Romantic Textualities

LITERATURE AND PRINT CULTURE, 1780–1840

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

Issue 17

(Summer 2007)

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*, 17 (Summer 2007). Online: Internet (date accessed): <*www.cf.ac.uk/encap/romtext/issues/rt17.pdf*>.**

Published by the Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research, Cardiff University.
Typeset in Adobe Garamond Pro 11 / 12.5, using Adobe InDesign CS3; images and illustrations prepared using Adobe Illustrator CS3 and Adobe PhotoShop CS3; final output rendered with Adobe Acrobat 8 Professional.

Aims and Scope: Formerly *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text* (1997–2005), *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840* is an online 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 17 SUMMER 2007

Editorial

Anthony Mandal

Following a slight delay, Issue 17 of *Romantic Textualities* effectively marks the tenth year of the journal, since its original publication under the title *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text* in 1997. Since its relaunch as *Romantic Textualities* in 2005, the journal has offered a combination of peer-reviewed articles, research reports, and reviews of publications relating to Romantic-era book history, bibliography, and intertextual studies.

The present issue carries two articles and a brief report, which examine the interconnections between satire, criticism, national canons, and print culture.

In his article, David Stewart examines the liminal position occupied by the art gallery during London's great expansion at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The confusion engendered by such transitional spaces, while viewed negatively by some, were welcomed by others, such as T. G. Wainewright, who saw the liberating potential in this confusion. Now remembered as a poisoner and forger, Wainewright was nevertheless an illuminating commentator on the ways in which art was consumed during this period. Stewart traces an analogous movement in the rise of the similarly hybrid form of the metropolitan periodical press. Writing within this matrix of indeterminacy, Wainewright articulated the interdependency between the aesthetic and the metropolitan.

Lisa M. Wilson's essay provides an analysis of the extensive female participation in Romantic-era satirical fiction. Challenging the conventional account of satire as a male-inflected genre, Wilson draws attention to various complicating factors in the gender-and-genre debates of the period. The article posits that women's narrative satire appeared less subversive to contemporary readers, despite being fare more direct and open than hitherto conjectured. Following a general definition of Romantic-era satire, Wilson moves onto look more specifically at the satirical fiction of three women writers: Mrs Martin, Sarah Green, and Mary Robinson. The essay concludes with two extensive checklists of satirical fiction from the Romantic period.

Anne MacCarthy's brief report on the Cork writer Edward Walsh supplies an account of the current state of editorial practice regarding Walsh's neglected writings. In examining the history of Walsh's textual fortunes, MacCarthy argues that the absence of a comprehensive commercial edition of Walsh's writings marks a significant gap in the canon of Anglo-Irish writing.

The issue concludes with reviews of four recent explorations of Romantic era literature, intermediality, and material cultures. The books under review attempt to negotiate the various interstices between a variety of cultural dynamics: art and empire; narrative and revolution; religion and Romanticism; Coleridgean aesthetics and recent literary theory. In each of these studies, new approaches to lingering questions about the period are applied through a sustained engagement with the history of Romantic-era print culture.

We hope that the relaunched version of the journal continues to meet its aims successfully and that the material so far published will inspire scholars to contribute: *Romantic Textualities* is only as substantial as the material it attracts, and we welcome any contributions that members of the academic community might wish to make.

T. G. Wainewright's Art Criticism and Metropolitan Magazine Style

David Stewart

The early decades of the nineteenth century are coming to be recognised as a peculiarly uncertain time, socially, culturally, and artistically. London is centrally important to this understanding: the rapidly expanding metropolis, bigger than any city had been before, was the site of a new sense of cultural and social flux, which proved at once vibrant and disorientating.[1] The expanded audience for art that was traditionally the domain of the upper classes alone made it difficult in the urban environment to maintain the distinction between the aesthetic realm and the confusing mass of metropolitan sights and sounds. Certain forms of artistic representation crystallised this sense of uncertainty. The art gallery was a social space devoted at once to high art, yet unnervingly continuous with the spectacular, ephemeral entertainments on show throughout the city. This provoked adverse comment by many—art was being debased by its audience—but other writers sensed a liberating force in the very confusion they recognised. Thomas Griffiths Wainewright, though best remembered as a poisoner and a forger,[2] both exhibited his art in the city and acted as art critic for the *London Magazine*, and his criticism offers a unique insight into the way art was consumed in the period. Periodical publications, particularly the new literary magazines, were, like the galleries, intriguingly poised between audiences and their different modes of consumption. Wainewright's accounts of visiting the popular galleries take advantage of the interstitial nature of both of these forms; his art criticism, rather than trying to create a separate sphere for the aesthetic, recognises that for both magazines and art galleries in the 1810s and '20s, the aesthetic is always part of the metropolitan atmosphere. Wainewright and others like him recognised the confusing, indistinct nature of modern social, cultural, and intellectual life, but rather than trying to preserve distinctions (whether between classes or between artistic forms), they created a form of writing capable of celebrating metropolitan heterogeneity.

Art and the City's Shows

London in the early nineteenth century was expanding at an unprecedented rate, and, with the defeat of Napoleon in 1815, it became the central city of a

newly dominant British Empire. The city was a source of national pride, but it was also recognised as the site of a newly confusing social scene. Some excellent recent work has drawn out some of the aesthetic, political, and literary implications of the rise of a new social class, the indeterminate class defined by Marjorie Levinson as occupying a 'neither/nor' social position.[3] Gregory Dart has drawn attention to the fact that this class and the reactions it provoked was a London phenomenon:

> [With] the decline of artisanship and the rise of new forms of communication, commerce and bureaucracy, an entirely new species of worker comes into being, what we might call the semi-professional class. It comprised a heterogeneous assortment of people, taking in clerks, trainee lawyers and industrial apprentices on the one hand, and shopkeepers and craftsmen on the other. What bound them together was the fact that they were all, in their different ways, difficult to place within traditional (that is, eighteenth-century) categories.[4]

What Dart recognises is not simply that there was a newly mobile social class with aspirations towards the pursuits and the lifestyle of a higher class, but that this new class was interstitial, uncertainly placed, difficult to identify. As the people Dart describes flooded into the city, it became apparent that the old class categories no longer applied: aspirational cockneys prompted ambivalent responses because it was so difficult to tell if they were high or low, if they were vulgarly pretentious or dandies with a taste for low life.

The periodical in the 1820s which sold itself to this class better than any other was Henry Colburn's *New Monthly Magazine*. Aimed at an audience of middle-class women, men, and their families, it caught the desire for respectability, gentle humour, and pleasant poetry in the emergent middle classes and soon achieved a high circulation. An article by Thomas Colley Grattan captured some of the continuing sense of instability that the existence of this class and their entertainments, including widely affordable periodicals like the *New Monthly*, produced. The piece offers itself as the account of a Londoner returning to his native city after seven years' absence, surprised to be rudely treated by a housekeeper:

> I was sadly puzzled to know the meaning of his housekeeper's want of ceremony. I looked at myself right and left, saw that my coat was good, a watch in my fob, and various other indications of gentility, all as they should be;—but my English readers will scarcely credit, that it was three hours afterwards before sundry such receptions reminded me that a single knock at the door was an official announcement that the hand which struck it was plebeian; and that all ranks are now-a-days dressed so much alike, that the man who has not the dandy knack for tying his cravat, may vainly hope to escape being occasionally confounded with his servant.[5]

'Gentility' has been reduced to a system of signs, which is why a gentleman might be 'confounded with his servant', and the class to which the *New Monthly* was directed was peculiarly sensitive to the possibility of such mistakes. Grattan makes light of the potential for social confusion, but the possibility of getting it wrong was forcibly felt in the period. The city was making differentiation worryingly uncertain.

Richard Altick in *The Shows of London* provides an important account of how social confusion began to affect the consumption of art. Discussing the exhibition of Wilkie's *Chelsea Pensioners Receiving the Gazette Announcing the Battle of Waterloo* at Somerset House in 1822, Altick notes how the audience for art had expanded: 'attracted by the subject, men and women representing all but the lowest walks of life, including the very classes whom the shilling admission charge had originally been designed to exclude, crowded Somerset House day after day'. This prompted adverse comment, even dismay at 'the intrusion of anonymous visitors without social credentials'.[6] Art was being democratised. William Galperin has shown how the visual nature of new nineteenth-century art forms such as the panoramas and dioramas—forms aimed deliberately at a wide range of social groups—haunted Romantic art with alternative ideas of consumption.[7] Fine art exhibitions were, it was feared, just one more show for the metropolitan crowd, and it was difficult to say what distinguished gazing at the latest pictures from gazing at the glittering shop fronts. Anna Jameson complained of

> the loiterers and loungers, the vulgar starers, the gaping idlers, we used to meet there—people, who, instead of moving among the wonders and beauties [...] with reverence and gratitude, strutted about as if they had a right to be there; talking, flirting; touching the ornaments—and even the pictures![8]

The social make-up of London, the uncertain composition of the audience for art, was at the centre of this concern: would readers *read*, would audiences appreciate, or unthinkingly consume? The traditional audience for art was still there, but the fear was that it, along with art itself, would be swallowed up by the expanding crowd, and that artists and artworks would start to be shaped by the habits of the new audience. Lucy Newlyn has shown how the anxiety over reading audiences and how they read was frequently phrased in terms that were 'culinary and appetitive, frequently combining metaphors of chopping up, recycling, and rendering down with ideas of hunger and lack of refinement'.[9] Works of art had become objects to be consumed, used, and thrown away—ephemeral entertainments for the vast metropolitan crowd. Benjamin Haydon asked 'is it not a disgrace to this country that the leading historical painters should be obliged to exhibit their works like wild beasts, and advertise them like quack doctors!'[10] An attempt to retain a clear distinction between the aesthetic sphere and the mountebank shows of the metropolis was threatened by this kind of uncertainty.

Other literary forms, however, found this social and aesthetic confusion liberating rather than oppressive. Gregory Dart has shown how important 'a certain degree of indeterminacy, even vagueness' is to Pierce Egan's immensely popular *Life in London*,[11] and part of the appeal of that book is that it provides a key to the different social codes, the languages of slang, dress, and manners that defined each class.[12] The novel is an eloquent expression of the joys of cultural confusion: the life of London consists, Egan suggests, not in experiencing high or low life alone, but in mingling with all shades of the social spectrum. Egan recognises that his book will find a home across a range of social groups: 'my readers of the higher class of society may feel, or seem to think, that I have introduced a little too much of the *slang*; but I am anxious to render myself perfectly intelligible to all parties. Half of the world are *up* to it: and it is my intention to make the other half *down* to it'.[13] Egan's readers are inducted into worlds which seem to exclude outsiders who do not speak the language of 'the fancy' or of the opera house by a wealth of footnotes explaining the latest fashionable slang terms, and this extends across the social spectrum. Those of the 'higher class of society' should know the slang of the boxing ring; those lower should know the codes of the fashionable drawing rooms.

Egan takes his heroes to the Cock Pits, the opera house, and even for a 'lounge' at the Royal Academy's Exhibition (*LL*, 32). The 'life' of London is various, unceasing, and socially diverse; and in this atmosphere the hero, Corinthian Tom, finds 'his mind so overwhelmed with passing subjects, that reflection was quite out of the question' (*LL*, 44). The 'rapid succession' leaves him unable to think of the 'merits or demerits' of the shows he attends (*LL*, 88): the metropolitan mind gazes, but does not digest what it gazes upon, whether it is an ephemeral entertainment or a Gainsborough at the exhibition. This epitomises a concern Wordsworth raised in 1807: 'these people in the senseless hurry of their idle lives do not *read* books, they merely snatch a glance at them that they may talk about them'.[14] By placing so many diverse entertainments within the reach, geographically and financially, of such a wide social spectrum, the metropolis produced a miscellaneous but uncomprehending mode of consumption that was applied to books and paintings as well as less elevated shows. Thomas Love Peacock expresses the anxiety raised by these flashy metropolitan modes of consumption when comparing modern periodicals with those of the previous century:

> The stream of knowledge seems spread over a wider superficies, but what it has gained in breadth it has lost in depth. There is more dictionary learning, more scientific smattering, more of that kind of knowledge which is calculated for shew in general society, to produce a brilliant impression on the passing hour of literature, and less, far less, of that solid and laborious research which builds up in the silence of the closet, and in the disregard of perishable fashions of mind, the strong and permanent structure of history and philosophy.[15]

Periodical productions partake of this malaise. By offering surveys of the intellectual life of the country in condensed weekly, monthly, or quarterly form, periodicals produced, contemporaries feared, a new type of reader, one who could give the impression of being well read without doing the hard work. This is not simply a concern about intellectual laziness, but a concern about social definition. A wide and comprehensive knowledge of Greek, Latin, French, German, and English texts suggests not simply a fastidious and intellectually curious mind, but membership of a class that has the leisure to read deeply and widely, a class of whom a classical education is expected. In a metropolitan social world where individuals are increasingly difficult to place, knowledge became an important tool of categorisation.

Francis Jeffrey was more lenient on contemporary readers:

> It is easy, indeed, to say, that the age has become frivolous and impatient of labour […] to us, the phenomenon, in so far as we are inclined to admit its existence, has always appeared to arise from the great multiplication of the branches of liberal study, and from the more extensive diffusion of knowledge among the body of the people.[16]

In an age when there is so much to read, the areas of study that require the greatest application and dedication (Jeffrey is reviewing an edition of Dugald Stewart's *Philosophical Essays*) are neglected in favour of miscellaneous knowledge. For Peacock, this diffusion leads to superficial knowledge, designed for show, and Jeffrey is inclined to agree:

> So many easy and pleasant elementary books,—such tempting summaries, abstracts and tables,—such beautiful engravings, and ingenious charts and *coups d'oeil* of information,—so many museums, exhibitions and collections, meet us at every corner,—and so much amusing and provoking talk in every party, that a taste for miscellaneous and imperfect knowledge is formed, almost before we are aware, and our time and curiosity is irrevocably devoted to a sort of Enyclopedical trifling.[17]

Jeffrey recognises that this is part of the metropolitan experience (entertainments are found at 'every corner') and that such an experience accommodates legitimate forms of knowledge as well as the dubious 'summaries'. Reviewing Thomas Campbell's seven-volume *Specimens of the British Poets*, a 'collection' of poetry, Jeffrey exempts it from the defects to which the genre is liable. Campbell

> sets before us, in a great gallery of pictures, the whole course and history of the art [of poetry], from its first rude and infant beginnings, to its maturity, and perhaps its decline. While it has all the grandeur and instruction that belongs to such a gallery, it is free from the perplexity and distraction which is generally complained of in such exhibitions; as each piece is necessarily considered sepa-

> rately and in succession, and the mind cannot wander, like the eye, through the splendid labyrinth in which it is enchanted.[18]

Jeffrey's sense of the literary 'gallery of pictures' posits an ordered reading experience, necessary, as he recognises, to overcome the 'great multiplication' that marked modernity. Jeffrey argues that Campbell's *Specimens* prevent spectacular, disordered reading (the 'glance' that provoked Wordsworth) by training its readers in what is best, and, by means of his introductory essays to each poet and the sense he gives of a coherent literary history (the 'wonderful progress […] and history of the art'), a sense of what to read and how to read it. Yet, 'Encyclopaedic trifling' remains a threatening aspect of contemporary culture. The 'gallery' of poets, presented in printed form, is set above the 'tempting summaries' of the present age and the endless 'museums, exhibitions and collections' of the modern city: Campbell's reader will not be distracted by metropolitan amusements. For Wainewright, I will argue, the idea of the gallery functions quite differently: 'perplexity and distraction' are central to his experience of writing the city.

Magazines, Education, and the Crowd

Part of the charm of the *London Magazine* in its early years was the sense of community it fostered by means of inter-contributor banter, of which Thomas Griffiths Wainewright was one of the most adept exponents: as Joel Haefner has commented, his articles often functioned as 'advertisements for the magazine'.[19] One of the most revealing of these debates was that between the magazine's fine arts writer, Wainewright, and William Hazlitt, the drama correspondent. Wainewright had, in the persona of Janus Weathercock, been building an identity as a leisured, dandyish connoisseur through the early numbers of the magazine, and Weathercock in the June number had been irked by Hazlitt's taste for low life and plain speaking:

> Now, Mr. Drama of the London seems determined to show his readers that his stomach [is] hearty—that he can relish bread and cheese, and porter, which certainly are very fine things in the country, and—when we can get nothing else, —and so far, all this is very well. But surely, in the centre of fashion, we might be now and then indulged with more elegant fair,—something that would suit better with the diamond rings on our fingers, the Antique Cameos in our breast pins, our cambric pocket handkerchief breathing forth Attargul, our pale lemon-coloured kid gloves. —Some chicken fricaseed white for instance; a bottle of Hock, or Moselle, and a glass of Maraschino.[20]

Continuing his gentle mockery, he paints a portrait of Hazlitt:

> He affects a liking for *Tatnam*-court-road, rather than for Albemarle-street. He pretends a dislike for lords in the abstract, and would have us imagine that he preferred the noisy rebels in the gallery.

> He makes honourable mention of a certain Miss Valency, who, our hair-dresser informs us, is a bouncing Columbine at '*Ashlays* or some of *them* places.' He entertains serious thoughts of the Royal Cobourg Theatre—which we find, by reference to the picture of London, is situated in the borough of Southwark!—faugh![21]

Weathercock is an exquisite who deplores all vulgar tastes: his is a fashionableness maintained by a system of exclusions. This prompted Hazlitt to respond quietly in a *Table Talk* essay: 'to condemn because the multitude admire is as essentially vulgar as to admire because they admire'.[22] In a more immediate response to Janus Weathercock in the *London*, however, he is at once playful and cutting: 'We are never afraid of being confounded with the vulgar; nor is our time taken up in thinking of what is ungenteel, and persuading ourselves that we are mightily superior to it'.[23] Hazlitt brings out the central ambiguity of Wainewright's dandified posturing. He insists on the distinction between what is fashionable and what is vulgar because he is conscious of his own insecurity. Wainewright's posturing was convincing enough to fool Hazlitt's grandson and Wainewright's only editor:

> he is realised to me as an individual who, having had no regular literary training, takes up his pen for a time, as he might his billiard cue, dashes off an article or so, when or while he is in the humour, or a few *vers de société*, and then throws up the hobby of the hour to choose a new one.[24]

Hazlitt, rather more perceptively, identified him as a 'newspaper hack'.[25] Wainewright became notorious as a forger and a poisoner precisely because his inheritance was insufficient to support his pseudo-aristocratic lifestyle, even when supplemented by paid journalism. The dandified amateur is himself a member of that socially unfixed class that wrote for, and, one assumes, read, the *London*.

In 1823, Thomas De Quincey began a series of five 'Letters to a Young Man Whose Education Has Been Neglected' in the *London Magazine*. He sets out a rather daunting program of study aimed precisely at 'semi-professionals' without a classical education. He recognises in the articles the difficulties of reading in an age when so much printed matter is produced, and of the dangers of swift reading that aims only at the 'showy emptiness, of pretence, of noise, of words'.[26] Wainewright parodies such programs in two 'Letters from a Roué' which propose 'to enlighten you and your readers—to show you some of *our institutions*—"to give you a peep into our knowledge box"'.[27] The Roué addresses his Letters from White's and lays down the codes of dress, manners, and language appropriate to such clubs and to the society in which Roués mix. The club itself is an important signifier of exclusivity: 'I have mentioned *White's*. You must know it—but some of your readers may not. It is now the leading subscription house in St. James's-street,—the Royal Exchange of the west, where men of *birth* "do congregate"'.[28] Wainewright toys with his readers

here. De Quincey prescribes a difficult but possible course of education: the language of the classically educated gentleman can be learned. Wainewright's Roué also recognises that society creates its divisions, its stratification into high and low, by making language, dress, and social customs into a system of signs: the cockney identifies himself by not knowing when to remove his hat or how to ride to hounds. The Roué teasingly suggests that the code can be learned, while continuing to maintain that White's is open only to men of '*birth*': social distinction is part of a joke. De Quincey preserves the distinction between 'high' and 'low' entertainment, but Wainewright, I will argue, uses the magazine and its uncertain audience to destabilise the possibility of maintaining such distinctions.

Wainewright again turns educator in his art criticism for the *London*. His criticism is distinctive because it is as much concerned with the buying and selling of prints as it is with commenting on the art displayed at the latest exhibition. His articles often finished with a list of the best of the current crop of prints available at Colnaghi's, Woodburne's, and the other popular print dealers. In the October 1821 number, he first extols the virtues of Giulio Romano, then gives a list of the best prints from his paintings and where to buy them: 'The Hours leading out the Horses of the Sun; in a very high taste of poetry: famous by the criticism of Sir Joshua' is available at '2*s.* 6*d.* or 3*s.*', while 'Jupiter suckled by the Goat Amalthea, and fed with Honey by the Nymphs' is three or four shillings, but 'if you can spare the cash, I advise you to buy Bonosone's print, (without name,) taken, as I should imagine, from a drawing: you will find it at either Woodburne's or Colnaghi's, to a certainty, for 1*l.*11*s.* 6*d.* or 2*l.* 2*s.* 0*d.*'.[29] There is something disconcertingly direct in the manner in which he gives prices.[30] Art is conceived of as a reproducible commodity, desirable because it is fashionable (whether the criticism of Sir Joshua is well founded is not at issue—Wainewright admired Reynolds but preferred Fuseli—what is important is that Sir Joshua makes prints *famous*), and yet, because of the modest cost of prints, it is a pursuit available to a wide social spectrum. In response to the articles under the name of 'Cornelius Van Vinkbooms' called 'Dogmas for Dilettanti,' 'Senex' (either Wainewright himself or his *London* cohort J. H. Reynolds) poses as a provincial lover of the fine arts, and remarks that 'I read your dogmas the first among the articles in the London Magazine, and that I learn enough from them to set me up as a connossieur [*sic*]'.[31] The periodical can educate, but the dilettantes it produces are rather dubious: they only 'set themselves up' as connoisseurs. The love of art becomes a social skill, something one can develop with 'cash' and the guidance of the periodical press.

Metropolitan Form: Magazines and the Gallery

Wainewright reported on the latest exhibitions for the *London*, and he soon developed a distinctive prose method to deal with what Jeffrey called the 'perplexity and distraction which is generally complained of in such exhibitions'.

The first article, 'Sentimentality on the Fine Arts' (February 1820), is an account of an illustrated edition of Goethe's *Faustus*, and it is dull in comparison with his later work because it does not focus on the things that make metropolitan art consumption distinctive: it is contained, linear, conclusive, and without the dandified personality that Wainewright came to assume. By the end of the first volume of the magazine, however, the personality of Janus Weathercock had become so strongly defined that he seemed three-dimensional, and he frequently carried on conversations with his audience.[32] His 'Dialogue on the Exhibition at Somerset-House' does criticise the art works on show, but the type of criticism he offers is quirkily individual:

> *Jonas Wagtail*. Yes! and the flesh is in a very beautiful tone of colour,—and what a pulpy, marrowy touch he had!—but here are several more that you must see.—Here's a most capital landscape, by Constable, which deserves very great attention, and this is Fuseli's (No. 25.) Incantation, in which you will find—
>
> *Janus Weathercock*. Plenty of food for an entire day's recreation, which I intend to devote to it, and to the Cathedral scene, yonder. (No. 131.)[33]

The 'Dialogue' carries on at this pace: it marks the works worthy of attention but is at once distracted by more enticing objects and hurries on. Wainewright's digressive style exemplifies the nature of viewing in the modern metropolis. When not talking to an imagined friend, he is talking to his dog, to his editor, or, most commonly, to his reader: consuming art, he recognises, is a social activity, and the effect this has on criticism is significant.

For Wainewright, the magazine text should aspire to the condition of chit-chat. What he calls, quoting *Blackwood's Magazine*, his 'chitty-chatty and off-hand' method comes into its own at the art exhibition.[34] One of the best examples is his account of 'The British Institution' (April 1821). It begins: 'My money paid—my book bought—here goes for the "feast of Belshazzar."—Sir, you must wait a full hour—it is the fashion'. He notices painting after painting, pausing at some, dashing past others, always noting (in brackets) the number of the painting as it appeared in the catalogue. 'Now to something pleasant: give me an ounce of civet, good apothecary!' he exclaims on seeing a 'pretty fragrant Landscape by Miss Landseer', and immediately adds 'there is a Portrait next to it (11, Cupid) by Jackson', but 'I must hurry on, otherwise I would compliment more at large'. The pace is frenetic, and he stops only when he runs out of space: 'gentle reader, "my pen is at the bottom of the page," as Beppo says, and I dare be sworn thou art glad of it'.[35] What he offers is not criticism of the exhibition, but an account of the experience of attending it. No work exists in itself, but is seen as part of a show: Jackson is 'next to' Landseer, and Wainewright's account of the exhibition is linear only in the sense that it records what he sees in the order that he sees it. This is breathless, spectacular commentary, unlikely

to leave much in the memory but a sense of exhilaration: and it is wholly appropriate to the type of exhibition he is commenting on.

Fig. 1. Robert and George Cruikshank, from *Life in London* (1823)

Fig. 2. George Cruikshank, from *Comic Almanack* (1835)

Two prints by the Cruikshanks (see Figures 1 and 2) suggest the way in which viewing art had become a social spectacle, open to a wide range of social groups. The first, made for Egan's *Life in London*, shows a colourful, fashionable crowd, enjoying the latest spectacle in a louche, but orderly fashion.[36] The art

itself seems secondary to the conversations the crowd enjoy, and the presence of Egan's somewhat unreflective heroes suggests that the art on show might be consumed in a less than discriminating fashion, that the exhibition, as C. S. Matheson has argued, may have more value as a social spectacle than as an intellectual pursuit. There are elements of the 'disorientating, modernistic blurring of the senses' that Martin Myrone has identified as a feature of the nineteenth-century gallery experience,[37] but the scene retains its order by virtue of its fashionability: a black face talking to a Turk in the crowd suggests a degree of social diversity, but the wrong classes are largely kept out. A later print presents a wholly different scene of art appreciation: whereas Tom and Jerry mingled with the finely dressed, here viewing art has become the occupation of the crowd. In both pictures, paintings fill the walls, but the later picture gives a sense of the confusing, distracting inundation of objects to view. The consumers, too, are of a much more diverse social range: there are some top hats, but their owners are caricatures with none of the elegant lines of the other scene; a child gawks upwards while her father stands open-mouthed; a fat man mops a sweaty brow; an elderly woman has her toe trodden on, and members of the crowd gape at the artworks as they might the freaks at Bartholomew Fair. The emphasis is on disorder, confusion, social uncertainty; art has become wholly obscured by the behaviour of the crowd.

Hazlitt, too, had his doubts about the nature of these large exhibitions: 'it is throwing down the barriers which separate knowledge and feeling from ignorance and vulgarity, and proclaiming a Bartholomew fair show of the Fine Arts'.[38] Art, Hazlitt feared, by being viewed by this new class of consumer, would begin to reflect the confusing atmosphere of the contemporary metropolis. The art world was being transformed by the increasingly obvious presence of a new class of consumer, and it is this social mixture as much as the chaotic hanging of paintings that lies behind Wainewright's sense of riotous confusion. His account of the Exhibition of the Royal Academy has this digression:

> We are now in the great room, reader, where, if you have no objection, we will sit down behind this gay party, who seem to be dealing about their remarks as freely as you and I do. 'Whose is that?' 'Fuseli's.'—'La! What a frightful thing! I hate his fancies of fairies and spirits and nonsense. One can't understand them.' (Speak for yourself, miss!) 'It's foolish to paint things which nobody ever saw, for how is one to know whether they're right? Isn't it, Mr D——?'[39]

This seems to echo conventional condemnation of the undereducated middle classes that Cruikshank satirises, but Wainewright is not able to dismiss this type of art consumption so easily. He recognises that they give their opinions as freely as 'you and I', meaning Janus Weathercock and the gentle reader. Mr Fine Arts and his disciples may claim the superiority of their 'remarks', but

the claim is insecurely based, because the judgments of the 'gay party' and Wainewright's own take the same form: 'remarks'.

In a paper in which he gives 'Reasons against Writing an Account of "The Exhibition"' (June 1822), he notes:

> There are 1049 *works*, as they are termed, occupying in their intitulation 49 pages 4to. To give anything like an account of a quarter of these would fill three of our Magazines. Let us count the notes of admiration in our catalogue—173! too many by 100! How many double crosses?—57! Still uncompassable![40]

Vast exhibitions for vast audiences inevitably create a sense of the unmanageable, of the mind struggling to contain the totality. The dominant response is one of bewilderment prompted by endless multiplication, of too much to view and not enough time to view it all in a thoughtful manner. In a moment of humility, Wainewright confesses:

> Things that spring up under my nose dazzle me. I must look at them through Time's Telescope. Elia complains that to him the merit of a MS. poem is uncertain;—'*print*,' as he excellently says, 'settles it.'—Fifty years' toning does the same thing to a picture. It is very possible, that Sir Thomas Lawrence and Phillips, and Owen, are as good in their way as Vandyke (and they have certainly less affectation).—Wilkie may be better than Teniers, and Westall be as much the originator of a style as Correggio. I really believe our posterity will think so; but in the mean time I am dubious and uncomfortable.[41]

The compelling immediacy of the metropolitan spectacle, in which the reviewer is placed amid a mixed crowd of consumers, inevitably compromises his judgments. No-one can be sure of the value of the metropolitan aesthetic experience, but for Wainewright, this is its charm.

Wainewright frequently recognises he is given to 'skipping from one thing to another'[42]:

> In vain I resolve and resolve—*this* shall be on Mr. Angerstein's collection—*this* on Rafaëllo!—*this* on modern embellished books!—and so on. No sooner is my pen filled with ink, but my conceit (I have not the vanity to affect a fancy, much less an imagination) goes round like a whirligig, and then shoots away in the very direction it should *not*. Our dear Editor is quite accustomed to this chance-medley *method*.[43]

Wainewright invents a style that is distracted, digressive, vivid, but inconclusive. This is his characterisation of another of his journalistic personae, Egomet Bonmot:

> He is *the* strangest medley, *the* maddest wag it was ever our fate to cope withal! [...] Every thing by fits, and nothing long, he changes

> about—not with the phases of the moon, but the minutes on the clock;—and one revolving hour shall find him critic, fiddler, poet, and buffoon. *He cannot last long*. We are something like adepts in diagnostics, and repeat that he cannot last long. The *materiel* must wear out with the friction of such violent changes.[44]

Like the metropolitan spectacle he comments on, his style is ephemeral. He regrets this, but he is also unrepentant. He intends to write about art, and to write in an artistic manner (one that would assure him of permanence), but life keeps breaking in. The metropolitan world around him demands a prose style that can express the social and aesthetic bewilderment that it produces: Wainewright's style is brilliantly adapted to do this, even at the cost of his posthumous reputation.

The Roué articles, however playfully, suggest that the magazine can be socially educative, that a new form like the magazine article can impose order on a metropolitan scene that it recognises as perplexingly uncertain. In another article he voices the concerns of his age about the packaging of knowledge: 'the vital aim of a *Review* was, and is staringly obvious; viz. to furnish a little compendious way to the Stagyrite's chair, for those who lack the ability or the will (which is pretty much the same thing in effect) to travel the regular rutty road.' But, after a lengthy parenthesis on the way the public uses reviews, he returns to his original topic: 'Where was I? Oh! ah! "nature of Magazines." Yes! well,—I leave you to ponder over my query, satisfied that I have awakened you to a very weighty and necessary preliminary to improvement'.[45] Typically, he defines what he takes the nature of magazines to be by performing a definition: magazines, for Wainewright, are defined by digression, exclamation, personality-filled parentheses, incompletion. The way in which Wainewright uses art criticism in the *London* is perfectly attuned to the metropolis of the early nineteenth century. He recognises that the consumption of art is a social activity, and his idea of aesthetic value is affected by this. By refusing to distinguish art from commerce, or art from vulgar spectacle, Wainewright represents the value of art as continuous with the joys of dandyism and the excitement of the crowded and confusing exhibition. Wainewright's prose is deliberately inexact, incomplete, flashy, spectacular. It is this that ties it to its immediate circumstances, and, as he so adeptly diagnosed, has ensured that it would not '*last*', but it is this that makes it so redolent of the metropolitan scene he presents.

Wainewright and his editor John Scott colluded in an early article titled 'Janus's Jumble'. The article consists of an uninterrupted digression, and halfway through there are several rows of asterisks where Weathercock's 'Account of the Exhibition at Somerset House' should be.[46] The account appears at the end of the magazine, with a footnote suggesting that Janus had left his manuscript at the club, and that a waiter handed it in to Scott. It is a typical magazine fiction, but one that Scott as Editor pretends to find a little troubling:

> these incoherencies and chasms afflict us (the Editor) sorely. The extraordinary author has either not written, or forgotten to transmit, the continuation of his conversation with Mr. Bohté, and almost the whole of his chapter on the exhibition. We can only, therefore, make out, that the conversation in question suggested the visit to Somerset House, and that the visit to Somerset House suggested notices of the pictures,—which if we can get hold of in any decent time, shall be crammed in wherever we may be able to find room—either under the head of Fine Arts, or the more appropriate one of *Commercial Report*.

Scott recognises that Wainewright's distinctive mode of art criticism, for all its aspiration to the aesthetic realm, has as much to do with the 'Business' department of the magazine as it does with its literary and artistic reports because Wainewright refuses to distinguish between the connoisseur and other kinds of consumer.

As one of the *London*'s chief writers, Wainewright helped to define the magazine's characteristic style. His 'incoherencies and chasms', the affected dandysism, the flashy, ephemeral style contributed to an understanding of magazine writing that was eminently metropolitan. His articles, rather than educating his readers or attempting to enforce social categorisation, instead capture the indeterminate, confusing spirit of the modern city. Magazines, like the great galleries Wainewright visited, are neither high nor low, nor aimed solely at the degraded sampling of 'culture' that the semi-professional class was thought to demand, but constituted a new genre designed to reflect variety, miscellaneity. Magazines were divided into sections which appeared to categorise knowledge: the 'Theatrical Report' was distinct from the 'Fine Arts', and both were distinct from business and commerce. Yet these categories, as Scott recognised, were never wholly separate: magazines best reflected the new metropolitan experience, the defining characteristic of which was that it placed the idea of distinction under threat. Charles Lamb was the *London*'s best-paid contributor, and when the magazine's sales started to drop off, the *London's* editor turned to him for advice. Lamb responded:

> What is gone [*sic*] of the Opium Eater, where is Barry Cornwall, & above all what is become of Janus Weathercock—or by his worse name of Vink-something? He is much wanted. He was a genius of the Lond. Mag. The rest of us are single Essayists.
>
> You must recruit. You will get too serious else. Janus was characteristic. He talked about it & about it. The Lond. Mag. wants the personal note too much. Blackwd. owes everything to it.[47]

Wainewright has been forgotten as an essayist, but, as Lamb recognises, it is the prose style that he developed, rather than that of more canonical periodical writers like Lamb, Hazlitt, and De Quincey, that best defines what is modern and distinctively metropolitan about the magazines which became so popular

in the years after Waterloo. Wainewright's style, by placing the modern city within the magazine, was able to capture the vivid, fleeting nature of the experience of London in a way that proved compelling to contemporary readers. Rather than attempting to cope with the perplexing uncertainty of modern culture, Wainewright revels in its indeterminacy, creating a form of writing poised between permanence and ephemerality, the aesthetic and the crowd that consumed art, a form of writing peculiarly well adapted to reflect the culture of his time.

Notes

1. Recent work has argued for the importance of London to the emergence of Romantic literature and culture, notably Marilyn Butler's 'Hidden Metropolis: London in Sentimental and Romantic Writing', in *London World City, 1800–1840*, edited by Celina Fox (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 187–98, and *Romantic Metropolis: The Urban Scene of British Culture, 1780–1840*, edited by James Chandler and Kevin Gilmartin (Cambridge: CUP, 2005).
2. For an account of Wainewright's turbulent career as a gentleman, artist, writer, forger and poisoner, see *Essays and Criticism by Thomas Griffiths Wainewright*, edited by W. C. Hazlitt (London: Reeves & Turner, 1880), pp. ix–lxxxi and Andrew Motion's recent biography/novel, *Wainewright the Poisoner* (London: Faber & Faber, 2000). Nick Groom has recently traced the influence of Wainewright as an emblem of depraved self-indulgence and forged identity in Victorian literature—see '"I am nothing": A Typology of the Forger from Chatterton to Wilde', in *The Victorians and the Eighteenth Century: Reassessing the Tradition*, edited by Francis O'Gorman and Katherine Turner (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 203–22. Oscar Wilde's 'Pen, Pencil and Poison' has added much to Wainewright's notoriety: it is an unsurprisingly amusing take on Wainewright, though Wilde does deserve credit as one of the very few to make any comment on Wainewright's career as either critic or artist—see *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde*, edited by Vyvyan Holland (London: Collins, 1948), pp. 993–1008.
3. See Marjorie Levinson, *Keats's Life of Allegory: The Origins of a Style* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), p. 5. Richard Cronin has drawn out some of the literary implications of the awareness of this class in *The Politics of Romantic Poetry: In Search of the Pure Commonwealth* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), especially pp. 181–99.
4. Gregory Dart, '"Flash Style": Pierce Egan and Literary London, 1820–28', *History Workshop Journal*, 51 (2001), 181–25 (pp. 184–85). In an article dealing with the attacks on the 'Cockney School' that appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine*, Dart recognises that concerns about the status of writing and art were connected to the experience of the metropolis: 'concerns about the culture of the nineteenth-century city were blended with a series of anxieties about modern journalism'—see 'The Cockney Moment', *Cambridge Quarterly*, 32.3 (September 2003), 203–23 (p. 206). Julian Wolfreys's fascinating study of London in literature sees the city itself as indeterminate and uncertainly defined. London, for Wolfreys, is an expression of modernity, 'a city in the act of becoming, a city always in the process of self-transformation'—see *Writing London: The Trace of the Urban Text from Blake to Dickens* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), p. 7.
5. *New Monthly Magazine*, 5 (Dec 1822), 503–04.

6. Richard Altick, *The Shows of London* (Cambridge, MA and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1978), p. 406. For excellent recent criticism on the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century art exhibitions at the Royal Academy, see *Art on the Line: The Royal Academy Exhibitions at Somerset House, 1780–1836*, edited by David H. Solkin (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 2001).
7. See *The Return of the Visible in British Romanticism* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993) and Gillen D'Arcy Wood, *The Shock of the Real: Romanticism and Visual Culture, 1760–1860* (New York: Palgrave, 2001).
8. Quoted in Altick, *Shows of London*, p. 406.
9. Lucy Newlyn, *Reading, Writing and Romanticism: The Anxiety of Reception* (Oxford: OUP, 2000), p. 325.
10. Benjamin Robert Haydon, *Correspondence and Table Talk,* 2 vols (London: Chatto & Windus, 1876), II, 293.
11. Dart, '"Flash Style"', p. 182.
12. Gary R. Dyer has related the use of 'flash' or 'cant' language in the criminal classes to literary language in the period, recognising the way in which its deployment by writers like Egan excludes certain types of reader, and recognising that such codes applied to all classes—see 'Reading as a Criminal in Early Nineteenth-Century Fiction', *Wordsworth Circle*, 35.3 (Summer 2004), pp. 141–46.
13. Pierce Egan, *Life in London; or, the Day and Night Scenes of Jerry Hawthorn, Esq. and his Elegant Friend Corinthian Tom, Accompanied by Bob Logic, the Oxonian, in their Rambles and Sprees through the Metropolis* (London: Sherwood, Jones & Co., 1823), p. 84. *Life in London* was published in monthly instalments in 1820, and first published in book form by Sherwood, Neely & Jones in 1821. Subsequent references are to the 1823 edition, abbreviated *LL*.
14. *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: The Middle Years—Volume I*, edited by Ernest de Selincourt and Mary Moorman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 150.
15. Thomas Love Peacock, 'An Essay on Fashionable Literature', *The Halliford Edition of the Works of Thomas Love Peacock*, edited by H. F. B. Brett-Smith and C. E. Jones, 10 vols (London: Constable & Co., 1924–34), VIII, 261–91 (p. 267).
16. *Edinburgh Review*, 17 (Nov 1810), 168.
17. Ibid., p. 169.
18. *Edinburgh Review*, 31 (March 1819), 468.
19. Joel Haefner, 'The Two Faces of the *London Magazine*', *Charles Lamb Bulletin*, 44 (Oct 1983), 69–81 (p. 75). Haefner's article is the only recent study of Wainewright's prose (Wainewright's later career as a poisoner is rather better documented), and he perceptively places Wainewright in his *London Magazine* context. For Haefner, Wainewright's 'anarchic presentation of personality' is one extreme of the magazine's style, with the 'intellectually ethical […] reasoned, logical' style of the editor John Scott at the other extreme.
20. *London Magazine*, 1 (June 1820), 631.
21. Ibid., pp. 631–32.
22. *The Collected Works of William Hazlitt,* edited by P. P. Howe, 21 vols (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1930–34), VIII, 160.
23. *London Magazine*, 2 (July 1820), 89.
24. Wainewright, *Essays and Criticism*, p. xxxii.
25. Hazlitt, *Collected Works*, XX, 148.

26. *London Magazine*, 7 (Mar 1823), 331. De Quincey recognises that 'under our present enormous accumulation of books, I do affirm, that a miserable distraction of choices […] must be very generally incident to the times' (p. 328).
27. *London Magazine*, 3 (Apr 1821), 420.
28. Ibid.
29. *London Magazine*, 4 (Oct 1821), 424.
30. W. C. Hazlitt remarks 'he occasionally offends us by his Dibdinian way of puffing current ware, and recommending to his reader to send to some shop to secure a copy of something or other'—Wainewright, *Essays and Criticism*, p. xxiv.
31. *London Magazine*, 4 (Nov 1821), 538.
32. See *London Magazine*, 1 (June 1820), 700–04.
33. Ibid., p. 703.
34. Ibid., p. 657.
35. *London Magazine*, 3 (Apr 1821), 437, 438, 438, 440, and 444.
36. See C. S. Matheson, '"A Shilling Well Laid Out": The Royal Academy's Early Public', in *Art on the Line: The Royal Academy Exhibitions at Somerset House, 1780–1836*, edited by David H. Solkin (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 2001), pp. 39–53. Matheson discusses this print by Cruikshank in the context of the developing nature of the Royal Academy, arguing that by the time of *Life in London*'s publication, 'the Royal Academy figures as part of the warp and woof of London itself, its patrons mobile rather than obedient, and the exhibition an experience to be performed rather than internalized' (p. 52).
37. Martin Myrone, 'The Sublime as Spectacle: The Transformation of Ideal Art at Somerset House', in *Art on the Line*, edited by Solkin, pp. 77–91 (p. 79).
38. *Annals of the Fine Arts*, 5 (1820), 294.
39. *London Magazine*, 4 (July 1821), 71.
40. *London Magazine*, 5 (June 1822), 551.
41. *London Magazine*, 4 (July 1821), 69.
42. Ibid., p. 74.
43. *London Magazine*, 6 (Nov 1822), 446.
44. *London Magazine*, 1 (June 1820), 657.
45. *London Magazine*, 5 (May 1822), 468.
46. *London Magazine*, 1 (June 1820), 629.
47. *The Letters of Charles Lamb, to Which Are Added Those of his Sister Mary Lamb*, edited by E. V. Lucas, 3 vols (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1935), II, 323.

Referring to this Article

D. Stewart. 'T. G. Wainewright's Art Criticism and Metropolitan Magazine Style', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 17 (Summer 2007). Online: Internet (date accessed): <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/romtext/articles/rt17_n01.pdf*>.

British Women Writing Satirical Novels in the Romantic Period

Gendering Authorship and Narrative Voice

Lisa M. Wilson

I

While eighteenth-century definitions of satire portray it as a masculine discourse, a survey of Romantic-period titles shows that women writers wrote *narrative* satire in numbers nearly equal to those of male satirical novelists.[1] As Audrey Bilger argues in her introduction to Jane Collier's *An Essay on the Art of Ingeniously Tormenting* (1753), '[t]he novel provided one safe venue for women's satirical observations as a genre that could contain subversive elements that would be more exposed in a free-standing satire'.[2] For women writing novels in the Romantic period, it seems equally the case that the novel provided a 'safe venue' for 'satirical observation', although we should remember that such observations were not always 'subversive' of political—or even of literary—norms. While some satirical novelists expressed radical political opinions, many more used satire to criticise such views and uphold mainstream, moderately conservative Tory/loyalist values. Furthermore, the numbers of women writing satirical novels in the period suggest that the narrative form became one place in which overt satire, whether liberal or conservative, was accepted and even expected of women writers.

Certainly satire's roots in classical forms and in poetic tradition suggest that it was still seen as a largely male province in the Romantic period. As Gary Dyer argues, literary–historical evidence suggests that 'both men and women traditionally have seen satire, more than other genres, as distinctly masculine'.[3] He points out that some male writers of the time believed that even *reading* translations of classical satire constituted 'improper study' for young women. Others argued that women were or should be excluded from the political–public arenas that were the major source of satirical writing, or they argued that women had too much sensibility (or too little reasoning capacity) to display the opinionated 'illiberality' needed to write satire. Dyer goes on to say:

> We should not be surprised that women authors observed when they composed satire that they felt they were straying from their proper sphere. For one thing, being 'satirical' was considered un-

> feminine: in conversation, ridiculing others was thought to render a young woman unattractive.[4]

In terms of the gendering of genres, Dyer's historical examples certainly render an accurate picture of one strain of the prevailing discourse surrounding satire as it applied to young women's education and conversation. They also clearly show cultural attitudes toward formal verse satire. They do not so accurately reflect the practice of a wider range of Romantic period writers, however, particularly that of novelists rather than the poets on whom Dyer's work concentrates.[5] While it is true that few women wrote satirical poetry throughout this period, the number of women writing satirical novels suggest that satire's 'unfeminine' reputation did not particularly discourage women authors from writing it.

Several issues complicate our understanding of satire's role in gender and genre debates during the Romantic period. Conduct-book-style rules, aimed at shaping young women's manners and conversation, were not necessarily the standards to which professional writers were held, even women writers. In this point, I disagree with Audrey Bilger in *Laughing Feminisms: Subversive Comedy in Frances Burney, Maria Edgeworth, and Jane Austen* (1998), as well as with Dyer. Bilger cites eighteenth-century conduct book writers Fordyce, Gregory, and Gisborne to illustrate her point that satire was frowned upon for women writers, although she also points out that the three authors she discusses indulge in private satire in their letters and in what she calls 'closeted' satirical writing in public .[6] While Bilger convincingly illustrates that Burney, Edgeworth, and Austen effectually manipulated period distinctions between 'sentimental comedy' and more overt forms of satire in order to authorise their own writing, I argue that women's narrative satire seemed less 'subversive' to contemporaries and was less 'closeted' and indirect than we have previously thought.

A number of women writers explicitly defended their use of satirical strategies, and, when satire shaded over into personal ridicule (as it frequently did), even male authors might be condemned as 'illiberal'—a period term frequently associated with improper or unjustified uses by both sexes of satire. In fact, we should not be particularly surprised to learn that reviewers of the period seem to have been as likely to praise or to condemn a satirical novel based on their opinion of the author's *politics* as of the author's gender. Examples of women writing explicitly satirical novels range from the moderate, archly comic social satirist 'Mrs Martin' to the prolific and wide-ranging conservative satirist Sarah Green (author of the literary satires *Romance Readers and Romance Writers*, 1810, and *Scotch Novel Reading*, 1823) to Mary Robinson who wrote on the liberal–Jacobin side in the Revolutionary political debates of the 1790s. Despite their political and even literary differences, all three authors shared some strategies common to women writing satirical novels in the Romantic period: they self-consciously manipulated gendered conventions regarding authorship, they adopted explicitly satirical narrative personae, and their narrators appeal directly to their (usually female) readers in order to achieve their satiric aims.

Defining Romantic Period Satire and Satirists

In the Romantic period, the term 'satire' was loosely applied to a range of narrative literary practices from entire novels explicitly labelled as satirical in their subtitles to individual scenes of satire and parody grafted onto other kinds of novelistic plot lines. A search of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century novel titles suggests that works explicitly subtitled 'a satirical novel' were most prevalent between 1800 and 1830, although some eighteenth-century narrative satires were identified as 'a satirical [or satirical] tale' or 'fable' (see note 1). Women authors appear to have been no less likely to have published titles explicitly labelled satirical than were their male counterparts *Lindamira; or, an Old Maid in Search of a Husband* (1810) by 'Caroline Burney' is subtitled *A Satirical Novel*;[7] the anonymous (and probably female) author of *Uncle Tweazy and his Quizzical Neighbors* subtitles hers *A Comi-Satiric Novel* (1816). Even larger numbers of novelists of both sexes follow a pattern of including satirical scenes in novels with sentimental main plots. An example of this type of novel, as Janice Farrar Thaddeus points out, is Elizabeth Hamilton's *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers* (1800), which combines its main plot, the 'sentimental story of the tragic destruction of the heroine Julia Delmond', with a clever parody of William Godwin's radical political philosophy and Mary Hays's Wollstonecraftian novels.[8] Elizabeth Inchbald's *Nature and Art* (1796) and Mary Robinson's *Walsingham; or the Pupil of Nature* (1797) follow a somewhat similar narrative pattern in order to make quite a different political point—both Inchbald and Robinson were classed as 'Jacobin' novelists, while Hamilton's politics are loyalist and anti-radical. We find male and female novelists writing in approximately equal numbers and across the political spectrum, in both of these satirical novel styles.

As we have seen, satire's cultural definition as a masculine discourse did not prevent women from writing it, although it may have discouraged some. However, it did lead women writers to adopt various authorial and narrative strategies in order to circumvent, to challenge, or otherwise to shape those gendered genre conventions. Many satirical novels were published anonymously or pseudonymously, a convention that continued well into the 1830s. Of the novels written between 1790 and 1830 that can be identified as satirical, at least a third were originally published anonymously; in some of those cases, prefaces or dedications give us clues to the gender, if not the name, of the author. For example, the anonymous author of *The Observant Pedestrian; or, Traits of the Heart* (1795) gives her readers a clue about her gender in the introduction to her sequel, *Farther Excursions of the Observant Pedestrian* (1801). In it, she notes that reviewers assumed her previous book was a man's work, and she gleefully surmises that the reviewers will 'be surprised to learn, that [this book's equally satirical] subject is the sole effusion of a female pen'.[9] As Kathryn Dawes points out, decisions to publish anonymously were not always made by authors themselves: publishers as well as authors might decide to omit author's names from title pages. Publishers might choose anonymity or pseudonymity in order to

afford themselves a degree of protection from state libel suits as well as to shield their authors, especially since publishers, printers, and booksellers were held legally responsible for libellous products as frequently as (if not more frequently) than the authors themselves.

In such cases of anonymous authorship, readers and reviewers (including present-day critics) cannot determine the gender of the authors, although they frequently assume that satirical writers were men. It is true that most of the pseudonyms used by novel writers during this period are fancifully parodic men's names, pseudonyms such as John Agg's 'Humphrey Hedgehog', Edward Dubois's 'Count Reginald de St Leon', Eaton Stannard Barrett's 'Cervantes Hogg', and 'Peregrine Puzzlebrain', fictional editor of the Scottian parody *Tales of my Landlady* (1818). While anonymous and pseudonymous publication sometimes (perhaps inadvertently) drew reviewers' attention to the question of authors' genders, anonymous female authors of satirical novels could mostly depend on reviewers to read their authorial identities as male, even when confronted with evidence to the contrary. William Taylor, reviewing Sarah Green's anonymously published political novel *The Reformist!!!* (1810) in the *Monthly Review*, goes so far as to claim not to believe Green's prefatory statement that she is a woman. He cannot believe 'that the experience of a lady could have furnished all the scenes which are […] delineated' and claims that he does not want to 'attribute to a female pen the great illiberality which occasionally displays itself' in the novel.[10] Taylor presents himself as refusing to believe, out of an exaggerated sense of chivalry that 'a lady' could write with 'great illiberality'. At the same time, his comment indirectly reminds his readers that it is unladylike (not just unwomanly) to write satire. Comments like Taylor's reveal the extent to which authors of satirical novels were assumed to be male; they also show us the ways in which reviewers took the opportunity to chastise women who wrote satirical novels, even those who wrote under the cover of anonymity. Such critical comments also point to the importance of considering the role that authorship plays in the development of narrative satire during the Romantic period. While critics and reviewers of the period conventionally emphasised the importance of *objects* of satire,[11] I would argue that an author's self-presentation and narrative stance are an equally important part of the narrative transaction between author and reader that takes place through the satirical object.

Mrs Martin: Gendering Narrative Voice in the Comic Novel

The case of the 1801 novel *The Enchantress; or Where Shall I Find Her?* illustrates one way in which women authors reacted to the satirical novel reader's gendered expectations. Published anonymously, the novel is attributed to a 'Mrs Martin', a Minerva Press author about whom little is known.[12] A lightly comic social satire, the one-volume novel features an eccentric hero's search for the perfect woman by placing a newspaper advertisement for a wife. A self-proclaimed

'humourist', the novel's protagonist comes in for his share of satirical commentary when his sentimental expectations lead him to read himself as the hero of a novel. A male forerunner of Austen's Catherine Morland, Martin's hero has both the chivalric idealism of a Don Quixote and the crochety eccentricity of Smollett's Matthew Bramble. For example, when the hero, Sir Philip, meets a young woman he thinks has answered his advertisement, the narrator notes that the hero 'read oppressed innocence in the countenance of the young [lady], and malicious oppression in that of the elder lady'.[13] Sir Philip thinks that the young lady's chaperon 'was the image of a spiteful stepmother.—Had not fairies been out of date, he could have thought her a wicked fairy' (I, 16). The narrator quickly notes that, in believing the girl to be the persecuted heroine of a fairy tale, Sir Philip 'was wrong'. The girl is unhappy, but not for the reasons Sir Philip deduces. This scene shows the hero's tendency to interpret events using fairy-tale standards—even while he himself acknowledges that such principles are 'out of date'. By portraying Sir Philip as a self-ironising romantic, Martin endows him with a touch of comic realism and retains her readers' sympathies for him, at the same time his character is the object of her satire.

Martin also chooses to use a narrative voice that clearly is male, and just as clearly is aimed at a female readership whom she satirises and with whom 'he' even flirts. While her choice of a male narrator seems conventional, her choice of a female readership for her narrator is not. After a brief digression criticising 'philosophers who employ much time, ink, paper, and speculation, in defining the mode by which the mind is influenced', which opens a new chapter, the male narrator speaks directly to his readers:

> You are impatient, Madam: your expressive eyes exclaim—But what's all this to Jessy [one of the novel's heroines]? […] You are right, Madam. I have indeed wandered from my subject; and when once a man ventures into the fields of digression, it requires some magnet as powerful as your eyes to call him back again.
>
> (pp. 105, 107–08)

By flirting with his readers, Martin's male narrator portrays his lady readers as impatient with such discussions of philosophy and eager to hear more about the sentimental heroine. Somewhat unexpectedly, instead of criticising his female readers' low tastes, Martin's narrator admits they are 'right'. The male narrator admits that such masculine digressions do not belong in a novel. In this way, he also implicitly pokes fun at himself as narrator/writer as well as at men's supposed tendency to lapse into pointless philosophical speculation—the female reader's implied point of view is the one validated by the narrator.

In other scenes, Martin's male narrator explicitly speaks for his female readers as well as for himself. He ventriloquises the questions he imagines his readers would ask—and then he answers himself. For example, the narrator asks, '"And did Sir Philip really surrender his heart to a well-toned voice?"', enclosing the reader's supposed question in quotation marks. Then the narrator answers:

> No, dear lady, he did not; his heart had formed to itself an idea of feminine graces, among which this silver voice now made itself heard. I am sure you are not yourself insensible to the charm of melting accents, or the liquid melody of soothing sounds. (p. 129)

Because the protagonist of the novel is at once romantic hero and object of satire, such commentaries on 'men's nature' occur throughout the novel. The effect is to portray the narrator as a 'man's man', but one who is willing to spill the secrets of his sex to members of the opposite sex like a female gossip. In one respect, Martin's choice to cast her narrator as male fits with the prevailing cultural assumptions that satirical novels are written by men. In this case, however, the presence of the male narrator actually complicates the questions of just who and what are being satirised. By developing the relationship between the male narrator and his lady-readers, Martin's narrator satirises and sympathises with both the hero's and the reader's sentimental expectations.

Sarah Green, Satirical Novelist

One of the most prolific women writers of satirical novels in the early nineteenth century was Sarah Green, who wrote both anonymously and pseudonymously (as 'A Cockney'). While we still know little about her personal identity, her writing shows her to be an unapologetic satirist. Between 1808 and 1825, she wrote at least sixteen novels, including some historical Gothics as well as seven explicitly satirical novels.[14] Although she initially published many of her satirical novels anonymously, she did not hide her gender from her readers, and she acknowledged later editions of these works with 'Mrs Green' on the title page.

Green's first satirical novel appears to have been the anonymously published *The Private History of the Court of England*, an 1808 political–social satire in the 'secret history' or satirical *roman-à-clef* mode. Framed as a historical novel of the fifteenth century, Green's *Private History* is a very thinly veiled satire on the Prince of Wales (later the Prince Regent and George IV). Green's 'Preface' makes her satirical intent clear by pointing out parallels between characters in her narrative and the rulers of the present day. She writes:

> The silly illiterate stripling, hastily emancipated from the tuition of monkish ignorance of the fifteenth century, is, in this age of improvements, the half-learned, half-travelled, trifling coxcomb of rank and fortune; a compound of frivolity and presumption, a smatterer of languages, a connoisseur of pictures, operas, and women![15]

As one contemporary reviewer described it, '*The Private History of the Court of England* is an ingenious satire, which, while it professes to give the private history of the court of Edward IV, in reality presents us with that of the present'.[16] Reviewers' reactions to this book suggest the widely divergent attitudes toward satirical novel writing in this period: while this reviewer from *Flowers of Lit-*

erature praises the work as 'ingenious', both the *Critical* and *Monthly* roundly condemned it.

These last two reviewers clearly object to 'private history' satires as a class. The *Critical* compares *Private History* to 'the *Atalantis* and *Utopia* of the 17th century' and waxes nostalgic for an earlier day when such works might be censored before they are published—presumably before 1695, when the Licensing Act expired, closing down legal options for pre-publication censorship.[17] The *Monthly* reviewer classes the novel with other recent works that, he argues, reveal a

> mischievous taste for libels on individuals, which has for a long time prevailed; gratifying at once the too general love of indiscriminate detraction, and the vulgar thirst after fashionable anecdote, by the mixture of a small portion of truth with a great share of falsehood and malignity.[18]

By placing the *Private History* in the context of the scandal-mongering secret history, these reviewers condemn it as belonging to what they considered to be the very lowest form of satire: the personal (and potentially libellous) attack.[19] Without a name or even a gender attached to the novel, these reviewers do no more than dismiss the novel as a poorly written example of a regrettable genre. For us, as perhaps for Romantic period readers, such reminders of the long history of the satirical *roman à clef* should bring to mind Delarivier Manley's *New Atalantis* (1709), as well as the seventeenth-century original, and remind us that secret histories, like the French *chroniques scandaleuses*, were a type of narrative satire that was peculiarly associated (albeit negatively) with the gossiping style of women writers such as Manley, Aphra Behn, and Eliza Haywood.[20]

In Green's best-known work, *Romance Readers and Romance Writers: A Satirical Novel*, her name does not appear on the title page: the novel first appears in 1810 as 'by the Author of a Private History of the Court of England, etc.'. However, she signs her lengthy 'Literary Retrospection' S. G**** and concludes her preface by 'outing' her gender. Responding directly to critics of her previous work, she writes:

> The title-page of this work informs the public that they are to expect a *Satirical* Novel! And, in spite of the London satirists' invectives […] the following volumes are avowed to be written by THE AUTHOR OF 'THE PRIVATE HISTORY OF THE COURT OF ENGLAND!' Various conjectures having arisen as to the writer of that work, the Author, who has reasons for *yet* concealing her name, will affix the REAL initials of that name to this advertisement. Her merits, as a writer, are small; the mercy, the forbearance of a BRITISH PUBLIC, ample; to such she looks up for support and protection: and she thanks the *Satirist*, who, while he pointed our her errors with *severity*, yet declared that the person who penned *one certain* chapter in the

> PRIVATE HISTORY OF THE COURT OF ENGLAND, '*had talents for writing a work that might defy criticism*'![21]

Instead of hiding behind her anonymity, Green seems to glory in 'avowing' authorship of the *Private History* and in defending her satirical practice. Her lengthy prefatory comments take the form of a scathing review of what she sees as the worst trends of modern novel writing. In it, she condemns several authors by name, including popular Gothic and historical novelists T. J. Horsley-Curties, M. G. Lewis, Francis Lathom, and 'Rosa Matilda' [Charlotte Dacre], a move that suggests she is unconcerned about libel suits from fellow authors at the very least. Significantly, very few works explicitly labelled 'a satirical novel' were signed, whether they were written by men or women. Green's choice to acknowledge authorship, even in this oblique manner, marks her as unusual among female satirical novelists.

The novel itself, like many of the satirical novels of the period, takes aim at a variety of mostly literary targets.[22] Unlike Austen in *Northanger Abbey*, Green seems more interested in satirising romance writers than romance readers, although the novel does feature a romance-reading heroine in the character of Peggy. Green's heroine (who renames herself the more romantic-sounding Margaritta) does not make a happy match like Catherine Morland's, however. By the end of the novel, 'Margaritta' has been seduced and abandoned and is carrying an illegitimate child—a situation that comically reifies the moralists' claims that too much romance reading leads directly to sexual immorality.

The opening volume of the work parodies and critiques novel writing, especially historical romances and novels of passion. As do many Anti-Jacobin novelists, Green also criticises Mary Wollstonecraft by name and explicitly condemns 'Jacobin' atheistic philosophy as immoral. Green also parodies the methods of French 'secret histories' by employing tongue-in-cheek footnotes in her own novel. For example, when one of the fictional characters contradicts a newspaper report about the adulterous Lady Egmont, she notes that the character's claim is 'historique'—that is, that the gossip retailed by her fictional character is historical fact.[23] The novel's speaker claims to know the truth: that Lady Egmont 'actually went off with her infatuated lover to an island which has the peculiar privilege of harbouring crim. con. [criminal conversation; i.e., adulterous] associates, insolvent debtors, and all the other *et-ceteras*, intitled—*indiscretions*!' (I, 7). The speaker's brother comments that the Lady Egmont story would undoubtedly be taken up by a corrupt novelist as the basis for a new secret history or novel of passion:

> I doubt not [...] but that this affair will furnish a foundation for the story of some *free*-minded novel-writer, or, as the new school calls it, *liberal*-minded! And we shall have it some day brought forward, so clouded with romantic incidents, that no one will guess who it means; and have for its title, perhaps, 'THE FATAL ATTACHMENT, OR LOVE TRIUMPHANT OVER DUTY!' (I, 8).

Here, Green's narrator pokes fun at 'free-minded' hack writers who would capitalise on the tragic break up of a titled family; she also hints that such writers of novels of passion might be followers of radical Jacobin political philosophies. In doing so, she presents herself as morally above such literary hackwork.

Readers are free to doubt whether or not her narrator's dismissive attitude toward the secret history novel is 'straight' or satirical, since Green herself repeatedly advertised herself as writing just such a novel, *The Private History of the Court of England*, and she continued to promote herself as a satirist. Even her non-satirical titles, such as *Tales of the Manor* (1809) and *The Festival of St Jago* (1810), were advertised as 'by the author of *The Private History of the Court of England*'; later titles, including *The Fugitive; or Family Incidents* (1814) were advertised as 'by Mrs Green, author of *Private History of the Court of England, Romance Readers and Romance Writers, &c., &c.*'

As she had done in the *Private History*, in her preface to *Percival Ellingford; or the Reformist!!!* (2nd edn, 1816), Green makes seemingly modest gestures that indirectly serve to defend her own satirical practices. A political novel satirising social reformers, *Percival Ellingford* was originally titled *The Reformist!!! A Serio-Comic Political Novel* (1st edn, 1810). She assures her readers:

> Slight, very slight are the allusions to Quixotic politicians, in the following pages—I have honestly confessed, politics are not my *forté*. My errors, I acknowledge, are many; my intention is only to amuse; at the same time, to instruct would afford me pleasure; and as I have ever observed a veneration for true morality, I again cast myself on the indulgence of an enlightened and candid Public.[24]

This preface is once again signed S. G ****, as she had done in her previous novels. By 'honestly confessing' that 'politics are not [her] *forté*', Green seems to be acknowledging the cultural truism that women writers are not well-equipped to write political satire. At the same time, readers must be suspicious of her claims 'only to amuse'. After all, if that was her only intent, she might have written a novel completely unrelated to contemporary events. Her claim to 'venerat[e] true morality' clearly marks her authorial stance as that of the social satirist who 'scourges Vice' by speaking from moral high ground. However, instead of utterly disavowing the techniques of the secret history writer, she tantalises readers with the hint that 'slight, very slight are the allusions' to real politicians in the novel, a comment that alerts her readers to look for these clues to the identities of real politicians in order to decipher her satire. Green's strategies thus illustrate some of the contradictory methods women novelists developed in order to insert themselves into discourses of satire; her career also illustrates the challenges inherent in uncovering the work of such anonymous and pseudonymous satirists, male and female.

Satire and Sentiment in Mary Robinson's Late Novels

Mary Robinson is more often thought of as an object of satire rather than as the author of it. Robinson, as a former actress and the first mistress of the Prince of Wales, later George IV, had unusually wide experience of the uses and abuses of satire; she was the target of Tory visual and verbal invective from the time of her association with the Prince in 1780, through her liaison with Whig MP Banastre Tarleton, to her friendship with radical intellectuals like William Godwin in the late 1790s. Robinson herself wrote poetic as well as narrative satire, writing under the classicist male pseudonym 'Horace Juvenal' as well as under 'Tabitha Bramble', a name taken from the garrulous female character in Smollett's *Humphrey Clinker*. Despite their satirical content, however, her late novels were all written under her own name, usually 'Mrs Robinson'. Although we might read Robinson's use of her well-known name as a move designed to capitalise on her celebrity, her choice to write her satirical novels under her own name instead of under a pseudonym must class her as unapologetic a satirist as Sarah Green. Robinson's final three novels—*Walsingham: Or, the Pupil of Nature, A Domestic Story* (1797), *The False Friend: A Domestic Story* (1799), and *The Natural Daughter; With Portraits of the Leadenhead Family: A Novel* (1799)—all contain elements of social and political satire, although they are not explicitly labelled as satires. *Walsingham*, for example, contains passages satirising female gamesters as well as poking fun at literary reviewers—and all were read by her contemporaries as, at least in part, *romans à clef*. Although contemporary critics have emphasised Robinson's connections to the literary circle surrounding William Godwin, Robinson's later novels go beyond the confines of the 'Jacobin novelist' label to critique the effects of the literary marketplace on women writers.[25]

In *The Natural Daughter*, her final novel, Robinson constructs her social and literary satire around a sentimental novel plot line, one that features an unjustly accused heroine persecuted by vulgar relatives, immoral aristocratic seducers, and a hypocritical husband. Martha Bradford, later Mrs Morley, becomes a social outcast when she adopts an orphan whom everyone thinks must be her own 'natural daughter' (illegitimate child). Abandoned by her family and her husband, Mrs Morley attempts to support herself by working as a paid companion, a provincial actress, and later, as a novelist.

Robinson points out the venality of publishers when Mrs Morley is forced to sell the copyright to her novel for a mere ten pounds. Mrs Morley's publisher, Mr Index, has assured her that works like hers, sentimental novels with realistic characters 'had become a drug, only palatable to splenetic valetudinarians and boarding-school misses'.[26] When she is accidentally given a copy of her novel in its sixth edition, Mrs Morley discovers that her work, far from being a 'drug' on the market, has sold extremely well. Instead of enriching its impoverished author, however, the novel has been reaping profits for its unscrupulous publisher

without her knowledge (p. 242). Robinson uses satire to expose venal publishers who would take advantage of naïve authors like Mrs Morley.

In a further comment on the literary marketplace, Robinson goes on to treat ironically the kind of novel that Mr Index wants Mrs Morley to write instead—a nearly libellous satirical secret history. Mr Index advises the heroine that, if she wants to 'bathe in the luxurious sea of satirical celebrity', then she should write with 'a lancet' instead of a 'mere pen' (p. 209). He tells her:

> If you have any talent for satire, you may write a work that would be worth purchasing: or if your fertile pen can make a story out of some recent popular event, such as an highly-fashioned elopement, a deserted, distracted husband, an abandoned wife, an ungrateful runaway daughter, or a son ruined by sharpers; with such a title as 'Noble Daring; or, the Disinterested Lovers;' […] 'Passion in Leading-Strings; or, Love's Captive;' 'Modern Wives and Antique Spouses;' 'Old Dowagers and Schoolboy Lovers,' or any thing from real life of equal celebrity or notoriety, your fortune is made; your works will sell, and you will either be admired or feared by the whole phalanx of fashionable readers; particularly if you have the good luck to be menaced with a prosecution.

In this passage, Robinson satirises the popular taste for just the kind of novel that she is often accused of writing: the tell-all satire that ridicules her acquaintances and capitalises on the reading public's prurient interest in the private lives of the celebrated and aristocratic. At the same time, she suggests that the reading public may have better taste than publishers think; after all, Mrs Morley's unsensational novel sells well, despite Mr Index's dire predictions. Mr Index's comments also suggest that writing satire was an established way for authors to become celebrated (or notorious) themselves—although Robinson herself may have thought of satirical authorship as more lucrative than celebrated.

Critical response to *The Natural Daughter* was largely negative, due in large part to the perception that it reflected its author's radical politics rather than to its satirical form, however. We might expect that reviewers would have responded more positively to the sentimental plot line of the heroine. However, the most positive review, that of *The Monthly Review,* actually emphasised the satirical qualities of the novel, perhaps because of Robinson's celebrity and her established reputation as a writer of satire in the late 1790s. The reviewer writes: 'Fancy has been little restrained in the composition of this novel, and the satirical talent of the writer has not lain dormant'.[27] Although Robinson also wrote sentimental verse and novels, this reviewer seems to recognise her for her 'satirical talent' as well as for her 'fancy', her feminine imagination. Ironically, the reviewer for the *European Magazine* actually encourages his readers to interpret the novel as a *roman à clef*, commenting that '[w]e must likewise inform the curious, that memoirs of herself, in some trying situations, are introduced into these volumes, under the fictitious character of Mrs Sedgley [Mrs

Morley's stage name]'.[28] Instead of discouraging readers from interpreting *The Natural Daughter* as a scandalous secret history, this reviewer seems to pander to his readers' taste for sensationalism by providing a supposed key to the *roman à clef*. He claims that the heroine's experiences as an actress parallel those of Mary Robinson herself. (In fact, there are a number of important differences between their situations, especially since Robinson's character, Mrs Morley, is a little-known provincial actress, while Robinson herself played to acclaim at London's Drury Lane.) Given Robinson's identification in the public imagination as a celebrated courtesan in the 1780s, coupled with her later reputation as a satirist, reviewers seem to expect that this will be the type of novel she will write—and they will stretch their interpretation of her novel to make it fit their preconceived notions. Response to Robinson's final novel illustrates the ways in which politics and personalities affect the reception of satirical novels as much as or more than their literary and generic characteristics.

Conclusions

We might assume that such responses to women's satirical novels discouraged them from continuing to write in the *roman-à-clef* or secret-history satirical subgenre. While it is certainly true that we may be more familiar with noteworthy examples from the earlier eighteenth century such as Manley's *The New Atalantis* or Haywood's *Adventures of Eovaai*, even overtly literary satires from the Romantic period such as Lamb's *Glenarvon* and Peacock's *Nightmare Abbey* were read as secret histories. Given the increasing importance of literary celebrity in this period and the central role it played in Byron's career in particular, such readings are unsurprising. And at least one writer, courtesan Harriette Wilson, wrote two comic novels in addition to her tell-all memoir in the early part of the nineteenth century. Wilson, facing financial difficulties later in her life, turned to writing as a source of income. Upon deciding to publish her memoirs, she apparently wrote letters to her many aristocratic and celebrated lovers, asking them for hush money to leave them out of the volume. The Duke of Wellington is supposed to have famously responded to her request: 'Let her publish and be damned!' In addition to her memoirs, Wilson also wrote two comic novels, including *Paris Lions and London Tigers*, a satire on Londoners abroad.

Paris Lions is prefaced by an 'advertisement by the Editor', noting that prepublicity for the novel claimed it was a secret history: 'no sooner had the following little volume, got wind, than all the world was on the *qui vive*, to learn what characters, it was to contain.' [29] The 'Editor' comically portrays Wilson 'tenderly sympathizing with her unhappy publisher [Stockdale]' in his fears that he'll be sued for libel, and therefore gallantly resolving to '[draw] on her imagination for her modern romance, of Paris Lions and Tigers' to protect him. The editor implies that Wilson's fashionable readers, instead of threatening to sue, are so eager to be identified with characters in her novel that they provide a key to the secret history themselves. The editor writes that an 'anonymous

correspondent, assisted as he says by many persons, no less *comme il faut*, than himself, avows that the list, hereto subjoined, is a true key to the characters of this romance'. Wilson's publisher, 'thinking the joke too good to be altogether lost', agrees to the list's publication—presumably because it reveals the absurdity of its writers' thirst for celebrity (p. 1). In Wilson's literary career, we see the lines continue to be blurred between legitimate narrative satire, the secret history, and the potentially libellous memoir.

In the range of satirical novels described and analyzed here, we have seen the ways that gender and genre interacted to shape both authors' and reader/reviewers' responses to this important sub-genre during the Romantic period. Understanding the range of satirical novels written by women provides us with a greatly enhanced understanding of the evolution of the novel in the period between the publication of Burney's *Evelina* (1778) and Austen's *Northanger Abbey* (1818). It also provides us with a larger field in which to study how narrative techniques develop in relation to satirical ones. The wide range of artfully self-conscious narrative poses used by these novelists to establish their authority as satirists and shape their relationships with the readers further provides us with a fuller picture of the authorial practices of women writers in the period that also sees the consolidation of the figure of the male Romantic author.

Notes

1. I want to thank the National Endowment for the Humanities and Steve Behrendt, as well as my colleagues at Steve's 2003 summer seminar for college teachers, 'Rethinking British Romantic Fiction' to whom this essay is indebted.

   I have identified at least twenty-five satirical novels written by women in the period between 1790 and 1830—excluding 'sentimental comedy' titles by Burney, Edgeworth, and Austen. During the same period, around forty titles were published by male authors and at least twenty titles were published anonymously or pseudonymously by authors whom we've not yet identified. See the timelines provided in Appendices A and B.

   I do not necessarily mean to suggest that greater numbers of satirical novels were written in the early part of the nineteenth century than in the eighteenth century. The tremendously useful database of British novels, *British Fiction, 1800–1829: A Database of Production, Circulation & Reception*, allows one to search by full title and subtitle, and so enabled a fuller search of nineteenth-century titles than the eighteenth-century ones. (See P. D. Garside, J. E. Belanger, and S. A. Ragaz, *British Fiction, 1800–1829: A Database of Production, Circulation & Reception*, designer A. A. Mandal, Online: Internet (14 June 2006) <*http://www.british-fiction.cf.ac.uk*>). However, I also consulted *The English Novel, 1770–1829: A Bibliographical Survey of Prose Fiction Published in the British Isles*, edited by Peter Garside, James Raven, and Rainer Schöwerling, 2 vols (Oxford: OUP, 2000) and *The English Language Literature of the 18th and 19th Centuries* short-title catalogue of the Corvey collection (Wildberg: Belser Wissenschaftlicher Dienst, 1999) in my survey of the satirical novels of the Romantic period.
2. In Jane Collier, *Essay on the Art of Ingeniously Tormenting*, edited by Audrey Bilger (1753; Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2003), p. 32.

3. Gary Dyer, *British Satire and the Politics of Style, 1789–1832* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), p. 150.
4. Ibid., p. 151.
5. Dyer considers the work of female satirists Mary Robinson, Sarah Green, and Jane Austen in *British Satire*. Robinson provides his main example of a woman who wrote verse satire—he argues she 'was practically alone in appropriating this classical form' and describes her as 'transgressing gender expectations' in so doing (p. 150). He gives two literary examples to support his point that women authors themselves believed that writing satire was a transgressive act—one from Green's *The Reformist*, the other from Austen's *Sense and Sensibility*. In both examples, fictional young female characters are chastised for using an inappropriately satirical style of conversation. I do not agree with Dyer that these fictional scenes about young women's conversation necessarily represent the novelists' views on the propriety of their own writerly practice.
6. Audrey Bilger, *Laughing Feminisms: Subversive Comedy in Frances Burney, Maria Edgeworth, and Jane Austen* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1998), pp. 22–36.
7. Garside, et al. suggest that 'Caroline Burney' may be a pseudonym (*English Novel*, II, 318). The name 'Lindamira' may refer to earlier pseudonymous eighteenth-century adventure or scandal fictions such as the 1702 *The Adventures of Lindamira, a Lady of Quality, Written by her Own Hand, to her Friend in the Country, in IV Parts, Revised and Corrected by Mr Thomas Brown*, reprinted under this and other titles through at least 1758. 1723 also saw the pseudonymous publication of *Royal Gallantry: Or, the Amours of a Certain K––g of a Certain Country, Who Kept his C–––t at a Certain Place, Much in the Same Latitude as That of W––stm–nst–r: Related to the Unhappy Adventures of Palmiris and Lindamira; in Which the Characters of Tersander and Caesarina, Are Vindicated from the Aspersions That Have Been or May Be Cast upon Them, and the Unfortunate Death of the Former Set in a True Light* (authored by 'Cato' and printed for 'A. Moor').
8. See Janice Farrar Thaddeus, 'Elizabeth Hamilton's Modern Philosophers and the Uncertainties of Satire', *Cutting Edges: Postmodern Critical Essays on Eighteenth-Century Satire*, edited by James E. Gill (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1995), pp. 395–418.
9. Quoted in Kathryn L. Dawes, 'Anonymity and the Pressures of Publication in the Early Nineteenth Century', *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text*, 4 (May 2000). Online: Internet (1 June 2006): <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/corvey/articles/cc04_n03.html*>, § 7.
10. Quoted in Dyer, *British Satire*, pp. 150–51.
11. Abbott, in *An Essay on the Use and Abuse of Satire* (1786) follows the literary-critical conventions of the late eighteenth century in grouping satires by type of target: personal, political, moral, and critical (quoted in Dyer, *British Satire*, p. 19). However, most satirical novels take aim at two or more of these types of targets: for example, the kind of satire we find in Elizabeth Hamilton's fictional *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers* (1800) might be said to encompass all four types, especially in the sections where she targets radical novelist Mary Hays—personally, politically, morally, and literarily.

    Other period definitions seem to make distinctions of degree as well as of kind. Corbyn Morris's *Essay Towards Fixing the True Standards of Wit, Humour, Raillery, Satire, and Ridicule* (1744) argues that 'the aim of Raillery, is to please

you, by some Embarrassment of a Person; Of Satire, to scourge Vice, and to deliver it up to your just Detestation; And of Ridicule, to set an Object in a mean ludicrous Light, so as to expose it to your Derision and Contempt'—quoted in Frances Burney, *Evelina*, edited by Susan Kubica Howard (1778; Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2000), p. 662. Morris's definition, that satire 'scourge[s] Vice', suggests that it is the wit's most potent weapon; his definition also implies that true satirists confine themselves to targeting abstract moral standards. As do Abbott's definitions of satire, Morris's definitions resist easy application to individual novels, however.

12. *The Feminist Companion to Literature in English: Women Writers from the Middle Ages to the Present*, edited by Virginia Blain, Isobel Grundy, and Patricia Clements (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990) calls Martin the 'obscure author of five intelligent, various, stylish Minerva novels (not Sarah M., author of a 1795 cookery book; or Sarah Catherine M., author–illustrator of the rhyme of *Old Mother Hubbard*, pub. 1804; or the minor-novelist great-aunt of Mary Martin)' (p. 721). We know little else of her biography.
13. 'Mrs Martin', *The Enchantress; or Where Shall I Find Her? By the Author of Melbourne, Deloraine, Reginald, &c.* (London: Minerva-Press for William Lane, 1801), p. 15. Subsequent references are taken from this edition of the novel, and will be given in the main text.
14. Biographical information on Green is scarce, and is potentially unreliable in being mostly culled from her literary works themselves and from reviews of her work. *The Feminist Companion* notes that Green was a 'novelist and miscellaneous writer publishing in London' and attributes to her a 1790 novel, *Charles Henley*, as well as the 1793 conduct book *Mental Improvement for a Young Lady* (p. 457). Her record of publication then apparently ceases until she begins to publish again starting in 1808. We cannot be sure that the Green who wrote in the 1790s is the same as she who wrote after 1808. Reviews of a selection of her novels are reprinted online at *British Fiction, 1800–1829* and also at *The Corvey Novels Project at the University of Nebraska: Studies in British Literature of the Romantic Period*, edited by Jamie Mraz and Hyejung Jun, Online: Internet (1 June 2006) <*http://www.unl.edu/Corvey/html/Projects/CorveyNovels/Green*>.
15. Sarah Green, *The Private History of the Court of England*, 2 vols (2nd edn, London, 1808), I, vii.
16. Review of Sarah Green, *The Private History of the Court of England*, *Flowers of Literature* (1808–09), lxxx.
17. Review of Sarah Green, *The Private History of the Court of England*, *Critical Review*, 3rd ser. 14 (June 1808), 217.
18. Review of Sarah Green, *The Private History of the Court of England*, *Monthly Review*, 2nd ser. 58 (Jan 1809), 101.
19. As April London reminds us, even Anti-Jacobin satirists of the 1790s had an 'anxious sense that their satires might be seen as privately motivated', a fear that stemmed as much from the real possibility of libel suits as from their desire to 'distance themselves from the mockery they identified as a characteristic feature of radical writing' and from illegitimate forms of satire—see 'Novel and History in Anti-Jacobin Satire', *YBES*, 30 (2000), 71–81 (pp. 79 and 79 n. 17).
20. See Jayne Lewis, 'Compositions of Ill Nature: Women's Place in a Satiric Tradition', *Critical Matrix*, 2 (1986), 31–69; John Richetti, *The English Novel in History, 1700–1780* (1999; New York: Routledge, 2003); Ros Ballaster, 'A Gender of Op-

position: Eliza Haywood's Scandal Fiction', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, edited by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebeccca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 143–67.

21. Sarah Green, *Romance Readers and Romance Writers: A Satirical Novel,* 3 vols (London: Hookham, 1810), I, xii.

22. If we are to take their most obvious targets as clues to their type, then the novelistic satires of the Romantic period might be loosely grouped into three categories:

    1. Both Jacobin and Anti-Jacobin political novels of the Revolutionary 1790s employ satire as weapons of debate in the 'war of ideas'. For example, Robert Bage's *Hermsprong; or Man as He is Not* (1796) is another novel, like those of Robinson and Inchbald, that defended political radicalism by employing the satirical methods of Sterne and Smollett. A number of anti-radical, anti-Godwinian satires, including Hamilton's *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers* (1800), Edward Dubois's *The Travels of St Godwin* (1800), and Isaac D'Israeli's *Vaurien* (1797), were all published between 1797 and 1800.

    2. Between 1810 and 1818 were published the most prominent satirical novels satirising novel writing, such as Sarah Green's *Romance Readers and Romance Writers* (1810), Eaton Stannard Barrett's *The Heroine, Or Adventures of a Fair Romance Reader* (1814), and Jane Austen's posthumously published *Northanger Abbey* (1818).

    3. Between about 1816 and 1826, a number of satirists published parodies of, or satires on, Scott and Byron, including Caroline Lamb's *Glenarvon* (1816), Thomas Love Peacock's *Nightmare Abbey* (1818), 'Peregrine Puzzlebrain''s *Tales of my Landlady*, and Sarah Green's *Scotch Novel Reading or Modern Quackery* (1823). All of these works can in some ways be seen as having primary targets that are literary, but certainly contain elements of political, social, and even personal satire as well.

23. Sarah Green, *Romance Readers and Romance Writers: A Satirical Novel* (1810), I, 7—available from Chawton House Library and Study Centre, Online: Internet (1 June 2006): <*http://www.chawton.org*>. Although I had access to a copy of the preface ('Literary Retrospection', I, v–xxxvi) of the original 1810 edition of the novel, all other page references for *Romance Readers and Romance Writers* are to this electronic edition study text found at the Chawton House website. The page numbers for the Chawton edition do not correspond to those of the original.

24. Sarah Green, *Percival Ellingford; or, the Reformist. A Novel*. 2 vols (1810; 2nd edn, London: Newman, 1816), I, xi–xii.

25. See, for example, Gary Kelly, who identifies Robinson as an 'English Jacobin', but classes her with other women novelists 'more indebted to Sensibility' such as Smith, Inchbald, and Hays—*English Fiction of the Romantic Period, 1780–1830* (Harlow: Longman, 1989), p. 26. Kelly also mentions Robinson in *The English Jacobin Novel, 1780–1805* (London: Clarendon Press, 1976) as one who 'partook of that "brisk traffic in opinions" around William Godwin' (p. 12). Katherine Rogers identifies Robinson's *Walsingham* as showing 'some evidence of the radicals' feminist concerns'—*Feminism in Eighteenth-Century England* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982), p. 218, n. 27). Eleanor Ty reads *Walsingham, The False Friend*, and *The Natural Daughter* as narratives that employ 'the language of sentiment, of romance, and of the Gothic'—rather than the language of satire—in order to 'empower the feminine'—*Empowering the Feminine: The Narratives of Mary Robinson, Jane West, and Amelia Opie, 1796–1812* (Toronto:

University of Toronto Press, 1998), p. 18. Sharon Setzer rightly points out that social ties, at least, between Robinson and Godwin were strong:

As entries in Godwin's diary indicate, he became a frequent visitor at Robinson's home after they were introduced by Robert Merry in February 1796. The visits came to an end, however, shortly after Godwin's marriage to Wollstonecraft in March 1797, and they did not resume until January 1798, some four months after her death.—In Mary Robinson, *The Natural Daughter. With Portraits of the Leadenhead Family. A Novel* (1799), in *A Letter to the Women of England and The Natural Daughter*, edited by Sharon M. Setzer (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2003), p. 19.

26. Robinson, *The Natural Daughter*, p. 208. Subsequent references are to this edition of the text and are given in the essay.
27. Quoted in Robinson, *The Natural Daughter*, p. 330.
28. Quoted in ibid., p. 329.
29. Like *Romance Readers and Romance Writers,* copies of original editions of *Paris Lions and London Tigers* are extremely rare. Therefore, page numbers used refer to the electronic edition study text found at the Chawton House website for this edition; they do not correspond to those of the original—see Chawton House Library and Study Centre, Online: Internet (1 June 2006): <*http://www.chawton.org*>.

II

Appendix A: Satirical Novels by Women, 1795–1825

1795 [Anon.] [probably female], *The Observant Pedestrian; or, Traits of the Heart: In a Solitary Tour from Caernarvon to London*

1796 Frances Burney, *Camilla*
Elizabeth Hamilton, *Letters of a Hindoo Rajah*
Elizabeth Inchbald, *Nature and Art*

1797 Mary Robinson, *Walsingham; or the Pupil of Nature. A Domestic Story*

1798 Sophia King, *Waldorf; or the Dangers of Philosophy*

1799 Mary Charlton, *Rosella*
Mrs [Mary] Robinson, *The Natural Daughter. With Portraits of the Leadenhead Family. A Novel*
Mary Robinson, *The False Friend; a Domestic Story*

1800 Maria Edgeworth, *Castle Rackrent, an Hibernian Tale Taken from Fact, and from the Manners of the Irish Squires before the Year 1782*
[Elizabeth Hamilton], *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*

1801 [Anon.], *Farther Excursions of the Observant Pedestrian, Exemplified in a Tour to Margate*
[Mrs Martin], *The Enchantress; or Where Shall I Find Her?*
Maria Edgeworth, *Belinda*

1805 Maria Edgeworth, *The Modern Griselda*

1806 Maria Edgeworth, *Leonora*

1808 [Sarah Green], *The Private History of the Court of England*

1809 Maria Edgeworth, *Tales of Fashionable Life*, vols 1–3 ('Ennui', 'Almeria', 'Madame de Fleury', 'The Dun', 'Manoeuvring')

1810 [Sarah Green], *Romance Readers and Romance Writers*

[Sarah Green], *The Reformist!!! A Serio-Comic Political Novel* [later retitled *Percival Ellingford* (1816)]

'Caroline Burney', *Lindamira; or, an Old Maid in Search of a Husband. A Satirical Novel*

1811 'A Lady' [Jane Austen], *Sense and Sensibility: A Novel*

1812 Maria Edgeworth, *Tales of Fashionable Life*, vols 4–6 ('Vivian', 'Emilie de Coulanges', 'The Absentee')

1813 'By the Author of Sense and Sensibility' [Jane Austen], *Pride and Prejudice: A Novel*

1814 'By the Author of Sense and Sensibility & Pride and Prejudice' [Jane Austen], *Mansfield Park: A Novel*

Frances Burney, *The Wanderer; or Female Difficulties*

Maria Edgeworth, *Patronage*

1815 Maria Edgeworth, *Harrington* and *Ormond*

1816 [Anon.], *Uncle Tweazy and his Quizzical Neighbours: A Comi-Satiric Novel. By the Author of The 'Observant Pedestrian'*

'By the Author of Pride and Prejudice, &c., &c.' [Jane Austen], *Emma: A Novel*

'Mrs [Sarah] Green', *Percival Ellingford or the Reformist; a Novel* [new edn of *The Reformist!!!* (1810)]

[Caroline Lamb], *Glenarvon*

1818 'By the Author of Pride and Prejudice, Mansfield Park, &c.' [Jane Austen], *Northanger Abbey: and Persuasion* [*NA* completed 1803]

Susan Ferrier, *Marriage* [written 1810]

1819 [Alicia Wyndham?], *Harold the Exile*

1822 Mrs [Sarah] Green, *Who is the Bridegroom? Or Nuptial Discoveries. A Novel.*

[Caroline Lamb], *Graham Hamilton*

1823 'A Cockney' [Sarah Green], *Scotch Novel Reading or Modern Quackery. A Novel <u>Really</u> Founded on Facts* [emphasis in original]

'Mrs [Sarah] Green', *Gretna Green Marriages, or the Nieces. A Novel*

[Caroline Lamb], *Ada Reis: A Tale*

1825 'Mrs [Sarah] Green', *Parents and Wives; Or Inconsistency and Mistakes. A Novel*

Harriette Wilson, *Paris Lions and London Tigers*

Appendix B: British Satirical Novels in the Romantic Period, 1790–1830

1792 Robert Bage, *Man As He is*
Thomas Holcroft, *Anna St Ives* (to 1794)

1794 Thomas Holcroft, *The Adventures of Hugh Trevor* (to 1797)

1795 [Anon.], *The Observant Pedestrian; or, Traits of the Heart: In a Solitary Tour from Caernarvon to London*

1796 Robert Bage, *Hermsprong; or Man As He Is Not*
Frances Burney, *Camilla*
Elizabeth Hamilton, *Letters of a Hindoo Rajah*
Elizabeth Inchbald, *Nature and Art*
George Walker, *Theodore Cyphon*

1797 Isaac D'Israeli, *Vaurien; or Sketches of the Times*
Mary Robinson, *Walsingham; or the Pupil of Nature. A Domestic Story*

1798 Charles Lucas, *The Castle of St Donats; or the History of Jack Smith*
Sophia King, *Waldorf; or the Dangers of Philosophy*
'R.S., Esq.' [Richard Sickelmore], *The New Monk: A Romance*
Jane West, *A Tale of the Times*

1799 Mary Charlton, *Rosella*
Mary Robinson, *The False Friend; a Domestic Story*
Mrs [Mary] Robinson, *The Natural Daughter. With Portraits of the Leadenhead Family. A Novel*
George Walker, *The Vagabond; or Practical Infidelity. A Novel*

1800 Robert Bisset, *Douglas: or, the Highlander*
'Count Reginald de St Leon' [Edward Dubois], [The Travels of] *St Godwin: A Tale of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Century*
Maria Edgeworth, *Castle Rackrent, an Hibernian Tale Taken from Fact, and from the Manners of the Irish Squires before the Year 1782*
[Elizabeth Hamilton], *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*

1801 [Anon.], *Dorothea; or, A Ray of the New Light*
[Anon.], *Farther Excursions of the Observant Pedestrian, Exemplified in a Tour to Margate*
[Edward Dubois], *Old Nick: A Satirical Story*
Maria Edgeworth, *Belinda*
Charles Lucas, *The Infernal Quixote, a Tale of the Day*
[Mrs Martin], *The Enchantress; or Where Shall I Find Her?*

1804 'Henrico F. Glysticus', *Tears of Camphor; or Love and Nature Triumphant. A Satirical Tale of the Nineteenth Century. Interspersed with Original Poetry*

1805 Maria Edgeworth, *The Modern Griselda*

Thomas Holcroft, *The Memoirs of Bryan Perdue*

[Isaac D'Israeli], *Flim-Flams! Or, the Life and Errors of My Uncle and the Amours of My Aunt; together with Illustrations and Obscurities, by Messieurs Rag, Tag, and Bobtail. With an Illuminating Index!*

1806 Maria Edgeworth, *Leonora*

T[homas] S[kinner] Surr, *A Winter in London: or, Sketches of Fashion: A Novel*

1807 'Cervantes Hogg, F.S.M.' [E. S. Barrett], *The Rising Sun; a Serio-Comic Satiric Romance*

1808 'Author of The Rising Sun' [E. S. Barrett], *The Miss-led General: A Serio-Comic, Satiric, Mock Heroic Romance*

[Sarah Green], *A Private History of the Court of England*

Dennis Lawler, *Vicissitudes in Early Life; or, the History of Frank Neville, a Serio-Comic, Sentimental, and Satirical Tale: Interspersed with Comic Sketches, Anecdotes of Living Characters, and Original Poetry; Elegiac, Humourous, Lyrical, and Descriptive. With a Caricature Frontispiece*

1809 Maria Edgeworth, *Tales of Fashionable Life*, vols 1–3 ('Ennui', 'Almeria', 'Madame de Fleury', 'The Dun', 'Manoeuvring')

1810 [Sarah Green], *Romance Readers and Romance Writers. A Satirical Novel*

'Caroline Burney', *Lindamira; or, an Old Maid in Search of a Husband. A Satirical Novel*

1811 'A Lady' [Jane Austen], *Sense and Sensibility: A Novel*

'Cervantes Hogg' [E. S. Barrett], *The Metropolis; or a Cure for Gaming. Interspersed with Anecdotes of Living Characters in High Life*

1812 [Anon.], *My Own Times, a Novel. Containing Information on the Latest Fashions, the Improved Morals, the Virtuous Education, and the Important Avocations of High Life. Taken from 'The Best Authorities,' and Dedicated, without Permission, to 'Those Who Will Understand It'*

'A Naval Officer', *A Peep at the Theatres! And Bird's-Eye Views of Men in the Jubilee Year! A Novel, Satirical, Critical, and Moral*

Maria Edgeworth, *Tales of Fashionable Life*, vols 4–6 ('Vivian', 'Emilie de Coulanges', 'The Absentee')

1813 'By the Author of Sense and Sensibility' [Jane Austen], *Pride and Prejudice: A Novel*

[Anon.], *It Was Me! A Tale, by Me, or, One Who Cares for Nothing or Nobody*

1814 'Humphrey Hedgehog' [John Agg], *A Month in Town. A Satirical Novel*

'By the Author of Sense and Sensibility & Pride and Prejudice' [Jane Austen], *Mansfield Park: A Novel*

E[aton] S[tannard] Barrett, *The Heroine, or Adventures of a Fair Romance Reader*

Frances Burney, *The Wanderer; or Female Difficulties*

Maria Edgeworth, *Patronage*

[Pierce Egan], *The Mistress of Royalty; or the Loves of Florizel and Perdita, Portrayed in the Amatory Epistles, between an Illustrious Personage, and a Distinguished Female; with an Interesting Sketch of Florizel and Perdita, including Other Characters*

1815 John Agg, *A Month at Brussels, a Satirical Novel*
Maria Edgeworth, *Harrington* and *Ormond*
Thomas Love Peacock, *Headlong Hall*

1816 [Anon.], *Gulzara, Princess of Persia; or the Virgin Queen. Collected from the Original Persian*
[Anon.], *Uncle Tweazy and his Quizzical Neighbours: A Comi-Satiric Novel. By the Author of The 'Observant Pedestrian'*
'By the Author of Pride and Prejudice, &c., &c.' [Jane Austen], *Emma: A Novel*
'Humphrey Glump', *A Tour to Purgatory and Back. A Satirical Novel*
'Green, Mrs [Sarah]', *Percival Ellingford or the Reformist; a Novel*
'Humphrey Hedgehog' [John Agg], *Eighteen Hundred and Fifteen; a Satirical Novel*
[Caroline Lamb], *Glenarvon*

1817 'Humphrey Hedgehog' [John Agg], *The Pavilion; or a Month in Brighton. A Satirical Novel*
E[aton] S[tannard] Barrett, *Six Weeks at Long's: By a Late Resident*
T[homas] L[ove] Peacock, *Melincourt*

1818 'By the Author of Pride and Prejudice, Mansfield Park, &c.' [Jane Austen], *Northanger Abbey: And Persuasion* (*NA* completed 1803)
Susan Ferrier, *Marriage* (written 1810)
[Anon.], *Prodigious!!! Or Childe Paddie in London*
'Thomas Brown the Elder', *Bath, a Satirical Novel. With Anecdotical Portraits*
'Peregrine Puzzlebrain', *Tales of my Landlady. Edited by Peregrine Puzzlebrain. Assistant to the Schoolmaster of Gandercleugh*
T[homas] L[ove] Peacock, *Nightmare Abbey*

1819 [Anon.], *The Englishman in Paris; a Satirical Novel. With Sketches of the Most Remarkable Characters that Have Recently Visited that Celebrated Capital*
['By the author of Prodigious!!!'], *Gogmagog-Hall; or the Philosophical Lord and the Governess*
[Anon.] [Alicia Wyndham?] *Harold the Exile*
[Anon.], *London: Or a Month at Stevens's, by a Late Resident. A Satirical Novel*
[Anon.], *The Metropolis. A Novel, by the Author of Little Hydrogen, or the Devil on Two Sticks in London*

1820 [Anon], *Edinburgh: A Satirical Novel. By the Author of London; or a Month at Stevens's*
Charles Lucas, *Gwelygordd; or, the Child of Sin. A Tale of Welsh Origin*

1821 Pierce Egan, *Life in London; or the Day and Night Scenes of Jerry Hawthorn, Esq., and his Elegant Friend Corinthian Tom, Accompanied by Bob Logic, the Oxonian, in their Rambles and Sprees through the Metropolis. […] Embellished with Thirty-Six Scenes from Real Life, Designed and Etched by I. R. & G. Cruikshank; and Enriched also with Numerous Original Designs on Wood, by the Same Artists*

Innes Hoole, *Scenes at Brighton; or 'How Much?' A Satirical Novel*

'A Real Paddy', *Real Life in Ireland; or the Day and Night Scenes, Rovings, Rambles, and Sprees, Bulls, Blunders, Bodderation and Blarney, of Brian Boru, Esq., and his Elegant Friend Sir Shawn O'Dogherty, Exhibiting a Real Picture of Characters, Manners, &c. in High and Low Life, in Dublin and Various Parts of Ireland. Embellished with Humorous Coloured Engravings, from Original Designs by the Most Eminent Artists*

1822 [Anon.], *Tales of My Aunt Martha*

'An Amateur' [Pierce Egan], *Real Life in London; or the Rambles and Adventures of Bob Tallyho, Esq., and his Cousin, the Hon. Tom Dashall, through the Metropolis; Exhibiting a Living Picture of Fashionable Characters, Manners, and Amusements in High and Low Life*

Mrs [Sarah] Green, *Who is the Bridegroom? Or Nuptial Discoveries. A Novel*

[Caroline Lamb], *Graham Hamilton*

T[homas] L[ove] Peacock, *Maid Marian*

1823 [Anon.], *Maria; or a Shandean Journey of a Young Lady through Flanders and France during the Summer of 1822. By My Uncle Oddy*

'Bernard Blackmantle' [Charles Molloy Westmacott], *The English Spy: An Original Work, Characteristic, Satirical, and Humorous*

'A Cockney' [Sarah Green], *Scotch Novel Reading or Modern Quackery. A Novel Really Founded on Facts* [emphasis in original]

'Mrs [Sarah] Green', *Gretna Green Marriages, or the Nieces. A Novel*

[Caroline Lamb], *Ada Reis: A Tale*

1824 Susan Ferrier, *The Inheritance*

James Hogg, *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner, Written by Himself, with a Detail of Curious Traditionary Facts and Other Evidence by the Editor*

1825 [Anon.], *New Landlord's Tales; or Jedediah in the South*

John Harman Bedford, Lieut. R.N., *Wanderings of Childe Harolde. A Romance of Real Life. Interspersed with Memoirs of the English Wife, the Foreign Mistress, and Various Other Celebrated Characters*

'Mrs [Sarah] Green', *Parents and Wives; or Inconsistency and Mistakes. A Novel*

Harriette Wilson, *Paris Lions and London Tigers*

1826 [Anon.], *The Eccentric Traveller*

1828 [Anon.] *Whimwhams*

Pierce Egan, *The Finish to the Adventures of Tom, Jerry, and Logic in their Pursuits through Life In and Out of London*

1829 T[homas] L[ove] Peacock, *The Misfortunes of Elphin*

1830 [Harriette Wilson], *Clara Gazul*

1831 Susan Ferrier, *Destiny*
[Catherine Gore], *Mothers and Daughters: A Tale of the Year 1830*
T[homas] L[ove] Peacock, *Crochet Castle*

1834 Maria Edgeworth, *Helen: A Tale*

Referring to this Article

L. M. Wilson. 'British Women Writing Satirical Novels in the Romantic Period: Gendering Authorship and Narrative Voice', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 17 (Summer 2007). Online: Internet (date accessed): <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/romtext/articles/rt17_no2.pdf*>.

Edward Walsh (1805–50)
An Author Study

Anne MacCarthy

I

The Cork writer Edward Walsh was born in Derry in 1805: at the time of his birth, Walsh's father belonged to the North Cork Militia and was posted in Ireland. However, Walsh was reared in the Sliabh Luachra area on the Cork–Kerry border,[1] and it is possible that he was actually born in Sliabh Luachra, in Doire (the Gaelic name for Derry).[2] The very confusion as to his place of birth indicates the extent to which Ireland has forgotten this writer.

While Walsh was a schoolteacher by profession (first at Millstreet, then in Tourin, Co. Wateford), he also contributed to the *Nation*, a paper associated with the Young Irelanders who staged a failed revolution in Ireland in 1848. The poetry published by the *Nation* was nationalist and rebellious in tone, but also attempted to instil a new pride in its Anglophone readers in their Irish origins. According to Brian Cleeve, Walsh quarrelled with Thomas Davis, the leader of the Young Irelanders which was 'a very difficult thing to do'.[3]

Walsh's letters to John Daly, the publisher of his translations for *Reliques of Irish Jacobite Poetry*, demonstrate that he was an outspoken person who was not willing to acquiesce to anyone. They also evidence his confidence in his talents as a writer and a translator, and his conviction that he could write good English. At this time—the middle of the nineteenth century—the Irish were still learning to be proficient in the English language and Walsh was, in fact, bilingual. He ended his life as a teacher on the penal colony on Spike Island in Cork Harbour, where he met the Young Ireland revolutionary, John Mitchel, before the latter's deportation to Australia. Mitchel provides a description of the writer in his *Jail Journal*.[4] Walsh's work as a teacher in a penal colony taxed his health, and he died in Cork on 6 August 1850 and his wife and young children were forced to emigrate to Australia where his descendants still live.

II

Walsh is best known for his poetry and the two collections of translations of Irish songs published in his life, all of which have been out of print until quite recently. Besides publishing a large number of poems in the *Nation* between 1843 and 1848, he also contributed to the *Cork Magazine*, *Dublin Journal of*

Temperance, Science and Literature, *Dublin Penny Journal*, *Irish Penny Journal* and the *Shamrock*—the first and the last being pointedly nationalist in orientation. Walsh also published short tales in newspapers: again, these have not been republished until recently, a fact that signals a notable gap in our understanding of the Irish prose tradition. There had not been a complete collection until 2005 when John J. Ó Ríordáin published *A Tragic Troubadour: Life and Collected Works of Folklorist, Poet and Translator Edward Walsh (1805–1850)*, in which poetry, prose, and letters are collected together for the first time, alongside a biographical account of the author. An indication of the lack of interest in Walsh is the fact that the author of this excellent example of scholarship was forced to publish it privately.[5]

The fact that he published in several magazines is evidence of some contemporary popularity. The nineteenth-century Irish nationalist and novelist Charles Kickham spoke of Walsh's being forgotten soon after his death,[6] yet his *Reliques of Irish Jacobite Poetry* (1844) and *Irish Popular Songs* (1847) were reprinted in 1866 and 1883 respectively.[7] A poem by Walsh, 'The Lady of Albany's Lament for Prince Charles', appeared in Henry Montgomery's *Specimens of the Early Native Poetry of Ireland* in 1846,[8] while selections of his poetry and a 'notice' appeared in the third volume of Charles Read's well-known *Cabinet of Irish Literature* (4 vols, 1879–80), the most comprehensive anthology of Irish writing in the nineteenth century, in Charles MacCarthy Collins's *Celtic Irish Songs and Song Writers* (1885).[9] Walsh appeared in Samuel Lover's *Poems of Ireland* (1858), and he is to be found as well in the first series of *Poetry and Legendary Ballads of the South of Ireland*, edited by John O'Mahony in 1894.[10]

Finally, W. B. Yeats included four poems by Walsh in his *Book of Irish Verse*: 'Mo Craoibhin Cnó', 'Mairgréad Ni Chealleadh', 'From the Cold Sod that's o'er you', and 'The Fairy Nurse' in 1895.[11] Yeats's anthology appeared in four editions up to 1920, so it is not really fair to say that in the nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century Irish world of letters Edward Walsh was entirely forgotten. In Yeats's anthology it is worth noticing that Walsh appears alongside such poets as Oliver Goldsmith and Richard Brinsley Sheridan, Anglo-Irish writers in the strict sense of the term, as well as such writers as James Clarence Mangan, Thomas Moore, Samuel Ferguson, Thomas Davis, and Charles Kickham. Yeats places Walsh within a wider tradition of Irish writing in English, as opposed to one merely predicated on nationality, language, or religion. Kickham showed great enthusiasm for the writer and wrote the fullest account of Walsh's life available and I suggest that this fact, together with Kickham's popularity as a nationalist writer, has contributed to the widely accepted view of Walsh in Irish literary history as a patriotic poet.

In *Fairy and Folk Tales of the Irish Peasantry* (1888), Yeats compares Walsh to Douglas Hyde and says of Hyde: 'I hope he may put some of his gatherings into ballads, for he is the last of our ballad-writers of the school of Walsh and Callanan—men whose work seems fragrant with turf smoke'.[12] In 'Irish

National Literature, I: From Callanan to Carleton', Yeats states his opinion that of the translators who followed J. J. Callanan, Edward Walsh, 'a village schoolmaster', was the best.[13] In fact, Yeats adapted a translation by Walsh of a stanza from the song, 'Edmund of the Hill', which he gives in his essay 'Popular Ballad Poetry of Ireland'.

III

Walsh continued the poetic, musical tradition for which Sliabh Luachra was famous when still Irish-speaking and indeed for which it is renowned to this day. He preserved the legends and songs of the region and in his prose works accurately recorded the life and customs of its people during the early nineteenth century. His stories are very much in the style of William Carleton, but Walsh's national pride emerges from the fact that he never apologises for the behaviour of his characters. The writer's perspective is that of an educated Irishman describing the country people without portraying them as 'quaint folk'—the typical attitude towards the Irish peasantry at the time. The reader is presented with a strong sense of the independence of this area and its indomitable spirit. Walsh was writing of a time just before the Great Irish Famine of 1845–49, the stories being published in the 1830s and '40s: they deal with life in Duhallow and Sliabh Luachra, the Whiteboys, heroic legends, thus supplying an accurate and widely ranging account of Irish society before its radical transformation by the Famine. During the nineteenth century, the stress on a uniform Irish identity implicit in nationalism resulted in the disappearance of local differences; by contrast, Walsh participated in the construction of this national identity without ignoring the particularities of his locality, living as he did at a time when nationalist ideology was just beginning in Ireland.

The only two books Walsh published were two translated collections of Gaelic poetry, *Reliques of Irish Jacobite Poetry* in 1844 and *Irish Popular Songs* in 1847. These works evidence the translator's intimate knowledge of these popular songs, most of them from the eighteenth century, and his understanding of contemporary Irish language amongst the people of Munster. His translations reproduce the musicality of the originals, which later translators of these poems tend to ignore, while avoiding what may be called 'primitivism'—a tendency among later translators of Gaelic to provide what they deem to be a colloquial touch expected by readers of the poems. Walsh was one of the writers who can be considered a part of Irish Romanticism, something identified by Patrick Rafroidi in his *L'Irlande et le romantisme* (1972).[14] It is a little-known phenomenon with similarities to movements in other countries—particularly in the recovery of native folklore, literature, and music, and in the emphasis on the search for a national identity which implied separation from the United Kingdom. Walsh played a key part in this recovery, which itself became the basis of the Irish literary identity at the end of the nineteenth and during the early twentieth centuries.

It is difficult to understand why there is no edition of Walsh's works available. Although a minor writer, Irish literature in English does not have such a long tradition as to be able to do without him and other nineteenth-century writers. An important part of the Irish literary tradition is impoverished by not reading the works of writers such as Walsh: if we are not fully aware of the authors who first began to compose in English in Ireland, we will be unable to understand fully, not only Walsh's contemporaries, but later generations of Irish writers. His prose writing is of enormous significance to the Irish prose tradition and it is also difficult to understand why commentators often remark on the paucity of prose in nineteenth-century Ireland when tales such as these lie forgotten. One of the reasons may be that the Irish canon now ignores a writer whose work played an important role in the translation of the native Irish culture into English because its literary identity is more cosmopolitan. This shows us that the Irish canon is still being established, preferring to overlook some of the past, as its identity is still fragile. A stronger sense of autonomy, as we find in English or French literature, leads to the preservation of the work of minor writers, sometimes of less worth than Walsh. It is significant that the only interest in publishing his work remains at a local level only, in the Sliabh Luachra area which still has a sense of cultural independence in the Irish state and the maturity to want to preserve its cultural tradition.[15]

Notes

1. See Jack Lane and Brendan Clifford, *A North Cork Anthology: 250 Years of Writings from the Region of Millstreet, Duhallow, Slieve Luachra and Thereabouts* (Millstreet: Aubane Historical Society, 1993), p. 164.
2. I would like to thank Dr Bernard O'Donoghue, a poet also from the Sliabh Luachra area, for this information.
3. Brian Cleeve, *Dictionary of Irish Writers: Fiction* (Cork: Mercier Press, 1967), p. 137.
4. John Mitchel, *Jail Journal; or, Five Years in British Prisons* (1876), rptd with an introduction by John Kelly (Poole and New York: Woodstock Books, 1996), p. 30.
5. John J. Ó Ríordáin, *A Tragic Troubadour: Life and Collected Works of Folklorist, Poet and Translator Edward Walsh (1805–1850)* (Limerick: Privately Printed, 2005).
6. See Charles Kickham, *The Valley near Slievenamon: A Kickham Anthology*, edited by James Maher (Kilkenny: Kilkenny People, 1942).
7. Edward Walsh, *Reliques of Irish Jacobite Poetry with Biographical Sketches of the Authors. Interlinear Literal Translations, and Historical Illustrative Notes by John Daly* (Dublin: Samuel J. Machen, 1844); *Irish Popular Songs; with English Metrical Translations, and Introductory Remarks and Notes* (Dublin: James McGlashan; and London: William S. Orr and Co., 1847).
8. Henry R. Montgomery, *Specimens of the Early Native Poetry of Ireland* (Dublin: McGlashan, 1846).

9. Charles Read, *Cabinet of Irish Literature*, 4 vols (London: Blackie & Son, 1879–80); Charles MacCarthy Collins, *Celtic Irish Songs and Song Writers* (London: J. Cornish & Sons, 1885).
10. Samuel Lover, *Poems of Ireland* (London: Ward, Lock, 1858); John O'Mahony (ed.), *Poetry and Legendary Ballads of the South of Ireland*, 1st ser. (Cork: Guy & Co., 1894).
11. William Butler Yeats (ed.), *A Book of Irish Verse* (London: Methuen, 1895).
12. William Butler Yeats (ed.), *Fairy and Folk Tales of the Irish Peasantry* (London: Walter Scott, 1888), p. xvi.
13. William Butler Yeats, 'Popular Ballad Poetry of Ireland', in *Uncollected Prose by W. B. Yeats—Vol. 1: Articles and Reviews*, edited by John P. Frayne, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), 362.
14. Patrick Rafroidi, *L'Irlande et le romantisme* (Paris : Éditions universitaires, 1972); translated as *Irish Literature in English: The Romantic Period*, 2 vols (Gerrards Cross, Bucks: Colin Smythe, 1980).
15. Fuller details about Walsh and nineteenth-century Irish poetry can be found in the present author's *James Clarence Mangan, Edward Walsh and Nineteenth-Century Irish Literature in English* (Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000) and 'Edward Walsh and Nineteenth-Century Translation', in *Writing Irishness in Nineteenth-Century British Culture*, edited by Neil McCaw (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 81–97. Also, see Robert Welch's *History of Verse Translation form the Irish 1789–1897* (Gerrards Cross, Bucks: Colin Smythe; Totowa, NJ: Barnes and Noble Books, 1988).

Copyright Information

Referring to this Article

A. MacCarthy. 'Edward Walsh (1805–50): An Author Study', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 17 (Summer 2007). Online: Internet (date accessed): <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/romtext/reports/rt17_n03.pdf*>.

The matter contained within this article provides bibliographical information based on independent personal research by the contributor, and as such has not been subject to the peer-review process.

Reviews

Hermione de Almeida and George H. Gilpin, *Indian Renaissance: British Romantic Art and the Prospect of India* (Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006), xv + 336 pp. ISBN: 0-7546-3681-X; £75 / $144.95 (hb).

This fascinating exploration by Hermione de Almeida and George H. Gilpin continues a strong series of studies, 'British Art and Visual Culture since 1750: New Readings', which attempts to unpack the social history, consumption, and display of British visual culture. This valuable addition, *Indian Renaissance*, gallantly strives to redress balances and bring the Indian sub-continent back from the periphery of British cultural concerns. The book's narrative attempts to highlight British Art's relation to imperial history in the context of British artists travelling to India during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries with unbridled fascination and wonder, eventually bringing home impressions of an India which informed the imaginations and curiosities of the Romantic Movement.

A wonderful image has been chosen for the front cover: William Hodges's painting 'Tomb and Distant View of the Rajmahal Hills' from 1781. This contemplative, almost infinite, vista depicts the Ganges at its broadest, as an immense and tranquil riverbed. The delicate oils distil a complex scene of mountain peaks, fertile green plains and tiny palm trees down to its bare essence. The authors position images such as this in terms of being firstly a naïve product of innocence and delight in the face of exciting, new subjects and inspirations, and later as appropriated tools in fulfilling Victorian imperial agendas and concerns of patronage.

Central to the opening chapter is the figure of Tipu Sultan, ruler of Mysore, who bravely represented a lone, final stand against British expansion in south-central India, but was eventually defeated in 1799. One of the more curious spoils of this battle was 'Tipu's Tiger', a large wood sculpture-*cum*-mechanical toy depicting a Bengal tiger ravaging an English gentleman, which now resides on permanent display in the Victoria and Albert Museum. (See *http://www.vam.ac.uk/collections/asia/object_stories/Tippoo's_tiger/index.html* for further details.) The object had been the Sultan's favourite joke display for visitors to the Mysore court, but here in the opening chapter this curious contraption is used to explore the figure of the tiger as metaphor for Indian military might, mysterious exoticism, and alien ferocity. The symbolism of extreme violence—

and savage sexual violence—was not lost on the propaganda machine of British colonial expansion, with the potency of the dark, menacing tiger soon being appropriated by the image of the British Lion. Just as 'Tipu's Tiger' had gorged on the Englishman who had ventured into his forest domain, so too would British soldiers and East India Company men capture an India 'ready and waiting' to be taken.

Mention is made of William Blake's illuminated poem, 'The Tyger', which was composed very soon after Tipu's mechanical toy arrived in London to be ceremoniously displayed at East India House in Leadenhall Street. Later however, owing to lurid tales of Tipu's atrocities involving tigers and Englishmen, the model's notoriety created such demand that the government decided to rehouse Tipu's Tiger as the centrepiece of the newly created East India Museum. Londoners and European visitors all flocked to see the remarkable exhibit.

One of the notable strengths of the book is the detailed study in Part Two given to Tilly Kettle, the first professional painter to travel and work in the subcontinent with East India Company approval. The authors' proposed 'Indian Renaissance' of British Romantic Art begins with an eighteenth-century British public expecting to be treated to images of India that satisfy pre-conceived notions of a strange and exotic land, built by English translations of works such as 'Arabian Nights'. Kettle's early work as a commercial, theatrical portraitist is presented here as the perfect grounding for a new career spent depicting India as a theatre of scenes, and as a manifestation of endless well-established fantasies of oriental narratives. The authors make the crucial point that Kettle's first images that were shipped home marked the beginning of the prospect of India as an aesthetic concept and popular subject in Europe. Kettle's images sated a British appetite of expectations, founded largely on rumour, concerning the spectacular wealth, explicit eroticism, and alien local customs of the new British locations in India. The chapter indicates that Kettle gave London cultural circles their first detailed and striking representations of an India that was both an imagined land and a real, lucrative entity.

A wonderfully poetic chapter entitled 'Hodges' Indian Sublime' explores the Indian paintings of William Hodges (who was sent to India by the Governor-General, Warren Hastings) in connection to Edmund Burke's theories on the visual Sublime. By examining the context of Hodges' meditative, brooding landscapes the authors reveal influences from Burke's references to the sublime as 'an experience of transcendent terror aroused by something vast, rough, angular, dark and gloomy'.

The artist perhaps most well-known for popularising this supposed 'Indian Renaissance' within British Romantic art is Thomas Daniell, to whom an entire section of the book is dedicated. Having arrived in India at a time of turmoil and transition, soon after Burke's testimonies had led to the impeachment of Governor-General Hastings, Daniell immediately set to work becoming the 'Piranesi of British Calcutta' by painstakingly producing a series of twelve aq-

uatints entitled 'Views of Calcutta' in 1786. This effort took two years, and was highly commended by many of the leading artistic figures of the time, including William Hodges, who praised Daniell for depicting an exciting spectacle of flourishing street life and fascinating diversity which could be compared to eighteenth-century London. To quote Hodges: 'the mixture of European and Asiatic manners, which may be observed in Calcutta [...] forms a sight perhaps more novel and extraordinary than any city in the world can present to a stranger.'

Towards the end of the book, and examination is made of Blake's self-appointed task as an Ezekiel-style prophet, condemning war and advising of the dangers of empire. Blake is shown to have drawn heavily upon images of India by artists such as Daniell in an attempt to find visual metaphors to contribute to his personal crusade against imperial rule; these works perhaps culminating in his epic masterpiece, *Jerusalem. The Emanation of the Giant Albion*.

De Almeida and Gilpin's book is a thoroughly researched, exhaustive inquiry into the connections between an imperial history and the related visual culture of recording these new lands and subsequent dissemination of images. The ability of the book to link political and social concerns with a unique visual aesthetic makes it a valuable addition to the study of this period of cultural history.

Abraham Thomas
Victoria and Albert Museum

Gavin Edwards, *Narrative Order, 1789–1819: Life and Story in an Age of Revolution* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), viii + 207. ISBN 1-4039-9211-8; £47 / $69.95 (hb).

This informative and often densely argued work brings together three main components in exploring a range of texts spanning Samuel Johnson's *Life of Savage* (1744) to Walter Scott's *The Bride of Lammermoor* (1819), with a concentration on the revolutionary years of the later eighteenth century. On the first front, it charts a situation where the concept of orderly narrative, involving a sequential movement from endings to beginnings, came under a variety of pressures, with a resultant shift from third-person accounts and the exhibition of 'character' to the first person and a prioritisation of 'self'—in broad terms from biography to autobiography. An integral part of the argument here is a connection between narrative and the idea of contract, an area which is also seen as becoming increasingly problematical.

Along with this, the book shows a sophisticated awareness of the complex semantics of a range of keywords in the literature of the period, their multiple and/or shifting meanings, and of how certain words came under pressure

through the dynamics of social change. The third main component of the book lies in its concentration on one cataclysmic historical event as a means of accounting for the narrative and linguistic changes described. Gavin Edwards acknowledges an allegiance 'to that tradition of analysis which credits the revolution in France with an epoch-making (or period-making) role in British literary culture' (p. 10); though this stance is modified by reference to other contributory elements, such as broad social changes within Britain from the 1760, while at some points the focus can become surprisingly specific (as in references to the positions of Scott and Wordsworth in the invasion-wary climate of 1805).

One of the main strengths of the book lies in the tightness of the specific 'case-study' analyses of individual authors and texts which constitute the main chapters. Here Edwards is capable of quite brilliant exegesis, especially through an ability to bring together dynamically different levels of approach. The account of Johnson's need to impose order through a forward-moving narrative, which so doggedly resists in the *Life of Savage* the impulse to return to and change beginnings, is elucidated by a combination of factors, ranging from Johnson's own psychological intensities to the context of contemporary Jacobitism and the desire to return to a *status quo ante*. Edmund Burke, in turn, directly responding to a revolutionary discourse where beginnings become precedents or (more threateningly) endings and beginnings collide, is seen as valorising instead middles and mediations. The occupant of the entailed estate (a key motif) is thus seen as being part of a kind of continual middle state of 'passing through', in this sense a 'life-tenant' rather than proprietor or owner. In an exceptionally fine passage of linguistic analysis, 'we' is seen as the controlling pronoun in Burke's rhetoric, and the present perfect the controlling tense.

Edwards then consciously widens and complicates the picture with a fine chapter on the British officer/writer Watkin Tench, whose two publications describing the British colonisation of New South Wales receive similarly sharp and wide-ranging analysis. A focal point of the argument here is the complex relationship between 'journal' and 'narrative' in Tench's recording and writing up of material, especially in view of the interlocking of their publication history with the outbreak of revolution in France—though arguably it is the situation in Australia itself, the untracked terrain and the breakdown of normative social relations, which threatens most starkly conventional forms of narrative ordering. After a slightly more routine chapter on Godwin's *Caleb Williams* (1794), in which 'character', 'narrative', and 'family' are among keywords under scrutiny, Edwards provides a quite stunning commentary on the signification of 'moving accidents' in a variety of Wordsworthian texts. While Wordsworth's allusion to the source passage in *Othello* has evidently elicited a fair amount of discussion amongst his critics, one doubts whether it has been carried anywhere close to the level of semantic intensity as found here. In particular, Edwards focuses on the three meanings of 'accident': the Shakespearean one of 'incident' or 'event', largely defunct in Wordsworth's day; the philosophical one of 'chance', or 'not

essential'; and the more modern one of 'mishap'. In a sequence of fascinating analyses, Wordsworth's texts are shown to include aspects of all three meanings, often caught in fluid states, the final possibility intriguingly offered by Edwards being one where the 'slighter' modern form overlays the more 'heroic' Shakespearean one, the resultant model being not unlike that of the Freudian consciousness/unconsciousness.

Following chapters point to further undermining of narrative order: firstly in the 'conservative' George Crabbe, in whose verse the 'parable' is seen as wilting under the pressure of irresistible changes in the social order; then in the more 'radical' Mary Wollstonecraft and Mary Shelley, in whose fictions beginnings and ends are confused or denied, contracts both attract and bind, first-person accounts override the third-person narrative, and stories are told in a desperate but often vain effort to form relations. The strengths and potential dangers of Edwards's approach are most strikingly visible in the book's final chapter. This begins by speculating an affinity between *The Bride of Lammermoor* (1819) and Keats's 'Ode on a Grecian Urn' (published one year later), as representatives of two major forms to emerge from the formal instabilities of the early nineteenth century, the short lyrical poem and the historical novel. The main weight in this chapter falls on the *Bride*, the interpretation of which hinges on the preliminary chapter involving a discussion between the rustic painter Dick Tinto and the putative author Peter Pattieson, concerning the aesthetics of narrative painting. Edwards from this launching-pad enters into several potentially productive areas, such as the relationship between sketch and finished product, one particularly insightful observation here being how the reader is invited to anticipate in the main story a movement from the first to the second. Arguably however some of the connections made border on the tendentious. Tinto's exclamatory mention of 'Sir Joshua' leads for example a little too smoothly into an assumption that 'Scott probably did have Reynolds' *Discourses* in mind' (p. 162)—an assumption which is subsequently transferred into something more like a certitude: 'as I have suggested, Reynolds' views are very much in evidence throughout the argument between narrator and painter' (p. 165).

Similarly, while it is a credit to Edwards that he is alive to the possible significances of the narrative's temporal setting round about the 1707 Union between England and Scotland, it is perhaps wrong to talk about 'uncertainty' on Scott's part as to whether the time is pre-1707 or not. The 1819 first edition of the *Bride* is fairly clearly set before the Union, and it is to the still extant Scottish Parliament that Edgar Ravenswood is envisaging an appeal—references to an appeal to the House of Lords, making the period unequivocally post-1707, probably only entered into the 1830 Magnum Opus text of the novel though Scott's insecurities over accuracy. The point might seem a purely technical one, but in fact a realisation of the original pre-1707 setting can help liberate a whole area of meaning from the novel, vital to Scott when writing, in which the dual possibilities of marital union in the novel parallel two alternative political unions, a consensual federal union and an enforced incorporating union.

Edwards's analysis certainly touches on such pivotal oppositions, but it is to a position of the 'undermining of narrative meaning' (p. 178) that one is finally led. On a more particular front, there are signs that the writer's knowledge of Scott is not so advanced as in the case of other authors discussed. It is surely an exaggeration to say that 'many of Scott's novels [are] narrated by Peter Pattieson' (p. 159); and it is almost certainly wrong to talk of Ravenswood's father as 'the old Master of Ravenswood' (p. 172), since 'Master of Ravenswood' is a courtesy title applying only to Edgar his son ('Master of' referring to the heir apparent of a Scottish barony). In view of these and other oversights, one is inclined to be sceptical about the proven status of some more sweeping statements, e.g. the assertion (made twice) that the *Bride of Lammermoor* is 'Scott's most Burkian novel' (pp. 15, 161)

As a whole, this is a brave, accomplished, and challenging book. Its concerns have clearly been fomenting in the author's mind for some time, one symptom of this being the high degree of interrelationship evident in the discussions of themes, authors, and works. The texts are well selected and operate in relation to each other in fruitful and sometimes surprising ways. At the same time, it is very much a book which accentuates *modern interpretation* as a primary level of activity, to the extent that aspects such as contemporary readerships and publishing conditions tend to be dealt with in a relatively cursory way. In this respect, notwithstanding its strong historical agenda, this book might ultimately tell us more about ourselves (or a section of ourselves) than its purported subject.

Peter D. Garside
University of Edinburgh

Gavin Hopps and Jane Stabler (eds), *Romanticism and Religion from William Cowper to Wallace Stevens* (Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006), 262pp. ISBN 0-7546-5570-9; £50 / $99.95 (hb).

This book is an important addition to Ashgate's Nineteenth Century series, containing critical and theoretical discussion of Romanticism and its relationship with Religion. The editors, Gavin Hopps and Jane Stabler, state at the outset their aim to redress secular criticism of the subject, which has been predominant for several years. Quoting Jerome McGann's *The Romantic Ideology* as an example, the introductory essay addresses the problems caused by this secular viewpoint, in that it 'presupposes a view of the world opposed to the religious' (p. 1). Examining the work of key Romantic period figures, in what the editors term 'a "theological turn" in postmodern thought', the book therefore invites us to rethink general assumptions in light of broader concepts of belief (p. 8).

One of the most thought-provoking comments of the volume is seen in Vincent Newey's fascinating essay on Cowper, where he writes:

> We tend to think of the Romantic age as an upsurge of freedom, as in certain respects it manifestly is, including the diffusion of conventional religious energies into broader causes and purposes; but with Cowper, we are prompted to comprehend it as being no less about quietly and persistently setting controls. (p. 54)

Certainly, when it comes to religion, the evidence of this book shows that issues of control appear relevant to a number of Romantic period writers. This is seen, for example, in Robert Southey and Samuel Taylor Coleridge's anxiety about 'the spreading Catholic infection' (p. 77). Catholicism was a major subject of debate and concern within the Romantic period: there were the anti-Catholic Gordon Riots of 1780; the influx of priests after the French Revolution; the creation of many Catholic seminaries in England and Ireland; and agitation surrounding the Catholic Relief Act of 1829. It was an area that was discussed by a number of leading writers of the time, including (to name a few) Radcliffe, Maturin, Wordsworth, Scott, and Hazlitt. Yet, as Timothy Webb rightly points out, it is an area that is often marginalised in contemporary writings. His article on 'Catholic Contagion: Southey, Coleridge and English Anxieties' admirably addresses this deficit by examining the writers' concerns on European and Irish Catholicism, in the context of wider political and religious debate. The chapter 'Sacred Art and Profane Poets' also engages with this important theme. Here, Jane Stabler highlights the responses of the 'Shelley circle' to religious Renaissance art and shows how it is possible to use these reactions to modify ideas 'about the Promethean heroism of the Romantic creator' (p. 207).

Almost half the book (six chapters out of fourteen) discusses Byron's responses to and beliefs about religion, which provides an interesting debate on this popular writer. One of the most compelling is Christine Kenyon Jones essay, which presents the argument that Byron was 'bi- or multilingual in religious matters'. She argues that this gave him an 'acute sensitivity to nuances of doctrinal argument, an intense and lifelong interest in religious and theological matters and their effect upon psychology and motivation' (p. 109). Far from popular perceptions of Byron's dour Calvinist upbringing, Kenyon Jones correctly highlights that Scottish religion at that time was a multifaceted, pluralistic, and socially complex influence that often engaged with English theological thinking. She also presents new research, which shows that the church the Byrons attended in Aberdeen was 'the only Church in Scotland where there was an organ' and where the service was chanted as in English cathedrals (p. 110). While essays such as these add to our knowledge and understanding of Byron's religious views and influences, the overall balance of the book is compromised by such a heavy-handed examination of one particular writer. This bias is undertaken to the detriment of many key literary figures of

Romanticism, who perhaps should have been included but were not, such as Walter Scott to name but one.

A. O. Lovejoy once commented that 'the offspring with which Romanticism is credited are as strangely assorted as its attributes and its ancestors', and this book is a prime example of this. It attempts to do many things in its overall structure: it re-examines the relationship between Romanticism and religion; addresses what Hopps and Stabler call the 'recent attempts to recruit the poet [Byron] for the cause of "radical unbelief" ' (p. 9); and extends temporal boundaries beyond first-generation Romantics to include Gerald Manley Hopkins and Wallace Stevens. Added to a mix of topics and genres (there are essays on poetry, prose, drama, art, and language), these competing aims make the book hard going at times and are a hindrance to its overall coherence. The book would also have benefited from a clearer explanation of how it defines the term 'Religion'. This is particularly relevant when the editors admit that '[n]ot all the chapters in the collection espouse a religious viewpoint', but what they contribute is [after appropriating Alan Rawes quotation], a responsive openness to possibilities' (p. 13). It could be argued that while these chapters are hugely valuable in their own right, they result in the book taking steps towards the blurred boundaries between secular and non-secular readings. Regardless of this, *Romanticism and Religion from William Cowper to Wallace Stevens* is a worthy contribution to the field of Romantic studies, and will instigate and inspire continued debate on the subject for some time to come.

Wendy Hunter
University of Sheffield

Nicholas Reid, *Coleridge, Form and Symbol: Or the Ascertaining Vision* (Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate 2006), ix + 189pp. ISBN 0-7546-5327-7; £45 / $89.95.

The aim of Ashgate's Nineteenth Century Series 'is to reflect, develop and extend the great burgeoning interest in the nineteenth century […] as a locus for our understanding not only of the past but of the contours of our modernity' (p. x). In *Coleridge, Form and Symbol: Or the Ascertaining Vision*, Nicholas Reid engages with the dual articulation of Ashgate's locus through an intriguing examination of Coleridge's metaphysics and his theories of the imagination, symbol, and form. What is especially refreshing about Reid's study is how it situates the relevance of Coleridgean concepts and thought within contemporary critical theory. Rather than solely reading Coleridge *through* the lens of critical theory, Reid frames an interchangeable *dialogue* between Coleridgean concepts and theory, which reciprocally inform and enlighten one another.

In Part I, for example, Reid draws on twentieth-century aesthetics to show that 'a Coleridgean phenomenology, far from being mere folk psychology, is

well-grounded by the evidence. I hope that readers will recognise in this an attempt to revalue those centrally Coleridgean concepts, form and imagination, and will also see the relevance of this part for contemporary critical theory' (p. vi). Reid does not approach Coleridge as a case-history whose system of thought belongs to the nineteenth-century past. Rather, he posits Coleridgean thought as a valuable contribution to current discussions: 'I do [...] think that Coleridge's thought is of interest in its own right. And to refuse to consider the major preoccupations of so major a figure as Coleridge, is to settle for a limited and partial view' (p. vii). Reid's balanced discussion accomplishes this convincingly throughout the volume.

The book is divided into three parts. Part I, 'Image and Form', explores the relationship between thought and image, and how that relation is embodied in the concept of form. Drawing on the works of Susanne Langer and Louis Arnaud Reid (incidentally, the author's grandfather to whom the volume is dedicated) these two chapters elucidate 'a somewhat polemical defence of Coleridge's intuitions about the connection between form and imagination' (p. 5). Yet, this self-termed 'defence' is forward-looking in embracing the contexts of the Artificial Intelligence debate to demonstrate how writers such as Alan Richardson, Antonio Damasio, Ralph Ellis, and George Lakoff 'have moved back towards what is in some ways a Coleridgean view of the place of imaging (or imagination) at the heart of cognition' (p. 11). Reid's discussion of 'image' as a mental construct, 'an object-directed, *mental* act' (p. 13, Reid's emphasis) in which 'imaging is the ground of meaning' (p. 22) and of 'Coleridge's view of form [...] the single most important concept in Coleridge's thinking' (p. 30) present the contemporary resonance of Coleridge's thought and the foundational scope for developing the significance of symbol in Part II.

The three chapters in the second section, 'Coleridge's Poetry', look at Coleridge's views more closely through an examination of his poems 'in which Coleridge first worked out the basis of his later theories of symbol and form' (p. 43). Chapter 3 reads the symbolic method in 'The Ancient Mariner' as an intertextual commentary on 'the process of interpretation' (p. 49). Specifically, Reid argues that 'the poem directs attention to its own function as myth, and to the function of the reader in participating in the interpretation of divine symbols' (p. 53). The 'emphasis on textuality and readership' in this reading 'reflects Coleridge's own hermeneutics' and supports Reid's premise that Coleridgean thought on form, symbol and imagination develop in, as well as from, his poems (p. 57). This is further developed in Chapter 4's examination of a 'pattern of absence and presence' in the conversational poems—specifically, 'This Lime-tree Bower', 'Frost at Midnight', and 'Dejection'—where Reid explores 'a phenomenology of vision, the correlative of form' (p. 61). Having always been very partial to Coleridge's conversational poems, Reid's lively discussion makes this chapter my favourite in the book. The last chapter in this section traces the influence of Mark Akenside's *The Pleasures of Imagination* (1744) as a contextual source 'in which Coleridge's views on symbol and form arose' (p. 83).

A self-confessed 'critical experiment', Reid's reading in this chapter examines 'Akenside from […] the Coleridgean perspective; and in fact […] engage[s] in the project of reading Coleridge *through* Akenside' (p. 83, Reid's emphasis).

The chapters in Part III, entitled 'Coleridgean Metaphysics', shift the focus to a discussion of the philosophical system of the later Coleridge. Chapter 6 traces the process of how the initial influence of F. W. J. Schelling's *System of Transcendental Idealism* (1800) develops into Coleridge's critique of 'Schelling's failure to derive the categories of thought and logic which underlie his system' (p. 116). This chapter's sections on 'Coleridge's Marginal Critique' and 'The Trinity' (pp. 116, 120) show how Coleridge's logic is fundamentally different from Schelling's *System*—specifically through Coleridge's development 'in the dynamic act of the Trinity […] an act which eschews the subject-object categories of the finite Understanding' (p. 125). In the last ten years of his life, Coleridge continued to engage with 'Schelling's transcendental deduction' and while 'the broader picture' and 'the essential logic of the system' did not change, Coleridge did 'modify […] [his] views of nature and the imagination' (p. 137). Chapter 7 focuses specifically on the imagination, and aims to affirm '[Anthony] Harding's sense that evil plays a fundamental role metaphysically in the later Coleridgean imagination—and that the kind of absence or via negativa which we have seen in Coleridge's earlier conversation poems reflects, phenomenologically, the role later seen for darkness in Coleridge's thought' (p. 138). Chapter 8 discusses Coleridge's theory of language. Reid aligns Coleridge 'akin to the views of Susanne Langer' about the human mind's use of two kinds of symbols—'the conventional symbols of language' and the symbol as 'perceptual image' (p. 152)—rather than pursing the 'desire to find in Coleridge a linguistic nominalism or anti-realism of the sort which was common in theoretical circles until the later 1990s' (p. 151). A discussion about Coleridge's 'On Poesy or Art' and the 'Essay on Method' in Chapter 9 concludes the volume.

Throughout Reid writes in a clear and direct style that highlights his vast knowledge of Coleridge and contemporary critical theory. The topical rubrics in the chapters are both a practical and informative aid for the reader. Occasionally, the reader may find the development of the book's overall argument slightly discursive—perhaps a result of the fact that most of the volume is a collection of previous publications. Aside from the concluding chapter, earlier versions of all chapters, in whole or in part, have appeared in: *Romanticism on the Net* (Chapters 1, 2, and 8), *AUMLA* (Chapters 3 and 5), *The Charles Lamb Bulletin* (Chapter 4), and *Studies in Romanticism* (Chapters 6 and 7). At times, this may have a disjointed effect upon the reader in completely connecting the full impact of the overall argument between individual chapters. Having said that, insightful discussions on the conversational poems, nature, and the Trinity—to name but a few—are interwoven throughout the sections in the text and it might be this reader's desire to encase these insightful and provoking thoughts more fully in their own chapters that fuelled the reservations noted above. The scope of this intriguing book is ambitious, and Reid convincingly

argues, challenges, and raises the reader's awareness of Coleridgean metaphysics, critical theory, and the history of ideas, in a manner sure to stimulate future debate.

Maximiliaan van Woudenberg
Sheridan Institute of Technology

Notes on Contributors

Peter Garside is Professor of Bibliography and Textual Studies at the University of Edinburgh. He has recently co-edited an edition of James Hogg's *The Forest Minstrel* (EUP, 2006), and has just completed work on an edition of Walter Scott's *Waverley* for the Edinburgh Edition of the Waverley Novels.

Wendy Hunter is in the process of completing her PhD thesis at the University of Sheffield, which has a working title of 'Literary Identity in the Work of James Hogg'. She has recently published an article on Hogg's periodical *The Spy* for the *Literary Encyclopaedia* and has contributed to a forthcoming e-book on Hogg's contributions in Chambers' *Edinburgh Journal*.

Anne MacCarthy is Senior Lecturer in English Literature in the English Department at the University of Santiago di Compostela, Spain. She has published book-length studies on Edward Walsh, James Clarence Mangan, and the development of Irish literature during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as well as heading a research project on the influence of nineteenth-century Irish literature on the work of James Joyce.

David Stewart (BA Stirling, MPhil Glasgow) is a second-year PhD student at the University of Glasgow. His thesis focuses on the periodical culture of the 1810s and '20s, particularly literary magazines such as *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, the *London Magazine*, the *New Monthly Magazine*, and Leigh Hunt's *Examiner*, *Reflector*, and *Indicator* papers, as well as the intersections between print culture, commercialism, and the aesthetic.

Abraham Thomas is Curator of Designs at the Victoria & Albert Museum. In 2006, he co-curated the V&A's 'Alternating Currents' season on Islamic architecture, and 'On The Threshold', an exhibition in the Architecture Exhibition Gallery looking at contemporary housing. During 2007, he will be curating a display entitled 'Full Tilt', looking at the fashion photography and graphic design at *Harper's Bazaar* and *Vogue* magazines in the 1940s/1950s, which opens in August in the V&A's 20th-Century Gallery.

Lisa M. Wilson is Assistant Professor in the Department of English and Communication at the State University of New York College at Potsdam. Her research focuses on issues of authorship, gender, and print culture in the British Romantic period and she has published on Matthew 'Monk' Lewis, Charlotte Dacre, and Mary Robinson. She is currently working on a book manuscript, *Marketing Authorship in an 'Age of Personality', 1780–1850*. This article forms part of her new study on Romantic-period satirical novels, which began as part of a National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Seminar directed by Stephen Behrendt at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Maximilaan van Woudenberg (BA McMaster, PhD Alberta) is Professor of Communications at the Sheridan Institute of Technology in Oakville, Canada, where he teaches Literature and Digital Storytelling. He has published several articles on Coleridge's activities at the University of Göttingen and is currently preparing a monograph entitled *Coleridge and the Continental University*.

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 (2 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.