Garrett's foregrounding of Wordsworth's classification *modus operandi* sheds additional light on his fascination with phenomena as appropriate content for his poetry.

Jeffrey Side
Independent Scholar

Frederick Burwick and James C. McKusick, eds, *Faustus: From the German of Goethe, Translated by Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. Oxford University Press, 2007. Pp. 360. £85. ISBN 9780199229680.

Part I of Goethe's *Faust* (1808), the masterpiece of German Romanticism, was considered both ingenious and blasphemous. A book collating early English translations is overdue. While this volume does so, its chief concern is the attribution of an anonymous translation of *Faust*, published by Thomas Boosey in 1821, to Samuel Taylor Coleridge. The translation is partial, interpolated by prose synopses, and accompanies illustrations by Henry Moses in imitation of Moritz Retzsch's celebrated engravings. There is no surviving manuscript by Coleridge. Following his translations of Schiller's *Die Piccolomini* and *Wallenstein's Tod* (1800), Coleridge vowed never to undertake translation again. In 1833 Coleridge insisted that 'I never put pen to paper as translator of Faust'. Frederick Burwick and James C. McKusick argue otherwise using circumstantial evidence, parallels with Coleridge's works, and stylometric analysis.

The editors' account of Coleridge's authorship of *Faustus* is highly speculative and factually erroneous. In 1814 Coleridge corresponded with publisher John Murray concerning a potential translation, but informed Murray that he offered inadequate remuneration. The editors assume that an agreement between the two was finalised in August 1814, claiming that 'Coleridge went to work with good will, leaving London for the countryside where he could work undisturbed in order to complete the translation.' In fact Coleridge had not been in London since

December 1813, when his suicidal inclinations moved Josiah Wade to place him under medical care in Bristol (see Richard Holmes, *Coleridge: Darker Reflections*, pp. 354ff). By September 1814 Coleridge was convalescent at Ashley. *Faust* was neither the occasion for Coleridge's travel nor his need for seclusion, and his letter to *The Courier*'s Daniel Stuart of 12 September, offering 'two Essays a week—and one political Essay', does not suggest preoccupation with another project.

The editors claim that Coleridge abandoned translating *Faust* in 1814 and resumed in 1820 for Boosey, but there is little evidence. Coleridge wrote to Murray that most of *Faust* 'cannot be rendered in blank verse', but Boosey's translation is nearly all blank verse. German bookseller Johann Heinrich Bohte informed Goethe of having 'learned to my pleasure that the local poet Coleridge is working on a complete translation', but Bohte's source is unknown and Boosey's text is incomplete. The editors make further suggestive claims that are unsupported. *The European Magazine* is said to have 'hinted that Coleridge was the translator' in 1821, but actually it repeats a mere 'rumour' that Coleridge 'tried at it and resigned it'. The editors allude to 'gossip of his friends' indicating Coleridge's authorship, but nothing of the sort is presented. Goethe, citing an English correspondent, reports that 'Coleridge translates the work', but his source is unknown. In a period when rumours spread with notorious inaccuracy between England and the Continent, including those of Shelley's alleged League of Incest, Goethe's comment would only be significant if a credible source was named. Additionally, as Walter Scott and Lord Byron failed to protect the anonymity of their works, it seems unlikely that not only Coleridge's friends but his enemies would never mention a translation of *Faust* by him even privately.

As a bridge between Boosey's *Faustus* and Coleridge's works, the editors provide an appendix of 'verbal echoes and parallels', claiming that 'the cumulative frequency and abundance of these features can be matched in the works of no other poet than STC.' However, the words and phrases selected – including 'forms', 'mist', 'magic', 'darkling', 'stout',

'moonshine', and 'in the air' – are so ubiquitous in Romantic poetry that even in combination it is unconvincing to identify them as Coleridge's. Boosey's *Faustus* shares the phrase 'great spirit' with Coleridge's *Remorse* for example, but searching Literature Online yields over 70 occurrences of 'great spirit' in poems by other authors published during Coleridge's lifetime. Stylistic traits of *Faustus* are also presented as Coleridge's, but likewise are commonplace. The phrase 'dark and narrow streets' in *Faustus* is annotated, 'STC had a persistent predilection for pairing "dark" with a second modifier', but Charlotte Smith uses this technique thrice in 'Beachy Head' alone, and Joseph Cottle on five occasions in *The Fall of Cambria*. Similarly the claim that 'my soul's wild warfare' employs a distinctly Coleridgean use of 'wild' is untrue; it is a favourite formulation of Anna Laetitia Barbauld among others. The editors suggest thematic parallels between Boosey's *Faustus* and Coleridge's works, but illogically: a theme occurring in Goethe's text appears in translation regardless of the translator. Ultimately, I contest the editors' claim that 'In *Faustus* there are passages that should prompt the reader to shout "Coleridge!"': the text is typical Romantic verse, but not specifically Coleridgean.

The developers of the *Signature* stylometric analysis programme, used to analyse Boosey's *Faustus*, posit that an author's distribution of certain 'function words' and word-lengths occurs at a unique frequency. The editors use this information to assess the 'stylistic correlation' of Boosey's *Faustus* and Coleridge's dramas. They also compare the other, contemporary translations of *Faust* to *Remorse*. It is not clear why this analysis emphasises *Remorse*: *Zapolya* (1817) was the most recent of Coleridge's dramas to Boosey's *Faustus*, and Coleridge's translations from Schiller seem pertinent choices. The worth of stylometric analysis here is questionable. According to *Signature*, Boosey's *Faustus* resembles *Remorse* more than the volume's other translations of *Faust* do in vocabulary and word-length distribution. However, Boileau's and de Staël's translations are in prose, Anster's and Soane's in varying forms, and Leverson-Gower's in heroic couplets. The formal constraints of blank verse affect word-distribution patterns and variations of word length; it is unsurprising that Boosey's *Faustus* resembles *Remorse* more than the non-blank verse translations do. Further, the editors do not consider the possibility of imitation: *Remorse*, an immense theatrical success, was an obvious model for a dramatist.

This is a disappointing book. It is unclear why Shelley's passages are omitted from the parallel translations of *Faust*. Index citations do not match page numbers (Wordsworth is not mentioned on pp. xxxi, xxxviii, or xliv as listed). Errors weaken the editors' credibility: 'silent thought' is not Wordsworth's coinage, as suggested, but Shakespeare's (Sonnet 30); 'Alhedra' is not the spelling of a character's name in *Remorse*; it is not true of 'The Three Graves' that Coleridge had 'begun with Wordsworth in 1797 and completed in 1809' (it was commenced by Wordsworth, continued by Coleridge and published incomplete). Most crucially, evidence is contorted to fit a hypothesis of Coleridge's authorship of *Faustus* rather than built into an argument for it. Lacking strong evidence, the claim is unconvincing.

Chris Murray
University of Warwick

Luisa Calè, *Fuseli's Milton Gallery: 'Turning Readers into Spectators'*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006. Pp. 259. £55. ISBN 0199267383.

In June 1788 the painter Henry Fuseli wrote: 'The excellence of pictures of language consists in raising clear, complete, and circumstantial images, and turning readers into spectators.' Fuseli was just one of many artists who had taken up or contested that most arduous and tendentious of hendiades – word and image. Three years later, the Swiss painter would disseminate his theories in the prospectus of the Milton Gallery. This venture, borne of the marriage of commerce and art typical of the period, connected two burgeoning spheres of romantic sociability and consumer culture: