

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER

Editors


William E. Buckler,
New York University

Robert A. Greenberg,
Queens College, City University
of New York

Arthur F. Minerof, Assistant Editor for Bibliography,
Staten Island Community College,
City University of New York

Warren R. Herendeen, Assistant Editor,
University of Rochester

Number 42	Contents	Fall 1972
	Page	
	The Martyr Clown: Oscar Wilde in <i>De Profundis</i> by Joseph Butwin	1 20
	On Some Aspects of the Comic in <i>Great Expectations</i> by Henri Talon	6 22
	A Missing Childhood in <i>Hard Times</i> by Edward Hurley	11 25
	A Reading of Hopkins' "Epithalamion" by Lionel Adey	16 26
		32
	English X News	

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER is sponsored for the English X Group of the Modern Language Association by New York University and Queens College, City University of New York. Editorial and business communications should be addressed to William E. Buckler, New York University, Washington Square, New York, N.Y. 10003. Subscription rates in the United States and Canada are \$3.00 for one year and \$5.00 for two years. Checks may be made payable to The Victorian Newsletter.  745

The Martyr Clown: Oscar Wilde in *De Profundis*

Joseph Butwin

AFTER EIGHTEEN MONTHS of his two-year prison term, Oscar Wilde composed an apologia in the form of a long letter to Lord Alfred Douglas, the cause of all his troubles. The letter was later published as *De Profundis*.¹ While working on the letter to Douglas, Wilde confided in his friend More Adey:

It is the most important letter of my life, as it will deal ultimately with my future mental attitude towards life, with the way in which I desire to meet the world again, with the development of my character: with what I have lost, what I have learned, and what I hope to arrive at. At last I see a real goal towards which my soul can go simply, naturally, and rightly. . . . My whole life depends on it. (p. 419)

In effect, he recreates himself. In order to do this he appeals to what may seem to be unlikely models — in one breath he shares the character of Christ; in the next he becomes a ridiculous clown. In one case he would appear to elevate himself in a shameful way; in the other he seems to degrade himself. It is not immediately clear that either comparison would glorify the condition of the defamed prisoner. One claim confirms his pride; the other, his folly. For most people both of these had been made sufficiently clear by his trials.

In fact, Wilde's comparisons are not outlandish.² His Christ is the very type of the romantic artist and the aesthetic gentleman, and the debilitated dandy of the prison years fits the figure of the pathetic clown that was becoming familiar in the visual, literary, and theatrical arts.³ Quite independently of Wilde several painters, James Ensor some-

what before and Georges Rouault somewhat after, began to use the two images interchangeably. It was in the relative isolation of his prison cell that Wilde developed and associated the dual image of Christ and the clown that dominates the writing of his last years.

In much of what he wrote from prison Wilde tried to remake his defamed character. He does not deny the charges; he converts them through the use of favorable images. Although within a few years he would bring his crusade against the prisons to the press, the Wilde of *De Profundis* is no Zola. When he describes himself in prison he is intent on image-making, not muckraking. Wilde himself proposed calling the letter *Epistola: In Carcere et Vinculis* (p. 513), but he does not go in for detailed accounts of prison life in general or of his own life in particular. In fact, the special feature of prison life is the wretched sameness of the days, the sameness of the prisoners. Variety is deliberately removed from life, details dissolve, and the particular prisoner becomes the representative prisoner.

What distinguishes the prisoner's life from life in the outside world, what the tedium of his days makes it impossible for the prisoner to forget, is his sorrow. "We who live in prison, and in whose lives there is no event but sorrow, have to measure time by throbs of pain . . . and the remembrance of suffering in the past is necessary to us as the warrant, the evidence, of our continued identity" (p. 435). There are no complaints, few details, no degrees of discomfort, only sorrow. Sorrow is atmospheric, pervasive, non-specific. In other letters he may demand more adequate lighting; here it is metaphorically "always twilight in the

1. On his release from prison Wilde gave the letter to Robert Ross intending that the original manuscript be sent to Douglas after two copies had been typed. It appears that Ross kept the manuscript and sent a typewritten copy to Douglas (though he denied ever receiving it). In 1905 Ross published an abbreviated version of the letter under the title *De Profundis* rather than the *Epistola: In Carcere et Vinculis* that Wilde had once suggested. A slightly expanded version was published in 1908, and in 1949 Wilde's son, Vyvyan Holland, published what appeared to be a complete text from one of the typescripts. But there had been mistakes and deletions in the typed copy, and a true printing of the letter awaited Rupert Hart-Davis' excellent edition of *The Letters of Oscar Wilde* (New York, 1962). Davis uses the original manuscript freed by the British Museum in 1959. All citations of *De Profundis* or of Wilde's other letters refer to this edition and appear in parentheses in my text.

2. The word clown appears often enough in accounts of Wilde's life before the fall, and critics sometimes use the term to

cover what they cannot take seriously in their subject. In *The Paradox of Oscar Wilde* (New York, 1950) George Woodcock opposes the "aesthetic clown" to the "creative critic." The imprisoned Wilde has been spared the title of clown that is generally considered abusive and in this case unfair. But it is precisely in prison that he begins to use it for himself. G. Wilson Knight (*The Christian Renaissance* [New York, 1962]) solemnly demonstrates Wilde's "Christ-like affinities" right down to his "Byronic love of children," and he recognizes the tragic form that both lives follow. However, Knight does not take up the self-conscious, theatrical, and ironic way in which Wilde adjusts and adopts the identity of Christ. Critics have not pointed out the conflation of the images of Christ and the clown in *De Profundis*.

3. In a deft and excellent study of poetry and painting, Jean Starobinski (*Portrait de l'artiste en saltimbanque* [Geneva, 1971]) traces the image of the acrobatic clown from Gautier, Banville, and Baudelaire into Rouault and Picasso. He describes the affinity between Christ and the clown in Rouault.

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER

Editors

William E. Buckler,
New York University

Robert A. Greenberg,
Queens College, City University
of New York

Arthur F. Minerof, Assistant Editor for Bibliography,
Staten Island Community College,
City University of New York

Warren R. Herendeen, Assistant Editor,
University of Rochester

Number 42	Contents	Fall 1972
	Page	
	The Martyr Clown: Oscar Wilde in <i>De Profundis</i> by Joseph Butwin	1 20 Fictional Conventions and Sexuality in <i>Dracula</i> by Carol L. Fry
	On Some Aspects of the Comic in <i>Great Expectations</i> by Henri Talon	6 22 Thackeray's <i>Esmond</i> and Anne Manning's "Spurious Antiques" by James C. Simmons
	A Missing Childhood in <i>Hard Times</i> by Edward Hurley	11 25 Tom Thumb Versus High Art: Douglas Jerrold's "The English in Little" by Angus Easson
	A Reading of Hopkins' "Epithalamion" by Lionel Adey	16 26 Recent Publications: A Selected List by Arthur E. Minerof
		32 English X News

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER is sponsored for the English X Group of the Modern Language Association by New York University and Queens College, City University of New York. Editorial and business communications should be addressed to William E. Buckler, New York University, Washington Square, New York, N.Y. 10003. Subscription rates in the United States and Canada are \$3.00 for one year and \$5.00 for two years. Checks may be made payable to The Victorian Newsletter.



The Martyr Clown: Oscar Wilde in *De Profundis*

Joseph Butwin

AFTER EIGHTEEN MONTHS of his two-year prison term, Oscar Wilde composed an apologia in the form of a long letter to Lord Alfred Douglas, the cause of all his troubles. The letter was later published as *De Profundis*.¹ While working on the letter to Douglas, Wilde confided in his friend More Adey:

It is the most important letter of my life, as it will deal ultimately with my future mental attitude towards life, with the way in which I desire to meet the world again, with the development of my character: with what I have lost, what I have learned, and what I hope to arrive at. At last I see a real goal towards which my soul can go simply, naturally, and rightly. . . . My whole life depends on it. (p. 419)

In effect, he recreates himself. In order to do this he appeals to what may seem to be unlikely models — in one breath he shares the character of Christ; in the next he becomes a ridiculous clown. In one case he would appear to elevate himself in a shameful way; in the other he seems to degrade himself. It is not immediately clear that either comparison would glorify the condition of the defamed prisoner. One claim confirms his pride; the other, his folly. For most people both of these had been made sufficiently clear by his trials.

In fact, Wilde's comparisons are not outlandish.² His Christ is the very type of the romantic artist and the aesthetic gentleman, and the debilitated dandy of the prison years fits the figure of the pathetic clown that was becoming familiar in the visual, literary, and theatrical arts.³ Quite independently of Wilde several painters, James Ensor some-

what before and Georges Rouault somewhat after, began to use the two images interchangeably. It was in the relative isolation of his prison cell that Wilde developed and associated the dual image of Christ and the clown that dominates the writing of his last years.

In much of what he wrote from prison Wilde tried to remake his defamed character. He does not deny the charges; he converts them through the use of favorable images. Although within a few years he would bring his crusade against the prisons to the press, the Wilde of *De Profundis* is no Zola. When he describes himself in prison he is intent on image-making, not muckraking. Wilde himself proposed calling the letter *Epistola: In Carcere et Vinculis* (p. 513), but he does not go in for detailed accounts of prison life in general or of his own life in particular. In fact, the special feature of prison life is the wretched *sameness* of the days, the sameness of the prisoners. Variety is deliberately removed from life, details dissolve, and the particular prisoner becomes the representative prisoner.

What distinguishes the prisoner's life from life in the outside world, what the tedium of his days makes it impossible for the prisoner to forget, is his sorrow. "We who live in prison, and in whose lives there is no event but sorrow, have to measure time by throbs of pain . . . and the remembrance of suffering in the past is necessary to us as the warrant, the evidence, of our continued identity" (p. 435). There are no complaints, few details, no degrees of discomfort, only sorrow. Sorrow is atmospheric, pervasive, non-specific. In other letters he may demand more adequate lighting; here it is metaphorically "always twilight in the

1. On his release from prison Wilde gave the letter to Robert Ross intending that the original manuscript be sent to Douglas after two copies had been typed. It appears that Ross kept the manuscript and sent a typewritten copy to Douglas (though he denied ever receiving it). In 1905 Ross published an abbreviated version of the letter under the title *De Profundis* rather than the *Epistola: In Carcere et Vinculis* that Wilde had once suggested. A slightly expanded version was published in 1908, and in 1949 Wilde's son, Vyvyan Holland, published what appeared to be a complete text from one of the typescripts. But there had been mistakes and deletions in the typed copy, and a true printing of the letter awaited Rupert Hart-Davis' excellent edition of *The Letters of Oscar Wilde* (New York, 1962). Davis uses the original manuscript freed by the British Museum in 1959. All citations of *De Profundis* or of Wilde's other letters refer to this edition and appear in parentheses in my text.

2. The word clown appears often enough in accounts of Wilde's life before the fall, and critics sometimes use the term to

cover what they cannot take seriously in their subject. In *The Paradox of Oscar Wilde* (New York, 1950) George Woodcock opposes the "aesthetic clown" to the "creative critic." The imprisoned Wilde has been spared the title of clown that is generally considered abusive and in this case unfair. But it is precisely in prison that he begins to use it for himself. G. Wilson Knight (*The Christian Renaissance* [New York, 1962]) solemnly demonstrates Wilde's "Christ-like affinities" right down to his "Byronic love of children," and he recognizes the tragic form that both lives follow. However, Knight does not take up the self-conscious, theatrical, and ironic way in which Wilde adjusts and adopts the identity of Christ. Critics have not pointed out the conflation of the images of Christ and the clown in *De Profundis*.

3. In a deft and excellent study of poetry and painting, Jean Starobinski (*Portrait de l'artiste en saltimbanque* [Geneva, 1971]) traces the image of the acrobatic clown from Gautier, Banville, and Baudelaire into Rouault and Picasso. He describes the affinity between Christ and the clown in Rouault.

cells." Argument becomes incantation. "Sorrow, then, and all that it teaches one, is my new world. . . . Sorrow is the ultimate type both in life and Art. . . . Truth in Art is the unity of the thing with itself: the outward rendered expressive of the inward: the soul made incarnate: the body instinct with spirit. For this reason there is no truth comparable to Sorrow" (pp. 472-73). The representative prisoner becomes the Christian martyr, the Man of Sorrows. In fact, he is talking about "truth in art" for he is also an artist.

Among the few consolations allowed the prisoner during the first half of his term had been what he calls "the four prose-poems about Christ . . . the Gospels." In *De Profundis* Wilde does not wish to distinguish the way he talks about art from the way he talks about the Christian religion. He has come to "see a far more intimate and immediate connection between the true life of Christ and the true life of the artist" (p. 476). More specifically, Wilde's continual allusions to Christianity make the life of Christ sound remarkably like his own. He lingers with what should have been embarrassing irony on the betrayal, "the false friend coming close to him so as to betray him with a kiss," until the Last Supper begins to sound very much like those affairs at the Café Royal that had been his own undoing:

I see no difficulty at all in believing that such was the charm of his personality that his mere presence could bring peace to souls in anguish . . . and those whose dull unimaginative lives had been but a mode of death rose as it were from the grave when he called them: or that when he taught on the hillside the multitude forgot their hunger and thirst and the cares of this world, and that to his friends who listened to him as he sat at meat the coarse food seemed delicate, and the water had the taste of good wine, and the whole house became full of the odour and sweetness of nard. (pp. 478-79)

This creed has more in common with Wilde's own undergraduate idolatry of Walter Pater than it does with the "four prose poems." It is as if a reading of Pater's "Conclusion" could raise Lazarus from aesthetic death, and Wilde is clearly thinking of himself when he quietly reminds Douglas that the charm rather than the champagne of his host should have been sufficient entertainment during their fatal and expensive courtship. It should be equally clear that Wilde is not making himself into a demigod; he is only making Christ into an aesthetic gentleman.

The moment Wilde robs Christ of his divine powers, he begins to talk about a *man*, a man of special powers, but in every case human powers. Wilde describes the extensive

sympathies of the Man of Sorrows and accounts for them in the same way he accounts for artistic creation: "the very basis of his nature was the same as that of the nature of the artist, an intense and flamelike imagination." The lesson taught by the example of both Christ and the artist is "Whatever happens to another happens to oneself," and should anyone ask you what such an inscription can possibly mean you can answer that it means 'Lord Christ's heart and Shakespeare's brain.'" Christ, according to Wilde, is the "true precursor of the romantic movement in life" (pp. 476-77). The life of Christ, then, is only a model for something more important, the life of the artist. And in that life the moral function is itself only a model for what must be superior functions of the imagination. When Wilde associates the brain of Shakespeare with the capacity to recognize the experience of other people as one's own, he is adopting the doctrine of Hazlitt's lectures. Shakespeare, according to Hazlitt, "was like the genius of humanity, changing places with all of us at pleasure, and playing with our purposes as with his own. . . . He had only to think of anything in order to become that thing, with all the circumstances belonging to it."⁴ Similarly, for Wilde's Christ, "there was no difference at all between the lives of others and one's own life. By this means he gave to man an extended, a Titan personality" (p. 480).

Wilde's preoccupation with the character of Christ is more Shakespearian than Christian; that is, he is attracted by the theatrical notion of making a personality. It is theatrical rather than moral. The personality is close to what the modern advertiser would call an image, a stance that an artist or a politician adopts before his public. Wilde becomes for himself the playwright, the player, and the audience or, in comparable mercantile terms, the publicist, the product, and the consumer.

Wilde describes a self-conscious, theatrical Christ who creates an impressive image of himself: "Feeling with the artistic nature of one to whom Sorrow and Suffering were modes through which he could realize his conception of the Beautiful, that an idea is of no value till it becomes incarnate and is made an image, he makes of himself the image of the Man of Sorrows, and as such has fascinated and dominated Art as no Greek god ever succeeded in doing" (p. 481). Sorrow ignites the artist's image-making sense, and the image that he creates is a self, *himself*. Wilde continues to describe Christ as the great self-maker: "The strange figures of poetic drama and ballad are made by the imagination of others, but out of his own imagination entirely did Jesus of Nazareth create himself" (p. 482). The character is split between the creator and the self. It

is as if playwright and actor were to conspire within one man to "realize" an abstract notion. In order to complete the metaphorical division a third ingredient is added by implication to the playwright and the actor. A spectator judges the performance. In *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, Lord Henry Wotton diverts his protégé with a criticism of life that Wilde would eventually apply to his own sad story:

It often happens that the real tragedies of life occur in such an inartistic manner that they hurt us by their crude violence, their absolute incoherence, their absurd want of meaning, their entire lack of style. They affect us just as vulgarity affects us. . . . Sometimes, however a tragedy that possesses artistic elements of beauty crosses our lives. If these elements of beauty are real, the whole thing simply appeals to our sense of dramatic effect. Suddenly we find that we are no longer the actors, but the spectators of the play. Or rather we are both. We watch ourselves, and the mere spectacle entralls us.⁵

Between the writing of *Dorian Gray* and *De Profundis*, Wilde became a first-rate playwright, and once in prison he was quick to recognize what bad theatre his own story had become. While writing the long letter, he was preoccupied with a classical sense of impurity in the drama that he was forced to rerun in his memory.

I thought life was going to be a brilliant comedy, and that you were to be one of many graceful figures in it. I found it to be a revolting and repellent tragedy, and that the sinister occasion of the great catastrophe, sinister in its concentration of aim and intensity of narrowed will-power, was yourself, stripped of that mask of joy and pleasure by which you, no less than I, had been deceived and led astray. (p. 444)

At the same time he writes to Robert Ross:

No man of my position can fall into the mire of life without getting a great deal of pity from his inferiors; and I know that when plays last too long, spectators tire. My tragedy has lasted far too long: its climax is over: its end is mean; and I am quite conscious of the fact that when the end *does* come I shall return an unwelcome visitant to a world that does not want me: a *revenant*, as the French say, as one whose face is grey with long imprisonment and crooked with pain. Horrible as are the dead when they rise from their tombs, the living who come out from tombs are more horrible still. (p. 413)

He presents himself as a grotesque, living Lazarus, a post-tragic figure returning to the stage after everyone's sense of an ending has been satisfied. He might like to be a tragic hero, but his theatrical sense is too good. The barest notion that he is a kind of Othello and Douglas an Iago trails off with Jacobean extravagance into a mad farce:

In all tragedies there is a grotesque element. [Douglas] is the grotesque element in mine. Do not think I do not blame myself. I curse myself night and day for my folly in allowing him to dominate my life. If there was an echo in these walls it would cry "Fool!" forever. . . . Indeed my entire tragedy sometimes seems to me grotesque and nothing else. . . . In certain places no one, except those actually insane, is allowed to laugh: and, indeed, even in their case it is against the regulations for conduct: otherwise I think I would laugh at that. . . . For the rest, do not let Alfred Douglas suppose that I am crediting him with unworthy motives. He really had no motives at all. (p. 414)

Wilde sees that he has lived out a laughable tragedy, a ghastly mixture of theatrical moods that his own Lord Henry Wotton would have surely rejected. Reading Gaol was to give him the image that would adequately express his newly and painfully acquired knowledge that the most fully realized life is an impure drama, a tragedy that provokes mad laughter. The sorrowful, martyred clown is the image of that life. In *De Profundis* he describes the event that prepared him to recognize the image:

I remember I used to say that I thought I could bear a real tragedy if it came to me with purple pall and a mask of noble sorrow, but that the dreadful thing about modernity was that it put Tragedy into the raiment of Comedy, so that the great realities seemed commonplace or grotesque or lacking in style. It is quite true about modernity. It has probably always been true about actual life. It is said that all martyrdoms seemed mean to the looker-on. The nineteenth century is no exception to the general rule.

Everything about my tragedy has been hideous, mean, repellent, lacking in style. Our very dress makes us grotesques. We are the zanies of sorrow. We are clowns whose hearts are broken. We are specially designed to appeal to the sense of humour. On November 13th 1895 I was brought down here from London. From two o'clock till half-past two on that day I had to stand on the centre platform of Clapham Junction in convict dress and handcuffed, for the world to look at. I had been taken out of the Hospital Ward without a moment's notice being given to me. Of all possible objects I was the most grotesque. When people saw me they laughed. Each train as it came up swelled the audience. Nothing could exceed their amusement. That was of course before they knew who I was. As soon as they had been informed, they laughed still more. For half an hour I stood there in the grey November rain surrounded by a jeering mob. For a year after that was done to me I wept every day at the same hour and for the same space of time. Well, now I am really beginning to feel more regret for the people who laughed than for myself. Of course when they saw me I was not on my pedestal. I was in the

4. *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt*, ed. P. P. Howe (London, 1930), V, 47-48.

5. *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (New York, 1923), pp. 185-86.

pillory. But it is a very unimaginative nature that only cares for people on their pedestals. A pedestal may be a very unreal thing. A pillory is a terrific reality. They should have known also how to interpret sorrow better. I have said that behind Sorrow there is always Sorrow. It were still wiser to say that behind sorrow there is always a soul. And to mock at a soul in pain is a dreadful thing. Unbeautiful are their lives who do it. (pp. 490-91)

This is a scene designed by Wilde for the making of his particular image, and in effect the audience is as much his creation as the performer is. During the crucial half hour he was neither in a pillory nor on a stage. It is that Wilde tends to see himself as a performer, and a sense of life as performance depends on an equally internal sense of audience. In this case the performer is a public victim. The victim becomes a clown and a martyr.⁶

The vicarious Man of Sorrows lives on and on in exaggerated tragedy that has become ludicrous. The clown emerges as a Christ who, like Lazarus, refuses to die, a continual victim who returns for more after every pummeling. At the nadir of his humiliation Wilde sees that his tragedy has spilled over into grotesque comedy, and he creates an image that simultaneously conveys the ridicule of the clown and the dignity of Christ. So far he has prepared his reader to accept a Christ who is very much like Wilde himself. Now the audience that only laughs has failed to recognize Christ in his latest incarnation. Presumably they would have joined the Roman soldiers who mocked the Man of Sorrows when he appeared before them crowned with thorns and wrapped in a purple cloak. The laughter that humiliates also dignifies the victim who has the right model in mind. Wilde's daily observance of the hour represents a private Good Friday, a confirmation of his own martyrdom.

The crowd at Clapham Junction satisfies Wilde's sense of audience for the performance of the image he has made, but it is also quite literally an expanding mob, a fair sampling of the great English public that did the artist in. In prison Wilde has acquired the imagination that he calls Shakespearian and Christlike — he knows that whatever happens to anybody happens also to him. Alfred Douglas does not know that and neither did the mob at Clapham Junction. It is for the larger audience embodied in Douglas and represented in part on the railroad platform that Wilde writes this long letter.

He had always recognized the potential villainy of the

public. In his *Soul of Man Under Socialism* (1891), public opinion is a tyrant, and Mill's liberty is a special necessity for the artist. In 1891 he was sure that true individualists could hold their own in spite of the public: "If people abuse them, they are not to answer back. What does it signify? The things people say of a man do not alter a man. He is what he is. Public opinion is of no value whatsoever. . . . After all, even in prison, a man can be quite free. His soul can be free. His personality can be untroubled. He can be at peace."⁷ Wilde would live to answer for this assurance. When writing the essay on socialism, Wilde, like Mill before him, deplores the new tyranny of public opinion, but, unlike Mill, he underestimates its power. The old tyrants, popes and princes, have been replaced by an awkward imitation. In order to demonstrate his contempt for this new authority, he dresses the public in the costume of the pathetic clown: "Their authority is a thing blind, deaf, hideous, grotesque, tragic, amusing, serious and obscene. . . . They have taken the sceptre of the Prince. How should they use it? They have taken the triple tiara of the Pope. How should they carry its burden? They are as a clown whose heart is broken."⁸ That was 1891. He uses the very words that he would use in the prison letter, but the image of the brokenhearted clown is entirely different. The audience is a clown; he might say "merely a clown," a ridiculous imitation of the real thing. The detail of the broken heart only compounds the insult. Even as a clown the public is false, unprepared for its poor show. He goes on to compare it to a "priest whose soul is not yet born."

The broken heart of the later version no longer represents the inadequacy of the clown; rather, it represents his intimacy with sorrow, his sympathy with other convicts, and his special kinship with the Man of Sorrows. In this ultimate moment of sorrow, the laughter of the audience and the tears of the performer are indistinguishable; each gasps in the moment that he recognizes an exaggerated example of imperfection, vulnerability, and, finally, of mortality. Baudelaire had called laughter Satanic: it "comes from the idea of one's own superiority" and he reminds his readers that "the Sage *par excellence*, the Word Incarnate, never laughed. In the eyes of One who has all knowledge and all power, the comic does not exist. And yet the Word Incarnate knew anger; He even knew tears."⁹ At this point laughter and tears are complementary. Christ cries when Satan laughs. The tragic clown answers both.

Baudelaire's poems as it is "wherever there is a romantic movement in Art" (p. 482).

7. Oscar Wilde, *The Artist as Critic*, ed. Richard Ellmann (New York, 1969), pp. 264-65.
8. *The Artist as Critic*, p. 283.
9. Charles Baudelaire, *The Mirror of Art: Critical Studies by Charles Baudelaire*, ed. and trans. Jonathan Mayne (London,

Wilde was to carry his broken heart away from prison. His few new writings are expressions of sympathy for the outcast prisoners, and the image of the martyred clown dominates both his first letter to the editor of the *Daily Chronicle* and the "Ballad of Reading Gaol." Wilde was moved to write the letter to the editor by the dismissal of the warder, Thomas Martin, who had been kind to him in prison and had more recently committed the humane crime of giving sweet biscuits to a child prisoner. In the letter Wilde moves from the treatment of Martin to the treatment of children to the treatment of the insane and those who become insane in prison. The suffering of prisoners in general is exemplified by the special case of a half-witted soldier named Prince.

Prince is not unique; he is a representative sufferer, an exaggerated version of what happens to all prisoners. "This young man struck me as being more than usually half-witted on account of his silly grin and idiotic laughter to himself." In the exercise yard he "used to walk around crying or laughing." The warders assume he is shamming madness and punish him for it; as a result of flogging his condition becomes worse:

I saw the poor fellow at exercise, his weak, ugly, wretched face bloated by tears and hysteria almost beyond recognition. He walked in the centre ring along with the old men, the beggars, and the lame people, so that I was able to observe him the whole time . . . grinning like an ape, and making with his hands the most fantastic gestures, as though he was playing in the air on some invisible stringed instrument, or arranging and dealing counters in some curious game. All the while these hysterical tears, without which none of us ever saw him, were making runnels on his white swollen face. The hideous and deliberate grace of his gestures made him like an antic. He was a living grotesque. (pp. 568-74)

Wilde reminds his audience that this particular cruelty is "inseparable from a cruel system." For the many, Prince is a representative sufferer who seems to recognize the pathos and ludicrousness of his own martyrdom with tears and laughter. Prince is, in effect, the saddest of clowns, another version of the image that Wilde made of himself in prison.

This image also presides over "The Ballad of Reading Gaol" which Wilde began a few weeks after his release and a few days after he composed the letter to the *Daily Chronicle*.¹⁰ The poem is written for the benefit of the victims described in the letter:

For they starve the little frightened child
Till it weeps both night and day;
And they scourge the weak, and flog the fool,
And gibe the old and gray,
And some grow mad, and all grow bad,
And none a word may say. (ll. 565-70)

And the prisoners at exercise are a group of grotesque clowns:

With slouch and swing around the ring
We trod the Fools' Parade . . .
And shaven head and feet of lead
Make a merry masquerade. (ll. 211-16)

Like ape or clown, in monstrous garb
With crooked arrows starred . . . (ll. 433-34)

The "Ballad" tells the story of a specific victim, a soldier condemned to hang for the murder of his lover. This representative sufferer is associated with Christ; the ugly mud and sand on his grave remind the prisoners "that God's Son died for all." And like Christ this martyr is subjected to ridicule:

They stripped him of his canvas clothes,
And gave him to the flies;
They mocked the swollen purple throat,
And the stark and staring eyes;
And with laughter loud they heaped the shroud
In which their convict lies. (ll. 517-23)

This is one "whom Christ came down to save."

How else but through a broken heart
May Lord Christ enter in? (ll. 617-18)

This, then, is the fate of the "zanies of sorrow," the "clowns with broken hearts."

Wilde once said with what his enemies would call characteristic pomposity and imprecision, "I was one who stood in symbolic relations to the art and culture of my age" (p. 473). The basis for this relation was his somewhat labored individualism which frequently depended on conduct that would make enemies. The very phrase about his "symbolic relations" is calculated to separate him from the "age." Many of his efforts at separation strike his judges as pompous, derivative, or just silly. His greatest enemies are often sincere defenders of individual liberty. To them Wilde is an apostate because he was willing to be many individuals and to put the characters on parade. He said many things that he did not believe or that his audience could not believe that he believed. The most common response by the straight men in his critical dialogues recurs throughout

6. Wilde may have known Baudelaire's prose-poem, "Une Mort Héroïque," that describes the execution of a jester on stage. The speaker of the poem senses a mingling of "les rayons de l'Art et la gloire du Martyre" in the last performance of the clown (*Oeuvres Complètes de Baudelaire* [Paris, 1961], p. 271). Wilde asked that *Les Fleurs du Mal* be sent to him in prison, and he notes that the soul of Christ is present in

1955), pp. 135-39.

10. Wilde was dismissed from Reading on May 18, 1897; Warder Martin, dismissed several days later, wrote a letter of explanation that appeared in the *Daily Chronicle* on May 24.

Wilde's letter was published on May 28, and by June 1 he had begun the poem (letter to Robert Ross in *Letters*, p. 586).

Dorian Gray: "I don't believe that, Harry, and I don't believe you do either."¹¹ He was insincere, and he knew that insincerity would be unforgivable. "You must not be frightened by words, Ernest," he writes to the incredulous auditor in "The Critic as Artist." "What people call insincerity is simply a method by which we can multiply our personalities."¹² This multiplication was a way that he could maintain his freedom in a society that expected consistency and would thereby imprison a man within the limits of his own character if he was foolish enough to allow it.

But the folly turned out to be Wilde's; his most stunning performance landed him in jail. In real confinement his relation with the "age" became something more than symbolic, and the question of individual freedom more than metaphoric. He had said that the artist and individualist might even be free in prison, and now he had to endure the

test of that notion. He had seen freedom as a theatrical multiplication of personality. The theatrical image includes a happy mingling of art and life, variety and coherence, but some of the basic requirements for this accommodating image are lost in prison. The prisoner is withdrawn from an audience; he is constrained to wear one dreary costume; he is not free to change character nightly. In writing the long letter to Alfred Douglas, Wilde found a key. On the blue prison paper he made a stage; in solitary confinement he made an audience, wrote a script, and performed his new self. It was the prisoner in the guise of the martyred clown rather than the dandaical playwright who would finally define Wilde's relation to the age. I use the word "guise" with the respect that Wilde himself reserved for theatrical language. For it was in prison that the author of "The Truth of Masks" found a true mask.

University of Washington

On Some Aspects of the Comic in *Great Expectations*

Henri Talon

CRITICS HAVE FAILED to do justice to the comic in *Great Expectations* in spite of its importance in close association with the "tragic"; for "the pivot on which the story" turns, as Dickens wrote to John Forster, is "the grotesque tragic-comic conception that first encouraged me." "You will not have to complain," he added, "of the want of humour, as in the *Tale of Two Cities*."¹

My purpose in this paper is not to study all the aspects of the comic in the novel, but only the forms it assumes when Pip smiles at himself or when, making fun of others, his mockery reverberates upon him so that he is always in focus and appears sometimes a little ridiculous or blamable. Since *Great Expectations* is supposed to be an autobiography, Pip, as historian of his own life, gives the lie to Bergson who asserts that however "interested a dramatist may be in the comic features of human nature, he will hardly go, I imagine, to the extent of trying to discover his own. Besides, he would not find them; for we are never ridiculous except in some point that remains hidden from our consciousness."²

Bergson is mistaken. To become aware and make fun of one's foibles and other comic features is not unusual. At any rate, Pip often sees himself, as Yorick does, "in the true point of ridicule." The detachment that comic observation demands comes not only of the lapse of time but of the maturity and inner poise that the narrator has achieved at the time he is writing. Because he has outgrown his past errors he can speak about them. "The singular kind of quarrel" with himself that he carried on for years is over and done with. He can well remember the feeling of guilt that long burdened his conscience, but he has forgiven himself. Without peace of mind, self-criticism gives rise not to laughter but to the wry smile of a grating irony that does not belong to the realms of comedy. Pip's clear-sighted sympathy for himself is a form of wisdom and gives his humor its distinctive quality. It is a question not of leniency toward one's mistakes but of self-understanding.

In the *Kritik der Urteilskraft*, Kant says that laughter conveys a sense of physical well-being and health, and

therefore is, like hope and sleep according to Voltaire, one of the favors bestowed on us by Heaven to counterweigh the many sorrows of life.³ As for Pip's self-mockery, it testifies to his health too — moral health, the integration of personality he has finally achieved. And thus his attitude qualifies Meredith's over-confident assertion that it is "unwholesome for men and women to see themselves as they are, if they are no better than they should be; and they will not, when they have improved in manners, care much to see themselves as they once were."⁴

First and foremost, Pip's humorous self-portrait evinces his belated self-knowledge. He was ridiculous because of his illusions and comparative self-ignorance. As though wearing the ring of Gyges with reverse effect, he was invisible to himself. But as the narrator breaks that spell, he can smile. The comic follows in the wake of his self-discovery. It is linked to the progress of memory and intelligence in search of truth. He smiles as he judges his past mistakes by his present practical and ethical standards. His self-criticism is that of a man who, after trial and suffering, has ordered his life and views past disorders in the perspective afforded by his moral and intellectual growth. And thus, whether humorous or ironical, the comic that Pip achieves at his own cost is a counterpoint to the tragic in his story. It is a comic that, as Meredith might have put it, smiles through the mind, for the mind directs it, but it is a mind listening to the heart. And thus, before he finds any serious mistakes to mock, the narrator, at once a little moved and very much amused, smiles at the harmless delusions of innocence.

The first instance of this occurs early when he remembers how, wandering alone in the village churchyard, he derived an idea of what his parents were like from the inscriptions on their tombs, and to "five little stone lozenges, each about a foot and a half long, which were arranged in a neat row beside their grave, and were sacred to the memory of five little brothers of mine . . . I am indebted for a belief I religiously entertained that they had all been born on their backs with their hands in their trousers-pockets, and had never taken them out in this state of existence" (Ch. 1).

In this passage, the comic is inherent in the very vision of the child who is ignorant of the adult's criteria of knowledge. Here incongruity hovers over the border-line of poetry. It is also the child's ignorance of our norms of judgment that calls the writer's smile as he remembers his fright at the convict's extravagant threats. We always laugh when we are made to realize how different the child's world is from ours. For instance, Pip remembers Mr. Hubble "with his legs extraordinarily wide apart: so

that in my short days I always saw some miles of open country between them when I met him coming up the lane" (Ch. 4). No doubt Pip exaggerates a little, but he reminds us nonetheless that our ways of looking at things are not exclusive and normative as we tend to imagine with unconscious pretentiousness. Indeed, humor might well start reflections on cognitive processes that would make philosophers of us all!

Fun blends with emotion when Pip tells us what it meant to be "brought up by hand" by a shrew: "my sister must have had some general idea that I was a young offender whom an Accoucheur Policeman had taken up (on my birthday) and delivered over to her, to be dealt with according to the outraged majesty of the law. I was always treated as if I had insisted on being born, in opposition to the dictates of reason, religion, and morality and against the dissuading arguments of my best friends" (Ch. 4). The passage suggests why Dickens decided that his narrator would have to be a humorist. He must hasten to laugh so as not to feel pain as he turns his look toward the little brat who was constantly bullied by Mrs. Joe, Pumblechook, and other cruel fools.

Plato who was very much aware of the paradox in the comic experience that blends pleasure with pain, compared it to relieving an itch by scratching.⁵ But is this true? To scratch an itch chafes rather than allays irritation, and Pip manages to rub old wounds without injuring himself anew. The moment he begins to see the fun in a painful situation there disappears the sadness so often perceptible in his tone. So to imagine a policeman skilled in obstetrics and the child's birth as the result of a culpable stubbornness is very droll because the narrator, far from contradicting Mrs. Joe's point of view, writes as if he accepted it; he pretends to believe that the ways of nature are "unnatural," thereby laying emphasis on the abnormality of a woman who can wish a child dead as his sister did. Humor stresses the child's right to live and be loved.

The comic of Pip's lying to his bullies when he returns from his first visit to Satis House springs from his unexpected revenge upon them. It is always amusing to witness the overthrow of established order in an unjust world. The physical incongruity in the defeat of strong and malicious grown-ups by a weak and presumably helpless little boy is made more funny by the moral congruity of his victory. This congruence, lying as it were at the core of incongruence, gives to the comic a truly happy resonance.

It is already amusing to see a termagant plying with questions a child she had sharply rebuked when he presumed to ask the meaning of a word and other information.

11. *Dorian Gray*, pp. 19, 23, 137.
12. *The Artist as Critic*, p. 393.

1. *The Life of Charles Dickens*, ed. A. J. Hoppé (Everyman, 1966), II, 285.
2. *Laughter, in Comedy* (New York, 1956), p. 169.

3. A. Philonenko, ed. (Paris, 1965), Bk. II, Sec. 54 (this number is not given by Kant), p. 160.

4. *An Essay on Comedy*, in *Comedy*, p. 9.
5. *Philèbe*, "Les Belles Lettres" (Paris, 1959), 46d, p. 60.

"Drat the boy! . . . What a questioner he is. Ask no questions and you'll be told no lies" (Ch. 2). Now it is she who wants to know and is made to swallow lies that might be said to be, like some words, a yard long. This is an instance of the comic resulting from what Bergson calls inversion or topsy-turvydom; but it is exceptionally effective here because the protagonist's mendacity expresses his sense of wonder. And thus Pip's mystification of his sister and uncle is more than a revenge upon them; it is also the triumph of the poetic over the arithmetical vision of life exemplified by Pumblechook. The corn-chandler who excels in converting pence into pounds and vice versa is "berné, moqué, joué," as La Fontaine would have said, by an urchin unskillful in mental arithmetic but endowed with imagination. Thus Pip asserts that he saw a black velvet coach in Miss Havisham's room, as well as four dogs fighting for veal cutlets out of a silver basket, and cake on gold plates. Pip stands in front of the grown-ups as the child privileged to have seen what they cannot even imagine. His fairy world is the negation of the cruel daily world he abhors, and, as he dreams aloud, his feeling of inferiority vanishes.

Of course Pip was unconscious of the comic inherent in his lies. But how the narrator relishes it as he looks back to the scene, combining the detachment of an outward observer with inner understanding. As for the boy, on that memorable day he could only enjoy his own wonderment and the pleasure of a victory soon tarnished by remorse at having cheated his dear old Joe too.

The reader, too, may smile as he sees in Pip's lies a paradoxical form of innocence. No adult would have dared to lie so. It is only when he was about to harness four richly caparisoned horses that Pip got suddenly afraid of going too far. This passage affords even greater pleasure to anyone who, as he reads it, remembers Kant's analysis of childish guilelessness. As an example, Kant mentions the little boy who speaks the truth when we expect a polite fib. Whatever our ostensible embarrassment, we laugh inwardly, say, when the child tells his miserly godfather that the toy he gave him is no good. "Naïveté," Kant writes, "associates two feelings: the straightforwardness, which was originally natural in Man, explodes and shatters the art of pretending which has become a second nature."⁶ The philosopher who speaks so gravely of the original straightforwardness of Man did not know children as well as Dickens, whose Pip shows brilliantly that the art of pretending is not a second nature but rather a first habit.

Before I leave the province of that comic which rises from the narrator's memories as he smiles at the pranks and harmless mistakes of his early boyhood, I should like

to say a few words — because the climate in the humorist's soul is the same — about his affectionate mockery of his only close friend at this unhappy period, Joe Gargery.

Joe's awkwardness is a constant source of fun, and his incongruity in his Sunday best at Satis House is rendered with a verbal felicitousness that sets off the acuity of Pip's observation in such a way that humor seems to be at once found and made, combining the alertness of the child who overlooked no detail and the narrator's mastery of language. "I could hardly have imagined dear old Joe looking so unlike himself or so like some extraordinary bird; standing, as he did, speechless, with his tuft of feathers ruffled and his mouth open as if he wanted a worm" (Ch. 13). Through the magic of words, the annoyance experienced by Pip ("It was very aggravating, but throughout the interview Joe persisted in addressing Me instead of Miss Havisham") is turned into fun; but it is fun touched with kindness, for the narrator understands the delicacy of feeling that motivated Joe's strange deportment. Joe was reluctant to make a bargain over what was, and should have remained, private. He had always taken it for granted that the child who was both son and friend would stay at the forge and learn the trade. "And there weren't no objection on your part, and Pip it were the great wish of your hart!"

The many readers who complain that Joe does not come to life are guilty of a confusion that both McTaggart and Gilson⁷ have exposed: they fail to distinguish a character's being from existential credibility. Joe's being asserts itself with a vengeance in this scene as in several others, for instance during his visit to Barnard's Inn.

With his good honest face all glowing and shining and his hat put down on the floor between us, he caught up both my hands and worked them straight up and down, as if I had been the last-patented Pump.

"I am glad to see you, Joe. Give me your hat." But Joe, taking it carefully with both hands, like a bird's nest with eggs in it, wouldn't hear of parting with that piece of property, and persisted in talking over it in a most uncomfortable way. (Ch. 27)

We smile at Joe's awkwardness because it introduces in his behavior that mechanical element that Bergson regards as the main spring of comedy. Outside his forge Joe seems to be hampered by his body, and this is always funny; but whereas a man's clumsiness generally awakens in the onlooker a Hobbesian sense of superiority, Joe's gaucherie makes us laugh without giving rise to contempt, because the narrator reminds us of his kindness even when he makes fun of him. He seems to draw our attention almost exclusively to the artisan's gawkiness and yet he cunningly succeeds in stressing his moral worth. Moreover, gestures —

shaking Pip's hands repeatedly, handling one's hat as if it were glass — do not make us forget action, in this case a visit to London prompted by faithfulness and affection. Let me quote Bergson once again: "Gesture slips out unawares, it is automatic. In action the entire person is engaged . . . and here is the essential point — action is in exact proportion to the feeling that inspires it: the one gradually passes into the other, so that we may allow our sympathy or our aversion to glide along the line running from feeling to action and become increasingly interested."⁸

If Pip laughed at the vanity and illusions of others without first laughing at his own, his mockery would not have the same amplitude. But his humour is, so to speak, both immanent and transcendent: on the one hand, it is an intimate process, the result of an inner dichotomy, the critical examination of the self in the past by the self in the present. On the other hand, it is directed outward, it opens up a perspective enabling us to survey, from afar and aloft, a vast human panorama and to perceive the kinship — through self-ignorance and pretentiousness — of characters who otherwise differ from one another. As Pip shows some of the amusing aspects of vanity and delusion, we are made to realize that they are innate, like egoism, and indeed more difficult to conquer.

Great Expectations exemplifies in its way, the three human illusions to which Socrates draws the attention of Protarques in *Philebus*. First, he mentions those men "who believe themselves to be more wealthy than they are," then those who think they are taller and better-looking than is the case, and finally — and this is the larger group and the major delusion — "those whose ignorance concerns moral qualities and who believe that they are virtuous although they are not."⁹ Pip laughs good-humoredly at his vanity, rather sadly at some of his false beliefs, and not at all at his major illusions. His comic modulates from downright gaiety to amusement with melancholy overtones. Humor and irony have both a major and a minor key.

To expose and deflate the protagonist's pretention is both a question of clear-sightedness and verbal virtuosity. Two or three incisive words are enough to prick the swelling of the head as one would a balloon. Soon after learning about his great expectations, Pip affects philanthropy: "I promised myself that I would do something for [the villagers] one of these days, and formed a plan in outline for bestowing a dinner of roast-beef and plum pudding, a pint of ale, and a gallon of condescension, upon everybody in the village" (Ch. 19).

The sudden shift from the dishes of the feast to the host's complacency is the more amusing because the modest

ration of ale he is ready to supply sets off his superabounding patronage. But the humorous passage also reveals one of Pip's moral delusions. As he is fundamentally decent, he is always uneasy about his conduct, and must believe himself a better person than he is. There is something genuine in his ineffectual impulse of generosity, but even generosity can be turned into food for a boy's — or a man's — vanity. Here vanity is just beginning to appear for what it is all through the novel: scarcely a vice, yet capable of debasing character. Dickens' comic is the child of moral aspiration. It laughs not only at deviations from usual ethical and reasonable standards but occasionally at deviations from the ideal norms of Utopia.

Another instance of an amusing generous velleity is to be found when Pip pompously tells Biddy that he hopes "to remove Joe into a higher sphere." Again he is trying to relieve his guilty conscience through self-deceit. ("All other swindlers are nothing to self-swindlers" [Ch. 28].) But Biddy, who sees through him and is not to be taken in by fine words, replies that "Joe may be too proud to let any one take him out of a place that he is competent to fill." This is a shock to Pip's smugness and, losing all sense of ridicule, he puts on airs and looks like the picture of offended Virtue. He taxes Biddy with envy and "in a virtuous and superior tone," says he is sorry to see in her "a bad side of human nature" (Ch. 19). The comic lies at once in Pip's attitude and in his tone. Both are incongruous because Biddy is a friend and because she is right, as Pip knows at bottom and refuses to acknowledge.

The same intellectual dishonesty is exposed and laughed at when, after his sister's death, Pip says to Biddy: "I shall be often down here now. I am not going to leave poor Joe alone." Silent at first, but requested to answer, Biddy utters such a dubious "Yes" that Pip gets angry. Again he betrays his *mauvaise foi* through his "virtuously self-asserting manner" (Ch. 35).

This delightfully humorous scene helps us to qualify the narrator's earlier statement about self-swindlers. What distinguishes them from other swindlers is their bad luck. They never manage to deceive themselves for long convincingly. What honesty there still is in them at once urges them to self-deception and makes it impossible for them to succeed. The narrator realizes that to speak the truth is, after all, both easier and better. Humorously he reminds us of it, for one of the characteristics of the obvious is that we are only too apt to forget it.

Thus man's major delusion in Plato's view — the moral delusion — stares the narrator in the face, but he has no occasion to write about the second delusion on Plato's list, for Pip never thought of himself as more personable than

6. Kant, p. 161.

7. See Etienne Gilson, *L'être et l'essence* (Paris, 1962), p. 235.

8. Bergson, p. 153.

9. *Philebus*, 48e, pp. 63-64.

he was; however he was naïve and pretentious enough to believe that if the cowl does not make the monk, the tailor-made suit makes the gentleman and, moreover, is such an unmistakable sign of fortune that he who runs may see. Pip's illusions fit each other like nested tables.

But, as he mocks himself, the narrator is inevitably led to deride those who instilled erroneous ideas into him. Thus the comic enlarges its compass and satire becomes more severe. To remain within the limits I have set to myself and therefore keep Pip in focus, I only wish to show how, in scoffing at Pip's elders, the narrator also makes the boy look slightly ridiculous. For instance, as we watch Mr. Trabb, the tailor, respectfully bending his body, opening his arms, touching the young gentleman's elbows, in short, gesticulating like the flunkey in a puppet-show, something like the image of a doll comes into our mind as we look at Pip himself. This is the harmless, amusing form of a theme whose development is mostly dramatic: the reification of human beings. "So, Mr. Trabb measured and calculated me in the parlour as if I were an estate and he the finest species of surveyor" (Ch. 19).

Pumblechook looks even more like an automaton, a piece of clockwork, the hypertrophic toady, a more ludicrous version of the caricatural tailor, as he shakes Pip's hands again and again and, parrot-like, asks him repeatedly if he may. Pumblechook's abjectness is repulsive as ever, but Pip is trivialized both by the mechanical handshake and by the fawning he is powerless to check. Flattery enslaves both the flatterer and the person he flatters.

Because we can laugh at both Pumblechook and Pip at the same time, the comic of this scene leaves no bitter aftertaste. The selfish, hypocritical corn-chandler is badly mauled, while the swollen-headed but kindhearted boy escapes practically uninjured. Vice is fustigated; human nature is spared.

As I have said before, Pip smiles occasionally at some of his major delusions with melancholy irony, but the great ironies of his life, those which express his vision of life, and therefore his philosophy, are among the tragic data Dickens alluded to in his letter to John Forster. They fall outside the scope of this paper, and I can examine only such ironies as still belong to the realm of the comic if only, as it were, to the march-lands of this realm.

Whether or not he has the heart to smile at his own illusions, Pip sees illusion as omnipresent in things human, and mostly in hope. Of hope, looked upon by so many as the inspiration of life, he might have said, like Bossuet in his *Sermon sur l'impénitence finale*, that it is a long chain which "we always drag along behind us." When, commenting upon his first visit to Satis House, Pip compares man's life to "a long chain of iron or gold, thorns or flowers," repeating the disjunctive conjunction twice to emphasize

the either/or character of Fate, then it is evident that he thinks his own iron chain was wrought in that mansion, because of the hopes it gave rise to and that he cherished so blindly and so long (Ch. 9). As for the reader, he may well smile as he becomes aware of another irony; it lies in the narrator's partial misunderstanding of facts and, therefore, ultimate delusion: he still regards determinism as a steady flow that nothing can stop or turn aside, whereas his story makes clear that man's will plays a part in man's fate and that life is not all iron or gold but rather a strand of both metals twisted together.

The narrator gives a faint smile when he tells how Pip took leave of Miss Havisham who, well-informed about his great expectations, makes game of him in order to hurt Sarah Pocket. All that we know about the recluse of Satis House and the mean and morbid enjoyment she betrays at the sight of her kinswoman's jealousy, makes us uncomfortable. But, ironically, Pip who had often heard his sister and uncle declare that Miss Havisham would make his fortune — indeed he had already received some tokens of her friendship — could not but look upon her as his anonymous benefactor. Ironically, it was "natural" enough that a romantic, visionary boy should take a woman who looked like a witch for a fairy god-mother.

All this the narrator understands and smiles at; but the last irony of the scene is perceptible to the reader alone as he gets the impression that the middle-aged autobiographer is still puzzled by the boy he was and indeed is taken in by him, for he finds natural Pip's gallantry which strikes the reader as childish play-acting. Indeed Pip must have fancied that he was behaving like "the young Knight of romance" as he went down on his knee and put Miss Havisham's hand to his lips.

But the narrator admirably conveys the irony of Fortune, the ambivalence of luck as experienced by the boy who, from the beginning, found more pain than pleasure in his great expectations, "feeling it very sorrowful and strange that the first night of my bright fortunes should be the loneliest I had ever known" (Ch. 18). Young Pip still wishes to attain the dazzling life he has so long yearned for, yet he is afraid of it, so that the future casts a shadow on the present. As a rule, hope is actually the happiness of the present hour since it consists in thinking of time to come with delight. But, for Pip, hope is present anxiety unaware of what it fears. Of all this the narrator can smile for he remembers how his complacency still asserted itself even through his uneasiness: "I dressed myself out in my new clothes for their delight, and sat in my splendour until bed time" (Ch. 19).

He can also smile for an instant at the part he imagined he was destined to play both as Miss Havisham's protégé and Estella's lover, but his smile fades as he remembers the

intensity of his love. Though he begins by deriding the young man who fancied he was meant to "restore the desolate house" and "do all the shining deeds of the Young Knight of romance," his tone suddenly becomes strident as he confesses: "I loved her against reason, against promise, against peace, against hope, against happiness, against all discouragement that could be" (Ch. 29).

It is practically impossible for the narrator to speak of his love with light irony. He knows that it was excessive, but to him, even after all these years, excess is the expression of a soul that burns more fiercely than others; unreason may be deplored, not laughed at.

However, he smiles happily at least once, on remember-

A Missing Childhood in *Hard Times*

Edward Hurley

THE FACTS ABOUT *Hard Times* seem plain enough but the critics cannot agree on their value as fancy. F. R. Leavis points to Dickens' fanciful use of facts to achieve a notable moral purpose and so accounts for the book's continuing popularity. The anti-Leavis critics argue that the facts are barren, the moral is simplistic, and the popularity is a fad created by Mr. Leavis.¹ If this evaluative argument has reached a stand-off, then perhaps a new reading of the facts may provide a new basis for evaluation of the fancy.

In the novel's terms, fact is equated with reality, reason, time, and adulthood. Fancy is equated with pleasure, the imagination, the timeless dream, and childhood. The two are mutually incompatible, destroying or excluding each other. Gradgrind, the fact man, "seemed a kind of cannon loaded to the muzzle with facts and prepared to blow [the children] clean out of the regions of childhood at one discharge. He seemed a galvanizing apparatus, too, charged with a grim mechanical substitute for the tender young imaginations that were to be stormed away."² In fancy's terms, he is an Ogre, "taking childhood captive" (I, iii, 7). Even without a Gradgrind, the world of reality tends to destroy fancy and childhood. In it, time, "the great manu-

ing how surprised he was when Herbert, to whom he had confessed his love for Estella, answered that he had always known about it. "How do you know it?" asked Pip, "I never told you." Laughingly his friend exclaims: "Told me! You have never told me when you have got your hair cut, but I have senses to perceive it. You have always adored her, ever since I have known you. You brought your adoration and your portmanteau here together" (Ch. 30). And thus is illustrated one of love's harmless delusions that Martial sums up, tersely but with less fun, *Dum tacet hanc loquitur*.

Université de Dijon

facturer" (I, xiv, 69), forces children to grow up. Thus time is associated with fact and factories. "Time went on in Coketown like its own machinery: so much material wrought up, so much fuel consumed, so many powers worn out, so much money made" (I, xiv, 69). In the midst of this grim, real, adult world, the only comforts are the remnants of childhood. "The dreams of childhood — its airy fables; its graceful, beautiful, humane, impossible adornments of the world beyond; so good to be believed in once, so good to be remembered when outgrown, for then the least among them rises to the stature of a great Charity in the heart, suffering little children to come into the midst of it, and to keep with their pure hands a garden in the stony ways of this world, wherein it were better for all the children of Adam that they should oftener sun themselves, simple and trustful, and not worldly-wise . . ." (II, ix, 151).

Thus like many of Dickens' novels, *Hard Times* is about the danger of childhood being destroyed by adults and the world of reality they have created — a theme that appears as early as *Oliver Twist*. Accordingly, Dickens gives us the adult reality for everyone and the childhood histories for Sissy, Louisa, and Tom, with a manufactured childhood

1. George Ford and Sylvere Monod have provided a judicious sampling of the two views in their edition of *Hard Times* (New York, 1966). After a period in which the anti-Leavis critics, led by John Holloway, have dominated, the Leavis position is again winning support. Robin Gilmour ("The Gradgrind School: Political Economy in the Classroom," *VS*, XI [1967], 207-24) argues, against Holloway, that Dickens did catch the spirit of a real and important "practical

utilitarianism" prominent in the age. His article is necessarily concerned mostly with external evidence and unfortunately does not counter the argument that even if Gradgrindian schools and theory did exist, their representation in the novel is not significant or successful.

2. Bk. I, Chap. ii, p. 2. This and all subsequent references to *Hard Times* are from the Ford and Monod text.

for Bounderby. But surprisingly we have no childhood for Stephen, his wife, or Rachael. If, as is usual in Dickens, the child is father to the man, this is particularly a problem with Stephen, since he is the novel's "tragic" hero. He carries the heaviest of the adult burdens without the corresponding childhood dilemmas of the other characters. The measure of this hiatus might be taken by examining the other childhood histories in the novel. The problems of Sissy, Louisa, Tom, and Bounderby in turn will eventually provide a context within which to understand Stephen.

In *Hard Times* childhood is repressed and the children are without parents figuratively or literally. Sissy is abandoned by her father and when Gradgrind takes her in, it is to educate her out of her childhood, the world of fancy and the circus. As he says to her, "From this time you begin your history" (I, vii, 36). Sissy proves impervious to this indoctrination, apparently because her childhood had already fully developed. It makes her into a human being and late in the novel gives her powers and capacities no one else in Coketown enjoys.

But Louisa has never had a childhood. She says to her father, "You have been so careful of me, that I never had a child's heart. You have trained me so well, that I never dreamed a child's dream. You have dealt so wisely with me, father, from my cradle to this hour, that I never had a child's belief or a child's fear" (I, xv, 78). Louisa is meant to be a parallel to Sissy, with all her potential but repressed and undeveloped. "Yet, struggling through the dissatisfaction of her face, there was a light with nothing to rest upon, a fire with nothing to burn, a starved imagination keeping life in itself somehow, which brightened its expression" (I, iii, 10). She is also analogous with Coketown, the social unit which has been repressed and allowed no fanciful development. Louisa draws the comparison for her father: "There seems to be nothing there but languid and monotonous smoke. Yet when the night comes, Fire bursts out, father!" (I, xv, 76).

The fire bursts forth in Louisa on the night Harthouse attempts the seduction. But before that the embers had glimmered in strange ways, masked and frustrated by repression. Her love and the love surrounding her is never direct, never whole. When she is twenty years old, she marries Bounderby, a man of fifty, closely associated with her father as "bosom friend" and just "a year or two younger" than Gradgrind. Mrs. Sparsit sarcastically comments to Bounderby, "You are quite another father to Louisa, Sir" (I, vii, 34). But this marriage with the father figure is further twisted since it is made not for love of

father or Bounderby but because of love for Tom. He in turn uses her love for him to promote his narcissism, and finally Harthouse uses her love for Tom to make her love him. As Daniel P. Deneau has pointed out, the climax of Louisa's diverted love is not in the scene with Harthouse but the remarkable scene in Tom's bedchamber in Book II, Chapter viii.³ The scene is explicitly sexual. "She kneeled down beside it [Tom's bed], passed her arm over his neck, and drew his face to hers. . . . She laid her head down on his pillow, and her hair flowed over him as if she would hide him from every one but herself. . . . 'As you lie here alone, my dear, in the melancholy night, so you must lie somewhere one night, when even I, if I am living then, shall have left you. As I am here beside you, barefoot, unclothed, undistinguishable in darkness, so must I lie through all the night of my decay, until I am dust. . . . You may be certain,' in the energy of her love she took him to her bosom as if he were a child, 'that I will not reproach you'" (II, viii, 145). The conversation is supposedly about the recent bank robbery, but the incestuous implications are overwhelming. Mr. Deneau calls it a seduction scene, where Louisa wants to share "a secret about a dark matter, a not-to-be revealed crime." As even Mr. Gradgrind comes to explain it, Louisa's childhood qualities have been "a little perverted" (III, iii, 183). The fire of childhood has become the adult sexual passion, repressed, turned in upon itself, perversely manipulated by everyone around her, directed toward a quasi-father, and most of all incestuously directed toward her brother.⁴

Sissy's childhood is developed, Louisa's perverted, but Bounderby's, energy and all, is annihilated and a fiction substituted. In effect Bounderby destroys his real mother and creates instead one who abandons him to a profligate and drunken grandmother, "the wickedest and worst old woman that ever lived" (I, iv, 12). Bounderby becomes an entirely self-made man, without any ties, debts, or love for his mother. Where he and Gradgrind destroy others' young lives, Bounderby has tried to destroy his own childhood and thus made himself the most flagrant public hypocrite in the novel. In the eyes of the reader and the public he is almost no one, since the childhood and history out of which he created himself do not exist. But childhood cannot be repressed forever. The mother keeps returning, year after year. Unwittingly she is finally brought into the open and the child's true feelings toward her are revealed.

Strangely, Bounderby provides the first link between these characters and Stephen. Like Bounderby, Stephen has no childhood and his wife is very similar to Bounderby's

fictitious grandmother. Thus two polar characters become associated by an unlikely pair of coincidences. This strange identification can be explained in the light of Stephen's other relationships, which will likewise show the parallel with Louisa's repressed and incestuous past and the contrast to Sissy's open childhood.

The earliest event we know in Stephen's life is his marriage when he is twenty-one and his bride twenty. In the biblical analogy that runs throughout the book she is Leah, paired with Rachael. Rachael tells us that the two were closely identified; "she worked with me when we were girls both, and . . . you courted her and married her when I was her friend . . ." (I, xiii, 64). Rachael is the younger of the two, and like Jacob, Stephen makes the mistake of marrying the older. According to an old Dickens pattern they are the two versions of the one woman. At one pole is the evil, fallen woman, and at the other, the good angel. Together they make up two sides of the familiar composite character that Dickens often uses, putting the good part in one character and the evil in another.

The novel opens about nineteen years after the marriage when Stephen is forty and Rachael thirty-five. But Stephen, unlike Rachael, refuses to acknowledge the passage of Time, the "great manufacturer." "No, Rachael, thou'rt as young as ever thou wast.' 'One of us would be puzzled how to get old, Stephen, without 'other getting so too, both being alive,' she answered, laughing" (I, x, 50). Also unwilling to recognize the world of Victorian reality as Bounderby outlines it to him, he wants to return to his youth and marry Rachael, the good young girl, instead of his wife, the older evil girl. Bounderby, in the inexorable Gradgrindian spirit, says this is an impossible fantasy. Then, in the presence of both women, Stephen has a remarkable dream, overlooked in almost every analysis of the novel.

He thought that he, and some one on whom his heart had long been set — but she was not Rachael, and that surprised him, even in the midst of his imaginary happiness — stood in the church being married. While the ceremony was performing, and while he recognized among the witnesses some whom he knew to be living, and many whom he knew to be dead, darkness came on, succeeded by the shining of a tremendous light. It broke from one line in the table of commandments at the altar, and illuminated the building with the words. They were sounded through the church, too, as if there were voices in the fiery letters. Upon this, the whole appearance before him and around him changed, and nothing was left as it had been, but himself and the clergyman. They stood in the daylight before a crowd so vast, that if all the people in the

world could have been brought together into one space, they could not have looked, he thought, more numerous; and they all abhorred him, and there was not one pitying or friendly eye among the millions that were fastened on his face. He stood on a raised stage, under his own loom; and, looking up at the shape the loom took, and hearing the burial service distinctly read, he knew that he was there to suffer death. In an instant what he stood on fell below him, and he was gone. (I, xiii, 65-66)

There are three important features of the dream only implicitly identified: the girl he is marrying, the commandment that shines, and the reason for the punishment. The girl is his wife, the commandment is the fifth, Thou Shalt Not Kill, and the punishment is for wanting to kill her. Each of these explanations is only partial. If he hates his wife and wants to kill her, why should he construct a dream, a wish fulfillment, in which he is happily marrying her all over again? As Stephen says, it surprises even him. And if the commandment is the fifth, why does it shine out at this moment and cause such havoc? In the dream Stephen is twenty-one, very happy, and with no thought or reason to kill. And, finally, even if he does desire to kill her, why the extravagant reaction to a mere wish, so that the entire world "abhorred" him? The punishment does not fit the crime; it is excessive for even real wife-murder, much less imaginary desires for wife-murder. The dream is contradictory and unintelligible under these explanations.

Dickens himself provides some help through a letter he wrote on dreams in February 1851, three years before *Hard Times*: "I would suggest that the influence of the day's occurrences and of recent events is by no means so great (generally speaking) as is usually supposed. . . . My own dreams are usually of twenty years ago. I often blend my present position with them, but very confusedly, whereas my life of twenty years ago is very distinctly represented. . . . I should say the chances were a thousand to one against anybody's dreaming of the subject closely occupying the waking mind — except — and this I wish particularly to suggest to you — in a sort of allegorical manner."⁵ Thus Stephen's dream is appropriately set twenty years ago and the chances are "a thousand to one" against its dealing with his immediately preceding waking desire to kill his wife, unless this were treated in a "sort of allegorical manner." But if the commandment shining out is the fifth, then the treatment is hardly allegorical so much as direct representation of the forbidden wish. Thus the dream deals with an unnamed wish that began twenty years ago, the condemnation of which is represented allegorically in the glare of an unspecified commandment.

3. "The Brother-Sister Relationship in *Hard Times*," reprinted in Ford and Monod, pp. 372-77.

4. Mark Spilka has pointed out similar incestuous brother-sister

relationships in Dickens: David Copperfield for his "sister," Agnes, and Paul Dombey for his sister, Florence. *Dickens and Kafka* (Bloomington, 1963), pp. 50-53.

5. *The Letters of Charles Dickens*, ed. Walter Dexter (Bloomsbury, 1938), II, 267-68.

Secondly, Dickens argues that dreams do not substantially differ from person to person but have "a remarkable sameness in them,"⁶ a point he repeats in an article written for *Household Words* in October 1852.⁷ There he comments that he, Queen Victoria, and "Winking Charley, a sturdy vagrant, in one of her Majesty's jails" may all have the same dream. Also "it is probable that we have all three committed murders and hidden bodies."⁸ Warrington Winters comments, "Here he does indeed tell us that the virtuous may commit crimes while they sleep, and suffer for them. . . ."⁹ Dickens therefore argues that dreams deal with universal topics and wishes, common to all men, and may include universal crimes, committed in imagination but still to be atoned for.

To reinterpret the dream, then, let us bring together this information, the axioms the novel has established about the child-adult relationship, and the ways in which other child-adults work them out. The child has an immense and potent reservoir of energy, directed toward fanciful exuberance (as in the circus). If allowed scope up to, say, the age of seven (as in Sissy), it may endure permanently and accomplish wonders despite all that adult reality can do to pervert it. If, however, it is repressed, it may become twisted and turn to incest (as in Louisa) or narcissism (as in Tom), instead of outward to its normal object. Another alternative is to attempt to destroy one's own childhood altogether, as does Bounderby, but thereby one also destroys oneself. The childhood will inevitably return, nonetheless, and the child's wishes toward his mother will be revealed. Stephen presumably also behaves according to these axioms and his dream tells us something about the unconscious motives behind his strange outward actions.

Stephen's waking energy, whose wellsprings must be from his childhood, is directed consciously toward attaining Rachael and unconsciously toward renewing an ideal marriage with his wife. Both are the dreams of youth since he still sees Rachael as a young girl and the fantasy marriage takes place many years previous. Moreover, the two objects are essentially two poles of one object, since we saw the identification of Rachael and his wife as the Rachael-Leah pair, the combination of angel-demon, who together make up a whole personality. But in the dream the marriage evokes universal abhorrence and punishment by death, instead of approbation of youthful ideals. The only explanation is that the Rachael-Leah combination masks yet another desire that becomes apparent in the punishment it receives. As the condemnation is universal, so must be the

sin. As the punishment is ultimate, so must be the sin. In other words, the sin is primal, in this case, incest. In desiring Rachael, Stephen idealizes her as a youthful angel, much as a child would idealize his mother. In desiring his wife, Stephen sees the other side to desire — an evil wish, which he carried out in fantasy when he married his wife. For that primal sin of incest, even though merely imaginary, Stephen pictures himself condemned by the entire world to death by hanging from his loom, the symbol of the realistic, adult, Victorian society about him that damns the sinner. Like Sissy, Stephen has an immense reservoir of childhood energy. As in Louisa and Tom, it has been repressed and perverted. Like Bounderby, he has tried to ignore it, but in the dream it returns to haunt and condemn him.

This reading of the dream makes Stephen's subsequent behavior intelligible and brings together in unity what is otherwise a divided novel.

Stephen returns to consciousness of his real environment "with this condemnation upon him, that he was never, in this world or the next, through all the unimaginable ages of eternity, to look on Rachael's face or hear her voice. Wandering to and fro, unceasingly, without hope, and in search of he knew not what (he only knew that he was doomed to seek it), he was the subject of a nameless, horrible dread, a mortal fear of one particular shape which everything took. Whatsoever he looked at, grew into that form sooner or later. The object of his miserable existence was to prevent its recognition by any one among the various people he encountered. Hopeless labour! If he led them out of rooms where it was, if he shut up drawers and closets where it stood, if he drew the curious from places where he knew it to be secreted, and got them out into the streets, the very chimneys of the mills assumed that shape, and round them was the printed word" (I, xiii, 66). He cannot look on Rachael the real woman since this is forbidden. Thus he insists she is not a flesh and blood object but an angel, therefore not sensual and so safe. He goes into exile, wandering about, in fear of "a nameless, horrible dread," the primal sin, which even now he cannot name, for its fruit is death. It must be concealed at all costs, though in his imagination it is apparent to everyone, it possesses him so thoroughly.

In the rest of the novel Dickens brilliantly portrays Stephen cooperating with his environment to work out all the ingredients of this dream, objectifying his fantasies and fears in the society about him. He is exiled apparently by

his fellow workers and Bounderby. But Stephen needlessly provokes that exile. He vows to Rachael that he will not join the workers' association, a promise she never asked for: "I didn't seek it of him, poor lad. I prayed him to avoid trouble for his own good, little thinking he'd come to it through me. But I know he'd die a hundred deaths, ere ever he'd break his word" (II, vi, 122). Stephen himself admits to his fellow workers that his abstinence has nothing to do with disapproval of their cause: "My friends, I doubt their doin' yo onny good. Licker they'll do yo hurt. . . . But 'tan't so much for that as I stands out. If that were aw, I'd coom in wi' th' rest. But I ha' my reasons — mine, yo see — for being hindered; not on'y now, but awlus — awlus — life long!" (II, iv, 108). Stephen's ostracism is thus ultimately tied to his devotion to Rachael. Again in the Biblical analogy, Stephen is the proto-martyr, bringing martyrdom on himself since it perfectly fulfills the vision he had in the dream and satisfies the punishment his continuing sense of guilt demands. Dickens describes the punishment in a scene that forcefully echoes the dream. "Thus easily did Stephen Blackpool fall into the loneliest of lives, the life of solitude among a familiar crowd. The stranger in the land who looks into ten thousand faces for some answering look and never finds it, is in cheering society as compared with him who passes ten averted faces daily, that were once the countenances of friends" (II, iv, 110).

But the punishment has not gone far enough. Stephen has now only the equivalent of universal condemnation. The death sentence has to be carried out because the nameless guilt continues. "It was even harder than he could have believed possible, to separate in his own conscience his abandonment by all his fellows from a baseless sense of shame and disgrace" (II, iv, 110). With all the naïveté of the ready victim, Stephen waits outside the bank for Tom's message. It conveniently accommodates his sense of guilt: "when the first hour was out, Stephen even began to have an uncomfortable sensation upon him of being for the time a disreputable character" (II, vi, 125). It produces further conviction of his guilt in the community and a demand for his return. Rachael sends him money to ride back, but Stephen deliberately takes the perilous, and probably longer, path across country. He knows of the abandoned pits and so takes the needless risk that ends in his death: "in an instant what he stood on fell below him, and he was gone" (I, xiii, 66). He has acted out the dream, objectified his sense of guilt, and helped bring on himself the appropriate punishment.

Yet paradoxically he has also become the martyr and proven his innocence. His guilt and need for punishment were only subjective and imaginary; but society's repression and persecution were objective and real. He was a lonely individual needing help and compassion, which the Vic-

torian Bounderby refused to understand or satisfy. Adult reality is so structured that he very easily is executed once he gets off the beaten path only slightly. The real criminal, then, is society's "muddle"; it has perverted his energy, made him feel guilty for crimes it creates for him, and then killed him for its own purposes.

The novel thus might be seen as a set of concentric circles, the first and innermost being subconscious and individual childhood, the last and outermost being conscious and social adulthood. The first premise is the boundless, mysterious energy of childhood directed imaginatively toward every object it can find for pleasure. Such energy is released objectively in the novel in the person of Sissy and Seary's circus. Unfortunately, as this energy moves outward into the real world of adulthood it meets opposition; fact tells it that only certain manifestations are acceptable. But the energy is boundless and remorseless and it will find its way out perversely even if fact ignores it. When it does so, the completely detached, unemotional, non-individual object, industrialized Victorian utilitarianism, comes down upon it with condemnation and extinction. "Reality will take a wolfish turn, and make an end of you" (II, vi, 125). Thus the disparate plots and characters — Sissy, the circus, the school, the Gradgrinds and Bounderbys, Stephen, his wife, and Rachael, Coketown, and Victorian industrialism — are brought together, each one illustrating a different facet of the common theme of childhood's confrontation with adult reality.

The outcome is not totally pessimistic, however. Stephen's aberration occupies the center of the novel, but the book begins and ends with Sissy and the circus. Sissy retains her childhood name with her childhood energy and imagination. She alone as an individual is happily married and bears children, because by a free childhood development she has "grown learned in childish lore" (III, ix, 226). And, on a social, public, and organized basis, Seary's circus and philosophy have escaped adult Victorianism. Seary recognizes the pleasure principle in his repeated "people muht be amuthed." His circus and its members represent a complete, isolated, child-like world, with all needful joys, sorrows, marriages, births, and deaths, and no factual intrusions. Through the magic of comedy it can counter the evil that adult reality sees everywhere. Seary turns the wicked Tom into a clown and counters Bitzer with a dancing horse and a trained dog. Childhood, fancy, imagination, comedy, magic win in the end and that energy that so damned Louisa and Stephen finds a satisfying and complete outlet.

In the early pages of Dickens's first novel, *Pickwick Papers*, Mr. Pickwick meets a "dismal man," constantly sad, who at one point laments, "God! What would I forfeit to have the days of my childhood restored or to be

6. *Letters*, II, 269.

7. This and many other of Dickens's references to dreams are collected in Warrington Winters' article, "Dickens and the Psychology of Dreams," *PMLA*, LXIII (1948), 984-1006. Winters uses the dream from *Hard Times* as an example of

Dickens' working out of his theories in fiction but does not analyze the dream or relate it to the novel.

8. "Lying Awake," in *Reprinted Pieces*, Edition de Luxe (Boston, 1890), pp. 92-93.

9. Winters, p. 990.

able to forget them forever!" (Ch. 5). This cry becomes a dominant theme in Dickens' fiction and is brilliantly worked out in *Hard Times*. Bounderby tries to forget his childhood days but they haunt him. Stephen (and Dickens

for him) blacks out his but his childhood wishes return inevitably, as they do in *Louisa*. But finally in *Sissy* and the circus, childhood is restored.

University of Colorado

A Reading of Hopkins' "Epithalamion"

Lionel Adey

HOPKINS' "EPITHALAMION," which he apparently scribbled while invigilating an examination, is both puzzling and in places quite hauntingly beautiful.¹ Why was this account of a solitary bath thought suitable as a wedding gift to his brother Everard, who was married in 1888? Why, being so designated, was it never finished? My object is to find answers to these two questions.

An answer to the first depends upon whether the poem was based upon a real experience or whether its incidents were purely imaginary, intended to serve as a moral allegory, or as some kind of symbolic reflection of marriage, perhaps as opposed to celibacy. The evidence offered by the poem is somewhat equivocal. The introductory description has so much detail of the river's appearance and surrounding vegetation that Hopkins was hardly likely to have found just such a scene in areas so diverse in character and climate as "Southern dene or Lancashire clough or Devon cleave" or the Irish estate suggested by one commentator.² Since the boys have come out from a town, which the poet evidently knows, any real locality would most probably have been in Lancashire, during his ministry there. Certainly the steepness of the hill, the rocks, and the cold of the water would suggest the north of England rather than the south.³ As he wrote the poem while in Dublin, such an experience cannot have been recent.

The rhythmic reproduction of the torrent's helter-skelter movement, so admirably caught in:

... where a gluegold-brown
Marbled river, boisterously beautiful, between
Roots and rocks is danced and dandled, all in froth and
water-blowballs, down (ll. 5-7)

suggests an actual river. Moreover, Hopkins' characteristic immediacy is very noticeable in the invitation to Everard to

Hark . . . make-believe
We are leaf-whelmed (ll. 1-2)

and in the neat parenthesis "it must be" before "boys from the town" (l. 12). Though "fairyland" is a cliché unworthy of him, the characteristics of the trees are observed as sharply as in any of his poems. No lines of his better catch the intoneness of Wordsworthian "spots of time" than:

Rafts and rafts of flake leaves light, dealt so, painted
on the air,
Hand as still as hawk or hawkmoth. . . (ll. 25-26)

Yet the apparently deliberate vagueness of the location, together with the ambiguous references to the observer's point of view, suggest some attempt to disguise the experience, possibly out of embarrassment. When the stranger arrives (ll. 14-18), reader and narrator are hidden in thick woodland high above the river that plunges down the hillside. The boys, though audible, are at this stage invisible to the narrator. The listless stranger must also be high up, for he too "drops toward the river." As though he has descended with the stranger, the narrator describes the boys subjectively, sharing the stranger's vision of the

dare . . . and downdolphinry and bellbright bodies
huddling out (l. 17)

sensing how the elements of earth, air, and water fuse when the boys dive and spread out beneath the surface. How could he descend unnoticed by the stranger, how share in

so subjective a perception, unless in some way he *were* the stranger? Nevertheless, the stranger is "he," while the poet-narrator and the reader are "we." In Paul L. Mariani's tentative interpretation, of which more will be said later, the narrator and reader are Gerard and Everard. To say that the stranger is "any bachelor" does not seem at first sight to deal with this problem of the subjective perception.

In fact, as soon as the stranger enters, a process of double vision begins, amounting almost to a split in the poet's personality. Though watching the stranger from apart, the narrator perceives as though he were the stranger, that at the neighboring pool

it is the best
There; sweetest, freshest, shadowiest. (ll. 22-23)

Then he shares the Wordsworthian vision of the leaves. This double vision works well enough until the narrator turns to the stranger's actions. The nakedness of the swimmers does not intrude, since the boys are seen as a "bevy" and the focus is on their graceful movement rather than their individual appearance.⁴ The stranger's impulse to imitate them is *felt*, subjectively, but his preparation for bathing is *seen*, objectively. Thus in a trice we descend from participating in a profound imaginative perception, almost a mystical experience, to reading an overparticular, though somewhat inaccurate, account of a man undressing.⁵

Before and after this unduly literal account, the details of actions and natural setting are charged with imaginative and spiritual significance. The images of spring and summer, the blending of natural and divine, above all the sense of joy, recall the verse written during Hopkins' happier ministry in northern England. "Bellbright" can have both a literal and a ritual sense, while "garland" refers both to the shape of the somersaulting bathers and to the spring flowers of lovers and children. Since it precedes the evocation of the sunlight upon the trees, even "fairyland" might have contained the Keatsian sense of "faerieland." The leaves are "stars" and "angels," while in the line "Like the thing that never knew the earth, never off roots Rose," the word "Rose" can be read at once literally as a verb and metaphorically as a noun.⁶ The stranger "feasts" in an aesthetic sense, but the term has also a sacramental sense. Shafts of light give the scene its ethereal quality, leaves being "painted on the air." Conceivably this sunlight could represent the element of fire missing in the earlier image

of the boys amid earth, air, and water, in which case the word "flashes" and the stranger's "sudden zest" would imply an inspiration by the fire or light of the Holy Spirit.

He then approaches the element of water, through those of earth and air. The religious overtone becomes even more insistent as the naked stranger, able (like Adam) to "walk the world," feels with his bare feet the incasces of age-old rocks "burly all of blocks . . . chancequarried, selfquained" (ll. 36-37). Foot can now feel, being unshod. Hopkins' religious naturalism comprehends an awareness of the geological evolution that has shaped the rocks. The "flinty, kindcold water" that breaks across this once listless man makes him "froliclavish." Already urged to joyous imitation of the bathers, perhaps by nostalgia, he is invigorated by this encounter with his natural elements. Yet this bath is more than a momentary regression to childhood freedom, for he bathes in a "neighbouring" pool. His walk may be viewed as the antithesis of that process of insulating ourselves from Nature that is lamented in "God's Grandeur." When he has become as the children, this renewal of bodily sensation brings back a joy long unknown. The "sacred matter" intended was presumably the relation of the whole experience directly to the sacrament of matrimony and indirectly to that of baptism.

Much of the content of the "Epithalamion" may be found in earlier poems. Hopkins' concept of the stranger who is also himself may be related antithetically to the alienation from homeland, relatives, humankind, and the Creator in "To seem the stranger lies my lot." The theme of the priest-poet's turning from natural to divine love underlies the final stanza of "At the Wedding March," written nine years earlier. Here the priest's personal sense of deprivation after the nuptial ceremony is transmuted into hope.

The early occasional poem "Penmaen Pool" contains the general idea of the invigorating power of water, as well as the suggestive phrase "In frank, in fairy Penmaen Pool." However, a passage in Hopkins' Latin imitation of Christina Rossetti's "The Convent Threshold" offers the most revealing parallels.⁷

Miss Rossetti's narrator abjures human love, to journey to the halls of the "glassy sea" of heaven. Hopkins' translation, though made many years earlier, features the speaker's inert heart, the spiritual alternative to marital love, the

1. The text used is that of Poem No. 159 in *Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. W. H. Gardner and N. H. Mackenzie, 4th ed. (Oxford, 1967). For a full account of the poem's text and occasion, see pp. 317-18 and also Foreword, pp. li-liii, in that volume.

2. Paul L. Mariani, *Commentary on the Complete Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins* (Ithaca, 1970), p. 292, suggests that the river might have been one on the estate of Lord Drogheda at Monasterevan. The word "dene" or "dene" in the Bourne-

mouth area denotes a wooded ravine. *New English Dictionary* lists uses in this sense in Surrey, Sussex, Somerset, and also in Northern England.

3. Norman H. Mackenzie, in *Hopkins* (Alva, Scotland, 1968), p. 15, quotes the poet as writing from Stonyhurst, Lancs., of "wonderful rivers rippling golden-brown, deep among wooded banks," which supports the view that he has a "Lancashire clough" in mind.

4. Until the nineteen thirties, the male swimming costume in Britain covered the entire torso.

5. For a contrary assessment, see W. H. Gardner, *Gerard Manley Hopkins* (London, 1948), I, 115. Charles Williams, in his Introduction to the 2d ed. of *Bridges' Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins* (Oxford, 1933), p. xv (note), says: "the stranger in the most lovely *Epithalamion* — admirable fellow! — in preparing to bathe, takes off his boots last."

6. As noun-metaphor, "Rose" would refer to the Blessed Virgin, as in the not very characteristic poem "Rosa Mystica," printed in the *Irish Monthly*, 1898, and reprinted as No. 85 in the Appendix to the Bridges-Williams volume.

7. The Latin text, which also includes an English translation (pp. 321-22), is printed as Poem No. 164 in the Gardner and MacKenzie 4th edition.

image of the cold, hard stones constituting the author's only bridal bed, and a physical excitement not traceable to Dionysian indulgence.

An interesting general parallel may be observed between the stranger's imitation of the boy swimmers and the action of the narrator who joins the swimming mermaids in the prize poem *A Vision of the Mermaids* (1862). Extracts from the later paragraphs reveal surprising similarities of imagery, mood, and even words.

So those Mermaids crowded to my rock,
And thicken'd, until it seem'd their father Sea
Had gotten him a wreath of sweet Spring-embroidery.
Careless of me they sported: some would splash
The languent smooth with dimpling drops, and flash
Their filmy tails adown whose length there show'd
An azure ridge . . . (ll. 98-105)

Some, diving merrily, downward drove, and gleam'd
With arms and fin; the argent bubbles stream'd
Airwards, disturb'd; and the scarce troubled sea
Gurgled, where they had sunk, melodiously. (ll. 108-11)

About twenty lines earlier, the mermaids were seen "sudden" to break from the water. The "spring-embroidery" recalls the "garland of their gambols" of the boys; the stranger's clothes are left "careless," a word used of the mermaids' sport, and their downward dive is akin to the "downdolphinry" of the boys.⁸ We have here the elements of earth, water, and air, and shortly afterward the mermaids watch the sun. From then on, the tone becomes romantically melancholy.

Clearly the theme and some of the symbolism of the "Epithalamion" had been in Hopkins' mind for many years. Doubtless the river was a real one, and perhaps the boys were encountered in some remembered experience. Nevertheless, any valid interpretation must take account of these anticipations of the poem's visual imagery and symbolism.

Among several commentators who read the poem as an intended allegory, broken off before the poet had supplied the key, only Mariani ventures an explanation, after pointing out the incompleteness of the evidence. The dene is wedlock, the entrance, therefore, to spousal love, for which the river stands. The listless stranger is a bachelor, like Everard, who resolves to partake of the marital happiness he observes. He enters the fresh water while about the bower stand the family and friends (i.e., the trees) who contribute to the freshness of the scene and are themselves refreshed by beholding spousal love in their midst. Through the stranger's removal of clothes, particularly walking shoes, the heat and burden of concupiscence gives way to the

playful innocence and fecundity of the bower. The poet's reward for chastity is the insight into the sovereign good, the joy and freedom betokened by the shouts of the boys.

This attractive interpretation does not fit all the facts. The boys are heard by Gerard and Everard, if the latter is the "reader," but the stranger who alone sees them is a third person. They inspire a "sudden zest / Of summertime joys" (ll. 20-21), a term hardly applicable to one about to be married. The trees are present before he strips and enters the pool. As an emblem of the marital sacrament, the incident would be indelicate. Moreover, why would such emphasis be placed upon the feel of the rocks during the walk to the pool? Again, can marriage be properly imaged as a "flinty kindcold element"? Children are not aptly seen as the paradigm of wedded love, but as its offspring. Finally, if the stranger's immersion in the neighboring pool be envisaged as the entrance into the married state, and therefore to joy and innocence like to the sport of children, in what way could the poet be wronging his sacred matter by leaving the stranger "froliclavish" in the water? By deciding to supply the final gloss, Hopkins admits that the allegorical meaning does not clearly emerge from the incidents.

Nevertheless, Mariani's explanation covers one crucial point, the disappearance of the poet and the reader. If the stranger stands for any man entering upon marriage, the two original observers are imaginatively identifying themselves with him, hence sharing his subjective perceptions of boys, trees, river, and rocks. Even so, the quasimystical experience of the sunlight through the trees does not correspond with any normal way of envisaging friends and relatives. Nor do the rocks and the cold water fit into the allegory.

Taking into account the many parallels already adduced from Hopkins' other poems, we may reasonably suppose that, though intending the stranger to typify a bachelor, such as Everard, he actually conveyed his own feelings. Everard was invited to see his own prospective joy reflected in the stranger's, but was actually taken into the consciousness of the brother who was ensconced with him yet was also, by vocation and place of residence, a stranger. The listlessness was the alienated state, the "accedia," so powerfully conveyed in the "Terrible Sonnets." Though his spirits are revived by the children's natural joy, the celibate dwells in the spiritual element. The sunlight on the trees typifies the eternal light by whose radiance the trees are seen as though in the timeless, or paradisaical world, "never off earth." His cast-off clothes are "careless" both literally

and in the sense of "without carnal or worldly cares"; by transferred epithet they represent his own state. A Catholic priest who walks upon ancient rock with unshod feet undertakes a pilgrimage, a spiritual journey, in which his support must be the historical tradition of the Church. He bathes in a "neighbouring" pool because his vocation takes him apart from these naked children who in their joy resemble unfallen Man and whom his vocation demands that he regard as neighbors. His immersion in water brimming with "heavenfallen freshness" recalls both the baptism in the Jordan⁹ and his own ministry, "flinty" and "kindcold" because it inflicts suffering yet leads to eternal life and joy. In a further sense, the stranger is Man, regenerated by throwing off worldly vesture, an estranged creature renewing his relationship with God through the walk across the bare rock and the immersion in the healing waters of grace, to become as a child.

Why did Hopkins never finish a poem so beautiful and so full of spiritual insight? To point to the great number of projects shelved or abandoned in his final years would be to evade the problem, for no great strength of will is required to add a final few lines to an occasional poem for a brother's wedding, of which over forty lines have been completed already. In a letter to Bridges, dated May 25, 1888, he expresses himself as being more frustrated because of his inability to complete the poem than by the rejection of an article on Sophocles:

For instance, I began an *Epithalamion* on my brother's wedding: it had some bright lines, but I could not get it done. That is worse. (This wedding was last month.)¹⁰

He could hardly have felt too dissatisfied with its verse-structure to continue, for in revision the occasional cliché or vapid phrase, such as "lovely is all," could have been eliminated and the undressing episode made less bathetic.¹¹ A more plausible supposition is that he felt unable to make the theme and content fit the occasion. As W. H. Gardner remarks,

. . . the delightful summer idyll is so completely enjoyed as "poetry of earth" that the sudden exegetic turn by which Hopkins hoped to elevate the subject to the intended doctrinal plane strikes the reader as extraneous and unconvincing. . . when trees, flowers and ferns became "father, mother, brothers, etc.," the poet himself must have felt that in consecrating the matter he had lost the dream.¹²

Certainly the trees as the poet has already described them

are absurdly out of keeping with the role now to be assigned them. Had the naked children sporting beneath the water represented the eventual offspring of the bridal pair, the symbol would have been in the tradition of romantic poetry from Blake's *Songs of Innocence* to Arnold's "For-saken Mermaid." A complex argument could be made for their symbolising unborn children, hurled through "earth-world, airworld, waterworld," to be brought into existence by creative fire of the Spirit, were the bathing scene not so literally described, did not the "gambols" so literally resemble the dolphin's dive, and were it not so illogical to have unborn children inspire the stranger to imitation.

Yet the theme of procreation runs through the imagery. The dene which is wedlock "leans along the loins of hills," and the river, which is "spousal love" joining the bride and groom, is "dandled." The word "garland" faintly evokes spring fertility rites, as do the details of the trees surrounding the naked bathers. The stranger, however, behaves as one seeking rebirth, a return to innocence and natural joy in life.

The real reason for Hopkins' abandonment of the poem seems to me to lie in its unsuitability as a wedding ode because of the irreconcilable conflict between its three lines of symbolism: procreation, rebirth, and spiritual fulfillment. The images of procreation, if not themselves indelicate, made the situation implausible. Personal rejuvenation, though very much in Hopkins' mind during his years in Ireland, was not a theme suitable for the poem's occasion. Still less would it be so if the stranger represented Man and the rejuvenation in mind was that of the species. Thirdly, if Everard had seen "To seem the stranger," written three years earlier, he would doubtless have recognized the stranger as Gerard. If he had not, the "Epithalamion" could have become a source of embarrassment, since he might well have taken the stranger's actions literally. Even were those actions taken symbolically, the poem's main emphasis would fall on the needs and predicament of the author rather than the future happiness of the bridegroom.

In fact, the double viewpoint by which poet and "reader" observe the stranger yet one or other *becomes* him, reflects a fundamental ambiguity. The poem at once conveys a literal (or quasilateral) experience, symbolises the attainment of natural love in matrimony, and expresses the celibate's divided feelings about his alternative mode of self-fulfillment. The tension is between acceptance of his vocation as a means of spiritual renewal, and a longing for

8. Webster, *New International Dictionary*, 2d ed., defines the dive of the dolphin as "a front half-twist." *N.E.D.*, cites Herbert, *The Temple*, for the dolphin's beautiful colors, esp.

when diving, and adds that in early Christian art the dolphin was emblematic of love, diligence, and swiftness.

9. For this and a number of other valuable suggestions I am indebted to my colleague, Dr. Victor Neufeldt.

10. *Letters of Hopkins to Bridges*, ed. C. C. Abbott (Oxford, 1935; 2d ed., 1955), p. 277.

11. Some caution is necessary in criticizing the poem's word

choice, as the apparent coinage "honeysuck" is still in local use and was used in 1879 in a botanical reference book by Britten and Holland (v. *N.E.D.*).

12. Gardner, *Gerard Manley Hopkins*, I, 186.

physical rejuvenation through the shedding of his garments and the encounter with earth, air, and water. The religious overtones in the diction and imagery seem at odds with the possibly unconscious strain of images of sexual fertility. "Summer's sovereign good" implies that the children's sport forms a physical counterpart to the *summum bonum* of the theologians. Though the stranger bathes elsewhere, undergoing a recognizably spiritual experience, he is left "frolic-lavish," laughing and swimming in a way inappropriate to the allegory.

Enough now; since the sacred matter that I mean
I should be wronging longer leaving it to float
Upon this only gambolling and echoing-of-earth note.
(ll. 43-45)

The words "only" and "echoing-of-earth" directly equate the stranger's enjoyment with the purely physical delight of the boys. Thus the allegorical intention now seems to the author to have been overlaid. He has therefore to resort to direct explanation.

Hopkins could not complete the "Epithalamion" because it contains several different poems. This lack of poetic integration seems to me to reflect an unresolved conflict within himself, one largely responsible for his fatigue and

desperate unhappiness. The poem includes a delectable imagist cameo of boys fleeting the time carelessly in their golden world; a fragment of nostalgic reminiscence or else of wish fulfillment; one of those luminously spiritual yet concrete descriptions of a natural scene found in so many of his earlier poems; yet withal an allegory betraying incomplete repression of a sexuality which remains discrete, instead of being transmuted as in the procreative imagery of "Thou art indeed just, Lord." He failed to complete his original purpose because the personal elements, both physical and nostalgic, got out of control. In his own country, among ordinary people, he could reconcile himself to the denial of both natural fatherhood and poetic renown. When exiled alike from country, family, and common life, he found the inner conflict irreconcilable. The "Epithalamion," however flawed and incomplete, has an importance not always recognized as recording an almost successful effort to break out of the relentless self-absorption of the later poems and recover an earlier delight in the created world and its inhabitants. Not surprisingly, it ceased to be a wedding song.

University of Victoria

Fictional Conventions and Sexuality in *Dracula*

Carrol L. Fry

TO THE GENERAL READING PUBLIC, Bram Stoker's *Dracula* is one of the best known English novels of the nineteenth century. It was an immediate best seller when it appeared in 1897, and the frequent motion pictures featuring the machinations of Count Dracula since the 1931 film version of the novel have helped make vampire folklore very much a part of the English and American popular imagination. The work's fame is in part attributable to its success as a thriller. The first section, "Jonathan Harker's Journal," is surely one of the most suspenseful and titillating pieces of terror fiction ever written. But perhaps more important in creating the popular appeal of the novel is its latent sexuality.

This feature of the work is most apparent in Stoker's use of disguised conventional characters, placed in new roles but retaining their inherent melodramatic appeal for a sexually repressed audience. The most apparent of these characters is the "pure woman," the staple heroine of popular fiction from Richardson to Hardy. In dozens of novels of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, this pure woman is pursued by a "rake," a seducer who has designs on

her virtue. The melodrama is based on the reader's suspense regarding whether or not he will succeed. Those women who lose their virtue become "fallen women," outcasts doomed to death or secluded repentance. In *Dracula*, there are two "pure women," Lucy Westenra and Mina Harker, the former of whom actually does "fall." The role of "rake" is played by Count Dracula, and vampirism becomes surrogate sexual intercourse. The women who receive the vampire's bite become "fallen women."

Stoker establishes Dracula as a rake in large part by making him a "gothic villain," a derivative of the rake in English fiction. Like most gothic villains, Dracula lives in a ruined castle, remarkably like Udolpho, Otranto, Grasmere Abbey, and dozens of other sublimely terrifying structures in English fiction. It even has subterranean passages, slightly modified to serve as daytime resting places for the vampires. Moreover, Dracula's physical appearance is that of the rake-gothic villain. He has a "strong — a very strong" face and "massive eyebrows." His face shows the pallor typical of Radcliffe's Schedoni, Maturin's Melmoth, and Lewis' Antonio, and, most impressively, he possesses the

usual "glittering eye" of the villain. Stoker returns to this feature over and over. When Harker first sees him, he immediately notes "the gleam of a pair of very bright eyes, which seemed red in the lamplight"¹ and the Cockney zoo-keeper interviewed by the reporter for the *Pall Mall Gazette* describes the Count's "ard cold look and red eyes" (p. 120).

The rake and the gothic villain pursue and "distress" the pure woman in melodramatic popular fiction of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and Dracula sets out in pursuit of Lucy Westenra and later of Mina Harker in the best tradition of this character type. First, however, Stoker firmly establishes his heroines in their roles. Lucy gets three proposals (a frequently used method of establishing worth in women) from thoroughly admirable men, and when she tells the heroic Quincy Morris that she has a prior attachment, he says: "It's better worth being late for a chance of winning you than being in time for any other girl in the world" (p. 56). Dr. Van Helsing says of Mina: "She is one of God's women, fashioned by his own hand to show us men and other women that there is a heaven where we can enter, and that its light can be here on earth. So true, so sweet, so noble, so little an egoist — and that, let me tell you, is much in this age" (p. 161). But perhaps the most important aspect of Stoker's presentation of Lucy and Mina is that the description of both, before Dracula preys on them, completely omits physical detail. One gets only an impression of idealized virtue and spirituality. They are like Rose Maylie in *Oliver Twist*, who is "cast in so light and exquisite a mould; so mild and gentle; so pure and beautiful; that earth seemed not her element, nor its rough creatures her fit companions."²

Stoker had apparently done some research on the folklore of vampirism,³ and most of the detail he gives is verified by the work of Montague Summers.⁴ The vampire's inability to cast a reflection, his fear of daylight, and the stake in the heart as a means of killing him are all part of the folklore of eastern Europe. But one element of this folklore is particularly appropriate for melodramatic fiction: the contagious nature of vampirism. Both the rake of the popular novel and the vampire of folklore pass on their conditions (moral depravity in the former and vampirism in the latter) to their victims. In fiction, it is con-

ventional for the fallen woman to become an outcast, alienated from the rest of mankind, or to die a painful death. If she lives, she often becomes a prostitute or the chattel of her seducer. The bawdy house to which Lovelace takes Clarissa in Richardson's novel is staffed by the rake's conquests, and in Mrs. Radcliffe's *Romance of the Forest*, Adeline, the heroine, is abducted by the villain and kept in a house occupied by his numerous kept women.

Similarly, Dracula's castle is occupied by his "wives," who were at some earlier time his victims. At the outset of the novel, when the fair bride who is about to drink the blood of Jonathan Harker is stopped by the Count, she utters "a laugh of ribald coquetry," and says to her lord: "You yourself never loved; you never love!" (p. 40). Dracula replies: "Yes, I too can love; you yourselves can tell it from the past. Is it not so?" (p. 40). He has loved them with the vampire's phallic bite, and they have become outsiders, Un-Dead, and, like the fallen woman, not part of the human race. The frequent references to "love" and to "kisses" and the type of physical description of the lady vampire makes the parallel between seduction and vampirism apparent. The wives are consistently described in terms of erotic physical beauty, but they are hard and wanton in their attractiveness. Moreover, in Victorian fiction, prostitutes, like cockroaches, most often appear at night (one thinks, for instance, of Esther in Mrs. Gaskell's *Mary Barton*), just as vampires, in folklore, must avoid the daylight.

The change in Lucy Westenra's appearance after she receives Dracula's attention is marked. Physically, her features are altogether different. Dr. Seward describes her in her tomb when the group goes there to destroy her: "The sweetness was turned to adamant, heartless cruelty, and the purity to wantonness" (p. 179). Instead of the "pure, gentle orbs we knew," her eyes are "unclean and full of hell fire" (p. 180). She approaches Arthur with a "languorous, voluptuous grace," saying "My arms are hungry for you" (p. 180). In all, "The whole carnal and unspiritual appearance" seems "like a devilish mockery of Lucy's sweet purity" (p. 182). Throughout, the description of female vampires underscores their sexuality, and the words "voluptuous" and "wanton" appear repeatedly in these contexts, words that would never be used in

1. Bram Stoker, *Dracula* (New York, 1965), p. 38. Further page references appear in the text.
2. Charles Dickens, *The Adventures of Oliver Twist*, The Oxford Illustrated Dickens (London, 1949), p. 212.
3. In *A Biography of Dracula: The Life Story of Bram Stoker* (London, 1962), Harry Ludlam states that much of the author's information came from Arminius Vamby, a professor of oriental languages at the University of Budapest. Also, there was a historical Dracula. Stoker was aware that one of the fifteenth-century leaders of the fight against the Turks, Vlad V, was called Dracula; and the Count's lecture

to Jonathan Harker in Ch. 3 of the novel shows that Stoker knew a little about the history of eastern Europe. But according to Professor Grigore Nandris, there is "no association in Rumanian folklore between the Dracula story and the vampire mythology" ("The Historical Dracula: The Theme of His Legend in the Western and in the Eastern Literatures of Europe," *Comparative Literature Studies*, III [1966], 366-96).
4. See *The Vampire in Europe* (New Hyde Park, N.Y., 1962) and *The Vampire: His Kith and Kin* (New Hyde Park, N.Y., 1960).

describing a pure woman. Clearly, Lucy has fallen, but in the end she is saved from herself in rather conventional fashion. Her death and the smile of bliss on her face as she passes satisfy the reader's desire for a happy ending to her story and fulfill his expectation regarding the fate proper to a fallen woman.

Much of the interest of the novel from this point on lies in the fate of Mina Harker, who begins to take on the character of the fallen woman. After the vampire has mixed his blood with hers and has been routed from her bedroom, she cries: "Unclean, unclean! I must touch him [Jonathan, her husband] or kiss him no more" (p. 240). Later, after she is burned by the holy wafer used as a weapon against the Count, she exclaims: "Unclean! Unclean! Even the Almighty shuns my polluted flesh" (p. 250). During the journey to Dracula's castle, she has begun to take on the "beauty and fascination of the wanton Un-Dead" (p. 309). But when Dracula is killed, all of the physical effects are reversed, and she again becomes a pure woman, fit for motherhood and a happy life. She never quite becomes a fallen woman and hence can be saved at the end of the novel.

There are a good many other parallels drawn between vampirism and sexuality in addition to the melodramatic effects achieved through the manipulation of conventional characters. The fact is that vampire lore has much in common with human sexuality. The vampire's kiss on the

throat and the lover's kiss are easily made one in the reader's mind, and the Nosferatu's bite can be made parallel in the popular imagination with the love bite or the phallic thrust. In the novel, the very act of biting is made highly erotic. In describing Dracula's embrace, Mina says: "strangely enough, I did not want to hinder him" (p. 250). But perhaps the most suggestive passage in the novel occurs when Jonathan Harker describes his experience while in a trance induced by Dracula's wives. As the fair bride approaches him, he finds in her a "deliberate voluptuousness which was both thrilling and repulsive," and he feels "a wicked, burning desire that they would kiss me with those red lips" (p. 39). After a certain amount of coquettish argument as to who would begin, the fair bride bends over his throat, and Harker describes his sensations:

Lower and lower went her head as the lips went below the range of my mouth and chin and seemed to fasten on my throat. Then she paused, and I could hear the churning sound of her tongue as it licked her teeth and lips, and I could feel the hot breath on my neck. . . . I could feel the soft shivering touch of the hard dents of two sharp teeth, just touching and pausing there. I closed my eyes in a languorous ecstasy and waited — waited with beating heart. (p. 39)

One can hardly wonder that the novel was enormously popular.

Northwest Missouri State College

Thackeray's *Esmond* and Anne Manning's "Spurious Antiques"

James C. Simmons

IT IS A CURIOUS SIGN of changing literary tastes that Thackeray's artful historical romance *Henry Esmond*, roundly condemned by many mid-Victorian reviewers, has met with almost unanimous critical approval from twentieth-century commentators. Most modern critics regard the book as Thackeray's finest technical performance and the masterpiece of Victorian historical fiction. It has become a critical cliché to account for the genesis of *Esmond* by reference to Thackeray's lifelong interest in the eighteenth century, especially in his immersion in the comic writings of the age in preparation for his highly successful lectures on the English humorists which immediately preceded the

novel. These lectures, Gordon Ray has argued, "served to consolidate the knowledge that he had acquired in twenty-five years of disconnected study" and suggested to him the manner in which he would write his own Queen Anne novel.¹ There certainly can be no doubt that the book's careful imitation of eighteenth-century modes of thought and writing reflects Thackeray's love for the age and its literature. *Esmond*'s prose, as has often been pointed out, is that of *The Tatler* and *The Spectator*, a beautiful imitation of Augustan prose style, an English polished into epigram, conversational, urbane, and civilized, of impeccable breeding, taste, and judgment. Smith, Elder, and

Company, the publishers, extended the imitation one step farther by issuing the novel in three volumes set in antiquated type, reproducing all the archaic conventions of eighteenth-century bookmaking. Everything was done to suggest an authentic memoir and book of the period.

In sharp contrast to the modern appraisal of *Esmond*, many of the book's contemporary reviewers were surprised and disappointed. Their general reaction was that *Esmond* failed for several reasons: Thackeray had violated historical truth in his presentation of historical personages, he had captured the manners but not the tone of the age, and he had presented characters who were little more than nineteenth-century personages masquerading in the costumes of the preceding century.² Thackeray's own contemporaries complained repeatedly about what they felt to be the author's lack of originality and his unexpected reliance upon the commonplace. The characters, as many critics observed, were much too familiar to readers of his earlier novels. And the imitation of eighteenth-century styles of thinking, writing, and bookmaking brought forth numerous objections. There was a sense of regret on the part of many critics that Thackeray had lapsed into what they thought to be the tired formulas of popular fiction. "It is very much to be regretted," wrote the reviewer in the *New Monthly Magazine*, "that an author whose originality is so striking as that of Mr. Thackeray should have addressed himself to a subject in which the greatest fame he seemed likely to achieve was that of being a successful imitator."³ Certainly, this hostile response can be traced in part to a general weariness with the historical romance. By the time *Esmond* appeared the vogue for historical fiction was well into its decline and the critical reaction to the form was now sharply antagonistic. The same critic for the *New Monthly Magazine* went so far as to fear that Thackeray's reputation as novelist might be irreparably damaged by his association with such a discredited fictional form.

But there is much more here than general exhaustion with a form worked to death by the horde of the post-Scott romancers. Much more to the point was the feeling that Thackeray's *Esmond* was entirely too much of an imitation of an imitation, for in form and appearance the novel was but one more in a long line of "authentic" memoirs foisted on the reading public over the preceding decade. The fact is that as much as the book owes to Thackeray's researches for his lectures on the eighteenth-century humorists, it also is strongly indebted to a short-lived fashion in the novel that enjoyed immense popularity in its own day. Important

to the final form of *Esmond* with its structure of a retrospective memoir cast in archaic diction and type was the inauspicious appearance of a small volume in 1844, issued by Longman and entitled *So Much of the Diary of Lady Willoughby, as Relating to Her Domestic History and to the Reign of Charles I.* It purported to be a transcription of an actual journal kept by a certain Lady Willoughby for the years 1635 to 1648, recording a miscellaneous selection of domestic matters and observations on the political and military events pertaining to the Civil Wars. Everything was done by the author and her publisher to simulate a book actually written and printed in the mid-seventeenth century. The grammar, vocabulary, and typography were in imitation of an early age, and so successful were they that the volume was immediately accepted in many quarters as an authentic memoir. It was not until the third edition in the following year that the publishers, responding to pressure from the Willoughby family, affixed a short note to the volume stating that the book was indeed a work of fiction. The author of this successful hoax was a middle-aged woman, Mrs. Hannah May Rathbone (1798-1878), whose antiquarian interests led her to do extensive reading in the histories and memoirs of the seventeenth century. When her first book became a popular success, Mrs. Rathbone issued a sequel in 1848, *Some Further Portions of the Diary of Lady Willoughby*, and the two were frequently republished in tandem throughout the next two decades.

The upshot of Mrs. Rathbone's two volumes was a short-lived, but intensely popular fashion in historical fiction for novels in the form of "authentic" memoirs in which considerable effort was made to imitate the thoughts, prose, and typography of earlier centuries. Thackeray's *Henry Esmond* is the sole example of this curious literary fashion to survive into the twentieth century, but in his own day the novel was overshadowed by the half-dozen successes of the most popular author to work this vein, Anne Manning (1807-1879), whose list of books runs to over fifty titles. She was best known for two books, *The Maiden and Married Life of Mary Powell (Afterwards Mistress Milton)* (1849) and *The Household of Sir Thomas More* (1851), both of which enjoyed an extravagant success with the reading public and went through more than a dozen reissues before the end of the century.

Miss Manning used the same format for these two books, as well as another four that followed: that of a journal or memoir in which the leading character (Sir Thomas More's daughter, Milton's wife, the daughter of a shopkeeper in

1. *Thackeray, the Age of Wisdom* (New York, 1958), p. 177.

2. See, for example, the reviews in *Westminster Review*, III (N.S., 1853), 363-88; *Athenaeum*, 1306 (November 6, 1852), 1199-201; *Dublin University Magazine*, XLI (January 1853), 70-79.

3. *New Monthly Magazine*, XCVI (December 1852), 483.

Restoration England, and so forth) recounted the thoughts and events of a personal, domestic nature which were given a broader interest by being set in an important historical context. Like Thackeray, who followed after her, Miss Manning sought to make history "familiar rather than heroic," and much of the melodramatic, sensational action that was a characteristic feature of post-Scott historical fiction was largely replaced by a domestic, placid realism.

As in *The Diary of Lady Willoughby*, considerable effort was expended to capture the flavor and style of an earlier diction through a frequent use of archaic vocabulary and grammatical forms. The following passage should suggest the lengths to which Miss Manning went:

We have ever been considered a sufficient religious Familie: that is, we goe regularly to Church on Sabbathes and Prayer-dayes, and keepe alle the Fastes and Festivalles. But Mr. Milton's Devotion hath attain'd a Pitch I can neither imitate nor even comprehend. The spirituall World seemeth to him not onlie reall, but I may almoste say visible.⁴

Given the care of Miss Manning to imitate the styles of earlier periods and of her publishers to recapture the idiosyncracies of early printing, it is little wonder that these novels were widely accepted as authentic memoirs "miraculously" rediscovered in the nineteenth century. A critic for *Fraser's Magazine* called them all "spurious antiques" but added that this was probably the chief source of their popularity: "we know it for a fact that in book societies where works of fiction are prohibited, these journals are freely admitted, thanks to the mask they wear."⁵ And for most of the reviewers of serious journals, these "authentic" memoirs, then entering the fiction market in increasing numbers, raised serious problems regarding the obligation of the historical romancer to historical truth. For these critics the attempts at imitation were in fact unscrupulous deceptions of a dangerous sort since numerous readers

would be perusing these books as works of fact rather than of fiction.

And it was into this dispute that Thackeray's *Henry Esmond* dropped in 1852. It was precisely because he was working in a fashion that was both controversial and stale by 1852 that so many of his critics reacted with surprise and disappointment when they read the novel. The same charges that were directed toward Miss Manning and the others now were aimed at Thackeray: the depiction of characters with nineteenth-century sensibilities in the costumes of a previous age, the distortion of historical truth, especially in regard to the depiction of historical personages, the appearances of an earlier prose style but not the substance. A critic for the *Dublin University Magazine*, after commenting on Thackeray's debt to Mrs. Rathbone's *Willoughby Papers*, wondered

What advantage, then, can be gained by this distinguished writer projecting himself into the past, getting up with infinite pains and labour a vast quantity of antiquated material, and then weaving it into the form of an old romance, when he has only to look forth into the world before us . . . and write? His great powers should not be squandered in research and imitation of the writings of others.⁶

Thus, by placing Thackeray's historical romance in the broader context provided by the popular fiction of his day, we can gain perhaps a more accurate perspective on the novel. This is not to argue that modern critical judgments of *Esmond* are suddenly invalidated, but we do gain, I think, additional insight into the genesis of the book, which has heretofore been examined chiefly in terms of Thackeray's lectures on the humorists and his personal entanglements with the Brookfield household. Furthermore, by setting the novel in this broader context much of the Victorian hostility to the book, which had hitherto appeared a bit obtuse, can now be more readily understood.

Boston University

Tom Thumb Versus High Art: Douglas Jerrold's "The English in Little"

Angus Easson

DOUGLAS JERROLD'S SATIRE on General Tom Thumb and P. T. Barnum, "The English in Little," was discussed by Richard Kelly in these pages (spring 1967) and has since been edited by him in a handy volume, *The Best of Mr. Punch: The Humorous Writings of Douglas Jerrold* (Knoxville, 1970). Jerrold's spoof autobiography of Thumb appeared in *Punch* during 1846 (November onwards) and 1847. Kelly rightly points out certain objects of Jerrold's attack, such as the "gullibility of the English and their preference for foreigners" and "royalty's attitude towards the arts" (pp. 28-29). Clearly, the account of Queen Victoria's reception of Tom Thumb along with various lights of the intellectual world, who have all had to come up the backstairs, is aimed at English philistinism. But there is one figure that looms behind Jerrold's "authors, and artists, and musicians, and players, and philosophers, and people of that sort,"¹ the man who had demanded in 1837: "What after so many years are the prospects of Art and the country? . . . The Court and the nobility are just in the same state of infantine passion for portrait, and by portrait, and by portrait alone, will any man make his way to high places here," a man who was found by his daughter on June 22, 1846, "stretched out dead, before the easel on which stood, blood-sprinkled, his unfinished picture of Alfred and the first British Jury . . . a half-open razor smeared with blood at his side; near it, a small pistol recently discharged; in his throat two frightful gashes, and a bullet-wound in his skull."² The unnamed yet ever-present opposite of General Tom Thumb in Jerrold's satire is this dead Titan, Benjamin Robert Haydon.³

Richard Kelly nowhere mentions Haydon, either in his article or his edition, and this may partly be Jerrold's responsibility, since "The English in Little" gives the impression that it is an account of Thumb's first visit (1844) to England and indeed it runs together events of that period with the later exhibition in 1846. The satire telescopes the events of three years, much of that time spent by Barnum and Thumb in touring Europe. By stressing the first showing of Thumb (when Queen Victoria certainly received Thumb and so helped promote the dwarf, as Barnum shrewdly intended), Kelly has diverted attention

from both the occasion and essential dynamic of Jerrold's satire. In his article Kelly says: "The most talked-about American in London in the year 1844 was a dwarf named Charles Stratton, better known as General Tom Thumb" (p. 28). But why should Jerrold begin a skit on Thumb in 1846 unless there was some sense of topicality in doing so?

That the matter was topical in 1846 is explained by Thumb's exhibition in the Egyptian Hall that year, with great success, at the same time and place that Haydon was exhibiting *The Banishment of Aristides* and *The Burning of Rome*. On April 13, 1846, Haydon noted in his diary:

They rush by thousands to see Tom Thumb. They push, they fight, they scream, they faint, they cry help and murder! and oh! and ah! They see my bills, my boards, my caravans, and don't read them. Their eyes are open, but their sense is shut. It is an insanity, a rabies, a madness, a furor, a dream.

I would not have believed it of the English people. (p. 664)

Then in some bitterness he wrote (April 21), "Tom Thumb had 12,000 people last week; B. R. Haydon, 133½ (the ½ a little girl). Exquisite taste of the English people!" (p. 644) and in despair he closed the exhibition on May 18, when he had "lost £111, 8s. 10d. . . . No man can accuse me of showing less energy, less spirit, less genius, than I did twenty-six years ago. I have not decayed, but the people have been corrupted" (pp. 646-47). His death a month later evoked some regret, heartsearching, and at least one attack on Thumb in the *Times*, which was taken up by *Punch* (July 1846) in an ironical piece, purportedly a letter by a lady dismayed to find herself attacked in a letter to the Thundereef where Thumb was called "a disgusting dwarf," who "attracted hordes of gaping idiots, who poured [out] . . . a stream of wealth one tithe of which would have redeemed an honourable English artist from wretchedness and death." The events of Haydon's death were notorious enough for both the *Times* and *Punch* not to give the name of the "honourable English artist"; Jerrold could rely on the same notoriety.

Jerrold takes up the assault initiated by the *Times* and backed by *Punch*. He himself was one of the few people

4. *The Maiden and Married Life of Mary Powell (Afterwards Mistress Milton)* (London and New York, 1898), p. 37.

5. "Spurious Antiques," *Fraser's Magazine*, LII (July 1855), 107.

6. *Op. cit.*, p. 72.

1. *The Best of Mr. Punch*, p. 312.

2. *The Autobiography and Journals of Benjamin Robert Haydon*, ed. Malcolm Elwin (London, 1950), pp. 551, 651.

who visited Haydon's exhibition (on April 4, 1846, Haydon wrote, "Nobody came except Jerrold, Bowring, Fox Maule, and Hobhouse") and when Tom Thumb is exhibited at the Egyptian Hall he is made to enquire of Barnum:

"Are we all alone in the Hall?" ses I.

"No," ses Barnum, "there's a poor critter that has made an Apollo in marble, and a Hebe, and a Venus, and half-a-dozen Graces, and things of that sort. All day yesterday — for I made inquiry special — there was only three people came to see the lot, and one o' them was a baby in arms." (p. 334)

This is ironically juxtaposed with Barnum's man coming in to ask, "if you please, sir, is the Gen'ral ready? There'll be murder if you don't open the doors; there's sich a crowd!" (p. 335) Art starves and dwarves flourish. The allusion to Haydon would be easily taken, and the ludicrous detail of three visitors, one of them a baby (though the reality was near enough this to make the humor almost

painful), clearly picks up Haydon's gloom at 133½ visitors, a fact he had not only confided to his diary but also published in an advertisement, that he "who has devoted forty-two years to elevate . . . taste, was honoured by the visits of 133½."³

Jerrold's presence at Haydon's exhibition, the tragic result of Haydon's failure, the reference to the artist sharing the Egyptian Hall, and the verbal echo all stress the missing name in the General's "memoirs." The satire on British philistinism that plays through Thumb's story is more immediately tragic, more immediately personal, than may strike us now on casual perusal; when we read "The English in Little" with Haydon in mind it stands both as an immediate relevant attack in 1846 and as a tragic-comic battle in which Haydon was routed from the field and yet won in his defeat.

Royal Holloway College, University of London

Recent Publications: A Selected List

Arthur F. Minerof

FEBRUARY 1972 — JULY 1972

I

GENERAL

- ARTS. Crook J. Mordaunt. *Victorian Architecture*. Johnson Reprint. 300 plates. Rev. *TLS*, 18 February, p. 196.
- BIBLIOGRAPHY. Bailey, Leslie G. "Victorian Studies Programs in Britain, Australia and New Zealand." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 307-37.
- . "Victorian Studies Programs in the United States and Canada." *Victorian Studies*, December 1971, pp. 185-230.
- Culler, A. Dwight. "Recent Studies in the Nineteenth Century." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn 1971, pp. 763-82.
- Pollard, Graham, ed. *Hodson's Booksellers, Publishers and Stationers Directory 1855*. Bibliographical Society. Rev. *TLS*, 16 June, p. 696.
- CRITICISM AND LITERARY HISTORY. Bell, Alan. "Gladstone Looks for a Poet Laureate." *TLS*, 21 July, p. 847. Gladstone's vain search for a suitable successor to Tennyson.
- Blow, Suzanne. "Pre-Raphaelite Allegory in *The Marble Faun*." *American Literature*, March, pp. 122-27. Hawthorne may have been influenced by Pre-Raphaelite theory in the composition of the novel itself.

- Bratcher, James T., and Lyle H. Kendall, Jr. *A Suppressed Critique of Wise's Swinburne Transactions*. Humanities Research Center, University of Texas. Rev. *TLS*, 10 March, p. 284.
- DeLaura, David J. "Ruskin and the Brownings: Twenty-Five Unpublished Letters." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Spring, pp. 314-56. The main support for one of the most significant three-way relationships in nineteenth-century literary history was removed by Mrs. Browning's death in 1861.
- Harris, Wendell V. "Arnold, Pater, Wilde, and the Object as in Themselves They See It." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn 1971, pp. 735-47. Both Pater and Wilde differ from Arnold in the resolutions they found to the unanswered metaphysical problems raised by Arnold.

- ECONOMICS AND POLITICS. Brundage, Anthony. "The Larded Interest and the New Poor Law: A Reappraisal of the Revolution in Government." *English Historical Review*, January 1972, pp. 27-48. The New Poor Law system was not centralized.
- Edsall, Nicholas C. *The Anti-Poor Law Movement 1834-44*. Manchester University. Rev. *TLS*, 31 March, p. 367.
- Funk, Alfred A. "Chain of Argument in the British Free Trade Debates." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, April, pp. 152-60. The arguments shifted to more

emphasis on the injustice of higher food costs for laborers and for the country at large.

- Horn, Pamela. "Agricultural Trade Unionism and Emigration, 1872-1881." *Historical Journal*, March, pp. 87-102. After 1881 the agricultural unions played virtually no part in the sponsored emigration of their members.
- Taylor, G. P. "Cecil Rhodes and the Second Home Rule Bill." *Historical Journal*, December 1971, pp. 771-81. Rhodes' emphatic role in the Irish home rule movement.
- HISTORY. Alder, G. J. "The 'Garbled' Blue Books of 1839 — Myth or Reality." *Historical Journal*, June, pp. 229-59. Disputes the traditional view that the Afghan war blue books of 1839 were "garbled."
- Aronson, Theo. *Queen Victoria and the Bonapartes*. Cassell. Rev. *TLS*, 7 July, p. 785.
- Betts, Raymond F. "The Allusion to Rome in British Imperialist Thought of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries." *Victorian Studies*, December 1971, pp. 149-59. Imperial Rome was a source of inspiration and historical comparison.
- Gladstone, W. E. *Autobiographica*. Ed. John Brooke and Mary Sorenson. HMSO for Historical Manuscripts Commission. Selection of the Prime Minister's papers. Rev. *TLS*, 7 April, 388.
- Howell, George. *A History of the Working Men's Association from 1836 to 1850*. Ed. D. J. Rowe. Frank Graham. Rev. *TLS*, 9 June, p. 667.
- Llewellyn, Alexander. *The Decade of Reform*. David and Charles. Rev. *TLS*, 21 April, p. 451.
- Prent, John. "The Decline of Lord John Russell." *History Today*, June, pp. 394-401. Russell made more impact as Leader of the House than he did later as Prime Minister.
- . *Lord John Russell*. MacMillan. Rev. *TLS*, 7 July, p. 766.
- Searight, Sarah. "The Treaty of Waitangi, 1840." *History Today*, February, pp. 111-19. The treaty was an inefficient measure by which Britain acquired New Zealand with the minimum of political and financial fuss.
- Sutherland, Gillian, ed. *Studies in the Growth of Nineteenth-Century Government*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. Rev. *TLS*, 16 June, p. 679.
- Tingsten, Herbert. *Victoria and the Victorians*. Trans. David Grey and Eva Leckstrom Grey. Allen and Unwin. Rev. *TLS*, 21 July, p. 841.
- RELIGION. Altholz, Josef L. "The Vatican Decrees Controversy." *Catholic Historical Review*, January 1972, pp. 593-605. The controversy marked the demise of no-popery as an overt issue in English politics.
- Marsh, Peter. "The Other Victorian Christians." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 357-68. English Catholicism and Nonconformity.
- McClain, Frank Mauldin. *Maurice: Man and Moral-ist*. SPCK. Rev. *TLS*, 23 June, pp. 717-18.
- SOCIAL. Anderson, Michael. *Family Structure in Nineteenth Century Lancashire*. Cambridge. Rev. *TLS*, 28 July, p. 894.

- Burton, Elizabeth. *The Early Victorians at Home, 1837-1861*. Longman. Rev. *TLS*, 21 July, p. 841.
- McClelland, Vincent Alan. "'The Liberal Training of England's Catholic Youth': William Joseph Petre (1847-93) and Educational Reform." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 257-77. The rise and fall of Petre's liberal school at Woburn Park.
- Murphy, James. *The Education Act 1870*. David and Charles. Rev. *TLS*, 17 March, p. 317.
- Price, Richard N. "The Working Men's Club Movement and Victorian Social Reform Ideology." *Victorian Studies*, December 1971, pp. 117-46. The Movement was one of the most successful of the Victorian social reforming institutions.
- Priestley, J. B. *Victoria's Heyday*. Heinemann. The 1850's. Rev. *TLS*, 9 June, p. 652.

II

INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS

- ARNOLD. DeLaura, David J. "Arnold and Hazlitt." *English Language Notes*, June, pp. 277-83. Two possible debts, one in "The Voice," and a second in the Preface to *Essays in Criticism*.
- Farmer, Andrew. "Arnold's Gypsy Reconsidered." *Essays in Criticism*, January 1972, pp. 64-73. A critic is in charge of the poem but intermittently the argument is broken and the poet's imagination takes over.
- Friedman, Norman. "The Young Matthew Arnold 1847-1849: 'The Strayed Reveller' and 'The Forsaken Mermaid.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Winter 1971, pp. 405-28. The conflicts of both poems are unresolved.
- Schneider, Mary W. "Orpheus in Three Poems by Matthew Arnold." *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 29-43. Arnold selects an Orpheus appropriate to subject and form in three poems on the death of a poet.
- Williamson, Eugene L. "Words from Westminster Abbey: Matthew Arnold and Arthur Stanley." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn 1971, pp. 749-61. The relationship between the two men.
- BRONTËS. Pittock, Malcolm. "Wuthering Heights and Its Critics." *Critical Survey*, Summer 1971, pp. 146-54. The book's triadic interpretation dramatizes some basic uncertainties in nineteenth-century culture.
- Starzyk, Lawrence J. "Emily Brontë: Poetry in a Mingled Tone." *Criticism*, Spring, pp. 119-36. Emily Brontë's conception of poetry as a state of mind in which life and death, the real and imaginary, the past and future are not perceived as contradictory.
- Tough, J. J. "Wuthering Heights and King Lear." *English*, Spring, pp. 1-5. The novel owes some artistic debt to Shakespeare's play.
- BROWNING. Cundiff, Paul A. "Browning's Old Bishop." *Victorian Poetry*, Winter 1971, pp. 452-53. Ecclesiastes and Job 7.
- McCarthy, John F. "Browning's 'Waring': The Real Subject of the 'Fancy Portrait.'" *Victorian Poetry*,

3. *Autobiography*, p. x.

- Winter 1971, pp. 371-82. "Waring" is an ironic monologue expressing a personal dilemma that signals a turning point in Browning's poetic evolution.
- Thomson, Patricia. "Elizabeth Barrett and George Sand." *Durham University Journal*, June, pp. 205-19. The liberating influence of George Sand.
- CARLYLE. Brantlinger, Patrick. "'Teufelsdröckh' Resartus." *English Language Notes*, March, pp. 191-93. Suggests "devil's dust" as a euphemistic rendering of "Teufelsdröckh."
- Campbell, Ian. "Carlyle and Sir Gideon Dunn." *English Language Notes*, March, pp. 185-91. Sir Gideon Dunn in *Wotton Reinfred* is a parody of what Carlyle considers wrong with educated Scots.
- Gilbert, Elliot L. "'A Wondrous Contiguity': Anachronism in Carlyle's Prophecy and Art." *PMLA*, May, pp. 432-42. Carlyle deliberately employed anachronism both structurally and thematically to present his most characteristic thoughts.
- Hopwood, Alison L. "Carlyle and Conrad: *Past and Present* and 'Heart of Darkness.'" *Review of English Studies*, May, pp. 162-72. The parallels between the two works are evidence of how much Conrad altered Carlyle in echoing him.
- CLOUGH. Leedham-Green, E. S. "Four Unpublished Translations by Arthur Hugh Clough." *Review of English Studies*, May, pp. 179-87. Critical examination.
- DARWIN. Huntley, William B. "David Hume and Charles Darwin." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, July-September 1972, pp. 457-70. The influence of Hume.
- Rogers, James Allen. "Darwinism and Social Darwinism." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, April-June, pp. 265-80. Darwin's theory offered the public the authority of science by which they could attempt to legitimize their private vision of human progress.
- DICKENS. Bennett, Rachel. "Punch Versus Christian in *The Old Curiosity Shop*." *Review of English Studies*, November 1971, pp. 423-34. The contrary tendencies in the novel are embodied in the opposing motifs of *The Pilgrim's Progress* and Punch.
- Collins, Philip, ed. *A Christmas Carol*. New York Public Library. The public reading version. Rev. *TLS*, 3 March, p. 256.
- Herbert, Christopher. "Converging Worlds in *Pickwick Papers*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 1-20. The importance of the novel's nine tales or interludes.
- Jump, J. D. "Dickens and His Readers." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Spring, pp. 384-97. Dickens' readers helped elicit his talent and even influenced the forms in which it expressed itself.
- Palmer, William J. "*Hard Times*: A Dickens' Fable of Personal Salvation." *Dalhousie Review*, Spring, pp. 67-77. The central meaning of the novel is involved with the quest for self and for salvation.
- Rogers, Philip. "Mr. Pickwick's Innocence." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 21-37. The apparent change in Pickwick results from a change in Dickens' estimation of Pickwick's innocence.
- DISRAELI. Nickerson, Charles C. "Disraeli, Lockheart, and Murray: An Episode in the History of the 'Quarterly Review.'" *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 279-306. Disraeli's letters provide some clues concerning the episode centering on Disraeli, the second John Murray and Lockheart's appointment to the editorship of the *Quarterly* in 1825.
- ELIOT. Barolini, Helen. "George Eliot as Mary Ann Cross." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, Summer, pp. 292-306. The irony of George Eliot's compulsion toward respectability.
- Haight, Gordon S. "New George Eliot Letters to John Blackwood." *TLS*, 10 March, pp. 281-82. Eight new letters.
- Steig, Michael. "Anality in *The Mill on the Floss*." *Novel*, Fall 1971, pp. 42-53. The concept of anality helps to reveal and clarify the underlying confusion of the novel's moral themes.
- Sullivan, William J. "Piero di Cosimo and the Higher Primitivism in *Romola*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, March, pp. 390-405. In di Cosimo, Eliot intended a major articulation of her ideas about art and life.
- Swann, Brian. "*Middlemarch*: Realism and Symbolic Form." *ELH*, June, pp. 279-308. Eliot's style transmutes the literal plot, which nevertheless exists fully in its own right.
- W. S. GILBERT. Lawrence, Elwood P. "'The Happy Lord': W. S. Gilbert as Political Satirist." *Victorian Studies*, December 1971, pp. 161-83. Gilbert's attitude toward political developments in England in the last half of the nineteenth century was both consistent and conservative.
- GISSING. Blench, J. W. "George Gissing's *Thyrza*." *Durham University Journal*, March, pp. 85-114. *Thyrza* is the best of Gissing's "proletarian" novels.
- HARDY. Amos, Arthur K. "Accident and Fate: The Possibility for Action in *A Pair of Blue Eyes*." *English Literature in Transition*, Vol. XV, No. 2, pp. 158-67. The novel is a unified whole.
- Björk, Lennart A. "'Visible Essences' as Thematic Structure in Hardy's *The Return of the Native*." *English Studies*, February, pp. 52-63. Egdon Heath, Clym, and Eustacia offer a visual representation of the novel's main ideological concern.
- Giordano, Frank R., Jr. "The Repentant Magdalen in Thomas Hardy's 'The Woman I Met.'" *English Literature in Transition*, Vol. XV, No. 2, pp. 136-43. The use of the Christ-Magdalen myth as a basis for the work.
- Hardy, Evelyn. "A Thomas Hardy Dream." *TLS*, 16 June, p. 688. From the Max Gate papers.
- Hardy, Evelyn, and F. B. Pinion, eds. *One Rare Fair Woman*. Macmillan. Hardy's letters to Florence Henniker, 1893-1922. Rev. *TLS*, 16 June, pp. 687-88.
- Meisel, Perry. *Thomas Hardy: The Return of the Repressed*. Yale. Study of the novels. Rev. *TLS*, 16 June, pp. 687-88.
- Starzyk, Lawrence J. "The Coming Universal Wish Not to Live in Hardy's 'Modern' Novels." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, March, pp. 419-35. This wish is not the ultimate statement of human despair, but a recognition that the basis of immortality and individual identity is mortality.
- Tillman-Hill, Iris. "Hardy's Skylarks and Shelley's." *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 79-83. Hardy's desire is to see the transcendental verified empirically.
- Williams, Merryn. *Thomas Hardy and Rural England*. Macmillan. Rev. *TLS*, 16 June, pp. 687-88.
- Wright, Walter F. "Vision, Perspective, Structure in Thomas Hardy." *Studies in the Novel*, Spring, pp. 93-97. Review-article.
- HOPKINS. Boyle, Robert S., S.J. "Hopkins' Use of 'Fancy.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 17-27. Hopkins uses the word "fancy" in the "Deutschland" primarily in Wordsworth's sense.
- Ferns, John. "'The Wreck of the Deutschland': Voice and Structure." *Victorian Poetry*, Winter 1971, pp. 383-93. The poem's three voices help to provide a logical and organic structure.
- Milroy, James. "Gerard Manley Hopkins: Etymology and 'Current Language.'" *Critical Survey*, Winter 1971, pp. 211-18. Hopkins' language really is the heightened current language he claimed it was.
- Wallis, Bruce. "'The Windhover' and the Patristic Exegetical Tradition." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, Spring, pp. 246-55. The poem as an example of Hopkins' Christian-philosophical background.
- White, Norman. "Hopkins' Sonnet 'Written in Blood.'" *English Studies*, April, pp. 123-25. The sonnet referred to is "No worst, there is none."
- "The Setting of Hopkins' 'Epithalamion.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 83-86. Hopkins had a specific spot in mind in England when he wrote this poem, the bathing-place in the river Hodder near Stonyhurst College, in Lancashire.
- KIPLING. Shippey, T. A. "Borrowing and Independence in Kipling's 'The Story of Muhammad Din.'" *Modern Language Review*, April, pp. 264-70. The story combines the influence of Bret Harte and Kipling's own exploratory pragmatism.
- HOUSMAN. Stevenson, John W. "The Ceremony of Housman's Style." *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 45-55. The style becomes the mask behind which the poet celebrates the ceremony of man's condition.
- MEREDITH. Stevenson, Richard C. "Laetitia Dale and the Comic Spirit in *The Egoist*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, March, pp. 406-18. Laetitia is Meredith's main spokesman for the critical intelligence that is the essence of the Comic Spirit.
- MILL. Lewisohn, David. "Mill and Comte on the Methods of Social Science." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, April-June, pp. 315-24. Comte's influence on Mill's social theory has been overemphasized.
- NEWMAN. Dessain, Charles Stephen. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. XXII. Nelson. Rev. *TLS*, 2 June, p. 627.
- Lease, Gary. *Witness to the Faith*. Irish University. Newman and the Church. Rev. *TLS*, 14 July, p. 823.
- PATER. Court, Franklin E. "Pater and the Subject of Duality." *English Literature in Transition*, Vol. XV, No. 1, pp. 21-35. The importance of dual relationships in Pater's work.
- Scheutz, Lawrence. "Pater's *Marius*: The Temple of God and the Palace of Art." *English Literature in Transition*, Vol. XV, No. 1, pp. 1-19. The Cupid-Psyche myth establishes the basic structural pattern of the novel.
- ROSSETTI. Banerjee, Ron D. K. "Dante Through the Looking Glass: Rossetti, Pound, and Eliot." *Comparative Literature*, Spring, pp. 136-49. Rossetti's "Blessed Damsel" serves Pound and Eliot as a bridge to Dante.
- Hobbs, John N. "Love and Time in Rossetti's 'The Stream's Secret.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Winter 1971, pp. 395-404. The poem, whose action is psychological rather than dramatic, illustrates Rossetti's romantic preoccupations and the dense structure of his poetic world.
- Hönnighausen, Gisela. "Emblematic Tendencies in the Works of Christina Rossetti." *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 1-15. The poet uses natural detail to express a deeper meaning.
- RUSKIN. Shapiro, Harold I., ed. *Ruskin in Italy*. Oxford University. Letters to his parents, 1845. Rev. *TLS*, 28 July, p. 892.
- Stevens, L. Robert. "John Ruskin, God and the Happening." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, Spring, pp. 149-54. Ruskin can be thought of as preparing the way for a whole new sociology of business.
- Surtees, Virginia, ed. *Sublime and Instructive*. Michael Joseph. Letters to three female correspondents, 1853-1875. Rev. *TLS*, 28 July, p. 892.
- WILLIAM SHARP. Halloran, William F. "William Sharp as Bard and Craftsman." *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 57-78. Sharp's poetry is unified by its concern with nature's beauty, the potential for human fulfillment, and the inevitability of loss, defeat, and death.
- STEVENSON. Saposnik, Irving S. "The Anatomy of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn 1971, pp. 715-31. The story is an imaginative exploration of social and moral dualism.
- SWINBURNE. McSweeney, Kerry. "Swinburne's *Poems and Ballads* (1866)." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn 1971, pp. 671-85. These pieces contain statements of themes and concerns more fully and positively expressed in Swinburne's later poetry.
- ARTHUR SYMONS. Gordon, Jan B. "The Danse Macabre of Arthur Symons' *London Nights*." *Victorian Poetry*, Winter 1971, pp. 429-43. The dance, which Symons used to structure the dialogue of the "inner" and the "outer" provides a frame for a better understanding of *London Nights*.
- TENNYSON. Campbell, Nancie, ed. *Tennyson in Lincoln*. Vol. I. Tennyson Society. A catalogue of the collections in the Research Center. Rev. *TLS*, 26 May, p. 606.
- Devlin, Francis P. "Dramatic Irony in the Early Sections of Tennyson's *In Memoriam*." *Papers on Language and Literature*, Spring, pp. 172-83. This dramatic irony promotes a sharper awareness of the psychological focus of the poem.
- Elliott, Philip L. "Tennyson's 'Sir Galahad.'" *Vic-*

- torian Poetry, Winter 1971, pp. 445-52. The poem has a logical progression of movement.
- Fredeman, William E. "The Sphere of Common Duties: The Domestic Solution in Tennyson's Poetry." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Spring, pp. 356-83. The importance of Tennyson's domestic vision to an understanding of his poetry.
- Gerhard, Joseph. "Tennyson's Concepts of Knowledge, Wisdom, and Pallas Athene." *Modern Philology*, May, pp. 314-22. Tennyson's "wisdom" rebuffs the classical one, while subordinating empirical knowledge to intuitive and mystical wisdom.
- THACKERAY. Dooley, D. J. "Thackeray's Use of *Vanity Fair*." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn 1971, pp. 701-13. *Vanity Fair* did not mean exactly the same thing for Thackeray as it did for Bunyan.
- Hawes, Donald. "Thackeray and the *National Standard*." *Review of English Studies*, February, pp. 35-51. Thackeray's literary theories and practices are discernible in the early writings published in the *Standard*.
- McMaster, Juliet. *Thackeray*. Manchester University. The major novels. Rev. *TLS*, 14 July, p. 794.
- Sutherland, John. "A Date for the Early Composition of *Vanity Fair*." *English Studies*, February, pp. 47-52. The novel was begun in February 1845 or very shortly thereafter.
- TROLLOPE. Arthur, Anthony. "The Death of Mrs. Proudie: 'Frivolous Slaughter' or Calculated Dispatch?" *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, March, pp. 477-84. Mrs. Proudie's calculated dispatch is both justifiable and necessary.
- Terry, R. C. "Three Lost Chapters of Trollope's First Novel" *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 71-80. Trollope's elimination of three chapters from *The Macdermots of Ballycloran* considerably improved the unity and pace of the story.
- "Trollope on the State of England." *TLS*, 28 July, p. 862. Review-article, centering on *The New Zealander*.
- WILDE. Murray, Isobel. "Oscar Wilde's Absorption of 'Influences': The Case History of Chuang Tzu." *Durham University Journal*, December 1971, pp. 1-13. The real and apparent influence of Chuang Tzu.
- . "Some Elements in the Composition of *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." *Durham University Journal*, June, pp. 220-31. A study of Wilde's careful revision shows how he greatly improves the action, structure, and balance of the novel.
- Pappas, John J. "The Flower and the Beast: A Study of Oscar Wilde's Antithetical Attitudes toward Nature and Man in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." *English Literature in Transition*, Vol. XV, No. 1, pp. 37-48. Wilde's portrayal of man's relationship to nature reflects his unresolved struggle and deeply antithetical attitudes on the subject.

Staten Island Community College
City University of New York

CORRESPONDENCE

Ruth apRoberts, program chairman for 1973 writes: "Because of the special nature of its 1973 meeting, the English X Section of MLA is announcing its topic early: 'Sexuality in Victorian Literature.' Two or three papers on aspects of this interesting subject will be published in THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER for November 1973, and the December meeting will give the membership opportunity for discussion arising from the papers. It will be led by several specially invited panellists. The papers must be submitted before March 1, 1973, to Ruth apRoberts, Department of English, University of California, Riverside, Cal. 92502."

Paul Elman (Seabury-Western Theological Seminary) re-

ports on a conference held this past April at the Seminary to celebrate the centenary of F. D. Maurice's death. The various papers read appear in the October issue of the *Anglican Theological Review*; copies may be purchased by writing to Miss Frances Zielinski, 1914 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill. 60201.

Alfred Thomas (St. Beuno's College) advises that the second annual Hopkins Society lecture, given by F. R. Leavis and entitled *Gerard Manley Hopkins: Reflections After Fifty Years*, is now in print. Inquiries should be addressed to The Hopkins Secretariate, 114 Mount Street, London, England.

Back issues of VNL, at a cost of \$1.50 per copy, are available in limited quantities for the following numbers: 8, 20, 23, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41.