

にブライアン R. ベイツによるワーズワス論が出版され、『リリカル・バラッズ』が論じられることになる。『ケンブリッジ英国ロマン主義文学史』(2009)では「出版界における諸変化」に関して一章が割かれていることから、本書において小林氏が提案したテーマと方法が、イギリス・ロマン主義研究の大きな潮流の一部として機能することが確認できる。

本書巻頭の「詩人の人生」から読み始めた読者は、「あとがき」において、はじめてそれが学位論文だとわかるのだが、それは、本書が読みやすい言葉で書かれていることを示す楽しい仕組であろう。一般読者にとって、編集者コトルやジョンソンや「JJ 草稿」が登場するくぐりは唐突であるかもしれない。「ロングマン」は、場合によって出版者とも出版社とも受けとれる。10行以上に渡る長いセンテンスや、ミス・プリントも一部に見受けられる。しかし、作家と読者と出版界の相互関係性は知的興味を誘い、人々の営みを跡づける歴史物語は純粹に面白い。そして、豊富な引用文は、詩や書簡から成るドラマ仕立てのアンソロジーとして、楽しい読書の時間を約束してくれる。著者の誠実なる労作が、研究者の想像力を掻き立て、ロマン主義文学研究の広い地平を指し示す一冊の書物として結実したことを喜び、評価したい。

(明治大学准教授)

Steve Clark and Tristanne Connolly (eds.)

*British Romanticism in European Perspective:  
Into the Eurozone*

(New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, xi+286 pp. \$100.00)

Alex Watson

*British Romanticism in European Perspective* is an engaging collection of essays that together ask: ‘what British Romanticism looks like when its own international connections and circulations are taken into account’ (1). As the volume’s editors Steve Clark and Tristanne Connolly observe, contemporary models of British Romanticism can be surprisingly insular, acknowledging Romanticism’s relationship with colonization, empire and slavery, but overlooking its important connections with continental Europe: ‘British Romanticism tends to be seen in isolation, even though a second genera-

tion of internationalist writers—no less formidable figures than Byron and Shelley—commit themselves to the support of the nationalist movements prompted by the break-up of the continental system’ (9). In order to challenge this narrow view, these essays focus on an innovative assortment of international examples: from Blake to Bosnia; Windham to Wollstonecraft.

As well as setting out a more internationalist approach, the collection reconsiders periodization, declaring ‘the often neglected or subordinated earlier decades of so-called “pre-Romanticism” in particular have much richness to offer in understanding what, as well as when, Romanticism is’ (5). The idea that British Romanticism has an undervalued pre-history is by no means new. As early as 1923, J. G. Robertson advanced the argument that Addison’s *Spectator* essays on the ‘Pleasures of the Imagination’ (1712) ‘laid the foundation of the whole romantic aesthetic’.<sup>1</sup> What distinguishes *British Romanticism* from such earlier interventions is its emphasis on what the ‘Introduction’ terms ‘[t]he psychological aesthetics based on Lockean empiricism (Addison, Shaftesbury and others) of the early eighteenth century’ (11) as a vital precursor. Of course, it is possible to posit alternative points of departure: the Miltonic (or even Shakespearean) sublime; or the pantheism of Baruch Spinoza (who, surprisingly, merits only one reference, in Peter Otto’s essay). Nonetheless, the selection of Locke yields valuable insights into the relationship between Romantic-period writing and Europe.

For example, Kaz Oishi examines the publication of William Windham’s *An Account of the Glaciers or Ice Alps in Savoy* in 1744 as ‘an alternative source for the Romantic images of the Alps’ (28). According to Oishi, what made Windham’s descriptions proto-Romantic was ‘the alternation of the rhapsodic-rational, emphatic-detached, enchanted-logical modes’ (32). Similarly, Evy Varsamopoulou examines how the advance of empiricism in the eighteenth century encouraged the spread of the sublime. She traces this ‘aesthetic revolution’ (45) to the publication of Shaftesbury’s ‘The Moralists, A Philosophical Rhapsody’ in 1711 and its subsequent redevelopment by Jean Jacques Rousseau, Mary Wollstonecraft and Madame de Stäel. Crucial to the popularity of sublime modes of representation was an emerging secularism, which disconnected the transcendent power of art from religious awe, linking it instead to human psychology. Varsamopoulou argues that ‘The Moralists’ was an especially important source because ‘Shaftesbury would like to replace the superstitious and hysterical transports of enthusiasm of religious mystics and/or fanatics with the earthly and grounded enthusiasm of a nature-inspired wholly human experience of transcendence’ (53).

Peter Otto also explores the relationship between the empirical tradition

and Romanticism, tracing how Locke, the critic and scholar Richard Bentley and William Blake each engage with a profound change in European culture and society: namely, ‘the shift from monarchical to state sovereignty’ (212) and the emergence of modern subjectivity. In Otto’s view, Blake’s multivalence unravels the integrity of the individual self: ‘in the pages of *Songs of Innocence, Songs of Experience* . . . the claims of the sovereign self are undone through context, irony, and multiple perspectives’ (225). For Otto, such polyvalence has revolutionary potential, drawing attention ‘to the relations between the body and the world in which subjects are formed, and in so doing foregrounds the possibility that the order of subjects and of things could be changed’ (225). Similarly, Diane Picitto focuses on the poet and print-maker, showing how Blake’s ‘highly emotional and visceral style’ (195) and preoccupation with ‘rebellion, [and] intense emotionality’ (193) constitutes a distinctively Romantic deployment of melodramatic techniques and themes. She connects Blake’s 1790s *Illuminated Books* with earlier examples of the genre—including Rousseau’s *Pygmalion* (1770) and Friedrich Schiller’s *The Robbers* (1781)—seeking to challenge conventional chronology in theatrical history, which dates the emergence of melodrama to 1800 in France and 1802 in Britain.

David Chandler also challenges the prevailing time-line of theatrical history. While scholarship tends to date the onset of Romanticism in English opera to the 1820s, Chandler proposes the earlier date of the late 1730s, pointing to the English composer Thomas Arne’s 1738 Milton adaptation *Comus* and the dramatist and songwriter Henry Carey’s 1739 *Nancy, or the Parting Lovers*. According to Chandler, ‘[a]lthough the interdisciplinary art form *par excellence*, opera often [is] . . . the one thing most Romanticists will not look at’ (174). Indeed, given Anglophone scholarship’s bad habits of mono-lingualism and disciplinary exclusivity, opera’s internationalism and intermediality may be reasons for its relatively marginal status in literary histories, in spite of its considerable cultural prominence at the time.

A comparable example of inter-cultural interaction is provided by Tristanne Connolly, who examines Erasmus Darwin’s popularization of Carl Linnaeus’s binomial nomenclature for plants in *The Loves of the Plants* (1789) alongside the naturalist Jean Phillipe François Deleuze’s French translation *Les Amours des Plantes* (1800). When even neighboring villages could have different names for plants, the wider dissemination of Linnaeus’s universal system was of obvious practical benefit. Yet both Darwin’s composition and Deleuze’s translation required careful linguistic and cultural negotiation. Darwin envisaged Linnaeus’ Latin as a ‘graft’ within vernacular English,

seeking to disseminate botanical knowledge to those lacking a classical education. Darwin's French translator instead performed a 'balancing act' (136), both 'Europeanizing' *Loves* by emphasizing the poem's parallels with European literary traditions, at the same time as emphasizing the poem's novelty. Connolly reminds us that the main motivator of European cosmopolitanism was not literature but science, yet even scientific internationalism encounters limits. As Connolly demonstrates, the examples of Darwin and Deleuze beg the question: 'Scientific language has often been thought, or wished, to be a transparent container for knowledge, but even if it is, can it easily be poured into another container?' (141).

Maja Pašović instead investigates the relationship between British Romanticism and Bosnian literature. As Pašović points out, the region interested Southey and Byron. Moreover, the lengthy South Slavic folk ballad *Hasanaginica* (1646–9) was translated into German by Goethe and Coleridge also transcribed fourteen verses. While Bosnian culture offered an older exotic tradition for Romantics, Romanticism represented modernity for Bosnia. According to Pašović, '[i]mporting Romanticism into a Bosnian literary heritage was part of the acclimatization process to . . . modernity' (238). Bosnia fashioned its own formulation of Romanticism, with less emphasis on heroic individualism: '[t]he hero of Bosnian Romanticism never really tried to break away from the rest of the society, but wishes to remain integrated' (240).

Steve Clark considers an analogous cultural exchange, arguing that proto-Romantic valorizations of feeling and spontaneity derive in part from the Della Cruscan engagement with Italy: '[t]here is a feedback loop through which British early Romantic poetry had already been assimilated by Italians, combining with their characteristic use of *sprezzatura* and *concetti*, to be reimported into English verse by the Della Cruscans' (91). Clark hails Hester Thrale and Robert Merry as exemplars of multi-cultural openness, since they based themselves temporarily in Florence, collaborated with and translated Italian writers and emulated Italian traditions of improvisation. According to Clark: '[t]his sense of improvised, throwaway proliferation . . . might also represent a new ideal of post-national citizenship' (91).

While Clark's case for the Della Cruscans as post-nationalists is compelling, it is more difficult, however, to characterize British Romanticism in the same way. Clark and Connolly highlight British Romanticism's 'latent resources for defining a post-national sense of European identity' (5). Yet other essays invoke a little more skepticism towards such laudable internationalism. Most obviously, David Shakespeare reaffirms the view of the Romantic period as the Age of Nationalism by examining how the transna-

tional topic of marriage is occluded in favour of the national in the writing of August Wilhelm Schlegel, Wordsworth and Shelley. More subtly, Stephen Bygrave investigates Joseph Priestley's somewhat contradictory attitude to other countries. On the one hand, Priestley was the epitome of enlightenment cosmopolitanism: the toast of liberal scientific circles worldwide, who lived his final ten years (1794–1804) in Pennsylvania U.S.A. On the other hand, Priestley's displayed a surprising lack of interest in other countries, exemplified for Bygrave by Priestley's decision to spend most of his time on a 1774 Paris trip in his hotel room. Bygrave casts Priestley's equivocal attitude as 'an exception *anglaise*—an opt-out negotiated partly for reasons of linguistic incapacity but perhaps indicating a wider reluctance to engage' (115). For Bygrave, Priestley's contradictory standpoint reveals a combination of internationalism and insularity still at work in Britain's view of Europe today.

In a similar vein, Kimiyo Ogawa observes that 'between the 1740s and 1780s, "Britishness" was often delineated by articulating its difference from a continental "other"' (70). This process was also complex and full of discrepancies: '[s]lippery terms such as "nature", "affectation", and "desultoriness" could readily be appropriated by both parties, making it possible for the French to take on British characteristics and *vice-versa*' (70). Paradoxically, at the same time as establishing oppositions, eighteenth-century interactions between Britain and France helped create a 'cross-channel literary zone' (71). As an example of such creative conversation, Ogawa shows how the Scottish writer Charlotte Lennox's translations of numerous French texts into English helped create a transcontinental literary system.

Viewing the collection as a whole, what is striking is that most of such examples of intercultural exchange identified in these essays take place either before the Romantic period or on the continent. In fact, European (and especially British) intellectual culture appears decidedly more inter-linked and post-national in the years *before* the French Revolutionary Wars (1792–1802). In its valorization of the link between land and language, British Romanticism could more plausibly be regarded as the distant ancestor of today's ethno-nationalisms than contemporary cosmopolitanism. Certainly, none of the British Romantic-period writers studied extensively today appear to have paid much consideration to the idea of a pan-European identity or to have produced a document comparable to Immanuel Kant's 'Perpetual Peace' (1795). Moreover, a more direct way to foster post-nationalist openness in Anglophone readers might be a volume focusing on the influence of continental European writers on English-language culture. Importantly, the volume overlooks the crucial contributions of countless continental writers

(the index, for instance, features entries for neither Ugo Foscolo nor Alexander Pushkin and indicates only one reference to Chateaubriand). The collection also ignores Burns, Byron and Scott—surely the British Romantic writers who had the greatest impact on nineteenth-century Europe.

Neither the scholarly significance nor the intellectual integrity of this excellent 2015 publication has been hampered by the June 2016 referendum, in which fifty two-percent of British voters elected to leave the European Union. However, it is difficult to imagine that future readers will disregard it entirely. If just two per cent more voters had opted to remain, the gestures in the ‘Introduction’ towards a post-national future might appear more convincing. Now it is difficult not to read with bitterness Chandler’s apt description of Britain as a country seeking to exist ‘both inside and outside the Eurozone’ (190) or Bygrave’s apposite analysis of the ‘exception *anglaise*’ (115). Ogawa quotes as an epigraph Voltaire’s exclamation in *Le Poeme sur la Bataille de Fontenoy* (1745) that ‘[t]he peoples of Europe have common principles of humanity which cannot be found in other parts of the world . . . A Frenchman, an Englishman, and a German who meet seem to have been born in the same town’ (quoted p. 69). We might compare Voltaire’s celebratory declaration with the ambivalent attitude towards Europe typical of British people demonstrated by the former UK Prime Minister—and ostensible leader of the ‘Remain’ campaign—David Cameron when he declared in 2016 that ‘[w]e are special, different, unique . . . [w]e have always seen the European Union as a means to an end . . . we don’t see it as an end in itself’.<sup>2</sup> A version of this volume written after the referendum might have focused on the status of the Napoleonic Wars in establishing Britain’s bizarre historical misperception of itself as an underdog fending off militarily superior continental foes; or the contribution of the Terror or Waterloo to the country’s equivocal, if not arrogant, standpoint; or even the role of the rise of Lockean empiricism in the creation of the perception that British are practical, in contrast with theoretical Europeans. Sadly, the multicultural optimism displayed by *British Romanticism in European Perspective* may be one of the many privileges the British people have lost forever due to their fateful decision in 2016.

(Associate Professor, Nagoya University)

<sup>1</sup> J. G. Robertson, *Studies in the Genesis of Romantic Theory in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923) p. 241.

<sup>2</sup> David Cameron, ‘David Cameron’s speech on the EU referendum: full text’ (May 9 2016) *Conservative Home*, <<http://www.conservativehome.com/parliament/2016/05/camérons-speech-on-brexite-full-text.html>> Accessed 9 September 2016.

ISSN 1341-9676

# イギリス ロマン派研究

*Essays in English Romanticism*

第41号

No. 41

イギリス・ロマン派学会

Japan Association of English Romanticism

2017

