

Book Reviews



THE LESLIE A. MARCHAND MEMORIAL LECTURES, 2000–2015: A LEGACY IN BYRON STUDIES. Edited by Katharine Kernberger. University of Delaware Press: Newark, 2017. Pp. 240. Hardback. ISBN: 978-1-61149-667-3. \$90. eBook. ISBN 978-1-61149-668-0. \$90.

Here are ten lectures from the series of annual lectures given in honour of Leslie Marchand. As Katharine Kernberger notes in her nicely conducted introduction: ‘the range of disciplines represented here goes beyond the usual limits of literary scholarship’ (p. xv) for there are articles by playwrights, publishers, medical authorities, as well as celebrated academics. Editing, too, must have been minimal in that the speaking, often anecdotal, character of the essays has been properly preserved. Most come with minimal endnotes. It does not read like the run of books on Byron published by a university press, but it is an extremely enjoyable and profitable read. Despite very varied approaches to Byron, the collection is unified simply by its attention to a single phenomenon – Byron’s life and works – and by the warmth of the many grateful references to Leslie Marchand whose name, Peter Graham well says, ‘invokes a blend of scholarly depth, range, and rigor, high-mindedness, industry, courtesy and kindness that cannot be copied’ (p. 123). I only met him a few times in 1988, but that was my lasting impression too. It is fleshed out in three opening essays recalling Marchand especially written for the volume by Hermione de Almeida, the late and much missed Byron Raizis, and Marsha Manns. The latter gives much interesting information about Marchand’s important role in the founding of the Byron Society in London in 1971 and the Byron Society of America two years later.

The lecture series was opened by Jerome McGann’s ‘Romantic Scholarship and Culture, 1960–2000: A Byronic View’. McGann discloses that it was Marchand who suggested that McGann should edit a new complete text of Byron’s poems and thus completely change the Byron landscape. His essay, idiosyncratic, vigorous, and compelling, goes beyond its announced dates for it proposes a nineteenth-century model of literary attention rooted in philology and history which was overturned (disastrously in his view) by New Criticism and then literary theory. The latter coincided with McGann’s turn to editing Byron which convinced him that the older emphases on philology, textual fact, and historical context were the right ones. A similarly idiosyncratic and compelling essay is Carl Woodring’s ‘Three Byronic Heroes: Leslie Marchand, Don Quixote, and Don Juan’. The essay jumps about brilliantly from anecdotes to surprising literary connections. Peter Graham’s ‘The Haunting of *Don Juan*’ illuminates both the preciseness and the enigmatic quality of the two ghost appearances in Norman Abbey, for Byron’s narrator ‘asks us to take things on trust but also urges us to use our minds’ (p. 135). These are the most obviously literary essays in the collection, though Alice Levine’s ‘Selecting *Byron Journal* 50.1 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.3828/bj.2022.9>

Book Reviews

Byron' charts (literally some of the time) the way that published 'Selections from Byron', including her own Norton Selection, share and differ in their choices. Particularly interesting here is what lyrics are taken to be Byron's best.

Malcolm Kelsall's 'The Delirium of the Brave: Byron and the United Irishman' begins by quoting Byron's self-identification with Edward Fitzgerald and then establishes a carefully staged and largely convincing thesis that Byron's concern with Irish politics is deeper and more pervasive than is normally assumed. John Clubbe's 'Beethoven, Byron, Napoleon and the Ideals of the French Revolution' argues that Napoleon embodied the Revolution and that Byron and Beethoven were enthusiastic about both. He acknowledges, of course, that they also had reservations (Hazlitt was horrified that Byron could be in two minds about Napoleon) but this essay has the force and merit of its simplicity. Romulus Linney, prolific novelist and playwright, wrote a play in 1977 (*Childe Byron*) about the relationship between Byron and Ada which was prompted by the author's own separation from his daughter because of divorce. His 'Byron in My Life' engagingly establishes the growing rapport between him and the poet. Kay Jamieson, Professor of Psychiatry at the Johns Hopkins University, is well known in the Byron world for her carefully detailed view that Byron's mobility is best explained by his being manic-depressive (a term she prefers to bipolarity). I remember Peter Cochran being bowled over by a lecture that she gave to this effect in the University of Delaware. I am less convinced, but her thorough immersion in Byron's life and works and her professional expertise command respect and attention. John Murray's 'Lord Byron from the Sidelines' is full of fascinating material about the very close co-operation and personal friendship of his father 'Jock' Murray and Marchand. It was Murray, for instance, who suggested that each volume of the Letters should have a quotation from Byron as its title.

Marchand was a modest, immensely scholarly, and genial man who did nothing but good. This volume is a worthy tribute to him and it communicates something of his own communicated warmth. It reminds us, too, how much all Byronists owe to American scholarship and acumen which has revolutionised attitudes to and knowledge of Byron from the emergence of Marchand's superb biography in 1957 up to the present day. Anyone who reads this journal is likely to agree and to enjoy the book as much as I did.

BERNARD BEATTY

Universities of Liverpool and St Andrews

BYRON, HUNT, AND THE POLITICS OF LITERARY ENGAGEMENT. By Michael Steier. New York and London: Routledge, 2019. Pp. xvi + 238. Hardback. ISBN 978-0-367-32135-2. £120.00. Paperback (2021). ISBN 9781032091112. £36.99.

As Michael Steier reminds us on his opening page, Byron called Hunt a "man worth knowing" while for Hunt Byron was a man "worth listening to". Steier's study aims to 'broaden our understanding of the Byron-Hunt friendship by attending to such statements' and 'the creative engagements that engendered them'. It chronologically follows these creative engagements through 'the first three decades of the nineteenth century', tracing the ways in which Byron and Hunt 'engaged each other as *authors* as they developed, refined, and marketed their poetry and politics'. It shows the friendship between Byron and Hunt 'highlight[ing] significant aspects of the politics that shaped Romantic authorship'. It also seeks to reveal new insights into the 'unquestionable' 'intimacy' of this friendship, and its 'importance' for both writers, by drawing

on newly available Hunt letters alongside Byron's better-known letters and reading these documents 'more meaningfully as part of an on-going dialogue' than has been possible to date.

Chapter 1, 'Byron, Hunt, and the Juvenile Tradition', traces the origins of the Byron-Hunt relationship to Byron's early reading of Hunt's *Juvenilia*. Hunt recalled Byron telling him that this volume was "'one of [Byron's] incentives to write verses, and that he had the same passion for friendship that'" Hunt had "'displayed in it'". Steier reads this direct influence, however, as part of 'an emerging juvenile tradition of literature in Britain' that Hunt's volume helped 'to shape' and that Byron's earliest publications inherited. This tradition was defined by 'self-conscious dramatic performance or role-playing', and especially the 'performance of youth' in a 'world of letters typically reserved for adults'. This 'performance' quickly developed a set of rhetorical tropes – the adoption of the role of the 'deferential prodigy of [poetic] ambition', for example – and characteristic themes – the young poet's 'Alma Mater', the ('Platonic') male friendships formed there, and the young poet's 'maturation' beyond 'childish pleasure', for instance. Hunt's *Juvenilia* 'closely followed the formal conventions of this tradition' to become a 'popular model' of it. In response, Byron 'decided to challenge many of these conventions in *Hours of Idleness*' – only then to be 'forced' to 'reassert himself firmly within the conventional bounds of juvenile authorship' in *Poems, Original and Translated* by the 'public reception' of *Hours*.

Byron came back out fighting, of course, and Steier's second chapter, 'Early Satire: *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* and *The Feast of the Poets*' sees Byron's 'maiden' satire as a direct influence on Hunt's. It also demonstrates that the two poems 'served as the basis of an extended literary dialogue between the two friends', 'preserved in the correspondence and in the poetry', about the 'direction British poetry had taken in 1814 and 1815' and about, in particular, 'renewed public interest in Wordsworth' – a dialogue that had a 'significant impact' on the poets' 'literary relationship' and on Byron's 'thoughts (and writings) on the state of British literature during his years in exile'. As Steier shows, however, the 'important [...] epistolary exchanges about Wordsworth' also show Byron 'seriously questioning Hunt's attitudes about Pope'. The satires address the issue of Pope too: *English Bards* is a 'ringing endorsement of the Popeian tradition of satire'; *Feast* urges a 'formal break from the Popeian model' and a return to 'earlier English writers' such as Suckling. Yet 'the two friends' remained friends, to 'carry on their conversations by addressing new topics in an altogether different context: *The Examiner*'.

In his third chapter, 'The Politics of Intimacy: Byron and *The Examiner*', Steier covers 'the period of the earliest personal acquaintance of Byron and Hunt' and the ways in which they 'frequently engaged each other' in the pages of *The Examiner* 'during a turbulent period in England between 1812 and 1816'. On Hunt's side, these ranged from his support of Byron during the break-up of his marriage – marked by Hunt's 'characteristic [over] familiarity' – to an 'intimacy' with Byron's writings and political career, where he finds Byron 'antithetical to his own political and philosophical positions' but also finds himself 'fully and sympathetically engaged with' Byron and 'using his columns to publicly strengthen the bonds of their private friendship'. On Byron's part, this engagement included poems ('Napoleon's Farewell' and 'On the Star of "The Legion of Honour"') and letters on 'Napoleonic topics, all of which Hunt proceeded to publish and discuss in *The Examiner*'. These engagements reveal 'strong and divergent opinions', especially about Napoleon, that were to stay 'powerful and shaping forces behind' Byron's and Hunt's 'intellectual friendship' but that also 'hinted at the complexities of public friendship in post-Napoleonic British literary culture' – all of which 'would be fully realized after the publication of *The Story of Rimini*'.

Book Reviews

This poem is the subject of Steier's next chapter, '*The Story of Rimini*: Annotating, Publishing, Reviewing'. Byron's contributions to the composition, development and publication of *Rimini* are well known. For him, Steier argues, it was a work that 'could showcase the "Italianism" he admired and would later adopt for his own poetic purposes' in *Beppo* and *Don Juan*. Other influences played a very large part in the invention of Byron's own 'Italianism(s)', but Steier shows Byron's 'deep interest in Hunt's poem' through a detailed analysis of his 'incisive marginalia', and epistolary comments, on the manuscript, and his promotion of the poem to, and angry argument about Hunt's payment with, John Murray. Hunt's famous 'My Dear Byron' dedication also kicked off the process through which 'Byron's connection with Hunt' 'increasingly became a public matter of debate and a serious cause of concern for the exiled poet' and had 'significant consequences for the Byron-Hunt friendship and literary relationship' that 'came to a head' when Byron 'joined the public outcry against Hunt' and the 'Cockney School', and entered the 'Bowles/Pope Controversy'.

Byron's concerns about, and 'angry response to', both the 'creative theories, associations, and motivations' of Hunt's *Foliage* and the public 'attention' being given to Hunt's 'private friendships' are the focus of Chapter 5, 'Byron and the Cockney School'. The 'simultaneous or near-simultaneous publication' of *Parisina* and *The Story of Rimini* 'ensured the two poets would be linked together'. Reviewers, especially John Gibson Lockhart, attempted to 'separate Byron's creative achievement in *Parisina* from Hunt's radical experiment in *Rimini*', but *Beppo* 'threatened to undo' this separation. By 1819 Byron 'was being constructed as an author with Cockney interests and associations'. *Foliage*, on the other hand (along with, Steier suggests, Hunt's critique of Moore's *Lalla Rookh* in a letter to Moore that Moore shared with Byron), produced 'Byron's first known expression of raw anger toward Hunt and his poetry'. A detailed reading of the drafts and final versions of 'Some Observations Upon an Article in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*' and the 'Addenda' to 'Letter to John Murray' show this anger finally issuing in the explicit criticisms of Hunt found in them. Yet even here Byron is still willing to 'promote the potential of *Rimini*' and defend Hunt's character. For Steier, this and the fact that the Addenda 'never appeared in print' were a 'statement of solidarity and friendship, a year before the two men would reunite in Italy'.

In Chapter 6, 'Byron and Hunt in Italy: The Art of *The Liberal*', turns to 'the most important literary engagement' in Hunt's and Byron's 'ten-year friendship'. Following the history of the collaborative work of Byron and Hunt in Italy on *The Liberal*, the chapter 'recovers additional primary evidence and offers close readings' of that work to show Hunt and Byron 'working closely together on the miscellany'. Both began the project believing 'that the miscellany had great merit as a document of taste and an expression of liberal opinion'. However, while Hunt continued to try and 'appeal to Byron on personal, political, and literary grounds', Byron began to have 'reservations about the miscellany and his living arrangements with Hunt'. Here we are on familiar ground, but Steier's reading of the end of the *Liberal* project suggests that it 'may have been Hunt who influenced his friend's decision to withdraw from the miscellany in its final stages'. While others argue that 'Byron worked to ensure *The Liberal*'s demise', Steier suggests that Byron 'attempted to rectify the situation' through 'works such as *The Age of Bronze* and *The Island* – works 'that Hunt, in the end, rejected'.

Steier's conclusion, 'A Painful Retrospect', follows Hunt beyond Byron's death to the composition of *Lord Byron and Some of His Contemporaries* and his *Autobiography*. The former is well-known for the "'spleen and indignation'" (Hunt's words) of its focus on what Hunt called the "'disagreeable truths'" of Byron's "'imperfections'". But Hunt 'had regrets' about

this account of Byron ‘before it was even published’, and it was not his last word on Byron. In his autobiography, Hunt seeks ‘reconciliation’ and to ‘apologize for his earlier opinions’. Hunt’s final note on Byron is one of sad ‘regret’.

This study is sometimes rather speculative about the relationship it describes, at other times too tactfully even-handed to want to intrude too deeply into, or scrutinise too sharply, that relationship and its participants. However, it very usefully brings together what we know and new information about this real-life and textual ‘friendship’ and will now become the standard book-length study of it. It demonstrates that, ‘despite their personal and artistic differences’ Byron and Hunt ‘managed to transform their literary sympathies and their critical disagreements time and time again into a creative and meaningful dialogue’. It is a dialogue that merits, and will certainly reward, the further exploration this book will no doubt inspire.

ALAN RAWES

University of Manchester

THE ITALIAN IDEA: ANGLO-ITALIAN RADICAL LITERARY CULTURE, 1815–1823. By Will Bowers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. Pp. xix + 269. Hardback. ISBN 978-1-108-49196-9. £75.

In his preface to *The Italian Idea*, Will Bowers recalls a classic line from the hit 80’s BBC comedy show *Blackadder*: Rowan Atkinson as ‘Edmund Blackadder’ satirizes the Romantic poets in a coffee house: “‘there’s nothing intellectual about wandering around Italy in a big shirt, trying to get laid”.’ The book sets out to make an important distinction at the outset between the idea of Italy experienced as a seductive Romantic dream and the more grounded interrogation of poetics/politics which emerged from the integration of Italian culture into radical Romantic circles in England between 1815–1823. In this sense, it marks a significant departure from studies of the ‘construction’ of Italy as a source of the picturesque and the sublime, moving away from what Chloe Chard has referred to in her essay ‘Nakedness and Tourism: Classical Sculpture and the Imaginative Geography of the Grand Tour’ as a preoccupation with ‘the drama and excess of Italy’ produced by the Grand Tour (*Oxford Art Journal*, 18.1, 1995, p. 17). Instead, it aims to examine the ‘reawakening’ of Italian influence on English radical poetry and the role that immigration (the actual presence of Italian migrants in Britain) played in moving Italian culture to ‘the centre’ of post-Congress of Vienna radicalism in London. In this respect, it is part of a recent conversation which attempts to reassess the links between British and Italian culture, among them Maria Schoina’s *Romantic ‘Anglo Italians’* (2009), Arnold Schmidt’s *Byron and The Rhetoric of Italian Nationalism* (2010) and essays in the recent collection edited by Alan Rawes and Diego Saglia, *Byron and Italy* (2018).

In Chapter 1, Bowers set outs to evaluate the impact of a growing community of Italian immigrants in exile (in London) on established historical paradigms of Italian culture, which he claims were ‘contested’ after 1815, as writers such as Hunt, Foscolo and Shelley began to uncover more ‘nuanced’ and modern conceptualizations of Italy. He discusses the contempt for contemporary Italians in the prevailing British social discourse of the period, including the term ‘macaroni’, a term used to mock ‘cosmopolitan men who had a penchant for ornate Italian textiles and fashions’. The author here compellingly positions the aesthetic and political contributions of members of the Italian diaspora such as Mozart’s librettist, Lorenzo Da Ponte, and Augustus Bozzi as well as the British scholar/translator Thomas Mathias, to construct an alter-

Book Reviews

native narrative of Italy which countered the ‘insularity’ of the Lakers and infused fresh blood into the radicalism of Byron and Shelley. Although Edward Said’s definition of nationalism is used to identify British insularity in Wordsworth and Southey, the author doesn’t complicate the alternative nationalist narratives that he is talking about here – there seems to be an assumption that these are somehow more ‘authentic’. At the end of the chapter, Bowers contends that ‘Italian life and ideas [...] offered a new freedom [...] of being at liberty to question state-promoted forms, genres, themes, and even the nation itself’, yet it is not quite clear how the ‘nation itself’ is being questioned by the writers discussed here. The ideological underpinnings of the Italian Risorgimento, even in its early stages, were quite complex and in many ways, problematic, in terms of the framing of national identity, state sovereignty and power; this dimension seems to be absent from the discussion of nationalism in this chapter and the book in general.

A consideration of this complexity would have benefited the discussion of Hunt’s *The Story of Rimini* and Byron’s *Parisina* in Chapter 2, where the author argues quite persuasively for the influence of *Rimini* on *Parisina* and describes both works as subverting the ‘nationalist and conservative romance’ established by Scott. However, though there is close attention given to Hunt’s reading of Dante, the political implications of ‘internal conflict’ and ‘civil disorder’ in these works are not teased out; Bowers is clearly more intrigued by and invested in exploring the formal innovations of both poets here (which he does beautifully), rather than delving into the way their recasting of the romance troubles the concept of nation.

Chapter 3 is a thoughtful analysis of Ugo Foscolo as an exiled journalist in London, attempting to ‘make connections for his English readers between the cultures of his new home and his native land’. Bowers emphasizes the centrality of Foscolo as a major voice amongst Italian exiles and the importance of his work in producing an alternative version of Italian history to counteract the conservative British press. He also examines Foscolo’s ties with the cosmopolitan circle at Holland House. Yet as in the first chapter, Foscolo’s ‘authenticity’ is not unpacked as carefully as it could have been, although he does examine the way the writer exploited nationalist binaries in his attack on the French scholar and historian Pierre-Louis Ginguené; this is one of the most incisive sections of this chapter.

The remaining chapters shift the scene from London to Venice, Naples and Pisa. In Chapter 4, the book attempts to set the responses of both Byron and Shelley to Venice against the background of contemporary historical events. Writing in ‘a state occupied for the second time in a decade which provided [...] an encounter with the strictures of post-Metternich Europe’, Bowers makes a case for both poets’ engagements with Venice – its politics and its cosmopolitanism, in terms of a radical difference from the tradition of Victorian ‘Venetophilia’ and also the liberal tendency (British and Italian) to ‘mythologise Venice in chains’. To this end, there is a particularly spirited discussion of style, form (ottava rima), cosmopolitanism and contemporaneity in Byron’s *Beppo* in this chapter. However, it could be argued that the distinction between aesthetic vision and turning Venice into a ‘radical signifier’ is not as sharp in the case of either Byron or Shelley – or, for that matter, Ruskin and Proust (whom the author tries to differentiate them from). Writing off the latter two writers’ approach to Venice merely as ‘aesthetic fascination’ is a bit puzzling. In fact, it is precisely the mingling of the aesthetic and the everyday life of the city that Proust highlights in *La Fugitive*, which includes detailed political discussions in restaurants on the Grand Canal.

In the next chapter, the book goes on to examine reactions to Caroline of Brunswick’s return to England from Italy in 1820 and the associations between the Queen’s trial and the Neapolitan

revolution; it is subtle and penetrating in its reading of the way Italians and their language were represented in the trial and its impact on the role of Italian culture in London. Bowers takes a clever look at the way the Italian phrase ‘non mi ricordo’ became ‘a slogan for the perceived absurdity of the case against the Queen’ and allowed the Queen’s lawyer, Henry Brougham, to ‘side with xenophobia’ in constructing his case. While the Queen had become a symbol for radicalism, this chapter nevertheless complicates this, by demonstrating the way xenophobia towards Italians resurfaced and became a part of the radical response to the trial (on the part of both the British public and the press). In the light of these events, Rossini’s opera *Elisabetta Regina D’Inghilterra* (1815) is tantalizingly but briefly discussed in this chapter; however, given the importance of opera in terms of Italian culture and revolutionary politics, I would have liked to hear more about its connections with radicalism, not only here, but throughout the book.

From this historical moment, which was followed by the failure of the Neapolitan revolution, the final chapter moves on to consider the disintegration of the radical aspects of the Italian idea, particularly with reference to Shelley and the Pisan circle. It ends with a powerful and moving look at ‘the balance of hope and failure’ in Shelley’s later poetry, focusing on *The Triumph of Life*, and including an elegant reading of the Roman triumphal tradition in the poem. With the assertion that after Shelley’s death, ‘grief became the dominant emotion of the Pisan circle’, Bowers brings his exploration of Anglo-Italian radicalism to a close on a melancholy and wistful note. The book marshals an impressive array of sources, both historical and literary and provides fresh insights into an important aspect of the British literary encounter with Italy. Bowers’ fascinating reconsideration of the role of the Italian diaspora in shaping the Romantic imagination is one of the strengths of *The Italian Idea*, and its interweaving of history, aesthetics and politics is sparkling and lively throughout.

PIYA PAL-LAPINSKI

Bowling Green State University

FRANKENSTEIN AND ITS ENVIRONMENTS: THEN AND NOW. Edited by Jerrold E. Hogle. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 83.4 (Winter 2020). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press. Pp. 643–837.

As Jerrold E. Hogle notes in his prolegomenon to this special issue of *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley’s *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus* has ‘continued to seethe in the cultural unconscious’ (p. 644) since it first appeared in January 1818. Upon publication Shelley’s work ‘gave symbolic form to a large number of cultural trends’ (p. 644) and, as the scholars and writers in this special issue demonstrate, the novel continues to loom large in our collective consciousness, its tensions, ruptures, and cultural shifts continuing to resonate in the present day.

Arising out of oral presentations given at a bicentennial celebration at the Huntington on 11–12 May, 2018, ‘*Frankenstein and Its Environments*’ ranges across conflicted cultural environments and debates and reflects the interdisciplinary nature of modern literary studies. The articles develop previous scholarship by examining ‘the *environments* that infuse *Frankenstein*’ (p. 645), providing critical readings of the personal, literary, physical, cultural, intellectual, and scientific milieus with which the novel intersects. By juxtaposing contemporary influences upon the novel with contemporary responses, the writers within this special issue also aim to

Book Reviews

challenge the limits of current scholarship, and to demonstrate the symbolic power of Gothic liminality in times of cultural conflict and transition.

Hogle's Introduction provides an extensive overview of recent critical thinking about *Frankenstein* and is supplemented by an extensive bibliography of important scholarly work on the novel from within the last decade. The remaining eight essays fall into four pairs, with each pair examining 'closely related kinds of environments, all of which are fundamental to *Frankenstein* or to the adaptation of it or to the issues that this extraordinary tale continues to raise for us now' (p. 658).

Susan Wolfson and Gillian D'Arcy Wood examine the personal, literary, and physical environments from which the novel first emerged in their respective contributions, '*Frankenstein's* Origin-Stories' and 'The Volcano that Spawned a Monster: *Frankenstein* and Climate Change'. Wolfson's wide-ranging and engaging essay, which combines a rigorous New Historicist approach with feminist enrichments, questions the idea of a single origin for the novel, posing the problem 'What is origin? Who is its "Author"? (p. 664) before re-establishing how the wide array of reference points for the novel reinforce, rather than undermine, Shelley's own authorial authority. D'Arcy Wood, meanwhile, combines a New Historicist approach with ecocriticism and climate change studies to consider the impetus of the disastrous 'Year without a Summer' within the text, as well as the ways in which our present climate emergency unveils 'a true myth, still grander, more totemic, and more urgent' (p. 703).

In the second pair of essays, Alan Bewell and Maisha Wester shift the conversation towards two further interdisciplinary environments. Bewell's 'Moving Parts: *Frankenstein*, Biotechnology, and Mobility' provides a 'bioethical' reading of the novel, arguing that Victor Frankenstein's creation of a new living being acts as a critique of the selective breeding utilised by farmers of Shelley's era. Bewell utilises postcolonial ideas to argue for the novel as 'a precursor to biotechnology that treated animals as machines and people as slaves to be used as their masters saw fit' (p. 728). In 'Et Tu, Victor? Interrogating the Master's Responsibility to – and Betrayal of – the Slave in *Frankenstein*', Wester interrogates this conflict further by examining the ways in which Shelley's text engages with the racial anxieties of her era. Wester ably contends that the novel's spectrality – and its central question about who the monster really is – 'provides Shelley's final comment on slavery and the future' (p. 748), demonstrating that 'slavery will haunt Britain beyond its moment, remaining in memory as something hopefully dead but not certainly so' (p. 748).

The third pair of essays contains Robert Mitchell's '*Frankenstein* and the Sciences of Self-Regulation' and Alan Richardson's 'Wild Minds: *Frankenstein*, Animality, and Romantic Brain Science'. Both advance New Historicist discoveries about the novel's dialogue with multiple scientific discourses. Mitchell's essay connects Shelley's use of concepts of regulation with the development of liberalism in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries to consider both what kind of narrative *Frankenstein* is, why it has served as cultural reference point for 200 years and, most interestingly, how it 'can help us develop a progressive political ecology for our era of global warming' (p. 770). Richardson, meanwhile, develops Bewell's interest in animal/human hybridity by placing the novel within the context of the sciences of Shelley's era, examining how the creation of the Creature played into the fears of contemporary readers whilst intersecting with debates of human/animal comparative physiology to pose a question, 'Of what materials was I made[?]' that has lost none of its power today.

Nick Dear, writer of the National Theatre's acclaimed 2011 adaptation of *Frankenstein*, is in conversation with Anne K. Mellor in 'Adapting the Unthinkable: An Interview', the first of a

pair of essays that address the legacy of Shelley's text within today's environments. In a lively and engaging interview, preceded by some general remarks from Dear, Mellor interrogates the bold choices made by Dear and his director, as well as the rationales behind his deviations from the original text, and the difficulties of ending a famously ambivalent story onstage. Following on from this, Henry Greely poses the question '*Frankenstein* and Modern Bioscience: Which Story Should We Heed?', expanding on Bewell and Mitchell's discussions to consider what attending to Shelley's tale means for scientists, and arguing that 'science needs to accept that it lives in – it *must* live in – a larger social context' (p. 819).

Closing the special issue with 'Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* and Genetic Engineering', Mellor recalls Shelley's own experiences of childbirth as sources for her story, returning to the importance of Shelley as author whilst responding to the contemporary resonances raised by Bewell, Mitchell, Greely, and others in this collection, arguing that 'if we as a society are going to avoid Victor Frankenstein's mistakes [...] we must take responsibility for both the intended and unintended consequences of human germline engineering' (p. 827). The questions of resonance and responsibility posed in Mellor's essay – and in this special edition as a whole – reveal the ways in which the problems posed by Shelley's novel have only intensified in the 200 years since its publication and demonstrate the necessity of such imaginary critical responses to the many legacies of this text and its conflicted environments.

AMY LOUISE BLANEY
Keele University

WRITE MY NAME: AUTHORSHIP IN THE POETRY OF THOMAS MOORE. By Justin Tonra. New York: Routledge, 2021. Pp. 208. Hardback. ISBN 978-0-367-41617-1. £120.00. eBook. ISBN 978-1-003-09096-0. £33.29.

Although critical perspectives on the Irish writer, poet, and lyricist Thomas Moore have begun to diversify ever since James Chandler's recognition of Moore's centrality in his study of literary culture and Romantic historicism, *England in 1819*, Justin Tonra's *Write My Name* offers several advancements in Moore studies.

As Tonra notes in his Introduction, Moore scholarship has primarily focused upon his *Irish Melodies*, published between 1808 and 1834. Whilst more recent scholarship has encompassed his Romantic Orientalism, satirical writings, musical works, and biographical writings, as well as Moore's status as a cultural cipher, findings have been largely articulated in articles, chapters, and essay collections, possibly as a result of the 'dizzying scope of his output' (p. 2). As such, *Write My Name* is the first monograph devoted to Moore's poetry and attempts to navigate through the breadth of his vast output by focusing on the different formulations of authorship contained within a range of his poetic work.

Whilst authorship is the organising principle of *Write My Name*, Tonra utilises a broad methodological approach to his study, from forensic analysis of individual poems and volumes such as *The Poetical Works of the late Thomas Little* (1801) and the later Orientalist poem *Lallah Rookh* (1817) to broader examinations of publication history, such as the legal context behind the urgent revisions made to *The Loves of the Angels* (1823), and, in his final chapter, a computational stylistic analysis of the consistency of Moore's authorial style and the changes to his authorial persona over time.

Tonra argues persuasively for the necessity of this broad approach, proclaiming that 'in both

Book Reviews

its operational procedures and its attentive union with close reading, computational analysis has much to offer in enhancing our understanding of literary authorship' (159). Whilst I do not work in the Digital Humanities and am therefore not qualified to assess his application of this approach, his assertion that such an approach can assist literary scholars in the identification of 'the broad stylistic patterns of a writing career' that are otherwise 'difficult to isolate and articulate' (p. 158) is a persuasive one. Certainly, his stylometric analysis of Moore's output in Chapter 5 supports Tonra's central thesis that 'Moore adopted different writing styles when writing in different genres' and, moreover, suggests that what Tonra terms Moore's 'distinctive authorial signal' (p. 157) frequently transcends the poetic modes and genres in which he writes.

Tonra's other chapters, although more traditional in their methodology, are no less compelling in their content. Beginning by examining Moore's adoption of the pseudonym Thomas Little, Tonra considers what the paratextual construction of his Thomas Little persona reveal about Moore's understanding and application of Romantic authorship (p. 14). In addition to situating Moore's *Little* poems within the wider contexts of English erotic verse, Chapter 1 examines the creation, revision, and effacement of Romantic authorship, and demonstrates Moore's own sense of authorial self as 'mutable – created and articulated through the revision and refinement of texts that reveal that identity' (p. 30). The chapter also reveals the poet's attempts, in later years, 'to bring final order and stability to the polyonymous commotion of the previous forty years' (p. 31), offering a cautionary warning to Moore scholars about the inherent textual and paratextual instability of Moore's work.

Chapter 2 examines the reprinting of Moore's early words in the United States, thus extending the initial chapters' consideration of the non-authorial agents such as critics and reviewers by attending to unauthorised reprints and what Tonra terms 'prosthetic authorship where editorial agents manipulate his works and personae for ideological ends' (p. 39). By querying Moore's position of supremacy within his own work, Tonra argues that Moore and his poems – in particular, his *Epistles, Odes, and Other Poems* (1806) – 'function differently at diverse points of reception, and [that] those functions reflect differently upon his authorship' (p. 40). The chapter concludes with a consideration of copyright and authorship, neatly situating Moore in relation to wider practices within British Romanticism (p. 61).

This leads neatly into Chapter 3, which examines the different modes of authorship evident across the publication history of Moore's most famous Orientalist poem *Lalla Rookh*. Tracing the sequences of changing formats, print runs, illustrations, and prices, Tonra connects wider publishing practices, changes within the literary marketplace, and copyright law to demonstrate 'the reciprocal influences of publisher, author, and market in shaping the material and textual form of a literary work over the course of more than sixty years' (pp. 72–73).

This avenue is extended further in Chapter 4's examination of the legal context for Moore's *The Loves of Angels* and, in particular, the consequences of charges of immorality and blasphemy for Moore's authorial identity. Tonra utilises Lord Byron as a model for Moore by 'analysing their separate engagements with critical, public, and legal perspectives of their religious-themed works' (p. 100). By focusing on the legal, commercial, and criminal pressures on Moore's poetry that prompted Moore to make decisive interventions in revising the text of *The Loves of Angels*, Tonra shows that Moore had to have 'an implicit recognition of the importance and influence of his public readership' (p. 122), despite his rejection of his public control elsewhere in his work. By contrasting such an approach with that of Byron, the chapter illustrates the 'differing ways in which the abstraction of the public and its morality influenced authorial unity and identity' in the period (p. 122).

Write My Name is an engaging examination not only of Moore's authorial personae but of the non-authorial influences on his work, and the literary world in which he wrote, packaged, revised, and repackaged his work. Moore scholars will, undoubtedly, find the book extremely useful but, in its consideration of both the literary marketplace and Moore's own centrality to the Romantic tradition, it is also of more general value to scholars of British and Irish Romanticism, as well as those interested in book history and digital humanities. By considering alternative methodological approaches, the final chapter also suggests new possibilities for a corpus-wide analytical approach that may prove fruitful for other scholars of prolific authors.

AMY LOUISE BLANEY

Keele University

Important Notice

Liverpool University Press's subscriptions order processing and distribution is now managed by us and not by Turpin Distribution.

This means that all subscriptions-related queries should be sent to LUP directly using the contact details below:

Email: subscriptions@liverpool.ac.uk

Tel: 0151 795 1080 (Monday to Friday, 9am-5pm UK time)

We are working hard to ensure that the transition between the systems is as smooth as possible but if you find anything that requires correction or if you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact LUP.