Romantic Textualities

LITERATURE AND PRINT CULTURE, 1780–1840

(previously 'Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text')

Issue 15

(Winter 2005)

Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research
Cardiff University

Romantic Textualities is available on the web @ *www.cf.ac.uk/encap/romtext*

ISSN 1748-0116

***Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 15 (Winter 2005). Online: Internet (date accessed): <*www.cf.ac.uk/encap/romtext/issues/rt15.pdf*>.**

Published by the Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research, Cardiff University.
Typeset in Adobe Garamond Pro 11 / 12.5, using Adobe InDesign CS; images and illustrations prepared using Adobe Illustrator CS and Adobe PhotoShop CS; final output rendered with Adobe Acrobat 6 Professional.

Aims and Scope: Formerly *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text* (1997–2005), *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840* is a twice-yearly journal that is committed to foregrounding innovative Romantic-studies research into bibliography, book history, intertextuality, and textual studies. To this end, we publish material in a number of formats: among them, peer-reviewed articles, reports on individual/group research projects, bibliographical checklists, and biographical profiles of overlooked Romantic writers. As of Issue 15 (Winter 2005), *Romantic Textualities* also carries reviews of books that reflect the growing academic interest in the fields of book history, print culture, intertextuality, and cultural materialism, as they relate to Romantic studies.

CONTENTS

ISSUE 15 WINTER 2005

Editorial

Anthony Mandal

This issue sees the relaunch of *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text* as *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*. The change in title reflects a change in scope. Since its founding in 1997, *Cardiff Corvey* has developed organically from a website dedicated to disseminating research resulting from Cardiff University's acquisition of the Corvey Microfiche Edition of belletristic works. Over its eight-year history, *Cardiff Corvey* has grown into a peer-reviewed academic journal dedicated to stimulating research in the related fields of print culture, book history, and intertextuality, as they relate to Romantic studies. To this end, we have disseminated a variety of research materials to the academic community, in the form of articles, reports of research, bibliographical checklists, and biographical studies of lesser-known Romantic authors.

It seemed timely that a new identity would reinscribe the journal's movement away from an institutionally based platform to an online academic journal that has been publishing international scholarship for over six years. Information about projects based within Cardiff's Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research will now be found solely on the Centre's website @ *www.cf.ac.uk/encap/ceir*, while *Romantic Textualities* will develop its international scholarly presence. The relaunch has enabled us to extend the journal's scope to disseminate material in a variety of format. We shall continue to publish articles of 5–8,000 words, which focus on book history, textual and bibliographial studies, the literary marketplace, and the publishing world. Similarly, we will also supply reports of ongoing research, in the form of author studies, snapshots of research, bibliographical checklists, and so forth—as we have done previously. As of this issue, a new addition to our output will be in the form of 3–4 book reviews per issue that relate to Romantic literary studies allied to the remit of *Romantic Textualities*.

While the name and visual appearance of the journal have changed to reflect its new function in Romantic-era studies, the critical focus on bibliography, textual scholarship, and print culture will remain the same—as the new title makes abundantly clear. *Romantic Textualities* will continue to provide an archive of all previously published articles, including those that appeared under the *Cardiff Corvey* banner.

This issue sees the publication of three articles that attempt to recontextualise one of the key figures of Romanticism—William Wordsworth—in a number of ways that relate to the print culture of the early nineteenth century.

Janette Currie's 'Re-Visioning James Hogg' considers the ambivalent relationship between the Lake Poet and the Ettrick Shepherd. By examining the various textual states of Wordsworth's 'Extempore Effusion Upon the Death of James Hogg' and the bibliographical apparatus of the magisterial *Cornell Wordsworth*, as well as Hogg's own account of his meetings with Wordsworth in the notorious 'Noctes Ambrosianæ' series in *Blackwood's*, Currie argues that Wordsworth's response to Hogg was far more nuanced and indecisive than critics have previously acknowledged.

Bianca Falbo examines how Wordsworth's relationship with Henry Reed, his American editor between 1837 and 1854, not only influenced American readers' ideas about the poet, but also Wordworth's concepts about his own writing. Reed's compliation of a 'complete and uniform' edition, Falbo argues, produced a more 'Wordsworthian' collection than the four-volume London edition of 1832 upon which it was based. Falbo's broader assertion is that the notion of 'British Romanticism' (and other similar concepts) can be connected to the production and circulation of the texts that, over time, come to constitute the category itself. In other words, the construction of Romanticism, and its much vaunted category of the Imagination, can be seen as resulting from the very un-Romantic practices of the print culture of the time and its commodity exchange.

Derek Furr's 'The Pefect Match' continues this exploration of the relationship between the Romantic Imagination and material exchange through his examination of Wordsworth and Coleridge's contributions to Charles Heath's *Keepsake for 1829*. Furr considers how the poets' respective contributions, 'The Triad' and 'The Garden of Boccacio', offer an engaging perception of their participation in the sentimentality of the giftbook and its gendered ideas of physical and spiritual beauty. Furr asserts that 'The Triad' sees the confluence of Wordsworthian ideas of a patriarchal, British image of female beauty and the giftbook's specular conceptualisation of femininity. If Wordsworth participates in the giftbooks' gender ideology, then Coleridge's 'The Garden of Boccacio' can be seen as idealising its notions of 'gift-giving'. Coleridge's construction of a 'friendship's offering' correlates as one in the same, the giving of a beautiful gift, the poet's subsequent encounter with the beautiful, and the beauty of the *Keepsake* itself.

We hope that you enjoy the relaunched version of the journal and feel inspired to contribute to it—*Romantic Textualities* is only as substantial as the material it attracts: therefore, we more than welcome any contributions that members of the academic community might wish to make.

Re-Visioning James Hogg
The Return of the Subject to Wordsworth's 'Extempore Effusion'

Janette Currie

'Extempore Effusion' declares itself a poem 'Upon the Death of James Hogg,' but the Ettrick Shepherd is mentioned in only three of the forty-four lines of the poem. Viewed as evidence of a biographical kind this might be thought not very surprising. Wordsworth felt no affinity with Hogg as he did with all of the others he mourned, nor did he value his writing. Although, 'undoubtedly a man of original genius,' Hogg was, Wordsworth judged, a man of 'coarse manners and low and offensive opinions' and the author of work disfigured by 'insupportable slovenliness and neglect of syntax and grammer [*sic*]*.' But whatever Wordsworth's opinion of Hogg, he was liable to eclipse in the 'Extempore Effusion' simply because he was inextricable from Wordsworth's memories of those who had mattered much more to him and from certain poems, both of the distant and the recent past, whose significance Wordsworth had not yet exhausted.*[1]

Wordsworth didn't know Hogg at all well and he didn't much care either for him or for his writings. […] *Hogg's memory seemed precious to Wordsworth now, because it was inextricably bound up with that of a Scottish writer he really did care about: Hogg's friend and erstwhile patron, Sir Walter Scott.*[2]

Genius: Native intellectual power of an exalted type, such as is attributed to those who are esteemed greatest in any department of art, speculation, or practice; instinctive and extraordinary capacity for imaginative creation, original thought, invention, or discovery.
(*Oxford English Dictionary*)

Literary critics of Wordsworth's elegiac poem, 'Extempore Effusion Upon the Death of James Hogg' [hereafter 'Extempore Effusion'] agree that the poem is concerned with Wordsworth's memories of Coleridge, Scott, Lamb, Crabbe, and Mrs Hemans: 'those who had mattered much more to him' than the subject of the poem, James Hogg. Stephen Gill and William

Ruddick ventriloquise Mary Moorman's statement of 1965 that 'Wordsworth held no very high opinion of Hogg either as a poet or as a man'. According to Moorman, Wordsworth had 'a limited admiration' of *The Queen's Wake*, and thought [Hogg] 'possessed of no ordinary power', but 'too illiterate to write in any measure or style that does not savour of balladism'. He classed him and Scott together as guilty of 'insupportable slovenliness and neglect of syntax and grammar'.[3] In his examination of 'Extempore Effusion', Stephen Gill follows Moorman, and he also cites the 'Fenwick Note' to 'Extempore Effusion' where Wordsworth described Hogg as 'undoubtedly a man of original genius, but of coarse manners and low and offensive opinions'.[4] Ruddick claims the tone of this 'Fenwick Note' was given 'frostily',[5] and he relies on Wordsworth's correspondence with Robert Pearse Gillies, a young Edinburgh lawyer with whom Wordsworth corresponded on literary matters: 'Wordsworth thought that Hogg's poems possessed merit up to a point, but declared that Hogg's best-known poem, *The Queen's Wake*, was marred because Hogg "was too illiterate to write in any measure or style that does not savour of balladism" '.[6] Gill does not indicate that Wordsworth held the same opinion of Scott's poetry in 1814 as he did of Hogg's, while Ruddick confuses Hogg's writing: in the letter he quotes from, Wordsworth was in fact discussing Hogg's experimental verse drama *The Hunting of Badlewe* and not the critically acclaimed *Queen's Wake*.[7] Wordsworth's negative criticisms of Hogg and his work lend weight to the argument that 'Extempore Effusion' was concerned with those who 'had mattered much more' to Wordsworth than Hogg. However, a different perspective can be selected from the same correspondence with Gillies where Wordsworth also discussed Hogg and his poetry in positive terms.

In 1814, Gillies gave Wordsworth two of Hogg's works, *The Queen's Wake* and *The Hunting of Badlewe*, and it is Wordsworth's literary criticism of these, one polished and the other experimental, that has contributed to the continuing negative perceptions filtered through Wordsworth's later 'Fenwick Note' to 'Extempore Effusion'. However, as the chronological sequence below reveals, Wordsworth's criticism was more measured and positive than has previously been suggested.

> [On *The Queen's Wake*:] It does Mr Hogg great credit. Of the tales, I liked best, much the best, the Witch of Fife, the former part of Kilmenie, and the Abbot Mackinnon. Mr H— himself I remember, seemed most partial to Mary Scott: though he thought it too long. For my part, though I always deem the opinion of an able Writer upon his own works entitled to consideration, I cannot agree with Mr H— in this preference. The story of Mary Scott appears to me extremely improbable, and not skilfully conducted- besides, the style of the piece is often vicious.—The intermediate parts of the Queen's Wake are done with much spirit but the style here; also is often disfigured by false finery, and in too many places it recalls

> Mr Scott to one's mind. Mr Hogg has too much genius to require that support however respectable in itself. [8]

> [On *The Hunting of Badlewe*:] Mr. Hogg's *Badlew* (I suppose it to be his) I could not get through. There are two pretty passages; the flight of the deer, and the falling of the child from the rock of Stirling, though both are a little *outre*. But the story is coarsely conceived, and, in my judgment, as coarsely executed; the style barbarous, and the versification harsh and uncouth. Mr. H. is too illiterate to write in any measure or style that does not savour of balladism. This is much to be regretted; for he is possessed of no ordinary power.[9]

> [On literary style in general:] I confess if there is to be an Error in style, I much prefer the *Classical* model of Dr Beattie to the insupportable slovenliness and neglect of syntax and *grammar*, by which Hogg's writings are disfigured. It is excusable in him from his education, but Walter Scott knows, and ought to do, better. They neither of them write a language which has any pretension to be called English; and their versification—who can endure it when he comes fresh from the Minstrel?[10]

In *Acts of Union: Scotland and the Literary Negotiation of the British Nation, 1707–1830*, Leith Davis finds that Wordsworth's criticism of Hogg and Scott 'conflates his economic anxieties with national prejudices'.[11] Davis explains Wordsworth's criticisms in light of Francis Jeffrey's hostile reviews of *The Excursion* in the *Edinburgh Review* of November 1814, but, as the above criticisms of *The Queen's Wake* reveals, Wordsworth finds fault with more than Hogg's Scottish diction, he also criticises his poetic style, including his use of 'balladism', 'false finery', syntactical and grammatical errors, and metrical rhythm. Such criticism is not surprising in light of Wordsworth's experimentation with a new philosophy of poetry in the *Lyrical Ballads.* Indeed, his radical poetics lead to the recognition of Hogg's intellectual acumen and poetic ability where he finds that Hogg is 'an able writer', 'a genius', 'possessed of no ordinary power'.

Two recent developments in both Wordsworth and Hogg textual studies enable a fresh analysis of 'Extempore Effusion' that re-places Hogg firmly at the centre of Wordsworth's commemorative poem. Firstly, the Stirling/South Carolina Research Edition of *The Collected Works of James Hogg* (hereafter S/SC Research Edition), an important international collaborative project that was inaugurated in 1995 with *The Shepherd's Calendar*. In the 'Introduction' to the series, Douglas Mack points out the urgent necessity of the venture,

> Hogg was a major writer whose true stature was not recognised in his own lifetime because his social origins led to his being smothered in genteel condescension; and whose true stature has not been recognised since, because of a lack of adequate editions.[12]

The guiding principle behind the S/SC Research Edition is to reveal Hogg as an important writer within the generic community of nineteenth-century British authors through a variety of different textual approaches to the individual volumes in the series, including, 'unbowdlerising' texts, reprinting first editions in facsimile, and presenting the first publication of texts from Hogg's original manuscripts. To date, sixteen volumes and eight paperback reissues have been published by Edinburgh University Press, enabling a serious re-evaluation of Hogg's work.

Secondly, the bibliographic array in the *apparatus criticus* of Cornell's edition of Wordsworth's *Last Poems, 1821–50*, edited by Jared Curtis et al.,[13] reveals that contrary to assumed critical opinion, Wordsworth thought a great deal about Hogg while he composed his poem: thought about Hogg both as 'a poet and as a man'. In the array, Curtis records nine different manuscript versions and four different published versions, together with an accumulation of over forty variants of Wordsworth's extempore effusion on Hogg's death.[14] Moreover, the array records that Wordsworth's eleven alterations to his third representation of Hogg in the concluding line of the poem are in stark contrast to his unaltered depictions of Scott, Coleridge, Lamb, and Crabbe.[15] Given Wordsworth's predilection for continuous revision, such an abundance of different versions is unsurprising. However, while Wordsworth's revisionary habits, most notably for *The Prelude*, continue to attract keen scholarly debate, the critical reception of the poem to date suggests that an inability to separate Hogg the man from Hogg the author in Wordsworth's 'Fenwick Note' have played their part in critical interrogations of the poem that refuse to take Hogg as its subject seriously.[16] The following examination of Wordsworth's revisions and alterations to 'Extempore Effusion' from the bibliographic array in the *Cornell Wordsworth* is informed by the S/SC Research Edition principle that Hogg is an important subject within nineteenth-century literary studies.

Ebba Hutchinson's recollections have become the context by which subsequent readings of the genesis of the poem have been made:

> Once when she was staying at the Wordsworths' the poet was much affected by reading in the newspaper the death of Hogg, the Ettrick Shepherd. Half an hour afterwards he came into the room where the ladies were sitting and asked Miss Hutchinson to write down some lines which he had just composed. She did so and these lines were the beautiful Poem called The Graves of the Poets.[17]

The poem entitled, 'The Graves of the Poets' has not been discovered and Hutchinson's transcript is also missing. The earliest surviving 'extempore effusion', or moment of spontaneous composition, is the version of the poem Wordsworth contributed to John Hernaman, the editor of the *Newcastle Journal*, on 30 November 1835.

The opening stanza acknowledges Hogg's prominent role in Wordsworth's emotional first visit to the Yarrow Valley late in the summer of 1814, when he

claimed 'The Ettrick Shepherd was my guide' (l. 4). Wordsworth's admission remained unaltered from the first version to the last known 'authorised' printed version in the fifth volume of *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*.[18] So too, lines 10–12 of the poem where Wordsworth referred directly to Hogg's death went unrevised: 'And death upon the braes of Yarrow,/ Has closed the Shepherd-poet's eyes'. This first version was transcribed by Mary Wordsworth and 'autographed by William', but misdated 'Dec^{r} 1st, 1835'. Hogg died on 21 November, and Wordsworth clearly felt that pre-publication revision was necessary to correct the error. In his second letter to Hernaman hurriedly sent the following day, he requested that the date be altered to 'Nov^{r} 30th', and with this letter, took the opportunity to include additional stanzas. Wordsworth told Hernaman on 1 December 1835:

> By yesterday's post I forwarded to you a copy of Extempory verses (which thro' inadventure were dated Dec^{r} 1st instead of Nov^{r} 30th) and which I will beg you, if not too late, to correct—as well as the word 'survive', in the 7th Stanza for which pray substitute 'remain'. And add to the poem the following 3 Stanzas, which were *cast*, but unfinished yesterday; and I did not wait, not knowing if I should turn to it again in time for your next publication. If this alteration does not suit your convenience for this week, I should rather the Poem were kept back till the week following—both for the fact above stated, and because without the concluding Stanz: the verses scarcely do justice to the occasion that called them forth.
>
> (*Letters: LY*, pp. 128–29)

Wordsworth did not rewrite the poem in full but sent the three additional stanzas with his letter. Both in the first eight stanzas and in these additional stanzas the majority of Wordsworth's revisions alter the tone:

> As if but yesterday departed,
> Thou too art gone before: >yet< but why,
> >For< O'er ripe fruit, seasonably gathered,
> Should frail survivors heave a sigh?[19]

The revision from 'yet' to 'but' is a repetition that adds a questioning, bewildered quality, and in the same stanza, Wordsworth's revision in line 35 from 'For ripe fruit' to 'O'er ripe fruit' alters the over-sentimental attitude suggested through the alliterative *f* and *s* sounds, to a more muted expression of loss. Cumulatively, Wordsworth's revisions reveal him fine-tuning the mood he wished to convey as his reaction to reading in the *Newcastle Journal* a note announcing Hogg's death.

The first version of the text comprising the eight stanzas that Wordsworth contributed to the *Newcastle Journal* on 30 November 1835 had a despondent ending where Wordsworth had questioned his own mortality:

> Yet I, whose lids from infant slumbers
> Were earlier raised, survive to hear

A timid voice, that asks in whispers,
'Who next will drop and disappear?'

This clearly did not fit well within a poem that purported to be about Hogg's death. Therefore, as he had indicated to Hernaman, in order to 'do justice to the occasion that called them forth' he concluded his revised final stanza with a return to its subject:

With sharper grief is Yarrow smitten,
And Ettrick mourns with her their Shepherd Dead!

The array in the *Cornell Wordsworth* reveals that Wordsworth was unhappy with the additional concluding stanza. Initially, Wordsworth had concluded with a general lamentation:

With sharper grief is Yarrow smitten,
And Ettrick mourns thro grove and glade

This was cancelled to:

With sharper grief is Yarrow smitten,
And Ettrick mourns with her their Poet dead!

Hogg was born in the Ettrick valley in the Scottish Borders in 1770, and he had lived in or close to the next valley, Yarrow, for over twenty years until his death at Altrive Lake, his cottage on the banks of the Yarrow River. Yet Wordsworth's revision adds more than biographical detail to his extempore effusion. In the first version, the flowing singlet to duplet rhythm evokes a sense of bewilderment, and concludes the questioning sense of loss that infuses the poem in the 'timid voice that asks in whispers,/ "Who next will drop and disappear?" ' Through his revised ending the rhythmic pattern is interrupted with the alteration from the pastoral 'glade' to an emphatic statement, 'Poet', together with a strong ending and exclamatory cry, 'dead!' Through his revisions, then, Wordsworth signals deeply felt personal grief over Hogg's death.

Wordsworth was still unhappy with his last line however, and he substituted 'Shepherd' for 'Poet': a revision that did not interrupt the changed rhyme-scheme, but an important change nevertheless. 'Ettrick Shepherd' was the mantle Hogg adopted early in his writing career, and the name by which he was internationally known. During his early years as a struggling poet, it was, as Wordsworth signals, an actual reality as well as a literary construct, as Hogg had shepherded on the Blackhouse Heights above the Yarrow River during the 1790s. By revising the personal pronoun that had signalled Hogg's professional status, to 'Shepherd', in the same line as 'Ettrick', Wordsworth acknowledged Hogg's unique biography and humble beginnings, and recognised, through capitalisation, Hogg's important contribution to nineteenth-century literature.

In his second letter to Hernaman, Wordsworth emphasised that this final version of the last line was the one that he wished to be printed, as he explained, 'I have written the last line over again below to prevent a mistake' (*Letters: LY*, p. 129). Wordsworth's contributions appeared together as the poem entitled,

'Extempore Effusion, Upon reading in the Newcastle Journal, the notice of the death of the Poet, James Hogg', in the *Newcastle Journal* of 5 December 1835. However, Wordsworth remained troubled by his revision from 'Poet' to 'Shepherd', so that when he extended the poem to include a commemorative stanza on Felicia Hemans around the middle of December, he revised his representation of Hogg once more. The extended version of the poem, transcribed by Dora Wordsworth, reveals that Wordsworth was still unhappy with the concluding line, as Wordsworth cancels a revision from 'Shepherd' to 'Poet' in her handwriting, and re-revises once more to 'Shepherd'. Jared Curtis draws our attention to Wordsworth's note, 'quere Poet' added at the end of the poem, as Curtis notes: 'Either his revision of "Poet" to "Shepherd" in this manuscript followed his query, or he contemplated changing back to "Poet" '.[20]

In 1837, the now canonical version of the poem entitled 'Extempore Effusion Upon the Death of James Hogg' was included in the fifth volume of *Poetical Works*. It is this 'latest authorial version' that comprises the 'reading text' of the *Cornell Wordsworth*, and in this version both the title and the concluding line are altered. As he had signalled in his note at the end of his December 1835 revision, Wordsworth reverts from 'Shepherd' to 'Poet': a word originally cancelled in the additional stanzas that were forwarded to John Hernaman on 1 December 1835. In this instance, the reversion to 'Poet' in the last line of the poem re-emphasised Hogg's professional status that the revised title had erased.

But this was not Wordsworth's final representation of Hogg in his commemorative poem. Helen Darbishire detailed the 'manuscript variants' of 'Extempore Effusion' in Wordsworth's marked copy of his 1836 *Poetical Works* that he used to mark corrections, revisions, and additional verses in the preparation of both his 1840 and 1845 collected editions. In this version (MS 1836/45), line 44 is revised to: 'And Ettrick mourns her Shepherd Poet dead'. So far as can be established this marked-up copy of the poem has never been published.[21] In her description of the 'heavily annotated' volumes Darbishire explained how Wordsworth used them:

> Wordsworth used the volumes as a working copy, first, when he prepared the text of the volume of Sonnets, published in 1838; secondly when he revised the six volumes for the reprint of 1840; and thirdly, when he thoroughly overhauled his text for the edition in one volume of 1845. In the first two revisions—for 1838 and 1840—the corrections, mostly in pencil, are nearly all the hand of John Carter, his faithful clerk, who was for many years responsible for the practical business of seeing the poet's books through the press. He seems particularly to have attended to the punctuation. For the more important revision for the volume of 1845 Wordsworth himself jotted down alternative readings in pencil or ink; or dictated to his wife Mary Wordsworth or to his daughter Dora a variant or whole new poem which he intended for fair copy.[22]

At some point, then, between 1838 and 1845, Wordsworth returned to the concluding line of 'Extempore Effusion' and marked in pencil 'her Shepherd Poet' to replace 'with her their Poet'.

The *Cornell Wordsworth* array allows greater scope than has previously been available to scholars to examine all of Wordsworth's revisions and alterations to the multiple versions of his poems. In particular, it reveals how he deliberated and worried about how he could best represent Hogg in the closing words to his commemorative poem.[23] The array raises an important question concerning 'Extempore Effusion' and Wordsworth's relationship with Hogg. Why, when he 'held no very high opinion of Hogg either as a poet or as a man', did it matter so much to Wordsworth whether Hogg was represented as a 'Shepherd', a 'Poet', or a 'shepherd-poet'? Wordsworth's revisions raise the possibility that Hogg 'mattered much more to him' than has previously been considered; however, they do not explain why Wordsworth was so disturbed. In *Social Values and Poetic Acts: The Historical Judgement of Literary Work*, Jerome J. McGann has explored the array as a form of critical discourse that offers 'special opportunities for those interested in exploiting the critical strategies available to writers' because 'narrativized discourse' in its 'formal commitment to the maintenance of continuity can throw up obstacles to its critical use'. However, McGann concludes that a return to narrative discourse is inevitable as the 'critical status of ideological discourse [...] can only be assessed in terms of its specific historical frame of reference'.[24] The array in the *Cornell Wordsworth* reveals the limitations of non-narrative discourse as a form of criticism because it is only by exploring the biographical details of their relationship 'in its specific historical frame of reference', which is inevitably narrativised, that we learn the cause of Wordsworth's insecurities over his representation of Hogg.

Wordsworth became acquainted with Hogg during the late summer of 1814 when they met in Edinburgh. A few weeks later Hogg met Wordsworth at Rydal Mount where the now frequently recounted anecdote of how their relationship was soured by Wordsworth's arrogant denunciation of Hogg by posing the question, 'Poets, where are they?' in Hogg's presence, occurred. This significant episode in Wordsworth/Hogg relations is usually described as 'the triumphal arch scene' from Hogg's autobiographical account of the event in his 'Reminiscences of Former Days: Wordsworth'. The 'Memoir of the Author's Life' that preceded 'Reminiscences' was a record of Hogg's professional life to 1832, and contained his account of his dealings with publishers and patrons, as well as offering his version of the genesis of many of his works. Hogg's 'Reminiscence' of Wordsworth contextualises his verse-parodies in *The Poetic Mirror* of 1816, where Hogg reveals, for the first time, that his verse-parodies of Wordsworth were generated by an 'affront' or snub to his poetic abilities. Hogg claims the 'anecdote has been told and told again, but never truly; and was likewise brought forward in the "Noctes Ambrosianæ, as a joke; but it was no joke'; his version, he insists, 'is the plain, simple truth of the matter'.[25] Critics frequently note that Hogg's later 'Reminiscence' is a repetition of an earlier anecdote that first

appeared in the seventeenth number of 'Noctes Ambrosianæ' of *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, in November 1824 (vol. 16, p. 592), and Hogg's remembrance of the anecdote some eighteen years after the event is used as evidence that he never forgave Wordsworth's insult.[26] However, the two anecdotes are not identical, and the first version is discussed below in order to establish why Hogg repeated it *now*.

Number 17 of 'Noctes Ambrosianæ' is concerned with the publication of *Conversations of Lord Byron,* by Thomas Medwin, and allusions to widely circulated correspondence between Byron and Hogg weave ironically through the conversation; the purpose of which was to cast doubt on Medwin's *Conversations*.[27] 'Mullion' tells 'Hogg', ' "I observe, Hogg, that Byron told Medwin he was greatly taken with your manners when he met you at the Lakes. Pray, Jem, was the feeling mutual?" Hogg, "Oo, aye, man—I thought Byron a very nice laud. […] We were just as thick as weavers in no time" '(p. 591). Hogg never met Byron but he had corresponded with him, and it would appear that he had planned to publish their letters.[28] In one of his letters to Hogg, Byron described the 'Lake poets' in unflattering and unprofessional terms: 'Wordsworth—stupendous genius! damned fool! These poets run about their ponds though they cannot fish. I am told there is not one who can angle—damned fools!'[29] It is this letter that Medwin expands upon when recounting Hogg's meeting with Byron. According to Medwin's retelling, Byron said that he had

> offended the *par nobile* mortally—past all hope of forgiveness—many years ago. I met, at the Cumberland Lakes, Hogg the Ettrick Shepherd, who had just been writing 'The Poetic Mirror,' a work that contains imitations of all the living poets' styles, after the manner of the 'Rejected Addresses'. The burlesque is well done, particularly that of me, but not equal to Horace Smith's. I was pleased with Hogg; and he wrote me a very witty letter, to which I sent him, I suspect, a very dull reply. Certain it is that I did not spare the Lakists in it; and he told me he could not resist the temptation, and had shewn it to the fraternity. It was too tempting; and as I could never keep a secret of my own, as you know, much less that of other people, I could not blame him. I remember saying, among other things, that the Lake poets were such fools as not to fish in their own waters; but this was the least offensive part of the epistle.[30]

The letters containing Byron's opinion of Wordsworth and Coleridge circulated widely, and their mention in the 'Noctean' conversation had a double function. As well as throwing doubt on the authenticity of Medwin's *Conversations*, they also compared Byron and Wordsworth through their respective association with Hogg. 'Hogg' asks, "O, man, wasna this a different kind of behaviour frae that proud Don Wordsworth's? Od! How Byron leuch when I tell'd him

Wordsworth's way wi' me!" ' And he goes on to recount his meeting with Wordsworth.

> I had never forgathered wi' Wordsworth before, and he was invited to dinner at Godswhittles, and down he came; and just as he came in at the east gate, De Quuncey and me cam in at the west; and says I, the moment me and Wordsworth were introduced, 'Lord keep us a'!' says I, 'Godswhittle, my man, there's nae want of poets here the day, at ony rate.' Wi' that Wordsworth turned up his nose, as if we had been a' carrion, and then he gied a kind of a smile, that I thought was the bitterest, most contemptible, despicable, abominable, wauf, narrow-minded, envious, sneezablest kind of an attitude that I ever saw a human form assume—and '*PoetS*!' quo' he, (deil mean him!)—'Poet*S*, Mr Hogg?—Pray, where are they, sir?' Confound him!—I doubt if he would have allowed even Byron to have been a poet, if he had been there. He thinks there's nae real poets in our time, an it be not himself, and his sister, and Coleridge. He doesna make an exception in favour of Southey—at least to ony extent worth mentioning. Na, even Scott—would ony mortal believe there was sic a donneration of arrogance in this waurld?—even Scott I believe's not a *pawet*, gin you take his word—or at least his sneer for't. […]
>
> I mind Byron had a kind of a curiosity to see him [Wordsworth], and I took him up to Rydallwood; and let him have a glimpse o' him, as he was gaun staukin up and down on his ain backside, grumblin out some of his havers, and glowering about him like a gawpus. Byron and me just reconnattred him for a wee while, and then we came down the hill again, to hae our laugh out. We swam ower Grasmere that day, breeks an a'. I spoilt a pair o' as gude corduroys as ever cam out of the Director-General's for that piece of fun. I couldna bide to thwart him in onything—he did just as he liket wi' me the twa days we staid yonder: he was sic a gay, laughing, lively, wutty fallow—we greed like breether. He was a grand lad, Byron—none of your blawn-up pompous laker notions about him. He took his toddy brawly. (p. 592)

Marilyn Butler has described 'Noctes Ambrosianæ' as 'a kind of dialogic gossip column in which the editor Wilson, using the pen name "Christopher North", discussed current topics with contributors such as John Gibson Lockhart and James Hogg, the Ettrick Shepherd'. Butler quite rightly records that the 'Noctes' 'are pages for browsing in, the place you go to find uneasy compliments to women poets and raw, demotic abuse of Hogg for his impenetrable accent and his bad manners: this teasing reads like eavesdropping, because it seems too lifelike to be anything else'.[31] In the gossipy, 'lifelike' nature of the 'Noctes', John Gibson Lockhart, William Maginn, and John Wilson co-authored the

first version of the 'triumphal arch scene' anecdote, and not Hogg, and it is likely that Wilson, who was also present at Rydal Mount, was the person most offended by Wordsworth.[32] A comparison of the tone of the earlier and later anecdote reveals that the former is more hostile and vindictive towards Wordsworth. Where Hogg depicted Wordsworth as 'treating him with utmost kindness', Wilson/Maginn/Lockhart describe him in unflattering terms as the 'bitterest, most contemptible, despicable, abominable, wauf, narrow-minded, envious, sneezablest kind of attitude that I ever saw a human form assume'. In the *Blackwood's* article, Wordsworth is depicted as a 'pompous laker', whereas according to Hogg he 'was delightful, and most eloquent'.[33]

While Hogg was in London to see the first volume of his projected *Collected Works* through the press, Lockhart assisted him with biographical recollections for 'Reminiscences of Former Days: Lockhart'.[34] It is not surprising, therefore, to find that Hogg's recollections of Wordsworth closely parallel Lockhart's 1824 'Noctean' conversation, and it may be that Lockhart also assisted Hogg with this biographical notice. Hogg had frequently complained that he did not write some articles published in his name. For example, Robin MacLachlan has written of how Hogg complained to Scott in October 1821:

> I have a written promise, dated 19 months back, most solemnly given 'that my name should never be mentioned in his mag. without my own consent', yet you see how it is kept and how I am again misrepresented to the world. I am neither a drunkard nor an idiot nor a monster of nature. Nor am I so imbecile as never to have written a word of grammar in my life.[35]

In one of several articles published to coincide with Hogg's London visit, Lockhart insists that Hogg was not in any way related to the 'Ettrick Shepherd' of the 'Noctes'. In the *Quarterly Review*, that he then edited, Lockhart described Hogg in a manner that readers of *Blackwood's* would have found surprising: 'no more sober and worthy man exists in his Majesty's dominions than this distinguished poet, whom some of his waggish friends have taken up the absurd fancy of exhibiting in print as a sort of boozing buffoon.'[36] In this context, it is important in Hogg's retelling of the anecdote, that De Quincey, and not Hogg, overhears Wordsworth's denunciatory comments. Hogg claimed, 'I have always some hopes that De Quincey was *leeing*, for I did not myself hear Wordsworth utter the words' (*Altrive Tales*, p. 68). It seems clear, then, that Hogg's aim in 'Reminiscences' of literary men was to distance himself from 'Noctean' gossip. More particularly, in his 'Reminiscence' of Wordsworth, Hogg distanced himself from the earlier publication of the anecdote in *Blackwood's*, which was the only public record of their 1814 meeting.

In *William Wordsworth: A Life*, Stephen Gill noted that Wordsworth would not accept editions of *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* into Rydal Mount.[37] Nevertheless, Wordsworth was aware of the accusation that he had egotistically denounced his contemporaries, including Hogg, De Quincey, Scott, Byron, and

Southey. For example, during a visit to the Lake District in August the year following the publication of the anecdote in *Blackwood's*, Lockhart reported to Sophia, his wife, that 'Wordsworth spoke kindly I think, on the whole, of Hogg, which is more than I should have expected after the story of "Poets, where are they?" being blabbed in print, especially as I knew Wordsworth took mighty offence at that matter'. Importantly, just prior to this report, in the same long, gossipy letter, Lockhart displays contempt of what he characterised as Wordsworth's egotism: 'the Unknown was continually quoting Wordsworth's Poetry and Wordsworth *ditto*, but that the great Laker never uttered one syllable by which it might have been intimated to a stranger that your Papa had ever written a line either of verse or prose since he was born.'[38] Since 1825, then, Wordsworth was aware that his egotistical posturing towards his contemporaries was publicly reported, and widely circulated. Wordsworth's memorialising of his contemporaries in 'Extempore Effusion', therefore, is an admission that others, even such uneducated shepherds like Hogg, are worthy of the appellation 'Poet'.

Wordsworth offers a renunciation of his treatment of poets such as Hogg in his footnote to the additional stanzas contained in his second letter to Hernaman on 1 December 1835. The note was published along with the poem in the *Newcastle Journal* but it has never been published with it since. Two versions of Wordsworth's note, the one contained in the letter and the version published in the *Newcastle Journal* are given in the bibliographic array of 'Extempore Effusion' in the *Cornell Wordsworth*. The former version is reprinted below:

> In the above, is an expression borrowed from a Sonnet by Mr G. Bell, the author of a small vol: of Poems lately printed in Penrith. Speaking of Skiddaw, he says—'yon dark cloud *rakes* and shrouds its noble brow.' These Poems, tho' incorrect often in expression and metre do honour to their unpretending Author; and may be added to the number of proofs, daily occurring, that a finer perception of appearances in Nature is spreading thro' the humbler classes of Society. (*CW* [1999], p. 470).

By this note, Wordsworth offered restitution for his elitist dismissal of Hogg's lowly background, and admitted through the association of Hogg with 'Mr G. Bell' that Hogg had poetic ability. It is an act that enters the unaltered sixth stanza of 'Extempore Effusion':

> Like clouds that rake the mountain-summits,
> Or waves that own no curbing hand,
> How fast has brother followed brother,
> From sunshine to the sunless land!
>
> (ll. 21–24; *CW* [1999], p. 306)[39]

As Byron and Hogg had 'greed like breether' in the early 'Noctean' anecdote, so finally, in death, Wordsworth accepts Hogg into the poetic fraternity.

Why then, does Hogg continue to be replaced by Coleridge, Scott, Lamb, Crabbe, and Mrs Hemans in studies of 'Extempore Effusion'? These studies include Gill's and Ruddick's literary criticism noted above, and also recent literary anthologies and generic studies of the nineteenth century that reprint the poem without contextual information about Hogg other than a short biographical footnote. For example, in the most recent scholarly pedagogic tool, *The Longman Anthology of British Literature, Volume 2A: The Romantics and their Contemporaries*, several 'major' poets and their poems are contextualised in a series of 'Perspectives' that suggest lines of enquiry and themes for consideration along with related 'companion reading'. Wordsworth's 'Extempore Effusion Upon the Death of James Hogg' is represented in the *Longman Anthology*, as are four of the six poets he laments: Scott, Lamb, Coleridge, and Hemans. There are no texts by either Crabbe or Hogg. It is Felicia Hemans who represents the 'contextual' element to the poem, with extracts from Wordsworth's biographical commentary of Hemans from the 'Fenwick Note' to 'Extempore Effusion' included under the heading of 'Companion Readings' to her poetry. Hogg's absence from discussion of Wordsworth's stately elegy on his death is continued with his exclusion from the 'Companion Website' on the 'Romantic Timeline', which begins in 1765 with Hargreaves' invention of the 'Spinning Jenny', skips over Hogg's birth-date of 1770, neglects to list any of his major works, and concludes in 1833, denying even the date of his death to be noted.[40]

The 'Fenwick Note' is clearly perceived to represent Wordsworth's final opinion on Hogg. Hogg's humble background is undeniable and explains Wordsworth's perception of him as 'rude' in polite company. However, what were Hogg's 'low and offensive opinions'? In April 1832 Wordsworth reacted to Hogg's 'Reminiscences', when he interrupted Dora's letter to Edward Quillinan in order to explain that Hogg's anecdote was not entirely true. He told Quillinan:

> Of Hogg's silly story I have only to say that his memory is not the best in the world, as he speaks of his being called out of this room when the arch made its appearance; now in fact, Wilson and he were on their way either to or from Grasmere when they saw the arch and very obligingly came up to tell us of it, thinking, w^{h} was the fact, that we might not be aware of the phenomenon. As to the speech, which galled poor Hogg so much, it must in one expression at least have been misreported, the word 'fellow' I am told by my family I apply to no one. I use strong terms I own, but there is a vulgarity about that, w^{h} does not suit me, and had I applied it to Hogg there w^{d} have also been hypocrisy in the kindness, w^{h} he owns I invariably shewed him, wholly alien, as you must know, to my character. It is possible and not improbable that I might on that occasion have been tempted to use a contemptuous expression, for H. had disgusted me not by his vulgarity, w^{h} he c^{d} not help, but

> by his self-conceit in delivering confident opinions upon classical literature and other points about w^{h} he c^{d} know nothing.[41]

Wordsworth's questioning in lines 25–32 of 'Yarrow Visited, September 1814' perhaps mirrors their conversation during their Yarrow excursion:

> Where was it that the famous Flower
> Of Yarrow Vale lay bleeding?
> His bed perchance was yon smooth mound
> On which the herd is feeding:
> And haply from this crystal pool,
> Now peaceful as the morning,
> The Water-wraith ascended thrice—
> And gave his doleful warning.[42]

The 'famous Flower of Yarrow Vale' is a quotation from the first stanza of Logan's 'The Braes of Yarrow': 'For never on thy banks shall I/ Behold my Love, the flower of Yarrow'. On the morning of their Yarrow tour, as Wordsworth later explained in his 'Fenwick Note' to 'Yarrow Visited', he met Dr Robert Anderson, the editor of *The Works of the British Poets*, in which Anderson had included a memoir and selections of Logan's poetry. It is therefore possible, and Wordsworth's direct quotation is highly suggestive, that they had discussed Logan's association with Yarrow. Hogg's first book-length publication was entitled *The Mountain Bard* (1807), his collection of songs was entitled *The Forest Minstrel* (1810), and Hogg himself appeared as one of the minstrels competing for Mary Queen of Scot's harp in *The Queen's Wake* (1813).[43] His apparent absence from the poem generated by their time together in the Yarrow valley, where Wordsworth bemoans,

> O that some Minstrel's harp were near,
> To utter notes of gladness,
> And chase this silence from the air,
> That fills my heart with sadness! (ll. 5–8)[44]

has led critics to interpret Wordsworth's 'Minstrel' as referring to that other Border Minstrel, Sir Walter Scott. Stephen Gill has made the case that 'remembering James Hogg meant remembering the Yarrow', an association that Gill suggests alludes to the Yarrow setting of Scott's long poem, *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*. Gill further suggests that the 'braes of Yarrow' (ll. 12–13) in the third stanza of his extemporary verses is an allusion to poems entitled 'The Braes of Yarrow', by William Hamilton and John Logan.[45] All of this is true. But Hogg was also present, and Wordsworth's reference to 'the braes of Yarrow' has associations with *The Queen's Wake*, recently published to critical acclaim. Hogg mentions Hamilton and Logan amongst a list of notable poets who had written of the Ettrick and Yarrow. For example, in his explanatory notes to 'Sweet rung the harp to Logan's hand', he explains he was 'alluding to Logan's beautiful song "The Braes of Yarrow" '.[46]

Wordsworth and Hogg's conversations surrounding Border poetry also surfaced in 'The Stranger: Being a further portion of The Recluse, A Poem', one of three verse parodies of Wordsworth's poetry that Hogg included in *The Poetic Mirror* in 1816 (London), and one that Hogg admitted he had written during his 1814 visit to the Lake District.[47] It is likely, as Wordsworth continued to assist Dr Anderson with a projected expansion of the *British Poets* on his return from Scotland to Rydal Mount, their conversations on 'British Poets' also continued from Yarrow.[48] The Wordsworthian narrator of 'The Stranger' recalls how he had travelled to Windermere with 'bard obscure' [Hogg]:

> Our conversation ran on books and men:
> The would-be songster* of the Scottish hills [*Hogg]
> In dialect most uncouth and language rude
> Lauded his countrymen, not unrebuked,
> Reviewers and review'd, and talk'd amain
> Of one unknown, inept, presumptuous bard,
> The Border Minstrel—he of all the world
> Farthest from genius or from common sense.
> He too, the royal tool*, with erring tongue, [*Southey]
> Back'd the poor foolish wight, and utter'd words
> For which I blush'd—I could not chuse but smile.
> 'Yet', said I, tempted here to interpose,
> 'You must acknowledge this your favourite
> Hath more outraged the purity of speech,
> The innate beauties of our English tongue,
> For amplitude and nervous structure famed,
> Than all the land beside, and therefore he
> Deserves the high neglect which he has met
> From all the studious and thinking—those
> Unsway'd by caprices of the age,
> The scorn of reason, and the world's revile.' (ll. 235–55)

Critics are divided over the figure of 'The Border Minstrel', and have suggested Burns or Scott as likely candidates.[49] However, the figure connects to *The Queen's Wake*. The setting for Hogg's major poem is an imaginary bardic competition between Scottish poets for an ornate harp before the court of Mary Queen of Scots in 1561. One of the poets named the 'Bard of Ettrick' does not win, but receives an unadorned harp, in consolation. Hogg theorised the origins of the Border ballads through the figure of 'the Bard of Ettrick' (one of the competing minstrels) who, 'grieved the legendary lay/ Should perish from our land for ay', and who therefore, 'strikes, beside the pen,/ The harp of Yarrow's braken glen' ('Introduction', ll. 351–52). In his explanatory 'Notes' Hogg glosses 'the bard of Ettrick':

> That some notable bard flourished in Ettrick Forest in that age, is evident from numerous ballads and songs which relate to places

> in that country, and incidents that happened there. Many of these are of a superior cast. […] *The dowy Downs of Yarrow*, and many others are of the number. Dumbar [*sic*], in his lament for the bards, merely mentions him by the title of *Etrick*; more of him we know not.[50]

In her study of Hogg's ballad contributions to *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, Valentina Bold has shown how Hogg collected and transcribed

> many texts, mainly his mother's and his uncle's, which were forwarded to Scott. They ranged from songs of love and chivalry from the Yarrow valley ('The Gay Goss Hawk', The Douglas Tragedy') to Ettrick's fairy traditions and cattle raids ('Tam Lin', 'Jamie Telfer'). Some Hogg ballads were included in the third volume of the Minstrelsy, such as […] 'The Dowie Houms o' Yarrow'.[51]

Bold reprints Hogg's manuscript transcription of 'The Dowie houms o' Yarrow' and indicates Scott's alterations:

> The change of 'noble' to 'leafu' lord, in verse 9, alters audience perceptions and the gory line in verse 12, where Sarah drinks her lover's blood, is replaced with a sanitised reference to kisses. The last two verses become sentimental, as Scott reflects, 'A fairer rose did never bloom/ than now lies cropped on Yarrow' and removes the final reductive equation of the couple's sorrow with a love of gear: 'your ousen' (oxen). A venomous Ettrick ending is thereby changed for romantic anguish.[52]

In the literary conversations that Hogg satirically replays in 'The Stranger', he reiterates his theory that the Border ballads originated with a Border Minstrel-poet from the Ettrick Valley: 'he of all the world/ Farthest from genius or from common sense'. Moreover, the interconnectedness of 'The Stranger' and the 'triumphal arch scene' that Hogg recounts in his 1832 'Reminiscence' reveal how Wordsworth's social arrogance undermined Hogg's self-appointed position as an important repository and transmitter of traditional balladry associated with the Yarrow valley. Within the context of Wordsworth's opinion of Hogg's 'self-conceit in delivering confident opinions upon classical literature and other points about w^{h} he c^{d} know nothing', his indecisive, careful deliberation in his commemorative poem over his representation of whether Hogg was a 'Poet', a 'Shepherd', or a 'shepherd-poet' becomes an admission that Hogg was right to complain in his Wordsworthian 'Reminiscence': 'It is surely presumption in any man to circumscribe all human excellence within the narrow sphere of his own capacity' (*Altrive Tales*, p. 68).[53]

In his recent S/SC Edition of *The Queen's Wake* Douglas Mack suggests that Hogg's opinions of traditional oral ballads 'connects powerfully with the kind of poetry advocated by Wordsworth in the 1802 Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*':

> Hogg must have felt that, while the circumstances of his upbringing were noticeably different from those of a university educated

> gentleman-poet, they nevertheless brought him some advantages as he sought to retune the harp of Ettrick's old oral ballads, in his capacity as successor to Robert Burns as a national bard who could speak on behalf of the people of Scotland.[54]

Wordsworth did not intend 'to give the [Fenwick] notes a prominence calculated to "manipulate" his readers by positioning them "as prefatory indexes to the poems" ', as Jared Curtis rightly notes.[55] At the same time as the array in the *Cornell Wordsworth* undermines the 'Fenwick Note' to 'Extempore Effusion' through the revelation of Wordsworth's insecure search for the best words to signify Hogg's stature as 'a national bard', each new volume of the S/SC Research Edition uncovers evidence of Hogg's 'original genius'. It is time for Wordsworth's assessment to be accepted, without the qualifying 'but'.

Notes

I am grateful to Suzanne Gilbert, Douglas Mack, Mardi Stewart, and Helen Sutherland, for their helpful comments during the preparation of this essay.

1. Stephen Gill, ' "The Braes of Yarrow": Poetic Context and Personal Memory in Wordsworth's "Extempore Effusion Upon the Death of James Hogg" ', *Wordsworth Circle*, 16:3 (Summer 1985), 120–25 (p. 121).
2. William Ruddick, 'Subdued Passion and Controlled Emotion: Wordsworth's ' "Extempore Effusion upon the Death of James Hogg" ', *Charles Lamb Bulletin: William Ruddick Issue*, n.s. 87 (July 1994), 98–110 (pp. 101–02).
3. *William Wordsworth: A Biography. The Later Years 1803–1850* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), pp. 518–19. See also, pp. 275–76.
4. Wordsworth dictated notes about his poems to Isabella Fenwick in 1843 and these were integrated into Christopher Wordsworth's posthumously published *Memoirs* of Wordsworth in 1850, and were first published in 1857 as 'headnotes' to individual poems in the posthumous collected edn of Wordsworth's poetry. See *The Fenwick Notes of William Wordsworth*, ed. by Jared Curtis (London: Bristol Classic Press, 1993).
5. Ruddick, 'Subdued Passion and Controlled Emotion', p. 101.
6. Ibid., p. 102.
7. Hogg's letters to friends and literary advisers in 1813–14 reveal his deep insecurities about his verse drama. Initially, only six copies were printed during a consultation and advisory period, before publication by Henry Colburn (London) in Mar 1814, under the pseudonym 'J. H. Craig of Douglas, Esq.'. For more information see, e.g., Hogg's letter to William Roscoe on 22 Jan 1814, and his letter to Eliza Izett on 11 Feb 1814, in *The Collected Letters of James Hogg, Volume I: 1800–1819,* ed. by Gillian Hughes (Edinburgh: EUP, 2004).
8. Wordsworth to R. P. Gillies, 23 Nov 1814, in *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth. Volume VIII: A Supplement of New Letters*, ed. by Alan G. Hill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 154–56 (pp. 155–56). In this letter, Wordsworth also discusses his contribution to Hogg's proposed literary miscellany: 'Pray say to Mr Hogg that the printing of my two volumes, of which both the Yarrows are a part, advances so [?rapidly] that there is no probability of its answering his purpose. If I write any thing else in time for his publication I shall [?send]

it' (p. 156). Wordsworth had given Hogg an early version of 'Yarrow Visited' but in the event the miscellany idea was abandoned through lack of support from other authors, such as Scott. For Hogg's version of this episode see his 'Memoirs of the Author's Life' in *Altrive Tales: Collected among the Peasantry of Scotland and from Foreign Adventurers, by the Ettrick Shepherd*, ed. by Gillian Hughes (Edinburgh: EUP, 2003), pp. 40–41 and 68. Hereafter, *Altive Tales*.

9. Wordsworth to R. P. Gillies, 22 Dec 1814, in *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth. Volume III: The Middle Years*, *Part II: 1812–1820*, ed. by Ernest de Selincourt, revised by Mary Moorman and Alan G. Hill (2nd edn, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), pp. 178–80 (pp. 179–80). Hereafter, *Letters: MY*.
10. Wordsworth to R. P. Gillies, 14 Feb 1815, in *Letters: MY*, pp. 195–98 (pp. 196–97).
11. *Acts of Union: Scotland and the Literary Negotiation of the British Nation, 1707–1830* (California: Stanford University Press, 1998), p. 136.
12. *The Shepherd's Calendar*, ed. by Douglas S. Mack, was the first volume of the ongoing, collaborative project between the Universities of Stirling and South Carolina, under the General Editorship of Mack and Gillian Hughes. When complete, the Stirling/South Carolina Research Edition [hereafter S/SC Research Edition] will comprise over thirty volumes of Hogg's 'prose, his poetry, and his plays'. The success of the S/SC Research Edition has generated numerous critical essays, and effected Karl Miller's recent biographical study, *Electric Shepherd. A Likeness of James Hogg* (London: Faber and Faber, 2003), which positively presents Hogg and his work centrally within nineteenth-century British literary history. See also contributions to the James Hogg Society journal, *Studies in Hogg and his World*.
13. William Wordsworth, *Last Poems, 1821–50*, ed. by Jared Curtis, associate eds Apryl Lea Denny-Ferris and Jillian Heydt-Stevenson (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999). Hereafter, *CW* (1999).
14. See especially, *CW* (1999), pp. 305–07 and 469–70. The overall series is under the General Editorship of Stephen Parrish. Stephen Gill points out that Moorman's statement, 'scarcely any poem of Wordsworth's has received so few alterations and corrections', is 'misleading' because 'the first version was subjected to considerable local revision and expansion after it first appeared in the *Newcastle Journal*, December 5 1835'. However, Gill did not have the advantage of the *Cornell Wordsworth* bibliographic array, and had clearly not personally examined Wordsworth's extant manuscript versions—see Gill, ' "Braes of Yarrow" ', p. 124, n. 1.
15. Wordsworth revised the stanza concerning Mrs Hemans prior to its inclusion in the expanded version of the poem in *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth. A New Edition*, 6 vols (London: Edward Moxon, 1836–37), v, 335–336. However, the alterations do not revise the representation of Mrs Hemans: 'holy spirit/ Was sweet as Spring as Ocean deep' is revised to 'holy Spirit,/ Sweet as the spring, as ocean deep', in the published form. See *CW* (1999), p. liv and 306 n.
16. For example, four of the essays included in *Romantic Revisions*, ed. by Robert Brinkley and Keith Hanley (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), are concerned with Wordsworth's revisions of *The Prelude*: see Jonathan Wordsworth, 'Revision as Making: *The Prelude* and its Peers', pp. 18–42; Stephen Gill, 'Wordsworth's Poems: The Question of Text', pp. 43–63; 'Revising the Revolution: History and Imagination

in *The Prelude*, 1799, 1805, 1850', pp. 87–102; and Keith Hanley, 'Crossings Out: The Problem of Textual Passage in *The Prelude*', pp. 103–35.

17. *Kilvert's Diary*, ed. by William Plomer, 3 vols (London: Cape, 1938–40), I, 318, reprinted in *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth. Volume VI: The Later Years, Part 3: 1835–1839*, ed. by Ernest de Selincourt, revised by Alan G. Hill (2nd edn, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), p. 127. Hereafter, *Letters: LY*.
18. *Poetical Works of Wordsworth* (1836–37), V, 335–36.
19. The information on Wordsworth's revisions that follow in this paragraph are taken from *CW* (1999), Manuscript Census, pp. lxxxiii–iv; the critical apparatus of the Reading Text, Part I, pp. 306–07, and Part II: Notes and Non-Verbal Variants, pp. 469–70.
20. This version (Houghton MS.2) was enclosed within a letter to Robert Percival Graves in mid-Dec 1835 (*Letters: LY*, p. 139). See *CW* (1999), pp. liv, 307 and 470, l. 44 n.
21. Helen Darbishire, *Some Variants in Wordsworth's Text in the Volumes of 1836–7 in the King's Library* (Oxford: The Roxburghe Club, 1949), p. 47. See also *CW* (1999), p. 307, l. 44 n.
22. Darbishire, *Some Variants*, p. ix.
23. A summary of the concluding words of the printed versions is as follows: *Newcastle Journal*, 5 Dec 1835, p. 3: 'Shepherd dead!'; *The Athenaeum*, 424 (12 Dec 1835), 930–31: 'Shepherd dead'; *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth* (1836–37), V (1837), 335–36: 'Poet dead' [and all subsequent editions]; *Yarrow Visited, and other Poems* (1839): 'Poet dead'.
24. Jerome J. McGann, *Social Values and Poetic Acts: The Historical Judgement of Literary Work* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), p. 133.
25. The 'Reminiscences' complete Hogg's 'Memoir of the Author's Life' in *Altrive Tales*, the first and only volume published from an unsuccessful attempt to publish his *Collected Works*. See *Altive Tales*, pp. 66–69 (p. 68).
26. E.g., Peter T. Murphy, in his chapter on 'James Hogg', in *Poetry as an Occupation and an Art in Britain, 1760–1830* (Cambridge: CUP, 1993), pp. 94–135 (p. 105), and most recently in the annotation to *Altrive Tales*, p. 254. See also, Lee Erickson, 'The Egoism of Authorship: Wordsworth's Poetic Career', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 89:1 (Jan 1990), 37–49.
27. See *Medwin's Conversations of Lord Byron*, ed. by Ernest J. Lovell (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), especially pp. 196–97 and 121. The *Conversations* were reviewed in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 16 (Nov 1824), 530–40, in the same number that the 'Noctes' appeared.
28. Shortly after the article appeared Blackwood wrote to Hogg on 4 December 1824:

> You will laugh very heartily at your account of your interview with Byron at the Lakes, which you will find in the 'Noctes'. I anxiously hope you are preparing the correspondence. You should give the letters as near as you can possibly recollect them. It will be all the better fun for you to state plainly the blunder Medwin has made in saying that you and Byron had met, and that when you were giving Medwin an account of the interview, North and you were only cramming him, etc.—Mrs Garden, *Memorials of James Hogg, The Ettrick Shepherd* (2nd edn, London: Alexander Gardner, 1887), pp. 195–96.

29. The letter is not extant; however, this 'fragment' from one of six letters that Byron sent to Hogg was 'quoted to Henry Crabb Robinson by a friend (Cargill) and recorded in his diary of Dec. 1, 1816'—see *Byrons's Letters and Journals*, ed. by Leslie A. Marchand, 12 vols (London: John Murray, 1973–82), v, 13. Wordsworth responded to Byron's slight by contributing to Mary Barker's verse satire, *Lines Addressed to a Noble Lord; (His Lordship will know why,) by One of the Small Fry of the Lakes* (London, 1815). This led to an acrimonious split between Wordsworth and Wilson that lasted until 1826, as Wordsworth told Gillies in his letter of 14 Feb 1815 (quoted above): 'Mr Wilson has probably reached Edin: by this time; for ourselves, we have not seen him for many months, except once when Mrs W. and I called at his House. To use a College phrase, he appears to have *cut* us', *Letters: MY*, pp. 195–98 (p. 197). In a letter to his wife on 25 Aug 1825, Lockhart explains that Wilson 'had not been in W.'s house for 6 years', but on this occasion he 'made up for lost time'—*Familiar Letters of Walter Scott*, ed. by David Douglas, 2 vols (Edinburgh: Douglas, 1893), II, 339–43 (p. 341). Hereafter, *Familiar Letters*.
30. *Medwin's Conversations of Lord Byron*, ed. by Ernest J. Lovell (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), pp. 196–97.
31. 'Culture's Medium: The Role of the Review', in *The Cambridge Companion to British Romanticism*, ed. by Stuart Curran (Cambridge: CUP, 1993), pp. 120–47 (p. 144).
32. Identified by Alan Lang Strout in, *A Bibliography of Articles in Blackwood's Magazine, 1817–1825* (Lubbock, TX: Texas Technical College, 1959), p. 585. Stephen Gill has noted the curiously inconsistent nature of Wilson's treatment of Wordsworth in his critical articles and 'Noctean' conversations in *Blackwood's*, and he notes Wilson's 'bizarre behaviour' towards Wordsworth through his contributing one 'highly laudatory article [followed by] another violent attack' in *Blackwood's*—see *William Wordsworth. A Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), p. 477, n. 65.
33. I am grateful to Helen Sutherland for pointing out that (although unpublished during his life) Byron denounced 'laker' egotism in the opening stanzas of the 'Dedication' to *Don Juan* where he urges them to 'recollect a poet nothing loses/ In giving to his brethren their full meed/ Of merit' (st. 8).
34. Hughes considers that 'the reminiscence of Lockhart is to some extent a collaborative effort between himself and Hogg, and that he may have revised other sections of these reminiscences of eminent men in proof' (*Altrive Tales*, p. 203).
35. 'Hogg and the Art of Brand Management', *Studies in Hogg and his World*, 14 (2003), 1–15 (p. 9). MacLachlan perceptively notes that 'outrage was only one strategy' adopted by Hogg to control the use of his 'name' (p. 11).
36. See, e.g., John MacKay Wilson's article in the *Literary Gazette*, 788 (25 Feb 1832), 121–23. Lockhart's revisionary article in the *Quarterly Review* is discussed in Miller's *Electric Shepherd*, pp. 296–300.
37. Gill, *Wordsworth: A Life*, p. 347.
38. Lockhart's letter is addressed from 'Lowther, Thursday 25 August 1825', *Familiar Letters*, II, 339–43 (p. 341).
39. This stanza remained unaltered through each version of the text.
40. Ed. by David Damrosch, Peter J. Manning, and Susan J. Wolfson (1999, 2nd edn, Harlow: Longman, 2003). The website can be accessed at <*http://www.ablongman.com*>. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, *Volume 2A: The Romantic Period*, ed. by M. H. Abrams and Jack Stillinger (7th edn, New York

and London: W. W. Norton, 2000) also includes 'Extempore Effusion on the Death of James Hogg' (pp. 299–300), and excludes texts by Hogg. Similarly, the online 'Chronological Index' and 'Author Index' omits Hogg: <*http://www.wwnorton.com*>. Jane Stabler's generic study, *Burke to Byron, Barbauld to Baillie, 1790–1830* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), also cites Wordsworth's 'Fenwick Note' to 'Extempore Effusion' but concentrates on Felicia Hemans, and omits Hogg—see pp. 214–16 and 233.

41. *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth. Volume v: The Later Years, Part 2: 1829–1834,* ed. by Ernest de Selincourt, revised by Alan G. Hill (2nd edn, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), pp. 517–19 (pp. 517–18). Wordsworth may not have read the 'Reminiscence' in *Altrive Tales*. Hughes records 'several newspapers published extracts', as it was 'already divided into convenient and self-contained sections' (*Altrive Tales*, p. liv).
42. The text is from William Wordsworth: *Shorter Poems, 1807–1820*, ed. by Carl H. Ketcham (*CW* [1989]), pp. 137–40.
43. Wordsworth owned copies of the 1807 edition of *The Mountain Bard* and 1813 edn of *The Queen's Wake*: see *Wordsworth's Library, a Catalogue*, compiled by Chester L. Shaver and Alice C. Shaver (New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1979), p. 125. Wordsworth received his copy of *The Queen's Wake* from Gillies in 1814. It is not known when he received *The Mountain Bard*.
44. Interestingly, in his array to 'Yarrow Visited', Ketcham records that Dorothy Wordsworth revised 'notes' to 'words' (l. 6) in her 'fair copy' transcript of the poem sent to Catherine Clarkson on 11 Nov 1814—see *CW* (1989), p. 137.
45. Gill, ' "Braes of Yarrow" ', p. 121. Gill includes an interesting discussion of Anderson's memoir of Logan, on pp. 122–23. See also Ronald Schleifer, 'Wordsworth's Yarrow and the Poetics of Repetition', *MLQ*, 38 (1977), 348–66.
46. James Hogg, *The Queen's Wake*, ed. by Douglas S. Mack (Edinburgh: EUP, 2004), pp. 446–47. Hereafter, *Queen's Wake*.
47. Hogg published Wordsworthian parodies or verse satires in 1816, 1817, 1829, and 1830, and together with the 'triumphal arch scene' (of 1824 and 1832) they are frequently cited as evidence that Hogg had 'revenge' on Wordsworth's insult: see Miller, *Electric Shepherd*, p. 119, and *James Hogg: Poetic Mirrors*, ed. by David Groves (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1990).
48. See, e.g., Wordsworth's letter of 17 Sep 1814 to Dr Anderson, 'favoured' by 'Mr Hogg', *Letters: MY*, p. 151. Yet, in the 'Fenwick Notes' to 'Yarrow Visited', Wordsworth barely mentions Hogg's presence:

    > As mentioned in my verses on the death of the Ettrick Shepherd, my first visit to Yarrow was in his company. We had lodged the night before at Traquhair, where Hogg had joined us,—& also Dr. Anderson the Editor of the British Poets, who was on a visit at the Manse. Dr. A. walked with us till we came in view of the vale of Yarrow, & being advanced in life he then turned back. (*Fenwick Notes*, pp. 27–28)

    Wordsworth's note continues for a further 219 words of biographical reminiscence of Dr Anderson and his edition of 'the British Poets'.
49. For example, Groves suggests Burns in *James Hogg: Poetic Mirrors*, p. 137, while Miller suggests Scott in his *Electric Shepherd*, p. 119. Recently, Samantha Webb has supported Groves in her essay, 'In-appropriating the Literary: James Hogg's *Poetic Mirror* Parodies of Scott and Wordsworth, *Studies in Hogg and his World*, 13 (2002), 16–35 (p. 30).

50. *Queen's Wake*, pp. 190 and 388. For an important discussion of the significance of the harps, see pp. xxv–xxxviii.
51. ' "Nouther right spelled nor right setten doun": Scott, Child and the Hogg Family Ballads', reprinted from *The Ballad in Scottish History*, ed. by Edward J. Cowan (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2000), pp. 116–41 [p. 2 of 16] in *The Glasgow Broadside Ballads* website of The Murray Collection, University of Glasgow—see <*www.broadsideballads.gallowayfolk.co.uk*>.
52. Ibid., p. 3.
53. A useful starting point for further studies of bardic theory such as Hogg proposes is *Wordsworth's Bardic Vocation, 1787–1842* by Richard Gravil (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2003), while Kathryn Sutherland's 'The Native Poet: The Influence of Percy's Minstrel from Beattie to Wordsworth', informs further studies of Beattie's influence on Hogg—see *RES*, n.s. 23:132 (1982), 414–33.
54. *Queen's Wake*, pp. xxxvii–xxxviii.
55. Curtis discusses a recent study by Scott Simpkins, entitled, 'Telling the Reader What to Do: Wordsworth and the Fenwick Notes', in *Reader: Essays in Reader-Oriented Theory, Criticism and Pedagogy*, 26 (1991), pp. 39–64, where Curtis explains how Simpkins mistakes the function of the 'Fenwick Notes': 'a significant part of Simpkins' argument rests on his misunderstanding of both the immediate context of the creation of the notes and the history of their use' (*Fenwick Notes*, p. xxi). In his biographical notes, Curtis, bizarrely, situates Hogg's home at St Mary's Lake in Yorkshire, p. 209.

Referring to this Article

J. Currie. 'Re-Visioning James Hogg: The Return of the Subject to Wordsworth's "Extempore Effusion" ', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 15 (Winter 2005). Online: Internet (date accessed): <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/romtext/articles/rt15_n01.pdf*>.

Henry Reed and William Wordsworth

An Editor–Author Relationship and the Production of British Romantic Discourse

Bianca Falbo

From 1837 to 1854, Henry Reed, Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature at the University of Pennsylvania, served as William Wordsworth's editor in America, and with Wordsworth's approbation did much to promote the poet's trans-Atlantic reputation. Reed's work not only shaped American readers' ideas about the poet, but influenced as well Wordsworth's ideas about his own work—particularly, about how he wanted that work to be received. Looking closely at Reed's preparation of a one-volume American edition of the complete works, this essay will show how specific editorial practices employed in compiling a 'complete and uniform' edition produced a more 'Wordsworthian' collection—one highlighting the work of the imagination—than the four-volume London collection on which Reed's was based. Reed's edition has not received much critical attention, but a closer look offers both a better understanding of an important mechanism by which Wordsworth's poetry in America was circulated, and also serves as an example of how the apparatus of the textual edition contributed to the emergence of Wordsworth's reputation and the circulation of British Romantic discourse.

Henry Reed established his reputation as an American authority on Wordsworth with the publication of his one-volume edition of *The Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth* in 1837.[1] A review of Reed's volume, published in the *Knickerbocker Magazine* in 1839, called it a 'beautifully-executed edition', 'heedfully adopted from the London edition', and a 'very valuable addition to every library claiming to contain the English classics'.[2] Herman Melville (who, in fact, disliked Wordsworth's poetry) owned a copy of Reed's edition,[3] as did Wordsworth himself who wrote to Reed in August of 1837 to express his thanks and approval on receiving a copy of the book: 'Upon returning from a tour of several months upon the Continent I find two letters from you awaiting my arrival, along with the edition of my poems you have done me the honour of editing'.[4] When the author of a series of travel pieces that appeared in *Godey's* in 1844 visited Wordsworth at Rydal Mount, it was the engraving of Wordsworth from the frontispiece of Reed's edition against which he measured the poet's appearance in real life: 'The likeness given in Professor Reed's edition […] *has*

been good', he writes, 'but [Wordsworth's] face is now longer and thinner'.[5] Regarding Wordsworth's opinion of the edition, the author observes:

> [Wordsworth's] library was small, but select, and he showed me with great pleasure a beautifully bound volume of the American edition of his works, sent to him by Professor Henry Reed. He told me that Mr. Murray had never produced an edition that suited him as well.[6]

That Reed's edition 'suited' Wordsworth is also evidenced by the fact that, following Reed's example, Wordsworth published a one-volume edition of his complete works, adopting key features of the American edition with respect to the arrangement and presentation of his writing, features of the collected works with which Wordsworth was preoccupied throughout his lifetime.

The example of Reed's volume and its subsequent influence on Wordsworth show how the print sources which made Romantic-period writing available have contributed to the emergence of British Romantic discourse and the impact that discourse has had on literary history. On the importance of the complete edition for the study of literary history, Andrew Nash has commented that 'it is possible to see the collected edition as one of the main determinants of our modern sense of authorship'.[7] By collecting together an author's 'complete works', for example, a collected edition highlights the connection between an author and his writing, reinforcing the idea that a text is a direct reflection of its author's mind, and in the case of a great author, of his genius. In addition, in their editorial apparatus (tables of contents, for example, running titles, footnotes), critical editions establish continuities across individual works, further reinforcing the idea of the author as a unifying presence behind the text (the presence described by Michel Foucault as the 'author function').[8] And of course it follows that these features of textual editions have consequences for readers, too. Footnotes, for example, although they mediate between reader and text, can appear to do just the opposite: they exist, in other words, to enhance a reader's access to the text, thereby theoretically decreasing the distance between reader and text; in practical terms, however, they add more text, thereby creating opportunities for further—not less—interpretive work.

As the work of Jerome McGann and, more recently, Clifford Siskin has demonstrated, such assumptions about the relations among authors, texts, and readers must be understood in the context of the legacy of British Romanticism.[9] McGann's *Romantic Ideology: A Critical Investigation* shows how twentieth-century criticism of British Romantics has tended to repeat and recirculate rather than historicise and interrogate assumptions about authorship, imaginative writing, and literary value. Such writing, he argues, has helped perpetuate the ideology of Romantic poems. Building on the work of McGann and also Raymond Williams, Siskin has shown how these same assumptions have mattered profoundly to the emergence of 'Literature' as a special (selective, elite, transcendent) category of writing: 'The reason that Romantic discourse so

thoroughly penetrates the study of Literature', Siskin explains, 'is that Literature emerged in its presently narrowed—but thus deep and disciplinary—form during that period and thus *in* that discourse'.[10] Accordingly, Siskin has argued, the history of literature needs to be understood within the larger context of the history of writing, which for him includes 'the entire configuration of writing, print and silent reading'.[11] In an alternative history of the kind imagined by Siskin the collected edition (no less than the writing of twentieth-century critics) plays a prominent role as a vehicle informed by and also helping to reinscribe Romantic ideology. A project like Reed's requires a second look, then, because of how it figures (and thus fixes) *in writing* the close relationship between the 'inherent' literary qualities of Wordsworth's writing and Wordsworth's place in literary history.

Reed-ing Wordsworth

Henry Reed's plan for an American edition of the complete works arose in large part because of Reed's enthusiasm for Wordsworth's poetry. As a reader, Reed admired the didactic nature of Wordsworth's poems, and that particular feature of the poems, he believed, made them worthwhile for an American audience. In his first letter to Wordsworth, sent in 1836 along with a copy of the American edition, Reed describes the effect of the poems on himself and his wife:

> The salutary warnings from your pages have, I persuade myself, not been addressed in vain: communing with you there, I have felt my nature elevated—I have learned to look with a better spirit on all around me. You cannot be indifferent to hearing that by your agency your fellow-beings at the distance of thousands of miles are thus benefited.[12]

In this letter, Reed represents himself and his wife not only as avid readers, but devoted students who return to the poems again and again for re-reading and reflection:

> When after some lapse of time we have recurred to our cherished volume, we have felt that you were aiding us in 'binding our days together by natural piety.' We find the periods of several successive years all associated with 'Simon Lee' and 'Michael' and 'old Adam'—with 'Margaret' and with our prime favourite '*Matthew.*'[13]

Moreover, Reed continues, Wordsworth's patriotic spirit, reflected in his poems, stirs similar feelings on the part of the reader:

> I feel that I have unconsciously been taught by you a warmer and more filial attachment to old England. But what is more, in your example I have discovered the best elements of a true and rational patriotism, and guided most safely by the light of your feeling, I have a deeper love for my own country. (p. 3)

In fact, Reed's feeling of having 'unconsciously been taught' aptly describes a characteristic effect of Wordsworth's poems whereby they instruct the reader by putting him or her in a position of hermeneutic mastery: the poem's message or moral is not directly stated; instead, the poem positions the reader to draw his or her own conclusion and, in so doing, effectively dissolves the boundary between author and reader.

Consider 'Simon Lee, the Old Huntsman', for example, one of the poems mentioned in the passage above. Halfway through the story of 'the old huntsman', the poem's speaker interrupts himself to directly address the reader:

> My gentle reader, I perceive
> How patiently you've waited,
> And I'm afraid that you expect
> Some tale will be related.
>
> O reader! had you in your mind
> Such stores as silent thought can bring,
> O gentle reader! you would find
> A tale in everything.[14]

There is no 'tale', the narrator explains, except what the reader 'would find' for himself, 'such stores as silent thought can bring'. The narrator goes on to describe his encounter with Simon Lee but, as promised, does not himself identify the point of his anecdote. Instead, in the final stanza, the narrator's change of heart is marked typographically by a dash:

> The tears into his eyes were brought,
> And thanks and praises seemed to run
> So fast out of his heart, I thought
> They never would have done.
> —I've heard of hearts unkind, kind deeds
> With coldness still returning.
> Alas! the gratitude of men
> Has oftner left me mourning. (pp. 97–104)

By shifting responsibility for interpretation onto the reader here, the poem instructs without overtly seeming to do so. The reader, for all intents and purposes, derives for him or herself the story's significance.

In a blank verse poem like 'Michael', another poem admired by Reed in the passage quoted above, this same effect is heightened because of the way, as Antony Easthope has demonstrated, the unrhymed iambic pentameter lines create the impression of a speaking voice and thus further encourage the reader's 'imaginary identification' with the first-person speaker.[15] The reader learns what the poem's speaker learns about the corrupting effects of the city (a characteristic Wordsworthian trope), only the instructional apparatus is invisible because the subject position (the position of mastery) is always already 'written into the discourse' of the form itself.[16]

This notion of Wordsworth—the poet as mentor—derived from the effect of the poems themselves, was the one that Reed wanted to recover for American readers. In his correspondence with Wordsworth, Reed talks often about the poet's reputation in America on these terms. Regarding his own suggestion for a poem about Niagara Falls, for example, Reed wrote to Wordsworth in March 1840:

> When I reflect how you have taught mankind to look upon the face of Nature, what spot in the wide world is there so grand as that one, whence *by you* could be uttered, to *all* to whom English words are dear, a strain that should endure as long as that unfailing torrent or that language.[17]

And writing to Wordsworth in November 1841, Reed argued, 'if there is one thing more gratifying than another to every one to whom your poetry is dear, it is to observe the constant indications of it's [*sic*] influence upon minds of high reflective power and also upon minds quite differently constituted'.[18] Reed's comments in these letters suggest that he saw Wordsworth's poetry as an ideal instructional venue, not only because of Wordsworth's cultural authority as a British author, but more importantly because he believed the poetry itself transcended national boundaries and thus had universal appeal.

A 'Complete and Uniform' Edition: Negotiating Authority, Restoring the Text

At first glance, there is nothing obviously 'American' about Reed's one-volume American edition which, its Preface claims, is 'adopted with great care' from the four-volume London edition of 1832 (*CPW*, p. iii). Reed's editorial apparatus is minimal: a short 'Preface by the American Editor' and some notes included at the ends of the sections on 'Poems Referring to the Period of Childhood', 'Poems of the Imagination', 'Poems of Sentiment and Reflection', and 'The Excursion'. But Reed's project in and of itself—the desire to import, as it were, an authentic Wordsworth—reflects conservative opinions in the Anglo–American literary field at large in the early part of the nineteenth century which held that America, not yet capable of producing its own national literature, might still look to England for literary culture. Reed's edition offers Wordsworth as such a cultural resource by promising access to the authentic (uncorrupted) poems, and, accordingly, the mind/genius of the poet himself.

Before Reed's edition of *The Complete Poetical Works* in 1837, Americans could have been familiar with the poetry of William Wordsworth through a number of different venues, most of which, because there was no international copyright law, were pirated. Individual poems were reprinted in literary, popular, and school collections, as well as in newspapers and periodicals. There were also a few collections of Wordsworth by American publishers: in 1802, there was an edition of *Lyrical Ballads, with a Few Other Poems*; in 1824, Boston printers Hilliard and Metcalf published *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth* in four volumes; and in 1836, just a year before Reed's edition, the 'first complete

American edition, from the last London edition' was published in one volume by Peck and Newton of New Haven, Connecticut.[19] Like Reed, some American admirers of Wordsworth may have owned or otherwise had access to British editions. Or there was also the possibility that they imported the pirated Paris edition of the collected poems published by the Galignani Press in 1828.[20] And, finally, Wordsworth was the kind of author—like William Shakespeare, Felicia Hemans, Sir Walter Scott, and Lord Byron—who, probably because of the frequency with which his work appeared in school literature, also circulated widely and more diffusely in the form of excerpts and quotations.

Dismayed at the proliferation of unauthorised and often faulty reproductions, Reed set out to produce an authoritative American edition of Wordsworth's poems. As he would later explain to Wordsworth in a letter dated January 1839,

> The editorship was assumed […] solely for the purpose of placing myself between you and the reprinters here and thus guarding your works from the errors and the abuse to which in the present defective state of legislation in International copyright the writings of foreign authors are more or less exposed. Perhaps I am not quite correct in saying this was the only motive,—because I had also an ambition to associate my name with those productions which had been long regarded by me with the most affectionate and thankful veneration.[21]

Reed's motivation—his concern, on one hand about how the poems circulated, and his admiration, on the other for the poems themselves—reflects a belief on his part that, under the proper conditions, Wordsworth's poetry spoke for itself. And it is this belief that guides his editorial work on the American edition.

In his 'Preface by the American Editor', Reed explains in some detail the shape and scope of his editorial project. 'This volume', he writes, 'is published with a view to present a complete and uniform Edition of the Poetical Works of William Wordsworth' (*CPW*, p. iii). The phrase, 'complete and uniform', is noteworthy. Reed's edition was more 'complete' than the London edition on which it was based because it included material never before published with the poet's collected works: 'A Description of the Country of the Lakes in the North of England', first published anonymously in 1810 as an introduction to Joseph Wilkinson's *Select Views in Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Lancashire*; the poems from *Yarrow Revisited*, published in 1835 (i.e. after the last London edition); and some additional poems published since the *Yarrow Revisited* poems. What Reed may have meant by 'uniform', though, is not entirely clear. His use of the term could reflect his intention that the American edition, unlike the unauthorised reprints, be free of errors. In addition, 'uniform' can be read in relation to his efforts to make the collection more accessible for readers. For example, the four-volume London edition divided up Wordsworth's various prose writings (e.g., the 'Essay Supplementary to the Preface' of 1815, the 'Essay Upon

Epitaphs'), including one or two of them at the ends of the individual volumes. Reed's edition, however, being a single volume, included all the prose writings at the end, as appendices, 'for the greater convenience of reference, and from a regard to their value' (*CPW*, p. iv). And, finally, 'uniform' can be understood in relation to Reed's efforts to produce an edition that was, for all intents and purposes, in keeping with the spirit of Wordsworth's edition—especially the poet's intentions regarding the classifications of the poems.[22]

These multiple connotations suggest that Reed's project is more complex than it might, at first, appear. That is, in producing his 'complete and uniform' edition, Reed was doing more than reprinting the contents of the London edition. In addition to the changes described above, the most immediately obvious difference in Reed's edition was its size—Reed's version of the collected works condensed the four-volume London edition, which was printed in single columns of type, into one volume with double-column pages. On one hand, this arrangement of the text likely created difficulties, aesthetic as well as visual, for readers of the American volume. Reed's pages, though roughly twice the size of Wordsworth's, are considerably more crowded, especially the prose writing, because there is more print and less white space. On the other hand, the double columns give a 'uniform' appearance to the volume and, even more importantly for Reed, make it possible to include all of Wordsworth's writing in a single volume.

Although Reed's edition looked different from Wordsworth's, its claims of authenticity were sincere. That is, Reed's edition did indeed give readers access to the 'complete' Wordsworth. As with any edited collection, though, its author is a product of the editing, and the 'Wordsworth' of the American edition was one who was carefully constructed by Reed. This point is reflected on the title page. Wordsworth's name is more prominent than Reed's, but Reed's is not so small as to go unnoticed. Reed's name—and by association, his authority (represented by his title, 'Professor of English Literature in the University of Pennsylvania')—does not compete with Wordsworth's, but the way the two names appear on the page makes it clear that this is an *edition* rather than a reprint by the publisher or some anonymous compiler.

The text of Reed's title page dramatises something of the larger dilemma that Reed faced as an editor: in producing his 'complete and uniform' collection, he had to make changes to Wordsworth's arrangement and presentation of the collection, and in doing so, he necessarily walked a fine line between undermining and reinscribing Wordsworth's authority as author. I do not mean to imply that Reed was interested in challenging Wordsworth's authority by supplanting or outdoing the London edition. Reed's project certainly seems intended as a corrective response to pirated editions. I am suggesting, however, that in producing a 'complete and uniform' edition, Reed ran the risk of appearing to understand the poet's work in ways that the poet himself did not. And for Reed who saw Wordsworth as a mentor, as the kind of cultural and moral

authority Americans ought to revere, it was necessary to convince readers of his own editorial expertise without undermining Wordsworth's role as author. This difficulty is mitigated in the American edition through Reed's strategic use of the paratextual apparatus at his disposal in ways that appear to reflect, and in doing so reinscribe, his understanding of the poet's intentions.

That is, by deferring—or appearing to defer—to the author's intentions, Reed could justify decisions made even when those intentions were unspoken, as they were, for example, regarding placement of Wordsworth's essay on the Lake District. This essay in Reed's edition appears as the fourth of six appendices. At the bottom of the page, there is a note by Wordsworth explaining that the essay first appeared in Wilkinson's *Select Views* ('an expensive work, and necessarily of limited circulation') and is

> now, with emendations and additions, attached to this volume; from a consciousness of its having been written in the same spirit which dictated several of the poems, and from a belief that it will tend materially to illustrate them. (*CPW*, p. 515)

The 'volume' to which Wordsworth refers in this passage is *The River Duddon* published in 1820.[23] Reed's note justifying the essay's inclusion in the American edition appears beneath Wordsworth's note:

> [The republication here mentioned, was made in the Volume containing 'Sonnets to the River Duddon and other Poems published in 1820.' No other reason than that stated by the Author himself need be given for introducing into the present Edition this Essay descriptive of the Scenery of the Lakes, and thus restoring its appropriate connection with the Poems.—H.R.] (*CPW*, p. 515)

Like all of Reed's notes in the American edition, this one is enclosed in brackets and signed 'H.R.' This editorial practice, common in Reed's day, would have been familiar to readers. Typographically, Reed's note is clearly distinguished from Wordsworth's note, and Reed's position as editor clearly distinguished in relation to Wordsworth's position as author. Thus, Reed inhabits a conventional space (i.e., conventional for his position as editor). At the same time, what he does in this space is interesting, because, in his deference to Wordsworth's authority ('No other reason than that stated by the Author himself need be given […]'), he confirms his own. He says, in effect, this essay belongs with the poems because the author says it does; the decision to include the essay was prefigured in a decision the author previously made.

Reed's move here is typical of how he defers to—and thus reinscribes—Wordsworth's authority in order to justify his own editorial practice. But there is more to it than that since, as the above example demonstrates, there is a dialectical relationship between authorial intention and the representation of those intentions in the editorial apparatus. Put another way, to what extent does Reed's decision here reflect Wordsworth's intentions and to what extent does it fill in the gaps, so to speak, to create a narrative of intention? To answer this

question, it is useful to know something more about the publication history of the Lake District essay itself.

After its anonymous publication in Joseph Wilkinson's *Select Views* in 1810, Wordsworth's essay was, as his note above explains, published in his own *Sonnets to the River Duddon* in 1820. The essay was published separately, again under Wordsworth's name, and with slightly revised titles, in 1822, 1823, and 1835.[24] Wordsworth's decision to include the essay with the River Duddon poems is, as Reed maintains, a good reason to include it as well in the collected edition since that volume, though issued separately, was intended to be the third volume of *Poems by William Wordsworth*, the first two volumes of which consisted of the 1815 *Poems*.[25] Stephen Gill explains the context for this practice:

> Before the 1830s, publishers issued books not in durable casing but in flimsy boards, sometimes only in paper wrappers, which were discarded when the purchaser had the volume bound. It was thus possible, even usual, for volumes bought over a number of years to be bound uniformly to make a set. When *The River Duddon* was published purchasers were informed that 'This Publication, together with The "Thanksgiving Ode", Jan. 18. 1816, "The Tale of Peter Bell," and "The Waggoner," completes the third and last volume of the Author's Miscellaneous Poems', and an alternative title page was included so that the book could be bound up into a uniform set, not as a separate volume, *The River Duddon etc.,* but as volume III of *Poems by William Wordsworth, etc.*[26]

It is tempting to read the publication history of this essay (from an anonymous piece in someone else's book, to its appearance under Wordsworth's name in the *River Duddon* volume, to its publication in volume III of the complete poems) as one that corresponds neatly to Wordsworth's rising status as an author. But, in fact, when the essay was first issued under his name in 1820, Wordsworth did not yet enjoy the kind of reputation he was coming to have by the time he knew Reed and, especially, after his death in 1850. More pertinent, then, is how the essay's incorporation in the complete poems contributed to a notion of Wordsworth as the personality behind the work.

And it is in relation to this notion of authorship that Reed's decision to include the essay in his American edition is key. As the above history suggests, Reed's decision is grounded in his observation of Wordsworth's own inclination for collecting and organising his work so that it might be read as a unified project. But the editorial apparatus by means of which Reed justifies his decision also constructs Wordsworth as an 'author' in ways that later emerge as hallmarks of Romanticism. Reed's editorial gloss on Wordsworth's note, for example, points the reader to the reason 'stated by the Author himself'—Wordsworth's belief that the essay 'will tend materially to illustrate' the poems—and effectively ignores the parenthetical comment about the essay's initially limited (and, although Wordsworth doesn't make explicit, anonymous) circulation, as

well as Wordsworth's mention of 'emendations and additions'. Thus, in Reed's gloss, writing is represented as a reflection of a state of mind and the product of a 'dictating spirit' rather than the exigencies of a form (an introduction to a travel book) or a print opportunity (the opportunity to earn money from the essay's 'republication').

All of this points to a notion of authorship that has come to be thought of as inherently 'Romantic' because of the way it foregrounds self-reflexivity (intention, thinking about thinking) and, in effect, imagines the text as a reflection of its author's mind. This was a notion of authorship that informed and organised Wordsworth's own editions, in the way his Prefaces (especially the 1815 Preface on his classifications of the poems) and notes appear to explain his intentions and thereby to instruct the reader about the meaning of the text. Reed's gloss on Wordsworth's note amplifies the general effect of such features by means of a specific editorial practice and, by constructing a notion of what is authentically 'Wordsworthian', consequently shows how a textual edition functions in the production of discourse. Such notions of authorship, McGann, Siskin, and others have argued, are part of the ideology of Romantic poems that modern criticism has traditionally perpetuated rather than exposed. In his capacity as editor, Henry Reed participates in this process by inhabiting the position of the ideal reader inscribed in Wordsworth's poems and other prose writing. But Reed's American edition is an example of how the production of this ideology is also, and in particular instances more immediately so, the consequence of the way specific modes of textual production inevitably highlight selected elements of an author's work. The assumptions about authorship inherent in and perpetuated by a textual edition like Reed's—assumptions about intention, for example, or the relationship between an author and his work—complement and amplify the presence of those same assumptions in the work of an author like Wordsworth, and consequently make him available to be recovered later in the century as a British Romantic, a group which never existed in its own day as it would later be constructed and institutionalised beginning in the 1860s.

The 'Yarrow Revisited' Poems

Some aspects of his project gave Reed more difficulty as an editor than others. Compared to his decision to 'restore' to the collection the essay on the lakes, incorporating the poems from *Yarrow Revisited* was a more complicated undertaking. The Yarrow poems had been published after the last London edition, and so they had not yet been incorporated into the collected poems, although Wordsworth had included a note to the volume explaining his intention to do so.[27] As an editor, Reed had to figure out how to incorporate the Yarrow poems. Most of them reappear in Reed's edition in three categories, or classes, whose contents and titles are based on categories from *Yarrow Revisited*: 'Yarrow Revisited, and Other Poems, Composed (Two Excepted) During a Tour in Scotland, and on the English Border, in the Autumn of 1831', 'Sonnets Composed

or Suggested During a Tour in Scotland in the Summer of 1833', and 'Evening Voluntaries'. The other poems from *Yarrow Revisited*, as Reed notes in the Preface, are 'interspersed' among Wordsworth's existing classifications.[28] His explanation, offered in the Preface to his edition, shows how Reed constructs himself as the ideal Wordsworthian reader, and in so doing, recirculates the terms of value associated with that reader—particularly those reinscribing the didactic nature of Wordsworth's poems (in effect, Reed learns from the poems themselves where to place them) and also the role of the 'reflecting reader'.

In preparing the American edition, Reed explains:

> It was at once obvious that great incongruity would result from inserting after the former collection of Poems, as arranged by Mr. Wordsworth [i.e., the 1832 London edition], the contents of the volume since published [i.e., *Yarrow Revisited*] in an order wholly different. Such a course would have been in direct violation of the Poet's expressed intention, and would have betrayed an ignorance or distrust in his principles of classification, or a timidity in applying them. It would have been a method purely mechanical, and calculated to impair the effect of that philosophical arrangement, which was designed 'as a commentary unostentatiously directing the attention of those, who read with reflection, to the Poet's purposes.' (*CPW*, p. 3)

The line in quotes is Reed's rewriting of a line from Wordsworth's own Preface to his 1815 collected poems in which the poet explains his system of classification in detail. 'I should have preferred to scatter the contents of these volumes at random', Wordsworth explains,

> if I had been persuaded that, by the plan adopted, anything material would be taken from the natural effect of the pieces, individually, on the mind of the unreflecting Reader. I trust there is a sufficient variety in each class to prevent this; while, for him who reads with reflection, the arrangement will serve as a commentary unostentatiously directing his attention to my purposes, both particular and general. But, as I wish to guard against the possibility of misleading by this classification, it is proper first to remind the Reader, that certain poems are placed according to the powers of mind, in the Author's conception, predominant in the production of them; *predominant*, which implies the exertion of other faculties in less degree. Where there is more imagination than fancy in a poem, it is placed under the head of imagination, and vice versa.[29]

Wordsworth's distinction between the 'reflecting' and 'unreflecting' reader was a fairly standard way at the time (in prefaces, for example, and other kinds of addresses to readers a well as in instructional literature) of positing the thoughtful, as opposed to the careless, reader. As a metaphor, reading as

'reflecting' characterises the importance the role of the author had come to have in shaping early-nineteenth-century reading practices. The aim of reflective reading, in other words, was the recovery of the author's meaning or intention, which was often described in terms of a mirror image 'reflected' or imprinted 'on the mind' of the reader. In this passage, Wordsworth is explaining that the 'reflecting reader' of his collected poems would understand his classifications as a 'commentary' on his intentions but would not allow that to interfere with the 'natural effect' of individual poems.

However, in order to incorporate the poems from *Yarrow Revisited* in the American edition, Reed was necessarily preoccupied with Wordsworth's classifications. In the interest of producing a 'complete and uniform' edition, he had to figure out how the individual poems fit into Wordsworth's organising categories, and in his 'Preface by the American Editor', he ventriloquises the same passage quoted above from Wordsworth's 1815 Preface in order to explain his rationale. 'In editing this volume', he explains,

> I have […] ventured to adopt the only alternative which presented itself—to anticipate Mr. Wordsworth's unexecuted intention of interspersing the contents of the volume entitled 'Yarrow Revisited, &c' among the poems already arranged by him.—I have been guided by an attentive study of the principles of classification stated in the general Preface, and of the character of each poem to which they were to be applied. In some instances special directions for arrangement had been given by the Poet himself;—these have been carefully followed. In many instances the close similarity between groups of the unarranged poems, and those which had been arranged, left little room for error. With respect to the detached pieces, it has been felt to be a delicate undertaking to decide under which class each one of them should be appropriately arranged. This has been attempted with an anxious sense of the care it required, though with an assurance that there was no possibility of impairing the individual interest of any of the poems. (*CPW*, p. iv)

In this passage, Reed implicitly characterises himself as a 'reflecting Reader' by working within the terms of the author's Preface and thereby claiming to represent the poet's intentions: Where Wordsworth's 'reflecting Reader' is open to the 'natural effect of the pieces, individually', Reed works 'with an assurance' that his arrangement won't 'impair […] the individual interest of any of the poems'. Interestingly, the way Reed's language echoes Wordsworth's, the notion of 'natural effect' gets rewritten as 'individual interest', and the revision commodifies the value of the individual poem over and above its placement in the collection. Taking its cues from Wordsworth's Preface, then, Reed's Preface ultimately highlights and re-circulates a connection between literary value and the transcending of generic boundaries—a connection that not only

came to define British Romantic writing, but the influence of the Romantics on terms of value for literary study. As the next section will demonstrate, following Wordsworth's plan, Reed slightly alters the presentation of Wordsworth's organising categories so that in the American edition the majority of poems appear to transcend not only generic but also period and national boundaries that defined the contents of the original London edition.

The Production of Discourse: The Wordsworthian Imagination

One of the most interesting and consequential features of Reed's project and his effort to produce a 'complete and uniform' edition was that he extended Wordsworth's class of 'Poems of the Imagination' so that it incorporated other classes as sub-categories. In the London edition, that is, 'Poems of the Imagination' preceded the paired classes of 'Miscellaneous Sonnets', parts one and two. In Reed's edition, these two classes as well as the next twelve (which included the two classes of Yarrow poems mentioned above[30]) became sub-categories of 'Poems of the Imagination'. This change in the arrangement of the poems might seem a minor detail; however its significance lies in the fact that in Reed's edition, more poems were classed as 'Poems of the Imagination' than in Wordsworth's edition. In the Table of Contents, the change is indicated typographically in the way the titles of the classes are printed. 'POEMS OF THE IMAGINATION', like the titles of the other classes, is in larger capital letters, while the sub-classes appear in smaller capitals. (In the London edition, all of the titles are the same size.) In addition, 'Poems of the Imagination', appears as a running title at the top of the right-hand page, from pages 130 to 323, roughly at the centre of Reed's volume, and covering a considerably larger portion of the book than in the London edition. (Someone opening Reed's edition to read the sonnet on Westminster Bridge, for example, which is under the sub-heading 'Miscellaneous Sonnets.—Part Second', would see 'Poems of the Imagination' as the running title at the top of the recto page. In the London edition from which Reed was working, the running title would have been 'Miscellaneous Sonnets'.) In his Preface, Reed notes that 'Pains have been taken to indicate typographically, in a manner more clear than in any former edition, the general classification of the Poems' (*CPW*, p. 4). But it was a typographical change that had a substantive effect, especially in the context of Reed's one-volume edition, because it made 'Poems of the Imagination' a more central (literally occupying the centre of the book) and prominent class.

Reed was aware of the way a single-volume edition called attention to Wordsworth's classifications. In a letter to Wordsworth in August 1845, he wrote:

> I am glad to hear that you are preparing an Octavo Edition of your Poems and that it will contain some additions. A single-volume Edition is desirable—especially as it will have a peculiar interest in giving a complete classification of the poems.[31]

In his reply, Wordsworth thanked the editor for the insight into his own intentions:

> I do not remember whether I have mentioned to you that following your example I have greatly extended the class entitled Poems of the Imagination, thinking as you must have done that if Imagination were predominant in the class, it was not indispensable that it should pervade every poem which it contained. Limiting the class as I had done before seemed to imply, and to the uncandid or observing did so, that the faculty which is the premum mobile in Poetry had little to do, in the estimation of the author, with Pieces not arranged under that head. I therefore feel much obliged to you for suggesting by your practice the plan which I have adopted.[32]

In response to this letter, Reed explains that he is able to 'apply' Wordsworth's 'principles of classification' because he has taken 'a good deal of pains in studying' them. 'In extending the class of "Poems of Imagination" ', he writes, 'I felt sure I was not going wrong'.[33] As he does in the 'Preface' to the *Complete Works*, Reed reinscribes Wordsworth's terms to authorise his own editorial practice and the result—as Wordsworth's letter implies—is that the American editor produces an arrangement of the poems that is more characteristically 'Wordsworthian' than Wordsworth's own arrangement. In the process, Reed highlights (by calling attention to) the role of 'imagination' in Wordsworth's poetry—an association that Wordsworth himself authorises and reinscribes when he incorporates this change into his own one-volume edition. What finally emerges in this process, then, is an emphasis on the Wordsworthian imagination, a trope that would later become one of the hallmarks of Wordsworth's poetry and of his position in the canon of British Romanticism.

When Reed published a revised edition of Wordsworth's collected poems in 1851, the year after the poet's death, he made much of the fact that his first edition not only earned Wordsworth's approval, but caused the poet to revise his arrangement of the poems. In his Preface to the revised edition, Reed includes the passages from Wordsworth's letters, quoted above,[34] in which the poet thanks him for 'the pains […] bestowed upon the work' and describes plans for his own one-volume edition that will follow Reed's example by 'extending' the class of 'Poems of the Imagination'. Reed also includes a 'Table of General Titles' listing all the classes and sub-classes which likewise called attention to the prominence of 'Poems of the Imagination'. In his ongoing effort to produce a 'complete' edition, Reed's second edition incorporates features of Wordsworth's 1845 edition, including an 'Index to the Poems' and an 'Index of First Lines'. Such features, Reed hopes, together with the Table of Contents which includes, for each poem, its date of composition 'will prove of great convenience, as giving […] such facilities for reference as are peculiarly needed in a collection containing many short poems'.[35] As in the first American edition, Reed claims

in the second to be scrupulous about following Wordsworth's classifications: 'In the present volume', he explains,

> the text of the former edition [i.e. the first American edition] has been for the most part retained; all the additional poems have been introduced, and the arrangement made to correspond more nearly in the details of it with that adopted by the Author.
> (*CPW* [1851], p. iv)

Reed's comments here show how a notion of Wordsworthian discourse can be said to emerge across these editions, from Reed's one-volume American edition in 1837, to Wordsworth's one-volume edition of 1845, to Reed's second edition in 1851 which incorporates Wordsworth's revisions to both the 1841 single-volume as well as the 1850–51 seven-volume editions. Although specific poems are shifted in and out, 'Poems of the Imagination' remains a key, organising category, containing more poems than any other class. As a result of Reed's revision, that is, most of Wordsworth's poems become poems of the imagination.

There is one other interesting consequence of Reed expanding Wordsworth's category of imagination. Reed's 'complete and uniform' arrangement of the poems, on behalf of Wordsworth's intentions and in the interest of importing an authentic Wordsworth for American readers, converts to sub-headings under 'Poems of the Imagination' nearly all the categories that refer to specifically British locations. In making 'Imagination' a more prominent feature of the edition, then, Reed produces, in effect, a less British Wordsworth. The editorial apparatus, that is, subordinates national differences to universal appeal. It is tempting to read this effect as one intended to appeal to Reed's audience—tempting to say, in other words, that American readers would find Wordsworth more palatable if his value could be said to transcend national boundaries. That Reed, himself, held this belief about Wordsworth's poems also makes such a conclusion seem reasonable, but while it makes sense that Reed universalises Wordsworth for an American audience, it is also important to consider that as a category, 'universal appeal' was one that had gained a certain cultural currency by the early nineteenth century. It was something that was considered to be a hallmark of great writers like Shakespeare and Milton. So when Reed, through strategic use of the editorial apparatus, implies that Wordsworth has 'universal appeal', he likewise confirms the poet's status as a great author. Moreover, other evidence suggests that this emphasis is more than a coincidence. In the second edition, Wordsworth's universal appeal is further distilled through an accumulation of paratexts, some of which are reprinted from the London editions, and some of which are Reed's own contribution. In comparison to Reed's first edition, then, the second edition takes on the added responsibility of being not only 'the most complete collection' but also a memorial to Wordsworth's life and career.[36]

Textual Production and Terms of Value for Literary Study

The real significance of Reed's American edition, I have argued, is not simply that it supplies bibliographic information about particular revisions to Wordsworth's collected works. Rather, the project of examining this volume in the context of Reed's relationship with Wordsworth has consequences for our current understanding of 'British Romanticism', a category which has served, in its various instantiations since the late nineteenth century, as an important organising moment for the study of a certain period in the history of English Literature. Thus, my aim here is not simply to call attention to the relationship between Reed and Wordsworth, but rather to extrapolate from that relationship implications it has for the study of Romantic-period writing and ultimately the study of literary texts in general.

First, some implications for the study of British Romanticism. The example of Reed's edition shows how certain key tropes of Romanticism like 'imagination' can be tied to the production and circulation of the texts that, over time, have come to constitute the category itself, that the institutionalising of those tropes has as much to do with literary critics' failures to historicise, as McGann has argued, as with the production and reception of those texts—how they represent the written works themselves, how they construct authors and readers, how they figure reading and writing. I say the 'example of Reed's project', because his relationship with Wordsworth is one instance of many such relationships between editors and authors of the period which, when re-examined, might disclose the mechanisms by which organising tropes and narratives in the discourse of Romanticism have become institutionalised. An examination of these kinds of relationships invites a kind of historical work that exposes the cultural contexts within which ways of figuring the work of authoring and the work of reading later designated 'Romantic' emerged and circulated.

To return, briefly, to Reed's example: in one sense, the process by which revisions to the collected poems take shape is the antithesis of the Romantic ideal. The idea of revision runs contrary to the image of the literary work as a direct reflection of its author's mind. Wordsworth's arrangement of the poems, that is, does not spring forth, perfectly conceived, from his own mind, but is, rather, an ongoing project, one that emerges out of the dialogue between author and editor/reader. But in another sense, the process itself of revising the collection by Reed and Wordsworth bears some resemblance to Wordsworth's description of the imagination—'a word […] denoting operations of the mind upon [absent external] objects, and processes of creation or of composition, governed by certain fixed laws'.[37] This claim, and the discussion that follows in which Wordsworth struggles to articulate his notion of how the imagination works, are part of the 1815 Preface which appears in all of the collected editions of the poems. The imagination has an 'endowing or modifying power', Wordsworth explains, and it also 'shapes and *creates*' by means of 'innumerable processes; and in none does it more delight than in that of consolidating numbers into

unity, and dissolving and separating unity into number'. In their revisions to the arrangement of the poems, Reed and Wordsworth, taking cues from the poems as well as one another's readings of the poems, perform just such operations so that the arrangement of poems in 'Poems of the Imagination' comes to be uniform with respect to the discussion of imagination in the 1815 Preface and, in turn, so that the collection itself coheres as a unified whole. In the 1851 edition, this coherence remains a priority,[38] and it is underscored by the accumulation of editorial apparatus intended as a memorial to Wordsworth's genius and his universal appeal. This appeal, moreover, takes precedence over Wordsworth's British heritage (although that heritage, by virtue of the complex cultural relationship between England and America, cannot be entirely subsumed). In its production of Wordsworth's universal appeal, the example of Reed's edition raises questions, as well, about the dissemination of British Romanticism—a movement which, as an *ex post facto* construction, is most often understood as traveling out from England. The example of Reed's edition shows how the emergence of British Romantic discourse was a trans-Atlantic phenomenon, that readers on both sides of the Atlantic shaped and were shaped by a common conversation.

Finally, then, the 'Romantic' view of the author and his work constructed by Reed's edition has implications for literary study because of the special place and influence that early-nineteenth-century writers and texts later designated as 'Romantic' have always had in the academy. At the same time that selected early-nineteenth-century authors were being grouped together as British Romantics in histories of English literature, the study of literature in English was becoming a legitimate field of academic study. Books like George L. Craik's *Compendius History of English Literature*, one of the first to group together early-nineteenth century texts and authors, were used or excerpted for use in the classroom.[39] Thus, those terms of value associated with the work of early-nineteenth-century writers ('imagination', 'originality', 'genius', 'universal appeal') were recirculated as part of the academic language for literary study. Of course, these terms don't originate with the work of early-nineteenth-century writers, but rather, have shaped the emergence of 'literature' as a special category of writing since the eighteenth century. Reed's edition of Wordsworth is part of the legacy of earlier collected editions—like Samuel Johnson's Shakespeare, for example—responsible for shaping modern notions of authorship. Thus, the example of Reed's edition is instructive not only because it contributed to the cultural production of Wordsworth as a Romantic poet, but also because it reminds us of a fundamental relationship that has always existed between literary terms of value and modes of textual production.

Notes

1. *The Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth* (Philadelphia: Kay and Troutman, 1837). Reed's other Wordsworth publications included a long critical review that appeared in the *North American Review* (1839) on the occasion

of a 2nd edn of the American *Complete Poetical Works*, *Poems from the Poetical Works of William Wordsworth* (1841), which was a popular version of his 1-vol. complete edn, and a lecture on Wordsworth in his *Lectures on the British Poets* (1851). In his correspondence with Wordsworth, Reed suggested ideas for new poems as well as revisions and additions to Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical Sonnets (particularly to acknowledge the common interests of the British Anglican and American Episcopal Churches). After the poet's death in 1850, Reed solicited American contributions for the poet's memorial and supervised publication of the American edition of the *Memoirs of William Wordsworth* (1851) edited by the poet's brother, the Reverend Dr Christopher Wordsworth. Of all his Wordsworth publications, however, Reed's 1-vol. edn of the complete works seems to have attracted considerable attention among his contemporaries and, in addition, had consequences for subsequent editions by Wordsworth himself. Reed's volume was reprinted in 1839, 1846 and 1848. In 1851, Reed published a revised edn, which was still being reprinted as late as 1870. Unless otherwise noted, references to Henry Reed's American edition come from this 1st edn and will be given after quotations in the text, abbreviated as *CPW*.

2. 'Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth', *Knickerbocker Magazine* (1839), 181.
3. *The Writings of Herman Melville*, ed. by Harrison Hayford and others, 15 vols (Evanston: Northwestern University, and Chicago: Newberry Library, 1968–91), IX: *The Piazza Tales and Other Prose Pieces, 1839–1860* (1987), 695 n.
4. *Letters of William Wordsworth: A New Selection*, ed. by Alan G. Hill, 8 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967–93), VI, 444.
5. Theo Ledyard Cuyler, 'The English Lakes and Wordsworth', *Godey's*, 24 (1833), 30–32 (p. 31).
6. Ibid., p. 31.
7. *The Culture of Collected Editions* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 1. See also Neil Fraistat (ed.), *Poems in their Place: The Intertextuality and Order of Poetic Collections* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1986). For readings of selected collections by Romantic poets, see Fraistat, *The Poem and the Book: Interpreting Collections of Romantic Poetry* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1986).
8. 'What Is an Author?' in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. by Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984), pp. 101–20 (p. 108).
9. Jerome McGann, *The Romantic Ideology: A Critical Investigation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983); Clifford Siskin, *The Historicity of Romantic Discourse* (Oxford: OUP, 1988); Clifford Siskin, *The Work of Writing: Literature and Social Change in Britain, 1700–1830* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).
10. Siskin, *Work of Writing*, p. 14.
11. Ibid., p. 2.
12. Leslie Nathan Broughton (ed.),*Wordsworth and Reed: The Poet's Correspondence with His American Editor: 1836–1850* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1933), p. 3.
13. Broughton, *Wordsworth and Reed*, p. 3.
14. 'Simon Lee, The Old Huntsman, With an Incident in Which He Was Concerned', *Lyrical Ballads, with a Few Other Poems 1797–1800*, ed. by James Butler and Karen

Green (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992), pp. 64–67 (69–76). Further references to this poem are given in the text.

15. Anthony Easthope, *Poetry as Discourse* (New York: Methuen, 1983), p. 75.
16. Ibid., pp. 75–76.
17. Broughton, *Wordsworth and Reed*, p. 18.
18. Ibid., p. 59.
19. *Lyrical Ballads, with a Few Other Poems* (Philadelphia: James Humphreys, 1802); *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, 4 vols (Boston: Hilliard and Metcalf, 1824); *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth* (New Haven, CT: Peck and Newton, 1836). Like Reed's, the New Haven edition was a one-volume 'complete' edition, which meant that it was based on the most recent London edition, published in 1832, and it included the *Yarrow Revisited* poems which had been published in 1835. And as Reed's would, the New Haven edition condensed the four volumes into one with double-column pages. Reed's edition is slightly bigger in size than the New Haven edition (27 as compared to 24 cm) and considerably longer in terms of pages (551 as compared to 320). Neither the Boston nor the New Haven edition of the collected poems was reprinted.

    In addition to Reed's more extensive editorial apparatus, the other important difference between it and the New Haven edition is how the *Yarrow Revisited* poems are incorporated. With the exception of the title poem, 'Yarrow Revisited', which was classed (without explanation) with 'The Excursion', the New Haven edition added the contents of *Yarrow Revisited, and Other Poems* to the end of Wordsworth's original arrangement, which concluded with 'The Excursion'. As I will explain, Reed's edition 'interspersed'—as opposed to just adding—the contents of *Yarrow Revisited* according to Wordsworth's existing classification in the interest of producing a 'complete and uniform' edition.
20. *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth* (Paris: Galignani, 1828).
21. Broughton, *Wordsworth and Reed*, p. 5.
22. Joseph Wilkinson, *Select Views in Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Lancashire* (London: Rudolph Ackerman, 1810). William Wordsworth, *Yarrow Revisited and Other Poems* (London: Longman, 1835). William Wordsworth, *Poetical Works*, 4 vols (London: Longman, 1832).
23. William Wordsworth, *The River Duddon, A Series of Sonnets; Vaudracour and Julia; and Other Poems; To Which is Annexed, a Topographical Description of the Country of the Lakes, in the North of England* (London: Longman 1820).
24. Stephen Gill, *William Wordsworth: A Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), p. 468, n. 132.
25. William Wordsworth, *Poems*, 2 vols (London: Longman 1815).
26. Gill, *Wordsworth: A Life*, pp. 335–36.
27. 'Advertisement', *Yarrow Revisited and Other Poems*.
28. Although it is beyond the scope of the present essay, analysing the poems' migration from Wordsworth's volume to Reed's would be worthwhile and interesting, especially if the analysis considered this in the larger context of Wordsworth's on-going revisions to his collected works. For the purposes of discussion in this essay, I focus on Reed's explanation of how he decided where to place the poems.
29. Wordsworth, *Poems*, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1815), rptd in facsimile, ed. by Jonathan Wordsworth (Oxford: Woodstock Books, 1989), pp. xiv–xv.

30. i.e., 'Yarrow Revisited, and Other Poems, Composed (Two Excepted) During a Tour in Scotland, and on the English Border, in the Autumn of 1831', 'Sonnets Composed or Suggested During a Tour in Scotland in the Summer of 1833'. 'Evening Voluntaries' was a sub-class of 'Poems of Sentiment and Reflection'.
31. Broughton, *Wordsworth and Reed*, p. 151.
32. Ibid., p. 152.
33. Ibid., p. 156.
34. i.e., 19 Aug 1837; 31 July 1845; 27 Sep 1845.
35. *The Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth, Poet Laureate, etc.* (Philadelphia: Troutman and Hayes, 1851), p. iv. Further references to this work given after quotations in the text.
36. Reed adds, for example, a biographical note and includes 'tributes paid to the genius of Wordsworth' by Hartley Coleridge, and Thomas Noon Talfourd (*CW*, p. iv).
37. *Shorter Poems, 1807–1820*, ed. by Karl H. Ketchum, *The Cornell Wordsworth* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989), p. 636.
38. Reed notes in the Preface that his edition is still the 'most complete' because it contains poems 'which were omitted (inadvertently it is believed,) from the latest London edition' (*CW*, p. iv), by which he means the 7-vol. edn of 1850–51.
39. George Craik, *Compendius History of English Literature* (New York: Scribner, 1864).

Referring to this Article

B. M. Falbo. 'Henry Reed and William Wordsworth: An Editor–Author Relationship and the Production of British Romantic Discourse', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 15 (Winter 2005). Online: Internet (date accessed): <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/romtext/articles/rt15_no2.pdf*>.

The Perfect Match
Wordsworth's 'The Triad' and Coleridge's 'The Garden of Boccacio'

Derek Furr

For over a decade after its first edition in 1828, Charles Heath's *Keepsake* stood out as the most elegant of the English annuals, its binding and engraving setting the high standard by which other giftbooks would be measured. But the 1829 volume, in particular, stands out to us because its boastful list of contributors includes William Wordsworth and Samuel Taylor Coleridge, as well as Mary and Percy Shelley (whose work Mary had submitted), Robert Southey, and Sir Walter Scott, whose 'Magnum Opus' would soon be published. This illustrious and costly group of writers represented Heath's attempt to make the literary material of his work as matchless as its artistic materials—or, as Heath phrased it in his Preface to 1829, 'to render the *Keepsake* perfect in all its departments'.[1] On an infamous tour through the country with his editor, Frederic Mansel Reynolds, he paid handsomely for contributions from England's most established poets, including Romanticism's aging patriarchs, who proved adept at striking a financial bargain. For twelve pages of verse, Wordsworth was paid 100 guineas; for seven pages, Coleridge was offered £50: no less than the steel engravings or silk bindings that were Heath's chief innovations in the costly aesthetics of the giftbook, Wordsworth, Coleridge, and the poetry they submitted to the 1829 *Keepsake* were moneyed matter.

Wordsworth and Coleridge's association with the 1829 book effectively collapsed the quintessentially Romantic distinction between the work of art and work for pay, summed up by Shelley in his 'Defense of Poetry': 'Poetry, and the principle of the Self, of which money is the visible incarnation, are the God and the mammon of the world'.[2] Eclipsed by the popular success of Felicia Hemans, L.E.L., and other frequent contributors to giftbooks like the *Keepsake*—books that unapologetically promoted a sentimental, materialistic aesthetic—Wordsworth and Coleridge found themselves rethinking their Romantic assumption that materialism compromises the high aesthetic and ethical purpose of authorship. Perhaps true poets could indeed serve both 'God' and 'mammon', the muse and moneyed self-interest.

Whether or not the Lake School was extinct, as Francis Jeffrey happily pronounced it in 1822, Wordsworth and Coleridge were decidedly less productive in the 1820s than in the decades before. After *Ecclesiastical Sonnets* was

published in 1822, Wordsworth wasn't to publish another volume of new verse until the 1830s. Coleridge devoted much of the early 1820s to his *Aids to Reflection* and published no new poems between 1819 and 1828. In a March 1828 letter to Lady Beaumont, he speculated that he could never 'resume Poetry', having composed only a handful of unfinished verses during the decade.[3] Why this decline in poetic output? Financial distress and the trials of his son, Hartley, are often cited as sources of Coleridge's decline. Of Wordsworth, Stephen Gill has maintained that 'One need not subscribe to "Romantic" notions about the ideal conditions for production of poetry—suffering, solitude, imaginative possession, and so on—to see that during the fifth decade of Wordsworth's life many factors were working against it [writing poetry]', including family worries, poor health, 'social life' and 'enjoyment of fame'.[4] As Peter Manning has pointed out, records from the sales of Wordsworth's poetry in the 1820s indicate that the poet's readership was limited, as were the financial returns on his time-consuming efforts to find a publisher for his *Collected Works*.[5] Though his reputation was well-established, his *Ecclesiastical Sonnets* received largely negative reviews, and the poet was distressed by how long it took his volumes to sell out and how little he profited by them.

Whatever the reason for the dormancy of their muses in the early 1820s, the *Keepsake* revived both poets. It loosened the grip of the Romantic ideology, massaged their egos, and paid them handsomely for their troubles. Manning demonstrates that writing for the *Keepsake* promised Wordsworth two things he dearly desired: a wide readership and financial rewards. Coleridge was similarly invigorated by writing for the annuals, particularly by the promise of a wide readership. In an essay on Coleridge's giftbook contributions, Morton D. Paley recalls that in 1829, a downcast Samuel Taylor Coleridge was eager for both money and public exposure. Although Coleridge shared Wordsworth's quintessentially Romantic anxieties about pricing and selling poetry, dealing with the annuals gave him (Paley writes) 'a much-needed connection with a readership who knew him through some of his earlier works' and brought out interests that Coleridge shared with the 1829 reading public.[6]

Wordsworth and Coleridge's most provocative contributions to the 1829 volume, 'The Triad' and 'The Garden of Boccacio', offer interesting insights into how those poets participated in the giftbook's sentimentality and gendered ideals of physical and spiritual beauty. On the subject of gender and the annuals, Anne Mellor notes that annuals like the *Keepsake*, marketed primarily to women, 'systematically constructed through word and picture the hegemonic ideal of feminine beauty', which treated women as 'specular' objects of a masculine gaze.[7] Wordsworth in particular participates enthusiastically in the construction of this ideal; his 'The Triad' is a carefully crafted poeticisation of the giftbook's trade in feminine beauty. The *Keepsake* also traded on the idealisation of gift-giving, and Coleridge's 'The Garden of Boccacio' is a sentimental celebration of a friendship's offering—an offering made by a woman and, in the giftbook

context, marked as characteristically, admirably *feminine*. Both of these poems draw upon the standard tropes and emotional affectations of sentimentalism, popularised by writers like L.E.L. and Hemans, and essential to the giftbook's articulation of beauty. In short, reading 'The Triad' and 'Boccacio' in context, we might conclude that Wordsworth and Coleridge are not so much reformed Romantics as they are *de facto* sentimental poets, comfortably at work within the conventions of the giftbook.

I

Beauty, gendered female and offered up for admiration and possession, is a preoccupation of the 1829 *Keepsake* and is the subject of William Wordsworth's 'own favourites' among his poetical contributions, 'The Triad' (*Keepsake*, pp. 72–78). Although Wordsworth had been ambivalent about publishing his work in such an overtly materialistic and stylised medium, and he was later to forswear the annuals as 'degrading to the Muses', it is clear that he took seriously and enjoyed the task of composing poems for the 1829 *Keepsake*. He believed that his poems 'The Wishing Gate' and 'The Country Girl' had 'merit', and asserted in a letter to Reynolds 'I will tell you frankly—I can write nothing better than a great part of "The Triad"—whether it be for your purpose or no'.[8] 'The Triad' unquestionably serves the ideological purposes of the *Keepsake* well, as the poet no doubt knew. And even if Wordsworth remained somewhat anxious about being associated with the annuals, his 'Triad' betrays his elective affinities for the annual's gender ideology.

Wordsworth's 'triad' consists of three idealised women, whom the poet presents to an imagined suitor. To Isabella Fenwick, Wordsworth identified the women as Edith Southey, Dora Wordsworth, and Sara Coleridge—daughters of the Lake Poets—and each recognised the poem as a tribute to her. The poem, a desultory ode with pastoral effects, begins with a challenge and a proclamation, in which Wordsworth as bard and matchmaker declares domestic England to be the source of ideal female beauty. 'Show me the noblest Youth of present time', he cries, 'And I will mate and match him blissfully':

> I will not fetch a Naiad from a flood
> Pure as herself—(song lacks not mightier power)
> Nor leaf-crowned Dryad from a pathless wood,
> Nor Sea-nymph, glistening from her coral bower;
> Mere Mortals, bodied forth in vision still,
> Shall with Mount Ida's triple lustre fill
> The chaster coverts of a British hill. (ll. 7–14)

The aging patriarch of 'The Triad' will proudly put modesty and femininity on display, will prostitute the private virtues of their female subjects—a paradox that in Wordsworth's poem deconstructs in such slippery lines as the 'chaster coverts of a British hill'. Wordsworth's immodest display of these women takes place, ostensibly, in seclusion, among 'coverts' suitably chaste for the unveiling

of such virtue. This is a private screening for the imagined suitor. But Wordsworth's coverts are located, ironically, on a hillside, specifically a 'British' hill—a British mount Olympus that lifts up these paragons of virtue for the approving gaze of good British subjects. And do not we, the readers of the *Keepsake*, stand by the suitor? And does not this poetical display have a particularly immodest forum, the scarlet red giftbook?[9] Wordsworth admires these daughters' modest, domestic, peculiarly English beauty—so much that he will show it off, wager us that it is matchless, tempt us to purchase it.

Wordsworth goes on to command a processional of his English domestic goddesses, led by the 'handmaid lowly' Edith Southey (l. 61), and to delineate their desirable qualities—Dora's 'smiles and dimples' (l. 138) for example, and the 'azure field' of Sara's eyes (l. 193). The *Keepsake* does the same with its illustrations, or 'embellishments', parading female beauties before the gaze of English consumers. Examining giftbook representations of women in her biography of Letitia Landon, Glennis Stephenson notes three principal character types—the mother, the young woman displaying her 'elegant accomplishments', and the woman as sovereign England—and maintains that each served to delineate a 'female domestic ideal'.[10] Stephenson's reading is certainly borne out by 'The Triad' and the *Keepsake*. Potential buyers and readers of the 1829 *Keepsake* opened their book to a portrait of the elegant Mrs Peel, wife of the famed English public man, and could page through a series of embellishments featuring delicate and submissive women and rosy-cheeked young ladies, not unlike the women of 'The Triad'.[11] This imagery was intended to define what a woman could/should be; delicate physical traits and demure posture were the idealised features of ladies who occupied, in Wordsworth's words, 'earth's proudest throne […] an unambitious hearth' (ll. 52, 54). Young female readers of the *Keepsake*, in their mid-twenties like Wordsworth's triad, were invited to emulate such English treasures, and engraved copies of favourites could be purchased separately for a few pence.[12] Not unlike the 'noblest youth' in 'The Triad', young men who bought the *Keepsake* for their sweethearts (one recalls the pitiful Mr Ned Plymdale in Eliot's *Middlemarch*) were encouraged to invest a 'hegemonic ideal' of female beauty—the beauties of the book being a tribute to those of the love object. Wordsworth's poem, in short, perfectly mirrors the culture/economy in which the poet writes. The poem is 'about' its context.

Not least among the *Keepsake*'s feminine treasures is Wordsworth's portrait of Dora—the brightest and most impassioned among his flattering tributes to the three daughters. The lines could easily be a précis or a caption for one of the *Keepsake*'s embellishments, and the diction and tropes are strikingly similar to those we find in Letitia Landon's portraits. Indeed, a comparison of the Dora text with one of Landon's portraits from the 1829 *Keepsake* makes a strong case for reading Wordsworth as a quintessentially *sentimental* contributor. The following quatrain from 'The Triad' calls out for such a comparison:

She bears the stringed lute of old romance,
That cheered the trellised arbour's privacy,
And soothed war-wearied knights in raftered hall.
How vivid, yet how delicate, her glee!

In the giftbook context, Dora is a character type—the female poetess of 'old romance', so called. By invoking 'old romance', Wordsworth locates his passage in a contemporary poetical discourse that had been developed largely by sentimental poets, Landon in particular, in giftbooks and volumes of poetry like *The Golden Violet, with its Tales of Romance and Chivalry*.

Dora's 'stringed lute', her 'glowing cheek', and soothing songs belong to the conventional imagery of this discourse, which is essential to the literature and engravings in the annuals. Witness Landon's lines to a portrait of Georgina, Duchess of Bedford (*Keepsake*, p. 121), in which the poet contends that Georgina's 'stately beauty' would have been better appreciated had she lived in 'that old haunted time,/ When sovereign beauty was a thing sublime,/ For which knights went to battle, and her glove/ Had more of glory than of love' (ll. 9–12). Landon's 'haunted time', like Wordsworth's 'old romance', is a sentimental space that serves primarily as a stage for the exhibition of nostalgia, and Georgina's 'glove', like Dora's 'glowing cheek', signifies beauty as the *Keepsake* defined it—feminine, physical, 'superficial' in the literal sense of the word. But it becomes increasingly clear as Landon's poem proceeds that she does not treasure this beauty or feel this nostalgia, in striking contrast with Wordsworth, for whom Dora's cheek and 'old romance' seem genuinely attractive. Landon goes on to write that in the 'Present'—by which she means the present age and the present book—the 'colour'd words' of poetry have little to do with beauty; they are distilled from the 'vague imagination' of poets with only a pretended knowledge of and investment in beauty (ll. 19–30). Momentarily disillusioned with writing for giftbooks, Landon calls attention to the artificiality of her work, and thus to the affectations of the *Keepsake*. Landon's disillusionment contrasts sharply with Wordsworth's obvious pleasure in portraying Dora. Contrary to what we might expect, Landon's is the more *Romantic* work—she ends her poem in a Keatsian mode, enervated, self-conscious, and 'wordless' (l. 30) before her subject. The poem seems out of place in a book of beauty, while Wordsworth's ode, overtly stylised and secure in its pronouncements on beauty, is an integral part of the book's ideological project.[13]

For Wordsworth, new to the giftbook market, writing about 'old romance' and feminine beauty is stimulating. More to the point, writing about his daughter (like writing for the giftbook) is a deeply sentimental act. In fact, his revisions of the Dora section show us that his attachments to the daughter complement his commitments to the giftbook's ideological designs. Wordsworth sent at least two versions of the poem to Dora before its publication, including a series of additions and revisions copied into a March 1828 letter to her.[14] He must have been especially attached to these lines, as to his daughter. In addi-

tion to metrical improvements and meticulous changes in diction and imagery, Wordsworth radically altered his representation of Dora's character. Take the following examples from the end of the Dora section, in which Wordsworth has suggested that when 'manners' and 'tutored elegance' fail Dora, her natural charm compensates. After the lines 'But her blushes are joy-flushes/ And the fault (if fault it be)':

> Only ministers to quicken
> Sallies of instinctive wit;
> Unchecked in laughter-loving gaiety,
> In all the motions of her spirit, free.
> ***
> Only ministers to quicken
> Laughter-loving gaiety
> And kindle sportive wit—
> Leaving this Daughter of the mountains free. (ll. 166–69)

Dora's 'sallies of instinctive wit', too saucy and strong for a properly charming girl, become the more playful and harmless 'sportive wit'. Her 'gaiety' is 'quicken[ed]' by her faux pas in the revised version, for never would she or Wordsworth allow it to blossom 'unchecked', as in the first. Generally, the language of the second passage is more sensitive to Wordsworth's feminine ideal than the first, and the syntax of the revised version is simpler and less stilted. The made-over Dora is lively but not unfeminine. Worthy of a floral crown of 'Idalian rose', she will choose instead a display of natural piety—'one wildfloweret' adorns her virgin 'bosom' (ll. 114–18). Moreover, she has become a 'Daughter', a change that doubtless came from Wordsworth's heart. The portrait has Wordsworth's touch, but his touch—prompted by sentimental attachment to his subject as well as by his ideological designs—makes the portrait even more suitable for the *Keepsake*. 'Dora' in 'The Triad' is not only a tribute to Wordsworth's daughter and to his affection for her, but is also an allegory for the (female) reader's benefit.

Wordsworth laboured intensely over these lines to Dora and over 'The Triad' generally. And his labour found its reward not only in the handsome sums paid by Heath, but in the poet's successful crafting of a giftbook ode without really losing himself. Several years later, Wordsworth, again in a paternal mode, was to advise the aspiring female poet Maria Jane Jewsbury to 'let the Annuals pay—and with whomsoever you deal make hard bargains'.[15] Thus, money would compensate the poet for compromises in her integrity and, ironically, for any Romantic anxiety she might feel about publicly associating with moneyed matters. But in 1829, Wordsworth has not really compromised himself, even if he has his Romantic perspectives on poetry and money. In 'The Triad', his shared interests with the annuals are more apparent than his anxieties. His ode is stylistically and ideologically suitable to him and to a book of beauty.

II

If Wordsworth is familiarly patriarchal in his 'Triad', Coleridge is just as familiarly despondent and needy in his most outstanding contribution to the 1829 *Keepsake*, his 'Garden of Boccacio' (pp. 282–85), a poem which he wrote to accompany an engraving after Thomas Stothard's 'Boccacio's Garden'. Just as Wordsworth discovered a personal affinity for the annual's gender ideology, Coleridge was to find its idealisation of 'gift giving' especially attractive. Indeed, 'The Garden of Boccacio' is essentially *about* the culture of 'giving' that the giftbook's purchasers and readers engaged in. Specifically, 'The Garden of Boccacio' describes the giving of a beautiful gift, a poet's subsequent encounter with the beautiful, and how objects like the *Keepsake* invite such encounters.

In the first stanza of the poem, Coleridge records how he came across this engraving. Finding the poet in a 'dreary mood', his 'Friend' Anne Gillman places before him an 'exquisite design' that lifts his spirits (ll. 3–14). Drawing on biographical evidence, Paley elucidates Coleridge's poetical account, demonstrating that Gillman approached Coleridge on Reynolds' behalf, to solicit a poem to accompany the engraving for the *Keepsake*. In essence, Paley writes, Gillman's gesture was 'an invitation to a commercial transaction'.[16] But in context, commercial act and charitable act, commercial motive and charitable motive, are indistinguishable. Coleridge was staying with the Gillmans while he attempted to wean himself from opium, and his letters demonstrate that he secretly used the very money he received for his *Keepsake* contributions to pay off recent debts to an apothecary.[17] He needed the money—but he also longed for Gillman's companionship. We might cynically label Gillman Reynold's proxy or Coleridge's unwitting enabler, but Coleridge believed that his friend had ministered to him. In the spirit of the *gift* in 'giftbook', we might instead assume that Gillman was motivated by her genuine desire to retrieve her friend from a self-inflicted depression. Coleridge's poem maintains that by offering him the Stothard engraving, Gillman lured him away from his self-pity and invited him to imaginative productivity. Her 'invitation to a commercial transaction' either was or effectively became an act of grace and sympathy.

In essence, Gillman's gesture and Coleridge's reaction mirror the giving and receiving of an annual. Just as her invitation to commerce is Coleridge's means to beautiful experience, so the *Keepsake* reader can experience the beautiful by virtue of a friend's generous expenditures. Let us imagine that we have come across the following stanza beside the exquisite steel engraving 'The Garden of Boccacio' in the *Keepsake*. We received this book for Christmas, from a dear friend, perhaps a lover. The poem and engraving are near the end of the volume, so we have probably read through Wordsworth's 'The Triad' and pored over several Italian vistas. We read the following lines:

> Of late, in one of those most weary hours,
> When life seems emptied of all genial powers,
> A dreary mood, which he who ne'er has known

May bless his happy lot, I sate alone;
And, from the numbing spell to win relief,
Call'd on the Past for thought of glee or grief.
In vain! bereft alike of grief and glee,
I sate and cow'r'd o'er my own vacancy!
And as I watch'd the dull continuous ache,
Which, all else slumb'ring, seem'd alone to wake;
O Friend! long wont to notice yet conceal,
And soothe by silence what words cannot heal,
I but half saw that quiet hand of thine
Place on my desk this exquisite design.
Boccaccio's Garden and its faery,
The love, the joyaunce, and the gallantry!
An Idyll, with Boccaccio's spirit warm,
Framed in the silent poesy of form. (ll. 1–18)

Coleridge assumes that we giftbook readers have experienced *Weltschmerz*, if not personally then vicariously in our literary pursuits, and that we can therefore sympathise with the self-indulgent watch he keeps. But both we and the poet recognise the dangers of such narcissistic nihilism, and we welcome the friend's silent ministry. In keeping with the annual's gender ideology, Anne Gilman's friendship and its manifestations are peculiarly feminine. Perceptive but tactful, she quietly and subtly ministers to the poet's sick spirit, soothing by silence as Wordsworth's Dora soothed by song. Her friendship's offering is an 'exquisite design'—a phrase we have often seen in reference to the annuals and their embellishments. Beautiful objects generate beautiful feelings, and Gilman's gesture has its intended, peculiarly sentimental effect, as Coleridge relates: 'A tremulous warmth crept gradual o'er my chest,/ As though an infant's finger touch'd my breast' (ll. 25–26). Exquisite beauty dispels darkness even as a baby's touch compels the affections. In giving Coleridge the Stothard engraving, Gilman recognizes the value of being sentimental, as did no doubt the one who gave us the 1829 *Keepsake*.

'The Garden of Boccacio' thus opens with a celebration of gift-giving, even of *giftbook*-giving—a celebration, that is, of the *Keepsake* we now have in hand. Despondency transcended, the warmth of sentiment infused, Coleridge next enters into an imaginative reverie based on the engraving, and the lines before us supposedly represent the reverie as it happens. As Paley notes, Coleridge imagines himself a part of the fantastic scene in Boccacio's garden, and gradually 'ekphrasis is abandoned in favor of the poet's own invention'.[18] But Coleridge's 'invention'—specifically his nostalgic representation of Italy—is shaped by sentimental convention and by the expectations of his readers. Again his lines resonate with their context, demonstrating Coleridge's oneness with the *Keepsake*'s designs. Like Wordsworth's 'British hill', Coleridge's 'star-bright Italy' is a sentimental landscape. Although Coleridge's nostalgia for Florence and the Arno may derive partly from actual experience, lines like 'Fair cities,

gallant mansions, castles old' (l. 80) and 'the golden corn, the olive, and the vine' (l. 79) affect longing in the standard vocabulary of sentimental writing. The images do not so much describe 'Florence' as Coleridge felt it, as echo an idea of 'Italy' that has already been described and felt—Madame de Staël's *Corinne, ou l'Italie* (1807), for example, which had made Italy the favourite setting for women writing about a favourite subject, the intersection of poetic reverie, public display, and private sentiments.[19] Coleridge's 'Florence' is the Italian dreamland we find throughout the 1829 volume, in the 'cypress groves', 'olive thicket', and 'poplar glade' of Lord Morpeth's 'On Leaving Italy' (*Keepsake*, p. 71: ll. 7–8), and in the 'kind Italian soil' of Naples in Mary Shelley's 'Fernando Eboli' (*Keepsake*, p. 204). Coleridge's landscape is, in short, one with which readers of the *Keepsake* were intimately acquainted and to which they were ever ready to return. In a sentimental mood, Coleridge revisits the 'brightest star in star-bright Italy' and graciously gives his readers what they want.

* * * * *

As a Romantic reading of Coleridge's reverie might suggest, 'The Garden of Boccacio' is a product of emotion recollected in tranquillity. But it is, more accurately, the product of a friendship's offering, and of a powerful/empowering tradition of sentimental writing that Coleridge joins when he submits to the *Keepsake*. And like Wordsworth's 'The Triad', Coleridge's poem is the result of a contractual agreement—of an invitation to contribute (as Coleridge put it) 'a very small number of lines' in exchange for an 'attractive sum'.[20] To read 'The Garden of Boccacio' and 'The Triad' is to read the giftbook itself—its peculiar qualities and ideological designs—poetically rendered. It is also to read the passions of Wordsworth and Coleridge in 1829, neither of whom could have been better equipped, sentimentally, to write giftbook poetry. In Wordsworth, the *Keepsake* finds an enthusiastic advocate for trade in feminine beauty, and 'The Triad' (disturbingly) makes poetry of that trade. If 'The Triad' is a brazen book of beauty, 'The Garden of Boccacio' is a friendship's offering, with its quieter implications for the giftbook's gender ideology and its gracious work within the traditions of sentimentalism. Moreover, in Coleridge's poem, as in the experience it records and in the annual itself, the union of commerce, compassion, and creativity is successfully negotiated. In sum, the 1829 *Keepsake* does more than offer us revised Romanticism. It shows us Wordsworth and Coleridge at one with their market, restored to productivity not only by the promise of ample return for their labours but by the giftbook's aesthetic, so fully realised in their best contributions.

Notes

1. All references to Heath's preface, and texts of poems quoted in this essay, are taken from *The Keepsake*, ed. by Frederic Mansel Reynolds (London: Charles Heath, 1829).

2. Percy Shelley, 'Defense of Poetry', in *Shelley's Poetry and Prose*, ed. by Donald H. Reiman and Sharon B. Powers (New York: Norton, 1977), p. 503.
3. Cited in Richard Holmes, *Coleridge: Darker Reflections, 1804–1834* (New York: Pantheon, 1998), p. 552.
4. Stephen Gill, *William Wordsworth: A Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), pp. 350–51.
5. Peter Manning, 'Wordsworth in the *Keepsake*, 1829', in *Literature in the Marketplace*, ed. by John O. Jordan and Robert L. Patten (Cambridge: CUP, 1995), pp. 44–73.
6. Morton D. Paley, 'Coleridge and the Annuals', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 57 (Winter 1994), 3.
7. *Romanticism and Gender* (New York: Routledge, 1993), p. 111.
8. *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: Volume IV, The Later Years, Part 1: 1821–1828*, ed. by Ernest de Selincourt, revised by Alan G. Hill (2nd edn, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), p. 692.
9. Contemporary economic history always lies just below the surface of the *Keepsake*'s materials, as is evident in one of its unique 'embellishments', its red silk binding. Charles Heath's biographer asserts that this innovation 'was probably inspired by the well-publicised plight of the Spitalfields silk industry, which faced ruin from foreign competition'—John Heath, *The Heath Family Engravers, 1779–1878*, 2 vols (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1993), II, 55. Since 1773, the uneconomic English silk industry had been protected by the Spitalfields Act, which severely restricted silk imports and set a minimum wage for labourers. The Act was repealed in 1824 by a Tory parliament increasingly convinced of the benefits of free trade and the exclusion of government from wage arbitration. Subsequently, silk imports increased and prices dropped—a blow to labour but a boon for the middle-class consumer of luxury items. The shrewd Charles Heath capitalised on a renewed demand for silk by binding his giftbook in this rich material and dyeing it bright scarlet. Like the silk, the *Keepsake* was a luxurious bargain. For more information about the silk industry in the 1820s, see Barry J. Gordon, *Economic Doctrine and Tory Liberalism, 1824–1830* (London: Macmillan, 1979).
10. *Letitia Landon: The Woman behind L.E.L.* (Manchester: MUP, 1995), pp. 139–44.
11. The *Keepsake*'s steel-engraved portraits were of a noticeably higher quality than illustrations in giftbooks prior to Heath's. Heath was instrumental in the introduction of steel-engraving into England—initially as a means of combating a growing cottage industry: the copper-plate forgery of paper bank notes. Steel engraving produced a sharper image and a more durable plate than the more common copper engraving. Thus, as Heath demonstrated to his future clients, banks could produce high quality notes with detailed images that were difficult to imitate. And they could produce these notes in greater quantity than ever before, something devoutly to be wished in an era of speculation. Heath later saw the potential that this engraving technique held for giftbook illustration, offering crisp images in great quantity, high quality at low cost. Thus the refined and delicate copies after Turner and Reynolds that would make the *Keepsake* a prized commodity inscribed, appropriately, a technique and craftsmanship that Heath practised and perfected in the actual production of money. Money quite literally generated artifice. A detailed explanation of steel engraving and its advantages over copper is offered by Frederic W. Faxon in *Literary Annuals and Gift Books:*

A Bibliography, 1823–1832 (Pinner: Private Libraries Association, 1973), pp. 19–20. See also Heath, *Heath Family Engravers*, pp. 17–20.

12. Class, as well as gender, plays a role in this 'emulation', though a full treatment of it lies outside the scope of this essay. Many of the women portrayed in giftbooks were aristocrats, and as critic Sonia Hofkosh has noted, in purchasing an annual, middle-class consumers engaged in the semblance of aristocratic extravagance. See 'Disfiguring Economies: Mary Shelley's Short Stories' in *The Other Mary Shelley: Beyond Frankenstein*, ed. by Aubrey A. Fisch (New York: OUP, 1993), p. 203. See also Laura Mandell's discussion of the giftbooks and 'bourgeois aesthetic' in 'Hemans and the Gift-Book Aesthetic', *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text*, 6 (June 2001), Online: Internet [12 July 2005]: <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/romtext/articles/cc06_n01.html*>.
13. Jerome McGann offers a different perspective on Landon's lines in *The Poetics of Sensibility: A Revolution in Literary Style* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).
14. See *Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: Later Years, Part 1*, pp. 590–91.
15. *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth. Volume V: The Later Years, Part II: 1829–1834*, ed. by Ernest de Selincourt, revised by Alan G. Hill (2nd edn, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), p. 28.
16. Paley, 'Coleridge and the Annuals', p. 12.
17. The narrative of Coleridge's desperate state is poignantly implicit in letters 1639 and 1640, in particular, in *The Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Volume VI: 1826–1834*, ed. by Leslie Griggs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).
18. Paley, 'Coleridge and the Annuals', p. 14.
19. Isobel Armstrong discusses this 'movement to Italy' and its importance for women's poetry in *Victorian Poetry: Poetry, Poetics and Politics* (New York: Routledge, 1993), pp. 324–25.
20. Coleridge, *Collected Letters, Vol. VI*, p. 761.

Referring to this Article

D. Furr. 'The Perfect Match: Wordsworth's "The Triad" and Coleridge's "The Garden of Boccacio" in Context', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 15 (Winter 2005). Online: Internet (date accessed): <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/romtext/articles/rt15_n03.pdf*>.

Reviews

Patricia Comitini, *Vocational Philanthropy and British Women's Writing, 1790–1810: Wollstonecraft, More, Edgeworth, Wordsworth* (Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005), viii + 168pp. ISBN 0-754-65042-1; £42.50/$79.95 (hb).

Didactic writing seldom sets the modern pulse racing, and it is a brave critic who sets out to concentrate on literature which explicitly aims to improve the morals of its readers. From a historical distance, even the best examples of improving literature have a taint of worthiness and condescension, but throughout the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the idea that the written word could help relieve suffering, challenge ignorance and make the world a better place was firmly embedded in the social mind, and many of the most successful authors of the time operated under such philanthropic auspices.

Comitini's study argues that the turn of the century saw a shift in the British attitude towards the less fortunate members of society, and that these changes were connected to wider debates about the role of women in the public sphere. For Comitini, this discourse is firmly located within textual acts of reading and writing, and she proposes that its practitioners created an new ideology of 'vocational philanthropy' by combining principles of aesthetic discernment with a 'calling' to address social ills. This term 'vocational philanthropy' describes a mode of writing that placed middle-class women at the centre of the philanthropic movement, and which sought to shift the idea of charitable action away from economic relief and towards a discourse of moral improvement. Many women writers, so Comitini argues, presented themselves as benevolent social reformers for whom increases in literacy during the period made it possible to reach out to the working classes and inculcate good values and a better understanding of their position and duties within the hierarchy of the nation. The paradigm of 'vocational philanthropy' allows for a better understanding the 'constructedness' of that benevolence and reform, and it is through this notion that the works of Mary Wollstonecraft, Hannah More, Maria Edgeworth, and Dorothy Wordsworth are filtered.

This central thesis is compelling and well-argued, and it is set up in a fresh and lucid Introduction, complemented by an intelligent and nuanced reading of Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women* in the second chapter. Wollstonecraft's position as the often unacknowledged ideological touchstone

for moral women's writing in the early nineteenth century is convincingly established, and Comitini sets out the competing discourses of public and private spheres, gender, aesthetics, morality and instruction with precision and verve. The third chapter deals with the 'popular' tracts and tales of Hannah More and Maria Edgeworth, and the efforts of didactic writers to bring their message to bear on the lower orders—creating morally responsible individuals capable of upholding society's religious, social, and economic structure. Chapter Four reads Edgeworth's *Belinda* as a parodic refashioning of the morally dubious genre of the novel into a vehicle for middle class reform. The final chapter of the book seeks to recoup Dorothy Wordsworth's journals from the convention of the 'subverted' Romantic woman writer, labouring under her brother's shadow, and to construct instead a more complex, self-defined 'benevolent, domestic model of a womanhood who is the ideal collaborator for William' (p. 134).

The difficulty with a study of this kind is that the texts under examination are not easily subjected to the conventions of literary criticism, and as such the intention and ideology of the authors take centre stage. Comitini is understandably wary when presenting readings of literature often dismissed as ' "coercive" dogma, preaching obedience and submission' (p. 69), but too much justification means that her 'vocational philanthropy' premise is often restated, and it is not until the midpoint of the book that the first literary criticism proper appears. There is often a tension between the presentation of texts as social history and reading texts as works of art, and although the critiques of Hannah More's *Cheap Repository Tracts* and Maria Edgeworth's *Popular Tales* and *Belinda* are competent and insightful, they build only slightly on previous criticism of these writers, and of Romantic-era fiction in general. Comitini is more assured when locating non-literary texts such as *Vindication of the Rights of Women* and Wordsworth's *Grasmere Journal* within a broadly cultural materialist analysis of the historical context. Here, she argues that the primary function of these didactic works was to inculcate 'the popular acceptance of the capitalist system' (p. 79) by presenting narratives in which the stability of society is shown to be reliant on its various strata performing their roles willingly and honestly.

Vocational Philanthropy is useful and well-argued, and sets out clearly the historical context and ideological agenda of Romantic-era didactic fiction, as well as elucidating the complex relationship between the private and public spheres that women writers often had to negotiate. Though slightly less convincing when it comes to textual analysis, Comitini's book is an admirable attempt to give us a clearer understanding of a popular and powerful mode of fiction: one which had far greater cachet in its own time than ours and which deserves such unapologetic reassessment.

Tim Killick
Cardiff University

David Higgins, *Romantic Genius and the Literary Magazine: Biography, Celebrity, Politics* (London: Routledge, 2005), xii + 192pp. ISBN 0-415-33556-6; £70 (hb).

David Higgins's readable and well-researched study contributes to the project of resituating key concepts of Romantic poetics within the print culture of the period. He brings together the period's unprecedented interest in 'genius', which has been a staple of Romantic studies, and the 'uniquely important role' played by the period's literary magazines, which have only recently begun to receive serious attention in their own right, rather than as 'context'. The book begins by sketching how the discourse of genius emerged in the eighteenth century with texts such as Young's *Conjectures,* developed in German thought, was re-imported by Coleridge and others, and became central to Romantic aesthetics. But Higgins is principally interested in the next stage of the story, in which the idea of genius was popularised for the middle-class by the literary magazines. This development produced a series of apparent contradictions, causing the tensions with which this book is concerned. As the 'Romantic' idea of the author as a gifted, self-expressive creator gave way to the 'Victorian' idea of the author as a professional, socially useful sage, discussions of genius became increasingly strident and polarised. Accounts of the genius as a transcendent, spiritualised moral exemplar opposed accounts of the genius as entrammelled in local details, worldly concerns, and morally suspect habits.

The first tension the book explores is between the theory of genius as a transcendent, inspired, even quasi-divine quality (a view advanced by John Abraham Heraud in *Fraser's*), and the practice of deploying the discourse of genius in the 'debased' and professionalised periodicals and the emerging celebrity culture that they sustained. The 'myth of the Genius Author' obscured the effect of the marketplace on literature, but it also 'played an important role in the way in which that marketplace operated' (p. 8). Despite his well known disdain for periodical criticism, Higgins argues, 'Wordsworth needs *Blackwood's Magazine* to mediate his work to early nineteenth-century readers, whether he likes it or not' (p. 101).

One way in which *Blackwood's* shaped Wordsworth's reception was through a new genre of magazine writing: the literary portrait. These biographical sketches often appeared in groups, such as William Maginn's 'Gallery of Illustrious Literary Characters' which appeared in *Fraser's Magazine* between 1830 and 1836. As a genre, the biographical sketch produced a second tension: on one hand it represented genius as a spiritual property that transcended the quotidian; on the other it sought evidence of genius in quotidian details of the author's appearance, manners, and habits. John Wilson's 'Letters from the Lakes', for example, depict Wordsworth as a contemplative sage, but also represent him embedded in a traditional rural Christian community of tea-drinking, church-going, and hill-walking. As discussions of genius increasingly became

suffused with biographical detail, appreciations of great authors risked sliding into the kind of gossip that boosted magazine sales.

A third tension emerged when the magazines generalised from the habits of men of genius to the place of genius in society. On one hand, genius was understood to be inherently transgressive. Geniuses such as Burns were subject to physical or moral infirmity. They found it impossible to conform to mundane societal norms and they paid scant heed to social niceties, but only because their minds were on higher things. By comparing the representations of male and female genius in *Fraser's,* Higgins shows how the discourse of genius was gendered. There were certainly female geniuses, Letitia Landon among them, but their genius did not excuse antisocial behaviour, as it often did for their male counterparts. Working against the transgressive view of genius, an essentially conservative account linked it to Christian spirituality, domestic felicity and social virtue. This understanding included a critique of the discourse of genius for providing an excuse for indolence and immorality. Edward Lytton Bulwer argued that Walter Scott's virtuous private habits were 'one splendid refutation of the popular fallacy, that genius has of necessity vices—that its light must be meteoric—and its courses wayward and uncontrolled' (p. 82). That 'popular fallacy' was dangerous because if geniuses were not held to the same standards of conduct as other men, and did not receive recognition during their lifetimes, then the most mediocre and immoral writer could excuse himself by claiming to be an unappreciated genius. But this argument also created a problem for Bulwer. Did Scott's private life and conservative politics prove that genius was not transgressive, or that Scott was not a genius?

Chapter Five traces a related tension in William Hazlitt's thought between two views of the relationship between poetic genius and worldly power. In his famous review of Kemble's production of *Coriolanus,* Hazlitt suggested that poetry always and everywhere had a natural affinity with power, and operated on an 'anti-levelling' principle. But he argued elsewhere that poetry was inherently democratic, and had fallen in with 'Legitimacy' only as a result of specific historical circumstances. 'Hazlitt had his limitations', Higgins concludes, 'but no British writer has expressed more powerfully than him the belief that it is the duty of literature to resist compromise with power, or has faced with more courage and clear-sightedness its failures to do so' (p. 126).

Finally, Higgins turns to the career of Benjamin Robert Haydon in order to investigate the difficult relationship between genius and (self-)promotion. Haydon's career, in a memorable phrase, 'was spent trying to bully the world into accepting that he was the great artist who was to lead the "British School" ' (p. 127). His problem was that the more he trumpeted his own genius or encouraged others to do so, for example in *Annals of the Fine Arts,* the more he sounded like a quack. Haydon was set apart from other aspirants to 'genius' because even those who derided his self-promotion acknowledged his talents, and because he never allowed himself the consolations of anticipating a post-

humous reputation. Haydon kept faith that the public would recognise him as a genius in his own lifetime, given time and education. When he lost that faith his debts overwhelmed him and he killed himself. Haydon's treatment in the magazines and in graphic satires raises a question that's at the heart of this book. 'Can you promote genius without debasing it?' (p. 146).

Throughout, Higgins writes in an accessible, engaging, and direct style. He thinks that genius 'is *always* socially constructed', but it is not always clear if he thinks it was *primarily* constructed in the magazines, or whether they simply took part in a discourse that was being produced through a much wider variety of discursive and material factors. He has, however, made the case very effectively that magazines were important in shaping, mediating, and popularising Romantic conceptions of genius, and that magazine writing should hold an important place, in its own right, in scholarly debates about the history, ideology and politics of genius.

Tom Mole
McGill University

Mark Sandy, *Poetics of Self and Form in Keats and Shelley: Nietzschean Subjectivity and Genre* (Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005), 160pp. ISBN: 0-754-63579-1; £45/$89.95 (hb).

This book uses Nietzsche's writings to explore the treatment of the self as a fictional construct in the work of Keats and Shelley and, in turn, argues that both poets anticipate Nietzschean theories of subjectivity, in particular his emphasis on 'becoming' rather than 'being'. Sandy's post-structuralist approach combines theoretical sophistication with a clarity of expression that is not always to be found in this sort of criticism. A notable strength of the book is its interweaving of analysis of the poetry of Keats and Shelley, which leads to some illuminating comparisons between the two writers.

The first chapter begins with an elegantly self-reflexive account of the impact of Nietzsche on deconstructionist and New Historicist approaches to Romanticism, and goes on to consider Nietzsche's understanding of subjectivity as a succession of competing fictions. Chapter Two is the most philosophically complex, allying Keats and Shelley's prose writing on poetics and identity with Nietzsche's rejection of Kantian dualism. Sandy argues that both poets 'campaign for an aesthetic of self-revision and release of the self from such metaphysical delusion' (p. 16); the word 'campaign', here, is an example of the book's occasional tendency to make Shelley and (particularly) Keats sound more philosophically didactic than they are actually are. The following chapter looks mainly at *Alastor* and *Endymion*, examining the tension between the ideal and the real in these two poems through Nietzsche's notions of 'Apollonian individuation' and 'Dionysian universality' (p. 40). This leads into an interesting discussion

of *Lamia*, which suggests that both Lamia and Apollonius produce 'stifling and exclusive fictions' that collapse into Dionysian tragedy (p. 55).

In Chapter Four, Sandy investigates the self-consciousness about fictionality exhibited by a range of Shelley's and Keats's lyrics. There is some sensitive close reading here, but at times—for example, after an extended discussion of 'Ode to a Nightingale' (pp. 81–85)—Nietzsche is deployed without really adding anything to the analysis. The fifth chapter considers *Adonais* and *The Eve of St Mark* as 'autotelic literary structures, concerned with their own cultural legacy and critical inheritance' (p. 107), and the book ends by examining indeterminacy of meaning and identity in the *Hyperion* fragments and *The Triumph of Life*. Sandy argues, rousingly, that these texts seek to 'endow individuals with creative potentiality to attain their identities through self-invention, prefiguring Nietzsche's belief that humanity could "overcome" itself through self-creativity' (p. 123) and suggests that they encourage the active participation of their readers in this process.

This book is at times impressively sophisticated, but its lack of historicisation leads to some strange omissions and crude statements. For example, it's simply not adequate to claim, without even a reference, that the Enlightenment understood 'the self as a fixed, singular and autonomous entity' (p. vii; see also p. 8). A number of scholars (most notably the late Roy Porter) have shown that the nature of personal identity was highly contested and debated during the eighteenth century. As described by Hume in Book One of *A Treatise of Human Nature*, the self is anything but fixed: rather, it is 'nothing but a bundle or collection of different perceptions, which succeed each other with an inconceivable rapidity, and are in a perpetual flux and movement' and therefore 'the identity, which we ascribe to the mind of man, is only a *fictitious* one' (my italics). And Adam Smith, in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, presents personal identity in modern society as fundamentally intersubjective, theatrical, and fluid. While the comparison of Keats and Shelley with Nietzsche is an interesting and illuminating focus for this study, it seems perversely ahistorical almost entirely to ignore the intellectual context in which the two poets actually wrote—Hazlitt, for example, who had plenty of interesting things to say about the construction of selfhood and who (unlike Kant) undoubtedly influenced Keats's conception of poetic identity, is not mentioned at all.

It's a shame that Sandy's approach is so one-sidedly formalist because much of his analysis is acute and suggestive. This book is a valuable comparative study of Keats and Shelley, and offers useful insights into the theoretical and critical context of current Romantic studies. But what Nietzsche might have termed the 'genealogy' of personal identity is considerably more complex than Sandy acknowledges.

David Higgins
University of Chester

Notes on Contributors

Janette Currie received her PhD from the University of Stirling, where she is now Research Fellow of the AHRC-funded 'Songs of James Hogg Project' for the Stirling/South Carolina Research Edition of The Collected Works of James Hogg. Forthcoming in 2006 is James Hogg, *Contributions to Literary Annuals and Gift Books* (S/SC Research Edition). A major interest, and the subject of a previous AHRB-funded research project, is Hogg's trans-Atlanticism —see ' "A Man's a Man for a' That": Burns, Hogg, and The Liberator' and 'From Altrive to Albany: James Hogg's Transatlantic Publication' on *STAR (Scotland's Transatlantic Relations)* project at <*http://www.star.ac.uk/Archive/Publications.htm*>.

Bianca Falbo is Assistant Professor of English and Assistant Director of the College Writing Program at Lafayette College. Her scholarship focuses on the institutionalising of literacy practices since the turn of the nineteenth century in a range of cultural sites including school books, periodicals, editions of 'literary' texts, and student writing. Her articles have appeared in *Reader and Composition Studies*.

Derek Furr is Assistant Professor of English in the Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching Program, where he teaches courses in Romantic period and post-colonial literatures, and works with pre-service and in-service public schoolteachers.

David Higgins is Lecturer in English Literature at the University of Chester, and is the author of *Romantic Genius and the Literary Magazine: Biography, Celebrity, Politics* (2005—reviewed in this issue of *Romantic Textualities*); he has also published articles on Wordsworth and celebrity, Hazlitt and prize-fighting, and nineteenth-century constructions of 'race'.

Tim Killick is Postdoctoral Research Associate on the AHRC-funded *Database of Mid-Victorian Wood-Engraved Illustrations* at Cardiff University's Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research. He has published articles on the fiction of Allan Cunningham, James Hogg, and Mary Russell Mitford. Current projects

include a monograph on short fiction of the 1820s and an edition of Allan Cunningham's *Traditional Tales of the English and Scottish Peasantry*.

Tom Mole is Assistant Professor of English Literature at McGill University. He has edited one volume for the Pickering & Chatto edition *of Blackwood's Magazine, 1817–1825* (forthcoming), and has published a number of articles on Byron and celebrity. He is currently preparing a monograph entitled *Byron's Romantic Celebrity: Industrial Culture and the Hermeneutic of Intimacy*, to be published by Palgrave.

Instructions for Authors

Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840 is only as substantial as the material it attracts: therefore, we more than welcome any contributions that members of the academic community might wish to make. Articles and reports we would be most interested in publishing include those addressing Romantic literary studies with an especial slant on book history, textual and bibliographical studies, the literary marketplace and the publishing world, and so forth.

Contributors should note that material submitted to the journal should represent original work previously unpublished elsewhere, and must not be submitted elsewhere for publication while under consideration by *Romantic Textualities*. Material can be submitted in either print (3 copies, single sided) or electronic versions, and should be double spaced; any of the usual electronic formats (e.g. RTF, Microsoft Word, WordPerfect, HTML) are acceptable. Authors will be contacted about editorial decisions by Anthony Mandal. The final, revised version of an accepted manuscript must adhere to the MHRA style. Authors are advised to consult both previous issues of the journal for examples and the MHRA style guide, which is available online *@ http://www.mhra.org.uk/Publications/Books/StyleGuide/download.shtml*.

Articles: All article submissions are subject to the normal process of anonymous peer review; authors are advised to put include their names and contact details on separate cover sheets attached to copies of their manuscripts. Papers of 5–8,000 words should be submitted in either print (3 copies) or electronic versions.

Reports: *Romantic Textualities* also publishes reports on individual/group projects, along with accompanying bibliographic (or similar) material, in order to publicise and disseminate relevant research in the discipline. Reports are generally *not* subject to peer review, but their suitability for publication will be assessed by the Editors and Chair of Advisory Editors. Reports can take a variety of formats, and the final presentation of material is usually a result of discussions between authors and editors.

Article/report submissions should be sent to Dr Anthony Mandal, Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research, ENCAP, Cardiff University, Humanties Building, Colum Drive, Cardiff CF10 3EU. Wales (UK), *mandal@cardiff.ac.uk*.

Book Reviews: Communications regarding reviews should be addressed to Dr Tim Killick (at the same address), *killickpt@cardiff.ac.uk*.

Proofs will be sent to authors if the production cycle of the journal allows sufficient time; in the first instance, these will be in the form of electronic PDF files. They should be corrected and returned to the Editor within one week. Only minor alterations to the text will be accepted.

Copyright: It is a condition of publication that authors vest or license copyright in their articles, in the Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research (CEIR), who will then ensure full copyright protection (according to the terms of 'fair use') in disseminating materials to the widest possible audience. Of course, authors may use their article elsewhere after publication, provided that prior permission is obtainted from CEIR. Authors are themselves responsible for obtaining permission to cite/reproduce copyright material from other sources.