75) that still allowed for expression of radical or conservative political views (p. 76). Crystal Lake shows, though, that despite dramatic changes in how history was being read and written, and the growing numbers of published "historical memoirs and correspondences," women "remained marginalized in historical studies and were viewed as incapable of writing as historians themselves" (p. 89). Uncovering another major obstacle in her discussion of the economics of female authorship, Jacqueline M. Labbe notes that if writing was considered as "property" by the publishing industry, and "female identity was property-less," then writings by women simply "lacked market value" (p. 166). In consequence, very few women were fairly compensated or felt that their publishers adequately represented their interests.

Quoting Elizabeth Barrett Browning's lament, "I look everywhere for Grandmothers and see none" (p. 169), Looser explores multiple dimensions of "age and aging," from period conceptions of the life stages, to the particular scrutiny focused on elderly women writers for a "falling off of powers" (p. 179). Fiona Price shows how perceived stability or instability of the "domestic unit" became associated with relationships between Ireland, Scotland, and England, and between Britain and the "wider empire," so that "if gender relations were unstable, so was the Union" (p. 190). In turn, female translators acted as "cultural mediators" (p. 135) according to Deirdre Coleman, while Catherine Ingrassia depicts the "pervasive, often unimagined, effects" (p. 101) of war by exploring poems by women that represent that cost. Julie A. Carlson cautions of the "dangers of generalizing about the relation between strong networks and successful authorship in the case of women," encouraging us to "consider more disinterestedly what effect relationships had on women's creativity" (p. 145).

A detailed chronology and excellent "Guide to Further Reading" for each chapter further enhance the superb value of this collection. I found myself wishing for a chapter on environmental themes suggestive of Romantic-era women's concerns for sustainability, and even more attention to racial issues and identities. Otherwise, the *Companion* compellingly depicts how much has been gained by exploding the canon of the "big Six." We find ideas for further research and course development poised for the next generation of scholars to proceed without the need to justify or excuse.

Elmhurst College ANN FRANK WAKE

Byron, Shelley, and Goethe's Faust. *An Epic Connection.* By BEN HEWITT. London: Legenda, 2015. Pp. xi, 196. Cloth, $120.00. *Hegel and the English Romantic Tradition.* By WAYNE DEAKIN. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. Pp. ix, 198. Cloth, $100.00.

In *Byron, Shelley, and Goethe's* Faust, author Ben Hewitt invites readers to share in the excitement felt by the English Romantics as they first encountered Goethe's *Faust I.* Hewitt's work is in fact far more ambitious than this, however, for his ultimate effort is to effect what he describes as an "equilateral triangulation"

by means of which the three poets can be brought into an "egalitarian, even republican, relationship" with one another. Hewitt is the first to admit that the results "will necessarily be quite ambitious, speculative, and suggestive, drawing on theory and philosophy for assistance in readings that stretch beyond what can be borne by historical, factual, evidence" (p. 1), but he is keen to convince us that such "lateral comparisons" are worthwhile. For if successful, he argues, "these will be the foundation for riskier and farther-reaching, synthesizing readings, touching upon broader and deeper connections between the writers under scrutiny, and between British and German Romantic literature more widely" (p. 2).

The key to Hewitt's triangulation lies in the difference between "epic" and "tragic" literary production. Here Hewitt suggests that we understand British Romantic epic writing as offering an antidote to the tragic. Goethe's *Faust* is central to this account since Hewitt sees it as effectively straddling the two forms so far as *Faust I* can be read as a predominantly tragic production—on this Hewitt notes that the play's subtitle is literally "A Tragedy"—whereas Part II bears important traces of the epic. It is significant that Goethe's two-part play straddles any historical account of our three poets as well, since Hewitt employs his lateral reading in order to bring Byron and Shelley into conversation with Part II, despite the British poets having both died before its publication. Hewitt develops this reading across four chapters, with the first two devoted to Goethe and chapters three and four to Byron and Shelley respectively. The opening chapters provide the historical and interpretive context for Hewitt's approach to the British poets by way of an investigation into the precise nature of *Faust* qua "tragedy" (Chapter 1), and then regarding the play's reception in Britain—primarily via de Staël's critique—and its effect on Byron and Shelley (Chapter 2, and *en passim*).

The value of the epic, as Hewitt reconstructs it and then interprets *Faust II*, is its ability to function as a response to the tragic view of life—a literary mode that had come to dominate Goethe's German Romantic contemporaries (see Butler's *The Tyranny of Greece over Germany*). In the case of Byron, this is most clearly figured in the space made for activity. Thus "*Don Juan*'s ironic capacity for indefinite further growth, reaching no 'conclusions,' political, philosophical, or otherwise," Hewitt argues, "is the shift in the same direction in which Goethe was to develop *Faust* into the epic mode ... that was the most vital step taken by Byron" for "it was an *action* too, with a wider significance" (pp. 114-15). In a similar manner Hewitt tells us that "Shelley's aim is to prove that love, properly understood, is an *activity*, rather than a static state or abstract metaphysical principle"; indeed, "we might say that the epic is the form that promises to convert this love into such an activity" (p. 164). In the end, "Shelley tries to shift the structure of *Prometheus Unbound*, from tragic monodrama centered on Prometheus in the first act, into diverse, dialogic poetry, resembling the lyrical variety of *Faust* but with a different aim: to depict the 'void' filled with the Love that replaces the rule of Jupiter." In other words, "to succeed in its aim *Prometheus*

Unbound must cease to be the tragedy it was born of, and become epic" (p. 164).

In bringing together Goethe and British Romantic poets Byron and Shelley, Hewitt provides us with a careful and convincing study. Given this, it would have been interesting to see Hewitt attempt to integrate Mary Shelley's work into his narrative. Apart from any similarities between *Faust* and *Frankenstein*, it bears remembering that Goethe himself remained unconvinced by efforts to clearly demarcate works as "tragic" or "epic"; a fact that becomes especially clear in the number of works he'd devoted to rewriting the story of Prometheus. One cannot help but wish that Hewitt had considered the connection between these works and Mary Shelley's own "Modern Prometheus" in juxtaposition to his reading of P. B. Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound*, for this would have made for an especially good ending to Hewitt's story.

Wayne Deakin's consideration of *Hegel and the English Romantic Tradition* does indeed close with a brief consideration of Mary Shelley's Prometheus, but this comes only at the end of a much longer set of considerations. Deakin adopts a similar strategy as that of Hewitt, namely, foregoing any historical recovery of Hegel's direct influence on the English Romantics—in Deakin's case, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and P.B. Shelley—in order to focus instead on a reading of key poetic works in concert with their Hegelian framework. This reading essentially flows from Deakin's effort to rethink Hegel's relatively early notion of self-consciousness through his late lectures on aesthetics. For Deakin, this leads to "aesthetic recognition"; a situating of the self in relation to the world that remains in tension so far as the subject's drive for autonomy will automatically be humbled by its reception of and to alterity—be that other "Nature" or other subject.

This tension drives Deakin's interpretation of each of the English Romantics. Thus Coleridge's distinction between the symbol and allegory, for example, is said to parallel the Hegelian subject's freedom of autonomy on the one hand, and its being simultaneously hostage to the world, on the other. It is this tension between self and other that allows Deakin to trace Coleridge's path from "Kubla Kahn" to "Frost at Midnight"—wherein Coleridge "searches for a cognitive recognition in the natural world" (p. 57)—to "Dejection," and finally "Constancy to an Ideal Object" in order to show that Coleridge had ultimately achieved a kind of Hegelian sublation: a recognition that genuine autonomy requires the mediation of the outside world.

Deakin's treatment of Wordsworth and Shelley follow the same pattern. Unlike Coleridge, Wordsworth tries to unify symbol and allegory, and he is thus notable for his "organic poeticism," that is, "the view that there is a deep connection between the imaginative powers of the poet and the *natura naturans* experienced when the poet communes with the natural world" (p. 72). This organicism is distinct from Coleridge's efforts to write poetry that seems itself to grow like an organism, since Wordsworth is interested in showing that mind and nature are unified enough that nature "reciprocally represents the imagina-

tion as its counterpart" (p. 75). Given the dialectic at work in Deakin's narrative, it makes sense then that Shelley needs to reject this as a dissolution of the subject in nature, searching instead for access to the Absolute. The fact that this sort of access turns out to be impossible only heightens Shelley's alienation from nature, a fact nicely complimented by Mary Shelley's constant depiction of her own monster's unnatural body against the backdrop of *natura naturans*.

Deakin's study makes for rewarding reading, and his Hegelian lens does not cloud but rather clarifies our view of the English Romantic poets in his focus. I did have concerns over the breezy references to Kant and other philosophical interlocutors, and would have liked greater care in delineating the many different uses of the word "organicism" in Deakin's discussions, but these are small matters, and by no means detract from Deakin's fine book.

Western Sydney University JENNIFER MENSCH

Byron and John Murray: A Poet and His Publisher. By MARY O'CONNELL. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2014. Pp. xi, 220. Cloth, $110.00.

It has been just over 25 years since the Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Publishing (SHARP) was established jointly in the USA and the UK. The event is important, not so much because it has some direct bearing on Keats or Shelley or Byron, but rather because it points to an interdisciplinary insurgency of book and publishing history into what previously had been the more insular field of literary studies. This interdisciplinary turn has had significant impact on the field of academic Romanticism, and nowhere is this impact more profound than in the study of Byron, whose singular fame (or notoriety) is now commonly seen not merely as the consequence of his formidable talents as a celebrity poet but also of the editorial advice and marketing strategies of his publisher John Murray. Mary O'Connell's *Byron and John Murray: A Poet and His Publisher* offers a useful contribution to this rapidly growing line of inquiry, taking its place alongside the work of Peter Cochran, Peter Graham, Peter Manning, Jerome McGann, Andrew Nicholson, William St Clair, and many others.

The book is organized chronologically, beginning with a chapter sketching Murray's early years and the emergence of the Murray publishing house followed by a chapter on Byron's early life and his youthful publications. O'Connell then brings the two together with the often-discussed publication of *Childe Harold* in 1812. The careful documentation of this landmark publishing event is one of the many strengths of the book; it sets forth very plainly the strategy Murray followed in order to maximize *Childe Harold*'s cultural impact and his own prestige as a publisher. While other critics have examined the matter and come to similar conclusions, O'Connell's clear and careful analysis demonstrates quite persuasively that Byron's "overnight" success was anything but a surprise. Rather, it was built on the foundation of Murray's assiduous market-