



NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE

Humanities

DIVISION OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Narrative Section of a Successful Application

The attached document contains the grant narrative and selected portions of a previously funded grant application. It is not intended to serve as a model, but to give you a sense of how a successful application may be crafted. Every successful application is different, and each applicant is urged to prepare a proposal that reflects its unique project and aspirations. Prospective applicants should consult the Education Programs application guidelines at <http://www.neh.gov/grants/education/summer-seminars-and-institutes> for instructions. Applicants are also strongly encouraged to consult with the NEH Division of Education Programs staff well before a grant deadline.

Note: The attachment only contains the grant narrative and selected portions, not the entire funded application. In addition, certain portions may have been redacted to protect the privacy interests of an individual and/or to protect confidential commercial and financial information and/or to protect copyrighted materials.

Project Title: Reassessing British Romanticism
Institution: University of Nebraska
Project Director: Stephen Behrendt
Grant Program: Summer Seminars and Institutes for College and University Teachers

Stephen C. Behrendt: *Reassessing British Romanticism*
5-week Summer Seminar for College Teachers
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE; 10 June — 12 July 2013

Table of Contents

Application cover sheets
Table of Contents
Narrative Description of Proposed Seminar
Project Budget Pages

Appendices:

1. Brief résumé: Stephen Behrendt, Director
2. Institutional letters of support:
 - a. Dr. Susan A Belasco, Chair of English
 - b. Dr. David Manderscheid, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
 - c. Dr. Joan Giesecke, Dean of Libraries
 - d. Prof. Kenneth Price, Co-Director, Center for Digital Research in the Humanities, University of Nebraska
3. Bibliographies
 - a. Modern critical and theoretical works mentioned in the proposal narrative
 - b. Primary and secondary Romantic-era texts, including texts of reviews and other works to be distributed in advance to participants (on flash drives) as the basis of seminar discussions
4. Participant evaluations from 2010 NEH Summer Seminar
5. Email from 2010 graduate student participant regarding acceptance for publication of his seminar project essay

Stephen C. Behrendt: Detailed Description of Proposed Summer Seminar

REASSESSING BRITISH ROMANTICISM

— University of Nebraska; Lincoln, NE; 10 June - 12 July 2013 (5 weeks)

NOTE: THIS IS A PROPOSAL FOR A 5-WEEK NEH SUMMER SEMINAR FOR COLLEGE TEACHERS

— ***Intellectual Rationale***

Scholarly, critical and cultural assessments of the British Romantic era (c. 1780-1835) have changed dramatically over the past quarter century, from a longstanding primary focus upon six male poets (Blake, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Shelley, Keats) and to a lesser extent upon two novelists (Austen, Scott) to a more expansive perspective that posits a very different “Romanticism” from the earlier model. One conspicuous change reflects the recovery of the works of Romantic-era women writers in poetry and prose fiction. Recent scholarship is investigating too the work of both laboring-class writers (e.g, Robert Bloomfield, Margaret Leech) and customarily neglected male authors (e.g., Anthony Holstein, Francis Lathom), as well as extra-literary genres including print journalism and ephemeral “street literature.” The historical privileging of a handful of “major” Romantic-era authors has been challenged by compelling documentary evidence of the activity and cultural influence of a remarkable array of authors during this protean period of literary and cultural history.

Revisiting “Romanticism” has required reconsidering and redefining Romantic-era “literature” in light of new (or in some cases renewed) attention to forms like travel writing, scientific discourse, sermonic literature, writing for children, and “popular” forms like Gothic fiction, sensational or sentimental romance fiction (like that produced by the Minerva Press), and multidisciplinary works ranging from broadsides and caricature prints to works intended for (and

acted upon) a variety of stage venues. Concurrently, detailed recent studies of the history of the production, circulation and consumption of printed materials during the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, together with the appearance of major new bibliographical resources, have opened new avenues of inquiry into the economic and demographic circumstances of Romantic-era publishing and reading, in turn generating new scholarship about audiences, readerships, and reading practices. Finally, a growing array of electronic resources is making accessible for scholarly study a wealth of previously scarce and relatively inaccessible texts that has itself facilitated a wholly new sort of quantitative and comparative scholarship .

Pivotal to the first stages of this reassessment were groundbreaking studies published two decades or more ago by scholars like Mary Poovey on women prose writers (1984),¹ Stuart Curran on women poets, genre and the literary canon (1988), Anne Mellor on feminism and Romanticism (1993), Paula Feldman on the recovery of neglected Romantic-era women poets (1997), and others, in addition to Jerome J. McGann's influential critique of "the Romantic ideology" (1983). That pioneering work has been foundational for more recent scholarship that explores connections among literature and the broader public culture which that literature both reflects and influences. This new scholarship has addressed relationships between science and literary culture (Holmes, 2008), cultural implications of environmental consciousness (Bate, 2000), Romantic-era aspects of education, pedagogy and brain science (Richardson, 1994), the rapid growth in the Romantic era of literature for children and young readers (Jackson, 1989), women's extensive and influential production as poets (Behrendt, 2009), the "high water mark" of Gothic writing during the Romantic era (Hoeveler, 2010), and the emergence of the literary

¹ Full title and information appears in the bibliography, Appendix 3a.

annual as a profitable venue and a barometer of bourgeois culture (Hootman, 2006). At the same time, innovative studies in Romantic-era literary and cultural theory generally over the past quarter century have ranged from the revisionist conception among Romantic-era writers of the nature of history (Chandler, 1998) to the contributions of feminist theory (Fay, 1998) and gender and queer studies (Elfenbein, 1999) to a fuller and more culturally nuanced assessment of Romantic-era cultural production; from the implications for Romantic-era cultural consciousness of food and animal studies within “natural history” (Morton, 2004) to the implications for scholarship in Romanticism of the new materials and methodologies in electronic and digital technology (Moretti, 2005). Furthermore, scholars now less often define “British” Romanticism narrowly and exclusively in terms of “English” authors, moving toward a broader appreciation of the culturally different and distinctive aspects of the Romantic era in Scotland (Davis et al, 2004) and Ireland (Kelly, 2011). This greater expansiveness is further evident in the growing field of “transatlantic Romanticism” that examines cultural interaction among non-adjacent national and cultural units (Newman et al, 2006) and in renewed scholarly interest in pan-European Romanticism, especially considered in an interdisciplinary context. As noted above, important perspectives are resulting from innovative scholarship on the demographics and economics of the Romantic-era publishing industry (St Clair, 2004) and on emerging readerships generated by the rapid but erratic spread of literacy and print culture (Klancher, 1987; Batchelor, 2010).

I have directed three NEH Summer Seminars for College Teachers (“Rethinking British Romantic Fiction,” 2003; “Genre, Dialogue, and Community in British Romanticism,” 2005; and “Revisiting British Romanticism and Aesthetics,” 2010). The present proposal develops logically from the related central concerns of these three seminars, building on scholarly and pedagogical matters that participants in all three identified as particularly relevant and important to them as

scholars and teachers. Participants in the 2010 seminar expressed particular enthusiasm about the timeliness and attractiveness of a seminar on the subject I am now proposing. In fact, though, all three seminars witnessed animated discussions almost daily about how the expanding roster of Romantic-era authors and their cultural contexts inevitably and necessarily impacts how we as scholars and teachers approach Romanticism as an artistic, cultural, and socio-historical phenomenon. This demonstrable ongoing interest in the subject among colleagues at all stages of their professional careers, then, informs and animates this present proposal.

The seminar I am proposing represents what I think of as a *structure of inquiry*. That is, while the seminar involves a clear organizational plan, a central component of that plan is *evolutionary* in nature, geared to the work we will do *as a seminar cohort* to formulate conclusions, tentative though they may necessarily be, about the critical issues of definition, delineation, and reassessment at the heart of my proposed topic. This is not to say that the seminar will be essentially process-driven and therefore less committed to conventional scholarly “outcomes” – articles and the like. Indeed, I *expect* participants to leave with completed projects that can be “published” or otherwise disseminated in the profession, and I will work with them to that end. But those products will reflect the process of comparative inquiry at the seminar’s core.

This seminar’s topic involves both nomenclature and what might be called literary-cultural descriptive anatomy: determining exactly what we now, in 2013, understand to be the nature of “British Romanticism,” in light of two-plus decades of revisionist projects in literary and cultural recovery and reassessment. From this complicated and slippery general subject follow several specific critical and theoretical questions. (1) In what fundamental ways must we revise our conception of the nature and scope of “Romanticism” in Britain, given the wealth of “new” material and the diverse scholarly and theoretical tools for assessing it? (2) By what

specific methods shall we reassess traditionally “canonical” authors in light of new data about the literary and cultural milieu in which they worked? (3) What (if any) features are “characteristic” of this reconfigured Romanticism? (4) In what meaningful ways did those characteristics change during the period’s roughly fifty years? (5) How can “new” comparative and contextual scholarly assessments of Romantic-era writers (and their works) best accommodate expanded literary and cultural demographics? (6) What is gained (and what is lost) in applying broadly contextual approaches to scholarship in Romanticism, and how is critical and intellectual “depth” (or “rigor”) best maintained without a crippling (and perhaps misleading) narrowness of focus?

These related questions will inform both the collective discussion and the individual research projects that participants in this seminar will undertake. Whether a participant’s personal expertise and research center upon a single author or more than one, canonical or non-canonical, or whether a participant’s emphasis is instead primarily literary-historical or theoretical, this seminar offers an intensive, focused environment for exploration. Indeed, the greater the diversity among participants and their projects, the more productive our work is likely to be: such diversity reflects the historical reality of the extraordinarily dynamic social, political, cultural, intellectual and artistic diversity that I regard as the hallmark of British Romanticism.

To provide a practical pathway into the seminar’s multi-faceted central subject, I will focus our attention particularly on a body of material *from the period itself* that offers a revealing lens on the period’s cultural production: the critical literary and cultural assessments published in the contemporary press. What did others who saw themselves as privileged arbiters of public taste think *at the time*? This question is neither new nor novel, of course, but advances in digital and electronic resources make it possible to ask the question in new and better ways that effectively draw upon archival materials that will be available to seminar participants. To make

the most of our brief five weeks time, we shall approach our subject “from both ends,” as it were. That is, while we shall begin by foregrounding some of the scholarly and theoretical work of the past quarter century that has most dramatically impacted our estimate of British Romanticism, we shall concurrently examine the works of selected authors and their reception among their contemporaries. I will furnish all participants *in advance* (on a flash drive filled with PDF files) with a large collection of contemporary reviews, ranging from brief periodical reviews to book-length works. I did something of the sort with my 2010 seminar, and it proved both popular and useful, especially for participants who have no regular access to such resources at their home institutions. While most participants in the 2010 seminar welcomed the expansiveness of the discussions that I promoted during our formal meetings, some observed that they would have welcomed more “scripting” on my part, and a more systematic discussion of key texts. The present proposal responds with increasingly focused work, both with the suggested set of “target” Romantic-era texts and with the review-based responses to those texts (and others) identified in *Appendix 3b* and in the detailed topics and procedures described in the “General Topics for Investigation” section of this narrative, below.

The contemporary reviewing press was almost always fiercely partisan and was often in the pay of particular parties or cultural factions. Ostensibly objective “critical” judgment about literary works routinely reveal strong moral or political biases about gender (e.g., disapproval of women writing about public affairs or politics rather than conducting “instructional” writing), class (e.g., out-of-hand dismissals of writing by or advocating the laboring class), and religion (e.g., anti-Catholicism). Biased “reviews” inevitably exerted a powerful formative influence upon their readers, often “preconditioning” readers’ responses to new works *and their authors* while subtly imposing criteria of judgment (or “taste”) that were inherently political, social, and moral

in nature, beyond any purely aesthetic criteria they ostensibly advocated. Individual authors (or groups of them) frequently became pawns in rancorous arguments among editors, publishers, and their patrons that regularly deteriorated into *ad hominem* attacks that virtually ignore purely literary or aesthetic considerations, as happened with John Wilson Croker's famous hostile characterization in 1817, in *Blackwood's*, of "the Cockney school of poets." The visible evidence of strategies by which individual authors, famous or not, dealt with friendly and hostile criticism alike, both after the fact and before (many employed preemptive rhetoric to forestall or defuse anticipated objections, for instance) illustrates the characteristically dynamic, "interactive" nature of the Romantic writing and reading community and confutes the popular image of Romantic-era authors as detached, ethereal artists who seemed hardly to frequent the "real world." The evidence suggests that authors were surprisingly savvy about the strategic advantages of manipulating their readers (and one another). Romantic-era authorship was in fact a more cosmopolitan and community-oriented activity than it has often been considered, and it involved sophisticated social, political and economic strategies that likewise militate against traditional images of flower-sniffing dreamers. In short, then, this seminar will involve the participants actively in the challenges of redrawing the literary landscape of British Romanticism. Engaging in this challenge together, as a group of seventeen energetic and committed seminar colleagues, ensures that our results, individually and collectively, will be all the more substantial.

— ***Project Content and Implementation***

This will be a "traditional" NEH Seminar with a scholarly research project central to each participant's work. Participants will arrive with a seminar project plan (I will work with them in advance to mesh these with our common objectives). They will read in advance from common texts, including primary texts, contemporary reviews, and comparative critical studies from the

period like Hugh Murray's *Morality of Fiction* (1805), which advocates enlisting fiction in "improving" the nation's moral culture; William Hazlitt's *On the Living Poets* (1818), which "surveys" contemporary poets while imposing hierarchical criteria inimical to objective assessment; Josiah Conder's *Reviewers Reviewed* (1811), which assesses both objective and biased, "insidious" reviewing practices in general and by particular journals; and the remarkable *Periodical Press of Great Britain and Ireland: or, An inquiry into the state of the public journals, chiefly as regards their moral and political influence* (1824), which tries to steer a middle course and inevitably reveals its author's partisan agenda. These common readings will anchor our first week's work, when we will also survey, briefly and concisely, the principal influential scholarly works identified in the opening pages of this proposal narrative (and the bibliography [*Appendix 3a*]) and when participants will introduce their individual seminar projects. As with my previous seminars, I will set up an internet listserv to facilitate exchanges among participants (and me), and I will help participants explore options for publishing results of their seminar projects or otherwise disseminating the products of their work, including electronically. Participants in past seminars have kept in touch with one another, planned joint professional conference panels, and edited several collections of scholarly and pedagogical essays that included their fellow participants' work, in addition to publishing numerous scholarly articles, chapters and complete books that have reflected their seminar work.

During the first week's formal sessions participants will present *précis* summaries of foundational contemporary critical and theoretical studies. Subsequent sessions, extending into week three, will focus concurrently on interrelated sets of Romantic-era texts: (1) individual book-length critical or pseudo-critical works and groups of related review essays from the periodical press, to elucidate reviewing protocols and the aesthetic *and ideological* agendas

evident in the reviews; and (2) primary works that were the subjects of these reviews, to trace the origins of aesthetic, intellectual, cultural, and ideological factors that have historically influenced scholarly assessments of British Romanticism, its authors and their readers. Examples of this second set include Mary Robinson's sonnet sequence *Sappho and Phaon*, 1796; the Evangelical novelist Jane West's *A Gossip's Story*, 1796; Ann Radcliffe's Gothic novel *The Italian*, 1797; Robert Southey's verse epic *Thalaba the Destroyer*, 1801; Frederick Lathom's sensationalist Gothic tale *The Impenetrable Secret*, 1805; Sarah Green's wickedly satirical novel *Romance Readers and Romance Writers*, 1810; S. T. Coleridge's influential *Christabel* volume (1816), John Keats' notorious *Endymion* volume, 1818; and Felicia Hemans' proto-feminist poems in *Records of Woman*, 1828. Other "target" texts may be added or substituted which are more relevant to the research of individual participants.

Our first three weeks will explore relationships between contemporary popularity or reputation and modern "canonical" status. What happens, for instance, when we place a canonical "classic" like Thomas Love Peacock's satire, *Headlong Hall* (1815) in conversation with other satirical novels like Green's *Romance Readers and Romance Writers* (1810) and the anonymous political satire *Gulzara, Princess of Persia* (1816), as well as with reviews of them? Or how does such contextualizing elucidate the hostile response to Wordsworth's publication of *Peter Bell* in 1819? Or how do works like Robert Bloomfield's immensely popular poetic tale, *The Farmer's Boy* (1800) remind us of the presence of a "majority culture" that is often overlooked in traditional academic assessments that emphasize a minority represented by progressive or radical writers? In the manner of these three examples, I shall ask participants to research both the contemporary reception and the "modern" estimate of works like those mentioned above and to conduct mini-seminars with the group on their discoveries. Moving into

week four, we will consider the consequences of applying “old” criteria to newly-recovered texts and investigate alternative means of assessing and valuing Romantic-era writing that take into fuller account the cultural and economic conditions that affected not just *what* was written but also *how* it was written *and read*. These preliminary discussions of individual works – *viewed in broader contexts* – should yield working principles that we shall then test with other constellations of Romantic-era texts suggested by the research interests of seminar participants. Our fifth week will be devoted to honing these preliminary findings for incorporation into participants’ seminar projects and into future projects suggested by the seminar’s work.

Placing Romantic-era texts and critical responses in dialogue with one another, and against a background of the exceedingly large body of literary production with which recent bibliographical tools and electronic archives can now put us in touch, is imperative for making adequately informed judgments, in 2013 and beyond, about whether familiar canonical works are in fact “characteristic” of Romantic-era writing or whether their canonical status is a consequence of historically exclusionary critical procedures. It is equally imperative for evaluating lesser-known works that emerge as a result of recovery projects. The intellectual point here lies not in re-arguing familiar issues of canonicity, periodicity and “lists,” of course, but rather in reconsidering from more broadly informed historical, critical and theoretical perspectives how we choose to characterize “British Romanticism.”

Pedagogy matters, too. Research and publication are central objectives in any NEH Seminar, but as a successful teacher I appreciate that most participants invest most of their time in teaching and I shall encourage them to explore how our seminar work relates to their teaching. I have arranged for them to have access to the staff and resources of the University of Nebraska’s cutting-edge Center for Digital Research in the Humanities, where they can get professional

advice and hands-on experience with the new technology and its applications for our classrooms.

To achieve maximum diversity of interest and expertise, I shall welcome applications from scholars working in both poetry and prose (including fiction and non-fiction) and whose interests include both canonical and recently recovered authors, as well as colleagues from disciplines outside “English” (like theatre history, art history, media studies, and the history of the book). I regard such dynamic diversity as vital for innovative, revisionist twenty-first-century scholarly and theoretical reassessments of the Romantic-era literary community.

ORGANIZATION OF SEMINAR ACTIVITIES – A TENTATIVE SCHEDULE, WITH TOPICS

OVERVIEW: To assure maximum collegial interchange, each week will include three or four formal sessions (c. 3 hours each, typically 9:00 a.m. to noon, with additional sessions in the first and last week). Roughly two-thirds of these will involve focused discussion of the common readings and related activities, guided initially by questions distributed before the seminar begins. In the other sessions, discussion of individual participants’ projects will aim at enriching and expanding our common critical ground. (Privately and in their formal evaluations, participants in my previous seminars have consistently praised the congenial environment for discussion that I establish [*Appendix 4*]). During the first week I will meet privately with all seminar participants to discuss their individual research projects, offer advice, and help them plan to make maximum progress on these during their time at the University of Nebraska.

I will reserve time (and space) for non-required informal meetings among sub-groups of participants (and the director) whose projects share significant elements; much of this collegial exchange will naturally be *ad hoc* and unscripted. The seminar location in the adjacent buildings of Andrews Hall (Department of English) and Love Memorial Library – and the nearby

participant lodging – assures plenty of daily opportunities for interaction. I shall maintain extensive daily office hours when no group sessions are scheduled, to provide consultation, advice, or direction about individual participants’ projects. Finally, to foster a sense of community, there will be several organized social activities, including an opening reception in the English Department and one or more social gatherings at the director’s home.

GENERAL TOPICS FOR INVESTIGATION, BY WEEKS:

WEEK 1: Full-group sessions: introductions — to each other, to our individual seminar projects and to the UNL library and microforms resources. Monday afternoon hands-on tour of library resources, conducted by the Humanities librarian. Beginning Tuesday: Comparing our assumptions about, and experiences with rethinking and reconfiguring “British Romanticism,” based on advance reading from the common texts and from our own research and teaching experience. Examining the relation of demographic data about authors, readerships and publishing (e.g., St Clair, Klancher) to the “business” of literary publishing. Reviewing Romantic-era “libraries,” popular subject matter, literacy and social class. Beginning this week and continuing through all five weeks: consultation between director and participants on individual projects.

WEEK 2: Full-group sessions: participants begin reporting on how their initial survey of library materials, including bibliographical, biographical, and technological resources relates to the common readings and their own projects. Particular examples of relations among primary literary texts, contemporary review, and modern scholarship (see earlier pages). Specific areas of inquiry may include: What issues arise from considering multiple genres? Do Coleridge’s repeated objections to novels, for example, apply also to poems, and if so, to what sorts of poems? If readers favored “popular” forms (like Minerva Press romances or social-consciousness ballads),

what “concessions” (if any) do we see authors making to such forms in works we usually think of as more esoteric? What about attempts in the other direction: appropriating (or approximating) features of “esoteric” writing in “popular” works? How do “modern” assumptions about aesthetics and reviewing influence how we read “period” documents, including “popular” novels? How do we identify and assess non-aesthetic matters like political, religious, class and gender bias both in published reviews and in the primary works? Preliminary thoughts on implications of our seminar work for classroom teaching, including ways of incorporating online and other electronic resources.

WEEK 3: Full-group sessions: Further examples and applications. Participant mini-seminars on works “in conversation” and under review. Identifying additional issues and directions we may need to explore. Theoretical questions/problems to consider will include: the exclusivity and inclusivity of Romantic literary genres; the modern canon(s) and their alternatives, and “periodization” in British literary and cultural studies; gender, class, and cultural bias in judgments about subject matter, class, literacy and reading; assessing the “politics” and economics of authorship and reviewing from the perspective of 2013.

WEEK 4: Full-group sessions: technology and writing, both “then” and “now.” How did the evolution of literacy, printing/publishing technology, and the implied moral function of reading (and judging) affect what was written and how it was evaluated by various readerships? What do data about numbers of copies, patterns of circulation (including circulating libraries), and placement of reviews reveal about Romantic-era reading activities, and what can this tell us about why authors wrote *what they did* and *for whom they did so*? Breakout sessions: demonstrations of techniques and resources (including electronic) for teaching, with opportunities for *ad hoc* individual or group work for interested participants in computer labs and

digital workshops. Teaching/pedagogical demonstrations.

In this week's final formal sessions, participants begin reporting on their projects, to further illuminate what they are discovering about some of the developments over fifty years in Romantic-era literary, artistic, cultural, and national(istic) values, from their "revolutionary" roots in the 1780s through the increasing "domesticity" of Regency and then early Victorian culture. At this point our collaborative *and individual* work should begin to help inform *everyone* about aspects of the seminar that not everyone has had time to investigate individually and in detail. In other words, this is where we begin "filling out" (or "filling in") the broad outlines we have all been drawing for the first four weeks.

WEEK 5: Full-group sessions: individual precis presentations of projects (3 sessions).

Consideration of remaining unvisited horizons for research and for teaching. What unresolved questions have we exposed in the seminar? Where does scholarly research seem poised to go next in remapping the Romantic literary landscape? What sorts of materials do extant archives suggest that we still *need*? What textual, critical, historical, intellectual, aesthetic, methodological, theoretical, and pedagogical assumptions must be challenged, interrogated, revised, and perhaps even abandoned as a consequence of what we have learned about the British Romantic writing community and the ways it was and is evaluated? Finally, how can we most effectively incorporate into our teaching and research both the particular discoveries we have made and – perhaps more important – their implications for how we think about the texts we teach, the contexts in which we teach them, and the students whom we attempt to engage?

— ***Project Faculty and Staff***

My own interdisciplinary scholarship and teaching embrace both canonical and non-canonical authors, especially but not exclusively in poetry, as well as pedagogy in Romanticism

studies. My more recent involvement in literary recovery projects (especially involving women poets) has yielded publications in conventional print and electronic forms. I have long stressed in print and at conferences the importance of reassessing the nature of “British Romanticism” both for scholarship and for teaching. I am therefore in an especially good position to help scholars extend their research and teaching into the new and frequently interdisciplinary areas that are inherent in my proposed subject. I will include as an assistant an advanced PhD student (not finally identified as of February 2012) whose focus lies in the seminar’s subject area and who will serve as an administrative assistant in the period leading up to and during the seminar and also be on site throughout the seminar to assist the director and participants with logistical support. Seminar participants will have full access to staff and facilities at the university’s nationally acclaimed Center for Digital Research in the Humanities and to subject specialists at the University Libraries, as well as to University of Nebraska faculty and students on campus during summer 2010.

— ***Participant Selection***

The selection committee will include me and two faculty colleagues at the University of Nebraska whose expertise includes the Romantic era: Professors Peter Capuano and Laura Mooneyham White. We will evaluate the applications privately and consult about our recommendations for selection, following NEH’s general selection criteria, with special attention to the potential value to Romanticism studies of the applicant’s proposed project and to a broadly inclusive distribution of participants relative to geographical distribution, types of home institution, length of time in the profession, and gender.

— ***Professional Development for Seminar Participants:***

One logical outcome of each participant’s project is an article, scholarly essay, or book

chapter; the seminar format should enhance opportunities for individual and/or group publication, and I will happily assist participants with preparing their work for dissemination. During the seminar (and afterward), I will help people shape their projects to take fullest advantage of available materials and resources, and will gladly read and respond to their work in progress. As indicated in the schedule (pp. 11-14), I have budgeted seminar time for pedagogical concerns, which may appeal especially to colleagues in teaching-intensive institutions. For all of us, how we rethink our *classroom teaching* (including both readings and in-class activities) has no less an impact on the profession and the public than traditional print-media (or electronic) “publication” of our work. Because I regard scholarship and teaching as functionally inseparable, I want my seminar to accommodate these twin realities – and twin imperatives – of a profession in which publication of research is widely rewarded while classroom teaching generally occupies the bulk of our time. Given both the historical collegiality of seminars and my own ability to facilitate productive discussions, this dual objective is entirely attainable.

— *Institutional Context*

The University of Nebraska is well suited for an NEH Summer Seminar, having hosted seminars I directed in 2003, 2005 and 2010. The University Libraries provide excellent facilities for individual research, and the skilled and professionally supportive staffs of both Microforms and Special Collections have been generous in assisting previous participants with their work. The Dean of Libraries has promised full support again in 2013, including granting faculty status to all participants to give them full (and free) access to all library services, including individual and group study space as well as our extremely efficient interlibrary loan service. The library’s Humanities liaison, Professor Kathy Johnson, has in the past provided an extensive half-day hands-on session to acquaint seminar participants with all the physical, electronic and

technological resources available to them, as well as furnishing a detailed bibliographical guide to library resources; she remains available to participants throughout the seminar (and I can testify to the rave reviews she receives every time for her professionalism and her generosity).

The University Libraries owns several extraordinary resources directly relevant to this seminar. The first is the “Corvey Collection,” a microfiche archive of nearly 10,000 literary works from the Romantic era, of which some 3,300 are in English (the others are in French and German). Because many of these works are extremely rare, the collection offers an unparalleled resource of primary materials, as well as an unusually representative “snapshot” of the actual publication history of the period. Supplementing the Corvey Collection are extensive microform holdings in early English books and periodicals, including a broadly inclusive representation of Romantic-era British literary periodicals. The extensive reviews contained in these provide especially rich source material for participants, who will find them invaluable in reconsidering patterns of literary production, consumption and judgment during the period. The Microforms department has excellent, easy-to-use facilities for copying and converting microform materials to PDF (and other) file formats; the helpful staff, who are now familiar with the dynamics of NEH seminars, efficiently accommodate special requests for assistance of any sort.

The University Libraries also house the Center for Digital Research in the Humanities (directed by Professors Kenneth Price [English] and Katherine Walter [Libraries]), where participants can get advice and assistance with designing and developing digital projects related to their research and teaching. Digital Humanities is increasingly important for scholarship and teaching, and the strength of the program at Nebraska (the university administration has dubbed it a “Program of Excellence” and funded it accordingly) immediately benefits my seminar.

Both the Department of English and the College of Arts and Sciences support this

seminar and will co-host both professional and social activities for participants, including an initial reception and orientation and various other social activities during the seminar's five weeks. The department will provide office space for participants, including private offices if possible, along with copying privileges, and will offer postal service for participants. Seminar meetings will be in a comfortable, air-conditioned room fully equipped with the appropriate electronic technology for all our needs, and we will have access to a computer lab in the building.

The Department of University Housing, which has consistently offered my seminars the best and most practical on-campus accommodations, will again provide residence facilities for seminar participants, including the option of full meal packages for those who desire them. In 2010, participants were lodged in a recently-built apartment-style dormitory in which most members elected to share space and which features 2-bedroom and 4-bedroom lodging with each unit containing individual private bedrooms and a common bath, living room, *and kitchen facilities*. The same dormitory will be available to us in 2013. This dormitory – which has on-site laundry facilities, a convenience store, and some food options – is physically separated from those dormitories that house summer youth groups and camps; it is specifically reserved in the summer for accommodating “adult” professional groups like the proposed seminar. Participants in the 2010 seminar praised both the physical accommodations and the convenient location.

Projected costs to participants for Summer 2013 are c. \$805 per person for multiple-occupancy lodging (including full, “extended” linen service – sheets, blanket, pillow and case, daily towel exchange – at c. \$23.65 per night for 34 nights); single occupancy (in two-bedroom units) will be available for c. \$1610 per person, or double the daily rate for multiple occupancy lodging. For those who wish to elect it, a full meal package will be available for c. \$655 (including all meals at a rate of c. \$19.25 per day for 34 days). No partial meal plan is available,

but since the room accommodations include kitchens, opting out of a meal plan should pose no great problem. Parking is available nearby for on-campus residents, and the residences have full computer facilities (including high-speed internet) to which participants can easily connect once they check in. Short-term off-campus housing in Lincoln is very difficult to arrange in the summer, but my assistant and I will do our best to help with contacts and arrangements for locating any possibilities for such accommodation. Finally, inexpensive passes are easily arranged for participants wishing to use the university's gym, pool, and other facilities.

Logistics: The Department of English is housed in Andrews Hall, which is immediately adjacent to the central research library, Love Memorial Library. On-campus housing for participants is within easy walking distance (approximately three blocks) of both. The nearby student union houses a bookstore, entertainment, food courts, and – conveniently – a branch of a local bank that has in the past extended complimentary services (including check deposit and cashing) to seminar participants.

Lincoln is a pleasant community of some 250,000 with varied cultural attractions: good museums (including the Sheldon Gallery, a leading museum of modern art), a summer repertory theatre, summer musical events, excellent parks and trails for walking and biking (rental bikes are available), as well as several dozen movie screens and a wide range of good restaurants. Lincoln is within an hour's drive of Omaha and its Joslyn Museum of Art, the splendid Durham Museum and other museums and galleries, and all the other amenities of a larger metropolis. Lincoln is also within easy driving distance (c. 120 miles) of Kansas City, which offers still other cultural opportunities to those who wish to venture further afield. Prices in the area are moderate, even by regional standards.

Conclusion

A final observation. The Summer Seminars I have directed have been among the most satisfying and intellectually energizing activities of my professional career. I relish the dynamics of the seminar environment and the mutually stimulating nature of the seminar activities. These seminars offer an opportunity for all of us who are physically separated from a real community of peers to get together in one place, work together, draw energy from one another, and accomplish far more collectively as a study group than we could hope to achieve individually in the relative isolation of our respective institutions, where teaching loads are often high, research funding low, and colleagues with similar interests often altogether non-existent. The evaluations submitted by my 2010 seminar participants, like those from 2003 and 2005, demonstrate that I have been able to provide for seminar participants an experience that is at once stimulating, productive, and eminently congenial and collegial. I am eager to share that experience with a new group of colleagues in 2013. As always, I particularly welcome scholars who are early in their careers (many previous participants have been pre-tenure), including the two graduate students whom NEH, in a wise investment in the future of the profession, now allows directors to include; the two graduate students in my 2010 seminar were outstanding young colleagues with whom I have subsequently kept in touch, as indeed I have with many former participants going all the way back to my 2003 seminar. The fact that colleagues continue even now to use the listservs I set up for the several seminars to keep in touch, coordinate activities, and develop related projects tells me that I have in each case provided a valuable and ongoing resource for these colleagues. Happily, in each seminar I have also been able to include several more “senior” colleagues, whose experience in the profession has made them especially valuable not just as researchers and discussants but also as mentors to less senior seminar members.

S. C. Behrendt: Appendix 3a: *Bibliography of secondary works cited in this application*

- Batchelor, Jennie. *Women's Work: Labour, Gender, Authorship*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2010.
- Bate, Jonathan. *The Song Of The Earth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2000.
- Behrendt, Stephen C. *British Women Poets and the Romantic Writing Community*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2009.
- Chandler, James K. *England In 1819: The Politics Of Literary Culture And The Case Of Romantic Historicism*. Chicago : U of Chicago P, 1998.
- Curran, Stuart. "Romantic Poetry: The I Altered." *Romanticism and Feminism*, ed. Anne K. Mellor. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1988; 185-207.
- Davis, Leith, Ian Duncan and Janet Sorensen, eds. *Scotland and the Borders of Romanticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.
- Elfenbein, Andrew. *Romantic Genius: The Prehistory of a Homosexual Role*. New York: Columbia UP, 1999.
- Fay, Elizabeth. *A Feminist Introduction to Romanticism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1998.
- Feldman, Paula R., ed. *British Women Poets Of The Romantic Era : An Anthology*. Baltimore: : Johns Hopkins UP, 1997.
- Hoeveler, Diane Long. *Gothic Riffs: Secularizing The Uncanny In The European Imaginary, 1780-1820*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2010.
- Holmes, Richard. *The Age Of Wonder : How The Romantic Generation Discovered The Beauty And Terror Of Science*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2008.
- Hootman, Harry E. *British Literary Annuals and Giftbooks*. (2006) Online resource: <http://www.britannials.com/mes/mesp1-2.php?siteID=britannials&pageref=1&pw=>
- Jackson, Mary V. *Engines of Instruction, Mischief, and Magic: Children's Literature in England from its Beginnings to 1839*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1989.
- Kelly, Jim, ed. *Ireland And Romanticism: Publics, Nations And Scenes Of Cultural Production*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Klancher, Jon P. *The Making of English Reading Audiences, 1790-1832*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1987.
- McGann, Jerome J. *The Romantic Ideology: A Critical Investigation*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.
- Mellor, Anne. *Romanticism and Gender*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Moretti, Franco. *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models For A Literary History*. London: Verso, 2005.
- Morton, Timothy, ed. *Cultures Of Taste/Theories Of Appetite: Eating Romanticism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Newman, Lance, Joel Pace and Chris Koenig-Woodyard. *Sullen fires across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism. Romantic Circles; Praxis*. College Park: Uof Maryland, 2006. Online journal.
- Poovey, Mary. *The Proper Lady and the Woman Writer: Ideology as Style in the Works of Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Shelley, and Jane Austen*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1984.
- Richardson, Alan. *Literature, Education, And Romanticism: Reading As Social Practice, 1780-1832*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- St Clair, William. *The Reading Nation In The Romantic Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Selected Reviews on Literature and Literary Genres in Romantic-era Periodicals

– provided to participants in advance, in PDFs on flash drive –

NEH Summer Seminar 2013

1789

- 1789-1 “An Allegory on the Dispute...between the Belles Lettres and the Fine Arts,” *Literary Magazine and British Review*, 2 (1789), 174-79. [general criticism]
- 1789-2 “Essay on the Genius of Tasso,” *Edinburgh Magazine*, 10 (1789), 255-62. [poetry]
- 1789-3 “Essay on the Various Ideas of Poetical Excellence and Unlettered Genius,” *Town and Country Magazine*, 21 (1789), 566-68. [poetry]
- 1789-4 “Observations on the Modern Drama,” *Edinburgh Magazine*, 10 (1789), 6-7. [drama and theater]
- 1789-5 “Of Female Authorship,” *Walker’s Hibernian Magazine*, pt1 (1789), 421-23. [general criticism]

1790

- 1790-1 “On Poetry,” *The Bee, or Literary Weekly Intelligencer*, 1 (1790), 20-24. [poetry]
- 1790-2 “On the various Ideas of Poetical Excellence and unlettered Genius. By W. Hamilton Reid,” *Walker’s Hibernian Magazine*, pt1 (1790), 22-24. [poetry]
- 1790-3 “Reflections upon Tragedy, and the Choice of Subjects,” *Literary Magazine and British Review*, 4 (1790), 119-20. [drama and theater]

1791

- 1791-1 “On the Essential Qualities of Poetical Genius,” *Bee, or Literary Intelligencer*, 5 (1791), 177-81. [poetry]
- 1791-2 “Thoughts on the Inferiority of Modern Poetry, to that of the Ancients,” *Literary Magazine and British Review*, 6 (1791), 283-89. [poetry]

1792

- 1792-1 “An Essay on the English Sonnet, illustrated by a Comparison between the Sonnets of Milton and those of Charlotte Smith,” *Universal Magazine*, 91 (1792), 408-14. [poetry]
- 1792-3 “Biographical List of Living English Poets,” *Gentleman’s Magazine*, 62¹ (1792), 504-06; 62² (1792), 615-16, 690-91, 1005-06. [poetry]
- 1792-3 “On the Nature and Essential Qualities of Poetry as Distinguished from Prose,” *Literary Magazine and British Review*, 8 (1792), 120-24, 196-99. [poetry]
- 1792-4 “The Effects of Imagination. For the Editor,” *Bee, or Literary Weekly Intelligencer*, 7 (1792), 169-72. [general criticism]
- 1792-5 “The Study of Polite Literature defended against the Objection that it is Useless, and even Pernicious to Society,” *New Annual Register*, 13 (1792), [106-13]. [general criticism]

1793

- 1793-1 “An Essay on Genius,” *Literary Magazine and British Review*, 10 (1793), 433-38. [general criticism]
- 1793-2 “A Few Cursory Remarks on the ‘Reflections on the Present State of Literature in England,’ inserted in the Magazine for July, 1793. To the Editor,” *European Magazine*, 24 (1793), 206-08. [general criticism]
- 1793-3 “Reflections on the Present State of Literature in England,” *Edinburgh Magazine*, ns, v2 (1793), 177-80. [general criticism]
- 1793-4 “Reflections on the Present State of Literature in England,” *European Magazine*, 24 (1793), 13-15. [general criticism]
- 1793-5 “Thoughts on Poetry, especially Modern, with Criticism of several Poets [To the Editor],” *Town and Country Magazine*, 25 (1793), 553-56. [poetry]

1793-6 "Thoughts on Poetry, especially Modern," *Gentleman's Magazine* 63 (1793), 12-15. Same as above entry.

1794

1794-1 "Poetry," *British Critic*, 3 (Preface 1794), xiii-xiv. [poetry]

1794-2 "Reflections on the Present State of Literature in England," *Town and Country Magazine*, 26 (1794), 114-16. [general criticism]

1794-3 "Thoughts on Poetry. To the Editor," *European Magazine*, 25 (1794), 19-23. [poetry]

1795

1795-1 "On the Neglect to which Authors are Exposed in their own Neighborhood," *European Magazine*, 27 (1795), 162-65. [general criticism]

1796

1796-1 "The Enquirer. No. III. Question: Are Literary and Scientific Pursuits suited to the Female Character?" *Monthly Magazine*, 1 (1796), 181-84. [general criticism]

1796-2 "The Enquirer. No. IX. Question: Ought Sensibility to be cherished or Repressed?" *Monthly Magazine*, 2 (1796), 706-09. [general criticism]

1796-3 "Introduction to the Literary History of the Present Period," *Monthly Magazine*, 1 (1796), 33-37. [general criticism]

1796-4 "Literary History of the Present Period," *Scots Magazine*, 58 (1796), 171-72, 235-39. [general criticism]

1797

1797-1 "Introduction to the Poetry of the *Anti-Jacobin*," *Anti-Jacobin, or Weekly Examiner*, 1 (Nov. 20, 1797), 31-34. [poetry]

1797-2 "On Romances and Novels, and the Proper Employment of the Time of the Fair Sex. (Extracted from Gisborne's *Duties of the Female Sex*)," *Scots Magazine*, 59 (1797), 374-77. [fiction]

1797-3 "Poetry," *Anti-Jacobin, or Weekly Examiner*, 1 (Nov. 27, 1797), 69-72. [poetry]

1797-4 "On the Characteristics of Poetry," *Monthly Magazine* 3 (1797), 538-45.

1798

1798-1 "Modern Literature," *Aberdeen Magazine*, 3 (1798), 338-40. [general criticism]

1798-2 "The Reflector. No. XVIII. On Criticism," *Monthly Visitor*, 4 (Aug. 1798), 334-38. [general criticism]

1798-3 "The Reflector. No. XVIII. On Taste," *Monthly Visitor*, 4 (July 1798), 227-33. [general criticism]

1798-4 "Strictures on the False Taste of Modern Poetry," *Monthly Visitor*, 3 (Jan. 1798), 40-45. [poetry]

1798-5 "Strictures on the Versification and Sentiment of Modern Poetry," *Monthly Visitor*, 4 (July 1798), 259-66. [poetry]

1800

1800-1 "On a Criterion of Perfection in Writing," *Edinburgh Magazine, or Literary Miscellany*, ns, v15 (Apr. 1800), 253-60. [general criticism]

1803

1803-1 "On Imagination," *Edinburgh Magazine, or Literary Miscellany*, ns, v22 (Nov. 1803), 348-52. [general criticism]

1805

- 1805-1 “[On the Ill Effects of Novel-Reading],” *European Magazine*, 48 (Nov. 1805), 326-27. [fiction]

1809

- 1809-1 “On English Sonnetteers,” *Literary Panorama*, 7 (Dec. 1809), 502-07. [poetry]

1811

- 1811-1 “An Essay on the Origin and Progress of Novel-Writing,” *European Magazine*, 59 (Apr. - May 1811), 270-73, 365-71. [fiction]
 1811-2 “Why Are There So Few Excellent Poets?” *The Reflector*, 2 (1811), 249-74. [poetry]

1814

- 1814-1 “On Taste in Literature and the Fine Arts,” *New Monthly Magazine*, 2 (Sept. 1814), 130- 32. [general criticism]

1815

- 1815-1 “Living Poets,” *Scourge*, 10 (Nov. 1815), 341-52. [poetry]
 1815-2 “Modern Poets. No. 1,” *Scourge*, 9 (June 1815), 441-47. [poetry]
 1815-3 “On the Study of English Poetry,” *New Monthly Magazine*, 3 (Mar. 1815), 118-20. [poetry]
 1814-4 “Modern Poets,” *Scourge* 6 (Nov. 1815), 375-81.

1816

- 1816-1 “On Literary Criticism,” *New Monthly Magazine*, 5 (May 1816), 305-07. [general criticism]
 1816-2 “Young Poets,” *Examiner*, Dec. 1, 1816, pp. 761-62. [poetry]

1817

- 1817-1 “An Impartial Review of the Stage from the Days of Garrick and Rich to the Present Period: Of the Causes of Its Degenerated and Declining State, and Shewing the Necessity of a Reform in the System...,” *Critical Review*, s5, v5 (Jan. 1817), 73-79. [drama and theater]
 1817-2 “An Impartial Review of the Stage from the Days of Garrick and Rich to the Present Period...,” *Critical Review*, s5, v5 (Feb. 1817), 190-93. [drama and theater]
 1817-3 “On the Present State of English Poetry,” *Literary Gazette*, July 19, 1817, pp. 40-41. [poetry]

1818

- 1818-1 “Fragment of an Essay on Taste,” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*, 3 (Apr. 1818), 21- 24. [general criticism]
 1818-2 “Thoughts on Taste,” *Edinburgh Magazine, and Literary Miscellany (Scots Magazine)*, ns, v3 (Oct. 1818), 308-11; ns, v5 (July 1819), 13-16. [general criticism]

1819

- 1819-1 Bowles, William Lisle. *The Invariable Principles of Poetry: In a Letter Addressed to Thomas Campbell, Esq. Occasioned by Some Critical Observations in his Specimens of British Poets, Particularly Relating to the Poetical Character of Pope*. 1819. [general criticism]
 1819-2 “Sonnet-Writers. To the Editor,” *British Stage and Literary Cabinet*, 4 (Nov. 1819), 67- 68. [poetry]

1820

- 1820-1 "On Critics and Criticism," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 8 (Nov. 1820), 138-41. [general criticism]
- 1820-2 "What Is Beauty?" *New Monthly Magazine*, 13 (May 1820), 580-83. [general criticism]

1821

- 1821-1 "General Literature, and the Causes that Influence the Revolution of Opinion," *European Magazine*, 79 (1821), 119-28. [general criticism]
- 1821-2 "Observations on the Present State of Literature in Great Britain," *Lady's Magazine*, ns, v2 (June 1821), 281-84. [general criticism]
- 1821-3 "On the Criterion of Poetical Pre-Eminence," *European Magazine*, 80 (1821), 501-08. [poetry]
- 1821-4 "On the Modern Poets," *Literary Chronicle*, no121 (Sept. 8, 1821), 564-66. [poetry]
- 1821-5 "Poetry; How Affected by Genius and Art," *Ladies' Monthly Museum*, ns, v14 (1821), 263-66; ns, v15-16 (1822), 34-47, 92-95, 151-53, 269-74. [poetry]
- 1821-6 "The Power of Imagination," *Ladies' Monthly Museum*, ns, v14 (1821), 191-95, 251-55. [general criticism]
- 1821-7 "Sonnetomania," *New Monthly Magazine*, 1 (1821), 644-48. [poetry]
- 1821-8 "Why Are Poets Indifferent Critics?" *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 10 (1821), 180- 85. [poetry]

1822

- 1822-1 "Essays Moral and Literary. No. 2. On Modern Poetry," *Imperial Magazine*, 4 (1822), 338-46. [poetry]
- 1822-2 "A Letter on the Different Stages of Taste, as Exemplified in the Different Classes of Literary Productions," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 11 (1822), 585-91. [general criticism]
- 1822-3 "On Novel-Writing and Poetry," *Edinburgh (Scots) Magazine*, ns, v11 (1822), 315-22. [poetry]
- 1822-4 "Some Remarks on the Modern System of Poetry," *Newcastle Magazine*, ns, v1 (1822), 134-38. [poetry]

1823

- 1823-1 "The Features That Captivate in Poetry," *European Magazine*, 83 (1823), 516-22. [poetry]
- 1823-2 "The Force of Imagination," *La Belle Assemblée*, ns, v28 (1823), 56-60. [general criticism]
- 1823-3 "Modern Literature and Periodical Criticism," *Gentleman's Magazine*, 93 (Mar. 1823), 218-20. [general criticism]
- 1823-4 "On Novel Reading," *Imperial Magazine*, 5 (1823), 744-47. [fiction]
- 1823-5 "The Classics and the Romantics," *New Monthly Magazine* 7 (1823), 522-28.

1824

- 1824-1 "Remarks on Poetry as Compared with Painting and Sculpture," *New Monthly Magazine*, 10 (1824), 157-61. [poetry]

1825

- 1825-1 "Contemporary Poets, and Writers of Fiction. No. I. Introductory," *La Belle Assemblée*, s3, v1 (1825), 5-8. [poetry]
- 1825-2 "Noctes Ambrosiane. No. XXI [Several of the Romantics]," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 18 (1825), 378-92. [general criticism]
- 1825-3 "On the Literature of the Nineteenth Century," *European Magazine*, 87 (1825), 435-40. [general criticism]
- 1825-4 "On the Evils of Poetry," *The Asiatic Journal* (June 1, 1825), 772-

1826

- 1826-1 "Booksellers and Authors," *Literary Magnet*, ns, v2 (1826), 65-74, 148-51. [general criticism]
 1826-2 "Essay on the Importance of Poetry," *Inspector*, 1 (1826), 141-45. [poetry]
 1826-3 "Poetry and Painting, Analogy between," *European Magazine*, ns, v2 (1826), 340-46, 467-72. [poetry]

1827

- 1827-1 "On Poetry and Music," *La Belle Assemblée*, ns. V. 31 (1827), 13-15

Longer Romantic-Era Works

– also in PDF format –

- Anon. *The Periodical Press of Great Britain and Ireland*. 1824.
 Ballard, Joseph. *England in 1815*. 1815.
 Barbauld, Anna Letitia. "On the Origin and Progress of Novel Writing." General Introduction to *The British Novelists*. 1810.
 Conder, Josiah. *Reviewers Reviewed*. 1811.
 Fawcett, Joseph. *The Art of Poetry*. 1797.
 Dunlop, John. *History of Fiction*. 1814.
 Hazlitt, William. "On the Living Poets." from *Lectures on the English Poets*. (1818), pp. 283-331.
 Hunt, Leigh. *The Feast of the Poets*. 1811 (1815)
 McDermott. *Beauties of Modern Literature*.
 Murray, H[ugh]. *Morality of Fiction; or, An Inquiry into the Tendency of Fictitious Narratives*. 1805.