A Neo-Victorian Smorgasbord: Review of Ann Heilmann and Mark Llewellyn's *Neo-Victorianism: The Victorians in the Twenty-First Century, 1990-2009*

Marie-Luise Kohlke
(Swansea University, Wales, UK)

Ann Heilmann and Mark Llewellyn, ***Neo-Victorianism: The Victorians in the Twenty-First Century, 1990-2009***
Houndmills, Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010
ISBN: 978-0-230-24113-8

Ann Heilmann and Mark Llewellyn's joint study of the neo-Victorian phenomenon in novel, film, and televisual adaptations, and (more briefly) in commodity culture and heritage parks, affords a veritable smorgasbord of Victoriana for fellow critics and readers of the genre to dip into selectively or consume in its entirety. Following closely upon a number of other Palgrave monographs and edited collections on the subject, *Neo-Victorianism* still manages to clearly differentiate itself from what has gone before, both in terms of coverage and approach. Its deliberately restricted focus on the millennial turn and the present state of critical play allows the authors to avoid a common tendency to rehash at length earlier coverage of the neo-Victorian 'canon'. While passing references to such works as John Fowles' *The French Lieutenant's Woman* (1969) or A.S. Byatt's *Possession*: *A Romance* (1990) are included to contextualise more recent aesthetic developments, the centre of attention is deliberately shifted to potential future 'classics', produced mainly in the last decade, and widened beyond the usual suspects, offering a refreshing gourmet menu. Even readers well versed in neo-Victorianism will likely encounter criticism on some works with which they were hitherto unfamiliar. A comprehensive introduction is followed by six diverse courses, ranging from intergenerational memory and mourning, through 'Race and Empire', 'Sex and Science', 'Spectrality and S(p)ecularity', and metatextual magic, to the final serving on broader cultural adaptations and recyclings of the

Victorians. Though the absence of a general conclusion (as opposed to brief individual chapter conclusions) deprives the reader of a just dessert, the monograph as a whole manages both to satisfy without gorging and whet the appetite for further neo-Victorian offerings.

If as Ian Sample claims in one of the epigraphs to the introduction, "classic British novels from the 19th century not only reflect the values of Victorian society, they also shaped them" (qtd. p. 1), Heilmann and Llewellyn's study makes clear that our present-day understanding and valuation of the Victorians' cultural heritage and socio-political legacies are increasingly informed by neo-Victorian novels. Rather than simply documenting and commemorating the Victorians, this genre actively (re-) constructs them in the light of changing contemporary needs and interests, producing "spaces of intellectual exchange, fundamentally concerned as they are with the ontological and epistemological roots of the *now* through an historical awareness of *then*" (p. 4, original emphases). In spite of a self-perpetuating tendency to homogenise 'the Victorian' in the popular imagination (pp. 2, 229, 242) – whether as a peoples, a literature, or an epoch – this renegotiation produces a continually changing consciousness of the Victorian's manifold meanings for the present. As such, the authors suggest, the Victorian functions as a fantasy mirror of postmodern fractured identities and contradictory desires: both *for* history *and* escape therefrom, for integrated character *and* diverse performances of subjectivity, for narrative unity, order, and certainty *and* multiple endings and 'truths' via a conglomeration of competing viewpoints/voices. This introduces elements of compensation and distortion but still facilitates self-reflection. Above all, what is compensated for is "our own awareness of belatedness" and the related suspicion of abjection and "creative impotence" (p. 3), which the neo-Victorian novel seeks to overcome through imitation-cum-innovation-cum-exploitation of what the authors call the still "dangerous edginess of nineteenth-century fiction" with its in-built potential for subversion (p. 4).

This does mean, however, that Heilmann and Llewellyn feel obliged to limit the term 'neo-Victorian' to *self-conscious* literary practice that goes beyond 'straight' historical re-enactments of the past. They class only those texts as genuinely neo-Victorian which disrupt and de-familiarise stereotypical assumptions about the period, by self-analytically and/or metafictionally dramatising "*the act* [and processes] *of (re)interpretation, (re)discovery and (re)vision concerning the Victorians*" (p. 4, original

emphasis), texts which specifically address "the metahistoric and metacultural ramifications of such historical engagement" (p. 5). While this review is not the proper place to elaborate on the on-going debates about the most appropriate or useful delineation of 'neo-Victorian', I do want to note one quibble with Heilmann and Llewellyn's study: though everywhere implicit, nowhere are the different methods/models of "*(re)interpretation, (re)discovery and (re)vision*" categorised and theorised in relation to each other, nor do the authors explicate their full diversity. With various gradations, these range from blatant postmodernist metafictionality, intertexuality, paratextuality, and games with the reader (as in Fowles' narrator's anachronistic reflections and authorial interventions, as well as the copious epigraphs, editorial notes, and multiple endings in *The French Lieutenant's Woman*), through narrative disturbance of the fictional illusion limited to the linguistic level of the text (as in Sarah Waters' use of the terms 'queer' and 'gay', weighted with present-day political and ideological connotations in *Tipping the Velvet* [1997]), to the deliberate introduction of a twenty-first century textual unconscious that undercuts an otherwise seamless nineteenth-century surface (evident, for example, in Valerie Martin's heavy-handed colour symbolism and ironic colour reversal in *Property* [2003], told from the highly racist perspective of a slave plantation owner's wife). Not least, such a methodological framework would have proved useful with regards to the authors' problematisation of the neo-Victorian's paradoxical tendencies towards conservatism and cliché as much as progressiveness and experimentation (pp. 6-7); so too for their persuasive notion of narrative ethics as deriving from "aesthetic choice[s]", which reflect writers' and readers' current preoccupations and sensitivities (p. 10). Predominantly, Heilmann and Llewellyn's study focuses on texts employing the first named and most obvious of these re-visionary strategies/paradigms.

One of the monograph's main concerns as a whole and arguably its most significant contribution to neo-Victorian theory lies in its exploration of how neo-Victorian texts position their readers and manipulate their assumptions, expectations, and desires. Thus, at its best, the neo-Victorian novel instructs us to become more critical readers of both the Victorians and ourselves, less inclined to 'buy into' naive comforting versions of the past and more prepared to reflect on our own complicated investments in sustaining narrative and/or cultural illusions, as well as seeking temporary relief and escapism from our own postmodern condition (pp. 12-13). One

resonant example of this is "[t]he readerly desire for (meta)romance" and happy endings, "so frequently frustrated in Victorian and satisfied in neo-Victorian fiction", a desire reliant on the wilful disregard or forgetting of many nineteenth-century novels' "highly ambiguous dénouements"; in one sense, like the protagonist Gerard Hugh Freeman in John Harwood's *The Ghost Writer* (2004), we might be said to risk coming into our "inheritance only by losing it forever" (p. 55). Chapter 5: 'Doing It with Mirrors' likewise foregrounds reader complicity in the neo-Victorian magic show of conjuring up the past, even where a text blatantly "stages its artefactual condition" – "like the audience of a stage magician we know from the start that it's all an act, but judge the quality of the performance by its ability to deceive and mystify us" nonetheless (p. 175). The representation of literal nineteenth-century conjurors and/or tricksters, and of the elaborate machinery and machinations by which they produce their illusions, functions as a metafictional commentary on readers' "fantasies as well as our blind-spots" (p. 176) – and on the way our perceptions of the Victorian are always based in part on wilful fiction and fantasy as well as knowledge and fact. That is to say, as readers, we actively participate in creating the blind-spots on which the success of the neo-Victorian illusion depends. In Waters' *Affinity* (1999), for instance, the reader, like the protagonist Margaret Prior, overlooks factual explanations of strange phenomena and clear indications of her maid Ruth Vigers' interventions, even though – much as in Edgar Allen Poe's 'The Purloined Letter' (1845) – the evidence is squarely in view all the time. Instead the reader, like Margaret, opts for the spiritualist cover story that looks set to facilitate the romantic 'happy ever after' envisaged by Margaret (and the reader) for herself and the imprisoned medium Selina Dawes, but which actually constitutes a strategic diversion/misdirection to facilitate Margaret's defrauding by the 'real' lovers Vigers and Dawes (pp. 181, 185). For the most part of Waters' novel, the deception/simulation *becomes* 'reality' so that, as in Scarlett Thomas' *The End of Mr Y* (2006), as readers we too become "entrap[ped] within our mental universe" (p. 194) and seductive self-referential "mind game[s]" (p. 201) of desire. Followed through to its logical endpoint, this suggests that "every neo-Victorian text is inevitably trapped in a metaphorical Troposphere of its own in which it can recreate […] nothing but the reflection of its own imagination" (p. 201). Thus the simulacrum becomes more 'real' or 'hyper-real' than any actual nineteenth-century referent.

Repeatedly, then, the neo-Victorian does not rely on sustaining but *collapsing* the distinctions between reality and fabrication, as also demonstrated in Heilmann and Llewellyn's problematisation of memory as potentially unreliable and inauthentic, contesting the neo-Victorian's tendency to valorise memory *per se*. In Brian Moore's *The Great Victorian Collection* (1975), for instance, the historian Anthony Maloney, who literally dreams into existence a treasure trove of Victorian artefacts, "searches in vain for the possibility of a real memory within the fabric of his authentic collection" (p. 225). Fallible memory, it could be argued, operates more analogously to imaginative fiction than 'objective' historiographical documentation, as one of the female protagonists of Blake's *Grange House* makes clear:

> what is the distinction between what one imagines and what one remembers? How often my memory, or my recording of events, slips the leash – and I wander just a bit further outward – into Possibility – where what Was and what Might Be [or, for the purposes of neo-Victorianism, what *Might Have Been*] are twin sisters on these pages (qtd. p. 45)

No matter how hard we try as neo-Victorian writers and critics to 'fill in the gaps' in narrated past-time, "the illusionary character of neo-Victorian fiction" (p. 47) creates new gaps in turn, albeit *enabling* ones according to Heilmann and Llewellyn: "gaps […] between our conceptualization of the Victorian and our construction of the neo-Victorian open up the potential for developing a new vision" (p. 47). The power of this vision arguably resides in its very provisionality and 'in-betweeness', refusing any definitive conclusions or certainties, as in the writer Vida Winter's constant unmaking and remaking of her past in Diane Setterfield's *The Thirteenth Tale* (2006, see p. 48). The same theme of productive liminality informs the fourth chapter on 'Spectrality and S(p)ecularity', focusing on novels that juxtapose forms of religious belief and secular/agnostic doubt, articulated through tropes of spirits and spiritualism, which metafictionally stand in for neo-Victorian textual production: "Texts themselves become shadows, spectres, and written ghosts that never quite materialize into substantive presences but instead remain simulations of the 'real'" (p. 145). Here the question of reader investment revolves not just around what we want to *believe* but also

disbelieve – or what we simultaneously want to "(dis)believe" (p. 146), by re-imagining, however temporarily, a different way of being in the world, were it a divinely ordered rather than chaotic postmodern fallen realm. Faith and worship, the authors suggest, are displaced from religious myths onto the acts of storytelling (p. 149), and retrospective spaces like the museum or stately home, which likewise order and interpret the past (p. 163). Admittedly, there is a problem here with repeated references to a "post-Christian" situation (pp. 148, 170), in effect spectralising any neo-Victorian reader and/or critic believers. The basic assumption of a faithless society seems questionable, and it might rather be the blatant resurgence of religions and theology in the public sphere, not least in terms of geopolitics and sectarian violence, and the perceived concomitant threat of society's creeping *de*-secularisation, that contributes to the prominence of the spectral trope in neo-Victorian fiction. As in the chapter on metatextual magic, however, the authors' main point is once again the reader's complicity – her/his wanting to be haunted by spectres, the spectres of faith, and the "false consolation[s]" they might provide (p. 172) – suggesting that, as in John Harwood's *The Séance* (2008), the writer is "asking us to think about why we continue to wish these spirits to be summoned before us" (171).

Yet Heilmann and Llewellyn also qualify the neo-Victorian's relativistic turn vis-à-vis simulated 'truth' and 'truthfulness', emphasising the role of hindsight or "historical foreknowledge that cannot really (or should not) be negated by the belated contemporary" (p. 14). This leads naturally to discussions of the ethics of traumatic memory and the memorialisation of the lost and silenced histories of the marginalised, where fictionalisation becomes more problematic However, Heilmann and Llewellyn stress that the inauthenticity of the neo-Victorian simulacra is not the same as "the idea of being beyond authentication" (p. 23), for inauthenticity does not preclude ethical integrity and "emotional […] sincerity" (p. 26), perhaps better described as critical empathy for history's victims facilitated by "a traumatic unveiling" (p. 28) of the painful abuses in and of the past, which readers are invited to share and witness. This ethical aim, then, is inherently double, reflecting the postmodern genealogical blurring of "distinctions between us and those no-longer-Othered Victorian", now viewed as sharing many of the same preoccupations about sexuality, faith, law and order, and evolutionary determinism (p. 24), so that, in a sense, neo-Victorian writers labour under a double imperative of

(however qualified) authenticity – both to the past *and* the present. Unpicking that imperative, the authors make clear, is by no means straightforward though. For there is always the possibility that the neo-Victorian, while exploring "themes that continue to dominate our political and social lives" and projecting these "backwards onto our forebears", may constitute an all too convenient attempt to "pass the blame", "seek[ing] a textual salvation" of our own, rather than an effort "to find resolution" or advocate for belated justice on behalf of history's underdogs (p. 27).

Fittingly, the first chapter focuses on traumatic memory and neo-Victorian writing as a quasi cathartic and transformative mourning-as-*Bildungsroman* narrative of personal development, healing, and reconciliation. While this enables some form of historical working-through and thence transcendence of painful pasts for characters and/or readers, it also links back to reader response in terms of dramatising the desire for origins. As Heilmann and Llewellyn cogently argue:

> Loss, mourning, and regeneration are prototypical preoccupations of the neo-Victorian novel, which often revolves around the re(dis)covery of a personal and/or collective history and the restitution of a family inheritance through the reconstruction of fragmented, fabricated, or repressed memories: a retracing and piecing together of the protagonist's roots which reflects, metafictionally, on the literary 'origins' of the neo-Victorian genre and the narratological traditions it seeks to reshape. (p. 34)

Neo-Victorian novelists, Heilmann and Llewellyn propose, employ ancestral houses – predominantly linked to maternal lineage and a presiding woman writer figure or spirit – both as sites of (repressed) memory and its re-enactment, enabling the bringing back of the past into personal and/or collective consciousness via uncovering an intimate biological connection. Inevitably, such figuration has Gothic overtones: standing in for lost and absent mothers as "*Urtext*" and "acting […] as sites of both alienation and ultimate reconciliation" (p. 65, original emphasis), these houses function as "womb and tomb in one" (p. 36), simultaneously implicated in the genealogical recovery of lost subjectivities and the subject's irremediable termination in individual death. The discussion of Wesley Stace's

Misfortune (2005), Sarah Blake's *Grange House* (2000), Setterfield's *The Thirteenth Tale* and Harwood's *The Ghost Writer* under this rubric throws up interesting convergences between the texts, but what is never attempted, here or elsewhere in the monograph, is a nuanced analysis of eventual gendered differences in narratological strategies adopted by neo-Victorian writers (though the judicious balance between male and female authored texts would readily have lent itself to just such an exploration).

Nonetheless, Heilmann and Llewellyn make insightful links between themes of identity and familial descent/estrangement, issues of Victorian influence, and neo-Victorian textual inheritance/reproduction, before moving from 'home-based' to more postcolonial 'away' textual politics. While exploring issues of voice and voiceless, perpetration and victimage, Heilmann and Llewellyn astutely note that, in neo-Victorian writing, political dispossession need not equate with voicelessness or disempowerment (p. 69), as evident in such linguistically hybrid, dialogical, polyglot and/or multi-perspectival texts, focused on the subaltern, as Amitav Ghosh's *Sea of Poppies* (2008), Laura Fish's *Strange Music* (2008), Ahdaf Soueif's *The Map of Love* (1999) and Kate Pullinger's *The Mistress of Nothing* (2009), all discussed in Chapter 2. The resulting multiplication of possibilities for (linguistic and cultural) misunderstanding reflects our numerous potential misconceptions of 'the Victorian', not least – though this point is never made as such by Heilmann and Llewellyn – because the vast majority of neo-Victorian protagonists still consists of white 'Western' characters. This leads me to a slight reservation about the monograph's otherwise incisive analyses of the politics of reading: what seems called for in *Neo-Victorianism*, as well as neo-Victorian criticism more generally, is a much more *nuanced* problematisation of the adopted/appropriated/re-imagined voice by neo-Victorian writers, but also by their nineteenth-century predecessors, those philanthropists, reformers, and authors who sought to 'speak for' society's outcasts and the deserving poor. Certainly Heilmann and Llewellyn register that there *is* a problem with what they term the "commitment to political revisionism" (p. 104), specifically citing Fish's Barrett Browning's doubtful self-questioning about "the boundaries of subjectivity and authorial ventriloquism: 'Can we not imagine ourselves into another's skin? Can we not dream ourselves into another world…? Give breath and life to histories that otherwise might not live?'" (p. 86) Yet the authors never fully unpack this dilemma, reading Browning's construction

of the abjected female slave of 'The Runaway Slave at Pilgrim's Point' (1848) as an ethical, laudatory self-projection, "an individual act of bearing witness to trauma shared imaginatively through identification" (p. 88), implicitly worthy of emulation by both Fish and her readers. We not only need to consider the complex ideological implications of white writers ventriloquising historical subalterns (Othered in terms of different race, class, religion, or education), but equally what it means for non-white contemporary writers like Fish to articulate the same. For arguably *both* draw on shared (hegemonic) cultural tropes – what Heilmann and Llewellyn elsewhere call "pattern-forming" (p. 161) – such as that of the raped maddened slave woman who kills her unwanted mixed-race child, featured in both Fish's West Indian sections and Barrett Browning's poem. (Did most slave women really blame and hate their part-white offspring for the circumstances of their birth?) A would-be abolitionist or otherwise liberationist narrative can still prove racist, class-conscious, or sexist, as Cora Kaplan recently pointed out.[1] Hence the impulse of expressing empathic solidarity with history's victims is a two-edged sword that potentially facilitates renewed, albeit modulated forms of symbolic victimisation. As much is implicit in Heilmann and Llewellyn's recognition of the contradictory nature of Fish's Barrett Browning, who "for all her imaginative empathy with the [black] protagonists of her inner vision, continues to collude with the system" (p. 85). Nonetheless, Heilmann and Llewellyn read Barrett Browning's transition from "associating blackness with illness (her body's condition) to identifying with the woman slave in a world of white male violence" (p. 86) in positive terms, though arguably it lends itself more readily to a contrary reading, analogous to Charlotte Brontë's problematic and implicitly racist appropriation of the slavery trope to gloss *white* women's struggle for emancipation in *Jane Eyre* (1847), while her protagonist conveniently ignores the source of her own inherited wealth in others' enslavement and suffering. Moreover, Brontë too has blackness symbolise decay, though moral and sexual corruption rather than physical illness, quite happily recycling racist stereotypes and connotations in the process.

Elsewhere, for instance in Chapter 3: 'Sex and Science', *Neo-Victorianism*'s consideration of the politics of representing race is more complex, like its nuanced discussion of class throughout. Belinda Starling's *The Journal of Dora Domage* (2007), for instance, is discussed in terms of

"expos[ing] radicalism", both in the forms of "female abolitionism and male anarchism", as little more than a convenient "guise for sexual libertinism" at the expense of those less fortunate (p. 108). It is Dora's working-class as much as her gender that renders her vulnerable to exploitation, when on account of her husband's illness she is forced to take over his book-binding business to feed her family and is compelled by her patrons to create beautiful covers for increasingly violent pornography. Heilmann and Llewellyn's intricate analyses of Jane Harris' *The Observations* (2006), Barbara Chase-Riboud's *Hottentot Venus* (2003) and Starling's novel again stress the way authors plays *to* and *with* reader expectations, particularly via manipulations of the predominantly male-gendered (pseudo) scientific gaze, with institutional and socio-political power "reproduced in textual form" (p. 111) – all too often with the reader's inadvertent participation or outright willing complicity. The Victorian exploited are turned into targets of our own "[p]ornographic scopophilia" (p. 128) and "prurient voyeurism", "implicat[ing] us […] in processes of objectification and commodification" (p. 114), though not just of individual historical 'Others', I would argue, but the Victorian period as a whole.

It is no coincidence that Heilmann and Llewellyn should discuss Chase-Riboud's abjected protagonist Sarah (a fictionalisation of Saartje Baartman) in the context of "the popularity of [nineteenth-century] freak shows, exhibiting human 'curiosities'" (p. 123). In a sense, neo-Victorianism constructs the nineteenth century *per se* as a cabinet of curiosities, a carnival of the weird, marvellous, and grotesque, with the revivified 'corpse/corpus' of the Victorians displayed as exotic spectacle for our consumption and hedonistic enjoyment. As Heilmann and Llewellyn note of *The Children's Book* (2009), "Byatt also raises the question about what we want to see in that display case" (p. 163). It is definitely *not* the Victorian ordinary, commonplace, and everyday which readers desire to encounter in the neo-Victorian novel. Rather, it seems to me, the act of reading in all three novels constitutes *a pursuit of sensation* as much as critical empathy, analogous to the instruction Starling's Dora receives from one of her patrons to bind his books so as "to arouse and induce a … carnal, rather than cerebral, reaction" (qtd. p. 134). Accordingly, Heilmann and Llewellyn's positive concluding note to this section appears premature: if, "[i]n exploring the resistance of their fictional protagonists to actual abuses in the past, neo-Victorian fiction by women seeks to overwrite the

pornographic 'edutainment' of our contemporary present" (p. 142), it does so by inviting highly dubious reader responses. The pyrotechnic vengeance wreaked by Chase-Riboud's Sarah on her tormentors, albeit only as a ghost – burning down Cuvier's museum, destroying his family, and seeing his brain (ironically found to be "smaller than hers") dissected on the same autopsy table where her body was subjected to its final humiliation (p. 129) – also functions as such a sensationalist ploy. Furthermore, "[t]he fantasy ending" (p. 130) once again provides "textual salvation" and (false) consolation not only for Sarah, but also for Chase-Riboud's readers for the disturbingly thrilling distress of witnessing her suffering and dehumanisation.[2]

In effect, Heilmann and Llewellyn lay the groundwork for further detailed studies in neo-Victorian reader response theory – "exploring the ways in which different readers respond to and seek different things from a contemporary [neo-]Victorian text" (p. 18) – something likely to assume increasing importance in future criticism on the genre. The "potentially controversial" distinction between neo-Victorian "'ordinary' reader[s] and the more 'knowledgeable' critical reader[s]" (p. 18) – that is, those only fleetingly familiar with or wholly ignorant of, as opposed to those well versed in Victorian source-/inter-texts and actual historical contexts – affords a particularly promising venue for further exploration, especially once ethnicity/race, nationality, education, and economic affluence are factored into the equation. (Will access to the internet and electronic book depositories, for example, render 'the Victorian' ever more virtual or enable a more informed engagement with its cultural contexts? Might nineteenth-century canonical works mean something very different to postcolonial readers, as opposed to those from British and American backgrounds, hence producing radically different reading expectations and experiences of neo-Victorian adaptations also?) The issue of reader sophistication or the level of "necessary knowledge of what is being adapted" (p. 228) – is further complicated by an increasing multi-layering or "incestuousness" in current adaptation practice (p. 226), which filters reader/audience responses. The authors define this as an "internalization of the nature of adaptation, whereby adaptations speak to themselves and one another rather than only [or even mainly] to the precursor text" (p. 212),[3] thus actively contributing to a de-historicised neo-Victorian hyper-reality.[4]

Neo-Victorianism looks set to become essential reading for fellow researchers as well as any serious student of neo-Victorian studies and will prove an invaluable guide for further critical enquiry into reader response theorisations of this genre. Among its crucial signposts, I would also note the author's highlighting of concerns with source, copy, and authenticity as "a preoccupation inherited from the Victorians themselves" (p. 216), and of a 'Dickensification' of "the Victorian landscape" (p. 217) already begun in the nineteenth century. It may well be that future criticism will need to scrutinise both readers then *and* now, undertaking a comparative analysis of the ideological investments in and rewards derived from reading as heritage or memory 'tourists' in the Victorian cultural imaginary.

Notes

1. My argument is deeply indebted to Cora Kaplan's unpublished research seminar '"I am black" – The Subaltern's Voice in Anti-Slavery Poetics and Neo-Victorian Fiction: The Case of Elizabeth Barrett Browning', held at Swansea University, Wales, UK, on 24 November 2010. The talk was based on Kaplan's current research for a book on the subject of racial thinking in Britain in the nineteenth century.
2. Heilmann and Llewellyn offer a somewhat more positive reading of the "carnivalesque" ending as "seek[ing] to explode the control exerted by the framing strategies so evocative of [Sarah's] textual and sexual confinement" (p. 130).
3. Though the authors address the issue of "how texts become not only adapted but translated into different cultural moments" (pp. 234-235), the study never considers the role or implications of neo-Victorian cross-cultural translation.
4. Their prime example of this process is Dickens World: "if what most of us imagine as the authentic representation of the Victorians is derived from our knowledge of the Dickensian adaptation on our TV and film screens, then Dickens World becomes a magnified and multiplied imitation of an imitation" (p. 214).