robinson similarly considers the under-explored inter-textual relationship between Byron and Hazlitt. This is then an excellent volume that is both wide-ranging and coherent, illustrating the importance and interrelation of editorial practice to readings of Romantic poetry. This is a fitting tribute to Reiman’s career.
Tim Fulford’s *Romantic Poetry and Literary Coteries: The Dialect of the Tribe* (PalMac) is another excellent 2015 publication that helps us to consider Romantic-period writing as not simply the original work of a ‘sublime egotist’ but as the result of ‘literary production in groups’ (p. 4). What follows is a convincing account of Romantic authorship as far more of a social experience than is popularly considered. Although his approach is ambitiously multi-faceted, Fulford primarily focuses on three ‘coteries’, ‘tribes’ or ‘sects’ of writers; the Southey/Coleridge (West Country) circle of the 1790s, the circles of labouring-class poets arranged around Clare and Bloomfield, and the so-called ‘Cockney School’ of poets associated with Leigh Hunt. As seems apparent, the relationship between the rural and the urban or the province and the capital, and the roles such groupings played in inculcating such consciousness, are an important part of the book. The formation of the ‘Bristol Coterie’ of Southey, Coleridge, More, Yearsley and Mary Robinson in the 1790s for instance, is considered in part to have resulted in a conscious removal from ‘the culture of conspicuous consumption and political repression’ the poets saw in London (p. 23). The book’s coteries become more complex than simple geographical groupings however. When discussing *Confessions of an English Opium Eater* (1821) for instance, and De Quincey’s reading of the Solitary’s account of an imagined city in Wordsworth’s *The Excursion* (1814), Fulford interprets this as the view of ‘an individual who speaks […] from a rural community’ and the scene as ‘a rural vision of a heavenly city’ (pp. 226-7). The fact that the Solitary’s ‘vision’ is one that, despite his name, is formed from experience of community, and is then subsequently alluded to by De Quincey as a means to illustrate opium visions of London, shows literary ‘coteries’ working on a number of levels. Not only does De Quincey seemingly emphasise an aesthetic inter-connection via intertextuality with Wordsworth, his allusion helps to connect the individual with the community, and the rural with the town. One of Fulford’s central theses is that although ‘the poetry led the group[s] to be defined by [their]
critics’ (p. 2), it nevertheless became an important part of the members’ poetic self-identities. This manifested itself in a number of ways or, rather, was shaped by a number of factors that Fulford considers in depth. As well as considering the pressures of publication, such as poets banding together to help get their work into print, Fulford explores the individual writers’ use of consistent tropes and allusions to the poetry of their peers. The example of De Quincey and Wordsworth is a case in point; other examples include the Orientalist intertextuality between Coleridge and Southey as well as Mary Robinson’s allusions to both poets in order to define herself as part of the Bristol school. The fact that this practice was also motivated by a need to maximise publication revenue helps to demonstrate how aesthetic considerations were not isolated from the realities of commerce.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of Fulford’s book, however, is his work on authorial recovery. As well as more major figures like Coleridge, Fulford is particularly invested in the importance of more minor figures in these various coteries, Mary Robinson and Robert Bloomfield being the two most obvious examples. Whereas Robinson is considered as playing a significant role ‘in shaping early Romanticism, as both the object and practitioner of allusions that signposted and cemented the literary partnerships she entered with the Bristol poets’ (p. 25), Bloomfield ‘had to make his locality an authentic site from which Englishness could be derived’ (p. 133). Fulford’s book then is both a fascinating and welcome addition to the study of Romantic poetry and not solely for his work in broadening the canon. Not only does his extensive primary research further emphasise the connections between poets, determining composition to be a communal experience, his attentiveness to the poetry allows us to see this manifesting aesthetically within the work itself.

Partly considered in section 2 above, Gerard Cohen-Vrignaud’s *Radical Orientalism: Rights, Reform and Romanticism* (CUP) essentially explores the radical implications of orientalist discourse in Romantic-period literature. Cohen-Vrignaud’s introductory example
of the 1817 case of Thomas Wooler helps illustrate his central thesis. Wooler’s comparison of the British people to Algerian slaves and the British government to the ‘Great Mogul of the Indian Empire’ shows how orientalising practices became a way to challenge conceptions of British freedom (p. 1). Essentially, the assertion of superior British freedom compared to that encountered in other nations is readily challenged in the same way; the British State is either no different to these foreign powers or its illiberality is regarded as ‘un-British’ (p. 1). As Cohen-Vrignaud puts it, Orientalism ‘offered pro-reform Britons a forceful way to articulate the rights they were due by society’, thus deviating from Edward Said’s claim ‘that Orientalist art primarily voices imperial designs’ (pp. 4-5). This thesis is interesting in its own right, but what is particularly original about the author’s approach is his relation of the radical periodical press’s invocation of a ‘radical Orientalism’ to the ‘Oriental romances’ and satires of Romantic poets such as Byron and Shelley (as well as Mary Shelley and William Beckford’s novels, as discussed above). For Cohen-Vrignaud, this not only draws together such figures as Byron and Shelley as writers of a shared tradition, but also allows Byron in particular to be much more readily connected to ‘plebeian radicals’ than is often considered (p. 3). Indeed Byron, as the author of ‘Oriental’ poems and plays that were both ‘literary’ and hugely popular, is the most prominently featured major author in the volume. A particular concern of Cohen-Vrignaud’s throughout the book is in thinking of how authors’ use of Orientalist tropes allows them to reflect on liberalism – and Humanism by extension – in Britain. Chapter 1 for instance considers Gothic Orientalism and how its depiction of bodily violence highlighted the violation by the British state of the ‘sanctification of the human body’ which is ‘at the core of liberalism’ (p. 24). Conrad in Byron’s The Corsair (1814) for instance is considered as falling into a victimised and emasculated position towards the end of the poem that reflects Western ‘liberal anxiety about male autonomy’ (p. 60). Chapter 2 relates Shelley’s Hellas and The Revolt of Islam most particularly to contemporary
discussions concerning fears of the mob and how Oriental-style despotism may lead to similarly ‘Oriental’ ‘popular violence’ (p. 66). Cohen-Vrignaud reads *The Revolt of Islam* (1818) then as a poem that eschews mob and popular violence for ‘reform constitutionalism’ arguing that it ‘emphasizes the power of language, exemplifying liberalism’s devotion to political change through discursive contestation’ (p. 81). It is worth noting that Cohen-Vrignaud prefers *The Revolt of Islam* to the poem’s original title *Laon and Cythna* arguing that ‘reform’ more reflects the poem’s ‘constitutionalism’ (p. 80). Although the poem’s revisions have been widely discussed elsewhere, Cohen-Vrignaud himself does not consider these beyond the title. This is a shame since some of the alterations might have benefitted his argument or are, at least, worth considering. For instance, the tyrannical ‘Christian Priest’ in *Laon and Cythna* is more specifically an ‘Iberian Priest’ only in *The Revolt of Islam*. This alteration thus ‘Orientalizes’ this figure in Cohen-Vrignaud’s understanding, since he sees Gothic Catholicism as similarly ‘Oriental’.

The final two chapters return to Byron (and Mary Shelley, as discussed in the Novel section above). The titular hero of *Sardanapalus* (1821) is read, on the one hand, as a strangely nuanced allegory of George IV. Sardanapalus’s pavilions clearly allude to the ‘Orientalist’ Brighton Pavilion of the British monarch, but Sardanapalus’s redemption towards the end of the play suggests that such extravagance is not to be condemned outright. Rather, invoking a wasteful, slothful and economically irrational Oriental ruler who ultimately redeems himself is not simply to condemn a British monarch but to reflect on Western ‘Economic Man’ as a flawed model prompting present discontentment. The final chapter continues in this vein, but focuses instead on Byron’s autonomy of the self, arrived at via his Orientalism. As Cohen-Vrignaud puts it ‘Byron’s Orientalism promoted radical detachment from ideal systems of philosophy and poetry that would impose commitment to principle over the vagaries of desire’ (p. 215). Cohen-Vrignaud’s book then is an ambitious
and well-researched work that provides a stimulating alternative to the standard Saidian approach to Romantic poetry’s frequent Orientalisms. Although guilty of imprecision with terms such as ‘radical’ and ‘liberal’ – they are certainly not interchangeable and are far more multifaceted than Cohen-Vrignaud implies – the exemplary research of a fairly niche trope among the radical press allows us to consider Byron and Shelley’s poetry in a rather different climate.

Also considered in section 2 above, H.J. Jackson’s *Those Who Write for Immortality: Romantic Reputations and the Dream of Lasting Fame* (Yale UP) contains chapters that deal with Wordsworth, Southey, Keats, Crabbe, Leigh Hunt, Blake, and Clare, among others, including Barry Cornwall and Robert Bloomfield, who stand as her counter-examples to canonical poets. The central and most important claim of the volume is that ‘long-term survival has depended more on external circumstances and accidental advantages than on inherent literary worth’ (p. 218), and Jackson’s thorough and careful scholarship certainly backs this up. *Those Who Write for Immortality* wears its learning lightly, but it is nonetheless an important work not just for our period, but for all those interested in the vagaries of fame in literary history.

The twelve essays in Kostas Boyiopoulos’ and Mark Sandy’s *Decadent Romanticism: 1780-1914* (Ashgate) offer a range of approaches to the question of Romanticism and its relationship to ‘Decadence’. Generally, the essays either consider the influence of Romanticism on the Decadence movement of the later nineteenth century or the Decadent tropes that are observable in earlier Romantic works. Anna Barton (pp. 15-26) for instance reads the recovery of Blake in the later nineteenth century in relation to notions of literary ‘perversity’, that is seen by early Symbolist critics as evidence of Blakean Decadence (as limiting as this might be). Frederick Burwick (pp. 27-42), on the other hand, is more focused on the Romantic period itself in his discussion of depictions of incest on the Romantic stage,
focusing on the dramas of Byron, Shelley and Joanna Baillie. An important point that
Burwick makes is that incest was far from taboo, and that ‘[n]o legal ban prohibited the stage
representation’ of it (p. 29). This is worth bearing in mind when we consider Romantic-
period censorship, such as of Shelley’s *Laon and Cythna*, which is often seen to be concerned
with matters of incest when evidence suggests the opposite. Bernard Beatty’s essay (pp. 43-
58) traces the influence of Byron and Wordsworth onto later Decadence, noting that
although Byron’s influence is more obvious, Wordsworth is ‘usually regarded as the
antithesis’ of the movement (p. 43). Beatty traces Decadent writers’, such as Baudelaire’s,
use of Wordsworthian tropes through the lens of de Quincey, whereas Byron’s relationship to
Decadence produces ‘the opposite problem’ in that the ‘path is all too well signposted’ (p.
50). Essentially, Beatty convincingly concludes that when Byron and Wordsworth are either
invoked or ignored by later writers, these writers are only really thinking of a mediated
figure, a ‘Byron’ or a ‘Wordsworth’ respectively. Boyiopoulos (pp. 59-74) and Sarah
Wootton (pp. 75-88) offer different essays on Keats’s influence on Decadent writers. Keats,
superficially at least, appears the canonical Romantic poet who is most easily relatable to
literary Decadence. Boyiopoulos reads the depictions of seeming intoxication or sensual
euphoria in Keats’s poetry as being important reference points for such depictions in the work
of Arthur Symons and Ernest Dowson. Boyiopoulos’s conclusion is that all three writers see
writing and creativity itself as the ‘ultimate intoxicant’ (p. 74). Wootton’s essay, on the other
hand, starts from the position that by ‘the end of the nineteenth century, John Keats was no
longer simply the author of “high” art, but the embodiment of art’ (p. 75). To this end,
Wootton explores the Keatsian books and images produced between 1888 and 1911, that
either served as illustrations for editions of Keats’s poetry or as visual attempts to capture a
Keatsian aesthetic. This medium, it is worth noting, is often neglected by critics. Shelley’s
Decadent influence is the subject of essays by Michael O’Neill (pp. 103-18) and Lisa Vargo
The legacy of Jonathan Wordsworth, who died in 2006, was evident in a 2015 volume. He was of course not only the great-great-great nephew of William Wordsworth but a leading Wordsworthian and Romantics scholar in his own right. His most important books, *The Music of Humanity* (1969) that successfully recovered ‘The Ruined Cottage’, and his *The Borders of Vision* (1983), are two of the most influential works in the field of Wordsworth criticism. *The Invisible World* (CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform) is a posthumous collection of ten of Jonathan Wordsworth’s previously unpublished lectures, delivered at Wordsworth Summer Conferences and Wordsworth Winter Schools, both of which are held annually near Grasmere. Edited by Richard Haynes, the collection is an impressive array of raw, stimulating and varied Romantic scholarship. It is regrettable that these lectures were not prepared for publication since, although fluent, they are not quite at Jonathan Wordsworth’s rigorous best and the volume itself, designed primarily as an e-book, is lacking a little in visual typography. However, Haynes’s editorship means that all essays are fully referenced, clearly presented and, most importantly, the selection is both thought-
provoking and wide-ranging. They nevertheless are unified by an overarching theme, the focus primarily being on different Romantic treatments of the imagination. The opening lecture on Wordsworth as a revolutionary poet, first delivered in 1989, argues for Wordsworth as maintaining his revolutionary fervour to a greater extent than is generally appreciated; essentially, that he is a ‘passionate sympathiser with the ideal of revolution’ (p. 17). Wordsworth is also ‘revolutionary’ in an aesthetic sense, in that he has the capacity to make the ordinary extraordinary. The third lecture on Wordsworth’s ‘Sympathetic Imagination’ similarly convincingly demonstrates Wordsworth’s exceptional capacity to identify the poetical potential within an ordinary mind. Jonathan Wordsworth argues that despite the young Wordsworth’s limited contact with women, the success of his sympathetic female characters demonstrate a strong sympathetic imagination that aligns Wordsworth closely with the ‘chameleon [sic] poet’ figure of Keats and not simply a poet of an ‘egotistical sublime’. Keats is himself the focus of the following essay on the ‘Keatsian Imagination’. Jonathan Wordsworth describes Keats as ‘yearn[ing] […] for the power to paint […] in the gleam of imagination […] that consecrates, makes holy and also substantial’ (p. 86). ‘The Doors of Perception’ is a broader lecture considering the differing Romantic conceptions of imagination, taking in Blake, Wordsworth, Coleridge and Keats, while two further lectures on Blake consider Blake’s ‘theory’ of the imagination in depth and the difficulty of *The First Book of Urizen* (1794). As well as two further lectures on Wordsworth, another chapter considers Burns and Macpherson, exploring the success of Ossian and its influence on later Romanticism. Coleridge’s own theory of the imagination is explored in depth through close attention to ‘Frost at Midnight’ (1817), taking into account the influence of Cowper’s *The Task* (1785). This collection of lectures reminds us of Jonathan Wordsworth’s insightful scholarship and will serve to inspire further generations of scholars even if these are not in
themselves completed or polished pieces of work. It is a welcome addition to the body of Jonathan Wordsworth’s criticism.

Romanticism and Philosophy: Thinking with Literature (Routledge) is a collection of sophisticated essays edited by Sophie Laniel-Musitelli and Thomas Constantinesco on Romantic-period engagements with philosophy. Considering Percy Shelley’s position in A Defence of Poetry (1840) that poets and philosophers are virtually interchangeable, it almost goes without saying that poetry is prominent in the volume, and the work of Shelley and Wordsworth particularly so. It is worth emphasising, as is indicated by the volume’s subtitle, that these essays are not simply concerned with the poetry as simple vehicles of the philosophical ideas of the authors, rather they are ‘bound by a common concern for literary writing as a form of thinking’ (p. 2). Indeed, a number of the essays are interested in the ‘afterlives’ of Romantic writing; for instance philosophical thinkers like Paul de Man and Stanley Cavell are considered as having approached their theoretical positions through their reading of Shelley and Wordsworth respectively. The essays are arranged in four sections. Part I, ‘Romantic Confrontations’, looks at both how Romanticism confronts previous philosophical certainties and how Romantic literature and philosophy are competitively engaged with the other. Mark Sandy’s essay on the ‘Ghostly Language’ of Wordsworth’s Salisbury Plain poems (pp. 60-74) explores how Wordsworth’s poetry is both ‘haunted and haunting’ (p. 60). This works on a number of levels within the Salisbury Plain poems in particular; most simply, the traveller is haunted by ‘the spectral presences’ of the environment, while he himself becomes a ‘haunter’ of the plain, possessing a ‘revenant-like impulse to return home’ despite the impossibility of doing so (pp. 62-3). This parallels the situation textually, in which the different versions of the poem, as well as Wordsworth’s other poetry, are ghostly presences, informing and informed by each other. Similarly, Sandy discusses how the Spenserian stanza form suggests a haunting of, and by, the form of the
older Romance of Spenser; the poem similarly echoes Milton. Most importantly, ‘Salisbury Plain is haunted by shadowy historical and social realities, which reassert themselves in the main narrative as a series of presences’ (p. 69). Arkady Plotnitsky’s essay on Shelley’s ontology (pp. 74-96) demonstrates how his poetry exceeds the investigation of Hume and Kant into the relationship between mind and matter, noting how Shelley’s poetry does not commit to certainties. Indeed, because of this, poetry ‘actively defines or redefines the field of possibilities, or of probabilities’ (p. 91). Therefore, Shelley’s poetry enables us to avoid the trap set by Alain Badiou that ‘when you decide upon what exists you bind yourself to Being’ (cited, p. 74). Part II, on ‘The Poetics of Thought’, includes essays by Simon Jarvis (pp. 97-116), Pascale Guibert (pp. 117-30) and Yves Abrioux (pp. 131-46) on Shelley, Wordsworth and Clare respectively. Jarvis’s essay demonstrates, in a similar vein to Plotnitsky’s, that Shelley’s form and technique are central to how a poem such as The Triumph of Life ‘thinks’, and how verse itself leaves no original concept unchanged. In contrast to Plotnitsky and Jarvis, Guibert’s essay shows, using Badiou, how the seeming separation of Wordsworth from a purely philosophical sphere means that ‘truth’ is something that can be objectively located for him. Abrioux’s theoretically dense essay on Clare, offering close-reading of three particularly ‘minor’ poems, considers Clare’s ‘minor’ status as one that frees him ‘from even the most implicit lip service to established philosophical or political hierarchies’ (p. 131).

Part III of the volume, on ‘Romantic Selves’, includes an essay by Laura Quinney (pp. 179-93) relating Blakean subjectivity to that proposed later by Kierkegaard, particularly in how both reject philosophical tradition that privileges ‘objective’ experience. At the same time, identity is really ‘an intrusion of outwardness into the inner life’ (p. 189), thus both Blake and Kierkegaard are seen to explore the difficulties in determining ‘self’ in relation to concepts of subjectivity. The volume ends with a Coda by Edward T. Duffy (pp. 245-54) that, in focusing on Stanley Cavell’s reading of Romantic poets and particularly his reading of
Wordsworth, encapsulates the findings of the volume. Duffy sees Cavell as not simply having used Romantic poetry to ‘carry’ the weight of his philosophy for him, but also as expressing it and carrying it into being in the first place (p. 253). This complex volume is nevertheless a superb addition to Romantic scholarship. The essays demonstrate not only theoretical but philosophical rigour, and all attest to the sophisticated thoughts of the poets considered, as well as the philosophical potential within poetry itself.

2015 also saw the publication of a number of scholarly versions of the works of more minor Romantic poets for the first time. Judith Thompson’s *John Thelwall: Selected Poetry and Poetics* (PalMac), for instance, is the first modern edition of Thelwall’s poetry and poetic criticism. This seems remarkable when we consider the significance of Thelwall within the Romantic period, not only because he was a radical orator and writer of great political significance, but also because of his relationship and engagement with figures such as Wordsworth and Coleridge. Thompson herself has written on this relationship in her *John Thelwall in The Wordsworth Circle: The Silenced Partner* (2012), and this edition of poetry serves as a continuation of Thelwall’s academic and poetical recovery. As the discoverer, in 2004, of Thelwall’s ‘Derby Manuscript’, which has revolutionised our understanding of Thelwall’s contribution to the literature and intellectual climate of the period, Thompson is well-placed to be at the forefront of this process.

Part of the task awaiting those who wish to recover the works of less canonical writers is to assert their literary merit. Thompson certainly achieves this in her introductory chapter, noting that despite Thelwall’s strength lying primarily in an oral tradition – ‘voice was to him what vision was to other Romantics’ (p. 3) – she nevertheless argues passionately not only for the breadth of forms with which Thelwall worked, but also for his originality and grasp of poetic style. For example, Thelwall is argued to have ‘revolutionized […] the sonnet’ (p. 5) in much the same way that Coleridge had ‘revolutionized’ the ode. The relationship between the
two men, beginning in the later 1790s, was not always cordial but is still seen as ‘catalyz[ing]
a new phase in the poetic careers of both men [that] changed the course of English literature’
(p. 5). It seems churlish to dispute this claim, but it nevertheless feels an unnecessary one; the
value of Thelwall’s poetry could have perhaps been allowed to speak for itself more, with
editorial comments limited to contextualising the poems’ biographical, political, social and
literary history. This is very minor criticism however, as otherwise the editorial decisions are
to be highly commended. Indeed, Thompson’s selections are well-chosen, not only
demonstrating Thelwall’s versatility as a poet and poetical thinker, but also offering evidence
of his extended work and experimentation in each form. To this end, the collection is
arranged in eight sections, covering Pastoral and Peripatetic Poems, Comic Ballads, Sonnets,
section is introduced with an appropriate extract from Thelwall’s prose criticism or poetic
theory, helping to establish his poetry as manifestations of a poetic philosophy not too
dissimilar, perhaps, to Wordsworth’s. Thelwall is an amusing and skilful prose writer; his
criticism of Alexander Pope, seen in his ‘On Pastoral Poetry’ (pp. 22-6), seems in part to
tackle Pope on the grounds of Wordsworth’s critique of Thomas Gray in ‘Preface to Lyrical
Ballads’. Thelwall is far less polite, however, dismissing Pope for his ‘puerilities’ and
describing his poetic imagery as ‘incongruous’ (p. 23). His poetry too has the same direct wit,
most obviously in his satiric poetry. Thompson herself argues for his comic voice as his
‘saving grace’ (p. 51) which strangely seems to damn with faint praise; he is clearly an
important poet in many other modes. In fact, what is most surprising about Thelwall’s
writing, considering what we know of his background and his reputation, is that so much of
his best poetry, much of which was found in the Derby Manuscript, is erotic or amatory. His
‘pastoral’ poems clearly show the influence of Erasmus Darwin, as Thompson herself notes,
but they frequently exceed even the eroticism of poems such as The Botanic Garden (1791).
Thompson’s edition is an excellent introduction to Thelwall as poet. It is well-presented, supported by superb original research and the engaging and representative selection of poetry suggests a readership beyond solely an academic one. Despite this, it is nevertheless an important addition to Romantic studies and should be recommended reading to all scholars of the period. It is hoped that Thompson’s work on Thelwall’s biography will produce a similarly accomplished piece of scholarship.

In contrast to 2014, there were few single-author studies on female poets in 2015. A notable exception, however, was Sharon Smith’s “I Cannot Harm Thee Now”: The Ethics of Satire in Anna Barbauld’s Mock-Heroic Poetry’ (ERR 26[2015] 551-73). As Smith notes, Barbauld’s satiric voice has been largely absent in poetry collections and in critical studies of satire, despite Barbauld’s command of the genre’s traditions and cultural capital. Challenging the conventional view of satire as a masculine mode, and identifying the way Barbauld employs mock-heroic to question the ethics of readers and writers alike, Smith puts forward a convincing case for Barbauld’s inclusion amongst Romantic satire that will hopefully continue in future works. John Pierce, in ‘The Suspension of Sensibility in Amelia Opie’s Early Poetry’ (Romanticism 21[2015] 238-49), considers, through study of an oft-neglected female writer of the period, the issue of sensibility within Romantic-period writing. Through close and careful reading of Amelia Opie’s early volumes of poetry, Pierce demonstrates Opie’s liminality in the history of sensibility. He argues that her poetry is ‘rooted in the eighteenth century but also looking forward to the Romantic period’ and ‘registers a shift in its expression of traditional characteristics of sensibility while problematizing the nature of unconscious and self-conscious expressions of passion as identity emerges through temporal experience’ (p. 229). Another less-canonical female Romantic poet is the subject of Harriet Kramer Linkin’s ‘Mary Tighe’s Newly Discovered Letters and Journals to Caroline Hamilton’ (Romanticism 21[2015] 207-27); reviewed in section 1 of this chapter. All three
articles offer a generous recovery of female writers that particularly emphasises their
significance as well as their literary merit.

Tighe’s literary merit is further evidenced by Linkin’s publication of a substantial
edition of her previously unpublished poetry on Romantic Circles
(https://www.rc.umd.edu/editions/tighe_verses). This makes a significant amount of
manuscript and archival material available for the first time. Verses Transcribed for H.T. is a
266-page two-volume autograph manuscript of 121 original poems and 72 illustrations. 65 of
the poems have not appeared in any known print sources and, of those that have, 17 are
significantly different in the manuscript album version. The ‘H.T.’ of the volume’s title is
Henry Tighe, Mary’s husband, who had urged her to prepare the collection for publication
despite her reservations concerning the commercialization of her poetry. For Linkin then, this
collection is not only important in unearthing previously unknown material, but also in
revealing that Tighe was a determined figure when it came to the direction of her publishing
career. This is detailed in depth in Linkin’s introduction, which also offers an overview of
Tighe’s life and career more generally. Linkin’s analysis of Tighe’s poetry reveals Tighe to
be a figure who self-consciously identifies herself as a poetess, despite her general
disinclination for publication, as well as one aware of the paradoxes of representation. Of the
benefits of an electronic edition, the most significant is the additional availability of the full-
size page images of the original album manuscript. These are beautifully presented in a fine
hand, and the images are of an exceedingly high quality. The fact that Tighe illustrated many
of her poems suggests that, like Blake, the relationship between text and image is not
necessarily simply incidental. Making these images available allows the interpretation of the
text and illustrations in unison to take place. Indeed, Linkin for instance explores the
relationship between three of Tighe’s poems – ‘The Faded Flowers’, ‘Sonnet VIII’ and
‘Address to My Harp’ – and the accompanying ‘tailpiece’ illustrations; like the poems, they
depict a paradoxically vibrant stasis. Tighe’s poetry is very much in keeping with the poetic
climate of the age; sonnets feature quite heavily in the first volume, and the relationship
between art, artifice, and nature are important thematic concerns. This is a superb edition
with excellent editorial work by Linkin. To publish without the illustrations would not do
Tighe’s artistry justice and, although a hardcopy facsimile edition would be a beautiful
object, the electronic version is more practical. This edition plays an important role in re-
evaluating Tighe’s canonical position in literary history.

There were a number of valuable contributions to Blake studies this year, with several
monographs, book chapters, and articles all offering new insights into this most bewitching
and at times baffling of poets. Saree Makdisi in Reading William Blake (CUP) draws
attention to the bewitching and baffling, and the benefit of embracing both when teaching
Blake. In the process Makdisi illustrates why he is one of the preeminent contemporary
critics of Blake. Focused on Blake the author and printer of the illuminated books, this
scholarly work goes much further than the introduction to the poet that such an edition is
intended as. Makdisi’s approach is imaginative and convincing, shedding important light on a
range of topics pertinent to Blake studies. Each short chapter considers a particular area:
Image, Text, Desire, Joy, Power, Time, Making. Songs of Innocence and of Experience
(1789-94) is used throughout so as to provide some consistency and grounding for the
exploration. This has the added benefit of being the work that for most students and critics
begins their fascination with Blake. Makdisi consistently focuses on the interplay between
words and image, and combines discussion of the material nature of Blake’s illuminated
books and our interpretative strategies toward them. Reading Blake can so often be
transformative and yet the weight of scholarly apparatus that surrounds his work can
sometimes minimise the intense experience of reading him. Thus, whilst keeping in view the
need to elucidate much that is challenging in Blake’s work, Makdisi rightly asserts that we
run the risk of losing so much of what is exciting and potentially spellbinding in the lines of verse if we read Blake primarily through the filter of critical commentary. Informed as he says by his own teaching practices, Makdisi’s work generously aims to offer a platform from which readers can think about Blake’s works, and find their own reading practices, rather than have Makdisi’s imposed upon them. It is thus an open and liberating work of criticism very much in keeping with the beliefs of its subject.

The hugely dramatic nature of Blake’s work encourages a sense of the theatrical. In both the popular and the scholarly imagination his verse has long been both appropriated to and examined through the performative. Recently we have had Susanne Sklar’s *Blake’s Jerusalem as Visionary Theatre* (OUP [2001]). Diane Piccitto seeks to add to our understanding of Blake’s theatricality with *Blake’s Drama, Theatre, Performance and Identity in the Illuminated Books* (PalMac). She reflects on the relation between the poetic performer and his audience, or, as she puts it, on verse as ‘dramatic performances of identity that create an active spectatorship’ (p. 1). Piccitto focuses on the illuminated books because, as she explains, the combination of image and text illustrates the interplay between the verbal and visual that makes up the dramatic performance of Blake’s forms and plays such a vital role in their reception. Piccitto’s first chapter nicely situates Blake within his historical context, specifically the debates about popular theatre. This allows her to develop her argument as to why the illuminated books should be considered ‘dramatic theatre’ (p. 35) and the means by which the poet constructs ‘Blakean spectatorship’ (p. 52). Combining historicism, theory, and close readings, Piccitto offers another angle on Blake’s relation to an important Romantic cultural context.

One chapter is dedicated to Blake in the late Marilyn Butler’s *Mapping Mythologies: Countercurrents in Eighteenth-Century Poetry and Cultural History* (CUP). Butler selected the authors for her study because they shared common interest in primitive religious beliefs
or myths, whilst also felt themselves to be patriotically speaking for the nation, and from an essentially country, rather than a city, perspective. Keen, as she puts it, to seek out ‘the needs, beliefs and assumptions that governed’, Blake and others and helped produce ‘some of the most innovative, characteristic and influential British writings of the period 1730-1820’ (p. 1), Butler’s take on Blake is typically clear-sighted and illuminating. Butler identifies Blake not with a Romantic flight from the preceding decades, but as a figure whose own mythologizing stems in large part from the works of eighteenth-century British poets and thought. It was a pleasure to read an essay on Blake first written thirty years ago that still feels germane.

Two essays on Blake appeared in *British Romanticism in European Perspective*, edited by Steve Clark and Tristanne Connolly (PalMac). Diane Piccitto, in ‘Blake and the European (Pre)History of Melodrama: Beyond the Borders of Time and Stage’ (pp. 193-209), considers the Illuminated Books as inspired by melodramatic techniques so as to place the Romantic Blake within a broader pan-European tradition. Theatrical melodrama is generally thought to have emerged in France in 1800 and England in 1802. However, as well as exploring the interconnections in melodrama between England, France, and Germany, Piccitto identifies Blake’s work as a way of detailing the earlier inception of the genre and its influence beyond the stage. Building further on the thesis of her book, *Blake’s Drama, Theatre, Performance and Identity in the Illuminated Books* (reviewed above) Piccitto advances an important area in Blake studies. It will be interesting to see what other lines of enquiry are possible involving Blake and the theatre. Peter Otto meanwhile, in ‘From the English to the French Revolution: The Body, the World, and Experience in Locke’s Essay, Bentley’s ‘A Prospect of Vapourland’, and Blake’s *Songs*’ (pp. 210-29), argues that Blake can be read as engaging with a pan-European phenomenon: that of a shift in political ideas from the sovereign head of state to the sovereignty of the people. By detailing Blake’s
interest in this transformation in the Romantic period, Otto also sheds light on debates that press upon our political experience today. John Harvey’s *The Poetics of Sight* (Peter Lang), reviewed in Chapter XIV, also contains a chapter on Blake (pp. 71-108), which will be fully reviewed in next year’s *YWES*.

As well as his chapter in *British Romanticism in European Perspective*, Peter Otto also published ‘Organizing the Passions: Minds, Bodies, Machines, and the Sexes in Blake and Swedenborg’ (*ERR* 26[2015] 367-77). Perceptively comparing Emanuel Swedenborg’s explanation for how bodies might be organized with Blake’s revisionism, Otto methodically details Blake’s radical development of Swedenborg’s theories. The radical difference, Otto argues, not only exists in the contest between reason and the imagination, but also in Blake and Swedenborg’s contrasting perceptions of bodies and passions. In ‘Blake’s Body Without Organs: The Autogenesis of the System in the Lambeth Books’ (*ERR* 26[2015] 357-66), Tilottama Rajan explores Urizen’s body as a form for Blake’s own body of writing and as a disfiguration of his idealistic ambitions. Rajan convincingly proposes that the Lambeth books serve as a ‘primal scene…of the imaginary system that Blake elaborates in *Jerusalem*, because ‘the grotesque body that dis-figures these books is an autoreferential figure for Blake’s projection of his own corpus as a systematic body of work’ (p. 358).

‘Reluctant Ecology in Blake and Arendt: A Response to Robert Mitchell and Richard Sha’ (*WC* 46[2015] 143-55) by Amanda Jo Goldstein develops out of Mitchell’s and Sha’s investigations into, as Goldstein says, the ‘risks and promises of Romantic(ist) enthusiasm for ‘the experience of experiment’’ (p. 143). Goldstein examines the commitment to the Earth in Blake and Arendt – poets who are generally held to hold contempt for a materialist view of Nature but in Goldstein’s reading are found to be curiously and intriguingly ‘earth-bound’ (p. 144), tethered to the natural world we inhabit. For all Blake’s fascination with the extra-
terrestrial and supernatural at certain moments, Goldstein charts his terrestrial as well as cosmic poetic adventures.

Lucy Cogan’s ‘William Blake’s The Book of Los and the Female Prophetic Tradition’ (Romanticism 21[2015] 48-58) manages to find something new to say about Blake’s visionary company. The critical positioning of Blake amidst a radical Dissenting community, too often uncritically assumed to be the domain of men, reaffirmed the sense of Blake’s masculine poetic identity. But as Cogan points out, further evidence of the active and vital role women played in the Dissenting community allows us to re-think Blake’s mythopoeia in relation to the significant female prophetic tradition at the time. This is thought-provoking and a pleasure to read.

Celebrity culture has been one of the most persistent trends in Byron studies since Tom Mole’s Byron’s Romantic Celebrity (2007). Clara Tuite’s Lord Byron and Scandalous Celebrity (CUP) nonetheless manages to unearth thrilling new areas of investigation that should sustain this off-shoot of Byromania and provide further readings of Byron’s importance to culture. Taking an historical perspective Tuite engages thoughtfully with the phenomenon that was Byron, and the phenomenon of celebrity more widely during the Regency period. Examining Byron’s persona in the literary, social, and political contexts of his time, Tuite suggests that the key to understanding his fascination lies in what Tuite calls ‘scandalous celebrity’ (p. xiv) – an ambivalent state of fame derived from a combination of notoriety and strutting a more traditional form of heroic distinction. This ‘scandalous celebrity’ rests on the ‘charm of the celebrity figure and the affective ambivalence of the fan and reader’ (p. xv), Tuite contends. It is how ‘the famous and the notorious become newly intimate’ and the ‘rites and receptions that celebrate and denounce this intimacy’ that form the focus of Tuite’s important contribution to Byron studies (p. xv). Moreover, as with other works on celebrity culture in the Romantic period, Tuite makes a strong case for seeing the
Regency period as a vital transitional moment for the emergence of our contemporary obsession with fame.

*The Byron Journal* continued its tradition of publishing some of the most engaging works on Byron by many of the field’s most important voices. We live in a particularly rich time for Byron scholars, and many of them published in the *Journal* this year. In ‘Byron at Home’ ([ByronJ 43][2015] 15-27) Bernard Beatty voyages across Byron’s career to illustrate the poet’s deft ability to make himself at home in both the world he inhabited and the world of poetry he found such refuge in. As Beatty notes, Byron is associated with particular geographical places, and is also famously a poetic figure of exile. Detailing Byron’s various responses to the notion of home – whether literal or metaphoric – Beatty also once again proves perfectly at home with Byron’s life and verse. Preceding Beatty’s essay is ‘Byron’s Love Letters’ ([ByronJ 43][2015] 1-14) by Alan Rawes, which reads the love letters in light of key passages from the poetry in order to suggest that Byron’s conventional approach to love letters is actually a way for him to steer through the expressive limitations of language while adapting its emotional force. Blurring the lines between writer and lover, Rawes suggests that Byron’s seduction of the recipients of the love letters operates through the inadequacy of language. Byron’s affection for canines is Michelle M. Taylor’s focus in ‘The Curious Case of ‘Epitaph to a Dog’: Byron and *The Scourge*’ ([ByronJ 43][2015] 43-56). Reflecting on the two acknowledged versions of ‘Epitaph to a Dog’ as a means of considering textual history and reception, Taylor also details the satiric attacks on the verse at the time, and unearths Byron’s place amidst a little known magazine, *The Scourge*.

The journal’s second issue of the year centred round the theme of ‘Byron and the Bible’. Developing out of the conference held at Newstead Abbey in May 2015, it produced a number of compelling essays on religious themes. ‘Why did Byron have to write *Cain* before he could finish *The Vision of Judgement*?’ ([ByronJ 43][2015] 141-46) by the late Peter
Cochran employs manuscript evidence and intertextuality to show how these very divergent works are interrelated. Cochran proves the importance of the dramatic and foreboding *Cain* to the composition of the satiric *Vision*, and once again shows us why Cochran’s voice will be missed in the future. Bernard Beatty’s ‘‘According to the Old Text’: Byron and the Sacred Scriptures’’ (*ByronJ* 43[2015] 121-29) identifies a relationship between the Bible and Byron’s oeuvre. Drawing attention to the interplay between history and storytelling in both the Bible and Byron, Beatty highlights the creative energy Byron derives from his use of Scripture and how his belief in the apparent meaninglessness of history, which might nonetheless hold meaning, is mirrored in sacred writing. In ‘Byron and the Post-Secular: Quia Impossible’ (*ByronJ* 43[2015] 91-108) Gavin Hopps skilfully proposes the sceptical Byron as a paradigm for a post-secular approach to our understanding of Romantic engagement with the otherworldly or mystical. For Hopps, Byron illustrates the Romantic combination of doubt and open-mindedness toward the possibility of religious transcendence.

Catherine Redford, in ‘No love was left’: The failure of Christianity in Byron’s ‘Darkness’ (*ByronJ* 43[2015] 131-40) offered us an important religious context for one of Byron’s most despairing of works. She suggests that Byron’s apocalyptic vision is evidence of his theological engagement since he can be seen responding to eighteenth-century Christian eschatology. Anna Camilleri’s ‘Sacrilegious Heroics: Biblical and Byronic Archetypes of the Vengeful Feminine’ (*ByronJ* 43[2015] 109-20) uses sacramental matters as a means of delving into Byron’s interest in female figures in the Bible. Pointing out that Byron likely drew on these women for inspiration, Camilleri focuses on *The Book of Judith* in particular in order to offer a gendered reflection on Byron’s interest in and portrayal of vengeance and violence.

Madeleine Callaghan also considers fearlessness and aggression in Byron, but from a markedly different perspective. In ‘Forms of Conflict: Byron’s Influence on Yeats’ (*English
64[2015] 81-98) Callaghan relays not just the vast shadow Byron casts over the Yeatsian imagination, but also provides a fascinating and convincing reading of the overlaps between their forms, voice, and themes. By highlighting the poetic kinship between the two poets, Callaghan gives us a thoughtful analysis of Byron as much as Yeats, and as such her reading does much to advance our appreciation of heroic forms and Romantic legacy.

Four articles on Byron appeared in *Studies in Romanticism* over the course of the year. Three concerned matters of race and depictions of the oriental ‘other’. Yin Yuan’s ‘Invasion and Retreat: Gothic Representations of the Oriental Other in Byron’s *The Giaour* (SiR 54[2015] 3-31) reflects on Byron’s formal strategies toward the orientalizing impulse witnessed in the Romantic period. Developing important lines of enquiry by Nigel Leask in *British Romantic Writers and the East* (1992) and considering in detail *The Giaour* (1813), Yuan suggests Byron ‘articulates and alleviates…[a] moral ambivalence through recourse to the gothic mode’ (p. 4), utilising the genre’s aesthetic strategies so as to present the text’s self-conscious perspective concerning its own orientalism. This permits Byron to both ‘contemplate and indict the violent work of empire through its drama of psychic fragmentation’ (p. 5). Fragmentation is also the subject of Mai-Lin Cheng’s ‘Lara’s Stutter’ (SiR 54[2015] 503-23). This details the various narrative and expressive breaks and falterings at play in this most self-reflexive and critically troubled poem in order to examine Byron’s complicated engagement with oriental themes and appropriation of the gothic genre. Detailing the interplay between hero and tale, Cheng discusses Byron’s use of conventional literary tropes amidst an endeavour for an original and distinctive voice. ‘Race, Writing, and *Don Juan* (SiR 54[2015] 303-28) by Mark Canuel, meanwhile, looks to Byron’s digressive and capacious epic in order to problematize the poet’s response to the slave trade. Though Byron was on record as being an abolitionist and broad supporter of the work of William Wilberforce and others, Canuel detects a degree of ambivalence toward race issues in *Don
Juan, even as he acknowledges the poem’s apparent voicing of support for the abolitionist movement. Don Juan, Canuel believes, relies on a ‘subtle yet profound logic that insistently privileges the purity and beauty of white bodies’ (p. 303). This is not a consequence of a racist ideology, but rather because the poem’s ‘intertwined configurations of political and aesthetic value are inseparable from a self-consciously constructed racial hierarchy’ (p. 303) – a hierarchy Byron is both conscious of and seeking to satirise but which he is incapable of distancing himself from. Andrew McKendry’s ‘Will the Public Please Step Forward? Libel Law and Public Opinion in Byron’s The Vision of Judgement (SiR 54[2015] 525-49) diverges from most critical receptions of Vision (1822) which prioritise biographical matters – principally Southey’s A Vision of Judgement (1821) that inspired Byron’s work – or literary and political allusions and contexts, and concentrates instead on jurisprudence. As McKendry points out, The Vision of Judgement centres on a trial. McKendry builds a convincing case that Byron’s captivating poem shows definite signs of a juridical issue created by changes to libel law, principally divergence between ‘courtroom invocations of ‘the people’ and the heterogeneous character of public opinion’ (p. 528).

Lastly, ‘Photographing Byron’s Hand’ (ERR 26[2015] 129-48) by Andrew Burkett provides a fascinating account of William Henry Fox Talbot, proto-photographer, who, at the inception of the photographic age in 1840, decided to photograph the final lines and signature of Byron’s ‘Ode to Napoleon Buonaparte’ (1832). Exploring publication history, posthumous reception, and offering a different perspective on Byronism, Burkett’s cultural history and close literary analysis captures the role of Romantic poetry and identity in the development of the burgeoning art medium of photography in the middle of the nineteenth century.

There was much wonderful work on John Clare this year, adding to the rich reservoir of criticism that has developed in recent times. New Essays on John Clare: Poetry, Culture, and Community, edited by Simon Kovësi and Scott McEathron (CUP), fields a diverse range
of approaches by ten distinguished scholars including practicing poets as well as literary critics. In this varied collection we consistently find visions that are invaluable for our understanding of Clare’s place within current debates on environmental ethics, aesthetics, literary history and periodization, and the nature of play and work. As the editors point out, it is now over twenty years since *John Clare in Context*, the first major critical essay collection focusing on Clare appeared from Cambridge University Press. Since then there has been an enormous amount of material produced on Clare, whilst editorial practices continue to be debated and contested. Underpinning the collection is the belief that Clare has always been relevant to poets and readers alike, receiving ‘quiet yet constant attention’ (p. 6) since his death in 1864, not least because of the challenge he poses to periodization. Indeed, it is Clare’s ‘ongoing status as an uncategorizable literary and social misfit[that] might in the end serve him well’ (p. 7). Whilst Clare has remained relevant throughout the last hundred and fifty years, the appetite for his verse has never been greater, and nor has Clare seemingly spoken with such weight to critical interests and contemporary matters. This new collection does an excellent job of detailing the breadth of Clare’s relevance and his diversity, including the poet’s engagement with poetic tradition, and the realisation by his contemporaries of his deep environmental thinking. ‘John Clare, William Cowper and the eighteenth century’ by Adam Rounce (pp. 38-56) illustrates how Clare’s engagement with Thomson and Cowper is foundational for his sense of his own poetic self and the construction of his verse. Fiona Stafford in ‘John Clare’s Colours’ (pp. 17-37), and Sarah M. Zimmerman, in ‘John Clare’s Conspiracy’ (pp. 57-76), skilfully pursue the complexity of Clare’s presentation of the natural world through his versification. Environmental approaches and interests are important refrains in this collection and in Clare studies more broadly. In his essay, ‘John Clare’s Natural History’ (pp. 169-88), Robert Heyes reveals the social context out of which Clare’s ecological voice emerges, so as to dispel some of the clichéd green myths that surround the
poet. Clare was deeply informed by the natural history, and the social and political writing of the time. In ‘John Clare and the New Varieties of Enclosure: a Polemic’ (pp. 79-96), John Burnside uses the nineteenth-century context in which Clare operated to engage powerfully and politically with our own ecological moment. Emma Mason, ‘Ecology and Religion: Kinship in John Clare’ (pp. 97-117), breaks new ground by unearthing the possible relation between Clare’s green politics and his knowledge of divinity and ideas of faith. Scott McEathron, in ‘The Lives of Frederick Martin and the First Life of John Clare’ (pp. 118-45), meanwhile, reflects on the presentation and reception of Clare via the career of his first biographer – Frederick Martin. Simon Kovësi’s ‘John Clare’s Deaths: Poverty, Education and Poetry’ (pp. 146-66) also thinks about the reception and creation of Clare by others – this time how the ‘jarring combination of poverty and poetry – of labour and literary culture – continued to inform his literary legacy and reputation’ (p. 162) after his passing. Sam Ward’s ‘This Radical Slang’: John Clare, Admiral Lord Radstock and the Queen Caroline Affair’ (pp. 189-208) does an excellent job of detailing Clare’s complex relationships with patrons and promoters. Clare’s relation to publishing is also the subject of the last essay in the collection, Richard Cronin’s masterful ‘John Clare and the London Magazine’ (pp. 209-27) relates the poet’s prominence in both the London literary scene and the pages of the periodical, even as he remained distinct and distant from each.

The John Clare Society Journal continues to house excellent essays and offer an insight into the most pressing issues in Clare studies. On this occasion we were offered an essay on Clare’s fen poems, followed by three articles on Clare’s relationship to the American poet and nature-lover Henry David Thoreau. The works on Clare and Thoreau were all adapted from papers originally delivered at the ‘John Clare in Space’ conference in Oxford in May 2014. ‘Syntax and World-view in John Clare’s Fen Poems’ (JCSJ 34[2015] 37-49) by Helen Pownall attends to Clare’s effusive verse describing the wild wetlands of his
environment. Pownall focuses on Clare’s syntax, which she admits is famously ‘sinuous, his clauses long and meandering’ (p. 37) in other works as well, but which, Pownall asserts, take on a particularly meaningful significance in the Fen poems that she finds to be mimetic to the topography of the landscape that also allows her to investigate Clare’s world-view. Lance Newman, in ‘John Clare, Henry David Thoreau, and Walking’ (JCSJ 34[2015] 51-62) surveys how these two ‘kindred spirits’ shared a passion for getting out of doors. Walking, Newman argues, was not only a ‘lifelong practice for both’, but also ‘shaped their thought and structured their art’ in ways that led to them developing ‘immersive ways of writing about walking that showed what kinds of vernacular experience were endangered by the privatisation of the commons’ (p. 51). ‘The Brighter Side of ‘Dark Ecology’: John Clare and Henry David Thoreau’ (JCSJ 34[2015] 63-73) by Markus Poetzsch reflects on the various manifestations of ecological thought in Clare and recent environmental criticism, offering an ambivalent and thought-provoking picture of the poet and the subject’s relation to the natural world. Poetzsch brings Thoreau and Clare together by detailing their shared sense of wonder at the world around them and their active and often ecologically problematic engagement with it. Jeremy Mynott in ‘Wonder: Some Reflections on John Clare and Henry David Thoreau’ (JCSJ 34[2015] 75-86) also marvels at each poet’s sense of wonder in order to get at their writing and reflect on our contemporary condition. Mynott details how Clare and Thoreau both evoke their fascination with the natural world through their use of the term wonder, and this is particularly evident in their respective close attention to local detail, fine and acute description, and deep understanding of the land and the creatures that inhabit it. These are matters which should also inform our appreciation of our environment today, as Mynott makes clear.

Clare’s relation to others was also the subject of R.K.R. Thornton’s ‘Joseph Skipsey and John Clare: Two Labouring-Class Poets’ (JCSJ 34[2015] 23-32). Deftly weaving
intriguing parallels between these two labouring-class writers – their similar backgrounds and situations, their drive and will to achieve, their love of learning, whether in books or the wisdom found in nature – Thornton offers us both a detailed biographical account and thorough knowledge of the social and publishing scene at the time. In ‘Clare on the Wane’ (*English* 64[2015] 296-311) Andrew Hodgson focuses on Clare’s style and form to offer perceptive insights into the poet’s distinctive voice. Informed by other critical voices as well as the poet’s own, Hodgson argues that Clare found a source of inspiration in the diminishment of his creative possibilities. Clare’s poems, Hodgson asserts, ‘rise to the peculiar challenge of writing successfully about imaginative failure’ (p. 298).

As well as the piece on Clare’s ‘dark ecology’ that appeared in the *John Clare Society Journal, Romanticism* also published work on Clare and ecology. ‘Homeless at Home’: John Clare’s Uncommon Ecology’ (*Romanticism*, 21[2015] 171-81) by Shalon Noble offers another perspective on Clare and Ecocriticism – perhaps the topic currently doing the rounds in Clare studies if samples from this year are anything to go by. The subject of Clare and nature is nothing new of course: it has had a central place in the majority of studies on the poet since the start, just as Clare and his verse are said to be rooted in the landscape. As Noble points out, however, too frequently we make easy assumptions about what it means for us (or Clare) to have a relationship with Nature, to be ‘rooted’ in it. More recent work on ecology has sought to question the assumptions surrounding Nature’s balance and stability, and it is this deconstructive approach to which Noble worthily contributes by offering us a new understanding of the poet as creative precisely because of the instability of the natural world and his place within it. There is, Noble argues, ‘a singularly ecological creativity’ in Clare’s work, ‘one that presents an experience of ecology as a restless and dynamic community’ (p. 173).
Turning to Coleridge: Wayne Deakin produced some significant work on Coleridge in *Hegel and the English Romantic Tradition* (PalMac). Deakin’s canonical focus offers the reader a chance to re-examine English Romanticism by returning to the importance of Hegel, particularly his theory of recognition. Hegel’s work continues to matter, Deakin believes, not only because of its philosophic value, but also for its assistance in understanding key moments of Romantic poetry. As with his other chapters, Deakin wisely avoids arguing for a direct influence of Hegel’s writing on Coleridgean thought. Instead he proposes that key ideas in Hegel are also addressed and explored in Coleridge’s verse. His chapter on Coleridge therefore seeks to ‘examine the vacillation between receptivity and autonomy’ (p. 35) in the poet’s writing. For Deakin, Coleridge’s attempt and failure to formulate a theory of knowledge based on the intuitive status of the imagination in chapter 13 of *Biographia Literaria* provides a springboard from which we can analyse Coleridge’s poetry as productively centred around a tension between ‘absolute idealism and an empirical-realism, or between imaginative autonomy and receptivity to the external world’ (p. 35). Deakin argues that this tension is also evident in that play between *symbol* and *allegory* in Coleridgean thought and verse. Deakin’s analysis of Coleridge’s thinking and writing is suggestive, and makes an implicit case for seeing Coleridge as a more systematic operator than we sometimes allow for nowadays.

The journal *Romanticism* offered us two equally convincing essays on Coleridge. Timothy Whelan, ‘Coleridge, Jonathan Edwards, and the ‘edifice of Fatalism’ (*Romanticism* 21[2015] 280-300) unearths a neglected yet apparently important figure for our appreciation of the life, work, and thought of Samuel Taylor Coleridge: one Jonathan Edwards – America’s ‘most influential and, at times, controversial theologian and philosopher’ (p. 280) during the eighteenth century. Though Coleridge alludes to Edwards rarely, Whelan is persuasive in his contention that the poet’s engagement with the theologian is significant, and
touches on topics uppermost in Coleridge’s religious thoughts from his earliest writings. In ‘Coleridge, Employment and the Sorcery of Wealth’ (*Romanticism* 21[2015] 132-44), meanwhile, Barry Hough considered issues of wages and poverty, reflecting on Coleridge’s engagement with the employment market of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The *Lay Sermons* explicitly advocates the need to moderate the socially and economically disruptive effects of *laissez-faire* liberalism, Hough suggests. Coleridge’s ambition was to propose reform of the liberal marketplace that was more inclusive and worked for all members of society. Coleridge reminds us all that ‘social justice requires a sophisticated inter-relationship between public and private initiative’ (p. 142) and that a moral perspective should shape economic policy beyond the need for growth.

Ewan Jones’s ‘Split Lines in Shakespeare and Coleridge’ (*EiC*, 65[2015] 421-46) imaginatively assesses the broken line, that ‘shifting, subterranean form’ (p. 444) of verse in part so as to reveal the interplay between dramatic performance and lyric, unsettling along the way critical narratives that ‘pass as standard’ (p. 444). Noting Coleridge’s ‘classical temper’ (p. 422) in verse as in other respects, Jones charts the practical and imaginative relevance of the hemistich in Shakespeare and the Romantic poet, opening up another view of Shakespeare’s influence on Romantic forms. This is a deeply rewarding read.

‘Infinite Closure in ‘Kubla Khan’ and the ‘Cave of Yordas’ (*WC* 46[2015] 48-52) by Peter Larkin explores scenes of containment in Coleridge’s verse. These spaces, Larkin points out, are ambivalent compressions, yet are also sites or situations that extend to an ‘infinity degree’ (p. 48) which, on a poetic level are ‘encountered as immeasurably enwrapping’, pulsing with mystery ‘put under pressure’ and whereby an ‘infinite space imitates a finite one and vice verse’ (p. 48). Greg Ellermann’s ‘Late Coleridge and the Life of Idealism’ (*SiR* 54[2015] 33-55) thinks again about what the concept of idealism offered the Romantics and us as Romantic critics. Giving the ‘romantic absolute another look’ (p. 34) as
he puts it, Ellermann wisely turns to Coleridge’s late works so as to connect realism with Romantic idealism and asks what an appreciation of this relation provides for our perspective on Coleridge and Romanticism more generally. In ‘Coleridge, Politics, and the Theory of Life’ (SEL 55[2015] 647-67) Jacob Risinger also approaches Coleridge’s later work in order to explore the interplay between Romantic science, poetry and politics. Emphasising a ‘convergence of political and natural philosophic considerations’ (p. 648) we are offered two interconnected and intriguing lines of argument by Risinger. He contends that Coleridge’s most important thinking on the political implications of organic life emerged not in the 1790s, as more commonly supposed, but over two decades later. More expansively, Risinger makes a convincing case for seeing Coleridge’s engagement with natural philosophy as a means of grappling with Britain’s political constitutional existence. Coleridge’s engagement with science is also the subject of Kevis Goodman’s ‘Reading Motion: Coleridge’s ‘Free Spirit’ and its Medical Background’ (ERR 26[2015] 349-56). Perceptively capturing the scientific spirit of the age Goodman argues that Coleridge inherits eighteenth-century medical ideas concerning the relation between bodies and external forces and applies them to the poet’s attention to and interest in the effect of poetic form upon the reader. Finally, ‘Romantic Flashbacks: Coleridge, De Quincey, and Duration’ (ERR 26[2015] 659-677) by Amanda Paxton also engages with Romantic science in its exploration of temporality, agency, and ideas of memory. For Paxton, the writings of Coleridge and De Quincey, in importantly divergent ways, show signs of a later cognitive theory of memory: Henri Bergson’s durational memory.

Gregory Leadbetter offered us two excellent essays involving Coleridge that were unavailable for review in last year’s YWES. (95[2016]). ‘The Comic Imagination in Lamb and Coleridge’ (CLB 159[2014] 11-19) nicely draws out Coleridge’s playfulness and mirth – both in life and his lines of verse. Leadbetter is interested in the Janus-faced nature of the
humorous – its capacity to create bonds with others and to be a means of distancing ourselves superiorly from others – but he also draws important distinctions between the comic and the intellectual freedom Coleridge (and Charles Lamb) held as sacrosanct. In ‘Poetry, Politics and Portents: Coleridge and the Waters of Plynlimon’ (*ColBulletin* 43[2014] 29-36), meanwhile, Leadbetter charts the course of Coleridge’s mind in the 1790s as he toured Wales and dreamt of Pantisocracy. Leadbetter proposes the walking tour as a medium for Coleridge’s ‘self-dramatization and, more obliquely, the drama of self-disclosure, where past behaviour and future hopes are held in tension’ (p. 29) that leads to a present at once thrilling and troubled. It is the combination of a ‘feeling for the destiny he desired, with one eye on the darkness of his own psychological history’ (p. 29) Leadbetter contends, that informs Coleridge’s record of the tour.

Critical studies of Sara Coleridge continue to grow, with many expert voices leading important reassessments of her place in art and culture beyond her role in the posthumous life of her father. One such critic is Jeffrey W. Barbeau whose *Sara Coleridge: Her Life and Thought* (reviewed in *YWES* 95[2016]) provided a thorough assessment of the intellectual as well as personal life of Sara Coleridge. This year we are lucky to have a nicely pitched essay in the *Wordsworth Circle*. Barbeau’s ‘Sara Coleridge on Love and Romance’ (*WC* 46[2015] 36-44) shows how Sara may have ‘inherited her father’s genius and fashioned herself as heir to his thought’ (p. 37) and also a Coleridgean idea of love. That concept of love is one tied to the unity of being, and a desire for complete unity with another. Barbeau shows that Sara not only loved deeply during her life but thought deeply about the subject and its philosophic as well as daily importance. ‘(Re-)Mapping the ‘native vale’: Sara Coleridge’s *Phantasmion*’ (*Romanticism* 21[2015] 265-79) by Joanna E. Taylor is a sensitive and erudite historicist approach that convincingly argues for the Fairyland of *Phantasmion* to be much more than a repetition of Wordsworthian Lake District tropes. Rather than simply inspired by literary
influences, Taylor suggests, Fairyland is a ‘reconstruction of Sara’s topographical childhood memories’ (p. 265). Using a rough sketch that Sara drew some time between 1834 (when the idea of a fairy tale *Phantasmion* was conceived) and 1837 when the poem was published, Taylor locates important differences between Fairyland and a Wordsworthian imaginative landscape and thus offers a new perspective on the individuality of Sara.

It was pleasing to find a chapter on Erasmus Darwin in *British Romanticism in European Perspective*, eds Clark and Connolly. Connolly’s essay ‘‘Mistaken for Natives of the Soil’: Translation and Erasmus Darwin’s *Love of Plants*’ (pp. 133-54) starts by acknowledging that the notion of translation is integral to Darwin’s work – its cross-fertilisation and interest in the exchange of ideas, themes, and languages. Connolly’s deft handling of the material, and her use of Deleuzian theory and French sources, reminds us that the idea of translation is for Darwin a way of describing and enacting the transmission and transmutation that occurs between various discourses, whether animal, vegetable, mineral, or linguistic.

Leigh Hunt was represented by only one article this year, reviewed in section 1 above, Alys Mostyn’s ‘Leigh Hunt’s ‘World of Books’: Bibliomania and the Fancy’ (*Romanticism* 21[2015] 238-49).

Like Saree Makdisi’s *Reading William Blake* (reviewed above), Susan J. Wolfson’s *Reading John Keats* is part of the new *Reading Writers and their Work* series from Cambridge University Press. Just as with Makdisi’s book, Wolfson’s deep affection for and knowledge of the poet presents us with a work that is at once introduction to Keats’s life and writing and packed with perceptive insights. Through ten rapid chapters, Wolfson moves us from Keats’s earliest literary inspirations and aspirations right up to the richness of his final works. And like her subject’s distinctive idiom, Wolfson’s writing is consistently a pleasure to peruse. She notices many fruitful connections between Keats’s writing and his reading,
while her playful style encourages readers to be lithe in their appreciation of Keats’s whimsy and word-play. The many archival images presented in the book are a nice touch, and lead Wolfson to engage most fully with Keats’s poetic thinking. Though in some ways an abridged version of the compendia available in Wolfson’s *Cambridge Companion to Keats* (2001), it is nonetheless helpful to find here suggested further reading, and a concise contextual timeline for Keats’s life as well as a series of snippets from Keats’s writing that serve as a brief summation of his extraordinary thoughts. For such a slim book, *Reading John Keats* is full of his expansive imagination and a valuable read, especially for those relatively new to Keats.

Brittany Pladek in “In sickness not ignoble”: Soul-making and the Pains of Identity in the Hyperion Poems’ (*SiR* 54[2015] 401-427) opens with a discussion of the medical issues surrounding Keats’s final year, neatly suggesting that what has for a long time sounded ‘like bad medicine’ (the misdiagnosis of Keats’s consumption) may well have been ‘good bedside manner’ (p. 402) from doctors keen to alleviate the concern of their patient, at a time when British medical ethics was just beginning to be codified. Such medical debates surrounding deception, pursuit of knowledge, and the alleviation of suffering are also at play in Keats’s corpus, and Pladek suggests that just as doctors in the Romantic period were arguing over whether or not they should reveal information that could do harm to their patients, so Keats examines ‘whether poetry could provide relief for readers even while acknowledging…that ‘Sorrow is Wisdom’’ (p. 403). Nicholas Roe also advances our knowledge of Keats and medicine in ‘Mr Keats’ (*EiC* 65[2015] 274-88). This brilliant essay unearths new historical detail about Keats’s medical life and its possible influence on his poetry. As Roe definitively shows, the alternative paths of poetry and medicine are not fully resolved by Keats the physician-poet; instead Keats’s ‘awareness of the one continued to define his consciousness of the other’ (p. 274). Roe focuses on his discovery of a newly recovered first-hand account
of Keats at work at Guy’s Hospital to provide us with a fascinating version of the vibrant life of Keats. The essay also makes important connections between Keats’s poetic works and his medical training more generally. During his medical training Keats took a trip to the seaside town of Margate where he dedicated himself more fully to his poetry. It also commenced a period of engaging and thoughtful letter-writing. John Barnard delves into both the poems and the letters related to this important period of transition for Keats in ‘Keats’s ‘Forebodings’: Margate, Spring 1817, and After’ (Romanticism 21[2015] 1-13). By reassessing Keats’s writing from this time, Barnard identifies ‘violent swings of emotion and artistic anxieties’ that whilst perhaps disguised by the ‘performative nature of his letters’ (p. 1) were much more severe than we have hitherto acknowledged. Barnard’s essay tellingly speaks to the self-fashioning of the poet and the emotional life of a young and ambitious but also deeply apprehensive Keats.

Published in 2014, but not reviewed in last year’s YWES, was Franca Dellarossa’s Talking Revolution: Edward Rushton’s Rebellious Poetics, 1782-1814 (LiverUP). This work coincides with the publication of Paul Baines’ edition of Edward Rushton’s works, The Collected Writings of Edward Rushton (reviewed in YWES 95[2016]), also published by Liverpool University Press. Dellarossa’s monograph is the first full-length study of this important, yet hitherto non-canonical, Liverpool-based, abolitionist poet. What is refreshing about Dellarossa’s approach is that it actively avoids being a fairly limiting biographical reading or, what Dellarossa calls, a narrowly ideological one. Instead, she focuses on the ‘conjunction of the aesthetic and the ideological’ in Rushton’s work since ‘his poetic language, and form itself, are knowingly determined by his politics’ (p. 4). As Paul Baines’s edition of Rushton’s work reveals, Rushton is a writer of merit who is thoroughly deserving of literary recovery and, interestingly, was more prolific in poetry than in prose. The fact that Rushton is known more for his admittedly fascinating biography than his genuine literary
talent is, in a sense, what Dellarossa seeks to overcome. This approach too is enlightening when contrasted with the literary criticism of so-called labouring-class poets of the period more generally, which often in fact ends up perpetuating the dichotomies of ‘high-brow’ and ‘low-brow’ poetics that such studies superficially seek to undermine. Although Dellarossa’s monograph is a single-author study, she is nevertheless at pains to consider Rushton’s position within various networks of radical, abolitionist poets – both global and local – as well as within a poetic milieu more generally. To this end, the volume is structured into two sections, ‘Local Radicalism’ and ‘Global Radicalism’ respectively. Although this implies a disjunction between these two sides of Rushton’s poetics they are, in fact, very much connected as Dellarossa reminds us. For instance, the opening chapter focusing on the late eighteenth/early nineteenth-century abolitionist movement and the situation within Rushton’s hometown of Liverpool is very interested in both the local and the global. Liverpool was, after all, at the heart of the global slave trade for much of the eighteenth century. Dellarossa reads Rushton’s ‘To a Redbreast in November, Written near one of the Docks of Liverpool’ for instance, the opening poem of his 1806 collection, as very much a Romantic one that also performs the ‘politics [that] epitomizes Edward Rushton’s closeness to and distance from the world’ (p. 42). The volume’s second section explores Rushton’s interest in global affairs, most particularly the slave trade in America and the Americas – the subject of Rushton’s most famous West Indian Eclogues (1787) – as well as the Haitian Revolution. Regarding the latter, Dellarossa reads Rushton’s ballad poem on the revolution’s leader Touissant L’Ouverture partly in the light of other poetic treatments of the figure, such as those by Southey and most particularly Wordsworth. For Dellarossa, Wordsworth’s and Rushton’s poems on L’Ouverture ‘exemplify fundamentally distant ideological attitudes to the historical event and the historical character as such, which also influence the terms of their transmutation into poetic discourse’ (p. 174). Dellarossa’s monograph then is an important
contribution to Romantic scholarship and an excellent work of literary recovery. Not only are we offered a full-length study of a previously neglected poet that considers his work on his own terms, but also a reconsideration of the wider literary and historical context more broadly. A fine addition to the libraries of scholars of the period and of abolitionist writing more specifically.

2015 was a particularly rich year for publications on the life and work of Shelley. Jacqueline Mulhallen’s short biography of Shelley for instance, *Percy Bysshe Shelley: Poet and Revolutionary*, is part of Pluto Press’s ‘Revolutionary Lives’ series. As the title and the series of which it is a part indicate, this biography focuses primarily on Shelley as a ‘revolutionary’ figure, contextualising him amidst the political and social upheaval of his age. Such a reading of Shelley, as Mulhallen puts it herself, suggests a continuation of the work of P.M.S. Dawson (*The Unacknowledged Legislator* [1980]), Paul Foot (*Red Shelley* [1981]) and Michael Scrivener (*Radical Shelley* [1982]) from the 1980s (p. xiii). The brevity of the work, its informal style and its limited end-noting however demonstrate that this is a book intended more for a wider, popular readership than for an academic one. In fact, for more ‘academic’ assessments of Shelley’s life and literature more generally, scholars should still stick to the aforementioned works. Despite this, Mulhallen’s informal, engaging style, and her book’s popular form, often belie the extensive research or, at least, synthesis of research that underpins it. For example, a very brief discussion of the campaign of Shelley’s friend Colonel Sergison in the Sussex election of May 1807 demonstrates a grasp of the minutiae of Horsham’s local political history despite this largely serving as a minor footnote in Shelley’s adolescence (pp. 15-6). Mulhallen’s earlier *The Theatre of Shelley* [2010] has already demonstrated her excellent grasp of Shelley’s drama; this latest work is further evidence of her familiarity with the poet’s work and, crucially, a number of more recent developments in Shelley studies. Although she does not discuss it in depth, Mulhallen does refer to *A Poetical
Essay on the Existing State of Things (1811), discovered fairly recently, as well as Shelley’s relationship with disparate groups such as Quakers and Spenceans (pp. 66-7). These brief accounts serve to demonstrate an awareness of critical debate as well as indicating potential areas of further research. Nevertheless, it is occasionally frustrating that Mulhallen does not develop each topic further, even if this is explained away by the space limitations of the volume. In fact, a reader’s desire to know more pays Mulhallen’s writing a great deal of credit.

Mulhallen’s knowledge of Shelley’s poetry and prose is extensive, but her reading of the poems is cursory at points. Often the poetry is seen as an extension of Shelley’s ‘revolutionary’ musings in other arenas or simple reflections of the social and political context rather than well-crafted pieces of art in their own right. Indeed, a more attentive reading of Shelley’s poetry would have revealed the political implications of his poems’ language, allowing a reader to see them as more than just a simple medium of delivery. The fact that Shelley decided to address political issues so often in verse is an important question; it is worth remembering that the matter under discussion is not so easily divorced from the manner of its expression. Mulhallen does seem to partly acknowledge this when she notes that ‘Revolutionary artists can be innovators in art’ (p. 86), but this still implies that politics and art are separate spheres. Nevertheless, this is an enjoyable, intellectual and, crucially, accessible book. If it is polemical at points and not as nuanced in regards to Shelley’s radicalism as other studies, it still serves as both welcome introduction and notable addition to an understanding of Shelley’s political life.

Alan M. Weinberg and Timothy Webb produced a follow-up to The Unfamiliar Shelley, a 2009 edited collection of Shelley essays. This new collection, The Neglected Shelley (Ashgate), contains fourteen essays that attempt to reverse the common practice among academics that, in Weinberg and Webb’s view, ‘tend to focus on a narrow range of
poems, thus excluding the larger and extraordinarily diverse corpus’ of Shelley’s works (p. 3). Weinberg and Webb suggest that Shelley’s gifts as a great lyrical poet are partly to blame for why many of Shelley’s longer poems – with the exception of *The Triumph of Life* – are neglected by critics. As well as exploring some of these longer poems in depth, a number of the essays consider Shelley’s prose pieces or, in the case of Timothy Morton’s essay on *Queen Mab* (1813), the overlooked paratextual elements of the poetry (pp. 77-94). Webb’s opening essay is one that appreciates Shelley’s letters as more than simple supplements to the poetry, but as interesting and frequently quite remarkable works of literary art in their own right. Not only do we discover a playful Shelley engaging in multiple epistolary personae, but also a number of poetic reveries that are, perhaps, reminiscent of the more widely appreciated letters of Keats. Diego Saglia (pp. 35-50) similarly reappraises Shelley’s early Gothic fiction that is commonly regarded as adolescent, clichéd – if not outright derivative – and unrestrained. Saglia reads works such as *Zastrozzi* (1810) and *St Irvyne* (1811) as inaugurating Shelley’s fixation on the physical human body that is often the subject of much of Shelley’s later more canonical poetry. David Duff (pp. 51-76) similarly focuses on Shelley’s Gothic juvenilia, most particularly his first two collections of poetry published in 1810; *Victor and Cazire* and *Posthumous Fragments of Margaret Nicholson*. Neither of these has received much critical attention, partly because, as Duff notes, these collections suffer from ‘persistent plagiarism’ (p. 56). Duff traces these borrowings, as well as reiterating the young Shelley’s inheritance from the Gothic, arguing that the collections ‘represent a vital stage in Shelley’s literary development’ (p. 75). Weinberg and Stephen C. Behrendt offer essays on Shelley’s unfinished or fragmentary works (pp. 157-76, 95-116), while Charles E. Robinson (pp. 117-36) argues that the c.4000 words and corrections Shelley made to *Frankenstein* can be seen as fragmentary texts in their own right, and read alongside his poetry. Jack Donovan’s essay on *Rosalind and Helen* (pp. 137-56), a poem surprisingly
neglected considering it appeared at the height of Shelley’s career in 1819, is read largely biographically and in relation to the incomplete ‘Mazenghi’, composed relatively contemporaneously. Richard Cronin (pp. 199-214), Timothy Webb (pp. 215-38) and Michael O’Neill (pp. 239-60) analyse The Sensitive Plant, the ‘Hymn to Mercury’ and Hellas respectively. Although all three poems are often covered in Shelley criticism, they are too often not given the focus or extended treatment they have been here. O’Neill’s attentive reading of Hellas for instance reveals a poem of ambivalence more complex than is commonly thought, that ‘tests the reader’s mind and affects the reader’s heart through its self-examining idealism’ (p. 260). Maria Schoina’s essay on Shelley’s Cyclops translation similarly refi gures our reading of the text to see Shelley’s reworkings as engaging in a ‘satyric’ tradition, where our laughter is levelled at Odysseus. Finally, Nora Crook’s essay on Shelley’s attitude towards the Jews (pp. 261-80) is a further example of an area that is very much neglected in Shelley studies. Although much has been written on Byron and others in this regard, very little has been written on Shelley. Crook explores both Shelley’s interest in the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible and his conception of wandering Judaism. This collection is a superb addition to Shelley studies. What is particularly successful is the additional space given to each chapter. Not only are we offered scholarly consideration of relatively less canonical aspects of Shelley’s oeuvre, this is given at length. This encourages a reader to see the particular works as far from minor and therefore significant in their own right. That the contributors are some of the academy’s leading Shelleyans also helps to situate this work as of central importance to the field.

Shelley’s online presence was also boosted in 2015. Romantic Circles published two ‘volumes’ of Shelley essays as part of their excellent Praxis Series. The first of these, The Politics of Shelley: History, Theory, Form edited by Matthew Borushko (https://www.rc.umd.edu/praxis/shelley_politics), is partly a follow-up to 2001’s Reading
Shelley’s Interventionist Poetry, 1819-1820 (http://www.rc.umd.edu/praxis/interventionist/).

Like the earlier volume, this present work is interested in the relationship of Shelley’s poetry to the political situation of his age while also emphasising Shelley’s autonomous poetics. A particular concern is in establishing that there is not in fact an impasse between the poetry’s political interventionism and the aesthetic moment of art. This volume essentially then is one that reads Shelley’s formal aesthetics as very much informing his political positions – or non-positions – and vice versa. Indeed, Joshua Lambier’s essay sees Shelley’s aesthetic departures from the contemporary situation as allowing for the presentation of alternative ways of viewing the world. He makes use of Jacques Rancière’s notion of ‘dissensus’ to describe Shelley’s approach, where notions of ‘common sense’ are disrupted through an alternative aesthetics. Borushko’s own essay similarly engages with Rancière, as well as Theodor Adorno, in his consideration of Shelleyan ‘non-violence’. Focusing particularly on Shelley’s responses to the ‘Peterloo Massacre’ of 1819 and his poem ‘The Mask of Anarchy’ of the same year, Borushko sees Shelley as not simply using it as a vehicle for non-violent politics, but as an example of aestheticised non-violence. Again, there is a clear reading of the political and the poetic as informing the other. The fact that Shelley’s sonnet ‘England in 1819’ is revolutionary in both form and content is not simply taken as read however; Borushko reads the sonnet as one that disrupts conventional notions of causality and agency – in both form and argument – and thus avoids slipping into advocating for revolutionary violence. Rancière is again invoked in Jared McGeough’s essay on ‘The Mask of Anarchy’. McGeough moves away from considering the poem solely in terms of the mid-twentieth-century Marxist tradition and instead reads it in light of emerging Anarchist theories. Although noting that some critics have read Shelley as an Anarchist poet, McGeough does not quite commit to this. Instead, he is more interested in considering how recent theoretical developments allow for a consideration of an aesthetics of Anarchism and how this can be
read in Shelley’s poem. Further than this, McGeough extends his reading to consider an Anarchist aesthetic in the Romantic period more broadly, exploring the tensions highlighted by Rancière’s concept of the ‘aesthetic regime’. Mischa Willett’s essay reads the vexed afterlives of Shelley in the later nineteenth century from a very original perspective; that is, his idolization by the school of poets referred to as the ‘Spasmodics’. As well as arguing for Shelley’s immense political legacy, challenging Victorian notions of Shelley as ‘apolitical’ or, famously, as an ‘ineffectual angel’ by Matthew Arnold, Willetts argues that the Spasmodics were more Shelleyan than, as is often thought, Keatsian. This is precisely because of their politics. Lastly, Michael Demson offers a contribution to the consideration of post-Peterloo Government repression in his essay on radical satire at this time. Demson uses the example of the fate of the radical publisher John Cahuac to demonstrate how there was a general distaste for satire following a repressive government climate. Alongside this, Demson reads Shelley’s relationship to satire as shifting and complex. The volume is an engaging and original consideration of Shelley’s form in relation to his radical politics and is a fine contribution to the growing Romantic Praxis series.

The second Praxis volume of 2015 was *P.B. Shelley and the Delimitation of the Gothic* edited by David Brookshire (https://www.rc.umd.edu/praxis/gothic_shelley). Taking as its starting point the increased interest more recently in the relationship between the Gothic and the Romantic, the volume explores the role played by the Gothic in the literature of Percy Bysshe Shelley which, it is argued, has often been neglected. Shelley’s engagement with the Gothic is often dismissed as a mere juvenile interest by critics; his short Gothic novels for instance were produced when Shelley was a teenager. Indeed, the fact that these feature in Weinberg’s and Webb’s *The Neglected Shelley* as reviewed above is quite telling. This volume instead seeks to trace the role played by the Gothic in Shelley’s writing throughout his career, particularly in the way that Shelley ‘delimits’ it by unleashing its symbolic
potential, trapped as the Gothic often is between reactionary and revolutionary impulses. Jerrold Hogle’s essay is perhaps the most exemplary of the volume’s aims to indicate the Gothic influence on Shelley’s works throughout his career, tracing the continuation of Gothic tropes from the early novels such as Zastrozzi to the final unfinished poem *The Triumph of Life*. Hogle sees the best work that Shelley produced in the final years of his life as essentially inspired by the Gothic’s main traits; that is, the possibilities of symbolism, undecidability and the contradictory aspects of the Gothic’s mixed modality. It is this ‘Gothic complex’, as Hogle calls it, that enables Shelley to critique contemporary society and to force his audiences to become aware of the choices they must make between the reactionary and the progressive paths towards humanity’s improvement. Tilottama Rajan’s essay similarly notes the continuities between *Zastrozzi* and *The Triumph of Life*, although refers to a ‘Gothic Matrix’ rather than Hogle’s ‘Gothic Complex’. Rajan is particularly interested in the opposition established by Hegel between the ‘romantic’ and the ‘symbolic’; the Gothic is seen as a type of disfiguration of the Romantic but both modes are indispensable to the other in Shelley’s poetry. Brookshire’s own essay also considers Shelley’s *Zastrozzi*. Whereas Brookshire shows how scholars are often apologetic for Shelley’s so-called ‘Gothic phase’, Brookshire is instead interested in attesting to the literary merit of Shelley’s works from this period. In particular, Brookshire argues for the significant historical moment in which novels such as *Zastrozzi* were produced as well as the antagonisms that they illustrate. Reading largely through a Lacanian lens, Brookshire sees the novel as both a complex satire of (slightly) earlier ‘anti-Jacobin’ texts and as a critique of ideological positions. Christopher Bundock is similarly interested in the historical moment of Shelley’s writing but in a rather different way. Offering a reading of *Adonais* (1821) and *The Wandering Jew* (1810, pub. 1877), Bundock’s essay considers the historicising impulse of the Gothic in Shelley’s writing, that seeks to remind us the material or ‘matter’ of history that has attempted to be elided. For
instance, the uncanny relation between Catholicism and Judaism in Shelley’s work is, for Bundock, a reminder that the increasing secularization via Protestantism of Shelley’s age is essentially an eliding of these past religions. Robert Miles’s closing essay focuses on another of Shelley’s later works, *The Cenci* (1819), exploring Shelley’s engagement with the Gothic and Romantic. These are modes that, as we have seen, are not necessarily interchangeable. With attentive close reading, Miles demonstrates how Shelley’s deployment of stock Gothic tropes – clichés even – in both the play and its preface illustrates a sophisticated self-consciousness. To this end, Miles concludes that Shelley’s thought is dialectical. A theoretically dense and complex volume, *P.B. Shelley and the Delimitation of the Gothic* is a valuable contribution both to Shelley and Gothic studies. The richness of the theoretical approaches is aided by the fact that the contributions are very much engaged with and even reference each other. To this end, the volume functions as a coherent and consistent whole rather than an assemblage of disparate essays.

Sophisticated readings and reinterpretations of Shelley’s poetry also appeared in a number of articles in 2015. Anne C. McCarthy’s article ‘The Aesthetics of Contingency in the Shelleyan “Universe of Things”, or “Mont Blanc” without Mont Blanc’ (*SiR* 54[2015] 355-76) for instance is a fascinating rereading of one of Shelley’s most complex poems. Whereas more traditional readings often focus on the poem’s attempt to locate power or Mont Blanc, McCarthy’s is one that sees the poem as undermining simple distinctions between subject and object in the face of sublime experience. McCarthy makes particular use of the philosopher Quentin Meillassoux’s notion of ‘the great outdoors’ that unsettles conceptions of the relationship between ‘thinking’ and ‘being’ (p. 359). In this way, McCarthy’s article can be read in relation to Arkady Plotnitsky’s chapter in *Romanticism and Philosophy: Thinking with Literature* as discussed above. Madeleine Callaghan’s article ‘Shelley and the Ambivalence of Idealism’ (*KSJ* 64[2015] 92-104) is a superb consideration of Shelleyan
ambivalence in such poems as *The Triumph of Life* and *Alastor*. Callaghan’s reading is one that sees Shelley as a poet – or, rather, the Poet-figure within the poems themselves – refusing to commit to either outright ‘idealism’ or ‘scepticism’. It is this very refusal to commit to either that is in fact not just at the heart of Shelley’s poetic vision or quest, but the very mission itself: ‘To commit to either choice would be to sacrifice an element of the poet, who requires both mortal and immortal facets to create “how beautiful an order…from the dust and blood of this fierce chaos!”’ (p. 104). This ambivalence, Callaghan shows, is not simply something thematic but also aesthetic, demonstrating that factors like Shelley’s verse form – such as *Terza rima* in *The Triumph of Life* – similarly emphasise the poetry’s ‘fast-moving and ever-shifting interpretive possibilities’ (p. 101).

Rosa Mucignat and Aileen Forbes both offered essays that at least partly considered Shelley’s relationship with Continental Europe and European writers in ‘Characters in Time: Staël, Shelley, Leopardi, and the Construction of Italianness in Romantic Historicism’ (*CL* 67[2015] 375-93) and ‘Return of the Cenci: Theaters of Trauma in Shelley and Artaud’ (*CL* 67[2015] 394-414) respectively. Mucignat’s essay considers Shelley’s role, alongside such writers as Germaine de Staël and Giacomo Leopardi, in establishing ‘Romantic representations of Italians [that] were imbued with, and helped shape, a new type of historical consciousness that characterizes nineteenth-century thought and concepts of national identity’ (p. 375). In Shelley’s time, of course, there was no unified Italian state. Through close reading of ‘Lines Written Among the Euganean Hills’, Mucignat illustrates a tension in Shelley’s mind between modern Italy and Italians, and the greatness of the (Romanticized) Italian past. Forbes’s essay considers the representation of trauma in Shelley’s play *The Cenci* in relation to the version produced by the French playwright and ‘theatre of cruelty’ theorist Antonin Artaud. Although Shelley and Artaud are often seen as rather different figures, Forbes notes how both treatments of the Cenci myth similarly react to historical trauma:
‘because both Shelley and Artaud wrote in the aftermath of historical cataclysm – the Napoleonic Wars and the Great War, respectively – their theaters reflect the traumatic tenor of their own historic moment’ (p. 395). Forbes then offers an overview of contemporary trauma theory, applying this to her reading of Shelley’s drama. Forbes notes how it reflects trauma’s splitting of self through the character of Beatrice as well as dramatizing the difficulties of representing such trauma. In particular, Forbes focuses on Beatrice’s inability to articulate her rape despite the representative burden falling on her shoulders, as well as the non-representation of it on stage.

Further to Decadent Romanticism discussed above, the posthumous nineteenth-century legacy of Shelley was also the subject of Michael Rossington’s ‘William Michael Rossetti and the Organization of Percy Bysshe Shelley in the Later Nineteenth Century’ (ERR 26[2015] 387-93). Rossington considers Shelley’s quasi-rehabilitation in the later nineteenth-century editing of his works but makes the case that William Michael Rossetti should be considered as having played a more major role than is often thought. Indeed, Rossington even goes as far as to argue that ‘Rossetti has a right to be regarded, alongside Mary Shelley, as the most heroic nineteenth-century editor of Shelley’s unfinished play Charles the First and the poem “The Boat on the Serchio”’ (p. 389). Rossetti’s argument at the time that unfinished works such as The Triumph of Life be placed among ‘fragments’ may not be popular among more modern editors but, as Rossington convincingly argues, Rossetti’s ‘life-long scholarly dedication to Shelley have nevertheless been of lasting value’ (p. 391). Others also considered the issue of Shelley’s ‘fragment’ works. Cian Duffy’s ‘Percy Shelley’s “Unfinished Drama” and the Problem of the Jane Williams Poems’ (ERR 26[2015] 615-32) returns to the key debates concerning the various Shelley fragments often called the ‘Jane Williams poems’. An issue that has vexed critics is whether the ‘Jane’ of the poems relates to the historical Jane Williams. Through the example of Nancy Moore Goslee and William
Ulmer in their reading of Shelley’s *Epipsychidion* (1821), and through consultation of manuscript and draft evidence, Duffy argues that the ‘Jane’ in the fragments is very much a ‘mediated’ figure. We should not read these fragments as solely accurately reflecting biographical information, but neither would it be appropriate to ignore this entirely. As Duffy puts it, we should be cautious in using these poems ‘to construct biographical hypotheses which are then reinscribed upon the very poems from which they originated’ (p. 627).

Very little was published on Robert Southey in 2015; Stuart Andrews’s ‘Before the Laureateship: Robert Southey as Historian’ (*Romanticism* 21[2015] 72-79) and ‘Southey, Coleridge and Islam’ (*WC* 46[2015] 109-15) by the same author, being the only two articles. In the first of these, Andrews revisits Southey’s claim to Walter Savage Landor in 1810 that he would be remembered more as a historian than a poet, arguing ‘he may have meant it’ (p. 72). Of course, Southey did indeed write a number of successful prose histories, but Andrews investigates how the figure of ‘Southey the Historian’ is very much evident even in the earlier poetry. His revisions to *Joan of Arc* (removing the supernatural aspects) show Southey’s desire to capture historical veracity. Similarly, his correspondence demonstrates his desire to capture authentic historical events rather than imagined ones in his poetry, and even ‘imagined’ tales see Southey working to chase down appropriate sources. Andrews’s second article considers Southey’s intriguing relationship to, and interest in, Islam. Islam is of course the subject not only of a number of his poems such as *Thalaba the Destroyer*, but also a recurrent theme in his correspondence with Coleridge. Andrews considers how Islam comes to be considered as a type of Unitarian Christianity for Southey, and notes that Southey’s admiration or respect for the religion in its purest form is not necessarily extended to the faith practised by the Ottoman Empire of his day, which Southey views as a corruption akin to ‘the Christianity of the Vatican’ (p. 113). Andrews also traces how both Coleridge and Southey move from Arabic Islam, to a consideration of the Islam of the Iberian peninsular.
2015 saw the publication of two very substantial reference works on the life and literature of William Wordsworth. To simply call them ‘reference works’ however is to do them a disservice, since both show evidence of exemplary and often very original scholarship. *William Wordworth in Context*, edited by Andrew Bennett, has thirty-five brief chapters divided between four sections that offer summaries of the multiple ‘contexts’ within which Wordsworth was living and working. The opening section provides us with context of the ‘Life and Works’ of Wordsworth. Stephen Gill interestingly offers autobiographical context to the writing of Wordsworth’s autobiographical works (pp. 3-9). Susan Levin’s chapter (pp. 10-18) details the life/practices of the Wordsworth Circle, encompassing close family and friends as well as figures such as Thomas de Quincey. Judith Page (pp. 19-26) takes as her subject the role played by Dorothy Wordsworth in not only the life of her brother, but also his works and the cultivation of his poetic persona. Sally Bushell’s following essay (pp. 27-37) reminds us that Wordsworth was an extensive redrafter. Using the example of the alterations made from ‘Descriptions of a Beggar’ to turn it into ‘Old Man Travelling’, Bushell argues ‘how intertwined the relationship is between composition and revision for Wordsworth’ (p. 35). Tim Milnes (pp. 38-44) reminds us of Wordsworth’s standing as a prose writer, and how Wordsworth’s poetic greatness ‘means his contribution to Romantic prose is easily overlooked’ (p. 38).

The book’s second section considers both Wordsworth’s critical reception and his subsequent influence on later writers. David Higgins (pp. 47-53) offers an account of Wordsworth’s generally negative early reviews [1793- 1806] but is at pains to point out that the common belief in the younger Wordsworth as a figure not beloved by contemporary reviewers is inaccurate. Peter Simonsen (pp. 54-60) is right to note that some of the most influential and significant criticism Wordsworth encountered in his lifetime is to be found in the mid-career period [1807-1818]. Richard Cronin (pp. 61-8) covers the longest period,
1819-1850, which sees Wordsworth’s public perception change significantly, so that by the
time of his death, he was ‘recognized as the great English poet of the age’ (p. 61).

The first three chapters of the book’s third section offer superb detail concerning the
literary traditions from which Wordsworth emerged and took influence from. These include
the ballad tradition, as discussed by Daniel Cook (pp. 101-10), the pastoral-georgic tradition,
as discussed by David Fairer (pp. 111-18), and eighteenth-century poetry more generally as
considered by Kevis Goodman (pp. 91-100). These help us to see Wordsworth not simply as
reacting against or moving away from these earlier forms but in deep and complex
negotiation with them. The section then turns to consider the various literary forms popular in
Wordsworth’s age as well as historically; Wordsworth took inspiration from and even
emulated these in his own writing. Ann Wierda Rowland reminds us of Wordsworth’s
seemingly contradictory attitude to ‘popular’ forms of poetry like antiquarianism (pp. 119-
26). Wordsworth’s similarly vexed relationship with the sonnet – and the recent ‘sonnet
revival’ of the late eighteenth century – is discussed by Daniel Robinson (pp. 136-44). The
third section also includes chapters on ‘Elegy’ and ‘Epitaphs’, by Paul Fry (pp. 127-35) and
Samantha Matthews (pp. 152-60) respectively, as well as ‘Autobiography’ by Joshua Wilner
(pp. 145-51). This chapter’s focus on The Prelude may well help explain the absence of a
standalone chapter on the Epic. James Chandler’s chapter on ‘sensibility, sympathy and
sentiment’ (pp. 161-70) again discusses Wordsworth’s work in relation to both popular
literary forms of his age as well as earlier.

‘Cultural and Historical Contexts’ forms the final section. The very significant context
of the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars and Wordsworth’s European travels are
discussed by John Bugg (pp. 173-81), Michael Ferber (pp. 190-98) and Simon Bainbridge
(pp. 199-206). As well as detailing the context, all three of these chapters closely relate this to
the poetry. This is also the case with the chapters considering specifically ‘English’
context(s), such as ‘London’ by Christopher Stokes (pp. 215-23), ‘Poverty and Crime’ by Toby Benis (pp. 182-89), ‘Education’ by Frances Ferguson (pp. 232-40), ‘Family and Friendship’ by Anne D. Wallace (pp. 224-31) as well as the chapters on walking, animals, nature and the environment by Robin Jarvis (pp. 291-9), Scott Hess (pp. 207-14) and Kurt Fosso (pp. 241-49). Sophie Thomas sees Wordsworth’s ‘visual’ poetics in the light of contemporary advances in visual technology such as the Eidophusikon and the Daguerreotype (pp. 300-07). The visual is of course at stake in Phillip Shaw’s and Noel Jackson’s chapters on the ‘Sublime’ (pp. 283-90) and the ‘Senses’ (pp. 267-74) respectively. The context of Wordsworth’s philosophical and religious beliefs is discussed by Stuart Allen (pp. 250-8) and Jonathan Roberts (pp. 259-66), while Alexander Regier’s chapter on Wordsworth’s language (pp. 275-82) addresses the ‘language as really used by men’ in relation to eighteenth-century linguistics. Despite the brevity of the chapters, they all nevertheless offer a detailed introduction to each topic. Bennett’s enforcing of the tight chapter length, as well as the overall coherence of the volume, is to be commended. Wordsworth is successfully refigured not simply as an isolated ‘poet of genius’, but as a man deeply influenced by the tumultuous – and creative – period in which he was living.

Of the two major Wordsworth ‘reference’ works published in 2015, The Oxford Handbook of William Wordsworth is, despite its title, the one that is most clearly more than a simple guidebook for undergraduate students. This mammoth volume, approaching 1000 pages comprising of fifty chapters including prefatory material, is produced by some of the leading scholars of Wordsworth and Romanticism more widely. It is therefore an astonishingly ambitious achievement. Far from simply serving as a reference volume to key and well-known ‘facts’ of Wordsworth’s life, the editors, Richard Gravil and Daniel Robinson, have established the work to be a forward-looking piece of scholarship, with the essays seeking ‘to present where Wordsworth studies are and to open windows onto where
they are going’ (p. 11). This is most certainly the case; as well as reminding us of some of the major issues in Wordsworth criticism historically, useful reference points in their own right, these are also refigured and reconsidered in light of contemporary and potential future scholarship. It is impossible to consider all the essays here, but they generally follow this ‘double pattern’. For instance, James Castell’s superb essay on ‘Wordsworth and “The Life of Things”’ (pp. 733-48) partly revisits crucial debates concerning ‘thingness’ in Wordsworth, particularly the different readings of ‘Lines Written a Few Miles Above Tintern Abbey’ by Jonathan Bate and Marjorie Levinson amongst others. Whereas Bate’s ‘ecocritical reading’ sees ‘things’ as an inclusive term, Levinson sees it instead as ‘a symptom of exclusion’ (p. 740). For Castell, citing Christopher Ricks’s emphasis on the importance of ‘doubleness’ in Wordsworth’s poetry, there is a potential ‘co-presence of the two positions’; however, Castell’s attentive close reading demonstrates how it ultimately has to remain ambiguous (pp. 741-2). This, as William Empson reminds us, is ‘among the very roots of poetry’ (Seven Types of Ambiguity [1930] Penguin p. 3). In this sense, Castell’s essay is both a concise summary of existing scholarship and also an insight into current and future developments.

It is the volume’s own ‘doubleness’ that suggests the handbook would be particularly suited to postgraduate students and those beginning a research career. The essays are nevertheless important works of criticism in their own right and likely to be cited by scholars at all career stages. Nicholas Roe’s opening essay (pp. 35-50) on Wordsworth’s early life for instance serves as a useful reference for students and scholars at all levels, offering both well-known and less well-known biographical accounts alongside close attention to the early poetry. A rather different essay by Michael O’Neill (pp. 237-53) is nevertheless similarly widely applicable. His essay on the Immortality Ode, as well as a useful summary of the poem’s critical history, includes his own original interpretation of the poem that is a genuine
contribution to scholarship. O’Neill’s reading is one that helps us to consider the poem as one of slippery signification; a poem ‘alive to the shifting meanings of words’ (p. 239). O’Neill even goes so far as to read the poem in the light of Keatsian ‘negative capability’ (p. 239). His reading emphasises, for instance, the paradox of memory and vision Wordsworth offers us; memory both reminds us of what is lost but is also ‘something that doth live’ (p. 250).

As well as reminding us of the immense variety and richness of both past and current Wordsworth criticism – for example, the strength of Ecocritical, New Formalist and New Historicist approaches – the handbook also helps to demonstrate that there remain some pivotal concerns that are not wholly satisfied within the field of Wordsworth studies. While analysis of Wordsworth’s revisions has produced some superb scholarship over the years, this has nevertheless not solved the vexed issue of ‘authoritative’ versions of poems. This problem is at the heart of much of the discussion throughout the handbook; Gravil and Robinson’s prefatory chapter for instance opens with an account of Charles Dickens’s purchase of the 1850 Prelude, reminding us that the Victorian Wordsworth is different to the one we read today (pp. 1-13). Indeed, the final essay, ‘Editing Wordsworth in the Twentieth Century’ by Bruce Graver (pp. 816-32), while praising the excellent Cornell volumes, nevertheless partly concedes that ‘the question of where we should draw the line between editorial principles and authoritative revisions’ remains (p. 832). In this sense, this concern brings us full circle. The Oxford Handbook of William Wordsworth then, despite its prohibitive cost and unwieldy size, is a tremendous work. This is not solely for the quantity but for the quality of its academic chapters. These are exceptionally engaging and readable, and it is clear that this will be a superb acquisition for research and university libraries.

There was a similar scholarly richness to be found in the articles published on Wordsworth in 2015. Wordsworth’s writing on infancy is the subject of Alexander Freer’s article ‘Wordsworth and the Infancy of Affection’ (Sir 54[2015] 77-99). Focusing on ‘Ode:
Intimations of Immortality’, Freer aims to not privilege ‘infancy’ or ‘adulthood’ over the other but instead to read the poem as part of Wordsworth’s ‘productive ambivalence between the two states’ (p. 79). Freer reads the ‘I’ of the poem productively, noting that in acknowledging one’s origins one is also acknowledging its disappearance and loss. The ‘I’ then ‘marks the speaker as having fallen away from “celestial light”’ (p. 81). Wordsworth’s poetic education – the ‘falling away’ of his own celestial light perhaps – was the subject of two further articles. Pamela Woof’s ‘Wordsworth Learns to Write Elegy’ (WC 46[2015] 70-9) both considers the influences that inspired Wordsworth’s youthful elegiac writing and traces Wordsworth’s honing of elegy into maturity. Major sources include Classical writers such as Catullus and Virgil, but also Milton and Helen Maria Williams. Whereas Wordsworth’s earlier elegy laid on the Classical techniques a little thick – Woof refers to ‘too much…alliteration and repetition’ and ‘over-clear literary allusion’ (p. 74) – his later elegy is the product of a poet who is ‘irrepressibly himself’ (p. 79). This is an excellent article, with very convincing close reading. Michael O’Neill’s ‘Poetic Education: Wordsworth, Yeats, Coleridge and Shelley’ (WC 46[2015] 79-86) similarly discusses poetic development and influence, although it focuses more on the question of ‘education’ that is understood in various ways. For O’Neill, poetic education for Wordsworth is seemingly contradictory; it is ‘at once anti- and post-Lockean’ (p. 82). ‘Nature’ and some elements of human society are teachers for the nascent poet, yet the figure of the uneducated child is closer to the divine as seen in poems such as the ‘Immortality’ Ode. O’Neill traces the connection to later writers such as Yeats, but also contemporaries such as Coleridge and Shelley. Coleridge’s ‘Frost at Midnight’ is seen to demonstrate education as reciprocal; it is ‘giving at the same time as asking’ (p. 85). For O’Neill, this is reflected by the very verse form itself. Shelley’s notion of education, O’Neill briefly asserts, is similar; although one based on error, the poet
nevertheless unleashes energies that both ‘overwhelms and is controlled by him’ (p. 86). This article benefits from O’Neill’s trademark attentive close reading.

Wordsworth’s poetic development is also central to Oliver Clarkson’s ‘Wordsworth’s Lyric Moments’ (EIC 65[2015] 125-43). This focuses on a number of Wordsworth’s short, lyric pieces produced in 1802 that were dismissed by some contemporary reviewers when they were published in 1807 as puerile or worse. Clarkson sensitively reads these ‘lyric moments’ as emerging at a time of Wordsworth’s ‘poetic in-betweenness’ (p. 127), where the poet is wrestling with significant questions of poetic expression, such as the slipperiness of language. Clarkson superbly demonstrates these lyrics to be self-conscious works of art, where the poet considers resisting the fixities of naming, or is aware that ‘a “moment” within the lyric becomes the “moment” of the lyric’ (p. 129). In this elegantly written article, Clarkson helps in recovering these seemingly minor pieces as demonstrating a significant stage in Wordsworth’s poetic career.

Three essays read Wordsworth through the lens of contemporary medical or scientific language. Arden Hegele’s ‘Romantic Autopsy and Wordsworth’s Two-Part Prelude’ (ERR, 26[2015] 341-8) contextualises the poem within the years surrounding the French Revolution in a fascinating and original way. He focuses in particular on the significance of the development of autopical dissection during this time. Exploring Wordsworth’s use of dissection tropes in his poetry, Hegele considers it as a way of articulating poetic self-analysis that owes much to the use of similar metaphors in William Godwin’s understanding of radical politics. As well as offering a thorough overview of Romantic and post-revolutionary period advances in medicine, Hegele notes how Wordsworth’s attitude toward dissection altered in a manner analogous to his political ideals, evidenced through close reading of the poetry. Amy Mallory-Kani, in her “‘Contagious Airs”: Wordsworth’s Poetics and Politics of Immunity’ (ERR, 26[2015] 699-717), similarly explores the use of medical
discourse in Wordsworth’s poetry as well as his politics. Mallory-Kani opens with
Wordsworth’s rhetoric of 1818 when he was campaigning for the Tories, which made use of
the language of ‘contagion’ in describing the influence of French radicalism, noting that this
was fairly typical of the time. Where Wordsworth differs from this standard discourse for
Mallory-Kani however is in his ‘biopolitical poetics’ of immunity (p. 700). This discourse of
pathology then is read through the lens of later ‘biopolitics’ as espoused by theorists such as
Michel Foucault. The relationship of Wordsworth’s poetics to the discourse relating the body
to the state is one that seems to indicate Wordsworth as a poet whose metrics Mallory-Kani
sees as inoculating the ‘powerful feelings’ within the poetry against spilling over into
contagious Jacobinical actions. Mallory-Kani’s short discussion of Wordsworthian
imagination as something that is ‘embodied’ more than is often thought (p. 707) draws a
connection to Lisa Ann Robertson’s “Swallowed Up In Impression”: Humphry Davy’s
Materialist Theory of Embodied Transcendence and William Wordsworth’s “Tintern Abbey”
(ERR 26[2015] 591-614). Noting how the chemist and inventor Humphry Davy had been
inspired by Wordsworth’s ‘Tintern Abbey’, Robertson offers an overview of Davy’s
unpublished theories of embodied cognition in which imaginative or transcendent
experiences are simply seen as examples of intense emotion that is very material or corporeal.
Therefore, Davy’s more empirical concept of embodied transcendence is one that offers a
different way of reading Romantic imagination. Robertson applies this to ‘Tintern Abbey’
and offers an original reading that argues that traditional interpretations of the poem as
transcendental neglect the poem’s many physiological references.

Three further articles similarly considered Wordsworth’s poetry and poetics in the
light of contemporary discourse and events. Joshua Stanley’s ‘Wordsworth and “the most
unhappy man of men”: Sentimentalism and Representation’ (ERR 26[2015]185-204)
reconsiders the traditional view of the relationship between Romanticism and earlier
sentimentalism. Instead of considering Wordsworth’s Romanticism as a ‘turn away’ from sentimentalism, it is read within the context of it (p. 185). Stanley’s focus is on Wordsworth’s sonnet ‘TOUSSAINT! The most unhappy man of men’ that first appeared in Poems, in Two Volumes and was later substantially revised by 1827. In a sophisticated reading, Stanley convincingly demonstrates the poem to be one in which Wordsworth, although ‘draw[ing] on the techniques of sentimentalism to represent the radical force of Toussaint’, is careful to keep his readers aware that it is a simple representation of sentiment (p. 202). To merely sentimentalise is to co-opt the experience and not to enact the necessary change. Essentially, ‘only those who have suffered […] can make a just world out of an unjust one’ (p. 203).

Betsy Winakur Tontiplaphol’s article ““Where Pastime Only Had Been Sought”: Wordsworth at the Ballet” (ERR 26[2015] 205-224) offers an analysis of a rarely considered aspect of Romantic-period life: the ballet. Although Byron’s contemptuous reference to ballet in Don Juan and the evident general disdain for it more widely establishes it as being somehow too frivolous and too French for the period, Tontiplaphol explores the oblique and largely positive allusions to the art in Wordsworth’s poetry. In particular, Tontiplaphol is at pains to emphasise the significance of more general popular theatrical dancing in the period, despite this often being neglected by critics. Paying close attention to a number of Wordsworth’s poems, Tontiplaphol not only illustrates the contextual importance of dancing and dance venues in the poetry, but also how the imagery of feet, and the rhythm and meter (or metrical ‘feet’) of Wordsworth’s lines themselves owe as much to balletic dance as they do to Wordsworthian walking. Richard Matlak’s ‘Wordsworth and the “Great Terror” of 1803-05’ (WC 46[2015] 21-6) considers the poems Wordsworth wrote during the fear of French invasion 1803-1805. Matlak opens with a historical overview of the French and British military preparations for the invasion that ultimately never came. At the height of this anxiety in the latter half of 1803, Coleridge and William and Dorothy Wordsworth holidayed in
Scotland. Although some have viewed this as a way to ‘dodge the draft’ into the military, Wordsworth did sign up for the ‘Grasmere Volunteers’ on his return (p. 23). Matlak, then, sees the Scottish tour as partly inspiring Wordsworth’s decision to enlist; the Wordsworths did indeed meet with Walter Scott in Edinburgh who was ‘an enthusiastic poet-soldier’ (p. 23). The sonnets of October 1803 seem to bear this out, adopting a seemingly ‘populist sentiment’ (p. 24). Matlak also contextualises Wordsworth’s other poetry of this period with his experience in the military and the fear of the invasion in an original and engaging way.

Eliza Borkowska’s “But I am too particular for the limits of my paper”: Religion in Wordsworth’s Poetry, Prose and Talk’ (Romanticism 21[2015] 14-24) revisits an oft-explored aspect of Wordsworth’s writing. This is not without reason since, as Borkowska herself evidences, ‘[s]tatistically speaking, religion is the second most important source of inspiration’ in his poetry (p. 14). Borkowska notes how the broad topic of ‘religion’ is less obvious in Wordsworth’s prose than his poetry. Whereas he is fastidious in describing, for instance, the topography and weather in his depiction of the Alps in his prose works, he essentially glosses his reflections on ‘the Creator’, arguing ‘I am too particular for the limits of my paper’ (cited, p. 15). This seeming ‘taciturnity’ as Borkowska puts it regarding religion in Wordsworth’s prose compared to his poetry, is seemingly at odds with Wordsworth’s claim in the Preface to Lyrical Ballads that there is little difference between the two. Explanations of ‘religious’ poems in Wordsworth’s prose, Borkowska reveals, are similarly cursory.

There were two 2015 articles that continued the glut of 2014 bicentenary essays on The Excursion. Anthony Harding, in his ‘The Excursion: Life, Lives and Writing’ (WC 46[2015] 87-92), reads the poem as one of life-writing that simply ‘tells the stories of many lives’ (p. 87). The dialogic nature of the poem, Harding argues, is one that helps to engage readers with a significant ‘cultural moment’ (p. 92) that is more than simply poetic reverie.
Not only do the various tales engage readers’ sympathies, they also reflect anxieties about the loss of an oral tradition of memorialising that, in Wordsworth’s day, was increasingly replaced by a commercialised print culture. The poem that eventually formed Book I of *The Excursion* is the subject of Matthew Rowney’s ‘Broken Arbour: “The Ruined Cottage” and Deforestation’ (*ERR* 26[2015] 719-41). Rowney reads the ‘broken arbour’ where Margaret sits towards the end of ‘The Ruined Cottage’ in the context of the deforestation of England between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. Rowney’s reading focuses partly on absence and loss. In particular, the ‘vacant and huge space’ that surrounds the traveller in the poem ‘illustrates a profound historical and ecological transformation’ (p. 721); what has been lost has been lost forever. In this light, further readings of ‘The Solitary Reaper’ and Goody Blake and Harry Gill help to demonstrate how Wordsworth’s poetry of deforestation – and the significance of trees – is connected to his writing about memory, in that memory is an awareness of what has passed rather than any sense of preservation. As Rowney puts it ‘the broken arbour illustrates the broken bond between the human and the natural, reflected in Margaret’s anguished attempt to remember and reshape the past’ (p. 734).

Memory was also considered in Michael Wiley’s exploration of a central Wordsworthian concept in his ‘Wordsworth’s Spots of Time in Space and Time’ (*WC*, 46[2015] 52-8). As the title suggests however, Wiley is interested in locating potential influences on Wordsworth’s famous concept, arguing that he engages with ‘the space-oriented writings and conversations of figures such as Isaac Newton, David Hartley, the Common Sense philosopher Thomas Reid, and Tom Wedgwood’ as well as Gottfried Leibniz (p. 53). Although Wordsworth is consistent with these philosophers in thinking of the ‘physical placedness of spots’ (p. 53), the phrase ‘spots of time’ is exceedingly rare, and is only used by the American educator Emma Willard in 1822 (who would not have read of the concept at this time). Wiley demonstrates thorough attentive research in exploring echoes of
Wordsworth’s idea in the work of different poets, noting that none quite share Wordsworth’s conceptual blending of space and time.

Heidi Thomson’s ‘Wordsworth’s “Song for the Wandering Jew” as a Poem for Coleridge’ (*Romanticism* 21[2015] 37-47) considers a slightly under-appreciated poem of Wordsworth’s that was first included in the 1800 *Lyrical Ballads* volume. Thomson’s argument is that the poem’s ‘resistance to classification’, and the fact that it a song *for* ‘the Wandering Jew’ as opposed to ‘of’, suggests it to be a ‘deflected address to Coleridge’ (p. 37). Thomson notes that Wordsworth and Coleridge had already begun to differ in their poetic vision in the later 1790s (for example Coleridge’s ‘teleological aesthetic’ versus ‘Wordsworth’s “lyrical and narrative inclination”’ (p. 39)). The ‘Song for the Wandering Jew’ then is seen as an ironically Coleridgean poem that ‘reminds us of the experimental, new nature of [Wordsworth’s] poetic work while at the same time issuing a declaration of independence from Coleridge’s tutelage’ (pp. 46-7). The subject of poetic intertextuality and influence is also investigated in Richard Gravil’s ‘“The Reign of Nature”; or, Mr Bryant’s Wordsworth’ (*WC* 46[2015] 58-68). Gravil considers the early reception and influence of Wordsworth in the United States as well as his championing alongside other Romantic poets by William Cullen Bryant. As Gravil reminds us, Bryant was himself seen as the one great American poet of this time and is a rather neglected figure in contemporary scholarship. Bearing this in mind, Gravil offers some close readings of Bryant’s poetry, emphasising its Wordsworthian influences, including such poems as the ‘Immortality’ Ode and the ‘Lucy’ poems. Interestingly, Gravil notes how the Solitary’s ambivalence toward Native Americans in *The Excursion* in fact may have partly inspired Bryant’s own (in ‘The Prairies’, Bryant’s most ‘Wordsworthian poem’ (p. 60)). The fact that Bryant had some political influence, however, meant that although he ‘wrote no more than a dozen genuinely remarkable
poems…he exercised a legislative influence of which Wordsworth and Shelley could only dream’ (p. 66).

The influence of continental Europe on Wordsworth was the subject of two articles. Eugene Stelzig’s ‘Vaudracour and William; or, a Tale of Two Different Recluses’ (WC 46[2015] 120-4) offers a fascinating reading of the Vaudracour figure that appears in the 1805 Prelude (IX ll. 556-935) but is excluded from 1850. The lines were, however, published as Vaudracour and Julia in Wordsworth’s River Duddon volume in 1820. Stelzig reads Vaudracour not simply as a disguised Wordsworth lamenting his lost love Annette, but as ‘Wordsworth’s version of a road not taken…his dark fictional double’ who is a ‘very different recluse’ to the poet (p. 123). Stelzig’s reading then is one that emphasises both the romantic and political analogies of Vaudracour’s doomed relationship with Julia.

‘Wordsworth and the Relief of Central Switzerland’ by Julia Tejblum (WC 46[2015] 116-20) investigates Wordsworth’s curious reference to a cartographic landscape model of Lake Lucerne and the neighbouring cantons that he encountered in Switzerland in 1790 and potentially again in 1820. Tejblum notes how Wordsworth uses the metaphor of the model – or ‘relief’ – in a number of versions of his Guide to the Lakes, first appearing with a different title in 1810. What Wordsworth attempts to achieve with this allusion, Tejblum argues convincingly, is to capture what Wordsworth sees as the relief’s ability to be ‘at once an aid to the future traveller and a retrospective tool, with which the reader can recast Wordsworth’s experience’ (p. 119).

In this light, it is a pleasing coincidence that Romantic Circles published an electronic edition of Wordsworth’s Guide to the Lakes (https://www.rc.umd.edu/editions/guide_lakes) edited by Nicholas Mason, Shannon Stimpson and Paul Westover. Wordsworth’s Guide was revised continually by the poet himself over 25 years, with five editions appearing in Wordsworth’s lifetime alone. Although the second to fifth editions of the work are fairly easy
to get hold of, the first edition is exceptionally rare and most of the available scholarly edited versions of the Guide are in extremely expensive volumes. This online version, that is of course open access, not only provides the text of the original 1810 edition, which was originally entitled Selected Views in Cumberland, Westmorland and Lancashire, but also Rev. Joseph Wilkinson’s accompanying engravings. This is very useful as these high quality images allow for easy consultation as well as reproduction. In addition, an annotated version of the 1835 edition is provided along with page images of suggested ‘Itineraries’ provided by the then editors, published alongside the original. A heavily detailed PDF chart of parallel comparisons of all five editions is also provided, illustrating the extent of Wordsworth’s revisionary practice as well as the diligent research undertaken by the editors. The thorough scholarly introduction provides an extensive overview of print history and the origins of Wordsworth’s decision to write the Guide as well as a consideration of Wordsworth’s potential influences regarding the writing of the Lake District. However, the editors stress Wordsworth’s originality, arguing he set out to write something that was far removed from a standard guidebook, and treated the Lake District as made up of something more than just ‘scenes’ to be observed from various viewing platforms. This treatment was very much informed by Wordsworth’s poetic view of the landscape. As a final touch, there is also an interactive map where areas that Wordsworth discusses in the Guides can be highlighted. This is an excellent resource for both general interest and Wordsworth scholars more specifically.

Finally, there were also two short Notes & Queries publications on Wordsworth. Stephanie Dumke’s ‘Wordsworth’s Portraits of the Royal Children: A New Letter of 1850’ (N&Q 62[2015] 415-7) details a previously unpublished letter from Wordsworth to Sir Charles Beaumont discovered in Coburg, Bavaria. Dumke notes that the status of the addressee means the paper used is expensive and the letter is very well presented. She then
transcribes the letter in full, highlighting that it is written in ‘a shaky hand’ (p. 415); unsurprising considering Wordsworth’s age (the letter was composed only two months prior to his death). The letter, as Dumke reminds us, also offers insights into Wordsworth’s attitude to the Laureateship. Thomas Owen’s ‘Nature’s Motto: Wordsworth and the Macmillans’ (N&Q 62[2015] 430-5) is a fascinating consideration of Wordsworth’s influence on the scientific journal Nature. Not only does Owens highlight that the magazine’s motto was taken from Wordsworth’s sonnet ‘A VOLANT Tribe of Bards on earth are found’, revised in 1827, but also how it remained misquoted for so long. Owens correctly points out that, although the errors seem minor or superficial, they actually substantially change the meaning of Wordsworth’s lines. In addition, Owens speculates with persuasive evidence that Wordsworth’s lines may have even provided the inspiration for Nature’s title; after all, the early editors had a deep passion for Wordsworth’s poetry. Amusingly, Owens notes that had the editors chosen another Wordsworth quotation which would have inspired the publication title in a different direction, it might not on occasion have been mistaken for a magazine for Naturists. This article is an excellent, thorough and entertaining piece of scholarship.

4. Drama

The scholarship from 2015 on the drama of the Romantic period sheds new light not only on the plays themselves but also on the many performances of them during these decades. While the attention to the latter concerns performances that took place at both major and lesser known theatres within and outside of London, the emphasis on the stage speaks to a concerted critical effort from this year to foreground contextual readings of era plays.

This trend begins to become evident, for instance, in Frederick Burwick’s and Manushag N. Powell’s transatlantic study, British Pirates in Print and Performance (PalMac), which focuses on the period’s fascination with the figure of the pirate in literary and theatre culture alike. Drawing on several works of the period and connecting them
significantly to a time of maritime trade, exploration, and conflict, the authors trace a consequential history of piratical representation, which they contend offers a ‘dramatic and performative affair’ that is ‘steeped in rebellion and chaos’ (p. 14).

One of the major contributions of the book is the attention that Burwick and Powell give to the performative tendencies of the pirate, who is either ‘striding the deck’ or ‘strutting the stage’ (p. 1). After giving helpful background on an array of pirate representations and performances from the period, Burwick and Powell make clear that their book’s purpose is to ‘track the very interesting movement between pirate on stage and pirate in print’ and how ‘performance is continually, regardless of medium, the key to a pirate’s successful mobility’ (p. 11). The first three chapters of their book examine how piracy was realized as a performance on stage. Works by Lord Byron, Walter Scott, and James Fenimore Cooper are given significant attention. The final chapters of this impressive monograph then focus on matters of gender, including ‘fraught pirate masculinity’ and the possibilities of the ‘she-pirate’ in period works (p. 14). The book concludes with a brilliant chapter on the origins of several pirate clichés, including ‘the “Pirate Code,”’ pirate fashion (from peg legs to parrots), the Jolly Roger or skull-and-crossbones flag, pirate music and musical pirates, [and] walking the plank’ (p. 14).

The next work reviewed also emphasizes the importance of stage history: a special volume of *DQR Studies in Literature* titled ‘The Romantic Stage: Holding the Mirror Up to Nature and Culture’. This excellent collection of essays re-examines the significance of the Romantic theatre from a myriad of perspectives. According to the Introduction by its editors, Lilla Maria Crisafulli and Fabio Liberto (*DQR* 55[2015] 1-22), their volume aims to take into account the fact that these dramatic works ‘were rich and innovative phenomena and that they made an essential contribution to the aesthetic and ideological complexity of British culture in the Romantic period’ (p. 1). Crisafulli and Liberto contend that the essays in their
collection contravene a long-standing critical bias that has maintained that the Romantics and the stage did not mix well. The essays ‘seek to capture the richness and diversity of British Romantic theatre and drama and situate [them] at the centre of the multiple, and often radical, literary and social transformations that Romanticism brought about’ (p. 20). Divided into four sections, the essays helpfully incorporate ‘interdisciplinary, international and inter-generic perspectives’ (p. 20).

The first section, ‘Contextualizing Romantic Theatre and Drama’, begins with Jeffrey Cox’s essay, ‘Editing Romantic Drama: Problems of Value, Volume, and Venue’ (DQR 55[2015] 23-40), in which Cox argues that we are lacking ‘a concerted effort to edit nineteenth-century drama so as to give us a complete picture of the dramatic and theatrical world during the Romantic era’ (p. 25). He makes this claim as a recommendation to future editors of period dramas to include details about the evening at the theatre, especially since such evenings often included multiple performances. By the end of his essay, Cox proposes that more attention should even be paid to performing Romantic dramas themselves: ‘Performance – whether in the theatre, the public reading, the classroom, or the closet stages of own heads – provides particular historical embodiments of texts, the moments when these texts stop being marks on a page and become living works. An edition, which is finally marks on a page, may never be able to replicate the double life of performance works’ (p. 40). Nicoletta Caputo’s essay, ‘Theatrical Periodicals and the Ethics of Theatre in the Romantic Age’ (DQR 55[2015] 43-56), follows Cox’s with an examination of the influence of periodicals on the theatre, including the ‘strategies that such magazines adopted to arouse interest in the theatrical event and its protagonists, to influence public opinion, and to create an ideal audience and an “ideal theatre”’ (p. 43). In ‘Romantic Drama and the Popular Theatre’ (DQR 55[2015] 57-70), Michael Gamer considers the relationships between the Romantic stage and early nineteenth-century culture. For him, the theatres of the age
provided cross-cultural spaces through which one can examine broader cultural and social issues: ‘Here people and productions, both high and low, meet, contest, jostle, applaud, and constitute an evening of entertainment. Here issues of canon and class are raised face to face – between differing audience members, between rival actors, between competing cultural forms, between mainpiece and afterpiece. Romantic theatre audiences may have been segregated physically and economically – by ticket price as well by location in the theatre – but these divisions hardly stopped class interaction and frequently served as a cause for it’ (p. 58).

The next section in the *DQR* volume, ‘Drama across the Arts’, begins with Carlotta Farese’s ‘The Strange Case of Herr von K: Further Reflections on the Reception of Kotzebue’s Theatre on Britain’ (*DQR* 55[2015] 71-84), and accomplishes precisely what its title suggests by offering an impressive analysis of August Friedrich Ferdinand von Kotzebue’s influence on both Romantic drama and theatre. Next, Fabio Liberto’s essay, ‘Shakespeare’s Visual Memorability during Romanticism’ (*DQR* 55[2015] 87-110), stresses the importance of visual culture, especially painting, on drama and theatre of the era, particularly with regard to ‘reconstructing the acting practices and dramatic conventions of the nineteenth-century stage’ (p. 89). According to Liberto, ‘paintings provide a different level of documentation and interpretation, offering a more immediate – and visually concrete – grasp of what was taking place in the London theatre’ – especially in relation to the staging of Shakespeare’s plays and heroes (p. 89). In ‘Poses and Pauses: The Theatrical Portrait in English Romanticism’ (*DQR* 55[2015] 111-34), Claudia Corti analyses the cultural fascination with celebrities by investigating the many circulating portraits of famous actors such as David Garrick, Sarah Siddons, and John Philip Kemble: ‘the stars of the English theatre, who fascinated audiences and critics in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries’ (p. 111). In “A Language in Itself Music”: Salvatore Vaganò’s Ballet en Action in
Shelley’s *Prometheus Unbound* (DQR 55[2015] 135-59), Lilla Maria Crisafulli then turns to Percy Shelley’s interests in multiple modes of performance, including choral drama, pantomime dance, and ballet. She does so by examining the influence of the Italian Romantic dancer and choreographer, Salvatore Viganò, on Shelley’s *Prometheus*, which Shelley wrote in Italy, where he was able to experience ‘new means of expression, new "languages", beyond the bounds of verbal discourse, capable to conjugate universality and subjectivism, personal emotions and human ties’ (p. 137).

The next section, ‘Staging the Gothic (Fear on Stage)’, begins with Diego Saglia’s ‘Staging Gothic Flesh: Material and Spectral Bodies in Romantic-Period Theatre’ (DQR 55[2015] 163-84). Saglia shows how Gothic drama in the period operated as a complex nexus of ‘generic and performative codes caught between the competing claims of conservatism and subversion, masculinity and femininity, the comic, the tragic and the melodramatic, the natural and the supernatural’; he argues that Gothic drama’s ‘distinctively hybrid nature is fully visible and active in the figurations of the body,’ and it also includes ‘oscillations between the cumbersome presence of the human physique and an evacuation of the physical into the immaterial, the evanescent and the spectral’ (p. 164). In ‘Matthew G. Lewis’s Theatre: Fear on Stage’ (DQR 55[2015] 185-97), Giovanna Silvani brings the discussion of Gothic drama specifically to Lewis’s dramas, especially *Castle Spectre* (1797), a work in which Lewis ‘succeeded in raising the popularity of Gothic drama to the level of that of the Gothic novel’ (p. 185). She primarily argues that *Castle Spectre* ‘provides an excellent example of a highly dynamic literary genre, often disharmonious in its various components, and teeming with inter- and intra-textual echoes and references’; for her, ‘gothic drama [. . .] becomes visible as a bridge linking past and future, tradition and innovation, a drama in progress, which inevitably seems to shun all classifications and clear-cut definitions’ (p. 197).

In the next essay, ‘Vampire in Kilts’ (DQR 55[2015] 199-214), Frederick Burwick traces the
period’s fascination with the figure of the vampire both on stage and on the page. Burwick specifically addresses how this figure transformed during the Romantic era into the aristocratic precursor to what many have considered the pinnacle of vampire literature, Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* (1897). In the final essay of the section, ‘Dramatic Discourse and the Romantic Stage in Joanna Baillie’s Theatre’ (*DQR* 55[2015] 227-43), Franca Dellarossa takes on the task of examining Joanna Baillie’s significant contributions to the Romantic stage. In analyzing Baillie’s plays, Dellarosa specifically takes ‘into consideration the various ways in which dramatic discourse and the theatrical codes which define its Gothic characteristics interact, sometimes questioning the Gothic sign in the very act of reinforcing it’ (p. 227).

The final section, ‘Texts, Theories and Contexts’, begins with Rosy Colombo’s ‘Closet Drama on the Stage of Revolution: Language on Trial in Wordsworth’s *The Borderers*’ (*DQR* 55[2015] 245-54). Through a careful analysis of Wordsworth’s play, Colombo argues that the Romantics indeed focused on the performative aspects of their dramas by investing heavily in the ‘theatrical performativity of their poetic language’ (p. 245). In ‘*Sardanapalus*, or, Romantic Drama between History and Archaeology’ (*DQR* 55[2015] 255-78), Carla Pomarè then transitions to discussing the convergence of historical knowledge and a ‘new discipline touching upon the historical field, archaeology’; she shows quite lucidly how Byron’s play offers a portal into this emergent field of study (p. 256). The last essay of the volume, ‘The Sensory and the Ideal: S.T. Coleridge’s Aesthetics in Romantic Theatrical Discourse’ (*DQR* 55[2015] 279-92), by Valeria Pellis offers a thorough and helpful exploration of the many critical readings of Coleridge’s work as dramatist as well as his views on his contemporary stage culture.

This fruitful attention to Romantic stage history continues just as impressively with an issue of *Studies in Romanticism*, ‘An Illegitimate History: Essays in Romantic Theater
History in Memory of Jane Moody’. The collection is edited by Kevin Gilmartin, who authors a touching introductory tribute to Moody (SiR 54[2015] 151-58), whose dedicated career singlehandedly brought Romantic literary and cultural history into dialogue with theatre history. As Gilmartin states, the essays in the volume ‘engage some aspect of Jane Moody’s own interest in late Georgian illegitimate theater – its performance practices, its material forms and geographical distribution, its generic transgressions and innovations, its emotional range, and its relation to the licensed stage’ (p. 157).

Jeffrey Cox’s article, “‘Illegitimate’ Pantomime in the ‘Legitimate’ Theater: Context as Text’ (SiR 54[2015] 159-86), begins the series of essays, focusing on how ‘action, sets and music displace language’ in nineteenth century drama (p. 160). For this reason, Cox argues, it is paramount to consider context (including ‘paratexts, intertexts, and historical contexts’) as much as the actual Romantic dramatic text itself, a line of argument consistent with Cox’s previously-cited essay (p. 168). In ‘That “Fine Word” Illegitimate: Children in Late Georgian Theater’ (SiR 54[2015] 187-209), Julia Carlson then argues that Romantic theatre became a conducive space not only for entertaining audiences but also for ‘a child’s mental flourishing’ – what she calls the ‘juvenile aspects of theater’s aesthetic education [which was] central to the success of theater in facilitating mental transformation, not chronological stages of development’ (p. 189). Next, Daniel O’Quinn addresses the ‘heightened affective bonds between audience, player, and theatrical technology’ in Romantic theatre in his essay, ‘Anticipating Histories: Emotional Life at Covent Garden Theatre, February 1811’ (SiR 54[2015] 211-39). Tracing the connections between legitimate and illegitimate theatres, O’Quinn draws on the specific case study of Covent Garden to show how emerging forms such as melodrama and spectacle offered a ‘new form of affective engagement’ at this specific moment in theater history – one that targeted ‘the bodily, visceral lives of the audience’ (p. 212). In “‘Announcing each day the performances”: Playbills, Ephemeralit,
Gillian Russell then turns to the significance of the playbill in relation to Romantic theatre as well as print culture: for her the playbill offers an ‘ephemeral zone in which print textuality and theatricality are profoundly imbricated’ (p. 242). Diego Saglia concludes the powerful series with his essay, “The Frightened Stage”: The Sensational Proliferation of Ghost Melodrama in the 1820s’ (SiR 54[2015] 269-93). As Saglia states, he sets out in his article to ‘reappraise how in the 1820s [. . .] melodramatists and managers drew on earlier Gothic drama and melodrama to reinvent them with new stage technology that enabled their plays to capture audiences and, by the same token, represent (or indeed “ghost”) topical questions and anxieties through the performance of the spectral’ (p. 271). In the final pages of the special Studies in Romanticism volume, Greg Kucich (Moody’s husband) provides a concluding response to the articles along with another tribute to Moody’s life and prolific scholarship, noting how Moody captured the way that Romantic theatre was able to cross borders in so many ways – a feature that all of the contributors to this volume have successfully underscored.

The contexts of Romantic dramas receive further attention from Susan Valladares, whose brilliant monograph, Staging the Peninsular War: English Theatres 1807-1815 (Routledge), focuses on the intricacies of British wartime theatre. As she considers the relations between the Napoleonic wars and theatrical responses to them in Britain, Valladares concentrates primarily on how Napoleon’s invasion of Portugal, which led to Britain’s involvement in the ensuing Peninsular Wars (the Iberian Peninsula of Spain and Portugal), affected much of the era’s theatre culture – both in London’s licensed and unlicensed theatres as well as outside the metropolis in provincial theatres.

Valladares opens her first chapter, ‘Pizarro, “Political Proteus”’, with an analysis of Richard Brinsley Sheridan’s Pizarro (1799) and how its interpretations varied from performance to performance. As she cleverly shows, Sheridan’s play took on a new set of
meanings during the Peninsular wars, as the Spanish conquistador became a stand in for French aggression, South American natives suddenly represented the British populace, and Spain surprisingly transformed into an object of sympathy because of Napoleon’s invasion of it (one need not forget the centuries-long adversarial relationship between both countries). In her next chapter, ‘Performing Shakespeare’, Valladares continues showing how the performances of dramatic texts offered an array of adaptations and interpretations. She focuses, for instance, on the staging of sympathies between Britain and Spain through the portrayal of Spaniards in Coleridge’s Remorse (1797). She turns her attention next to performances of Shakespeare’s plays, arguing cogently that these dramas served as enactments of British nationalism during these specific years. Her third chapter, ‘Spectacular Stages,’ shifts the direction of her analysis to the unlicensed theatres of London, where pantomime, burlesque, burletta, and melodrama received a new kind of status. According to her, these dramatic forms were indisputably in dialogue with the happenings in the Iberian Peninsula. Her final chapter, ‘Playing to the Provinces,’ then brings the reader to a specific case study outside of London altogether: Bristol’s Theatre Royal and Regency Theatre. Valladares demonstrates how Bristol’s theatrical community became entangled in matters of the Peninsular wars by virtue of the city’s status as a consequential port of commercial and military traffic.

Valladares complements her fine pages of research with a series of indexed performances that occurred at the Bristol Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, and Drury Lane from 1807 to 1815, and this wealth of material is certainly a boon for drama scholars of the period. Through a book that introduces a new kind of methodology, given her performative objects of analysis, she does an admirable job of considering the valences of theatrical performance within an era in which considerable censoring practices took place. Valladares succeeds in showing how several dramas of the era were transformed time and time again
through each of their individual enactments. She also makes the compelling case that the theatre of wartime Britain turned into a medium for celebrating military campaigns as well as shaping public sentiment – one that channeled the social and political influences of the day in new ways.

With an impressive essay in Studies in English Literature, ‘Linguistic Instability in R.B. Sheridan’s Pizarro’ (SEL 55[2015] 603-20), Michael Wiley picks up Valladares’s interest in the Anglo-Hispanic connections of the era as well as on what he calls the most popular play of the 1790s, Sheridan’s Pizarro. As Wiley argues, ‘Pizarro engages extensively with the political and literary contexts and debates of the late 1790s and helps set the critical, political, and literary stage for the following decades. By engaging and even shifting such contexts, Pizarro details an antifoundational — and antityrannical — hermeneutics of linguistic and representational instability and change’ (p. 604).

The next monograph reviewed also picks up on some of the themes of Valladares’s work, offering exclusive attention to a form of theatre in mining towns, mill towns, and port cities dedicated to the labouring classes in both London and its provinces. Frederick Burwick’s extraordinary British Drama of the Industrial Revolution (CUP) provides a new account of the post-Revolutionary effect on the world of the theatre, particularly as it represented the plight of exploited labourers, including weavers, miners, charcoal burners, steel mill workers and field workers. Like Valladares, Burwick argues that the meanings of individual plays adapt according to each of their performances and audiences. In making his argument, Burwick draws significant attention to political and cultural contexts that have affected these local milieus, showing, for instance, how a melodramatic villain and victim on stage suddenly represent the factory owner and his underpaid, overworked employees.
Burwick argues that the performances he scrutinizes, including the emergence of a kind of industrial melodrama, offer a bridge between the failures of the French Revolution and the dawning of the Chartist movement. He shows how these performances offered the labouring classes an opportunity for bonding through common purpose. Extending his compelling argument across nine chapters of careful analysis, Burwick offers helpful background on several labouring-class playwrights as well as a meditation on the influence of various local organizations such as the Freemasons. He then shifts his attention to the influence of specific industries as well as leaders of protest movements such as Captain Rock and King Ludd on the era’s dramas and performances, taking his reader even to specific cases that called for reform through performances themselves. Burwick also considers the theatrical representations of counterfeit coiners, poachers, and smugglers. All in all, Burwick succeeds at shedding ample light on neglected subject matter, and one can hope that his attention to the labouring classes and provincial theatres – along with Valladares’s – will begin to set a new direction for scholarship of our period.

The final essays reviewed here provide important biographical analysis pertaining to the dramas of women writers as well as Percy Shelley and Lord Byron. Marcie Frank has contributed a wonderful essay in English Literary History titled ‘Frances Burney’s Theatricality’ (ELH 82[2015] 615-35). Frank argues that ‘Burney’s development of narrative techniques for modulating distance, including free indirect discourse, grows out of the configuration of theater, shame, and narration in her oeuvre. The narrative innovations on view in her work are significant to the history of the novel not simply because she precedes Austen, but also because they reorient our attention to theatrical, indeed melodramatic, aspects especially prevalent in some Romantic novels for whose extraordinarily labile features we still lack a proper account’ (pp. 616-17). In an essay on ‘Drama’ in The Cambridge Companion to Women’s Writing in the Romantic Period, edited by Devoney
Looser and reviewed across this chapter, Catherine Burroughs (pp. 32-44) contributes an impressive analysis of this subject matter by drawing on plays by women writers from the late sixteenth century and culminating with an intensive focus on famous playwrights such as Joanna Baillie, Elizabeth Inchbald, Frances Burney, and Frances Anne Kemble. Burroughs sets out to ‘paint a clear picture of the contributions made to drama and theatre by British Romantic women writers so that what came before and after them can be rendered with more nuance’ (p. 32). In ‘Percy Shelley’s “Unfinished Drama” and the Problem of the Jane Williams Poems’ (ERR 26[2015] 615-32), also discussed in section 3, Cian Duffy maps the relationship between the ‘Jane’ included in Shelley’s late poetry and the actual historical figure, Jane Williams, whom Shelley had befriended during the final months of his life. In presenting a thorough archival investigation of manuscripts and poetic texts, Duffy also offers an extensive reading of Shelley’s ‘Unfinished Drama’, which treats the subject of unrequited love and finds its inspiration, according to Duffy, in the fraught relationship between Shelley and Williams. Duffy also contributed another fascinating essay, ‘Percy Shelley’s Other Lyrical Drama and the Inception of Hellas’ (SEL 55[2015] 817-40), in which he draws links between Shelley’s plans for his Greek revolutionary drama, Hellas, and his lifelong fascination with the Book of Job in the Old Testament. In ‘Byron, Original Sin, Shadows of Death and the Dramas of 1821’ (ByronJ 43[2015] 29-42), Harold Ray Stevens brings all the plays that Byron wrote in the same one year – Marino Faliero (1821), The Two Foscari (1821), Sardanapalus (1821), Cain (1821), Heaven and Earth (1821), and Werner (1821) – into a single discussion: namely through how Byron treats the subject of original sin and its consequences. Stevens even sees a parallel between Byron’s inclusion of this biblical subject matter, which also underscores the subject of death and dying, and what ultimately transpires through Byron’s own death in Greece a few years later.
On a final note, a recent collaborative project between the New York University Department of English and the Red Bull Theater of New York City is worth mentioning. Spearheaded by this reviewer, this initiative has brought together scholars of Romantic drama and theatre experts through a common dramatic text of interest. Since 2012, the team has staged dramatic readings of Romantic plays with Red Bull, a theatre company dedicated to reviving neglected classics. Our productions have included Byron’s *Sardanapalus* (November 2012), Shelley’s *Prometheus Unbound* (November 2013), and Baillie’s *De Montfort* (November 2014). The joint project has aspired to be win-win for both communities: while theatre experts – including trained actors and directors – profit from literary scholars who serve as resident dramaturgs during rehearsals, literary critics benefit from experiencing these texts as performances in a number of ways (from rehearsals up to the final product). According to this reviewer, this approach indeed sheds new light on research, as Cox has persuasively written. All the while, the NYC community has benefitted from encountering these texts – probably for the first time – on stage rather than through the page. Future productions of Romantic dramas with Red Bull will include Frances Burney’s *The Woman Hater* and Byron’s *Manfred*.

Based on all of the recent critical attention given to the contexts of Romantic drama, including analyzing performances that took place during the period itself as well as scholarly efforts to reanimate Romantic dramas today, the direction of our scholarship is pushing well beyond the close readings of these dramatic texts. Such a propensity is sure to open new pathways and possibilities for what undoubtedly was the most popular of Romantic genres, and perhaps such an effort can help to shift the considerable imbalance between the era’s criticism on plays and that devoted to both poetry and the novel.
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