'great men' in the narrative" and highlight the collaborative nature of creating museum displays and collections (189). In her chapter, Berkowitz seeking to reassert the position of Philadelphia-based John Leidy within the history of science, uses both letters and specimens to emphasize the collaborative, rather than competitive, nature of scientific collecting in the mid-nineteenth century. Only Brooker takes a genuinely transatlantic approach to these networks by considering how Morton, Tyndall, and Pepper negotiated their varied career paths in America in relation to one another and the latter two men's earlier work in Britain.

Many of these examples expose the tensions surrounding the development of popular science in the nineteenth century. In a fascinating study of the checkered and short-lived history of the National Repository, Iwan Rhys Morus shows how this institution, designed to celebrate artisanal knowledge, became the site of tense debate over ownership of technical expertise. These revealing arguments demonstrate how many people questioned some fundamental elements of museum-making, including explanation and transparency, in their wish to protect the power of the inventor and maker. Samuel J. M. M. Alberti's exploration of the design and construction of the Hunterian Museum shows how museum architecture "comprises not only bricks and mortar but also material and social relations" (85) and reveals the numerous compromises and improvisations inherent in museum buildings. Lukas Rieppel reexamines the controversy surrounding Albert Koch, the German showman who brought his "sea serpent" fossil, dubbed the *hydrarchos*, to New York in 1845 and who was subsequently exposed as a fraud. He uses this example to show how credibility, identity, and the authenticity of specimens were co-constituted and interdependent.

In sum, the volume's individual chapters provide a wealth of case studies and succeed in foregrounding the myriad sites where science was displayed and performed beyond the walls of the specialist museum. The authors adopt numerous approaches, from studies of individuals, displays, objects, and buildings to institutional histories, to deepen our understanding of the history of science on both sides of the Atlantic. Diverse strands from the chapters are necessarily woven together by John Tresch's afterword. He particularly notes how the convergence of science and empire, a lively subject in British scholarship, can inform the interpretation of the history of science in the United States before and after the Civil War, which was likewise influenced by imperial logic and expansion. The British examples are largely focused on London, with fleeting references to relationships between the metropole and regional Britain. When considering questions of nation and empire, these chapters would benefit from considering concurrent developments in Scotland, for example, as explored in Geoffrey Quilley's work. The volume nonetheless offers an original and enlightening set of essays that broaden our ideas of what constituted a "science museum" and situates the celebrated late nineteenth-century institutions in a longer history of exhibition and popular display.

Sarah Longair
University of Lincoln
slongair@lincoln.ac.uk

JONATHAN BLACK. *Winston Churchill in British Art, 1900 to the Present Day: The Titan with Many Faces*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017. Pp. 287. $29.95 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2018.28

For a serious artist wanting to portray Churchill on canvas or in clay, there were always two major obstacles to overcome. The first was simply to get him to show up for a sitting. The second was to keep him in the same pose for more than a few seconds. "Of all the portraits I have ever done," complained the artist Clare Sheridan, who was also Churchill's cousin,

"Winston's was the hardest, not because his face was difficult, but because it was for him a physical impossibility to remain still" (50). This helps to explain why the most powerful image of him was captured by the photographer Yousuf Karsh, who was allowed only a few minutes to take a formal portrait, and who made the most of the right moment when he dared to take Churchill's cigar away from him. "He looked so belligerent," Karsh recalled, "he could have devoured me" (106).

As Jonathan Black points out in this valuable new study, Karsh's photograph—which was taken in 1941—is one of the most widely reproduced images in the history of photography. In one fleeting second, he captured forever the look that Churchill used to such advantage in a political career that lasted more than half a century—the look that said, "I bend but never break." It was not so much a pose as an attitude, and Karsh knew how to bring it out. Under its influence, Churchill had long ago discovered the trick of transforming his figure of modest height and thick frame into an impressive pillar of strength and resolve.

Black has done a great service for Churchill scholarship by methodically gathering and analyzing the major efforts to draw, paint, sculpt, and photograph the most influential British statesman of the twentieth century. There are, of course, many familiar works in this book, including not only the Karsh photo but also the Ivor Roberts-Jones bronze in Parliament Square. Happily, there are also many surprises. I had not realized that the great John Singer Sargent sketched Churchill in charcoal in 1925. We tend to think of Sargent working in the Victorian and Edwardian periods, so it is startling to see an elegant portrait in his distinctive hand from his last days (Sargent died only weeks after completing the work), with Churchill looking more sensitive and refined than usual.

There is nothing of the bulldog in Sargent's sketch, and it is worth noting that the image of Churchill as a squat canine fiercely defending his turf—now so well established—caught on with political cartoonists much faster, and much later, than some may realize. He always looked the part, but it was not until he became prime minister in 1940 that the idea caught on that Churchill's face and attitude bore some resemblance to a British bulldog. A nice, early touch was a tight collar around the four-legged Winston with a tag dangling under his jowls identifying his home as "No. 10."

Rightly, I think, Black emphasizes the importance of William Orpen's 1916 painting of Churchill in a characteristic pose leaning slightly to one side, with a hand firmly planted at his waist. At the time, Churchill was gravely worried about his political future, not to mention the grim outlook for the world after two years of war. His steady climb to the top ranks of British political power had abruptly ended with the failure of his plans for the Dardanelles in 1915, and when he sat for Orpen he seemed to fear that his career might never recover from his military misjudgments. The painter was able to capture both the look of determination that we later see in Karsh's photo and the sensitivity of Sargent's drawing, with an additional touch of sadness lingering in the face. From the moment he saw the completed painting, Churchill was touched by its powerful evocation of this moment of crisis in his life, and—as Black writes—it "adorned his London dining room until the end of his days" (42). No doubt it was a constant reminder to him of how quickly a politician's career could rise and fall.

The painting of himself he liked least was Graham Sutherland's 1954 portrait in oil, which Churchill's own wife so loathed that she unwisely destroyed it in later years. The surviving photograph of the work leaves no doubt of its artistic merit, but what the subject hated was the way his own grand image of himself was reduced to something dull and mundane—or, as he put it, a painting of an old man "as if sitting on a lavatory" (168). In an age when so many British politicians were conventional in every way—unimaginative and plodding in the manner of, say, Stanley Baldwin—Sutherland chose to make Churchill look ordinary, an unforgivable sin from the sitter's viewpoint at the end of his long, spectacular career.

All in all, Black's study reminds us of how crucial the right image is for a leader, particularly when it is backed by qualities of character that reinforce the surface appearance. In his prime, Churchill proved that he had substance as well as flair, but as one of his parliamentary

colleagues observed, he was always a man who "looks and behaves like someone important. He is 'news' and looks news" (3).

Michael Shelden
Indiana State University
michael.shelden@indstate.edu

Andrew Burkett's *Romantic Mediations: Media Theory and British Romanticism* is a difficult book to summarize. Burkett says that the book's main objective is to explore why "media innovators" so frequently find inspiration in romantic-era art and literature. Why, for instance, in the 1830s did the English gentleman William Henry Fox Talbot use Byron's "Ode to Napoleon" (1814) to test his new negative-positive photography? Why, in 1939 in Santa Monica, California, did F. Scott Fitzgerald choose to "remediate" Keats's "Ode to a Nightingale" (1819) when he made his only phonograph recording? What ties William Blake's late illuminated manuscripts to Jim Jarmusch's 1995 film *Dead Man*? Or, finally, why would Eric Sonstroem and Ron Broglio choose Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* as the base text for their 2001 *FrankenMOO*? The media archeology Burkett offers in such case histories has intrinsic interest, and Burkett's book is in turns insightful, penetrating, speculative, and engaging as a media history that unearths conceptual linkage between the old and new, in particular between romantic art and literature and contemporary media technologies of storage and processing. As its subtitle suggests, it is a book about romantic studies and the intersection of that field with the concepts, aims, and methodologies of media theory and history. The nature and outcomes of this pairing stand at the conceptual center of Burkett's book and are perhaps the work's most challenging and provocative aspect.

Romantic Mediations fits squarely at the intersection of Burkett's larger research agenda on romantic authors and his work on pedagogy and digital humanities initiatives at Romantic Circles. His introduction lays critical groundwork for locating this book in the emerging field of romantic media studies alongside the work of such scholars as Miranda Burgess, Kevis Goodman, Celeste Langan, Maureen McLane, Tom Mole, Andrew Piper, Yohei Igarashi, and Lauren Neefe. Burkett marshals an impressive array of media theorists and technical language to "underscore the significance of questions concerning media and mediation to romantic-era literary and cultural production" (10). This redirect toward media and mediation results in the book's "focus on not only the hermeneutic status of Romantic texts but also their material dimensions and qualities as dynamic conceptual objects" (10). In each of his case studies that follow, Burkett probes the shared conceptual ground between romantic imaginative art and literature and emerging media devices, emphasizing along the way that it is a history not of technical media devices, per se, but of processes of mediation.

Burkett divides his four case studies into two unofficial parts: the first two chapters on intersections between poetry and technical storage devices (photography and phonography) and the final two on Blake and Mary Shelley and the work of mediation in processing, networking, and digital media. Chapter 1, "Photographing Byron's Hand," aligns William Henry Fox Talbot's negative-positive photography and the complicated publication history of Byron's "Ode to Napoleon." As it turns out, Burkett argues, both Byronism and photography "empty and ultimately subvert what have been traditionally characterized as the hallmarks