

The Victorian Newsletter

Editor

Ward Hellstrom

Managing Editor

Louise R. Hellstrom

Number 78

Contents

Fall 1990

Page

- | | | | |
|--|----|----|--|
| Antinomianism or Anarchy
A Note of Oscar Wilde's
"Pen, Pencil and Poison"
by William E. Buckler | 1 | 22 | Faith of Our Mothers:
Elizabeth Gaskell's "Lizzie Leigh"
by Joanne Thompson |
| Sara Coleridge: The Gigadibs Complex
by Nathan Cervo | 3 | 26 | The Problem of the Man-Trap in
Hardy's <i>The Woodlanders</i>
Jonathan C. Glance |
| "On Tuesday Last, at St. George's . . .":
The Dandaical Wedding in Dickens
by Patricia Marks | 9 | 29 | <i>Sartor Redivivus</i> , or
Retailoring Carlyle for the
Undergraduate Classroom
by Linda K. Hughes |
| Ruskin to the "Elusive" Mr. Horn:
An Unpublished Letter from a
Neglected Friendship
by Warren Dwyer | 14 | 32 | Identification of Literary, Historical and
other References in Trollope's <i>The Mac
dermots of Ballycloran</i> (1847), <i>The Three
Clerks</i> (1858), <i>Rachel Ray</i> (1863), <i>The
Vicar of Bullhampton</i> (1870), <i>Ralph the
Heir</i> (1871), and <i>The American Senator</i>
(1877)
by James Means |
| "Three Cups in One":
A Reading of "The Woodspurge"
by Andrew Leng | 19 | 39 | Books Received |

The VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER is sponsored for the Victorian Group of Modern Language Association by the Western Kentucky University and is published twice annually. Editorial and business communications should be addressed to Ward Hellstrom, FAC 200, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY 42101. Please use *MLA Handbook, 2nd Ed.*, for form of typescript. Manuscripts cannot be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Subscription rates in the United States are \$5.00 for one year and \$9.00 for two years; foreign rates, including Canada, are \$6.00 per year. Checks should be made payable to *The Victorian Newsletter*.

Antinomianism or Anarchy? A Note on Oscar Wilde's "Pen, Pencil and Poison"

William E. Buckler

"Pen, Pencil and Poison" and "The Decay of Lying" both appeared in January 1889, the former in the *Fortnightly Review*, the latter in the *Nineteenth Century*. In both of them, as in all his critical essays and dialogues, Wilde registers various aspects or stages in an evolving attitude toward art, the arts, and art criticism that will climax temporarily in "The Critic as Artist," "The Soul of Man under Socialism," and the "Preface" to *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. The deepening and spiritualizing of his aesthetic attitudes as a result of the total collapse of his personal and literary fortunes in and after 1895 is recounted with moving solemnity in *De Profundis*.

Except for the partially shared subject of art and art criticism, "Pen, Pencil and Poison" and "The Decay of Lying" are very different literary creations, and we have Wilde's own judgment that "The Decay of Lying" is very much "the better of the two" (*More Letters* 80). In it, especially, "Wilde discovered his own genius" (Ellmann 299). "Pen, Pencil and Poison," on the other hand, was the beginning of those oblique suggestions that induced in many of Wilde's readers a more or less vague disquiet—the sort of revelation that would seem to get narrower, more specific definition in "The Portrait of Mr. W. H." and would make many readers of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* feel that they had read an immoral book despite Wilde's protestations to the contrary in letters to the editors of the *St. James Gazette*, the *Daily Chronicle*, and the *Scots Observer* (*Letters* 257-72). It was as if Superman were revealing certain subterranean fascinations and proclivities that would shock society even while they exhilarated him. To make an argument for sin was one thing; to insinuate it into the actual experience of reading without compunction or corrective was quite another. It had about it some of the undertones of seduction.

Even as a literary creation, "Pen, Pencil and Poison" is quite different from anything else Wilde wrote. Thematically, it points in the direction of "The Portrait of Mr. W. H." and *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, and the presence in it of a substantial portion of biographical narrative with symbolic intent reminds one of Pater's invention of the "imaginary portrait" as a creative critical strategy. But "Pen, Pencil and Poison" is reminiscent of the sort of thing Carlyle had done in *Past and Present*, the form being more like a critical product of the 1840s than of the 1880s or 1890s.

That this symbolic intent is the controlling purpose of "Pen, Pencil and Poison" is the unmistakable conclusion to be drawn from the narrator's statement that "fiction has paid homage to one who was so powerful with 'pen, pencil and poison'" and from his assertion that "To be suggestive for fiction is to be of more importance than a fact" (1008). That

critical conclusion is further reinforced by the recognition that the attitude with which the story is told—its tone—is the crucial key to what it means. As in Browning's early monologues, the character of the speaker gives piquancy and color to the subject and profoundly affects the reader's reaction to it. As Wainwright the painter "had contrived to put the expression of his own wickedness into the portrait of a nice, kind-hearted girl" (1007), so the narrator shares the murderer's total lack of moral compunction.¹

A wry, sardonic tone, both tongue-in-cheek and subversive, is established in the opening paragraph. If you want your artists whole and complete, the narrator suggests, then you had better be prepared to take their completeness as it comes. Some artists, it is true, have been able to overcome the limitations imposed on their artist temperaments by "concentration of vision" and "intensity of purpose" and have served the state in positions of high public trust, but for others wholeness has taken a different course. "Charles Lamb's friend, Thomas Griffiths Wainwright," for example, added an exceptional gift for forgery to a creative talent for poetry, prose, painting, aesthetic criticism, antiquarianism, and a general interest in and fondness for things "beautiful" and "delightful"; he was also "a subtle and secret poisoner almost without rival in his or any age" (993). Wainwright is perceived as a sort of Renaissance man, and there is no hint that the public service of, say, a Goethe or a Milton was morally better or more admirable than Wainwright's extra-artistic activities. Indeed, the narrator observes later that crime seems to have made Wainwright's style "far more subtle and suggestive" and concludes that "One can fancy an intense personality being created out of sin" (1007).

That aesthetics and ethics have nothing to do with each other is an explicit declaration of "Pen, Pencil and Poison": "neither art nor science knows anything of moral approval or disapproval"; "the fact of a man being a poisoner is nothing against his prose"; "there is no essential incongruity between crime and culture" (1007-08). But such explicitness is not the source of the portrait's profounder aesthetic effect. On the other hand, we are asked to see the subject Wainwright in the radiance of an almost universal taste and artistic temperament whom some of the notables of his time found extraordinarily impressive—"a man who had a true passion for letters," a painter whose work Blake found "very fine," a writer of prose that Lamb called "capital," and a "dandy" whose affectations Hazlitt regarded as "the signs of a new manner in literature" (995). On the other hand, we are supposed to look on his career as a forger and the perpetrator of numerous recorded and unrecorded poisonings as so much amusing personal his-

¹ According to Ellmann, Wilde took his cue from Maurice Rollinat's "Le Soliloque de Troppmann": "What made the poem impressive was its total

absence of compunction, as if evil had its assured place in the scheme of things" (227). Also see Ellmann 300.

tory concerning which it would be tasteless and provincial to pass moral judgments. When "reproached" for poisoning his young sister-in-law, he is reported to have "shrugged his shoulders and said, 'Yes, it was a dreadful thing to do, but she had very thick ankles'" (1006). A reader can perhaps dismiss such cynical flippancy as theatre of the absurd, but only one with anarchistic or nihilistic tendencies could be expected to accept the narrator's view that the artist's need for self-fulfillment puts him above society's moral code—that even the gifted amateur and dilettante, the "dandy" who seeks "to be somebody, rather than to do something" (995), has aesthetic needs that he should be allowed to satisfy without having those who do not understand or respect the artistic temperament taking actions against him based on a moral code having no relevance to art.

The case for the fictional identity of the narrator of "Pen, Pencil and Poison" adds to the piece little in the way of imaginative complexity or critical energy. Since Wilde made no effort to distinguish between himself and his narrator through character development, dramatic situation, or ironic distancing, we may assume that he is Wilde in one of his representative roles—the iconoclast determined to push a revolutionary thesis beyond the tolerance-point of even the liberal-minded members of his audience.

The Wainewright portrayed in "Pen, Pencil and Poison" is a pioneering aesthete and individualist who is entirely detached from the Philistine social and ethical values of his time. No explanation is offered for his lack of moral scruple about forgery and murder, though a modern biographer would have stressed his loss of both parents in early childhood and his being shuttled between different guardians, one of whom he would later poison, by the time he was nine. Wilde mentions the elegant surroundings in which Wainewright spent his boyhood and, with ironic intent, his early and persistent susceptibility "to the spiritual influences of Wordsworth's poetry" (994, 1001, 1003).

Although Wilde declines throughout to find Wainewright's prose "capital," as Lamb had done, and suggests that the worst of his crimes was creating the "Asiatic prose" of modern journalism (1002), he pictures him as a pioneer in aesthetic appreciation and insight, a pace-setter and practical prophet. Besides being "one of the first to develop what has been called the art-literature of the nineteenth century" of which Ruskin and Browning were the "two most perfect exponents" (998), he was also "one of the first to recognise . . . the very keynote of aesthetic eclecticism," namely, "the true harmony of all really beautiful things irrespective of age or place, of school or manner" (996). This pre-Paterian motif is accompanied by several others: a primary concern with "the complex impressions produced by a work of art, . . . the first step in aesthetic criticism [being] to realise one's own impression"; a lack of interest in "abstract discussions on the nature of the Beautiful" and stress instead on "frequent contact with the best work"; a predilection for painters of the Renaissance and post-Renaissance and for "Hellenic marbles and Hellenic methods of work"; enthusiasm for "style as a conscious tradition" (997-98); the idea of "making a prose poem out of paint" from which "much of the best modern literature springs" (1001); and a wonderful variety of literary "sympathies," ranging freely from the English Romantics back

through the Elizabethan poets and dramatists to Petrarch, Chaucer, and the late Middle Ages. Like the typical aesthete of a later date, too, Wainewright had a natural aptitude for "masks" and had so peculiarly the "dangerous and delightful distinction of being different from others" that he reminded one of such singularly memorable fictional persons as Balzac's Lucien de Rubempré and Stendahl's Julian Sorel (995).

Like Wilde himself and some of Wilde's imaginary characters, Wainewright had "that curious love of green, which in individuals is always the sign of a subtle artistic temperament, and in nations is said to denote a laxity, if not a decadence in morals" (996); like them, too, he surrounded himself with beautiful objects from many different places and times, not because they were archaeologically accurate, but because they were aesthetically pleasing. He was so convinced of "the identity of the primal seeds of poetry and painting" that he maintained that "any true advancement in the study of one art co-generates a proportionate perfection in the other . . ." (1001). The "qualities" he looked for in a painting were "composition, beauty and dignity of line, richness of colour, and imaginative power," and he held that a work of art will pass the best critical judgment on itself if only the critic will "see the object as in itself it really is" (997).

Despite the fact that Wainewright's moment in time precluded his being an authentic Hegelian or a fin de siècle impressionist, his credentials are extraordinary. Had he realized himself artistically as fully as he did criminally, he would have been one of the great aesthetic critics of his age, perhaps the greatest. What Wilde seems to ask us to do is to weigh these spectacular artistic credits against a life of crime and to find the account balanced. He asserts that "Crime in England" is almost "always the result of starvation" rather than of "sin" (1006) and seems to equate with physical starvation Wainewright's hunger for an elegant, gracious life amidst a personal collection of objets d'art. The antinomianism that Gilbert, in "The Critic as Artist," claims as the right and obligation of the critic and the mystic appears to be offered as exoneration of Wainewright for defrauding banks and insurance companies and for murdering countless persons whose existence he found inconvenient.

As Wilde knew, Plato had dealt with the same subject. In the *Republic*, he left "art for art's sake" intact, but he imposed upon artists the same obligation assumed by all citizens in the City of the Perfect, that is, the obligation to strive for individual fulfillment in the overriding interests of the fulfillment of the whole society. The artist who so disciplined his art as to contribute to society's search for perfection would be welcome; those who did not would be excluded. That artists should be allowed to conduct their lives according to some "vicious centrifugal tendency" without having moral judgment passed on them, Plato did not entertain as an issue deserving serious consideration.

Had Wilde treated the issue of art and sin more whimsically, one might be able to consider it more as a rhetorical strategy than as the assertion of a belief seriously, if tentatively, maintained. However, as his fame increased along with his notoriety, Wilde became more persistent and less guarded on the most disturbing social attitude he had ever seemed to endorse. There is no evidence that this particular ideology attracted a significant following, but the chaotic implications

for society even of the idea were too sobering to be laughed off or ignored unless, of course, one chose that as the best way to laugh off or ignore Oscar Wilde himself.

Works Cited

- Buckler, William E. *Walter Pater: The Critic as Artist of Ideas*. New York: New York UP, 1987.
- Ellmann, Richard. *Oscar Wilde*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1988.
- Pater, Walter. "Plato's Aesthetics." *Plato and Platonism*. London: Macmillan, 1910.

- Wilde, Oscar. *Letters of Oscar Wilde*. Ed. Rupert Hart-Davis. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1962.
- _____. *More Letters of Oscar Wilde*. Ed. Rupert Hart-Davis. New York: Vanguard, 1985.
- _____. "Pen, Pencil and Poison." *Complete Works of Oscar Wilde*. London & Glasgow: Collins, 1966.
- _____. "The Critic as Artist." *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde*. London & Glasgow: Collins, 1966.

New York University

Sara Coleridge: The Gigadibs Complex

Nathan Cervo

Sara, the gifted daughter of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, was born at Greta Hall, Keswick, on December 22, 1802. In the *Memoir and Letters of Sara Coleridge*, S. T. Coleridge is cited as describing her thus: "My meek little Sara is a remarkably interesting baby, with the finest possible skin, and large blue eyes; and she smiles as if she were basking in a sunshine, as mild as moonlight, of her own quiet happiness" (35). In 1822 she translated Dobrizhofer's Latin *Account of the Abipones*, and in 1825 the "Loyal Servitor's" memoirs of the Chevalier Bayard. In 1829 she married her cousin, Henry Nelson Coleridge, and helped to edit her father's writings. She died on May 3, 1852. To read *Memoir and Letters* is to make the acquaintance of a highly educated, very articulate, quite refreshingly charming woman of Victorian letters in whom a combination of Epictetus, Boethius, Pepys, and her own father seems to have been reincarnated.

What is of particular interest to us here is her meeting with the Brownings. In a letter to Mr. Ellis Yarnall (dated 28 August 1851), Sara notes: "My daughter and I lately met at the house of my excellent old friend, Mr. Kenyon, that poetical pair, Mr. and Mrs. Browning" (*Memoir* 516). The subject of conversation on that occasion is not given. In 1855 Browning published "Bishop Blougram's Apology" in *Men and Women*. I am not suggesting that, with the psychological poet's deft and ready expertise in such matters, Browning picked Sara's psyche clean, and that he later had her specifically and exclusively in mind when he concocted the Gigadibs-figure of the "Apology"; but I am proposing that a good deal of light can be shed on the shadowy Gigadibs' insistence on "Pure faith" (l. 647) by experiencing it through the prism of Sara Coleridge's memoir and letters. The Coleridgean connection with the "Apology" appears to be supported by these lines:

You, Gigadibs, who, thirty years of age,
Write stately for Blackwood's Magazine,
Believe you see two points in Hamlet's soul
Unseized by the Germans yet— (ll. 944-47)

Hartley Coleridge, Sara's brother, had spent two desultory years in London, writing occasionally for *Blackwood's Magazine*. One of the essays was on *Hamlet*. After Hartley's death (6 January 1849), Sara wrote in 1850 to her brother, the Reverend Edward Coleridge, of Hartley's "beautiful critique on 'Hamlet' in Blackwood" (*Memoir* 465). One is left wondering just what did take place at her 1851 meeting with the Brownings.

In what follows I shall cite a good deal from Sara in order to show how she shared Gigadibs' insistence on "Pure faith." I shall indicate to what extent this idea of hers was derived from "the Germans" (see "Apology," l. 947) by way of her father's thought on the subject; and, just as Gigadibs had his Blougram, I shall treat briefly of Sara's relationship to the Tractarians, Newman, and other traditional ecclesiastics. Finally, I shall conclude by suggesting that what I have described as her "Gigadibs Complex" in the title of this paper resolved itself, as Hamlet himself hoped to do, "in a dew"; by which I mean the sparkling distillation and liquefaction of Christian indifference.

Just as Gigadibs is put off by Bishop Blougram's temporal splendor, Sara is distressed at the religious notion of faith as place, or "edifice":

... I do not feel quite satisfied that church grandeur was ever based on pure Gospel *faith*, as Keble and others maintain. Pure faith does so much *else* for God, so much for her neighbor during lifetime, that she leaves not great sums behind to build a temple Then our modern church splendor is so poor and petty and equivocal; so vulgarized by patterns displayed in shops, and all kinds of trade associations. It does not flow from any great universal spirit which will last, but is supported by an effort of a busy section, running counter to the age instead of concurring with it. (336-37)

The trouble with edifices is that people can be locked out of them; indeed, *ecclesia* derives from Greek etymons meaning "locking out." Sara prefers "any great universal spirit" to temples erected on the basis of false or postponed charity. The "purity" that Sara has in mind characterizes the soul that has been regenerated through Baptism. Her thoughts on Baptism demonstrate that, for her, Baptism "shows who the Elect are." It is an "instrumental" *act*—and here she opposes the passivity of outlook on the part of "the Oxford writers." In her estimation, Baptism is an intersubjective act, one that confirms the elected soul as a child of God. She considers the sacrament of Confirmation as "complementary" to Baptism, which makes men and women "incapable of sinning." One can see why she honors Luther so much, whom she describes as vulgar (at times) but never "profane"—a real man, not suited to the prissiness of Oxford "tea-parties." Luther represents the authentically manly aspect of the continuing Baptismal intersubjective act.

. . . However, it seems to be a point with the Oxford writers, either for good or evil, very much to represent, not children only, but men, as the *passive* unco-operating subject (or rather, in one sense, *object*) of divine operation. They are jealous of holding up, or dwelling much upon, grace as an *influence* on the conscious spirit, a stimulator and co-agent of the human will, or enlightener of the human intellect. (143)

The trouble with "intersubjectivity" of this non-"objective" kind is that, on the face of it, it does seem to retreat from "the conscious spirit" in order to abide in "the depths of the human spirit":

What think you is my last appeal which is not your last appeal? Whither can either of us go as the last resort, the ultimatum of our religious search, but to the depths of the human spirit, the heart and conscience of which Reason is the pervading light, and in which God and His truth are mirrored? Have *you*, then, any place or object of appeal beyond this? Can *you* contemplate God and His Christ except in your own soul? (340)

This recourse to the Kantian *Vernunft* ("Reason"), the Leibnizian monad, and, proleptically, to Jungian Depth Psychology is not without its cogency. Certainly, it reaffirms the "purity" (according to essence) of the elect soul. Sara writes:

You will hold me pseudo-philosophical, rationalistic, and so forth, I fear, when I avow my belief that popular dogmatic Christianity, whether of your Church or of ours, is not pure faith, and that a greater approximation to just views of the Bible and of the grounds of religious belief belongs to individuals than is found in any *party* . . . Is it genuine fear for pure religion that . . . leads the Catholic clergy "to deprive the Irish youth of their communion of a liberal education," rather than let them receive it, even in its secular branches, from any but the servants of Rome? (462-63)

Again, in this matter of "purity" vs. polity:

The principles of the Anglo-Catholic writers are contrary to the principles of the Reformation, those on which the formularies of our Church were framed. It is very true that our first Reformers held many of the opinions of the Anglo-Catholics, but they did not carry them out as Anglo-Catholics do now; their new doctrines did not harmonize with the old ones which they still retained. They reformed *doctrines* only to a certain extent, and this is the less to be wondered at because reform of doctrine, as such, was not the original chief object of the Reformation, but the putting down of corrupt moral practices, which had grown out of doctrine, and were more and more overshadowing the truths of the Gospel, and darkening its pure light. (470-71)

What is fundamental to Christian belief is not "party" but the "pure light" of the Gospel.

Sara's predilection among the four gospel accounts is obviously for that of the seer, symbolized by an eagle gazing unflinchingly at the sun, St. John, the only one among the original twelve apostles who died a natural death, and at a very advanced age, according to tradition. She writes:

Chester Place, September, 1838.—The more one thinks of it, the more puzzling it seems that the raising of Lazarus is only recorded in St. John's Gospel. The common way of accounting for the matter can not easily be set down, but yet it does not satisfy. We feel there may be something yet in the case which we do not fathom, and knowing as we do from constant experience how much there is in most things which transcend our knowledge—what unsuspected facts and truths have come to light, and explained phenomena of which we had given quite different explanations previously—we can not but feel that the true way of accounting for this discrepancy has never yet come to light. (161-62)

This is provocative. Does Sara mean that St. John is beyond history at this point and writing pure mythopoeia? If so, what is the meaning of the myth? Is it that the elect soul simply responds to the Master's call and thus leaves the ceremonies of "party" in favor of the "pure light" of spiritual gnosis? The Tractarians, of course, would accept the event as undiluted history and explain the silence of the Synoptics as an attempt to preserve the renewed life of Lazarus, for we are told by St. John himself that the "Jews" sought to kill Lazarus. By the time St. John wrote his Gospel, it may be safely assumed, Lazarus had died a second time.

For Sara, as for her father, metaphysics is the ally of Christianity. As she joshingly wrote to Aubrey de Vere in an 1849 letter:

I quarreled with naught in [your Landor article] but a certain sentence about modern metaphysics, by which I suppose you mean Kant, Jacobi, Schelling, and Co., "like a dog questing after old philosophies." *Pray what do you mean by that, sir?* As if dogs ever quested after philosophy. Now don't attempt to set me right about the sentence—I remember it distinctly. I consider your view of modern metaphysics quite canine, almost inclining to mad-doggish. You have a German metaphysico-phobia! You

ought to smother, not yourself, but *it*, that same *phobia* of modern metaphysics. (384-85)

The trouble with "pure metaphysics" (as Sara calls it) is that it is highly corrosive of matter, tending to refine "object" into what de Vere called "*scenic illusion*." From a "Romanist" point of view, the Mystery of the Hypostatic Union (*i.e.*, that Jesus was simultaneously True God and True Man) is likely to go up in smoke, and with it the "right worship" of orthodoxy—including the Incarnation, Mary qua *Mater Dei*, and the Eucharist. And in Sara's thought they do:

Pure metaphysics are in reality as distinct from religion as mathematics. No man could tell from the philosophical essays of Leibnitz or of Berkeley whether the author was a Roman or Anglican, or whether he was or was not a believer in Revelation, or even whether he was a Theist or Pantheist or Polytheist, or at least even this would not be necessary to the enunciation of the philosophy. Leibnitz applies metaphysical principles to the elucidation of doctrine, and tries to defend transubstantiation on his own particular theory, the result of which seems to me to be that he arrives at the Anglican idea of the Real Presence as a spiritual power in the soul of the receiver. But in his pure metaphysical treatises his creed is not to be discovered. (463-64)

The Real Presence turns out to be the Ideal Presence, and the Incarnation means that the Word became a suit of clothes.

In life there is no more personal identity than in the body to which it belongs; indeed, the tangible frame and the life together constitute the body; it is *my* life, *my* body, not more myself than my clothes, and only seeming more so because in this world inseparably connected. (131)

Sara later speaks, in connection with Jesus Christ, of "a material and fleshly body, such as He wore upon earth, and appeared in after the Resurrection" (244). She adds:

But my father believed that there will be a resurrection of the *body*, which will have nothing to do with flesh and blood; he speaks of a *noumenal* body, as opposed to our present phenomenal one (245)

The "*noumenal* body" is "a supersensual body, the *noumenon* of the human nature." One is left mulling over a multitude of questions. Are all people saved? Does death automatically release one from the "purgatory" of this life into Heaven (to which I can give no other status, under the circumstances, than that of the apotheosis of man, his restoration to Logos qua Anthropos)? If all is really a "cycle of images and sensations in the imagination of the beholders" (S. T. Coleridge, cited 245), and if "really" in this context means "phenomenally," why should Christ have become Incarnated? If believers are, by essence, indistinguishable from the Good Shepherd, why the masquerade? One need not be a "Romanist" to reel before this onslaught in which gnosis transcends even Jesus's words, "I know my sheep and they know me." The sheep are "*de trop*":

On the other hand, I can not admire Landseer's "Shepherd in Prayer" so much as it is the fashion to do. In this picture he aims at something in a higher line than he has attempted before; and, to my mind, in this higher line he wants power. There is doubtless a sweet feeling about the picture: the shepherd is good, and he kneels before a most picturesquely rural crucifix; but the sheep are *de trop*—such a quantity of dead fleece scattered around, and continued on to the very horizon [.]. (227)

The Petrine formula "one shepherd, one flock" is given a bizarre turn and becomes "one flock = one shepherd."

Since the flock equals the shepherd, there is no need for a pastoral church, no need for anything that is "external" to faith. "The kingdom of heaven is within you."

What matters for believers is *being*. The existential meaning of charity is to be Christian. The authentic substance of "Pure faith" is identical with that of ontology:

The truth is, those who undervalue this branch of philosophy, or rather this root and stem of it, seem scarce aware how impossible it is for any reflective Christian to be without metaphysics of one kind or another. Without being aware of it, we all receive a metaphysical scheme, either partially or wholly, from those who have gone before us; and by its aid we interpret the Bible. It is but few perhaps who have time to acquire any clear or systematic knowledge of divinity. When the heart is right, individuals may be in some respects first-rate Christians without any speculative insight, because the little time for study is caused by active exertion; and this active exertion, pursued in a religious spirit, and converted into the service of God by the way of performing it, is perhaps the most effective school of Christianity. But when there *is* time to read, then I do think that, both for the sake of others and of ourselves, the cultivation of the intellect, with a view to religious knowledge, is a positive duty; and I believe it to be clearly established, though not cordially and generally admitted, that the study of metaphysics is the best preparatory exercise for a true understanding of the Bible. False metaphysics can be counteracted by true metaphysics alone; and divines who have not the one, can hardly fail, I think, to have the other. (160)

The ontology which Sara is describing here as "true metaphysics" corresponds to grace enacting itself in the hearts of Christian believers. This grace must be regarded as monergistic in operation: sheep = shepherd.

Just as Gigadibs was no doubt to think of himself as confronted by Blougram, an "arch-hypocrite" (l. 927) who strategically resorted to inferential logic, the premises of which were established on wholly mundane experience, to win his rhetorical argument, so Sara Coleridge viewed Newman and the other Tractarians as being vitiated by worldly notions of knowledge and the reliability of its sources. She saw them as trying to spoon the ocean of *being* into the beach pail of dogmatic systematization. For her, they resorted to the Church Fathers only to hear their own voices, like ventriloquists. In a letter to Miss Arabella Brooke (29 July 1837), she writes:

I have lately been reading, certainly with great interest, the sermons of John Henry Newman; and I trust they are likely to do great good, by placing in so strong a light as they do the indispensableness of an orthodox belief, the importance of sacraments as the main channels of Christian privileges, and the powers, gifts, and offices of Christian ministers derived by apostolic succession—the insufficiency of personal piety without Catholic brotherhood—the sense that we are all members of one body, and subjects of one kingdom of Christ—the danger of a constant craving for religious excitement, and the fatal mistake of trusting in any devotional thoughts and feelings, which are not immediately put into act, and do not shine through the goings-on of our daily life. But then these exalted views are often supported, as I think, by unfair reasonings; and are connected with other notions which appear to me superstitious, unwarranted by any fair interpretation of Scripture, and containing the germs of Popish errors. (137-38)

Newman was not inclined to her father's notion of the "noumenal body" that, upon death, was released from phenomena into a restoration with whatever lay gloriously beyond. His traditional eschatological concerns included not just death and heaven but death, judgment, heaven, hell. Sara wrote, in a letter to Mrs. Joshua Stanger (28 November 1837):

Mr. Dodsworth, Mr. J. H. Newman, and other influential writers, insist very strongly on this point, that the Resurrection, and not the departure from this life, is the period on which the hope of a Christian ought to be fixed; and they say it is too common to hear the bereaved enlarge on the immediate felicity of the released sufferer escaped from his tabernacle of clay. (154)

Sara goes on to say that she can find no Scriptural basis for this assertion.

As Tractarianism gained strength and it became increasingly clear to Sara that Newman and his colleagues were working from the starting point of a *depositum fidei*, namely not only from the Scriptures but from tradition, she asserted that she was "Catholic":

Yes! a Catholic Christian, as I humbly hope—and, *more-over*, a Protestant of the Church of England To call myself such does not make me a whit less Christian and Catholic, nor imply that I am so; it does not mix me up with sectarians any more than the latter term connects me with the gross errors and grievous practices of Romanists, who, whether they are entitled to the name or not, will always assume it. As for its being a *modern* designation—that which rendered a distinctive appellation necessary is an event of modern times; and that, I think, is a sufficient defense of it on this score. "Reformed Catholic" savors altogether of Newman and the nineteenth century. (168-69)

If only etymologically, no one could be more "catholic," or universal, than Sara, for whom charity was theoretically the substance of authentic human being. However, wherever Anthropos may be, he is not of this world. Interspersed

among other matters of interest to her, including some excellent literary criticism on her part concerning Keats, Shelley, Wordsworth, and continental European writers, allusions to and examinations of Newman become more frequent and acerbic. He is a dogmatist; he therefore goes her "true metaphysics" one better by absolutely ignoring it in favor of the Catholic Mysteries. For Newman, the world is no symbol. It means and it means not only intensely but extensively.

It is no irony that liberty is often dependent on tyranny. This apparently was the case in England when the adherents of the New Christianity (which, at bottom, so it was claimed for it, was really Old) eradicated Catholic corruption by putting a bastard on the throne, confiscating vast estates, and using the pages of precious manuscripts to wrap fish in. Sara saw a resurgence of the "party" of scoundrels, hypocrites, and libertines gathering at her feet. Like all lovers of individual liberty, she was shocked by Catholic Emancipation. When the Catholics actually began to agitate for their civil rights—the reestablishment of sees in England was a matter of enormous concern on both sides—she suddenly constricted her ontological charity into a "party" of her own. She took sides:

I own I rejoice in the anti-papal demonstration. The fear and anger of this crisis will, of course, subside; but what has taken place proves, and will show the Romanists and Romanizers that there is a deep-seated and wide-spread aversion to Popery in this fair realm of England, which will come into effective action whenever any attempt is made to reintroduce a form of religion which is the natural and necessary enemy to liberty in all times and in every place. I can not agree with C_____S_____, who thinks we are straining at a gnat after swallowing the camel of Emancipation. There was nothing that directly endangered our Church in a Romanist's sitting in Parliament; and the principles of toleration and equal dealing with all religions, *as such*, seemed to demand the concession. But this act is, in reality, a political movement, and ought to be politically resisted. My Uncle Southey would have refused Emancipation in the foresight of this and similar aggressions; but it was better to give them *rope* enough to strangle their own cause in the hearts of the whole nation. Now no man can say that the intolerance and ambition of Romanism are obsolete; all must see that it is a born Ishmael: its hand is against every other form of religion, and every other form must keep a controlling hand upon it. (473-74)

To be quite frank, if anybody had been given enough "rope" to "strangle" on, it was Sara. She had been raised by a bigot, Southey, and had a man for a father who defined "Northernism" as "A Gnostic whisper," the "superlative *Species*" of which is "Scotism" (cited by Coburn 82). Coleridge's defining "Northernism" as a "genus," which turns out to be "A Gnostic whisper" shows just how cracked the man could be. Why "whisper," which evokes Satanic furtiveness? In addition, to speak of Scotism as a "species" is indeed sardonic, since Scotism, which held that form not matter is the principle of individuation, is an extreme realism insisting that each thing is uniquely itself and cannot properly be subsumed under the heading of genus. What Coleridge evokes is a material world that is informed (*i.e.* takes its form) by diabolic

laughter. If "superstition" is derived from etymons meaning "to survive a calamity" (cf. the Italian *superstite* today), it is not Romanism that is superstitious, as Sara claims it is, but the mythopoeic telescoping of all the orders of *being*, indeed all the integral materiality of individuals, in that "Gnostic whisper." Concerning her father's eerie monism, whatever particular name be given it, Sara wrote:

He laughed at the notion of the separability of the *real* body from the soul—the arbitrary notion of man as a mixture of heterogeneous components. "On this doctrine," he says, "the man is a mere phenomenal result, a sort of brandy-sop, a toddy-punch, a doctrine unsanctioned by, indeed inconsistent with, the Scriptures. It is not true that body plus soul makes man. Man is not the syntheton or composition of body and soul, as the two component units. No—man is the unit, the prothesis, and body and soul are the two poles, the positive and negative, the thesis and antithesis of the man, even as attraction and repulsion are the two poles in and by which one and the same magnet manifests itself." (245)

The official (*i.e.* Thomistic) Romanist position on this is that man is a composite, and furthermore that the principle of individuation is matter not form. Obviously, if form makes the individual instead of matter, a thing may be present as itself independent of its material manifestation. With this in mind, it should come as no surprise that Sara says that she believes that "Jesus is God." But, to my mind, her father believed precisely the same thing about the albatross in his "Rime of the Ancient Mariner."

I have no doubt that Sara was sincere and earnest in her rejection of Romanism as intolerant, superstitious, and, perhaps worst of all, humanistic. The subject of "Pure faith" is not man but God. For her, flock = shepherd, and it was wrong for a priesthood to set itself up as a brokerage firm specializing in ritualistic magic, grace, indulgences, Mariolatry, the forgiveness of sin, and papal despotism. "Pure faith" contemplates only the Bible as the Word of God and meets God intimately and inexplicably within the soul. The human content of "Pure faith" is the regenerate man:

The Spiritual in man is the Will; the Will, because it is will, can only be changed by its own act, under a higher impulsion.

St. John declares that the regenerate can not live in sin. We find that none abstain from sin but by acts of will, and an energy of submission to God. Thus the idea of a spiritual being born into a divine and sinless nature, and St. John's description, taken in the plain, undistorted sense, perfectly coincide. (419)

In a word: "What grieves my soul the most in all the teaching and preaching of the Tractarian new-old divines is their treatment of St. John's Epistle" (417). To say that a baptized person *who sins* is regenerate in the sense that he still retains the power to become the child of God through repentance impresses Sara as outrageous: "If this in not Antinomianism, I know not what is" (418). Succinctly, it would appear that Romanism does not only make it possible but actually makes

it easy for the sinner to have his cake and eat it too. Considered purely as a humanism, Romanism has the obvious advantage of keeping the wolf of despair (cf. Coleridge's "Dejection: An Ode") from the door. In reference to "Bishop Blougram's Apology," one can understand Gigadibs' dismay at Blougram's opulence, worldliness, and pride in both his personal attainments and official sumptuousness, with ladies kissing his ring. Is *this* what it means to be Christian? Blougram would answer yes, since Romanism is a realism, and human psychology and society being what they are, the Church must accommodate itself to the best ways of being effective in promoting the Gospel message, which includes the fact, stated in Genesis, that God *created* the world (*i.e.* God is *not* the world in any shape, form, or manner) and found it to be good, very good. As Jesus expressed His mission, "I have come so that you may have life more abundantly." For Blougram, the essential Mystery is *human* not ontological—the humanity and example of Jesus. As Jesus put it, "What you do unto the least of these my brethren you do also to me." When Blougram pours wine out for himself, he is accepting the world as good and is grateful for it. When he offers to pour wine out for Gigadibs, he is actually offering it to Jesus—or, more precisely, to Gigadibs for Christ's sake. From the Romanist point of view, this is as it ought to be. And it should be remembered that the Bible also tells us that to him who has it shall be added, from him who has not it shall be taken away. Faith is pure when it is situated in the world and piously attentive, as Adam should have been, to the happy maintenance of the world. When the speaker of the coda of the "Apology" expresses the hope that Gigadibs has "studied his last chapter of St. John" (l. 1014), he may mean that there are, after all, four gospels, and it will not do to be obsessed by one.

Sara is her father's daughter and will not be moved from her position of "Pure faith." For her, as will be the case for Northrop Frye more than a century later in *The Great Code*, the Bible is sufficient when read by the regenerate believer. She accuses the Romanists of adulterating the purity of the Bible by including apocrypha suited to their purposes of universal political dominion. Whereas Romanism claims that it alone is Christ's Church operating in the existential plenitude of His will, and that this is proved by its four marks; namely, that it is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, Sara is of a different "opinion" (a word she uses to oppose "dogma"):

The Bible itself, that is, the five Books of Moses and the four Gospels, with a mother's living commentary, together with the Catechism and Liturgy, appear to me the best instruments for teaching the Christian religion to young children. (137)

She sees the Tractarians as setting the Protestantism of the Church of England in harm's way:

The inconsistency of the Anglo-Catholic position seems to me to be this: The Anglican, who firmly maintains the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, as absolutely essential to the being of the Christian Church, and boasts that our hierarchy, by means of regular ordination, descends in an unbroken line from the Apostles; who insists upon the

absolving powers of the clergy, and founds them upon Scripture, by transferring the promise of our Lord to His faithful followers (the chosen Twelve) that they should have the power of binding and loosing, to all their successors ordained in due form, whatever their personal qualities may happen to be; when it is objected that the language of the New Testament itself authorizes no such application, that it is an arbitrary extension of the sense, and supposes a thing in its own nature unreasonable, because the mission and the promise are obviously adapted to the personal qualifications of those to whom they were originally addressed—their supernatural powers, which ceased with them—their burning faith and zeal, which can not be conveyed by ordination, or any other ceremony; the Anglican, I say, constantly replies (and certainly no other reply can be given) that all sound members of the Catholic Church submit to the judgment of the Church, which is to be ascertained by the decrees and acts of general councils and the consent of ancient bishops and doctors. But on all the same grounds of Scripture, and application of Scripture by Councils and Fathers, we ought to believe in the primacy of the Pope, that he is the supreme judge in all controversies, and the determiner of doctrine, whence it follows that we ought to accept the whole Romish system, with its deification of the Virgin, doctrine of the Mass, adoration of saints (for such it practically is), with all those religious institutes and practices which the English mind so revolts from and contemns—the mockery of indulgences, the corruption of the confessional, monasticism with all its social mischiefs, lossening the bonds of family life, intrusion and domination of the priesthood. For all these things and more are contained in that dark womb—so simple without, so labyrinthine within—the Papal Supremacy and Infallibility; for though the latter article is not called *de fide*, yet it so obviously follows from the former that exalters of the Papacy may very well afford to leave it to take care of itself when the Supremacy has been established. (513)

Of such, much of it Waldensianism pure and simple, is the fabric of the mind of Gigadibs, or The Gigadibs Complex. However, whereas Gigadibs is figured by the Bishop as scornfully dismissing Romanism as “humbug” (l. 41), Sara is much more gracious finally in her summation. To Aubrey de Vere she wrote (19 October 1851):

My dear friend, . . .

I am sure you would have a pleasure in giving up your own favorite project of visiting Rome—postponing it in order to guard the poor invalid on her way to a better clime than this . . .

I do verily think no pious Romanist can suppose that faith does not involve a spiritual intuition and internal revelation of the truth. But the question was, which is the *ultimate ground of belief*, that which underlies and supports all the rest, this discernment of divine things which Christ himself by his Spirit works in the heart, or the teaching of the Church? Is the latter necessary to assure us that the very work of God in the soul of man is really and truly His work? (525)

The Romanist answer, which may surprise some, to this question is no. The Church is not *absolutely* necessary to salvation; however, it is *morally* necessary. The Church is extremely lenient in its interpretation of the formula “*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*” (“outside the Church there is no salvation”). The Church divides its membership into two classes: 1) the visible members, and 2) the invisible members. The second class consists of all men of good will who, for whatever reasons, have not formally entered the Church. Of such, I should think, was Sara Coleridge. She sincerely believed in the “Pure faith” of her religious position. Her question—which is the *ultimate ground of belief*?—has direct relevance to the “Apology”:

“On the whole,” he thought, “I justify myself

“On every point where cavillers like this

“Oppugn my life: he tries one kind of fence,

“I close, he’s worsted, that’s enough for him.

“He’s on the ground! if ground should break away

“I take my stand on, there’s a firmer yet

“Beneath it, both of us may sink and reach.

“His ground was over mine and broke the first.

“So let him sit with me this many a year!” (ll. 997-1005)

Gigadibs’ “ground” was a brittle contemptuousness for the Bishop. On this level, Blougram engaged him and compelled his respect—if only by demonstrating that he (the Bishop) was no nincompoop. But there is another “ground” below that one, the “*ultimate ground of belief*” mentioned by Sara in her letter to Aubrey, which, in Blougram’s opinion, both he and Gigadibs “may sink and reach.” This sinking implies what lies below a man’s efforts to fend for himself, to save himself; it implies an abject reliance on God’s love and mercy, on the complete sufficiency of God’s salvific will for each of us. The Bishop’s “spiritual intuition and internal revelation of the truth” is that, when all appears lost, “Pure faith,” corrected and made acceptable by humility, does have a place; indeed, the key place. Humility was no stranger to Sara:

Humility is not the mere consciousness of our low estate, but the disposition to act and suffer as if we had no high claims; and this is different from modesty, yet, I think, akin to it. Humility, perhaps, is the being *content* with the low place and scant portion; Modesty, a sense of the impropriety of claiming a higher and a better. (226)

In this light, the Bishop’s “Apology” is immodest, but it contains the regenerate seed of humility, held in reserve.

To return to Sara’s letter to Aubrey:

An external system for teaching Christianity, for initiating men into it, leading them to Christ, I believe to be a part of God’s providence; and such a system, in so far as it is conformed to reason and moral truth, will have the blessing of the Spirit. But I can not think it necessary, or even desirable for the right religious education of mankind—the education of the higher faculties and nobler feelings—that this system should be infallible. I admit that sin is not the only obstacle or impediment by which divine truth may be kept from the minds of men. The African

savage can not make himself religious wholly from within. There must be a preacher and outward instrumentalities. I only meant to say that when the deep spiritual verities, which are the substance of the faith, are presented to the mind, it is *sin*, and not any imperfection in our faculties, which can alone prevent it from being clearly perceived. This seems to be plainly intimated by our Lord, when He shows why the Jews did not receive Him, in His discourse to Philip. Upon the whole, we have as good means of knowing the Saviour, and all that concerns our peace, as our Lord's disciples had. We can not know Him at all, except by an inward revelation of the Spirit. It is by knowledge of the truth—that is, information of it from without—that this communion with the enlightening Spirit comes about. But where it is, surely it is an absolute, independent certainty . . .

. . . I care not so much about the difference between

Romish and Anglican, though I confess the views of the Blessed Virgin in the Church of Rome do seem to me to make modern Romanism an essentially different faith and system from that of the Bible and of early Christianity. (526)

Seven months later she was dead.

Works Cited

- Coburn, Kathleen. *Experience into Thought: Perspectives in the Coleridge Notebooks*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1979.
Coleridge, Sara. *Memoir and Letters of Sara Coleridge*. Ed. her daughter. New York: Harper, 1874.

Franklin Pierce College

“On Tuesday Last, at St. George’s . . .”: The Dandaical Wedding in Dickens

Patricia Marks

While I—good Heaven!—have thatched myself over with the dead fleeces of sheep, the bark of vegetables, the entrails of worms, the hides of oxen or seals, the felt of furred beasts; and walk abroad a moving Rag-screen, over-heaped with shreds and tatters raked from the Charnel-house of Nature, where they would have rotted, to rot on me more slowly!

Carlyle's fulminations in *Sartor Resartus* against the genesis of the rags and riches in which we wrap our transcendental selves suggest a vision of the universe that would seem to make his friendship with Dickens, a would-be dandy who loved flamboyant waistcoats, unlikely. Yet we know that, although Carlyle's evaluation of Dickens was measured, he quickly saw that the novelist who “dressed à la D'Orsay rather than well, . . . [was] a quiet, shrewd-looking, little fellow, who seems to guess pretty well what he is and what others are” (qtd. in Kaplan 261). For his part Dickens responded both personally and fictionally to Carlyle. The influence of *Sartor Resartus* is pervasive in Dickens's novels, reflected generally in his handling of the existential effects of clothing and the emptiness of social conventions and institutions. More specifically, however, Dickens treats the wedding ceremony as an artifice fashioned of conventions about ritual and clothing; by the time of *Dombey and Son*, it has become a touchstone against which human relationships are tested. Dickens's satires of weddings and his mock terror at the untoward interest of small female children in the proceedings are, then, the comic sides of a more philosophical fear, one that he held in consort with Carlyle: that the lavish wedding ceremony replete with festive clothing and decoration is an artifact created by the female dandy, whose male prototype Carlyle attacks so resoundingly in *Sartor Resartus*.

The question of whether and how Dickens borrowed from Carlyle has been well debated and certainly documented in Michael Goldberg's and William Oddie's detailed studies, and almost everyone agrees generally with Mildred Christian's observation that Dickens “seems to have been acquainted in greater or less degree, with every important social pronouncement of Carlyle between 1829 and 1843 and to have agreed so heartily with their expressions that he may appropriately be termed a true disciple” (pt. 2, 26). The problem is in identifying the direct influence of *Sartor Resartus*, especially on the early works. Christian, who looks closely at Dickens's 1850's novels, sees “specific, though less extensive evidence” as early as *Oliver Twist* (pt. 2, 17), and F. S. Schwarzbach finds an early borrowing in Dickens's 1836 *Morning Chronicle* essay “Meditations in Monmouth Street.” On the other hand, Oddie argues that unless Dickens happened to read *Sartor Resartus* in periodical form (it was published in *Fraser's* in 1833-34; Dickens actually met Carlyle in 1839), the book, published in 1838, could not have influenced *Oliver Twist*, which began serial publication in 1837 (4-5). Others deal with specific works: Richard Dunn notes that there is no definitive proof that Dickens had read *Sartor Resartus* before writing *David Copperfield* (1849-50) (195, note 1); Christensen sees “Brummellism” in *Martin Chuzzlewit* (1843-44); and both Goldberg and Alan Kennedy explore dandyism in *Bleak House* (1852-53). Perhaps one of the most focused analyses of the influence of Dickens's use of the dandy theme is in Ellen Moers's book *The Dandy: Brummell to Beerbohm*, in which she examines the development of the “grey man,” “a gentleman of the new dandy tradition” (232).

As Moers says, the dandy stood for “superiority, irresponsibility, inactivity”; he was

a creature perfect in externals and careless of anything below the surface, a man dedicated solely to his own perfection through a ritual of taste. The epitome of selfish irresponsibility, he was ideally free of all human commitments that conflict with taste: passions, moralities, ambitions, politics or occupations. (13)

He was a man who intellectualized and aestheticized the act of dressing; he made wearing clothing into an existential gesture. Teufelsdröckh's dandy is all of this and more:

A Dandy is a Clothes-wearing Man, a Man whose trade, office, and existence consists [*sic*] in the wearing of clothes. Every faculty of his soul, spirit, purse, and person is heroically consecrated to this one object, the wearing of Clothes wisely and well: so that as others dress to live, he lives to dress. (272; bk. 3, ch. 10)

In a witty self-parody Carlyle sees in this "willing sacrifice of the Immortal to the Perishable" a mark of the prophet, but a prophet who is engaged in cultic "Self-Worship" and who asks no return but "that you would recognize his existence." Like a cult, Dandyism has its "Temple"—Almack's with its assembly rooms whose weekly balls were marked by exclusivism; its "Sacred Books"—silver-fork novels that put Teufelsdröckh to sleep; and its creed—seven propositions prescribing waistcoats, jewelry, and trousers. The dandy's indifference to his poorer brothers provokes Teufelsdröckh to a Dantean vision of the Dandies and the Drudges, canceling each other out like the wasters and spenders in the fourth circle of the *Inferno*. The moneyed and the hungry are like positive and negative electrical forces, coming together and annihilating the world:

The stirring of a child's finger brings the two together; and then—What then? The Earth is but shivered into impalpable smoke by that Doom's thunderpeal; the Sun misses one of his Planets in Space, and thenceforth there are no eclipses of the Mood. (286-87; bk. 3, ch. 10)

Given such cosmic consequences, what happens when that Victorian "womanly" woman, who, as Michael Slater points out, had for Dickens such hidden strength precisely because of her "God-given power to uplift, regenerate, and redeem" (309), becomes a believing member of the "Dandiacal Body"? She exhibits, as Dickens creates her, the elements of masquerade, of exclusiveness, and of idleness; she lacks heartfelt passion or motivation; and she endangers the whole fabric of society when she engages in marital masquerade. Yet Dickens, even at his bleakest, does not predict, as Teufelsdröckh wildly does, irretrievable cosmic dissolution: there is always a redemptive figure, and usually that figure is a woman—Florence, Little Dorrit, Little Nell, Esther—who marries with little attention to clothing and ceremony, the wedding sanctified by the relationship, and not vice versa.

It is in *Nicholas Nickleby* that Dickens first enlarges upon the idea that the wedding with its finery and ritual is a compound of masquerade and exclusiveness, a dandified exercise whose elaborateness is in inverse ratio to its meaning. By the end of the novel, when three weddings—Kate's,

Madeline's, and Miss La Creevy's—are perfunctorily settled in one paragraph, Dickens has implicitly demonstrated what he will seem later much more deliberately to do: to connote a relationship of substance by the simplicity of his reportage. The marriages that are described in elaborate detail or with ironic intent are those centered on clothing and ritual; such overstatement permits the convention to define the relationship (as the dandy is defined by his clothing), and not vice versa. In this novel, then, January/May marriages are significantly preceded by new trousseaux from Madame Mantalini's establishment, and the most elaborately reported wedding is Miss Petowker's, a performance staged by the Crummleses.

In agreeing to marry the "old lord[s] of great family" (224), the youthful brides who come to try on their nuptial bonnets in the Mantalini showroom engage in the masquerading and exclusivism of the dandy. Marrying money and not men, the sprightly young ladies create the semblance of courtship by prodding, teasing, and kissing their fiancés, who are too old to do more than mumble, leer, and stumble into their carriages. Their very act of trying on the bonnets and then posing not only before mirrors but before the ever-adoring audience of Miss Knag and Madame Mantalini is dandiacal "Self-Worship"; such self-centeredness, the basis of exclusivism, is what leads one "lively young lady" spitefully to send away Miss Knag, that "fright," and to call for Kate Nickleby, so that she may see her own youth and beauty in those around her and avoid the *memento mori* of the aging milliner. Dickens mirrors the foppishness of Mr. Mantalini, whose sole concern is clothing and horseflesh, in these young brides; just as he bankrupts his wife's business, they are on their way to bankrupt their marriages.

Mrs. Nickleby envisions exactly the kind of wedding that Dickens condemns. Blinded by the flattery of Sir Mulberry Hawk, she dreams of a splendid ceremony whose announcement informs the world only to exclude:

On Tuesday last, at St. George's, Hanover-square, by the Right Reverend the Bishop of Llandoff, Sir Mulberry Hawk, of Mulberry Castle, North Wales, to Catherine, only daughter of the late Nicholas Nickleby, Esquire, of Devonshire. (342; ch. 27)

When the event does take place, however, Dickens simply notes the occasion:

when her term of mourning had expired, Madeline gave her hand and fortune to Nicholas; and, on the same day and at the same time, Kate became Mrs. Frank Cheerble.

Similarly, Miss La Creevy and Tim Linkinwater, going out together "before breakfast, and, coming back with merry faces, were found to have been quietly married that day" (829; ch. 65). In these cases Dickens has transferred the emotional freight from the actual weddings to the reunion of the lovers, so that the relationship is clearly more important than the ceremony.

The more detailed terms in which Dickens sketches Miss Petowker's wedding are a blueprint for his developing clothes philosophy; he seldom again used such a broad brush

to paint the artificiality of the trappings. The bride's procession is "previously arranged and rehearsed"; the clothing and adornment serve to call attention to the party and to set it aside from commonplace realities. All is false, including the flowers, Dickens's sly comment on the state of Miss Petowker's virtue:

The costumes were beautiful. The bridesmaids were quite covered with artificial flowers, and the phenomenon, in particular, was rendered almost invisible by the portable arbour in which she was enshrined. (326; ch. 25)

One bridesmaid wears a second-hand locket with a portrait of "some field-officer unknown"; the others are bedecked in "dazzling articles of imitative jewelry, almost equal to real." In Mr. Crummles' "striking" outfit in which he "personated the bride's father" may be seen a satire of the Regency dandy: he dresses "in a theatrical wig, of a style and pattern commonly known as a brown George, and . . . a snuff-coloured suit, of the previous century, with grey silk stockings, and buckles to his shoes." Beau Brummell's outfit, on the other hand, was marked by "fine linen, plenty of it, and country washing"; blue coat, buff waistcoat and pantaloons; and striped silk stockings and black pumps or boots. His understatement was a model for George IV, who, at one point in his sartorial career had invented an ostentatious shoe-buckle five inches across (Moers 21, 34). Dickens's comment that "the ceremony was very quickly disposed of" (327; ch. 25) sums up an anti-dandiacal attitude that pervades even his early novels.

A similar attitude is suggested in *Martin Chuzzlewit*, where Charity Pecksniff uses the preparations for her wedding to mask the unsuitability of her match to the melancholy Moddle. Charity's whispered confidences to Ruth Pinch imply that the marriage cannot take place without furniture; she gives Ruth "a general inventory" of what is bought and what is still needed and what she intends to wear. It is the appearance that intrigues her, so much so that, arrayed in bridal headdress and dimity nightgown, she bounces in to "console her sister in her affliction [at Jonas's disgrace and death] with a sight of the aforesaid bonnet" (830; ch. 54). A comparison of Phiz's drawings of the two sisters is instructive. Merry, newly married to Jonas, stands simply dressed and dismayed at her new gloomy home; the lack of ostentation with which Dickens records her marriage is a key to her eventual change of heart. It is Merry who, at the end, can say that she would not recall her trouble: "It has been my friend, for without it no one could have changed me; nothing could have changed me" (828; ch. 54). Charity, on the other hand, arrayed in bridal finery, has fainted into the arms of Jinkins (dressed in an exaggerated high collar, the unfortunate legacy of Brummell's more extravagant followers). She is no longer the cynosure of the wedding quests; rather, Moddle's muddled letter of apology has all eyes (835; ch. 54). Michael Steig notes that Dickens's instructions to Hablôt Browne are "abundant" and give the dramatic context of the drawing; Dickens writes, "Mrs. Todgers is decorated for the occasion," as if she and the rest of the company were mannequins (78). Miss Pecksniff, as Carlyle's "clothes-wearing [wo]man," has only the furniture left to console her.

Dickens's antagonism to the fashionable wedding seems to crystallize in *Dombey and Son*, in which Dombey's impeccable tailoring and frigid exclusivism are earmarks of the dandy. From this point on the most elaborate weddings—Edith's, Fanny Dorrit's, the Lammles's, for instance—are failures, their substance nonexistent, the relationship merely "thatched-over," in Carlyle's words. Others, like Florence's, Esther's, Little Dorrit's, Bella's, and Lizzie's are correctives, the brides generally marrying either secretly or quietly in their street clothes.

The weddings in *Dombey and Son* constitute an interrelated commentary on Dickens's attitude toward dandyism and his redemptive antidote to Carlyle's apocalyptic vision. Edith's wedding to Mr. Dombey is an affair whose lavishness suits their mercantile agreement: new furniture and a redecorated house; a "gorgeous . . . new blue coat, fawn-coloured pantaloons, and lilac waistcoat" for Mr. Dombey (439; ch. 31); and Edith, a figure "resplendent and majestic in the zenith of its charms, yet beating down, and treading on, the admiration that it challenges" (442; ch. 31). Edith embodies the dandy ideal: she is both elegant and talented, yet careless of both. Importantly, she rejects the values of her mother, an aging Regency beauty, although, like Merry Pecksniff, she must undergo trouble in order to discover her own heart. Edith's wedding bears the earmarks of materialism and exclusivism. She rides away from the church in a flurry that recalls Teufelsdröckh's sorrows over the "Basilisk-glance of the Barouche-and-Four" that intrude upon his Romantic wanderings in the mountains. In that scene a carriage decorated with wedding favors and carrying Blumine and Herr Towgood bursts gaily upon the scene: "With slight unrecognising salutation they passed [Teufelsdröckh]; plunged down amid the neighbouring thickets, onwards, to Heaven, and to England. . . (151). In the Dombey wedding party,

Horses prance and caper; coachmen and footmen shine in fluttering favours, flowers, and new-made liveries. Away they dash and rattle through the streets: and as they pass along, a thousand heads are turned to look at them . . . (445; ch. 31)

Their separation from the mocking crowd—as well as Dombey's disdainful indifference (Harvey 17; Steig 97)—is emphasized by Phiz's drawing, "Coming Home from Church," in which pride of place is given to the youthfully-dressed Mrs. Skewton and Major Bagstock, who are responsible for the match. The onlookers, including a starved mother begging with her three children, are set apart from the stylish entourage by their shabby dress.

As the outworn arbiter of *ton*, of taste and style, Mrs. Skewton has become absolute appearance without substance. While Edith's indifferent manner is motivated by despair over her situation, her mother's concern for clothing is truly dandiacal. Her masquerade is transparent, however; less an attack on female sexual assertion (Slater 362-63), it is a warning reminiscent of the *danse macabre*. She has prepared for her daughter's wedding by ordering a dress just like the young Florence's, but when she tries on "the juvenile dress that was to delude the world," it

had savage retribution in it, as such dresses ever have, and made her infinitely older and more hideous than her greasy flannel gown. But like Mrs Skewton tried it on with mincing satisfaction; smirked at her cadaverous self in the glass, as she thought of its killing effect on the Major; and suffering her maid to take it off again, and to prepare her for repose, tumbled into ruins like a house of painted cards. (432; ch. 30)

While the "Thunderbolt" chapter seems to presage the kind of ruin prophesied by the opposing energy of Carlyle's "Drudgism" and "Dandyism," Dickens instead provides a redemptive vision, a kind of new creation out of chaos. For Dickens, "the stirring of a child's finger"—the death of Paul, or Edith's affection for Florence—may loosely be said to bring Edith and Dombey together, but the resultant explosion proves to be healing, rather than destructive. Both Dombey and Edith find their better natures, and Florence and Walter Gay's marriage is made possible. Because Florence and Walter are not wealthy, they marry in a ceremony the reverse of Dombey's lavish wedding. As they walk "plainly dressed" through the labyrinth of dark, narrow streets,

Riches are uncovering in shops; jewels, gold, and silver flash in the goldsmith's sunny windows; and great houses cast a stately shade upon them as they pass. But through the light, and through the shade, [Florence and Walter] go on lovingly together, lost to everything around; thinking of no other riches, and no prouder home, than they have now in one another. (806; ch. 57)

In the dark, vault-like church, where "No gracious ray of light is seen to fall on Florence, kneeling at the altar with her timid head bowed down," they are married before an audience of loving, but certainly not socially distinguished, friends. The wedding coach drives away, decorated not with favors and bells, but with living reminders—Susan Nipper and Captain Cuttle, clinging to the doors to say a last good-bye. Dickens's conclusion about the inverse relationship between pomp and meaning is clear.

Other weddings in the novel seem to be comic commentaries on the more serious theme. Like Dombey, Dr. Blimber refurbishes his house, but it is for the wedding of his daughter, not for his own comfort; it is "painted and repaired" instead of redecorated, and Cornelia's outfit is notable, not for dress but for "a new pair of spectacles" (848; ch. 60). Again, like Dombey, who marries the widowed Edith Granger, Bunsby is fairly trapped by the widow Mrs. MacStinger. Their "triumphant procession" through the streets is a parody of Florence and Walter's walk: their clothing is of a "dreadful smartness," and Mrs. MacStinger wears "attached to her obdurate bosom [Bunsby's] stupendous watch and appendages." The illustration "Another Wedding," as Steig points out, seems to be a parody of the sketch of Dombey's wedding (108-10). Instead of dogs, there are chickens, a pig, and a herd of cattle and sheep driven through town; Punch and Judy have been replaced by a wall of notices for marital farces, including *She Stoops to Conquer*, *Black-Eyed Susan*, and *La Mariage Forcè*. The starving mother of three surveying Dombey's pomp is here represented by a plump housewife

with baby in her arms and son at her side. Clearly, the focus in text and sketch is on the marriage itself, not on the trappings, a circumstance underscored by Captain Cuttle's comic terror as he beholds Juliana MacStinger's "deadly interest" in the proceedings (857; ch. 60).

Weddings in novels after *Dombey and Son* follow a similar pattern in which dandyism is redeemed by simplicity. Esther and Allan Woodcourt's low-key wedding in *Bleak House*, for instance, is barely mentioned. In ch. 54, when Jamdyce relinquishes his engagement, Esther notes that she and Allan "were to be married before the month was out"; in ch. 57, after Richard has died and Ada has had her child, Esther writes,

They throve; and by degrees I saw my dear girl pass into my country garden, and walk there with her infant in her arms. I was married then. I was the happiest of the happy. (877; ch. 57)

The marriage is legitimated by the emotional experience and not by the ceremony itself; indeed, in this novel, the episode is religiously decentered from the church to the domestic garden of Eden and the redemptive birth of a child.

More extensive examples appear in *Little Dorrit* where, for instance, Dickens gives a pair of marriages that mirror Edith's and Florence's. Fanny Dorrit, in marrying young Sparkler, does so to spite society in the person of Mrs. Merdle. Little Dorrit's pleas—"If you loved any one, you would no more be yourself, but you would quite lose and forget yourself in your devotion to him"—is juxtaposed to Fanny's purpose:

"I wish to have a more defined and distinct position, in which I can assert myself with greater effect against that insolent woman . . . perhaps she little thinks how I would retort upon her if I married her son. I would oppose her in everything, and compete with her. I would make it the business of my life." (591; bk. 2, ch. 14)

Her trousseau, bought in France by impersonal "agents"; the elaborate wedding-breakfast; above all, the money spent ("the drafts of Mr. Dorrit almost constituted a run on the Torlonia Bank," we are told): all contribute to a wedding that is characterized by "surface." Dickens summarizes the wedding in a way that puts it in perspective. Fanny may have been the cynosure, but ultimately human affairs are untouched by a ceremony that has no meaning: after "The celebration went off with admirable pomp," monks look after the carriages, beggars resume their trade, the troops engage in military exercises, and

the festival wore away; the thousand churches rang their bells without any reference to it; and St. Peter denied that he had anything to do with it. (609; bk. 2, ch. 15)

The quality of Fanny's life after her wedding is indicated by Dickens's borrowing of the carriage metaphor from *Sartor Resartus*. Like Mrs. General, who "drove the proprieties four-in-hand," Fanny becomes a new arbiter of taste, concerned primarily with surface polish; and like the newly-married Blumine, Fanny rides toward England:

[Fanny] had mounted into her handsome chariot, incidentally accompanied by the Bridegroom; and after rolling for a few minutes smoothly over a fair pavement, had begun to jolt through a Slough of Despond, and through a long, long avenue of wrack and ruin. Other nuptial carriages are said to have gone the same road, before and since. (610; bk. 2, ch. 15)

In contrast, Little Dorrit marries in poverty, her fortune lost to the Merdle bankruptcy. It is not insignificant that she sews for everyone: she stitches for Mrs. Clennam, who wrongs her by withholding the Clennam bequest; she stitches for Flora Finching, who generously plies her with tea and cakes; she stitches, at last, for Arthur, imprisoned in the Marshalsea. During those times she wears her old dress, a reminder of the past, an assurance that she herself remains unchanged. Likewise, she wears her old dress when she comes to nurse Arthur in the Marshalsea, from which she goes, "simply dressed as usual," to be married. Phiz's illustration, in which Little Dorrit and Arthur Clennam sign "The Third Volume of the Registers," is remarkable for its relative absence of iconographic commentary, but whether the reason is the artist's own indifference or declining powers (Cohen 115-17; Steig 171-72), the simplicity is fortuitously appropriate for Dickens's wedding motif. What is important is not only that "they are married, with the sun shining on them through the painted figure of Our Saviour in the window," but that the witnesses—Doyce, Maggy, John Chivery, the turnkeys, and Flora—come from all walks of life. Once the ceremony is over, they join the world of human affairs, even more definitively than Florence and Walter. In the often-quoted last paragraph, we find that they are not in a carriage, but on foot, and that like Fanny, they are ignored by those who "made their usual uproar," but unlike her, they "went quietly down into the roaring streets, inseparable and blessed" (825-26; bk. 2, ch. 34).

In *Our Mutual Friend* Dickens provides a cluster of marriages, again stressing the redemptive quality of the ceremony "without clothes." Lizzie's is hurriedly undertaken at the bedside of the dying Eugene, who is too weak to put the ring on her finger (752; bk. 4, ch. 11). Even that "Mercenary little wretch" Bella Wilfer, with her love for worldly things, gives up her splendid equipage once she is convinced that Boffin's love of money has ruined his character. When she leaves his mansion, she changes her dress, symbolically discarding Boffin's set of values and reinvesting herself with her father's. In this regard she is like Edith, who eventually leaves behind not only Dombey but the possessions that represent him: "thrown down in a costly mass upon the ground, was every ornament she had had, since she had been his wife: every dress she had worn; and everything she possessed" (664; bk. 4, ch. 47). The difference is that when Bella marries John Harmon (who, masquerading as the secretary John Rokesmith, has given up his legacy), her wedding dress is street clothes and her only adornment "a little bonnet of quiet, but on the whole of sly appearance, which she had yesterday made" (664; bk. 4, ch. 47). The "Wedding Dinner at Greenwich," which Marcus Stone illustrates, is even simpler and more iconographically bare than Phiz's sketch for Little Dorrit's wedding. To be sure, Stone's updated style is different from

Browne's: larger, more anatomically correct figures, and less commentary to be read "independently of the text" (Cohen 207). Nonetheless, the drawing, if only accidentally, fits Dickens's theme of simplicity. As Bella finally laughs, "Disguise is no use": her happiness is such that even the waiters guess that she is the "mendicant's bride." If ornateness of dress is a key to lack of substance, then simplicity reveals a loving relationship.

While the Cherub—Rumty Wilfer—presides over Bella's wedding, the Veneerings produce the Lammles's, with Lady Tippins, whose masquerading and whose manner identify her as a dandy, as the guardian spirit. Unlike Rumty, who can never outfit himself from head to toe before one article of clothing wears out, Lady Tippins presents a finished appearance. Dressing for the Lammles's wedding, she

begins to be dyed and varnished for the interesting occasion Whereabout in the bonnet and drapery announced by her name, any fragment of the real woman may be concealed, is perhaps known to her maid; but you could easily buy all you see of her, in Bond Street: or you might scalp her, and peel her, and scrape her, and make two Lady Tippinses out of her, and yet not penetrate to the genuine article. (119; bk. 1, ch. 10)

A master of clothing herself, she accurately weighs and measures the wedding through her eye-glass:

"Bride; five-and-forty if a day, thirty shillings a yard, veil fifteen pounds, pocket-handkerchief a present Mrs. Veneering; never saw such velvet, say two thousand pounds as she stands, absolute jeweller's window, father must have been a pawnbroker, or how could these people do it? . . . (119; bk. 1, ch. 10)

The wedding party celebrates with a "splendid cake, covered with Cupids, silver, and true-lovers' knots"; "gorgeous breakfast-rooms"; and titled company; yet the marriage is bankrupt, the "happy pair" discovering that each has deceived the other about their fortunes and social connections. For these two, as Dickens says, "this hopeful marriage contract is signed, sealed, and delivered" (127; bk. 1, ch. 10) well after the wedding ceremony, when they have dropped their disguises and mutually agreed to take revenge upon the Veneerings.

From the Crummleses to the Veneerings, then, is not so far a distance, although the whole of Dickens's career intervenes. Dickens's response to the influence of dandyism grows in sophistication, but the underlying idea remains the same: the masquerading, exclusivism, and ritual of the elaborate wedding are characteristic of a dandiacal attitude, much as Carlyle describes it. The bride is a "clothes-wearing [wo]man," requiring as part of her cult of "Self-Worship" that all eyes be on her; her "Temple," her exclusive "assembly rooms" are the church, where the pew-opener controls the wedding-guests just as the powerful lady patronesses controlled admission to Almack's balls (Moers 44); her "sacred books" are the marriage service, whose words, like clothing, cannot confer meaning; and her creed is the set of social conventions that dictate her trousseau articles. Such a wedding is

an end in itself, full of pomp and procession, unlike those—of Little Dorrit, say—that are incorporated into the everyday affairs of being born, living, and dying. Like Carlyle, who has the gift of seeing through the obvious, Dickens looks through the “clothing” of human celebration to reinvigorate its meaning and to suggest that women, as moral and emotional focal points, determine the soundness of human relationships by their attitudes toward marriage.

Works Cited

- Carlyle, Thomas. *Sartor Resartus: The Life and Opinions of Herr Teufelsdröckh*. Ed. Charles Frederick Harrold. New York: Odyssey, 1937.
- Christensen, Allen Conrad. “A Dickensian Hero Retailored: The Carlylean Apprenticeship of Martin Chuzzlewit.” *Studies in the Novel* 3 (1971): 18-25.
- Christian, Mildred G. “Carlyle’s Influence upon the Social Theory of Dickens.” *The Trollopian* 1 (1947): 27-35; 2 (1947): 11-26.
- Cohen, Jane R. *Charles Dickens and his Original Illustrators*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1980.
- Dickens, Charles. *The Oxford Illustrated Dickens*. 21 vols. London: Oxford UP, 1970.

- Dunn, Richard. “David Copperfield’s Carlylean Retailoring.” *Dickens the Craftsman: Strategies of Presentation*. Ed. Robert Partlow. London: Feffer; Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1976. 95-114.
- Goldberg, Michael. *Carlyle and Dickens*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1972.
- Harvey, J. R. *Victorian Novelists and Their Illustrators*. New York: New York UP, 1971.
- Kaplan, Fred. *Thomas Carlyle: A Biography*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1983.
- Kennedy, Alan. *Meaning and Signs in Fiction*. London: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin’s, 1979.
- Moers, Ellen. *The Dandy: Brummell to Beerbohm*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1960.
- Oddie, William. *Dickens and Carlyle: The Question of Influence*. London: Centenary P, 1972.
- Schwarzbach, F. S. “Dickens and Carlyle Again: A Note on an Early Influence.” *Dickensian* 73 (1977): 149-53.
- Slater, Michael. *Dickens and Women*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1983.
- Steig, Michael. *Dickens and Phiz*. Bloomington and London: Indiana UP, 1978.

Valdosta State College

Ruskin to the “Elusive” Mr. Horn: An Unpublished Letter from a Neglected Friendship

Warren Dwyer

Probably as a result of the decline of his reputation in the years immediately after his death, *The Library Edition of Ruskin’s Works* (1903-1912) was not profitable.¹ In 1920, the Encyclopædia Britannica Company assumed publication of it and to promote sales offered with each set an original Ruskin letter inside “a red morocco folder” (Viljoen 13). In spite of the lack of interest in the Library Edition, it became profitable to bring out handsome issues of individual works, *Sesame and Lilies* being a particular favorite (Strouse xviii). It is possible, moreover, that some of these were also accompanied by epistolary bonuses. At any rate, when its owner acquired the letter printed below, it was pasted inside a richly-bound presentation copy of *Sesame and Lilies*.²

27 June 1875

My dear Horn

I was very grateful / for your kind letter³ though / it has lain by me till today.

Yes, indeed I should like / that photograph.

There is nothing of me that / has either good will or / the

good work in it. Nothing / but the discontent and failure / of age, and—(Richmonds) the coxcombry / of youth. I have always / meant to do a bit of what / I can see in the glass, / but have always / been hindered.

Aff[ectionately] y[our]s
John Ruskin

Someone, perhaps a bookseller, had affixed to the back of the letter a transcription of it beginning with the phrase “My dear Tom.” Admittedly, the name appears to be such in Ruskin’s handwriting, but it is in fact “Horn.”⁴ For this letter dated 27 June 1875 was to Robert Horn (1810-1878), a prominent advocate, art collector, and civic figure in the Edinburgh of his time. While grossly misleading as to his identity, the salutation “My dear Tom” is nevertheless somewhat appropriate since Horn, though he was in fact a good friend of Ruskin’s, is but dimly known to students of Ruskin’s life, one of whom has described him as “a strangely elusive figure Ruskin-wise” (Dearden).⁵

¹ All quotations from Ruskin and references to him, unless otherwise noted, are from this edition.

² The owner is Dr. J. A. Pearce of Peoria, Illinois.

³ The text is on a page 4 7/8" x 7 1/16", three sides having been left blank. There is no accompanying envelope. The stationery is “Ivory,” and the word appears in the upper left-hand corner of the letter embossed in an oval. The typewritten version of the letter was pasted on the blank page [3]. Whoever

transcribed “Horn” as “Tom” also omitted the phrase “of age” after “failure” and “coxcombry” before.

⁴ Established as “Horn” for the writer by Glenise Matheson, Keeper of Manuscripts, John Rylands Library, Manchester, England.

⁵ James S. Dearden, Curator of the Ruskin Galleries at the the Bembridge School, Isle of Wight, in a letter dated 25 January 1982, to the writer.

Nor is Horn generally well-known. There is, for example, no entry on him in the *Dictionary of National Biography* or in the *Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Scotsmen*. His obituaries and certain official documents in Edinburgh, however, provide a reasonably complete sketch of his life.⁶ Born on 24 May 1810, the youngest son of William Horn, "a prosperous farmer near the Bridge of Allan" and Jeanne Headrick Horn, "a woman of Danish descent," he grew up in the vicinity of Stirling Castle, in the countryside that delighted Ruskin so, and received his earliest education at the Stirling Grammar School. He attended high school in Glasgow and later earned a bachelor's degree in mathematics from the University there. Having read law at Edinburgh, he was admitted to the bar in 1834, and for a year thereafter he traveled in Europe, particularly in Italy and Germany, studying languages and refining his taste in art ("Obituary" 93-94). Eventually, he had a long and successful practice in Edinburgh as a "chamber counsel," specializing in the handling of estates and trusts. In 1876, for "his useful and honorable career" (*Courant*), his colleagues elected him "Dean of Faculty," or head of the bar in Scotland ("Faculty").⁷ This distinction was the high point of his professional life. In 1856, Horn married Jane Miller Galbraith, the heiress to a Glasgow commercial fortune, and was thus, as a "favourite of fortune," able to live on a grand scale and to indulge, among other things, his fondness for art (*OPR Edinburgh*). Probably because of his reputation as both a lawyer and collector, Queen Victoria in 1866 appointed him a member of the Board of Trustees of Manufactures in Scotland. The jurisdiction of this body extended to the national support of the arts, and Horn inevitably became active in numerous other cultural enterprises (*Mintues* 43: 258). Horn died of a respiratory complication at his home at 7 Randolph Crescent, Edinburgh, on 2 January 1878. He is buried in the Dean Cemetery in the city ("Funeral").

The correspondence between Ruskin and Horn has largely been neglected, perhaps because Ruskin only mentioned him casually in his diaries and letters to other correspondents. Thus, commentators on this material have been almost uniformly unenlightening. Although sometimes characterized as "an Edinburgh advocate" or "a friend," he remains essentially "unidentified," as the editors of the *Diaries* put it (2: 614). The Library Edition does not refer to him, even though it quotes from one of the most revealing of Ruskin's letters to him and distorts it in the bargain (35: lxxiii).⁸ Derrick Leon offers brief passages from this letter and another but does not attempt to characterize the recipient "Robert

Horn" beyond the use of his name (478, 482). In the letters they wrote to each other in 1858, Ruskin and his father discuss him at great length and with considerable animus. Yet in his excellent edition of this correspondence, John Hayman concedes that he lacks solid information about the identity of the "Edinburgh lawyer and art collector" (44n).

This gingerly treatment of Horn in Ruskin scholarship is, however, quite at odds with the "Obituary" in the *Journal of Jurisprudence*, which asserts that Ruskin was one of his "most intimate friends" and raises the question of whether in his letters to Horn Ruskin was addressing one of the "countless strangers" he wrote to or someone inside "his circle of friends and acquaintances" (Bradley 126). An examination of the relevant material, particularly of the letter presented here and the rest of the correspondence, reveals that the two men were indeed close for almost twenty-five years, that they had common interests and mutual friends, and that Horn, far from remaining the interrogator and sounding board that he was at the outset, not only became his friend's confidant but was often involved in the very events described in Ruskin's letters.

While the letter of 27 June 1875, printed above, is in some ways baffling, there is much in it, like the date, that can be readily accounted for. It was probably written at Oxford, since, according to his diary (2: 850), Ruskin, who was then Slade Professor of Art, had gone to the University two days before. Ruskin's apology, his expression of thanks, and his answer to a question posed by Horn all follow the usual pattern of letters to him. "Richmonds"—that is, Richmond's—undoubtedly stands for George Richmond (1810-1896), the famous painter and friend of Ruskin's, who did a number of portraits of him.⁹ "Coxcomby" is, of course, not directed at Richmond but at the vanity he presumably trapped in his portraits of the handsome young man. It is a measure of Ruskin's self-abasement here that within two years he would express his utter contempt for the painter Whistler by flinging at him the word "coxcomb" (29: 157).

For all that Ruskin unequivocally wants "that photograph,"¹⁰ the identity of the person therein, if it is a person, is not easily established. Horn was in the habit of sending photographs to his friend, and this one could have been of his family or himself, or even of Ruskin. There is, however, a more likely candidate. The Horns had a large family, and it was not long before Ruskin was on affectionate terms with parents and children alike, sending best wishes to "Papa and Mama" and kisses to "Louisa and Mary" and showing concern over "Willy's knee" (1857). But his favorite among them was

⁶ Although they are not always sound, three contemporary obituaries of Horn are, in varying degrees, highly informative. More comprehensive than the account in either the *Scotsman* or the *Courant*, the "Obituary" in the *Journal of Jurisprudence* alone refers to the friendship between Ruskin and Horn. Unless otherwise indicated, incidental material about Horn can be assumed to be from the "Obituary."

⁷ Evidently his yearning to be a judge was never realized because of his inability—which Carlyle remarked—to speak succinctly. In spite of the prestige of the Deanship, of more lasting significance was Horn's contribution to the Advocates' Library, which, according to the *Courant*, was "next to the British Museum and the Bodleian among the libraries of the United Kingdom." As Vice Dean and later Dean, Horn worked unstintingly at cataloguing its holdings. By the time he died in 1878, "five quarto volumes of nearly 900 pages each" of the catalogue were in print. Horn was often ill during this

arduous undertaking, to which he contributed funds of his own, and the great National Library of Scotland, the lineal descendant of the Advocates' collection, could be said in some way to be a memorial to his labors.

⁸ Horn's name does not appear in the two lists of Ruskin's correspondents (36: cxiii-cxv and 37: xv-xviii) or in the "Private Letters" (38: 56-84) or in that arsenal of cross reference, the *General Index* (vol. 39).

⁹ Typical of such works is the water-color of 1843 entitled "The Author of 'Modern Painters,'" a photogravure of which serves as the frontispiece of volume three of the Library Edition.

¹⁰ Ruskin's reference to "the good will" and "the good work" seems to be echoed, with a different application, in a letter (30 April 1882) to the photographer Herbert R. Barraud: "They are the first photographs of me that expressed what a good character there is in me for my own work" (34: 562).

the eldest child Christina—"Tinie"—whom he adored. In a letter in which he complains that he can no longer afford to buy Turners, Ruskin says that he can afford horses, adding "but Tinie knows I don't want them" (1864). He is alluding to the "grand horse controversy," an elaborate piece of fooling that had gone one between them a number of years before, when she was a child of nine. The dispute had culminated in an eleven-page letter from Ruskin (31 May 1857) proving "that the common horse is a stupid, inept, useless and ungracious beast" (Strouse xi).¹¹ Ruskin never describes Tinie, but there is no mistaking the impression her person made on him. Contemplating a photograph Horn sent him when she was twenty-one, he writes that her "expression is wonderfully gentle and noble"; and he is openly jealous of Horn for being the father of one "in whom the sun can find no fault" (25 May 1869).

The letters exchanged between the two men survive in a dozen or so from Ruskin, the rest ostensibly qualifying for inclusion among the "thousands of missives" unaccounted for, which Bradley bemoans in discussing Ruskin's correspondence (126).¹² More specifically, it is conceivable that certain letters from Horn were dispersed as a result of the "outrage" perpetrated at Brantwood when, according to Viljoen, "no one had any way of knowing who had bought unlisted items or precisely what had been scattered" (8). There is no question, however, that Horn himself, and certainly his heirs, had earlier contributed to the scattering of Ruskin's letters. At the sale of Horn's library after his death, the *Catalogue*—foreshadowing the practice of the Encyclopædia Britannica Company—describes the volumes of *Modern Painters* as having "five letters from the author and one from his father, inserted" (28).

Ruskin's letters have been said to furnish "a running commentary on his life, his work, and his character" (36: cix), and his surviving correspondence with Horn supports this view. For in his writing to him, he chronicles the glittering public triumph of his Edinburgh lectures in 1853, the publishing of his last volume of *Modern Painters* in 1860, the subsequent eroding of his self-esteem under the harassment of *Blackwood's Magazine*, the slow abandonment of Turner partly for financial reasons, his espousal of social reform, and finally the throttling of his emotional life upon the death of Rose La Touche.

It is not certain when the two men began writing, but it was probably no later than November, 1853, when Ruskin visited Edinburgh, his parents' "native city," to deliver four lectures on art; he and Horn might have also met for the first time then. Whenever it was, Horn, a notorious stalker of

celebrities, was not likely to have let his prey, once sighted, elude him; anyway, it would appear from Ruskin's first letter that Horn started the correspondence (1853). Not surprisingly, the early letters are on art, and in them Ruskin is often magisterial to the point of abrasiveness on the subject. But his tone, bespeaking a deepening of their friendship, gradually becomes gentler. At times, Ruskin can be downright affectionate, as when, in the midst of scolding Horn for not realizing the precariousness of his financial condition, he says without a suggestion of irony, "You are a very nice kind of friend" (1864). Towards the end of the correspondence, Horn has become a sympathetic confidant to whom Ruskin unburdens the most intimate details of his personal life. Although they were obviously good friends when Ruskin wrote the letter of 27 June 1875, they might have stopped writing then because of Horn's chronic illness and the darkening of Ruskin's mind.

The letters to Horn not only portray Ruskin's passing from young manhood to the onset of old age but reveal the extent to which Horn was party to some of the most crucial events of his friend's life, the first probably being his triumphant visit to Edinburgh in 1853, Horn was a member of the Philosophical Institution, which sponsored the lectures Ruskin delivered, but, more importantly, he was an established figure among those leaders of society who welcomed Ruskin to Edinburgh. Some of these people became his friends, most notably two that in time he would revere, Dr. John Brown (1810-1882) (J. T. Brown 20), the "beloved" Edinburgh physician and author, and Professor John Stuart Blackie (1809-1895), "the chief cultural and intellectual ornament" of the city (Gordon 206). Wise in the ways of the world, able to see past their young friend's eccentricities, both men appreciated his genius and cherished his friendship. Horn had long been a crony of both Brown and Blackie, and the three have been described as having enjoyed together "pure pleasure and happy hours" (*Courant*). Obviously, Ruskin's deep attachment to both Brown and Blackie must have strengthened his ties to Horn.

The triumph of Edinburgh, of course, was not without its underside, and predictably Ruskin's old nemesis, *Blackwood's Magazine*, vilified his performance. Seven years later, as if repudiating the triumph of the lectures, Ruskin includes all of Edinburgh in protesting to Horn his treatment at the hands of that journal and especially its editor, William E. Aytoun (1813-1865). He will go there no more, he writes, "without an apology from Aytoun for their beastliness" to him. It is evident that he expects Horn to intervene for him, perhaps with Aytoun himself or through another mainstay of *Blackwood's*,

¹¹ The taint of Horn's elusiveness apparently descended to his children, for in the printed version of the "Horse," Tinie is described as "undoubtedly" his daughter (xi).

¹² The discussion of the correspondence between the two men is based principally on the letters listed below, each with its probable date, place of origin, and repository:

1. 1853 (?), Denmark Hill, National Library of Scotland
2. 31 Aug. 1857, Bridge of Allan, Morgan Library
3. 1860 (?), not known, National Library of Scotland
4. 13 May 1862, not known, Morgan Library
5. 9 Jan. 1864, not known, Yale, Beinecke Library
6. 24 Aug. 1865, Denmark Hill, Morgan Library

7. 8 Nov. 1866, Denmark Hill, Morgan Library
8. 1867 (?), Denmark Hill, National Library of Scotland
9. 27 March 1867, Denmark Hill, Morgan Library
10. 25 May 1869, Verona, Morgan Library
11. 27 June 1875, Oxford, Privately owned

The writer wishes to thank the officers of the Morgan Library, the National Library of Scotland, and the Beinecke Library of Yale University for permission to quote from letters in their possession related to this study. Those at the Morgan Library are indexed, in chronological order, as MA2188, MA2189, MA2621, MA2487, MA2027 No. 2, MA2027 No. 3. Those at the National Library of Scotland as MS 3706 ffl, 249-53 and include a letter from Ruskin to Brown about Horn.

Theodore Martin (1816-1909), who, like Ruskin, would be listed in Horn's obituary as one of his "most intimate friends." Ruskin's antipathy towards Edinburgh figures in another letter, the longest of all, in which he berates Horn unmercifully because a "curious friend" of his has beaten Ruskin out of a Turner drawing at an auction. Doubly vexed that he can no longer afford "art" and that Turner should go to Edinburgh, he warns Horn that his friend must put *Blackwood's* review of Turner under the picture when it is hung—"tell him." The high cost of Turners was not the only reason Ruskin was being drawn away from art, for he was becoming increasingly interested in political economy, which, he reminds Horn bitterly in this same letter, "you and all my friends choose to ignore. . . (1864).

It should be obvious that Ruskin's letters to Horn confirm the spirit of that tantalizing assertion in the "Obituary" that Ruskin was one of Horn's "most intimate friends." Surely, whatever its degree, their intimacy must have sprung in part from the fact that their friendship was not exclusively epistolary but included visits that were mutually enjoyable. One of Ruskin's sunniest letters is an invitation to Horn to have breakfast at Denmark Hill, with a promise of "a fresh egg and real cream" and, with luck, a view of some "almond blossoms" (27 March 1867). In another letter, Ruskin recalls his own visit to Horn's country home and his delight at seeing "ponies and herds of deer." Referring to Horn's memory of "a single pleasant walk," he describes it as "very touching and wonderful" (24 August 1865).¹³

Horn's enjoyment of such encounters was obviously tinged with the pleasure he took in recounting them to others. In a speech to the students of the Edinburgh School of Design defending contemporary Scottish painters, he recalls a "conversation" with Ruskin, who expressed himself with "kindliness and discrimination" about them. Horn is addressing the school officially as a member of the Board of Manufactures, and this elaborate aside, redolent of table talk with the greatest art critic of the age, must have impressed both the students and Horn's fellow members of the Board (*Address* 8).

Whether this flaunting of their friendship offended Ruskin, it survived a more serious strain put on it by Ruskin's father. The letters that John James and his son—from Europe—exchanged in 1853 reveal that the father had, quite typically, insinuated himself into Ruskin's friendship with Horn. There is considerable talk of his activity as a collector,

and John James is openly contemptuous of his qualifications, remarking that he shows "not the least possible knowledge" of painting (44). Perhaps to ingratiate himself with his father, Ruskin, in a display of petty malice hardly becoming him, refers to Horn's pursuit of art as "hankering." Elsewhere, he writes, presumably of a dispute between his father and Horn, "Your answer to Horn, capital" (*Letters* [1858] 25). Horn undoubtedly vexed the elder Ruskin as a rival collector of art; but he was also a successful Edinburgh lawyer, something that John James had always had a "hankering" to be. In marrying an heiress, he could hardly be said to have married beneath him, a charge that might be made in all honesty, if not charity, of John James. In the end, of course, Ruskin's affection for Horn asserted itself, and he rejected his father's view of him.

But nothing suggests the depth and endurance of their friendship as much as the evidence that Ruskin confided in Horn about his entanglement with Rose La Touche. Identifying Horn only by name, Derrick Leon quotes from two of Ruskin's letters to him on this painful subject, and though the excerpts are brief, they are crucial, for they deal with the agonizing collapse of Ruskin's hopes of a life with Rose. In the first, written to Horn on 12 January 1870, he abruptly announces, "And last Friday about twelve o'clock at noon my mistress passed me and would not speak." Her rebuff was especially painful because the incident occurred a few days after her twenty-first birthday, when she was to tell him whether she would marry him.¹⁴ Seeing Mrs. La Touche as the demon who frustrated his hopes, he tells Horn that she has introduced her daughter to "all those who speak or know any evil" about him (478). Reconciled briefly, the lovers soon fell out permanently, and on 22 November 1870, Ruskin, writing to Horn and lamenting Rose's unhappy life, bitterly denounces her mother and "that accursed woman at Perth" for turning his beloved against him, the "accursed woman," of course, being Effie Gray Ruskin, his former wife, presently married to the painter John Millais (482). Since such topics could hardly be introduced out of the blue, there must have been a series of letters to Horn about Rose. Ruskin's vehement allusion to Effie suggests, moreover, that Horn was familiar with the other personages in his friend's sad story.

Although it does not mention her outright, the letter of 27 June 1875 should be classed with those in which Ruskin discusses Rose La Touche, for, at the very least, it undoubtedly stirred memories of her in both men. Its general note of despair, whether or not caused by the mention of "that

¹³ Besides the house at 7 Randolph Crescent, Horn had a home in Portobello, the Edinburgh suburb, and a country home called Killiechassie House in Perthshire, where, presumably, Ruskin saw the animals he mentions.

¹⁴ On 8 January 1870, Ruskin wrote to Mrs. Cowper-Temple describing a painful meeting with Rose the day before "in the rooms of the Royal Academy," when she refused to talk to him. Bradley is undoubtedly right in arguing that this letter—so filled with vivid and painful particulars—is the authentic version of what happened (Mount-Temple 247n). The description sent to Horn four days later is much flatter and more general, and its somewhat Dantean overtones obviously proved irresistible to E. T. Cook. For in the Library Edition, he subtly alters the version Ruskin gave to Horn of the meeting with Rose. "It is Dante's language," he says, "that consciously or unconsciously, he sometimes adapts in speaking of her [Rose]. 'Last Friday noon,' he once wrote to a friend 'my mistress looked at us and passed silently'; it is Beatrice denying Dante her salute" (35: lxxiii). The means by which the

Dantean mood has been deepened are fairly obvious; thus, for example, "about twelve o'clock at noon" has become the more strictly canonical "at noon," "me," the more austere "us," and "would not speak" the more poetic "silently." A few years later in his *Life of Ruskin*, Cook introduces what he calls "this entry," purportedly taken from Ruskin's diary for 7 January 1870, the day of the fateful meeting with Rose, and repeats verbatim the language Ruskin used in the letter to Horn. The label "this entry" seems calculated to mislead, for the only entry in the diary for that day is the date, under the top margin, followed by a small square cross, the page below being left blank, this information being supplied to the writer by James S. Dearden of the Ruskin Museum, Bambridge. Cook apparently had no idea who Robert Horn was, but he nevertheless did not scruple to call him "a friend" and alter Ruskin's language in the Library Edition. In *The Life of Ruskin*, the epistolary "friend" has been dropped, the letter to him assigned to the diary, and Horn himself demoted from anonymity to non-existence (2: 264).

photograph," must have been intensified by Ruskin's grief over the death of Rose less than a month before, on 30 May 1875.¹⁵ Indeed, Horn's "kind letter," said to have "lain by" Ruskin for some time, might well have been one consoling him on his loss. Horn would have been deeply touched by her death, not only because he had been privy to the painful details of Ruskin's entanglement with her but because Rose was only a year younger than his own beloved Tinie. The loss of Rose could only have exacerbated Ruskin's envy of Horn for having a daughter so "noble and beautiful." Like Tinie, Rose had that mingling of playfulness and intellectual agility that Ruskin found so delightful in young girls, but Tinie was a healthy Rose.¹⁶ Indeed, that there was nothing of the hothouse in Ruskin's relations with her must have been due in large part to her father's influence on her. She never thought of giving up a normal life for him as some of his "birds" at the Winnington School did, like Amy Yule, for example, who dreamed of Ruskin's "bringing her up," or Sarah Elizabeth White, who gave up a normal life out of love for him (*Winnington* 548, 461n). Ruskin's awareness of the difference between Rose and Tinie and between himself and Horn must have been acute and doubtlessly contributed to his delay in answering Horn and to the self-disgust that informs the "last letter" of 27 June 1875.¹⁷

One way of looking at the foregoing study is to see it as attempt to substantiate the claim in the "Obituary" that Ruskin was one of Horn's "most intimate friends." While the evidence offered here certainly seems in keeping with the spirit of this assertion, it tends to make the letter of it somewhat extravagant, not so much because of the inclusion of Ruskin among the "most intimate friends" but because of the pre-eminence granted him over the others. That this view of Ruskin found its way into the "Obituary" suggests that Horn succeeded in establishing it as gospel. It is perhaps best taken as reflecting the same pride in his association with Ruskin that he showed in his address to the School of Design. It should thus, at the very least, be allowed to stand as his view of the friendship. As for Ruskin's, there appears to be no reason for challenging the words to Horn cited earlier: "You are a very nice kind friend."

Works Cited

- Births, Marriages, Deaths, New Deer, Aberdeenshire.* Scots Ancestry Research Society. B / 51383.
- Births, Marriages, Deaths, St. George, Edinburgh.* Scots Ancestry Research Society. B / 51383.
- Bradley, John L. *An Introduction to Ruskin.* Riverside Studies in Literature. Boston: Houghton, 1971.
- Brown, John Taylor. "John Brown" (1810-1882). *Dictionary of*

- National Biography.*
- Catalogue of A Collection of Very Valuable Books: The Library of the Late Robert Horn.* Edinburgh, 1886.
- Chambers, Robert. *Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Scotsmen.* Glasgow: Edinburgh, 1870.
- Cook, Edward T. *The Life of John Ruskin.* 2 vols. London: Allen, 1911; New York: Macmillan, 1911.
- Dearden, James S. Letter to the writer. 25 January 1983.
- The Diaries of John Ruskin.* Ed. Joan Evans and John Howard Whitehouse. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1956.
- "Faculty of Advocates." *Encyclopædia Britannica* 11th ed. 1910.
- "Funeral of the Late Mr. Horn." *Courant* 8 Jan. 1878: n.page.
- Gordon, Alexander. "John Stuart Blackie." *Dictionary of National Biography.* Supplement.
- Horn, Robert. *Address Delivered to the Edinburgh School of Design on the Occasion of the Delivery of Prizes for the Year 1865-66.* Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1867.
- Inventory of the Personal Estate of Robert Horn.* Edinburgh. 12 March 1878. Scottish Record Office: Reference SC70 / 1 / 187.
- John Ruskin: Letters from the Continent, 1858.* Ed. John Hayman. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1982.
- "The Late Mr. Robert Horn, Dean of Faculty." *Courant* 3 Jan. 1878: n. pag.
- "The Late Mr. Robert Horn." *Scotsman* 3 Jan. 1878: n. pag.
- Leon, Derrick. *Ruskin: The Great Victorian.* London: Routledge, 1949.
- Letters of John Ruskin to Lord and Lady Mount-Temple.* Ed. John L. Bradley. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1964.
- The Library Edition of the Works of John Ruskin.* Ed. Edward T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn. 39 vols. London: Allen, 1903-1912; New York: Longman's, 1903-1912.
- Minutes of the Board of Trustees for Manufactures.* N. G. 1 / 1 vols. 43-46.
- "Obituary. Robert Horn, Esq., Dean of Faculty." *Journal of Jurisprudence* 22 (1878): 93-97.
- Old Parish Records Edinburgh.* Scots Ancestry Research Society. B / 51383.
- Strouse, Norman H. *Intro. The Contemptible Horse.* By John Ruskin. Illus. Adele Bichan. Adagio, the Private Press of Leonard F. Bahar: n.p., 1962.
- Viljoen, Helen Gill. *Ruskin's Scottish Heritage: A Prelude.* Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1956.
- The Winnington Letters: John Ruskin's Correspondence with Margaret Alexis Bell and the Children of Winnington Hall.* Ed. Van Akin Burd. London: Allen, 1969.

Bradley University

¹⁵ Horn might not necessarily have heard of that calamity from Ruskin himself. On 30 May 1875, five days after Rose died, Ruskin wrote Dr. John Brown, "That death was very bad for me" and might have asked the physician to tell the sad news. For he had been known to act as Ruskin's go-between with Horn, as in the undated letter in which Brown is enjoined to "just read the enclosed and then enclose it to Mr. Horn," to which is added what had increasingly become a refrain in Ruskin's letters to many of his friends, "all writing being weariness to me" (National Library of Scotland).

¹⁶ On 8 April 1870, Tinie married William Dingwall Fordyce (1836-1875) of

New Deer, Aberdeenshire, an advocate, member of Parliament, and a "landed proprietor" (*BMD, St. George*). At the time of Rose's death, Tinie was the mother of two small children, though still her father's "bairn." Tinie's husband died when she was only twenty-seven and married but five years; after forty-seven years of widowhood, she died in New Deer on 16 January 1922, at the age of seventy-four (*BMD, New Deer*).

¹⁷ This study was made possible in part by a grant from the Board of Research and Creativity of Bradley University.

“Three Cups in One”: A Reading of “The Woodspurge”

Andrew Leng

Dante Gabriel Rossetti's lyric “The Woodspurge,” a poem written in 1856, is one of his best known works, made memorable perhaps because of its culminating but paradoxically anti-climactic image of the woodspurge flowering “three cups in one”:

The wind flapped loose the wind was still,
Shaken out dead from tree and hill:
I had walked on at the wind's will,
I sat now for the wind was still.

Between my knees my forehead was,—
My lips drawn in said not Alas!
My hair was over in the grass,
My naked ears heard the day pass.

My eyes, wide open, had the run
Of some ten weeds to fix upon;
Among those few, out of the sun,
The woodspurge flowered, three cups in one.

From perfect grief there need not be
Wisdom or even memory:
One thing learned remains to me,—
The woodspurge has a cup of three.

Most recent commentators agree with Jerome McGann's view that “the three-in-one detail is completely freed of its possible religious connotations” (46): Carol Christ thinks that “Rossetti is suggesting the religious allusion [to the Trinity] only to deny it” (46); while David Riede argues that

“The Woodspurge” embodies in a peculiarly pure form one kind of poetry that may result from a loss of faith in the visionary. It is a poetry of nonstatement. A fact is presented, but the fact remains nothing, means nothing. (57)

Reide's passing observation that “The Art-Catholic, of course, could exploit the obvious trinitarian potential of the natural symbol,” highlights a general limitation in the consensus view presented by these three critics: namely their tendency to treat “The Woodspurge” as though it existed in a vacuum. In fact the self-consciousness of the poem to which all these writers draw attention is a strong indication that as a “nonstatement” “The Woodspurge” has a great deal to say. It can be argued that in “The Woodspurge” Rossetti renounces his Art-Catholicism, signals his final break from Ruskinian and Wordsworthian aesthetics, and indicates the new direction

in which his floral imagery and cup symbolism will develop.

The cup is a ubiquitous image in Rossetti's *oeuvre*. It is a key symbol in “My Sister's Sleep,” one of the poems Rossetti had sent to William Bell Scott for his perusal under the title “Songs of the Art Catholic,” and his first published poem, appearing anonymously in *The New Monthly Belle Assemblée* in September 1848.¹ Like the narrator of “The Woodspurge” the speaker of “My Sister's Sleep” is in a state of hyperaesthesia, which has been induced by the contemplation of his sister Margaret, who lies dying on Christmas Eve. In this version of “My Sister's Sleep” the speaker's hyperaesthesia induces a moment of theophany, a sudden revelation of God in nature which results in his conversion from unbelief to Christianity:

Outside there was a good moon up,
Whose trailing shadow fell within;
The depth of clouds that it was in
Seemed hollow, like an altar cup.

I watched it through the lattice-work;
We had some plants of evergreen
Standing upon the sill: just then
It passed behind, and made them dark

I had been sitting up some nights,
And my tired mind felt weak and blank:
Like a sharp strengthening wine, it drank
The silence and the broken lights. (ll. 9-24)

The conjunction of moon and clouds is, as D. M. R. Bentley points out, a splendid visual image for the sacramental configuration of the Eucharistic Host and chalice (329), and this lunar theophany is an outstanding example of how Rossetti's Art-Catholic poetry transfigures natural phenomena into religious symbols. For from its Eucharistic conjunction with the “altar cup” cloudscape, the lunar Host becomes a “broken” light which blends synaesthetically with the “silence” to be drunk by the speaker like a “strengthening” communion “wine.” Through this process of sacramental synaesthesia the speaker is enabled imaginatively to receive both elements of the Eucharist in a manner which conforms to Christian ritual and which therefore ensures the “strengthening” of his hope in eternal life on the night that his sister dies but is reborn with the newly born Christ.

If the religious significance of the cup is explicit in “My Sister's Sleep” then it is implicit in the iconography of Rossetti's early, Marian painting *The Annunciation* (1849-50)

¹ The full text of this poem is reprinted in Bentley, together with an analysis of it and the revised 1850 and 1870 versions.

(Surtees 1: 44), in which the triune lily of the Virgin's embroidery symbolizes the Trinity and also indicates her foreknowledge of its completion with the birth of her Son. This inference is supported by the second sonnet Rossetti wrote for the companion painting to *The Annunciation, The Girlhood of Mary Virgin* (1848-49) (Surtees 1: 40), which explains that:

These are the symbols. On that cloth of red
I' the centre is the Tripoint: perfect each,
Except the second of its points, to teach
That Christ is not yet born (ll. 1-4)

Because the speaker of "The Woodspurge" is in a hyper-aesthetic state similar to the one the narrator of "My Sister's Sleep" was in when his theophanic vision occurred, and because the "three cups in one" he carefully picks out so closely resemble the triune lily depicted in *The Annunciation* there can be little doubt that these works are all alluded to and their symbolism renounced by "The Woodspurge."

But besides signalling the renunciation of his Art-Catholicism Rossetti's gratuitous non-reading of one of his stock symbols may also be a reaction against the religious interpretations of nature and landscape painting habitually made by his patron, Ruskin, and against the floral epiphanies of Ruskin's favorite poet, Wordsworth. An anecdote recounted by Thomas Hall Caine gives some idea of the irreverence with which Rossetti regarded Wordsworth and Ruskin towards the end of his life: ". . . seeing two camels walking together in the Zoological Gardens, keeping step in a shambling way, and conversing with one another, Rossetti exclaimed: 'There's Wordsworth and Ruskin virtuously taking a walk!'" (148 n1).

While the aging Rossetti regarded virtuousness with scorn, a certain Ruskinian virtue and piety were an integral part of his early religious works. The sonnet "St. Luke the Painter," written in 1849, invites us to "Give honour unto Luke the Evangelist" because he first "taught Art to fold her hands and pray." And having learned "How sky-breadth and field-silence . . . / Are symbols also in some deeper way" Art "looked through these to God and was God's Priest" (ll. 1-3, 6-8). This ideology is implicit in "My Sister's Sleep" and Rossetti's Marian paintings and sonnets, and it is therefore particularly ironic that a major catalyst in Rossetti's abandonment of the priesthood of nature may have been Victorian England's leading exponent and proponent of nature worship, John Ruskin.

Carol Christ suggests that because of its emphasis on "visible fact" "The Woodspurge" recalls Ruskin's poetic ideal as expressed in this analysis of "Peter Bell" from *Modern Painters* 3, which "distinguishes three ranks of men" (46):

the man who perceives rightly, because he does not feel, and to whom the primrose is very accurately the primrose, because he does not love it. Then, secondly, the man who perceives wrongly, because he feels, and to whom the primrose is anything else than a primrose And then, lastly, there is the man who perceives rightly in spite of his feelings, and to whom the primrose is for ever nothing else than itself—a little flower apprehended in the very plain and

leafy fact, whatever and how many soever the associations and passions may be that crowd around it. (5: 209)

While the speaker of "The Woodspurge" eventually only apprehends "a little flower . . . in the very plain and leafy fact" he does however also appear first to flaunt its triune appearance and flout its trinitarian "associations" in a manner which indicates how difficult it is to evaluate the precise nature of Ruskin's influence on Rossetti's aesthetic.

The Ruskin-Rossetti relationship was always profoundly mutually ambivalent. It began in 1854 when the Ruskin marriage broke up with Ruskin's consequent loss of his first Pre-Raphaelite protégé, Millais, as well as his wife. On May 2 the relationship with his new protégé was inaugurated when Ruskin told Gabriel: "I have ordered my bookseller to send you copies of all that I have written" (*Ruskin:Rossetti* 2-3). At this time included among "all" that Ruskin had written were the first two volumes of *Modern Painters* (1843 and 1846), the three volumes of *The Stones of Venice* (1851 and 1853) and his Edinburgh *Lectures on Architecture and Painting* (1854), which included one on "Pre-Raphaelitism" (*Works* 12: 134-64). Rossetti read extensively in the works Ruskin gave him and followed with interest the writing of *Modern Painters* 3 and 4 (1856).

Before meeting him, however, Rossetti felt that Ruskin was "only half informed about art," a judgment he made to Thomas Woolner on April 16, 1853, when he discovered "that Ruskin had never seen any work of mine before, though he never thought it necessary to say this in writing about the PRB" (*Letters* 1: 134). Thus it was only from his knowledge of the work of Holman Hunt and especially of Millais, who had been painting his portrait on their ill-fated trip to Scotland, that Ruskin had arrived at his famous conclusion that

Pre-Raphaelitism has but one principle, that of absolute, uncompromising truth in all that it does, obtained by working everything, down to the most minute detail itself, from nature, and from nature only. (*Works* 12: 157-58)

Although it has been seen that nature played an integral part in Rossetti's Art-Catholic poetry and Marian painting he realized that Ruskin had not known this when he announced the "one principle" of Pre-Raphaelitism, and it may thus have been Rossetti's wounded pride as much as his indolence that made him subsequently antagonistic towards Ruskin's principle of "uncompromising truth" to nature.

In October, 1855, Ruskin sent Rossetti on a mission to Wales "to make a sketch of some rocks in the bed of a stream, with trees above, mountain ashes, and so on, scarlet in autumn tints" (*Works* 36: 225). In response to Rossetti's apparently indignant refusal to do this, Ruskin tried to placate him thus:

"Dear Rossetti,—I never should think of your sitting out to paint from Nature. Merely look at the place; make memoranda fast, work at home at the inn, and walk among the hills." This last plea to Rossetti to "walk among the hills" is particularly ironic since in the Preface to his *Pre-Raphaelitism* pamphlet of 1851 Ruskin had claimed that the injunction he had made to "the young artists of England" in the first volume of *Modern Painters*, to "go to nature in all singleness of heart,

and walk with her laboriously and trustingly" (*Works* 12: 339), had been obeyed by the Pre-Raphaelites. Yet now he had explicitly to command Rossetti to do so.

In the context of this conflict between Ruskin and Rossetti over "Nature" it is perhaps significant that the narrator's crisis in "The Woodspurge" occurs when he walks in Ruskin's Nature. Thus while "The Woodspurge" may appear to conform to certain concepts expressed in *Modern Painters* 3 it can with equal justice be argued that in its coldness towards nature "The Woodspurge" is constructed in opposition to the kind of nature worship which occurs, for example, in the enthusiastic interpretation of the trefoil which Ruskin made in the second volume of *The Stones of Venice* in 1853:

Nor let us fail to note in passing how strangely delightful to the human mind the trefoil always is . . . there are two mystical feelings at the root of our enjoyment of this decoration: the one is the love of trinity in unity, the other that of the sense of fulness with order. (*Works* 10: 53)

In "The Woodspurge" there are no "mystical feelings" nor are we invited to enjoy the sense of "trinity in unity" with which we are presented. The poem is aggressively anti-theophanic and the speaker is resolutely joyless, in complete contrast with the joyful Ruskin reading the trefoil of Murano.

Because it was an anti-theophany Rossetti evidently had some difficulty in deciding precisely what positive value, if any, to attach to the experience described in "The Woodspurge." In the Fitzwilliam Museum's collection of Rossetti manuscripts is one entitled "Poems and Sonnets," containing works which appeared in *Poems*, 1870, and including an interesting earlier version of "The Woodspurge." In this version lines 11 to 14 read:

Among *the which*, out of the sun,
The woodspurge *bloomed*, three cups in one.

From *sharpest* grief there need not be
Knowledge or even memory . . . (my italics)

All the italicized words were subsequently changed: the replacement of "the which" with "the few" undoubtedly clarifies Rossetti's description of a narrowing gaze, while the substitution of "flowered" for "bloomed" eliminates the connotation of flourishing in favor of a more neutral, botanical term. The changes to stanza four are more difficult to analyze, but whereas stanza three became less evocative and more empirical, the reverse seems to have occurred with this stanza in which "sharpest" grief acquires the qualitative connotations of perfection. But although in the published version of "The Woodspurge" the narrator does acquire a kind of "knowledge" from his "perfect grief" he is at pains to insist that he gains neither "wisdom or even memory" from it.

The speaker's explicit denial of wisdom or memory can be seen as a rejection of the values which Wordsworth

attaches to floral epiphanies, and in particular to those associated with the daffodil epiphany in the lyric "I wandered lonely as a cloud." In this connection it is perhaps significant that in the Fitzwilliam "Poems and Sonnets" manuscript Rossetti has deleted the word "wandered" from line three and replaced it with "walked," since the line: "I had wandered on at the wind's will," conspicuously echoes the cloud-like wanderings of Wordsworth. Hall Caine recalls that Rossetti

thought Wordsworth was too much the High Priest of Nature to be her lover: too much concerned to transfigure into poetry his pantheo-Christian philosophy regarding Nature, to drop to his knees in simple love of her to thank God that she was beautiful. (148)²

This attitude to Wordsworth may explain why Rossetti chooses such a humble flower as the woodspurge to write about and why, unlike Wordsworth, he refuses to contemplate "What wealth the show [of daffodils] to me had brought." Nor does Rossetti draw any "moral" from this encounter with the woodspurge as Wordsworth does when he describes how:

. . . oft when on my couch I lie
In vacant or in pensive mood,
They flash upon that inward eye
Which is the bliss of solitude
And then my heart with pleasure fills,
And dances with the daffodils. (ll. 19-24)

By refusing to "transfigure" Nature or to appeal to the "inward eye," "The Woodspurge" signals the end in 1856 of his Art-Catholic poetry, a hybrid Romantic genre in the Wordsworthian and Ruskinian tradition of nature worship.

Although "the Woodspurge" was written in 1856 it was not published until 1870, when it appeared as the eighth of eleven "Songs" in the sequence of "Sonnets and Songs Towards a Work to be called 'The House of Life,'" published in Rossetti's first volume, *Poems*.³ Although these songs were eventually dropped from the final version of *The House of Life* published in *Ballads and Sonnets*, 1881, a final understanding of "The Woodspurge" can perhaps best be gained when it is read within the context of this song sequence.

The sequence is dominated by eroticized floral lyrics whose Lawrentian emphasis upon "virgin lamps" ("The Honeysuckle" l. 12) and "lady's laps" ("A Young Fir-Wood" l. 3) provoked "Robert Buchanan" into describing the mind of the "fleshly" Mr. Rossetti as possessing "a surface so thickly sown with the water-lilies that it retains its glassy smoothness even in the strongest wind." Despite its maliciousness much of Buchanan's onslaught on Pre-Raphaelite poetry was perceptive, and this comment is a case in point, juxtaposing as it does two of Rossetti's favorite poetic images, flowers and wind, and observing with some justice that however strong the gale Rossetti's floral arrangements always remain unnaturally unruffled. For although "The Woodspurge" is not erotic as

² In 1854 Rossetti reported to his mother that Ruskin had sent his wife Lizzie "a splendidly bound copy of all Wordsworth's works" (*Letters* 1: 222), but this appears to be the only remotely respectful thing he ever said about

Wordsworth.

³ This sequence of Songs is reproduced in *Poems* 132-40.

"Love-Lily" (*Poems* 132), "The Honeysuckle," and "A Young Fir-Wood" obviously are it is nevertheless a "fleshly" floral subject in terms of its "superfluity of extreme sensibility . . . and a deep seated indifference to all agitating forces and agencies" (441-42).

"The Woodspurge" can thus be seen as one of a series of "fleshly" floral poems which Rossetti began writing in the 1850s when, despite the wholesome influence of Ruskin, his work became eroticized and decorative.⁴ This change in treatment of a subject which had once been religious finally estranged Ruskin from Rossetti in 1865, for on seeing Rossetti's *Venus Verticordia* (1864-68) (*Surtees* 1: 173) Ruskin told him that the honeysuckle and roses in it were "awful—I can use no other word—in their coarseness" (*Works* 36: 491).

The Art-Catholic "altar cup" image became similarly coarsened after its appearance as "a cup of three" in "The Woodspurge," as Rossetti became increasingly interested in secular subjects. In *The Loving Cup*, painted in 1867, Rossetti depicts a woman raising "a cup to her lips with which she is about to pledge her unseen knight" (*Surtees* 1: 201), while the gold lid she holds suggestively in her left hand clearly represents her breast. By 1870 the metamorphosis of the cup from an Art-Catholic symbol to fleshly, pagan image was completed. For in "Troy Town," a ballad which Rossetti illustrated with a drawing of the same name (c. 1870) (*Surtees* 1: 219), Helen of Troy presents her patron Venus, not with "a cup of three," but with "a carven cup . . . moulded like my breast" (ll. 15-22).

Works Cited

Bentley, D. R. M. "The *Belle Assemblée* Version of 'My Sister's Sleep.'" *Victorian Poetry* 12 (1974): 321-34.

Faith of Our Mothers: Elizabeth Gaskell's "Lizzie Leigh"

Joanne Thompson

"He for God only, she for God in him"
Paradise Lost 4:299

In a single line, Milton managed to enshrine the concept of male superiority and to posit husband-worship as appropriate feminine religion. In 1850, however, Milton's argument was completely inverted in the unlikely hands of Elizabeth Gaskell, devout Christian and wife of a Unitarian minister. Gaskell was also a mother of daughters, and her firm belief in the power of motherhood inspired her to revise not only Milton's text, but also one of the most typical plots of her

"Buchanan, Robert." [Thomas Maitland.] "The Fleshly School of Poetry: Mr. D. G. Rossetti." 1871. (In *The Pre-Raphaelites*. Ed. Jerome Buckley. New York: Random House, 1968. 437-60.

Caine, Thomas Hall. *Recollections of Dante Gabriel Rossetti*. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1883.

Christ, Carol. *The Finer Optic: The Aesthetic of Particularity in Victorian Poetry*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1975.

McGann, Jerome. "Rossetti's Significant Details." *Victorian Poetry* 7 (1969): 41-54.

Reide, David. *Dante Gabriel Rossetti and the Limits of Victorian Vision*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1983.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. *Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti*. Ed. Oswald Doughty and John Robert Wahl. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.

_____. *Dante Gabriel Rossetti: Poems and Translations 1850-70 Together with the Prose Story "Hand and Soul"*. London: Oxford UP, 1913. Cited as *Poems*.

_____. *The Works of Dante Gabriel Rossetti*. Ed. William Michael Rossetti. London: Ellis, 1911.

Ruskin, John. *The Works of John Ruskin*. Ed. E. T. Cook and A. Wedderburn. 39 vols. London: George Allen, 1904-12. Cited as *Works*.

Ruskin: Rossetti: Pre-Raphaelitism Papers 1854 to 62. Ed. William Michael Rossetti. 1889. New York: AMS Reprint, 1971.

Surtees, Virginia. *The Paintings and Drawings of Dante Gabriel Rossetti: A Catalogue Raisonné*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

University of Queensland

time, the story of the fallen woman.¹ "Lizzie Leigh" is unusual in having the fallen woman saved, unique in having her saved by her mother.

"Lizzie Leigh" begins with the death of a patriarch, Lizzie's father, James Leigh.² Milton is invoked on the very first page, as Gaskell describes the original state of Lizzie's parents' marriage:

Milton's famous line might have been framed and hung up as the rule of their married life, for he was truly the interpreter, who stood between God and her; . . . (2)

⁴ According to the dates of writing supplied by William Michael Rossetti in the Contents of *Works*, "A Young Fir-Wood" was written in 1850, "The Honeysuckle" in 1853, and "Love-Lily" in 1869.

¹ For an excellent discussion of the fallen woman in English literature, see Mitchell.

² It is notable that this death occurs on Christmas day, a feast celebrating motherhood.

This patriarchal bliss had come to an end with the "fall" of their daughter and the father's disowning her. Lizzie's mother, Anne, whose behavior before the fall was characterized by "loving submission," after this "rebelled against her husband as against a tyrant" (2). Anne Leigh had clearly ceased to see her husband as the interpreter of divinity. On his deathbed James forgives his daughter, asking God's forgiveness in return. It is through his wife, Anne, that the blessing of God is invoked.

James Leigh was not, as the narrator is at pains to point out, a wicked man, "though as certainly as he was an upright man, so surely was he hard, stern, and inflexible" (2). His attitude to his ruined daughter, if harsh, is consistent with literary convention, according to which the fallen woman always dies. The logic of this fate is derived not from observation but desire; it is not that women "died of sin" but that it was felt that they deserved to. This moral logic is imposed by James Leigh on his daughter's fate; to him she is, metaphorically, dead. The elder of Lizzie's two brothers has been told "the family shame," but the younger grows up believing that his sister really is dead. Thus desire becomes belief, and belief very nearly becomes fact; without the help of her family Lizzie might easily die of starvation or disease. The only member of the family interested in making the distinction between literal and metaphorical death is Lizzie's mother, who persists in the belief that her daughter has survived her father's censure, but is in danger of death by more concrete means.

After her husband's death, Anne Leigh turns for comfort to the Bible, significantly, to the parable of the prodigal son. She has, as we see here and elsewhere, her own way of interpreting the scriptures. The authority to interpret scripture for oneself is a tenet of Protestantism, allowing the reader to interpret the Bible in the light of reason and knowledge; Anne interprets scripture in the light of her own experience and compassion. She envisions her daughter as the prodigal, whose return will be welcomed by God. But instead of waiting for the return of the prodigal, Anne is inspired to go out to look for her.

The parallels with the parable include the attitude of Anne's eldest son, who shows all the enthusiasm of the "good" son at the idea of the prodigal's return:

Will sat with his head depressed, and hung down. He knew why that chapter had been chosen; and to him it recalled the family's disgrace. When the reading was ended, he still hung down his head in gloomy silence. But [Anne's] face was brighter than it had been before for the day. Her eyes looked dreamy, as if she saw a vision; . . . (3)

The contrast between James and Anne is continued between Will and Anne; the man stern and righteous, the woman gentle and sympathetic. Will, like his father, upholds the fiction that Lizzie is "probably dead"; that is, that she ought to be. Anne, however, believes that her prayers have been heard by God, and that God is not of the same set of opinions as Will and James. She tells her son, "I could never ha' spoken to thy father as I did to Him" (4). "Milton's famous line" has been contradicted; soon it will be completely reversed.

James's other will allows Anne lifetime tenancy on the farm before it passes to Will. This disruption of patriarchal

order makes space for matriarchy, giving Anne the power to find her daughter. She rents out the farm and moves the family to Manchester. Will opposes this plan, but a compromise is reached: they will stay in Manchester for one year. Will finds work, Thomas goes to school, and Anne wanders the streets by night in search of her daughter.

Although Will demonstrates an astonishing lack of pity for his own sister, he is not entirely without virtue. One night he encounters an elderly drunken man in the street:

For his father's sake Will regarded old age with tenderness, even when most degraded and removed from the stern virtues which dignified that father; so he took the old man home, and seemed to believe his often-repeated assertions that he drank nothing but water. (5)

Will's good deed is rewarded. The old man has a daughter, with whom Will falls in love. Susan Palmer is, in Will's eyes at least, the very opposite of Lizzie, pure and gentle, shy and modest. His feeling for Susan makes him angrier about what his sister has done. Moreover, "he became angry with his mother for her untiring patience in seeking for one who, he could not help hoping, was dead rather than alive" (6).

Will's morality is most peculiar. He feels that his family is hopelessly contaminated by Lizzie, if she is still alive. He does not, however, allow Susan's father's alcoholism to influence his opinion of her. Her care for her father is evidence of her virtue; Anne's care for Lizzie, apparently, is not. He has proven that he can be sympathetic, and he is so, throughout, to Mr. Palmer. Yet he has no sympathy whatever for his sister. His sympathy toward Mr. Palmer is specifically linked to his feelings for his father. It appears that his sympathy is limited to others like his father (i.e. males) and that caring has value for him insofar as it is applied to males, as Susan's is to her father.

Will does not value Anne's care for Lizzie, and does not inquire about her progress. When he shows his impatience with his mother, she responds by giving him a report of her progress in search of Lizzie, adding, "thou'rt too like thy father for me to tell without asking" (32). It is clear that she fears her son as she did his father. She has learned from Lizzie's former employer that Lizzie went into the workhouse to have her baby. She was later ejected to look for outside employment. Anne then asks her son a question to which he, and she, and we, and the Victorian reading public, know there is only one likely answer: "'whatten kind o' work would be open to her, lad, and her baby to keep?'" (32).

The information she has collected is a source of hope to Anne, of shame to Will. He feels he must give up any thought of marrying Susan Palmer, because of what his sister has done:

"if she knew about my sister, it would put a gulf between us, and she'd shudder up at the thought of crossing it. You don't know how good she is, mother!"

"Will, Will! if she's so good as thou say'st, she'll have pity on such as my Lizzie." (32)

Will is certain that Susan will act in accordance with this convention (and his own view) and his mother is equally sure that

if Susan Palmer is a good woman she will sympathize with Lizzie's case. In order to prove her theory, and the worthiness of Susan to be her son's bride, Anne Leigh goes to visit Susan Palmer and tells her the whole story.

The encounter between Anne and Susan is the turning point of the story. Not only is Susan full of sympathy for both Anne and Lizzie, she reveals that the child she has been raising as her niece is the daughter of a mysterious woman who is, it turns out, Lizzie. The child's name is Anne. From this point in the story, having found a daughter in Susan, her daughter Lizzie, and a granddaughter bearing her own name, Anne acquires increasing strength and dignity. She demonstrates this in her behavior toward Susan:

She stood up, and stretched out her hands in the attitude of blessing over Susan's bent head.

"God bless you, and show you His mercy in your need, as you have shown it to this little child." (34)

Susan further explains that the child's mother comes regularly and slips packages of money under the door for the child. Susan is touched by the mother's continuing devotion to her baby, and suggests that these visits might provide a way of reuniting Lizzie with her mother. Anne, still shocked by the revelation she has received, succumbs briefly to the fiction of the fallen woman: "I'd take her in my arms, and we'd just lie down and die together." This time it is Susan who provides the hopeful counter-myth: "Nay, don't speak so!" said Susan gently; 'for all that's come and gone, she may turn right at last. Mary Magdalen did, you know'" (34).

Anne Leigh returns home confirmed in her certainty of Susan's goodness, her daughter's life, and her own divine guidance. She faces her son Will in a very different manner from the night before:

"Will, my lad, I'm not afeard of you now and I must speak, and you must listen. I am your mother, and I dare to command you, because I know I am in the right and that God is on my side. If He should lead the poor wandering lassie to Susan's door . . . thou shalt never say a casting-up word to her about her sin, but be tender and helpful . . . so may God's blessing rest on thee, and so mayst thou lead Susan home as thy wife."

She stood no longer as the meek, imploring, gentle mother, but firm and dignified, as if the interpreter of God's will. Her manner was so unusual and solemn, that it overcame all Will's pride and stubbornness When she had spoken, he said in so subdued a voice that she was almost surprised at the sound, "Mother, I will." (61)

The Miltonic reference of the first page has been reversed; it is Anne Leigh who is the interpreter of God's will.

Things happen thick and fast after Anne's transfiguration. That very night little Nanny falls downstairs and dies, and Lizzie, who hears Susan's cries for help, arrives at Susan's house. The doctor arrives too late to save the child, but is able to give the distraught Lizzie something to make her sleep. In the morning, Susan, putting aside her own grief for

the moment, goes to fetch Anne Leigh. By nightfall the tale is resolved, with the reunion of Anne and Lizzie, and the engagement of Will and Susan.

Anne had acted as the interpreter of God's will to Will the night before; when Lizzie awakens she acts as the interpreter of God's mercy. Confronted with her daughter's fear and shame, Anne holds our her own enduring love, and the words of the Bible. Anne can barely read, so she has memorized all the texts in the Bible that demonstrate God's mercy and forgiveness. The Bible of Anne Leigh—which she embodies, in all senses—is the salvation of her daughter. The incentive for the pursuit of this salvation is provided by Nanny's death:

"Thy little child clung to me only yesterday; and if it's gone to be an angel, it will speak to God for thee . . . thou shalt have it again in Heaven; I know thou'lt strive to get there, for thy little Nancy's sake—and listen! I'll tell thee God's promises to them that are penitent—only doan't be afeard" (64-65)

The centrality of the mother in this version of the fallen woman story alters the myth considerably. In the typical version of the story, the young woman is seduced and abandoned by an upper-class villain, suffers the curses of her father, and dies begging the mercy of her male savior. In Gaskell's story, by contrast, the male figures are absent. Lizzie's father is dead. We never learn anything about the seducer or the seduction itself. By not providing any details, Gaskell avoids the issue of responsibility for Lizzie's fall. She also deprives the seducer of his place in the spotlight; he is unimportant in this version. Gaskell's is emphatically a mother's-eye view of the fallen woman. The emphasis is not on what Lizzie has done, but on her suffering and, most importantly, her enduring love for her child. These two facts are sufficient for Anne, and for Susan, and they are meant to suffice for the reader. It is not important to assign blame for sin; it is important to lift up the fallen. This lifting up, the story seems to indicate, is the proper work of women, sympathetic, motherly women.

Gaskell seldom commits herself to gender stereotypes, but the division between the sexes in this tale is startling. All of the men in the story are committed to the fiction of the fallen woman: James Leigh chooses to believe that Lizzie is dead, Will hopes that she is, and young Tom sincerely believes that she is. Tom is the only male in the story who is not authoritarian, and his role is marginal. The terribleness of the stern if good father reverberates through the story, not only through its inheritance by Will, but even in the funeral of the innocent Nanny:

They took the little corpse . . . to the hills, which in her lifetime she had never seen. They dared not lay her by the stern grandfather in Milne-Row churchyard, but they bore her to a lone moorland graveyard, where long ago, the quakers used to bury their dead. (65)

Despite the innocence of the child, the role it has played in redeeming its mother, and James Leigh's deathbed forgiveness

of Lizzie, Nanny cannot be laid in the patriarchal grave.³

The split between the fearsome sternness of male virtue and the sympathetic goodness of Anne and Susan, and ultimately Lizzie as well, causes Gaskell some serious problems in the treatment of the relationship between Susan and Will. One cannot help noticing the similarity between this match and that between Anne and James Leigh, and the whole story seems likely to repeat itself. Will expects the knowledge of his sister's fall to make an irreconcilable difference between Susan and himself. What comes very close to making this kind of difference is the disparity between their views on the subject. Susan is offended when she discovers that Will had expected her to react with horror. Anne Leigh attempts to reassure her: "But you mun not think badly of Will. He's so good hissel, that he can't understand how any one can do wrong; and, above all, I'm sure he loves you dearly" (34). The love of Will for Susan, and hers for him, is made to cover some pretty difficult ethical terrain. Anne's assurance is not very convincing in the light of her own experience. Nor does it explain why Will can understand Susan's father's drunkenness and not Lizzie's fall, or why Susan's goodness can include sympathy and understanding and Will's cannot, and does not seem to be expected to. The inescapable conclusion is that females have the capacity for sympathy and that males do not, or have it only in a limited form. Feminine sympathy seems to be linked with the capacity for motherhood; although Susan is not a mother, she is Nanny's foster-mother, and her school-keeping is a form of social motherhood. The contrast between male and female virtue is so clearly drawn in this story that one is made to wonder about the suitability of the match of Susan and Will, indeed, of any woman and any man.

The links between women, by contrast, are powerful and forged by motherhood, in the very broadest terms. Gaskell posits a matriarchy that operates on principles of analogy and sympathy. This matriarchy is remarkable in its universality—virtually all women are related—and its separateness from biological emphasis essential to patriarchy.⁴ Like feminist ethical theorists such as Sara Ruddick and Carol Gilligan,⁵ Gaskell can be said to both radicalize and reinforce traditional female roles and attributes—especially motherhood. Gaskell's view of motherhood is not androcentric; males are hardly necessary to it at all. In one after another of Gaskell's stories, women provide for themselves and each other; they raise their own children and those of other women.⁶

"Lizzie Leigh" is a case in point. Anne has come to Susan to see whether she is a suitable daughter. Susan, who has no living mother, is drawn by sympathy into a relationship with Anne. When Susan suggests that she might be able to

restore Lizzie to her mother, Anne declares, ". . . if thou canst catch her for me, I'll pray for thee when I'm too near my death to speak words; and while I live, I'll serve thee next to her—she mun come first, thou know'st" (35). Anne puts only one of her children before Susan—her daughter. Susan's marriage to Will takes her out of her father's house and restores her to the mother to whom she has proven herself a true daughter. And the matriarchy continues through Susan's daughters, including little Nanny, who bears Anne's name and accompanies Lizzie to her own daughter's grave. The story ends by outlining the fate of the women characters, emphasizing the identity among them, as if they were aspects of the same beneficent goddess. We are told, "Mrs. Leigh is quiet and happy," and "Susan is the bright one who brings sunshine to all" (65). Lizzie is redeemed by her love for her child and, unlike most fallen women, is permitted to work out her redemption in this life. She and her mother go to live in a secluded cottage, from which Lizzie emerges when the community has need of her.

Motherhood, for Gaskell, is also authoritative, as she shows through Anne Leigh, and if this authority requires the support of divine will, the divinity is definitely maternal. It is clear from the story that Anne is the enactor and interpreter of God's will—for herself and to Susan and Will and Lizzie. Against the fiction of the fallen woman she succeeds in embodying a feminized version of the parable of the prodigal son, in which the mother forgives the erring daughter. In this version the parent is active and not passive; she goes out and searches for her lost child. Only the sex of the "good son" remains the same. The feminization of the story, besides fitting it more closely to the story of the fallen woman, projects, though it does not actually articulate, an image of God as mother. Although referred to throughout as "He," God is consistently identified with Anne, and disassociated from James and Will.⁷

The connections between women not only transcend the bounds of biology, but also those of fiction. "Lizzie Leigh" was published in the first number of *Household Words*, a publication edited by Charles Dickens. Gaskell had written to Dickens in January, 1850, for advice in arranging the emigration of a fallen woman, a young prostitute in whom she was "very much interested." Four days later, she wrote to thank him and inform him that the girl was in a "Refuge." "Lizzie Leigh" appeared in *Household Words* in March, 1850. The story of a young prostitute saved by her mother, it was written by a motherly woman who has (one hopes) recently saved a young prostitute. Moreover, Gaskell notes in a letter to Eliza Fox that she has received Dickens's check and that some of it

³ The stern patriarch is a common Gaskell villain, insofar as there can be said to be villains in Gaskell's fiction. He appears as the elder Mr. Carson in *Mary Barton* and Mr. Bradshaw in *Ruth* and in the short stories, in a more sinister form. In "The Old Nurse's Story" and "The Doom of the Griffiths," he is responsible for the death of his grandchild—the most serious crime conceivable given Gaskell's maternal world-view. Although James Leigh is not directly responsible for his granddaughter's death, she cannot be buried with him. Moreover, her death is indirectly brought about by the actions of another patriarch, Mr. Palmer, who has been identified by Will with his father.

⁴ Biological paternity is central to patriarchy because property is transferred according to primogeniture. Because there is no such material transaction

associated with motherhood, biological parenthood becomes irrelevant.

⁵ Patsy Stoneman makes a strong argument for interpreting Gaskell's work in the light of Ruddick and Gilligan's work.

⁶ Libbie Marsh, in "Libbie Marsh's Three Eras," is a case in point, as is Susan Dixon in "Half a Lifetime Ago."

⁷ The association of maternity with divinity can also be seen in the death scenes of many of Gaskell's female characters. The heroines of *Ruth* and "Lois the Witch," as well as Alice Wilson in *Mary Barton* have visions of their mothers at the moment of their deaths—indeed, Lois's last word is "Mother!"

is to go to her "Refuge."⁸ We might speculate, as Susan does of Lizzie, that "she [felt] near to God when she [brought] this money" (34).

Works Cited

Gaskell, Elizabeth. *The Letters of Mrs. Gaskell*. Ed. A. Pollard and J. A. V. Chapple. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1966.

_____. "Lizzie Leigh." *Household Words* 1 (1850): 2-6; 2 (1850): 32-35; 3 (1850): 60-65. Citations in text are to this edition. "Lizzie Leigh" is available in *Elizabeth Gaskell*:

Four Short Stories. Intro. Anna Walters. London: Pandora P, 1983.

Mitchell, Sally. *The Fallen Angel: Chastity, Class and Women's Reading 1835-1880*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green University Popular P, 1981.

Stoneman, Patsy. *Elizabeth Gaskell*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987.

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

The Problem of the Man-Trap in Hardy's *The Woodlanders*

Jonathan C. Glance

A reader, upon completing Thomas Hardy's *The Woodlanders*, may feel some confusion over how he should take the closing chapters. If he has read other novels by that author, he may expect a tragic ending; or, if he has read other Victorian novelists, he may expect the bad characters to be punished and the good to be rewarded. Neither of these endings quite seems to occur here. The novel's approximate villain, Edred Fitzpiers, reclaims his wife Grace. They appear happily united, although the novel suggests his future infidelity to her. *The Woodlanders* rejoins Edred and Grace by means of an unusual plot device: the man-trap. This device, and its function in the novel, has received little critical comment. This paper will examine the problem of the man-trap in the book, and attempt to determine its significance.

Before discussing the man-trap as a problem, it is best to justify whether it is a problem. Some critics have no difficulty with it. For example, William R. Rutland speaks of the man-trap section in glowing terms: "[Hardy] was certainly an accomplished story-teller by 1886, and the novel shows it; to take only a small illustration: it would be hard to find a more cleverly constructed little narrative than the story of the man trap, in Chapter 47; not until the very last minute is the secret given away" (212). Indeed, that chapter does compel the reader's anticipation, and the various delays and hints do create suspense. However, when we view the "cleverly constructed little narrative" within the context of the novel, its success is less obvious. Richard Hannaford, in his discussion of the novel, chooses to interpret the man-trap scene as a symbol of hope for Grace: "only her dress is caught, and it is perhaps not unreasonable to see in her discarding of the dress a symbolic sloughing off of debilitating indecision which had hitherto blighted her life" ("Robert Browning" 120). Five years later, Hannaford alters his interpretation of the caught dress from "debilitating indecision" to "a symbolic sloughing off of inflexible conventions" ("A Forlorn Hope?" 76), but in both articles he chooses to view the reunion as a happy one.

Early reviewers of *The Woodlanders*, however, did point to the man-trap and the reunion as problems in the book.

In his review for the *Academy* of April 9, 1887, William Wallace refers to the man-trap incident as "not only eccentric but farcical"; in his view, it is "too obviously a piece of hurried stage 'business' to bring Edred and Grace together again" (155). Theologian and journalist R. H. Hutton is even more condemning in his review for the *Spectator* in March 26 of that same year. His primary concern is for the apparent rewarding of the unrepentant Edred: "It is evident, for instance, at the close of the tale, that Mr. Hardy spares Fitzpiers the man-trap . . . and even turns it into the means of reconciling him to his wife, from a feeling of tenderness for him which we cannot admire" (143). Hutton acknowledges that "poetic justice" does not exist in life, and so need not exist in fiction. Yet he asserts that "the pain and mutilation" Edred would have suffered if caught "would have been too good a fate for his deserts," and he goes on to chastise Hardy for letting "this sensual and selfish liar" off so easily (143-44). These two reviews, I believe, point out the problematic nature of the man-trap in *The Woodlanders*. They raise the questions of whether the plot device works effectively, and for what use Hardy employs it. Hutton's review also directs our attention to the conclusion of the novel. I believe these reviews raise some important points for discussion.

The man-trap episode caused problems for me when I first read the novel. The chief problem was that it seemed to undercut both the tone of the novel and my expectations. Several of Hardy's works portray tragic events (such as the decline and fall of Michael Henchard or Tess Durbeyfield), and the tone of many novels and poems tends toward pessimism. Indeed, an authorial aside in *The Woodlanders* seems to sum up for me Hardy's fictional world: at one point, Melbury plans to accost Fitzpiers, thinking "there could come of his interference nothing worse than what existed at present. And yet to every bad there is a worse" (188). This aside encapsulates the tendency for human events to evolve toward disaster in Hardy's novels, despite (or more usually because of) the characters' attempts to alleviate matters. With this tendency in mind, a reader might expect some tragic con-

⁸ The letter to Dickens is no. 61, dated 8 Jan. [1850], the one to Eliza Fox no. 70, dated 24 [22?] Jan. 1850; see *Letters* 98-100.

sequence from Tim Tangs' man-trap.

Hardy encourages that expectation in his handling of the episode. Chapter 46 ends in a manner which dramatically heightens our interest in the man-trap. The vengeful Tangs goes to a nearby cottage and withdraws a mysterious item from its hiding place. The author intensifies the mystery by his suggestive description: it is "a cobwebbed object curiously framed in iron, which clanked as he moved it. It was about three feet in length and half as wide" (263). Such a description has as its purpose confusion rather than recognition. At last the chapter ends with the revelation of the object in a brutally terse statement: "It was a man-trap" (263). Chapter 47 opens with a brief history of man-traps, called "devices for producing sound artistic torture" (264). Hardy discourses on the varieties of this device ("toothless," "half-toothed" and "bruiser" models), but points out that Tangs' trap is the fiercest. He continues to increase our anticipation of disaster as he describes the object itself, its history, and its deployment. The man-trap assumes a malevolent quality as Hardy compares it to particularly unpleasant animals; besides seeming "endowed with life," it "exhibited the combined aspects of a shark, a crocodile, and a scorpion" (264). Hardy furthers our sense of dread when he mentions the career of this particular trap. He says, "this very trap" had lamed Tangs' great-uncle for life, and it had also wounded a gamekeeper who had set it but accidentally walked into it; this victim eventually dies of lock-jaw because of it (264-65). This man-trap has tasted blood, then, and we expect that it will again. Finally, Hardy's description of Tangs' care in handling, setting and placing the trap reinforces the reader's anticipation that something horrible is about to happen. The scene is set: "Midway between husband and wife was the diabolical trap, silent, open, ready" (267).

Yet nothing horrible does happen. Although there is a "penetrating, but indescribable" scream in the night, and although Fitzpiers imagines that his wife has been "mangled" in the trap, Grace has had a providential escape. It merely caught her skirt, causing surprise and subsequent embarrassment, but no damage. Even the fierce trap begins to seem less dangerous. Although Fitzpiers fears that it could have broken Grace's legs, the narrator adds reassuringly that, "whether the old springs would have done quite so much mischief may be doubted" (269). In spite of our expectations of tragedy, then, Hardy delivers apparent comedy—no one is hurt, the lovers are reunited, the trap is rusty and less fearsome than it looked. We as readers may feel disappointment; not because we enjoy seeing characters maimed (although Hutton wished that fate for Fitzpiers), but because we feel Hardy has bungled an opportunity to use the man-trap as a metaphor for the world. The world of Hardy's novels is full of cruel coincidences which destroy men's lives; thus the man-trap would seem a perfect concrete metaphor for Chance and Fate awaiting the characters, and for the machines of destiny which trap and maim. The luck of Hardy's characters is nearly always bad, and so we feel almost cheated by Grace's fortuitous escape. Why does Hardy use the trap in this way? I will discuss several possibilities, ranging from bald narrative ploys to more subtle plot twists for symbolic purposes.

In speculating on the purpose for Hardy's use of the man-trap episode, we might begin with surface concerns. For

instance, we could begin by wondering whether the entire episode is a narrative trick to excite the audience's interest. J. I. M. Stewart seems to say as much in his discussion of the novel: "The man-trap is in the story, no doubt, chiefly because Hardy had hit upon it . . . as a useful means of generating a long moment of suspense and sensation at the close" (134). It is a fact that *The Woodlanders* first appeared in serial form, and the end of Chapter 46 seems like a melodramatic cliff-hanger intended to retain the audience until the next installment. Is this the sole purpose to the incident? In his Clarendon edition of the novel, Dale Kramer provides the serialized divisions of *The Woodlanders*. The American serialization, in weekly installments in *Harpers Bazaar*, did divide Chapters 46 and 47. The British serialization, however, in *Macmillan's Magazine*, published Chapters 44-48 together (62-64). Therefore, it is unlikely that the divisions of chapters was a real factor in Hardy's use of the man-trap; he wrote the novel primarily for British publication, and oversaw the installments in that country's magazine. Continuing with surface concerns, we might speculate that he composed the episode as a way to reunite Edred and Grace. While the trap does serve to break down Grace's reserve, I do not think we should assume that Hardy could not think of any other way of accomplishing that end. Even though novels of that era often seem to rely on such overtly mechanical plot twists as hidden identities, unexpected inheritances, birthmarks, and even spontaneous combustion to achieve an end, it appears to me that Hardy devotes more attention to the man-trap than such a purely pragmatic interest would warrant.

We might further speculate about the episode on a subtler level. The man-trap does bring about the reunification of Edred and Grace Fitzpiers, yet acceptance of that fact does not really say how we should interpret it. If we say that the episode furthers the ending, we must also judge that ending. If we say that Hardy refrains from maiming a character in order to create a happy ending in opposition to the novel's tone, we must analyze whether the ending is actually happy, and whether the overall tone is actually tragic. Critics do not agree on these points. There are some who view the end as unhappy or unjust. These critics tend to accept Melbury's judgment in the matter: "'But let [Grace] bear in mind that the woman walks and laughs somewhere at this very moment whose neck he'll be coling next year as he does hers tonight . . . It's a forlorn hope for her; and God knows how it will end'" (274). There is a strong tendency to bemoan Grace's return to an unfaithful husband, and her forgetting of the faithful Giles in his grave; Hutton's review epitomizes this view. Hardy seems to reward his villain, since he gets to keep the woman the hero loved but could never gain. Such a conclusion violates the accepted Victorian fictional model, and seen in this way the harmless man-trap seems further to frustrate the reader's expectations of just deserts. On the other hand, some critics interpret the ending optimistically. Glen Irvin offers a fairly persuasive argument that *The Woodlanders* employs comic structure and tone amidst tragic incidents; the novel, he claims, "demonstrates the power of comedy to absorb and contain tragedy" (79). For Irvin, the ending is not the destruction associated with tragedy but rather a qualified "comic reconciliation" (88). Mary M. Saunders reads the ending as a sign that the couple has experienced "inner growth"; in escap-

ing the man-trap, "they are emerging from the destructive social attitudes that have so influenced their lives" (531). Hannaford contrasts the active couple to the passive villagers, and congratulates the pair for making "the gamble for survival" (76). These optimistic interpretations, as well as the view which reads the ending as unjust, tend to share the assumption that the escape from the man-trap shows Hardy's encouragement of Edred and Grace.

Symbolic interpretations of the man-trap do not necessarily share that assumption, however. Saunders, in one of the few critical articles on the man-trap, reads the device as a social symbol. She states in her thesis, "The cruel trap, like the equally cruel class distinctions to which both Grace and Fitzpiers have subscribed, should have disappeared at a much earlier date, but the trap, like social snobbery, may still be found" (530). She bases her interpretation in part upon the earlier appearance of man-traps in the novel. In Chapter 8, Grace meets Mrs. Charmond at Hintock House, and notes the traps which serve as rather bizarre wall decorations. Saunders points out Grace's response: "They are interesting, no doubt as relics of a barbarous time happily past" (46). Ian Gregor also sees a social symbolism in that object. Tangs' attempt at vengeance, he claims, represents Little Hintock's impotence in the face of outside forces. The device belongs "to an older, simpler community which persists uncomfortably in a world where cause and effect have become increasingly difficult to locate. The man-trap, once a means of dispensing rough justice and enforcing the social and economic *status quo*, has now become 'a cobwebbed object'" (163). These social interpretations read the trap's failure as indicative of the failure of the old order. Yet while Saunders suggests that Hardy favors the new enlightened ways, Gregor asserts that the author "feels little sympathy" for the protagonists, and that the old order's decline is natural but unfortunate. This view of the man-trap as a social symbol does seem inviting. Such a reading meshes with the conflict in *The Woodlanders* between the natives of Little Hintock and the outsiders (Fitzpiers, Grace and Mrs. Charmond). It also coincides with the apparent defeat of the woodlanders; just as Giles fails to capture Grace, so too does the trap fail to capture its prey.

There is another way we can view the man-trap, however. Textual support exists for a reading of that object as a symbol of sexual relations. The first suggestion favoring this reading occurs in the same scene Saunders mentions. In Chapter 8 Grace's eyes are attracted to Mrs. Charmond's man-traps, and the latter playfully suggests, "Man-traps are of rather ominous significance where a person of our sex lives, are they not?" Grace responds with a smile, but the narrator adds, "that side of womanliness was one which her inexperience felt no great zest in contemplating" (46). The moment passes quickly, but it plants a kernel of a theme which flowers in Chapter 47. This reading offers a different interpretation of the man-trap; while Grace escapes the iron jaws of one trap, she does not escape the more tender and enduring trap of reconciliation with Fitzpiers. Fate, or Chance, or luck has spared her shins, but at the cost of her freedom and happiness. Read along these lines, *The Woodlanders'* apparent motto—"And yet to every bad there is a worse"—is fulfilled rather than undermined by the conclusion. If for no other reason, then, this interpretation of the man-trap would seem

attractive.

There is, however, further support for this approach. This support is both thematic and textual. The theme of sexual relations pervades the novel, appearing in anecdotes of marriages happy and sad, and in the halting social mating dance of the characters. Mrs. Charmond hints at the man-trap as a symbol of those relations in Chapter 8; less obvious man-traps include the hair-piece she obtains from Marty South, and the lace handkerchief she drops when a child, which the young Edred cries over (143). The hair-piece snares its victim—Edred notices its beauty (142)—but eventually that trap rebounds on its "toiler." Chapter 20 details the Midsummer eve ritual, when the maidens go to the woods to discover "their future partners for life." Here Fitzpiers lurks behind a bush along the path in order to catch Grace; his position is remarkably similar to that of the man-trap later. Chapter 47 also suggests the theme, in its juxtaposition of a discussion of the trap with Grace's recognition of the extent of her wedding vows. The narrator accentuates the connection between the marriage and a trap: "She became lost in long ponderings on how far a person's conscience might be bound by vows made without at the time a full recognition of their force" (266). These textual incidents reinforce this reading of the man-trap, and underscore the pessimism of the novel at the conclusion.

This essay has attempted to explore the problem of the man-trap in *The Woodlanders* in order to determine what it means and how Hardy uses it. As I have pointed out, there is no simple answer to the problem. Yet of all the ways of reading that episode in Chapter 47 within the context of the novel, I find the last interpretation works the best to explain the problem. Reading the man-trap as a symbol of sexual relations, we can view it as a part of that pervasive theme, and as a fulfillment of the novel's pessimistic and deterministic tone. The conclusion still raises questions, however, since Grace seems punished by the reconciliation while Edred appears free to continue his infidelity. However, the absence of didactic "just deserts" at the end does not have to mean Hardy encourages Fitzpiers' behavior. In his essay "The Profitable Reading of Fiction," Hardy asserts that such an ending can teach a more powerful lesson than an overtly sermonizing one:

the didactic novel is so generally devoid of *vraisemblance* as to teach nothing but the impossibility of tampering with natural truth to advance dogmatic opinions. Those, on the other hand, which impress the reader with the inevitableness of character and environment in working out destiny, whether that destiny be just or unjust, enviable or cruel, must have a sound effect, if not what is called a good effect, upon a healthy mind . . . A novel which does moral injury to a dozen imbeciles, and has bracing results upon a thousand intellects of normal vigor, can justify its existence. (118)

I believe this statement goes some way towards alleviating objections to Fitzpiers' success. The man-trap, though placed for him, is destined to affect Grace. She escapes physical damage and merely loses her skirt; "And yet for every bad there is a worse," and for Grace that worse is yet to come at the novel's end.

Works Cited

- Gregor, Ian. *The Great Web: The Form of Hardy's Major Fiction*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1974.
- Hannaford, Richard. "A Forlorn Hope?" Grace Melbury and *The Woodlanders*." *The Thomas Hardy Yearbook* 10 (1980): 72-76.
- _____. "Robert Browning and Thomas Hardy's *The Woodlanders*." *Studies in Browning and His Circle* 3.1 (1975): 117-20.
- Hardy, Thomas. "The Profitable Reading of Fiction." *Thomas Hardy's Personal Writings*. Ed. Harold Orel. Lawrence: U of Kansas P, 1966. 110-25.
- _____. *The Woodlanders*. The World's Classics ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985.
- Hutton, R. H. Review of *The Woodlanders* in *Spectator*. *Thomas Hardy: The Critical Heritage*. Ed. R. G. Cox. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970. 142-45.
- Irvin, Glenn. "Structure and Tone in *The Woodlanders*." *Thomas Hardy Annual* 2 (1984): 79-90.
- Kramer, Dale, ed. *The Woodlanders*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.
- Rutland, William R. *Thomas Hardy: A Study of His Writings and Their Background*. 1938. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962.
- Saunders, Mary M. "The Significance of the Man-Trap in *The Woodlanders*." *Modern Fiction Studies* 20.4 (1974-1975): 529-31.
- Stewart, J. I. M. *Thomas Hardy: A Critical Biography*. New York: Dodd and Mead, 1971.
- Wallace, William. Review of *The Woodlanders* in *Academy*. *Thomas Hardy: The Critical Heritage*. Ed. R. G. Cox. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970. 153-55.

University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill

Sartor Redivivus, or Retailoring Carlyle for the Undergraduate Classroom

Linda K. Hughes

Sartor Resartus hardly needs reviving among scholars, since it has always maintained its status as one of Carlyle's (and the Victorian age's) preeminent works. But for undergraduate students, particularly in North American undergraduate classrooms, *Sartor Resartus* is generally as exotic—and as unreadable—as it was for many *Fraser's Magazine* subscribers in 1833 and 1834. An acquaintance of mine recently taught a course in Victorian autobiography to an upper-level undergraduate course consisting mostly of English majors. He reports that the course got under way only after students were past *Sartor Resartus*, which they loathed. Those students given any opportunity to read and discuss *Sartor* in the classroom, moreover, rarely read the complete work. For the most part, *Sartor* seems to be represented in North American classrooms by excerpts, especially "The Everlasting No," "The Centre of Indifference," "The Everlasting Yea" (from Book II) and "Organic Filaments" and "Natural Supernaturalism" (from Book III).¹

It seems a pity that Carlyle's most genial, engaging work should be so little read, especially in its entirety, outside circles of advanced students of Victorian literature. There is, however, one available method of incorporating the entire *Sartor Resartus* into undergraduate classrooms with some success. This involves reviving the original parts-issuance of the work. Ironically, the installment format which distressed Carlyle and dismayed many of his readers can now be used to

enhance *Sartor's* accessibility to students who resist the work when they are presented with it as a single volume. If classes read the original installments of *Sartor* printed in *Fraser's Magazine* one at a time, that is, with intervals between readings during which students read related materials, they are able to come to terms with Carlyle's idiosyncratic style and (often) unfamiliar concepts rather than being overwhelmed by the work all at once. This reading format can also interest scholars of Carlyle because the installment reading method—despite Carlyle's desire to publish the work as a whole volume—in effect extends and strengthens one of the work's principal themes.²

Michael Lund has advocated that Victorian fiction first issued serially by taught in parts in undergraduate classrooms (Lund). Reading a prose work like *Sartor Resartus* in parts is feasible for many of the same reasons Lund cites. That is, students can better cope with a long work during a fifteen-week semester when they read it a part at a time instead of hurriedly (and often superficially) over a few days; and students' sympathy for a work tends to deepen as they spend more time with it. The link between installment reading and plot or characterization noted by Lund cannot work in quite the same way with a text such as *Sartor Resartus*, but reading *Sartor* in parts has its own benefits, as I explain below.

I included the complete *Sartor Resartus* in "Nineteenth-Century British Literature," a course devoted to poetry and

¹ The *Oxford Anthology of English Literature: Victorian Prose and Poetry*, for example, reprints "The Everlasting No," "The Everlasting Yea," and "Natural Supernaturalism."

² Carlyle himself acknowledged that reading *Sartor* a part at a time might be useful. In the letter in which he offered *Sartor* to *Fraser's*, he commented, "It

is already divided into three 'Books,' and farther into very short 'Chapters,' capable in all ways of subdivision. Nay, some tell me, what perhaps is true, that taking a few chapters at a time is really the profitablest way of reading it" (qtd. in Tennyson 153).

prose. Since the course was designed to cover Romantic as well as Victorian poetry, I thought *Sartor* could provide an interesting link between the two eras. The classroom text I adopted also allowed students to learn something about the publication and distribution system of the nineteenth century, for I ended up using a photocopy of the original edition of *Sartor* issued in *Fraser's Magazine* from November 1833 to August 1834.³ Though I had not originally intended to use a photocopy, I discovered from *Books in Print* that *Sartor* is available only in an expensive scholarly edition⁴—an indication of how seldom the complete *Sartor* is taught in undergraduate classrooms. Copyright, needless to say, poses no difficulty for an 1833-34 work, and the bound issues of *Fraser's* available on university library shelves are in adequate condition to endure photocopying. I had the original photocopy duplicated for my students (in a "Kinko's text") at a tenth the cost of the only available volume edition. Students thus had contact with the same text as Carlyle's first readers. Since I distributed the *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals* contents pages for the November 1833-August 1834 *Fraser's* to the class, students also had the opportunity to recall that literature always appears in the context of other literary works and cultural forces, a truism sometimes hard to keep in mind for those students who encounter literary works only through the pages of late twentieth-century anthologies.

Students read one of the eight installments of *Sartor* every two weeks. They began the course with the first installment, went on to the poetry of Blake and Wordsworth; read a second installment, then reverted to the poetry and prose of Wordsworth and Coleridge; read a third installment, continued with Coleridge; read a fourth installment followed by the works of Byron and Shelley; read a fifth installment and then several of Keats's poems and letters. Their reading of the sixth, seventh, and eighth installments of *Sartor* occurred in the context of Tennyson's and Browning's poetry.⁵ Students were required to write a one-page response to every reading assignment in the course, so I was able to keep track of how well students comprehended *Sartor* as the semester progressed and the connections they made between *Sartor* and other assigned readings.

Student response to the first installment of *Sartor* must have approximated what some witness among students assigned to read the entire text—general dismay and incomprehension. One or two students familiar with biblical studies or a broad range of British literature were relatively comfortable with the text, but these were distinct exceptions. After encountering the work of Blake, a few students found *Sartor* less intimidating; and by the midpoint of the semester, when students had read the first four installments, Carlyle's metaphoric exuberances and insistence on the essentially spiritual nature of the universe were familiar not only from students' practice of reading Carlyle but also from, say, Wordsworth's account of his revelation at the Simplon Pass in *The Prelude*. When students encountered the references to the

Satanic school of poetry in Book II, Chapter VI of *Sartor* (March 1834), they had recently read excerpts from Byron's *Childe Harold* and thus could integrate and place Carlyle's allusions quite easily. By the end of the course two students had elected to write term papers on *Sartor*, and every student in the class was able to write an hour-long essay on the work on the final exam.

I cannot claim uniform success with this approach to teaching *Sartor Resartus*. Some students had to struggle even at the end of the course to understand the work at an elementary level. But I can claim that the students learned how to engage a work, how to avoid dismissing it out of hand. Perhaps this minimal accomplishment is best illustrated by the little peroration one student placed at the head of his examination essay:

Just as a preface, let me say that initially I found *Sartor Resartus* repulsive. It was unreadable, quirky, and to me unappreciable. In retrospect I find it delightfully creative, extremely humorous and still totally unreadable.

Many students (if with less wit) went further than this. Students taking the final exam could choose one of the three essay questions on *Sartor* to respond to. One question asked students to envision Diogenes Teufelsdröckh as a Visiting Professor of Things in General at TCU and to give at least five examples of how Teufelsdröckh might apply his clothes philosophy to their institution. Students who wrote on this question showed a clear comprehension of Carlyle's essential points and were able to extrapolate and apply these concepts nicely to twentieth-century culture, demonstrating that for them *Sartor Resartus* had genuinely been revitalized.

Equally important, this teaching method allowed students to read the entire *Sartor* and see it as a connected piece rather than envisioning it as a cluster of concepts represented by a few excerpts. Only by reading the whole work, of course, can students encounter the three books essential to Carlyle's insistence that the universe is fundamentally spiritual and that, to be perceived, this spiritual essence must be embodied—hence the philosophical, biographical, and pragmatic emphases of the three books. And for those students who read the entire work a part at a time, one of the text's significant tropes can also become a trope for students' reception of the work. In the opening installment of Book I (November 1833), Teufelsdröckh is remote, aloof, above all his compatriots: "the Professor's private domicile . . . was the attic floor of the highest house in the Wahngasse; and might be called the pinnacle of Weissnichtwo, for it rose sheer up above the contiguous roofs, themselves rising from elevated ground . . . So that it was in fact the speculum or watch-tower of Teufelsdröckh; wherefrom, sitting at ease, he might see the whole life-circulation of that considerable City . . ." (587). At the conclusion of *Sartor Resartus*, in the August 1834 installment, Teufelsdröckh has disappeared from his tower; he is at

³ As G. B. Tennyson points out, Carlyle asked *Fraser's* to gather and bind the individual installments into book form after serialization ceased; fifty-eight copies were gathered in all (154). Our Kinko's text was essentially identical to this first edition of *Sartor*.

⁴ 1921. rpt. Denver: Arden Library, 1981. This edition, issued in a library

binding, is listed at \$39.50 in the most recent *Books in Print*.

⁵ The poetry and prose of Arnold were originally included on the course syllabus, but the class fell behind schedule. Had this been a Victorian course, students would have read several additional Victorian poets and a number of short prose works or excerpts in between assignments of *Sartor*.

large rather than removed and remote, his influence dispersed among many people. Thus, after reporting Teufelsdröckh's influence on the tailors' sedition in Weissnichtwo and Berlin and the Saint-Simonians in Paris, the editor comments: "Our own private conjecture, now amounting almost to certainty, is that, safe-moored in some stillest obscurity, not to lie always still, Teufelsdröckh is actually in London!" (193). The shift from seclusion and elevation to engagement and commingling mirrors Carlyle's exhortation to embody thought in action; it also suggests the literal dispersal of *Sartor Resartus* amongst Londoners in the pages of *Fraser's* and (one hazards to guess) a model of the effect Carlyle hoped the work would have on his readers. The last becomes realized in the classroom, in my experience, when *Sartor* is once again read in its original parts. Students at first considered *Sartor* beyond their grasp, over their heads. By the end of the eighth installment, some individuals still struggled with the work but the students as a whole were comfortable with it, able to enter the text (and receive it) in the spirit of give and take.

A final benefit of approaching the entire *Sartor Resartus* in its original parts is that this reading format in effect extends one of Carlyle's principal themes. This might be called the phoenix theme, since Carlyle invokes the metaphor of the phoenix several times to assert that old, outworn symbols and institutions must first be destroyed before new embodiments of spiritual ideas can arise in their place. As we read through *Sartor* over the semester, my class and I realized that the installment format becomes yet another embodiment of the theme of death and renewal, lapsing and arising. Each part, of course, terminates, followed by the work's resumption, or renewal, a month or two later. But each part is also plotted as an experience of destruction or renewal in that the most frequent pattern is one of hope followed by obstruction and the necessity of starting all over again.

Thus, in the opening installment (November 1833), the editor first mentions Heuschrecke's hint that documents to tell the story of Teufelsdröckh are available, and so the editor undertakes the biography of the Professor (584). A few pages later, the editor reports that the documents are not, after all, available, and so he must turn from the biography to Teufelsdröckh's own text on the clothes philosophy: "what reader expects that, with all our writing and reporting, Teufelsdröckh could be brought home to him, till once the Documents arrive? . . . on the other hand, does not his Soul lie enclosed in this remarkable Volume . . . ?" (590). In the second installment (December 1833), the editor again longs for the documents—"Would to Heaven those same Biographical Documents were come!" (674)—but when the documents finally arrive, the "cheerful daystar of hope" that had "hung before" the editor "melts now, not into the red of morning, but into a vague, gray, half-light" (682). The editor, in short, must begin his task yet again, and his labor, constructing meaning out of six paper bags of documents, is interestingly analogous to that of serial readers, who must piece together and construe eight bundles of text (installments) also separated by space and time.

The third installment (February 1834)⁶ opens with a triple genesis: the start of a new book (Book II); the start of Teufelsdröckh's biography; and the start of Teufelsdröckh's life in the mysterious story of his arrival. But the installment, after tracing the professor's early life and education, ends not with the young man's advancement but with his utter frustration. A life that had begun fairly now goes nowhere, and even the epitaph Teufelsdröckh is commissioned to compose "still remains unengraved" (195). In the fourth installment (March 1834), which culminates in the chapter entitled "The Everlasting No," Teufelsdröckh leaves the law profession and begins a new quest. He also begins his brief love affair with Blumine, another beginning which starts with hopefulness and ends in futility or destruction. The entire installment is suffused with fire imagery betokening at once the fire of passion, of torment, of Satanic verse-making, of damnation, and of purgation. For if the installment ends on the everlasting no, it also ends with a fire-baptism that suggests renewal to come: "It is from this hour that I incline to date my Spiritual New-birth, or Baphometric Fire-baptism; perhaps I directly thereupon began to be a Man" (313). The fifth installment (April 1834) relates this renewal at greater length; Teufelsdröckh's journey from the Everlasting No through the Centre of Indifference to the Everlasting Yea brings him "a new Heaven and a new Earth" (449), and now his "spiritual majority" begins (453). But at the end of Book II, in a chapter entitled "Pause" (especially apt for a serial work about to break off), the entire matter of the past three installments is suddenly presented as a possible ruse or false lead: "Here . . . must the Editor give utterance to a painful suspicion . . . that these Autobiographical Documents are partly a Mystification! What if many a so-called Fact were little better than a Fiction . . . ?" (454). The editor now abandons the biographical mode as a dead end and determines to start over again with Teufelsdröckh's clothes philosophy.

The sixth installment (June 1834) represents two fresh beginnings, a new book (Book III) and an approach to the clothes philosophy from a pragmatic point of view; the part ends, appropriately, with a chapter entitled "The Phoenix." More than the others, the seventh installment (July 1834) may represent a continuation of the preceding chapter rather than a fresh start, as Carlyle pulls together the various filaments of the clothes philosophy, a principle also enunciated in the chapter called "Organic Filaments." Still, new beginnings are twice announced in the part, for the editor contends that "It is in his stupendous Section, headed Natural Supernaturalism, that the Professor first becomes a Seer," and here also the clothes philosophy "attains to Transcendentalism" and "Palingenesia, in all senses, may be considered as beginning" (83). The formal function of the last installment (August 1834) is of course to end; the work's last chapter is entitled "Farewell." But this final cessation also inaugurates a new beginning, for the work begun by Teufelsdröckh must now be carried on by readers if it is to be successful: "Happy few, little band of Friends, be welcome, be of courage! By degrees, the eye grows accustomed to its new Whereabout; the hand

⁶ A two-month hiatus in publication occurred between the end of Book I and the beginning of Book II, and between the end of Book II and the beginning of Book III. This publication format could be seen as emphasizing the sepa-

ration between books and, in general, the possibility of sundering or rifts in experience, followed by fresh beginnings.

can stretch itself forth to work there: it is in this grand and indeed highest work of Palingenesia that ye shall labour, each according to ability" (183). Insofar as Carlyle's audience takes up and realizes aspects of the clothes philosophy, Teufelsdröckh's story begins anew in each reader. The editor himself, moreover, suggests that Teufelsdröckh's story is about to begin anew after relaying Heuschrecke's news of the professor's disappearance from Weissnichtwo "Thus far the Hofrath; who vanishes, as is his wont, too like an Ignis Fatuus, leaving the dark still darker.—So that Teufelsdröckh's public History were not done, then, or reduced to an even, unromantic tenor; nay, perhaps, the better part thereof were only beginning?" (193). Even the final farewell is both an ending and a beginning, a good-bye to readers and a hope that, in the future, *Fraser's* will fare well.

The transformation of the work's ending into a beginning is of course discernible to scholars and readers of the whole-volume version of *Sartor*. What has been less evident is the role of the installment format in extending the theme of destruction and renewal through content and form. Each installment is a new beginning, often following upon what has been presented as a narrative dead end (the expected documents, the six paper bags, the biographical mode in general.) Hence the installment *Sartor* reinforces Teufelsdröckh's insistence that the old must be abandoned and a new start made, thought the new may depend on what has preceded. Each part also demonstrates that pauses, turnings away, even losses, can be a means of advancing.

The phoenix theme is unique to *Sartor Resartus*, but its original publication format was shared by many significant Victorian prose works, including Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy* (serialized in the *Cornhill* from July 1867 to September 1868) and Morris's *A Dream of John Ball* (serialized in the

weekly *Commonweal* from November 1886 to January 1887). Many other prose works were published in parts (either individual volumes, as in Ruskin's *Stone of Venice*, or in pamphlets, as in Newman's *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*), if not in magazines. All these works, too, can successfully be taught in their entirety, in parts, in the classroom. In many instances photocopies from Victorian periodicals can be adopted, though ideally editions could be made available that combine an installment format with sufficient annotation for clarity to late twentieth-century readers. In any case, one means of reviving the presence of *Sartor Resartus* in the classroom is to begin anew with the format Carlyle happily abandoned after initial publication in *Fraser's* in 1833-34. It is a delicious irony Carlyle might have enjoyed that the parts-format which once scarified author and reader alike can be, a century and a half later, a means of retaining an audience. We need not destroy the whole-volume editions favored my most, but scholars and students alike can gain by closing our volumes and opening our parts editions.

Works Cited

- Oxford Anthology of English Literature: Victorian Prose and Poetry.*
Ed. Lionel Trilling and Harold Bloom. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.
- Tennyson, G. B. *Sartor Called Resartus: The Genesis, Structure, and Style of Thomas Carlyle's First Major Work.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1965.
- Lund, "Teaching Long Victorian Novels in Parts." *Victorian Newsletter* No. 58 (1980): 29-32.

Texas Christian University

Identification of Literary, Historical and other References in Trollope's *The Macdermots of Ballycloran* (1847), *The Three Clerks* (1858), *Rachel Ray* (1863), *The Vicar of Bullhampton* (1870), *Ralph the Heir* (1871), and *The American Senator* (1877)

James Means

The numerals in the left-hand column correspond to the page in the Dover paperback editions.

The Macdermots of Ballycloran

Ch.	Pg.	Identification
-----	-----	----------------

1.	1.	"Donkeys carrying turf . . . home in double kishes." "A large wickerwork basket, used in Ireland for carrying turf, etc." (OED)
----	----	--

- | | | |
|----|-----|--|
| 2. | 6. | "Smoked out of a <u>dhudheen</u> . . ."
OED gives priority to "Dudeen." Irish name for a short clay tobacco-pipe. (1841) |
| 3. | 7. | "Macdermot, as he sat eating <u>stirabout</u> ."
"Porridge made by stirring oatmeal, etc. in boiling water or milk." OED, 1682. |
| | 8. | "Fanny was reading <i>The Mysterious Assassin</i> ."
I have been unable to ascertain whether this is a real or invented title. |
| 4. | 16. | "Father Mathew's pledge was then unknown." |

- "Mathew (Father). 1799-1856, called the Apostle of Temperance. His success was almost miraculous." (Brewer, *Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*)
21. "pulling like a gossoon at a pig's hind leg."
Chiefly an Anglo-Irish term, 'gossoon' is ultimately derived from the Fr. *garçon* and means 'a boy, servant-boy, lackey.'" (*OED*)
21. "Ribbonism, about 1830-, was again becoming very prevalent."
"A Catholic association organised in Ireland about 1808. Its two main objects were (1) to secure 'fixity of tenure,' called the tenant-right; and (2) to deter anyone from taking land from which a tenant had been ejected. The name arises from a ribbon worn as a badge in the button-hole." (Brewer)
5. 25. "Charles O'Malley's."
Charles O'Malley (1841) was a early and extremely popular work by the prolific Irish novelist Charles Lever (1806-1872). Trollope admired his novels.
26. "Repeal of the Union."
1801. The Union of Great Britain and Ireland, forming the United Kingdom.
7. 54. "*ex pede Herculem*."
A proverb which means, "You may judge of Hercules' size by his foot."
55. "*Optat ephippia bos piger*."
This phrase, from Horace's *Epp.* I. xiv. 43-44, translates: "No one is content with his condition. The ox wishes for the horse's trappings. The lazy nag wishes to plow."
"*Fumum bibere institutae*."
This phrase, from Horace's *Seventh Ode of the Third Book*, may be translated: "This festal day . . . shall draw a well-pitched cork forth from a jar." (Loeb translation)
8. 62. "Pat has got Shamus na Pebria, all the way out of County Mayo."
Note that on p. 111, Trollope has changed (corrected?) this name to Shamuth na Pibu'a. I have been unable to ascertain whether this is the name of an historical person. Given the name-change, which shows Trollope trying to be correct, I would imagine that Shamus was a real piper Trollope had heard or had heard of.
62. ". . . who had made the music out of his own head, all about O'Connell."
Daniel O'Connell (d. 1847) known as the Liberator, who founded the movement for Irish independence. From about 1829 he called in Parliament for the repeal of the Union.
12. 117. "The sign of a copper harp."
In other words, a penny.
13. 127. "refused to pay either rent, tithes, or county cesses."
cesses. *OED* 2. Ireland. "the obligation to supply the soldiers and the lord deputy's household with provisions at prices 'assessed'; hence, *loosely*, military exactions."
129. "like the fiddle in the German tale, compel the hearers to dance."
The Funk and Wagnall's Standard Dictionary of Folklore . . . (New York, 1950) identifies Trollope's description as the motif of one of Grimm's fairy tales. *No. 110*.
129. "The tune of the 'wind that shakes the barley.'" I have been unable to trace this air.
16. 117. "suspected to be ribbonmen, or Terryalts."
"Terry Alts": "Insurgents of Clare who appeared after the Union and committed murderous outrages. These rebels were similar to the Thrashers of Connaught . . . and the Fenians (1869)." (Brewer).
17. 184. "but he'd be able to ride 11 stone 4."
As a unit of weight, one stone is equivalent to fourteen pounds. So, 11 stone 4 equals 158 pounds.
18. 190. "writs would be issued for his body . . . and *latitats*."
Law. "A writ which supposed the defendant to lie concealed and which summoned him to answer in the King's Bench." (*OED*)
19. 197. "I'd sooner take a score of freize-coats."
"A kind of coarse-woollen cloth, with a nap, usually on one side only: now esp. of Irish make." (*OED*)
197. "All in the new fashion—brass fittings and brass haines."
"Haines" is not in *OED* and I have failed to find a definition.
19. 206. "The figures as good as any that could be adorned for Almack's by a Parisian head-dresser."
"Almack's Assembly Rooms stood in King Street, St. James's, and were celebrated in the 18th and early 19th cents. as the scene of social functions. They were founded by one William Almack (or Macall, d. 1781), who appears to have come to London as a valet to the duke of Hamilton" (*Oxford Companion to English Literature*, 3rd ed.). Brewer adds that the rooms were built in 1765 by a Scotsman named Macall, "who inverted his name to obviate all prejudice and hide his origin." He adds that "to be admitted [to these rooms] was as great a distinction as to be presented at court."
28. 295. "a kind of *lucus a non lucendo*."
An etymological contradiction. The Latin word *lucus* means a 'dark grove,' but is said to be derived from the verb *luceo*, 'to shine' (Brewer). However, Riley's *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Quotations* (London, 1872), 209, citing several conflicting authorities, points out that the real etymology of *lucus* is unknown.
297. "With what 'becks, and smiles, and wreathed nods.'"

Probably an intentional misquotation of Milton's *L'Allegro*, l. 28.

300. "that willow-wearing spinster, Letitia Murphey."

Brewer states that to wear the willow means to go into mourning, *esp.* for a sweetheart or a bride. As Letitia has been jilted, the willow is appropriate.

300. "no case of Bardell v. Pickwick."

The famous action for breach of promise in *The Pickwick Papers* (1837).

29. 317. "Mr. Thady would jine them in putting down the Peelers."

"A member of the Irish Constabulary: Hence, any policeman (1829). Ex. Mr. (later, Sir) Robert Peel, Secretary of Ireland (1812-1818)" (Partridge).

31. 340. "they were marched away to *durance vile*."

Possibly an unconscious allusion to Burns's "An Epistle from Eposus to Maria," 57-58. In *durance vile* here must I wake and weep, And all my frowzy couch in sorrow steep.

The Three Clerks

Ch.	Pg.	Identification
1.	8.	Two lines from <i>Lycidas</i> , ll. 68 and 67.
1.	9.	As he pronounces lastly on each deed, Of so much fame, in Downing Street—expect the meed. Unidentified
2.	26.	Two lines of verse misquoted or adapted from <i>Love's Labour's Lost</i> , IV, iii, 303ff.
2.	27.	". . . Poet has said that women are all rakes at heart." Pope, <i>To a Lady</i> , l. 216.
4.	35.	"The battle of Navarino or the bombarding of Acre." Navarino (1827): a naval battle in the Greek war of Independence in which the British, French, and Russian fleets defeated the Turkish and Egyptian fleets. Acre: (1799): defeat of the French before John d'Acre.
6.	61.	<i>Detur digno . . . detur digniori</i> : "Let it be given to him who is worthy . . . To him who is more worthy."
7.	72.	"Growing taste of the day for torsos, Palissy ware." "Palissy ware takes its name from Bernard Palissy (c. 1510-1589), a French Huguenot potter and naturalist. Drawing on a lifetime interest in natural science, he frequently decorated his ware with reliefs of lizards, snakes, leaves, fruit, and other plant and animal life. Using

glazes of yellow, blue, gray, and brown, he colored these forms to approximate nature. Palissy ware was imitated throughout Europe during the nineteenth century." *Encyclopedia Americana*.

8. 79. *res angusta domi*
straitened domestic circumstances.
8. 80. "a bundle of shagreen spectacle cases."
Refers to well-known episode in Goldsmith's *The Vicar of Wakefield* (1766), Ch. 12.
8. 84. "a poor Peri"
Refers to "Paradise and the Peri" in Thomas Moore's spectacularly popular *Lalla Rookh* (1817).
10. 105. *Facilis decensus Averni*
Easy is the descent to hell.
A famous Virgilian tag from the *Aeneid*, 6: 126.
10. 107. *Aequam memento*
Opens Horace's third ode of the second book, the first phrase of which is thus rendered by the Loeb translator: "Remember, when life's path is steep, to keep an even mind."
13. 136. "Shall I wasting in despair."
Opening lines of Wither's "The Lover's Resolution," (1619).
16. 164 *Cum tot sustineas. . .*
Opening phrase of Horace's *Epistle to Augustus*, the first epistle of the second book.
17. 167. "umquhile sheriff."
Sometime sheriff.
17. 171. "au ravir."
Ravishingly.
17. 172. *Rem . . . quocunque modo rem*.
From Horace, first epistle of the first book. The Loeb translator has: "Get money, honestly if you can; but, if not, anyway you can."
19. 194. *Meleager . . . ab ovo*.
Horace, *Ars Poetica*, ll. 146-47: "Nor does he [Homer] begin Diomedes' return from the death of Meleager, or the war of Troy from the twin eggs." (Loeb)
19. 195. *Omne tulit punctum*.
Horace, *Ars Poetica*, l. 343: "He has carried the point who mixes pleasure with profit." (Loeb)
20. 205. *Dolus an virtus*.
Virgil : "Who enquires in an enemy whether it was stratagem or valour?"
22. 225. "The distinguished establishment of Madame Mantalini."
Madame Mantalini is the exclusive dressmaker in Dickens's *Nicholas Nickleby* (1839).
22. 225. "To gar [make] the auld claes look amaist as weel's the new"
Unidentified
26. 281. "Ample room and verge enough."
From Gray's "The Bard," l. 51 (1757).
29. 314. "Put rancors in the vessels of their peace."

31. 340. *Macbeth*, III, i, 66.
"Across his weasand."
His throat.
31. 341. "Them as wills not, when they may,
When they wills they shall have nay."
Unidentified
32. 347. "Such a brock."
"A Badger, usually qualified as stinking."
(*OED*).
33. 361. "black care would sit behind him."
Translates Horace's *Atra Cura*, (Post equitem
sedet atra Cura.) This is one of Trollope's
favorite Latin tags; one will find it in several
novels. From Horace (first ode of the third
book, l. 16.)
38. 406. "... I would not change
My exiled, mangled, persecuted husband,
Alive or dead, for prince or paladin,
In story or in fable, with a world
To back his suit."
From Byron's *The Two Foscari* (1821), II, i,
158ff.
40. 422. "The labour he delighted in physicked pain."
Paraphrase of *Macbeth*, II, iii, 55. From my
reading of Trollope's novels, I should say this
line was his favorite Shakespearean tag.
47. 491. "Stand not upon the order of your going, but go
at once."
Macbeth, III, iv, 119.
47. 495. *Aliter non fit, amice, liber.*
Unidentified

Rachel Ray

- | Ch. | Pg. | Identification |
|-----|------|---|
| 1. | 9. | "She established a Dorcas society in Bas-
lehurst."
Brewer explains: "A society for supplying the
poor with clothing. So called from Dorcas,
mentioned in Acts, IX. 39." |
| 7. | 87. | "How easy is the path down the shores of the
Avernus!"
Translates <i>facilis descensus Averno</i> (<i>Aeneid</i> VI,
126), one of Trollope's favorite Latin tags. |
| 13. | 171. | "Ruat coelum, fiat justitia," he said.
"Let justice be done, though the heavens fall."
Another proverb one finds frequently in Trol-
lope's novels. The <i>Oxford Dictionary of Quota-
tions</i> attributes its origin to Lord Mansfield
(1705-1793). |
| 14. | 172. | "'I wonder', says the wicked man in the play, 'I
wonder any man alive would ever rear a
daughter!'"
The wicked man is Mr. Peachum, a receiver of
stolen goods, in Gay's <i>The Beggar's Opera</i>
(1728). Peachum and his wife are quite
exasperated with their daughter Polly, who not |

- only insists on marrying Macheath,
but—because she is so foolish as to love
him—refuses her parents' demand that she
betray him for a reward.
18. 229. "He was no longer *totus teres atque rotundus*."
Horace's phrase from the seventh satire of the
second book (l. 86), means "complete, smooth,
and round"—*i.e.*, self-contained. Horace—
whose works Trollope quotes perhaps more
often than those of any other author—is giving
expression to the Stoic ideal of *apatheia* or free-
dom from suffering through cultivated
indifference.
18. 233. "Audi alteram partem," said Mr. Comfort.
I.e., "I heard the other side of the story."
22. 289. "It's best mixed bird's-eye."
A kind of tobacco (*OED*).
28. 366. "Mrs. Ray was there with a book in her
hand,—a serious book . . . and Mrs. Prime was
there, with another book, evidently very
serious."
(*Cf. Nicholas Nickleby*, ch. 16, where Dickens
has a lot of fun playing with this word.)
Serious. (like *earnest* later on in the century)
was an adjective very frequently on the lips of
evangelical Christians, of which species both
Mrs. Ray and Mrs. Prime are good examples.
To these people, serious meant "earnest about
things of religion" (*OED*). Ford K. Brown, in
his *Fathers of the Victorians*, observes that
serious was the adjective consistently applied
by the evangelicals to the sort of gospel preach-
ing of which they approved. In this context,
then, a *serious* book would be a book on a reli-
gious subject.
30. 384. "Otium cum dignitate is a dream. There is no
such position at any rate for the man who has
once worked. . . ."
The *Oxford Dictionary of Quotations* gives this
phrase to Cicero (*Pro Sestio*, xlv. 98). Cicero
holds up the ideal of "leisure with honor" as that
good which is chiefly to be desired. Trol-
lope—of course—did not agree. His quasi-
religious dedication to hard work as a sure
source of happiness is well known to readers of
his works.

Ralph the Heir

- | Ch. | Pg. | Identification |
|-----|-----|--|
| 1. | 1. | "wears his heart upon his sleeve for daws to
peck at"
<i>Othello</i> I, i, 64. |
| 1. | 2. | "Trace our Meleager . . . egg."
Translates Horace in the <i>Ars Poetica</i> 146-47. |
| 1. | 5. | "the figure of the old king on horseback"
Refers to the statue of Charles I by Le Sueur,
which was erected in 1675 at Charing Cross. |

3. 19. "we've got sherry, and port wine, and Gladstone."
Partridge explains that "Gladstone" refers to French claret; a jocular abbreviation for "Gladstone claret," as Gladstone had in 1860 lowered the tariff on clarets.
10. 73. "Guide, philosopher, and friend."
Pope's characterization of Bolingbroke at the conclusion of *An Essay on Man*.
12. 93. "Sydney Smith . . . Count D'Orsay."
Both were celebrated for their witty conversation. Sydney Smith (1771-1845); Count Alfred Guillaume Gabriel D'Orsay (1801-1852), came to London in 1821 and soon became famous as a wit, dandy, and artist.
21. 155. "a member of Parliament is by law an *esquire*."
See *OED*, 2 (Note): "esquires by creation on office, as judges, officers, justices of the peace, etc." Presumably, MPs would fall under this category.
21. 156. "Cobden . . . Bright"
Two eminent radical parliamentarians. Richard Cobden (1804-1865), the "foremost leader of the Anti-Corn Law League." John Bright (1811-1889) was associated with Cobden in the same struggle.
21. 157. "The political privilege lately accorded them."
Refers to the passage of the *Second Reform Bill* in 1867, which enfranchised certain members of the middle-class, along with most town workers. About a million men thereby gained the vote.
21. 157. "a demand for manhood suffrage."
Granted in 1884, with the passage of the *Third Reform Bill*.
22. 165. "To sport with the tangles of Naæra's [*sic*] hair." *Lycidas*, 69.
23. 170. "The gods are just . . ."
King Lear V, iii, 170.
42. 317. "You've seen that thing at Dresden."
Perhaps this vague remark refers to the famous *Sistine Madonna* by Raphael, which was a touchstone of Victorian taste and a "highlight" of the Dresden gallery.
47. 354. "and yet she was a rake at heart."
Paraphrases Pope's *To a Lady*, l. 216: "But ev'ry woman is at heart a rake." Trollope frequently quotes this line.
48. 363. ". . . the story of Juan and Haidee . . . the lady who was loved by the veiled prophet . . . the false Queen's passion for Launcelot."
These lines refer, of course, to Byron's *Don Juan* (1819-1824), Thomas Moore's *Lalla Rookh* (1817), and Tennyson's *Idylls of the King*. Guinevere is "the false Queen" and the part containing her story was published in 1859.
49. 372. "the famous Carlton."
The Carlton Club—a political club for men of Conservative opinions—founded in 1831.

49. 373. "Ralph did not know a Cooke from a Hook."
And neither, I warrant, would most of us. Edward William Cooke (1811-1880) was famous in his own day as a landscape painter. He showed his first picture at the Royal Academy in 1835 and was elected a member in 1864. James Clark Hook (1819-1907), who is equally obscure today, specialized in seascapes. He was a student at the Royal Academy where he exhibited from 1839 and was elected a member in 1860. Hook was also celebrated for canvases depicting subjects taken from Italian history and from the life of Shakespeare.
51. 386. ". . . Treated as the cities of the plain."
Destroyed, as were Sodom and Gomorrah (Genesis, ch. 18.)
51. 386. "not sufficient Hercules to cleanse so foul a stable."
Refers to one of the labors of Hercules, the cleansing of the Augean stables.

The American Senator

<u>Pt:Ch.Pg.</u>	<u>Identification</u>
1:1. 2.	"dower" "The portion of a deceased husband's estate which the law allows to his widow for her life." (<i>OED</i>)
2:1. 191.	Before competitive examination had assumed its resent shape. . . Trollope was opposed to competitive examinations for positions in the civil service. For his criticisms, see the <i>Autobiography</i> (World's Classics ed.), pp. 37-41 <i>et passim</i> .
2:1. 192.	Patagonia "The increasing domination of Uruguay by Brazil eventually sparked a war in 1865. Paraguay attacked Brazil and in doing so violated Argentine territory. The Triple Alliance of Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay invaded Paraguay. Paraguayan soldiers and citizens fought a tenacious defensive war until 1870. Paraguay was devastated and foreign troops occupied the country for six years.." (<i>Encyclopædia Britannica</i>)
2:1. 195.	"Mens conscia recti" A variant of Virgil's <i>Mens sibi conscia recti</i> , <i>Aeneid</i> , I, 604) which means "a mind recognizing in itself what is right."
2:4. 228.	"A domestic sort of 'coventry'" To send a person to Coventry is "to refuse to associate or have intercourse with him" (<i>OED</i>).
2:17 302.	"Caesar still clinging to the Commentaries." Trollope, a more than competent classicist—at least in Latin—produced <i>The Commentaries of Caesar</i> for Blackwood, who published it in 1870. He was deeply hurt that the critics did

not take it seriously; see the *Autobiography* (World's Classic ed.), pp. 338-40.

- 2:24.354. "to question Porson and to Be-Bentley Bentley."
That is, to challenge either of the two greatest classical scholars of eighteenth-century England on his own turf:
Richard Porson (1759-1808), perhaps the greatest Greek scholar of his time, was elected Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge in 1792. He is remembered for his brilliant edition of Euripides and for his witty annihilation of clerical ignorance in the *Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis* (1790).
Richard Bentley (1662-1742) Appointed Master of Trinity College in 1699. He is remembered for his editions of Horace and Manilius and for his quarrel with Pope and Swift.
- 3:5.415. "I cannot tell mine [*i.e.* my love]."
Twelfth Night II, iv, 112ff.
- 3:6.419. . . . bring his strawberry leaves to bear"
Refers to the strawberry leaves that decorate the coronet of an earl, a marquess, or a duke.
- 3:9.452. "If Paraguay gets the better of the Patagonese, all Brazil will be in a ferment."
See note on "Patagonia," *supra*.
- 3:9.452. "I never nursed a dear gazelle!"
An unforgettable line from Moore's *Lalla Rookh*, "The Fire-Worshippers," i. 279, which appeared in 1817 and became incredibly popular. The line became notorious; Dickens ridiculed it before Trollope.
- 3:14.476. "The Idle Apprentice."
A famous print by Hogarth.
- 3:16.488. "Has she a father, has she a mother,
Or has she a dearer one still than all the others?"
I have been unable to identify this doggerel.
- 3:21.525. "'Odious in woolen;—'twould a saint provoke,
Were the last words which poor Narcissa spoke,"
The couplet is from Pope's *Epistle to Cobham* (1734), 242-43.
- 3:21.525. "'My mother's maiden name was Mounser, and it isn't French at all. I don't see why it should not be as good a Christian name as Willoughby or Howard.'"
Perhaps an allusion to Pope's satire on rank in *An Essay on Man* (IV, 215-16):
"What can ennoble sots, or slaves, or cowards?
Alas! not all the blood of all the Howards."
"Buncombe."
- 3:24.547. Partridge explains: "In English from ca. 1852; ex. U.S.(-1827). In C. 19 coll.; in C. 20, S.E. and rarely spelt *buncombe*. Talk, empty or 'tall'; humbug; clap-trap. Ex. Buncombe County, North Carolina."

The Vicar of Bullhampton

- | Ch. | Pg. | Identification |
|-----|------|--|
| 1. | 3. | "Tidings of a new reform bill."
Refers to the Second Reform Bill of 1867. |
| 7. | 40. | "The <i>quarentines</i> are rare this year."
"A variant of the Quarenden apple, grown in Somerset and Devon" (<i>OED</i>). |
| 8. | 49. | "With such a one as Flora McIvor she had no patience."
Flora McIvor is the heroine of Scott's <i>Waverley</i> (1814). |
| 12. | 69. | "life-preserver"
"a stick, or bludgeon, loaded with lead, used for self-defense" (<i>OED</i>). |
| 29. | 151. | "In another ten years he will be the great Akinetos."
Gk. Akiwtos = "the Immovable." |
| 25. | 161. | "'I seed an old poem in which they thought much of a poor girl after she was drowned.'"
Most likely an allusion to Hood's "The Bridge of Sighs," (1843), whose heroine, like Carrie Battle, is a prostitute. |
| 27. | 171. | "'Atra Cara' [<i>sic</i>] sits behind the horseman."
Atra Cura is Black Care. The line comes from Horace's first ode of the Third book, <i>Odi profanum vulgus</i> . Trollope frequently cites "Post equitem sedet atra Cura" either in the original or in his own translation. |
| 29. | 187. | Mr. Cockey declared the bill to be carried <i>nem. con.</i>
<i>Nemine contra</i> : no one objecting. |
| 42. | 268. | "Has there been a deed of gift,—perhaps a peppercorn rent?"
See <i>OED</i> (1.b): "Stipulated as a quit-rent or nominal rent. (1607)" |
| 44. | 283. | "Of Robert of Gloucester, and William Langland, of Andrew of Wyntown, and the Lady Juliana Berners, he could discourse. . . ."
<u>Robert of Gloucester</u> (fl. 1260-1300) the reputed author of a metrical chronicle of England from Brutus to Henry III.
<u>William Langland</u> (? 1330-1386), the author of <i>Piers Plowman</i> .
<u>Andrew of Wyntown</u> (c. 1350-1425), a canon regular of St. Andrews and author of <i>Orgynale Cronykil</i> (c. 1420), a metrical history of Scotland in octosyllabics, from the beginning of the world to the accession of James I.
"Lady Juliana Berners," (rectè Dame Julians Barnes). <i>The Oxford Companion to English Literature</i> points out that "the name Juliana Berners and her identity as abbess of Sopwell are 18th-century inventions." Dame Julians flourished in the mid-fifteenth century and contributed a treatise on hunting to the <i>Book of St.</i> |

- Albans*, "the last work issued by the press that was set up at St. Albans about 1479, soon after Caxton had begun to print at Westminster" (*OCEL*).
55. 358. "whereas the Puddlehamites of Bullhampton were *Primitive Methodists*, he was a regular *Wesleyan*."
The Primitive Methodists split off in 1811 from
55. 360. the main-line Methodists, because they felt the Wesleyans were ignoring evangelism.
"difficulty in getting at the terrier of the parish."
The terrier is the *rent-roll* or "register of landed property; a book in which the lands of a private person, or a corporation, civil or ecclesiastical, are described . . ." (*OED*).

Coming in

The Victorian Newsletter

Joseph Gardner, "Hopkins' Panic in 'Spring'"

Millie M. Kidd, "In Defense of Latimer: A Study of Narrative Technique in George Eliot's 'The Lifted Veil'"

Diane D'Amico, "Fair Margaret of 'Maiden-Song': Rossetti's Response to the Romantic Nightingale"

Annette Federico, "'A cool observer of her own sex like me': Girl-watching in *Jane Eyre*"

Elliot L. Gilbert, "No Originals, Only Copies: Pre-Raphaelite Images of Belatedness and Innovation"

Tom Lloyd, "Thomas Carlyle and Dynamical Symbolism: The Lesson of Edward Irving"

Charisse Gendron, "Images of Middle-Eastern Women in Victorian Travel Books"

Franklin E. Court, "*A Tale of Two Cities*: Dickens, Revolution, and the 'Other' C----- D-----"

Nancy Williams, "Dickens and Eliot in Dialogue: Empty Space, Angels and Maggie Tulliver"

Books Received

- Arthurian Poets: Matthew Arnold and William Morris.* Intro. James P. Carley. Woodbridge: The Boydell P, 1990. Pp. 84. \$13.00 paper. Includes Arnold's "Tristram and Iseult," and Morris's "The Defence of Guenevere," "King Arthur's Tomb," "Sir Galahad, A Christian Mystery," "The Chapel at Lyonesse," and select bibliog.
- Ashton, Rosemary. *The Mill on the Floss: A Natural History.* Twayne's Masterwork Studies. Boston: Twayne, 1990. Pp. xiii + 123. \$19.95. Chapters on the following: Historical Context, Importance of the Work, Critical Reception, Realism, Natural History, Tragedy, Love and Duty, Structure, Autobiography, Education, and a conclusion.
- Bass, Eben. *Dante Gabriel Rossetti: Poet and Painter.* New York: Peter Lang, 1990. Pp. x + 362. \$64.95. The work "attempt[s] to explore some of Rossetti's complex dealings with the sister arts" (30).
- Breuer, Hans-Peter and Roger Parsell. *Samuel Butler: An Annotated Bibliography of Writings about Him.* Garland Reference Library of the Humanities, vol. 769. New York & London: Garland, 1990. Pp. xlv + 497. \$58.00. Covers a period 1863 through 1988, 1462 entries. Includes a substantial introduction and indexes.
- The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain: The Later Victorian Age.* Vol. 7. Ed. Boris Ford. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989. Pp. xiii + 363. \$59.50. Essays on "The Cultural and Social Setting" (Asa Briggs); "Architecture" (John Summerson); "The Public Park" (Jacques Carré); "Literature" (John Holloway); "The Drama of Wilde and Pinero" (George Rowell); "New Homes for Barons and Artisans" (John Nelson Tarn); "Fine Arts" (Peter Fuller); "The City of Glasgow" (Andor Gomme); "Design, Craft and Industry" (Gillian Naylor); "The Eisteddfod" (William Price); "Music" (Michael Kennedy); "Clowns and Augustes" (Roly Bain); and intro. and conc. essays by Boris Ford and Norman Vance.
- Cevasco, G. A. *Three Decadent Poets, Ernest Dowson, John Gray, and Lionel Johnson: An Annotated Bibliography.* Garland Reference Library of the Humanities, vol. 968. New York & London: Garland, 1990. Pp. xi + 400. \$49.00. Includes an introduction and indexes.
- Dellamora, Richard. *Masculine Desire: The Sexual Politics of Victorian Aestheticism.* Chapel Hill & London: U of North Carolina P, 1990. Pp. ix + 276. \$29.95 cloth, \$12.95 paper. "This book represents a first attempt at a synthetic study of desire between men as it figures in sexual-aesthetic discourses in England during the nineteenth century" (1).
- Eliot, George. *Collected Poems.* Ed. and Intro. Lucien Jenkins. London: Skoob Books, 1989. Pp. 488. £18.95. Prints 29 shorter poems, *The Spanish Gypsy*, and epigraphs from *Felix Holt*, *Middlemarch*, and *Daniel Deronda*.
- Ganz, Margaret. *Humor, Irony, and the Realm of Madness: Psychological Studies in Dickens, Butler, and Others.* AMS Studies in the Nineteenth Century, no. 9. New York, AMS, 1990. Pp. xv + 307. \$39.50. A post-humous collection of essays—four on Dickens (*Sketches, Pickwick, Nicholas Nickleby*, and "Dickens' Humor in Decline"), two on Samuel Butler ("Ironic Abdication and the Way to the Unconscious" and on *The Authoress of "The Odyssey"*), one on Don Juan plays of Shaw, Frisch, and Montherlant, and one on Daniel Paul Schreber.
- Gillett, Paula. *Worlds of Art: Painters in Victorian Society.* New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1990. Pp. xiii + 299. \$40.00. "This study . . . has as its principal goal the broadening of our understanding of English social and cultural history to include the role of contemporary art and its creators. It does not attempt to be comprehensive . . . and deals especially with painters whose names are unfamiliar even to many people knowledgeable about art history . . . Finally, the book concentrates its attention on oil painters rather than watercolorists" (xi).
- Gissing, George. *The Collected Letters of George Gissing. Volume One, 1863-1880.* Ed. Paul F. Mattheisen, Arthur C. Young, and Pierre Coustillas. Athens: Ohio UP, 1990. Pp. lxiv + 334. \$49.95. Includes introduction, genealogical survey, chronology, indexes and letters both to and from Gissing.
- Harden, Edgar F. *Annotations for the Selected Works of William Makepeace Thackeray: The Complete Novels, the Major Non-Fictional Prose, and Selected Shorter Pieces.* Garland Reference Library of the Humanities, vol. 1000. 2 vols. New York & London: Garland, 1990. Pp. 653 & 729. \$150.00 (2 vols.). An exhaustive undertaking.
- Harrison, Antony H. *Victorian Poets and Romantic Poems: Intertextuality and Ideology.* Victorian Literature and Culture Series. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1990. Pp. 235. \$29.50. "This study investigates a complex of issues that emerge when authors refer, either explicitly or in less immediately visible ways, to the work of earlier writers" ([1]). Includes chapters on *Empedocles on Etna*, "Cleon," "Maud," Dante Rossetti, Christina Rossetti, William Morris, and Swinburne.
- Inman, Billie Andrew. *Walter Pater and His Reading, 1874-1877, With a Bibliography of His Library Borrowings, 1878-1894.* Garland Reference Library of the Humanities, No. 667. New York: Garland, 1990. Pp. lx + 537. \$96.00. A curious collection of identification and annotation of books borrowed, authors or classes of authors, titles or their equivalent, quoted phrases or statements from works mentioned by Pater in works by him. Very helpful I should think for Pater specialists.
- Kirchhoff, Frederick. *William Morris: The Construction of a Male Self, 1856-1872.* Athens: Ohio UP, 1990. Pp. xv + 248. \$29.95. "The process through which Morris rethought his self-image as a Romantic poet and identified himself with his role as an artisan-businessman was long and difficult; and it was not until the first years of the 1870s that Morris resolved the conflict between his image of self and the circumstances of his life. His newfound understanding, both of his own needs and of his place in the power structure of Victorian England, led eventually to political activism. As a more immediate consequence, it altered the manner in which [he] experi-

- enced the act of writing poetry. Composition was no longer his chief mode of confirming the self. For this reason, the poetry he wrote after 1872 was significantly different from the work of his first period as a writer" (ix-x).
- Kohl, Norbert. *Oscar Wilde: The Works of a Conformist Rebel*. Trans. David Henry Wilson. European Studies in English Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989. Pp. x + 439. \$59.50. Originally published in German in 1980. "In interpreting Wilde's literary and critical writings, I put text analysis first, while incorporating those elements of biography and literary and social history that seemed directly relevant" (ix).
- Mancoff, Debra N. *The Arthurian Revival in Victorian Art*. Garland Reference Library of the Humanities, vol. 1034. New York & London: Garland, 1990. Pp. xxii + [466]. \$75.00. "To the Victorian imagination Arthur was not an historical man but a metaphor, a means to express the idealism and aspiration of the present in the ennobling raiment of a glorious past. The conceptual basis of the Victorian legend was the same as that behind the legend in medieval times, employing the legend as a didactic mirror, to express strong moral and social truths, gentled by a form and setting in the distant and undefined past" (xvii). Includes 7 color plates and 101 black and white.
- Miles, Peter. *Wuthering Heights*. The Critics Debate Series. London: Macmillan, 1990. Dist. by Humanities P, Atlantic Highlands, NJ. Pp. 103. \$29.95 cloth, \$8.50 paper. Michael Scott, the ed. of the series, says, "The purpose of this series is to help delineate various critical approaches to specific literary texts" ([7]).
- Orel, Harold. *A Kipling Chronology*. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1990. Pp. xiii + 127. \$35.00. Includes a section of sketches—"Among Those Who Knew Kipling" and a "Select Bibliography," as well as an intro. and index.
- Ormond, Leonée. *Tennyson and the Old Masters*. Lincoln: The Tennyson Society, 1989. Pp. 29. £1.50 paper. "In fact, Tennyson was an assiduous gallery-goer, and his poetry reflects the powerful visual images of painting with which he stored his mind" (3).
- Reed, John R. *Victorian Will*. Athens: Ohio UP, 1989. Pp. xvi + 493. \$39.95. "... I offer here a core sample of attitudes toward the will understood in its different senses as free will (as opposed to determinism), volition (as the power to initiate action), and strength of will (as character trait revealed in assertion and self-control)" (ix). Includes sections on "Will and the Moral Being," "Will and the World," "Early Nineteenth-Century English Literature," "Midcentury Fiction," and "Late Victorian Fiction."
- Romanticism and the Sciences*. Ed. Andrew Cunningham and Nicholas Jardine. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. Pp. xxii + 345. \$59.50 cloth, \$19.95 paper. Includes 22 essays grouped under "Romanticism," "Sciences of the Organic," "Sciences of the Inorganic," and "Literature and the Sciences." Focused on European rather than British Romanticism.
- Socialism and the Literary Artistry of William Morris*. Ed. Florence S. Boos and Carole G. Silver. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1990. Pp. 177. \$25.00. Includes "Archaeological Socialism: Utopia and Art in William Morris" (Lawrence Lutchmansingh); "Boffin in Paradise, or the Artistry of Reversal in *News from Nowhere*" (Laura Donaldson); "A Guest in the Future: *News from Nowhere*" (Norman Talbot); "William Morris and the Anarchist Tradition" (Lyman Tower Sargent); "Bellamy, Morris, and the Great Victorian Debate" (Alexander MacDonald); "Counter-Projects: William Morris and the Science Fiction of the 1880s" (Darko Suvin); "The Encouragement and Warning of History: William Morris's *A Dream of John Ball*" (Michael Holzman); "Socialism Internalized: The Last Romances of William Morris" (Carole Silver); "Morris's 'Chants' and Problems of Socialist Culture" (Christopher Waters); "Narrative Design in *The Pilgrims of Hope*" (Florence Boos); "Joseph Riggs Dunlap: Pilgrim of Hope" (Carole Silver).
- Swinburne, Algernon Charles. *Arthurian Poets: Algernon Charles Swinburne*. Intro. James P. Carley. Woodbridge: The Boydell P, 1990. Pp. 311. \$18.00 paper. Includes "Tristram of Lyonesse," "The Tale of Balen," "Queen Yseult," "Joyeuse Garde," "King Ban," "The Day before the Trial," "Lancelot," and a select bibliog.
- Verne, Jules. *Around the World in Eighty Days: Illustrated Edition*. London: Cassell, 1990. Pp. 222. \$24.95. Illus. with more than 200 paintings, photos, drawings, and engravings from the Victorian period.
- William Morris & News from Nowhere: A Vision for Our Time*. Ed. Stephen Coleman and Paddy O'Sullivan. Bideford: Green Books, 1990. Pp. 213. £8.95 paper. Includes "Synopsis of *News from Nowhere*" (Clifford Slapper); "The Feast's Beginning: *News from Nowhere* and the Utopian Tradition" (Christopher Hampton); "How the Change Came: *News from Nowhere* and Revolution" (John Crump); "How Matters Are Managed: Human Nature and Nowhere" (Stephen Coleman); "The Obstinate Refusers: Work in *News from Nowhere*" (Ray Watkinson); "Concerning Love: *News from Nowhere* and Gender" (Jan Marsh); "An Old House Amongst New Folk: Making Nowhere Somewhere" (Colin Ward); "The Hammersmith Guest House Again: William Morris and the Architecture of Nowhere" (Mark Pearson); "A Market by the Way: The Economics of Nowhere" (Adam Buick); "The Ending of the Journey: William Morris, *News from Nowhere* and Ecology" (Paddy O'Sullivan).

Victorian Group News

Announcements

The Dickens Project of the University of California, Santa Cruz announces a scholarly conference on "Masterpieces in the Marketplace: Victorian Publishing and the Circulation of Books" to be held Aug. 8-11, 1991, at UC Santa Cruz. The deadline for 20 minute papers is Feb. 1. Write: The Dickens Project, Kresge College 354, UC, Santa Cruz, CA 95064.

Northeast Victorian Studies Association: *Victorian Endings*, a conference to be held April 26-28, 1991, at the University of Rochester, Rochester, NY. Send papers and abstracts (10 copies) to Dr. Sandra Segan Wheeler, Program Coordinator, English Department, Yeshiva Univ., 500 W. 185th Street, New York, NY 10033. Deadline Oct. 12, 1990.

Newman Centenary Conference: "Tradition, Values, and Progress: The Intellectual Ethos of John Henry Newman." Saint Louis Univ., Nov. 29-Dec. 2, 1990. Contact: Gerard Magill, Verhaegen Hall 183, St. Louis University, 3634 Lindell Blvd., St. Louis, MO 63108 (314) 658-2881.

The 1991 Conference of the Southeastern Nineteenth Century Studies Assoc. will take place April 11-13 at Loyola University of New Orleans on the theme "Political Agendas of Nineteenth-Century Cultures." Twenty-minute papers must be accompanied by a 3-sentence abstract and postmarked no later than Nov. 1, 1990. Send to Maureen L. Egan, Philosophy Dept., Elms College, Chicopee, MA 01013; other inquiries to Nancy Anderson, History Dept., Loyola Univ., 6363 St. Charles St., New Orleans, LA 70118.

Victorian Virtue and Vice is the topic of the Midwest Victorian Studies Association meeting in Chicago, April 26-27, 1991. Interdisciplinary proposals by Oct. 15, 1990, to Micael Clarke, English Dept., Loyola Univ. of Chicago, 6525 N. Sheridan Rd., Chicago, IL 60626.

The Editors of *Nineteenth-Century Prose* (formerly *The Arnoldian*) announce the publication of *An Arnold Family Album*, ed. Cecil Lang. The *Album* "is a group of autographs collected by Matthew Arnold, mounted in an album and inscribed to his youngest daughter, Eleanor." Professor Lang provides extensive commentaries on letters from Wordsworth, Gladstone, Browning, Ruskin, Carlyle, and others. The soft-bound volume is \$15.00; write The editor, *Nineteenth Century Prose*, Dept. of Languages and Literature, Mesa State College, Grand Junction, CO 81502.

The Huntington Library will hold a conference on Sir Richard Burton (1821-1890) on Oct. 19-20, 1990. For information and registration call Jane Hill 818-405-2194 or write her at the Library, 1151 Oxford Road, San Marino, CA 91108.

The 1991 Conference of the Victorian Studies Association of Ontario will take place in Toronto on Saturday April 13; the theme will be the literature and history of the 1890s. Please write to: Secretary-Treasurer, Victorian Studies Assoc. of Ontario, 322 Pratt Library, Victoria College University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1K7 Canada.

Notice

The number on your address label is the number of the last issue covered by your subscription. Renewals should be made at the rate of \$5/yr. or \$9/2yrs.—\$6/yr. foreign and Canada.

Back issues of *VN*, at \$4 per copy (\$5 for Index) are available for the following numbers: 8, 20, 23, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, Index.