

“But it’s only a novel, Dorian”: Neo-Victorian Fiction and the Process of Re-Vision

Louisa Yates

(University of Chester, England, UK)

Abstract:

‘Re-visionary fiction’, as defined by Peter Widdowson, has many elements that are strikingly similar to the impulses and aims of the burgeoning neo-Victorian genre. This article sets out to explore the relevance of applying the principles of ‘re-visionary fiction’ to Sarah Waters’ *Tipping the Velvet* (1998) and Will Self’s *Dorian: An Imitation* (2002). This article outlines the ways in which re-visionary fiction elaborates or constrains neo-Victorian fiction.

Keywords: *Dorian: An Imitation*, historical fiction, the literary canon, neo-Victorian fiction, postmodernism, re-vision, Will Self, *Tipping the Velvet*, Sarah Waters, Oscar Wilde.

Neo-Victorian fiction is, to paraphrase Henry James, a loose, baggy genre, whose desire to engage with the Victorian by “re-thinking and rewriting Victorian myths and stories” may give neo-Victorian texts a shared identity in the broadest sense (Gutleben 2001: 5), but whose individual aesthetic realisations of rethinking and rewriting vary wildly.¹ Sarah Waters’ *Tipping the Velvet* (1999) and Will Self’s *Dorian: An Imitation* (2002) exemplify the paradoxical yet inclusive nature of both the neo-Victorian genre and neo-Victorian narrative respectively. Before any comparison of these novels can take place, it is important to establish their position within a genre of contemporary fictions, the chief collective characteristic of which at this point in their genealogy is an obstinate resistance to generic characterisation. The popularity of neo-Victorian novels is matched by a shared reluctance to conform to one narrative standard. One of the earliest definitions of the “retro-Victorian novel” sought to engage with the complexity of the genre’s desire to re-visit and re-vise through the questions “why has there been such a proliferation of Victorian-centred novels in Britain in the 1990s?” and “what are the attractions of the Victorian era for writers and readers in the post-modern era?” (Shuttleworth 1997: 5). Clarifying the sub-generic differences between novels is an important task; as pointed out in the inaugural issue of

this journal, the genre’s success could become its critical downfall if the impulses that lie behind its creation are not identified. Indeed, as Marie-Luise Kohlke states: “Neo-Victorian Studies is being held back by its diffusiveness, which currently undermines efforts to get to grips fully with the subject matter and *why* it matters” (Kohlke, 2008: 1).²

Though *individual* engagements with “Victorian myths and stories” take many narrative forms (Gutleben 2001: 5),³ the *shared* impulses behind neo-Victorian re-writing and re-vising broadly coalesce, maintaining a form of generic identity. An urge to revise can be held as an approximate standard of the genre; re-vising and re-writing are situated as reclamations of alternative histories, while neo-Victorian novels display a “desire to re-write the historical narrative of that period by representing marginalised voices, new histories of sexuality, post-colonial viewpoints and other generally ‘different’ versions of the Victorian” (Llewellyn 2008: 165). In addition to a desire “to give voices to women, or the racially oppressed who have been denied a voice in history” (Shuttleworth 1997: 256), a further category of queer voices, especially gay men and rather more frequently, lesbian-identified women, can be distinguished amongst the growing corpus of neo-Victorian fiction; Diana Wallace, for example, calls Sarah Waters’ three neo-Victorian novels “perhaps the most radical examples of this project” (Wallace 2005: 206). The re-viving of marginalised voices understandably brings about an examination of metafiction and textuality – the roles of literature and written history. But the way in which they go about pursuing such shared aims varies enormously. As this article will show, certain novels, in particular Self’s *Dorian*, rewrite specific canonical texts, while others, such as *Tipping the Velvet*, engage with multiple conventions, fictions, and histories.⁴

Linda Hutcheon’s important concept of historiographic metafiction, defined as a self-reflexive literary engagement with history and theory, which prompts a text to install “totalizing order, only to contest it, by its radical provisionality, intertextuality, and, often, fragmentation” (Hutcheon 1998: 116), provides an established and convenient critical foundation upon which politicised stylistics and marginal voices can proliferate, as well as offering a contextualisation of the neo-Victorian genre within the more mainstream genre of non-self-reflexive historical fiction. The principles of historiographic metafiction are readily applicable to neo-Victorian literature,⁵ and have formed the basis for other critical approaches; yet, with

typical contrariness, not all neo-Victorian novels seek to radicalise the relationship between text and history. A proliferation of alternative terms to historiographic metafiction has developed as a result, seeking to emphasise the different impulses resident in the neo-Victorian genre. Texts with a specifically politicised approach to canonical narrative forms have been defined as “re-visionary fiction” (Widdowson 2006: 491), or “queer *Bildungsroman*” (Jeremiah 2007: 131-144), while novels which revise Victorian tropes and conventions are variously described as “neo-Victorian” (Shiller 1997: 538), “post-Victorian” (Letissier 2004: 111), or “faux-Victorian” (Kaplan 2008: 142). They are said to simultaneously represent and address our anxieties at the rise of “post-modern Victorianism” (Wilson 2006: 286) or the “postmodern historical crisis” (Sadoff and Kucich 2000: x), and neo-Victorian texts’ preoccupation with their own fictionality is described as “new(meta)realism” (Kohlke 2004: 155). These definitions accurately reflect the duality inherent in the neo-Victorian genre, the tension between old and new, past and present, even as emphasis is repeatedly placed upon the ‘new’ elements of the process. Thus re-vision cannot escape association with reproduction; Shuttleworth described a postmodern, self-conscious “retro-Victorian” novel, which reveals “an absolute, non-ironic, fascination with the details of the period, and our relations to it” (Shuttleworth 1997: 253), a thesis further developed by Gutleben’s consideration of the nostalgic postmodern (2001). This complex relationship is also reflected in Hutcheon’s most recent publication, *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006).

As such, the ranks of the neo-Victorian genre happily accommodate novels which apparently contradict one another in style but which have the same impulse to rewrite behind them. In Waters’ ‘autobiographical’ account of Nan King – Whitstable oyster-girl turned West End music hall star, turned ‘male’ prostitute turned accidental socialist campaigner – the various characters work, perform, and campaign against a pin-sharp backdrop of a turbulent, glittering, historically accurate city.⁶ The city and its inhabitants lend the novel its Victorian credentials in order to valorise a nineteenth-century lesbian experience – in short, placing lesbians into a convincing nineteenth-century landscape. In doing so, Waters provides a satisfying lesbian historiography. *Tipping the Velvet* is Waters’ “attempt to write a Victorian-style novel telling a very lesbian story in a way that was half-authentic but half-anachronistic too” (Anon 2002: 9). This contrast renders

her novel particularly interesting, as it reproduces the cultural landscape even as it re-vises the sexuality of those who inhabit it. The novel welcomes anachronism in order to provide and valorise an absent historical lesbian voice, evoking the Victorian in both its realist narrative style and historical accuracy, while exploiting the ‘neo’ prefix of ‘neo-Victorian’ to insert sexually explicit lesbian relationships and self-identified lesbian women. Re-vising notions of the flâneur, the novel penetrates the authentic, urban panorama to reveal ‘very lesbian’ rooms and corners – not to mention behaviours – that are not generally the subject of nineteenth century canonical novels.

Neo-Victorian, post-Victorian, faux-Victorian. No matter what the nomenclature (or perhaps because of it), this remains a genre that delights in proffering numerous exceptions to any universal definition, both in form and function. Quite apart from the proliferation of architextual nomenclature, there remains the tricky task of defining the various textual relationships between the covers. Often, neo-Victorian fiction, as a genre, appears to occupy a limitless intertextual space, continually subject to a paradoxical nature. The influence of historiographic metafiction pervades here; in a return to Hutcheon that seems almost inevitable, the neo-Victorian narrative has been characterised as having a “hyper-fictionalized-historicized-theorized textual style” (Llewellyn 2007: 195). Despite differences in style, both *Tipping the Velvet* and *Dorian: An Imitation* share an urge to revise in order to engage with issues of visibility in the gay and lesbian past. The notion of re-vision is intimately connected with representations of minority groups. For example, Adrienne Rich’s politically motivated practice engaged with textual representation and the significant role that texts play in constructing subjectivity. Thus revising an existing ‘text’ – potentially as vague as our historical comprehension of the Victorian era – in order to reveal and rectify inadequacies or omissions, is a necessary practice, not least from a perspective of gaining socio-political visibility: “Re-vision – the act of looking back, of seeing with fresh eyes, of entering an old text from a new perspective – is for women more than a chapter in cultural history: it is an act of survival” (Rich 1980: 35). Rich was writing some twenty years before neo-Victorian fiction evolved, and was chiefly concerned with the broader impact of women’s writing on representations of female history; nonetheless, re-vision is a practice that potentially binds together otherwise disparate neo-Victorian novels. Both

Dorian: An Imitation and Tipping the Velvet revise Victorian narratives and conventions from a queer perspective.

Neo-Victorian fiction offers a textual site within which a specific re-vision is performed, offering new impetus to Rich's re-vision. Rather than merely speaking the silences of 'original' texts, however, the process of re-vision also creates new and different kinds of silence in the transformed texts:

Dorian forces us to see what a novel like Wilde's would have to be like if written at the beginning of the twenty-first century – whether, ironically, despite its wit and sophistication *The Picture of Dorian Grey* represents an innocence no longer available to us. (Widdowson 2006: 505)

Ironically, however, the assertion that it is possible for *Dorian* to update Wilde's novel by filling in Victorian silences ossifies the very reticences and elisions it locates and critiques in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891). This new fictionally performed re-vision may also be directed towards the non-heteronormative texts that inhabit the literary canon, rather than only, as in Rich, the exclusively patriarchal (although the two may intersect at many points). A clear binary relationship is drawn between the canonical (in this case *The Picture of Dorian Gray*) and re-vised texts. Though both Wilde's novel and *Dorian* concern themselves with the homo-sexual and -social dynamics of a group of men, the former requires silence, gaps, and a presumed innocence, while the latter forcefully speaks, elaborates, and details – an assumed condition of modernity. Paradoxically, however, *Dorian*'s verbosity highlights "the profound difficulties in telling 'the whole story' or 'the whole truth'" (Widdowson 2006: 495). Re-visionary fiction is situated in close proximity to historiographic metafiction. It maintains similar inter-, intra-, and transtextual relationships, with a significant ability to "write back to – indeed, rewrite – canonic texts from the past, and hence call to account formative narratives that have arguably been central to the construction of 'our' consciousness" (Widdowson 2006: 491). Rich's earlier cited "act of survival" is transformed into an investigation of 'our' socio-cultural psyche. While challenging patriarchal, heteronormative, and Eurocentric assumptions traditionally associated with canonical fiction is no

bad thing, this assigns a certain authority to the act of re-vision that is potentially problematic.

The neo-Victorian paradox of authenticity versus anachronism, re-vision versus reproduction, is playful rather than radically confrontational, as Hutcheon or Widdowson suggest, lending *Tipping the Velvet* much of its energy, but distancing it from being straightforwardly classified as historiographic metafiction. The novel wears its metatextual references to Victorian prostitution, gender relations and sexual activity “lightly” (Kaplan 2007: 11),⁷ via ostensibly light-hearted and knowingly gendered cultural practices, such as the music hall, pantomime,⁸ street-based prostitution, and a peculiar artefact – the hand crafted leather *Monsieur Dildo* (see Waters 1999: 241). Significantly, *Tipping’s* delight in the anachronistic follows the “intense historiographical curiosity” that Sadoff and Kucich believe characterised “1980s and 1990s Victorian revivalism”; the wide range of touches and small references imports a general “Victorian feel” (Sadoff and Kucich 2000: xi) to Waters’ novel.

Will Self’s *Dorian: An Imitation* takes almost precisely the opposite approach. As the subtitle implies, the hyper-modern novel unabashedly follows the structure of Wilde’s *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, relying on a reader’s familiarity with this original to draw attention to the changes in narrative and characterisation. Despite Self’s claim that he “read Wilde once through, gutted it, analysed it, and then did my best to forget it” (McCrum 2002: 15), the kind of “fascination” with all things Victorian, as mentioned by Shuttleworth earlier, is revealed through Self’s exacting attention to detail in order to contemporise Wilde’s classic. Despite contemporary camouflage – in the form of a modern historical setting, filled with flagrantly contemporary descriptions of anal sex, intravenous drug use, and art (the famous Picture is rewritten as a television art installation, its creator Basil Hallward as a junkie devotee of Andy Warhol) – *Dorian* constantly hearkens back to its pre-text, by eerily echoing the narrative which it imitates, albeit set against a 1980s and 1990s backdrop of Sloane Rangers, glory holes, Young British Artists, Palladian country piles, bathhouses in San Francisco, and Britain’s increasingly morbid obsession with the life (and death) of Princess Diana. Following neo-Victorian fiction’s preoccupation with the metropolis, London is also a character here; far from the swells and Mary-Annes of Waters’ Burlington Arcade (see Waters 1999:

196), the city is both a hyper-jaded, drug-ridden, exotically-queer capital and the street handle of a second generation immigrant (see Self 2002: 184).

Can this re-visionary silencing be expanded to include all neo-Victorian texts? Self's novel contemporises a nineteenth-century text that itself is far removed from its nineteenth-century contemporaries. Waters, in contrast, delves into nineteenth-century textual silence in order to reclaim the lesbian past, locating the omissions in both gay and lesbian fiction and seeking to rectify that omission. Re-visionary fiction provides a specific framework, which will be used here to read *Tipping the Velvet* and *Dorian*. Both novels exploit – though in different styles – readerly expectations of very particular nineteenth century societal models. Expectations of a heteronormative nineteenth century are maintained by necessarily incomplete canonical fictions, as no singular literary text can be expected to adequately represent all of Victorian society; omissions, ellipses, spaces are inevitable, and both *Tipping the Velvet* and *Dorian* exploit such omissions in order to valorise alternate, queer historiography. These books do not seek to render the nineteenth century redundant, but to exist alongside them and paint a more complete picture of our historical conceptions. *Dorian* viciously plays with reader's expectations, while *Tipping the Velvet* chooses to work within canonic conventions in order to present a credible narrative of lesbian visibility in the Victorian age. This article specifically considers re-visionary fiction's claim to speak, where before there was silence.

1. Queer Neo-Victorian Intertextuality

There is a frequently cited review of *Tipping the Velvet*, which is notable not only for its praise for Waters' novel, described as “a sexy and picaresque romp through the lesbian and queer demi-monde of the roaring nineties”, but also for the texts that are said to inform it: “imagine Jeanette Winterson, on a good day, collaborating with Judith Butler to pen a Sapphic *Moll Flanders*. Could this be a new genre? The bawdy lesbian picaresque novel? [...] It's gorgeous” (Steel 1998). Once more, the canonic is set in a relationship with the contemporary. Only well-known figures make the grade in the review of Waters' novel – Butler and Winterson are mentioned, so that their publications need not be. Queer neo-Victorian intertextuality is limitless, lively, and endlessly productive, but does not dominate. This “new genre”, whether picaresque or not, is more than capable of integrating and ameliorating paradigmatic texts. Similarly, a review of the openly imitative

Dorian concluded that Wilde’s original text, “which filled its first reviewers with ‘the odour of moral and spiritual putrefaction’ just got smellier, darker, and funnier” (Heawood 2002: 15). Again, it is suggested that only a contemporary mind has the capability of such dank imaginings. *The Picture of Dorian Gray* may be smelly, dark and funny, but *Dorian: An Imitation* delves into the mire that its predecessor delicately avoids, ramping up the excesses and assaulting the senses of the squeamish. Speaking out, disrupting the canonical silences that surround “sexual and other interrelated binaries” (Sadoff and Kucich 2000: xix), is to be praised.

In the context of re-visionary fiction, nineteenth-century texts serve as a point of departure, existing only to be disrupted. ‘Original’ material, such as Wilde’s novel or *Moll Flanders* (1722), is categorised as the ‘pre-text’, a close relation to Genette’s ‘hypo-text’ and a specific point of origination, which is dialectically referenced by its imitator or ‘re-visionary’ text (Widdowson resists calling it the ‘hyper-text’) (Widdowson 2006: 497 and 499). A specific hypo-text is a non-negotiable element of re-visionary fiction, while canonical status is a non-negotiable element of the hypo-text: “it is arguable whether *Lord of the Flies* (1954) is a prime example of the genre, insofar as its pre-text [R. M. Ballantyne’s 1857 *The Coral Island*] no longer has the mythic resonances and ‘classic status’ it once had” (Widdowson 2006: 497). This adds to the adaptive rather than the eclipsing status of re-visionary fiction; as Hutcheon has noted, “adaptation as adaptation is unavoidably a kind of intertextuality if the receiver is acquainted with the adapted text” (Hutcheon 2006: 21, original emphasis). It is this which makes re-visionary distinct from general adaptation – Hutcheon notes that the “adapted text” (her preferred term) “can be plural” (Hutcheon 2006: xii). Adaptation is more negotiable and eclectic. Not all neo-Victorian novels enter into such a defined relationship; it is in the definition of the hypo-text, for example, that *Tipping the Velvet* differs from *Dorian*. While *Dorian*’s hypo-text has a classic canonical status, Judith Butler’s theory of the performative, accounts of the Yellow Decade, or theatrical memoir, are not suitable to classify *Tipping*’s rewriting as truly re-visionary.

The re-visionary relationship (as opposed to that of adaptation) problematically categorises the hypo-text as one that is silent, repressive, and usually patriarchal, concretising notions of canonicity as much as promoting the intellectual scope of the re-visionary text. Not all intertexts, however, are chosen for their silence; *The Picture of Dorian Gray* can

hardly be said to be repressive in the context of the nineteenth century. Moreover, not all readers can be “acquainted” with every text (Hutcheon 2006: 211). In addition to the inclusion of Butler, Winterson, and Sappho (none of whom can be said to be silent on issues of lesbian identity and subjectivity), *Tipping the Velvet* has a definitive intertextual antecedent, which nonetheless consistently resists any identification as a canonical hypo-text. Published by the Gay Men’s Press rather than Penguin Classics, Chris Hunt’s *Street Lavender* (1986) is a politically engaged “queer Bildungsroman” (Jeremiah 2007: 131-144) of the self-identified gay man Willie Smith. In a journey of self-discovery which roughly corresponds with that of Nan King, Willie develops from a child, “who sold my arse for peaches” (Hunt 1986: 100), to Socialist social worker, via the reformatory, brothel, street prostitution, and kept boy for a group of pre-Raphaelite artists.

The novel anticipates Waters’ novel by some years and the writer freely cites its influence: “to be honest, *Tipping the Velvet* is a lesbian version of that [*Street Lavender*]” (cited in Armitt 2007: 121). A love of “theatrical exhibitionism” (Hunt 1986: 254) and a “pleasure in performance, display and disguise” (Waters 1999: 126) permeate both novels and, in both cases, the protagonist’s love of performance benefits the burgeoning Socialist movement of the period. Nan, whilst renting, is picked up and ‘kept’ by wealthy society Lady Diana Lethaby; Willie gains a similar patron in the figure of ‘Mr Scott’, a wealthy Arabian explorer and probable Marquis. Both protagonists model Antinous for the benefit of a wider audience (see Hunt 1986: 259; Waters 1999: 308). Both fictional characters have a queer sexuality reminiscent of Oscar Wilde – modern, yet subject to resolutely Victorian morals, while being allowed to flourish in the underworld. Though Nan never needs to defend her sexuality in the same manner as Willie does in his defiant screech of “I *like* being a sodomite” directed at the sexologists who wish to ‘cure’ him (Hunt 1986: 156, original emphasis), she is notable for a similar lack of shame and a conspicuous absence of any self-reflexive analysis of her sexuality. Homosexuality is a productive force, providing both protagonists with community and continuity, in sharp contrast to the often overly didactic insistence on queer loss throughout history (see Love 2007).

As well as narrative similarities, flashes of lavender – a symbol of both gay and lesbian communities – link the two texts, for those who know

where to look. Yet this neo-Victorian rewriting cannot be called re-vision; the lavender is appropriated from queer culture *and* from *Tipping the Velvet*’s pre-text without wishing to render the pretext silent. At this point, it is useful to consider the definition of allusion in contrast to the more explicit process of re-writing. Allusion constitutes “an enunciation whose full meaning presupposes the perception of a relationship between it and another text, to which it necessarily refers by some inflections that would otherwise remain unintelligible” (Genette 1997: 2). Paratextual references contribute to the effect – the cover of *Street Lavender* depicts a man with a lavender neckerchief and a sprig of the flower at his buttonhole.⁹ A purple scarf is constantly around Willie’s neck, and upon first venturing out as an independent street walker, he purchases a “buttonhole of lavender” from a flower girl, who cements the link with a knowing “it was *made* for yer, mister” (Hunt 1986: 213, original emphasis). Similarly, a pungent lavender perfume ‘speaks’ homosexuality in the confined silence of a hansom cab (Hunt 1986: 228). Lavender initiates Nan into lesbian subculture before she consciously identifies herself as part of this community; her first glimpse of the woman who will become her first lover, music hall masher Kitty Butler, notes the inclusion of the colour without consciously foregrounding its queer symbolism: “she wore a suit – a handsome gentleman’s suit [...] with lavender gloves at her pocket” (Waters 1999: 12). In an admiring, adaptive double gesture, Nancy covers herself in swatches of the colour for her next trip to Kitty’s show:

I had on my Sunday dress, and my new hat trimmed with lavender; and I had a lavender bow at the end of my plait of hair, and a bow of the same ribbon sewn on each of my white linen gloves. (Waters 1999: 25)

Nan, at this point, does not self-identify as lesbian and it is not until she parts from Kitty altogether that she becomes aware of the queer society symbolised by the lavender. Unlike intertextuality, however, the participant’s knowledge or ignorance is no barrier to the adaptive process: “adaption is an act of appropriating or salvaging, and this is always a double process of interpreting and then creating something new” (Hutcheon 2006: 20). As such, Nan is able to appropriate the lavender as a tribute to Kitty without fully comprehending its queer significance; the narrative, however,

is able to exploit Nan's ignorance for the reader. Also noted by Hutcheon is the fact that adaption links both Victorian and postmodern cultures: "the Victorians had a habit of adapting just about everything [...] We postmoderns have clearly inherited this same habit" (Hutcheon 2006: xi). This is a multi-layered process that can be utilised by anyone, but relies on an informed reader in order for the symbolism to become fully explicit. It is not just Victorians and postmoderns who are in the habit of adapting; *Tipping's* use of lavender reveals the protection afforded to those who bend symbols to their own sub-cultural ends. Kitty, in particular, is anxious to remain closeted due to an intense fear of nineteenth-century repercussions, in particular being "*laughed at; or hated; or scorned [...]. We should never be careful enough!*" (Waters 1999: 171, original emphasis). Thus it is unlikely she would signal her sexuality from the stage with anything but the most clandestine of signals.

It is important to note that re-vision, in Widdowson's definition, specifically resists association with adaption, which would "not be *challenging* the original pre-texts in a way, as we shall see, re-visionary fiction crucially does" (Widdowson 2006: 500, original emphasis). This is the binary tension at the heart of neo-Victorian fiction – to reproduce or to revise. In contrast to re-visionary tactics, Gutleben divides the "subversive" revisionary and "nostalgic" reproductive impulse of the neo-Victorian genre, dividing them according to their use of parody and pastiche (Gutleben 2001: 7). A binary relationship is far more receptive to the presence of nostalgia in neo-Victorian fiction (resisted in Hutcheon's definition of historiographic metafiction) and far more sensitive to neo-Victorian fiction's consistent quest to reconcile subversion with nostalgia, parody with pastiche. Rewriting does not always have to mean a silencing or a critique of that nostalgia which came before. *Tipping the Velvet's* flashes of lavender contain little "ludic subversion" (Gutleben 2001: 8), and do not seek to challenge and revise *Street Lavender*; rather, they are content to establish community through acknowledgement of the lavender link between gay and lesbian subcultures.

Equally, Waters' novel does not pay homage to Hunt's earlier novel either as pastiche or parody – unlike in *Dorian: An Imitation*, there is no clear 'pre-text' towards which veneration (or scorn) *can* be explicitly expressed. *Tipping the Velvet* does not seek to challenge or re-vise *Street Lavender* and thus resists being interpreted as strictly re-visionary in many

ways. Re-vision, in this context, is a very particular kind of intertextuality: hyper-texts must “keep the pre-text in clear view, so that the original is not just the invisible ‘source’ of a new modern version but is a constantly invoked *intertext* for it and is constantly in dialogue with it” (Widdowson 2006: 502, original emphasis). The dialogue of re-vision causes one to speak the silences of the other, with a specific moral impetus of writing the wrongs of the previous era. Waters’ novel seeks to be candid as well as explicit, but the nineteenth-century lesbian voice it re-creates is, in fact, ‘lost’, or at least very hard to find. With the exception of the diaries of Annie Lister there are few lesbian sources available – those that are have largely been hidden.¹⁰ *Tipping the Velvet* promotes these lost queer voices, testifying not to pre-texts but rather their absence.

However, *Tipping the Velvet* keeps a rather different text “in clear view”. The late nineteenth century, so vividly evoked, is chiefly established through a myriad of – to take Widdowson’s term – “mythic resonances” (Widdowson 2006: 497), maintained through prime-time television and non-ironic adaptations of literary classics such as the hugely popular *The Forsyte Saga* in 1967 (BBC, dir. by David Giles), or the recent *Jane Eyre* (BBC 2006, dir. by Susanna White) or *Little Dorrit* (BBC 2008, dir. by Dearbhla Walsh, Adam Smith, and Diarmuid Lawrence). As playwright Mark Ravenhill notes, the cumulative power of “bonnets, orphans or moustaches so big you can twirl them for hours” is both pervasive and persistent (Ravenhill 2009: 24), a cultural delusion which *Tipping the Velvet* profitably exploits: cups of tea and delicate slices of cake, served whilst seated in overstuffed horsehair armchairs; jellied eels, luxuriant moustaches; trams, hansom cabs and the broughams of the rich; scullery maids with downcast eyes; Smithfield Meat Markets, and overbearing landladies all permeate Waters’ novel (Waters 1999: 87, 43, 231, 247, 365, 183). Heteronormative families enjoy a host of what are frequently characterised as more innocent pleasures, astounded by the simple trickery of a “Mentalist Extraordinary” (Waters 1999: 73). Like other neo-Victorian novels, *Tipping the Velvet*’s consistent dialogue with multiple ‘texts’ of culture causes it to be far more resistant to establishing a clear and consistent ‘pre-text’ intertextuality.¹¹

Initially, the underworld of the queer demi-monde appears to exist in simple opposition to such wholesome, comforting images of the Victorians. Nan’s entrance into the world of lesbianism is brought about by something as simple as the donning of trousers, making her thrillingly aware of “what

it really felt like to have two legs, joined at the top” (Waters 1999: 114). Most significantly, the novel installs the “totalizing order” of narratives of nineteenth century urban sexual danger (Hutcheon 1988: 116), peopled by enforcers of patriarchal space, only to contest them with the figure of a cross-dressed rent ‘boy’. East and West End streets are characterised as dominated by men and automatically perilous for women in order to establish a space in which queer transgression proves a successful survivalist tactic. Traversing London’s East End as a single woman in 1899, just a year after the sensational crimes of Jack the Ripper, Nan feels suitably vulnerable:

I was stared at and called after – and twice or thrice seized and stroked and pinched – by men. This, too, had not happened in my old life; perhaps, indeed, if I had had a baby or a bundle on me now, and was walking purposefully or with my gaze fixed low, they might have let me pass untroubled. But, as I have said, I walked fitfully, blinking at the traffic around me; and such a girl, I suppose, is a kind of invitation to sport and dalliance. (Waters 1999: 191)

The eyes, ears, and speech of the city reside in twin figures which, in the nineteenth century, were most intimately connected with the ebb and flow of the urban environment: the streetwalker and the flâneur. Women who, like Nan, walked unmarked by symbols of patriarchy or property – the “baby” or the “bundle” – were frequently equated with the innately heterosexual but equally transgressive figure of the prostitute, while the flâneur, the “strolling subject” (Shields 1994: 62), combined the ideologies of spectatorship, autonomy of movement, and urban consumption in a body that is specifically gendered as male. Far from establishing the East End as a space of “sexual and social disorder” (Koven 2004: 128), Nan’s treatment reinforces the peculiarly Victorian phenomenon of “street harassment” (Walkowitz 1998: 2), which saw sexual and social anxieties congeal around the figure of the unchaperoned single woman. Pinches are a physical reprimand and an impediment to her progress, while the male gaze possesses a similarly violent physicality. The novel requires these glimpses of a repressive, heteronormative society in order to properly contextualise

the nineteenth century’s hidden, disguised, and often subversive, queer lesbian identity.

The free and easy stroll of the flâneur – Walter Benjamin described the “intoxication” that “comes over the man who walks long and aimlessly through the streets” (Benjamin 1999: 880) – is not permitted for women. Nan gazes around, takes in her surroundings, and refuses to pitch her gaze “low”. She walks the London streets like a man and thus, for her, the solution is simple: she will assume a male identity. Nan’s “old life” involved dressing as a man in the carnivalesque space of the music hall. Male clothing, cross-dressing as male, or assuming a patriarchal role such as that of patron, symbolically express the novel’s predominant concern with queer sexualities. Male clothing symbolises women’s membership of a queer subculture and that subculture’s defiance of the conventions of femininity. Indeed, Kitty Butler finds success “since I changed my name and became a masher”, and the autocratic Diana Lethaby funds her endless pursuit of sensation with the income inherited from her late husband (Waters 1999: 39, 251). Thus assuming masculine attributes equals freedom, autonomy, and movement. As Nan plainly states: “the truth was this: whatever successes I might achieve as a girl, they would be nothing compared to the triumphs I should enjoy clad, however girlishly, as a boy” (Waters 1999: 123). Yet the novel contains no explicit references to Benjamin, nor any other writings on flânerie.

Without explicitly referencing anything as specific as a Victorian ‘pre-text’, Nan’s actions and choices challenge preconceptions of the late nineteenth century whilst adding some historiography of her own. Nan recalls authentic queer experiences; dressed as a man, she walks traceable London streets. *Tipping the Velvet* cleverly inserts its “anachronistic” lesbian action into a society redolent with ‘traditional’ symbols of the Victorian in order to authenticate and valorise lesbian existence in the period; a historical reality that has conventionally been silenced – or evoked by silence – in classic nineteenth century texts. *Tipping the Velvet* rewrites Adrienne Rich’s transformative impulse for queer theory and gay activism. Utilising myriad sources, rather than a monolithic ‘pre-text’, allows lesbian women to make a powerful claim on the nineteenth century’s historiography.

2. Queer Historicity vs. Heteronormative Nostalgia

Even when there is a pre-text to keep in “clear view” that does not always mean that its silences are finally spoken. While *Tipping the Velvet* valorises Victorian culture and lesbian existence, establishing a queer historicity that exists alongside the nostalgic heteronormative history promoted by Victoriana, Self’s *Dorian: An Imitation* of Wilde’s original – calls into question the relationship between history and text, to the extent that the eponymous character offends a guest at a dinner party with the ultimately postmodern claim that “the Gulf War didn’t happen” (Self 2002: 143). The ultimate re-visionary advocate for speech over silence, Dorian then declares: “if one doesn’t talk about a thing it never happened. It’s simply expression – as Henry says – that gives reality to things” (Self 2002: 144).

Self’s novel is certainly vocal, bringing to the surface that which would – perhaps should – remain hidden. The narrative is recounted through the recollections, pronouncements, and questionable memories of an insular group of men, who relish the spoken word and revel in their jaded, and affected, hedonism. They are happy to recount the most explicit details of their pursuits of pleasure in a coded language which is nevertheless easy to understand – when ‘Batface’, as the wife of Henry Wotton (the ‘Lord’ is omitted) is affectionately and comically known, nonchalantly declares that “Henry insists on a little smackerel from F-Fortnum’s for supper” (Self 2002: 76), the novel gathers the reader into a world where intravenous drug use is commonplace and slangy. Wotton, in particular, possesses the sharp, bitchy intellect of the original Lord, relishing the delivery of airy pronouncements, such as “like the poor, the pretentious are always with us” and “confession is such a *bodily* relief, don’t you agree? It’s like *shitting out* guilt – no wonder the Catholics and Freudians have made an entire system of mind control out of it” (Self 2002: 79, 179, original emphasis).

Wotton’s affected ennui is shared by the narrative in which he exists. Self’s re-vision of Wilde’s novel is intended to impart, as the twentieth century draws to a close, that we’ve seen it all before, twice; a jaded air of the *fin-de-siècle* is evoked not only with the temporal setting – at the close of the twentieth century – and the novel’s weary presentation of cultural awareness that one suspects it would rather not possess, but also through the infection of the entire coterie – Wotton, ‘Baz’ Hallward, ‘the Ferret’ (Self’s rewriting of Lord Fermor), Alan Campbell – with HIV. Effects of ‘the virus’

are discussed with unflinching, rather than candid, relish: in a narrative of abjection rather than adaptation, Wotton chronicles his “most appalling flatulence”, his proliferating mollusca, failing vision, and increasing bodily and mental weakness, despite pleas from the others to spare them the details (Self 2002: 182). Irreverence dominates. Henry refuses to be comforted by Princess Diana – or “Fatty Spencer” (Self 2002: 80) as he prefers to call her – while his response to a counsellor’s suggestion that he sew an AIDS quilt as a coping mechanism is to diligently stitch a rag which is known as “Quilty” and contains the names of everyone Wotton wishes would contract the virus (Self 2002: 148). The unspeakable – lapses of taste, idle gossip, carelessly cruel actions, and sexual behaviours that are often hidden away – is vocalised with gusto.

Dorian’s dextrous but crude loquacity has been taken to mean that “at the very least, what the contemporary text does is ‘speak’ the unspeakable of the pre-text by very exactly evoking the original and hinting at its silences or fabrications” (Widdowson 2006: 505). If we accept a direct relationship between the Victorian and the Postmodern, as Hutcheon suggests, then the Victorians lie and we tell the truth. Again, a condition of modernity is the compulsion to speak, to lay bare. Specifically, Self’s novel is darker, smellier and funnier, because it is able to speak that which was forbidden to Wilde, and therefore can succeed where Wilde was culturally compelled to fail; as we have seen, *Tipping the Velvet*’s refusal to silence its lesbian characters is at the root of its successful adaptation. Re-visionary speech is comfortably situated in the larger genre of critically re-visiting nineteenth-century silence. Rich characterised re-vision as a process which caused those silenced by the “old political order” (Rich 1980: 35) to recognise their silencing, before taking action to ensure that they are seen to speak in the future: “We need to know the writing of the past, and know it differently than we have ever known it; not to pass on a tradition, but to break its hold over us” (Rich 1980: 35). As such, queer, postcolonial and feminist discourses profitably address patriarchal, heteronormative silences. This process revises not only writings that promoted silence, but the nature of silences itself; silences can remain so and still be subject to effective re-vision. Silence is reclaimed from restriction and instead becomes a productive and fruitful space, in which to situate feminist, queer, or post-colonial historicities.

However, unquestioningly following this process risks ossifying reductive constructions of the nineteenth century, closing down any potential exploration of the unrepressed and vocal Victorian. This is particularly pertinent in Widdowson's comparison of the two cases of Lady Gloucester. Wilde draws a mysterious veil over the unnamed horrors that that befall women who associate with his fin-de-siècle anti-hero – though the silences are surrounded by a cloud of words, not least the famous “by-word” of Lord Henry Wotton's sister: “When you met Lady Gwendolen, not a breath of scandal had ever touched her. Is there a single decent woman in London now who would drive with her in the park?” (Wilde 2003: 145). Speaking, in this case, is entirely negative – the chatter of gossip and the “breath” of scandal are damning. Any reader tempted to scoff at the delicate Victorian ladies, who cut social acquaintances at the merest hint of scandal, are soon put right: “Why, even her children are not allowed to live with her” (Wilde 2003: 145). What reader could resist speculating on such irresistibly vague events? Silence is evocative of a horror, rather than a love, that cannot be named – ironically it is directed at a transgressive heterosexual relationship.

Even blood absents itself when Dorian presents himself: “Women who had wildly adored him, and for his sake had braved all social censure and set convention at defiance, were seen to grow pallid with shame or horror if Dorian Gray entered the room” (Wilde 2003: 136). In the case of Lady Gloucester, life ebbs away altogether as a result of her interactions with the “untroubled youth” (Wilde 2003: 136). The original contains Gothic horror in its allusive silence:

Lord Gloucester was one of my greatest friends at Oxford. He showed me a letter that his wife had written to him when she was dying alone at her villa in Mentone. Your name was implicated in the most terrible confession I have ever read. (Wilde 2003: 145-146)

Again, silence is wielded as an effective narrative device. The letter is filled with deferred and absent meaning, but its questions remain. Why is Lady Gloucester dying? Is her death intimately connected with Dorian Gray? Why has her husband abandoned a dying woman? What exactly has occurred in Mentone? These irresistible questions may provide a clue as to

why neo-Victorian re-writing has proved so successful. An astute combination of *reproduction* and re-vision satisfies “people’s persistent craving for ‘a good read’” (Widdowson 2006: 491), whilst allowing silenced voices to speak:

Indeed, the emphasis on the ill-treatment of women, homosexuals or the lower classes is not at all shocking or seditious **today**; on the contrary, it is precisely what the general public wants to read. So in fact the retro-Victorian novels reproduce what the Victorian novel had conceived for its immensely wide readership, that is, an aesthetics of the politically correct. Finally then we want to insist on the ambiguous, paradoxical, oxymoronic nature of that type of postmodernism which appears estranged from the experimental tendency of its aesthetic predecessor. (Gutleben, 2002: 11-12, original emphasis)

This paradox is at the heart of neo-Victorian fiction. In order to critique, re-vise, respond, or pay homage, one must inevitably imitate. Upon its publication, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* was variously deemed “nauseous” (*The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post* 1890), and “pseudo thinly veneered false philosophy” (*Freeman’s Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser*, 1891). In the context of historiographic metafiction, contestation of what comes before is required; *Dorian: An Imitation*, however, is far more reproductive than re-visionary. In many ways, Self’s novel seeks to reproduce not only Wilde’s text but also the controversy stirred by the original novel.

Self’s novel fills Wilde’s silences with speech; it does not naturally follow, however, that what is spoken is re-visionary. Though we witness the act that ruins Lady Gloucester in the 1980s – in contrast to Wilde’s irresistible silence – neither Dorian’s cruelty, nor his logic, is made any the clearer. Dorian and the contemporary figure of Lady Gloucester, Octavia, are staying with the Wotton family and assorted guests on the Côte d’Azur. In a geographical area devoted to pleasure – filled with luxury yachts, vineyards, waterparks and with the constant sun encouraging a hedonistic attitude – the nineteenth-century intrudes in the form of tedious social conventions. The secrecy and silence of the pre-text is deemed ridiculously

out-dated; to her tentative suggestion that they stay in a hotel, presumably to render their affair less flagrant, Dorian scoffs “for Christ’s sake Octavia, anyone would think this is the eighteen - rather than the nineteen-eighties” (Self 2002: 103). Dorian shares re-visionary fiction’s assumption that modern speech says more. What follows turns notions of privacy and silence upside down. Wotton and Dorian take Octavia to Bendor, an island of “utterly chichi falsity” owned by a Pastis millionaire whose paradoxical architectural style is explained away with Wotton’s searing condemnation of “the French, similarly the most stylish and the most gauche people imaginable” (Self 2002: 103). Intending to end the day at Aqualand – Wotton, presumably not representative of the water park’s usual customer, desires to “ride the big twister chute” (Self 2002: 98) – they swallow varying amounts of LSD before embarking the Bendor ferry. Like her predecessor, Octavia’s geographical and psychological isolation is complete. Unlike her predecessor, however, isolation serves as no protection.

The novel provides slightly more than a ‘hint’ at the contents of the original Lady Gloucester’s confession. What follows on the isolated island is described in distressingly explicit detail. Octavia, rendered childlike and defenceless by the acid, remains pliable as “Dorian bent her upper body over until she was face down across the balustrade. Her vacant visage was now in a position to babble at some lichen. You’re green and small and slow and old, so very old” (Self 2002: 105). The absence of punctuation confirms the indirect and vague nature of Octavia’s speech, but any protection offered by her stoned state is punctured by Dorian’s assault: “as Dorian did things at the other end of her, Octavia’s face became contorted with awareness, and her spaced-out vacancy was overwritten with the most earthly of violations” (Self 2002: 105). The confession is no longer written by Lady Gloucester but is written on Octavia’s face, although, significantly, *Dorian* still resists a full re-vision of its pre-text’s silence; the anal rape to which Octavia will later confess again is not proffered frankly, but sketched out in euphemistic terms such as “things” and “the most earthly of violations”. She is an absence who is filled by the modern Dorian. Octavia’s rape is a violation that haunts the reader through the text – sadly, it is only the reader who may be expected to feel a modicum of sympathy for the forlorn figure.

Wotton’s re-telling of the story is more concerned with the disruption to the day’s events than Dorian’s victim:

I concede, she did seem distressed, but there was nothing untoward about that – it was bloody righteous acid [...] And we never made it to Aqualand that day – I had to dose the poor waif up with brandy and Valium before we could even get her in the mini sub. (Self 2002: 105)

In amongst the absurdity of mini subs and LSD, we are still reminded that Octavia is a “poor waif” who deserves our sympathy. In this modern re-write, readers are not permitted to forget Dorian’s homosexuality – yet his misogynistic cruelty goes as unremarked upon as in the original. Adrienne Rich would surely object to Dorian’s re-vision. His behaviour is not revised for the benefit of women – the homosocial trio’s original unconcern for the fate of Sibyl Vane is rewritten for Octavia. Self’s narrative, as we have seen, is brutal and unsparingly detailed, but can this, as Widdowson suggests, truly recast Wilde’s text as representative of “an innocence no longer available to us” (Widdowson 2006: 505)? Lord Wotton’s unconcern for the actress is truly callous: “Mourn for Ophelia, if you like. Put ashes on your head because Cordelia was strangled. Cry out against heaven because the daughter of Brabantio died. But don’t waste your tears over Sibyl Vane. She was less real than they are” (Wilde 2003: 100). Sibyl is a phantom, a fiction, and has less life than Shakespeare’s tragic heroines. They, at least, are reborn the next night on stage.

Casting Self’s novel as specifically re-visionary, rather than in the more adaptive mould of neo-Victorian fiction which Gutleben suggests, is problematic. Casting Wilde’s novel as innocent *in specific relation to its re-revised text* is likewise suspect. Hutcheon considers queer theory instrumental in shattering “the pernicious sense of nostalgia to which so many men on the anti-postmodern left fell victim” (Hutcheon 2002: 177). The re-visionary process strongly rebukes any charge of nostalgia; in common with historiographic metafiction, re-vision “is not a nostalgic return; it is a critical revising, an ironic dialogue with the past of both art and society (Hutcheon 1988: 4). Yet “ironic dialogue” is more enmeshed in the character of Henry Wotton – no matter which version one refers to – than it is in Self’s often non-ironic re-writing of Wilde. *Dorian: An Imitation* retains and reproduces much that is spoken in the original, such as Wotton’s “mastery of *bon mots*” (Self 2002: 98) and Hallward’s devotion to the subject of his artwork. The addition of explicit sex to the reproduced

narrative is not necessarily enough to perform a convincing re-vision of Wilde's original presentation of gendered sexual relations; as the misogynistic treatment of Octavia (and Dorian's ex-girlfriend Helen, whom he deliberately infects with HIV) reveal, Self's novel appears only to reinforce the most patriarchal of values.

Widdowson specifically suggests that Self's novel revises the silences and naivety of Wilde's text. As demonstrated above, however, innocence is not a natural associate of silence. Though the bombastic verbosity of the 2002 text certainly *speculates* upon and *illuminates* the muteness of its predecessor, Wilde's dark caverns of silence are never fully lit. Conversely, *Tipping* relishes the opportunities offered by ill-lit streets, private bedrooms, and the backstage hush in order to re-write narratives of Victorian theatrics and lesbian historicity. This is not to criticise those who have sought to define a complex, paradoxical genre; rather, it is intended to reveal just how paradoxical the neo-Victorian genre can be. *Tipping the Velvet* and *Dorian: An Imitation* are examples of the increasing power of neo-Victorian fiction's varying ability to import critical approaches into fictional genres. Indeed, the combination of reproduction and re-vision would seem to continue to remain a profitable approach that could see the genre dominate canons of the future.

Notes

1. See the special issue of *Literature Interpretation Theory* (2009), guest edited by Rebecca Munford and Paul Young, for a collection of papers arising out of the conference 'Neo-Victorianism: the Politics and Aesthetics of Appropriation', held in September 2007 at the University of Exeter. At the later 'Adapting the Nineteenth Century: Revisiting, Revising, and Rewriting the Past' conference, held at the University of Wales, Lampeter, in 2008, a diverse range of neo-Victorian texts were the subject of papers, including *Alias Grace* by Margaret Atwood (1996), Sarah Waters' *Affinity* (1999), *Fingersmith* (2002) and *Tipping the Velvet* (1998), *The Observations* by Jane Harris (2006), Michel Faber's *The Crimson Petal and the White* (2002), and Michèle Roberts *In the Red Kitchen* (1990). Lively discussions introduced several other recent novels including Kate Summerscale's *The Suspicions of Mr Whicher* (2008), Scarlett Thomas' *The End of Mr Y* (2007), and Belinda

Starling’s *The Journal of Dora Damage* (2007), as well as confirming the status of pre-1990 texts such as *The French Lieutenant’s Woman* by John Fowles (1969) and, of course, A. S. Byatt’s *Possession* (1990).

2. There is a palpable need for critical definition of this emergent genre. Mark Llewellyn asks ‘What is Neo-Victorian Studies?’ (2008), while Valerie Sanders suggests that interest in neo-Victorian fictions and histories have led to a corresponding explosion in more traditional, Victorian research interests: “it seems impossible to draw any meaningful conclusions from all this evidence, or even from an overview of our weekly seminars in Hull’s English department, where recent speakers have talked about naval surgeons, cannibalism and *Bleak House*, Flora Annie Steel and the Indian Mutiny, dress in Thomas Hardy, and the train compartment as a crime scene. A colleague from creative writing, however, complained there was ‘too much history’ in what was meant to be a literature seminar” (Sanders 2007: 1294).
3. See Kucich and Sadoff’s edited collection *Victorian Afterlife: Postmodern Culture Rewrites the Nineteenth Century* (2000) for a more comprehensive list of those texts that locate “the Victorian age as historically central to late twentieth-century postmodern consciousness” (Sadoff and Kucich 2000: xi).
4. Gordon Dahlquist’s *The Glass Books of the Dream Eaters* (2006) was initially published in the UK as a ten-weekly serial, mimicking the production of Victorian periodicals and magazines. *The Suspicions of Mr Whicher* (2008) is not strictly a novel at all, but shares stylistic features with academic histories that examine the more sensational aspects of British history. Scarlett Thomas, in perhaps the most knowing, referential move of all, examines the role of literature – both Victorian and neo-Victorian – in *The End of Mr Y* (2007), a novel about a doctoral student reading the novel of a little known Victorian scientist.
5. Historiographic metafiction remains the most popular term for those considering neo-Victorian fiction (see, e.g., Heilmann and Llewellyn 2007; and Kohlke 2004).
6. The stasis of London geography, resulting in streets and landmarks as familiar to us as to the Victorians, is something that neo-Victorian novels frequently exploit. When interviewing Sarah Waters, Lucy Armitt confessed that “I have found myself, on occasions, when reading your books, actually reaching down for the London A-Z and plotting out the routes various characters have taken” (Armitt 2006: 120).

-
7. The terms ‘metatextual’, ‘intertextual’, ‘paratextual’, ‘hypotext’ and ‘hypertext’ are all taken from the work of Gerard Genette, in particular from *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (1997).
 8. In the pantomime, Nan and Kitty play the “First and Second Boy roles” (Waters 1999: 146). The Principal Boy is a nineteenth-century figure imbued from its very inception with cross-dressing: “as it evolved in the latter part of the nineteenth century from its roots in *commedia dell’arte* and the harlequinade, the pantomime was a traditional Christmas entertainment in which an actress, designated the Principal Boy, played the hero’s part, and an actor (the Dame) played the comic female character, usually an old and/or ugly woman” (Garber 1992: 176). Garber also points out that a classic pantomime, that of Peter Pan, has at its heart “transgression without guilt, pain, penalty, conflict or cost: this is what Peter Pan – and *Peter Pan* – is all about” (Garber 1992: 184). Transgression without guilt is at the heart of Waters’ novel.
 9. The cover of the UK Virago edition of *Affinity* (1999) depicts a woman’s gloved hands holding a sprig of lavender-coloured blooms.
 10. Sharon Marcus’ extensive examination of nineteenth-century women’s relationships addresses the lack of definitive evidence of lesbian sexual relationships, pointing out that “if firsthand testimony about sex is the standard for defining a relationship as sexual, then most Victorians never had sex” (Marcus 2007: 43).
 11. The “rich and difficult and complex and pleasurable” (Sweet 2001: xxiii) depictions of Victorian culture, which provide multiple points of engagement for neo-Victorian novels, have been examined at some length in Matthew Sweet’s *Inventing the Victorians* (2001) and Simon Joyce’s *The Victorians in the Rearview Mirror* (2007).

Bibliography

- [Anon.]. ‘In Bookland’, *Freemans Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser*, May 16 1891, in *19th Century British Library Newspapers*, viewed 2 December 2008, <http://newspapers.bl.uk/blcs/>.
- [Anon.]. ‘Mr Oscar Wilde’s “Dorian Gray”’, *The Pall Mall Gazette*, 26 June 1890, in *19th Century British Library Newspapers*, viewed 2 December 2008, <http://newspapers.bl.uk/blcs/>.

-
- [Anon.]. ‘Our Library Table’, *The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post*, 23 June 1890, in *19th Century British Library Newspapers*, viewed 2 December 2008, <http://newspapers.bl.uk/blcs/>.
- [Anon.]. ‘Hot Waters: An Interview with Sarah Waters’, *The Guardian*. 26 September 2002, G2 Comment and Features Section, 9.
- Armitt, Lucy. ‘Interview with Sarah Waters (CWWN Conference, University of Wales, Bangor, 22 April 2006)’, *Feminist Review*, 85 (2007), 116-127.
- Benjamin, Walter. *The Arcades Project*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: The Belkin Press of Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Bennett, Anthony. ‘Music in the Halls’, in J. S. Bratton (ed.), *Music Hall: Performance and Style*. Milton Keynes and Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1986, 1-22.
- Cocks, H. G. ‘Secrets, Crimes and Diseases, 1800-1914’, in Matt Cook, Robert Mills, Randolph Trumbach and H. G. Cocks (eds.), *A Gay History of Britain*. Oxford: Greenwood World Publishing, 2007, 107-144.
- Garber, Marjorie. *Vested Interests: Cross Dressing and Cultural Anxiety*. New York and London: Routledge, 1992.
- Genette, Gerard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (trans.). Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
- Gutleben, Christian. *Nostalgic Postmodernism: The Victorian Tradition and the Contemporary British Novel*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2001.
- Heawood, Jonathan. ‘The Sincerest Form’, *The Observer*, 29 September 2002, Review Section, 15.
- Heilmann, Ann; and Mark Llewellyn (eds.). *Metafiction and Metahistory in Contemporary Women’s Fiction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Hunt, Chris. *Street Lavender*. London: Gay Men’s Press, 1986.
- Hunt, Peter. *The Encyclopaedia of Children’s Literature*. New York and London: Routledge, 1996.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetics of Postmodernism*. New York and London: Routledge, 1988.
- . *The Politics of Postmodernism*, 2nd edn. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- . *A Theory of Adaptation*. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Jeremiah, Emily. ‘The “I” Insider “Her”’: Queer Narration in Sarah Waters’s *Tipping the Velvet* and Wesley Stace’s *Misfortune*’, *Women: A Cultural Review*, 18:2 (August 2007), 131-144.

-
- Joyce, Simon. *The Victorians in the Rearview Mirror*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2007.
- Kaplan, Cora. *Victoriana: Histories, Fictions, Criticism*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- . 'Fingersmith's Coda: Feminism and Victorian Studies', *Journal of Victorian Studies*, 13:1 (Spring 2008), 42-55.
- Kirchknopf, Andrea. '(Re)workings of Nineteenth-Century Fiction: Definitions, Terminology, Contexts', *Neo-Victorian Studies*, 1:1 (Autumn 2008), 53-80.
- Kohlke, Marie-Luise. 'Into History through the Back Door: the "Past Historic" in *Nights at the Circus* and *Affinity*', *Women: A Cultural Review*, 15:2 (July 2004), 153-166.
- . 'Introduction: Speculations in and on the Neo-Victorian Encounter', *Neo-Victorian Studies* 1:1 (Autumn 2008), 1-18.
- Koven, Seth. *Slumming: Sexual and Social Politics in Victorian London*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Letissier, Georges. 'Dickens and Post-Victorian Fiction', in Susana Onega and Christian Gutleben (eds.), *Refracting the Canon in Contemporary British Literature and Film*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2004.
- Llewellyn, Mark. 'Breaking the Mould? Sarah Waters and the Politics of Genre' in Ann Heilmann and Mark Llewellyn (eds.), *Metafiction and Metahistory in Contemporary Women's Fiction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, 195-210.
- . 'What is Neo-Victorian Studies?', *Neo-Victorian Studies*, 1:1 (Autumn 2008), 164-185.
- Love, Heather. *Feeling Backward: Loss and the Politics of Queer History*. Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Marcus, Sharon. *Between Women: Friendship, Desire, and Marriage in Victorian England*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- McCrum, Robert. 'Self Analysis', *The Observer*, 29 September 2002, Review Section, 15.
- Munford, Rebecca; and Paul Young (eds.). 'Introduction: Engaging the Victorians', *Literature Interpretation Theory*, Special Issue: 'Neo-Victorianism', 20:1-2 (Jan. 2009), 1-11.
- Ravenhill, Mark. 'So the Victorian TV drama has gone out of fashion? Don't be fooled. The bonnet will be back', *The Guardian*, 19 January 2009, Arts Section, 24.

-
- Rich, Adrienne. ‘When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision’, in *On Lies, Secrets and Silence: Selected Prose 1966-1978*. London: Virago, 1980, 33-49.
- Sadoff, Dianne F.; and John Kucich (eds.). ‘Introduction: Histories of the Present’, in *Victorian Afterlife: Postmodern Culture Rewrites the Nineteenth Century*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000, ix-xxx.
- Sanders, Valerie. ‘Where Next in Victorian Literary Studies?’, *Literature Compass*, 4:4 (2007), 1292-1302.
- Self, Will. *Dorian: An Imitation*. London and New York: Penguin, 2002.
- Shields, Rob. ‘Fancy Footwork: Walter Benjamin’s Notes on Flânerie’, in Keith Tester (ed.), *The Flâneur*. New York and London: Routledge, 1994, 61-80.
- Shiller, Dana. ‘The Redemptive Past in the Neo-Victorian Novel’, *Studies in the Novel*, 29:4 (Winter 1997), 538-60.
- Shuttleworth, Sally. ‘Natural History: The Retro-Victorian Novel’, in Elinor S. Shaffer (ed.), *The Third Culture: Literature and Science*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter & Co, 1997, 253-268.
- Steel, Mel. ‘[F]iction in Brief’ in *The Independent*, 22 March 1998, viewed 19 November 2009, <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/books-fiction-in-brief-1151853.html>.
- Sweet, Matthew. *Inventing the Victorians*. London: Faber and Faber, 2002.
- Walkowitz, Judith R. *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late Victorian London*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press and Vintage, 1992.
- . ‘Going Public: Shopping, Street Harassment and Streetwalking in Late Victorian London’, *Representations*, 62 (Spring 1998), 1-30.
- Wallace, Diana. *The Woman’s Historical Novel: British Women Writers, 1900-2000*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Waters, Sarah. *Tipping the Velvet* [1998]. London: Virago, 1999.
- Widdowson, Peter. ‘Writing Back: Contemporary Re-Visionary Fiction’, *Textual Practice*, 20:3 (September 2006), 491-507.
- Wilde, Oscar. *The Picture of Dorian Gray* [1891]. London and New York: Penguin, 2003.
- Wilson, Cheryl A. ‘From the Drawing Room to the Stage: Performing Sexuality in Sarah Waters’s *Tipping the Velvet*’, *Women’s Studies*, 35:3 (2006), 285-305.