Dickens, His Readers, and the Victorian Authorship:

An Annotated Bibliography

Introduction

This bibliography consists of studies on Dickens and his readers: the peculiarity of the Victorian authorship and reading public and the interaction between Dickens and his readers. This field of study—history of audience—gives light to the overlooked elements of Dickens’ works that were published in weekly/monthly installments. The Victorian readers read Dickens’ “ongoing” novel, and Dickens produced “a piece” of a whole novel considering readers’ direct response to the former piece.

The first thorough study of the reception of Dickens is George H. Ford’s *Dickens and His Readers*, published in 1955. But Ford’s major focus is on the critics’ response to Dickens. As to the study of the “common” reader, Richard D. Altick is a pioneer. He offers valuable surveys of the Victorian reading public in *The English Common Reader*. The successors of Altick’s historical study of the audience also illuminates who the historical common readers were and what they read.
The reasons for Dickens’s popularity are well-discussed in the earlier studies: Dickens’ self-presentation as the readers’ friend. But the social origin of this “friendship,” the complex, ambivalent relationship and interaction between Dickens and his readers, is almost ignored. After the great influence of the New Historicism (especially the theories of Bakhtin and Foucault), which eventually came to dominate the study of Dickens from 1980s onward, many scholars began to direct their attention to such matters and to reach for how Dickens’ craft of fiction is shaped, as well as conditioned, by his readers. On the other hand, Marxist study of Dickens and the Victorian authorship, which by and large responds to Raymond Williams’s works, becomes conspicuous from the 1980s. The study of the authorship and marketplace illustrates the peculiar conditions of Victorian literary production and consumption, which influenced both author and reader. Nevertheless, the recent study of the audience still has a problem. As Jonathan Rose claims, it is sometimes distorted by the so-called receptive fallacy.¹ The complication of this scholarly field and the hazard of the facile generalization of audience’s responses are also emphasized by Altick again and again. More thorough deliberation is demanded in future study when analyzing the historical materials.

The bibliography is divided into two parts and an
appendix; Part one covers the earlier studies from Ford to the 1970s. Part two comprises the studies after Foucault and Bakhtin, from the 1980s to the present. The items of each part are listed chronologically. Main parts of this bibliography include the studies that have direct concern with Dickens; the studies without remarks on Dickens are omitted here. And by "Dickens' reader" I mean here is not the hypothetical reader but the historical reader. I exclude hypothetical reader-response criticism from the main parts, but put them in the appendix. Furthermore, the appendix contains the noteworthy studies of the audience, one of which explores theoretical perspectives of the audience itself, and the other of which thoroughly examines the audience before the Dickensian era. The autobiographies of "common" (nonprofessional) writers, which give us basic but valuable information about the common people’s thought and taste, are also covered in the appendix. The appendix is divided into three sections and the items of each section are listed alphabetically.

In order to build this bibliography, I consulted with the following sources: 1) online database: MLAIB, Humanities Index, Book Review Digest, EBSCOhost, The University of Tokyo Book Contents Database. 2) printed bibliographies: Charles Dickens: Critical Assessments, A Bibliography of Dickensian Criticism: 1836-1975, Charles Dickens,
1940-1975: An Index to Periodical Criticism (I mainly used the last one, which includes books as well as periodical criticism from 1940 to 1975 in order to cover the studies from 1957 to 1962, which MLAIB does not contain.) 3) printed periodicals: Dickens Studies Annual, Dickensian, Dickens Quarterly. 4) Home Page: The Dickens Page: A Dickens Bibliography. 


The keywords I used for the search are as follows: “reader,” “readers,” “reading,” “reading public,” “audience,” “author,” “authorship.”

Note

Part 1: 1955-1970s

1955


Traces the reception of Dickens’ works from 1836 to 1952. Ford makes good use of the materials from diaries, autobiographies, letters as well as critical reviews, and analyzes not only the taste of the Victorian readers (including other novelists and critics like Thackeray, Carlyle, etc.) but their influence on Dickens. But as the subtitle indicates, this volume concentrates on critics’ response to Dickens rather than common readers’.

1957


Gives the thorough examination of the Victorian reading public based on the large survey of the 19th-century historical background. But “the many-faceted one of the relationship between public and author” (9) is excluded.

Examines how Dickens as a “periodical essayist” “responded to and conveyed ‘the feeling of the day’” and “combine[d] the ‘circumspection’ of preparation with the immediate and intimate relation to his readers which he valued so highly” (9). They focus on the process of making and Dickens’s craft of fiction consulting with manuscripts, proof sheets, memoranda, letters etc.


Examines the taste of the mid-19th century Victorian people who read cheap periodicals. Dalziel views that Dickens’s producing *Household Words* is his acceptance of the implicit challenge to provide morally better cheap literature. Discussion of Dickens and Collins’s view of the lower-class audience found in *Household Words* is included.

Examines the reading public in terms of class, literacy, periodicals they read, etc. Analysis of various surveys (literacy rate and the books found in circulating libraries) is included.

1959


Demonstrates that “there existed a many-leveled reading public with divisions and tastes strikingly similar to those of the mass public a century later.” The birth of All the Year Round and its audience is remarked. This article is reprinted in his collected essays published in 1989.

See also: Altick, Richard D. Writers, Readers and Occasions. (1989) 159-173.

1963


Louis considers that Dickens has a central place in the development of cheap popular literature by his once
readers because Dickens began to write when the lower-class readers were “living in the hard and disillusioned culture of the towns” and Dickens brought them “a new intimacy and strength into writing,” in other words, “something more vital than the outworn conventional fiction of Gothic and the sentimental novel” (71).

1965


Questions the widespread view that the most of the significant part of Dickens’s work is something “seriously symbolic and prophetic” (3). Garis denies audience’s “willing suspension of disbelief” and argues that Dickens’s art provides a temporary illusion of reality, which gives the audience “the shock of belief in what we seem to know can’t be ‘really there’ but do in fact see” (17).

1966


Explores the influence of the conventions of the early
Victorian popular theater on Dickens’ novels. Axton points out that Dickens’ theatrical style such as direct address of reader, function of apostrophe and invocation in *Bleak House* aimed to “indicate how events of his plot correspond to an external situation in real world” (143) to his audiences who were familiar with the “ambiguous state” (27) of theatrical illusion emerged from the balance between fantasy and reality on the stage.

Bracher, Peter Scholl. “Dickens and His American Readers, 1834-1870: A Study of the American Reception, Reputation, and Popularity of Charles Dickens and His Novels During His Lifetime.” Ph. D. thesis, U of Pennsylvania. 1966. Divides the history of Dickens’s American reputation into three periods: the period of the uncritical reader (1834-1842), a serious breach between Dickens and his American readers (1842-1852), and the revival of his popularity (1852-1870). Bracher points out, without the South, Dickens’s success was near-universal and it was related to “Dickens’s ability to voice the sympathy and benevolence that were the popular spirit of the age.”


Demonstrates “the way in which his personality, his audience, and the popular forms he used combined into a typicality, a generality of appeal” (147). Pearson refers to Dickens’s anarchism as “a potent contribution to his popularity” (151) and the interaction between Dickens and his readers as a reading community.

1967


Compares the critical reception of Dombey and Son of Dickens’ time to that of the present. Collins points out that “Dickens was wrongly accused of having killed off Paul to raise his readers’ interest” (86) on the basis that only one out of 15 scripts Dickens devised for his public reading contained a death-bed of Paul.


View serial publication of novel as an orientation of the reader in a prepared labyrinth, but concentrates rather on Dickens’s various serial techniques than on the reader’s influence on or response to the novels.
1969


Epitomizes the contemporary reception of Dickens’s Christmas Books; The Chimes caused “a great uproar” (17); benevolence of The Cricket on the Hearth is all applauded; The Battle of Life could not grasp the readers’ mind; The Haunted Man did not sell well and was reviewed dryly. Slater traces shifts in the five books and concludes that A Christmas Carol is the only entirely satisfactory “[f]rom an artistic point of view” (24) but other books also deserve more attention.

1970


Considers the reader of novels who borrowed them from the circulating library, and the influence of them on publishing, writers, and novels. Griest claims that three-decker publication, which Mudie’s standardized as a respectable form of novel, was regarded as “a means of maintaining his reputation” (47) even by Dickens, who “in effect bypassed the libraries by selling his works in monthly parts directly to his readers” (46). Mudie’s influence on the reading public is epitomized.
See also: Altick, Richard D. The English Common Reader. (1957)

1972


Questions the assumption that major notices in Examiner up to 1855 were by Forster. Brice suggests “an almost entirely new state of things in relation to Forster, Dickens, Hunt, Morley, the Examiner, and the [Life of Charles Dickens by Forster]” (79).


Argues that Dickens’s “over-emphasis and exaggeration are merely the excess” (384) which has much to do with his relationship with his readers. Jump acknowledges Dickens’s individual talent but considers it was elicited by his readers and “they even influenced the forms” (397) of his works.

1973

Stone, Harry. “Dickens and the Uses of Literature.”
Views Dickens desired “to promote cheerfulness with his concerns for the plight of the lowly,” (139) i.e., combination of “teaching that was sometimes distasteful or even painful to his middle-class audience. . . [and] humour or sentiment or sensation” (140). Stone insists that discontentment of ideal and reality, art and life weakened Dickens’s ability to create literature as salvation but his delight in his art survived even after some disillusioning events such as divorce.

1974


Calls re-examination of our attitude towards the Life demonstrating Forster’s biographical purpose and journalistic background. Nevertheless, Brice acknowledges “the Life still remains probably the closest that we can get to Dickens, outside his own writings” (189-90).


Claims that Dickens has belonged to, and written for the
middle-class readers and they have admired Dickens as an ordinary man of good humour, a benevolent friend of the family, and have been faithful to him throughout his career.

Fielding, K. J. “Forster: Critic of Fiction.” *Dickensian* 70 (1974): 159-70. Demonstrates that Forster is essentially a reviewer and "'less stupid' than he 'often seems to be.'" Fielding persuades us to "allow for the way in which Forster’s views were affected by the conventions of the mid-Victorian novel" (169) and claims that it will give us the sense better than anyone else of the contemporary reception of Dickens.

Vann, J. Don. “*Pickwick* in the London Newspapers.” *Dickensian* 70 (1974): 49-52. Considers London newspaper notices not mentioned by Walter Dexter, who has cited 23 reviews and corrected John Forster’s statement that “the first five parts of *Pickwick* appeared ‘without newspaper notice or puffing’” (52). Vann found 45 reviews and more, and argues that this would seem “*Pickwick* appeared in London amid considerable critical acclaim” (52).
Part 2: 1980s to the Present

1980


Examines various responses of Dickens’s contemporary readers and critics, and demonstrates that there were different responses to pathos, style, religious and political attitudes, and topicalities in Dombey and Son. Altick calls attention to the fact that there was no monolith response of readers and “the deeper psychological elements of their response...are past retrieval” (140). This article is reprinted in his collected essays published in 1989.

See also: Altick, Richard D. Writers, Readers and Occasions. 113-40.

Ford, George H. (1955)


1981

Attempts to answer how “the novelist’s sense of moral responsibility to his audience affect[ed] the narrative form of his art” (2). Carlisle views Dickens’s conception of himself as the reader’s friend is “a starting point for more elaborate formulations of the morality of his narrative presence” (43). Two chapters are allotted for Dombey and Son and Little Dorrit.


Traces the month-by-month comparison of two novels simultaneously published by two “rival” authors. Rodolff asserts the contributor of the Weekly Chronicle was “not an eccentric reader” (103) and his notices “[give] us an idea of the sort of reader-response the novelists themselves encountered” (109).

1982


Focuses on “Dickens’s ambiguous position in the social market-place—both critic and participant” (167). Brown claims that Dickens always adhered to the taste of his middle-class audience; on the other hand, he was “hostile
to the contemporary social experience of the mid-Victorian middle classes” (166) as a novelist.


Classifies Household Words and All the Year Round as the periodicals for entertainment in comparison with the ones for serious discussion. Houghton refers to Dickens’s explanation and defense of the vogue of periodicals for entertainment; Dickens considers those periodicals as salvation for “the hardest worked people” and he has a desire to “raise the level of popular reading” (18).


Includes the indication that when we considers of Dickens’s Sketches by Boz as one of the articles of a serialized miscellany, “a Morning Chronicle ‘Sketch’ gives a vivid sense of the way Dickens’s art grew out of the social awareness of his time. Analysis of the contents of the London Journal is the major concern here.

Includes Dickens’s influence on Collins. Lonoff indicates Dickens’s soundest advice was “on the subject of audience relations” (46); Dickens cautioned Collins against over-directing the reader. Dickens gave Collins lessons not only “in the craft of fiction” but also “in the art of holding the reader” (50).

1983


Illustrates the history of authors who became platform readers in 19th century, in order to answer the following questions: “What factors entered into his decision to read? How did he proceed once the decision was made? What was the reaction to his professional readings? How did his career as a reader affect the careers of other authors?” (652).

Paroissien, David. “Literature’s ‘Eternal Duties’: Dickens’s Professional Creed.” *The Changing World of*
Epitomizes Dickens’s view of the artist’s role is to promote self-reformation of his readers, in other words, to educate the people and to “create the ‘new’ moral standard of opinion” (31); and another role is to “supply readers with a satisfying emotional and imaginative experience” (33). Paroissien claims that such views are closely linked to Dickens’s social and political beliefs, which are based on his Christian vision of life.

Gives a standard historical explanation of Dickens’s public readings. Ponting remarks that Dickens’s pains to enrapture his audience and his awareness of the difference between performing for an approving audience and doing so before “a coldly ‘professional’ audience” (114).

Countering the complaint about reader-oriented criticism, Lund cites contemporary reactions to
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Pendennis and David Copperfield “in an effort to define an actual historical reader” (16). He claims the debate in the Victorian press about the role of writers has influenced the future of David, and both Dickens and Thackeray have “attempted to broaden their audience’s understanding of the novelist’s place in society” (16).

See also: Lund, Michael. “Clocking the Reader in the Long Victorian Novel.”

Rodolff, Rebecca. (1981)

1985


Offers the survey to identify the date of serial publication and the correspondence between serial parts and chapters in volume edition. In introduction, Vann infers that “the consciousness that subtlety may be lost on the reader of serial publication and the realization that vivid portraiture is needed to help the audience recall characters from month to month that led Dickens to create characters who are easily visualized or identified with a tag” (4).

1986

Applies Marxist ideas of literary modes of production. In chapter 1, Feltes demonstrates “Pickwick Papers marks the transition. . . from the petty-commodity production of books to the capitalist production of [commodity-]texts” (3) “produced by a writer within a determinate capitalist mode. . . in which the series provides the distinctive form of control, and in which the profits are made by ever more inevitable interpellation of a mass bourgeois audience” (10).

Questions the previous view of Dickens as “a writer of/for the middle class and analyzes his unmerciful attitude towards middle-class hypocrisy in Dombey and Son.


Examines the writing style of Dickens considering the
influence of the reformists in the 1830s on his writing. Comparison of the themes and styles of Dickens and Tennyson is included.

1988
Under the strong influence of Foucault, Miller views the Victorian novels and their readers as “the individual, the inward, the domestic” (82) sort. He emphasizes the privacy and the shift from drama to novel in the era. Chapter 3 is allotted for Bleak House.

1989

Deals with “the audience for melodrama, the manner in which the critics of the day perceived the working-class segment of that audience, and the way in which the content of the melodrama itself reflected working-class life and experience” (97).

1990

Considers Dickens’s “direction as an apprentice author in the context of London literary life during the 1830s” (ix). Chittick examines numerous reviews of Dickens’s works and demonstrates that “Dickens himself saw his work as rhetorical in nature, and that the persuasion he practised on his readers was considered politically important” (181) and that he recognized “authorship as a political force” (182).

Examines Dickens’ public personae as “products of an ongoing dialogue between the author and his contemporary audience.” Spurgin views that Dickens moved among his different personae “in order to manage his career and maintain his enormous popularity.”

[DAI-A52/06(1991) AAT9131578]


Discusses “topicalities” that mean “references to people, events, or places that were present in the public consciousness” (2). Altick examines the nature of the Victorian reading public and their taste appeared in the details of the texts of many writers, including Dickens’s use of his characters as his mouthpiece to the public.

See also: Butt, John, and Kathleen Tillotson. (1957)

Carlisle, Janice. “Spectacle as Government: Dickens and the
Examining Dickens’s remarks on theater and audience based on Foucaultian theory, Carlisle questions “the comforting image of a great artist praising a working-class theater for the admirable job” (164) and argues that the theaters like the Britannia, “successful institutions of popular entertainment allowed at least the illusion of liberty” (176) and that Dickens regards popular art as “a technique of supervisory discipline” (175) of the dominant middle class.


Examines how the serial format affected the ways Victorian audience interpreted 16 major works including Dombey and Son and Tale of Two Cities. The authors point out that Victorian literature was much more integral to the context of everyday life because of its serial structure, thus the relationship between life and literature was more dynamic and intense at the time.

1992

Rose, Jonathan. “Rereading the English Common Reader: A

Discusses the question raised by Richard Altick: how do texts change the minds and lives of common readers. Rose calls attention to receptive fallacy of “new” book history. The role of Dickens “in making the British working classes articulate” (60) is compared to Reynolds. Rose examines the difference between middle-class and working-class autobiographers.

1993


Modifies Marxist view of literary form as “a mere consequence of market and technological forces.” Bell demonstrates that literary form is itself “an articulation of the values of the age” (125). In the last section, Bell examines Oliver Twist which unconsciously “serves to reinforce the bourgeois myth, so dear to the readers of Bentley’s” (141) and questions the inclusive view of early Dickensian audience.

See also: Feltes, N. N. (1986)
1995


As a response to Altick’s view of Victorian serials as “anticipatory and topical,” (124) Patten adds a third perspective: retrospective. Pattern considers Dickens’s readers “rarely got such up-to-minute synchronicity” and that Dickens’s fiction is “the ‘extensive and peculiar blend’ of past and present... emphasized and obscured... [the backward look] to Dickens’s first audience” (129).

See also: Altick, Richard D. The Presence of the Present. (1991)


Illustrates the problems involved in exploring “the response of the actual ordinary reader in history” (195); how to analyze the statistics and memoirs. Rose states that “[t]he history of reader response... can and should tell us something about the political influence of
authors” and laments the misinterpretation of the recent political criticism. Objection to the methodology of hypothetical reader response criticism is remarked.


Considers Victorian fiction as industry and the novelists as “the human infrastructure of Victorian fiction” (152). Sutherland discusses non-canonical writers as well as canonical ones and attempts to portray the whole of the Victorian novelists. Chapter 3 is about Dickens and Reade on *Hard Cash*, and Chapter 4 is about Dickens’s imitators.

1996


Offers “a revised picture of an evolving readership narrated rather than merely implied, the mass audience conscripted, written with, figured in. Directing response aesthetics away from the a priori reader function toward this reader figure, *Dear Reader* intercepts two tendencies in the recent criticism of fiction: the blanket audience determinations of
ideological critique and the thinness of historicizing discourse analysis when divorced from literary history’s own discursive field.” [Amazon.com. 23 September 2004 <http://www.amazon.com/>.]


1997


Seeks to reconstruct the conditions in which Dickens' novels were initially received, using *Nicholas Nickleby*, Dickens’ “most explicitly theatrical novel” (164). Vlock rewrote this essay in more comprehensive work published in 1998.


As a response to Miller’s Foucaultian view, Vlock adds the Bakhtinian social vision, and argues that novels were shaped by the popular theatre in the nineteenth century, and that the possibility of reading and writing narrative was conditioned by the culture of the stage.

*See also:* Miller, D. A. (1988)

1999


Examines the Victorian authorship through reading of novels by Scott, Dickens, Collins, and James, and shows that “the influence of the growing public remains indelibly stamped on the themes and forms of Victorian fiction.”

[DAI-A60/12(2000) AAT9953263]

2000

Under the influence of Eagleton, Cerutti discusses why Dickens has been widely read notwithstanding his distance from hegemonic cultural discourses in terms of his technique and revision and amendment of the text.


Considers “the problem of prolific and successful authors who have reached a point of reckoning, real or imagined, with their reading public.” Chapters on Dickens discuss how the “transaction with his public” influences his form of fiction.

[DAI-A61/10(2001) AAT9991203]


Examines “convention of single authorship, the genre of fiction itself, the apparent self-containedness of the ‘material whole,’ and the timing and effect of the story’s reception” (140) which are deconstructed by magazine serialization. A case study of Dickens and
Oliver Twist is included.

2001


Opposing the previous view of his reading as entertainment, Bevis demonstrates Dickens’s attitude toward the public reading is quite political and he uses reading for social criticism examining various modes in public address and representation of people in speech.


Summarizes the relevance between Dickens’s form of main novels and the ambivalent effect of the author-reader relationship originated in serial publication. Bradbury concludes that Dickens’s comedy and sentiment, the selling points to his contemporary readers, is still his strength which endures various critical approaches.


Explores the diversity of the Victorian theatre audience with the example of Charles Dickens’ creation on the
Victorian tradition of Christmas, etc. The authors acknowledge the importance of Bakhtinian concepts, but hope “a more open and contested discussion of spectatorship.” (229)


Examines how Dickens’s public readings “participated in the shaping of Dickens’s public persona and of the idea of the ‘author’ more generally in the Victorian period” (729). Inspired by Bakhtin and Foucault, Ferguson explains that Dickens makes out his own concept of author as “readers’ friend”; he avoids authoritative narrator’s part in order to emphasize heteroglossic dialogues and characters, but simultaneously deals with the audience’s desire to see “Dickens the author.”


Uses the memoirs collected by Vincent and others in order to illuminate “the vital minority of self-improving workers”, and consult with other sources (oral history, educational records, sociological surveys, opinion polls, etc.) to offer “a more representative portrait
of the working class as a whole" (2). Rose emphasizes the importance of history of audiences in political criticism. The working-class reception of Dickens is included.

See Appendix: Vincent, David.
John Burnett, Vincent, David., and David Mayall.

2002


Illuminates the unequal relationship between Dickens and his party such as Collins, Elizabeth Gaskell and Reade. Nayder points out that Dickens monitored and controlled his contributors to Household Words while he "encouraged writers to embrace 'the spirit of reform' " (19) in order not to offend his middle-class readers.

2003


In the second chapter, Deane examines Pickwick Papers in the context of the copyright reform debates and finds out "the hidden narrative of Dickens’s emergence as a
sympathetic friend to his readers”. At the same time, Deane considers *Pickwick* as “a record of traditions that were repressed to create the familiar ‘Dickens,’ including the trope of editorship and the possibility of a relatively anonymous, collaborative model of literary production” (xiii).
Appendix: Further Reading

Reader-Response


Influenced by Jonathan Culler’s structuralist view and the reader-response theory of Iser and Fish, Horton traces her “own” exploration of Dickens World in the process of reading.


Applies Iser’s theory and attempts to “measure three specific activities of installment readers as they move through the worlds of their novels: their expansion of certain elements of the text; their contribution to the development of fictional characters; and the involvement of their own concerns in the form of the novels” (22). More “historical” study of the Victorian reader, see Michael Lund, “Novels, Writers, and Readers in 1850.”

On the basis of close-reading of the texts, some contemporary reviews and Iser’s theory, Lund relates open-endedness of three unfinished works to the Victorian citizen who read literary pieces and sought “a life full of potential,” (32) and suggests that “Victorian audiences found their identity (a profound faith in the future) in the process of reading, not in its aftermath” (43).

Analyze four of Dickens’s novels in terms of “the dialectic between ‘fancy’ and ‘authority,’ the psychology of symbol and memory, and the relationship between narrator and reader.”

Is supposedly the reprint or the revision of his dissertation which is listed above.

Rainsford, Dominic. Authorship, Ethics and the Reader: Blake,
Amplifies Wayne Booth’s view of literary texts and their implied authors as “friends,” and offers “an even more paradoxical kind of friendship: they present themselves, at times, as enemies, and thus they encourage the reader to be wary” (3) of any author’s and any reader’s ethical standard. Chapter 4, 5 and 6 are allotted for Dickens.

“Locates in Dickens a tendency to reanimate the ancient principle of mimesis that not only does the text become a mirror held up to its reader but, in a radical revision of our post-Saussurean understanding, language becomes not so much a deconstructive system of differences as a reconstructive system of resemblances.” [Amazon.co.uk. 25 September 2004 <http://www.amazon.co.uk/>.]

Audience

Deserves reading though this volume contains nothing about Dickens and other Victorian novelists. Blau explores the question of the audience from the perspectives of various critical theories,
psychoanalysis, and cultural studies.


Encompasses theoretical as well as historical perspective of audience of pre-Dickens period. Klancher discusses 18th-century writers’ use of the periodical to organize audience, three great audiences of 19th century—”a newly self-conscious middle class, a nascent mass audience, and an insurgent radical readership” (15)—and writers’ (mainly Romantic poets’) relation to them.

**Autobiographies of “Common” Writers**


Volume 1 covers from 1790 to 1900. In introduction, editors show a brief view of the tendency of the contents of the working-class autobiographies: affections for mother rather than father, working experiences rather than family relationships, etc.

Matthews, William, ed. *British Autobiographies: An Annotated Bibliography of British Autobiographies Published of*
Lists more than 6,000 works, mainly by middle-class and upper-class writers. [Jonathan Rose, “How Historians Study Reader Response.” Jordan and Patten 205-6.]

Discusses the meaning of the past in the working-class autobiographies, their family relationships, and a book as an entrance of their pursuit for the useful knowledge for self-reformation and freedom of life. A bibliography covering from 1790 to 1850 is included.
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