The Secret Sharer: The Child in Neo-Victorian Fiction

Anne Morey and Claudia Nelson
(Texas A&M University, Texas, USA)

*****

In their introduction to *Neo-Victorian Families*, Marie-Luise Kohlke and Christian Gutleben observe that the families to be found in contemporary neo-Victorian fictions operate as ready-made cultural critiques of both past and present (Kohlke and Gutleben 2011: 10). But the utility of the neo-Victorian family extends well beyond the exploration and rejection of what was wrong with Victorian society. More provocatively, the families in neo-Victorian fiction permit a fantasy of belonging to a moment not the reader's own, manifesting a desire to insinuate a contemporary self into the very phenomenon that Western liberal discourse now recognises as often dysfunctional, horrifying, or cruel. The endless rehearsal of characters such as the abused or abandoned child or woman, the victim of the workhouse or the orphanage, or the despised prostitute represents both disavowal of and longing for a moment that seems perversely impossible either to reject or to forget. The modernists hoped to disguise their literary debts to the Victorians (Clayton 2012: 713); in contrast, contemporary novelists working in the neo-Victorian vein unashamedly rehearse and amplify their debts to the Victorians, whether literary or psychological, in novel after novel. It is not enough that well into the twenty-first century we find that we cannot abandon the novel, the literary form that Victorians made so completely their own for their ideological explorations and accommodations (Wagner 2009: 745); whether moved by nostalgia, a desire to revisit ancient trauma, a wish to assert connections to cultural roots, or other impulses, authors and readers of neo-Victorian literature must also return to or multiply the characters, locations, plot types, settings, and language of the nineteenth century.

If the family serves as both mechanism of critique and site of fantastic interpolation, the child within it or excluded from it dwells at the centre of the oscillation between disavowal and longing. Indeed, the child or young adult character often affords the means by which the contemporary

Neo-Victorian Studies
5:1 (2012)
pp. 1-13

reader penetrates the primal scene of the Victorian moment, and as Eckart Voigts-Virchow observes, literary criticism focusing on neo-Victorianism has identified a number of "thematic clusters" emerging from neo-Victorian creative works, a list of preoccupations in which children are prominent (Voigts-Virchow 2009: 109). And just as the contemporary investment in neo-Victorian fiction doubles and shadows the canon of original works, the child character contained in such fictions is often a double or is multiplied in some other way – for instance, in the perdurable popularity of time-slip novels such as Ruth Park's award-winning *Playing Beatie Bow* (1980), Antonia Barber's *The Ghosts* (1969), or Philippa Pearce's Carnegie medallist *Tom's Midnight Garden* (1958), in which children exist both in the present and in the Victorian past. One might argue that the adult-oriented, realist version of such texts is what Jay Clayton calls "the two-generation plot, which alternates between a contemporary group of characters […] and characters from the Victorian era," as in A. S. Byatt's 1990 novel *Possession* (Clayton 2012: 727). As Louisa Hadley observes, neo-Victorian fiction is necessarily "bi-directiona[l] […] pointing to both the Victorian past and the contemporary present" (Hadley 2010: 15), so that it effectively doubles time itself.

The doubling of characters, at least, has its analogue in Victorian narrative; it is characteristic of nineteenth-century forms ranging from sensation fiction (Anne Catherick and Laura Fairlie in Wilkie Collins's *The Woman in White* [1860], for example) to women's life writing about their childhoods, which is marked by a mingling of reality with fantasy such that the memoirist may appear to occupy two worlds simultaneously (Sanders 2000: 11). In the neo-Victorian context doubling has the interesting consequence of permitting the display of aggression within the narrative, not only because it offers more youthful targets of cruelty within this reconstructed Victorian world, but also because it stages a retrospective struggle for control over the materials that constitute Victorian narratives. Tammy Lai-Ming Ho's article in this special issue, for instance, discusses how Richard Flanagan's *Wanting* (2008) proposes Charles Dickens and John Franklin as devourers of nineteenth-century girlhood, a process recapitulated in Flanagan's aggressive appropriation of two major public personalities of the period as the raw material for his own creative processes, thus recapitulating the alleged cannibalism of his subjects. Similarly, Alan Moore and Kevin O'Neill's *The League of Extraordinary*

Gentlemen (1999-) not only invokes characters familiar from novels of the period but also, as Lara Rutherford's contribution contends, uses the look and conventions of the twentieth-century comic book to revisit the presumed social effects of the penny dreadful; like American comic books in the 1950s and television and video-game violence more recently, nineteenth-century penny dreadfuls were perceived as contributing to juvenile delinquency and subsequent adult crime. In short, one of the most marked features of neo-Victorian fictions is aggression toward the content of nineteenth-century fictions, although these works suggest that the contemporary response both deplores the cruel vitality of the period being explored and acknowledges that either combativeness or imitation (or both) is necessary for continued creativity in the present. Neo-Victorian fictions, then, both depend on their originals and run counter to them inasmuch as the new works acknowledge the despised, oppressed, and neglected subjects of their originals. Indeed, we might call this process parasitism for the achievement of redemption, a phrase that could also characterise the progress of the relationship between child and parent.

That neo-Victorian fiction so consistently engages in this appropriation suggests the stakes of authors' relationship with the literary and social past. If Victorian literature constitutes a cultural inheritance passed on to later generations, why must writers take an aggressive stance in claiming it? Why is it not theirs by descent alone? J. B. Bullen indicates that this urge to plant flags in the literary terrain of the past, so to speak, represents the working out of a conflict between the modernists and the generations that followed them; in their apparent rejection of the immediate past, which he likens to "the nursery tantrums of children rebelling against the despotic regime of their parents" (Bullen 1997: 2), the modernists may be said to have alienated us from our patrimony. Voigts-Virchow adds that neo-Victorian works are preoccupied with subcultures, which tend to privilege youth and to be "defined against the family" (Voigts-Virchow 2009: 111). His point suggests the opposition between child and family that is both common within neo-Victorian fiction and symbolic of that fiction's relationship to its nineteenth-century forebears. One way of retrieving this past, then, may be to imagine the present as the cut-off orphan, the portionless child who must reconstitute her or his family. This device points to why the adopted child figures so prominently in neo-Victorian narratives (see, e.g., the contributions to this issue by Ho and Elisabeth Wesseling),

since the tropes of orphaning and adoption so powerfully represent the necessity of what Goethe called "elective affinities" in the constituting or reconstituting of family.

Whether the relationship between text and reader/writer is imagined as biological or as elective, our fascination with the Victorians is in part a fascination with textual reproduction, with the ways in which even a forgotten or spurned past may resurface in the present. At times, in order to secure this continuity, the text itself appears to be endowed with agency, with the ability to select or create its own offspring. Elsie Michie's analysis of the prominent kidnapping trope in works by Sir Walter Scott, Robert Louis Stevenson, and C. S. Lewis proposes that fiction is capable of bearing the child reader off to moments and places not his own in a kind of pleasurable enslavement to narrative. Once again, the child is the locus of reproduction, because he or she represents the future, and once again the child is subject to a rule of adult authority that may or may not bring agency in its wake. This device strongly encapsulates our ambivalence about progress and what it might mean. The Victorian period as seen from the vantage point of twenty-first-century child rearing practices is ostensibly a moment of abjection for children, who are controlled, worked, exploited, checked, trained, restrained, and, often, dead before puberty. Yet, since we also acknowledge the nineteenth century as a golden moment in the development of fictions, particularly fantasy, for those same thwarted children, this moment perversely offers great power to the children's story, if not to actual children. The powerful children's narrative proves once again both parasitic and redemptive, capturing the defenceless child while at the same time offering a kind of bulwark against the assaults of quotidian Victorian or neo-Victorian life.

Just as Clayton suggests that popular culture did not participate in the modernist distaste for Victorianism (Clayton 2012: 716), one sees a tension here between narratives of childhood aimed at adults and those aimed at children. Victorian novels of childhood often stress the child's vulnerability in a threatening grown-up world; Jane Eyre's initial challenge is simply "to keep in good health, and not die" (Brontë 1847: ch. 4), itself a tall order, while Oliver Twist may be found on his knees, pleading with adult evildoers not to make him one of them. As Susan Zieger notes, Dickens's "very name is a byword for the sentimentalization of children's suffering and dying"; the child's flirtation with death, whether

consummated or not, is something that the adult reader evidently relishes. Zieger quotes Lee Edelman's remark that "Tiny Tim survives at our expense in a culture that always sustains itself on the threat that he might die" (qtd. Zieger 2009: 141). In contrast, the protagonists of Victorian children's fiction conquer African jungles, come home with pirate treasure, or become the spiritual and emotional centres of their families, demonstrating power rather than pathos. If adult readers were instructed to protect and nurture the young, child readers were often encouraged to imagine themselves as infinitely resilient and effective. A similar dichotomy is discernible in much neo-Victorian fiction, in which youthful protagonists such as Philip Pullman's Sally Lockhart (in the 1985-1990 trilogy that begins with *The Ruby in the Smoke*) surmount the twin threats of super villains and a repressive society, while Antoinette in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966) is no more an agent in childhood or adolescence than she is as a wife. And if Sarah Waters's *Fingersmith* (2002) suggests the possibility of a happy ending in which Maud and Susan, survivors of child abuse, establish their own household, they cannot put behind them the connection with pornography earlier forced upon Maud; the extent to which they are empowered is thus arguable.

The issues of critique, agency, and appropriation rehearsed in the foregoing paragraphs are central to the articles contained in this special issue. The first group of contributions, all of which deal with girlhood, engages in various ways with the recycling of the content of Victorian fiction and history. Ho's 'Cannibalised Girlhood in Richard Flanagan's *Wanting*' examines a recent novel in which Dickens and Lady Jane Franklin appear as central characters. Like some of the other appropriation projects discussed in this issue, the motive power for the novel comes from interpolating into the familiar and the historical a dimension deemed to have been suppressed from the original. In this case we have the experience of an aboriginal girl in Tasmania adopted by the Franklins to satisfy Lady Jane's desire for motherhood and subsequently raped by her new father, which in turn comments upon Dickens's relationships with Ellen Ternan and with his own children. Flanagan's account of the suppression of young female personality is aggressive toward Franklin and Dickens in its suggestion that these admired historical figures (and the Victorian period more generally) were effectively cannibals of both domestic and colonial girls and girlhoods. Yet his novel also permits the reader to interpret the author himself as a

latter-day cannibal preying on the Victorian men who preyed on Victorian girls. As William Boyd wrote in reviewing the novel in the pages of the *New York Times*, Flanagan here demonstrates

> how fictionalizing history and real people can pay great dividends. Unlike the biographer or historian, the novelist is not constrained by documented facts or their frustrating absence, and is free to roam – always keeping authenticity and plausibility in mind – through character and motive, supposition and possibility. (Boyd 2009: BR10)

The idea that part of the past's appeal may be the lack of restraint that it promises to those pursuing artistic and financial success is reminiscent of the appeal of colonialism itself. If the neo-Victorian seeks to be redemptive, it is simultaneously parasitic, a point often made of nineteenth-century imperialism as well.

Flanagan's novel hints at the continuity of experience between an aboriginal Tasmanian child and a young British actress a generation her junior. Sonya Fritz's 'Double Lives: Neo-Victorian Girlhood in the Fiction of Libba Bray and Nancy Springer' likewise examines doubling, in this case in two popular series for today's girl readers. As heroines of fictions for a young adult audience, Libba Bray's Gemma Doyle and Nancy Springer's Enola Holmes (Sherlock Holmes's sister) conform to the pattern of agency and self-determination characteristic of youth fiction both in the Victorian era and today; despite the challenges they face, neither Gemma nor Enola ultimately partakes of the victimhood and degradation forced upon Flanagan's Mathinna. Fritz draws on earlier critics' insights to argue that Victorian girlhood was always already double due to the multiple roles required of young women in and beyond the home. Picking up both on the idea of respectable femininity as performance and on more recent invocations of Girl Power, Bray and Springer layer past over present, fantasy over realism, and (in Springer's case) new female creation over an icon of masculinity in *fin de siècle* popular culture. Because a significant component of doubleness was already present in Victorian culture, and particularly in those aspects that shaped the behaviour of adolescent girls, the doubleness of the modern narratives is less an imposition of something previously absent than it is a ratification, development, and fictional

extension of an already present feature of Victorian culture. Yet Fritz also explores the idea of doubleness by negotiating between the analytical categories of Girl Power, which encourages girls to see themselves as autonomous agents who may cast aside social convention, and the Ophelia discourse popularised by psychologist Mary Pipher, which imagines girls as suffering and vulnerable fragmented selves. Thus in Bray's work, Gemma is simultaneously a Girl Power heroine when she occupies the fantastic world of the Realms and an Ophelia in her quotidian Victorian life. Springer's less ambiguously powerful Enola nonetheless succeeds by manipulating the disadvantages of Victorian girlhood (for instance, in clothing and social expectations) in order to accomplish feats of agency and empowerment.

Looking at the dark side of agency, Sandra Dinter's 'The Mad Child in the Attic: John Harding's *Florence & Giles* as a Neo-Victorian Reworking of *The Turn of the Screw*' discusses the use of a Victorian innovation in a 2010 novel by John Harding, namely the use of a child narrator. In Harding's hands, the device heightens the already extant subversiveness of Henry James's approach to childhood; whereas James's text acknowledges the child's role as the construct of adults, a being whose symbolic meaning looms so large as to overshadow individuality, Harding's not only allows the subaltern child to speak but also allows her to craft her own language and to resist adult approaches to child rearing. Simultaneously, Dinter argues, Harding's Florence, a feminist rebel, doubles and revises both James's Flora and Charlotte Brontë's Bertha Mason. So far so good, yet as a manipulator and murderess, Florence moves beyond mere lack of innocence – as far as the Victorians were concerned, a shocking enough state for a child to occupy – to an obsessive insistence on her own authority. Like William March's 1954 novel *The Bad Seed* and the play and film based on it, *Florence & Giles* uses adult assumptions about the natural virtue of young girls, a concept particularly dear to the Victorians, as a cover for what Dinter interprets as serial slaughter and some reviewers, such as William Palmer in the *Independent*, regard as justifiable. Rather than seeing Florence as the unreliable narrator of Dinter's reading, Palmer takes her at her own valuation:

> The witch-like governess is able to appear in the mirror of any room in the house and so spy on Florence. The climax of their struggle, when Florence has to fight to the finish to

> protect Giles, is genuinely exciting and shocking. (Palmer 2010: n.p.)

Dinter's interpretation suggests rather that, since Harding's work plays on adult revulsion at the idea of the child who is also a killer, the novel manipulates its readers into insisting on her innocent selflessness despite evidence to the contrary. In doing so, the narrative takes on its own Florence-like qualities by potentially revealing twenty-first-century American and British readers as modern-day Victorians so invested in girls' moral purity that we cannot see them as agents and individuals in their own right.

Agency, in other words, is perhaps particularly laden emotionally when the agent in question is young and female. Katie Kapurch's '"Why Can't You Love Me the Way I Am?": Fairy Tales, Girlhood, and Agency in Neo-Victorian Visions of *Jane Eyre*' argues that recent adaptations of Brontë's novel reveal that the work retains its currency as a means of negotiating agency for contemporary girls, a Victorian task in which our culture remains engaged. Kapurch's article discusses both Susanna White's 2006 BBC television mini-series based on *Jane Eyre* and April Lindner's loose pastiche of the novel in her 2010 young adult work *Jane* in order to consider how revisions of *Jane Eyre*, particularly through their use of the text's fairy tale allusions, permit young women to consider and revise their social roles. Kapurch argues that the fairy tale elements ritually invoked and recreated by Brontë adapters afford access to Jane's interiority and thus to an understanding of her assertion of agency. Precisely because girlhood was a troubling, ambiguous concept for the Victorians, Jane's relationship to fairy tales – which, like reading and writing for Harding's Florence, permits the oscillation between old-fashioned girl and contemporary radical, dreaming heroine and effective protagonist of her own narrative – helps to explain the popularity of the neo-Victorian for modern girls, who must confront similar ambiguities in social status. Like the texts that Fritz examines, then, those explored in Kapurch's article suggest that a significant function for many neo-Victorian works may be the interrogation of female adolescence in today's society.

Concluding this first section of the special issue is a creative work, Anne Hanafin's 'Proserpine', a piece of neo-Victorian speculative fiction that proposes a meeting between the child Virginia Stephen (later Virginia

Woolf) and Jane Morris, wife of William Morris and model for a number of Dante Gabriel Rossetti's paintings including his 1874 *Proserpine*. Young Virginia's careful scrutiny of the environment of Lord Leighton's 'at-home' catalogues the fish in his fountain, the figures on the tiles in his hall, and the very insects on the plants in his garden, turning all into the stuff of stories, until her attention is captured by the woman she imagines as the Queen of the Underworld. The alertness to detail and immersion in vivid thought inspired by the nineteenth-century world that she occupies marks Virginia as simultaneously a Victorian and a modernist in the making, crossing a boundary of difference once held to be more or less impassable (at least in high culture) and participating in what Clayton terms "the emphasis on connection, on relation within the context of great, sometimes overwhelming historical change". As he goes on to argue,

> The twentieth-century response to Victorian literature emphasized difference, whether it was the difference of rebellion in high Modernism or the difference that fosters nostalgia in popular culture. In the twenty-first century the pleasure is in seeing the parallels. (Clayton 2012: 726)

If authors such as Flanagan and Harding seem to participate, for thematic purposes, in the acts of Victorian aggression that they chronicle, Hanafin suggests that aggression and indeed plot may be submerged and smoothed out in a moment of union.

In the next two contributions to this issue, by Lara Rutherford and Elsie Michie, the attention shifts away from characters to the form or forms of nineteenth-century literary production, offering an approach that imagines the text endowed with some kind of agency vis-à-vis the child. Rutherford's 'Victorian Genres at Play: Juvenile Fiction and *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen*' is concerned with Alan Moore's appropriation of late-Victorian genres and print forms. Moore's eponymous League consists of five superheroes culled from late Victorian genre fiction; Rutherford's focus is on how these appropriations simultaneously privilege a fragmented, decentred reading and insist on the continuity between Victorian reading and contemporary reading, lowbrow entertainment and canonical literature, as a way to tease out links between Victorian concerns about children and those prevalent today. In Rutherford's presentation of this material, Moore

appears to be offering a social challenge that was initially missing from working-class reading, which, while perceived as a threat to the dominant order, did not in fact prove to be one. If one of the functions of the series is to expose the hypocrisy of Victorian attitudes, Rutherford contends that another is to emphasise the longevity of both attitudes and hypocrisy. The postmodern aspects of Moore's work invoke play, including the interpolation of games for readers. But, Rutherford argues, on some level the sheer quantity of contradictory sentiments marks Moore's recognition of the depth and vitality of Victorian culture, its rich generative capacities. Like Ho's article, then, Rutherford's focuses on a work that is interested in both critiquing the Victorians and feeding upon the content of the era being critiqued.

Meanwhile, in Michie's 'Kidnapped by the Book: Children, Reading, and Recovering the Past from Walter Scott to C. S. Lewis', the dominant metaphor is text as raptor, capturing and translating the child to a moment and place not its own. Michie argues that the trajectory of this metaphor, sketched from Scott to Stevenson to Lewis and beyond, is one in which each successive hero becomes younger and one in which the purpose of the ransom changes, from that which is paid to permit the child to return to the potential of adult life in the everyday realm, to that which is paid to permit the child to remain in the realm of fantasy. Kidnapping thus functions as a trope of resistance to progress, which, as Michie observes, is an ironic association for one to make with the nineteenth century, so closely allied with understandings of material development and the working out of fully modern conceptions of man's relationship to nature (as in the work of Charles Darwin) and to his own unconsciousness (as in the work of Sigmund Freud). But as Michie notes, these are the very features most resisted by Lewis's Narnia series in particular, and it is puberty, with its suggestion of sexual development and interest in adult concerns and all the materiality that those concerns imply, that threatens to exile both the child protagonist and the reader from the fantastic land to which the fiction has transported them. Neo-Victorianism is often allied with nostalgia, a trait for which it is sometimes condemned and sometimes applauded; Michie's way of conceptualising this nostalgia asks us to consider what (or who) is being appropriated and for what ends.

The last pair of articles in this special issue both deal, albeit in different ways, with displaced children and the impulse to exert authority

over them – perhaps to 'parent' them, whether in benevolent or sinister ways. As such, they offer a means to examine the generational issues that this introduction has sought to contextualise, questions of belonging, inheritance, descent, and connection. Catherine Siemann's '"But I'm Grown Up Now": *Alice* in the Twenty-First Century' examines postmodern iterations of the *Alice* narratives (films, graphic novels, and videogames) in order to argue that the contemporary desire to be protective of children has had two interlocking and unexpected effects on the characterisation of Alice figures. The first is to age Alice from a child of seven to an adolescent of seventeen in response to the strangeness of her adventures and her apparently unprotected state, tenable only for an older child. In other words, the displaced state of Lewis Carroll's seven-year-old is evidently deeply unsettling to today's consumers, who are more comfortable with the concept of the emancipated, if still vulnerable, adolescent. Paradoxically, the second is to amplify and update the threats that this newly adolescent Alice faces, which include violence, sexual predation, and incarceration in mental hospitals. Indeed, the videogames go so far as to invite the consumer to pile further assaults or degradations on Alice in order to advance to the next level. Updating Alice requires more victimisation, which in turn requires that an older Alice emerge to be victimised. Siemann's insight returns our attention to the topic of aggression and its connection with creativity, explored earlier in this introduction. The relationship of the audience to the representation of agency proves a factor here as well, since she notes that the degree to which Alice is represented as resilient and powerful varies from text to text, medium to medium – the Girl Power trope versus the Ophelia trope, to recall Fritz's contribution.

But in the sentimental tradition, power may derive from pathos rather than being inimical to it. The final article in this special issue, Wesseling's '"Like Topsy, We Grow": The Ambiguous Legacy of Maternalism in Adoption Autobiographies from Cold War America', examines mid-twentieth-century memoirs by Helen Doss and Bertha Holt in the context of the nineteenth-century sentimental novel. As Wesseling observes, the ability of both types of narrative to move their audience depends to some extent on the dramatisation of child suffering, helplessness, and the threat of separation from the family. While Doss's memoir, for one, often employs a light tone, playing up the humour of such domestic disturbances as a flooded basement and a small child's lost shoes, these

episodes consistently remind the reader of the mother's role as homemaker, the plethora of large and small menaces to family life with which she must deal, and the tragedy of children cut off from this fount of devotion and nurturance. As the Dosses' family grows to embrace not only adopted children who share their parents' race and general appearance but also those who look different (but who, we are assured, are all real Dosses in every way that matters), the case for transracial and, potentially, transnational adoption is made on a compelling emotional level by leveraging Victorian conventions and domestic ideologies, reaching out to 1950s readers who, like some of the Dosses' siblings and parents, might not initially have felt entirely comfortable with the concept of bringing racial difference into the family. Similarly, Holt's memoir, complete with a visual representation of the tombstone of a baby girl adopted in Korea but dead before she could be brought to her new American home, draws upon the rhetoric of much earlier religious texts to assure its audience of the universal family of humankind. In each case the power of maternal love proves transcendent and transformative, while – as in such potent nineteenth-century texts as Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852) – sentiment overflows the container of the individual family to affect national and even international practice. Neo-Victorianism thus becomes explicitly a source of power. We might, then, return to and adapt a point made at the beginning of this introduction: in permitting the fantasy of belonging to a moment not our own, texts such as the ones examined here seek to change the moment in which they were created.

Bibliography

Boyd, William. 2009. 'Saints and Savages', *New York Times Book Review* (28 June), BR10, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/28/books/review/Boyd-t.html?_r=1 (accessed 23 August 2012).

Brontë, Charlotte. 1847. *Jane Eyre*, www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/1260 (accessed 23 August 2012).

Bullen, J. B. 1997. 'Introduction', in J. B. Bullen (ed.), *Writing and Victorianism*. London: Longman, 1-13.

Clayton, Jay. 2012. 'The Future of Victorian Literature', in Kate Flint (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Victorian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 712-729.

Hadley, Louisa. 2010. *Neo-Victorian Fiction and Historical Narrative: The Victorians and Us*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kohlke, Marie-Luise, and Christian Gutleben. 2011. 'Introducing Neo-Victorian Family Matters: Cultural Capital and Reproduction', in Marie-Luise Kohlke and Christian Gutleben (eds.), *Neo-Victorian Families: Gender, Sexual and Cultural Politics*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 1-42.

Palmer, William. 2010. 'Florence and Giles, by John Harding: Gothic Tale with Mystery Appeal'. *Independent* (5 May), n.p., http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/books/reviews/florence-and-giles-by-john-harding-1962319.html (accessed 13 August 2012).

Sanders, Valerie. 2000. 'Introduction', in Valerie Sanders (ed.), *Records of Girlhood: An Anthology of Nineteenth-Century Women's Childhoods*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1-21.

Voigts-Virchow, Eckart. 2009. '"In-yer-Victorian-face": A Subcultural Hermeneutics of Neo-Victorianism', *Literature Interpretation Theory* 20:1-2, Special Issue: *Neo-Victorianism: The Politics and Aesthetics of Appropriation*, 108-125.

Wagner, Tamara S. 2009. Review of Penny Gay, Judith Johnston, and Catherine Waters (eds.), *Victorian Turns, NeoVictorian Returns: Essays on Fiction and Culture*, *Victorian Studies: A Journal of the Humanities, Arts and Sciences* 51:4, 744-746.

Zieger, Susan. 2009. 'Dickens's Queer Children', *Literature Interpretation Theory* 20:1-2, Special Issue: *Neo-Victorianism: The Politics and Aesthetics of Appropriation*, 141-157.