



Edited for the English X Group of MLA by William E. Buckler  
737 East Building, New York University, Washington Square, New York 3, New York

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

- David Bonnell Green (*Boston University*)
- Robert A. Greenberg (*Cornell University*)
- William J. Hyde (*Wisconsin State College*)
- U. C. Knoepfhnacher (*Princeton University*)
- Boyd A. Litzinger (*St. Bonaventure University*)
- Daniel J. Mulcahy (*Yale University*)
- Harland S. Nelson (*University of Connecticut*)
- Donald H. Reiman (*Duke University*)
- James K. Robinson (*University of Cincinnati*)
- Harry W. Rudman (*College of The City of New York*)
- Alexander Sandow (*New York University*)
- Michael Timko (*University of Illinois*)
- George J. Worth (*University of Kansas*)

## I. PAPERS READ AT THE PHILADELPHIA MEETING

### HARDY'S RESPONSE TO THE CRITICS OF JUDE

The stormy reception of *Jude the Obscure* is a familiar matter to students of Hardy, one described in numerous critical works and accounts of his life. In fact, so familiar is the main course of events from Hardy's initial conception of "something . . . the world ought to be shown" to his finally being cured of "further interest in novel-writing"<sup>1</sup>, that some complications and inconsistencies are often overlooked. This brief study is undertaken with the hope of suggesting a more balanced view of Hardy's motives and the climate of opinion which he faced, and of qualifying the familiar assumption that he was driven from novel-writing by a storm of critical protest.

Hardy's expectations at the outset of his undertaking are clearly implied in several essays on the subject of fiction with which he preceded publication of *Tess*, particularly "Candour in English Fiction."<sup>2</sup> Here his central aim is to object to the prudery and the resultant censorship that mark the magazine and the circulating library. That he had already chafed under the restrictions of these media may freely be inferred from the tone of his article, nor is it to be doubted that he anticipated trouble with the novels he then had in embryo. Although he proposes remedies, it would be erroneous to assume that Hardy expected such an article to pave the way for a favorable reception of *Jude*. Not only is it inconceivable that a single brief argument should change the whole climate of publishers' and novel readers' opinion, but it must be borne in mind that he was forced to offer *Jude* through the magazine and lending library, vehicles which he distinguished as "acting under the censorship of prudery" ("Candour," p. 79).

His essays serving to predict and define, not allay, difficulties, the ultimate question remains, why did Hardy choose to write and publish *Jude* at all? Circumventing a part of this mystery, and conceding that the marriage question looms large in both space and depth in its treatment in *Jude*,<sup>3</sup> it remains clear that Hardy's general idea, and thereafter his conception of the central idea of *Jude*,<sup>4</sup> concerns a poor man's want of a higher education, and here only do we possess the author's testimony of his inspiration. In his reference in a note of April 28, 1888, to doing a short story of a young man's "struggles and ultimate failure" to go to Oxford, Hardy had concluded: "There is something [in this] the world ought to be shown, and I am the one to show it to them—though I was not altogether hindered going, at least to Cambridge, and could have gone up easily at five-and-twenty" (*Early Life*, pp. 272-273). His sentence develops abruptly; its significance lies in its assumption of a strong if un verbalized linkage of subject to self. Logically the thought must proceed: I am the one to show it because I am the man himself, though not the same man in all particulars. The important point is that his impulse to write the book was intensely personal. There is an irresistible claim in Hardy's word, "I am the one."

Having described the disappointments to be found in publishing and none the less taken his position, Hardy soon faced a torrent of critical abuse which he proved capable of enduring with a fearless if not altogether consistent line of response. Replying to Miss Jeanette Gilder's request for an interview after she had maligned his novel in the *New York World*, he speaks, in July 1896, "of its misrepresentation here by one or two scurrilous papers which got the start of the more sober press" (*Later Years*, p. 51). Clearly he is, though otherwise remarkably genial, rather high-handedly minimizing the abuses of the critics. That the attacks were widespread is well known and is a fact that Hardy himself was ready to emphasize elsewhere. Abuse ranged in Britain from Mrs. Oliphant's indignation at this shamefully immoral book to *Punch's* parody of

"Dude the Diffuse" and included even the mockery of the *Times*.<sup>6</sup> Echoes of the "scurrilous papers" were heard plainly in America too,<sup>7</sup> the attacks lashing at his indecency, groaning at his unrelieved ugliness and dreariness, finding his plot contrived for the sake of his argument and finding the whole of his argument grossly pessimistic and unreal. Charges of obscenity, hotly pursued, reflect fear that Hardy is undermining some of the sacred bulwarks of society,<sup>8</sup> and accordingly his means must be discredited. Comprehensive of all such arguments is a Chicago critic's view of *Jude* as "a bitter tirade against the fundamental institutions of society," affecting "cynicism," a "sullen temper," and "moral perversity" to make its point.<sup>9</sup>

Hardy's making light of this criticism in his note to Miss Gilder is contrary to the usual view today, one that he certainly helped to foster, that this great weight of petty criticism bowed him sorely, depressed and disheartened him, bewildered him and stung him to defiance, and finally exploded his career and cured him of novel-writing.<sup>10</sup> Already at the time of publication he was expressing deep depression over the reviews, confiding to Rider Haggard one day after picking up "one of the leading weekly papers" at the Savile Club, "There's a nice thing to say about a man! Well, I'll never write another novel."<sup>11</sup> Yet if he was elsewhere inclined to minimize his attackers, he was here ignoring a substantial body of defenders, allied with whom he need have resigned himself to no appearance of being driven from his profession. D. F. Hannigan in the *Westminster*<sup>12</sup> defends *Jude* from "certain critics of the didactic school," praising the treatment of *Jude*'s aspirations for a university education and defending his sexual relations as "strong meat," but . . . human in the widest sense of that comprehensive word." Stress is placed upon educational aspirations in a review in *The Bookman*,<sup>13</sup> where it is declared that "all that concerns *Jude*, in his strength and weakness, is masterly and written out of a deep heart." The reviewer, a woman, reserves highest praise for the frankness and imaginative power with which Hardy lays bare the aims and sorrows of *Jude*'s career and identifies himself with them in passionate sympathy. In his treatment of Sue she objects to some of the "downright propaganda," yet is careful to assert that she feels none of the offense found by "timid readers." In the same issue of *The Bookman* (IX, 120-122), Sir George Douglas takes to task not the timid reader but the reviewer of "official arrogance or authorized incompetence," denouncing the bad taste of several recent attacks upon *Jude*, among them that of a (London) *World* critic, who "appears to be a transcendentalist, with aspirations after a non-sexual and vegetarian state." Douglas' main point, curiously close to anticipating Hardy's final move, is to demand more dignified criticism, suggesting that we have too few great writers to lose them by paining them with abuse.

In America, voices in defense were not silent. *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*,<sup>13</sup> in which the installments of *Jude* had been published, praised the whole work, including the "powerful picture of pig-sticking," and somewhat innocently wondered "what more can be said?" In response to the many things that were being said, W. P. Trent in *The Citizen*<sup>15</sup> suggested that deriders of the pessimism and repulsiveness of *Jude* were "little wiser than ostriches hiding their heads in the sand. . . . [But] there are some of us who listen to [Hardy] with wonder and admiration." Offering a basis for his admiration, Howells in *Harper's Weekly*<sup>16</sup> undertook to stress the "artistic excellence" of *Jude*, praising its unity, its lofty solemnity as a "tragedy of fate," the pity and despair evoked by "the blind struggles" of its figures calling to mind what he had experienced "from the destinies of the august figures of Greek fable." Howells was careful to distinguish any immediate unpleasantness in the action (indeed "the pathos [of] almost intolerable effect") from the "invulnerable dignity" of the central character and the conviction of undeniable if undesirable truth that runs through the whole. This compelling note of truth led Howells to defend the ethics as well as the art of *Jude*, including its display, not of an indiscriminate attack upon marriage, but of "how atrocious and heinous marriage may sometimes be."

Closer to home for Hardy, at least three further reviewers undertook extensive championing of *Jude* that could have set the novelist upon a more active course of self-defense: Havelock Ellis in *The Savoy*, H. G. Wells in the *Saturday Review*, and Edmund Gosse in *Cosmopolis*.<sup>17</sup> Ellis offers a penetrating analysis of Hardy's admirable treatment of woman, dismissing charges of indecency as "necessary incidents in the career of a great novel," even while its revelation of the facts of present-day marriage problems makes it most suitable reading for the Young Person whom the obtuse critic would shelter. Less incisive on points of feminine nature and the marriage question but more outspoken along lines which Hardy himself was privately emphasizing was the defense in the *Saturday Review*. This opens with impatience at the "foolish reception" given *Jude* by the "sanitary inspectors of fiction" who are repelled by the development of the secondary theme, "the destructive influence of a vein of sensuality upon an ambitious working-man." Wells, with less interest in this portion of the book than Ellis, scoffs at reviewers who have rushed to pick apart the sexual material; like Hardy, he finds "the neglected major theme" to be a study of "the almost intolerable difficulties that beset an ambitious man of the working class" attempting to enter college. Glancing at the secondary theme, Wells, like Ellis, finds Sue "exceptional" but upturned (cf. *Later Years*, p. 42); at Christminster she appears as "the feminine counterpart of *Jude*'s intellectual side," while her femininity involves the sexual side of *Jude* that is necessary for "his

complete presentation." Wells deprecates the thought that Hardy should have "ignored sex altogether in deference to the current fashion," but passes quickly over "the perfectly natural incidents of [Jude's] encounter with Arabella" in order to stress events at Christminster. Both reviewers reveal marked approval of the message they find in Hardy's material, unlike Gosse, whose praise of Hardy's "irresistible" art is tempered by admonishment against his impassioned outbursts. Gosse's review, that of a friend, was held to take a "generous view" of *Jude*, yet one may wonder whether Wells did not come closest, perhaps not to the novel in its totality, but to what Hardy had intended to "show the world."

Why, aside from in a few personal letters, was Hardy not given to utilizing his several champions in a defense of *Jude*? That conviction had led him to produce the novel in spite of an anticipated stormy reception and to issue it to the world through those very channels which were certain to evoke the storm must be set against any notions of cowardice on his part, any bent for retreat. First it must be considered that in Hardy the detachment of the artist took precedence over the concern of the propagandist. That he cared little for the fate of either his writings or his reputation, as he asserted to Miss Gilder (*Later Years*, p. 51), can be suspected as a display of the magnanimity aroused by the occasion, yet it is possible to understand his view that the book was "quite without a 'purpose,'" or, as he declares elsewhere (*Later Years*, p. 41), "that my own views [on marriage] are not expressed therein." For an artist, as Hardy understood it, creates not an argument but a life in his novel, this life being the end product of his obsession to create. The views and experiences belong, then, no longer to the author but to his characters, his own passion being purged off in the writing of the novel. Added to the sense of relief and detachment that can come with the completion of a piece of work, Hardy had experienced the boredom of uncreative revision from serial to novel, an effort which might do much to release an author from a vital attachment to his writing. But further than this, the end, for Hardy, was explicit at the beginning of his task, where he was determined not to change but to "show" the world.

It may be doubted that Hardy, as a man, could remain fully detached, however, in the midst of so much personal abuse; indeed, he was ready enough to consider an interview with Miss Gilder "painful." Yet it might be well here for the critic to notice something of the kindness that Miss Gilder found in his reply. Hardy's sympathy for man and for all living beings is a mark of character that could assuredly be documented in his novels but that must here be postulated as a key to his disposition. Instead of bitterness, one finds in the sparse revelations of his biography an inclination to extenuate the faults of his kind, supported by "a sense of the comicality of [the extreme charges voiced against him that]. . . saved his feelings from being much hurt by the outrageous slurs." Such is the quality of his "mildly skeptical" response to Bishop How's burning of *Jude*. A decade later, scarcely in the manner of a man driven in bitterness from his profession, he and Swinburne "laughed and condoled with each other on having been the two most abused of living writers" (*Later Years*, pp. 52, 48, 112).

Hardy's unwillingness to give pain to his enemies and his great-hearted ability to discover a comicality in their antics did not lead him down a soft path of retreat. Rather than submission, a defiant silence appears as his public response to the treatment of *Jude*. "Never retract. Never explain. Get it done and let them howl" (*Later Years*, p. 38). These words which Hardy had copied beforehand in his notebook Mrs. Hardy surmises (with perhaps unnecessary surprise) to anticipate the reception of *Jude*. To reply, to attempt to rectify one's position, means descent to the level of the opponent: ("Personal abuse best answers itself"—*Later Years*, p. 60.) Not only does an author, in responding, belittle himself, but in addition he invalidates his art by carrying the argument beyond the finished work. If the novel is valid as a view of life, it must carry its own argument to the heart of the reader (see *Later Years*, p. 41). Added defense by an author will invariably attempt to support a work that either needs or else deserves no defending.

Hardy's ability to assume a role of silence provides testimony of his detachment as an artist, his lack of bitterness as a man, and, far from the self-effacement of retreat, his superb confidence in the unassailable value of his work, "feeling quite calm on the ultimate verdict of Time" (*Later Years*, p. 48). To understand, further, his abandonment of novel-writing, one must emphasize the very real disappointment that lay behind his behavior. Hardy was keenly if whimsically aware of the personal nature of many of the attacks, of the Bishop's burning the book "in his despair at not being able to burn me" (Preface, p. vii). Not only were reflections cast upon the author in outbursts against the "grossness, indecency, and horror" of his work,<sup>18</sup> but his very method of portraying life was rejected time after time in charges of his "suppression of a whole side of the truth" and his "tendency to dwell on foul details." It is "not a realistic work," does not, that is, present an "artist's colourless rendering of facts"; the "morbid and hysterical people" of Hardy's world "belong to pathology, and not to general fiction."<sup>19</sup> Here were repeated attempts on the part of those uncomfortable with Hardy's message to heap discredit upon his method, retreating to a seemingly sounder basis of realism and indeed one that would not shake the status quo. Even among impartial reviewers there was difficulty, once realizing the subjectivity of his

method, to give it much credit. Howells appears to stand alone with his pronouncement that "I have not been able to find [*Jude*] untrue, while I know that the world is full of truth that contradicts it" (see n. 16 above). Yet this subjectivity, the responsibility of the artist to select his material from the infinite strands of reality open to him, was for Hardy at the heart of the realistic writer's method.<sup>20</sup> Thus while he could emphatically deny the presence of autobiographical content, he was admittedly involved personally in the selection of and emphasis upon whatever went into his novel. If he was to be shamed for an inescapable relationship to that material which conscience and creative urge demanded he show the world, then a different portion of the world must be addressed through a different medium.

In seeking to change his medium Hardy obviously had not written himself out, for he was not even conceding to change his line of subject matter:<sup>21</sup> "Perhaps I can express more fully in verse ideas and emotions which run counter to the inert crystallized opinion . . . which the vast body of men have vested interests in supporting" (*Later Years*, p. 57). Answering his search for a freedom not to be found among critics of magazine stories and lending library volumes, poetry offered itself as a desirable alternative; some few months after his above remark (Oct. 1896 to Feb. 1897) Hardy was already engaged in the planning of *Wessex Poems*. Yet the choice of alternatives is obviously biased by the years prior to that earlier choice, at the time of *The Poor Man and the Lady*, when novels promised to be more rewarding of reputation and income than poetry. Considering Hardy's first and last preference for poetry and his well known refusal to view himself as seriously in his intervening role, one can imagine a measure of satisfaction to be drawn from the circumstances that faced him in 1896. Though perhaps without foreseeing the result at a distance, did he not, with the publication of *Jude*, deliberately place himself in a position in which further prose writing proved undesirable? Painful as the cure to novel-writing must have been, the effect of that cure was assuredly a pleasure. It would be unreasonable to expect Hardy to fight against a change which his heart approved.

Wisconsin State College (La Crosse)

William J. Hyde

#### FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Florence Hardy, *The Early Life of Thomas Hardy* (London, 1928), p. 272; Preface (1912) to *Jude the Obscure* (London, 1949), p. vii.
- <sup>2</sup> *New Review*, Jan. 1890, reprinted in *Life and Art by Thomas Hardy*, ed. Ernest Brennecke, Jr. (New York, 1925); also reprinted here are "The Profitable Reading of Fiction" (1888) and "The Science of Fiction" (1891).
- <sup>3</sup> Albert J. Guerard, *Thomas Hardy, The Novels and Stories* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949), p. 27, and John Holloway, "Hardy's Major Fiction," in *From Jane Austen to Joseph Conrad*, ed. Robert C. Rathburn and Martin Steinman, Jr. (Minneapolis, 1958), p. 234, point out the topicality of the subject in Ibsen's plays and in news of the notorious Parrell case. Holloway discounting any supposition that the marriage question derives from Hardy's private life. Yet the examples of Eustacia Vye, Lady Constantine, and Grace Melbury, to mention a few, suggest Hardy's long and more than topical interest in the problem. His concern with mismatching is apparent from the time of his first novel, contemporary with J. S. Mill's *Subjection of Women* (1869); his emphasis upon compatible temperaments in marriage stems (as Sue Bridehead makes clear) from Mill.
- <sup>4</sup> Florence Hardy, *The Later Years of Thomas Hardy* (London, 1930), p. 40.
- <sup>5</sup> Cf. Guerard, p. 16, on the "energizing indignation" in *Jude*.
- <sup>6</sup> M. W. O. [Oliphant], "The Anti-Marriage League," *Blackwood's*, CLIX (1896), esp. 137-142; Edmund Blunden, *Thomas Hardy* (London, 1942), p. 86; *Times*, Dec. 18, 1895, p. 4. See also, e.g., *Fortnightly*, LIX, NS (1896), 857-864; *Athenaeum*, Nov. 23, 1895, pp. 709-710; *Spectator*, LXXV (1895), 722-724.
- <sup>7</sup> See, e.g., *The Bookman*, II (New York, 1895-96), 427-429; *The Critic*, XXVII, NS (New York, 1895), 437; *Atlantic Monthly*, LXXVIII (1896), 279.
- <sup>8</sup> Cf. Guerard, p. 37.
- <sup>9</sup> *The Dial*, XX (Chicago, 1896), 76-77.
- <sup>10</sup> See, e.g., Blunden, p. 92; Samuel C. Chew, *Thomas Hardy, Poet & Novelist* (New York, 1928), p. 58; Evelyn Hardy, *Thomas Hardy* (London, 1954), p. 246; and C. J. Weber, *Hardy of Wessex* (New York, 1940), pp. 148, 152.
- <sup>11</sup> H. Rider Haggard, *All the Days of My Life* (London, 1926), I, 272-273. In the Preface of 1912 (p. vi) Hardy recollected but "two or three dissentients from the chorus" of shrill abuse.
- <sup>12</sup> "Mr. Thomas Hardy's Latest Novel," *Westminster Rev.*, CXLV (1896), 136-139.
- <sup>13</sup> "Jude the Obscure," *The Bookman*, IX (London, 1895-96), 123-124.
- <sup>14</sup> Laurence Hutton, "Literary Notes," p. 2, in XCII (Dec. 1895).
- <sup>15</sup> I (Philadelphia, Amer. Soc. for the Extension of Univ. Teaching, 1895-96), 284-286.
- <sup>16</sup> XXXIX (1895), 1156.
- <sup>17</sup> On Gosse's article, see Blunden, pp. 86-88, and *Later Years*, p. 43. Havelock Ellis, "Concerning *Jude the Obscure*," *The Savoy*, Oct. 1896, pp. 35-49, in Ellis, *From Marlowe to Shaw* (London, 1950), pp. 267-284. "Jude the Obscure," *Saturday Rev.*, LXXXI (Feb. 8, 1896), 153-154; supporting opinion on authorship, see Bernard Bergonzi, "An Early Wells Review of Henry James," *London Times Literary Supplement*, Apr. 18, 1958, p. 216.
- <sup>18</sup> Mrs. Oliphant (n. 6), p. 138; *The Bookman* (New York), II, 428, observes in the author "the morbidly curious

imaginings of a masochist or some other form of sexual pervert." Here was the fallacy against which Hardy protested of considering views of the characters to be, necessarily, views of their author. Yet one also recalls Hardy's proneness to deny autobiographical elements in *Jude* ("no book . . . contained less of his own life"—*Later Years*, p. 44); the pain which exposure of his person cost him within the context of the novel's unpleasant reception might be suggested by the psychological parallel of his lifelong dislike of being touched (see *Early Life*, p. 32).

<sup>19</sup> A. J. Butler, "Mr. Hardy as a Decadent," *National Rev.*, XXVII (1896), 388, 390; *The Bookman* (New York), II, 429; *London Times*, Dec. 18, 1895, p. 4; *The Nation*, LXII (1896), 124; *The Critic* (New York), XXVII, 437.

<sup>20</sup> See my "Hardy's View of Realism," *Victorian Studies*, II (1958), esp. 58-59.

<sup>21</sup> That a growing awareness of the deterioration of vital energies in the old traditional life of Wessex cut Hardy off from material for further novel-writing, a point raised in Holloway, p. 245, appears doubtful and is certainly not a part of Hardy's complaint. It would, indeed, explain why there were no more *Under the Greenwood Tree*'s.

### CORYDON HAD A RIVAL

In at least one area of Victorian studies there has developed a point of view that is fast becoming a critical commonplace. One notices, in reading discussions of the Matthew Arnold—Arthur Hugh Clough relationship, that a definite pattern has been established. The two are usually lumped together as "Poets of Doubt" or "Poets of Scepticism," and Arnold is pictured as constantly resisting these doubts, in contrast to Clough, who, the critics insist, was overcome by them. The two are depicted as slowly growing apart, their critical and poetic ideals becoming more and more incompatible. Arnold, this tradition points out, consistently fought Clough's influence, for to him Clough represented, in Lionel Trilling's words, "the driving restless movement of the critical intellect," the force "against which his poetic gifts must be protected."<sup>1</sup> In the end, the tradition concludes, Arnold saved himself from the sorry fate suffered by Clough, whose "piping took a troubled sound," and who spent the rest of his days after his resignation from Oxford looking for "the heavenly light." W. S. Knickerbocker epitomizes this tradition in his review of H. F. Lowry's *The Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough* (New York, 1932). "This book," he writes, "supplies evidence that from 1847 to 1853 Arnold developed his own conception of poetry and of his own role as poet by vigorously resisting the impulse of the time to which Clough yielded (a resistance which took the form of criticising Clough's poetic productions and the conceptions which inspired them) and at the same time seeking objects of contemplation and a technique for his spiritual life which would save him from immolation in the flux of contemporary influences and events."<sup>2</sup>

There are a number of implications in this tradition that should be examined more thoroughly before being accepted, especially those concerning the poetic theories of each and the extent of the influence of Clough on Arnold. The critical tradition, exaggerating the growing apart of the two men, has failed to recognize the essential agreement of their poetic theories and the extent of the influence that Clough had on his younger friend. It is true, of course, that the two did not agree on many questions concerning poetry; it is also true that Arnold did resist certain ideas of Clough, particularly in the early years of their friendship, and W. Stacy Johnson has given us an interesting account of their "debate" in poetry in his article "Parallel Imagery in Arnold and Clough" (*ES*, XXXVII [Feb., 1956], 1-11). But their occasional disagreements and Arnold's resistance did not result in their being as widely separated in their poetic beliefs as the tradition asserts. On the contrary, a comparison of their theories indicates that they correspond at many points, particularly on the end of poetry and the relationship of style or form to thematic content. When they differ, it seems to be a matter of emphasis rather than outright disagreement, and this concurrence supports my principal thesis: Clough's influence on Arnold was greater than most critics are inclined to recognize.

To deny or to underestimate the close friendship of the two and the influence of Clough on Arnold is to ignore the evidence of both their actual relationship and of Arnold's own statements. Tom Arnold, Matthew's brother and in his own right a close friend of Clough, has testified to the beginning of the friendship between Clough and Arnold at Rugby and its continuation during the Oxford years and later. When Clough was at Rugby under Dr. Arnold he lived in the School-house and was, in Tom Arnold's words, "not seldom in the private part of the house; for my mother, who marked his somewhat delicate health, conceived a great liking for him; and his gentleness, and that unwonted humanity of nature which made him unlike the ordinary schoolboy, caused him to be a welcome guest in her drawing room."<sup>3</sup> Matthew, of course, saw Clough on occasions during this period, and his attitude towards him must have been properly respectful, for Clough was then three years his senior (a formidable difference to one in his early teens) and the accepted leader in almost every phase of school life. When Arnold came to Oxford in 1841, the two became friends on a more equal and intimate basis; but Clough was still the accepted leader, having not only those three precious years of seniority and the actual experience of residence at Oxford, but also displaying the force of that side of his personality which is so strangely absent from most of his writing, the side that Tom Arnold reveals so well and Lowry characterizes as "high-spirited, deeply imaginative, and full of gusto."<sup>4</sup>

It was this side that enabled him, at the time when he and Arnold were closest, to be the self-assured and confident intellectual and social leader of what F. L. Mulhauser, the editor of the *Correspondence*, characterizes as "a group of able, vigorous men slightly younger than himself."<sup>5</sup> He certainly was the dominant figure of the "little interior company" formed in 1842, when Tom Arnold came to join Clough, his brother Matthew, and Theodore Walrond, the fourth member. Besides engaging in such physical activities as skiffing and hiking, the group breakfasted every Sunday morning in Clough's rooms, at which time they discussed everything and anything, including the subject of poetry. "I can talk tremendous!" Clough confessed in one of his less reserved moments, and we may be sure that he exhibited this gift during these animated Sunday-morning discussions. It was this same quality that made him one of the most effective speakers of the Decade (some envious spirits insisted on pronouncing it Decayed), the small debating society to which he belonged at Oxford. Clough, in short, while at Oxford was able to, and did, exert a great deal of influence on those with whom he came in contact; and there is no reason to believe that Arnold, an intimate acquaintance, would not be affected by his older friend. It was Clough, we remember, who assumed responsibility for Arnold when it seemed that the latter might not get even a second class at Balliol; the two spent some time together in the summer of 1844 in the North, from where Clough wrote to his friend Burbridge that he was painfully coerced to his work by the assurance that "should I relax in the least my yoke fellow would at once come to a dead stop" (*Corr.*, I, 131). Even after both men had left Oxford they saw each other occasionally, particularly during the time when Clough was in London as Principal of University Hall, and they corresponded regularly, especially between 1847 to 1853, the years in which the bulk of the correspondence falls.

If these outward evidences of their close association are not enough to indicate the nature of their relationship, we have the testimony of Arnold's own words; for throughout the period that they were exchanging letters, Arnold never failed to express his admiration of and affection for Clough. Writing to Clough in 1853 to explain that they had never been, and never could be, estranged, Arnold told him that he has "clung to him in spirit" more than to any other man. "Only remember," Arnold pleaded, "pray remember that I am and always shall be . . . powerfully attracted towards you and vitally concerned with you." (Lowry, p. 130) A year earlier Arnold had written: "Let us, as far as we can, continue to exchange our thoughts, as with all our differences we agree more with one another than with the rest of the world, I think" (Lowry, p. 124). In 1857 Arnold gave Clough a copy of *Merope*, his verse tragedy, inscribed with a quotation from Goethe: "With truly like-minded people one cannot in the long run be at outs, one finds oneself always eventually together again" (Lowry, p. 148). And seven days after Clough's death in Florence on November 13, 1861, Arnold wrote to his own mother that this was "a loss which I shall feel more and more as time goes on, for he is one of the few people who ever made a deep impression upon me" (Lowry, p. 157).

Together with this personal friendship existed the intellectual bond between the two. "How much Arthur Clough had to do with deepening his young friend is hard to say," writes Professor Lowry. "The depth was, to be sure, already there; it only needed sounding. And in this last work Clough unquestionably had a part" (Lowry, p. 27). Arnold himself recognized the part played by Clough. "This I am sure of": he wrote to Clough in 1853, "the period of my development . . . coincides with that of my friendship with you so exactly that I am for ever linked with you by intellectual bonds—the strongest of all: more than you are with me: for your development was really over before you knew me, and you had properly speaking come to your *assiette*" (Lowry, p. 130).

"The later Clough correspondence shows," writes Alba Warren, "that by the time Arnold came to the writing of the preface to the *Poems* of 1853 he had already fully developed his theory of poetry, and his task was merely to give his ideas the formal 'articulation' of prose."<sup>6</sup> Clough's part in the formation of his friend's theory of poetry is borne out not only by the evidence of their personal friendship and the close agreement of their thinking; it is also supported by more specific statements of Arnold's concerning the value he placed on Clough's judgments. Arnold's avowal of his intellectual bond with Clough—"the strongest of all"—has already been cited; he was always deeply interested in having Clough's opinions on individual pieces that he had written or was in the process of composing. After supplying Clough with a running commentary for "The New Sireas" in a letter of 1849, Arnold tells him: "I have thus, my love,<sup>7</sup> ventured to trouble you with a sort of argument to the poem, thanking you for the trouble you seem to have bestowed on it. But your word is quite just—it is exactly a mumble—and I have doctored it so much and looked at it so long that I am now powerless respecting it" (Lowry, pp. 106-107). In 1853, writing to Clough about "Sohrab and Rustum," Arnold states that he is in great hopes that Clough will one day like the poem—really like it, for "there is no one to whose *apercus* I attach the value I do to yours" (Lowry, p. 145). In 1859 Arnold writes to his sister: "You and Clough are, I believe, the two people I in my heart care most to please by what I write" (Lowry, p. 148). To Clough himself in the same year he begins a letter with, "My dear old soul. I find that, au fond, when I compose anything, I care more, still, for your opinion than that of any one else about it" (Lowry, p. 148). And in writing to Clough's wife of the shock that Clough's death had given him, Arnold stated:

"Probably you hardly know how very intimate we once were; our friendship was, from my age at the time when it was closest, more important to me than it was to him, and no one will ever again be to me what he was. I shall always think . . . that no one ever appreciated him . . . so thoroughly as I did; with no one of them [his other "men friends"] was the conviction of his truly great and profound qualities so entirely independent of any visible success in life which he might achieve. I had accustomed myself to think that no success of this kind, at all worthy of his great powers, would he now achieve—and, after all, this would only have been common to him with one or two other men *the influence of whose works is most precious to me* [italics mine]—but now his early death seems to have reopened all the possibilities for him" (Lowry, p. 159). Granted this last letter was written in the spirit of offering condolences to Clough's widow, still the sincerity of Arnold's feelings is evident in this as well as in the other letters. In his letters Arnold himself freely admits and acknowledges that Clough did indeed exert some influence upon him.

The effect of this influence is most clearly seen in two particular aspects of Arnold's critical thought: his views of the end of poetry and the degree of emphasis that should be placed on style or form in relation to that end. These were vital concerns to Arnold. "Over the years," Warren tells us, "the problem of poetry, particularly of the practice of poetry, was most present to Arnold as an antithesis between content and expression" (Warren, p. 158). There seems little doubt that Arnold began with a stress on form and ended with a stress on content. In his early letters he is formalistic, being very close to the pure aesthete, and he criticizes Clough for trying "to solve the universe," sacrificing in the process form to content. In the end, however, Arnold comes to admit that the moralistic end of poetry is at least as important as the formalistic; he insists that modern poetry can subsist only by its contents, by having the language and style be very "plain direct and severe," in order not to detract from the content. He is advocating, in other words, the very qualities which in the beginning he condemned in his older friend's poetry; rather than bring Clough over to his point of view, Corydon seems to have acceded to the ideas of Thyrsis.

The gradual shift of emphasis in Arnold's thought is fascinating to follow. In 1845 he calls Clough a fellow worshipper of Isis and reminds him that "while we believe in the Universality of Passion as Passion, [we] will keep pure our Aesthetics by remembering its oneness as doctrine" (Lowry, p. 59). In a letter of late November, 1847, he condemns Clough's "The human spirits saw I on a day" because it is allegorical. In February, 1848, he apologizes to Clough for a beastly "vile" note he had sent him and explains that "A growing sense of the deficiency of the *beautiful* in your poems, and of this alone being properly *poetical* as distinguished from rhetorical, devotional or metaphysical, made me speak as I did" (Lowry, p. 66). In May of the same year, commenting on Racine, Arnold brings in the inevitable criticism of Clough's stress on content and his lack of form: "Mithridate was a young man's effort—but you know you are a mere d-d depth hunter in poetry and therefore exclusive furiously. You might write a speech in Phedre . . . but you could not write Phedre. And when you adopt this or that form you must sacrifice much to the ensemble, and that form in return for admirable effects demands immense sacrifices and precisely in that quarter where your nature will not allow you to make them" (Lowry, p. 81). In February, 1849, he <sup>Arnold</sup> indicates his extreme position regarding form over matter. "The greatest wealth and depth of matter," he tells Clough, "is merely a superfluity in the Poet as such," while form is "the sole necessary of Poetry as such" (Lowry, pp. 98-99). Aestheticism can go no further.

But even while he is berating Clough for his lack of form and beauty and for his damned depth hunting, Arnold indicates that he is not quite sure about his own position. Behind his dissatisfaction, of course, lies his recognition that the formalistic emphasis on poetry is not enough if poetry is to be an aid to man in overcoming the multitudinousness of experience and life; something in addition to form and beauty is needed if poetry is to function as a means to enable man to see life and see it whole, if poetry is to answer the question how to live. It is this growing concern over the unifying role that poetry must play that leads him to become increasingly aware of the many admirable qualities of Clough's poetry and to admit that Clough, with his constant concern to treat the timeless aspects of human nature (so evident in many of the *Ambarvalia* poems, for instance, and in his statements on poetic theory) and his insistence that poetry should attempt to introduce into life "a soul of purpose and reality" (an insistence especially evident in his review of Arnold's own poems), might be right after all. As early as 1847 Arnold writes that he has attained in the "inward ways" (Lowry, p. 64). And he confesses that although Clough's attempt "to solve the Universe . . . is an irritating as Tennyson's dawdling with its painted shell is fatiguing," he also has to say that "to reconstruct the Universe is not a satisfactory attempt either" (Lowry, p. 63). A still more illuminating admission is contained in a letter of July, 1848. After quoting one of Goethe's remarks on the various views towards the Wolfian theories of Homer, a remark that "in these matters there is no certainty, but alternating dispositions," Arnold then concludes: "This view, as congenial to me as uncongenial, I suspect, to you, causes me, while I confess that productions like your Adam and Eve are not suited to me *at present*, [italics mine] yet to feel no confidence that they may not be quite right and calculated to suit others." And he concludes with a compliment to Clough and another admission that Clough may be right and

he wrong: "The good feature in all your poems is the sincerity that is evident in them: which always produces a powerful effect on the reader—and which most people with the best intentions lose totally when they sit down to write. The spectacle of a writer striving evidently to get breast to breast with reality is always full of instruction and very invigorating—and here I always feel you have the advantage of me: 'much may be seen, tho: nothing can be solved'—weighs upon me in writing" (Lowry, p. 86).

The last sentence is significant. He has told Clough that his attempts to solve the universe were irritating; yet he admits that Clough has the advantage over him because his own view that "nothing can be solved" weighs upon him heavily. Certainly it is not being too fanciful, especially in the light of the identical vocabulary used in these two instances, to see that Arnold is far from settled in his own mind regarding the end of poetry and the place of style or form in support of this end. And it is not being too fanciful to see that he is leaning more and more towards Clough's views, and that his later emphasis on content rather than form owes a great deal to Clough. This is not to deny, of course, that Arnold was reading and studying other men and works; one cannot discount his classical background, his catholic interest in all literatures, including European and Oriental, and his own maturing thoughts and beliefs. But the influence of the person who made a deep impression on him during his formative years, the only other person besides his sister whom he cared most to please, should not be ignored.

It is really not surprising, then, although some critics have professed this reaction, to see Arnold become more and more a moralistic rather than an aesthetic critic. "The depth was already there," as Lowry tells us; "it only needed sounding." And Thyrsis was there to do his part. While we have no direct evidence of what Clough wrote in the missing letters to Arnold, we are able to gather Clough's principal critical ideas from the answers that Arnold gives and from the other writings of Clough.<sup>8</sup> From this latter source, especially, we are able to tell what he thought about the style and content of poetry, and the similarity of his ideas on these two points to those of the mature Arnold is indeed striking.

This similarity is especially apparent in their views toward style. In his poetic theory Clough defines style as the form that the poet gives to his work, or, in his words, "that permanent beauty of expression, that harmony between thought and word, which is the condition of 'immortal verse'" ("Wordsworth," *Remains*, I, 317); and using this definition as the basis for discussion, he emphasizes the necessity of the poet's keeping the style simple and severe, so that it contributes to the "total impression" of the poem. Since the thematic content is, in Clough's poetic theory, the most important element of the poem, the poet must keep the style in the subordinate position. Form, metre, imagery, and diction must not call attention to themselves; they must, instead, contribute to the main drift of "what calls itself a single poem, *simplex et unum*" ("Review," *Remains*, I, 380). Arnold, too, in his later criticism equates style with the form that the poet gives to his materials, defining it as "saying in the best way what you have to say." He, too, emphasizes the need for subordinating imagery, metre, and diction to the total impression of the poem, and in his preface to the *Poems* of 1853 he speaks of the Greeks' attention to the "careful construction" of the poem and stresses the need for a greater recognition of such qualities as "clearness of arrangement, rigour of development" (*Poems*, p. 12). Arnold, like Clough, clearly affirms one basic belief regarding style: it must in no way detract from the message of the poem.

The disregard of the moral effect of the poem is attacked by both in their criticism of "modern" poetry. In reviewing the poetry of Alexander Smith, Clough subjects the poet to severe criticism for his excessive fondness for similes, metaphors, and "vicious expressions." He is especially severe on Smith for his careless construction: "Our author will not keep his eye steady upon the thing before him; he goes off, and distracts us, and breaks the impression he had begun to succeed in giving, by bidding us look now at something else. . . . The movement of his poem is indeed rapid enough; . . . but . . . the attention, which the reader desires to devote to the pursuit of the main drift of what calls itself a single poem . . . is . . . incessantly called off" ("Review," *Remains*, I, 380, 382).

Arnold's agreement with Clough on this particular aspect of style is so complete that the words he uses could have been written by the latter. In contrast to the early Arnold who insisted that "depth of matter" was merely a superfluity and that form was the sole necessary of poetry, the mature Arnold condemns the imitators of Shakespeare who have given their exclusive attention to the imitation of the "attractive accessories" of his work. He singles out Keats. The poem "Isabella" is a "perfect treasurehouse of felicitous words and images" and "picturesque turns of expression," but what of "the action, the story?" (*Poems*, pp. 10-11). A letter to Clough written in 1852 also contains his mature concept of style and its relationship to content. After telling Clough that he feels more and more that "the difference between a mature and youthful age" compels the former to use "great plainness of speech," Arnold goes on to say that Keats and Shelley were "on a false track" when they set themselves to reproduce the "exuberance of expression, the charm, the richness of images, and the felicity" of the Elizabethans. "Modern poetry," he concludes, "can only subsist



by its contents. . . . But the language, style and general proceedings of a poetry which has such an immense task to perform, must be very plain direct and severe: and it must not lose itself in parts and episodes [one is reminded here of Clough's criticism of Smith's poetry] and ornamental work, but must press forwards to the whole" (Lowry, p. 124).

The insistence on the subordination of style or form to content by both reflects their firm belief in the moralistic basis of poetry; for both it must be a criticism of life: for both it must answer the question how to live. The greatness of poetry for both lies in its application to life. Clough reveals his moralistic bias in a number of different essays, but perhaps most clearly in the "Review." Could not poetry, he asks, "introduce into business and weary task-work a character and a soul of purpose and reality; intimate to us relations which, in our unchosen, peremptorily-appointed posts, in our grievously narrow and limited spheres of action, we still, in and through all, retain to some central celestial fact? . . . Cannot the Divine Song . . . prove to use, that though we are what we are, we may yet . . . be related to the purer existence." (*Remains*, I, 361) To Clough, then, the value of a poem lies in its ability to give the reader some new or added insight into his own life; it should be both consolatory and illuminative; it is a criticism of life in that it defines in universal terms those actions and ideas which we see only as particulars. This belief underlies not only such anthology pieces as "Say not the struggle," "Sic Itur," "Qui Laborat, Orat," and "Qua Cursum Ventus" but also such lesser known poems as "Put forth thy leaf, thou lofty plane," "It fortifies my soul to know," "Easter Day, Part II," and "Some future day when what is now is not." This principle also underlies Clough's favoring Arnold's *Tristram and Iseult* over his *Empedocles on Etna*: "We still prefer," he states, ". . . the human passions and sorrows of the Knight and the Queen, to the high, and shall we say, pseudo-Greek inflation of the philosopher musing above the crater, and the boy Callicles singing myths upon the mountain" ("Review," *Remains*, I, 373).

Arnold's later criticism reveals that his moralistic bias is as strong as Clough's; it is undeniable, of course, that he never stopped insisting that poetic truth and poetic beauty must accompany and fix the conditions under which poetry makes its powerful application of ideas to life, but the fact remains that the emphasis throughout his later criticism is on content over form. He tells Clough in one of the later letters (1852) that modern poetry, if it is to be at all meaningful, needs to become "a complete magister vitae as the poetry of the ancients did: by including as theirs did, religion with poetry, instead of existing as poetry only" (Lowry, p. 124); and even more significant is his own rejection of *Empedocles* from the 1853 volume, because of its failure to "inspirit and rejoice" the reader, because of its belonging to a class of situations "in which the suffering finds no vent in action; in which a continuous state of mental distress is prolonged, unrelieved by incident, hope, or resistance; in which there is everything to be endured, nothing to be done" (*Poems*, pp. 2-3). Surely in this we hear, at the very least, an echo of Clough's insistence that poetry should console man and give him some added insight into his narrow existence. In "The Study of Poetry" Arnold expands this idea of poetry as *magister vitae*: "The future of poetry is immense, because in poetry, where it is worthy of its high destinies, our race, as time goes on, will find an ever surer and surer stay. . . . Our religion has materialised itself in the fact, in the supposed fact; it has attached its emotion to the fact, and now the fact is failing it. But for poetry the idea is everything; the rest is a world of illusion, of divine illusion. Poetry attaches its emotion to the idea; the idea is the fact. The strongest part of our religion to-day is its unconscious poetry." <sup>10</sup>

In his essay on Maurice de Guérin Arnold goes into still more detail regarding the task of poetry. "Poetry," he writes, "is the interpretress of the natural world, and she is the interpretress of the moral world" (*EC*, I, p. 104). For Arnold, the latter task is, of course, the more important and more serious of the two. "In other words," he remarks later in the essay, "poetry is interpretative both by having *natural magic* in it, and by having *moral profundity*. In both ways it illuminates man; it gives him a satisfying sense of reality; it reconciles him with himself and the universe" (*EC*, I, p. 108). Arnold's preference for the latter quality—the moral profundity—is evident in his final estimate of Maurice de Guérin, who, like Keats, is a poet in whom "the faculty of naturalistic interpretation is overwhelmingly predominant." It is precisely because Guérin's faculty is that of naturalistic and not of moral interpretation that Arnold likens him to the "passive and ineffectual" Uranus of Keats's poem. "He hovers over the tumult of life," Arnold concludes, "but he does not really put his hand to it" (*EC*, I, p. 105).

Both Guérin and Keats fail to do the very thing for which Arnold gives the greatest praise to Wordsworth; they fail to show in their poetry a "noble and profound application of ideas to life." Their poetry does not fulfill the function that Arnold envisioned for poetry. Arnold's essay on Wordsworth reveals the great distance he has traveled since his first criticisms of Clough's own poems, at which time he insisted that the "beautiful" alone was properly poetical, as distinguished from "rhetorical, devotional or metaphysical" (Lowry, p. 66). His uncompromising view of the moral end of poetry permeates the essay. He is now able to say without any qualifications: "It is important, therefore, to hold fast to this: that poetry is at bottom a criticism of life; that the

greatness of a poet lies in his powerful and beautiful application of ideas to life,—to the question: How to live. . . . A poetry of revolt against moral ideas is a poetry of revolt against life; a poetry of indifference towards moral ideas is a poetry of indifference towards life" (*EC*, II, pp. 143-144). And in "The Study of Poetry" the same uncompromising view is present; in words that again distinctly recall Clough's belief that poetry should console and enlighten man, Arnold writes: "More and more mankind will discover that we have to turn to poetry to interpret life for us, to console us, to sustain us. Without poetry, our science will appear incomplete; and most of what now passes with us for religion and philosophy will be replaced by poetry" (*EC*, II, 2-3).

Contrary to the current critical tradition, then, not only are Clough and Arnold much alike in their poetic theories, but if there is any influence of one on the other, it is that of Clough on Arnold, as the difference between Arnold's early letters, with their stress on the "beautiful," and his later attitude, with the stress on content and moral function, reveals. In the end he has come to regard poetry as a complete *magister vitae*; and he has come to insist no longer on form as the sole necessary of poetry, but instead, on a very plain, direct, and severe style that must always remain subordinate to thematic content. Arnold, influenced exactly how much by Clough we do not know, has accomplished an almost complete about-face in these critical areas.

Perhaps what has made the evaluation of the exact relationship between the two so difficult is that, although they have the same ends in mind, they differ somewhat as to the basic approach to achieve these ends. Both want poetry to be a criticism of life; but Clough wants the poet to examine life from no preconceived point of view, while Arnold wants the poet to start with an "Idea of the world" and work from there, or else he will be "prevalled over by the world's multitudinousness" (Lowry, p. 97). Hence his criticism of Clough as a person: "But, my dear Clough, have you a great Force of Character? That is the true Question" (Lowry, p. 56). Another time, in answer to a question by Clough, he writes: "You ask me in what I think or have thought you going wrong: in this: that you would never take your assiette as something determined final and unchangeable for you and proceed to work away on the basis of that" (Lowry, p. 130). Clough, for Arnold, is too content to fluctuate; he was not able to see that Clough himself felt that he had the "higher courage" to wait for "the truly right."

But the critic must be careful not to fall into the error of interpreting the full relationship between these two merely on the evidence of some of Arnold's statements that were attempts to overcome what he apparently felt to be the too idealistic side of Clough's character, the side that made Clough resign from Oxford because of his refusal to indulge his conscience by a hypocritical support of the Thirty-nine Articles. "It is one of the ironies of English literature," writes Lowry, "that the friendship formed in these Oxford days between Arnold and Clough has been immortalized in a poem which probably does not suggest its chief ground. When he wrote *Thyrsis*, Arnold well knew he was selecting one aspect of Clough, the ideal side; so strongly did he feel this that he did not even send the poem to Mrs. Clough. All some very cultured people know of him to-day is that 'his piping took a troubled sound.' . . . By putting in light one aspect of *Thyrsis*, he has helped blind us to others" (Lowry, pp. 21-22).

One of the sides that he has blinded to others is that of Clough as poet and critic. "We have forgotten," concludes Lowry, "that Corydon once had a rival, and a very good one!" (Lowry, p. 22) The influence of Corydon has not yet been properly evaluated, and all the evidence shows, I believe, that it has up to now been underestimated. Arnold himself, as we have seen, regarded the period of his development corresponding so exactly with the period of his friendship with Clough that he felt himself to be forever linked with him by intellectual bonds; and he regarded Clough as one of the two people that he in his heart cared most to please by what he wrote. To insist, then, that the friendship of Arnold and Clough was at the end only an "affectionate formality" (Trilling, p. 24), to emphasize the differences and to overlook the essential agreement of their poetic theories, and to deny Clough the apparent influence that he had on Arnold's thought smacks of critical arteriosclerosis. Lionel Trilling writes in his study of Arnold that *Thyrsis* is the lament for a dead friend but also for a dead friendship. In light of Arnold's own words, does *Thyrsis* not seem to be, rather, a lament for the passing of one whose friendship had meant a great deal, the effect of which would never die? Perhaps the real extent of Clough's influence will never be known, but Arnold has written what may be taken as the key to the solution of this complex relationship. "The impression he left," Arnold wrote to a friend after Clough's death, "was one of those which deepen with time and such as I never expect again to experience" (Lowry, p. 163).

University of Illinois

Michael Timko

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Lionel Trilling, *Matthew Arnold* (New York: Meridian Books, 1955), p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> W. S. Knickerbocker, "Semaphore: Arnold and Clough," *Seawave Review*, XLI (April, 1933), 155.

<sup>3</sup> Thomas Arnold, "Arthur Hugh Clough: A Sketch," *Nineteenth Century*, (Jan., 1898), 105-116; same in *Eclectic Magazine*, CXXX (March, 1897), 358-365; same in *Living Age*, CCXIX (Oct. 1, 1898), 67-70.

<sup>4</sup> H. F. Lowry, *The Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough* (New York, 1932), p. 21—hereafter cited as Lowry.

- <sup>5</sup> Arthur Hugh Clough, *Correspondence*, ed. F. L. Mulhauser. 2 vols (Oxford University Press, 1957), I, xix. See, also, in Lowry (p. 21) the notes of the conversation Mrs. Clough had with Frederick Temple in 1862. "He said that he had great influence, that those immediately succeeding him (next to his contemporaries) felt they owed more to him than to any other man, that he himself had seen a great deal of him. . . . Once Dr. Temple had expressed some opinion, when A. said, 'Why, you thought differently six months ago.' Dr. Temple said, 'Yes, but you knocked that out of me.'"
- <sup>6</sup> Alba H. Warren, Jr., *English Poetic Theory, 1825-1865* (Princeton, 1950), p. 161.
- <sup>7</sup> Arnold often addresses Clough in this way.
- <sup>8</sup> The following sources, found in the first volume of *The Poems and Prose Remains of Arthur Hugh Clough*, ed. Blanche Smith Clough (London, 1869)—hereafter cited as *Remains*, I, contain much of the materials from which may be gathered Clough's critical ideas: "Lecture on the Poetry of Wordsworth," pp. 307-326—hereafter cited as "Wordsworth"; "On the Formation of Classical English: An Extract from a Lecture on Dryden," pp. 327-334; "Lecture on the development of English Literature from Chaucer to Wordsworth," pp. 335-346; "Two Letters of Parsipidemus," pp. 385-402; "Review of Some Poems by Alexander Smith and Matthew Arnold," pp. 357-384—hereafter cited as "Review"; "Memoir" by Blanche Smith Clough, pp. 1-54; valuable, too, are the *Correspondence*; manuscript materials at the Honold Library, Claremont, California; at the Bodleian, at Harvard, and Yale; and Walter Houghton's "The Prose Works of Arthur Hugh Clough: A Checklist and Calendar with Some Unpublished Passages," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, LXIV (July, 1960), 377-394. The latter is especially valuable for the comments on manuscript material; see, for instance, the remarks on "Review."
- <sup>9</sup> Matthew Arnold, *Poems, 1840-1887* (London, 1930), p. 5—hereafter cited as *Poems*.
- <sup>10</sup> Matthew Arnold, *Essays in Criticism*, Second Series (London and New York, 1888), pp. 1-2—hereafter cited as *EC*, II. He is, of course, repeating these words from his introduction to *The Hundred Greatest Men*, 1879. The other volume of Arnold's criticism cited is *Essays in Criticism* (London and Cambridge, 1865)—cited as *EC*, I.
- <sup>11</sup> Other aspects of Clough's character are discussed in Thomas Arnold, "Arthur Hugh Clough: A Sketch," *The Nineteenth Century*, XXXIII (January, 1898), 195-212; the "Memoir" in *Remains*, I, 1-54; Lowry, pp. 1-30; the biographies by Goldie Levy, *Arthur Hugh Clough: 1819-1861* (London, 1938); J. I. Osborne, *Arthur Hugh Clough* (London, 1919); the monograph by Samuel Waddington, *Arthur Hugh Clough* (London, 1883); and the introduction in F. L. Mulhauser, *The Correspondence of Arthur Hugh Clough*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1957).

### DICKENS' PLOTS: "THE WAYS OF PROVIDENCE" OR THE INFLUENCE OF COLLINS?

Wilkie Collins, according to an opinion that seems to have passed into the canon of Dickens criticism, provided the inspiration and the example for Dickens' tighter and more intricate plotting in his later novels. That opinion appears frequently in older studies like A. W. Ward's *Dickens in the English Men of Letters series* and J. W. T. Ley's *The Dickens Circle*.<sup>1</sup> It is in Ernest Baker's *History of the English Novel*, where *A Tale of Two Cities* is said to show how Dickens was then "aspiring and learning to emulate his friend Wilkie Collins, in the neat dovetailing of plots. . . ."<sup>2</sup> In my casual investigations of more recent works I have not found it so confidently and explicitly avowed, except by Jack Lindsay; but Lionel Stevenson mentions the matter, and so does Walter Allen, and so does Samuel Chew in the graduate student's *vade mecum*, *A Literary History of England*; and no one, so far as I know, denies it, at least in print.<sup>3</sup>

This view seems to me to be wrong. There is a fundamental difference that Dickens himself recognized between his way and Collins' way of developing a plot, a difference suggesting a debt not to Collins but to evangelical Christianity. The effect of Dickens' characteristic method is an impression of an all-pervading design in human affairs, unexpectedly encompassing and harmonizing the profusely various elements of the story; not (as in a novel by Collins) an impression of an unbroken causal chain of events, unobtrusively laid down and given a final shake to bring the whole linked series at once into view. This sense of a governing order in life has more to do with the unity of Dickens' later plots than does his more detailed interweaving of characters and events. And it is to be found in novels of his published even before he met Collins: that is to say, it appears not only in *Bleak House* (which Dickens began soon after meeting Collins) but also in *Dombey and Son*, which preceded *Bleak House* by more than five years, and even in *Martin Chuzzlewit*, published more than four years before *Dombey*.

In saying that Dickens' plots show the influence of evangelical Christianity, I do not mean to assert, against all biographical evidence, that Dickens was an evangelical Christian; and against the evidence of his work, where the bad eminence that he gave to such evangelical religionists as Mr. Stiggins in *Pickwick Papers*, the Murdstones in *David Copperfield*, and Miss Barbary and Mr. Chadband in *Bleak House* leaves no doubt of his distaste for the kind of Christianity that they stand for. Yet whether he was aware of it or not, the evangelical outlook on life was in many ways Dickens' own, shaping and informing the world of human events that appears in his novels. It is hardly necessary to look for specific influences in his life—say in his reading—to account for this. Everyone knows how evangelicalism colored the Victorian outlook. G. M. Young in his *Victorian England* remarks that the boy born in 1810 "found himself at every turn controlled, and animated, by

the imponderable pressure of the Evangelical discipline";<sup>4</sup> and Dickens, one remembers, was born in 1812. He lived and wrote, as Santayana says, in the shadow of a religion that "lay on him like the weight of the atmosphere, sixteen pounds to the square inch, yet never noticed nor mentioned."<sup>5</sup>

Dickens' views on Providence and on plotting appear in the same letter of his and constitute the most explicit evidence for my case. The letter is Dickens' half of an exchange between him and Collins that took place while *A Tale of Two Cities* was in progress (the novel that Professor Baker says shows Dickens copying Collins). Collins had suggested that a certain matter might have been handled differently, in a way that may be inferred from what Dickens said in reply.

I do not positively say that the point you put might not have been done in your manner; but I have a very strong conviction that it would have been overdone in that manner—too elaborately trapped, baited, and prepared—in the main anticipated, and its interest wasted. . . . I think the business of art is to lay all that ground carefully, not with the care that conceals itself—to show, by a backward light, what everything has been working to—but only to suggest, until the fulfillment comes. These are the ways of Providence, of which ways all art is but a little imitation.<sup>6</sup>

Two things are to be noted in this passage: the providentialism that Dickens explicitly avows, and his reason for objecting to the narrative tactics that Collins seems to have been advocating, that is, the careful laying down of links and trains of events to make the outcome plausible.

In the first place, then, Dickens' view of life here is precisely the one held by evangelical Christians. Like Dickens, they insisted upon the direct governance of human affairs by a divine intelligence. Sydney Smith, a Low Church clergyman in the eighteenth-century sense of the phrase, remarked of evangelical Christians, "There is nothing heretical in saying, that God sometimes intervenes with his special providence; but these people differ . . . in the degree in which they insist upon this doctrine."<sup>7</sup> Hannah More's numerous devotional and inspirational works attest to the accuracy of his observation. In chapter viii of *Practical Piety*, for example, entitled "The Hand of God to be Acknowledged in the Daily Circumstances of Life," she settled it that blessings, punishments, and all possible circumstances come directly from the hand of God.<sup>8</sup> In chapter ii of *Christian Morals*, entitled "On Providence," she stated flatly that ascribing even the commonest events to chance is an evasion. She went on to say, "There is one omnipotent, omniscient, perfect, supreme Intelligence, who disposes of every person and of every thing according to the counsel of his own infinitely holy will. . . . The most oppressive and destructive agents are his mysterious ministers; they are carrying on, though unconsciously, his universal plan—a plan, which though complicated is consistent; though apparently disorderly will be found finally harmonious."<sup>9</sup> (This is not of course a view of life originated by evangelicals. Still it seems fair to say that when the view was abroad in nineteenth-century England, its source was evangelical theology rather than, say, Greek tragedy.)

The idea of a guiding Providence (however inexplicable the providential design may be to us) is the fundamental assumption that governs Dickens' plots. Allowing for his secular and temporal focus, Dickens was as faithful to the idea of a divine hand ordering human affairs to a just conclusion as Mrs. More showed herself to be. In a letter to Bulwer Lytton about a criticism of *A Tale of Two Cities*, Dickens wrote of "accident" in the same tone that Mrs. More used when she dealt with "chance":

I am not clear, and I never have been clear, respecting that canon of fiction which forbids the interposition of accident in such a case as Madame Defarge's death. Where the accident is inseparable from the passion and emotion of the character, where it is strictly consistent with the whole design, and arises out of some culminating proceeding on the part of the character which the whole story has led up to, it seems to me to become, as it were, an act of divine justice.<sup>10</sup>

This passage, then, like the one quoted earlier from the letter to Collins, shows how intrinsic to Dickens' thought is the evangelical idea of a divine plan, and Planner, of human events. Dickens' readers will have no difficulty in supplying their own illustrations from the novels.

To proceed to the second matter—how Dickens' reason for rejecting Collins' advice about plotting shows the influence of evangelicalism—I return to Sydney Smith's remark. What made the doctrine of divine Providence offensive to him when invoked by evangelical Christians was, as he put it, "the degree in which they insist upon this doctrine." Everything meant something. Everything showed the hand of God at work, if not openly and visibly, then in some inexplicable way. Given the apparent disorder of most human affairs, of course, rigid application of this doctrine meant that the inexplicability of the plan naturally had to be much emphasized. Hence the idea of hidden significance in life, of unfathomable but undeniable connections between things, which appears in Mrs. More's mention of the godless wicked who whether they want to or not are as God's mysterious ministers unconsciously doing his bidding. Cowper's famous contribution to the *Olney Hymns*, "God moves in a mysterious way/His wonders to perform," perfectly expresses the evangelical idea of the way that Providence orders human affairs.

In this respect, too, Dickens' novelistic practice shows that his beliefs are remarkably like those of the evangelicals. For Dickens, too, mystery—the sense of hidden significance—is an integral quality of life. In *Dombey and Son*, for example, it turns out that Edith Dombey, Mrs. Skewton's daughter, and Alice Marwood, Good Mrs. Brown's daughter, are first cousins. But that information really is not of much interest in itself; what makes it significant is that it was unknown, and that once known it seems somehow to link and to account for a whole web of relationships and events—to make them a web, in fact. Florence Dombey was victimized as a child by Good Mrs. Brown. Alice Marwood was ruined by Carker. Dombey, Carker's employer, meets Edith, Carker's sister. Harriet befriends Alice, who happens to pass Harriet's house. None of these relationships has any visible connection with any of the others, yet the events that grow out of them come together in the end. One specific bond is discovered between two of the people involved: is it somehow the main strand of a web? or is it one of several strands, the rest of which remain hidden? The precise nature of the design is not explained—after all, why should a blood relationship account for the interweaving of all these lives?—but that very imprecision, coupled with the portentousness of the glimpse of hidden machinery that we do receive, is the whole point. Life is inexplicable, but there is more to it than appears on the surface. Dickens deals explicitly with the theme, too: "In this round world of many circles within circles," he says at one point, "do we make a weary journey from the high grade to the low, to find at last that they lie close together, that the two extremes touch, and that our journey's end is but our starting-place?" (ch. xxiv). The same mysterious symmetry informs the world of *Bleak House*: "What connexion can there be, between the place in Lincolnshire, the house in town, . . . and the whereabouts of Joe the outlaw with the broom . . . ? What connexion can there have been between many people in the innumerable histories of this world, who, from opposite sides of great gulfs, have, nevertheless, been very curiously brought together!" (ch. xvi).

The hidden connection: the mystery is as significant as the link itself. Dickens' way of expressing his belief in the active management by divine Providence of a deep-laid design, and his wonder at it, was to imitate in his art what he believed to be the ways of Providence: "only to suggest," as he wrote Collins, "until the fulfilment comes." The plot "too elaborately trapped, baited, and prepared" not only dissipated the reader's interest; it was false to "the ways of Providence, of which ways all art is but a little imitation."

Partly, of course, one sees in Dickens' letter to Collins the serial novelist's practical concern for maintaining suspense. If too much groundwork is laid in the open, it will point too unmistakably to the conclusion of the story. (In his essay on Dickens and Collins, T. S. Eliot says that this is in fact what happens as a rule in Collins' fiction.<sup>11</sup>) Or one might argue that Dickens was merely contending for a structural convention with a long history, not making a confession of faith that echoed the evangelical world view. But is that really likely? Dickens was no scholar in the history of his craft. On the other hand, he certainly did believe that art should be moral—that is, should present a picture of the world faithful in essence to the original—and he certainly was closely tuned enough to the tastes and aspirations of his age to participate in them himself. It seems much more probable that this was not merely a technical matter to Dickens. His personal view of life was involved. According to his friend and biographer John Forster, "On the coincidences, resemblances, and surprises of life, Dickens liked especially to dwell, and few things moved his fancy so pleasantly. The world, he would say, was so much smaller than we thought it; we were all so connected by fate without knowing it; people supposed to be far apart were so constantly elbowing each other; and to-morrow bore so close a resemblance to nothing half so much as to yesterday."<sup>12</sup>

The core of Dickens' objection to Collins' method of plotting, then, must surely be that it was simply not consistent with Dickens' view of how life's meaning becomes manifest. Collins' method annihilated all the wonder. For the mystery in life it substituted a mere puzzle. It ruled out the sort of suggestive incident that Dickens felt Providence was partial to, and so failed to convey the sense of hidden significance and of the divine guidance behind it all that Dickens, like Cowper and Hannah More, felt when contemplating the nap and pile of human affairs.

The kind of incident in question occurs often in *Bleak House*, the first of Dickens' novels to appear after he met Collins. In chapter viii Esther Summerson describes her first morning in the house from which the novel somewhat incongruously takes its name. Up before daylight, she watches the landscape take shape and substance gradually as day advances. Objects at first only faintly visible become recognizable, more and more details become apparent, until at last the dark places are all gone. For Esther the incident is a portent; in just this way she comes to a full knowledge of who she is. Similarly, there is the strange disturbance and sense of familiarity that she feels in the presence of her as yet unrevealed mother, Lady Dedlock (ch. xviii). And there is too the scene where Richard Carstone, fatally drawn to the Chancery case of Jarndyce and Jarndyce, drives away from Bleak House to London, and to his death, behind a gaunt pale horse (ch. xxxvii). These are not incidents of the kind that Dickens seems to have thought characteristic of Collins' invention (and rightly, as any reader of Collins can testify): links in a chain, the full significance

of which will emerge only in the backward light cast by the resolution of the plot. In and of themselves, these incidents can illuminate the meaning of life for the characters in *Bleak House* if they are wise enough. These incidents, for Dickens as for the evangelical Christian, are the sort that Providence arranges for us to give us clues to the power governing our lives.

If, then, Collins' influence were the main reason for Dickens' greater strength in plotting in his later novels, as has customarily been alleged, it hardly seems likely that Dickens would have maintained so firmly a view of plot construction fundamentally at odds with Collins' view. And he did maintain it. In the unfinished *Mystery of Edwin Drood*, of course, Dickens was working more in Collins' vein, writing a mystery thriller to challenge him at his own game; but even there Dickens uses the portentous incident—for example, the storm that topples chimneys and tears up roof slates on the night that (as nearly all critics now agree) Edwin Drood was murdered. In *Great Expectations* Pip discovers Estella's identity from hints and suggestions akin to those tremors that Esther felt in the presence of Lady Dedlock, not from a train of events laid down "with the care that conceals itself" and seemingly without meaning until some light breaks to illuminate the whole sequence. In *Little Dorrit* there is the periodic rustling sound that warns of the collapse of Mrs. Clennam's house; in *Our Mutual Friend* the drowning imagery and action that foreshadow the destruction of Bradley Headstone and the salvation of Eugene Wrayburn; in *A Tale of Two Cities* the whole schematic arrangement of parallel events. In Dickens such details are of the essence, not merely stage props introduced for atmosphere.

That Dickens did in this respect hold to his own technique so firmly bears out what his explicit statement about Providence and its ways suggests: the evangelical outlook on life is very far from being a superficial element in Dickens' own world view. And a thorough understanding of the consequences of that strain for his work indicates that the influence of Collins on his technique has been exaggerated. This is not to claim that Collins' work suggested nothing at all to Dickens. But given the sense of design in life that I have argued Dickens possessed, his later strength in plotting may be accounted for by pointing to his growing technical skill and to his growing awareness of the complexity of life, quite as well as by invoking the influence of Collins. That influence may have speeded Dickens' development; his bristling pride in his own craftsmanship doubtless impelled him to show his young friend that he too could lace things together as tightly need be. But the basis in belief for doing so was his already, his share in that part of the Victorian outlook stemming from evangelical Christianity.

University of Connecticut

Harland S. Nelson

#### FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> *Dickens* (London and New York, 1906), pp. 111, 201; *The Dickens Circle: A Narrative of the Novelist's Friendships* (New York, 1919), p. 334.
- <sup>2</sup> *The History of the English Novel* (London, 1924-39), VII (1936), 305. For similar passages, see pp. 238 and 257.
- <sup>3</sup> Jack Lindsay, *Charles Dickens: A Biographical and Critical Study* (London, 1950), pp. 363, 391; Lionel Stevenson, *The English Novel: A Panorama* (Boston, 1960), p. 325; Walter Allen, *The English Novel: A Short Critical History* (London, 1954), p. 163; *A Literary History of England*, ed. Albert C. Baugh (New York, 1948), p. 1349.
- <sup>4</sup> *Victorian England: Portrait of an Age*, 2nd ed. (Garden City, N.Y.; Doubleday Anchor Books, 1954), p. 12.
- <sup>5</sup> "Dickens," *Essays in Literary Criticism of George Santayana*, ed. Irving Singer (New York, 1956), p. 212.
- <sup>6</sup> *The Letters of Charles Dickens*, ed. Walter Dexter (London, 1938), III, 124 f. (Oct. 6, 1859). (This is Vol. XIII of the Nonesuch Dickens.) I owe this reference to Richard M. Baker, *The Drood Murder Case* (Berkeley, 1951), p. 57.
- <sup>7</sup> *The Works of the Rev. Sydney Smith* (London, 1839), I, 121.
- <sup>8</sup> *The Works of Hannah More* (London, 1830), Vol. VIII. *Practical Piety* was published in 1811.
- <sup>9</sup> *Works*, IX, 31, 33 f. Mrs. More published *Christian Morals* in 1813.
- <sup>10</sup> *Letters*, III, 162 f. (June 5, 1860).
- <sup>11</sup> "Wilkie Collins and Dickens," *Selected Essays*, 3rd ed. (London, 1951), p. 468.
- <sup>12</sup> *The Life of Charles Dickens*, BR. I, ch. v.

## II. NOTES AND BRIEF ARTICLES

### I. CLOUGH AND GRAHAM GREENE'S *THE QUIET AMERICAN*

Graham Greene's *The Quiet American* (The Viking Press, New York, 1956) is prefaced by two

epigraphs, identified only by the names of their authors. The first is by A. H. Clough (Claude to Eustace, *Amours de Voyage*, Canto II, lines 272-275):

I do not like being moved: for the will is excited;  
and action  
Is a most dangerous thing; I tremble for something  
factitious,  
Some malpractice of heart and illegitimate process;  
We're so prone to these things, with our terrible  
notions of duty.

The second is by Lord Byron (*Don Juan*, Canto I, Stanza 132, lines 1049-1051):

This is the patent age of new inventions  
For killing bodies, and for saving souls,  
All propagated with the best intentions.

In the novel the narrator, an English newspaperman named Thomas Fowler, apparently speaks for Greene in attacking American policy in what was French Indo-China as well meaning but ignorant, unintelligent, and meddlesome. Alden Pyle, "the quiet American," has the best intentions, yet does "a lot of harm" in his quest for a third force between the French and the Communist Vietminh of Ho-Chi-Minh. Hence Fowler remarks: "God save us always from the innocent and the good." With irony fiercely pricking American foibles and attitudes Greene describes Pyle's father, Professor Harold C. Pyle, "world authority on under-water erosion," as holding isolationist views with respect to American foreign policy; but the interventionist son, ostensibly attached to the American Economic Mission though in reality a member of the O.S.S., and the father agree in a common devotion to the fad of "health" foods. The third force, armed with a new type of explosives particularly suitable for sabotage and terrorism, engages in futile and meaningless violence. And if the results of American intervention are the outcome of the acts of a fool rushing in where angels fear to tread, the other Americans in the novel are presented in an even less favorable light than the younger Pyle. Granger, the American journalist, is shrewd, boorish, lecherous, and loathsomely sentimental. The American Economic Attaché is repugnantly pictured as "a stout middle-aged man with an exaggerated bottom and a face that looked as if it had never needed a razor."

As though to comment on Pyle's statement that he has wired to Washington for permission to use "some of our funds" for the relief of the relatives of those killed or wounded in the acts of terrorism he has facilitated, Fowler quotes from Clough, identified (page 234) only as "an adult poet in the nineteenth century. There weren't so many of them":

I drive through the streets and I care not a damn,  
The people they stare, and they ask who I am;  
And if I should chance to run over a cad,  
I can pay for the damage if ever so bad.  
So pleasant it is to have money, heigh ho!  
So pleasant it is to have money.

These verses are from *Dipsychus* (lines 124-129) and are spoken by the Mephistophelean Spirit.

The foregoing note testifies to Greene's distaste for the policy of the United States in the war for Indo-China which culminated in the French disaster of Dien-Bien-Phu. It also reveals Greene's judgment that evil may result from good intentions if these are not directed by political wisdom. But it is primarily written to demonstrate Greene's employment of poetry conversational in tone, realistic and practical in point of view, moralistic in intent to illuminate the theme. These qualities are in Byron and in Clough.

Are *The Quiet American* and the Oxford editions of *The Poems* (1951) and *The Correspondence* (1957) signs of a Clough revival?

The City College of New York

Harry W. Rudman

## 2. ARTHUR HUGH CLOUGH AND FRANCIS H. UNDERWOOD

Arthur Hugh Clough's relationship with America was, as is well known, particularly close, but one relationship with an American literary figure has up till now, with the irony that seems to haunt everything connected with Clough, escaped notice. The name of Francis Henry Underwood does not appear in the most recent histories of American literature, but he deserves nevertheless to be remembered as the originator and, substantially, founder of the *Atlantic Monthly* and as the intimate friend and associate of such men as Longfellow, James Russell Lowell, and Oliver Wendell Holmes.<sup>1</sup>

Underwood first conceived the idea of the magazine in 1852, and the work of commencing it was at an advanced state when in the latter part of 1853 the publishing house which was to undertake

it failed. He then joined the house of Sampson, Phillips & Company and with the support of Harriet Beecher Stowe and others persuaded them to take up the project. By June 1857 preparations were in full swing, and Underwood went to England to solicit manuscripts from noted authors of the day, among whom Clough was included.

Clough had not met Underwood during his visit to the United States in 1852-53, and Underwood on his arrival in London sent Clough a note of introduction from Lowell asking for an interview. The reply which he received follows.<sup>2</sup>

St. Marks Crescent  
Monday [June 29, 1857]

A. H. Clough  
Sept. 1857 [in another hand]<sup>3</sup>

Dear Mr Underwood

I am very sorry you did not come in on Monday—[Monday seems to be written over Sunday, but the day of the week intended is uncertain]

Can you come with Mr Coolidge<sup>4</sup> to Combe Hurst (Mrs. Clough's former home) on Thursday or Friday. There will be dinner at 7 & a bed, at your service.— Thursday I believe would be more convenient, but if you will excuse Mr Smith's<sup>5</sup> possible absence, Friday will also be suitable—

The house is 3 miles from the Putney Station on the Southwestern Windsor Railway. A train leaves Waterloo Station at 1/4 before 5, & reaches Putney at 5, & thence an omnibus will take you to Mr Smith's door—

Yours faithfully  
A. H. Clough.

Please to direct to me  
at S. Smith Esq.'s  
Combe Hurst  
Kingston on Thames  
S. W

Combe Hurst is 3 miles across the Park from Richmond (if you go there). It is 1/4 mile to the left of the Ladder Stile.

Clough contributed his "Amours de Voyage" to the new periodical,<sup>6</sup> but whether as a result of Underwood's solicitation or that of Lowell, or both, one cannot be sure. The two corresponded more than once,<sup>7</sup> but it is hard to estimate the closeness of their acquaintance. Much later Underwood recorded his impression of the poet in words which do not indicate great intimacy. In his biographical sketch of James Russell Lowell he writes:

Arthur Hugh Clough, an English scholar and poet, lived in Cambridge for about a year (1885), and appears to have made a deep impression upon Lowell. The unlearned public knows little of Clough; but all poets know the author of "The Bothie" and "*Qua Cursum Ventus,*" and cultivated people know the charming memoir of the author by Professor Norton. He had a beautiful, spiritual face and delicate, shy manners; such a face and such manners as are dimly seen in morning dreams. One may be sure that such a rare being, if real flesh and blood, would at some time be found at Elmwood.<sup>8</sup>

And in his *Hand-Book of English Literature* he remarks:

Mr. Clough was a reserved, quiet man, with a sweet simplicity of manner rare even among poets and scholars. His attachment to his American friends and to republican principles was strong; and it may be mentioned, to show his self-denying generosity, that, during the Irish famine in 1847, while Tutor at Oxford, he advocated and practised a rigid abstinence from luxuries, in order to relieve the distress in the sister island.<sup>9</sup>

Clough and Underwood are perhaps most alike in the sense they gave their contemporaries of unfulfilled promise. But Clough's achievement was, after all, of solid value, and his importance at the heart of the Victorian era is beginning at last to be recognized. Underwood was not so fortunate. His work tantalizes with the hint of something much finer, but it is only potentially excellent. Of his books, the most interesting is his first novel, *Lord of Himself* (1874), which depicts the Kentucky life he had experienced as a young man. The dialogue is generally wooden, the plotting weak, and the leading ideas of the book are imperfectly unified and resolved, but scenes occasionally come to life, and at times he is able to fuse his uneasy combination of realism and romance into moments of true feeling and to give valid insights into the characters and events he is portraying. His most praised work, *Quabbin, the Story of a New England Town* (1893),<sup>10</sup> I find



strangely disappointing, though it contains a number of vivid scenes. Its uneasy combination of fiction, social history, and analysis make it uneven, and Underwood is unable to be sufficiently objective about his native village. The other novels, *Man Proposes* (1880)<sup>11</sup> and *Dr. Gray's Quest* (1895), are undistinguished, although the latter again suggests latent powers. His biographies, or biographical sketches as he called them, of Longfellow, Lowell, and Whittier are pleasantly discursive and contain a good deal of information, despite Underwood's reticence about his own relationships with his subjects, but they are finally disappointing.

His later career was not, however, devoted to literature, and his books were done in the intervals afforded by his other work. With the dissolution of Sampson, Phillips & Company in 1859, he lost his place as sub-editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*, and he never regained an important position in the literary life of his time. His friendships with literary men continued, however, and during several periods as United States consul at Glasgow towards the end of his life he came to know George Meredith and other contemporary English writers.<sup>12</sup>

But it is as the founder of the *Atlantic Monthly* that Underwood ought to be remembered and as a link, particularly in his acquaintance with Clough, in the Anglo-American literary connection during the nineteenth century.

Boston University

David Bonnell Green

#### FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> The fullest accounts of Underwood (1825-1894) are in Bliss Perry, *Park-Street Papers* (Boston, 1908), pp. 205-237, reprinted from the *Atlantic Monthly*, C (1907), 658-678, and John Townsend Trowbridge, *My Own Story, With Recollections of Noted Persons* (Boston, 1903), *passim*, reprinted in part from the *Atlantic Monthly*, LXXV (1895), 108-116. See also *DAB*.
- <sup>2</sup> I should like to thank Miss Katherine Duff and Mr. R. Norris Williams, 2d, and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania for their kind permission to print this letter. I should also like to express warm thanks to Professor F. L. Mulhauser for his kindness in making transcripts of several Clough letters available to me. Editorial insertions are placed in square brackets.
- <sup>3</sup> This date is clearly not right. As Clough's letter of June 23, 1857, to Charles Eliot Norton makes plain, Underwood had just arrived in London and had sent Clough a letter of introduction from Lowell. Clough planned to go to Combe Hurst on Monday or Tuesday, June 29 or 30, according to Blanche Clough's letter of June 25, 1857, to Norton, but on Monday, June 29, he was still in London. He therefore wrote the letter here printed to Underwood suggesting that he come to Combe Hurst on July 2 or 3. During most of July Clough was on vacation in the Lake District and wrote to Florence Nightingale that he expected to be back on Saturday, August 1. Underwood had sailed for England early in June 1857 and was back at his desk by August 15 at the latest. June 29, 1857, seems therefore the only possible date for the letter, which should be numbered 885a with reference to the "Catalogue of All Known Letters" in *The Correspondence of Arthur Hugh Clough*, ed. Frederick L. Mulhauser (Oxford, 1957), II, 622-649.
- <sup>4</sup> Joseph Randolph Coolidge, lawyer, son of Joseph Coolidge, Jr., and Eleanor Wayles Randolph, older brother of Thomas Jefferson Coolidge, Sr., and great grandson of Thomas Jefferson.
- <sup>5</sup> Samuel Smith (1784-1880), father of Clough's wife.
- <sup>6</sup> *Atlantic Monthly*, I (1858), 419-426, 536-543, 667-673, 784-790.
- <sup>7</sup> Perry (p. 236) speaks of "many hospitable notes from Charles Reade, Wilkie Collins, John Forster, A. H. Clough, and other English writers."
- <sup>8</sup> James Russell Lowell, *A Biographical Sketch* (Boston, 1882), pp. 159-160.
- <sup>9</sup> (Boston, 1875), p. 560.
- <sup>10</sup> George F. Whicher, in *DAB*, calls it "his best book. . . a pleasantly discursive account of Enfield [Massachusetts] as he remembered it from his boyhood."
- <sup>11</sup> This is incorrectly dated 1885 in *DAB*.
- <sup>12</sup> Perry writes (p. 276) that "he made friends [during his consulship at Glasgow] as always and everywhere, and the most brilliant of living writers is represented in the scrap-book by some letters inquiring into the value of certain American securities, which Underwood had recommended him to purchase. To name these securities now might invoke the Comic Spirit." The scrap-book to which Perry refers was (p. 207) in "two huge leather-backed volumes" and contained "hundreds upon hundreds of letters received during his forty years of correspondence with many of the foremost American and English writing men." Underwood's potential reputation received a deathblow from the dispersal of these two volumes.

### 3. A NOTE ON BROWNING'S DEFENSE OF CHATTERTON

In his excellent edition of Browning's *Essay on Chatterton* (Cambridge, Mass., 1948), Professor Donald Smalley has given us a detailed analysis of Browning's misinterpretation of Thomas Chatterton's character and has demonstrated how clearly this foretold the mature Browning's penchant for "special pleading" as well as his habitually faulty understanding of historical characters. It is the purpose of this note to call attention to a passage in the essay which might cast further light on Browning's misdirected defense of Chatterton.

Browning writes:

Genius almost invariably begins to develop itself by imitation. It has, in the short-sightedness of infancy, faith in the world; and its object is to compete with, or prove superior to, the world's already recognized idols, at their own performances and by their own methods. This done, there grows up a faith in itself: and, no longer taking the performance or method of another for granted, it supersedes these by processes of its own. It creates, and imitates no longer. Seeing cause for faith in something external and better, and having attained to a moral end and aim, it next discovers in itself the only remaining antagonist worthy of its ambition, and in the subduing what at first had seemed its most enviable powers, arrives at the more or less complete fulfilment of its earthy mission. (p. 111)

Professor Smalley has noted (pp. 140-141) certain parallels between this passage and the semi-autobiographical heroes of *Pauline* and *Sordello*, but in a larger sense this passage comments upon Browning's own experiences as a struggling author and explains, in part, Browning's sympathetic view of Chatterton.

By late spring of 1842, to which Professor Smalley assigns the composition of this essay (pp. 10-11), Browning was just beginning to taste the success he had been pursuing for nearly a decade. Of the work accomplished by this time—*Pauline* (1833), *Paracelsus* (1835), *Strafford* (1836), *Sordello* (1840), and parts of *Bells and Pomegranates*—only *Bells and Pomegranates* had received anything like the success the poet had hoped for. But the path was looking brighter before him, and Browning had a right to feel that the pieces he had lately composed, and would soon publish in *Dramatic Lyrics*, were in a more popular vein. From his improving position he could look philosophically upon the parallels between Chatterton's unhappy career and his own early years.

Like Chatterton, he had imitated others. Like Chatterton, he had had the ambition to outdo established "idols, at their own performances and by their own methods." On a blank page of a copy of *Pauline*, in fact, he alluded to the details of this ambition:

The following Poem was written in pursuance of a foolish plan which occupied me mightily for a time, and which had for its object the enabling me to assume and realize I know not how many different characters;—meanwhile the world was never to guess that 'Brown, Smith, Jones, and Robinson' (as the spelling books have it) the respective authors of this poem, the other novel, such an opera, such a speech &c. &c. were no other than one and the same individual, (*Letters of Robert Browning, Collected by Thomas J. Wise*. Ed. by Thurman L. Hood, London, 1933, p. 367.)

Like the ideal Chatterton he was creating, he had abandoned unworthy imitation and found in his own genius "the only remaining antagonist worthy of its ambition."

Enjoying in 1842 the prospects of long-sought-for success, Browning was able to carry these parallels one step further, this time into the purely hypothetical: If Chatterton's career had not been cut short by the harshness of unimaginative critics and enemies, his natural genius would have come to the surface, to the lasting benefit of the world of letters.

St. Bonaventure University

Boyd A. Litzinger

#### 4. SHELLEY, DEVERE, AND THOMPSON'S "HOUND OF HEAVEN"

One of the greatest shortcomings of the once-popular sport of source-hunting in English poetry was that too often a scholar seized upon a word or phrase common to a pair of poems without considering the respective contexts of these words or the tone and connotations they assumed within their matrixes. Such has been the case with the suggestions advanced for the origin of the title of Francis Thompson's "The Hound of Heaven." The source most frequently suggested by students of Thompson is Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound* I.34, where appears the phrase "Heaven's winged hound." R. L. Megroz, for example, writes that "the very image [of the Hound of Heaven] seems to be Shelley's, for his 'winged hound of heaven' in 'Prometheus' is the nearest model of Thompson's in English Poetry. . . ." <sup>1</sup> Such speculation ignores, however, the context of the quotation, for Prometheus' words describe the vulture <sup>2</sup> that knaws at his vitals: "Heaven's winged hound, polluting from thy lips/His beak in poison not his own, tears up/My heart; and shapeless sights come wandering by" (I.34-36). It is unlikely that Thompson so completely misread the passage in *Prometheus Unbound* that his mind stored up the image with favorable connotations to bring it forth as a symbol for Divine Love.

Another possibility has been advanced by T. A. Pijpers, who suggests, in his monograph *Aubrey De Vere as a Man of Letters* (Nijmegen-Utrecht, 1941), that Thompson may have taken the image from De Vere's legend of "Kind Sigebert of East Anglia, and Heida the Prophetess," where the

expression is "the Winged Hound of Heaven." Once again, however, the context of the phrase militates against the assumption, for when we turn to the poem we find: "She stood: she sang a death-song centuries old, / The dirge prophetic of Gods and men: / The iron age shall make an iron end: / The men who lived in hate, or impious love, / Shall meet in one red battle field. That day / The forests of the earth, blackening, shall die; / The stars down-fall; the Winged Hound of Heaven, / That chased the Sun from age to age, shall close / O'er it at last . . ." (*Legend of the Saxon Saints* [London, 1879], p. 78). Here is certainly the idea of pursuit, but as in the passage from *Prometheus Unbound*, the connotations accompanying "the Winged Hound of Heaven" are those of violence and destruction; Thompson could not have been consciously drawing on the correlative value of such an image for his poem, nor is it likely that he would have subconsciously reversed the tenor of its associations. It is far more likely that he drew his conception of the Hound of Heaven from a context that generated favorable overtones.

There is, in fact, such a source from which Thompson could have drawn his title. In the fourth stanza of "Lines Composed near Shelley's House at Lerici"<sup>3</sup> De Vere wrote of Shelley: "Here he caught / Visions divine. He saw in fiery flight / The 'hound of Heaven,' with heavenly vengeance fraught, / 'Run down the slanted sunlight of the morn;' / Prometheus frown on Jove with scorn for scorn." De Vere, here quoting Shelley from memory, not only misquotes but also confuses the vulture, "Heaven's winged hound," with Mercury, whose exit is described by Panthea in these words: "See where the child of Heaven, with winged feet, / Runs down the slanted sunlight of the dawn" (*Prometheus Unbound* I.437-438). Although the mistake is a natural one, the recurrence of the words "Heaven" and "winged" making plausible such confusion of the two passages, in telescoping the two images De Vere completely alters the tone of "the hound of Heaven," bringing it into harmony with Thompson's use of the expression. Moreover, here for the first time the phrase appears without the accompanying adjective "winged," and there is no evidence that in Thompson's poem the Hound of Heaven retains even vestiges of wings.

What I suggest, then, is that if we must name a source for the title of Thompson's masterpiece, the image is to be found in its final form in De Vere's lines honoring the master of both poets. De Vere's juxtaposing of "the hound of Heaven" with such phrases as "visions divine" and "heavenly vengeance" would lend a religious aura to the image, while the line "Runs down the slanted sunlight of the morn," referring as it does to one called in its context "the child of Heaven," would reinforce this favorable connotation, thus leading naturally to Thompson's use of the phrase as the title of the divine pursuer.

Duke University

Donald H. Reiman

#### FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Francis Thompson: *The Poet of Earth in Heaven* (London, 1927), p. 130. See also John Thomson, *Francis Thompson: Poet and Mystic* (London, 1923), pp. 116-117, Terence L. Connolly, *Poems of Francis Thompson* (New York, 1932), p. 350.
- <sup>2</sup> Hounds, like wolves, are always symbols of evil in Shelley's poetry. Cf. *Prometheus* I.331, 341, II.iii.65, IV.73; *Adonais*, II. 279, 333; *Prologue to Hellas*, l. 144; *Hellas*, ll. 468, 528; *Cenci* IV.i.91, V.i.8; *Ode to Naples*, l. 82; *Orpheus*, l. 48.
- <sup>3</sup> *Fraser's Magazine*, LVI (November 1857), 547-550. The poem appears in collections of De Vere's poetry under slightly varying titles and with a minor alteration in punctuation; in *Irish Odes and Other Poems* (New York, 1869), p. 130 and *Alexander the Great and Other Poems* (London, 1892), p. 358, the entire phrase "The hound of Heaven" is enclosed in quotation marks.

## 5. THE FIRST PUBLISHED AMERICAN TEXT OF ARNOLD'S "LITERATURE AND SCIENCE"

An American printing of Matthew Arnold's "Literature and Science," substantially the essay which was collected in *Discourses in America* (1885), has for over seventy-five years escaped detection.<sup>1</sup> It appeared in April 1884 in *The Manhattan: an Illustrated Monthly Magazine*, edited by William Henry Forman.<sup>2</sup> Just as the Rede Lecture delivered at Cambridge University had been the basis for the essay published in *Nineteenth Century* in August 1882, so this same lecture, revised for delivery during Arnold's American tour of 1883-1884, was the basis for the American printing in *Manhattan* less than a month after Arnold sailed back to England.

One may briefly characterize the *Manhattan* text by distinguishing it from its predecessor in *Nineteenth Century* and its successor in *Discourses in America*. The essential difference in substance is between the introduction to the *Nineteenth Century* text and the introduction published in *Manhattan* and *Discourses*. The *Nineteenth Century* text begins with five paragraphs bearing immediately on the occasion, the delivery of the Rede Lecture at Cambridge. The *Manhattan* text begins with four paragraphs (broken into six in the *Discourses*) devoted to considering the applicability of Plato's ideas to a "great work-a-day world like the United States." The *Nineteenth*

*Century* introduction is the longest, some 278 words longer than that in *Manhattan* and 240 words longer than that in *Discourses*. Another difference, really more a matter of arrangement than of substance, is to be found between the conclusions in *Nineteenth Century* and in its successors. The conclusion in *Nineteenth Century* (paragraphs 34 and 35) is reordered and revised in later versions. One effect of these alterations is the lengthening of later conclusions. The *Manhattan* conclusion is 223 words longer, the *Discourse* conclusion 249 words longer, than that in *Nineteenth Century*. What length Arnold saved in the *Manhattan-Discourses* introduction, then, he expended in the conclusion. To account for the fact that the later texts are successively longer than the *Nineteenth Century* one, one has to remark the numerous brief additions to the body of the *Manhattan* text, additions of words, phrases, parenthetical expressions. Yet, even here, Arnold's revisions should not be exaggerated. Not one whole sentence is peculiar to the *Manhattan* text.<sup>3</sup> Some peculiarities of the *Manhattan* text are inevitably typographical, yet there are remarkably few variations in spelling and word-division from the two British versions. *Manhattan*, for instance, gives *learned* for *learnt*, *endeavoring* for *endeavouring*; *anyone* for *any one*, *forever* for *for ever*.

That the *Manhattan* text differs so little from the other two may make its neglect defensible but does not explain it. There would seem to be two good reasons why the *Manhattan* text has so long gone unnoted. The first is Arnold's silence about its existence. The second is the obscurity of *Manhattan*. One scans Arnold's correspondence in vain for any clear hint of the matter. Only after one knows of the *Manhattan* publication can he see a possible relevance in Arnold's remark to Alexander Macmillan in a letter dated 1 January 1884: "Of course they are wild to print the 'Emerson' here, and I wish I had him to sell them, but I keep him for you as promised." <sup>4</sup> We know that Arnold kept his promise to Macmillan and that "Emerson" appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine* in May 1884. We also know that the first of the three American lectures, "Numbers; or, The Majority and the Remnant," appeared in *Nineteenth Century* in April 1884. What we may now guess is that "they" got Arnold's remaining American lecture, "Literature and Science," and arranged for its publication in *Manhattan* in April 1884.

Who "they" were can at least be hazarded. "They" could have included Brander Matthews and H. C. Bunner. These two were among the members of the Authors' Club who held a reception for Arnold in New York City on the evening of February 28.<sup>5</sup> Matthews was one of the dignitaries who saw Arnold off March 8 on the SS *Servis*,<sup>6</sup> and Bunner and Matthews both wrote for *Manhattan* and served as intermediaries between that periodical and other contributors. In the first year of its existence, 1883, *Manhattan* paid contributors well. For example, Bunner sold a ballad by Austin Dobson to *Manhattan* for \$50.00, and Matthews relayed Dobson the check.<sup>7</sup> By the time the twenty-first and final number appeared, in September 1884, *Manhattan* was not paying at all. As Matthews wrote Dobson in October of that year, "*Manhattan* has blown up—owing [Laurence] Hutton and me £20."<sup>8</sup>

It is unlikely that so eminent a Victorian as Arnold did not get paid for an article published six months before *Manhattan* blew up. But it is possible that he felt it undesirable or unnecessary to call attention to the fact that he had published a very important essay in an obscure and ephemeral periodical.

That Arnold did not acknowledge the *Manhattan* version is almost excused by its disappointingly close correspondence to the text which was to appear in *Discourses in America* the following year. Yet what Arnold was silent about we do well to remember. An early American printing exists, and by our recognition of that fact we come a step closer to the establishment of the full Arnold canon.

University of Cincinnati

James K. Robinson

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Arnold, as will be suggested, contributed to the oversight. Relevant works which carry no reference to the American printing include Thomas B. Smart, *The Bibliography of Matthew Arnold* (1892); J. D. McCallum, "The Apostle of Culture Meets America," *New England Quarterly*, 2 (1929), 357-361; E. P. Lawrence, "An Apostle's Progress: Matthew Arnold in America," P.Q. X (1931), 63-79; Chilson Hathaway Leonard, "Arnold in America," (Yale dissertation, 1932); Marion Mainwaring, "Notes Towards a Matthew Arnold Bibliography," *MP*, 49 (1952), 189-194.

<sup>2</sup> See Matthew Arnold, "Literature and Science," *Manhattan: an Illustrated Monthly Magazine*, III (1884), 323-332.

<sup>3</sup> The following chart indicates in terms of number of words per paragraph the extent of Arnold's revisions:

NINETEENTH CENTURY		MANHATTAN		DISCOURSES		COMMENT
Par.	Words	Par.	Words	Par.	Words	
Introduction						
1	144	1	356	1	235	Non. par. 1 is pars. 1 and 2 in Disc.
2	312			2	121	
3	134	2	117	3	117	
4	182	3	191	4	195	

NINETEENTH CENTURY		MANHATTAN		DISCOURSES		COMMENT
Par.	Words	Par.	Words	Par.	Words	
5	477	4	307	5	118	Man. par. 4 is pars. 5 and 6 in <i>Disc.</i>
	1249		971	6	223	
					1009	
Body						
6	199	5	196	7	206	Beginning with NC par. 6, pars. having similar or identical content are on same line.
7	168	6	187	8	187	
8	148	7	163	9	170	
9	168	8	168	10	176	
10	112	9	114	11	117	
11	122	10	122	12	122	
12	111	11	111	13	113	
13	396	12	399	14	399	
14	153	13	154	15	154	
15	106	14	108	16	108	
16	434	15	440	17	452	
17	222	16	233	18	237	
18	234	17	235	19	144	
				20	119	
19	183	18	184	21	185	
20	71	19	71	22	71	
21	101	20	151	23	170	
22	187	21	207	24	221	
23	181	22	183	25	185	
24	241	23	242	26	247	
25	291	24	322	27	325	
26	177	25	172	28	174	
27	212	26	226	29	226	
28	579	27	630	30	584	This is the only case in which a par. in <i>Man.</i> is longer than its parallel par. in <i>Disc.</i>
29	89	28	93	31	93	
30	172	29	182	32	183	
31	145	30	153	33	155	
32	145	31	151	34	151	
33	76	32	76	35	76	
34	269	36	280	39	284	
35	490	35	92	38	90	
		33	327	36	347	
		34	283	37	287	
	6182		6655		6758	
Grand Total:	7431		7826		7767	

<sup>4</sup> Quoted in William E. Buckler, *Matthew Arnold's Books: Toward a Publishing Diary* (Genève: Librairie E. Droz, 1958), p. 162.

<sup>5</sup> See Leonard, "Arnold in America," p. 243.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 246.

<sup>7</sup> See Austin Dobson, "The Ballad of the Judgment of Paris," *Manhattan: an Illustrated Literary Magazine*, II (1883), 539. Matthews encloses the check with his letter to Dobson of Nov. 19, 1883, and comments on the publication in his letter of Dec. 3, 1883. Both letters are in the Austin Dobson Collection, University of London Library.

<sup>8</sup> See Matthews' letter to Dobson of Oct. 22, 1884, in Austin Dobson Collection, Univ. of London Library.

## 6. SOURCE OF AN "INSPIRATION": Francis Newman's Influence on the Form of "The Dream of Gerontius"

With the publication of the *Apologia pro Vita Sua* in 1864, John Henry Newman emerged triumphantly from two decades of estrangement from most of his countrymen, during which he had been regarded with hostility or—worse—"thought 'passe' and forgotten."<sup>1</sup> Although Newman was then 63 years old, both he and his friends felt that the renewed attention of the British public offered an opportunity for deeds comparable, perhaps, to those of his days at Oxford. "Now you have got the ear of the public—" he was advised, "take care not to lose it again by your silence." He wrote in his journal, "[the *Apologia's*] success has put me in spirits to look out for other means of doing good,"<sup>2</sup> and to his brother Francis he expressed the desire to accomplish "some one great work."

But what sort of work should it be? To the surprise of those who had expected some new

foray into polemic or apologetic, Newman's first production, finished early in 1865, was "The Dream of Gerontius." This long dramatic poem of a Christian's death, judgment, and initiation into heaven was the most ambitious poetic effort of Newman's life. It was all the more unexpected in that the twenty years since he had left Littlemore had occasioned fewer than two dozen short hymns and lyrics, none of which gave any hint of the experimentation with dramatic form and blank verse embodied in "Gerontius." The poet himself could offer no satisfactory explanation, as he confessed in a letter of October, 1865:

On the 17th of January last, it came into my head to write it, I really can't tell how. And I wrote on till it was finished on small bits of paper, and I could no more write anything else by willing it than I could fly.<sup>3</sup>

As to the theme of the poem, Newman's biographers agree in tracing it to an incident of the Kingsley controversy, when he had

been seized with a very vivid apprehension of immediately impending death, apparently derived from a medical opinion—so vivid as to lead him to write [a] memorandum headed "written in prospect of death," and dated Passion Sunday, 1864...<sup>4</sup>

This incident of the spring of 1864 explains how Newman's mind was turned to the "last things," but it casts no light on the literary form in which he decided to embody his reflections. I believe, however, that the form of "Gerontius" may have been derived from a suggestion of his brother Francis, made in a letter which discusses at length the possibilities for John's proposed "great work."

Kindly, eccentric, at odds all his life with his elder brother's religious positions, Francis William Newman was not to be the mentor of John's future efforts. He explicitly cautioned him to avoid theology and philosophy, unable to foresee that the crowning effort of Newman's final period would be such a work as the *Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*. He did not overestimate his influence on the future cardinal, but said of his letter of October 15, 1864, that "it may turn the scale of your mind if it so chance that you are already debating the very thing which I suggest." His limited expectation appears to have been fulfilled, for his suggestion was that John should turn to religious poetry. Specifically, he recommended Aeschylean tragedy; and though it is obvious from his further remarks that he expected something rather different from what actually resulted, the dramatic form of "The Dream of Gerontius" and its extensive use of choruses seems to owe something to Francis' suggestion. Furthermore, he warns against "propagandism" in poetry; and Charles Frederick Harrold, who believes most of Newman's poems to be impaired by this propagandistic tendency, does not bring the charge against "Gerontius."<sup>5</sup> Understandably enough, John Henry Newman seldom sought or followed advice from a brother whose views on every subject were so different from his own, and he must soon have forgotten this letter. But it does not seem too far-fetched a notion on our part to trace to its subconscious ferment the form of the inspiration which suddenly, three months later, rose to the surface of his mind.

Aside from its influence on "The Dream of Gerontius," the letter is interesting for its indirect reflection of a period of hope and vividly-sensed potentialities in the life of Newman—hopes and potentialities that remained largely unfulfilled. However the personal influence of Newman may have waxed, his last 25 years were not productive in the ordinary sense.<sup>6</sup> Leaving aside "Gerontius"—unique in the Newman canon—only the *Grammar of Assent* bears comparison with the *Apologia* or the *Idea of a University*. In this respect, Francis' letter is a false harbinger of John Henry Newman's own "second spring."

10 Circus Rd NW  
Oct 15/64

My dear John,

The packet of *Apologia* is just arrived.<sup>1</sup> Maria<sup>2</sup> still lingers at Bristol. I dare say she will write again to thank you.

I have been turning often in my mind what you said, of your wish to do *some one* great work. More than one person has pressed this on me. I quite recognize the legitimacy of the desire. Even when it takes distinctly the form of desiring Renown or Posthumous Fame, I count it right if duly subordinated to higher aims. (The subordination may be difficult, the passion dangerous; but to be wholly without it is, I suppose, a defect.) In my own case, I say: What is the use of a "great" work, if it is not to find readers? PROS TON KRITEN<sup>3</sup> is an inexorable law. CRN<sup>4</sup> has largely gone wrong from obstinately refusing to submit to it. I attempt what is *great for me*, & there rest. But tho' nothing I say can come to you with weight, it may turn the scale of your mind if it so chance that you are already debating the very thing which I suggest.

In my belief you were naturally made for a great poet or a great musical composer. In the latter it is perhaps impossible to excel, in the modern development of the art, without a high command of a keyed instrument.<sup>5</sup> Besides, it could only take up a part & the less valuable part, of your attainments. I cannot fully give my reasons for believing that you wd fail if you attempt a great work in Theology,

in Philosophy or in History; yet I can say what perhaps will suffice. You could not expect your Theology to engage interest with *Protestants*; & your Philosophy or History would be essentially theological. On Protestants (& this is the most active minded part of the world, & contains the most numerous readers of high thought) your book would fall stillborn. Then *Catholics* are divisible mainly into 3 classes; 1. the most intellectual part, I think you will admit, are doubtfully Christian at all; 2. a second part, by far the largest I suppose, is attached to the Church as an institution; but—as a Catholic Baronet said to me, “Mr. Newman, I have enough to do to look after my farms, and I do not trouble myself about *books*” (emphasis *sic*). 3. The really earnest part of the Catholics are now all Ultramontane; glad & proud to have such converts as you & yours, but frightened at the novelty and boldness of your arguments, and looking upon you as an *enfant dangereux*.<sup>6</sup> Until I see it, I shall not believe that they will account any work of yours a standard classic.

Of course, if you write poetry of which the manifest object is propagandism, it will not easily circulate much among Protestants; nay, I think, if written with this *object*, it must greatly lower its worth as poetry. But if it be merely Catholic as coming from the heart without conscious object, we shall be no more repelled by it, than we are by the paganism of Aeschylus or Sophocles. I have somewhere read in you an admission or complaint that our Protestant literature of necessity affects the Catholic mind undesirably. On the face of the matter there is reason why, as Catholics, you should desire to create, if you can, a noble Catholic literature in English.<sup>7</sup> Your Church must recognize it in you as a laudable aim. Poetry is the part of literature most effective on religious minds & in the religious direction, and if you fail in it, I should expect all to fail. The form of literature which I should suggest is Tragedy, varied by scenes half comic, not coarse as in Shakespeare, but veiled as in the *Orestes* & the *Persae*.<sup>8</sup> I feel persuaded, there is no chord of true poetry which you cannot strike. You could choose your topic & plot so as to call interest on to the scenes & characters wch you think unduly neglected. (We have no objection at all to se[e] characters acquitted and justified, whom our histories have branded; so that only it be in good faith, & not part of a propagandism which seems fanatical.) Tragedies are not so very long as to exhaust attention. You do not cast all on one throw, as in a pretentious interminable “Epic.” You can command great variety in different Tragedies, & lead us all over the world. You could write, I know without books, at your pretty cemetery,<sup>9</sup> at a friend’s house, or in the fields; & it would not strain your head.

If you ask, Do I wish you to succeed, with all its possible results? I reply: I count on far more good to Catholics than damage to Free Thought<sup>10</sup> from any imaginable success; & wherever genius finds its true course, I believe there is always a vast balance of good. I have said my say.

Affy yours,

F. W. Newman

Daniel J. Mulcahy

Yale University

#### FOOTNOTES

##### To Introduction

- <sup>1</sup> JHN’s words (written January 29, 1868), quoted in Wilfrid Ward’s *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman* (London, 1927), ii, 203.
- <sup>2</sup> This quotation and the preceding are from JHN’s *Journal* (1859-79), February 22, 1865. The friend is Hope-Scott.
- <sup>3</sup> Quoted by Ward, ii, 78.
- <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>5</sup> Charles Frederick Harrold, *John Henry Newman* (London, 1945), 272, 277-83.
- <sup>6</sup> JHN wrote, “I have been startled on considering, that in the last 15 years I have only written two books [as contrasted with almost a book a year between 1826 and 1859], the *Apologia* and the *Essay on Assent*, of which the former was almost extempore. What have I been doing with my time? though I have never been idle.” *Journal*, October 14, 1874.

##### To Letter

(The text of this unpublished letter is to be found in the Microfilm Collection of the Sterling Memorial Library, Yale University: Film 2167, Roll 67, Batch 57. I have incorporated Francis Newman’s corrections into the text without comment, except in one instance [see note 10 below].)

- <sup>1</sup> The *Apologia pro Vita Sua* appeared in pamphlet form between April and June of 1864.
- <sup>2</sup> Francis Newman’s wife, Maria Kennaway.

<sup>3</sup> Freely translated, "keeping an eye on the critic."

<sup>4</sup> Charles Robert Newman (1802-84), second of the three brothers. An eccentric and wastrel, he spent a large part of his life as the pensioner of his brothers. Francis wrote of him that his "wasted life were better buried in silence" (*Contributions Chiefly to the Early History of the Late Cardinal Newman*, vii). Sean O'Faolain gives a good account of his exasperating activities in *Newman's Way* (New York, 1952).

<sup>5</sup> JHN was an amateur violinist.

<sup>6</sup> Strangely enough, JHN's chief opponents within the Church were themselves converts who had set out to be "more Catholic than the Pope." In his *Newman: His Life and Spirituality* (London, 1958) Father Bouyer gives an interesting, though hostile, account of those (like Cardinal Manning and W. G. Ward) who "identified themselves with a Catholicism of an extremist and provocative form."

<sup>7</sup> Francis was probably thinking of "English Catholic Literature" (published 1858), in which JHN speaks of "the desirableness of forming a Catholic literature." *The Idea of a University*, edited by C. F. Harrold (New York, 1947), 277.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Harrold's mention of the "Aeschylean effect" of JHN's earlier poems, "The Elements" and "Judaism." *John Henry Newman*, 274-5.

<sup>9</sup> Presumably that attached to the country house which the Oratorian Fathers had recently acquired at Rednal. JHN was to be buried there in 1890.

<sup>10</sup> Francis originally wrote "Protestantism," then changed it to "Free Thought."

## 7. "POPULAR CULTURE" AND THE SEMINAL BOOKS OF 1859

In his important essay on "Victorian Reviewers and Cultural Responsibility," Mr. Michael Wolff has assessed the manner in which the reviewers for twenty-five "better periodicals" in 1859 fulfilled their mission of mediating between the "seminal minds" whose riches came forth in such abundance in that *annus mirabilis* and the growing mid-Victorian reading public.<sup>1</sup> I have no quarrel with Mr. Wolff's methods or conclusions: indeed, I am in hearty agreement with them; rather, I should like to suggest that a whole new dimension can be injected into this sort of study if we stray away from the "better periodicals" and examine the response of one mass-circulation magazine to the great books of 1859.

The *Illustrated Times* was founded in 1855 by the publisher David Bogue and the colorful jack-of-all-trades Henry Vizetelly with the avowed purpose of capturing as large a readership as possible.<sup>2</sup> The imminent abolition of the newspaper stamp tax would make possible the publication of an illustrated paper at 2d. an issue to undersell the popular *Illustrated London News*; the Crimean War would provide plenty of exciting copy for the new weekly's writers and, especially, plenty of pictorial material for its artists. Bogue and Vizetelly did their preparatory work carefully. Well in advance of the publication of the first number, Vizetelly sent a former pupil of his, Julian Portch, to the Crimea to make sketches; a brilliant staff of artists (including "Phiz," Birket Foster, Gustave Doré, Kenny Meadows, Charles Doyle, and George Cruikshank) and a solid staff of experienced and gifted writers (including James Hannay, Robert Brough, Edmund Yates, George Augustus Sala, Sutherland Edwards, Frederick Greenwood, Augustus Mayhew, and Edward Draper) were rounded up. According to Vizetelly, the *Illustrated Times* "secured at once a circulation of 200,000 copies," about 75,000 more than the *Illustrated London News*.<sup>3</sup>

Though reliable figures seem impossible to come by, there is no reason to suppose that the *Illustrated Times*'s popularity declined during the first four or five years of its existence. On the contrary, its sales must have been stimulated by the periodic occurrence of events which lent themselves perfectly to the kind of lavish verbal-cum-pictorial coverage which it was equipped to give. While the Crimean War was still going on, the story of the poisoner William Palmer broke in the Staffordshire market town of Rugeley; the *Illustrated Times* for weeks recorded every scrap of information, misinformation, and rumor that could be dug up concerning this celebrated case, and the profusely illustrated "Rugeley Number" of 2 February 1856 sold 400,000 copies.<sup>4</sup> A similar special number, eighteen months later, was devoted to the "Glasgow poisoning case," the trial of one Miss Madeleine Smith for disposing of her lover, Emile L'Angelier. And, of course, there were other events, less sensational but equally dramatic, to be recorded in prose and pictures: the Indian Mutiny, wars in China and Italy, the coronation of Czar Alexander II, the marriage of the Princess Royal to Prince Frederick of Prussia, Royal Visits, General Elections, and many more.

However, it would be a great mistake to write off the *Illustrated Times* as a precursor of the yellow press or the witless pictorial journalism of the shoddiest modern magazines. Each week's issue contained detailed reports of domestic and foreign news, accounts of the state of the arts, and remarkably sane and sober editorial comments on what was happening in the world. It seems clear from all the evidence that the *Illustrated Times* represented an effort, largely successful, to reach a much wider audience than the far more austere monthlies and quarterlies, or even than the weekly *Athenaeum*, *Spectator*, or *Saturday Review*:<sup>5</sup> certainly a reasonably intelligent and aware audience, but one that liked to see reliable information and responsible opinion livened up with



plenty of pictures and a good deal of gossip. (An audience, I should like to suggest, not very different from that which is reached by our *Life* or *Look* and their counterparts in every Western country.)

It is against this background that the *Illustrated Times's* response to the important books of 1859 must be studied. Of the eleven titles considered by Mr. Wolff,<sup>6</sup> eight were mentioned in the *Illustrated Times*. Of these eight, five were given extended reviews; one was given a perceptive briefer notice; and two others, *A Tale of Two Cities* and the Mansel-Maurice controversy, were referred to in other connections.<sup>7</sup> The one really disturbing omission is the *Origin of Species*, which does not seem to have been reviewed at all in the *Illustrated Times* (but then it was missed by three of Mr. Wolff's twenty-five periodicals); Arnold's *England and the Italian Question* and the *Rubaiyat*, which also went unnoticed, received only four reviews and one review, respectively, in the periodicals studied by Mr. Wolff. Though the neglect of Darwin is embarrassing, it would seem that on strictly numerical grounds the *Illustrated Times*, unabashedly popular as it was, meets Mr. Wolff's criteria of "a perceptive book-reviewing organ."

But what about the quality of the *Illustrated Times's* reviews? I should rate it high: certainly as high as that of the reviews in the contemporary literary weeklies.<sup>8</sup> There is more in these notices than mere impressionism and quotations of purple passages, though there is some of that: rather, the reviewers seem able to seize on the essential virtues and failings of the books and authors under consideration with admirable tact. In the review of *Adam Bede*, for instance, George Eliot is praised as a master of sympathetic psychological analysis, "the greatest living master of a well-nigh lost art—that of telling a simple story of human nature as it is, and leaving you in love with that intricate faulty thing." Her "evangelical" men and women" and her "image of dissenting piety" (Dinah Morris) are especially well done. But she shows some signs of being a "self-repeater" (not a surprising judgment, based as it was on her first two books only); and she tends to be too detached, too deliberate, too cold: "we could occasionally spare a little of the wonderful clearness of a detail for an equivalent in strength and fire, and we resent as an affront an 'effect' which has been so much stippled in" (VIII [19 February 1859], 123). The other novel treated at length, *The Virginians*, was greeted with disappointment. Its plot, like that of most of Thackeray's novels, is defective, "a mere string of incidents, which might have been more or fewer, have been cut short here or prolonged there, at the author's arbitrary pleasure, without any harm being done." The character-drawing is "somewhat crude," but, even in *The Virginians*, "Mr. Thackeray stands quite alone among modern novelists" in his understanding of female characters (IX [19 November 1859], 335).

The *Idylls of the King*, the year's great achievement in poetry, was received, with all due respect and admiration, as the most ambitious work of "our greatest living poet," but again an important reservation was expressed:

Mr. Tennyson wants the concentration and sustained power requisite for telling a long story, and it costs him a manifest effort to keep up the serenity and stateliness requisite for epic effect during a hundred lines. How seldom, too, do you get from him a great rugged giant of a verse, even when the topic is rough and large as Stonehenge; and how glad our poet always seems of a chance to run off into little liquid warblings, such as the three love-songs in the volume before us. These "Idylls," or legends, told in his finest blank verse, have in them more of the stateliness and the "retarding art" which belongs to the highest realms of poetry than anything else he has ever written before; but the sweetness is still too sweet for the strength, and the grand old fresco-seeming stories of the Round Table are pointed out with a miniature daintiness of handling that wellnigh cloy.

Writing during a spell of muggy London summer weather, the reviewer had the charity to add: "So at least it seems to us, though part of the fault may lie with the thermometer" (IX [23 July 1859], 59).

Though Mill's attitude toward modern society seemed to the reviewer excessively gloomy, *On Liberty*, "this very remarkable and weighty book," was well received by the *Illustrated Times*. His Essay was held to articulate a point of view implicit in "all our best literature of every class—a cry for more self-assertion, the expression of an intellectual and emotional revolt against the tyranny of society." In stating this claim, as well as the claim which society rightly places on the individual, Mill was expressing his essential agreement with such thinkers as Carlyle, Spencer, and Tennyson. "The fundamental question of moral philosophy, Should life be considered as a theorem or as a problem? Mr. Mill answers in one word—both" (VIII [26 March 1859], 202-03). The *Illustrated Times* notice of Ruskin's *The Two Paths* is more expository than judicial, but the reviewer's admiration for Ruskin is obvious. Ruskin, he admits, is often eccentric, but what matter? The fifth lecture in *The Two Paths*, for example, "strikes us as being out of bounds fantastic, though, to apply what Mr. Leigh Hunt finely says in allusion to some redundancies of Shakespeare, having anything of Mr. Ruskin's, it is impossible to wish it away again" (VIII [18 June 1859], 395).

All five of these lengthy reviews appeared in the "Literature" section of the *Illustrated Times*, but this was not the only place in the paper that new publications and related matters were discussed. Two gossip columns, "The Lounger at the Clubs," a weekly feature, and "The Literary Lounger," which appeared more irregularly, also dealt with books and authors, though in a chattier manner.<sup>9</sup> In the winter and spring of 1859, for instance, the identity of George Eliot was a lively topic for speculation and debate, not only in literary circles and not only in London, and the "Lounger at the Clubs" participated with relish. His first guess was remarkably close to the truth, in view of the influence which Lewes is now known to have had over George Eliot at the time of the composition of *Adam Bede*: "George Eliot is a *nom de plume*, under which a husband and wife shelter their identity. . . . there is a force, health, decisiveness and daring . . . which are eminently masculine, and yet . . . various portions show such accurate knowledge of female littlenesses and inmost thoughts as is, thank Heaven! but given to women" (VIII [12 February 1859], 106-07). Two months later he hit upon the literal fact of the matter, stating flatly that George Eliot was a woman (VIII [9 April 1859], 235). But as the spring drew on he wavered in his conviction, first giving considerable credence to Liggins' claim of authorship (VIII [30 April 1859], 282); then rejecting it, on the basis of George Eliot's letter to the *Times* (VIII [14 May 1859], 315); finally arriving at a compromise: George Eliot was undeniably a woman, but she must have obtained most, if not all, of her information about life in the Midlands from Liggins (VIII [11 June 1859], 378). (The name of Marian Evans, incidentally, was not mentioned in these columns.)

A *Tale of Two Cities*, which, according to Mr. Wolff, was "hardly noticed when published" in book form, was not reviewed in the *Illustrated Times*, but the "Lounger at the Clubs," after quoting extensively from the *Saturday Review's* sharp attack on the novel, came to Dickens' defense. His sarcastic rejoinder, in which he spoke for the common reader against the kind of false sophistication which the *Saturday Review* seemed to him to embody, ended with this sentence: "There are many districts in England—rude, illiterate districts—into which the classical *Saturday Review* has never penetrated where a man would run serious risk of broken bones were he known as a systematic columnist of Mr. Charles Dickens" (IX [24 December 1859], 418-19).

"The Lounger at the Clubs" also devoted more than three hundred words to pointing out the great merits of another new novel, *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel*. This was not a formal review, certainly, but it was equal in shrewdness and discrimination, if not in length, to many reviews. "The Lounger" held that *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel* would have to be added to "the little list" of novels that had "created any real sensation" in the past few years. While recognizing that the "ordinary novel reader . . . will probably throw aside this book in disgust," he pointed out that there is a quaint, caviare relish even about the very earliest pages which will at once tickle the palate of the literary gourmand, leaving him afterwards to revel in a feast of scholarly writing, worldly knowledge, and singularly well-written descriptions of nature, imbued with a strong poetic tinge.

Though there is questionable matter in the novel, which is not in any case written for the young person, there

is no veiled prurience, none of that horrible hinting at the improper which to sensible people is the bane, and to fools the charm, of so many modern books.

Better see vice made openly repulsive in all its capricious detail than alluring by the display of a well-turned ankle or the inch-high lifting of a jupe.

Meredith's "wit . . . never degenerates into frivolity" and his humor, "though occasionally broad, is never coarse" (IX [13 August 1859], 107).

We see, then, that even the readers of a mass-circulation periodical with sensationalistic leanings like the *Illustrated Times* were being very adequately informed by perceptive reviewers about the notable books that were coming off the presses in 1859. May we not say that the audience which the seminal minds who wrote these books reached, if only indirectly by means of reviews, was surprisingly large: that the level of "popular culture" in 1859 was considerably higher than some of us would have thought?

University of Kansas

George J. Worth

#### FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> In 1859: *Entering an Age of Crisis*, ed. Philip Appleman, William A. Madden, and Michael Wolff (Bloomington, Ind., 1959), pp. 269-89.
- <sup>2</sup> For the early history of the *Illustrated Times*, see Henry Vizetelly, *Glances Back Through Seventy Years* (London, 1893), I, 388ff.
- <sup>3</sup> Richard D. Altick, *The English Common Reader* (Chicago, 1957), p. 394.
- <sup>4</sup> Ralph Straus, *Sala: The Portrait of an Eminent Victorian* (London, 1942), p. 111.
- <sup>5</sup> For circulation figures of nineteenth century periodicals, see *The English Common Reader* and Alvar Ellegard, *The Readership of the Periodical Press in Mid-Victorian Britain* (Göteborg, 1957).

- <sup>6</sup> *Idylls of the King, The Rubaiyat, the Origin of Species, Adam Bede, On Liberty, The Two Paths, The Ordeal of Richard Fevrel, England and the Italian Question, The Virginians, A Tale of Two Cities*, and the several published stages in the theological controversy between H. L. Mansel and F. D. Maurice, considered as one title by Mr. Wolff.
- <sup>7</sup> For *A Tale of Two Cities*, see below. Manson's Bampton Lectures, *The Limits of Religious Thought*, and Maurice's reply, *What Is Revelation?*, were mentioned in a review of another theological work, James Hinton's *Man and His Dwelling Place*, IX (15 October 1859), 255.
- <sup>8</sup> At least one of the *Illustrated Times's* reviewers, James Hannay, also reviewed for such periodicals as the *Athenaeum*, the *Leader*, the *Westminster*, and the *Quarterly*.
- <sup>9</sup> Edmund Yates initiated "The Lounger at the Clubs" in 1855, and seems to have retained responsibility for the column through the volumes under study here. See Vizetelly, I, 393; and Yates, *Recollections and Experiences* (London, 1894), I, 278.

## 8. DANIEL DERONDA AND WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE

On the 10th of November 1877 George Eliot recorded in her Journal: "Yesterday Mr. [Alexander] Macmillan came to ask me if I would undertake to write the volume on Shakespeare, in a series to be issued under the title 'Men of Letters.' I have declined."<sup>1</sup> It is hazardous to speculate about the reasons prompting George Eliot's refusal;<sup>2</sup> the motives behind Macmillan's gesture seem more obvious.

To many a loyal contemporary George Eliot had become nothing less than a "modern" Shakespeare. By 1877, one year after the publication of *Daniel Deronda* and three years before her death, this identification was about to become a commonplace.<sup>3</sup> However extravagant, the association was by no means gratuitous. The novelist's admirers pointed to the Shakespearean atmosphere of her early stories and exulted in the fact that she was born only thirty miles from the Bard's native village.<sup>4</sup> What is more, they detected, or thought that they detected, an even wider range of resemblances: they compared the quality of George Eliot's non-Dickensian type of characterization, and feeling for landscape with its counterpart in the work of Shakespeare. More vaguely, they saw an analogy between the two writers in their common concern with human illusion and in their joint environment and a similar heritage is undeniable. But there was also a very deliberate pro-indifferently treated by most of her immediate critics.

Although the full influence of Shakespeare on George Eliot's work has yet to be examined, his impact is most noticeable in the productions of her later phase. The apparent by-product of George Henry Lewes' critical theories concerning the superiority of verse drama over prose fiction, an impetus through her use of Shakespeare as a "heightening" model. George Eliot turned to blank verse in *The Spanish Gypsy* and in her shorter poems. She introduced Shakespearean image clusters and poetic chapter-headings in her last three novels in an effort to provide them with a pattern of spatial associations. At times these innovations were artistically disastrous; occasionally, as in her intricate punning on the word "Will" in *Middlemarch*, they succeeded in opening wider vistas through a clever, quasi-Joycean exploitation of word and meaning.<sup>6</sup>

*Daniel Deronda*, George Eliot's last work of fiction, is the most consciously "Shakespearean" of all her novels. The culmination of her drive towards a more imaginative form of expression, the novel itself is concerned with the recovery of "poetry and romance" from the "events of everyday life."<sup>7</sup> While *Middlemarch* deplored the prosaic pressure of this "everyday life," *Daniel Deronda* tries to invest it with a new poetic value. It is not at all improbable that George Eliot may have conceived of the novel as a *Tempest* of sorts, a creation in which the reality of the ideal is seen to surmount "the pressure of that hard unaccommodating Actual" (II, 156). If so, she failed considerably: rather than a reproduction of Shakespeare's interweaving of romance and realism, her confusion of the novel's "ideal" and "actual" halves results in an awkward amalgam. In *Daniel Deronda* the real obtrudes on the visionary: as Henry James subtly suggested, Mirah's smartly tailored travel-outfit does not contribute to our belief in her and in Deronda's idealized crossing. In *The Tempest* the chimerical and the actual become one and the same. Shakespeare's exiles forsake an imaginary island in order to return to reality: Ferdinand and Miranda travel to what they regard as a "brave new world," but what is essentially the old world known to what they regard as Deronda and Mirah,<sup>8</sup> on the other hand, must escape from the disillusioned Prospero. England in order to take refuge in the hopefulness of new horizons. And even so their exalted "prophetic consciousness" is—despite the messianic visions of Mordecai—simply a solid Victorian missionary goal (II, 382). Their world admits no Ariels. Even Caliban is not allowed to roam free without an appended moralization: in a discussion which threatens to take on racist overtones, Deronda liberally appeals to tolerance and good sense by reminding his audience of Shakespeare's highly liberal creation of Caliban as one "who naturally had his own point of view and could sing a good song" (II, 81).

And yet, as critics will again and again point out, the superb craftsmanship of *Daniel Deronda* belies the relative failure of its intentions. Here, too, George Eliot relies on Shakespeare by simply incorporating the playwright and his works into the novel itself as an original means of characterization and differentiation. *Deronda*, we are told, is raised on "Shakespeare as well as a great deal of history" (I, 248); Mirah is brought up on "Shakespeare and Schiller" (I, 317); the language spoken by Mordecai is that of the Jacobean Bible. But Gwendolen Harleth, who is ironically identified with Rosalind of *As You Like It*, has no understanding of either Shakespeare or of England's glorious past. She participates in an archery contest which is a travesty of the country's heroic history; confronted with "choir" of the Mallinger Abbey (an estate given to the family by Henry VIII), the young girl admires the horses which are stabled in it, but is oblivious to the ruined cloisters where dried hay hangs "where the saints once looked down" (II, 216).<sup>9</sup> In one of the prime ironies of the novel, Gwendolen enacts Hermione in a *tableau* of *The Winter's Tale*. Having been brought up on French romances, she lacks an understanding of the nature of her role. At the end of the book this understanding is provided by George Eliot: the widowed girl has become "the melancholy statue of the Gwendolen whose laughter once had been so ready when others were grave" (III, 347)—a clever, if somewhat didactic reversal of Shakespeare's conclusion to his play.

George Eliot takes for granted her audience's familiarity with Shakespeare. As if afraid that her readers may identify *Deronda* with a wrong prototype, she feels compelled to warn them that he is to be regarded as "the reverse of that type painted for us in Faulconbridge and Edmund of Gloster" (II, 293): i.e. a creature whose uncertain parentage has not brought with it a "coarse ambition for personal success" (II, 293). Her omissions are perhaps equally notable. In a book teeming with spatial allusions to Jewish figures of fact and fiction the character of Shylock is tactfully avoided.

George Eliot's unwritten volume on Shakespeare would have made a revealing sequel to *Daniel Deronda*. Her refusal of Macmillan's offer was possibly prompted by an awareness of the extent to which Shakespeare had permeated her own creative efforts. At one point of the novel we are informed that Gwendolen's deepening disgust with her husband has brought with it a revulsion over the "spaniels" that "fawn" on him (III, 65). George Eliot's almost careless echo of the famous cluster rediscovered by E. E. Kellett and Caroline Spurgeon in the twentieth century may not have been unintentional.<sup>10</sup> Whether intentional or not, it acts as a reminder to the student of her novels that he is dealing with a mind which frequently ran on channels quite similar to those followed by England's foremost dramatist.

Princeton University

U. C. Knoepfelmacher

#### FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> J. W. Cross, *George Eliot's Life as Related in her Letters and Journals* (Edinburgh and London, 1885), III, 320.
- <sup>2</sup> Her refusal had been preceded by similar rejections on the part of Matthew Arnold and Sir John Robert Seeley.
- <sup>3</sup> In 1877 Swinburne's crusade for the reputation of Charlotte Brontë was stimulated in part by his revolt against the partisans of George Eliot and against their fantastic claim. Although the claim was first made in 1859 (Charles Reade enthusiastically declared *Adam Bede* to be the "finest thing since Shakespeare" [Cross, II, 95]), it became widespread in the 1870's and recurred with an even greater intensity in the eulogistic articles immediately after George Eliot's death. While most writers were, like Edward Dowden ("Middlemarch" and "Daniel Deronda," *The Contemporary Review*, XXIX [February 1877], 348-369), content with placing George Eliot in a Shakespearean tradition, some were carried away by their enthusiasm. In America William Wilkinson vowed that the novelist was even "finer than Shakespeare," lesser in "quantity," but greater in "quality" (*A Free Lance* [New York, 1874], p. 18). A slightly more sober view was taken by the anonymous author of "Shakespeare and George Eliot," *Blackwood's*, CXXXIII (April 1883), 524-538.
- <sup>4</sup> Cf. *The Spectator*, LIII (December 25, 1880), 1645: "the greatest man and the greatest woman who have appeared in English literature are both from the 'Midlands'."
- <sup>5</sup> Dowden, *op. cit.*, 349.
- <sup>6</sup> In *Middlemarch* frequent references to the "will" of individual characters or to the providential Will worshipped by the pious Bulstrode are given a wider meaning through the decisive, causal role played by the last wills of Featherstone and Casaubon and by a character named "Will" Ladislav. George Eliot's emulation of Will Shakespeare's favorite pun no doubt was willful enough: her letters contain almost a hundred references to the plays and the sonnets.
- <sup>7</sup> *Daniel Deronda*, Cabinet edition (Edinburgh and London, n.d.), I, 305. Subsequent references are to this edition.
- <sup>8</sup> The similarity between the names "Mirah" and "Miranda" is more marked than it would seem: any reading edition of the play abbreviates the heroine's name as "Mira."!
- <sup>9</sup> Cf. Sonnet LXVIII with its similar association of dry hanging leaves and "bare ruin'd choirs, where late the sweet birds sang."
- <sup>10</sup> A person combining her erudition with her interest in iterative imagery could well have known of Walter Whiter's pioneering study, *A Specimen of a Commentary on Shakespeare* (1794), which dwelt, among other things, on Shakespeare's associational combination of the metaphors of flattery, fawning spaniels, and melting sweets.

## 9. CONSCIENCE IN CONFLICT

St. George Jackson Mivart, the English zoologist, was a professional colleague and, for a time, an intimate friend of Charles Darwin, Thomas Huxley, and others of the 19th Century who were involved in the ideological upheavals aroused by the promulgation of the doctrines of Darwinian evolution. He was also, by conversion when he was only sixteen, a Roman Catholic, and he became an outstanding leader in the lay world of his adopted Church. The conflict in conscience that is the subject matter of this book and formed the dominant driving force of Mivart's adult life, was the consequence of his unsuccessful attempts to harmonize the inherent incompatibilities of his scientific and religious convictions.

In writing this account of the intellectual and moral events of the life of Mivart, Dr. Gruber, an Associate Professor of Anthropology at Temple University, has done a most welcome service for all interested in not only the issues but especially the people embroiled in the ideological struggles of the Victorian era. Present day biologists and students of recent science history, if they know Mivart's name at all, may have read in Huxley's "Darwiniana" a lecture, "Mr. Darwin's Critics," in which there is a devastating rebuttal of the attempt of "Mr. Mivart" to prove that acceptance of evolution is consistent with Catholic ecclesiastical authority. (Huxley's rejoinder, incidentally, was to charge that "ecclesiasticism in science is only unfaithfulness to truth.") Or, more likely, they have noted his name in the later editions of the *Origin of Species*, where Darwin himself answered objections to the theory of natural selection that had been published by his critics subsequent to the initial full-length presentation of the theory in the first edition of the *Origin*. Thus, in the 6th edition Darwin writes: "A distinguished zoologist, Mr. St. George Mivart, has recently collected all the objections which have ever been advanced by myself and others against the theory of natural selection . . . they make a formidable array; and as it forms no part of Mr. Mivart's plan to give the various facts and considerations opposed to his conclusions, no slight effort of reason and memory is left to the reader, who may wish to weigh the evidence on both sides." Though it is clear that Darwin was nettled—as he had a right to be—by Mivart's lack of scientific objectivity, he nevertheless devoted a good part of some forty pages of his chapter on 'Miscellaneous Objections to the Theory of Natural Selection' in meticulously stating and then, where evidence was available, refuting Mivart's criticisms. It is Dr. Gruber's accomplishment that he succeeds in portraying a credible, flesh-and-blood human being that dramatically personalizes the "Mr. Mivart" dealt with in the texts of Darwin and Huxley.

There is no doubt that Dr. Mivart was a "distinguished zoologist", as is indicated by the serious attention given him by the Darwinians and by the extensive bibliography of his publications listed in this book. But his enduring accomplishments, as Dr. Gruber notes, were practically wholly concerned with the minutiae of morphological and systematic zoology, and they have by now been anonymously subsumed in the encyclopedic accumulation of biological fact. Had Mivart limited himself to work in these fields, and had he, furthermore, submitted to the claims by his church of infallibility in all matters, including the scientific, he would have fulfilled a position of some eminence in both Victorian science and Catholicism. His tormenting conflicts arose, however, from his projection of himself as a theorist, egocentrically and selfrighteously convinced of his ability not only to improve Darwinian evolutionary conceptions, especially in respect to man, but also to reform his Church by demanding relaxations of its more anti-scientific tenets.

As a theorist in biological science, Mivart was a failure. Though Dr. Gruber is aware of this, he allows an evident warm sympathy for his subject to blur the critical edge of his analysis of Mivart's scientific attainments by praising "Mivart's philosophical approach, his emphasis on the extra-empirical aspects of science . . . so apparent—and so fruitful—as in his treatment of man." The difficulty here, that is not pointed out by the author, lies not in the need to accept the fact that man is superior to any of the lower animals, even those closest to him in the evolutionary phylogenetic tree, but in the assumption that it is necessary to go beyond empiricism, i.e. beyond science, to explain this superiority. If we list Mivart's "extra-empirical" conceptions, such as his belief in: (a) fixed ideal types according to which all organic forms have been created, (b) "an inner tendency of organisms to change irrespective of external conditions," (c) human reason alone as the means for discovering truth, (d) the value of this specifically in the elucidation of the psychological life of man by introspection alone, and, finally, (e) the conclusion that "the real world is not mechanical . . . it is spiritual and moral, and guarantees the outcome of man's endeavors"—in the face of all this, we recognize the completeness with which his deeply Catholic theism had made him not only anti-Darwinist, but also against evolution itself as a universal feature of the organic world. What Dr. Gruber fails to make clear is that by these developments Mivart—somewhat like his younger German contemporary, Hans Driesch, though for rather different reasons—had by adoption of a thoroughgoing Vitalism removed himself from science and had committed himself to the methods of philosophic idealism as the means of understanding the world. Such a change was, of course, enough to professionally estrange Mivart from his scientific colleagues. But there were also other elements to this cleavage, which, as Dr. Gruber fully documents,

\* A CONSCIENCE IN CONFLICT: The Life of St. George Jackson Mivart. By Jacob W. Gruber. Published for Temple University Publications by Columbia University Press. New York, 1960. 266 pp. \$6.50.

do no credit to either the judgment or the fairness of his subject, and which led to an embittered personal break with Darwin, Huxley and others of the evolutionary camp.

As Mivart became increasingly isolated from the progressive scientific world, he turned more and more to activities closely connected with his Church. But here also he was headed for defeat. Dr. Gruber tells in fascinating detail of the series of dire steps by which Mivart increasingly—and it would seem almost deliberately—provoked the Church so that it finally denied him its sacraments and thus effectively excommunicated him. Mivart's initial provocations stemmed from his already mentioned belief in quite watered down kinds of evolutionary mechanisms in the origin of species. But the final steps arose from matters outside of science, such as an article calling for a new version of hell as "redemptive and reformatory," and a bitter, though enlightened condemnation of not only French Catholicism for its reactionary anti-Dreyfus activities, but the Papacy itself for its failure, by a policy of silence, to curb such activities. To these affronts the Church responded by demanding that Mivart recant his heretical views and also affirm a new Profession of Faith as a Catholic. When Mivart—to his great credit—courageously stood his ground, he was excommunicated.

In the deep suffering engendered by this blow, Mivart could with sincerity yet declare: "I have freed my mind and my spirit." There was in this defeat an element of triumph—and it was even so noted by some of his formerly close scientific colleagues. But it was too late to fully heal the breach with them. Early in the controversy with the evolutionists, Huxley, recognizing the religious trend in Mivart's scientific thinking, said to him: "One cannot go on running with the hare and hunting with the hounds." As it finally turned out, Mivart's struggle for the harmonious compromise he so devoutly desired, resulted in his estrangement from the proponents of both poles of the intended compromise. And so, poor Mivart neither ran with the hare nor did he hunt with the hounds. He died a doubly defeated man. But the crowning irony came after his death, when, in response to the protestations of friends that his heresies were products of a diseased mind, the Church relented and permitted transfer of his grave from unhallowed to sacred ground, where he still rests in final peace.

New York University

Alexander Sandow

### III. ENGLISH X NEWS

Chairman, George H. Ford, University of Rochester; Secretary, Francis G. Townsend, Florida State University.

Advisory and Nominating Committee: Chairman, Carl R. Woodring, University of Wisconsin (1961); William E. Buckler, John T. Fain (1960-1961); A. McKinley Terhune, J. Hillis Miller (1961-1962); \*George H. Ford (ex officio).

1961 Program Committee: Chairman, A. Dwight Culler (Yale University). Subject: "Victorianism: Toward a Critical Definition."

Bibliography Committee: Chairman, Robert C. Slack, Carnegie Institute of Technology; R. A. Donovan; C. T. Dougherty; D. J. Gray; R. C. Tobias; R. E. Freeman.

Editor, Victorian Newsletter: William E. Buckler, New York University.

### IV. RECENT PUBLICATIONS: A SELECTED LIST

September, 1960 -- February, 1961

#### I. General

**BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PUBLISHING.** Gettmann, Royal A. *A Victorian Publisher: A Study of the Bentley Papers*. Cambridge. The Bentley papers are studied for the light they give on different phases of Victorian publishing.

Hanford, James Holly. "Victorian Literary Autographs." *Princeton University Library Chronicle*, Autumn, pp. 42-43. Information on the recent acquisition of literary correspondence: "wide representation of the secondary talent and some of the first of late Victorian times." The largest group of letters is by Trollope—thirty in his hand, and others signed by him.

**CRITICISM AND LITERARY HISTORY.** Clapp, Edwin R. "The Victorian Mettle: Three Words More." *Western Humanities Review*, Winter, pp. 11-12. A general prospect of Victorian literature that finds it wanting in literary criticism and in true comedy (as distinct from parody, burlesque, and nonsense humor), and finds its poetry too meaning-ridden.

Rosenberg, Edgar. *From Shylock to Svengali: Jewish Stereotypes in English Fiction*. Stanford. Largely on the nineteenth century novel.

Shapiro, Charles, ed. *Twelve Original Essays on Great English Novels*. Wayne State. Includes essays on *Great Expectations* (Mark Spilka) and *Return of the Native* (Charles C. Walcutt).

Stevenson, Lionel. "The Death of Love: A Touchstone of Poetic Realism." *Western Humanities Review*, Autumn, pp. 365-376. Romantic and realistic attitudes towards love, with emphasis on Crabbe, Browning, and Meredith.

Wright, Austin, ed. *Victorian Literature: Modern Essays in Criticism*. Oxford. Twenty-eight essays—on authors, works, and the period generally—are reprinted in this important collection.

**HISTORY.** Ausubel, Herman. *In Hard Times: Reformers Among the Late Victorians*. Columbia. A large view of personalities, ideas, and events.

Briggs, Asa and John Saville, eds. *Essays in Labour History*. St. Martin's Press. Nine essays, with reminiscences of the late G. D. H. Cole for whose memory the collection was made.

Kelley, Robert. "Midlothian: A Study in Politics and Ideas." *Victorian Studies*, December, pp. 119-140. A close analysis of Gladstone's methods and views in the Midlothian campaign of 1879.

Milne, Alexander Taylor, ed. *Writings on British History, 1940-1945*. Royal Historical Society. A bibliography of books and articles covering the period 1714-1914.

Schapera, I., ed. *Livingstone's Private Journals, 1851-1853*. Chatto and Windus. Rev. *TLS*, 25 November, p. 751.

- RELIGION. Cannon, Walter. "The Problem of Miracles in the 1830's." *Victorian Studies*, September, pp. 5-32. Lyell's *Principles of Geology* revived the question of miracles, and provoked men like William Whewell to redefine the Catastrophic position.
- SOCIAL. Chadwick, Owen. *Victorian Miniature*. Hodder and Stoughton. An attempt at a typical squire and a typical parson. Rev. *TLS*, 9 December, p. 784.
- Lutyens, Mary, ed. *Lady Lytton's Court Diary, 1895-1899*. Rupert Hart-Davis. The inconsequential diary of a lady-in-waiting to Victoria. Rev. *TLS*, 6 January, p. 7
- Spring, David. "The Role of the Aristocracy in the Late Nineteenth Century." *Victorian Studies*, September, pp. 55-64. Remarks on the character and transformation of the aristocracy under the pressure of social, political, and economic change.
- Woolf, Leonard. *Souling: An Autobiography of the Years 1880 to 1904*. Hogarth Press. This first installment of Leonard Woolf's autobiography throws much light on late Victorian living.
- II. Individual Authors
- ARNOLD. Brick, Allan. "Equilibrium in the Poetry of Matthew Arnold." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, October, pp. 45-56. Arnold's search for a balance between the external and the internal, between commitment to society and separation from it.
- Gottfried, Leon A. "Matthew Arnold's 'Strayed Reveller'." *Review of English Studies*, November, pp. 403-409. Writing as a youthful "poetical reformer," Arnold intended the poem as an ironic commentary on the ornate style.
- Johnson, W. Stacy. *The Voices of Matthew Arnold*. Yale. A study of Arnold's "voices"—oracular, personal, and dramatic—in the poetry.
- Super, R. H., ed. *On the Classical Tradition*. Michigan. This first volume of what will be an edition of Arnold's complete prose includes the Homer lectures, the 1853 Preface, the 1854 supplementary note, the *Merope* preface, the *Italian Question*, and "On the Modern Element in Literature."
- Tobias, Richard Clark. "On Dating Matthew Arnold's 'General Note-Books'." *Philological Quarterly*, October, pp. 426-434. The two "General Note-Books," comprising one-fifth of the Lowry, Young, Dunn edition, may be dated 1860-1865 and, largely, 1876-1888.
- BARNES. Levy, William Turner. *William Barnes*. Longmans. Biography and critical study. Rev. *TLS*, 20 January, p. 44.
- BRONTËS. Colby, Robert A. "*Villette* and the Life of the Mind." *PMLA*, September, pp. 410-419. A general appraisal of *Villette*, noting particularly its relationship to earlier and later traditions of the novel.
- du Maurier, Daphne. *The Infernal World of Bramwell Brontë*. Gollancz. Biographical study.
- McKibben, Robert C. "The Image of the Book in *Wuthering Heights*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, September, pp. 159-169. By the use of book images, Emily Brontë indicates the spiritual condition of her characters and also implies her judgments of them.
- BROWNING. Palmer, Rupert E. "The Uses of Character in 'Bishop Blougram's Apology'." *Modern Philology*, November, pp. 108-118. The poem was designed less as a slur on Cardinal Wiseman than as a demonstration that religious faith "of some sort is possible even in mid-nineteenth-century England."
- Reed, Joseph W. "Browning and Macready: The Final Quarrel." *PMLA*, December, pp. 597-603. A review of the quarrel over Browning's *Blot in the Scutcheon*, with an analysis of Macready's proposed cuts and revisions.
- CLOUGH. Timko, Michael. "The 'True Creed' of Arthur Hugh Clough." *Modern Language Quarterly*, September, pp. 208-222. A working through of the phases of Clough's religious development, to the final stage of belief in God, in Christianity, and in the practice of Christian tenets.
- DICKENS. Adrian, Arthur A. "Charles Dickens as Verse Editor." *Modern Philology*, November, pp. 99-107. Dickens' standards and taste as reflected in the poetry he accepted for *Household Words*; identifies a number of the contributors, including Landor, Meredith, and Hood.
- Cooperman, Stanley. "Dickens and the Secular Blasphemy: Social Criticism in *Hard Times*, *Little Dorrit*, and *Bleak House*." *College English*, December, pp. 156-160. Dickens' social criticism expresses the views and values of the middle class, and is more an "alliance" than a "declaration of war."
- Mackness, George. "*Hunted Down*: A Dickens Link with America." *American Book Collector*, November, pp. 6-10. Details about Thomas Griffith Wainwright, the original of Julius Slinkton in *Hunted Down*, indicating that Dickens distorted the actual facts of Wainwright's life.
- McMaster, D. J. "*Little Dorrit*: Experience and Design." *Queen's Quarterly*, Winter, pp. 530-538. Dickens orders the material of the novel by use of the myth of the Inferno, whose main constituents are labyrinth, wasteland, and garden.
- Tillotson, Kathleen. "A Letter from Mary Hogarth." *TLS*, 23 December, p. 833. A sketch of Dickens' sister-in-law based on one of her own letters, newly come to light.
- DISRAELI. d'Avigdor-Goldsmid, H. J. "Disraeli's Novels." *London Magazine*, October, pp. 45-48. Light comments on the novels.
- Jerman, B. R. *The Young Disraeli*. Princeton. Rev. *TLS*, 23 December, p. 823.
- Stewart, R. W. "The Publication and Reception of Disraeli's *Vivian Grey*." *Quarterly Review*, October, pp. 409-417. Details on the writing and publication of Disraeli's first novel, and on its damning by the reviews.
- ELIOT. Beatty, Jerome. "*Middlemarch*": From Notebook to Novel. Illinois. Further subtitled, "A Study of George Eliot's Creative Method," this is an indispensable study of the book's composition.
- Crompton, Margaret. *George Eliot: The Woman*. Cassell. Rev. *TLS*, 21 October, p. 678.
- Leavis, P. R. "George Eliot's Zionist Novel." *Commentary*, October, pp. 317-325. Dr. Leavis now agrees that the Zionist portion of *Deronda* cannot be eliminated (see his remarks in *The Great Tradition*), though it is unquestionably weak. George Eliot could not really believe in the *Deronda* ideal.
- Preyer, Robert. "Beyond the Liberal Imagination: Vision and Unreality in *Daniel Deronda*." *Victorian Studies*, September, pp. 33-54. In *Deronda*, George Eliot tries to proceed beyond her earlier concern with environmental conditioning to a concern with the possibilities of non-perceptual experience. A remarkably suggestive study.
- HAGGARD. Cohen, Morton. *Rider Haggard: His Life and Works*. Hutchinson. Rev. *TLS*, 30 September, p. 630.
- HARDY. Crompton, Louis. "The Sunburnt God: Ritual and Tragic Myth in *The Return of the Native*." *Boston University Studies in English*, Winter, 229-240. An archetypal reading which sees Clym as a type of messianic hero and Eustacia as a variation on the witch of romance.
- Deen, Leonard W. "Heroism and Pathos in Hardy's *Return of the Native*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, December, pp. 207-219. This and other Hardy novels fall short of tragedy; their effect is generally that of pathos.
- Modern Fiction Studies*, Autumn, offers a "Thomas Hardy Issue" that includes studies of *The Mayor of Casterbridge* (Frederick Karl), *The Return of the Native* (John Paterson), Hardy's imagery of the grotesque (Richard C. Carpenter), *Jude the Obscure* (Frederick P. W. McDowell), and *The Woodlanders* (Robert Y. Drake); and also includes a Checklist of Hardy criticism, on both poetry and fiction, with emphasis on what has appeared since 1940.

- KIPLING. Gerber, Helmut *et al.* "Rudyard Kipling: An Annotated Bibliography of Writings about Him." *English Fiction in Transition*, vol. III, no. 3, pp. 1-74. This is the first of either two or three installments.
- MARRYAT. Zanger, Jules, ed. *Diary in America*. Indiana. Marryat's record of his visit, 1836-1837.
- MEREDITH. Baylen, Joseph O. "George Meredith and W. T. Stead: Three Unpublished Letters." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, November, pp. 47-57. On Meredith's friendship with Stead, who was editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*; the letters are Meredith's.
- MILL. Kelvin, Norman. *A Troubled Eden: Nature and Society in the Works of George Meredith*. Stanford.
- MILL. Anna Jean, ed. *John Mill's Boyhood Visit to France*. Toronto. Mill's journal and notebook for 1820-1821.
- Stillinger, Jack. "The Text of John Stuart Mill's *Autobiography*." *Bulletin of John Rylands Library*, September, pp. 220-242. A study of three manuscripts of the *Autobiography*, and of related matters.
- NEWMAN. Cameron, J. M. "The Night Battle: Newman and Empiricism." *Victorian Studies*, December, pp. 99-117. An important analysis of the closeness of Newman's thought to the empiricist tradition.
- Dessain, Charles Stephen. "Cardinal Newman's Papers." *Dublin Review*, Winter, pp. 291-296. Describes the Newman papers generally, and announces the forthcoming edition of the letters, which will be complete, will draw on the correspondence to Newman for annotations, and will be arranged chronologically. The first volume should appear in 1961, and will cover the period October 1845 to December 1846.
- Walgrave, J. H. *Newman the Theologian*, trans. A. V. Littledale. Chapman. Rev. *TLS*, 20 January, p. 45.
- PATER. Lenaghan, R. T. "Pattern in Walter Pater's Fiction." *Studies in Philology*, January, pp. 69-91. Much of Pater's work is patterned according to an Apollo-Dionysus antithesis, which is expressed in concrete, sensuous imagery.
- READE. Smith, Sheila M. "Propaganda and Hard Facts in Charles Reade's Didactic Novels: A Study of *It is Never Too Late to Mend* and *Hard Cash*." *Renaissance and Modern Studies*, IV, 135-149. Reade's melodramatic devices are inseparable from the social criticism and recorded fact in the novels.
- SHAW. Laurence, Dan. "G.B.S. and the *Gazette*: A Bibliographical Study." *Shaw Review*, September, pp. 20-31. Shaw's journalism in the 1880's, with reference to the *Pall Mall Gazette*: reprints two Shaw reviews and one essay.
- SWINBURNE. Lang, Cecil Y., ed. *The Swinburne Letters*, vol. III: 1875-1877; vol. IV: 1877-1882. Yale. Two volumes remain to be issued.
- Sitwell, Edith, ed. *Swinburne: A Selection*. Harcourt, Brace. The choices are from early Swinburne.
- TENNYSONS. Buckley, Jerome Hamilton. *Tennyson: The Growth of a Poet*. Harvard. Criticism and biography blend in this major study of Tennyson's development.
- Schweik, Robert C. "The 'Peace or War' Passages in Tennyson's *Maud*." *Notes and Queries*, December, pp. 457-458. Tennyson seems to have derived several of his hero's arguments from an article in *Blackwood's* for November 1854.
- Turner, Charles Tennyson. *A Hundred Sonnets*, ed. John Betjman and Charles Tennyson. Rupert Hart-Davis. A selection from the more than three hundred sonnets written by Tennyson's brother. Rev. *TLS*, 23 December, p. 830.
- THOMPSON. Butter, Peter. "Francis Thompson." *A Review of English Literature*, January, pp. 87-94. At his best, Thompson expresses "deeply felt spiritual experiences" in "strong and precise words."
- TROLLOPES. Chaloner, W. N. "Mrs. Trollope and the Early Factory System." *Victorian Studies*, December, pp. 159-166. Reviews the background and content of Mrs. Trollope's reform-novel, *The Life and Adventures of Michael Armstrong, the Factory Boy* (1839-1840).
- Thale, Jerome. "The Problem of Structure in Trollope." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, September, pp. 147-157. A close reading of *The Last Chronicle of Barset* suggests that it is not plot but the repetition and variation of themes and actions that give coherency to the longer Trollope novel.
- TYNDALL. Blinderman, Charles S. "John Tyndall and the Victorian New Philosophy." *Bucknell Review*, March, 281-290. Tyndall's contribution was significant in helping to establish a rational, causal view of history.
- MRS. WARD. Knoepfmacher, U. C. "The Rural Ladies: Mrs. Ward's *Lady Connie* and Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*." *Victorian Studies*, December, pp. 141-158. Striking similarities and differences between the two novels measure Mrs. Ward's inadequacies and Lawrence's dual role as traditionalist and revolutionary.
- WILDE. Holland, Vyvyan. *Oscar Wilde: A Pictorial Biography*. Thames and Hudson. Text and pictures towards a biography.
- Spivey, Ted R. "Damnation and Salvation in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." *Boston University Studies in English*, Autumn, pp. 162-170. Wilde shows a modern distrust of the intellect by making Dorian's damnation the consequence of his intellectual curiosity, aroused and guided by Lord Henry who figures as the Devil or tempter.

#### Projects -- Requests for Aid

- WILLIAM BARNES. Bernard Jones is preparing an edition of the poetry and would like information on Barnes' life and writings. *TLS*, 30 December, p. 850.
- GEORGE CRUIKSHANK. J. C. Trewin is doing a biography and would like to hear of letters or other relevant documents. *TLS*, 6 January, p. 9.
- HERBERT SPENCER. Richard L. Schoenwald is engaged on a biography and would be grateful for letters and related materials. *TLS*, 18 November, p. 741.
- RICHARD WHATELY. Rica Brown is anxious to learn of the whereabouts of Whately's private papers and correspondence, especially of any relating to Blanco White. *TLS*, 11 November, p. 729.

Cornell University

Robert A. Greenberg

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER is edited for the English X Group of the Modern Language Association by William E. Buckler, 737 East Building, New York University, New York 3, New York. Subscription rates in the United States and Canada are \$1.00 for one year and \$2.00 for three years. All checks should be made payable to William E. Buckler, personally, so that they may be easily negotiated. The subscription rates for the United Kingdom are 7/6 for one year and 15/ for three years. Checks should be made payable to K. J. Fielding, C.F. Mott Training College, Prescott., The Hazels, Lancs., England. Mr. Fielding is the British Representative of VNL.