© Ellen Malenas Ledoux 2013

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

No portion of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, Saffron House, 6–10 Kirby Street, London EC1N 8TS.

Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The author has asserted her right to be identified as the author of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published 2013 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN

Palgrave Macmillan in the UK is an imprint of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan in the US is a division of St Martin's Press LLC, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN 978–1–137–30267–0

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Typeset by MPS Limited, Chennai, India.

Contents

List of Illustrations viii

Acknowledgments ix

Introduction: Fantastic Forms of Change 1

1 Emergent Forms: Horace Walpole, Politics, and the Eighteenth-Century Reader 23

2 A Castle of One's Own: The Architecture of Emerging Feminism in Works by Charlotte Smith, Ann Radcliffe, Eliza Fenwick, Joanna Baillie, and Sarah Wilkinson 55

3 Transmuting the Baser Metals: The Post-Revolutionary Audience, Political Economy, and Gothic Forms in Godwin's *St. Leon: A Tale of the Sixteenth Century* 93

4 "Schemes of Reformation": Institutionalized Healthcare in Charles Brockden Brown's *Arthur Mervyn* 127

5 Reforming Genres: Negotiating the Politics of Slavery in the Works of Matthew Lewis 157

Notes 199

Bibliography 219

Index 235

Introduction: Fantastic Forms of Change

On the night of March 22, 1803, Covent Garden staged Matthew Lewis's monodrama *The Captive* for the first and last time. Interspersed with pantomime and dramatic music, the monodrama depicts a woman's gradual descent into madness after her tyrannical husband wrongfully imprisons her in a private lunatic asylum. Mrs. Litchfield's portrayal of the unnamed Captive proved so affecting that "many ladies were thrown into fits of hysterics."[1] Despite the manager's announcement of a second performance, Lewis immediately withdrew the piece. He explains to Lady Holland:

> It was performed . . . to the extreme surprise, confusion, and terror of a numerous and brilliant audience: for when it was about half over a Man fell into convulsions in the Boxes; presently after a Woman fainted away in the Pit; and when the curtain dropped, two or three more of the spectators went into hysterics, and there was such a screaming and squalling, that really you could hardly hear the hissing. When the Piece was given out again, there was a good deal of applause, but more hissing: and as it really is not my wish (whatever others may think) to throw half London into convulsions nightly, I immediately sent on a Performer to say, that I had withdrawn the Piece.[2]

The audience's unanticipated "screaming and squalling" and Lewis's subsequent dismay exemplify a phenomenon central to this book's main argument: Gothic writing has a particular power, greater than that of verisimilar writing, to raise audience consciousness about political issues. That raised consciousness, in turn, has the power to shape populist opinion and to influence social policy, but the degree to which it succeeds in doing so depends much more on reader response than it does on authorial intention. This book charts how the political power of Gothic writing stems from a spirited exchange between authors and consumers through the medium of a recognizable set of aesthetic conventions.

Although the ensuing chapters describe successful instances of Gothic texts raising consciousness and spurring dialogue about change throughout the Anglophone world over a period of 70 years, much can be learned about how author/audience interaction works by questioning why *The Captive* failed to channel emotion into reflection. *The Captive*'s ability to produce audience "convulsions" represents both the rhetorical power and the rhetorical limits of Gothic texts. Its reception throws into relief the complex, and often unpredictable interaction between authors (juggling their own set of competing commercial, aesthetic, and political goals) and their diverse audience.

The play uses horror to demonstrate forcefully how husbands can exploit aspects of English common law, most notably coverture and conjugal rights, to subjugate married women. However, the play's particular production leaves no room for the audience to experience some aesthetic distance from this dramatized exploitation. The contemporary setting renders imminent the threat of wrongful imprisonment to the female spectators.[3] In addition, the staging and special effects force the audience to experience first-hand the terrors to which the Captive is subjected, rather than asking spectators to imagine them.[4] Lewis's copious stage directions create a dark and claustrophobic environment. The curtain rises to reveal a multi-level set with the Captive residing in the lower "dungeon . . . guarded by strong bars and chains" (p. 226). The action begins in the "upper gallery" from whence the "Gaoler" descends to distribute bread and water to the Captive below (p. 226). Audience members seated in the pit would thus be compelled to look up at an "underground" space, creating a sense of live burial. Lewis's use of fire adds to the claustrophobic atmosphere. The only light source scripted is a series of torches held by the characters moving in the gallery. This concentration of light in an otherwise dim space forces the audience to attend only to what the Captive can see and therefore to mimic the prisoner's perspective. These visual horrors are enhanced by diegetic and non-diegetic sounds: the "noise of the bars falling" and "loud shrieks, rattling of chains, &c." accompanied by "harsh" and "melancholy" music. When a "madman" tries to break into the Captive's cell with "a blazing firebrand in his hand" the terrifying ambient noise and flashing light finally drive her insane (p. 229). She laments, "such screams to hear, such sights to see! / My brain, my brain! . . . I am not mad . . . but soon shall be!" (p. 229). Given that the audience has been asked to view the same "sights" and hear the same "screams" as the Captive, it is not surprising that they responded hysterically to the play's sensory onslaught.

Lewis's letter also gestures toward the tension between the play's commercial and political goals. While some audience members tolerated the play's force more than others – "a good deal of applause," but "more hissing" – Lewis never explains if the negative reaction addressed its aesthetic or its ideological failures. It remains unclear if the audience hissed because they disapproved of the play's intensity, wanted to scold the cruel husband *in absentia*, or because they simply thought the play was bad. While Lewis claims to withdraw the piece out of deference for the audience's tender feelings, one wonders if *The Captive*'s unpopularity motivated Lewis's retreat. One could argue that his withdrawal sacrifices the play's feminist message at the altar of commerce.[5] Yet, Lewis's dilemma cannot be reduced to a simple choice between popularity versus political critique. His chosen theme is moving but not terribly commercial, as *The Captive* confronts Romantic-era audiences about a significant social problem. Throughout the eighteenth century, husbands looking to control or to extort property from rebellious wives had increasingly resorted to imprisonment in private lunatic asylums to achieve their ends. This practice was frequent enough for the House of Commons to issue a report on the problem in 1763 and for Parliament to pass the Act for Regulating Private Madhouses in 1774. Although the Act made it more difficult to arrange forced committal, as Elizabeth Foyster notes, records from the King's Bench show that this practice continued throughout the end of the century.[6]

If Lewis had just wanted to make money and have another hit, he would have taken a different tack. Covent Garden's manager had given Lewis free reign over the subject of this particular production, and Lewis was facing considerable financial pressure; however, he staged what Jeffrey Cox rightly calls "feminist theater" instead of producing the type of spectacle play with which he had achieved so much commercial success in *Rolla* (1799) and *Adelmorn the Outlaw* (1801).[7] Lewis is not the first to depict this exploitative practice in literature; his source material was most likely Mary Wollstonecraft's novel *Maria, or The Wrongs of Woman* (1798). To align himself politically with the unpopular Wollstonecraft at a moment of post-Revolutionary backlash makes the play commercially vulnerable. As Cox points out, Lewis further commits himself when he publishes *The Captive* in his *Poems* (1812) without the final scene of redemption contained in the performance. By deleting this scene, in which the Captive's father saves her (and perhaps the reputation of patriarchy), Lewis represents forcefully how current marriage laws could create horrific conditions for women.[8]

The Captive's genre influences how it raises political consciousness within the viewer while still remaining a commercial product. From a marketing standpoint, Lewis's generic choice reflects a desire to tempt English audiences with a form already proven successful in German and Austrian theater.[9] Monodrama consists of one character narrating his or her feelings directly to the audience. The absence of plot lends monodrama a heightened tone to which Romantic audiences had already responded enthusiastically in earlier Gothic and melodramatic productions. Lewis perhaps wagered that the monodrama, as a kind of distillation of melodrama, would be even more popular and lucrative. The genre, however, also demands that the audience confront married women's suffering. Its "rousing" effect serves as an artistic means of reinforcing its political message. Being subjected to the same sensory horror as the Captive encourages the audience's sympathetic identification with her, an identification that might prompt them to rethink the potential abuses inherent in contemporary marriage laws. In fact, Lewis recounts that a heterogeneous group of theater-goers – those from the pit as well as the boxes, men and women – were equally affected. Not only women identified with the Captive, but also their husbands were moved by the horrors she endured. Thus, the play's commercial appeal and the recorded impact of its political message are interdependent.

The Captive's brief run is one manifestation of a cultural and literary phenomenon this book traces throughout transatlantic eighteenth- and nineteenth-century politics. As the Revolutionary period began and political rhetoric became inflamed, British, American, and colonial authors increasingly challenged conventional thinking and normative politics within Gothic writing in ways that encouraged social consciousness. Yet, audiences played a crucial role in determining the shape of that consciousness. Focusing on genre, reader response, and material culture, this book documents the ideological shifts wrought by author/audience interaction that allowed Gothic texts to make an indelible mark on the discourse and activism of their day surrounding seminal issues such as women's property rights, population pressure, public health, and abolition.

The Power of the Gothic Imagination in the Age of Revolution

In 1800 the Marquis de Sade initiates one of the most enduring political interpretations of Gothic fiction by suggesting its ability to reflect cultural anxiety about current events, particularly the American and French Revolutions. Gothic novels, he argues, "became the essential product of the revolutionary shaking felt by all of Europe."[10] As de Sade's strange image of a productive "shaking" suggests, however, the relationship between political and textual events is not easily characterized. Since scholarly interest in Gothic writing was reinvigorated in the 1980s, mainly by David Punter's *Literature of Terror* (1980), historicist critics developed a dominant interpretation of the Gothic novel that added important nuance to de Sade's basic premise. Drawing inspiration from different branches of Marxist thought, many readings embrace an appropriately gloomy notion of cultural determinism, suggesting that Gothic narratives contribute to what Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer call the "culture industry."[11] To varying degrees, literary studies suggest that, as a popular art form, Gothic fiction works insidiously to naturalize the dominant ideology, here meaning a set of cultural or economic beliefs that work to serve those already in power.[12] A variant of Louis Althusser's concept of interpellation has been central to this reading. Studies such as Ronald Paulson's *Representations of Revolution* (1983) and Maggie Kilgour's *Rise of the Gothic Novel* (1995) argue that the Gothic novel's Saturnalian narrative eruptions depict subversion and provide a cathartic release for readers, only to contain it by narrative's end.[13] These theoretical frameworks apply readily to the English Gothic novel, most notably Matthew Lewis's *The Monk* (1796), which forms a centerpiece of many Gothic studies. It is easy to read this novel's final scenes of riot and subsequent containment as patriarchy, the nobility, and the Church reasserting what Antonio Gramsci terms "hegemony."[14] However, when one evaluates authors' deployment of Gothic motifs as a transatlantic phenomenon that finds expression in multiple genres, as this study does, it becomes clear that Gothic texts encourage political activism in manifold ways. This activism can denote the type of concrete causal relationships between text and action that are most evident in this book's treatment of political economy, the yellow fever, and the slave trade (Chapters 3 to 5). Yet activism can also take more ideal forms, such as encouraging the conception of alternate possibilities, provoking audiences to engage in political analysis, and/or modeling desirable behavior via fictional characters – a practice that

Charles Brockden Brown refers to as "rous[ing] in the spectators the spirit of salutary emulation."[15] In particular, Chapter 2 demonstrates how Gothic literature's ability to stimulate the mind and stir the heart can be a potent form of activism, even when no visible "action" occurs.

My reading of the Gothic mode as an imaginatively constructive force dependent upon author/audience interaction draws inspiration from the more optimistic strain of historical critique that emphasizes its dialogic nature. Starting with Kenneth Graham's collection, *Gothic Fiction: Prohibition/Transgression* (1989), groups of scholars have recognized the give and take between the revolutionary and the reactionary content in Gothic writing. Studies such as Robert Miles's *Gothic Writing: A Genealogy* (1993) and Cannon Schmitt's *Alien Nation* (1997), which entertain the possibility of Gothic texts expressing resistance, have particularly influenced this book's emphasis on aesthetics' unique role in forming social change. Employing Michel Foucault's genealogy approach, Miles focuses on the contending discourses within Gothic writing. Schmitt identifies Gothic texts' ability to uncloak power structures, yet still frames them as fundamentally concerned with the ideological control necessary to forming nationalism.[16] Jacqueline Howard and others employ Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of dialogism to demonstrate how Gothic texts represent competing ideologies; however, the voice of resistance is characterized as having mostly the power to destruct the status quo, rather than construct a new reality.[17] Robert Collings reads the Romantic era's fascination with the monstrous as the working class's demand for recognition during industrialization. Resistance is thus articulated, but its message is one of annihilation.[18] Tom Duggett's recent offering, *Gothic Romanticism*, moves closer to claiming a constructive rhetorical purpose for Gothic aesthetics by charting the Lake Poets' instigation of a "second Gothic culture" to create political continuity between the "glorious" English revolutionary past and its identity after the French Revolution.[19]

Using a multi-generic approach and a wide geographic scope, my study attributes greater power to Gothic writing. I argue that these texts' transgressive fantasies have transformative influence – they often disrupt, rather than reinstate, ideological control – an ability recognized by Romantic-era critics and censors but often ignored by today's scholars. Viewing Gothic writing as an agent of social change depends upon approaching it as a transatlantic phenomenon.[20] Until very recently, political readings of the Gothic have been limited to either an American or a British national context despite the deep cultural, linguistic, economic, and legal ties that bind the Atlantic world. However, as William Keach has argued, "Gothic" is one of the key terms that "demand to be understood as historical developments that connect as well as differentiate British and American culture during the 'romantic century.'"[21] Recent book chapters and essays by Robert Miles, Laura Doyle, and Joel Pace have begun to shift the focus of Gothic studies to transatlanticism, already flourishing within Romantic studies more generally. Miles emphasizes how Gothic texts' characteristic "push/pull of expression and denial" enabled both American and British authors to come to terms with the violence of imperial expansion.[22] Joel Pace makes a compelling case for Wordsworth's influence on key American gothicists Poe, Hawthorne, and Chestnutt.[23] In a discussion of what she terms the "Atlantic Gothic" Laura Doyle reads central authors, such as Horace Walpole, Matthew Lewis, and Charles Brockden Brown, in the context of the pervasive racial and sexual violence that characterized Atlantic trade.[24] In the only book-length study of the transatlantic Gothic, *The Transatlantic Gothic and the Law, 1790–1860*, Bridgett Marshall demonstrates how novelistic representations of laws such as the Black Act (England) and the Fugitive Slave Act (United States) highlight the injustices of the Anglo-American legal system.[25] This book builds on these studies by exposing Gothic writing's advocacy for reform across genre and throughout the Atlantic world. My more holistic examination reveals that Gothic prose, drama, and poetry democratized access to political debates about the most pressing social issues of the Revolutionary era and created one conversation among consumers in England as well as her past and current colonies.

Verisimilar writing within multiple genres also harnessed the power of literature to affect political outcomes. Consider, for example, "Jacobin" novels such as Thomas Holcroft's *Anna St. Ives* (1792); abolitionist poetry such as Ann Yearsley's "A Poem Written on the Inhumanity of the Slave Trade" (1788), and the broadsheets of Hannah More's "Cheap Repository" series (1795–97). Yet, as my opening comments make clear, this book argues that the Gothic mode is particularly suited to inciting reader consciousness and influencing social change. Before entering into particulars, I will define what I mean when I say "Gothic mode" and how I apply "Gothic" throughout this discussion while acknowledging that the term is as fraught and slippery as any other single word adopted as a shorthand descriptor for a varied and complex phenomenon. As many others have noted, the definition of the Gothic constantly shifts in response to culture. Elizabeth Napier, Fred Botting, David Punter, Jerrold Hogle, and others have written extensively on the problems inherent to and the limits of invoking the term "Gothic."[26]

Robert Miles goes so far as to restrict the Gothic's definition to a "discursive site, a carnivalesque mode for representations of the fragmented subject."[27] Given the plasticity of the term, and its broad application across texts and periods, such circumspection seems prudent. Yet, establishing my own working definition of "Gothic" as an *entrée en matière* for this book's arguments about how aesthetics influence social change is both useful and desirable. First, although many critics loosely refer to the Gothic as a "genre" it is best characterized as a mode: a literary category that is "thematically specific but non-specific as to literary form."[28] The thematic specificity of Gothic texts is recognizable by a series of markers, transcending temporal, geographic, and generic limits, described within seminal work on the English (David Punter, Jerrold Hogle) and American (Leslie Fiedler, Jane Tompkins) traditions. These themes include a preoccupation with paranoia, barbarism, and the taboo; a persistent blurring of the boundaries between alive/dead, male/female, human/animal, among others; and an obsessive attention to haunting secrets, unresolved crimes, and historical violence.[29] The texts discussed in the ensuing chapters each exhibit a constellation of these modal attributes, allowing them shelter under the Gothic's contested yet expansive umbrella. Late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century authors, reviewers, and readers did not, of course, systematically apply the term "Gothic" to these chosen works, but as I will address in detail in the next section, they recognized and responded to the same thematic clusters outlined above, even if they referred to them with a more heterogeneous nomenclature.

The Gothic is not the only mode of writing that can influence social change, but I argue that its aesthetic properties make it especially well suited to the task. I take as my starting point the idea that literature has the capacity to shape the beliefs of both readers and society as an aggregate. First, there is the issue of authorial intention: why authors often worked within Gothic conventions to voice political speech. Drawing inspiration from cultural anthropology, this study emphasizes the transcendent capacity of language. Language-based expression (such as writing) occupies a privileged place to enable ideas of resistance, including "proposing, denying, lying, and inventing."[30] As Bradd Shore notes, language's ability to talk about something, rather than just present it, allows human beings to engage in "propositional thinking," to imagine an alternative to what exists (p. 120). In many ways, Shore's arguments hearken back to Enlightenment- and Romantic-era writers' arguments about the power and pre-eminence of the imagination. Works from Addison's essays on "The Pleasures of the Imagination" in *The Spectator*

(1712) to Wordsworth's "Preface" to the second edition of *Lyrical Ballads* (1800) assert man's fundamental capacity to use the imagination to transcend the boundaries of everyday life and literature's ability to evoke that capacity to spur readers' moral and intellectual development.[31] One needs the ability to imagine a changed world in order to go about enacting such change. Because of its fantastic nature, Gothic writing has the power to invent social and political scenarios that differ wildly from the status quo. For example, in *Secresy* (1795), discussed in Chapter 2, Eliza Fenwick conceives of a physically strong heroine who, though she does not reflect women's contemporary reality, creates an empowering ideal of female agency. Chapter 4 demonstrates a further evolution of the transformative fantasy. In *Arthur Mervyn* (1798–1800), Charles Brockden Brown uses an imagined, alternate history of Philadelphia's 1793 yellow fever outbreak to call for civic action in response to failed institutionalized healthcare. In discussing the American Gothic tradition, Jane Tompkins notes that authors routinely viewed their imaginative work as inherently political. That Charles Brockden Brown sent a copy of *Weiland* (1798) to then Vice-President Thomas Jefferson demonstrates that he "saw his book not so much as a work of art in our modern sense of the term, but as an attempt to influence public policy" by presenting "a shocking and uncharacteristically negative view of what it meant to survive the War of Independence."[32]

While authors offer texts as venues for propositional thinking, much of the text's political meaning is made only in conversation with the reader. Tracing nascent reader-response theory back to the eighteenth century, Wolfgang Iser demonstrates how authors such as Laurence Sterne understood reading as a creative act. Iser argues that reading is a "dynamic interaction between text and reader" in which "the linguistic signs and structures of the text exhaust their function in triggering developing acts of comprehension. . . . these acts, though set in motion by the text, defy total control by the text itself, and indeed, it is the very lack of control that forms the basis of the creative side of reading."[33] Thus, the words on the page are just starting points for the real intellectual work of reading that takes place, not in comprehending an author, but within the reader's own process of interpreting what is offered.

Within this process of interpretation lies the capacity for literature to influence social reform. Integral to my reading of Gothic texts as politically constructive forces are cultural materialist arguments, especially Alan Sinfield's notion that literature has "dissident potential" and that there can be "dissident reading." Gothic writing, I argue, lends itself eagerly to these "dissident" practices. In Sinfield's view, even texts looking to "subordinate" a competing perspective have to represent it in order to refute it, thus unconsciously reproducing what they attempt to silence. A dominant discourse, in turn, cannot control the appropriation of its content. With reference to the Gothic mode, its long-standing practices of adaptation and redaction reveal how other genres redeploy the political messages embedded in earlier forms. Sarah Wilkinson's bluebook, *The Castle of Montabino* (c. 1810), uses an inset narrative to critique the ideology of the novel's bourgeois heroine while simultaneously copying many of the novel's plots and characters. Readers, in turn, respond unpredictably to texts. As Sinfield notes, texts looking to reinscribe the dominant can foster revolutionary indignation, whereas those that encourage "dissidence . . . cannot prevent the drawing of reactionary inferences by readers."[34] Anticipating this idea in the 1790s, William Godwin embraces the notion that reader response cannot be controlled via authorial intention or textual architecture. For this reason, with *St. Leon* (1799), he abandons the tendentious methods of the "Jacobin" novel and instead offers narratives of epistemological uncertainty to prompt reader reflection. Even the voice of the "dominant" can be self-subverting. As discussed in Chapter 5, when Matthew Lewis tries to naturalize slavery within the subjective journal genre, the contradictions of his position erupt in an imperial Gothic fantasy poem, later embedded within the journal manuscript.

Unlike didactic or philosophical narratives, Gothic writing embraces, rather than resists, this author/audience give and take and the constant shift in meaning it entails. Through inset narratives, false identities, revenants, and other devices Gothic texts question the foundations of knowledge and the nature of perceived reality, forcing the reader into reflection. As Tzvetan Todorov notes: "by the hesitation it engenders, the fantastic questions precisely the existence of an irreducible opposition between real and unreal."[35] Whether Gothic texts ask us to suspend disbelief and accept "actual" supernatural events (horror Gothic) or just hint at the appearance of the supernatural (terror Gothic), each of them is fundamentally concerned with exploring the nature of truth: what can be trusted and what cannot. Consider, for example, *The Monk*'s "Matilda" who first presents as a young man, Rosario, then reveals herself to be a woman, and finally is exposed as a "subordinate but crafty spirit," inhuman and sexless.[36] Readers and characters alike struggle to keep pace with these changes that underscore the instability of identity and the unreliability of sensory experience. By creating uncertainty and placing epistemological demands on the reader, Gothic texts invite "dissident" reading.

At its most instructive and intellectually rigorous level, Gothic writing also draws attention to the existence of multiple, sometimes irreconcilable, approaches to reality – what Slavov Žižek refers to as "the parallax view." As Chapter 3 discusses, William Godwin's *St. Leon* uses the epistemological quandary inherent to the fantastic to destabilize the notion of historical narrative, demanding the popular audience rethink what they know to be "true" in an era when reactionary rhetoric dominates public discourse. What has been called the Gothic mode's "playful," or sometimes downright irresponsible, attitude toward history, which began with Horace Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto* (1764), has a more serious function of demanding a reader's intellectual engagement.[37] Central to the Gothic mode is the notion of an anachronism.[38] Romantic-era reviewers, especially of Ann Radcliffe's work, often cited historical inaccuracy as a reason to dismiss these texts.[39] Yet, Gothic writing has played an integral role in rethinking the development of historical fiction since George Lukács published *The Historical Novel* (1937). *St. Leon*, Walpole's *Otranto*, and Sophia Lee's *The Recess* (1783–85) help form what Richard Maxwell argues is an important bridge between the seventeenth-century French historical fiction tradition and Walter Scott's *Waverley*.[40] Most important, however, are the political implications of these texts' mixture of the historic and legendary. By destabilizing a cohesive linear view of history these texts draw attention to the constructed nature of historicity, inviting alternative interpretations of the past.

Gothic writing, however, influences because it hails both a reader's intellect and emotions. Authors self-consciously express their desire to arouse a reader's "passions" for the purpose of demanding reader sympathy for suffering. In this way, Gothic texts offer a particular version of sensibility, one that combines evocations of sympathy and the linguistic sublime to concentrate narrative's emotional impact. As Janet Todd, Markman Ellis, Nancy Roberts, and Jerome McGann (among others) have demonstrated, sensibility was the dominant strategy through which authors attempted to influence reader affect during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[41] Beginning with Shaftesbury in the late seventeenth century, English moral philosophy had begun to conceptualize variants of sensibility as a foundational component of human nature. These ideas reach their effulgence in the writings of David Hume – *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1739) and *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* (1751) – and Adam Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759). Although there are myriad subtle differences between each articulation of sensibility and its role in moral development, for the purposes of this discussion, one can approach sensibility as a belief that human beings have an innate capacity to sympathize with others, including literary characters. This capacity, in turn, aids individuals in making moral judgments. Further, the instructive potential of sensibility can be strengthened through reading, positioning texts as major resources for moral education. In her eminently useful *Sensibility, An Introduction*, Janet Todd notes:

> In all forms of sentimental literature, there is an assumption that life and literature are directly linked, not through any notion of a mimetic depiction of reality but through the belief that the literary experience can immediately affect the living one. . . . At the same time literary emotions herald active ones; a theatrical or fictional feeling creates greater virtue in the audience or reader, and a contrived tear foreshadows the spontaneous one of human sympathy.[42]

Todd, however, does not extend these capabilities to Gothic literature, arguing that it "goes far towards sensationalizing and sexualizing these elements [virtue and vice], while it retreats from the didactic aim of sentimental literature" (p. 9). More recently, scholars such as George Haggerty and Steven Bruhm have noted sensibility's importance in shaping Gothic aesthetics and evaluating their cultural impact. Haggerty gives insight into how, especially in Gothic fiction, sensibility allows women to represent socially unacceptable desires and expressions of resistance.[43] Bruhm demonstrates how Romantic authors contemplate the body in pain, or what he calls the "Gothic body," to investigate literary and political projects: "The literature of sensibility, and by extension Romantic fiction, fostered the myth that pain could be shared through the medium of the sympathetic body. Thus pain became a proclamation of ontological presence both for the victim and the spectator of pain."[44] In Gothic writing, the reader is asked to not just experience suffering by proxy and sympathize with it; he or she is asked to feel distress.

This book builds upon these ideas, relating how Gothic texts' particular appeal to emotion has the power to influence politics. The very psychological and physical violence that makes Gothic writing sensational, alluring, and profitable is also what empowers it to challenge its broad audience to imagine a world changed for the better. Gothic scenes of suffering, especially those depicting abused women and children, appeal to reader sympathy in ways similar to the verisimilar novel of sensibility. However, the emotional impact of Gothic writing goes beyond the realistic novel, because it couples this appeal to sympathy with the linguistic sublime, creating a heightened emotional effect that can be harnessed for political purposes. Anticipating the popularity of Gothic texts in the 1790s, Edmund Burke's *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful* (1757) privileges literature's ability to engage readers with images that transcend everyday life: "There are many things of a very affecting nature, which can seldom occur in reality, but the words which represent them often do; and thus they have an opportunity of making a deep impression and taking root in the mind."[45] This attempt to "mak[e] a deep impression" – or to evoke the linguistic sublime – is one that continues throughout Romantic-era Gothic writing and finds theoretical expression in everything from Joanna Baillie's "Introductory Discourse" to the illustratively titled *Plays on the Passions* (1798) to Walter Scott's description of Ann Radcliffe's strange power over readers in *Ballantyne's Novelists Library* (1824).

Some Gothic authors consciously link the linguistic sublime with political activism. One of the best expressions of this phenomenon manifests in Charles Brockden Brown's preface to *Arthur Mervyn*. When discussing the moral imperatives that can be gleaned from the recent yellow fever outbreak, Brown addresses the role of the author, suggesting:

> Men only require to be made acquainted with distress for their compassion and charity to be awakened. He that depicts in lively colours, the evils of disease and poverty, performs an eminent service to the sufferers, by calling forth benevolence in those who are able to afford relief, and he who pourtrays [*sic*] examples of disinterestedness and intrepidity, confers on virtue the notoriety and homage that are due to it. (p. 3)

Brown's sanguine view of human nature foreshadows the ways in which *Arthur Mervyn* engages with the ideas of Francis Hutcheson and David Hume – using Gothic motifs to both explore and to cast doubt upon sympathy's role in fostering benevolence. His "lively colours" are the yellow of the jaundiced patient and the so-called black vomit he produces, two recurring grotesque images that push the limits of both reader and character identification with suffering. While Brown ostensibly aims to encourage moral behavior through the linguistic sublime, the narrative's scenes of suffering are so graphic that they elicit feelings of both disgust and sympathy. By closing the gap between suffering characters and suffering readers, Gothic writing creates the kind of discomfort with the status quo that can spur readers into reflection and action.

Gothic writing's ability to couple an appeal to sympathy with sublime imaginings comes with additional rhetorical risks. First, this double assault on readers' emotions can lead to an over-stimulation that is counterproductive. Rather than rousing the reader into reflection or action, the text or performance incites hysteria, fainting, and convulsions, as with Lewis's *The Captive*. In addition, as discussed in relation to Walpole, the heightened emotional tone can backfire, eliciting bathos instead of pathos. In his discussion of Wordsworth and Radcliffe, Steven Bruhm also points out another consequence of invoking extremes, demonstrating how representations of pain can also work to privilege the experience of the individual over the collective.[46] When overly stimulated by suffering, Gothic characters and Gothic readers are apt to withdraw, resulting in a numbing egotism evident in the works discussed here, especially *St. Leon*. This study is as interested in these moments of rhetorical failure as it is with Gothic writing's demonstrated potential to invoke social change, and each chapter analyzes moments in which the author over-reaches, creating moments of disidentification, rather than eliciting the intense sympathetic arousal he or she desires.

By describing the discursive fluidity between authors and the public, the book demonstrates that Gothic texts do cultural work beyond expressing the deep-seated political anxieties of their authors and their zeitgeist. Rather, Gothic literature works through a process of political persuasion, one that asks a reader to evaluate the merits of a political position by using her imagination to develop a social consciousness. For example, Charlotte Smith asks women readers to conceive of a world in which women establish maternal lines of succession; William Godwin and Charles Brockden Brown offer protagonists who could be charlatans or humanitarians depending on one's point of view, forcing readers to self-define good and evil. Although, as Chapter 1 discusses, Horace Walpole suggests Gothic narrative is the most effective means to influence the reading polity, the book entire shows that this popular platform allows for both authorial and audience agency in shaping the text's political meaning.

Genre and the Romantic-era Consumer

Part of the reason Gothic audiences have particular agency in making meaning is because the mode is ubiquitous; it manifests in everything from broadside ballads sold in the street to "high" Romantic poetry such as Samuel Coleridge's "Christabel" (1797–1816). Although even some recent scholarship classifies the Gothic as a characteristically novelistic and English-national form,[47] this book's multi-generic approach builds on important efforts by Robert Miles (1993), Michael Gamer (2000), and, more recently, Diane Hoeveler (2010) that emphasize the Gothic's generic diversity.[48] What we now call "Gothic" writing found expression in a variety of forms. Most important, these diverse generic offerings were recognized by late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century readers as a cohesive aesthetic category – even if there was no single agreed upon label. In *Romanticism and the Gothic*, Michael Gamer persuasively contends:

> Without much difficulty, then, readers by the 1800s grouped together texts as disparate as James Boaden's dramas, Matthew Lewis's ballads, and Charlotte Dacre's fiction under a single categorical umbrella. Several names may have existed for this rubric – "terrorist school of novel writing," "*modern* romance," "the trash of the Minerva Press," "the German school" – yet what is clear from these multiple groupings is the recurrence of specific writers, readers, and publishers under a single heading.[49]

Reviewers regularly compared authors and texts we now classify as Gothic by grouping them in one "school" or "species." Just taking Ann Radcliffe as an example, one can see that her first success, *The Romance of the Forest* (1791), was immediately compared to Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto* and Clara Reeve's *The Old English Baron* (1778) by the *Critical Review* because it "resembles" those texts "in manner."[50] After her solidified reputation earned her a place in *Lives of the Novelists* (1821), Radcliffe was praised by Walter Scott as the "founde[r] of a class or school . . . which has been attempted by many, but in which no one has attained or approached the excellencies of the original inventor, unless, perhaps the author of *The Family of Montorio* [Maturin]."[51] In his *Treatise on Poetry and Modern Romance* (1839), George Moir refers to Walpole's *Otranto* and Reeve's *Baron* as examples of a "species of romance writing [that] was carried to its perfection by Mrs. Radcliffe" arguing that "she herself with two exceptions only [Lewis and Maturin] . . . remains the solitary writer of genius by whom it has been adorned."[52] These three examples demonstrate what a larger study of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century reviews makes clear: that authors as politically and stylistically dissimilar as Walpole, Reeve, Radcliffe, Lewis, and Maturin were understood to be in literary conversation.

This critical understanding is reasonable considering that the authors themselves acknowledged, in public and private venues, the reciprocal nature of their aesthetic conversation and its ability to transcend genre. In her preface to *Baron*, Clara Reeve addresses Walpole's work by name in citing her impetus for writing. Lewis admits *Otranto* and *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794) as his inspiration for *The Monk* in letters to his mother.[53] Radcliffe pays homage to Walpole's play *The Mysterious Mother* in her epigraphs to *Forest* and *The Italian* (1797). Consider John Keats's well-known 1819 letter to George and Georgiana Keats, in which he discusses naming two compositions then called "St. Agnes's Eve" and "Eve of St. Mark." He says, "you see what fine mother Radcliff [*sic*] names I have – it is not my fault – I did not search for them."[54] As Margaret Homans argues, Keats's sheepish admission of this titular inspiration acknowledges only partially the debt of inspiration. "Mother Radcliffe's" presence can be traced throughout the imagery and narrative style of one of these important poems that will soon become "The Eve of St. Agnes."[55]

Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century reviewers also grouped specific authors and texts together, because they recognized them as serving similar cultural functions or being consumed by readers in similar ways. These uses intersect with both commercial and aesthetic concerns. We know, for example, from Edward Jacobs's excellent work that circulating libraries advertised and shelved books now classified as "Gothic" together in categories such as "mysteries" and "modern novel" so that readers who enjoyed these conventions could easily locate material suited to their taste.[56] This practice, in turn, solidified readers' understanding that these types of texts formed a single category. The frequency and success of adaptations also underscores these texts' aesthetic coherence. Readers and viewers responded enthusiastically to the prospect of consuming familiar narratives in different forms. Again, just by looking at one author, we can trace this phenomenon in action. Matthew Lewis's *The Monk* (1796) was quickly adapted by James Boaden into a play – *Aurelio and Miranda* (Drury Lane 1798). *The Monthly Mirror* (January 1799) argues that though much of the artistry of Lewis's original contribution is lost, the adaptation, unlike the novel, is "both probable and moral" suggesting that the play enlarges the suitable audience for Lewis's narrative.[57] Adaptation allowed *The Monk* to find an audience even in the Victorian era through two operas: *La Nonne Sanglante* (1854) and *Raymond and Agnes* (1855). The process of adaptation is multi-directional, locating primary source material in many other genres besides the novel. Greatly influenced by Matthew Lewis, Sir Walter Scott begins his career as a gothicist, writing ballads, ghost stories, and translating German drama. As Michael Gamer documents, these early experiences go on to affect profoundly his work as a nationalist bard and novelist whose verse and prose narratives exemplify a specific brand of Gothic antiquarianism.[58] Lewis's own play *The Castle Spectre* (1798) finds new life in 1807 as a bluebook of the same name by Sarah Wilkinson. The bluebook allows *Spectre*'s earlier audience to relive the play's thrills, and it creates an opportunity to garner a new subset audience of bluebook readers who do not attend the theater or buy published plays for either economic or social reasons. In short, Gothic texts find cohesion in the practices of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century authors, readers, and reviewers – through their artistic influence, the way they are marketed, and the means by which they are consumed.

For these reasons, this book's central arguments draw from pragmatic genre theory, which suggests that genre is related to the "use-value" of a discourse, not its formal properties.[59] That is, genre is defined by how a text gets used or what needs it serves for its readers. This approach emphasizes the importance of an audience in determining how groups of texts cohere around discursive practices. Specifically, I am most interested in how the text's genre interfaces with its rhetorical action. As Carolyn Miller argues, genres become established by formal features that evoke a particular effect. Genre is more than form; it is a way to signal intention and to influence reception, which Miller identifies as "an aspect of social action."[60] Genre itself is activist in nature. For this particular study, pragmatic genre theory offers several important benefits for critical explanation and for gauging a text's political impact. For example, the ensuing chapters describe how authors choose genres to influence specific constituencies and, in Walpole's, Godwin's, and Lewis's case, protect themselves from a politically or critically hostile world. Readers in turn use genre to push back, creating parodies, adaptations, redactions, and homages.

As Adena Rosmarin notes, approaching texts through the critical lens of genre also enhances opportunities for analysis. "The genre is the critic's heuristic tool, his chosen or defined way of persuading his audience to see the literary text in all of its previously inexplicable and 'literary' fullness and then to relate this text to those that are similar or, more precisely, to those that may be similarly explained."[61] Using genre in this way exposes how similar ideological concepts are expressed in both "high" and "low" culture and what rhetorical practices succeed in different forms. For example, examining Sarah Wilkinson's "shilling shockers" alongside the novels of which they are ostensibly redactions reveals Wilkinson's working-class contribution to an ongoing feminist discussion of women's rights. Reading Walpole's *Castle of Otranto* in conversation with its dramatic adaptation, *The Count of Narbonne* (1782), demonstrates how Walpole's experimental text loses much of its political force when Jephson reinterprets it for the stage.

Focusing on a genre's pragmatics also demands particular attention to the material culture of books. Thus, my study focuses on each text's particular publication history arguing that the name of a book's publisher, its presentation as a physical object, its illustrations, among many other conditions, shape the Gothic's meaning and influence who consumes a work and with what level of serious attention. For example, Charles Brockden Brown's decision to begin his yellow fever narrative, *Arthur Mervyn*, as a periodical serial demonstrates his desire to intervene in the public discourse about the disease in a quickly available and widely-accessible format. In Chapter 2, my discussion of the frontispiece to Sarah Wilkinson's *The Castle of Montabino* reveals how bluebook covers leveraged recognizable scenes from novels to increase sales. Yet, because the image not does correspond with the text, the reader is left with two competing narratives strands. By theorizing how this discrepancy came about and how readers might have reconciled it, my discussion reveals how commercial and ideological pressures work together to influence textual reception.

This dynamic interchange between artist, producer, and public was occurring throughout the Anglophone world. As Chapters 4 and 5 address in detail, attending to transatlantic publication histories allows insight into how political ideas were disseminated differently in England versus America or the colonies. When Charles Brockden Brown's novels appeared in England under a Minerva imprint, it lessened the seriousness with which critics approached them.[62] Matthew Lewis's Gothic poem "The Isle of Devils" (1827), which is an anxious exploration of slave rape and miscegenation, was published as a standalone work in Jamaica but embedded within his pro-slavery *Journal of a West India Proprietor* (1834) when it first appeared in England. That publishers packaged these texts differently in accordance with national and international concerns underscores the texts' political nature and demands that they be read within their original transatlantic context.

It is not enough, however, for an author to attempt to influence political discourse. An audience must recognize this attempt and respond to it. One of this project's main interventions is to demonstrate that Gothic writing's political content affected discourse and action. Although it is impossible to document individual shifts in political thinking, this book measures the political influence of Gothic texts in a series of ways. First, I pay careful attention to reviews, adaptations, or parodies that directly address an imaginative work's political content to demonstrate that the content was both noticed and incorporated into a larger public discussion. Second, I examine how censorship laws shaped, or in some cases, pre-empted the political speech found in Gothic works, again showing that the politics were noticed and thought influential enough to be silenced or curtailed. Third, where possible, I document parliamentary speeches, political memoirs, and pamphlets, among other discursive practices, that directly relate to governance and link that content with the political expressions of contemporary Gothic texts. Finally, I prioritize the commercial reception of the text. Gauging a text's or performance's popularity gives important indications about what types of people were exposed to political speech and how they responded to it by essentially voting with their pocketbooks.

Organization of the Book

Chapters 2 to 5 follow a roughly historical trajectory, tracing how authors increasingly leveraged the rhetorical capacity of emerging Gothic conventions to achieve political ends from the 1780s to the 1830s. Chapter 1, however, has a unique purpose within the book. Rather than providing the first example of an author deploying Gothic motifs to advocate for a specific ideology or to invite political action, this chapter demonstrates how the *tools* of Gothic activism came into being through one of the least likely sources – the elitist politician, author, and antiquarian, Horace Walpole. Tracing the nascence of a literary phenomenon is often a contentious business, and the precursors to Walpole's self-proclaimed "Gothic story" are present in a wide variety of genres: the literary history of Richard Hurd, the poetry of Edward Young, and the historical romance of Thomas Leland, among many others.[63] Yet, we can discuss the 1764 publication of *The Castle of Otranto* as a moment in which there was "a Sea-change / Into something rich, and strange"[64] that had a profound influence over the development of prose, poetry, and drama in the Revolutionary period. Through his role as the "originator" of a "new species of romance," Horace Walpole self-consciously points out that terror fiction, with all its persuasive power, has a growing role in political discourse that will only be augmented as literacy continues to expand. His first preface to *Otranto* boasts, not without some irony, that the story's vivid depiction of ghosts, saints, and miracles can "enslave a hundred vulgar minds beyond half the books of controversy" written since Luther.[65] Reading *Otranto* alongside Robert Jephson's dramatic adaptation, *The Count of Narbonne*, and Walpole's own tragedy, *The Mysterious Mother* (1768), the chapter analyzes the source of Gothic writing's rhetorical power. By placing Walpole's literary contentions within the context of his political writing – the *Memoirs* of

George II and George III, letters, and pamphlets – I illustrate Walpole's keen understanding of the role fear plays in politics on and off the page. As the chapter makes clear, Walpole's personal positions on specific issues are often idiosyncratic and self-serving, but the political potential he outlines for Gothic writing is one that remains constant, a potential that serves to inspire the writers discussed in the ensuing chapters.

Chapters 2 and 3 demonstrate how, beginning in the late 1780s, Walpole's successors respond enthusiastically to his suggestion that Gothic themes are best-suited to produce political persuasion. As Revolutionary debates kindle, they embrace these themes to lobby specific political agendas. Chapter 2 reads Charlotte Smith's *Emmeline* (1788), Eliza Fenwick's *Secresy*, and Joanna Baillie's *Orra* (1812) in conversation with Ann Radcliffe's so-called "female Gothic" novel par excellence, *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, to demonstrate how women authors leveraged the symbolic richness of Gothic space to challenge existing forms of domestic politics before and after the French Revolution. Eschewing the "damsel in distress" the novels and play reimagine Gothic settings in which heroines exhibit physical prowess and find economic enfranchisement. A subsequent discussion of Sarah Wilkinson's bluebook, *The Castle of Montabino*, demonstrates how these "defiant damsels" appeal to a broad demographic and find their way into print ephemera. A short, inexpensively published narrative, *Montabino* nevertheless adapts novelistic and dramatic themes to expose how economic inequalities among women erode female solidarity, reminding readers that acts of heroinism depicted in novels and on the stage are often made possible by the protagonist's upper-class privilege.

Chapter 3 investigates William Godwin's evolving political deployment of Gothic motifs, arguing that *St. Leon*'s alchemical themes create opportunities for Godwin to reimagine the educational purpose of literature after the French Revolution. St. Leon's ability to create limitless wealth facilitates Godwin's intervention into contemporary debates about political economy. The narrative's events reveal how economic inequality, not population growth, is the true barrier to creating universal prosperity. The protagonist's immortality, in turn, calls attention to the constructed and revisionist nature of history, inviting readers to question contemporary interpretations of current events such as the French Revolution. By disseminating these ideas via a popular platform, Godwin revives the pedagogical potential of the novel, using the instability of a narrative predicated upon magic to prompt reader investigation into the foundations of knowledge.

Chapters 4 and 5 delineate the next stage of Gothic writing's political evolution, in which texts move beyond simply advocating abstract positions and begin to urge policy solutions to contemporary problems. Taking a materialist approach to setting, Chapter 4 argues that *Arthur Mervyn* (*Weekly Magazine* 1798–1800) addresses yellow fever as an immediate medical and social problem. Gothic scenes of horror, inspired by the outbreak of 1793, discredit institutional healthcare, in particular the Bush-hill hospital, by characterizing it as brutal and ineffective. Although descriptions of the hellish hospital and its mercenary attendants engender readers' fear and disgust, Brown also offers a handful of exemplary characters to demonstrate how suffering can be mitigated by altruistic acts shared between civic brethren. The sense of urgency created by horror becomes channeled into a serious, practical discussion about the role of individual responsibility in response to these recurring pandemics. As the chapter underscores, however, Brown's advocacy for an idealized form of civic virtue works against adopting more pragmatic solutions to the ongoing health crisis faced by America's northeastern cities.

The book concludes by highlighting the reformist writings of one of the principal figures of the Gothic canon, Matthew Lewis. Although best known as a scandalmonger, Lewis wrote both Gothic and non-fiction texts that engage with the abolition and emancipation debates over a 21-year period. Using archival research of the Larpent Manuscripts, the first section reveals how Lewis exploits the historical setting of his play *The Castle Spectre* to render his criticism of the trade acceptable during a period of intense censorship. In *Journal of a West India Proprietor*, Lewis de-emphasizes the most radical solution to the slave trade, emancipation, and instead outlines practical reforms to ameliorate conditions on sugar plantations. Within the non-fictional *Journal*, Lewis inserts the previously published "The Isle of Devils" that calls attention to the ethical problems endemic to his anti-emancipation position while at the same time preserving the journal's overall argument.

As these chapters make clear, through the medium of populist entertainment, Gothic prose, drama, and poetry render accessible the political debates of the Revolutionary era. Notorious for scenes of rape, riot, murder, necromancy, incest, and torture, these texts are unlikely candidates for fostering social change. Yet, it is precisely the passionate response such graphic scenes evoke that authors harness to provoke debates about political events and to challenge public policy. By exposing Gothic literature's reformist potential within multiple genres and throughout the Atlantic world, this book reveals late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century culture as infused with not only revolutionary anxiety but also preoccupied with producing an imaginative discourse of change.

Index

Act for Regulating Private Madhouses (1774), 3
adaptation, *see also* redaction, 10, 16–19, 25, 34–5, 77–8
alchemy, 20, 93–8, 106–9, 122–5
altruism, 91, 130, 146–56
American Revolution, 5
anachronism, in Gothic settings, 11, 111–14, 161–2
Allen, Richard, *see also* Jones, Absalom, 141–2, 146
Analytical Review, 59, 172
Anti-Jacobin Review, 97, 111
antiquarianism, 16, 19, 27, 53
Austen, Jane, 62, 73
authorial intention, 2, 8–10, 17, 27, 31, 97–102, 130–4, 178–9

ballads, 14–16, 158
Baillie, Joanna, 53
  Orra, 20, 59–60, 70, 64–6, 75–8, 80, 82, 85, 92
  Plays on the Passions, "Introductory Discourse" to, 13, 65
Bakhtin, Mikhail, *see also* dialogism, 6, 178
benevolence, see also Hutcheson, Francis, 13, 90–1, 117, 123–4, 146–56
bildungsroman, 66, 70
bluebooks, *see also* chapbooks and shilling shockers, 10, 17–18, 20, 59, 77–92, 197
Boaden, James, 15–16
British Critic, 111
Brockden Brown, Charles, 6–9, 13–14, 18, 94, 197
  Arthur Mervyn, 9, 13, 18, 21, 128–55
  Ormond, 128, 133, 145–6, 153–5
Bruhm, Steven, 12, 14
burial, live, 2, 130, 133, 139–44
Burke, Edmund, 13, 36–7, 47, 80, 98
Burney, Frances, 46
Bush-hill Hospital and Mansion, 21, 128, 130, 135–9, 142–4
Bute, Lord, 42–5
Byng, Admiral, *see also* Walpole, Horace, 26, 29–30, 39
Byron, Lord, 46, 161

Carey, Matthew, 137, 141, 143, 146
Catholicism, representations of, 27–9, 31, 49, 52–3, 111, 190
censorship, 6, 18, 21, 159–60, 163–6, 172–3
chapbooks, *see also* bluebooks and shilling shockers, 28, 30–1, 56, 77, 79
circulating libraries, 16, 78
Clarkson, Matthew (Mayor, Philadelphia 1792–6), 128, 141
Clery, Emma, 37, 47, 69, 73
Clemit, Pamela, 97–8, 100, 115
Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 14, 75, 160
Committee of Health (Philadelphia), 128, 137
Covent Garden Theatre, 1, 3, 25, 34, 163
coverture, *see also feme covert*, 2, 67–9
Cox, Jeffrey, 3, 165
Critical Review, 15, 111
Cumberland, Duke of, 23, 33
Currie, William, 135

Devèze, Jean, 137–9, 143–4
dialogism, *see also* Bakhtin, Mikhail, 6
disguise, 27, 107–10
dissident reading, *see also* Sinfield, Alan, 9–10
Drury Lane Theatre, 16, 45, 160, 162–3, 169, 198
Dryden, John, 23–4
Du Bois, W.E.B., 182–3
dueling, 62–3, 110
Duggett, Tom, 6, 57

education, early feminist theories of, 56, 65–6, 70–1

"female gothic," *see also* terror gothic, 20, 58, 89
feme covert, *see also* coverture, 67
Fenwick, Eliza, 9, 20, 26, 53, 58–9, 62, 81–2
  Secresy, 69–77
food riots, 95, 113–14, 119–121
frame narratives, 27–31, 101–4, 190
French Revolution, 5–6, 20, 58, 67, 94–98, 111, 131
frontispieces, 18, 28, 43, 57, 77–8, 82–5

Gamer, Michael, 14–16, 161, 163, 171, 173
genre theory, 17–18, 176–7
Garrick, David, 45
George III, of England, 23, 26, 42–6, 51
Gillray, James, 98–9
Girard, Stephen, 137, 139, 143–4, 156
Godwin, William, 10–11, 14, 17, 20, 26, 28, 30, 70–1, 129–32, 190, 197
  Caleb Williams, 93, 95–8, 100, 104, 110
  The Enquirer, 98, 100, 120, 125, 131
  "Of History and Romance," 97, 110, 114, 131
  Of Population, 116–17, 125
  Political Justice, 71, 93, 97, 102, 115–16, 120
  St. Leon, 10–11, 14, 20, 93–125, 129, 132, 190, 197
Gordon Riots, 26, 36–7
Gray, Thomas, 28, 32, 45

Haitian Revolution, 131, 159, 169–70
Helm, Peter, 137, 139, 143, 156
Hermippus Redivivus, see also prefaces, importance of, 103–4
Hoeveler, Diane, 15, 56, 79
Hogle, Jerrold, 7–8, 102
horror gothic, *see also* "male gothic," 10, 94, 158

Hume, David, 11, 13, 122–3, 131, 146–7
Hutcheson, Francis, 13, 131, 146–7, 150

immortality, 20, 93–4, 104, 112–13
imprisonment, 1–3, 39, 55–8, 61–2, 66, 69–71, 75, 80, 89–90, 94, 105–7, 160
incest, 21, 25, 42–52
Inchbald, Elizabeth, 167–9
inflation, 95, 119–22, 125

Jamaica, 18, 157–9, 161, 169–70, 177–9, 185–8, 196
Jephson, Robert, 17, 19, 25, 34–5
Jones, Absalom, *see also* Allen, Richard, 141–2, 146

Keats, John, 16, 134
Kelly, Gary, 89, 98, 100, 115
Kelly, Michael, 160, 196–7
Kilgour, Maggie, 5, 55

Larpent, John, *see also* Licensing Act and patent theatres, 21, 163–6, 168–9, 171–2, 174
Lee, Sophia, 11, 96
Lewis, Matthew, 1–5, 7, 10, 14–18, 21, 28, 35, 80, 101
  The Captive, 1–4, 14
  The Castle Spectre, 16–17, 21, 35, 75, 80, 157–75, 187, 196
  "The Isle of Devils," 18, 21, 160, 186–96
  Journal of a West India Proprietor, 18, 21, 157, 159, 175–96
  The Monk, 5, 10, 16, 89, 101, 113, 158–60, 163, 173
Licensing Act, *see also censorship*, 162–3
literacy, 19, 24, 26–35, 53, 79
London Corresponding Society, 70, 94
Lukács, George, 11

Macauley, Catherine, 56, 66, 71, 86
madness, 1–3, 42, 49, 75–6, 130, 166

"male gothic," *see also horror gothic,* 158
Malthus, Thomas, 95, 115–21
masking, themes of, *see also disguise,* 10, 14, 94, 101–4, 107, 132
Maturin, Charles Robert, 15
melodrama, 4, 34
Miles, Robert, 6–8, 14
Milton, John, 34–5, 101
Minerva Press, 15, 18, 129, 131, 134–5
monodrama, 1, 4
Monthly Magazine, 111
Monthly Mirror, 16, 161, 165
Monthly Review, 32, 93–4, 125
Monthly Visitor, 172–3
moral economy, *see also* E.P. Thompson, 50, 107, 121–2
moral relativism, 106, 136
More, Hannah, 7, 86, 177
Murray, John (publisher), 176

Newcastle, Duke of, 30, 33
New London Review, 96
New Monthly Magazine, 134
novel, the, 5, 10, 12, 14, 16, 28, 56, 60, 67, 69, 75, 77, 80, 113, 134, 158, 178
  didactic, 20, 95, 97
  historical, 11, 110–11
  "Jacobin," 7, 10
nursing, of sick, 130–1, 135–47, 150, 153–4

paranoia, 8, 94, 121, 129, 139–40, 169
patent theaters, *see also* Covent Garden Theatre and Drury Lane Theatre, 34, 162, 163
Paine, Thomas, 57, 96
periodicals, importance of, 18, 78–9, 129, 131–4, 155
Philadelphia College of Physicians, 128
Pinto, Fernão Mendes, 102
political economy, *see also* population pressure, 5, 20, 95–6, 115–25
population pressure, 4, 20, 95, 115–25, 131, 146
prefatorial material, 13, 15, 19, 24–5, 27–9, 31–3, 45–6, 53, 97, 101–4, 128, 140, 147, 190
pregnancy, 74
Princess Dowager, Augusta, *see also* George III, 26, 42–6
Punter, David, 5, 7–8, 37, 113

Radcliffe, Ann, 11, 13–16, 20, 25, 46, 58–64, 66–73, 76, 79–90, 94, 101
  The Italian, 16, 61, 67, 72, 78, 80, 86, 90, 101
  The Mysteries of Udolpho, 16, 20, 57–9, 61–9, 72–4, 80–1, 84–7, 89–92
  The Romance of the Forest, 15–16, 72, 87–9, 91
rape, *see also* slavery, 18, 21, 35, 56, 60, 145, 169–70, 190, 193–5
reader response, theory and experience of, 4, 9–10, 32, 77, 100–1, 129
reception history, 2, 18–19, 32–3, 62, 79, 93–4, 160–5, 172–3
redaction, *see also* adaptation, 10, 17, 77–8
Reformation, Protestant, 27–30, 49
Reeve, Clara, 15, 25, 32, 86
Robinson, George (publisher), 67–9
Robinson, Mary, 56, 59, 62–3, 70
romance, the, eighteenth-century conceptions of, 15, 19, 24, 27–8, 31–2, 72, 85–6, 95–8, 114
Rush, Benjamin, 141, 143, 154

Sade, Marquis de, 5
sensibility, 11–12, 25, 90, 98, 115, 123, 129, 142, 146, 149, 153–4, 156
Scott, Sir Walter, 11, 13, 15–16, 32, 80
Shakespeare, William, 32, 37
Shelley, Mary, 105, 134–5, 188, 191
Shelley, Percy, 78, 134
shilling shockers, *see also* chapbooks and bluebooks, 17
Shore, Bradd, 8
Sinfield, Alan, 9–10

slavery, 10, 18, 86, 157–98
  abolition, 4, 7, 21, 157, 159, 161–3, 169, 172, 175, 177, 185, 190, 198
  emancipation, 21, 159–60, 169–70, 175–8, 183, 187, 196, 198
  rebellions against, *see also* Haitian Revolution, 161, 168–71, 174, 179–84, 190–1
  representation in drama, 160–75
  Romantic poetic treatment of, 7, 188–90
  sexual violence within, *see also* rape, 18, 170, 190, 193–5
  song, as political resistance to, 180–6
Smith, Adam, 11, 117, 123, 146, 148
Smith, Charlotte, 14, 53, 59, 63–4, 67, 81–2, 84
  Emmeline, 20, 58, 60–2, 64, 66–7
Sterne, Laurence, 9, 60, 51–2, 79
Strawberry Hill, *see also* Horace Walpole, 25, 27, 45
sublime, the, 11–13, 25, 31–6, 64, 71–2, 75, 87–8, 160
suicide, 42, 51–2, 79

terror gothic, *see also* "female gothic," 10, 58
Thompson, E.P., *see also* moral economy, 121
Todd, Janet, 11–12
Todorov, Tzvetan, 10, 101
tragedy, 23–4, 31–4, 37, 41, 46

uncanny, the, 56, 108, 127, 135, 191

Wakefield, Priscilla, 56, 65, 71
Walpole, Horace, 7, 11, 14–17, 19–20, 60, 84, 101–2, 140, 190, 197
  The Castle of Otranto, 11, 15, 17, 19, 24, 26–41, 53, 61, 84, 94, 101, 190
  "A Letter from Xo Ho," *see also* Byng, Admiral, 29–30, 39, 53
  Memoirs of the Reign of King George II, 20, 26–7
  Memoirs of the Reign of King George the Third, 20, 24, 42
  The Mysterious Mother, 16, 19, 24–5, 41–53
Walpole, Robert, 26, 37, 42
Weekly Magazine (Philadelphia), 21, 133
Whigs, 26–7
Wilberforce, William, 177, 182–4
Wilkinson, Sarah Scudgell, 10, 17–18, 20, 28, 59
  The Castle of Montabino, 10, 18, 20, 57, 59, 77–92
Wollstonecraft, Mary, 3, 56, 59, 66, 70, 79, 86, 94, 98, 102–3, 131
Wordsworth, William, 7, 9, 14, 160–1, 190
working class, representations of, 6, 17, 37, 56, 77–92, 119, 121–3, 125, 141–2

yellow fever, 5, 9, 13, 18, 21, 127–156, 196, 198