

Discussion

Samuel Baker [to John Han]: Did you have anything spring to mind?

John Han: No. [Laughter] I need to walk around in my head a little bit.

Baker: Well, I felt like there's a few things I'd like to try to clarify or reiterate from my paper, and I appreciate the invitation to revisit the "mixture": the idea that there is a mixture of sudden intensity and slow ruination in the gothic. I think actually though the notion of such a mixture is so consonant with the discussion so far that I might leave that provocation to resonate with the assembled. What I want to...what I mainly want to put on the table is the question of the relationship between the experience of the eighteenth century at the beginning of the nineteenth century (which my paper concerns) and the experience of the eighteenth century here in the twenty-first century that we're all enacting. At the beginning of my really (I think) somewhat gnomic last paragraph I have the sentence: "The Wordsworth Circle writers, in responding to the Enlightenment, stage a drama of what we might call the emergence of the residual, when they strive to reimagine Enlightenment as unfolding on the platform of gothic and georgic cosmologies." I think when I wrote that "The Wordsworth Circle writers . . . stage a drama," I was writing metaphorically, but I think I might want to think about that figure... about the non-metaphorical possibility of its capturing a performance—a studied performance—of themselves *as authors* that these writers are conducting and also a "presentation of self in everyday life" (to use Erving Goffman's title phrase) that has an importance for how we think about the possibilities for eighteenth-century futures. Because I think that for these writers the idea of the self as enlightened, right, is very important, and it's something that needs to be continually (even ritualistically) reenacted. At the same time, the notion of—I'm glad you picked up on this—the notion of a contra-Enlightenment, a post-Enlightenment self is also just as important for them... and for them in interesting ways even more modern. And that notion of a performance that can inter-articulate different affects that are representative of different moments of feeling, I think, is what I was trying to show as a possibility in history.

So how is this a possibility now for us? I ought to just say that more and more I'm thinking that it's really crucial for academics who care about the repertoire (the historical repertoire) of different periods, styles, and different archives of works and authors to create a popular front, right, with actual working artists and people generally beyond academia who care about this sort of thing too because it's a basic thing that artists do, right?—to revivify, ritualistically bring us again through a place that's passed. Classical music is nothing odd at all, right, while playing an eighteenth-century work. And when an eighteenth-century work is playing, well, you know, in some very literal way, right, one is experiencing a kind of historical continuity with...—you know, not to be totally unsophisticated, and with all of the mediations that we know exist. There is something to that. I feel like too often academic status gets used as a standpoint for differentiation and a hyper-mediated relationship to the object, when in fact there's also an immediate relationship that can be captured. And so yeah, this remark at the end of the paper about being out of pocket for being present to say these remarks, because the last third of this paper was originally a conference paper at a conference where there was a lot of affect around the sense that this particular academic public was underfunded and unable to do what it was doing—or not being institutionally enabled to do what it was doing—and I wanted to express a kind of solidarity with that.

And I think it's fantastic that this kind of public is funded [here in Bloomington] to be assembled. I also think it's really good to think about the resonance of the academic work we can do here in this kind of research environment with artistic projects being undertaken in all different kinds of institutional and non-institutional formats that are also, you know, making a past period present and possible for other futures.

Han: So thanks, Nick, for that great introduction, and I'm glad that Sam went first because it gave me some [time to] kind of like collect my thoughts and flip through the pages because I think there were some really good connections there. When it comes to—when you're talking about walking—the first thing that kind of popped into my mind was the issue of pace, and another issue that we didn't really talk about was directionality, and I think it was Koselleck who was the...—yeah. And so, you know, [Barbauld] published in 1812 and she's essentially walking backwards, right? And so I think pace here, and also just the notion that the tour—you know kind of deriving from Sam's paper—was considered an enlightened project. I think the way Barbauld figures walking and touring is in the gothic mode, right? And it's precisely the, maybe the gothic view of history, and moreover just the fact that... you know, pace, I think in Barbauld it occurs a lot slower. A lot of the papers you discussed so far have—like Michael's paper—like 1787-2440 has a rather long duration, so there's kind of a lot of filling in to be done there, whereas Barbauld it's—there's no future date. There's only one date in the title, so there's less of duration. So I feel like what ends up becoming more... instead of acceleration there's more of [a] compression of time. So the notion that decay doesn't accelerate but the outside forces of history kind of... You see more, I think, when you're walking. The world becomes a much smaller place, so you just happen to see a little more immediate problems, financial, of the empire.

Nick Williams: Can you remind me of your name? Sorry.

David Alff: Dave.

Williams: Dave.

Alff: So the thing about georgic is it's never the thing that I remembered it to be, and I might take the time to actually read one in its completion. And I'm wondering, Samuel, the extent to which you—your process for distinguishing the sudden intensities owing to a gothic intrusion on georgic versus the depictions of ruin, famine, disease, death, displacement that have always been part of georgic, that were part of Virgil's georgic—to what extent has georgic always carried a gothic strain that's maybe latent and is then activated in Burns or, you know, becomes conspicuously visible there?

Baker: Yeah, I—a book I need to read is the book by—Tina, help me out? David...—the book on genre and mixed genre by the fellow who's at Aberdeen—remember this book, David...?

Alff: Duff.

Baker: Duff, yeah. David Duff, thank you. David Duff's book on generic mixture [and] so forth (which I've looked up, but I haven't properly processed) is a place for thinking—I think of it as a resource for helping me think through the problem of how to present generic mixture that... I did

not want to suggest that it's only through the interjection of gothic that georgic can have a sudden intensity. I think that it's perfectly... I think it's *necessary* to understand that range of temporal effects to be intrinsic to gothic (to georgic) on its own terms. That said, I did feel that the recourse to a double-generic lens, right, might help to clarify some of these workings.

Williams: Tracey?

Tracey Hutchings-Goetz: So my question is for Samuel but also for John, and it concerns the (kind of) embodied experience of temporality. So it certainly intersects with the issue of walking, but one of the thoughts that I had was that you associate the gothic with the spectral, but there isn't really a comparable term for the georgic [in your paper]? And for me that [term] would be "the tactile" because the georgic is defined by this hands-on experience, right? And that is also associated with life, right: because it's gardening, it's pruning, it's braiding together apple trees, right? And so I was wondering if you could speak about that a little bit or if you'd thought about those as kind of balanced terms? And then for John, you know, I'd love to hear you just speak a little bit more about walking: because there is this weird way in which both, you know, both Barbauld and Pope are—they're visual, right? It's about perspective. But then to throw walking in there kind of complicates it, right, through this phenomenological experience and how that's connected to the understanding of time or temporality.

Baker: Well I can be quick: I hadn't thought of that; I'm taking note of it. That's a fantastic—

Hutchings-Goetz: Thank you. [Laughter]

Baker: I think it's better than you realize for this reason: The tactile actually is intrinsic, right, to many period understandings of the visual, right, so—

Hutchings-Goetz: Yeah, my dissertation is on touch, so—

Baker: Excellent. Excellent.

Hutchings-Goetz: So I have thought about it a lot.

Baker: So you're the touch person? [Laughter]

Hutchings-Goetz: Yeah, I'm the touch person.

Baker: And then the ... Moreover, you talk about the spectral, right, in your dissertation?

Hutchings-Goetz: Yeah, there's going to be a chapter on the gothic and the invisible hand.

Baker: So do you think of the spectral then as representing like a...a broadening out from just certain kinds of supernatural phenomenon [*sic*] to representing non-tactile, visual phenomena?

Hutchings-Goetz: Yeah, so it's not fully worked out. But for me the spectral is kind of the fantasy that you can have touching without bodies, which is kind of, like, purely metaphorical in

some ways, right? But it's, "How can you..."—for me the spectral is a lot about kind of trying to think through, "How can you have kinds of effects or agency but without bodies?" So it's kind of systems thinking in some ways, but—

Baker: Well so then the spectral *is* tactile?

Hutchings-Goetz: Well...It's not... I've not totally worked it out, but can you expand on that? How would it be tactile then if it's—because it's...It might be felt or experienced, so you think that you're felt by a hand, right, you think that someone reaches out and touches you, but you're not...

Baker: "Touched by an angel"?

Hutchings-Goetz: Yeah. So you're touched, right, but you're not touching, and so there's no reciprocity there because the ghost or the spectral hand does not in itself feel you, right?

Han: You'd have to trip over a tombstone. That could... [Laughter]

Baker: All I can say is that I am going to appropriate "tactile" to go into my account, my whirl of possible oppositions, and we'll work all this out.

Hutchings-Goetz: Yeah, we'll talk more about...

Baker: That's good.

Williams: Let's go to Nush—she has a hook quickly.

Manushag Powell: Sorry, yeah, because I—this is kind of—but the thing is ghosts in the eighteenth century are material, right? You know, the Canterbury ghost: Mrs. Veal slaps her leg and you hear a sound. She doesn't eat, and she doesn't quite kiss hello, but there is a body there.

Jesse Molesworth: The Cock Lane ghost...

Hutchings-Goetz: Yeah.

Powell: Exactly, right? So it may not be, like, haptic in the standard sense, but it is absolutely haptic in some kind of conceivable sense, and that's one of the things that's sort of special about the Enlightenment spectral experience. The other place that I would always go with this is "Blah blah blah, Mr. Spectator," who is all about the sensate body without the body being directly sensible to his readers. It's just everywhere.

Hutchings-Goetz: Yeah. So I guess my question would be, "Does that change, right, by the Romantic period or by the texts that we're looking at here?" And so that's the thing I'm trying to work out in the chapter that's not written, so...

Powell: It may, but I think the heritage is always—like, I think there's a strong awareness of it.

Hutchings-Goetz: Yeah.

Williams: I don't know if you want to read this as walking, John.

Han: Well I think...I mean, for the most part I think both Pope and Barbauld are very—well, Barbauld is a lot more ethereal, right? It's about—and even in Pope—it's visual or it's aural, so it's always at a distance. I don't think there's really... Even with the tour scene, they're visiting—he (the American tourist) is visiting—the graves but, you know, Johnson's not really buried there. There's no sense of—it's just a memory that might be connected to standing on a monument. I'm not sure if that's necessarily embodiment as such?

Jonathan Sachs: But don't forget that the whole poem is framed—at least from the middle point onwards—by a specter that's walking.

Han: Right, but that spirit is—and it has chains that it breaks free of, but I tend to read that as, you know, the muse, that guy. And it's very, you know, it's—I don't see this spirit being particularly embodied. Perhaps “buff” because he breaks the chains?

Williams: Jesse?

Molesworth: John, I'm wondering if—I mean, I want to think about this transformation between Pope and Barbauld maybe in the context of, you know, the discussion we just had on Koselleck. I mean, is *that* the difference between Pope and Barbauld? the sort of emergence of this notion of an open future?

Han: Right.

Molesworth: I mean, it seems, you know, this is precisely the, you know, when you're discussing the turbulence of the weather and so forth...

Han: Right.

Molesworth: But this seems to be something that Barbauld recognizes in “Eighteen Eleven” [*sic*] that potentially Wordsworth doesn't recognize in “Tintern Abbey” or that, you know, Charlotte Smith doesn't in “Beachy Head.” You know, just the impossibility, you know, of this project of the prospect poem, the envisioning of the future...I mean, that's the kind of ambitious territory that I'm hoping you can push this argument into.

Han: Yeah. I mean, I think that the prospect poem is—it's just a weird genre. I mean, it's—I'm not sure how many of you know what the prospect poem... I certainly don't know. I've tried to kind of cobble together a history of it, but it's progress, it's topographical over descriptive, and it borrows from georgic, and what I want to say is I think Barbauld's use of such a grounded genre in nationalistic soil; I mean, you're standing literally on a hill overlooking St. James Cathedral [*sic*]. She uses that intentionally to contrast sharply her view of a history that is precisely un-

grounded, and I would even go as far as to say it's not tenable, it's sort of—it's not circular, it's not—it's just it's kind of diachronic. It goes both ways, I think...

Molesworth: But is it Koselleck, you know? This is the question.

Han: Yeah, I don't know. I think so, in the sense that there's no... maybe not in the sense that the instantaneous present links to a future. I think her future: once you get there, the present gets erased. All right? So that's where—and that's why I tried to bring in some of the ocean metaphors because the way the ocean works is just completely chaotic, and I think that's what Barbauld is trying to advocate for.

Williams: Jon?

Sachs: Very quick, one way to open this up along those lines is to introduce into the comparison between Pope and Barbauld: Volney.

Han: Volney, yeah.

Williams: I didn't know if you had a bigger point that you were in line for, or a series of hooks, Jonathan?

Sachs: I'm just happy to let... I have no more after that.

Williams: Okay. Let me go to Monique.

Monique Morgan: So thank you both for these great papers, and I was thinking about the binary that each of you has set up (which was very effective), but I guess I have a suggestion for each of you for a sort of intermediate term, and I'd be curious to hear your reactions on whether or not it makes sense or is useful. So, Sam: I was thinking that between the georgic and gothic we might place the elegiac? Because it's about death but it also requires some kind of recuperation-consolation-moving forward. You know, Wordsworth poems are in a sense elegies for Burns.

Baker: Right.

Morgan: Right? And John: between *Windsor Forest* and *Eighteen Hundred and Eleven*, I'm wondering if we should place Coleridge's "Fears in Solitude"? Because he starts off in this silent dell, you know, this little valley where he can't see anything. He's thinking about his fears of a French invasion and giving his critique of (you know) domestic policy and imperial policy. And then it's like the limited landscape of England...

Han: Right.

Morgan: ...that consoles him. And then he's able to walk out of the dell and onto a prospect, onto a hill, and, you know, have this consoling vision, right?

Han: Right. Yeah, that's right. Thank you.

Williams: Daniel?

Daniel Fulda: Yes, my question is to John's paper, to an aspect which was not discussed yet. You characterize the concept of history in Pope's poetry and Pope's poem with Walter Benjamin's notion of a Messianic Time, and I wanted to ask firstly, generally, "What does it say about our assumptions about the change between the eighteenth and the twentieth century when Walter Benjamin's notion was coined, mid-twentieth century?" Is it possible to work emphatically...No, to work with a concept of Messianic Time, which shall be a fundamental critique of modern time regime[s] and Messianic Time says for Benjamin that the continuum of time should be brought to an explosion, yes? It's a revolutionary term in religious language. That's my second point. My first point [is] a general question to the anachronistic use of this notion by Benjamin? And second, is it plausible to use a concept which combines political critique from a Marxist standpoint and which is emphasized by religious speech [and apply it] to Pope?

Han: Yeah, I think so. I mean, I see your point that it's rather anachronistic, but I think that the basic principle behind Messianic Time does—aspects of it—perhaps I maybe should have framed it better, but I do think that in the late seventeenth/early eighteenth century there was that function, that explosion. Dryden's "Annus Mirabilis" was a poem, was an epic poem that had a very beginning and a strong sense of end, right? And Pope oversaw, you know, the fall of, you know, he was very...he was a Catholic in a time when it was Protestant and there was, you know. So the sense that there was an end, that there was a Messianic end—maybe not "Messianic," but there was some sort of apocalyptic end—was already prefigured by Dryden in the late seventeenth century. And I think Pope carries...because then the neo-Augustan also.

Fulda: The messiah is a redeemer which *shall* come, which...—*who* has not come, who did not come yet.

Han: Right.

Fulda: And who shall be this redeemer in the view of Pope?

Han: Anne. Queen Anne.

Fulda: But she came?

Han: Right. [Laughter] But his poetic imagination... because he was pretty political. He was at that point lobbying for getting another Tory, so it was—

Baker: Or getting another Stuart.

Han: Mhm.

Fulda: But there's a complete change: expecting a messiah or speaking about somebody who is identified as the messiah. There is no desire for a *coming* messiah in Pope.

Han: I think there is. See, I think—

Richard Nash: Can I turn my question into a hook?

Williams: Yes. [Laughter]

Nash: Because there is a certain sense in which I wanted to offer what I think is a different reading of *Windsor*. I think you and I disagree about *Windsor Forest*, and so I want to offer a comment here, but in some ways I want to hook it now to a possible intervention. If you think of *Windsor Forest* as written in two parts (1704 and then the later 1714)—I think I read that divided structure differently than you do. But in that early 1704 version, where he’s imagining Windsor Forest, he publishes it in connection with—or he imagines it in connection with—the pastorals, and when he publishes the pastorals they are deliberately written cyclically in cyclic time that then leads to—and the heading in the first version carries over—to “Messiah,” so that his four pastorals culminate not in winter but in his—what do we call it?—adaptation of the *Polio*, Virgil’s *Polio*. It’s creating a certain Messianic cycle: I do think there’s an argument you might make that at least [when] conceiving of *Windsor Forest* in 1704, Pope may have been imagining the project that way.

Baker: In the tradition of Virgil being read as a Messianic text or as...

Nash: ...as the fulfillment, right. But the poem then doesn’t appear until he comes back to write in 1714, and that’s where the politics of this strike me as really quite interesting in that there’s a sort of a cautionary component here. In 1704, William has just died in Windsor Forest, and things are good: Protestant succession (we have that negotiated promise) and we have the Stuarts, who are still in place, but by 1714 it’s pretty clear we’re moving the other way... And if there’s any elegiac component to *Windsor Forest* it may be a cautionary tale that: “You want prosperity to...—we’re about to lose the prosperity of the Stuarts unless the Jacobites—” So there’s this sort of ominous undercurrent it seems to me in the politics of reading this divide. On the one hand, the good news in 1704 is William’s death, right, and Anna [*sic*] reigns. The bad news in 1714 is Anna [*sic*] reigns and she’s going to be dead soon, what comes next? And that’s where... Do you read *Windsor Forest* as triumphant, or is there somewhere—is there a latent Jacobite threat underneath the poem? And that’s the politics that to me seem much more unstable than...

Han: Yeah, that’s a really good comment. In an earlier version of this paper I tried to mix pastoral and georgic into this form, but the pastoral (the original form), it carries within it the threat of violence, the threat of eviction, right? So I think that’s embedded in the notion of the prospect. So in *Windsor Forest*, sure, it’s a happy garden. Everything looks great, but it’s—there—like the hunting scene is, I find it’s very, very dark, and I—but—that doesn’t mean—just because this—and maybe these are the different temporalities—I think he sees the gothic ending, right, but that doesn’t negate the possibility that in this form he still hopes for a pastoral conclusion.

Nash: I guess the way that I... and this is now the time for me to articulate the difference between the way I’m thinking about the poem and the way I *hear* you speaking about it. I’m less sure that I can identify a stable “Pope” behind what is called...

Han: Oh, yeah. Yeah, yeah.

Nash: And so *Windsor Forest* becomes interesting to me in terms of seeing it as written at two different phases and therefore two different voices, even though it's sort of sutured together. And I guess that's...

Han: But then you could also argue that what I talk about, that's why I talk about the garden. In the same way, the garden's changed, right? The Twickenham, it's an amalgam of different artifacts. He constantly renovates it. So I think the same way that gardens change, you know, because of bad climate... It's always... it requires a constant cultivation. So his notion of messiah is—to really reduce this into a horrible metaphor—is sort of like a perennial, right? He wants to do his best to kind of grow that messiah as a plant, as a fauna. I can't believe I said that. [Laughter] That's all I had to say.

Williams: A hook from Helge, and then I had a hook from Rebecca.

Helge Jordheim: It goes to those two questions from Daniel and Richard. I'm just wondering why you're so invested in the idea of a *stable* present? You write that it is necessary to conceive of this as a stable present, and then you use Benjamin and Auerbach to argue for a stable present—two theorists that don't have stable presents. They have presents that are incredibly dynamic and open, and they're Messianic in the sense that they're unstable. They point you somewhere, but they're not finished. They're not stable at all. They point to something else, they point to something happening, right? So it's just...and I'm wondering if that means that you're really interested in Benjamin and Auerbach in relation to Pope but not in the stable present? Or if you're really interested in the stable present but those are maybe the wrong people to theorize it with? I'm just...there's tension here that I'm just interested in, yeah.

Han: Well I—again, I think it's a really good point. For me, I... Benjamin: I see it's vertical, right? It's a very eschatological system and that for me is more stable than sort of the horizontal mode, the one that—if everything is kind of, you know—the rise of chronometry in the eighteenth century—then in comparison, the Messianic is a lot more stable. At least you have a direction. You can look up and say, “We don't know what's going to be up there. We don't know what the message is going to be, what the messiah is going—when he's going to come—but we anticipate that,” whereas the empty homogenous—there's no such expectation. I guess that's where I'm... Maybe “fixed” is a bit *too* strong, but I feel like there's a certain element of stability that the Messianic Time offers versus empty, homogenous time.

Jordheim: Yeah, yeah. Interesting.

Baker: So in a sense are you saying that if in *Windsor Forest* Pope presents a Benjaminian dialectical image, there's an emblematic—even if the, in its nature it's dialectical—there's a[n] instability in this picture of the era? There's still at least a notion of emblematic completeness, right, that feels like something one could affiliate with and makes the poem—gives the poem—force as an organizing work.

Han: Exactly.

Williams: Your hook, Rebecca?

Rebecca Spang: I just want to try to keep us vaguely “on topic” by glossing what Richard said: which is that the future looks very different to Pope in 1714 and 1704. And Pope in 1704 isn’t imagining “future Alexander” in 1714 looking ahead and not being able to see what happens next...

Nick Williams: Rachel?

Rachel Seiler-Smith: Oh, wow. Yeah, I had a question that sort of was born out of Jonathan’s reference to Volney... And you know, John, I think you do a really nice job of covering your base—albeit briefly—in saying that, you know, the things that you’re talking about are not particular to the prospect poem, but nonetheless you’re going to talk about the prospect poem. But at the same time, I think you’re also right to point out that prospect is (you know), it saturates so many genres, not to mention painting and, you know, the actual development of optics, but also prose. And so not only Volney, but I’m also thinking of Wollstonecraft very famously in her letters is sort of looking out to the ocean and imagining the future in her present. Volney is thinking about it as well. And even Austen: you know, when we think of Austen using the word “prospects” it’s always in relationship to “ladies with prospects,” and it’s a very dire future for these women. And at the same time what’s interesting is whereas Austen’s use of prospect in her novels ties into the form of the novel in the sort of quotidian “everyday,” you know, the idea is a precarious present so to speak—going back to Helge—a very precarious present for these women that points towards a lived everyday future that, you know, is economical and about sustenance and sustaining. In Wollstonecraft and Volney, it’s not nationalistic: it’s actually global the way that they’re thinking about it. They’re traveling across time and ruins but also looking towards a global future that’s at the level of species. So I wonder if looking at the prospect poem—and you’re interest in the sort of sheer formulaic-ness of the prospect poem—is what roots it to this idea of the stable present, but it’s obviously... it was never stable. The stability is in this fantasy of the *form* being stable, whereas in these prose works (you know), the sort of protean nature of the prose seems to unmoor them from these stabilities perhaps more obviously. So I’m wondering if your project is going to speak to prose as well as other forms?

Han: Yeah, I was actually going to talk about—because, I mean, my... One of my primary investments is the notion of, “Is there a poetics of time, and how does that differ from a prose of time?” And I was gonna add a section about *Jane Eyre* that, the famous line where she’s ... you know, “Where are my prospects?” Right? And so—and I think there’s—I guess I wanted to address the notion in this... I take all your points about this repeated instability of the present, and I want to suggest that it’s poetry that allows that illusion to work, right? The heroic couplet, you know, it’s a complicated, you know, form, but nonetheless it contains some sort of uncertainty that... to borrow some of your discussion of the open future. So I think the prospect poem is the—is a unique genre that allows someone to imagine a stable present and to imagine the illusion of a stable present, and this is precisely why Barbauld has so easily dismantled this notion of the stable present. Right, the prospect is all about, “You’re standing here,” right? You’re looking—for all intents and purposes—you’re looking at, you know, stationary at a distance. Now

that doesn't mean you can't look elsewhere, you can't fall over, but that's sort of what I'm... where I'm coming from.

Williams: Joanna?

Joanna Stalnaker: So I think I have two questions—one for each of you—that are related. The first one has to do with the question of literary genre/poetic genre and the idea of an open future. So what I know is the French context for this kind of poetry, and in a way some of the differences are interesting there. So this idea of—you've referred to the question of loco-descriptive, which presumably means there's a very specific place, right, that's delimited in a certain sense, and Barbauld is reconfiguring that in a certain way. In the French context, the reconfiguration of the georgic is going to be associated with the so-called descriptive genre that's considered to be a modern genre, and then there's going to be a tremendous backlash against that practice of descriptive poetry. And one of the problems with it is that it's not delimited in space and this relates to the question of walking. So the poet could just keep on walking and the poem would go on and on and there's no didactics to the structure, there's no narrative structure—and this is conceived to be a sort of a real problem in the critical reaction to the genre. So I'm wondering with respect to Barbauld in particular: I see this, you know, sort of idea of a reconfiguration of the prospect poem with the idea of the future—you know, this sort of paradoxical-looking future—as one way of being able to walk in some sort of unlimited way. So is this... is there a thinking in the English context about the idea of these as being modern genres? Or are—with an open future that really departs from the georgic, that departs from—or are they really conceived of as continuing in a tradition even as they're being reconfigured? And so I'll just say the second question first and then (before you respond) is the question of genre versus medium. So media—you seem to be very invested in the language of medium—the medium of literature, the new medium of georgic, I think you refer to... What are the—with respect to the question of temporality of genre and the temporality of media or medium—what are the stakes of that language for you? I thought they might be related, sorry.

Han: The prospect poem is I think squarely placed in the neo-Augustan tradition. When you get to the Romantic—you know, Wordsworth—and they're walking, that represents the sharp break.

Stalnaker: And is that conceived of as very different from Thomson's *The Seasons*? That's just—

Han: Yeah. Well Thomson's *Seasons* is a whole different genre. I can't—I don't even know what the hell that is. They're related but like, they're walking in, like, the Himalayas and it's, you know, so it's not as isolated, you know. Or Cowper's *The Task*, right? They have certain elements of pastoral/georgic, but it's harder to—to use a pedestrian term—to *track* where they're going because they're... Maybe in some ways Barbauld's reconfiguration of the prospect poem allows—opens up the possibility of moving around? Like, the way the spirit—I mean, I didn't really think about this, and I thank you for bringing it up—but the notion of, you know, the spirit: he walks, right? So it's—I guess correcting myself—so he is, you know, mobile. He is embodied, and I think that sets up nicely future iterations of traveling and looking at different locales in Romantic poetry.

Stalnaker: And walking into the future, no?

Han: Walking—it can, but even like in Cowper, like, they go to like Lapland, but they don't actually really come back; it's strange. They don't. They're all going outwards, right? You never get a sense of "They're coming back" to some degree. In Cowper there are a few moments when... I think actually in *The Task*—I think... Doesn't he, doesn't Cowper have like a little cabin where he invites the ghost of Pope and... maybe I'm thinking of... maybe this was a dream of mine [laughter], but I, there are moments where Cowper—it's kind of like with Coleridge's "Frost at Midnight": where they go out and the news is brought back in. So there's that kind of dialectic, whereas a prophet is always kind of looking this way and not really asking for any sort of return. Except for Pope, I guess? but that's more of an empirical empire.

Baker: I'm going to try to talk my way through the problem (the terminological problem) of "genre" and "media" by starting just with some thoughts on Monique's suggestion about the elegy as being a genre that has an important—maybe even mediatory—relation to the georgic and the gothic (as I'm thinking about them): I think it's a great suggestion. I think that elegy *might*—the thought of elegy—might suggest a role for pastoral here also, because there's something about the... first of all, there's a strong tradition—a strong connection between the pastoral tradition and the elegiac occasion, the elegiac moment in the history of poetry. There's... The elegy is a—it's an operative expression of what we call it in an ideological context "pastoral care," right? And it's about the—not the instantiation of a national or otherwise institutional project like the georgic is—but rather about the recognition and convocation of fellowship in the form of a flock or a church, right? So the elegiac seems to be—and then finally, there's not work in elegy in the same way that there is in georgic, and yet there's a ministration to what are often... you know, very gothic concerns with death, loss, and the... even just the unbearable of duration. So I like that.

Genre and media. So, the first place I want to... I like thinking with media because of the materiality of media as extensions of the senses and of consciousness, right? To me, genres are conventional practices within media but then they also cross media, particularly as we see the contents of media being other media... that remediation and intermediation of different works, right? So for instance when animated television starts, you know, to pick up on the history of cinema, right, which is, after all, originally a different medium, you'll see a transformation of different generic staples of cinema like Western gangster movie, right, to, you know, other—first of all citations of that genre, but then even all kinds of subgenres in television. And so I think that for me, one interesting ongoing research question is the relationship of pastoral drama (and other kinds of dramatic performances) to this literature. And another major moment of remediation—intermediation—that I do discuss in the paper that bears on this is the relationship of the genre of the loco-descriptive poem to the medium of landscape, right? And there's surely a medium there in the sense that like, you know, Windsor Forest is landscaped, right? That these poems are not just, you know, landscaped, but they're taking—they're literary explorations of spaces that have been shaped, right, already, that are in a different medium. And to me the graveyard scenes, right, churchyards, are another example of this, right? Like the disposition of monuments in a churchyard, right, is a...—I don't know if you want to call it architecture or landscape architecture or what—but there's already a work of mediation there that graveyard-school poetry is mediating.

Williams: Yes, Jonathan?

Sachs: I don't mean to be petty, but I'm not sure you've answered Joanna's question, either one of you. I want to push this a little further. I mean, in a sense... Right. There's this question about the relationship between genre, medium, and mode, and that's one thing I want to pick out—not just the distinction between genre and media or medium, but also between genre and mode. And so, John, in your paper there's a deep concern with genre, and what you're trying to do is to define very precisely what the genre of the prospect poem is as a genre and then to think about an example of the prospect poem and the way that problem might be thought to reverse the genre.

Han: Right, right.

Sachs: So then, Sam, in your paper you're pushing away from the category of genre because you want to bring your inquiry into this question of, this problem of media history. And so there's an issue of medium there, but there's also your preferred term, which is "mode." And so the question I have about this is: If genre's working very hard to build towards generic terms, it seems to me that by introducing mode you're trying to push away from generic terms, and that might have some problems of its own that I want us to think about before I get to my actual question [laughter], which is, "When you talk about a mode, right, when is a bone just a bone?"

Baker: When is a what...?

Sachs: When is a bone just a bone, or when is a plow just a plow, right? When you break genre down into mode, one of the things that it invites you to do is repeatedly to invoke "genre" at any moment that you see an aspect of genre, right? So if somebody has a plow in a poem, that's georgic [laughter]; if there's any element of threat or death in a poem, that's gothic, right? and to—I want to hear about that. My real question then is ultimately, "Okay, so whether we call it mode, medium, or genre, how do these categories—and this is where I think Joanna's question comes in; this is the part I think has not been answered—if we call it 'mode, medium, or genre,' how do these categories of inquiry allow us to think about time?" That's the part that I think is missing. It's there in the papers, but I want to hear it more clearly.

Han: I would say that... I mean, for me, I could... Maybe my rush to call it a "genre" was too quick...

Sachs: No! [Laughter]

Han: My—I mean, after writing this I quickly realized that my real investment was in the prospect poem and how that's a genre (a very temporal genre) that is playing with the notion of prospect in terms of futurity and in terms of the felt experience of seeing, hearing, anticipating across a channel, across, you know, across the transatlantic, you know; it's that notion. So I think for me prospect is a temporal—is a deeply temporal genre.

Williams: Lara has a hook.

Lara Kriegel: Yeah, I just wanted to say... I mean, as we answer this challenge, I just want to—I was very taken with Sam’s notion of the emergent residual, and I wonder if this might be an opportunity to put that in play as you answer.

Williams: It’s your hook now, Nush.

Powell: To offer yet another term—but it does get to the point of temporality... The most recent issue of *SECC—Studies in the Eighteenth Century...? Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture?* Yeah, okay, you know the one I mean!—has a panel on microgenres, which was a thing two ASECS ago that got a fair amount of attention. And, you know, microgenre is what it sounds like: a really specific genre. But there was an added element to the way they were trying to define it that I thought was interesting—and I haven’t made my mind up as to whether or not I’m buying it—but the idea was it’s not only a very specific genre, but it’s one that is locatable in a specific temporal moment. And some of the writers on it were in fact invested in charting a rise and a fall of that particular microgenre, and so that may be useful to the way that you’re trying to conceive of this.

Han: Yeah, yeah. Thank you.

Williams: Another hook?

Christina Lupton: Am I the next up?

Williams: Yes.

Lupton: Okay. So I want to just kind of get my bit in on the media side of things by asking... I think I’m going to—I mean, I want to respond to the media thing by modeling a *real* media question, like, which was what I was going to ask you in question form, but now it’s a hook, so... So here’s the real media question. So for me all of this is a bit sort of wishy-washy around the media stuff, so I’m going to give you a real media question. The media question is this: So—it’s for both of you—so these contrasts that you’re pointing out between (or relationships between) the gothic and the georgic or Burns and Pope are going to some extent be resolved in the future of these texts by the fact that readers are going to read them at the same time, all of them. And I’ve been working with a little library in Scotland where there’s a complete set of borrowers’ records, so we know that in 1820 someone’s going to go to this little library in Perthshire and they’re going to get some sermons, and a farming manual, and Pope, and Burns. And then they’re going to go home and, you know, in the course of a month they’re going to read those, and they’re going to read some aloud, and they’re going to read some intensely and superficially. Then they’re going to put them back in the library. And I wonder—I mean, if we throw that sort of ethnographic aspect of the future of books into this conversation, what I think we get is the fact that the real, material history of these texts is one of mixture and combination and perhaps—to go back to our temporality discussion—one of layered temporalities, in a very material way that I would describe really being about mediation. This is the future of material text, is to be layered temporally in very complicated ways by the way that they’re used.

Now, if we turn that back to the sort of questions that we’re having about the content of these texts: does it make any difference to think about the fact that these thoughts of the future are in

some sense at least potentially primed to see themselves participating in that mixture? If the future of your text is the future of a book which is not going to be read in order of influence or in order of its own sort of generic primacy—it's going to be read as part of that temporal and generic mix that is simply the fated future of books. What happens, then, to the arguments that we're making from the perspective of these works' creation?

Baker: So I'd like to try to immediately answer your "real media question," for which I think you.

Lupton: Excellent.

Baker: I think that everything you said strikes me as true and important. I think that for the... Where the particular set of texts and events that I'm concerned with, as far as they go... Yes, the reception history of these works in books, and yes, their history as participating in an afterlife of canonicity or noncanonicity matters. Hence the significance of the debate over Burns involving Wordsworth, Currie, and Jeffrey, right? I also think, however, that for the poets what—I think I'm using the word correctly—I think for the poets—the phrase correctly—I think "secondary orality" matters more. Because I think what matters even more for the poets is the afterlife of these works as verses, as lyric, right, as song, as thought, because I think the idea is that if these poets are really effective this fellow in 1820 may check out these books, right? You know, a woman in 1920 may check out these books. (I think often of Terry Castle's work on the reception of the eighteenth century in the 1920s, right?) But especially the poetry's going to matter to them as they memorize it and think of it. Which, coming back to Jon's question, right, about the relationship between media and mode, right? I think there is a hope for the future that these poets have (and I'm not saying they're right) but I think they have a hope for the future that their works may be encoding dispositions, right, that can emerge in some possible future, right, through the remediation of books and memorization and teaching institutions and the experience of art outside of institutions, right? All kinds of routes, but there's a way in which they'll re-emerge and matter for people not just as they are doing literature again, but as they are living. So: plowing It's, like, not the case—no, it's absolutely not the case—every time there is a plow there is the georgic, right but I do think that every time there is plowing, there is working. And every time the plow has rows you have verses, right, too, and therefore there's a potentiality of the transmission of disposition from mode to mode through genre. Happening, you know, across these works. But to grasp it you have to have a full sense of the movement from thought and disposition into material mediation, either, you know in a book—or just in the waves in the air—and then back, right, into somebody else's bodily expression.

Han: And I think that the notion of the microgenre was really helpful; thanks for that.

Powell: You're welcome.

Han: And I want to point out the fact that Barbauld's *Eighteen Hundred and Eleven* was bashed. The critical apparatus—when you look at any anthology, it's—the first few lines are: "This was a heavily planned project. She died; this is the last published piece she ever wrote," right? So the narrative behind that microgenre in some ways kind of marks the end of the prospect poem, so I am trying to in some anachronistic way show how Pope sort of is the starting point and this is

Barbauld's kind of last version of it... But it still goes on, and it's very much mixed with time. I mean, she was—Croker was a complete dick and he called her a “fatidical spinster,” right? There's a certain element of gendered temporality. So the notion that she can't give birth to, you know, in a biological sense or in a poetic sense to further texts, right, sort of, I think, is an important component of this genre. *Her* prospects are gone, but her work remains. And it allows—and to answer your question a little bit, sort of, about the larger implications—I think her move to have America brought back is kind of a cheeky way to talk about how Romanticism goes to America. So you have Whitman walking, and so I think there's a certain kind of fluidity that way.

Baker: So can I ask you a quick, naïve question about Barbauld? So I knew she was at Warrington Academy—what's her understood relation to Unitarianism later on? Do you know? Does anybody know? Because it just seems to me that for me and my guilty conscience around this—which is why I'm here at a workshop with this paper, right—I feel like... We can have our present-day “media” theory of what was happening, right, in eighteenth-century or late-eighteenth-century literature or history [but] it's also significant to recognize what their media history was—of course, not expressed in those terms, right? To me I think a lot of their media history really did have (really was articulated in terms of) theology. So I think that the question about Pope and how Pope was imagining futurity in *Windsor Forest* probably has a lot to do with, like, you know, crypto-Catholicism and ideas about the Stuart dynasty in relation to Catholic divine right.

Han: Right, right. Right, right.

Baker: And I feel like with books and with people and their dispositions and the notion of living on into a possible future I think that—I know that—there's a powerful intervening model of Unitarianism, you know, that happens between *Windsor Forest* and then, you know, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Burns, Barbauld in 1811, which gives a whole different model for the relationship of individual action and material mediation.

Williams: Hook from Jesse.

Molesworth: This actually may be lost, but I want to defend, you know, “mode” as a necessary literary concept. You know, Jon, I don't think there's anything, you know, wrong with what Sam is doing. Things can have both a genre and a mode, or, as I prefer, a form and a mode. You know, gothic novel: the form is the novel—fiction. The mode is simply a series of tropes; that's what a mode is. If you have enough of them that's... You know, pastoral elegy. The elegy is the form; the pastoral is the mode—the series of tropes, the shepherds. You know, there's nothing—

Sachs: Sure, but to be clear, what I'm asking is not—what I'm trying to do is not to disqualify the use of “mode,” but try to ask about the border between the genre and the mode, right? That you... At what point does—because my issue is that a lot of times you can play... When is something that involves death *not* gothic? Right?

Molesworth: That's not the only trope that has to do with the gothic.

Sachs: I'm not saying that it is! There are plenty of tropes that are part of the gothic; that's why we call it a genre.

Molesworth: Right, but just because something has death doesn't make it gothic. You need many more tropes, again.

Sachs: But that's my point. [Laughter] That's my point, right? That if I were to put pressure on these two papers respectively I would put the pressure in different directions, right? I think that when I push John about defining a genre he wanted to back away and say, "Well maybe I don't want to define this as genre." No, you absolutely do need to define it as genre and stick to your guns! But if I put pressure on the opposite direction on Sam...I mean, there are moments in that paper where I see what he's talking about very clearly as being gothic or as being georgic, right? There's a sustained set of reference and tropes—if you want to call it that—that read to me exactly as he wants to characterize them, as gothic and as georgic. But there are also moments where a certain—I don't want to rattle through examples now—where one term, one word does all the work: and that's what I'm pushing at. So we're on exactly the same page, and I'm not saying that we should never talk about mode [or] we should only talk about genre, but what I'm asking about are: you know, what does it take to build a case from a word?

Molesworth: Well do it. There's form and then there's mode. You know, they're different. There's content, you know; content versus form, you know.

Williams: Hook from Richard.

Nash: I think what I'm going to say will somehow suture the disagreeing agreement between these two gentlemen and a point raised by Lara earlier about emergent residual and Monique when she was suggesting elegy. Let's see if I can pull this all off. [Laughter] Sam, what I found interesting is that Lara was asking you to go back to—and I would like to echo that again—your final paragraph where you're speaking of gothic and georgic as jointly contributing to what you think of as the emergence of the residual. While the notion of elegy and pastoral came in, it seemed to be in some way supported. It seems to me that there is a distinction between notions of time and temporality invoked by—and particularly by the relation of the past to the future—that's invoked by georgic and gothic when you suture them together (and that's maybe a super-genre rather than a microgenre; I don't know). But whatever you get out of that conjunction that speaks to your notion of the emergence of the residual seems to me *not to be* the same thing that you get when you think about how elegy and pastoral configure temporality. So I—maybe I'm wrong about that?—but I'd like to hear you talk more about what you see as being the payoff of this "emergence of the residual," and is this something that you want to tie specifically to that georgic/gothic conjunction, or do you want to include the more expansive elegiac modes?

Baker: Right. That's great; that's really useful. Now I'm going to follow Jon's example from yesterday by robustly defending my paper. I was telling you [Sachs] yesterday, "Jon, well-defended." So when I start quoting from Wordsworth's elegies of a kind that Burns—although they're not titled elegies; they're titled "thoughts"—I agree with Burns. It's not an elegy for him in terms of its titling. It's in a different generic space of graveyard thoughts. I quote these lines about, you know, "Address to the Sons":

Ye now are panting up life's hill!
'Tis twilight-time of good and ill

.....
Ye Sons of Burns! for watchful care
There will be need.

Right? But I say about these lines—I don't say these lines are georgic; I don't say they're gothic, right? I say, "Right, here we've got Wordsworth furthering, right, his general (you know) project, right, of recontextualizing his previous Enlightenment sympathies within a Burkian conception of traditional social order," right? It's this kind of counter-Enlightenment and (between the lines here) a very Anglican sort of tidying up of Burns, right, that I don't see as particularly georgic or gothic. It's elegiac in a certain "church-y" way, but that's it. But what interests me is that he then feels like he needs to have, right, you know, some more thoughts? And in his further thoughts he awakens all of these lingering anxieties, doubts, right, maybe inspirations? And then he's giving you, you know: "I shiver, Spirit fierce and bold, / At thought of what I now behold," right, when he's at the mold where Burns is laid. And then he says, "And have I then thy bones so near, / And thou forbidden to appear?" Right? But yeah, it's the word "bones"—but, like, yeah, I think this is a gothic scene. I think this is some body where there's bits of bones and, like, I imagine I'm by an uneasy grave, right, and it interests me that here, right, after verses that are very boringly in one traditional genre you get—not the genre of gothic re-appearing; it's certainly not a gothic poem, heaven forefend—but you have the mode, you have that *attitude* emerging in a striking way through something that is worth quoting twenty years later.

Sachs: I'm going to hook in there because this is not the case I'm thinking, about, right? Obviously, barnyard—

Baker: That's not bones.

Sachs: But then declaring that this is gothic, right? This is a poem that "remediates the gothic architecture of the cemetery, and finds in the graveyard a perverse georgic landscape." It's the "georgic landscape" that I find objectionable, right? So why is that georgic, right? Is it georgic because Burns was a ploughman? That seems to be the implication of what you're arguing. But if Burns was a ploughman, does that make everything written about Burns georgic? That's my issue.

Baker: Because sadness grows through the bones of the ploughman, right.

Sachs: Yeah, I see your point. [Laughter]

Baker: Burns's virtue, he declares, is that he "showed my youth / How Verse may build a princely throne / On humble truth," right? Having been able to visit with Burns, he writes, "What treasures would have then been placed / Within my reach; of knowledge graced / By fancy what a rich repast!" which makes me think—a text that was very much on everyone's mind in this moment was, you know, Malthus's "Feast of Nature," right? I mean, to me, those lines that aren't in the block quote but that continue on, you know, [they] very much start rewriting the scene into, you know, [one] of providence, right? You know, of agricultural gathering.

Sachs: Just to be very clear very quickly, very explicit: I *buy* your argument. I'm not pushing against the argument at all, and I think that it's a very convincing suggestion of the way in which the interplay of the georgic and the gothic creates this mode that we might call "Romantic." But what I'm questioning (and I'm glad we're getting it out here) is just that I also buy your use of "mode" as a way of getting away from the strict confines of genre, as a way of thinking about the georgic and gothic essentially as metaphors, right, or as signs and symbols of these larger sets of concerns that are also generic.

Baker: Well, and one of the things that I think is so helpful in this discussion—this discussion is helpful in so many ways—one way in which your particular intervention's helpful right here is making me think, you know, had I slowed down over this passage, right? And highlighted, you know, where the moment comes that Wordsworth's having trouble is premature Anglican closure ([which] with this gothic further thought resorts to georgic) might have made this stronger.

Williams: Is yours a hook, Rebecca?

Spang: It's a meta-hook. [Laughter] There's someone ahead of me.

Williams: Oh, yeah. Dave?

Alff: Yeah, I really like Nick's formulation of georgic as a mode that attempts to remember the past to stage the future, and I'm wondering, John, what happens when that past is really awful? Windsor Forest is...I mean, it's ground zero for the Norman yoke.

Han: Right.

Alff: It's this place that William the Conqueror supposedly depopulated in order to create a hunting preserve. And *Windsor Forest* also occasions this history of seventeenth-century England that's really strange because he talks about—Pope's speaker grieves over—the bones of Charles I (supposedly interred in the park) and then talks about the intestine wars (the Civil Wars) which raged quote until "Anne said 'Let discord cease!'," which leaps over the Commonwealth Protectorate, the reigns of Charles II, James II, William and Mary, William on his own. So my question is, "With respect to the histories that Windsor Forest conjures up, does Pope's future of blue water navy, *asiento*, imperial dominance over the Atlantic sphere depend upon misremembering or selectively remembering this past?"

Han: That's a great question. I tried to play it up in the paper, but I essentially said that he's using—this is a horrible metaphor—but it's almost like the past is like a check, right? So he's using—that underwrites, that funds this instantaneous present, right? The violence of the past makes the instantaneous present seem worthwhile—somehow in his mind the Norman Conquest, those were, at that time they were investing—rather violently, in blood—into a future that then Pope kind of, you know, re-creates and says, "Yeah, this is—we paid for it, and this is the fruit of our labor."

Alff: But it's also such—I mean, I think about, like, the reinvention of slave plantations as resorts. I mean, if you're Pope this is... I mean, you're looking back at the legacy that still seems so toxic and that he seems to be writing against at the same time the Stuarts vacation there.

Han: Right.

Alff: And that seems to me to be one of the hardest things about the literal state of Windsor Forest. It's not how it comes to be, [but] how it ceases to be a forest in the period of Interregnum in the middle of the seventeenth century

Han: And, you know, maybe, you know... It's been agreed that some of the plantations are just, you know, they're renovating them so it doesn't look so "slavey" and stuff, and I think that's where *Windsor Forest* sort of—that's why I bring in the gardens and stuff, because he's literally cultivating the past. He's saying, like, "Eh, it was a little bloody. It's fine. We'll just put up, you know, a statue there, a grotto. It's fine. You can't see the blood." So I think there's that element of selective remembrance and editing.

Williams: Okay. Rebecca?

Spang: This is probably an appropriate but provocative thing to say at the *end* of this session. So I'm sitting here trying to think what this very good discussion means for the future of eighteenth-century studies and the future of the workshop. It has sometimes been said about previous workshops that we have fascinating discussions, but we don't actually talk about the papers. This particular session all we've done is talk about the papers—which could be thought in terms of, "Well, yes; we've actually learned to concentrate and focus." It's also striking to me that the people who participated most vocally in this session are not the people who participated most vocally in the previous session and the discussion of Koselleck, so I have a little bit of an anxiety—and again, as is well known, I'm a historian who likes hanging around with literary people and likes going to papers on "literature," but I did repeatedly in this discussion think, "I don't see a hook for a historian." Is there a way to think about those questions of mode, media, genre as also being relevant for history *writing*? Would that be a way to do that hook? And I suppose that's kind of a Hayden White move. Would there be a way to historicize the gothic as sometimes a mode, sometimes a media [*sic*], sometimes a genre? Perhaps there are other ways of re-enabling a conversation between historians and literature scholars. And, thinking about Joanna's question about, "Well, this looks different in France": again wondering how we get this very "English literature" discussion into some kind of [broader] conversation—I mean, there are references in both papers to empire, but it's a gesture. It doesn't really go to the Atlantic World, and so again I'm wondering how those kinds of connections might be forged, or if we need to forge them, or if the future of the workshop and the future of eighteenth-century studies is saying: "We have these things side by side, right? And we can have a historical paper, we can have a very close reading of a couple of texts, we can have a historicist reading of a text, and we'll just do these things one after the other."

Jordheim: Can I just hook in with a small point? It's interesting; in Germany, the main Koselleck reception has been among literary people. So the real historians haven't really—you can chip in on this—but at least for a while it was something that literary people would read.

Fulda: It's easier to read in English than in German. [laughter]

Nash: Not for some of us.

Williams: Well perhaps we should make an effort to have literary people join historical people for lunch. [laughter]