"The Prismatic Medium of Fancy": Female Authorship, Popular Culture, and Technological Modernity in Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan's *Florence Macarthy* (1818).

On 3rd February 1819, Mary Russell Mitford wrote a letter to her friend and fellow author, Barbara Hofland, in which she derided Lady Morgan's recently published novel *Florence Macarthy: An Irish Tale* (1818) as 'not only long but tedious.' She followed this terse dismissal with a more detailed yet no less scornful elucidation:

> You know, of course, the *Dramatis Personæ*,—a hero, compounded of Buonaparte and General Mina; a hero, *en* second, Lord Byron; a villain, Mr Croker; and a heroine, Lady Morgan herself;—this, with a plot half made of "O'Donnel" and half "Guy Mannering,"—a vast deal of incredible antiquarianism, and Ireland! Ireland! Ireland! as the one single sauce to all these viands,—forms the principal ingredients of this puffed-off novel.[1]

Mitford was not the only contemporary author to excoriate the text and its author. Describing the novel as 'a shameful mixture […] of the highest talent & the lowest malevolence,' fellow Irish novelist, Maria Edgeworth, lambasted Morgan for possessing 'the most despicable disgusting affectation & *impropriety*—& disregard of the consequences of what she writes.'[2] She concluded by evincing the 'wish never more to be classed with *novel* writers when the highest talents in that line have been so disgraced.'[3] The critical reception of Morgan and her novel was equally derisive and damning. *The British Review* sardonically asserted that 'the interest is kept up far enough into the fourth volume to satisfy the most rigorous *canons* to which the writers for the Minerva Press can be supposed to be subject'.[4] Though professing that 'it is not an agreeable task to

---

[1] *Letters of Mary Russell Mitford*, ed. by Henry Fothergill Chorley, 2 vols (London, Bentley, 1872), i, 42.

[2] *Maria Edgeworth: Letters from England 1813-1844*, ed. Christina Colvin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 166.

[3] ibid., p167. For further discussion of the political and literary differences between the two Irish novelists, see Thomas Tracy, *Irishness and Womanhood in Nineteenth-century British Writing* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009) and Mary Jean Corbett, *Allegories of Union in Irish and English Writing, 1790-1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

[4] 'Review of *Florence Macarthy: An Irish Tale*', *British Review*, 13, May 1819, p. 487.

animadvert with severity on the writings of a woman,' this anonymous reviewer wryly observes that Morgan 'continually vaunts of the immense profits she has reaped from the sale of her books,' whilst giving 'pretty intelligible intimations that her daily bread depends, in a great measure, on those profits.'[5] Facetiously confessing that 'Lady Morgan, or any other lady, may, for aught we care, deluge the town with her crudities,' s/he nonetheless interposes 'but when she comes forward as an instructress and a reformer [...] she enters a field where it becomes our duty to meet her.'[6]

Despite its remarkable asperity, *Florence Macarthy*'s initial reception was lamentably predictable. Both contemporary and later commentators have repeatedly remarked upon the especial rancour with which critics of Lady Morgan – formerly known as Sydney Owenson – admonished her works.[7] Yet, despite the personal and professional vituperation that greeted the publication of *Florence Macarthy*, Morgan heralded her latest novel as a 'success with a vengeance' and 'a triumph after the persecution I have undergone.'[8] Reprimanding her younger sister, Olivia, for not showing 'a little proper spirit'[9] in defending her against her many critics, she claims that those who have read it in Paris 'think it my *chef-d'oeuvre*'. She also exults in *The Morning Chronicle*'s report that 'the whole of the first edition was bespoke before it was published, and a second came out in five days after'.[10] This defiant response was entirely characteristic of Morgan, who had penned a sprightly retort to critics of her earlier fiction in the controversial

---

[5] ibid.

[6] ibid.

[7] For example, when Robert Southey discovered that a scathing review of Morgan's *France* (1817) had been wrongly attributed to him, the poet vociferously retorted that he 'would rather have cut off [his] right hand than have written anything so unmanly and disgraceful'. See Jacqueline E. Belanger, *Critical Receptions: Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan* (Bethesda: Academica Press, 2007) for a detailed exploration of the 'exceptionally fraught' reception history of the author's works, p.1.

[8] Sydney, Lady Morgan, *Passages from My Autobiography* (London: Bentley, 1859), p. 216.

[9] Morgan, *Passages*, p. 289.

[10] Morgan, *Passages*, p. 216.

travelogue *France* (1817). Indeed, the torrent of critical hostility that cascaded upon *Florence Macarthy* was the inevitable backlash against Morgan's supposed presumption in rebuking professional reviewers in her former work.

As Claire Connolly notes however, Morgan's clashes with reviewers were 'not so much obstacles on the path to fame as constitutive of her writing identity and celebrity.'[11] Undoubtedly, *Florence Macarthy* serves as striking evidence of this fact. Here, Morgan dexterously weaves her longstanding conflict with her most vociferous professional critic, J. W. Croker, into the intricate fabric of her fictional narrative by caricaturing him as the provincial Irish toady, Conway Crawley. Indeed, as the aforementioned reactions of rival authors and critical opponents attest, much of the invective against *Florence Macarthy* specifically targets Morgan's unabashed blurring of the boundaries between both the public and the personal, and the popular and the belletristic. By investing the text's eponymous heroine with some of the more controversial traits of her own authorial persona, Morgan struck at the heart of contemporary anxieties regarding the literary and cultural legitimacy of Romantic prose fiction. As Jacqueline Belanger states:

> Morgan has been called the first professional Irish woman writer. This claim certainly might be disputed, but it is clear that Morgan saw her literary activity as a career that held the potential to generate both income and fame. […] In publicizing the financial and social successes she gained from her writing, Morgan appeared to reviewers to reduce authorship to its most basic economic terms. Almost every aspect of the production and marketing of Morgan's work seemed to provide evidence of an increasingly commercial literary culture, one that was far removed from the model of the gentlemanly 'republic of letters' favored by reviewers.[12]

---

[11] Claire Connolly, ''I accuse Miss Owenson:'' *The Wild Irish Girl* as Media Event.' *Colby Quarterly*, 36.2 (2000), 98-115 (p. 113).
[12] Belanger, p. 18.

This article explores the ways in which *Florence Macarthy* responds to and ultimately repudiates such critical distinctions. Boldly asserting its allegiance to the precariously feminised domain of popular romance, the text simultaneously posits a challenge to more prestigious – and implicitly masculine – models of textuality. While the critical establishment baulked at 'the rapid expansion of the literary marketplace and the changing demographic of readers,'[13] *Florence Macarthy* revels in its own syncretic and synthetic modernity. Replete both in extra-literary controversy and inter-textual allusivity, Morgan's text embraces the spectacle, sensation and simulation so vociferously denounced by critics of popular fiction in the period. More specifically, in its self-reflexive scrutiny of the material processes of its own production, *Florence Macarthy* interrogates its own position within an increasingly commercialised and mechanised publishing industry. In order to elucidate the text's engagement with such contemporary concerns, the article contextualises *Florence Macarthy* in relation to a more famous and blatantly more technologically-oriented text of 1818, Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein.* Responding to Mark Hansen's description of *Frankenstein* as a 'machinic text', it suggests that Morgan's fiction is likewise 'a text constructed from materials (most centrally language, but also materially concrete institutions [...] and indeed technology itself).' However, whereas Hansen interprets Shelley's work as a 'fundamental deterritorialisation of the human perspective', Morgan's text disavows such philosophical skepticism and remains fastened to a literary agenda that is decidedly and decisively populist.[14] The materials out of which Morgan constructs *Florence Macarthy* derive from an evolving popular cultural industry that is increasingly characterised by mass reproduction and performative display.

---

[13] Christina Morin, 'Regina Maria Roche', in *Lost Souls of Horror and the Gothic*, ed. by Elizabeth McCarthy and Bernice M. Murphy (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2016), pp. 186-189 (p. 187).
[14] Mark Hansen, "Not Thus, after All, Would Life Be Given": "Technesis", Technology and the Parody of Romantic Poetics in Frankenstein', *Studies in Romanticism*, 36.4 (1997), 575-609 (p. 578).

In asserting the centrality of such commercial and mechanical modernity to Morgan's aesthetic, this article departs from previous scholarly discussions of her oeuvre. For, although modern criticism has offered a much more nuanced and sensitive analysis of Morgan's literary achievement than that bestowed by her contemporaries, it has become somewhat of an axiom to locate Morgan's work in a 'Gaelocentric tradition of cultural nationalism,'[15] as Joep Leerssen avers. Leerssen further describes Morgan's most well-known fiction, *The Wild Irish Girl* (1806), 'as a clearing house through which most pre-romantic appreciations of Ireland, and its inhabitants and its antiquities, passed from out-of-date modes of discourse into the realm of literature.'[16] For Leerssen this 'constant automatism of explaining Ireland in terms of its past'[17] is typical of the Romantic national tale, where 'Gaelic Ireland is set both in a spatial and in a chronological distance, neither in the present, nor in the past, but in adventure time, in an anachronistic time warp.'[18] In contrast, more recent scholarship has reassessed the complex spatio-temporal manoeuvrings undergirding Morgan's antiquarian romances. Natasha Tessone, for example, argues that Morgan's 'heightened museological imagination' may have enabled her to 'stage her vision of a displayable Irish nation',[19] but 'her project of appropriating such museological practices to promote Ireland's national character contains significant ambiguity'.[20] Indeed, there is a 'complexity and multivalence in both the spectacular

---

[15] Joep Theodoor Leerssen, *Remembrance and Imagination: Patterns in the Historical and Literary Representation of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), p.66.
[16] Leerssen, p. 65.
[17] Leerssen, p. 38.
[18] Leerssen, p. 51.
[19] Natasha Tessone, 'Displaying Ireland: Sydney Owenson and the Politics of Spectacular Antiquarianism', *Eire-Ireland: a Journal of Irish Studies* 37 (2002): 169-86 (p. 184)
[20] ibid., p.184.

nature of Morgan's antiquarianism and the spectacular aspect of Irish nationhood as it was construed in the early nineteenth century'.[21]

Certainly, Morgan's mobilisation of this antiquarian aesthetic – or 'aesthetiquarianism',[22] as Katie Trumpener terms it – requires further scrutiny. Heather Braun suggests that Morgan 'reinvests a language of ancient myth and romance with a parodic sense of its own contrivance, further suggesting the need to adopt fluid and autonomous forms that more accurately re-imagine an increasingly adaptable Irish narrative.'[23] Drawing on such critical interventions, this article asserts that *Florence Macarthy* invokes a Romantic aesthetiquarian perspective only to interrogate its function within a rapidly evolving print culture, both in Britain and in Ireland. Moreover, whereas Tessone argues that 'the antiquarian movement forged a tight link between Ireland's material culture and national feeling',[24] this article contends that Morgan simultaneously parades and problematizes this link in *Florence Macarthy*. Throughout this fiction, Morgan openly vaunts the fact that her museological display of Ireland is not anchored in antiquarian retrospection but instead emerges out of an effervescent literary marketplace in direct competition with new arenas of spectacular entertainment. Rather than promote an atavistic and anachronistic cultural nationalism, the surface narrative's flirtation with the romance of Irish antiquity is continually disrupted by an underlying acknowledgement of the competing literary, political and historical narratives at play within the national tale. Synchronising and synthesizing these competing discourses for the popular reader, *Florence Macarthy* registers the hybridity of its own romance as a

---

[21] ibid., p.184.
[22] Katie Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and The British Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), p. 144.
[23] Heather Braun, 'The Seductive Masquerade of *The Wild Irish Girl*', *Irish Studies Review* 13.1 (2005): 33-43 (p. 48)
[24] Tessone, p.169.

distinctly modern yet sophisticated form of mechanical reproduction that cannot be dismissed as the mere automatism of an antiquarian reflex.

Of course, as her critics were quick to point out, Morgan treads well-worn plot terrain in *Florence Macarthy*. The national marriage device that *The Wild Irish Girl* inaugurated is revisited in this tale, which sees its dashing hero journey incognito from his sloop's docking place in Dublin bay to the wilds of Connemara. Here, somewhat predictably, he encounters an alluring Irish gentlewoman with a keen intellect and even keener social conscience. However, though contemporaries readily accused Morgan of trotting out a crude and unreflective pastiche, the tale's textual eclecticism is both deliberate and determined. Connolly observes that 'a great many novels in the 1810s veer between parody and pastiche'[25] and *Florence Macarthy* is no exception. From the very outset, the text plays host to a political and aesthetic contest between vying modes of Romantic sensibility. Commencing with the description of the docking of a ship in the 'silvery'[26] Irish dawn, the opening paragraphs introduce the enigmatic General Walter Fitzwalter as the text's protagonist, and the Byronic De Vere, as its somewhat desultory deuteragonist.

With his 'square chest', 'fine bust' and 'vehement passions' (5), Fitzwalter exudes a heroic masculinity that would embellish any Minerva romance. Yet, Morgan also endows this character with a distinctly political salience. Sailing under the soubriquet of 'The Commodore' on a ship called 'Il Librador', Fitzwalter is immediately identifiable as a revolutionary leader of Spanish American independence. In *Spanish America and British*

---

[25] Claire Connolly, 'Irish Romanticism, 1800-1830', in *The Cambridge History of Irish Literature, Volume 1: To 1890*, ed. by Margaret Kelleher and Philip O'Leary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006) pp. 407-448 (p. 417).

[26] Sydney Owenson [Lady Morgan], *Florence Macarthy: An Irish Tale (1818)*, ed. by Jenny McAuley (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), p. 5. Further references to this text are given after quotations in the text.

Romanticism, 1777–1826 (2010), Rebecca Cole Heinowitz observes that 'the cause of Spanish American independence bridged political gaps' in Britain,[27] with both liberal and conservative voices triumphing in the defeat of their Spanish rivals. As stated above, critics accused Morgan of drawing liberally upon her sympathetic portrayal of Napoleon in *France* for the character of Fitzwalter. Yet, Fitzwalter also possesses more local political resonance as a kindred spirit to the newly mythologised hero-martyrs of the 1798 United Irishmen Rebellion. Intriguingly, the hero of *Florence Macarthy* shares his name with a character in Morgan's later fiction, *The O'Briens and the O'Flahertys* (1827) - the Irish revolutionary, Lord Walter Fitzwalter. As Connolly notes, Irish literature of the later Romantic period often depicted such figures as victims of their own heightened sensibility as opposed to violent insurgents.[28] In particular, the dashing United Irish leader, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, looms as a 'shadowy presence behind' the latter Fitzwalter.[29] However, Fitzgerald haunts Morgan's earlier fiction too. Like Fitzgerald, Morgan's hero in *Florence Macarthy* is eventually revealed to be an Irish aristocrat whose experiences in the Americas kindle a revolutionary zeal.[30] Fintan Cullen argues that early nineteenth-century visual representations of Fitzgerald served to transform him 'from an impressive political and military strategist to a tragic yet romantic innocent'.[31] In many ways, Morgan's fictional Fitzwalters borrow their romantic allure from this popularised version of Fitzgerald.

---

[27] Rebecca Cole Heinowitz, *Spanish America and British Romanticism, 1777–1826: Rewriting Conquest* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), p. 1.
[28] Claire Connolly, *A Cultural History of the Irish Novel, 1790-1829* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p.97.
[29] Connolly, 'Irish Romanticism,' p. 416.
[30] Daniel Gahan states that the common view in the Romantic period was that Fitzgerald gained his revolutionary principles from his visit to America. '"Journey after My Own Heart:" Lord Edward FitzGerald in America, 1788-90,' *New Hibernia Review / Iris Éireannach Nua* 8. 2 (2004), pp. 85-105.
[31] Fintan Cullen, 'Lord Edward Fitzgerald: The Creation of an Icon', *History Ireland* 6. 4 (1998), pp.17- 20 (p.19).

In contrast, 'the precise arrangement' of De Vere's 'glossy auburn curls left it difficult to decide whether its fanciful and fashionable possessor was more fop or philosopher, dandy or poet.' On observing the Irish coastline from the ship's helm, this 'ideologue' exhibits his poetic temperament by professing 'a singular attraction in the aspect of an unknown firmament.' When Fitzwalter contends that 'remembrances of country' are 'as precious and important,' De Vere remonstrates:

> 'Can you not credit then the existence of a creature placed by nature or circumstances beyond the ordinary pale of humanity […] – one so organized, so worked on by events, and thwarted in feelings, so blasted in his bud of life, as to stand alone in creation, matchless or, at least unmatched, whose joys, whose woes, whose sentiments and passions, are not those of other men, but all his own, beyond the reach of affection, or the delusions of hope?' (7)

Heavily redolent of Byron's most celebrated work, *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (1812-1818), a reader might well suspect that this pastiche of 'Promethean' Romanticism is teetering on the edge of parody. The Commodore's rejoinder confirms such suspicions:

> 'He, who wants the appetites and passions common to all men, with the sympathies and affections that spring from them, is something better or worse, angel or demon, but he is not man […] poets feign it, or vain men affect it; but it has no real existence in nature or society. Man is always man; and he who pretends to be more, is rarely placed by nature at the head of his species – he is in fact usually less.' (7)

In this moment, the text converts its romantic pastiche into a superbly bathetic parody of the Byronic hero. Of course, Morgan was not the only author of the period to interrogate this figure. Her friend, Caroline Lamb, had reproached her former lover in the controversial roman à clef, *Glenarvon* (1816), where she loosely fictionalised Byron as a United Irish leader who betrays his comrades. In fact, by the fourth canto of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (1818), even Byron sought to distance himself from 'the Pilgrim of

[his] Song'.[32] Perhaps even more intriguingly, by interrogating this figure, *Florence Macarthy* displays a remarkable thematic contiguity with an otherwise unrelated fiction of 1818, Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. Although Morgan and Shelley were not to become closely acquainted until later in life, it is entirely possible that the former read *Frankenstein*, (which was published in January 1818), prior to completing *Florence Macarthy*, (which was published eleven months later). On the other hand, Julia M. Wright points out that a number of recent critics have argued that *Frankenstein* owes a significant debt to Morgan's earlier novel, *The Missionary* (1811).[33] Whatever direction the flow of influence ran, the underlying preoccupations of these, in other respects, widely divergent texts are curiously concordant. After all, not only does *Frankenstein* commence with a markedly similar opening dialogue but it also delivers a corresponding rebuke to the solipsism of male Romantic endeavour:

> [If] no man allowed any pursuit whatsoever to interfere with the tranquillity of his domestic affections, Greece had not been enslaved; Caesar would have spared his country; America would have been discovered more gradually; and the empires of Mexico and Peru had not been destroyed.[34]

The high Romantic ideal of creativity as both autonomous and transgressive is nimbly unmasked as just another form of tyranny and destruction. Observing that Shelley's 'Prometheus figure is strikingly different from the creations of her romantic

---

[32] Lord Byron [George Noël Gordon Byron], *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage: A Romaunt: 4 Cantos* (London: Murray, 1818), p.85.

[33] Julia M. Wright, Introduction to *The Missionary: An Indian Tale, by Sydney Owenson* (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2002), p. 43. Wright cites Joseph W. Lew, 'The Deceptive Other: Mary Shelley's Critique of Orientalism in *Frankenstein*', *Studies in Romanticism*, 30. 2 (1991), 255-283; D.S. Neff, '"Hostages to Empire:" The Anglo-Indian Problem in *Frankenstein*, *The Curse of Kehama*, and *The Missionary*', *European Romantic Review* 8 (1997), 386-408; and William D. Brewer, 'Unnationalized Englishmen in Mary Shelley's Fiction', *Romanticism On the Net* 11 (1998), <https://www.erudit.org/fr/revues/ron/1998-n11-ron423/005812ar/.>

[34] Mary Shelley, *Frankenstein, or, The Modern Prometheus: The 1818 Text*, ed. by Marilyn Butler (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p.7.

contemporaries,'[35] Harriet Hustis argues that Shelley's preface to the 1831 edition of *Frankenstein* lays bare this distinction:

> Invention, it must be humbly admitted, does not consist in creating out of void, but out of chaos; the materials must, in the first place, be afforded: it can give form to dark, shapeless substances but cannot bring into being the substance itself.[36]

Here, the Romantic pursuit of originality and individuality is undermined by Shelley's gender-inflected 'conception of what it means to create, a performance premised on her refashioning or 'modernizing' of the legend of Prometheus.'[37] Like Shelley, Morgan refutes the Romantic ideal of authorship. Instead, both writers champion an inherently modern model of female authorship that is more a form of palimpsestic rewriting than a celebration of creative autonomy. However, though both favour intertextuality over originality, Morgan consciously embraces an almost bric-à-brac eclecticism. Like Shelley, Morgan's literary allusiveness engages poets revered by the Romantics, including Milton, Spenser and Shakespeare, but it also encompasses diverse modes of popular culture – both folkloric and consumerist. After all, as Martha Woodmansee observes, it was as much changes in the material conditions surrounding book production as the emergence of the Romantic concept of literary genius that engendered the notion of individualized authorship in this period. Due to concomitant developments in both printing technologies and literacy rates, literary production became increasingly commercialised with new laws regarding property and copyright reinforcing its capitalist economy.[38]

---

[35] Harriet Hustis, 'Responsible Creativity and the "Modernity" of Mary Shelley's Prometheus, *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900: The Nineteenth Century*, 43.4 (2003), 845-858 (p. 845).

[36] Shelley, 'Appendix A: Author's Introduction to the Standard Novels Edition', *Frankenstein*, p. 195.

[37] Hustis, p.856.

[38] Martha Woodmansee, 'The Genius and the Copyright: Economic and Legal Conditions of the Emergence of the 'Author', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 17. 4 (1984), 425-448.

Unlike many of her contemporaries, Morgan does not shrink from the commercial modernity of the nineteenth-century literary marketplace in *Florence Macarthy*. Rather, she astutely recognises that both the conceptual authority of the critical reviews and the actual diversity in Romantic literary production arise out of the same commercially evolving print culture. Indeed, she exploits this fact to expose the superciliousness of those who would disavow the interconnectedness of the popular and literary spheres; from the theatrical dilettante, Lord Risbron, who renders himself a target of ridicule by speaking only in Shakespearian verse, to the sniping critic, Conway Crawley, who is regularly 'born away by the shallow rapidity of his own exhaustless volubility' (141). In contrast, Morgan playfully interlaces self-consciously literary epigraphs with knowing allusions to popular comic performances and songs of the era. In so doing, she acknowledges the diversity of reading practices in the era of the industrial printing press, where even the Irish peasantry living 'amidst the savage mountains of the Galties' (51) may enjoy profligate textual variety. As General Fitzwalter and De Vere observe on examining the 'whitewashed walls' of a 'wild and remote' Munster inn:

> The history of many a saint, the sufferings of many a martyr, were here detailed in bright vermilion and yellow ochre; and angels and devils, hymns and homilies, were mingled promiscuously with the amatory history of 'Cooleendas,' 'Croothenamœ,' the 'Connaught daisy,' the 'last dying speech of Captain Dreadnought,' bloody and barbarous murders, and a favourite song, called 'Ma chere amie,' as sung by Mrs. Billington. (52)

Of course, as the above quotation also evidences, *Florence Macarthy* does not allow such popular printed ephemera to supersede the prior claims of Irish folk culture. On the contrary, these amatory fictions and broadsides curiously complement the Irish hymns, homilies and hagiographies that deck the ramshackle inn's interior. Indeed, Irish antiquarianism plays as prominent a role in this narrative as it did in Morgan's earlier

National Tales. As Jenny McAuley delineates in the introduction to her recent edition of the text, its eponymous heroine inherits her name from the historical Irish Earl, Florence Macarthy Reagh, known in Ireland as Fínghin mac Donnchadh Mac Cárthaigh (1560–1640). As the Tanist (successor) to the Barony of Carbery in Munster, Macarthy's perilous political manoeuvrings during the Nine Years' War (1595–1603) eventually led to his imprisonment in the Tower of London. Here, in 1608, he wrote an epistolary essay on the antiquities of the Irish nation that reiterated claims regarding the Scythian and Milesian origins of the Gaels as previously asserted in Irish medieval pseudo-histories such as the *Lebor Gabála Érenn* [*The Book of Invasions*].

The historical Macarthy and his genealogical researches intrude upon the fictional world of the text in multifarious ways. Not only commemorated through the patronymic inheritance of his fictional female descendants, Macarthy becomes a pivotal figure in his own right in Volume 3 of this text. This volume commences with a show trial in which the villainous Conway Crawley attempts to frame General Fitzwalter for sedition. Having arraigned a group of disaffected local peasants known as 'Padreen Gar's Boys', Crawley accuses them of 'feloniously assembling for purposes of rebellion' (203). He then charges the local 'pedagogue' (93) Terence Oge O'Leary of leading them in 'a plan of insurrection' that is aided and abetted by the supposed 'foreign incendiary' (203), Fitzwalter. However, Crawley exposes himself to public ridicule when he mistakenly cites Macarthy's sixteenth-century correspondence regarding an uprising against Elizabeth I as evidence of a pact between Fitzwalter and O'Leary. Given Crawley's pretensions to scholarly erudition, his absolute ignorance of local history renders him absurd. Significantly, it also serves to expose the perduring association of Catholic Ireland with violent insurrection; whether the accused be sixteenth-century Gaelic lords or nineteenth-century impoverished agrarians.

13

Serving as a direct foil to Crawley, the hedge schoolmaster Terence O'Leary ensconces himself in 'national and traditionary lore' (147). From ancient Irish mythology to the dynastic lineages of extant Gaelic families, O'Leary's antiquarian knowledge proves an important agent in redressing historical wrongs. His recondite genealogical inquiries alert him to the hidden identities of both General Fitzwalter and De Vere, who are revealed as Walter de Monteney Fitzadelm and Adelm Fitzadelm respectively. Unknown to each other before this propitious visit to Ireland, these latterly estranged cousins belong to an Old English, or Norman Irish, family that has suffered a rapid decline due to the profligacy and vice of their fathers, Lord Walter Fitzadelm, and his brother, Lord Gerald Fitzadelm. Habitually viewing the world through 'the mind's eye' (100), O'Leary retains crucial memories of the Fitzadelm brothers that confirm the Spanish American hero's suspicions concerning the dark secret behind his almost forgotten exile from Ireland. As foster father to Walter de Montenay Fitzadelm in his youth, O'Leary served as an innocent pawn in an ignominious scheme contrived by the Fitzadelm patriarchs. Heavily debt-ridden, Lord Walter Fitzadelm was encouraged by his younger brother to conceal the existence of his son 'in order to raise money on the little that was left of his estate' (102). On his impecunious death shortly after this event, Gerald abducts the young Fitzadelm heir and arrogates the family's hereditary wealth and titles to himself. Sold into slavery, the disinherited Walter de Monterey fortuitously escapes and eventually becomes the South American Guerrilla Chief, Captain Fitzwalter, also known as 'The Commodore'. However, O'Leary remains haunted by this treacherous deed and spends the remainder of his days 'wandering in the mountains… and bothering the world with the MACARTHIES and FITZADELMS' (58).

In many ways, the perfidy of the brothers serves as a metaphor for the trauma of colonial dispossession and oppression of Gaelic culture. In fact, the newly rediscovered

Lord Walter De Montenay Fitzadelm explicitly declares that, 'my story is not without its parallels in the history of the land' (363):

> [M]y story … belongs to the history of a long disorganised country, where, under the influence of political misrule, the moral relations of society too often sit loosely: and where the demoralisation of the people is a necessary dogma in the code of those who rule by national debasement and disunion. (363)

Here, Morgan emphasizes the importance of cultural rejuvenation to the constitutional stability of Ireland. However, if the text does wield cultural nationalism as a political tool, the antiquarian realm of imagination that O'Leary inhabits is nonetheless viewed with a deep, if benevolent, scepticism. A rich repository of Gaelic culture and learning, O'Leary is both a sympathetic and inscrutable character. Respectfully described by the local peasantry as a scholar and bard, they nonetheless regard him as either 'possessed' or 'out of his mind' and are convinced that 'larning cracked his brain' (57). Whilst deeply affected by his reunion with O'Leary, even his former foster son laments his credulous reiteration of Ireland's national origin legends and pseudo-histories:

> 'And yet,' said the Commodore,' with an half-repressed smile, 'there are some sceptics of opinion that there has always existed a perfect identity between the Irish and the Anglo-Saxon; that in fact the Irish received their ancient alphabet from the Britons; and that their pretensions to an eastern origin is a groundless notion, generated in ignorance, and idly cherished by a mistaken patriotism, which might be better directed.' (85)

Morgan's South American hero unambiguously refutes the cultural and political import of O'Leary's archaic epistemology, but the text is also concerned to highlight the narrow discursive parameters upon which this antiquarian knowledge rests. If *Florence Macarthy* parodically pastiches the insular and blinkered reading practices of Romantic aesthetes, critical reviewers, and aristocratic dilettantes, the text is no less critical of O'Leary's monological and logocentric thinking. Through such variegated portraits of the narrow,

and decidedly masculine, pursuit of exclusive and exclusionary knowledge systems, the narrative exhibits an acute distrust of patriarchal modes of literary production and representation.

More specifically, *Florence Macarthy* envisages a model of modern female authorship that disrupts patrilineal channels of influence, imagination and interpretation. In its delicate imbrication of canonical allusions, scholarly erudition, popular culture, and folklore, the text signals the constructedness of its own fragile modernity. Collating fragments from these diverse literary and cultural traditions, Morgan evidently delights in assembling the synthetic fabrics out of which she crafts her narrative. In this way, *Florence Macarthy* once again reveals its propinquity to Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. For, as Mark Hansen argues, Shelley's novel confronts 'the necessity, for a female ideology of creation, to part with the male model of the expressive and autonomous self'.[39] 'Contextualiz[ing] the feminist deconstruction of the romantic self against the background of the industrial revolution', Hansen further observes that *Frankenstein* 'self-reflexively interrogates the so-called romantic ideology'[40] by 'embodying the experiential impact of the industrial revolution'.[41] In so doing, Shelley demonstrates 'the severe limitations of a literary model of invention and [...] correlat[es] the materiality underlying such a demonstration with the advent of industrialization':

> Shelley's text construes romantic sublimation as an ideological strategy whose very plausibility derives from the suspect ontology of technological change it advances [...] More precisely, the text puts into question the ideological supposition that technology's (decidedly negative) effects can be overcome through the rejuvenating effects of great literature. In so doing, it reveals the costs of approaching industrialization exclusively as a threat to cultural values.[42]

---

[39] Hansen, p. 577.
[40] Hansen, p. 579.
[41] Hansen, p. 603.
[42] Hansen, p. 580.

Admittedly, Morgan's fiction does not achieve nor, in fact, aspire to the radical 'deterritorialization of thought'[43] that Hansen claims for Shelley's work, which is more directly concerned with technological modernity and its discontents. Furthermore, Morgan's commitment to the cultural and political narrativization of Irish nationhood disallows for such an outright rejection of Romantic representational strategies and techniques. Instead, via playful pastiche, irreverent parody, promiscuous intertextuality and unflinching self-reflexivity, *Florence Macarthy* both refashions and synthesizes the diverse array of textual materials that constitute Irish print culture of the early nineteenth century. Indeed, the 'mongrel heterogeneity' that Leerssen ascribes to *The Wild Irish Girl*'s 'unblended accumulation of superimposed discursive sediments',[44] also manifests itself in Morgan's later fiction. As Braun remonstrates, however, Leerssen's "breakdown of the 'textual traditions' at work throughout this novel' does not fully address the novel's 'subversive aspects',[45] as embodied in the text's exoticised Gaelic heroine, Glorvina. Braun, in contrast, argues that:

> Glorvina helps locate a distinct, feminised danger that engages with such genres as mythology, romance, Orientalism, and the Gothic. It is through this contradictory character—as well as the hybrid form of the novel as a whole—that Owenson consistently resists the narrow parameters of what Terry Eagleton identifies as an 'ideological dilemma' between Realist and Romantic projects.[46]

Respecting this, it is worth reflecting that the eponymous heroine of *Florence Macarthy* not only inherits such generic hybridity from her literary predecessor but also exceeds the latter in terms of self-performativity and spectacular display. Moreover, although ostensibly unrelated, Frankenstein's monster and Morgan's later heroine

---

[43] Hansen, p. 590.
[44] Leerssen, 'How *The Wild Irish Girl* Made Ireland Romantic', in *The Clash of Ireland: Literary Contrasts and Connections*, ed. by C.C. Barfoot and Theo D'haen (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1989) pp. 98-117 (p. 100).
[45] Braun, p.40.
[46] Braun, p.33.

generate curiously similar contradictions and excesses that expose the fault line between Romantic aesthetics and the nascent modernity of Romantic print culture. Morgan evidently shares Shelley's perception that 'technological change just cannot be marshaled poetically, especially not in its high romantic form as expression of man's sublime encounter with nature'.[47] Therefore, though highly disparate in terms of genre and mode, both *Frankenstein* and *Florence Macarthy* openly confront technology's impact upon creative production in the period. Just as '*Frankenstein* forges a link between industrial technology and the suspension of representation's jurisdiction - a link which surfaces in the textual contradictions generated by the monster',[48] *Florence Macarthy* likewise 'forges connections which exceed textual strategies of legitimation'[49] through its elusive and allusive heroine.

Introduced somewhat belatedly into a narrative that bears her name as its title, Florence Macarthy makes her first acknowledged appearance in the dramatic court scene delineated in volume 3 (and described above). Held under a false accusation of insurrection by the contemptible Crawleys, she effortlessly charms her way out of trouble and straight into the good graces of the fashionable set residing at Dunore Castle, the most recent seat of the Fitzadelm line. Encouraged to participate in an amateur production of *As You Like It* that the Shakespeare buff, Lord Rosbrin, organises to stave off ennui, she aptly undertakes the role of the protean Rosalind. A consummate performer, it is eventually revealed that Florence has in fact been assuming multiple guises throughout the course of the narrative. Secretly manoeuvring to restore Walter to his rightful legacy, she practices minor deceptions upon the text's two peripatetic heroes, haunting them as

---

[47] Hansen, p. 598.
[48] Hansen, p. 603.
[49] Hansen, p. 581.

a spectral voice among the ruins of the long abandoned Court Fitzadelm and harrying them as the evangelical convert, Mrs Magillicuddy. Known by a variety of titles including Lady Clancare and the 'Bhan Tierna' (White Lady), she enacts a curious kind of doubling in her relationship with other female characters, including her cousin and namesake, the Spanish nun, Florence Macarthy Reagh and the whimsical yet volatile matriarch of the Fitzadelm family, Lady Dunore. Of course, as *The British Review*'s critic waspishly remarked, Morgan's heroine 'shadowed out a resemblance to herself, and some of the recent occurrences in her own life,'[50] as much as anything or anyone else. As a female novelist who is forced to wield her pen against hostile critics and in defence of her native land, Florence Macarthy is an unapologetic self-portrait of the equally chimerical and capricious Lady Morgan. The author's critics must have been galled to read the fictional Florence audaciously assert:

> I shall take the liberty of *putting myself in my own book*, and shall record the events of this last month of my life under the title of Florence Macarthy.' (364)

And yet, this heavily stylized self-characterisation is arguably more sophisticated and nuanced than Morgan's contemporaries credited. As Terry Eagleton astutely notes, Lady Morgan imbues the aforementioned Lady Dunore with as many of her own traits as she does Florence Macarthy, 'thus slyly exculpat[ing] herself by an act of fictional projection'.[51] Nevertheless, by ostentatiously writing herself into this text and redeploying her usual (and by this stage, somewhat shop-worn) sources in parody and pastiche, Morgan interrogates her own writerly tools and agenda.

---

[50] *British Review*, p. 487, cited in Belanger, p. 208.
[51] Terry Eagleton, *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger: Studies in Irish Culture* (London: Verso, 1995), p.178.

In so doing, she also translates *Florence Macarthy* into a metatextual exploration of the role of the female author in the literary marketplace of the early nineteenth century. The ambivalence with which she views this creative enterprise is articulated in Florence's account of her both literal and metaphorical spinning:

> With Ireland in my heart, and epitomising something of her humour in my own character and story, I *do* trade upon the materials she furnishes me; and turning my patriotism into pounds, shillings and pence, endeavour, at the same moment, to serve her and support myself. Meanwhile my wheel, like my brain, runs round. I spin my story and my flax together; draw out a chapter and an hank in the same moment; and frequently break off the *thread* of my reel and of my *narration* under the influence of the same association; for facts, will obtrude upon fictions, and the sorrows I idly feign are too frequently lost in the sufferings I actually endure.' (274)

Drawing on the classical association between the act of writing and the act of spinning, Morgan reminds her readers that spinning and weaving are, after all, Penelope's crafts and thus a particularly resonant symbol of female creativity. Moreover, the trope of the female spinner had been harnessed recurrently in eighteenth-century Ireland to refute British restrictions on Irish trade, the most famous example being Jonathan Swift's invocation of Arachne in *A Proposal for the Universal Use of Irish Manufacture* (1720). In her own earlier fictions, Morgan similarly deployed the figure of the Irish spinner as an agent of subversion against English political, cultural and economic hegemony. In the aforementioned national tale, *The Wild Irish Girl*, the English hero Horatio falls in love with the Irish princess, Glorvina, as she 'sits at her little wheel, by her father's side.'[52] However, this self-satisfied young gentleman is also forced to confront his gender and national biases in a less agreeable fashion when he accidentally intrudes upon an Irish spinning circle:

---

[52] Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan, *The Wild Irish Girl: A National Tale* [1803], ed. by Kathryn Kirkpatrick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 121.

> [A] group of young females were seated round an old hag who formed the centre of the circle; they were all busily employed at their *wheels*, which I observed went merrily round in exact time with their song … Supposing that some one among the number must understand English, I explained with all possible politeness the cause of my intrusion on this little harmonic society. The old woman looked up in my face and shook her head; *I* thought contemptuously — while the young ones, stifling their smiles, exchanged looks of compassion, doubtlessly at my ignorance of their language … *I* never felt myself less invested with the dignity of [a man], than while I stood twirling my stick, and 'biding the encounter of the eyes,' and smiles of these 'spinners in the sun.'[53]

In *The Wild Irish Girl*, then, the English traveller's confidence in his superior knowledge, manners and civility is confounded by his encounter with these Irish women. Their quiet dignity in the performance of this homespun industry serves to elevate Irish folk culture both in the eyes of the hero and the reader. However, whilst this discursive strategy necessarily reinforces the hoary old dichotomy between England's masculine modernity and an antiquated and feminine Irish culture, Morgan's later fiction repeatedly ruptures such binarism. Though *Florence Macarthy* still engages the romance of an illusory Irish past, it deliberately interpolates such elegiac mythmaking with the disorienting dislocations of a dynamic modernity. Florence's evocation of the spinning wheel may initially connect her writing to the 'rude rustic work' (273) of an Irish cottage industry but her admission that she does 'trade upon' Ireland, turning her patriotism into 'pounds, shillings and pence' alerts us to the fact that she actually operates under the matrix of a transnational capitalist economy. According to Julie Donovan, Morgan's fictions repeatedly play upon the link between text and textile, thereby implicating 'not just Owenson but also her consumers in complex networks of commodification and exchange'.[54] This 'politics of style' enables Morgan to 'interweave Irish history with the

---

[53] Sydney Owenson, *The Wild Irish Girl*, p. 21.
[54] Donovan, Julie, *Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan and the Politics of Style* (Palo Alto, CA: Academica Press, 2009), p. 3.

physical world of material objects'. In particular, textiles and clothing provide Morgan

with 'a kind of master trope [...] because of their very material nature – their ability to be

circulated and exchanged, restitched and refashioned'. Morgan's 'provocative

materialising of history' is therefore, simultaneously, 'malleable, portable and

transformable'.[55] Ina Ferris likewise recognises the paradox of the author's 'rootless

nationality.'[56] She argues that Morgan's later heroine might still 'double' as the Irish

nation, but in an unsettling and disruptive manner that clearly distinguishes Florence

from her literary predecessor, *The Wild Irish Girl*'s heroine, Glorvina:

> [B]oth Ireland and the performative heroine become detached from the unifying figure of place and reconstructed in the disjunctive temporal terms of mobility and metamorphosis [...] the Irish nation now 'appears' in different locations and among different groups, an internally stratified and dispersed category. The heroine herself undergoes a similar scattering, as Glorvina's *thereness* – her fullness of being, her rootedness, her iconic visibility – gives way to an oddly elusive and deterritorialized being who belongs nowhere, exactly, and who typically operates in the interstices of culture, keeping herself hidden and in reserve.[57]

Considering this, it is curious to note Florence's equivocal reaction to Fitzwalter's

suggestion that she must embrace her habitual solitude given that she possesses 'an

imagination to create around you a perpetual Paradise' (274). In response, Florence

immediately abandons the motif of traditional Irish spinning for a product symbolic of

technological modernity – the kaleidoscope:

> An imagination,' she interrupted eagerly, 'to exalt every anguish, to exaggerate every suffering [...] to oppose the dreariness and privation of a rude and ungenial solitude, to all the refined and elegant tastes of polished social life, whose details passing through the prismatic medium of fancy, like the broken and worthless particles flung into the kaleidoscope, arrange themselves in symmetric beauty and

---

[55] Donovan, p. 19-20.
[56] Donovan, p. 13.
[57] Ina Ferris, *The Romantic National Tale and The Question of Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 75-6.

harmonic colouring, to charm and to deceive, and to assume forms, hues, and lustre, beyond their own intrinsic qualities. (274)

Invented by Sir David Brewster in 1815, the kaleidoscope was soon replicated as a 'philosophical' toy using mass production techniques. As Jonathan Crary observes, Brewster had conceived of the kaleidoscope 'as a mechanical means for the reformation of art according to an industrial paradigm.'[58] However, for later artists and thinkers such as Baudelaire 'it figured as a machine for the disintegration of a unitary subjectivity and for the scattering of desire into new shifting and labile arrangements'.[59] Significantly, in her appropriation of the kaleidoscope as a metaphor for her own imaginative production, Florence appears to recognise not only the dual, and seemingly contradictory, functions of the kaleidoscope but also the fact that:

> [T]he abstraction necessary for Brewster's industrial delirium is made possible by the same forces of modernization that allowed Baudelaire to use the kaleidoscope as a model for the kinetic experience of 'the multiplicity of life itself and the flickering grace of all its elements.'[60]

By representing her own imagination as kaleidoscopic, Florence acknowledges the intrinsic modernity of her literary output. Furthermore, her description of the kaleidoscope as an instrument that creates beauty out of the deceptive rearrangement of 'broken and worthless particles' registers contemporary concerns regarding the commercialisation of art in the early nineteenth century. Identifying the emergence of a mass visual culture and entertainment industry in this period, Gillen D'Arcy Wood delineates the Romantic ideological reaction against this 'new visual-cultural industry of

---

[58] Jonathan Crary, *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*. (Cambridge, CT: MIT Press, 1990), p. 116.
[59] Crary, p. 113.
[60] Crary, p. 116.

mass reproduction, spectacle and simulation'. He argues that the sudden popularity and availability of new visual media confounded 'Romantic expressive theories of artistic production, emphasizing original genius and the idealising imagination'.[61] This resulted in an 'educated literary sensibility outraged by the spectacle of bourgeois consumption of art, and by the increasing influence of a decidedly middle-class taste for visual novelty and the 'real'.'[62]

Evidently, Morgan does not collude with this 'Romantic anti-visual culture prejudice'.[63] As evidenced throughout *Florence Macarthy*, Morgan's writing unashamedly embraces the ephemerality, performativity and derivativeness that was derisively attributed to this nascent market of popular cultural entertainment. In so doing, her fiction fundamentally rejects the Romantic ideal of autonomous authorship and foregrounds the prolific productivity of mass publishing and printing technologies over the, by then, calcifying concept of the republic of letters. At the same time, Florence's underlying ambivalence regarding her writing process, or rather, writing performance, is persistently underscored. Whether the sorrows she idly feigns 'are too frequently lost in the sufferings she actually endure[s]' or the 'broken and worthless particles' of her imagination only serve to deceive, the fictional novelist unabashedly confronts the vulnerability of the woman writer within the literary marketplace. Though seemingly disparate tropes, the rich tapestry produced by the spinning wheel and the synthesis of particles flung together in the kaleidoscope both testify to female authorship as a precarious commercial enterprise. The means of material production of fiction may be shifting in the new Industrial Age, but the woman writer remains 'the mere creature of

---

[61] D'Arcy Wood, Gillen. *The Shock of the Real: Romanticism and Visual Culture, 1760-1860*. (New York: Palgrave, 2001), p. 7.
[62] D'Arcy Wood, p. 13.
[63] D'Arcy Wood, p. 8.

circumstances […], friendless, unprotected, and dependent upon [her] own exertions for subsistence' (277). Significantly, on her eventual marriage to the Commodore, latterly revealed as Walter de Montenay Fitzadelm, Lord Dunore, the narrative's conclusion sees Florence relinquish her pen with a typically theatrical gesture:

> I would fain, like one of my own heroines, wind up the denouement of my story with some touch of humour or pathos – some appeal to the feelings I address, which should enable me to retire with applause: but hitherto adversity has been my muse, and now,' placing her hand in Lord Dunore's, 'she deserts me.' (364)

If she ever decides to write again, Florence continues, it will be in 'the calm of my dull prosperity', 'with my own amusement for my object, and my husband for my critical reviewer' (364). Arguably, then, *Florence Macarthy* only envisages a happy ending for its novel-writing heroine under the auspices of a benevolent patriarchal reviewer. And yet, Florence's earlier assertion that she "shall take the liberty of *putting* [*her*]*self in* [*her*] *own book*" (364) somewhat complicates her explicit acceptance of this narrowly domestic role. Indeed, *Florence Macarthy*'s persistent and deliberate conflation of protagonist and author renders such declamatory professions as shrewdly performative. After all, as her critics caustically observed, Lady Morgan's real-life marriage to a peer did not diminish either her literary output or ubiquity. Whilst endowing her fictional counterpart with 'all the brightness and evanescence of a rainbow' (274), Lady Morgan simultaneously reminds both readers and reviewers of her enduring effervescence within the literary marketplace.

Bibliography

Belanger, Jacqueline E., *Critical Receptions: Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan* (Bethesda: Academica Press, 2007)

Braun, Heather. 'The Seductive Masquerade of *The Wild Irish Girl*', *Irish Studies Review* 13.1 (2005): 33-43.

Brewer, William D., 'Unnationalized Englishmen in Mary Shelley's Fiction', *Romanticism On the Net* 11 (1998), https://www.erudit.org/fr/revues/ron/1998-n11-ron423/005812ar/.

Chorley, Henry Fothergill, ed., *Letters of Mary Russell Mitford*, 2 vols (London, Bentley, 1872)

Connolly, Claire, *A Cultural History of the Irish Novel, 1790-1829* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

——, '"I accuse Miss Owenson:" The Wild Irish Girl as Media Event.' *Colby Quarterly*, 36.2 (2000), 98-115.

——, 'Irish Romanticism, 1800-1830', in *The Cambridge History of Irish Literature, Volume 1: To 1890*, ed. by Margaret Kelleher and Philip O'Leary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006) pp. 407-448.

Corbett, Mary Jean, *Allegories of Union in Irish and English Writing, 1790-1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Crary, Jonathan, *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*. (Cambridge, CT: MIT Press, 1990)

Cullen, Fintan, 'Lord Edward Fitzgerald: The Creation of an Icon', *History Ireland* 6. 4 (1998), pp. 17-20.

D'Arcy Wood, Gillen. *The Shock of the Real: Romanticism and Visual Culture, 1760-1860*. (New York: Palgrave, 2001)

Donovan, Julie, *Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan and the Politics of Style* (Palo Alto, CA: Academica Press, 2009)

Eagleton, Terry, *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger: Studies in Irish Culture* (London: Verso, 1995)

Ferris, Ina, *The Romantic National Tale and The Question of Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Gahan, Daniel, '"Journey after My Own Heart:" Lord Edward FitzGerald in America, 1788-90,' *New Hibernia Review / Iris Éireannach Nua* 8. 2 (2004), pp. 85-105.

Hansen, Mark. "Not Thus, after All, Would Life Be Given": "Technesis", Technology and the Parody of Romantic Poetics in *Frankenstein'*, *Studies in Romanticism*, 36.4 (1997), 575-609.

Heinowitz, Rebecca Cole, *Spanish America and British Romanticism, 1777–1826: Rewriting Conquest* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010)

Hustis, Harriet, 'Responsible Creativity and the "Modernity" of Mary Shelley's Prometheus,' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900: The Nineteenth Century*, 43.4 (2003), 845-85.

Lamb, Caroline. *Glenarvon* [1816], ed. by Deborah Lutz (Richmond, VA: Valancourt, 2007)

Leerssen, Joep Theodoor, *Remembrance and Imagination: Patterns in the Historical and Literary Representation of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997)

---. 'How *The Wild Irish Girl* Made Ireland Romantic', in *The Clash of Ireland: Literary Contrasts and Connections*, ed. by C.C. Barfoot and Theo D'haen (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1989) pp. 98-117.

Lew, Joseph W., 'The Deceptive Other: Mary Shelley's Critique of Orientalism in *Frankenstein*', *Studies in Romanticism*, 30. 2 (1991), 255-283.

Lord Byron [George Noël Gordon Byron], *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage: A Romaunt: 4 Cantos* (London: Murray, 1818)

Morin, Christina, 'Regina Maria Roche', in *Lost Souls of Horror and the Gothic*, ed. by Elizabeth McCarthy and Bernice M. Murphy (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2016), pp. 186-189.

Neff, D.S., '"Hostages to Empire:" The Anglo-Indian Problem in *Frankenstein*, *The Curse of Kehama*, and *The Missionary*', *European Romantic Review* 8 (1997), 386-408

Owenson, Sydney [Lady Morgan], *Florence Macarthy: An Irish Tale (1818)*, ed. by Jenny McAuley (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012)

——, *France*, 2 vols (London: Colburn, 1817)

——, *The Missionary: An Indian Tale,* ed. Julia M. Wright (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2002)

——, *The O'Briens and the O'Flahertys* [1827]*, ed. Julia M. Wright (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2013)

——, *Passages from My Autobiography* (London: Bentley, 1859).

——, *The Wild Irish Girl: A National Tale* [1803], ed. by Kathryn Kirkpatrick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

'Review of Florence Macarthy: An Irish Tale', British Review, 13, May 1819, 482-494.

Shelley, Mary, *Frankenstein, or, The Modern Prometheus: The 1818 Text*, ed. by Marilyn Butler (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Swift, Jonathan, 'A Proposal for the Universal Use of Irish Manufacture (1720),' in *Swift's Irish Writings*, ed. by Carol Fabricant and Robert Mahoney (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010)

Tessone, Natasha, 'Displaying Ireland: Sydney Owenson and the Politics of Spectacular Antiquarianism', *Eire-Ireland: a Journal of Irish Studies* 37 (2002): 169-86.

Tracy, Thomas, *Irishness and Womanhood in Nineteenth-century British Writing* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009)

Trumpener, Katie, *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and The British Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997)

Woodmansee, Martha, 'The Genius and the Copyright: Economic and Legal Conditions of the Emergence of the 'Author', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 17. 4 (1984), 425-448.

Wright, Julia M., Introduction to *The Missionary: An Indian Tale, by Sydney Owenson* (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2002)