for more. The book satisfactorily exhibits various approaches to his novels and the approaches are all certainly interesting, but their success in classes may depend upon the particular conditions of each class and is not necessarily assured. It may be also said that the approaches proposed and practiced by the contributors are, in general, heuristic and not “complete,” so that, when we try to use them, we may be obliged to leave some parts to students’ own judgments or imaginations. In other words, each approach in Approaches is interesting, but inconclusive. Furthermore, Japanese scholars may wish to add to the book the problem how Richardson’s novels are translated into Japanese or other languages. For the process of translation itself can be a good material for teaching the novels of Richardson in Japan and other countries outside English-speaking ones. In fact, Richardson’s novels spread over the contemporary European countries, and their translations and adaptations had great influence on the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literary authors outside Britain. It doesn’t seem reasonable to suppose that even students of English-speaking countries have no interest in the process of translation or adaptation and the influence of Richardson’s novels on English romanticism through their reception in European continent. However, Approaches no doubt shows a good variety of lively approaches to challenging novels of Richardson and provides opportunities for inventive pedagogy. The book is sure to give a boost to reading novels written by the man “who knew how a watch was made.”

James Bieri, Percy Bysshe Shelley, A Biography: Youth’s Unextinguished Fire, 1792-1816.


Reviewed by TAKUBO Hiroshi, Tsurumi University

James Bieri’s two-volume biography of Percy Bysshe Shelley is a publication of great importance that specialists in English romanticism have long been waiting for—a book that incorporates developments in recent editorial, critical, and historical scholarship to present a

11 In Japan, two complete Japanese translations are now available: Shunji Ebiike’s translation for Pamela (1966) and Yoichi Watanabe’s for Clarissa (2004).
balanced and reliable account of the ever controversial English romantic poet. For students and teachers researching Shelley, it will be the primary biography to be consulted, as it safely replaces the highly respected but dated Newman Ivey White's *Shelley* (1940) and Richard Holmes's *Shelley: The Pursuit* (1974), the most accessible book on the subject until now.

Shelley scholarship has long been indebted to Newman Ivey White, whose *Shelley* is a historic achievement incorporating various sources not generally available at that time with scholarly, organized assessment and interpretations of relevant documents. In the 1950s and 60s a series of important editions of Shelley's works and documents were published, including *The Esdale Notebook* by Kenneth Neil Cameron (1964) and *The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley* by Frederick L. Jones (1964). There were also an increasing number of good critical studies during that period. Richard Holmes took advantage of those new studies and editions to write a new biography in response to the increasing general interest in the ever fascinating romantic poet. Holmes's book, however, was not favorably received by Shelley scholars, who criticized it for carelessness in its treatment of documents and for the perceived lack of balance in presenting the figure of the poet. It is, however, a readable account of the life of the poet who has few rivals in literary history in terms of the dramatic aspect of his eventful life.

Many of the researchers who produced significant studies on Shelley in the past thirty years or so were indebted to Donald H. Reiman of Carl Pforzheimer Library, who, after Kenneth Cameron, edited *Shelley and His Circle* (10 vols., 1961-2002). It is difficult to overestimate the importance of this publishing project. The Carl Pforzheimer collection of documents relating to Shelley and second generation English romantics is, except for the Bodleian Shelley manuscripts, the largest and most important. The editors organized and transcribed various documents meticulously, describing their physical conditions with extensive essays on the backgrounds and implications. Numerous historical facts were uncovered in the process and the scholastic discipline involved set the standard for Shelley studies. Paura Feldman and Diana Scott-Kilvert's *The Journals of Mary Shelley* (1987), Betty B. Bennett's *The Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley* (1980-1988), E.B. Murray's *The Prose Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley* (1993), and of course, Reiman and Powers's Norton edition (1977) and Reiman and Fraistat's Johns Hopkins edition of Shelley's poetry that is in progress (1999-), as examples of editorial expertise, would not have been possible without the precedence of Reiman in *Shelley and His Circle*. James Bieri's new biography owes much to this heritage of Shelley studies. Bieri makes full use of all those editions, which gives him a definite advantage over earlier biographies.

Bieri's field research is another strength of his book. He spent years researching in the town of Horsham in Sussex, near Field Place, Shelley's birthplace. Detailed study of the family background of the Shellesys helped Bieri uncover some hitherto unknown details in Shelley's relationship with his family. In particular, he discovered Sir Timothy, Shelley's father, had an
illegitimate son before he married Elizabeth, Shelley's mother, even though he has yet to concretely establish the identity of Shelley's illegitimate half-brother. Bieri investigated a mysterious person called Edward Graham, who became a music teacher and was very close to the Shelley family although the circumstance that brought him to the Shelley household is uncertain. Bieri suggests Elizabeth later had an affair with him. Bieri, however, concludes Graham was a different person from Shelley's illegitimate half-brother, who still remains a mystery.

At age six, Shelley was sent away from home to a boarding academy called Syon House. Shelley always had a sense of being in confrontation with the hostile and unjust world. Shelley's lifelong uneasiness with power dates back to his entrance to school, and his clash with power and authorities continued through his Eton and Oxford days. Shelley's antagonism to what he perceived as an unjust society and his sense of being persecuted by that society remained with him throughout his life. Bieri's detailed account of Shelley's school life is effective in illuminating the personality of the poet, with insights into the youth's internal turmoil, always in conflict with the world that he always felt to be domineering and unsympathetic toward him.

Bieri also makes more detailed examination of Shelley's family relationships than earlier biographers. His loving younger sister Elizabeth with whom Shelley wrote many poems and stories became estranged from him while his confrontation with his father continued to intensify. Also the separation from his first love, Harriet Grove, who rejected him for his atheist ideas, is dealt with in greater detail than in other biographies. Bieri's account gives us an understanding of the deep stigma left in Shelley by what he felt to be the betrayal of those to whom he had strong attachment. His father Timothy has often been presented as a tyrannical father persecuting his son, in a Jupiter-Prometheus relationship. The relationship with his father, however, did not deteriorate until his expulsion from Oxford. It's amusing to learn that after the expulsion Timothy picked up Paley's *Natural Theology* in an effort to reconcile with his son by showing his son his understanding of religious skepticism, only to be laughed at upon the mispronunciation of the name "Paley." From that point onward, all the differences in personality between the two, combined with mutual distrust, developed. Bieri pays attention to Sir Timothy's reliance on the family solicitor, William Whitton, in dealing with his son, as a factor that made matters worse, as Whitton always advised Timothy against compromising with his son.

Bieri discovered the role of Reverend George Stanley Faber behind the University College's decision to expel Shelley for publishing *The Necessity of Atheism*. Faber was infuriated when he found out that he was deceived by a letter he received from a clergyman called Charles Meyton who confessed that his faith had been shaken after reading the pamphlet *The Necessity of
Atheism. Faber wrote in response but it was Shelley's ruse to get a reaction to his pamphlet from Faber. He pretended to be a poor clergyman writing to an Oxford dignitary enclosing a copy of The Necessity, earnestly asking Faber for advice. Shelley had likewise distributed The Necessity of Atheism to Oxford dignitaries and earnestly courted their responses and opinions. He was looking for stimulating intellectual discussion with the academic community of Oxford by this trick. The effort wasn't very successful as apparently he received few stimulating responses except from Faber.

Another point of Bieri's departure from previous biographers is his adoption of Nora Crook and Derek Guiton's argument in Shelley's Venomed Melody (1986) that Shelley contracted venereal disease in his youthful adventures with prostitutes (customary among students in those days) during his Eton days. It is a fact that he was sent home from Eton for illness for some period. There is evidence of his habitual use of arsenic, nitric acid, powerful resins, opium, and mercury, which were often prescribed for syphilis in those days. Shelley also confessed on different occasions that his abuse of drugs had permanently impaired his health. His habitual use of drugs together with his interest in chemistry and medicine appears to have been part of his effort to cope with the disease. After he left Oxford he considered taking up the medical profession and began attending lectures by renowned physicians. With those and other facts as indirect evidence, Bieri believes Shelley had contracted syphilis, which left a physical and psychological scar that remained with him for the rest of his life.

As soon as he left Oxford, Shelley's life long trouble with money began as his father decided to cut off all economic support in order to exert his influence, following the advice of his solicitor Whitton. He patiently negotiated with Timothy, making repeated requests and using every channel including his uncles and Duke of Norfolk under whose auspices Timothy was elected MP. The financial situation turned exasperating due to the expenses he accumulated after his elopement with Harriet Westbrook. He was continually followed by bailiffs and had to go into hiding; on one occasion he was actually arrested. After he met William Godwin, his future father-in-law, the problem began to get out of control as Godwin persistently demanded Shelley make money to pay for his large debts by means of arranging post obit bond, that is, to borrow money on the expected inheritance of his grandfather and his father. It could have been ruinous to the family estate since it was the practice that money lenders bought that kind of bonds at an enormously lucrative rate; for example, Shelley received only £500 for the credit of £2000. Godwin drew thousands of pounds from Shelley by this means. One of the main reasons for Shelley's final departure from England to live in Italy was to escape from Godwin's persistent demand for money.

One of the large issues a biographer of Shelley must face is how to account for his relationship with his first wife, Harriet Westbrook, who was eventually found drowned in
London. It is impossible to recover enough evidence to ascertain what was the immediate circumstance that drove Harriet to death, or even whether she was actually pregnant at the time or not. It is difficult to judge how far Shelley was responsible for her death. Careful accounts are given on how each was attracted to the other, and how the differences developed leading to a tragic end. Bieri presents the relevant facts, such as Harriet’s habitual fantasizing of suicide and father’s wish for upward social mobility, and leaves the judgment to the reader regarding Shelley’s responsibility. There are episodes that some readers may find reprehensible like Shelley’s inviting Elizabeth Hitchener, a school teacher, whom he found intellectually attractive, to live together in the same household with Harriet and later driving her away. It was also characteristic of Shelley that he asked Harriet to remain a good friend of his after he had eloped with Mary Godwin.

Immediately before he learned of Harriet’s death, he had to suffer from the shock of suicide of Mary’s half-sister Fanny Godwin. Fanny was the illegitimate daughter of Mary Wollstonecraft’s, born before she met Godwin. Bieri gives a fuller account of this woman than previous biographers have hitherto done. In Godwin’s household, she was the only child who had lost both parents and she felt herself insignificant and being a burden on the economically strained family. Bieri sees those circumstances behind her suicide. She had hardly any experience of socializing or talking with different people, so when she suddenly met a young brilliant spirit like Shelley it must have changed her whole outlook of the world. After Shelley’s first visit to the Godwins, she sent a letter to him in Wales shyly asking whether it was “proper” for her to write to him. It was, however, her step-sister Claire Clairmont, being more forward in her actions, who put into action what Fanny had wished to do—to get away from the Godwin household to stay close to Shelley. Claire accompanied Mary and Shelley on their elopement and she mostly lived with or close to Shelley during his life. Fanny’s acute sense of being unneeded together with the economical and other worries at home seems to have overwhelmed her. Shelley realized Fanny’s feelings only after her death. The tormenting thought that he could have saved her never seemed to have left him.

In terms of Shelley’s relationships with women, earlier biographers have never made Shelley’s involvement with Claire Clairmont so explicit as Bieri does. Claire told Byron that she had once been Shelley’s lover before she met Byron. Her intimacy with Shelley is supposed to have taken place in the spring of 1815 during the period of Mary Shelley’s pregnancy and miscarriage. In Bieri’s view, “Claire’s affair with Byron was, in part, her attempt to deal with her unstable relationship with Shelley by reaching out to the sexually notorious Byron” (Youth’s 368). Claire had also written to Byron that Shelley was the man she had loved and for whom she had “suffered much” (Youth’s 381). She later insisted that her infatuation with Byron was momentary; in 1835 she wrote to Mary Shelley of her continued “extreme
contempt and obstinate aversion” to the now-deceased Byron, who had “so wantonly willfully destroyed my Allegra,” the daughter between Byron and Claire, who died of fever in a convent at the age of five. She also told Jane Williams that her affair with Byron was a “brief ‘happy passion’ of ‘ten minutes’ that ‘discomposed the rest of my life’” (Exile 349). Claire’s love for Shelley, on the other hand, lasted for all her life. She never married, and more than ten years after Shelley’s death, Claire told Mary of Shelley as “a friend whom I loved entirely and who certainly loved me much; yet immense were the lies he told of me” (Exile 270).

Claire moved away from Shelley household to Florence in late 1820 to Shelley’s sorrow. Shelley sent her letters which he later asked her to destroy. In one of the letters that remained he complained that “Her absence was ‘too painful,’ he missed her ‘sweet consolation’” (Exile 211). In another letter Shelley wrote to Claire: “[You] should not think ‘I ever love you less although that love has been & still must be a source of disquietude to me” (Exile 271). Claire took care not to be noticed by Mary when she wrote to Shelley by always addressing to Mrs. Mason (Lady Mount Cashell), another English liberal in exile, who had become a mother figure for Claire.

One of the bold suggestions that Bieri makes is that “Claire probably was pregnant by Shelley when they arrived at the Hoppeners in Venice, in August 1818” (Exile 252), and that Claire possibly miscarried or aborted the baby in December. Bieri’s evidence is, however, only circumstantial. Claire, who usually recorded her periods in her diary, skipped entries during these months. Shelley and Claire visited a physician in Padua in September. From Mary Shelley’s record in her journal that Claire was “not well” on December 27, Bieri argues that Claire had miscarriage on that day (Exile 102-103). Most telling is his letter to Claire in September 25: “Meanwhile forget me & relive [or revive] not the other thing. . . . above all—my dear girl take care of yourself.” It could be read as “Shelley’s attempt to dampen their relationship and possible sexual intimacy” (Exile 80). It was during the period immediately after Shelley had lost his infant daughter. It is natural that he felt the need to be by the side of Mary. Bieri’s evidence for Claire’s pregnancy does not seem strong enough; nevertheless, it is more than probable that Shelley’s relationship with Claire was physical with strong emotional attachment to each other.

In terms of the relationship between Byron and Shelley, Bieri, following Charles E. Robinson’s Shelley and Byron (1976), focuses more deeply on its complex nature than previous biographers have done, especially because of the attention he pays to the role of Claire. It is Claire who brought Byron and Shelley together. Byron’s repeated cruelty toward Claire, however, led Shelley to question the personal integrity of Byron. Shelley reportedly told Mrs. Mason that “he could with pleasure have knocked Lord Byron down” after seeing Byron’s “gleam of malicious satisfaction” when being told of Claire’s declining health (Exile 289).
Byron’s cruelty to Claire reveals his own weakness. As Bieri says Claire was “the woman who most threatened Byron’s sense of power”; she threatened Byron “not only by her sexual aggressiveness but by not allowing him to evade direct paternal responsibility for his child. For once in his life, Byron was not an absentee father to a child of his” (Exile 251). Byron’s frustration in this led him to a most cruel treatment of Claire, neglecting her plea for him to take good care of their daughter. Byron wished Claire’s daughter had been Shelley’s, not his, so that he could get away from her. Claire also had the effect of empowering Shelley over Byron by reminding Byron’s obligation to the daughter and also by the fact of Shelley’s winning Claire’s love, which in turn invited Byron’s malignity in taking part in spreading the story that Claire had secretly given a birth to Shelley’s child.

Shelley was increasingly disappointed with his friendship with Byron in its creative aspect as well. While Byron appropriated Shelley’s ideas of the Dopplegänger motif in Goethe and Calderón in his work without acknowledging it, and enjoyed the popularity and reputation as a great prolific author, Shelley was struggling to find an audience who could sympathize with his political and artistic ideals in his works. Shelley must have been increasingly aware of the disparity in personality between Byron and himself, as well as in daily habits and lifestyles. On different occasions, he told Claire of his wish to part company with Byron for good, but there were circumstances that prevented that move, like the presence of Allegra and the concern for the project of launching a new liberal literary and political journal, in which he was involved coordinating between Leigh Hunt and Byron.

Bieri succeeds in the formidable task of bringing the outcomes of Shelley scholarship in the past thirty years into a balanced and reliable biography, which bears fruit as insights into many aspects of his life as touched upon in this review. Bieri’s approach of carefully discussing controversial issues surrounding the life and personality of Shelley is certainly a merit. On the other hand, when we use these volumes as a research tool to check the relevant biographical facts, we would find them more useful if we could more readily find the dating of each event. In Bieri’s style, references to the dates of events that he describes are often buried in the text of detailed discussion and it is difficult to pick up the dates quickly enough.

James Bieri is a specialist both in psychology and literature, which ought to be his strength when he discusses the topics like Shelley’s childhood experiences, the suicides of Harriet Shelley and Fanny Godwin, and Shelley’s hallucinatory experiences, among others, but he is generally cautious about making psychological explanations. Readers, however, might wish to learn more from psychological analyses, or would hope that the author might elaborate on his psychological suggestions in his reading of Shelley’s poems. For instance, in his reference to The Revolt of Islam, Bieri mentions cannibalistic imagery, but does not explain it. I’d like to hear of the author’s ideas about what cannibalism may psychologically imply in the context.
Likewise in his commentary on the tormenting words of Fury in Act I of *Prometheus Unbound*, Bieri mentions the sadistic and masochistic sexual perversion. He might have added here a few words as to what it might imply in psychological terms instead of his more general remarks.

The Johns Hopkins University Press is shortly reissuing this two-volume biography as a single volume edition to be available both in paperback and hardcover. This is good news for different reasons. It is welcome firstly for the obvious reason of wider distribution by a larger publisher. Another reason is that the current edition in separate volumes is very inconvenient for readers because the list of abbreviations is only in the first volume and the list of works cited is included only in the second volume. Besides it is very expensive to personally purchase both volumes. Since Bieri's work will be an indispensable reading for both students and researchers of Shelley and English romantic period, as the author has accomplished a remarkable task of producing a reliable and up-to-date major biography of Shelley that has been in need for so long, the volumes should be distributed in a form most useful to the readers.
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本書は、ウォルター・スコットの「ウェイヴァリー小説群」中で、スコットランド史を背景とした小説がいかに面白いかを解き明かしたものである。本書の意義はそこに存する。なぜなら、小説家として（いや、詩人としても）スコットは、繰り返し再発見と再評価が要請されているにもかかわらず、依然として一般読者から遠い存在にとどまっているからである。スコットを読むことがいかに面白く、興奮させられる経験であるか、それを再認識してくるのが本書なのだ。

スコットが大作家と呼ばれるにふさわしいことは、大方が認めるだろう。彼の小説は同時代では圧倒的な大衆の支持を得ていたし、リチャードソン、フィールディングの後、ヴィクトリア朝小説の隆盛までの小説史の狭間で伝統を継承し、新たな可能性を切り開いた意義は否定し得ない。詩人、小説家としてのスコットの人気は、かつてリチャードソンがそうであったように、汎ヨーロッパ的なものであった。そのことは、たとえば、『湖畔の美人』がロッシーニの同名オペラとなり、『ラマーマーデの花嫁』がドニゼッティのオペラ『ランメルモールのルチア』となっていることに端的に示されている。ヴィクトリア朝のメロドラマ等の大衆文学・演劇やディケンズ、サッカレイ等の小説に与えた影響にも絶大なものがあっ