

John Scattergood
Trinity College, Dublin

Introduction

John Mitchell Kemble (1807-1857)

On 19 March 1830 John Mitchell Kemble, in whose honour these lectures are named, took the part of Dogberry in a Cambridge production of *Much Ado About Nothing*, other parts being taken by a number of his friends. In a characteristically entertaining letter he writes: 'I can assure you if laughing be a criterion, no company ever did better, for from first to last, especially in the tragic scenes, the audience were in a roar'.¹ If he had chosen to make a career on the stage, instead of devoting himself to philology, history, archaeology and antiquarianism, nobody would have been particularly surprised.

He was born into what was the most famous theatrical family of the time.² His father Charles Kemble was an excellent actor. His mother Maria Theresa de Camp, born in Vienna, of French and Swiss extraction, had been an actress from her youth. The famous John Philip Kemble was his uncle; the even more famous Sarah Siddons was his aunt; and Fanny Kemble was his sister. As a boy Kemble made toy theatres and acted with Fanny in plays. But his interest in philology may have been initiated when he went to a school in Clapham run by Charles Richardson, a lexicographer, who, in 1836-37, published 'his

¹ For the letter see Catherine Bodham Johnson, *William Bodham Donne and his Friends* (London, 1905), pp. 5-6.

² There are numerous short accounts of Kemble's life. See Frances M. Brookfield, *The Cambridge Apostles* (London, 1906), pp. 159-187; Bruce Dickins, 'John Mitchell Kemble and Old English Scholarship', *PBA*, 25 (1939), 51-84 (with a bibliography of Kemble's writings); R.A. Wiley, 'Anglo-Saxon Kemble: The Life and Works of John Mitchell Kemble, 1807-1857, Philologist, Historian, Archaeologist', *ASSAH*, 1 (1979), 165-273 and J. D. Haigh, 'John Mitchell Kemble', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, eds H.C.G. Matthew and B. Harrison, 60 Vols (Oxford, 2004), 31. 153-55. I have drawn on all these sources for my own brief account.

really remarkable dictionary, distinguished by its wealth of quotations' and based on the historical method.³ From there he went to the King Edward VI Free Grammar School at Bury St Edmunds, which had 'a deservedly high reputation especially among parents of latitudinarian views in church and state'⁴ – views which Kemble in later life was to espouse. Its headmaster was Dr Benjamin Heath Malkin, Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries and later Professor of History in the University of London. Among Kemble's contemporaries there were James Spedding, who wrote a biography of Francis Bacon, Edward Fitzgerald, the poet, and William Bodham Donne, the classicist and man of letters, who became a lifelong friend. 'I never heard such capital declamation as his Hotspur ...' wrote Fitzgerald of one of Kemble's schoolboy theatrical performances.⁵ He was admitted to Trinity College, Cambridge, as a pensioner, on 26 June 1824, and went into residence in Michaelmas Term 1825. He was also the recipient of a Hewer Exhibition from his school. It was expected that he would have a distinguished academic career in Cambridge, but things did not work out quite like that.

Kemble threw himself enthusiastically into the life of Cambridge, but not primarily in an academic fashion, though he did gain first place in the Trinity Declamations in 1827. He spent his time fencing, rowing, shooting – but mainly he spoke in debates in the Union Society, of which he was President in Lent Term 1828. He was at this time, according to his sister Fanny writing in January 1828, in 'constant excitement about political questions'. She continues: 'He is neither tory nor whig, but a radical, a utilitarian, an adorer of Bentham, a worshipper of Mill, an advocate of vote by ballot, an opponent of hereditary aristocracy, the church establishment, the army and the navy, which he deems sources of unnecessary national expense...' Fanny admires all this but is sensitive to the fact that it was not what he ought to have been doing: 'they will not teach him mathematics, or give him a scholarship or his degree'. She also feared, rightly as it turned out, that the vehemence with which he pursued arguments would 'perhaps endanger

³ See J.R. Hulbert, *Dictionaries British and American* (London, 1955), p. 32. For another assessment of Charles Richardson see M.M. Matthews, *A Survey of English Dictionaries* (London, 1933), pp. 62-64.

⁴ The judgment is that of Dickens, 'John Mitchell Kemble and Old English Scholarship', p. 52.

⁵ See *Letters and Literary Remains of Edward Fitzgerald*, ed. W. Aldis Wright, 7 Vols (London, 1902-3), IV. 37-38.

his future prospects'.⁶ It certainly appears to have put back his gaining a degree. When he sat for his degree, after the usual ten terms, he was, according to Richard Monckton Milnes, later Lord Houghton, 'very ill treated ... nobody knows why, expect that in his examination he called Paley a "miserable sophist", and talked of Locke's "loathsome infidelity" which pleased one very much but made the examiners very angry'.⁷ His degree was deferred and he did not take it until February 1830. He took his MA in 1833. But the period in late 1829 was extremely formative for Kemble: he went to Germany with his friend from Trinity, Charles Barton, wrote some poems, and, after he and Barton had parted in Heidelberg, went to Bavaria and the Tyrol, read Kant, and became an admirer of German scholarship. As Frances M. Brookfield puts it: 'The Germans with their deeper tone of thought and more deliberate methods of study suited him well'.⁸

At this point in his life Kemble's career could have developed in a number of directions: he was endowed with a handsome physical appearance, a quick intelligence, enviable skills in communication, both verbal and written, and a restless energy. He had intended to go into the law, but in 1829 gave this up and, perhaps influenced by his friend Richard Chenevix Trench, who eventually became Archbishop of Dublin, decided to read for the church. 'He will be a bright and burning light in God's church', wrote Donne to Trench.⁹ Both Donne and Trench, like Kemble, were members of the Trinity 'Apostles' – more properly called the 'Cambridge Conversazione Society' – a group which met regularly to discuss a wide range of speculative philosophical and sometimes political questions. Dean Charles Merivale, who was also a member, wrote retrospectively: 'It was our vague idea that it should be our function to interpret the oracles of transcendental wisdom to the world of Philistines and Stumpfs, as we designated them and from time to time call forth from this world the few souls who might be capable of sympathizing with them...'¹⁰ But this patrician intellectual arrogance did sometimes generate plans for practical action, and in 1830 Kemble and Trench were 'lured by Sterling into the Spanish business'.¹¹

⁶ See Frances A. Kemble, *Record of a Girlhood*, 3 Vols (London, 1878), I, 199.

⁷ See T. Wemyss Reid, *The Life, Letters and Friendships of Richard Monckton Milnes, First Lord Houghton*, 2nd edn, 2 Vols (London, 1890), I, 160.

⁸ See *The Cambridge Apostles*, p. 169.

⁹ See Johnson, *William Bodham Donne and his Friends*, p. 5.

¹⁰ Quoted by Brookfield, *The Cambridge Apostles*, p. 7.

¹¹ *Ibid.* p. 169.

John Sterling, the owner and editor of *The Athenaeum* and an old ‘Apostle’, together with a number of his friends were zealous supporters of General José Maria de Torrijos and the exiled ‘constitutionalists’ who were planning to invade Spain and overthrow Fernando VII, the absolutist monarch.¹² The expedition was partly financed by Robert Boyd, Sterling’s cousin, a retired East India Company officer. It was a dangerous enterprise and Trench writes, with some bravado, to Kemble on 29 June 1830: ‘I am in high spirits at the prospect of our speedy hanging, as anything is better than to remain and rot in this country’.¹³ Trench and Kemble shared a house in Gibraltar and waited for the call to arms through the autumn and winter of 1830, but the enterprise was ill-organized, the support that Torrijos needed did not appear, and all attempts at invasion were frustrated. Trench, seeing the futility of the plan, returned to England in February 1831, but Kemble stayed on for several months. On 28 May 1831, back in England, he wrote to Trench: ‘I have at length followed your example which might have given me courage sooner if I were less subject to foolish and false fancies of my own...’ He includes a clear-eyed appraisal of the situation: ‘at this moment our friends have not an armed man in Spain on their party, and many thousands against them’.¹⁴ Eventually, Torrijos invaded on 1 December 1831 but was betrayed, captured and he and fifty two of his men, including Boyd, were shot on the esplanade at Malaga.

In *Poems Chiefly Lyrical* (1830) Alfred Lord Tennyson, another ‘Apostle’, mindful of Kemble’s intention to enter the church and his involvement in the projected expedition to Spain, had begun his ‘Sonnet to J.M.K.’ with the lines:

My hope and heart is with thee – thou wilt be
A latter Luther, and a soldier-priest...¹⁵

¹² For Sterling and the exiles see Thomas Carlyle, *The Life of John Sterling* (1851). There is a brief account of Sterling in Brookfield, *The Cambridge Apostles*, pp. 283-307.

¹³ See *Richard Chenevix Trench, Letters and Memorials*, ed. by the author of ‘Charles Lowder’ [M. Trench], 2 Vols (London, 1888), I. 74.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* I. 89.

¹⁵ The poem most recently appears in *The Works of Alfred Lord Tennyson*, with an Introduction, Bibliography and Head Notes by Karen Hodder (Ware, 2008), p. 50.

But Kemble became neither soldier nor priest. When he returned from Gibraltar he had missed the lectures in divinity he had intended to follow at Cambridge in Michaelmas Term 1830 to prepare him for the church, but, more than that, he had evidently given up his intentions of joining the ministry. He turned in 1832 briefly to the law but mainly to philology and Anglo-Saxon. From then until the summer of 1835 he spent most of his time working in the Cambridge libraries, familiarizing himself with the sources of Anglo-Saxon language, literature and culture. In 1834 he lectured on Old English language and texts in Trinity College Cambridge, and gradually the publications began to appear too – reviews, and an article ‘On English Preterites’, in *The Philological Museum*, ii (1833), 373-88, which developed and extended some of the work of Rasmus Rask and Jakob Grimm. This was a fine piece of analytic scholarship and established what is now the currently accepted taxonomy into seven strong and three weak classes. But Kemble was ambitious beyond this. In 1832 he had written enthusiastically to Donne about *Beowulf*, describing it as ‘the oldest, finest and hardest of the Anglo-Saxon poems; and one particularly valuable as being the only hero-poem they have left us, of any length. It is so mythic, that from that and other circumstances I am inclined to think it must have accompanied our forefathers into England’.¹⁶ In 1833, his edition of the poem, along with texts of *Widsith* and *The Fight at Finnsburh*, appeared ‘with a glossary of the more difficult words and a historical preface’. It was dedicated to Jakob Grimm. After its publication, according to Arthur Hallam, Kemble was spoken of as one of ‘our best Anglo-Saxon scholars for real learning and capacity of his subject’.¹⁷ A second, corrected and much improved, edition appeared two years later.

With the dedication, in a perfectly proper way, Kemble was acknowledging an intellectual debt and registering his admiration for Grimm and German scholarship. But this admiration existed contrastively with a critical attitude towards certain aspects of Anglo-Saxon scholarship in England, which emerged, intemperately stated, in an otherwise favourable review of Benjamin Thorpe’s *Analecta Anglo-Saxonica* (1834) which appeared in *The Gentleman’s Magazine*, New Series, I (1834), 391-3. If it had not been for ‘the industry of the Danes and Germans’, he wrote, ‘and those who drew from the well head of

¹⁶ See Johnson, *William Bodham Donne and his Friends*, p. 13.

¹⁷ See Brookfield, *The Cambridge Apostles*, pp. 171-72.

their learning', by which he probably meant people like Thorpe and himself, 'we might still be where we were, with idle texts, idle grammars, idle dictionaries and the consequences of all these – idle and ignorant scholars'. He goes on to refer to those who edit 'books which they could not hope to understand' and mentions Doctors and 'Professors of Anglo-Saxon' who are guilty, in their writings, 'of false concords, false etymology, and ignorance of declension, conjugation and syntax'. A long letter in the next issue of the journal entitled 'Oxford Professors of Anglo-Saxon' made the target of the attack clear, as did his criticism of the work of J.J. Conybeare, who had held the Rawlinson Chair in Oxford.¹⁸ Even allowing for the conventions of the times, which were more tolerant of forthright intellectual debate than ours are, this was pretty arrogant and deliberately offensive. Predictably, it provoked equally vituperative reactions and the journal became a site for attacks on Kemble which were both personal and academic, and pointed up his espousal of Germanic methods. Typical is Thomas Wright's letter on 'The Saxon Scholars of England' in which he says: 'We have no longer Anglo-Saxon but GermanSaxon. Some of our half-educated countrymen, after spending a few months on the Continent, return surcharged not only with gloomy ideas on divinity, but even upon philology'.¹⁹ A lot of these criticisms were collected together, added to and republished as *The Anglo-Saxon Meteor; or Letters, in Defence of Oxford, treating of the Wonderful Gothic Attainments of John M. Kemble, of Trinity College, Cambridge* (1835), which may have been financed by Joseph Bosworth. The attacks were generally unsuccessful on a scholarly level: Bosworth's own attempt to discredit Kemble's work on the preterite really got nowhere. But they did establish the view that in academic circles Kemble was a controversial figure.

Kemble replied to some of the criticisms but for some of the time that this was going on he was in Germany: after corresponding with Jakob Grimm extensively he eventually visited him in Göttingen in August 1834, and stayed for three weeks or more. Trench writes to R.W. Blakesley, another former 'Apostle' and later Dean of Lincoln: 'Kemble has shunned all communication with me since he went to Germany. I suppose he is so absorbed in etymological bliss with Grimm that he can spare no thought for Christians and ordinary men like

¹⁸ See *The Gentleman's Magazine*, New Series, II. 601-5.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* II. 259.

myself'.²⁰ But Kemble's interests evidently were not only linguistic. It was probably on this visit that he met Natalie Auguste Wendt, daughter of a professor of Philosophy at Göttingen, who was to become his wife on 24 July 1836. They had three children but parted in 1847. Kemble complained about her bitterly after this in letters to Grimm, accusing her of 'drunkenness and adultery' and of not bringing up their children properly.²¹ The truth of all this is difficult to establish, but she did die, several years after Kemble, in a home for inebriates.

Kemble was not wealthy and needed occupations to sustain his researches, particularly after his marriage and increasing family commitments. He tried for several posts, including those of Principal Librarian at Cambridge and for the Regius Professorship of Modern History, but was unsuccessful: no doubt his controversy with the Oxford Anglo-Saxonists did not enhance his chances. Before he married he had taken on the editorship of the *British and Foreign Review or European Quarterly Journal*, a post he held from 1835 to 1844, when the magazine ceased to appear. Besides earning him £400 a year it provided an appropriate outlet for the essentially European dimension of Kemble's political thinking and he was proud of his part in it: 'Our foreign information is unrivalled', he wrote to Donne, 'there is no periodical in Europe which knows as much as we do; no set of men in the world who so uncompromisingly act upon the knowledge they possess; so boldly tell the good and the evil of our times, and so determinedly point to the path which Europe must follow if she would regenerate herself'. He took his duties seriously and worked hard on the contributions he received. He writes to Donne again: 'Prometheus himself was never tighter bound to his bit of the Caucasus than I am to my review'.²² In 1840 he succeeded his father in the post of Examiner of Plays, which not only involved censoring the texts of plays but also examining the theatres they were performed in. He held this post until his death. He also made some money from his writings. But Fanny

²⁰ Quoted by J. Bromley, *The Man of Ten Talents: A Portrait of Richard Chenevix Trench 1807-86, Philologist, Poet, Theologian, Archbishop* (London, 1959), pp. 61-62.

²¹ See R.A. Wiley, *John Mitchell Kemble and Jakob Grimm: A Correspondence 1832-1852* (Leiden, 1971), pp. 264-5, 271, 284.

²² See Johnson, *William Bodham Donne and his Friends*, pp. 26-27.

describes him, in a letter of 1 February 1849, as living in very reduced circumstances in a cottage in Cassiobury (Herts.) with his children.²³

Yet it was in these years – years of controversies, family responsibilities, shortage of money – that some of Kemble’s best work was produced. His translation of *Beowulf* ‘with copious Glossary, Preface and philological notes’ appeared in 1837, and texts of *Andreas* from the Vercelli Book, published with an English translation in 1843, followed by *Elene* and the shorter poems in 1856. An edition of *The Dialogue of Salomon and Saturn*, with a long historical introduction was published by the Ælfric society in 1848. Kemble also began to interest himself in runes and in a paper in *Archaeologia*, XXVIII (1840), 327-72, according to Bruce Dickins, ‘first placed the study of the English variety of the runic alphabet on a sound basis’.²⁴ He was also the first to notice that the runic inscription on the Ruthwell Cross in Dumfriesshire was part of the text of *The Dream of the Rood*, most completely preserved in the Vercelli Book (*Archaeologia*, XXX [1843], 31-46).

But his main work in these years was not on poetry but on Anglo-Saxon charters and history. On 12 December 1839 Kemble writes to Donne that he is at work on ‘my Saxons in England’, and that the charters are essential to the understanding of Anglo-Saxon society. It is regrettable, he goes on, that they have been so often misinterpreted because of the failure of scholars to understand them, or even to read them properly. He provides an amusing instance: ‘Wilkins gives me an example: he represents it as a Saxon law that “no man shall kill another man except in the presence of two or three witnesses, and then shall keep his skin for four days”’. With a restraint he does not often show, he lets the implausibility of this speak for itself. He points out that Old English *hryðer*, meaning ‘ox’, has been misread as *hwyðer*, meaning ‘other’ or ‘another’, because of a palaeographical confusion between insular minuscule long *r* and runic *wynn*, representing *w* – which can look a little alike. He suggests that the charter dealt with ‘some regulation for slaying which might well be necessary among a race of cattle-stealers’. He says that he intends to publish ‘such of the charters as are in Anglo-Saxon with a translation, and perhaps some few

²³ See Frances A. Kemble, *Records of Later Life*, 3 Vols (London, 1882), III. 151.

²⁴ See ‘John Mitchell Kemble and Old English Scholarship’, p. 65.

philological remarks, but the great thing is to make their contents accessible to all the world'.²⁵

He was as good as his word, and between 1839 and 1848 his *Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici* appeared in six volumes. The plan was typically ambitious. Kemble tried to collect together all the charters, both in Latin and the vernacular, from the seventh century to the Norman Conquest. Some of these had been located and published earlier by seventeenth- and eighteenth-century scholars, but Kemble's was, and is, the only collection which can claim to be comprehensive.²⁶ But he did more than assemble. He had always been good at finding things – on 4 January 1835 he had written to Sir Henry Ellis informing him that he had found a text of *Bede's Death Song* in St Gallen Stiftsbibliothek MS 254²⁷ – and much of his material in the collection was new. Especially valuable were the 180 charters from Winchester in what is now London, British Library Additional MS 15350. In the Preface to the final volume Kemble claims that 'for law, language and history, they are full of data, without which no inquiry in this field, however industrious and conscientious, could possibly be successful'.²⁸ The charters, as Kemble well recognized, were important outside Britain too. On 20 September 1848 he wrote to Donne: 'They are for all Germany, as well as for ourselves, an invaluable monument ... I gather this from the compliment that the great northern associations have thought to bestow upon myself...' This pride was not misplaced: academic institutions in Denmark, Sweden and Germany honoured him. As often, his work was better received abroad than in Britain and he contrasts these accolades with the 'stolid indifference of friends and fellow countrymen'.²⁹ He himself drew much upon the charters for his most popular book, *The Saxons in England*, which appeared in two volumes in 1849. It was translated into German in 1853-54. Kemble intended to add two further volumes to this, and knew of more charters

²⁵ See Johnson, *William Bodham Donne and his Friends*, pp. 46-47.

²⁶ Some have been re-edited and republished. See particularly *Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, ed. F.E. Harmer (Cambridge, 1914) and A.J. Robertson, *Anglo-Saxon Charters* (Cambridge, 1939).

²⁷ The letter is preserved in London, British Library MS Additional 38626, fols 184-85 (quoted from Dickens, 'John Mitchell Kemble and Old English Scholarship', p. 65).

²⁸ See *Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici*, VI. v.

²⁹ See Johnson, *William Bodham Donne and his Friends*, p. 166.

which he wanted to include in a revised edition of his collection, but his early death prevented these plans from being realized.

In 1849 Kemble moved to Hanover, handing over his duties as Examiner of Plays to Donne, who did the work *gratis* as Acting Examiner until Kemble's death when he succeeded to the post. But with the move to Germany came a change in focus for Kemble's attention. He still interested himself in texts and in 1850 found the Leibnitz correspondence from which came a lot of material for his much admired *State Papers and Correspondence illustrative of the social and political state of Europe, from the Revolution to the Accession of the House of Hanover* (1857). But increasingly he worked on archaeological subjects. In 1854 he arranged and catalogued the collections in the Royal Museum of Hanover, and excavated the funeral barrows at Lüneburg Heath: he published several papers on mortuary urns, sepulchral objects and customs of burial and cremation in *Archaeologia*, XXX (1855), 270-83, 349-69 and the *Archaeological Journal*, XII (1855), 309-39. These were all republished in Kemble's *Horae Ferales*, edited by R.G. Latham and A.W. Franks in 1863 after his death. When Kemble returned to England he was employed by the Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition to arrange their Celtic and Roman antiquities. It looked as though a new area of antiquarian studies was opening up for Kemble, who had adjusted to antiquarian research with an informedness and confidence which was characteristic of his swift intelligence. He was invited to Dublin in early 1857 to address the Royal Irish Academy on 'The Utility of Antiquarian Collections as throwing light on the Pre-historic Annals of the European Nations'. His discourse was a great success and made him many friends. But while in Ireland he fell ill and died of pneumonia in the Gresham Hotel on O'Connell Street on 26 March 1857. Kemble died a poor man. He had made enemies in his life but he had kept most of his friends. It is characteristic that, though he had very little money, he is buried in one of the most splendid tombs in Mount Jerome Cemetery, Dublin. Some of the 'Apostles' also contributed to a fund to provide for his children.

Kemble's discourse in Dublin was, in all sorts of ways, characteristic of the man and of his approach to cultural matters. There is nothing bland about it: the debater's challenging tones are there from beginning to end. There is criticism of nationalistic narrowness on the part of the Danes and the French for concentrating on the evidence of their own cultural antiquities; there is an insistence that cultural forms

and styles travel, both temporally and spatially; and there is, crucially, an insistence on the importance of trans-national thinking. He can understand, he says, pride in the past of one's own nation and its surviving cultural artifacts: 'No man values higher than myself that noble spirit which makes us look with love upon the records of our own ancestors, of our own land'. And he can understand the pride which his audience felt 'in the connection of the high state of culture to which the earliest denizens of this island had attained'.³⁰ But, he says, 'let us not forget that we are liable here to a prejudice, against which it befits us manfully to strive – the confining too much of our own field, in the spirit of narrow inquiry, excluding the claims of others'. Kemble had a genuinely pan-European intelligence, which was particularly attuned to the Teutonic but not exclusively so. National antiquities were for him 'as links in one great chain which embraces many nations and many periods of human culture'. Behind such statements lies all the experience of someone who was looking at Celtic cultural antiquities in the light of what he had deduced from intense first-hand study of British and European collections. Behind it also lies the realization that one scholar can learn from others, outside his immediate ambit and traditions, as he had learned from Grimm and others. He ends with a call for collective effort and a mutual respect for each other and each other's cultures '... not believing that the products of our own land can exhaust the great subject of archaeological study, but that each land has its own portion to bring into the common stock; and that, in proportion as each carefully elaborates its own collection, will be the beauty and solidity of the edifice which we can collectively raise'.³¹ Kemble could not have known that these would be his last public utterances, but, if he had, it is unlikely that he would have been too displeased with what they affirmed.

³⁰ For what follows see *The Utility of Antiquarian Collections, as throwing Light on the Pre-Historic Annals of the European Nations: An Address delivered to the President and Members of the Royal Irish Academy at their Meeting, February 9, 1857*, with a foreword by James H. Todd (Dublin, 1857), pp. 29-32. This was reprinted in *Horae Ferales*, pp. 107-22.

³¹ The sentiments expressed in this discourse are significantly at odds with what has become the modern attitude to Kemble's archaeology, as expressed, for example, by Howard Williams: 'His archaeological practice and theory reflects the use of material culture and cemeteries as a powerful metaphorical representation of a clustering of racial and philological values that Kemble believed reflected the primitive, pagan, noble Teuton'. See 'Heathen Graves and Victorian Anglo-Saxonism: Assessing the Archaeology of John Mitchell Kemble', *ASSAH*, 13 (2006), 1-18 (11).

Please cite as:

John Scattergood, 'Introduction: John Mitchell Kemble (1807-1857)', in *The Kemble Lectures on Anglo-Saxon Studies 2005-8*, ed. Alice Jorgensen, Helen Conrad-O'Briain and John Scattergood (Dublin: The School of English, Trinity College, Dublin, 2009), pp. 1-11