than wondered at. Again Schoch's stated astonishment at audiences' interpretations of antiquarian revivals of Shakespeare in the context of Dion Boucicault's sensation dramas (164) is evidence of twentieth-century expectations about genre categories rather than a sensible commentary on audience tastes which could have been avoided if Schoch had offered something more of the popular theatrical context for his study. Schoch's book is of more significance for the Victorianist than the theatre historian, but perhaps that's as it should be as his work is a powerful argument against Victorianists' continuing tendencies to neglect the theatre as an important cultural and political site.

Katherine Newey

Edward Neville (1995), by Marianne Evans (George Eliot); *Branwell's Blackwood's Magazine* (1995), by Branwell Brontë; *The Twelve Adventurers* (1993) and *My Angria and the Angrians* (1997), by Charlotte Brontë. Alberta: English Department, U of Alberta, 1993-97.

The productions of the Juvenilia Press are designed above all as pedagogical exercises in which the early writings of famous authors are edited by means of a collaborative effort between established scholars and their students so that, as founding editor Juliet McMaster eloquently explains, "both can benefit, and all can participate in the satisfying consummation of a book published, an early work of genius duly highlighted and given to the world in a tenderly loving scholarly format" ("A Word from the Editor").[1] To date the Press has published eighteen volumes, and while this review will deal with only four of them—those pertinent to the Victorian period—it is important to note that the pedagogical nature of the whole enterprise links every one of the volumes together in a spirit of enthusiastic editorial problem solving. This is an ongoing learning experience for both teachers and students alike, and the emphasis for the Press, quite rightly since the material edited is a foretaste of adult success, is on bigger and better things. McMaster makes the point: "This is a little press, its authors are young by definition, and many of its editors are young, too, and on the threshold of a literary career. This is a place where we pay close attention to those budding geniuses who are still trailing their clouds of glory" ("A Word from the Editor").

The Press certainly tips these budding editors straight from the clouds into the deep end: for any editors, regardless of their age, nothing could be quite as problematic as producing for publication the fragmentary early writings known as juvenilia. The need to preserve the flavour of the original if the exercise is to be a success is obvious; yet in some cases the very flimsiness of the piece might rule out publication unless some scholarly weights are appended (Branwell's tiny 5.4 x 3.1 versions of *Blackwood's Magazine* for instance). How to develop a rationale that could accommodate this seeming "ephemera" in a scholarly manner must have been the subject of hours of debate; there is a real danger of burying the childish texts beneath the full paraphernalia of scholarly editing—introduction, textual notes,

---

[1] References in this review, except where otherwise noted, are taken from the Juvenilia Press Website at http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/juvenilia and were accessed on 1 November 1999.

footnotes/annotations, works cited—and yet in some cases it is the scholarly augmentation that assigns their worth as publications. One student given the task of copy editing outlines some of the issues debated in this area alone:

> Sometimes, difficult decisions have to be made in order to achieve a balance between readability and faithfulness to the original. The task is especially problematic given that most of the literature that the Juvenilia Press works with was never intended for publication by the author. The questions of whether spelling mistakes and variations in content should be corrected or preserved to illustrate the author's youth, of whether deleted phrases should be re-inserted to demonstrate the author's writing process are left to the editors to decide, with only their scholarly instincts and knowledge of the author's later works to guide them. Every decision has the potential to change the impact of the final edition, and must be documented in endless footnotes in keeping with scholarly tradition. (Joanne Denford "Textual Editing")

Just how successfully do the "endless footnotes in keeping with scholarly tradition" mentioned here fit with the "tenderly loving scholarly format" required by Juliet McMaster? Just how successfully does the Juvenilia Press translate juvenilia into scholarly editions?

To some extent the answer rests with the audience. One reviewer of *Branwell's Blackwood's Magazine* dismisses it as "so arcane as to be nonsensical"[2] despite the explanatory notes provided. But for another with a direct scholarly interest in the youthful Brontës and the collaborative nature of their early writings, or with an interest in early periodicals, Branwell's effort is more than just an inaccessible curio. His aping of the ambience of *Blackwood's Magazine* for instance provides some fascinating and amusing insights into the popular reading culture of the nineteenth century. What periodical buff could resist the bravado of Bravy's reply to the Duke of Wellington's question: "Bravy, what Newspapers do you take?" The eleven-year-old Branwell, in his precocious parody of one of them, is well aware of the growing competition between the newspapers of the day—and of the kudos associated with "taking" 'em: "Why the Young Man's Intelligencer, the Opposistion, the Greybottle, the Glass Town Intelligencer, the Courier Du Français, the Quatre Deinne, &c.&c.&c." (14).

My criticism of *Branwell's Blackwood's Magazine* takes another tack: the attempt to preserve Branwell's original layout in modern formatting is anachronistic in my view. A better result could perhaps have been achieved by using enlarged facsimiles of Branwell's texts (with appropriately modified annotations) instead of an edited version, but I doubt whether the idiosyncratic nature of his little books could ever be successfully represented. But then this is one of my hobby horses. Why even try to present a replica of the original? It can never be done except in facsimile. And this is not often a viable option. Although in this case, because the amount of text is small, it could have been an option worth considering. Maybe it was considered? The editor of *The Glass Town Magazine* and her assistant must have had to resolve some pretty curly

[2] Review by C. Anita Tarr, *George Eliot/George Henry Lewes Studies* 30-31 (September 1996): 110-13.

editorial problems. The other three texts translate quite successfully into their published format; of these *Edward Neville* is the only one whose copy text was taken from a manuscript (or rather a photocopy of a manuscript, a form that has its own set of problems); Christine Alexander's *An Edition of the Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë* provided the copy text for the other two. The principle generally adopted is an admirable one since it follows the rule that the published text should be as free from editorial interpolations as possible.

On the whole the juvenilia in all four editions is enhanced by their scholarly apparatus. The introductions are particularly valuable as they set the youthful writing in the context of the author's life and literary influences and suggest, or directly demonstrate, how juvenilia relates to mature work. For instance in *Edward Neville* Juliet McMaster points out Eliot's early use of visual imagery—engravings of maps, topographical illustrations from a guide book—to realise scenes and places, just as she did in her later writings; John Barach sets out the parallels between the "fairy tale" quality of *Villette* and the fantasy and romance of *The Twelve Adventurers*, he compares the "genii" (the Brontë children manipulating the toy soldiers) to the adult author Charlotte manipulating her characters; Christine Alexander enlightens readers on Branwell's association with *Blackwood's Magazine*, both as a reader and as a bumptious would-be contributor; in *My Angria and the Angrians* Leslie Robertson underlines the exotic quality of Charlotte's imagined world informed as it was by her reading of Byron, Morell's *Tales of the Genii*, and the *Arabian Nights*. The introductory pages of *My Angria* also supplement the narrative with maps and family trees, crucial signposts in negotiating the character relationships and the terrain of Charlotte's fancifully complicated sagas.

The annotations help to unlock some of the mysteries of the text including the significance of places and allusions in the lives of the young writers. In *Branwell's Blackwood's Magazine* they incorporate reference works for those readers who want to inquire further. In the other books references are better organised within the handy frame work of an alphabetised Works Cited although the consistency of their documentation could be improved. If MLA is the chosen format then trainee editors should be encouraged to use the MLA handbook to make sure all their references conform to its rules. This goes for footnotes and annotations as well. It may seem pedantic, but then editing is a pedantic business. One typo or inconsistency and there goes your credibility. As trainee Denford says after her experience with textual editing: "Let's face it, it's a job that's only ever noticed when it's done badly" ("Textual Editing"). In some cases the annotations may be a little too full: in *Edward Neville* for instance they sometimes repeat information already presented in the introduction. The rationale for annotation has been given further thought in later volumes. Robertson, a member of the editing team of *My Angria and the Angrians*, notes: "There is a fine line between ample annotation and excessive annotation. Putting in so many notes that the reader can't get through a sentence without tripping over several of them can overwhelm a text and result in making it less accessible rather than more" ("Annotations").

Editing as a scholarly and pedagogical enterprise is underrated: it is about teamwork, about sensible compromise, about consistency, about attention to detail, about clarity, about sensitivity to the text and to the author, about presentation, about

commitment to excellence, about learning from mistakes, about enthusiasm and salesmanship, and more. With these four very successful collaborations between scholars and students the Juvenilia Press demonstrates that practice and pedagogy can go hand in hand.

Victorian Journalism: Exotic and Domestic. Essays in Honour of P. D. Edwards, edited by Barbara Garlick and Margaret Harris. St Lucia: U of Queensland P, 1998.

The potential subject matter of *Victorian Journalism: Exotic and Domestic* is as Barbara Garlick notes in her Preface "voluminous and various" so it is not surprising that this volume makes no real attempt to fulfil the all-encompassing promise of its title—"exotic" usually means "Australian" and the thirteen essays are individually often quite narrow in focus, more frequently concerned with journalists than journals. Cumulatively, however, these highly specialised studies build to an unexpectedly broad overview of the developing professionalisation and significance of British journalism in the nineteenth century. The volume has been published to honour Peter Edwards, Emeritus Professor of English at the University of Queensland. While it is fashionable to sneer at festchrifts (an "institution," according to J.C. in the *Times Literary Supplement*, "in which cronies line up to pay tribute to some national treasure who, just the other day, was a Young Turk" [2 April 1999: 16]), in this case the essay writers have produced not only a fitting tribute to their friend and colleague but also a significant contribution to the rapidly growing field of nineteenth-century journalism studies.

With collections of essays, as with periodicals, most people don't begin at the beginning but select and zigzag according to particular interests, an approach which the diversity of content in this volume encourages ranging as it does over more than a hundred years and several countries. My own immediate concerns took me first to the end to read about "Journalism and Victorian Fiction" and then back to alternate between studies of more or less familiar women writers and digressions into the (to me) tantalising unknown—what was the *Tomahawk*? should I know who Benjamin Kidd was? what mystery would John Sutherland probe this time?—before the memory that I was reviewer and not a casual reader prompted me to more ordered attention. Yet my first impressions of an accessibility and readability that diverted as well as informed me were a good general indication of the volume's character and its main strength. The essays in this collection reflecting the biographical expertise of many of the writers tend to tell stories: as well as being academic, carefully researched, cogently argued, alert to historical contexts and theoretical implications, they have a predominant emphasis on narrative and a human focus which give them a unity (though not a uniformity) of purpose and strengthen their more obvious thematic links.

For those who do begin at the beginning those links are pithily summarised in the Preface where Garlick lists the recurrent themes which structure the "heterogeneity" of the essays' content: