CHAPITRE DE LIVRE

« Representing Leigh Hunt's Autobiography »

Michael E. Sinatra

dans *Virtual Victorians : Networks, Connections, Technologies*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, p. 107-119.

Pour citer ce chapitre :

SINATRA, Michael E., « Representing Leigh Hunt's Autobiography », dans Veronica Alfana et Andrew Stauffer (dir.), *Virtual Victorians : Networks, Connections, Technologies*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, p. 107-119.

liberal side of the Italy question in the short-lived *Tuscan Athenaeum* and other journalism, as well as in historical articles and such books as *Tuscany in 1849 and 1859*. T. A. T. and Frances Eleanor Trollope collaborated on *Homes and Haunts of the Italian Poets* (1881).

20. Thus begins the chapter entitled "The Apprenticeship to the Laurel" (*DIW* 2:393). The Italian-language Wikipedia site shows an image of the house, with the plaque in capital letters: "Qui Abitò Corilla Nel Secolo Decimo Ottavo."
21. Thomas Adolphus Trollope, *Filippo Strozzi: A History of the Last Days of the Old Italian Liberty* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1860), http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/008640645. Quoted in Lawrence Poston, "Thomas Adolphus Trollope: A Victorian Anglo-Florentine," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 49 (1966): 133–64. 143.
22. Mr. Trollope and T. A. T. visited the family in Cincinnati briefly in 1828, Anthony remaining at school, but the US sojourn and business venture were mostly in Mrs. Trollope's hands.
23. To compare versions of a persona, we name key events (standard date, GIS), adding ID attributes in the BESS files. Events that would be kernels or that one would expect to be nearly ubiquitous are often missing in biographies of Trollope: Birth (E00079) is missing in three versions; Death (E00088) is missing in two; and we have seen the cursory way these facts are dealt with in two versions. Only one version deals with Trollope's move to Italy, and only three note her major novels. Her marriage or her husband's death, her important travel writing other than *Domestic Manners*, and the births and deaths of her children are all elided in four or five out of the five versions studied.
24. Her classes and soirees are described in the present tense. The discursive chapter headings in a626 frequently begin with birth and end with death; in Abbot's collection, too, subjects besides Trollope have their life-spans traced in detail (a001).
25. LC n 50012547 says, "1780-1863." Ditto VIAF, ID: 34551336 http://viaf.org. I follow the *ODNB*, which cites the Bristol Record Office.

CHAPTER 5

REPRESENTING LEIGH HUNT'S *AUTOBIOGRAPHY*

Michael E. Sinatra

In his biography of Leigh Hunt, Anthony Holden asserts, "Alongside Wordsworth, who largely eschewed literary London, Hunt's was the longest nineteenth-century literary life, with the widest circle of acquaintance and as large a claim as any to the shaping of literary opinion" (2). In my earlier monograph, *Leigh Hunt and the London Literary Scene*, I illustrated the kinds of change that Hunt's reputation went through over a 30-year timespan. That study attempted to elaborate the problematic of his position within the London literary and political scene between the years 1805 and 1828, the contributions he made to British literature and journalism, and his public standing at the end of the romantic period. Since Hunt's life is obviously too complex to be rendered fully in any single study, the idea was not to attempt an exhaustive history, but rather to present a starting point for further inquiry into Hunt's career as a writer and public figure under the reign of Queen Victoria.

The trajectory of Hunt's life and work traced in the years 1805 to 1828 appears to fall off rather steeply toward the end, leaving Hunt as a failed author, with neither a dependable, receptive audience nor any clear future as an author in sight as the third decade of his public life comes to an end. To conclude this account of Hunt's early career abruptly at this point, however, would be to create a misleading impression of his career as a whole. Hunt survived the setbacks of *The Liberal* and *Lord Byron and Some of his Contemporaries*, and he remained more or less true to his principle of independence. The

second half of his life was very fulfilling for Hunt, both personally and professionally. Hunt's later years deserve more attention from twenty-first-century scholars, and they offer many topics of research worth pursuing further. During that time, Hunt made new friends and lost most of his enemies; his advancing age also had an impact on the stamina he could invest in new literary projects, such as running a periodical or going to the theater every night. His reputation as a well-known and respected personality grew during these years and brought him many visitors from around the country as well as from America, where his works had been regularly published and reviewed since *Juvenilia*, in the same way that those of Coleridge and Wordsworth had been between 1830 and 1850. Yet all throughout the second half of his life, Hunt retained a keen political sense and a sharp critical judgment, which motivated him to promote new poetical voices, such as Tennyson and D. G. Rossetti, as well as past authors, in his critical anthologies and editions *Imagination and Fancy* (1844), *Wit and Humour* (1846), *Stories from the Italian Poets* (1846), and *Beaumont and Fletcher* (1855).

My essay focuses on a reading of the complex politics of authorial revisions and the reception history of Hunt's 1850 *Autobiography*, with some reference to *The Examiner* since this is arguably Hunt's most famous publication as editor and the work that gave him a place of prominence within the romantic period.[1] The importance of independent judgment, first expressed in Hunt's earlier work in journalism in *The News*, clearly influenced Hunt's journalistic career in *The Examiner*, as the prospectus for this periodical (included at the back of *Critical Essays* and reprinted in the first issue of *The Examiner*) demonstrates. This lengthy advertisement also serves as further evidence of the sociopolitical implications of Hunt's theatrical criticism, the way in which *Critical Essays* constitutes the first instance of Hunt's longstanding insistence on independence from external pressures (whether they be editorial, personal, or political), and his early engagement in social and cultural issues. Hunt links critical and political independence in his choice of motto for *The Examiner*: "Party is the madness of many for the gain of a few." He thus effectively advertises the impartiality of his new periodical by using his current reputation as an impartial theatrical critic:

> The Gentleman who till lately conducted the THEATRICAL DEPARTMENT in the NEWS, will criticise the Theatre in the EXAMINER; and as the Public have allowed the possibility of IMPARTIALITY in that Department, we do not see why the same possibility may not be obtained in POLITICS. (Hunt, 2003 1, 31)

Hunt distinguishes *The Examiner* further by describing the contemporary tendency of the press: "The newspaper proves to be like the generality of it's species, very mean in it's subserviency to the follies of the day, very miserably merry in it's puns and it's stories, extremely furious in politics, and quite as feeble in criticism" (Hunt, 2003 1, 31). Hunt asserts in the conclusion of the prospectus that, just as he had cleared the way for a new, unbiased drama criticism when he started writing for *The News*, so too would he change political journalism and provide a new, neutral voice within the contemporary press with the founding of *The Examiner*.

The Examiner rapidly rose to success, and the sales were very strong in the first decade of the newspaper's existence, with a circulation of approximately 2,200 issues by November 1808, rising to a peak of between 7,000 and 8,000 in the 1810s. These circulation figures are quite impressive when one bears in mind the limited numbers of copies sold by all the publications of that period; for instance, the *Edinburgh Review*'s circulation was 12,000 and *The Times*'s 8,000 (Deguchi, 1996 vii). This success can be ascribed in part to the shared commitment to reform of both Hunt and his brother John, and in part to Hunt's personality as editor. Indeed, Jeffrey N. Cox and Greg Kucich rightly explain that part of the success of the newspaper, in terms of both longevity and influence, comes "from the power of Hunt's writing, which is by turns chattily erudite and aesthetic, cleverly satirical, and filled with political rage" (Hunt, 2003 1, xxxvii).

The Examiner played a major role in the London political scene, as well as in the literary periodical world. The new weekly also had an important impact on Hunt's life and career. As Kenneth Neill Cameron notes, "*The Examiner* became not so much a weekly paper as an institution and Leigh Hunt was transformed from an obscure poet and essayist into an influential editor, a man whose opinions were read and admired by thousands of readers week by week for some thirteen years" (1961–70 1, 263). Hunt's periodical came to have a major influence on an entire generation of writers in the early decades of the nineteenth century, from a political as well as a literary perspective. Studies devoted to Shelley, Keats, and Hazlitt frequently include a discussion of Hunt's newspaper, since it played such an important role in their writing careers. *The Examiner* also provides modern readers with the proper contextual information for Keats's and Shelley's poems, as Nicholas Roe and Cameron, among others, have persuasively argued.

On June 8, 1850, the three-volume edition of *The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt; with Reminiscences of Friends and Contemporaries* appeared under the imprint of Smith, Elder, and Co. Although based in large part on works previously published, Hunt's *Autobiography* is

probably the most important work of his later life. While a large section of the material included in Hunt's *Autobiography* comes from *Lord Byron and Some of his Contemporaries*, the tone is greatly altered. Whereas *Lord Byron* was very much a statement of personal justification in the face of the various attacks Hunt had suffered in publications on Byron, and a reaction against the fulsome praises that the dead poet now garnered from around the country, the *Autobiography* offers a calmer depiction of Hunt's life, imbued with an obvious sense of pleasure in the recollection of past events and friendships. Hunt's revision pleased reviewers, for several either allude or explicitly refer to Hunt's gentler treatment of Byron. For example, *The Palladium* notes Hunt's more benevolent treatment and reproduces passages of "the apologetic remarks" (138); *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* similarly marks the difference between 1828 and 1850 by noting that the later work shows "the asperities of his nature gently worn away, and his mind brought under the influence of a kindly and genial humor" (572). The *Methodist Quarterly* highlights Hunt's revisions the most of these three reviews, asserting that, for Hunt, "the chief delight which he enjoyed in writing his own life seemed to result from the opportunity afforded of setting forth motives once misconstrued, and expressing manly regret for early indiscretions" (253).

As Ken A. Bugajski notes in his article "Editing and Noting: Vision and Revisions of Leigh Hunt's Literary Lives," "Even Hunt's best and most successful periodical endeavor, the *Examiner*, does not escape revisionary criticism in 1850" (n.p.). In Hunt's 1828 volume, *Lord Byron and Some of his Contemporaries*, he had described the founding of *The Examiner* thus:

> At the beginning of the year 1808, my brother John and myself set up the weekly news paper of the Examiner in joint partnership. The spirit of theatrical criticism continued the same as in the News, for several years; by which time reflection, and the society of better critics, had made me wiser. In politics I soon got interested . . . I was very much in earnest in all I wrote . . . I think precisely as I did on all subjects when I last wrote in it. (411)

When Hunt reworked this passage into the 1850 *Autobiography*, he significantly changed its tone in recasting the verbatim section he used in a more negative light:

> At the beginning of the year 1808, my brother John and myself set up the weekly news paper of the Examiner in joint partnership. It was named after the Examiner of Swift and his brother Tories. . . . I thought only of their fine writing, which, in my youthful confidence, I proposed to emulate . . . I wrote, though anonymously, in the first person, as if, in addition to my theatrical pretensions, I had suddenly become an oracle in politics. . . . I blush to think what a simpleton I was. . . . The spirit of the criticism on the theatres continued as it had been in the News. (2, 1–3)

Thus, Hunt now "views the name of the periodical as an arrogant usurpation; he discounts the certainty of his political beliefs; and his widely respected theatrical opinions have become pretension" (Bugajksi n.p.).

Interestingly, just as Hunt's work after 1828 tends not to be considered by modern critics, Hunt himself is curiously silent about the later part of his life. To some extent the rather abrupt truncations of the account of his literary career may be due to the practical necessities of producing copy under pressure of time. The process of revision was certainly cut short by Smith, Hunt's publisher, who insisted, in a new contract dated February 7, 1850, that Hunt should produce the manuscript within three months.[2] Stephen Fogle comments on Hunt's financial motivation for publishing his autobiography in 1850 when he asserts that "the circumstances of the composition of the book, that is, the need to make good on his contract . . . go far to explain this emphasis [on Hunt's early life]. Much of the material lay ready to his hand, suitable for reprinting once the rights were cleared" (vii–viii). Indeed, the pressure to meet his contractual obligation with the firm in time may also have been a motivation for Hunt to borrow heavily from his previous publications, principally *Lord Byron and Some of his Contemporaries*, the essays on Italy he published in *The Liberal*, and some articles from *The Examiner*.[3] However, Hunt may also have been attempting to recuperate his stance of independence by revisiting and revising this earlier controversial material into more temperate terms. Since it was in the early period of his life when he was most fiercely independent, it is that period that he spends the most time revisiting.

Thomas Carlyle's enthusiastic reaction to Hunt's *Autobiography*, in a letter dated June 17, 1850, is one of the most positive comments that the volume gathered after its publication:

> I call this an excellently good Book; by far the best of the autobiographic kind I remember to have read in the English Language; and indeed, except it be Boswell's of Johnson, I do not know where we have such a Picture drawn of a human Life as in these three volumes. A pious, ingenious, altogether *human* and worthy Book.[4]

If the reviews of Hunt's book were generally mixed, they were nevertheless very numerous: the *Autobiography* received no less than 15 reviews in Britain and Ireland, and 5 in America. The style of Hunt's *Autobiography* is heavily criticized, particularly for what the reviewers feel to be dullness, in the *North British Review*, *The Palladium*, and the *Dublin University Magazine*.[5] The anonymous reviewer for *The Spectator* acclaims Hunt's *Autobiography* as an enriching source of information on literature and society,[6] and the anonymous reviewer for *The Times* observes that Hunt's life is an interesting subject for a book, even though the financial problems that figure so prominently argue for an origin in pecuniary motives rather than an interest in literary history.[7] Hunt's central place in the London literary scene is recognized favorably in the reviews for *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* and for *The Literary World*,[8] and Hunt's appreciation of his fellow authors is commended in *Chamber's Edinburgh Magazine* and in *The Literary Gazette and Journal of Belles Lettres*.[9] Alongside Smith's offer to publish Hunt's recollections, these reviews attest to Hunt's widely respected position within the London literary scene and the considerable interest in his memoirs.

Hunt's choice of material for discussion in his *Autobiography* might suggest that he never considered himself to be part of what is now called the Victorian period. It might also simply indicate that Hunt was primarily interested in reflecting upon what he thought of as the best years of his life, including of course his friendships with Keats and Shelley. In any case, one can legitimately question whether Hunt should be considered as a Victorian autobiographer as well as a key romantic figure whom modern periodization tends to overlook. His life and success under the reign of Queen Victoria complement his pivotal role during the romantic period, and his *Autobiography* contains much undiscussed material that is relevant to both literary periods. Nevertheless, Hunt's *Autobiography* does not give, to adopt Anthony Trollope's words, "a record of [Hunt's] inner life,"[10] and one needs to turn to his 1853 book, *The Religion of the Heart*, to find a detailed expression of Hunt's personal beliefs, as I have explored elsewhere.[11] Commenting on the revisions Hunt made in the *Autobiography*, Timothy Webb—in the words of Bugajski—"argues that [they] result from a conscious change in philosophical perspective through which Hunt begins to look at fellow humans more charitably. Webb writes, for example, that Hunt's 'gradual process of revisionary evolution . . . strongly suggests that for Hunt the process of revision was not only a matter of stylistics or even of truth to history and to self but to an activity whose deepest resonances were moral and religious'" (Bugajski n.p., quoting Webb 299). The religious sentiment was not, however, always welcomed by contemporary readers, as demonstrated by the anonymous reviewer for *The Palladium* who criticized what he perceived as anti-Christian sentiments in Hunt's *Autobiography* (137) and by a similar anonymous complaint that appeared a year later in *The Rambler, a Catholic Journal and Review of Home and Foreign Literature, Politics, Music and the Fine Arts* (47).

For inclusion in the planned Leigh Hunt Archive website, I will prepare an edition of Hunt's *Autobiography* (both the 1850 and the 1860 editions); this online resource will also include an annotated collection of all Hunt's critical writings, as well as a selection of primary and secondary works by and about other writers involved in his literary circles. These works will include letters by Charles Cowden Clarke and Vincent Novello, Benjamin Robert Haydon's diary, William Hazlitt's essays in the *Round Table* and other writings he published in Hunt's periodicals, a selection of John Hamilton Reynolds's and Charles Lamb's contributions to the *London Magazine*, and a biography of Madame Vestris, along with several other memoirs and critical writings on drama. All these works will provide a unique intertextual reading environment for the digital version of Hunt's critical writings. Furthermore, the Leigh Hunt Archive website will be constructed along the lines of Jerome McGann's *Rossetti* archive, "so that its contents and its webwork of relations (both internal and external) can be indefinitely expanded and developed" (McGann n.p.).[12] The idea is to have a "central text hypermedia"[13]—an electronic edition of Hunt's entire critical corpus, with appended notes and hypertext links, along with links to historical-critical editions. This website will allow for an exploration of a new facet of Hunt's critical productions, and it will contribute to an ongoing effort to consider the true importance of so-called minor literary figures—as well as to further study of the 1830s, a decade that (as Richard Cronin notes) does not constitute a literary period but instead gets lost between two others.[14] Since students and scholars alike need access to primary texts for their work, the site will be crucial in making possible a proper reevaluation of Hunt's writings in the first half of the nineteenth century. It will also encode Hunt's own literary networks by featuring biographical notices of other writers within his literary circles, along with reviews, notices, and a detailed chronology.

Digital editions, due to the affordances and constraints established by the compound platforms of the modern computer and the World Wide Web, are learning commons, parliamentary hubs, urban squares within which active processes of scholarly debate and exchange can be

rapidly broadcast, recorded, collected, preserved, and shared. If digital editions are to take full advantage of their environments (rather than simply emulating print traditions), they need to visibly include both process and product, and to offer opportunities for editorial diligence, contribution, perspective, control, and debate to their knowledge-community of users. The Leigh Hunt Archive intends to incorporate the work of Stéfan Sinclair on data-mining tools (specifically the implementation of his *Voyant* tools in the various electronic editions prepared during the course of the project) and Jon Saklofske on visualizing data (specifically through his *NewRadial* prototype).[15] Data mining offers many opportunities to bring together different sets of data which, when prepared to the highest standard of text encoding, can yield new and innovative results that encourage further reconsideration of preconceived notions regarding the transfer of ideas from one author to another, or one literary genre to another. Furthermore, the results of the research undertaken in the Leigh Hunt Archive will be presented in a collaborative, visual context that reimagines the digital scholarly edition as a transparent workspace layer in which established primary objects from existing databases can be gathered, organized, correlated, annotated, and augmented by multiple users in a dynamic environment that also features centralized margins for secondary scholarship and debate. *NewRadial* is a site for the generation of social editions and for a more public and open process of edition formation, pluralization, and persistent growth. It is also a site of scholarly process, discussion, and development. It has the ability to represent database material in a sandbox environment, thus encouraging iterative experimentation, hosting methodological and interpretative debate, and supporting new juxtapositions and connections. Most important, adapting *NewRadial* for specific use with this project will place the Leigh Hunt Archive database in conversation with efforts relating to the idea of the semantic web. *NewRadial*'s use of an RDF (Resource Description Framework) data model to organize and export any secondary scholarship that grows out of user interactions with its primary database makes it extremely useful for prosopography- and placeography-related data manipulation, and for compatibility potential with other RDF-oriented applications such as NINES.[16]

Ultimately, the Leigh Hunt Archive will be useful for anyone working on the romantic and Victorian periods because it will provide access to important contextual information that allows for a better understanding of the key literary and historical events between 1800 and 1850. The biographical notices that it will include—along with a planned series of recorded interviews of scholars discussing Hunt and

the other authors under consideration, as well as relevant information on topics such as the methods of publications available at the time and the evolution of Hunt's literary circles—will make this website an important resource for researchers, students, and the public at large. It will feature contextual information useful for anyone interested in (say) freedom of the press, the rise of the historical novel and historical plays, antiwar poetry, or autobiographical writing. The website will make these texts available for the first time in electronic format; what's more, the site itself, through the use of Geographic Information System (GIS), will generate customizable visual maps of London's literary circles and their contributors. These will allow users to explore the encoded material in original and innovative ways that extend beyond Hunt himself and yet reassert his centrality to the romantic and Victorian periods. Thanks to the data-mining and visualization tools to be implemented in the project, the Leigh Hunt Archive will feature cutting-edge methods for searching and analyzing the large body of data that will have been scanned and prepared to the Text-Encoding-Initiative standards (thus ensuring full compatibility with other electronic resources as well long-term preservation and accessibility). Mass-digitization projects such as Google Books do not offer researchers the same level of granular searches or visualization tools, and thus there is still the need for such a database to be constructed from the ground up.

Thinking of editorial representation today leads one to consider the complex relationship between digital humanities and literary studies, bearing in mind that, with its emphasis on tools, digital humanities can seem to be detached from traditional literary methods even though it arguably became prominent thanks to its origin in literary studies. Howard Besser asserts in the 2004 *Companion to Digital Humanities* that

> though the promise of digital technology in almost any field has been to let one do the same things one did before but better and faster, the more fundamental result has often been the capability of doing entirely new things. (558)

An interdisciplinary field that before the Web appeared to specialize in electronic concordances, digital humanities is now training students in disciplines ranging from philosophy to history to communicate through the Web and use its powerful resources. Further, digital humanists are working with libraries to develop the electronic archives that are the durable research content that scholars use to understand

themselves and their history. The fundamental restructuring of the research record represents a vast modernizing opportunity that is a necessary step forward given the ever-increasing dominance and enabling features of the digital media.

A large number of digital humanities projects have grown out of, or found a happy home in, digital humanities centers around the world. As Neil Fraistat puts it in the collection of essays *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold:

> digital humanities centers are key sites for bridging the daunting gap between new technology and humanities scholars, serving as the cross-walks between cyberinfrastructure and users, where scholars learn how to introduce into their research computational methods, encoding practices, and tools and where users of digital resources can be transformed into producers. Centers not only model the kind of collaborative and interdisciplinary work that will increasingly come to define humanities scholarship; they also enable graduate students and faculty to learn from each other while working on projects of common intellectual interest.[17]

I believe that digital humanities centers and some large-scale digital infrastructures are indeed the best way forward, but what does this mean for literary studies more specifically?

The first place is probably the most obvious since it comes from the origins of digital humanities, or humanities computing, as it was more commonly called in the 1950s when Father Roberto Busa started working with IBM to produce an index to the works of Thomas Aquinas. In other words, digital humanities was arguably at first, and some would suggest still is, a set of tools that can facilitate some aspects of scholarly work by using large-scale computational processing. In that sense, digital humanities is only another step in the technological developments that have gone hand in hand with literary scholarship over the last few hundred years as we moved from orality to the technologies of literacy. Thus, far from fearing it, we should accept its potential as a new resource, one that accompanies new forms of editorialization, such as the shift from manuscripts to print editions set by hand and then to those mass-produced by the steam press.

Digital humanities also does offer new reading and annotating tools; some are already implemented (think of the shared annotation in Kindle books), and some try to break away from the skeuomorphic transfer from print format to electronic format by introducing dynamic tables of contexts (rather than contents)[18] or new methods of annotation, as Ray Siemens and his SSHRCfunded MCRI project,

Implementing New Knowledge Environments, have been prototyping for the past few years.

Lack of physical support for literary content, in the form of primary or secondary sources, is now common. This should not in itself be a source of concern for literary scholars either (except for those also interested in the history of books), since they tend to focus their analysis on the content of the work, not whether it's published in octavo format. The argument of a democratization of knowledge is one that should support the happy marriage of literature and digital humanities. Indeed, which author doesn't dream of reaching a wider audience among the readers who may look for or simply stumble across the millions of books made available by Google in the last few years?

Yet there is the argument that new ways of reading, as described by the notion of "distant reading" whereby scholars can analyze millions of books for patterns, also correspond to the end of literary studies as we know it, in that attention to details (the traditional method of so-called close reading) gets lost in the overwhelming amount of data now available. It is worth bearing in mind, however, as Eric Hayot suggests, that

> the first thing to say is that distant reading is not really distant, and close reading is not just close. No reading practice ever maintains itself as one "distance" from a text; rather what we call a reading practice is among other things a pattern of systems of habitual distances and relations among those distances. So "close reading" is not always close; rather it pairs a certain kind of analysis of relatively small pieces of text with very powerful analytic tools—the tools of New Criticism, but also of psychoanalysis, deconstruction, new historicism, and so on—that leverage those small pieces of text into structures that are more "distant" from the text than is, say, the sentence or the phoneme.[19]

Thus, digital humanities as a method of reading is once again simply another way of dealing with data—"literature as the site for the *storage l* of information," as Hayot puts it—that retains the same intrinsic quality and interest as other literary methods, namely, the pursuit of new ways to explore and understand meanings present in texts that are at the center of our scholarly investigations by retrieving information from the texts studied. In fact, Jerome McGann's latest book, *A New Republic of Letters*, quite neatly adds to this discussion:

> We see this in and as the emergence of the digital humanities, which both its promoters and its critics regard as a set of replacement protocols for traditional humanities scholarship. But the work of the

humanist scholar has not changed with the advent of digital devices. It is still to preserve, to monitor, to investigate, and to augment our cultural life and inheritance. (4)

If the textual infrastructure in a digital world is to match the quality of textual data in the print world, scholars need to take a much more active curatorial role. Forms of "scholarly crowdsourcing"—comparable in some ways to the practices of *dispersed annotation* in genomic research—offer the promise of creating models of data curation that will maintain fundamental primary data and incrementally improve them over time. This is a big task, with progress measured in decades rather than years. It poses important technical challenges for developing new forms of man-machine interaction. It raises institutional questions of where to locate repositories and how to manage workflows and issues of quality control. It also underscores how digital humanities has grown from being understood as a tool for a range of disciplinary-based projects to a transdiscipline in itself, including at this point in its history competing definitions of its very meaning. Finally, it raises questions about the "prestige economy" of the academy and the way in which scholarly labor is ultimately allocated and rewarded.

NOTES

1. This essay borrows some data from my chapter on *The News* and takes its premise from the epilogue of my book *Leigh Hunt and the London Literary Scene* (Routledge, 2005).
2. The arrangement between Smith and Hunt is at the Brewer–Leigh Hunt Collection and is referred to in Landré vol. 1, p. 253.
3. J. E. Morpurgo's edition of Hunt's *Autobiography* contains a very useful appendix that identifies all the passages in the *Autobiography* that are reproduced verbatim from earlier sources; among these, *Lord Byron and Some of his Contemporaries* is the main instance. See *Autobiography*, pp. 496–98.
4. *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle, Vol. 25—1850*, eds. Ian Campbell, Aileen Christianson, and Hilary J. Smith (Durham: Duke UP, 1997), 97.
5. Anon., "*The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt*," *North British Review* 14 (November 1850): 165; Anon., "[Review of *Autobiography*]," *Palladium* 1 (August 1850): 137; Anon., "Leigh Hunt," *Dublin University Magazine* 36 (September 1850): 272.
6. Anon., "Leigh Hunt's *Autobiography*," *Spectator* 23 (June 22, 1850), 593.
7. The anonymous reviewer also advances that Hunt was responsible for his own problems, rather than society ("The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt," *The Times* 20585 [September 4, 1850]: 7).

8. Anon., "Autobiography of Leigh Hunt," *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* 17 (September 1850): 571; Anon., "Review of *The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt*," *Literary World* 7 (September 14, 1850): 210.
9. Anon., "[Review of Leigh Hunt's *Autobiography*]," *Chamber's Edinburgh Magazine* 14 (July 13, 1850): 23; Anon., "Leigh Hunt and His Contemporaries," *Literary Gazette and Journal of Belles Lettres* 1745 (June 29, 1850): 437. The anonymous reviewer for *The Literary Gazette* also notes that age has improved Hunt's style and predicts that the work should be popular outside the literary world (437).
10. Anthony Trollope, *An Autobiography*, ed. David Skilton (London: Penguin, 1996), 232.
11. See my essay "'A Natural Piety': Leigh Hunt's *The Religion of the Heart*," *Allen Review* 19 (1998): 18–21.
12. Jerome McGann, "The Rationale of Hypertext" (1995) http://www2.iath.virginia.edu/public/jjm2f/rationale.html.
13. Lynette Hunster, "Hypermedia Narration: Providing Social Contexts for Methodology." *Conference Abstracts*. Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing / Association for Computers and the Humanities Conference, April 1992; quoted in Claire Lamont, "Annotating a Text: Literary Theory and Electronic Hypertext," in *Electronic Text: Investigations in Method and Theory*, ed. Kathryn Sutherland (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 60.
14. See Richard Cronin, *Romantic Victorians: English Literature, 1824–1840* (New York: Palgrave, 2002).
15. Sinclair's *Voyant* tools can be found at http://voyant-tools.org; Saklofske's *New Radial* is at http://socrates.acadiau.ca/courses/engl/saklofske/newradial.html.
16. I am grateful for Jon Saklofske for his many suggestions regarding this project.
17. Neil Fraistat, "The Function of Digital Humanities Centers at the Present Time," in *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 281.
18. For more on this topic, please consult the work of Susan Brown and Stéfan Sinclair/Geoffrey Rockwell in their CFIfunded projects Canadian Writing Research Collaboratory and the Voyant Tools suite.
19. Eric Hayot, "What Is Data in Literary Studies?" (January 14, 2014), http://erichayot.org/ephemera/mla-what-is-data-in-literary-studies/.