

**The Centre For The Study of Byron and Romanticism**

**The Byron Foundation Lecture 2006**

**'HIS HERO'S STORY': CURRIE'S BURNS,  
MOORE'S BYRON AND THE PROBLEM  
OF ROMANTIC BIOGRAPHY**

**Professor Nigel Leask, University of Glasgow**



The University of  
**Nottingham**

School of English Studies

**The Byron Foundation Lecture, 2006**

**'His Hero's Story': Currie's Burns,  
Moore's Byron and the Problem  
of Romantic Biography**

**Nigel Leask, University of Glasgow**

The Centre for the Study of Byron and Romanticism

---

The University of Nottingham

This Lecture was founded in 1912 by public subscription. In accordance with the terms of the Foundation, the subject of the Lecture need not be confined to Byron, but must be on some aspect of English Literature.

Published in 2007 by  
The Centre for the Study of Byron and Romanticism  
School of English Studies,  
University of Nottingham,  
University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD  
<http://byron.nottingham.ac.uk>

© Nigel Leask 2007

This is a revised version of the Byron Foundation Lecture delivered by Professor Nigel Leask in May 2006.

ISBN: 978-0-9555740-0-9

## **‘His Hero’s Story’: Currie’s *Burns*, Moore’s *Byron* and the Problem of Romantic Biography**

In the stanzas following the ‘sad trimmer’s’ song ‘The Isles of Greece’ in canto three of *Don Juan*, Byron meditates on the vicissitudes of posthumous poetic fame. ‘And glory long has made the sages smile; / ‘Tis something, nothing, words, illusion, wind – / Depending more upon the historian’s style / Than on the name a person leaves behind’.<sup>1</sup> Andrew Bennett paraphrases this nicely in *Romantic Poets and the Culture of Posterity*; ‘any attempt to shore up meaning against the ruins of time is subject to the catachresis of others’ citations, or more generally to the scandal of the unpredictability of reading itself’.<sup>2</sup> Above all, Byron goes on to suggest in stanzas 91 and 92, fame is subject to the catachreses of scandal-mongering biographers who feed the public’s curiosity for the ‘minute particulars’ of their hero’s lives:

All these are, *certes*, entertaining facts,  
Like Shakespeare’s stealing deer, Lord  
    Bacon’s bribes;  
Like Titus’s youth, and Caesar’s earliest  
    acts;

Like Burns (whom Doctor Currie well

describes);  
Like Cromwell's pranks; – but although  
Truth exacts  
These amiable descriptions from the scribes,  
As most essential to their hero's story,  
They do not much contribute to his glory.  
(Don Juan, III, 92, ll. 825-832)

It's a surprise to encounter Dr James Currie's 1800 *Life and Works of Burns* cited by Byron here as sole exemplar of contemporary literary biography (we learn from McGann's note that a rejected draft cited Dr Johnson's Savage instead) (*Don Juan*, p. 194). Although vilified by modern Burns scholars, it was hugely popular in the romantic period: having gone through 5 editions and 10,000 copies by 1805, Cadell and Davies were bringing out an 8<sup>th</sup> edition of Currie in 1820. Possibly thoughts of Scotland's national bard sprang to Byron's mind in connection with the 'sad trimmer' who 'knew the self-loves of the different nations [...] when he was ask'd to sing, / He gave the different nations something national' (*Don Juan* III, 84, l. 666; 85, ll. 673-4). After all the 'The Isles of Greece' is a clear instance of what Katie Trumpener calls 'Bardic Nationalism'.<sup>3</sup> Although McGann has associated the trimmer poet with Robert Southey in 'preferring pudding

to no praise', (III, 79, l.628),<sup>4</sup> I think the song's invocation of 'The Hero's harp, the Lover's lute' also alludes to the Irish poet Thomas Moore, Byron's friend and future biographer, celebrated both for his translations of Anacreon, his patriotic *Irish Melodies*, and his love of polite English drawings rooms. But McGann is surely correct in discerning in the trimmer poet also the palimpsest of all poets, including Byron himself, who wield the emotions of their auditors by the power of poetic language; 'but [poets] are such liars, / And take all colours – like the hands of dyers' (III, 87, ll. 79-2).

Byron's reference to Currie here might also be explained by the attack on the Lakers which follows immediately in stanzas 93-5: 'all are not moralists', like Southey, Wordsworth and Coleridge (III, 93, ll. 823-840), poets whose pretensions to rectitude (in contrast to the chequered lives of Milton, Shakespeare, Burns, Moore, etc), Byron hints, conceal an embarrassing political tergiversation; 'their loyal treason, renegado rigour, / Are good manure for their more bare biography' (III, 94, ll. 843-4). Dr Currie's *Life of Byron* had recently been the target of Wordsworth's pamphlet *A Letter to a Friend of Robert Burns* (1815), which extended into an attack on literary biography itself. Wordsworth

felt that poets should be exempt from the biographers' 'coarse intrusions into the recesses [...] of domestic life', a practice which he felt betrayed 'the characteristic reserve of Englishmen'; 'our business is with their books [...] if their works be good, they contain within themselves all that is necessary to their being comprehended and relished'.<sup>5</sup> By contrast, Byron's apparent indifference to exposing his privacies – *Don Juan* is one long flirtation with the fame machine – denies Wordsworth and poets of his ilk a representative voice and a stake in controlling literary posterity. To cite Bennett again, 'Byron's ironical critique of the self-serving appeal to posthumous reputation is central to his attack on contemporary poetics'.<sup>6</sup>

In this lecture I want to contrast Byron's sceptically permissive attitude to contemporary literary biography with the 'anti-biographical' animus of romantic writers like Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Carlyle. I'll suggest that the biographical tradition under attack derived from Boswell's *Life of Johnson* (1791), but gained new impetus from Currie's *Life of Burns* and the polemic instigated by Wordsworth's 1815 *Letter to a Friend of Burns*. According to Joseph Reed, John Wilson Croker's major edition of the *Life of Johnson*, published in 1831 was 'widely re-

viewed, perhaps more extensively than Boswell's original had been', a symptom of the intense contemporary interest in biography at that time.<sup>7</sup> It coincided with the publication of a cluster of best-selling biographies of romantic poets, John Gibson Lockhart's *Life of Burns* (1828) and *Life of Scott* (1837-8) and Tom Moore's *Life of Byron* (1830-1), all of which show an awareness of the terms of the critique, but essentially conform to the Boswellian formula.

Following Wordsworth's lead, Thomas Carlyle took issue with this later wave of biographies, seeking to distinguish a superficial, regulative and unromantic genre of 'life-writing' from biography proper (but it's noteworthy that in his remarks on both Burns and Scott, in contrast to Wordsworth, Carlyle viewed the poet's life as carrying more symbolic weight than the poetry itself). 'Many *lives* will be written, and, for the gratification of innocent curiosity, ought to be written, and read, and forgotten, which are not in this sense biographies' he wrote. As Reed comments, 'the distinction between true biography and the "life" was that the former was *composed*, the latter only *compiled*'.<sup>8</sup> In Carlyle's view, the Currie, Lockhart and Moore tradition, like Boswell's *Johnson*, con-



## 'His Hero's Story'

tained merely the raw materials of true biography, waiting to be composed according to the organic principles of romantic aesthetics. One can of course discern in texts like Wordsworth's unpublished *Prelude* and Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria* the organicist roots of Carlyle's counter-tradition, and I'll end my lecture with some thoughts on *Sartor Resartus* as a critique of Moore's *Life of Byron*. Carlyle's position certainly prevailed in 20<sup>th</sup> century attitudes to polite romantic biography, and since I'm in Nottingham I can't avoid citing D.H.Lawrence's verdict on one exemplar; 'I read just now Lockhart's bit of a life of Burns. Made me spit! These damned middle-class Lockharts grew lilies of the valley up their arses, to hear them talk'.<sup>9</sup>

We shouldn't forget, however, that notwithstanding *Don Juan*'s scepticism on the matter, Byron also sought to control his posthumous fame. In 1819 in Venice he presented Tom Moore with 'a white leather bag' containing his 'Life and Adventures', instructing him that 'it is not a thing [...] that can be published during my lifetime, but you may have it – if you like there, do whatever you please with it'.<sup>10</sup> The *Memoirs* with which Byron hoped Moore would 'astonish the latter days of the nineteenth century' were however infamously burnt by a

‘committee’ which included Hobhouse, Moore, and John Murray in Albemarle St shortly after the poet’s death in 1824. As we’ll see, this tragic decision impelled Moore to undertake his major biography of Byron, although not, interestingly, in any spirit of atonement or repentance.

### **‘The Boswellian plan’ and Currie’s *Burns***

I’ll start by saying a word about the ‘Boswellian plan’ of biography before turning to the writings of Currie and Moore, in order to contest Joseph Reed’s misleading claim that ‘there was no large-scale attempt to imitate the whole “Boswell” formula” in the early part of the [19<sup>th</sup>] century’.<sup>11</sup> In 1815 Wordsworth had no doubt that Currie’s *Life of Burns* was (his own words) ‘composed upon the Boswellian plan’,<sup>12</sup> regretting Currie’s documentary approach and intrusive publication of Burns’ private correspondence, as well as his moralistic condemnation of the squalid details of the poet’s licentious life-style. Currie was in this respect simply following Boswell, who, after all, refused to apologise for mentioning ‘minute particulars’: ‘Everything relative to so great a man is worth observing’ he wrote. ‘I remember Dr Adam Smith, in his rhetorical lectures at Glasgow, told us he

*'His Hero's Story'*

was glad to know that Milton wore lachets in his shoes instead of buckles'.<sup>13</sup>

Focus on 'minute particulars', deriving here from the Scottish enlightenment concern with private life and the 'history of manners', was only one aspect of the Boswellian formula, however, spelt out more fully in the introduction to the *Life of Johnson*:

Instead of melting down my materials into one mass, and constantly speaking in my own person, by which I might have appeared to have more merit in the execution of the work, I have resolved to adopt and enlarge upon the excellent plan of Mr Mason, in his Memoirs of Gray. Wherever narrative is necessary to explain, connect, and supply, I furnish it to the best of my abilities; but in the chronological series of Johnson's Life, which I trace as distinctly as I can, year by year, I produce, wherever it is in my power, his own minutes, letters or conversation, being convinced that this mode is more lively, and will make my readers better acquainted with him, than even most of those were who actually knew him, but could know him only partially; whereas there is here an accumulation of intelligence from various points, by

which his character is more fully understood and illustrated.<sup>14</sup>

There's an ideological as well as an aesthetic interest evident in Boswell's statement of purpose here. Boswell scholars have drawn attention to the *Life* as an 'act of union' in a political as well as a biographical sense, an awareness entirely absent from Joseph Reed and Francis Hart's major 20<sup>th</sup> century studies of romantic biography. Despite notable work by Godwin, Hayley and Southey, many of the major biographers and critics of the genre were Scottish (Currie, Galt, Lockhart, Scott, Carlyle) or Irish (Moore, Croker). This consideration is particularly relevant to my present comparison of Currie's Burns (an Anglo-Scot's biography of Scotland's greatest poet) and Moore's Byron (an Irishman's biography of an Anglo-Scottish poet).

Like Boswell's book, Currie's and Lockhart's biographies, for all their internal differences, were certainly acts of union, in Currie's case conceived and published in England, and largely aimed at an English and colonial readership. (In contrast, Moore, I'll suggest, actively resisted any unionist resolution). The biographer was more than just the invisible mediator of the life of his subject, particularly in the case

of Boswell. Gordon Turnbull has suggested that by carving his *Life of Johnson* from the copious and unpublished journal records of his own life, Boswell 'turned secondariness into success, and, like Scotland, retrieved from a lost original magnificence a rich co-partnery, and a considerable compensatory triumph'.<sup>15</sup> Although the subject of Boswell's biography was the *echt*-English figure of Dr Johnson, his refusal to 'melt down my materials into one mass' evokes the distinctively Scottish post-Union discourse which Susan Manning has recently studied in her book *Fragments of Union*.

Manning reads Boswell's journals, quarries for his *Life of Johnson*, as 'the first post-Humean account of personal identity [...] a series of fragments in search of a principle of union [...] the ingredients of a biography or autobiography without the evident "connecting principle among the several events, which form the subject of a work of art"'.<sup>16</sup> Although Hume was himself a supporter of the 1707 Act of Union, his epistemology and philosophical prose, Manning suggests, was 'federative' rather than 'incorporative'; 'its syntax is paratactical not hypotactic; there is no 'core' of identity other than the sum of the parts, which may, philosophically if not experientially speaking, be re-

garded separately.<sup>17</sup> For this reason Union, whether of mind or nation, is terrifyingly fragile, dependent upon what Hume called ‘the fiction of a continu’d existence’.

The fragmented, documentary form of Currie’s *Burns* and Moore’s *Byron* (as well as the Humean resonances of Byronic ‘mobility’ discussed below) echo Boswell’s federative and paratactic project, in itself anathema to the organicist discourse of high romanticism in a Coleridgean or Carlylean mould. But at the same time, and perhaps to a greater extent than Boswell’s, Currie’s influential 335 page *Life*, prefixed to his 4 volume edition of Burns’s correspondence and poetry, represents a post-Humean bid to reconstruct the unity of the mind, to regulate the dangerous mobility of genius, by setting it off against a normative appeal to moral agency and Common Sense. To quote Manning once again, ‘the “Act of Union” in [Thomas] Reid [and by extension in his follower James Currie] is, so to speak, a verb – the mind acts union, does not simply passively receive its impression, as in Hume’s version’.<sup>18</sup>

Although Currie published Burns’s life, correspondence and poetry in separate volumes, in contrast to the integration of biographical narrative and correspondence in Moore’s *Life of*

## 'His Hero's Story'

*Byron*, he made no attempt to 'melt down' documentary sources into a single omniscient voice. The work is largely a collation of testimonies from leading Scottish literati who were happy to supply Currie with material as long as their names weren't directly implicated with Burns's supposed moral delinquency and political radicalism. Currie's biographical method is illustrated by his opening gambit of collating three different texts: Burns' autobiographical essay to Dr Moore in the famous letter of 2<sup>nd</sup> August 1787, Gilbert Burns' epistolary account of his brother's early life, and a letter from the poet's tutor John Murdoch, describing his boyhood education.

Comparing the three testimonies, Currie writes that they serve 'not merely to illustrate, but to authenticate each other. Though the information they convey might have been presented within a shorter compass, by reducing the whole into one unbroken narrative [...] the intelligent reader will be far more gratified by a sight of the original documents'.<sup>19</sup> Wordsworth's withering comment on this, in his *Letter to a Friend of Burns*, was that 'few readers will take the trouble of comparing these letters with each other, and with the other documents of the publication, in order to come at a genuine

knowledge of the writer's character!<sup>20</sup> And Carlyle dismissed this method as 'not painting a portrait; but gauging the length and breadth of the several features, and jotting down their dimensions in arithmetic ciphers'.<sup>21</sup>

Although Currie's immediate motive in undertaking the biography was philanthropic, to raise money for Burns' indigent family, he also sought to shift the blame for the poet's premature death in 1796 from the Scottish establishment which, it was alleged by many critics, had failed adequately to patronise him; 'To speak my mind to you fully' he wrote in a letter of 1797, 'it appears to me that [Burns'] misfortunes arose chiefly from his errors. This it is unnecessary and, indeed, improper to say; but his biographer must keep it in mind, to prevent him from running into those bitter invectives against Scotland, &c., which the extraordinary attractions and melancholy fate of the poet naturally provoke'.<sup>22</sup> On the one hand, then, Currie's portrait of Burns is both the image of an individual, and a representative figure for the collective 'intellectual power' of an impoverished but enlightened Scottish peasantry in an age of monumental social transition following the 1707 Act of Union. Scotland may have trailed behind England on the arc of social and



'His Hero's Story'

economic development, but her vigorous and well-educated peasantry, currently emigrating in droves to England and her colonies, represented a huge asset to the British Empire.

But on the other hand, Currie's *Life* is also an account of the neuropathology of poetic genius, in which analysis of Burns's 'hypochondriasm' and a sensibility 'liable to inordinate impressions' (Works, I, 219) introduces a philosophical attack on necessitarian ethics from a voluntarist perspective. Echoing Thomas Reid's critique of Hume in his 1788 *Active Powers of Mind*, Currie wrote;

the fatal defect in [Burns's] character lay in the comparative weakness of his volition, that superior faculty of the mind, which governing the conduct according to the dictates of the understanding, alone entitles it to be denominated rational; which is the parent of fortitude, patience, and self-denial; which by regulating and combining human exertions, may be said to have effected all that is great in the works of man, in literature, in science, or on the face of nature. *The occupations of a poet are not calculated to strengthen the governing powers of the mind, or to weaken that sensibility which requires perpetual control, since it gives birth to the vehemence of pas-*

*sion, as well as to the higher powers of imagination.* (*Works*, I, 236; italics mine)

Charles Lamb's verdict on this, in an 1800 letter to Coleridge, was 'Very confusedly and badly written, and interspersed with dull pathological and *medical* discussions [...]. Do you know the well-meaning Doctor? Alas, *ne sutor ultra crepitum!*'<sup>23</sup>

In his critique of Burns, Currie seeks to exorcise a particularly Scottish pathology of mind, which he associates with the necessitarian ethics and the scepticism of David Hume. Burns's protean, mobile character – illustrating Hume's account of the mind as merely a 'kind of theatre' through which ideas and impressions passed in aleatory surges – stretches the biographer's descriptive vocabulary to its utmost limits; Burns is kind, brave, sincere, compassionate, by turns, but he's also proud, irascible, and vindictive (*Works*, I, 235). Disappointed by the frustration of his political hopes, Burns has aggravated his nervous condition by misapplying alcoholic stimulants, particularly spirits, and mixing in the dissipated *demimonde* of Dumfries taverns; endowed with all the talents, intellect and passion of the Scottish peasantry, he's failed in the voluntaristic regulation of his own over-energetic sensibility.

## 'His Hero's Story'

Tellingly, Currie suggested that Burns's poems and songs 'display and as it were *embalm*, the peculiar manners of his country; and [...] may be considered as a *monument* not to his name only, but to the expiring genius of an ancient and once independent nation' (*Works*, I, 31; my italics). Currie hints that his amorous and patriotic lyrics written in the Scottish vernacular – creations of the 'over-powering sensibility of the bard of nature' – have the power to reinvigorate English – or rather *British* – poetry. But like Burns himself, the cultural legacy of pre-union Scotland is represented here as 'expiring genius'. Katie Trumpener describes the ideological work of Currie's unionism when she writes of 'a [Scottish] cultural nationalism that survives because it learns to separate cultural distinctiveness from the memory of political autonomy and can therefore be accommodated within the new imperial framework'.<sup>24</sup>

### **Moore's *Life of Byron***

Damage limitation is one important, and under-acknowledged, pressure on literary biography in the tense ideological climate of the revolutionary aftermath. Already an urgent motive for Currie's 'authorised' Burns edition in 1796, the death of Byron in 1824 signalled the same phe-

nomenon in spades. We've seen that if Wordsworth veiled his own 'hidden life' by attacking the project of literary biography *per se*,<sup>25</sup> Byron preferred playing to the gallery by penning his own *Memoirs*, and entrusting the manuscript to Tom Moore. Chided by Hobhouse (who loathed Moore) for 'purchasing a biographer', Byron responded; 'I suppose however that like most men who have been talked about – I might have had – (if I did not outlive my reputation which however is not unlikely) a biographer without purchase – since most other scribblers have two or three – gratis –. Besides, – I thought that I had written my *own*'.<sup>26</sup> Byron was guilty of a fatal misjudgement on this last score, however, even if the destruction of his *Memoirs* would simply fan the flames of his posthumous celebrity.

Andrew Elfenbein writes of the burning of the *Memoirs* that 'no gesture could have been better calculated to heighten the aura of scandal that surrounded Byron. For those who had known [the poet], and some who had not, the burning provided a welcome occasion to make quick money by converting their knowledge into print'.<sup>27</sup> Doris Langley Moore's punchy, opinionated study *The Late Lord Byron* still offers the best survey of the early torrent of Byroniana

## 'His Hero's Story'

which poured from the pens of Robert Dallas, Pietro Gamba, William Parry, Leigh Hunt, James Kennedy, Edward Trelawney and Teresa Guccioli, in the wake of the poet's untimely death in Missalonghi. The range of these often conflicting accounts created a tremendous buyer's market, to the extent that each revealed a new and different facet of Byron's character.<sup>28</sup>

In agreeing to the destruction of the *Memoirs*, Moore had sought to preserve Byron's posthumous reputation from the lethal candour of his own autobiography. It's hardly surprising that subsequently he felt morally obliged to assume the role of authorised biographer, quite apart from the attraction of the 4,000 guineas offered him by John Murray, a tempting prospect for a struggling professional writer with expensive tastes. When Hobhouse warned him that 'there was a very general feeling against life-writing as unfair and unprofitable',<sup>29</sup> he surely can't have intended 'unprofitable' in a financial sense. Like Currie's *Life of Burns*, Moore's 1,493 page 'authorised' *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron with Notices of his Life and Letters* (to give its full title), was published by Murray in two volumes in 1830-31, as an act of monopolization, setting its compendious bulk against the encroaching tide of gossipy

biographical ephemera. Yet as we'll see, unlike Currie, Moore carefully abstained from offering a single dominant interpretation of Byron's flawed genius. Such an 'authorised' biography was desirable even when the subject was less risqué than Burns or Byron. J.B.S.Morrith wrote to Lockhart concerning the latter's projected biography of Scott: 'You will have given us a standard work, and no temporary controversy will survive the newspapers and periodical magazines into which it may creep for you will so exhaust the materials that no bookseller will find any that can be separately profitable'.<sup>30</sup>

Modern opinion remains divided concerning the merits of Moore's book. Joseph Reed dismisses it 'a sprawling, unselective conglomeration [...] fragmented autobiography, not the scheme or vision or control of biography'.<sup>31</sup> In contrast, Doris Langley Moore writes that, despite his suppressions and copious use of asterisks (Moore avoids saying much about Byron's sexual liaisons – in England at least – and dispatches the divorce scandal with a brisk objectivity) 'a portrait emerges which has not been invalidated by the scores of new and searching lights that time has cast upon it'.<sup>32</sup> However deficient by modern standards,

### 'His Hero's Story'

Moore's biography, like Currie's of Burns, is surely the most influential one ever written.<sup>33</sup>

Moore wholeheartedly embraced the Boswellian 'documentary' plan in preparing his biography. As early as May 1826 he noted in his *Journal* that it 'should consist as much as possible of extracts from Byron's letters and journals, making him tell his own story',<sup>34</sup> later described in the preface as 'a canvass of animated and, often, unconscious self-portraiture' (*Moore*, p. xix) Thomas Macaulay's review in *Edinburgh* lavished praise on Byron's correspondence, but also upon the unobtrusiveness of his biographer; 'Mr Moore never thrusts himself between Lord Byron and the public. With the strongest temptations to egotism, he has said no more about himself than the subject absolutely required'.<sup>35</sup> Accurate in one sense, it would however be a mistake to regard this as the last word on Moore as biographer.

Even Joseph Keen, who dismisses Moore's biography as a massive lost opportunity, is alert to the growing assertiveness of Moore's authorial personality in the development of his long narrative; 'His comments, for the most part, appeared as islands in a sea of correspondence and journals. When he came to a crisis, a poem, or a turning point in Byron's career he

would pause to assess, reflect, or synthesize'. Yet far from being 'functions of continuity or unity', hypotactic links adding an organic order to the whole, these 'islands' represent merely paratactic fragments added to the already heterogeneous miscellany of Byron's literary remains, intended to add up to a portrait of Byron based on what Keen unkindly terms 'a stereotype theory of genius'.<sup>36</sup> The fact that this might have reflected a conscious strategy on Moore's part, rather than the failure of organic unity, hardly occurs to him. In the rest of this lecture I'll explore the affinities between the 'paratactic' fragmentary mode of Moore's biography and Currie's *Life of Burns*, and compare his analysis of Byron's genius with Currie's critical reading of Burns's 'Humean' mobility.

Like the Scots biographers Boswell, Currie and Lockhart, Moore occupied a position of cultural 'secondariness' as a voice of Britain's 'Celtic' peripheries. Unlike the Anglo-Scottish Currie, however, (and to an even greater extent the Tory Unionist Lockhart) the Catholic Moore was a life-long antagonist of the incorporated Union of Great Britain and Ireland: a warm supporter of Grattan's Irish parliament of 1782, he had been a close friend of Robert Emmett at Trinity Dublin, and described the 1801 Union



as an 'ill-assorted marriage' between Britain and Ireland, proclaiming in a letter of 1830 'the union I always detested the very thought of'.<sup>37</sup> On the strength of his most famous collection of 'national songs' published from 1808-38, the *Irish Melodies*, he depicted himself as 'the Minstrel of Erin'<sup>38</sup> who sought to rehabilitate Irish culture in the eyes of English society in the wake of the violence of 1798 and the 1801 Union.

In an 1807 letter to Sir John Stevenson, Moore represented the *Melodies* as a true expression of Irish character, 'that rapid fluctuation of spirits, that unaccountable mixture of gloom and levity', adding that 'if Burns had been an Irishman (and I would willingly give up all our claims to Ossian for him), his heart would have been proud of such music'.<sup>39</sup> We might note in this connection Leith Davis's 'postcolonial' account of Irishness in Moore's *Melodies* as 'a state of tension and translation rather than a static state of authenticity [...] dynamic encounter [and] overlapping layers of meaning'.<sup>40</sup> In this respect Moore's understanding of Byron's 'versatility', and his association of Burns with the 'rapid fluctuation of spirits' characteristic of the Irish is highly significant, as I'll argue below. Although Byron mocked his

friend's taste for Whig high society ('Tommy loves a lord') and, as I've suggested, in the persona of *Don Juan's* 'Sad Trimmer', the preface to *The Corsair* lavished praise on Moore as an Irish patriot.

Superficially, Moore's *Life of Byron* seems totally disconnected from the two other 'Irish' biographies which he published around the same time, *The Life of Sheridan* in 1825 and the *Life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald* in 1831, the latter depicting the 1798 Irish uprising in heroic terms, reflecting what Moore dubbed his persistent 'zeal for Ireland and her liberties'.<sup>41</sup> Despite his allegiance to the Whig party line on Irish affairs, and his ambivalence towards Daniel O'Connell and Catholic Emancipation, Moore was widely seen in England as a spokesman for the Irish cause. Southey deplored his support for terrorism or 'fun-stirring' in his satirical *Memoirs of Captain Rock* (1824);<sup>42</sup> Moore's later writings, such as the *Travels of an Irish Gentleman* (1833) and his unfinished multi-volume *History of Ireland* (1835-46) all sought to redress the wrongs of Ireland.

Reviewers of Moore's 1825 *Life of Sheridan* detected in his style the affected dazzle and rhetorical excess that had marked *Lalla Rookh* as a work which was at once 'oriental' and

'Hibernian', and stigmatised Moore as an effeminate sensualist. Moore's popularity amongst female readers, and his celebrity as a drawing room performer of his own national melodies linked up with an older English feminisation of Irish culture. To quote Leith Davis again, the judgement of his work as feminine was used to weaken its politically radical potential'.<sup>43</sup> In his defence, however, the *Edinburgh Reviewer* insisted 'Mr Moore is an Irishman, and a man of genius, – and his works will betray him. Why should not the Dorians speak Doric?'<sup>44</sup> But in the same organ, Macaulay later praised the prose of Moore's *Byron* for being 'de-Hibernicized' in relation to the *Life of Sheridan*; 'it is immeasurably superior to that work. The style is agreeable, clear and manly; and, when it rises into eloquence, rises without effort or ostentation'.<sup>45</sup>

Read in the light of the cultural politics of biography which we've seen underpinning Currie's *Burns*, however, the view of an 'unobtrusive' Moore needs to be revised, and the *Life of Byron* considered in relation to Moore's critique of Union in the 'Irish' writings. The *Life* does quote Byron's 1814 boast in his journal that 'If I had been a man [in the 1790's] I would have made an English Lord Edward Fitzgerald'

(*Moore* p. 230). Caroline Lamb made much of this in representing Byron as the deeply flawed, Fitzgerald-like character Glenarvon in her 1816 novel of the same title. But Moore refuses to be drawn on this matter, and has a lot more to say about Byron's sympathy for the Italian carbonari, or the Greek revolutionaries, as well toning down the radicalism of Byron's politics by representing him as an aristocratic Whig. Nevertheless, I want to argue that Moore's Irish patriotism underpinned his portrayal of Byron's genius as exemplifying the failure of Union. Rather than being the 'gloomy egotist' of popular reputation, Moore's Byron was 'not one but many', a self-divided, antithetical figure, formed, despite his aristocratic pedigree, of an impure national 'mixture or alloy'. I take this to underlie Moore's account of Byron's cultural, as well as personal, identity, as the locus of conflicting and irreconcilable principles.

Such an interpretation is based on Byron's Anglo-Scottish lineage. Descended on his English father's side from the venerable Norman barons of Newstead, his Scottish mother Miss Gordon of Gight traced her family back to the Earl of Huntley, and King James I, 'a line of ancestry as illustrious as any that Scotland can boast' (*Moore* p. 2). Despite this noble pedigree,

the Anglo-Scottish union as personified in the poet's life has spectacularly failed to achieve domestic settlement or 'union'. Moore dilates upon the failure of his parents' marriage and Byron's troubled relationship with his 'insane' mother, helping to explain the ambivalence with which the poet regarded his Scottish inheritance. We are reminded that in *Don Juan* he describes himself as 'half a Scot, and bred a whole one' (Moore p. 12), and Moore narrates how the Aberdonian 'Wee Geordie' Byron's romantic love of landscape was fed by 'the dark summit of Lachin-y-gair' which later, in *Childe Harold*, 'mixed Celtic memories with the Phrygian mount' (Moore p. 8).

Unlike Moore, Byron resisted any temptation to pursue a career in Bardic Nationalism, particularly insofar as his Scottish roots were concerned, and his early animus against the *Edinburgh Review* for its unkind remarks on *Hours of Idleness* hardly helped. Byron's boast of his Scottish descent in later correspondence with Sir Walter Scott ('I was bred a canny Scot till ten years old') appears to be as much the result of his admiration for the imaginative world of Scott's Waverley novels as of any real national pride (Moore p. 548). For Byron, a hyphenated Anglo-Scottish cosmopolitanism was infinitely

more attractive than Caledonian *amor patriae*, as he makes clear in an 1814 letter to Moore criticizing James Hogg 'the Ettrick Shepherd'; 'I think highly of him, as a poet; but he, and half of those Scotch and Lake troubadours, are spoilt by living in little circles and petty societies. London and the world is the only place to take the conceit out of a man – in the milling phrase' (*Moore* p. 260). If Moore associates Byron's genius with any particular spot, however, it seems to be Greece, not London, and Missaloughi in particular. At any rate Byron's 1809 visit to Missaloughi is the occasion for Moore's moving evocation of Byron's death, fifteen years later in the same spot, as the moment of his real homecoming (*Moore* p. 99).

After 1816 and the divorce scandal it was of course to the wider world that Byron turned as an exile from polite English society, and Moore is alert to the fact that it was in this melancholy condition of homelessness that his distinctive genius appeared to flourish. Byron's maltreatment by his tempestuous Scottish mother Catherine, upon whom he (perhaps unfairly) blamed the curse of his lameness, is offered as one explanation for this 'homelessness' (*Moore* p. 120) and his subsequent failure to domesticate with Annabella Milbanke. Moore also, con-

roversially, insisted that genial poets make bad husbands, and that genius was by nature 'self-centred'. In his review in the *Quarterly*, Lockhart utterly rejected this hypothesis, preferring to blame the mother (Catherine Gordon) for Byron's rejection of the wife (Annabella Milbanke); 'this miserable woman's gifted child imbibed that nervous suspiciousness which afterwards ripened into a quarrel with human nature'.<sup>46</sup> Lockhart perhaps hints that a better Scottish mother might have made Byron a more 'British' poet.

Perhaps the positive side of Byron's sense of his own Scottishness emerges most clearly in his admiration for Robert Burns, despite the social gulf which divided the two poets. Moore cites a remarkable journal entry of November 1813 in which Byron wrote; 'Read Burns today. What would he have been, if patrician? We should have had more polish – less force – just as much verse, but no immortality – a divorce and a duel or two, the which had he survived, as his potations must have been less spirituous, he might have lived as long as Sheridan, and outlived as much as poor Brinsley' (*Moore* p. 200). Byron here imagines Burns as an aristocratic rake – in other words as himself – whose social elevation would have prolonged

his life at the expense of diminishing the force of his poetry. (It's noteworthy that Byron's remark on Burns' 'spirituous potations' is a specific allusion to Currie's *Life*: if Burns had drunk vintage claret rather than whisky toddy he might have lived longer.) More revealing perhaps is Byron's famous journal entry for December of the same year, written after he'd been lent some of Burns's unpublished letters and pornographic songs by Lord Holland's librarian; 'What an antithetical mind! – tenderness, roughness – delicacy, coarseness – sentiment, sensuality – soaring and grovelling, dirt and deity – all mixed up in one compound of inspired clay!' (*Moore* p. 214-5).

Moore's insightful understanding of the distinctive aesthetic of Byron's *Don Juan* in the *Life of Byron* is largely, I think, influenced by the 'dirt and deity' commentary on Burns: following Byron's imagining of Burns as himself, his biographer now in turn imagines Byron as Burns. In a long passage at the end of Chapter 32 he fugged upon Byron's account of Burns' 'dirt and deity' in representing *Don Juan* as a true reflection of its author's antithetical mind; 'the two extremes [...] of man's mixed and inconsistent nature, now rankly smelling of earth, now breathing of heaven, – such was the



strange assemblage of contrary elements, all meeting together in the same mind, and all brought to bear, in turn, upon the same task [...] the most powerful and, in many respects, painful display of versatility of genius that has ever been left for succeeding ages to wonder at and deplore' (*Moore*, p. 386).

Moore's analysis of Byron's genius in Chapter 57, which concludes the second, 1831 volume of his *Life*, finds the explanatory consistency of a single 'ruling passion' 'almost wholly wanting' in the case of Byron, whom he prefers to describe as 'an unexampled complication of qualities' (*Moore* p. 643). In employing Byron's own terms 'mobility' and 'versatility' Moore openly alludes here to the characterisation of Lady Adeline Amundeville in *Don Juan* canto 16, stanza 97, a woman, Byron's note tells us, who possesses 'an excessive susceptibility of immediate impressions', which he describes as a 'most painful and unhappy attribute' (*Don Juan*, p. 769). As McGann presciently remarks here, Byronic 'mobility involves a structure of social relations and [is] not simply a psychological characteristic'.<sup>47</sup> McGann also links the concept of mobility to Byron's description of the 'trimmer poet' in the third canto, as I remarked above. Byron's comment here 'I am not sure

that mobility is English' (Don Juan p. 769) has been taken to refer to the word's French original 'mobilité', but it is also possible that the note refers to the English nation rather than the language. Remembering Moore's characterisation of the Irish ('that rapid fluctuation of spirits, that unaccountable mixture of gloom and levity') in his 1807 letter to Sir John Stevenson, the 'unEnglish' mobility might look rather Irish, or, in the light of Moore's association of Burns sympathy with Irish mobility, even Scottish.

In his illiberal *tour de force* 'On the Scotch Character', first published in the second volume of *The Liberal* in January 1823, William Hazlitt had stirred up the Scotophobia of an earlier, Wilkesite era, in denouncing the post-Union Scots in terms of the very nationality which they sought to play down; 'They are not straggling individuals, but embodied, formidable abstractions – determined personifications of the land they come from. A Scotchman gets on in the world, because he is not one, but many'.<sup>48</sup> Moore appears to play with Hazlitt's stereotype in his analysis of Byron's character; 'So various, indeed, and contradictory, were [Byron's] attributes, both moral and intellec-

tual, that he may be pronounced *not one, but many*' (*Moore* p. 643; italics mine).

Unlike Hazlitt's embodied abstractions, whose collective (although deracinated) Scottishness substitutes for any individual *gusto*, Byron's distinctive personality is composed of a mosaic of cultural fragments without any organic incorporation. Like Burns, 'a susceptibility of new impressions and impulses' (and Moore almost paraphrases Currie, as well as Byron's note to Canto XVI, at this point) and an 'uncontrolled impetuosity [...] in yielding to them' are isolated as the 'two great and leading sources of all that varied spectacle which [Byron's] life exhibited' (*Moore* p. 645). Moore elsewhere described Byron's inability to sustain 'any regular train of reasoning', and 'his caprices, fits of weeping, sudden affections and dislikes' as 'striking traces of a feminine cast of character' (*Moore* p. 600). I've commented above on the reviewer's denunciation of Moore's femininity as an Irish poet and singer, which maybe helps explain why, in contrast to Currie's critique of Burns, Moore as Irish biographer abstained from any moralistic comment on such a damaging failure of Byron's own masculinity.

I'm certainly not the first critic to note the affinities between Byron's Burns and Moore's

Byron. It's not surprising that even when they praised Moore's impartiality as a biographer, conservative reviewers felt called to close the gap between Moore and Currie by supplying the omitted moral critique of Byronic genius. Lockhart, whose own biography of Robert Burns had been published in 1828, was well placed to note several similarities between the two poets in his review of Moore's *Byron*. He was completely unconvinced by Moore's special pleading for *Don Juan*, which he diagnosed as the effect of Byron's increasing dependence on alcohol.<sup>49</sup>

Discussing Byron's mental condition at the time of his death in Greece led Lockhart to a direct comparison with Currie's Burns; 'In one of his diaries Lord Byron concludes a brief character of Robert Burns with these words: 'what a strange compound of dirt and deity!' Mr Moore had better have drawn his pen through them, unless he wished to provoke a *mutato nomine*'.<sup>50</sup> For Lockhart, Moore's notion of Byron's versatility was a red herring, the real dynamic empowering Byron's genius being a time-honoured 'struggle between the evil principle and the good', in which lay the main interest of his 'mournful tale'.<sup>51</sup> Hart describes Lockhart's biographical ethic as 'an ideal of spiritual health (anti-Byronic and, hence, proto-Victorian) [en-

capsulated] in a word Lockhart often uses: "manly". Exquisite sensibility passes the ethical test of true genius only when controlled by a manly character'.<sup>52</sup> White lilies up his arse, as D. H. Lawrence memorably put it.

With remarkably modern insight, Moore argued that the 'scorching and drenching' effect of *Don Juan*, rather than the egotistical gloom of a Conrad or a Harold, was the key to Byron's poetic greatness. For this very reason, he refused to foreclose on his subject by explaining away Byron's versatility in terms of 'weakness of volition'. Although he downplayed Byron's sexual licentiousness, as well as his political and religious heterodoxy, he refused to apply a regulative moral framework in understanding the Byron phenomenon. 'Doing Byron justice' was refusing to reduce his antithetical genius to any single interpretation, staving off the temptation to domesticate or enclose him within the fold of an organic tradition of English literary genius. As the brilliant but tragic creation of a flawed act of union, Byron remained 'not one but many'.

Andrew Elfenbein has recently argued that Moore's *Life of Byron* engendered its own powerful *riposte* in the shape of Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus*. While unfavourably comparing Byronic

'affectation' with Burnsian 'honesty' in his 1828 review of Lockhart's *Life of Burns*, Carlyle praised both poets of 'dirt and deity' for their uncompromising refusal to serve God as well as Mammon; 'the celestial element will not mingle with the clay of the earth', as he put it. 'Byron and Burns were sent forth as missionaries to their generation, to teach it a higher doctrine, a purer Truth; they had a message to deliver, which left them no rest till it was accomplished; in dim throes of pain, this divine behest lay smouldering within them; for they knew not what it meant, and felt it only in mysterious anticipation, and they had to die without articulately uttering it'.<sup>53</sup>

In 1830 Carlyle wrote to the editor of the *Edinburgh Review* asking to review Moore's *Life of Byron*, the first volume of which he was currently reading: in the event, this proved impossible, as the task had already been assigned to Macaulay. Thwarted, he turned his biographical energies to elaborating the life of Diogenes Teufelsdröck in the second volume of *Sartor Resartus*, later serialised in *Fraser's Magazine* in 1833-4. Complicating Carlyle's famous assertion of the 'Everlasting Yea' 'Close thy Byron, open thy Goethe', Elfenbein argues that 'Byron's life as told by Moore becomes a deci-

sive negative model for the biography of Teufelsdröckh [...] allowing him to expand the implicit narrative of transition that he had always associated with Byron into a full-fledged plot that would trace the origins of genius'.<sup>54</sup> If Burns and Byron as 'missionaries to their generation' had glimpsed the truth but died without articulating it, the torch had now passed into the hands of the egregious 'Professor of Things in General' at the University of Weissenichtwo. And of course his name 'Diogenes Teufelsdröckh' ('God-born Devil's dung') glossed the Burnsian/Byronic compound of 'dirt and deity', which assumed such a central explanatory role in Moore's biography.<sup>55</sup>

Carlyle's extravagant visionary narrative parodies the polite idiom and the fragmentary structure of Currie's or Lockhart's or Moore's biographies by questioning the validity of the genre itself; 'What are your historical Facts; still more your biographical? Wilt thou know a Man, above all a Mankind, by stringing together bead-rolls of what thou namest Facts?'<sup>56</sup> The linguistic 'flesh-garment' of Carlyle's exuberant metaphoric style defies the polite English of Moore's toned-down, 'de-Hibernicized' prose, although it seems unlikely that the staunchly Unionist Carlyle would have been blind to the

ideological strategies underpinning Moore's presentation of Byron. That's not to say that Carlyle is denying his own plebeian Scottish roots, but rather performing that distinctive post-1707 Scottish manoeuvre of asserting cultural nationalism in support of Union. Perhaps one should rather speak here of a *displaced* cultural nationalism in relation to Carlyle's adoption of the idiom of Germanic transcendentalism, albeit one which competes, as a voice from the periphery, with Moore's Irish patriotism. As Elfinbein notes, 'nominally, Teufelsdröckh's prose is German, but it also stands as a kind of 'Scottish' redeemed from the contempt heaped on that language by the users of polite English [...] Teufelsdröckh's literary Scottish manifests all the prophetic verve and ferocity that Carlyle suggests has been drained from modern English'.<sup>57</sup>

Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* then appropriates the cultural nationalism implicit in Burns's Scottish poetry, but now displaced and Germanified into a critique of English – and one might add Anglo-Irish – literary convention, in favour of a dynamic, transcendental British romanticism. (The emphasis here lies on transcendentalism, given that 'Weissnichtwo' means 'know-not-where'). Tom Moore's antithetical,



fragmentary, anti-unionist 'dirt and deity' is here synthesized into the higher unity of Carlylean 'natural supernaturalism'. If adopting the 'Everlasting Yea' entails a rejection of the fragmentary, paratactic model of identity underwriting 'the Boswellian plan' of biography, Carlyle's 'completion' of the failed project of Byronism is dedicated to forging a higher symbolic unity of both self and nation from the shards of 'his hero's tale'.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Don Juan*, III, st.90 ll.809-12, in *Lord Byron: The Complete Poetical Works*, ed. Jerome J. McGann, 7 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980-93), V, 193; henceforth *Don Juan* in text.

<sup>2</sup> Andrew Bennett, *Romantic Poets and the Culture of Posterity* (Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 196.

<sup>3</sup> *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire* (Princeton University Press, 1997).

<sup>4</sup> Jerome McGann, *The Beauty of Inflections: Literary Investigations in Historical Method and Theory* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), pp. 274-5.

<sup>5</sup> 'A Letter to a Friend of Robert Burns' (1816), in *William Wordsworth: Selected Prose*, ed. John O. Hayden (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1988), p. 421.

<sup>6</sup> Bennett, p. 194.

<sup>7</sup> Joseph Reed, *English Biography in the Early 19<sup>th</sup> Century, 1801-1838* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), p. 4. For an excellent recent treatment of these issues, which has influenced my thinking in this lecture, see David Higgins, *Romantic Genius and the Literary Magazine: Biogra-*

*phy, Celebrity, Politics* (London and New York: Routledge, 2005).

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 80; italics mine.

<sup>9</sup> 'To Donald Carswell, 5<sup>th</sup> December 1927' in *Selected Letters of D.H.Lawrence*, ed. Diana Trilling, p. 267. Cited in Francis R. Hart, *Lockhart as Romantic Biographer* (Edinburgh University Press, 1971), p. 81.

<sup>10</sup> Thomas Moore, *The Life, Letters and Journals of Lord Byron* (1830-1), New and Complete Edition, in one volume (London: John Murray, 1892), p. 422; henceforth *Moore* in text.

<sup>11</sup> Reed, *English Biography*, p. 6.

<sup>12</sup> 'Letter to a Friend of Robert Burns', p. 422.

<sup>13</sup> Cited by Gordon Turnbull in 'James Boswell: Biography and the Union', in *The History of Scottish Literature Vol 2, 1660-1800*, gen. ed. Cairns Craig, vol. ed. Andrew Hook (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1988), p. 170.

<sup>14</sup> James Boswell, *The Life of Johnson*, ed. R.W.Chapman, rev. by J.D.Fleeman, with a new intro by Pat Rogers (Oxford University Press, 1980), p. 22.

<sup>15</sup> Turnbull, p. 172.

<sup>16</sup> Susan Manning, *Fragments of Union: Making Connections in Scottish and American Writing* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), p. 126.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>18</sup> Manning p. 50.

<sup>19</sup> [James Currie], *The Works of Robert Burns; with an Account of his life, and a Criticism on his Writings. To which are prefixed, Some Observations on the Character and Condition of the Scottish Peasantry*, 4 vols. (Liverpool, London, Edinburgh, 1800), I, 99; henceforth *Works* in text.

<sup>20</sup> 'Letter to a Friend of Robert Burns', p. 419.

<sup>21</sup> Quoted in Reed, p. 75.

<sup>22</sup> William Wallace Currie, *Memoir of the Life, Writing and Correspondence of James Currie, MD, FRS, of Liverpool*, 2 vols. (London: Longman 1831), I, p. 281; henceforth *Memoir* in text.

<sup>23</sup> '28<sup>th</sup> July, 1800', in Donald A. Low, *Robert Burns: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974), p. 112. The quotation from Pliny translates 'Let the Cobbler stick to his rattling'.

<sup>24</sup> *Bardic Nationalism*, p. 246.

<sup>25</sup> I allude here to Kenneth Johnston, *The Hidden Wordsworth* (London: Pimlico, 2000): 'Anyone who studies Wordsworth's young life for long comes to agree with E. P. Thompson that there is something secretive about it' (p. 5).

<sup>26</sup> *Byron's Letters and Journals*, ed. Leslie A. Marchand, vol 9, 1821-22 (London: John Murray, 1979), p. 88.

<sup>27</sup> Andrew Elfenbein, *Byron and the Victorians* (Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 76

<sup>28</sup> Doris Langley Moore, *The Late Lord Byron: Posthumous Dramas* (London: John Murray, 1961).

<sup>29</sup> Hobhouse's *Journal*, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 1826, quoted by Doris Langley Moore, p. 274.

<sup>30</sup> Cited in Hart, *Lockhart as Romantic Biographer*, p. 188.

<sup>31</sup> Reed, p. 102.

<sup>32</sup> Doris Langley Moore, p. 289.

<sup>33</sup> On problems of contemporary Byron biography in relation to the incest question, see Alan Rawes's essay 'That Perverse Passion' and Benita Eisler's 'Byronic' Byron', in *Romantic Biography*, ed by Arthur Bradley and Alan Rawes (Aldershot: Ashgate 2003), pp. 74-92.

<sup>34</sup> *The Journal of Thomas Moore, 1818-1841*, ed. by Peter Quennell (London: Batsford, 1964), p. 137.

<sup>35</sup> *Edinburgh Review*, 53:106 (June 1831), 544.

<sup>36</sup> Keen, p. 112.

<sup>37</sup> Quoted in Javed Majeed, *Ungoverned Imaginings: James Mill's The History of British India and Orientalism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), p. 89.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 87.

<sup>39</sup> *Letters of Thomas Moore*, ed Wilfred S. Dowden, 2 vols. (London: Clarendon Press, 1964), I, 143.

<sup>40</sup> Leith Davis, *Music, Postcolonialism and Gender: The Construction of Irish National Identity, 1724-1874* (Notre Dame, Ind.: Univ of Notre Dame Press, 2006), p. 145. See also Matthew Campbell, 'Thomas Moore's Wild Song: The 1821 Irish Melodies', in *Bullán: An Irish Studies Journal*, 4.2 (1999), 83-103. Thanks to Willy Maley for this reference.

<sup>41</sup> Majeed, p. 88.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 88.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 161.

<sup>44</sup> *Edinburgh Review* 45:89 (Dec, 1826), 47.

<sup>45</sup> *Edinburgh Review* 53:106 (June 1831), 544.

<sup>46</sup> *Quarterly Review*, 44 (1831), 225.

<sup>47</sup> McGann, *Beauty of Inflections*, p. 273.

<sup>48</sup> William Hazlitt, 'On the Scotch Character: A Fragment', in P.P. Howe, ed., *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt*, 21 volumes (London and Toronto: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1930-4), Vol 17, Uncollected Essays, p. 100.

<sup>49</sup> *Quarterly Review*, 44 (1831), 204.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 219.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 168.

<sup>52</sup> Hart, p. 102.

<sup>53</sup> Low, Burns: *The Critical Heritage*, p. 390.

<sup>54</sup> Elfenbein, *Byron and the Victorians*, p. 106.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 109.

<sup>56</sup> *Sartor Resartus: The Life and Opinions of Herr Teufelsdröckh*, in *A Carlyle Reader*, ed. G.B. Tennyson (Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 264.

<sup>57</sup> Elfenbein, p. 122.