

Acknowledgements

This project was supported by a grant from the Australian Research Council. Gillian Russell would like to thank especially Paul Campbell, who aided in research for her chapter and in preparation of the volume for publication. Joan Sussler of the Lewis Walpole Library, Erin Chase of the Huntington Library, John Powell of the Newberry Library and Alastair Laing at the National Trust, UK, were extremely helpful in obtaining illustrations. Clara Tuite would like to thank Iain McCalman for a fellowship at the Humanities Research Centre, Australian National University, which enabled the editors an extended period of *in situ* sociability and collaboration on the project. We are grateful to Josie Dixon for initial encouragement and shepherding of the volume in its early stages: our editor at Cambridge University Press, Linda Bree, has been a trusted guide in its completion.

This volume has been produced in its own sociable contexts: we would like to note the companionable discussions with Judith Barbour and Deirdre Coleman, Sarah Lloyd, Jon Mee and Iain McCalman, that have been so important in shaping its development. We are enormously grateful to our contributors for the lively spirit of international sociability, dialogue and discussion that energizes the volume and makes it so much more than just the sum of its parts. Our greatest debts, as always, are to Benjamin Penny and Susan Conley.

Introducing Romantic sociability

Gillian Russell and Clara Tuite

On the night of 28 December 1817, the painter Benjamin Robert Haydon held a dinner in the painting room of his studio at 22 Lisson Grove, London. The centrepiece of the room, illuminated by the flickering light of a winter's day fire, was *Christ's Entry into Jerusalem*: the occasion was partly marking a completion of a phase in the painting which had involved Haydon's portrait of William Wordsworth witnessing Christ between the figures of Voltaire and Milton. Present at the party were Wordsworth himself, John Keats, who was meeting Wordsworth for the first time, Charles Lamb and Thomas Monkhouse. The evening soon became exceedingly convivial. There was a vigorous debate on the merits of Homer, Shakespeare, Milton and Virgil, and toasts were made to Voltaire and Newton. Others joined the party in the course of the evening - the surgeon Joseph Ritchie, who was about to embark on a trip of exploration in Africa, and John Kingston, comptroller of the Stamp Office and a man with some pretensions in *belles lettres*. According to Haydon, Kingston had been curious to meet Wordsworth partly because of the latter's literary celebrity but also because, as distributor of stamps for Westmorland, Wordsworth was Kingston's inferior in the civil service. 'The moment he was introduced he let Wordsworth know *who* he officially was', writes Haydon in his diary. This produced an awkward moment of self-consciousness for Wordsworth, who was exposed before the company as a placeman, subject to the authority of men like Kingston. The latter's attempt to enter into the world of these artists and writers by talking to Wordsworth about poetry was ridiculed by a drunk Charles Lamb, who countered Kingston's sage remarks with the nursery rhyme 'Diddle diddle don', an assertion of the infantile and the ludic against the bureaucratic intruder. 'There is no describing this scene adequately', Haydon commented.

There was not the restraint of refined company, nor the vulgar freedom of low, but a frank, natural license, such as one sees in an act of Shakespeare, every man expressing his natural emotions without fear. Into this company, a little heated with wine, a Comptroller of the Stamp Office walked, frilled, dressed, & official, with a due awe of the powers above him and a due contempt for those beneath him.

He goes on:

There was something interesting in seeing Wordsworth sitting, & Keats & Lamb, & my Picture of Christ's entry towering up behind them, occasionally brightened by the gleams of flame that sparkled from the fire, & hearing the voice of Wordsworth repeating Milton with an intonation like the funeral bell of St Paul's & the music of Handel mingled, & then Lamb's wit came sparkling in between, & Keats's rich fancy of Satyrs & Fauns & doves & white clouds, wound up the stream of conversation. I never passed a more delightful day & I am convinced that nothing in Boswell is equal to what came out from these Poets. Indeed there were no such Poets in his time. It was an evening worthy of the Elizabethan age, and will long flash upon "that inward eye which is the bliss of Solitude."¹

The 'immortal dinner', as it was described in Haydon's *Autobiography*, was a sociable event staged by the painter in what was both a private and a professional space – his studio – and before a work in progress which was not merely a kind of theatrical backdrop but another kind of guest in dialogic relationship with the drama before it.² *Christ's Entry* was a heroic vindication and, indeed, sanctification, of the capacity of men of genius to transcend the age. The dinner has been restaged on a number of occasions in biographies of the principals and has recently been the subject of a study in its own right which uses the event as a centrepiece of biographical accounts of the protagonists and a survey of metropolitan culture in 1817, but it has not received any sustained critical attention within Romantic studies, like 'Romantic sociability' as a whole.³ The turn to history in Romantic studies has given us some glimpses into the sociability of men and women of the Romantic period – for example, the dense network comprised by the reform societies, publishers' dinners, theatre-going and supper parties of the Godwin circle in the 1790s; the suburban sociality of sonnet-writing contests, tea-drinking and music-making of the Hunt circle in the 1810s and 1820s; the 'Italianate salon' of William Roscoe at Liverpool; John Clare's scrutiny of Coleridge, Lamb and Hazlitt at the *London Magazine* dinners of the 1820s; the freneticism of Thomas Moore's conversational commerce; Helen Maria Williams's anglicization of French salon sociability – but in only a few of these cases has sociability actually been the focus of the analysis

and there has certainly been no work which has attempted to define 'Romantic sociability' or map a possible field of study in such terms.⁴

Within the social history of the long eighteenth century it would be true to say that sociability has received more substantial attention in work by scholars such as Peter Borsay, John Money, Kathleen Wilson and Peter Clark.⁵ Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen's *English Masculinities* uses sociability as a sub-category in which to group two of the chapters of that collection while both John Brewer's *Pleasures of the Imagination* and Amanda Vickery's *The Gentleman's Daughter* deal extensively with the topic, without explicitly foregrounding it.⁶ Paul Langford's essay 'Manners and the Eighteenth-Century State: the Case of the Unsociable Englishman' tackles the subject more directly, culminating in a sub-section entitled 'English sociability'. Langford's essay exemplifies a general tendency in eighteenth-century history, literary studies and social and political theory to regard sociability ahistorically as a given of social interaction which does not require explanation.⁷ For example, the two essays in *English Masculinities* grouped under the rubric 'Sociability' which address plebeian male sociability and gendered constructions of conversation for upper-middle class and elite males, suggest that sociability varied according to class and social rank, but the editors do not directly address how they are using the category nor how their essays might inflect its meaning. Leslie Mitchell's *TLS* review of Peter Clark's monumental *British Clubs and Societies* speculated that the willingness of Britons to associate in clubs and societies could be explained by urbanization and a non-interventionist state post 1688 but 'must also owe something to what was innate in the British character', a universalizing perspective also apparent in Langford's essay which develops into what is in effect a polemic about English national character.⁸ Rejecting the Habermasian model of the public sphere, Langford defines 'English sociability' as 'distinct from sociability as extended kinship and sociability as the divided or alienated self, as public' and concludes with a quote from a Victorian, George Gissing, to the effect that English sociability has never been 'ceremonial' or 'mirthful' but 'as regards every prime instinct of the community . . . [the English] social instinct is supreme'. Glossing this quotation, Langford concludes: 'If, at last, [English sociability] is an illusion, it is one that has entranced the English themselves. Its most lasting legacy is surely the potent image of the gentleman as the authentic representative of Englishness, in the character which the eighteenth century bestowed on him.'⁹ Langford's essay illustrates the continuing discursive potency of sociability, how it can articulate particular constructions

of gender, class and national identity. As this volume will outline, this discursive potency is not just a feature of current academic discourse on sociability but was apparent in the eighteenth century.

The comparative neglect of events such as Haydon's account of the 'immortal dinner' is a reflection of the marginal status of texts such as the essay, diaries and letters in Romantic literary studies, which have had considerable ideological investment in canonical genres and forms such as the lyric, as well as in a narrow text-based definition of the Romantic public sphere. As Paul Magnuson states: 'The public space of Romanticism is the book and the periodical', which suggests that it is not to be found in the theatre, the debating club, the bookshop or the dining room.¹⁰ An argument of this volume is that we need to recover the significance of sociability, not simply for biographical studies of Romantic writers or in order to contextualize their work, but as a kind of text in its own right, a form of cultural work – sometimes playfully convivial as at 22 Lisson Grove – which was a fundamental part of the self-definition of Romantic writers and artists. Another reason why events such as Haydon's 'immortal dinner' have been neglected is the apparent incompatibility of such convivial and theatrical social occasions with Romanticism's traditional identification with the lone poet, withdrawn into productive introspection, with individualism rather than collective activity, and with the cultivation of the authentic rather than the performative self.¹¹ These emphases have been given a historical inflection in Mark Philip's claim that in the 1790s 'the ideals nurtured by sociability collapsed . . . leaving the stage free for the isolationism of the Romantics', a statement which appropriately highlights the crucial significance of the 1790s but which also proposes the 'Romantics' as anti-sociable and Romanticism as a whole as representing the rejection of Enlightenment sociability.¹² The chapters in this volume will attempt to challenge these assumptions. It is our contention that the solitary self has stood for Romanticism for too long: this volume will investigate its sociable other.

* If the sociable occupies the position of the other of a solitary or interiorized Romanticism, this is partly because there has been no critical tradition of representing a Romanticism in which sociability is a value. As Lawrence Klein has pointed out, '[i]t is often observed that a reaction against emphatic sociability took shape in the form of a rehabilitation of solitude'.¹³ Before we move on to survey the heterogeneous forms that could be said to constitute Romanticism's sociable others, it might be

worth mapping the move from what Klein refers to as the 'emphatic' sociability of the earlier eighteenth century to the Romantic moment of solitude, which is engaged in Haydon's dialectic between solitude and sociability. In *British Clubs and Societies*, Peter Clark refers to 'an intricate tessellation' of social activity in the Georgian period of which he distinguishes three broad categories: the 'private' sociability of the home, where 'the greatest volume of social contact took place'; an 'old-style' sociability based around the church, parliament, court and the street; and a 'new-style' sociability engendered by the commercialization of culture in venues such as the coffee-house, the inn, tavern, alehouse, the proliferation of forms of voluntary association, theatres, pleasure-gardens, dancing assemblies and so on. Within this last category Clark notes but does not substantively analyze distinct gender differences between what he calls 'fashionable sociability', 'influenced by sensibility and the public presence of women', and the sociability of the club, coffee-house and tavern, which was strongly identified with male homosociality.¹⁴ The predominance of the coffee-house and the club as models of sociability, both within eighteenth-century representations and contemporary readings of the period, has functioned to produce a paradigmatic model of sociability that is implicitly male and homosocial. It is one of the aims of this volume to re-examine this model in order to account for a more diverse range of sites of sociability, in particular, sites which are more inclusive of female modes of sociability, and to account for forms of female participation in the public sphere more generally, as part of a larger investigation of gender and Romantic-period sociability.¹⁵

The coffee-house and the club are the primary sites and practices of the conversational model of culture which starts to gain ground in the eighteenth century.¹⁶ A vital cultural formation in this respect is the early periodicals, in particular, Richard Steele's *The Tatler* (1709–11) and Joseph Addison's *The Spectator* (1711–12, 1714).¹⁷ Whilst *The Tatler* and *The Spectator* exist for us as edited 'texts', they began their lives as 'papers', circulating within the heterogeneous worlds of the actual sites of sociability with which they conducted their sociable traffic. There are a number of ways in which the early eighteenth-century public sphere might be said to announce sociability as a value:

- (1) in the modelling of culture as a conversation, and the cultivation of the sociable virtues of laughter, clubbability, conviviality, taste and politeness;¹⁸
- (2) in the modelling of culture as object of spectatorship (a less participatory yet more theatrical model than (1) above);

- (3) in the use of sociability to ground moral judgements in Enlightenment moral philosophy;
- (4) and in the production of sociability as a value through its absence, i.e., in the satirical production of the absence of sociability or through the sentimental conventions of melancholy and pathos.

Written from particular coffee-houses (*The Spectator* was written from Lloyd's, for many years), where the editors reported on the passing sociable world they saw and heard, and where they were known (at least to begin with) to their audience of readers, the periodical papers are significant in attesting to the importance of sociability as a fact in eighteenth-century public culture, and in producing this sociability as a value. *The Tatler* and *The Spectator* produce sociability as both a fact, as anecdote, topic, as part of the 'motley' of 'Whate'er men do, or say, or think, or dream' (*The Tatler*, motto for No. 1, p.15) and as a value. Part of what is distinctive about this early eighteenth-century public discourse, then, at least as it is manifested in *The Tatler* and *The Spectator*, is its utopic heterogeneity, and a certain Menippean satirical and carnivalesque inclusiveness. If these papers strike William Godwin as 'strikingly loose and unsystematical',¹⁹ it is because they are intended to be, in that a certain looseness keeps the model of conversation in view of the reader. In *The Tatler*, conversation provides a model of democratic exchange: 'Equality is the Life of Conversation' (*The Tatler* No. 225, p. 174). And if equality is the life of conversation, it is also the life of business exchange:

Man is said to be a Sociable Animal, and, as an instance of it, we may observe, that we take all Occasions and Pretences of forming our selves into those little Nocturnal Assemblies, which are commonly known by the Name of Clubs . . . When Men are thus knit together, by a Love of Society, not a Spirit of Faction, and don't meet to censure or annoy those that are absent, but to enjoy one another: When they are thus combined for their own Improvement, or for the Good of others, or at least to relax themselves from the Business of the Day, by an innocent and cheerful Conversation, there may be something very useful in these little Institutions and Establishments. (*The Spectator* No. 9, p. 39, p. 42)

Part of what is at stake here is the integration of politics and business into sociable practice. Here, sociability is produced as a naturalizing feature of business, as the clubbable man eases into 'innocent and cheerful Conversation' at the end of the 'Business of the Day'. The assertion that the spirit of the club is 'not a Spirit of Faction' also registers the erasure of political interest as a key feature of early Hanoverian modes of

politeness and sociability: politics and sociability do not go hand in hand. Our volume seeks to examine what happens to this model which keeps politics and sociability separate in a period such as the 1790s which is marked, we argue, by highly charged combinations of politics and sociability. Jon Mee's chapter, in particular, examines the nature of precisely this kind of transformation of an early eighteenth-century mode of sociability, elaborated in the work of Shaftesbury, within the radical political cultures of the 1790s in the circles of Robert Merry.

Another significant model of sociability is the theatrical, performative or what John Dwyer has referred to as the 'spectatorial model'²⁰ of culture. This model intersects with the conversational model, but can diverge from it in that it can involve a less participatory model of culture and sociability. As *The Spectator* No. 1 says: 'I have acted in all the parts of my Life as a Looker-on, which is the Character I intend to preserve in this paper.' (*The Spectator* No. 1, p. 5). The figure of the spectator is a significant sociable presence in the writings of the Scottish Enlightenment, a crucial cultural form of the classical eighteenth-century public sphere. Adam Smith founds the Scottish Enlightenment tradition of what John Dwyer has referred to as 'spectatorial ethics', exemplified by Smith's invocation of the 'cool and impartial spectator' (in *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1749, revised 1790)). As Dwyer has also suggested, sociability is an 'imperative' of Enlightenment moral philosophy in general.²¹ According to Adam Smith, the best model of society is a conversational one in which pleasure arises 'from a certain correspondence of sentiments and opinions, from a certain harmony of minds, which like so many musical instruments coincide and keep time with one another'.²² This moral philosophy is exemplary in its elaboration of sociability as a value. Moral philosophy and journalism are not separate realms, though. Indeed, the bringing together of journalism and philosophy – the open and critical discussion of modes of behaviour and everyday life – is a critical impulse of the bourgeois public sphere. As Addison's speaker in *The Spectator* No. 10 says: 'I shall be ambitious to have it said of me, that I have brought Philosophy out of Closets and Libraries, Schools and Colleges, to dwell in Clubs and Assemblies, at tea-Tables, and in Coffee-Houses' (*The Spectator* No. 10, p. 44).

And just as Scottish Enlightenment philosophy is characterized by a focus on emphatically social and sociable relations, so too does this new coffee-house sociability involve both a democratization of philosophy and an enactment of the ideal of philosophy as a mode of sociable

interchange. *The Tatler* and *The Spectator* papers popularize the philosophical ideals of the Scottish Enlightenment, self-consciously promulgating sociability as a virtue.

In *The Spectator's* reading of Thomas Hobbes's *Discourse of Human Nature* (1650), its satirical reproduction of Hobbes's misanthropic reading of laughter as pride – '[a]ccording to this Author therefore, when we hear a Man laugh excessively, instead of saying he is very Merry, we ought to tell him he is very Proud' (*The Spectator* No. 47, p. 200) – produces the sociable virtue of laughter, thereby offering another example of the early eighteenth-century public sphere's production of sociability as a value. Running counter to the pessimistic and mechanistic model of civil society offered by Hobbes, produced out of a seventeenth-century background of religious and civil conflict, this reading offers a moment at which *The Spectator* foregrounds its own ideological implication within the Enlightened Hanoverian Whig regime in its valuing of social order and harmony, free of the 'Spirit of Faction', and of an order of 'Merry' sociability. Even the categories of melancholy and pathos are pressed into sociable service in the culture of the early eighteenth-century public sphere. The discourse of sentiment, for example, involved the category of catharsis, which relies on the sympathy of spectators. As Addison writes in *The Spectator*, it is by contemplating the 'greater miseries of others [that] a man forgets his own and obtains the needed mental catharsis' (*The Spectator* No. 387). A literature of pathos is a primary tool also in this training of feeling. Dwyer has referred, for example, to the Ossian poems of James Macpherson as attempts to 'increase humanity through the skilful manipulation of pathos'.²³

In this context, the political overdetermination of sentiment and sensibility in the 1790s as signifiers, on the one hand, of Jacobin revolutionary excess, and on the other, of counter-revolutionary chivalry and loyalism (most notably in Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790)), offer a measure of what is distinctive about Romantic-period sociability in contrast with the earlier period. In the 1790s, one of the primarily contested set of associations with sentiment is sociability and anti-sociability. In Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility*, written in the late 1790s though not published until 1811, the sensibility embodied in the character of Marianne Dashwood is represented as emphatically anti-sociable. This is inflected in the novel through the counter-revolutionary perception of sensibility as a form of excess which threatens social and familial stability. John Mullan's important *Sentiment and Sociability: The Language of Feeling in the Eighteenth Century* (1988) frames a discussion of the

relations between solipsism and sociability in the moral philosophy of Shaftesbury, Adam Smith and David Hume with a play on the title of Austen's novel and passing references to Austen. For Mullan, Austen's identification of sensibility with anti-sociability is invoked as though Austen transcends the struggles over the definition of sociability and sentiment that Mullan is describing in the book, rather than participating in the contestation of the meaning of both sociability and sentiment that characterized the 1790s. Furthermore, Mullan both endorses the conventional literary-historical narrative which reads the Austen novel as a sociable cure for sentimental excesses, and relies on an idea of sociability as a given which does not require explanation.²⁴ Our project, on the other hand, understands sensibility and sociability to be heavily contested terms and practices critically implicated in the cultural politics of the 1790s, with often highly unstable meanings.

The culture of sentiment is a vital part of what Jürgen Habermas in his *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* refers to as the 'audience-oriented privacy' which develops in the early eighteenth century.²⁵ Genres such as the letter and the diary, as well as the epistolary novel²⁶ – sentiment's primary literary genre – all participate in the particular *frissons* of this new culture of 'audience-oriented privacy', in which forms of intimacy are staged in public. A similar recognition of the public and socially oriented production of the individual underlies Niklas Luhmann's investigation of the 'codification of intimacy', and the culture of 'affect-management',²⁷ which is predicated upon an understanding of the individual not as an isolate, but as a socially recognized entity who is required to *perform* his or her individuality within a repertoire of codes and modes of affect. Such conventions break down any absolute distinction between the solitary and the sociable. Similarly, such a culture of 'audience-oriented privacy' suggests a complicated version of the so-called public and private distinction, which has been such a significant category of cultural, social and historical analysis since the English translation in 1989 of *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Here the public sphere is used to account for the ways in which modern European democracies are distinguished from their centralizing absolutist predecessors, and refers to a democratic space of discursive interaction in which citizens participate in a public culture of critique. Implicated in the economic, social and cultural developments of *laissez-faire* capitalism, the public sphere is nonetheless distinct in principle from both apparatuses of state and from economic markets. The distinction between the so-called private and public spheres has been a critical distinction

for cultural history, for the study of gender and for politically oriented studies of culture, and for our rubric of sociability. Within this field of debate on the public and the private, as in the social and literary history of this period, the category of sociability is engaged regularly but fleetingly, never elaborated in its own right. When sociability does make an appearance, it is often used as a term of differentiation from the political, as a site of mere play or of a purposeless form of performance or theatricality. Influential in this respect is the work of the German sociologist Georg Simmel, whose 1911 essay 'On Sociability' identifies sociability as any social interaction which exists primarily 'for its own sake and for the fascination which in its own liberation from [social] ties it diffuses'. It is a 'play-form' of interaction which need have 'no extrinsic results'. 'Sociates feel that the formation of a society as such is a value; they are driven toward this form of existence.' For Simmel, sociability's 'aim is nothing but the success of the sociable moment and, at most, a memory of it'.²⁸ A similar ahistoricizing construction of sociability is apparent in more recent accounts of the public sphere, for example in Jeff Weintraub's reference to: 'The approach, exemplified . . . by the work of Ariès (and other figures in social history and anthropology), which sees the "public" realm as a sphere of fluid and polymorphous sociability, and seeks to analyze the cultural and dramatic conventions that make it possible.'²⁹

Weintraub's tag of 'fluid and polymorphous' underplays the complexity of the historical and social specificities that might be said to be played out in sociable practices. And Bruce Robbins's summary of Weintraub's model, in his introduction to *The Phantom Public Sphere*, emphasizes the theatricality of sociability, its 'symbolic display and theatrical self-representation [which] has little if anything to do with collective decision making or state power'.³⁰ Here, sociability is opposed both to political power and to rational communalism; it is fully comprehended by a model of theatricality which is associated with individualistic impulses of 'display' and 'self-representation'.

Similarly problematic in this respect is Nancy Fraser's reading of the public as 'a theater in modern societies in which political participation is enacted through the medium of talk'.³¹ 'The pure metaphoricity of this relation between the theatre and the public sphere — by which an abstracted model of the theatre and of the public sphere become mutually signifying — works to evacuate both of any real material meaning. The public sphere is not simply a theatre, and sociability is not purely dramatic. The theatre is one particular form of material site of the public and of the sociable, with specific and changing conventions of sociable behaviours. To elaborate this materiality (as against a kind of abstractedness) is one

of the projects which will be conducted in this volume. Performativity and publicity are vital defining categories for the public sphere, and for understanding the social and the sociable. They are also particularly important categories in terms of the possibilities of making sexuality a central category for social theory, rather than the marginal one it often is. As Michael Warner has pointed out, 'it remains depressingly easy to speak of "social theory" and have in mind whole debates and paraprofessional networks in which sexuality figures only peripherally or not at all'.³² Critical figures within social theory such as Jürgen Habermas, Anthony Giddens, Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, Niklas Luhmann and Pierre Bourdieu, all elaborate important social-theory models in which sexuality is either a marginal category or an unproblematically heteronormative one. As Warner further points out, '[s]ocial theory as a quasi-institution for the past century has returned continually to the question of sexuality, but almost without recognizing why it has done so, and with an endless capacity to marginalize queer sexuality in its descriptions of the social world'.³³ 'The work of Judith Butler has been enormously important in theorizing performativity as a critical category both of social and textual analysis, and in relation to gender and sexuality. As Butler suggests, '[p]erformativity is neither free play nor theatrical self-representation; nor can it simply be equated with performance'. Performativity is both a self-conscious or literalized form of social performance, and a 'repetition of norms [that is] not performed by a subject [but] what enables a subject'.³⁴ 'The nuanced and theorized mode of performativity that Butler brings to the study of subjectivity, gender and sexuality in contemporary culture offers enormous scope also for the historical study of sexuality, and for the more specific theorization of social performance and sociability, enabling, for example, a theoretical inflection of that historical model of sociability associated with modernity that Peter Clark identifies as 'fashionable sociability'. Just how the idea of the performative might be used to inform a sense of a fashionable sociability that is both embodied and discursively produced is examined in Clara Tuite's chapter on the relations between style, sociability and sexuality — and what we might call a 'queer' and 'Tory' cultural politics and sociable style — in the diaries of the landed gentry heiress, Anne Lister.

The most influential account of the public sphere, Habermas's *Structural Transformation*, also participates in social theory's view of sociability and the performative as essentialized forms of human behaviour which are distinct from political or historical engagement. For Georg Simmel, the category of conversation was important in precisely those

ways in which it is 'merely' sociable, not critical: 'In purely sociable conversation, the topic is merely the indispensable medium through which the lively exchange of speech itself unfolds its attractions . . . Talk [is] its own purpose.' Here, the 'purely sociable conversation' of a phatic sociability in which '[t]alk [is] its own purpose' is distinct from a 'talk' that is geared to critique. However, in Habermas's narrative of the 'transformation' from a courtly to a public model of culture his phatic sociability – analogized to the phatic modes of performativity that characterize courtly modes of behaviour – functions as the courtly other of what bourgeois culture of critique surpasses. What distinguishes the bourgeois public sphere from an aristocratic culture, where talk is its own medium, is the way in which an urban culture begins to 'shed its dependence on the authority of the aristocratic noble hosts and to acquire that autonomy that turns conversation into criticism and *bon mots* into arguments'.³⁵ For Habermas, then, it is precisely the *transformation* of conversation away from the ideal form into critique that is important. But what of Simmel's 'purely sociable conversation'? Does it have another function besides being this courtly other? How is sociability critical to these modes of critique? Do we have to sacrifice the *bon mot* for the rational argument? Margaret C. Jacob's chapter, 'Sociability and the international republican conversation', engages precisely these issues in its examination of the sociable production of the democratic subject which occurred in printed periodicals, letters and drawing rooms across Europe, as well as in the colonies. This question – what function has sociability in a culture of critique? – becomes even more pressing when we move the focus, as this volume does, from the earlier half of the eighteenth century – the golden Habermasian age of the bourgeois public sphere – to the end of the century, the 1790s, when the public sphere becomes politicized. And this is a primary question of the volume: what happens to this influential Habermasian model of the public sphere, and of sociability, in the Romantic period?

Habermas does not address 'Romanticism' as such, but nonetheless traces a development whereby the late eighteenth-century public, 'England after 1750', 'grows out' of 'early institutions' such as the coffee-house. The 'medium of the press and its professional criticism . . . formed the public sphere of a rational-critical debate in the world of letters within which the subjectivity originating in the interiority of the conjugal family, by communicating with itself, attained clarity with itself'.³⁶ In this model the conversation within print and between writer and reader 'grows

out' of, implicitly displacing or exceeding the actual conversation of the coffee-house and the kind of print culture which in Addisonian terms models itself on and evokes that 'talk'. The Habermasian public sphere as it applies to England therefore has two aspects, an early eighteenth-century phase in which cultural production is primarily conceived in sociable terms and a post-1750 phase in which the 'imagined community' of print takes precedence.³⁷ This phase initiates what is a movement of decline for Habermas, staged in his chapter title as 'From a Culture-Debating to a Culture-Consuming Public'. As Deidre Lynch puts it in her chapter in the volume, 'Habermas . . . narrativizes the relationship between commerce and the public sphere – outlining a process in which commercialization represents the sad, feminized sequel to public sphere conversation' (p. 214). Lynch's chapter seeks to challenge Habermas's model which links consumption and femininity against political activism, and re-examines the relations between commerce, the public sphere and women's historical agency, by considering shopping as a model of sociability and an occasion for the rational articulation of public issues.

The most influential applications of Habermas to the Romantic period in Britain have been those of Terry Eagleton and Jon Klancher, both of which engage the genre of the periodical as a paradigmatic formation of the public sphere constituted by and through print culture.³⁸ Klancher's *The Making of English Reading Audiences, 1790–1832* (1987) 'explains how eighteenth-century writers used the periodical to organize audiences, but also why their "widening circle" of readers perceptibly fragmented in the political crises of the 1790s'. Klancher argues that Habermas's "'public sphere" was deeply compromised from the start, no sooner projected than transformed into an image to consume by readers who did not frequent it'.³⁹ Eagleton's critique of Habermas's model of the public sphere similarly notes its 'severe problems of historical periodization' and its 'nostalgic', 'idealizing' connotations. The consensual model of the public sphere was exploded from within, Eagleton argues, by the emergence in the 1790s of a counter public sphere of 'the Corresponding Societies, the radical press, Owenism, Cobbett's *Political Register* and Paine's *Rights of Man*, feminism and the Dissenting churches, a whole oppositional network of journals, clubs, pamphlets, debates and institutions'. Periodical criticism registered 'fissiparousness' rather than consensus: 'Sir Roger de Coverley and Sir Andrew Freeport were no longer drinking companions at the same club, but deadly rivals.'

Eagleton argues that the 'function of criticism' in the Romantic period moves from the press and its professional criticism to 'poetry itself' because 'the depth and span of critique which would be equal to a society wracked by political turmoil is altogether beyond the powers of criticism in its traditional sense'. The force of that criticism lay in the Romantics' elaboration of 'disinterestedness as a revolutionary force, the production of a powerful yet decentred human subject which cannot be formalized within the protocols of rational exchange'.¹⁰ The latter phrase 'protocols of rational exchange' indicates but does not name Addisonian sociability as a set of rules or the particular cultural space of the coffee-house encoding an interaction of the discursive and non-discursive, material and theoretical, which Romanticism by implication had to 'grow out' of or exceed. Eagleton's more historically nuanced account of the public sphere as it applies to Britain in this period therefore basically recapitulates Habermas's two-phase model of the public sphere. However, while Habermas's 'world of letters' that subsumed the world of the coffee-house includes periodical criticism and forms such as the novel (by implication allowing a place for a writer such as Austen), Eagleton limits the function of criticism to poetry. His emphasis on the counter public sphere is also problematic insofar as he represents it as the source of a 'turmoil' which fragments and 'invades' the ideal of the consensual public sphere but which implicitly cannot function as the sphere of critique in itself – that honour is given to poetry as a reaction to the crisis which the counter public sphere had exposed.

Rather than interpreting 1790s radical culture as a counter public sphere revealing the self-interest and untenability of the earlier model of consensus between gentlemen as a synecdoche of civil society, it might be more useful to see this decade as representing an intensified politicization and expansion of the boundaries of the public sphere in which sociability as a value – encoding principles of free debate, openness, harmony between equals – is amplified by the French Revolution and its impact on Britain. The chapters in this volume by James Epstein, Margaret C. Jacob, Jon Mee and Gillian Russell address this phenomenon in a variety of ways. Eagleton's description of the counter public sphere refers to print culture in the form of Cobbett, Paine, journals and pamphlets but interestingly he situates these as part of a range of activities and institutions, such as the corresponding societies, which had a significant sociable dimension.¹¹ To Eagleton's definition of the counter public sphere we might add political lecturing, ultra-radical tavern culture, radical dining

and the circles of Horne Tooke, William Godwin and publishers such as Joseph Johnson.¹² Such a sociable culture does not suggest a simple eclipse of the coffee-house model of the public sphere but what might be described as its apotheosis as critique. As James Epstein's chapter in this volume suggests, the political potency of the ideals of unfettered expression and mutual openness and trust expressed through companionship, the right of a man to discourse with his friends, made the coffee-house more significant than ever in the 1790s. The ludic or performative dimensions of sociability which scholars as diverse as Simmel, Sennett, Habermas and Fraser have sought to distinguish from the political or rational also came into their own in the 1790s as part of the parodic or subversive strategies of radical culture. An example is John Thelwall's 'King Chaunticlere' in *Politics for the People*, for which its publisher, Daniel Isaac Eaton, was prosecuted in 1793. The title registers its origins as a sociable performance, stating that 'King Chaunticlere' was 'An Anecdote, related by Citizen Thelwall, at the Capel Court Society', a debating club, and the text itself notes the audience response, how it produced 'applause', a fracas, and ultimately Thelwall being 'conducted away with shouts of triumph by the greater part of the company'.¹³ In this case the function of criticism emerges out of Thelwall's elaboration of the sociable art of telling stories in company; the ideal of unfettered exchange (which also allows for the possibility of contention and even the unsociable) underpins his political performance.

As Paul Hamilton states in relation to Godwin's emphasis on the value of 'unreserved communication', 'such a meeting of idealism and empiricism is the political consequence of a utopian moment which Augustan literary culture had contained and postponed for so long'.¹⁴ We might extend this 'meeting' to include 1790s radical culture as a whole. One of the aims of the counter-revolution was to close down the spaces in which texts such as 'King Chaunticlere' could be enacted and subsequently disseminated in the form of print, spaces such as the debating clubs, lecture-rooms and taverns. But more effective in many respects was the use of the spy-system to place in doubt the very principles of mutual confidence and trust on which social intercourse was based. The coffee-house was a site of surveillance, not by Mr Spectator, whose role encodes and enables a sympathetic social relationship, but by a spy masquerading as a true companion in order to betray and punish. (The counter-revolution of the 1790s accentuates what might be described as the fear of the anti-sociable – the 'Spirit of Faction' – underlying sociable relations, particularly between men, throughout the eighteenth century.)¹⁵

The threat posed by counter-revolution to the sociable ideals of the Enlightenment public sphere is the subject of Godwin's *Caleb Williams*. Trying to escape from his persecutor Falkland, the eponymous hero 'disappears' in multi-cultural London by taking on the identity of a Jew. The metropolis is represented as a place of alienation, loneliness, isolation and pretence (Caleb regards himself as a 'counterfeit'). In short, it is anti-sociable: 'I dared not look for the consolations of friendship; but, instead of seeking to identify myself with the joys and sorrows of others, and exchanging the delicious gifts of confidence and sympathy, was compelled to centre my thoughts and my vigilance in myself. My life was all a lie.'¹⁶ Caleb tries to support himself financially by producing journalism in the style of 'Addison's Spectators', an index of the difference between the early eighteenth-century public sphere and its 1790s version.¹⁷ The sociable conception of literary production, based on the ideals of free interchange as well as actual social interchange between individuals is shown to be impossible. 'Counterfeited' as a Jew, Caleb uses his servant as an intermediary between himself and his publisher, whom he never sees: his writing, moreover, is not a disinterested expression of a secure gentlemanly identity but a mode of 'subsistence', with mechanistic overtones. Caleb's imitation of *The Spectator* to earn a living anticipates Klancher's claim that the public sphere was 'no sooner projected than transformed into an image to consume by readers who did not frequent it'.¹⁸ The allusion to *The Spectator* also suggests how the 'spectatorial ethics' of the Enlightenment public sphere, implying communality and sympathy, have mutated into spectatorship as police: ironically Williams, 'counterfeiting' as Mr Spectator, is himself being traced by Falkland's agent Gines. It suggests a suspicion of the products of a commodity print culture as inherently 'counterfeit'. 'Textuality itself – in its printed form – is problematic for Godwin. Print culture is counterfeiting because it is subject to the invisible workings and secret machinations by which the dominant classes can appropriate the energies and audiences of a popular form such as the handbill and redirect them to its own ends. For Godwin, only face-to-face contact unmediated by textuality can ensure free and open communication. However, at the same time he distrusted the licentiousness of the ludic, performative sociability in which men like Thelwall and Merry indulged. "Truth", he claimed, "could never be properly communicated in theatres and halls of assembly". Godwin saw the elaboration of radical culture as subversive laughter, the giving way of politeness to the carnivalesque inherent in the looseness of the Addisonian model of the public sphere, as having the potential to unleash

the dangerous enthusiasm of the mob: 'the conviviality of the feast may lead to the depredations of a riot'.¹⁹

Godwin's emphasis on the importance of conversation in *Political Justice* was an attempt to reconfigure the terms of trust inherent in the Addisonian public sphere, constructing a space that might be more secure from the attentions of government but which would also serve to monitor the dangers of conviviality's 'loose talk'. His ideal of conversation was based on his own sociable circles, a company of friends, 'private sociability', in terms of Peter Clark's categorization. In the wake of the 1790s this version of sociability came to sustain literary culture in Romantic-period Britain in ways that have been only partially recognized. Sociable practices which were hitherto not part of the coffee-house model of the public sphere as critique, practices such as home visiting, private dinners (often under the auspices of publishers) and walking, played an increasingly important part in the validation of a distinctively literary public culture. This is apparent, for example, in Benjamin Haydon's careful delineation of his dinner party in 1817 as occupying a space between the 'restraint of refined company' and 'the vulgar freedom of low' (reminiscent of Godwin's conviviality). Moreover, the 'frank, natural license' which the event exemplifies is qualitatively different from the model of literary culture as conversation represented by Boswell and Johnson: 'I am convinced that nothing in Boswell is equal to what came out from these Poets. Indeed there was no such Poets in his time.' The men at Haydon's assume public representativeness not in terms of class or social status, or even as cultural arbiters on the Addisonian or Johnsonian model, but as a company of 'Poets'. Similar occasions, lubricated by alcohol, enlivened by highly performative conversational strategies such as Charles Lamb's punning or Samuel Taylor Coleridge's monologues, formed the sociable contexts in which literary production was discussed, circulated and sometimes created. The participants also worked to constitute this form of sociability textually, particularly through periodical publication (apparent in titles such as *The Companion*, *Table Talk*, *The Round Table* or *The Ambulator*), in letters and also in poetry. As Nicholas Roe and Jeffrey Cox have shown, the cultural politics of the Hunt-Keats circle and that of the attack against them in magazines such as *Blackwood's* was at base a struggle over what Hunt described as 'sociality' – a particular idealization of friendship and group interaction as an exemplary model of social organization in general.²⁰ In the context of post-Waterloo Britain such an emphasis on the transcendent and redemptive capacities of the bonds of brotherhood and companionship had distinct political

connotations. As Cox says: 'Against violence in society and despondency in culture [the Hunt circle] pitted sociability: the bonds between them offered the hope of a society unbound.'⁵¹ Anne Janowitz's chapter explores such possibilities of friendship and radicalism in the movement from an 'amiable' to a 'radical' model of sociability in the Dissenting circles of Anna Laetitia Barbauld, a milieu with which Deirdre Coleman also engages in her chapter on Barbauld's friendships with Joseph Priestley and his wife Mary Priestley, seared as they were by the violence of the Birmingham riots of 1791. The theme of 'old friends' is also the topic of Julie Carlson's chapter on William Hazlitt, Thomas Holcroft and the sociability of theatre. As Carlson's chapter explores, Hazlitt, recognizing the barriers of class and gender that make the Godwinian ideal of culture as conversation impossible, nonetheless retains an attachment to the utopian possibilities of unfettered interchange between rational beings, and therefore a model of culture which is based in sociability.

The sociability of figures such as Leigh Hunt was not encompassed by the activities of his circle in the Vale of Health in Hampstead: as editor of *The Examiner* he was intimate with the coffee-houses, the taverns, theatres and indeed the prisons of the Regency.⁵² Hunt attempted to categorize his periodicals in terms of these different modes of sociability, describing *The Examiner* as 'his tavern-room for politics, for political pleasantry, for criticism upon the theatres and living writers. The Indicator is his private room, his study, his retreat from public care and criticism, with the reader who chuses to accompany him.'⁵³ Hunt's statement, like the elaboration of 'sociality' in the poems collected in *Poliage*, demonstrates the orientation of Romantic literary culture away from the ludic, convivial and spy-infiltrated tavern world towards the 'private' and domestic sociability of *The Indicator*, a move not without its risks in both gender and class terms, insofar as it made the boundaries of the public sphere more permeable to groups such as women and servants. The elaboration of Huntian sociality, and other kinds of literary sociability in the period, courts effeminization in both positive and negative terms: hence the attacks on Hunt, Keats and Hazlitt for guilt by association with 'superannuated governesses', footmen and washerwomen.⁵⁴ These attacks were partly a sign of the way in which the reconfiguration of the public entailed in the move from the tavern room to the drawing-room inevitably entailed a reconfiguration of the gender and class dimensions of that public. The pressure exerted upon this masculine and homosocial coffee-house model of Romantic literary sociability by the active presence of women as writers and participants

within the literary public sphere is examined in Judith Barbour's chapter on the relations between sociability and literary textuality in the correspondence of William Godwin. Barbour examines the fraught relations between the more recognizably 'public' and masculine homosocial model of literary sociability of the coffee-house and the more domestically oriented form of literary sociability, by tracking a 'repertoire of sociability' in Godwin's relationship with Mary Wollstonecraft, the latter mediated by sociable and quasi-sexual relations with other women writers such as Mary Hays, Elizabeth Inchbald and Amelia Alderson.

As many critics have acknowledged, Romantic-period Britain is notable as the era in which imaginative literature assumes a fully-fledged cultural and political authority. It is our contention that sociability as both fact and value, reconfigured and realigned as a result of the repressed utopian moment of the 1790s, was a crucial element in the shaping of that authority. The process of reconfiguration and realignment considerably expanded and in some cases threatened the literary public sphere by incorporating others – women, servants, the lower orders – which the paradigmatic coffee-house model of the public sphere could more easily ignore. A lesson of this for our own definition of 'Romantic sociability' is not to focus solely on the sociability of literary circles but to recognize its fluid interplay with other modes of sociability within British society as a whole. We need to be alert to the contexts in which sociability is taking place and also to its potential to be constructed discursively as a value both then and now. As editors of a volume that emanates from Australia we find it interesting to note that the part that the Antipodes had to play in the Romantic discourse of sociability was for Charles Lamb, at least, in defining the limits of sociability. In a letter to Barron Field in New South Wales he contemplates the difficulty of conducting an epistolary relationship as sociable interchange: at one point he says to Field, 'Your "now" is not my "now"; and again, your "then," is not my "then"; but my "now" may be your "then," and vice versa.'⁵⁵ Lamb later used this letter as the basis of an essay for the *London Magazine*, 'Distant Correspondents', thereby staging his lost intimacy with his friend in a more public context:

I am insensibly chatting to you as familiarly as when we used to exchange good-morrows out of our old contiguous windows, in pump-lamed Hare-court in the Temple. Why did you ever leave that quiet corner? Why did I? . . . My heart is as dry as that spring sometimes proves in a thirsty August, when I revert to the space that is between us; a length of passage enough to render obsolete the phrases of our English letters before they can reach you.⁵⁶

Lamb's letter is typical of a certain Romantic discourse of sociability in which occasions of companionship, conviviality and friendship are nostalgically commemorated by a speaker writing from a standpoint of isolation or self-willed solitude. His correspondence with Field in Australia suggests that in a period when the British sphere of influence was wider than ever before, due to global war, empire and exploration, sociable networks and communities had to be reconfigured and reimaged. A history of sociability in this period might therefore also function as an alternative history of war and empire, a topic towards which we can only gesture.

Conversation being a predominant trope of the volume, we seek to engage the topic of Romantic sociability in a spirit of open dialogue and discussion. The volume is not exhaustive or comprehensive – we are aware of too much ground to be covered in this vast field to set out to do this – but rather seeks to extend our exercise here of introducing sociability to the field of Romantic literary and cultural studies. The 1790s and the sociability of radical circles are foregrounded in the collection because of what we regard as the crucial significance of this decade and these sociable milieus in the shaping of a distinctively 'Romantic' sociability. William Hazlitt's 1820 essay, 'On the Conversation of Authors', which recognizes that conversation can no longer be universalized as a model for culture, contains a fascinating metaphor which inscribes imaginative literature as the evanescent tracings of a sociability which always exceeds its textual representation. Writing, he claims, is 'like the chalk-figures drawn on ballroom floors to be danced out before morning!'⁵⁷ In the spirit of Hazlitt's sense of the hopelessness of the task, the aim of this book is to attempt to retrace some of these figures, restoring to our sense of Romantic period culture the sociable contexts in which it was lived and inscribed.

NOTES

For full citations see Bibliography.

- 1 Haydon, *Diary*, vol. II, pp. 174, 175, 176.
- 2 Taylor, *Life*, vol. I, p. 354.
- 3 Hughes-Hallett, *Immortal Dinner*. Despite having the dinner as its subject, Hughes-Hallett's book does not contextualize the event in relation to Romantic and eighteenth-century sociability as a whole. See also Olney, *Haydon*, pp. 131–4; Moorman, *Wordsworth*, pp. 316–18; George, *Life*.
- 4 Philp, *Godwin's Political Justice*, pp. 122–9; Roe, *Culture of Dissent*, esp. chapter 4; Cox, *Poetry and Politics*; Sweet, "'Lorenzo's" Liverpool'; Swartz, "'Their

- terrours"; Chandler, *England*, pp. 282–4; Leask, 'Salons'. Relevant work also includes Aske, 'Critical Disfigurings'.
- 5 Borsay, *English Urban Renaissance*; Wilson, *Sense of the People*, esp. chapter 11; Money, *Experience and Identity*; Clark, *British Clubs*.
- 6 Hitchcock and Cohen, *English Masculinities*; Brewer, *Pleasures*; Vickery, *Gentleman's Daughter*. Similarly, the related category of 'social reputation' is used as a section to group two essays in Barker and Chalus (eds.), *Gender*.
- 7 Langford, 'Manners'. See also his *Englishness Identified*. See also Whyman's *Sociability and Power*, which, despite using 'sociability' in the title of the volume, does not explicitly address the term as an analytical category.
- 8 *TLS*, 20 March 2000, p. 10.
- 9 Langford, 'Manners', pp. 314, 316.
- 10 Magnuson, *Reading Public Romanticism*, p. 5. A similar criticism could be made of the articles in the forum 'Romanticism and its Publics', in *Studies in Romanticism* 33 (1994), pp. 523–88.
- 11 For the performativity of literary production in the Romantic period see Pascoe, *Romantic Theatricality*.
- 12 Philp, *Godwin's Political Justice*, p. 164.
- 13 Klein, 'Sociability, Solitude', p. 156. Klein signals the movement away from an 'emphatic' sociability to a Romantic solitude, but does not engage this at any length.
- 14 Clark, *British Clubs*, pp. 192, 39, 451.
- 15 The gendered dimension of accounts of the public sphere is addressed by Eger *et al.*, *Women, Writing*. While a number of chapters by Ellis, Kelly and Leask refer to sociability (often extensively), the use of the term as an analytical category is not explicitly foregrounded by either these writers or the editors: the term receives no entry in the index, for instance. See essays by Ellis, 'Coffee-women', Kelly, 'Bluestocking Feminism', Leask, 'Salons'. See also Cowan, 'What was Masculine about the Public Sphere?'
- 16 See Borsay, *English Urban Renaissance*, pp. 150–62.
- 17 References to these works taken from Bond (ed.), *The Tatler*, and Bond (ed.), *The Spectator*. Subsequent references are included in parentheses in the text.
- 18 See Klein, *Shaftesbury*.
- 19 Godwin, 'Of English Style', p. 439.
- 20 See 'Enlightened Spectators and Classical Moralists', in Dwyer and Sher (eds.), *Sociability*, esp. p. 96.
- 21 Dwyer, 'The Imperative of Sociability'. On Scottish Enlightenment philosophy and sociability, see also Hont, 'The Language of Sociability and Commerce'.
- 22 Smith, *Theory*, p. 337.
- 23 Dwyer, 'Enlightened Spectators', p. 109.
- 24 For a further discussion of Austen, sensibility and sociability, see Tuite, *Romantic Austen*, chapter 2.
- 25 Habermas, *Structural Transformation*, p. 51.

- 26 For Habermas on these genres, see *ibid.*, pp. 48–51.
 27 This is formulated in Luhmann, *Love as Passion*, p. 17.
 28 Simmel, 'Sociability', pp. 50, 15, 43, 4, 45.
 29 Weintraub, 'The Public/Private Distinction', p. 7.
 30 Robbins, *Phantom Public Sphere*, p. xiii.
 31 Fraser, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere', p. 2.
 32 Warner, 'Introduction', p. viii.
 33 *Ibid.*, p. ix.
 34 Butler, *Bodies*, p. 95.
 35 Simmel, 'Sociability', p. 52; Habermas, *Structural Transformation*, p. 31.
 36 *Ibid.*, p. 51.
 37 The phrase 'imagined community' derives from Anderson's *Imagined Communities*, which has been a major influence on theories of the public sphere. For a challenge to Habermas's (and Anderson's) emphasis on the importance of print in constituting that public sphere see Landes, 'The Public and the Private Sphere'. Landes's argument that 'a theory of "public representations" needs to account for the culturally variant ways that humans produce and make use of multiple representations' (p. 155) can be extended to justify our focus on sociability.
 38 Eagleton, *Function of Criticism*; Klancher, *Making*. More recent applications of Habermas to Romantic-period Britain include Gilmartin, *Print Politics*; McCann, *Cultural Politics*; Keen, *Crisis*; and Eger *et al.*, *Women, Writing*.
 39 Klancher, *Making*, p. 15.
 40 Eagleton, *Function of Criticism*, pp. 8, 36, 39, 38, 41.
 41 See Thale, *Selections*, for references to toasting and songs.
 42 For the sociability of ultra-radicalism see McCalman, *Radical Underworld*; for radical dining see Epstein, 'Radical Dining'; for Godwin see Philp, *Godwin's Political Justice* and St Clair, *Godwins and the Shelleys*; for Horne Tooke see Bewley, *Gentleman Radical*.
 43 Butler (ed.), *Burke, Paine, Godwin*, pp. 186, 188.
 44 Hamilton, 'Coleridge and Godwin', p. 46.
 45 For an account of how this fear of relations between men takes its most extreme or quasi-homophobic form in our period in the paranoia of the Gothic novel, see Sedgwick's *Between Men*, esp. pp. 83–117.
 46 Godwin, *Caleb Williams*, p. 265.
 47 *Ibid.*, p. 268.
 48 Klancher, *Making*, p. 15.
 49 'Conviviality' has distinct gendered connotations, being linked with male homosociality and the enduring influence of what Peter Clark describes as 'the older cultures of honour (with its stress on masculine conviviality, heavy drinking, and reputation)': *British Clubs*, p. 450. For an account of the gender politics of the sociability of philanthropy see Lloyd, 'Pleasing Spectacles'.
 50 Roe, *John Keats*; Cox, *Poetry and Politics*.
 51 Cox, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 60.

- 52 For prison sociability see McCalman, 'Newgate'.
 53 *The Indicator* 2 (20 October 1819), p. 9, quoted in Cox, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 73.
 54 See Holkosh, *Sexual Politics*.
 55 Lamb, *Letters*, vol. III, p. 252.
 56 Lamb, *Works*, vol. II, p. 108.
 57 Hazlitt, *Complete Works*, vol. XII, p. 27.



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

TUITE, C; RUSSELL, G

Title:

Introducing Romantic sociability

Date:

2002

Citation:

TUITE, C. & RUSSELL, G. (2002). Introducing Romantic sociability. TUITE, C (Ed.). RUSSELL, G (Ed.). Romantic Sociability: Social Networks and Literary Culture in Britain, 1770-1840, (1), pp.1-23. Cambridge University Press.

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/25785>

File Description:

Introducing Romantic sociability