

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER

William E. Buckler, Editor
New York University

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

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

Warren R. Herendeen, Assistant Editor,
New York University

Hugh H. Wilson, Assistant Editor,
New York University

Number 33 Contents Spring 1968

	Page	
Of Time, Rivers, and Tragedy: George Eliot and Matthew Arnold by U. C. Knoepfelmacher	1 43	Carlyle, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, and Madame Cottin by Edwin W. Marrs, Jr.
Dickens' Woman in White by Harry Stone	5 46	Reviewer of Browning's <i>Men and Women</i> in the <i>Rambler</i> Identified by Esther Rhodes Houghton
Another Pippa by Betty Cobey Senescu	8	
Ruskin's Revisions of the Third Edition of <i>Modern Painters</i> , Volume I by George P. Landow	12 47	Tennyson's "Break, Break, Break" Again by Bert G. Hornback
Swinburne and the Whitmaniacs by William J. Goede	16	48 An Unpublished Housman Letter on the Preface to <i>Last Poems</i> by B. J. Leggett
"The Butterfly" and <i>Wuthering Heights</i> : A Mystic's Eschatology by Jo Anne A. Wilson	22	49 Thomas Hughes's Continuing Memorial: A Treasure Trove for Victorian Scholars by Ben Harris McClary
The Porcelain-Pattern Leitmotif in Meredith's <i>The Egoist</i> by Daniel R. Schwarz	26	50 Dramatic Irony in Thackeray's <i>Catherine</i> : The Function of Ikey Solomons, Esq., Jr. by John Christopher Kleis
Gilbertian Humor: Pulling Together a Definition by John Bush Jones	28	53 Dickens and Langland in Adjudication upon Meed by Florence Jones
Egerton: Forgotten Realist by Wendell V. Harris	31	56 Scenes of Clerical Life: Idea Through Image by David Leon Higdon
Hebraism, Hellenism, and <i>The Picture of Dorian Gray</i> by Jan B. Gordon	36	58 "Dover Beach" and "Andrea del Sarto" by Burton R. Pollin
Amendments and Additions to the <i>Complete Poems of Lionel Johnson</i> (1953) by Ian Fletcher	38	60 Recent Publications: A Selected List by Arthur F. Minerof

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER is edited for the English X Group of the Modern Language Association by William E. Buckler, New York University, New York, N. Y. 10003. Subscription rates in the United States and Canada are \$2.00 for one year and \$3.00 for two years. All checks should be made payable to William E. Buckler, personally, so that they may be easily negotiated.



Of Time, Rivers, and Tragedy: George Eliot and Matthew Arnold*

U. C. Knoepfelmacher

SHORTLY AFTER THE PUBLICATION of *The Mill on the Floss*, George Eliot became indignant to find that a French reviewer had compared her to the then popular Dinah Maria Mulock: "the most ignorant journalist in England would hardly think of calling me a rival of Miss Mulock—a writer who is read only by novel readers, pure and simple, never by people of high culture."¹ Only a few years before, George Eliot would have been more than content to capture the public of novel readers, pure and simple. Now, however, the novelist hoped to address herself to "the deeper life of this age,"² to be understood by people of "high culture." Her very derogation of ordinary novel readers rather resembles that often made by Matthew Arnold. What is more, the impulses that led these two writers to the composition of their respective tragedies, *Merope* and *The Mill on the Floss*, are far closer than these very different end products would suggest.

Arnold's shift from "Empedocles on Etna" (1852) to "Sohrab and Rustum" (1853) and *Merope* (1858) is, in its implications, not unlike George Eliot's, from the little-known fantasy tale of "The Lifted Veil" (1859) to *The Mill on the Floss* (1860). As George Levine points out in his essay on that novel,³ both Arnold and she believed that the Victorian artist should inspire his age. Yet both writers had contravened their own credos when they depicted situations "from the representation of which though accurate, no poetical enjoyment can be derived." Arnold removed "Empedocles" from the 1853 edition of his poems; George Eliot did not acknowledge the authorship of "The Lifted Veil" until the very end of her career. His poem and her story are quite similar in emphasis. Both portray the plight of a man paralyzed by his inwardness. Empedocles, according to Arnold's gloss, sees reality "as it is." He can find permanence only through death. George Eliot's protagonist, a visionary called Latimer, likewise pierces a reality veiled to others; his vision of a dreadful city crossed by a metallic river and peopled by stony inhabitants first suggests to him how

the passage of time petrifies all faith into dead illusion. Increasingly disappointed, Latimer, like Empedocles, welcomes the moment of death which will liberate him from the flux of life. If Arnold's Empedocles dismisses the ordinary physician Pausanias ("Because thou must not dream, thou need'st not then despair!"), George Eliot's protagonist likewise shrinks away from a friendly physician whose sympathy might have restored his faith. By isolating themselves from more commonplace fellow mortals, both of these extraordinary seers succumb to despair.

Yet despite this faint, superimposed moralism, the fates of Empedocles and Latimer illustrate above all their creators' own despair over the transience and mutability encountered by the modern seeker who yearns for the unity still apparent to the Romantics. Arnold and George Eliot thus faced a common dilemma: how can the artist who despairs of the crippling flux also remain true to his desire to address himself to the "deeper life" of his own time-ridden age? By turning to the mode of tragedy both writers detected a way out of their predicament. Through its form, they hoped to give a more elevated cast to the same conflicts that had lamed Empedocles and Latimer. Action rather than inaction, catharsis rather than self-pity, would be the result of their endeavors.⁴

But the form chosen by Arnold was to differ radically from that adopted by George Eliot. In his 1853 Preface Arnold attacked those modern artists (like Clough) who had tried to reproduce the complexities of the *Zeitgeist*. He had, five years earlier, written to Clough that he, for one, would not "be sucked for an hour even into the Time Stream."⁵ In the Preface he insisted that the modern artist move away from works "conceived in the spirit of passing time." By turning instead to the limited, but perennially enduring, actions of the ancients, the modern writer could impress on his own poetic efforts the fixity and permanence of great art. To be sure, he would have to be cautious in his choice of models. He could not write

* This paper and the one that follows by Professor Stone were read originally in December 1967 to Group Ten of the Modern Language Association.

1. *The George Eliot Letters*, ed. Gordon S. Haight (New Haven, 1954-1955), III, 302.
2. *Ibid.*, III, 241.
3. "Intelligence as Deception: *The Mill on the Floss*," *PMLA*, LXXX (September 1965), 402-9.
4. In his 1853 Preface, Arnold argues that, in tragedy, even "the representation of the most utter calamity" cannot affect the

"feeling of enjoyment" (*The Poetical Works of Matthew Arnold*, ed. C. B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry [London, 1957], p. xviii); in her later "Notes on *The Spanish Gypsy*," George Eliot likewise maintained that tragedy, despite its "calamitous issue," can "instill the emotions of 'Love, pity, constituting sympathy, and generous joy with regard to the lot of our fellowmen'" (J. W. Cross, *George Eliot's Life as Related in Her Letters and Journals* [Edinburgh and London, 1885], III, 47).
5. *The Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough*, ed. H. F. Lowry (London and New York, 1932), p. 95.

another *Antigone*, for its conflicts had become dated, invalidated by time; nor ought the nineteenth-century writer simply feign a classical repose by turning his back on the turbulence of his own age. In his preface to *Merope*, Arnold agreed with George Henry Lewes' censure of Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris* for its avoidance of all emotional "agitation." Yet though Arnold agreed that the "repose" in Goethe's play was artificially achieved, he insisted that the Greek tragedians, too, had avoided turbulence in their dramas. Their repose, however, was achieved without the sacrifice of passion: Sophocles, according to Arnold, exhibits always "the most agitating matter under the conditions of severest form."⁶

In both "Sohrab and Rustum" and the pseudo-Sophoclean tragedy of *Merope*, Arnold tried to impose the severeness of "form" on the same matters that had agitated his Empedocles or George Eliot's Latimer. Like the novelist, he hoped to conduct his readers "to a state of feeling which is the highest aim of tragedy to produce, to a sentiment of sublime acquiescence in the course of fate."⁷ He regarded "Sohrab and Rustum" and *Merope* as mere preparations for another tragedy, which was to be his chef-d'oeuvre. But he was never to write the planned *Lucretius*. For, in his handling, both "Sohrab and Rustum" and *Merope* became nineteenth-century allegories such as the ones he had asked modern poets to discard. Despite its Miltonic echoes and epic similes, the action of "Sohrab and Rustum" merely dramatizes externally the internal conflicts that had led Empedocles to submit to the destructive flux. On "the low flat strand / Of Oxus, where the summer-floods o'erflow" (ll. 13-14), the old kills the new—an exacting Hebraic father mistakenly slays his loving, idealistic son.

Arnold's poem opens and ends, as George Eliot's novel was to do, with the description of a mighty river. In both works, this river becomes an emblem for the stream of change, the permanence of impermanence. Like the Floss, the Oxus becomes the *deus* in a tragedy of modern existence where the children must pay for the mistakes of their parents. The same "mighty tide" that, in the novel's opening paragraph, carries blackened ships to St. Ogg's will eventually hurl the splintered pieces of some "wooden machinery" at the last of the Tullivers. Arnold's epic machinery likewise stresses the implacability of change.⁸ Young Sohrab dies by the yellow river's "brink"; old Rustum wails: "Oh, that its waves were flowing over

me! / Oh, that I saw its grains of yellow silt / Roll tumbling in the current o'er my head" (ll. 768-80). But the father's death wish is not fulfilled. As in *The Mill on the Floss*, the young must perish senselessly.

In *Merope*, the same situation is simply reversed: it is the new that now slays the old. The innovation represented by the young Aepytyus clashes with the reaction represented by the aged Polyphontes. If Aepytyus' allies are the Messenian city dwellers who hate "their present," Polyphontes' are the conservative Dorian lords. In *The Mill on the Floss*, Tom Tulliver adapts himself to the city ways of St. Ogg's. Like Aepytyus, he wants to revenge a father; like Aepytyus, he has lived in Arcadia and yet must embrace the ways of the future. George Eliot's novel ends with the catastrophe of the flood; Arnold's play culminates in an "all-flooding ocean of blood" (l. 1246). Significantly enough, the inertness of his tragedy is relieved at only two points: when Merope almost commits the same mistake that led Rustum to kill his son, and when that son, the disguised Aepytyus, describes with extraordinary vividness the purely imaginary circumstances of his presumed death. These circumstances are noteworthy in themselves. For Aepytyus graphically relates his own drowning in the tumultuous torrent of a "rumbling subterranean stream." Merope herself, wooed by the extremes of Polyphontes and Aepytyus, stands by as frozen as Empedocles had been. Maggie Tulliver must yield to the capricious river; Merope, however, can at least evade the flux by becoming as impassive a spectator as the poet who was to look at the ebb and flow of human misery perched on the cliffs of Dover. Around her, Ionian disruption and Dorian order collide in one further cycle of that systolic movement of expansion and contraction which is history.

If George Eliot wanted "people of high culture" to appreciate her tragic novel, Arnold hoped that ordinary "John Bull" might recognize his play to be more than an incursion into classical antiquity.⁹ The newly elected Oxford professor of poetry wrote a long explanatory preface in which he broadly hinted that the "events on which the action turns belong to a period of transition" like his own. He also tried to stage his tragedy in order to make it accessible to a wider audience. Yet as a piece of dramaturgy, the play was as unsuccessful as Dr. Johnson's *Irene*. Though not perhaps the "utter failure" that Lionel Trilling declares it to be,¹⁰ *Merope* does founder because, as

transitory one in which the immediate action moves" (p. 81). I cannot agree with this view. Symbolically, the river is that temporal order; "the immediate action," but a ripple in its larger stream.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 279.

10. *Matthew Arnold* (New York, 1955), p. 142.

6. *Merope: A Tragedy* (London, 1958), p. xli.

7. *Ibid.*, p. xl; George Eliot likewise regards the sentiment of "grand submission" to be the main aim of tragedy.

8. In *The Poetry of Matthew Arnold: A Commentary* (London, 1950), the late C. B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry maintain that the Oxus acts as a reminder of "another order than the temporal

Mr. Trilling puts it, Arnold refused "to see that the subjectivism in romantic poetry had its roots in historical reality, that it could not be dismissed by turning away to its seeming opposite, 'classical' objectivity" (p. 143).

George Eliot never lost sight of this "historical reality." In her 1856 essay on "The Antigone and Its Moral," she framed what seems to be a careful reply to Arnold's objections to that tragedy. Far from having become invalidated for moderns, the play depicts a universal struggle: "Wherever the strength of a man's intellect, or moral sense, or affection brings him into opposition with the rules society has sanctioned, there is renewed the conflict between Antigone and Creon."¹¹ Yet this universality, George Eliot felt, could not be attained by simply borrowing the classical Greek forms. To her, as to Arnold, human existence was essentially tragic: death merely confirms each man's defeat by the flux. She therefore spoke of some of her ordinary *Scenes of Clerical Life* as being, loosely, tragedies.¹² Like Arnold, she sought a more elevated form to express this tragic sense of life; yet she recognized far more clearly that she would have to devise new ways of embodying the conflicts that he and she wanted to portray.

In 1854 George Eliot had read and supported the views of a German friend, Otto Friedrich Gruppe, whose treatise on Greek tragedy she declared to be "one of the best books, if not the very best we have on the Greek Drama."¹³ In that work, *Ariadne: Die Tragische Kunst der Griechen* (1834), Gruppe had bitterly declaimed against those moderns who (like Goethe in his *Iphigenie*) had merely tried to emulate classical tragedy. Greek tragedy, he argued, had sprung from a gradual historical process. Had German writers only understood that process, they might

have turned to a comparable fund of myth provided to them by their own native folklore or "Volkspoesie":

Those myths have waned away, disappeared from our racial consciousness: what can a learned inquiry do at this point? Even if we could convince our modern tragedians that it is impossible for them to emulate the Greeks in general and Sophocles in particular . . . how could this insight help us any more? It is too late.¹⁴

Gruppe's thesis—important only because of its connection to George Eliot rather than for its originality or validity—is inimical to an approach such as Arnold's. Greek tragedy, Gruppe asserts again and again, can no longer be imitated. But the modern tragedian may tap similar sources of poetic belief. Though difficult, the task is not impossible. For Arnold, *Hamlet* had marked the beginning of modern self-division; for Gruppe, Shakespeare's plays point out the way for those moderns who must admit the reality of history: "He stands, as did Sophocles, at the end of a developmental period of folk-literature" (p. 656). The modern artist, he implies, might also enlist the poetic belief of predecessors living in a simpler yet immediate past. It is easy to see why Gruppe's views should have appealed to the English novelist who wanted to see life steadily and see it whole. In her 1856 essay on Riehl, for instance, George Eliot asked that both German and English novelists turn to the poetry still extant in their rural communities. In her own *Scenes of Clerical Life* she took for her starting point that "naturalistic" stage that, in Gruppe's view, had also set in, during an earlier cycle, after the fragmentation of Greek religion.¹⁵

George Eliot turned to the Wordsworthian world of

11. "The Antigone and Its Moral," *Leader*, VII (29 March 1856), 306; in *Essays of George Eliot*, ed. Thomas Finney (London, 1963), p. 265.

12. In two recent articles, Mr. Darrell Mansell, Jr., implies that all of George Eliot's fiction ought to be read as "a kind of tragedy" ("A Note on Hegel and George Eliot," *VNL*, No. 27 [Spring 1965] pp. 12-15, and "George Eliot's Conception of Tragedy," *NCF*, XXII [September 1967], 155-71). It would perhaps be more accurate to say that all of her fiction was written to resist a tragic sense of life. Like Arnold, George Eliot tries to conquer her despair over an existence in which death confirms each man's defeat by the same flux that affects all things. Humor, for her as for Arnold, often helps to divert a natural inclination toward the sort of cosmic brooding that destroys Empedocles or Latimer. In "Menander and Greek Comedy," George Eliot claimed that the "highest comedy" might, in effect, contain "tragedy in the disguise of mirth" (*Leader*, VI [16 June 1855], 579). Her comic short story, "Brother Jacob," is directed at some of the same questions raised, tragically, in *The Mill on the Floss*. But to assume therefore that all her novels are identical representations of "tragic conflicts" is to ignore acute differences in form, conception, and success. Mr. Mansell's failure to discriminate more carefully between the various "tragic novels" he discusses is not only reductive, but also, as Mrs. E. Anne Kilcullen points out in a letter (*VNL*, Spring 1966), is based on some careless

reading. Still, even as fine a formalistic critic as Mrs. Barbara Hardy seriously underestimates differences in form when she assumes that George Eliot's major novels are similar "unheroic tragedies."

13. "The Future of German Philosophy," *Leader*, VI (28 July 1855), 723-24; in *Essays*, p. 149. The article was a review of Gruppe's later work, *Gegenwart und Zukunft der Philosophie in Deutschland* (1855). George Eliot had met the philosopher during her 1854 sojourn in Germany: "He has written books on everything—on the Greek drama—a great book on the Cosmic Systems of the Greeks—an epic, numberless lyric poems, etc.—he has a philosophical work and a history of literature in the press" (*Letters*, II, 192). She remembered him as late as 1878, two years after his death (*Letters*, VII, 29).

14. *Ariadne: Die Tragische Kunst der Griechen in ihrer Entwicklung und ihrem Zusammenhang mit der Volkspoesie* (Berlin, 1834), pp. 655-56; my translation.

15. In that historical stage, Gruppe contended, the pictorial art of the Greeks had depicted "scenes" similar to those painted by the "Dutch genre-painters"; even sculptors now turned to the portrayal of an "old woman" (*Ibid.*, p. 769). George Eliot's remarks in *Adam Bede* about the "Dutch paintings which lofty-minded people despise" immediately come to mind, "I turn from cloud-borne angels . . . to an old woman bending over her flower pot."

Adam Bede in the same year that Arnold published *Merope*. In an earlier review of Arnold's poems, she had praised his "expression of exquisite sensibility united with deep thought, in which he reminds us of Wordsworth."¹⁶ But Arnold's echoes of Wordsworth had been elegiac.¹⁷ With *Merope*, he had left Romanticism behind. George Eliot, on the other hand, had appropriated Wordsworth's poetry in *Adam Bede*.¹⁸ For she regarded Wordsworth as tapping a "Volkspoesie" such as that described by Gruppe. Though devoid of her predecessor's faith, she hoped to knit her own experience to his, to stand—as Gruppe had put it—"on the shoulders" of an earlier age of belief. *The Mill on the Floss* depicts the erosion of the pastoral world that had sustained Adam Bede. In the early, childhood portions of the novel, Wordsworth's influence can be felt on every page; but Maggie's rural life is precarious. Soon, she suffers the disruption experienced by her namesake and counterpart, Arnold's Marguerite.

Just as Arnold's classical tragedy vainly tries to reproduce Sophocles' repose, so does George Eliot's Wordsworthian novel vainly enlist the Romantic's power of memory. Arnold elegized the "eternal note of sadness" that Sophocles had heard by the Aegean; George Eliot lamented the lost childhood from which Wordsworth could still have drawn the sustenance of faith. In "Tintern Abbey," by the "banks/Of this fair river," a brother oppressed by mutability had looked into the "wild eyes" of his romantic sister. Summoning his confidence, he placed his faith in the ways of Nature. Wordsworth's ringing apotheosis bears comparing to a scene near the ending of George Eliot's novel. Here, too, a brother stares into his sister's wild romantic eyes; here, too, memory revives the latent emotions of childhood. But change is irrevocable. We are on a different sort of river. "The dreary intercourse of daily life" can no more be disregarded than "the sneers of selfish men" (ll. 131, 129). As Tom looks into Maggie's eyes he can hardly wax as loquacious as the rapturous William:

They sat mutely gazing at each other: Maggie with eyes of intense life looking out from a weary, beaten face—Tom pale with a certain awe and humiliation. Thought was busy though the lips were silent; and though he could ask no questions, he guessed a story of almost miraculous divinely-protected effort. But at last a mist gathered over the blue-grey eyes, and the lips found a word they could utter: the old childish—"Magsie!" (Bk. VII, chap. 5)

Here, too, there is a catharsis, a purification; but significantly enough this recognition comes before the novel's final action. The wooden fragments are about to destroy the last of the Tullivers. The novelist's words are therefore pregnant with irony: Maggie's "intense life" will soon be extinguished; the "divinely-protected effort" sensed by Tom is but an illusion. Like Empedocles or Latimer, Tom and Maggie can find the unity they desire only through the repose of death.

In *The Mill on the Floss* George Eliot did not quite succeed in converting the laming paralysis of despair into the motions of tragic action. Like Arnold, she concluded that the only catharsis a Victorian tragedy could offer was an acceptance of the ineluctable flux. After *Merope*, Arnold rejected the writing of poetry. He abandoned the planned *Lucretius* and turned to the form of the critical essay. The *Zietgeist* could be mastered only in those occasional elegies exploiting his melancholic vision of perennial change. In the essays, however, the quarrel between Sohrab and Rustom, or between Aepytus' Messenians and Polyphonotes' lords, was to become the quarrel between Philistines and Barbarians, Hellenism and Hebraism, science and religion. In *Merope*, the heroine stands at the sidelines and witnesses the collision of ignorant armies; in the essays, the poet who had demanded the "repose" of a great action becomes the ironic advocate of the inaction of "Culture." The "confluent streams" which once watered the Messenian plains could now be avoided.

George Eliot would not abandon the collisions she had tried to portray. If, after *Merope*, Arnold would desist from writing poetry, she would even more unsuccessfully try her hand at a poetic tragedy in *The Spanish Gypsy* (1868). Eventually, however, she was to profit from her experimentations. In *The Mill*, where life at the Ripple becomes subsumed by life on the Floss, the extraordinary Maggie is devoured by the angry river. In *Middlemarch*, the extraordinary Dorothea can find the moderation denied to Maggie.¹⁹ For, by the time she came to write her greatest novel, George Eliot had likewise come to adapt her own tragic vision to the moderation of ordinary life:

That element of tragedy which lies in the very fact of frequency, has not yet wrought itself into the coarser emotion of mankind; and perhaps our frames could hardly bear much of it. If we had a keen vision and feeling of ordinary life, it would be like hearing the grass grow and

the squirrel's heart beat, and we should die of the roar which lies on the other side of silence. (*Middlemarch*, chap. 20)

Latimer and Empedocles, Maggie and Sohrab die of that "roar"; Arnold became content to listen to its grating sound by proclaiming that Sophocles, too, had heard it

Dickens' Woman in White

Harry Stone

SOME OF THE ENTANGLED THEMES that became *Great Expectations* and some of the everyday experiences that became Miss Havisham and ordained her fiery destruction can be traced to the most casual happenstance of Dickens' early and late years. In the case of Miss Havisham this is surely a paradox, for she is often pointed to as a character who is totally unreal. She is too bizarre, runs the arraignment, too Dickensian; she is unbelievable. Whatever the validity of this judgment, one thing is certain: Miss Havisham is constructed out of everyday events. But there is another, still greater irony, and it is this: Dickens consciously suppressed the wilder, the more "Dickensian" aspects of the everyday reality he drew upon.

That reality commenced with childhood. As a boy, Dickens had seen a strange lady wandering through the streets of London. The sight of this grotesque creature, and the romantic and tragic speculations he attached to her, sank into his memory and became an evocative part of his consciousness. Many years later, in 1853, in his magazine, *Household Words*, he wrote an essay about the indelible impressions of his boyhood. He called the essay "Where We Stopped Growing," and in it he described the strange lady of his youth in the following words:

Another very different person who stopped our growth, we associate with Berners Street, Oxford Street; whether she was constantly on parade in that street only, or was ever to be seen elsewhere, we are unable to say. The White Woman is her name. She is dressed entirely in white, with a ghastly white plaiting round her head and face, inside her white bonnet. She even carries (we hope) a white umbrella. With white boots, we know she picks her way through the winter dirt. She is a conceited old creature, cold and formal in manner, and evidently went simpering mad on personal grounds alone—no doubt because a wealthy Quaker wouldn't marry her. This is her bridal dress. She is always walking up here, on her way to church to marry the false Quaker. We observe in her mincing step and fishy eye that she intends to

long ago by the Aegean. Yet Dorothea Brooke, the modern Antigone, was destined to resist her creator's tragic vision. She would be allowed to merge with the maelstrom of human existence.

University of California at Berkeley

lead him a sharp life. We stopped growing when we got at the conclusion that the Quaker had had a happy escape of the White Woman.

Here already are most of Miss Havisham's attributes: her externals—bridal dress, all-white accoutrements, and ever present staff (represented for the moment by an umbrella); her personality—cold, formal, conceited, eccentric, and man-hating; and her history—jilted and thereby frozen forever (she too has stopped growing!) in the ghastly garments of her dead love. But this White Woman—the White Woman of "Where We Stopped Growing"—is not the simple figure of Dickens' boyhood. He had long since begun to surround the original image with fantasies of his own creation. What he had actually seen as a boy was an eccentric woman in weird white garments. The jilting Quaker, the walk to church, the white umbrella, the romantically provoked onset of madness—all these were added or magnified, as Dickens suggests, by his imagination.

His imagination may have embroidered or intertwined some of these motifs shortly after he turned nineteen, that is, several years after he had first seen the Berners Street White Woman. On the evening of 18 April 1831, at the Adelphi Theatre in London, Charles Mathews the elder, a great favorite of the youthful Dickens, opened in the twelfth of his annual "At Homes." One segment of the 1831 "At Home," a sketch entitled "No. 26 and No. 27" or Next Door Neighbours," featured a "Miss Mildew," a character based upon the Berners Street White Woman. Miss Mildew, played by Mathews, was an eccentric old lady in white who had been jilted by her first love forty years earlier. On the day originally set for her marriage, Miss Mildew had donned her wedding garments, and every day since, in those yellowing weeds, she had made her way through London streets to a place bearing a startling name: the "Expectation Office." At the Expectation Office she inquires fruitlessly after her lost love. Her

16. "Belles-Lettres," *Westminster Review*, LXIV (July 1855), 298.

17. See the present writer's "Dover Revisited: The Wordsworthian Matrix in the Poetry of Matthew Arnold," *VP*, I (January 1963), 17-26.

18. For a discussion of Wordsworth and *Adam Bede*, see my forthcoming essay on "The Post-Romantic Imagination: *Adam Bede*, Wordsworth, and Milton," scheduled to appear in *ELH*.

19. "Moderation," desired by *Merope* at the end of Arnold's play, also informs the moral that George Eliot extracts from *Antigone*: "our protests for the right should be seasoned with moderation and reverence" ("The Antigone and Its Moral," *Essays*, p. 265).

next door neighbor—a character played by Frederick Yates and also based upon a real-life London eccentric later described by Dickens in “Where We Stopped Growing”—dresses all in black and constantly calls at the Expectation Office to collect a vast fortune that never arrives: another theme central to *Great Expectations*.

If Dickens saw this piece, it would have brought him instantly back to “where he stopped growing”; it would also have presented him, given the context of what he had seen as a boy, with an unforgettable linking of women in white and deluded expectations.

Mathews’ evocative cluster of associations may or may not have attached itself to the strange white wanderer Dickens knew as a boy. Many years later, however, another, more fantastic cluster of associations merged with Dickens’ boyhood White Woman and helped shape Miss Havisham and the basic structure of *Great Expectations*. The second cluster of associations apparently entered Dickens’ mind in 1850, that is, nineteen years after Miss Mildew’s brief life and two years before he wrote “Where We Stopped Growing.” In 1850 Dickens launched a monthly news supplement to the weekly *Household Words*. He called this supplement the *Household Narrative of Current Events*, gave it a departmentalized format, and sold it for twopence. In the first issue, that is, in the January 1850 *Household Narrative*, in the section entitled “Narrative of Law and Crime,” appeared the following paragraph:

An inquest was held on the 29th, on Martha Joachim, a *Wealthy and Eccentric Lady*, late of 27, York-buildings, Marylebone, aged 62. The jury proceeded to view the body, but had to beat a sudden retreat, until a bull-dog, belonging to deceased, and which savagely attacked them, was secured. It was shown in evidence that on the 1st of June, 1808, her father, an officer in the Life Guards, was murdered and robbed in the Regent’s Park. A reward of £300 was offered for the murderer, who was apprehended with the property upon him, and executed. In 1825, a suitor of the deceased, whom her mother rejected, shot himself while sitting on the sofa with her, and she was covered with his brains. From that instant she lost her reason. Since her mother’s death, eighteen years ago, she had led the life of a recluse, dressed in white, and never going out. A charwoman occasionally brought her what supplied her wants. Her only companions were the bull-dog, which she nursed like a child, and two cats. Her house was filled with images of soldiers in lead, which she called her “body-guards.” When the collectors called for their taxes, they had to cross the garden-wall to gain admission. One morning she was found dead in her bed; and a surgeon who was called in, said she had died of bronchitis, and might have recovered with proper medical aid. The jury returned a verdict to that effect.

Reading about this eccentric white woman, Dickens

must have recalled his own boyhood White Woman, and perhaps, if the association existed, Miss Mildew as well, for when he came to write about his Berners Street White Woman two years later in *Household Words*, he seems to have overlaid his early memories with details and associations from the history of Martha Joachim—i.e., he projected upon his Berners Street White Woman the Martha Joachim syndrome of rejection and ensuing madness. Miss Havisham herself, who was not conceived until 1860—that is, not until almost ten years after the *Household Narrative* paragraph and eight years after “Where We Stopped Growing”—is indebted in yet other ways to the *Household Narrative* account of Martha Joachim. Miss Havisham, like Martha Joachim (but unlike the boyhood or the *Household Words* White Woman, and unlike Miss Mildew) is wealthy, is associated with crime and murder, undergoes an instantaneous breakdown caused by her suitor, becomes a recluse, surrounds herself with toylike mementos of her past, and lives in a house with a walled garden. But Dickens—softening, as he so often did, life’s own outrageous brand of “Dickensian” exaggerations—left out such proto-Dickensian touches as the pampered bulldog, the lead-soldier bodyguards, and the splattering brains.

For reasons that are less clear, other portions of the January 1850 issue of the *Household Narrative* also stuck in Dickens’ mind. The January issue deals, for example, with the transportation of convicts. In one section, a section eerily and crazily premonitory of the Magwitch-Pip relationship, a paragraph discussing the “loathsome contamination”—the phrase is from the paragraph—of Australia by transported convicts, is followed by an account of how lowly emigrants to Australia, having buried their past, can expect to achieve wealth for themselves and social standing for their children. This theme had impinged upon Dickens’ mind several times during these months. In “A Bundle of Emigrants’ Letters” (an article on emigrants to Australia that Dickens wrote for the first issue of *Household Words*), he had included one letter from a transported convict. “[My master],” wrote the convict to his wife, “is a rich Gentleman . . . and when you come ask for me as an emigrant and never use the word Convict . . . never let it be once named among you, let no one know your business.” The account in the January 1850 *Household Narrative* quotes similar letters. An emigrant daughter warns her father, who is about to join her, not to “say how you got your living at home” but to “remember, you are to be a gentleman if you come here; that is, you will be dressed as well as any country farmer in Scotland—you will have the best food, a good horse to ride on, and a farm of sixty acres to go to.” Here then, in matter-of-fact compression, are some of the primary con-

cerns and concatenations of *Great Expectations*. One is struck by the analogs: one thinks of the crude transported convict Magwitch, of how he hides his past, accumulates wealth in Australia, and gives his surrogate son the trappings and prestige of a gentleman; and one thinks also of Pip, the surrogate son, of how he buries his lowly origins (in this he is like Dickens himself), shrinks from the returned Magwitch as from a "loathsome contamination," and hurries, when summoned, to the dress and food and appurtenances of a gentleman.

But perhaps the most extraordinary example of how happenstance and association can help shape art occurs in yet another paragraph in that January 1850 issue of the *Household Narrative*. Under the section entitled "Narrative of Accident and Disaster," just a leaf removed from the Martha Joachim history, appears the following paragraph:

An accident, fortunately not serious in its results, occurred on the evening of the 7th at the residence of W. O. Bigg, Esq., of Abbot's Leigh. There was a large party at the house, and during the night a "German Tree," about five feet high, with its branches covered with bon-bons and other Christmas presents, and lit with a number of small wax tapers, was introduced into the drawing-room for the younger members of the party. While leaning forward to take some toy from the tree, the light gauze overdress of one young lady, Miss Gordon, took fire, and blazed up in a most alarming manner. One of the lads present, whose quickness and presence of mind were far superior to his years, with much thought and decision threw down the young lady, and folding her in a rug that was luckily close by, put out the flame before it had done any serious damage beyond scorching her arms severely.

Here, in brief, close enough to become forever entangled in Dickens' mind with those other *Household Narrative* themes destined for *Great Expectations*—with made gentlemen, transported convicts, hiding one's past, jilted white-robed recluses, and his own boyhood White Woman—occur the accident, the rescue, and the wound that he will later attach to his burning white woman and her rescuer when he comes to write *Great Expectations*. For in *Great Expectations* Miss Havisham's gauzy white dress blazes up when she approaches too close to a fire; Pip puts out the flames by throwing her down and folding her in coats and a tablecloth that are luckily nearby, and Pip's hands and arm are severely scorched.

So much for this *Household Narrative* confluence of some of the central images and themes in *Great Expectations*. But Dickens' Woman in White teases us still. Why, we ask, did a convict and a made gentleman become entangled with the White Woman, why not some other equally available human events out of the scores recorded in that ordinary issue of the *Household Narrative*? Was the

eccentric Berners Street White Woman of Dickens' boyhood somehow connected with the great secret of his early years—his apprenticeship in a blacking warehouse and his association with prisons and prisoners, and did the unexpected juxtaposition in the *Household Narrative* of a daft woman in white, convicts hiding their past, and made gentlemen merge with his own similar hidden associations and with his current position as a self-made gentleman? In other words, did the *Household Narrative* associations become meaningful because they reinforced vital configurations in Dickens' life?

I think this was the case. In fact, I think the key reinforcement may have been the *Household Narrative* statement that Martha Joachim had died in York Buildings. For York Buildings, strange to say, was also the name of a group of buildings that had caused Dickens to "stop growing." The York Buildings I refer to—York Buildings, Strand (the structure still exists)—was located just a few hundred feet away from the blacking warehouse in which Dickens had drudged as a boy; the streets surrounding York Buildings were his special haunt during that time. York Buildings was thus an inextricable part of those desolate and unforgiven days when his family was imprisoned in the Marshalsea, and he became, as he put it, a mere "labouring hind," a "small Cain." The pain Dickens felt at this time merged with the bricks and mortar, with the streets and buildings, surrounding him. One can scarcely overestimate that identification. Until long after he was a grown man, until long after he had become the most famous writer in England, he could not reenter that region. For Dickens, therefore, the very name York Buildings was surcharged with blacking-warehouse and prison emotion. Coming on the name as he did in a context filled with other powerful boyhood associations, he must have been startled and affected by what he read. York Buildings probably served, therefore, as an emotional magnet that raised the intensity and influenced the pattern of his responses. It probably helped Dickens gather and then retain one of the great formative assemblages of *Great Expectations*, an assemblage that included the January 1850 *Household Narrative*, Martha Joachim, women in white, Berners Street, imprisonment, servitude, the blacking warehouse, and his own secret childhood.

But we are not done yet. Why—to probe still further into questions we cannot answer with certainty—why did the first item rooted in childhood, the Martha Joachim-York Buildings paragraph, seem to sensitize, to make artistically available—if that was the way it worked—so many other passages, some so outwardly remote from the original association (the Christmas burning, for example)? And why did Dickens begin *Great Expec-*

tations some ten years after that fateful issue of the *Household Narrative*?

Perhaps that commencement was shaped and heralded by the fact that the street frequented by the White Woman—Berners Street, Oxford Street—again entered Dickens' everyday life, again dramatically and unforgettably, a year or so before he began *Great Expectations*. For No. 31 Berners Street, Oxford Street was Ellen Ternan's residence in 1858 and probably in 1859—a residence that Dickens himself seems to have procured for her, and a residence that Ellen and her sister moved to when Dickens sent Ellen's mother and Fanny Ternan to Italy. In any case, by virtue of this strange Berners Street conjunction and Dickens' latter-day visits to Berners Street, those motifs of self-wounding love which he would soon attach to the Estella-Pip node of *Great Expectations*—motifs of secrecy, forbidden passion, and social prohibitions—become merged forever with the cluster of associations surrounding his Berners Street White Woman and the January 1850 issue of the *Household Narrative*. In other words, the Estella-Pip cluster became fused with the Magwitch-Miss Havisham cluster and with myriads of associations going back to Dickens' boyhood.

Another Pippa

Betty Cobey Senescu

IN CREATING THE CHARACTER of Pippa, Browning had a dual intention. He himself said that Pippa was to "symbolize the unconscious messenger of good spiritual tidings to so many souls in dark places."¹ And indeed as this messenger she is the unifying element in the structure of the poem. In his early conception of the work, on his walk in the woods, according to Mrs. Orr, this unconscious messenger was to be "one apparently too obscure to leave a trace of his or her passage." So Browning created the character of Pippa, the little silk-winder of Asolo, who has a carefully drawn personality and a poignant story of her own.

The key word in Browning's statement is "unconscious." Because Pippa herself is completely unaware of what she brings about during her day, it is not necessary to have her character fit this role of messenger. As a messenger she is a puppet of God, but as Pippa, the mill girl on her

The "long chain"—to use a metaphor from *Great Expectations*—was being hammered and beaten into shape; some of the great unconscious links at the center of the novel were now almost complete. The gestation of *Great Expectations* had gone on for thirty-five years. In the last years and months before Dickens sat down to begin his novel, the crucial associations that we have been tracing were intensifying and drawing closer together. Perhaps Wilkie Collins' *Woman in White*, a novel that appeared in Dickens' *All the Year Round* immediately before *Great Expectations*, and a novel that also concerns a white-robed woman, criminals, and death by fire, catalyzed this highly charged constellation at the heart of *Great Expectations*. Perhaps some other stimulus—some chance remark or sight or sound—quickened that waiting core.

Such speculations engross and provoke us. But the heart of the matter eludes us still. The shaping process itself—the process that ultimately created *Great Expectations*; the process that selects, adds, orders, reshapes, and then finally brings forth; the process, in short, that transforms experience into art—that process goes on, as always, in silence and obscurity.

San Fernando Valley State College

day off, she is something else entirely. This duality of Pippa's role may in part explain, if not excuse, some of the gross misconceptions concerning her that have become commonly accepted as truth.

The difficulty Browning critics have in giving a satisfactory interpretation to Pippa's character results from their desire to turn Pippa the obscure silk-winder into Pippa the unwitting messenger of God. Too often such words as naïve, childlike, and spiritual have been used to describe her. J. M. Purcell typically refers to the "peace and serenity of her mind and heart" and calls Pippa "the apotheosis of joy and contentment."² This description might aptly fit a divine messenger. But the poem gives us, instead, a rather worldly young working girl on her one day off in the year, hopeful in the morning, but despairing and disappointed in the evening, concerned not with how she may influence others, but rather with how

1. Mrs. Sutherland Orr, *A Handbook to the Works of Robert Browning* (London, 1907), p. 55.

2. J. M. Purcell, "The Dramatic Failure of *Pippa Passes*," *Studies in Philology*, XXXVI (January 1939), p. 85.

her own unhappy life may be brightened. As she searches desperately for some crumb of pleasure to sustain her through the monotonous days ahead, she is scarcely serene, peaceful, or "the apotheosis of joy and contentment." One of the ironies of the poem and the great pathos of Pippa's story is that, having wrought such significant changes in the lives of those who hear her songs, she is totally unable as far as she is aware to effect even the meagerest change in her own very dreary life.

There is really no basis for a close connection between Pippa's rather common lonely life and the miraculous salvations her songs bring about. The closest affinity the mill girl has with the messenger of spiritual tidings is the ironic hint Browning puts in the New Year's hymn she sings. To make these two Pippas one is to misread her lines or ignore many of them completely.

One of the most erroneous ideas about Pippa to gain popular credence is that she is a child. This assumption, originally springing no doubt from the desire to make her a pure, innocent, joyful spirit, has become so widely adopted that it is now accepted as fact. Norton Crowell refers to her as "perhaps the most cerebral child of eleven years in all of English literature."³ Her intelligence and her emotions would be astonishing for a child since, in fact, she is a young woman just past puberty and on the threshold of her adult life.

Besides the evidence in her character, Browning gives her age in the fourth episode when we learn from the Monsignor that his eldest brother, Pippa's natural father, died exactly "fourteen years and a month, all but three days" (iv, 22-23) ago. From this we can assume that Pippa is about fourteen, possibly fifteen or more, years old. The very youngest Pippa could possibly be would be thirteen years, four months, and this only if she were conceived on her father's deathbed, which would seem unlikely. Since the matter of the inheritance is a vital factor in the fourth episode, it would seem logical to assume that the heir, Pippa, was born before her father's death. The important fact, however, is not her exact age in years but that she is no longer a child but a young woman. She is old enough to be a bride since she is the same age as Phene, old enough for bold action since she is almost Luigi's age, and old enough for prostitution as the byplay at the duomo steps shows.

The others in the poem do refer to her as "little" or "child," which may mislead readers, but to the Intendant she would be regarded as a child still, and, of course, to haughty Ottima she is not only little and insignificant but ragged to boot. In the poem Pippa herself refers to

Phene as the "little bride" though they are the same age. Even the lusty scoundrel Bluphox speaks of her as a little girl while in the next breath, eying her admiringly, he tells us, "Well, your Bishop's Intendant's money shall be honestly earned" (ii, 329). Physically she is obviously a mature young woman.

By a careful reading of the Introduction and the last scene, the only two places where Pippa expresses her own thoughts (of her songs, I will speak later), we will try to discover the Pippa Browning gives us. In the morning of her holiday she anticipates the day eagerly and hopefully. The morning is golden, overflowing, filled with sunshine. It bodes well for her. It is not just the morning of her one free day of the year; it symbolizes for her the morning of her life. She daydreams of the pleasures of the day ahead and the pleasures of love that may be hers one day. It is typical that at her age she is preoccupied, almost obsessed, with thoughts of love. The Four Happiest Ones in Asolo represent to her the four kinds of love, adulterous, marital, maternal, and divine, of which she daydreams. During the day she intends to play out her fancy and taste of the pleasures of these four.

It is no wonder she begins by fancying herself Ottima as the sunbeam lighting on her martagon has just brought some very sensuous thoughts to her mind. Critics have almost completely ignored the flower passages in Pippa's lines, and well they might since Browning seems to indulge in some sexual symbolism in them. Henry Duffin is apparently distressed by these lines for he says, "there is one passage of some thirty lines (beginning, 'And here I let time slip') which betrays the fault of garrulousness"⁴ in Browning. To many critics the lines are simply non-existent.

It seems to me that these flower passages are very telling and relevant to her personality. Pippa is no prude. Like herself the lily is a newly opened flower, and in describing it she uses some sexually suggestive phrases and rather voluptuous metaphors. It would seem quite natural for an imaginative young girl of this age whose life has been as gray and joyless as Pippa's to color it with exotic daydreams.

The flower, however, is a lily, symbol of purity, and just as she encourages it to gibe the bee, so she already having fancied herself Ottima now rejects adulterous love for another better love.

Pippa is innocent but she is not ignorant of what is going on around her. She gives a very full and accurate account of what has been happening in the shrub-hudse. In view of this there seems no question but that when she

3. Norton B. Crowell, *The Triple Soul: Browning's Theory of Knowledge* (University of New Mexico, 1963), p. 161.

4. Henry Charles Duffin, *Amphibian: a Reconsideration of Browning* (London, 1956), p. 73.

sits down on the shrub-house steps later on in the morning she is singing her song ironically. However, the controversy still rages over Pippa's famous lyric. D. C. Wilkinson writes, "It is common to ascribe to him [Browning] the kind of optimism expressed in 'God's in his heaven.' No doubt this is indeed only the optimism of innocent Pippa. But this is not to refute the fact of Browning's own hardly less naïve optimism."⁵ From my point of view I can only say that Browning was a great deal more optimistic than Pippa and that neither was naïve.

Archibald A. Hill makes a structural analysis of the lyric. Hill quotes John Crowe Ransom, who objects to the last two lines as "a tag of identification so pointed as to be embarrassing . . . except that she must conclude by putting in her Theological Universal." Then Hill defends the lines, "Pippa breaks her strict analogical pattern to bring *snail* and *God* together. . . . The juxtaposition does not correspond with the way we expect theologians to talk about God. It correlates, instead, with the way we expect children to talk of him, in concrete simple terms."⁶ The fallacy, of course, lies not only in the assumption that Pippa is a child but also in the assumption that the lines are Pippa's own words.

I want to point out that the songs Pippa sings in her role as messenger are, in Browning's own words, "refrains." I doubt that he intended them to be taken as an expression of Pippa's own thoughts any more than he expected us to think that the harlot had composed the lyric she sings. If it is simply a "refrain" that Pippa happens to know, it needn't be an exact expression of anyone's philosophy—either Pippa's or Browning's.

All four of the lyric "refrains" that she sings carry ironic overtones as the characters who hear them are quick to pick up. However, the poem doesn't tell us how much, if anything, Pippa knows of the practical joke on Jules, the intentions of Luigi, or the plot of the Intendant. Most likely the irony is intended on Pippa's part in the first episode and accidental in the other three, but intended on Browning's part in all four of them. Pippa disapproves of Ottima at the same time that she envies her, and she is not above a little spitefulness as we see in other of her passages. Hence her choice of that particular song to sing on the very steps of the shrub-house.

After rejecting adulterous love Pippa imagines herself to be Phene, the bride of Jules. In this speech Pippa is her most scornful and sarcastic:

Blacker than all except the black eyelash;
I wonder she contrives those lids no dresses! (Intro., ll. 138-39)

and a few lines later:

a bride to look at and scarce touch,
Scarce touch, remember, Jules! For are not such
Used to be tended, flower-like, every feature,
As if one's breath would fray the lily of a creature?
(Intro., ll. 142-45)

Her spite toward Phene, whom apparently she doesn't even know, hardly seems justified unless we accept the fact that it is a sour grapes attitude and covers poor Pippa's envy. How happily marriage would deliver her from her almost intolerably wretched life as a mill hand.

Next she dreams of maternal love. She fancies herself Luigi, thinks of her own lost mother, and, as she tells us in the last scene, she also fancies herself Luigi's "gentle mother."

All of these loves she muses over represent possible ways of life by which she might escape the drudgery of her present life, and when she turns her thoughts to the Monsignor and God's love it is not inconceivable that she is thinking of a convent life as a last recourse.

Taking her first speech as a whole, the reader does not find Pippa unduly concerned with God. She seems to take God's love for granted, as someone in her circumstances would, something to fall back on when all else fails. This pattern is repeated in the last scene. Margaret Eleanor Glen makes a point of Pippa's final *choice*, "But Pippa shows a shrewd power of discrimination when she in fancy chooses her lot."⁷ (This would almost imply that she chooses to be the instrument of God.) It would seem to be more in keeping with the character of the little mill girl that she comes to this as the only alternative left to her. This does not diminish her faith in God, but simply emphasizes the point that she is in no way responsible for the miracles her songs perform. Miss Glen cannot separate the *function* of Pippa in the poem from the character of Pippa as it is revealed in the dramatic monologue. "Perhaps," she writes, "in Pippa's hymn the use of the word 'puppets' is unfortunate; [then why did Browning use it? we might ask] certainly Browning did not hold the fatalistic conceptions which such a word brings to mind (cf. his attack on these conceptions in 'Caliban Upon Setebos' and 'Andrea del Sarto'). It is necessary to remember that although each works only as God wills, man is still to be

5. D. C. Wilkinson, "The Need for Disbelief: a Comment on *Pippa Passes*," *University of Toronto Quarterly*, XXIX (January 1960), 151.

6. Archibald A. Hill, "Pippa's Song: Two Attempts at Structural Criticism," *Texas University Studies in English*, XXXV (1965), 55.

7. Margaret Eleanor Glen, "The Meaning and Structure of *Pippa Passes*," *University of Toronto Quarterly*, XXIV (July 1955), 414.

about his Father's business. . . . Pippa does things."⁸ I do take exception here to Miss Glen's citing later works (in this case ten and twenty-five years later) as proof of Browning's philosophical attitudes expressed in his earlier work. It would imply that the poet sprang forth full grown without possibility of further development or change.

In fact we do see in *Pippa Passes* Browning working with the germs of several concepts that were to take form later on. Not the least of these, however, is his attitude toward inaction, the beginning of which we see in Pippa's situation and the culmination of which we see in "The Statue and the Bust." For all practical purposes at the end of her day, as far as Pippa is concerned, she has not "done things," and she can look forward only to 364 more days of tiresome work at the mill.

Her own thoughts on God are not especially profound, and she resorts to reciting a hymn and getting what solace she can from that. And in the middle of even these reflections she suddenly, impatiently interrupts herself with:

A pretty thing to care about
So mightily, this single holiday!
But let the sun shine! Wherefore repine?
(Intro., ll. 206-8)

Between the first and the last scene we hear Pippa singing her "refrains" as she passes by those whose lives seem so much more exciting and pleasurable than her own, but she does not speak her own thoughts again until she is alone at night in her chamber. The last people to have spoken to her are the three harlots on the duomo steps. Their life is not for her; she recognizes its pitfalls all too well:

Ha, ha, thanks for your counsel, my Zanze!
"Feast upon lampreys, quaff Breganze"—
The summer of life so easy to spend,
And care for to-morrow so soon put away!
But winter hastens at summer's end, (iv, 188-92)

But she can't seem to get them out her mind. Even though they were teasing her, she reviews their conversation and particularly dwells on the reference they made (prompted by the Intendant) to a possible suitor for Pippa. They so piqued her curiosity that she seems a little provoked that their conversation was interrupted by the clatter of the Monsignor's people. This annoyance might prompt her comment about this prelate, not very complimentary:

No mere mortal has a right
To carry that exalted air;
Best people are not angels quite: (iv, 217-19)

Then Pippa briefly reviews her day, naming the Four

Happiest Ones over again and with resignation asks herself, "And now what am I?" Unhappily, the only answer she has is, "tired of fooling." All of her fancies and hopes have brought her nothing but weariness.

She tells herself that she must be content, but all her disappointment in her day and life, all her frustration and despair come out in one last burst of raucous, bitter mockery. Again we have the flower images, just as suggestive as earlier. Back to her poor lily Pippa brings the flower she picked at Ottima's door, a double heartsease. The pansy has been cultivated so beyond its wild state that it appears unnatural, "with Petals triply swollen./ Three times spotted, thrice the pollen" (iv, 242-43). It is so sexually suggestive that Pippa compares it to Zanze the harlot who has just been teasing her. Her sarcasm is her revenge, and it brings her almost to the point of coarseness:

"Zanze from the Brenta,
I have made her gorge polenta
Till both cheeks are near as bouncing
As her . . . name there's no pronouncing!
See this heightened color too,
For she swilled Breganze wine
Till her nose turned deep carmine; (iv, 251-57)

Such malice would not be in keeping with a messenger of God but would be perfectly in keeping with Pippa's feelings as she has revealed herself. She could not possibly bring herself to harlotry, but even that life has a color that hers lacks.

In final despair she describes the "drear dark close" to her poor day, ending on a note of darkness, of night, of "Monks and nuns, in a cloister's moods." A pathetic contrast to her morning thoughts and hopes. In the next lines Pippa makes a reference to how she might have touched the Four Happiest, intimating that she might have some awareness of her role. I think these lines can be explained by examining an earlier version of them. In the first scene just after the New Year's hymn Browning originally wrote the lines (Intro., ll. 202 ff.) as:

And more of it, and more of it—oh yes!
So that my passing and each happiness
I pass will be alike important—prove
That true! Oh yes—the brother,
The bride, the lover, and the mother.—
Only to pass whom will remove—
Whom a mere look at half will cure
The Past, and help me to endure
The coming . . . I am just as great, no doubt, as they. |

This would indicate that Browning at first has Pippa aware, or at least hopeful, that her passing would be im-

8. Glen, p. 413.

The fact that Ruskin removed passages specifically condemned by reviews would seem to reveal that he was more sensitive to periodical criticism than has been realized. Ruskin was, in fact, quite sensitive to criticism of his early works, and when, for example, a critic objected to the arguments of his chapter "Of Water, as Painted by the Ancients," Ruskin revised the chapter almost completely. J. H. Maw, a correspondent for *The Art-Union Journal*, which had not given the first volume of *Modern Painters* a particularly favorable review, had written a letter to the more receptive *Artist's and Amateur's Magazine*³ attacking Ruskin's statement that "the horizontal lines cast by clouds on the sea, are not shadows, but reflections" (Vol. 3, pp. 521-22). Ruskin replied to Maw's objections with additional proof which the *Artist's and Amateur's Magazine* published in February 1844.⁴ When Ruskin published his revised edition in 1846, he included a new, more elaborate discussion of the points that Maw had criticized.

Although this sensitivity to criticism is typical of many of Ruskin's revisions, his manner of revision here was not: usually he was most concerned, not to clarify a point, but to remove rhetorical flourishes, unnecessarily harsh criticism, and arrogant advice. For example, he deleted this attack on Claude, and more than a dozen similar passages criticizing continental artists:

No there is no doubt nor capability of dispute about such painting as this; it is the work of a mere tyro, and a weak and childish tyro, ignorant of the common laws of light and shadow; it is what beginners always do and always have done, but what, if they have either sense or feeling, they soon cease to do. (Vol. 3, p. 466n)

In addition to removing such passages, Ruskin improved the manner of the work by altering some of his images. Thus, he changed his remark that "The simple pleasure in the imitation would be precisely of the same degree (if the accuracy could be equal), whether the subject of it be a Madonna or a lemon-peel" to read "whether the subject of it were the hero or his horse" (Vol. 3, p. 101n).

Furthermore, as Ruskin departed from his pamphleteering manner and as he found it necessary to create a less arrogant work, he tried for a more moderate, more reasoning tone. This new attitude toward his readers and his material is pointed out by his removal of sections in which he had emphasized his superiority as a critic of Turner. The third edition appeared without this passage

from the section on mountains: "It will only be when we can feel as well as think, and rejoice as well as reason, that I shall be able to lead you with Turner to his favourite haunts" (Vol. 3, p. 468n). Ruskin's less arrogant attitude is to be observed in many revisions of this kind. In some cases the modification was simply the exchange of a few words. The first two editions contain the following praise of Turner: "Beyond dispute, the noblest sea that Turner ever painted, and, if so, the noblest certainly ever painted by man, is that of the *Slave Ship*" (Vol. 3, p. 571). In the third and subsequent editions, "Beyond dispute" is replaced by "I think."

Ruskin not only made many such stylistic revisions to allow the first volume to lead more smoothly toward the more dignified, less polemical style of the second, he also removed many statements that made the first volume primarily a defense of Turner and English landscape art. First of all, he omitted many passages commending Turner. There are, for example, at least ten occasions in which the third edition did not have the previously inevitable conclusion that "no artist, dead or living, except Turner, has ever attained" (Vol. 3, p. 295n) this or that truth of nature. Some of the omitted passages that referred to Turner contained lists of examples (Vol. 3, p. 266n) while others were but brief phrases (Vol. 3, pp. 351n, 366n), and in all these instances Ruskin felt it necessary to prune them from a volume that was now, in the third edition, more than a defense of one artist.

And, since *Modern Painters* was also more than the defense of one school, Ruskin found it necessary to remove much of the emphasis he had previously granted lesser English painters. Thus, although he did remove praise of Michelangelo (Vol. 3, p. 117n), an early favorite with whom he became disenchanted, most of the passages of commendation that he omitted refer to English landscape painters. For example, all editions contain the sentence that "Three penstrokes of Raffaele are a greater and a better picture than the most finished work that ever Carlo Dolci polished into inanity" (Vol. 3, p. 91), but the first two editions continue with another parallel: "A pencil scratch of Wilkie's on the back of a letter is a great and a better picture—and I use the term picture in its full sense—than the most laboured and luminous canvas that ever left the easel of Gerard Dow" (Vol. 3, p. 91n). This particular comparison, it is interesting to note, had been attacked by *The Athenaeum*: "With what justice," they conclude, "might the Modern Painters cry out on reading

3. E. V. Ripingale's review in the *Artist's and Amateur's Magazine*, I (1843), 257-64, praised Ruskin's method and attacked *The Art-Union Journal's* criticism of the first volume of *Modern Painters*. Maw, correspondent for *The Art-Union Journal*, then wrote a

letter to the *Artist's and Amateur's Magazine* which was printed with Ruskin's reply.

4. The editors include Ruskin's answering letter in an appendix to the first volume of *Modern Painters* (Vol. 3, pp. 655-61).

these ludicrous exaggerations—Heaven defend us from such a defender as this!⁵ Ruskin's attempt both to improve the tone of his work and to remove undue emphasis upon the moderns appears to have been prompted by this notice in a review. He omitted other similar contrasts of ancients and moderns, such as this one, which, as far as I can discover, was not specifically attacked: "There are few of our landscape painters, who though they may not possess the intimate and scientific geological knowledge of Stanfield and Harding, are not incomparably superior in every quality of drawing to every one of the old masters" (Vol. 3, p. 479n). Ruskin deleted other commendations of English landscapists, among which was an extended praise of Copley Fielding (Vol. 3, p. 482n), but the most important indication of his changed estimate of English art appears in the extensive revisions he made in the chapter "General Application of the Foregoing Principles," which ends the section on the sources of pleasure in art. The first four parts of this chapter, which remain unaltered, examine the works of Claude, Cuypp, Gaspar Poussin, and Salvator Rosa. In the first and second editions, sections six through thirteen, which discussed David Cox, Copley Fielding, J. D. Harding, Clarkson Stanfield, Turner, Canaletto, and Samuel Prout, were mainly a comparison of the manner in which the last four artists painted Venice. Ruskin removed the emphasis from English painters in the new concluding sections that discussed an additional forty-five painters, most of whom were European. Thus, while retaining the artists he had discussed previously, Ruskin widened the scope of his chapter to make it prepare for the second volume, which, with its examples from Italian art, had recently appeared.

In addition to the revisions made in the main text of Volume I, Ruskin also removed, changed, and added many notes. In one case the omission of a note can be traced to the harsh criticism of a review. The first and second editions contained the following note on Maclise's *Hamlet*, a work which had been exhibited at the Academy in 1842:

We have a very great respect for Mr. Maclise's power as a draughtsman, and if we thought that his errors proceeded from weakness, we should not allude to them, but we most devoutly wish that he would let Shakespeare alone. If the Irish ruffian who appeared in 'Hamlet' last year had been gifted with a stout shillelagh, and if his state of prostration had been rationally accounted for by distinct evidence of a recent 'compliment' on the crown; or if the maudlin expression of the young lady christened 'Ophelia' had been properly explained by an empty gin-

bottle on her lap, we should have thanked him for his powerful delineation both of character and circumstance. But we cannot permit him thus to mislead the English public (unhappily too easily led by any grinning and glittering fantasy) in all their conceptions of the intention of Shakespeare. (Vol. 3, p. 619n)

The Art-Union Journal based its unfavorable review of *Modern Painters* on Ruskin's arrogance and unfairness to artists other than Turner, using this note as its major example:

From this new teacher the public may hope nothing—the beginning, end, and middle of his career is Turner, in whose praise he is vehement and indiscriminate; when speaking of other artists not in the vein of his own taste, he hesitates not at indulgence in scurrilities, such as have not disgraced the columns of any newspaper. In allusion to Maclise's 'Hamlet' of last year, he speaks of the ruffian who appeared in *Hamlet*; and after adding that "a stout shillelagh" would have been a fitting accompaniment to the figure, continues "and if his state of prostration had been rationally accounted for by distinct evidence of a recent compliment [sic] on the crown; or if the maudlin [sic] expression of the young lady christened *Ophelia* [sic] had been properly explained by an empty gin-bottle on her lap," &c. &c. Is this criticism? We humbly opine that a tone so coarse is not to be found in any of the newspaper notices, which we agree with him in condemning.⁶

Ruskin evidently took heed of this criticism, for he removed the note from the third edition.

Ruskin's usual method, however, was not to delete but to add notes, and his additions indicate the changes in his attitudes and interests that we have already observed. Throughout his career he continued to add notes to earlier works until, like a medieval palimpsest, a particular work, such as *Modern Painters*, would contain layers, occasionally contradictory, that had been deposited at different times. In the third edition he frequently supplied new notes, clarifying his earlier statements, qualifying them, or adding later commentary or praise. For example, in the section on truth of tone where he had first remarked that "truths of form and distance . . . are more important than truths of tone" (Vol. 3, p. 270), Ruskin added the note: "More important, observe, as matters of truth or fact. It may often chance that, as a matter of feeling, the tone is the more important of the two; but with this we have here no concern" (Vol. 3, p. 270n). He qualified his earlier criticism of engraving (Vol. 3, p. 299n) and his discussion of tree form (Vol. 3, p. 579n). He also added a remark that a

5. February 3, No. 849, p. 106.

6. *The Art-Union*, V(1843), 151. This periodical is variously known as *The Art Journal*, *The Art-Union*, and *The Art-Union Journal*;

the second title is used for the issue including the review of the first volume of *Modern Painters*.

group of trees in Turner's *Marly* resembled a group in Tintoretto's *Cain and Abel* (Vol. 3, p. 593n). In one case Ruskin removed a criticism of Fielding's cloud drawing from the text and replaced it by a generally complimentary footnote (Vol. 3, p. 399n). There is, however, one instance when he added, rather than removed, a critical note, and this addition was apparently prompted by the second review of *Modern Painters*, Volume I, in *The Athenaeum*. The *Athenaeum* reviewer had wondered "How such a grand-tourist as he proclaims himself should not say one word of the sublime Pitti Salvators. . . ." Ruskin gave his answer in a note: "I have above exhausted all terms of vituperation, and probably disgusted the reader; and yet I have not spoken with enough severity: I know not any terms of blame that are bitter enough to chastise justly the mountain drawing of Salvator in the pictures of the Pitti Palace" (Vol. 3, p. 456n). This note was not, however, characteristic of those notes added to the 1846 edition of Volume I, for the usual note adds praise or explanation, not censure. Perhaps the most important note of explanation is that with which Ruskin closed his revised edition of the first volume. Answering the reviews of Volume II, which had, he says, suggested that he had lost his respect for Turner, Ruskin states that his first view and valuation of Turner has not changed, and that any change of method was necessitated by a new subject that demanded "a more general view of the scope and operation of art. . . . The reader will therefore find, not that lower rank is attributed to Turner, but that he is henceforward compared with the greatest men, and occupies his true position among the

most noble of all time" (Vol. 3, p. 630n). In other words, although Ruskin had not changed in his belief that Turner was one of the greatest of painters, he had decided that *Modern Painters* was to demonstrate this greatness, not by polemical sorties against the reviewers, but by a more dignified elucidation of a theory of art.

In the third edition Ruskin removed much of his earlier emphasis on English painters, because as long as he had been concerned solely with defending a master of landscape painting, such an emphasis on native art and artists had been appropriate, but once he began to treat other aspects of art, he had to remove much of both his earlier praise and earlier censure. If we look at the effect of deleting passages praising Turner, we shall see that their removal tends to place the importance, not on Turner himself, but on the points Ruskin is making about art; and this is appropriate because he had realized that his work would be, not merely a defense of Turner that used a theory of art and beauty, but a theory of art and beauty that included Turner as one of the greatest of all painters. In many cases Ruskin improved his style, ridding the first volume of unclear constructions and repetitious concluding remarks, but most of the deletions, as well as his other changes, were the result of a new conception of *Modern Painters*. And, although one of the most important changes Ruskin made was to shift his attention from the periodical reviewers to a more general audience, the reviewers were responsible for many of the specific revisions of the first volume.

Columbia University

Swinburne and the Whitmaniacs

William J. Goede

FRANCES WINWAR tells how "the instable little Swinburne" heard Dante Rossetti reading *Leaves of Grass* and "shrieked his delight, his long thin hands fluttering at his sides, like the wings of his excitement." But in time his wings become horns: "Just when Whitman was enjoying a taste of fame at home, Swinburne turned against him. True, Swinburne had long ceased to be the poet of 'rap-

tures and roses.' Theodore Watts had seen to that when he took the red-haired demon from the vices of London and carried him off bodily to Putney for purposes of reform."¹ To paraphrase Swinburne himself on Whitman,² it seems the truth, for good and evil, of their friendship has been lost. Edmund Gosse's widely accepted theories about Swinburne's "ungracious recantation,"³ his "unstable

7. February 10, 1844, No. 850, p. 132.

1. *American Giant: Walt Whitman and his Times* (New York, 1941), p. 242.

2. *Under the Microscope*, in *The Complete Works*, ed. E. Gosse and T. J. Wise, Bonchurch ed. (London, 1927), XVI, 411, hereafter cited as *Works*.

3. *The Life of Algernon Charles Swinburne* (London, 1917), p. 95.

temperament," and his "reform" at Putney have exorcised a "red-haired demon" to haunt us a half-century.⁴

But recent studies of Swinburne's criticism and the publication of letters—many hitherto unprinted—by both him and Whitman make it possible to re-evaluate their relationship.⁵ This has not always been done. Gay Wilson Allen, for instance, reiterates the charge that "Swinburne was not entirely consistent," Robert Peters is himself inconsistent about the "reappraisal" of Whitman, and W. B. Cairns finds him not merely inconsistent but also unfair because "... judicial estimates cannot be expected of a man who enjoyed using so intense a vocabulary."⁶

On the contrary, Swinburne was quite capable of justice, and it is possible now to say and to document that the "recantation" of Whitman was, in fact, but restatement. It is true that Swinburne qualified his earlier views, but he did not change them. His vocabulary is in fact "intense," but he does reveal strong reservations about Whitman from the start: he detected a certain "noise" that, if it grew, would turn poetry into politics. First sensed in *William Blake*, this "noise" is discussed in *Under the Microscope* and then ridiculed in "Whitmania."⁷ His later censures do seem erratic. We should see, however, that Swinburne continually uses Whitman not as a subject of praise or abuse, but simply as an illustration of a larger poetic principle. He is thrilled by Blake, and Whitman provides an example of Blake's sublimity and contemporaneity; he is infuriated by Robert Buchanan and other devotees of blank verse and historicisms, and Whitman is an example of their posturing.

Two points critics make in defense of Swinburne are: first, that he never qualified his admiration for a few of Whitman's poems; second, that he attacked not so much Whitman as he did his imitators and apostles, the Whitmaniacs who were comparing "the good, gray poet" not simply with Blake, as Swinburne had cautiously done, but with Dante, Homer, and Shakespeare.⁸

Although Gosse thought that Swinburne became acquainted with Whitman in 1862 through George Howard's copy of the 1855 *Leaves of Grass*,⁹ Swinburne had in fact already told William Bell Scott in December 1859: "Item

—I have got the immortal Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* and there are jolly good things in it, I allow" (Lang, I, 28). When later Swinburne is critical of Whitman while other critics were just beginning to find "jolly good things," we should recall that Swinburne was perhaps his first sympathetic reader in England. As Blodgett has said, the general reader, unlike Swinburne, was at first disturbed; the early English reviews of Whitman's poems "all run the same gamut from shocked indignation to jocularly and puzzled friendliness."¹⁰ As a matter of fact, Swinburne wrote to Whitman for another copy of the 1855 *Leaves* and received an autographed copy of the 1860 edition.¹¹ He found there a new poem that was better than anything in the 1855 *Leaves*. He told Lord Houghton on August 18, 1862 (the letter, incidentally, which Gosse sets against "the ungracious recantation" of later years): "Have you seen the latest edition of Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass*? for there is one poem in it—'A Voice [sic] from the Sea'—about two birds on a sea-beach, which I really think the most lovely and wonderful thing I have read for years and years. I could rhapsodize about it for ten or more pages, there is such beautiful skill and subtle power in every word of it; but I spare you . . ." (Lang, I, 58). Although in 1862 he was rhapsodic—scarcely "shrieking"—about the poem re-titled "Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking," four years later he found "bluster" in Whitman's newer poems. It seems at the time that he was alone, for according to Blodgett Whitman had inspired the European imagination like no other American poet: "In transatlantic perspective the bard became colossal and fascinating, an Adamic figure with a thrilling message from a young country. . . . Still another turn was given to the English literary unrest by the aesthetic revolt of the '90's, the leaders of which regarded Walt as a fellow rebel."¹² Swinburne's misgivings appeared privately in 1866, six years before *Under the Microscope* and eleven before "Whitmania." On November 7, 1866, but five days after he had described "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd" to Houghton as "a superb piece of music and colour" (Lang, I, 156), he told G. B. O'Halloran: "I am sure you will thank me for an

4. See for instance W. B. Cairns, "Swinburne's Opinion of Whitman," *American Literature*, III (May 1931); Harold Blodgett, "Walt Whitman in England," *American Mercury*, XVII (August 1929); Harold Nicholson, *Swinburne* (London, 1926), p. 161; Samuel Chew, *Swinburne* (Boston, 1929); T. E. Welby, *A Study of Swinburne* (New York, 1926); James E. Miller, Jr., et al., *Start With the Sum: Studies in Cosmic Poetry* (Lincoln, 1960), pp. 22-23. Miller adds "fear" to "unreasoned hostility"; he believes as well that Whitman regarded Swinburne as an "enemy" in his last days. Opposed to this view is Georges Lafourcade, "Swinburne and Walt Whitman," *Modern Language Review*, XXII (January 1927), 84-86.

5. Thomas E. Connolly, *Swinburne's Theory of Poetry* (Albany, 1964); Robert Peters, *Crowns of Apollo: Swinburne's Principles*

of *Literature and Art* (Detroit, 1965); Cecil Y. Lang, *Swinburne's Letters* (New Haven, 1962), hereafter cited as Lang; and *The Collected Writings of Walt Whitman*, ed. Gay Wilson Allen and C. T. Davis (New York, 1961-1965), hereafter cited as Allen.

6. Gay Wilson Allen, *The Solitary Singer* (New York, 1955), p. 446; Peters, pp. 22 and 23; Cairns, p. 125.

7. *Works*, Vols. XVI and XV, respectively.

8. Swinburne's obsession for a hierarchy of poets, and the reasons behind it are discussed in Connolly, pp. 23-28.

9. *The Life*, p. 94.

10. Harold Blodgett, *Walt Whitman in England* (Ithaca, 1934), p. 8.

11. This copy is missing from the list Lang supplied from the auction of Swinburne's library, see MLN, LXIV (1949), 176-77.

12. *Walt Whitman in England*, pp. 9-10.

introduction (if you want one) to so true and great a poet, faulty and foolish as I think him now and then" (Lang, I, 210-11). At the same time, however, he wrote to Moncure Conway, an American clergyman in England proselytizing for Whitman, of the poet's real strengths, for the first time favorably comparing him to Blake: "... in many points both of matter and manner—gospel and style—his Leaves of Grass have been anticipated or rivalled by the unpublished semi-metrical 'Prophetic Books' of William Blake" (Lang, I, 208). He also noted that Whitman writes the same kind of "semi-metrical verse (or prose)," but at this point his not knowing what to call it seems, to him, unimportant. It will mean a great deal later. Both Whitman and Blake, he said, write about the "healthy, natural, and anti-natural" and they both belong "to the same race of men. . . ." (Lang, I, 209).

The following spring and summer, Swinburne wrote a number of letters to John Nichol in Glasgow. (Lang reports that Nichol's daughter burned most of the letters.) Swinburne struggled not to accept Nichol's blanket rejection of Whitman: "About the *Drum Taps* I at once agree & disagree with you—i.e., there was some half of new things in the book so beautiful & noble that I can't think of the rest or care about it. On the whole, though, I have little doubt you are right—but how perfect & how grand is that dirge for President Lincoln . . ." (Lang, I, 251). As he had found "Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking" the outstanding work of the 1860 *Leaves*, he now recognized "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd" as Whitman's most successful poem in *Drum Taps*. So far at least, Swinburne's critical insights have been borne out by time.

His fullest criticism of Whitman to date appeared in a letter to William Rossetti on October 6, 1867, a portion of which Rossetti cited, with minor changes, in his 1868 edition of Whitman:

To me it seems always his great flaw is a fault of debility, not an excess of strength—I mean his bluster. His own personal and national self-reliance and arrogance I need not tell you I applaud and sympathize and rejoice in, but the frothy and blatant ebullience of feeling and speech at times is very feeble for so great a poet of so great a people. He is in part, certainly, the prophet of democracy, but not wholly, because he tries so openly to be, and asserts so violently that he is: always fighting the case out on a platform. This is the only thing I really or gravely dislike and revolt from. On the whole, my admiration and enjoyment of his greatness grows keener and warmer every time I think of him (Lang, I, 222).

Still Swinburne is proud "of being cited as a witness to the honour of . . . Whitman." At the same time, Swinburne told Rossetti about his own plans to write a book, which ultimately became *Songs at Sunrise*; "I think I may some time accomplish a book of political or national poems as complete and coherent in its way as . . . Drum Taps. . . . The only fear is that one may be disabled by one's desire—made impotent by excess of strain" (Lang, I, 267-68). Rossetti could not agree about Whitman's "bluster." He printed his first encomium in *The Chronicle* on July 6, 1867, and supported Whitman to the end. His edition of Whitman helped to bring about a movement of writers in support of Whitman.

Then, in *William Blake*, completed in 1866, Swinburne made his attitude toward Whitman public. We should not doubt the sincerity in his comparisons between two vatic poets, but rather note that Swinburne was among the first to suggest a continuity that later critics regard as matter-of-fact.¹³ Swinburne recognized their shared hatred for tyranny, love of freedom, and heightened belief in the inevitability of democracy: "The great American is not a more passionate preacher of sexual or political freedom than the English artist. To each the imperishable form of a possible and universal Republic is equally requisite and adorable as is the temporal and spiritual queen of ages of men. . . ." ¹⁴ Throughout this section we recognize "a luxuriance of prolonged emotion" that, as Robert Peters says, often seems to be work "for an ambitious advertizing agency."¹⁵ This extravagance is, however, more evident in the concluding comments than in the body of the book; it is here, of course, that the comparison occurs. Whitman seems to be an interesting footnote to an extensive study of Blake.

What is ignored in the theory of Swinburne's "recantation" is his early recognition of the same shortcomings of the two writers: "... that their poetry has at once the melody and the laxity of a fitful stormwind; that, being oceanic, it is troubled with violent ground-swells and sudden perils of ebb and reflux, of shoal and reef, perplexing to the swimmer or the sailor; in a word, that it partakes of the powers and the faults of elemental and eternal things; that it is at times noisy and barren and loose, rootless and fruitless and informal; and is in the main fruitful and delightful and noble, a necessary part of the divine mechanism of things" (WB, p. 337). But we note that Swinburne's impressionistic language—the poetry is "oceanic" and part of the natural order of things—is in the closing pages of a long book on Blake.

13. See for example Josephine Miles, "The Poetry of Praise," *The Kenyon Review*, XXIII (Winter, 1961), 204-25.

14. *William Blake* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1906), p. 334, hereafter cited as WB.

15. Peters, p. 24.

Swinburne does not choose to dwell on fine points; this is not a book of comparative criticism.

More important, however, are Swinburne's distinctions. Whitman has not "struck a note of thought and speech so just and so profound as Blake has now and then touched upon; but his work is generally more frank and fresh, smelling of sweeter air. . . ." (*WB*, p. 337). Later, Swinburne will enlarge upon Whitman's profundity; ironically, Whitman also protests against Swinburne's "thought and speech." Finally, this footnote is obviously exploratory, and his reservation, here sensed, will become clearer as he reads more of Whitman's "improved" work.

For all their goodwill toward each other, the two poets never met; they never even wrote to each other. Each sent autographed editions to the other, but Whitman seemed reluctant about encouraging Swinburne's friendship; moreover, Burroughs persuaded him to avoid it. When Moncure Conway told him that Swinburne was cheering him in England, Whitman replied: "I feel prepared in advance to render my cordial and admiring respect to Mr. Swinburne—I would gladly have him know that I thank him heartily for the mention which, I understand, he has made of me in the *Blake*" (Allen, I, 16). Later he reported that Swinburne had sent him "a handsome copy" of the *Blake*, and he typically wrote, not to Swinburne, but to Hotten to convey his thanks.

When Rossetti heard that Swinburne had suggested the title "Songs before Sunrise" for his volume of 1871, he reminded the poet that it too closely echoed Whitman's "Songs before Parting"; this, Swinburne said, was precisely the point: "I don't think Whitman's title . . . need act as an impediment to mine of Songs before Sunrise (if suggested by Whitman's, that is itself so far a compliment to Whitman)" (Lang, II, 65-66). And on August 28, 1870, he told Rossetti that he had doubled the length of his Whitman poem: ". . . I have enlarged the expression of an appeal from the suffering European democracy to the triumphant American" (Lang, II, 121-22). Whitman was pleased. According to Moncure Conway, he "took it rather as a laudation of himself."¹⁶ Once again, however, Whitman is an excuse, or perhaps a leading example, for Swinburne's real purpose. The poem's force, I think, lies in its humanity, its patriotic fervor, and its universal implication.

His "appeal" worked; Whitman sent one of his "songs" overseas: "Democratic Vistas," his program for American poets. Swinburne, however, found it confirmed his suspicion. In a letter to Frederick Locker on November 23, 1871,

he said: "Walt Whitman has just sent me his pamphlet on 'Democratic Vistas'—there are noble things in it—also perverse" (Lang, III, 172-73). We note again Swinburne's insistence upon the two aspects of Whitman. His ambivalence was, unfortunately, not known widely, as illustrated by a *New York World* article-interview in which Swinburne was quoted praising *Leaves*.

Whitman's "perversities" were publicized in *Under the Microscope* the following spring. The poet told Watts-Dunton that "the mere fringe and drapery" of the essay, a "Fragment of a Prose Dunciad," is but one part of a serious discussion "on which I had long been moved to speak my mind" (Lang, II, 208-09). This long essay amplifies his ambivalence toward Whitman.

I do not intend to discuss the whole essay, engendered and explained as it is in part as a refutation of Robert Buchanan's attack upon Swinburne in his essay, "The Fleshly School of Poetry." Buchanan, like Rossetti and Swinburne, had supported Whitman from the first; but, unlike them, not always wisely. Since the essay is essentially an attack on Buchanan, Swinburne uses Whitman only to point out that critic's inconsistencies. For the third time, Whitman is used as example, not as subject.

His objections to Whitman are, however, partly independent of this attack. They outline rather succinctly Swinburne's feelings toward Whitman. Peters says that Swinburne "favored a modified aestheticism," and that he felt that once "technical matters are properly attended to other matters will take care of themselves."¹⁷ Swinburne despised both esthetes and reformers. Whitman seemed a reformer. Although he failed to list him with Prudhomme and Millais as an "archetypal capitulator" to the Philistines, there is little doubt that his increased attack upon Whitman stems in part from Whitman's radical defense of himself in "Democratic Vistas."

He says that "the good and evil" of Whitman has never been spoken; he will thus discuss both aspects, enlarging upon what he had already suggested in the *Blake*: "There are in him two distinct men of most inharmonious kinds; a poet and a formalist."¹⁸ A formalist is a writer whose technical matters have not been "properly attended to"; he merely rhymes morals, lectures, catalogues, and above all does not "sing." But his real theme is stated unequivocally: he approves of any poetic materials so long as the poet makes something of them. Although he will enlarge upon this in "Whitmania," he notes that Whitman's peculiar debility is that he does not make anything out of

16. Moncure D. Conway, *Autobiography* (Boston and New York, 1904), p. 416.

17. Peters, pp. 55, 63.

18. See Vol. XVI, Bonchurc ed., *Complete Works*; hereafter cited as *UM*.

his subjects. He is content merely "to tumble down together the names of all possible crafts and implements in one unsorted heap" (*UM*, p. 414). On the other hand, he lectures when he should be singing. This does not mean that Whitman is not a poet; on the contrary: "Whenever the pure poet in Whitman speaks; it is settled by that proof in his favour; whenever the mere theorist in him speaks, it is settled by the same proof against him" (*UM*, p. 413). The rest of the criticism stems from this distinction.

But it is the drift toward proletarian art that shocks Swinburne. He views with alarm the acceptance of Whitman as the new poet, for "the prophet in him too frequently subsides into the lecturer." He is simply not for us a viable model; but this is perhaps more wish than prediction. In the next few years, first in England and then in America, Whitman became a model not so much of materials but certainly of free verse. Moreover, Whitman's influence on twentieth-century poets is overwhelming. Swinburne could not himself stem the tide.

Whitman's response to the essay is really unknown. But for a few letters we have to believe what Horace Traubel and John Burroughs tell us. Traubel's method of interview is limited,¹⁹ and Burroughs once said, "I cannot read Swinburne without a kind of mental nausea."²⁰ When Whitman is incommunicative, particularly during the latter part of the 1880's, Burroughs *assumes* that Whitman feels this way or that, and his assumptions become facts.

Whitman all the while was pleased with Swinburne, yet once again he does not write to him but to Rossetti: "I deeply appreciate Swinburne's courtesy and approbation. I ought to have written him to acknowledge the very high compliment of his poem addressed to me in *Songs before Sunrise*—but I am just the most wretched and procrastinating letter-writer alive. I have sent him my last edition, to care of Ellis and Green. If I should indeed come to England, I will call upon him among the first, and personally thank him . . ." (Allen, II, 161). But, of course, he never visited England. Traubel felt, however, Whitman was in 1877 turning away from Swinburne when he quoted him saying: "He is always the extremist—always all pro or all con: always hates altogether or loves altogether."²¹

Swinburne, however, continued to support Whitman in his correspondence. He wrote to Paul Hayne in 1875: "But of all your eminent men I know none but Whitman who has said a good word for us, sent us a message of sym-

pathy nobly conceived and worthily expressed, paid a memorial tribute to the countless heroes and martyrs of our cause" (Lang, III, 35). After Lord Houghton had visited Camden, he wrote to Swinburne about his trip. Swinburne's reply was an occasion for him to continue his struggle against Whitman's followers: "I was very glad to hear from you that you had seen Whitman, and that he showed interest in my recognition of his genius. I wish you could have brought him over to shake hands with his English admirers, among whom there are plenty of sober and rational judges like myself, apart from the ultras or Whitmaniacs . . ." (Lang, III, 121-22). The term "Whitmaniacs" was in general usage; William D. O'Connor claimed it as his own invention.²² On March 4, 1876, Swinburne let fly his most emphatic statement in a letter to William Rossetti: "Poor old Whitman? . . . Pity he has no friend at hand to keep him from writing such *damned* nonsense about poetry and verse . . . the most blatant bray of impudent ignorance I ever heard except from the throat of Bavius Buchanan or Maevius Maitland" (Lang, III, 171). The Blake-Whitman comparison is being steadily narrowed to a Buchanan-Whitman relationship, which, in his next essay, will be made more explicit.

Finally, Swinburne unleashed his accumulated resentment against the "Whitmaniacs." It was his final word upon the whole affair. Two letters he wrote before the essay suggest, however, that his animus was not personal. Two more of Swinburne's acquaintances, Oscar Wilde and Edmund Gosse, had just returned from Camden. A letter to Gosse elaborates upon the two-sided Whitman: "I retain a very cordial admiration for not a little of his earlier work; but the habit of vague and flatulent verbiage seems to me to have grown upon him instead of decreasing; and I must say it is long since I have read anything of his which seemed to me worth the nobler passages of his *Drum Taps* and the earliest 'Leaves of Grass'" (Lang, V, 100). The last letter in Lang's collection in which Swinburne discusses Whitman is perhaps most important in explaining "Whitmania." He tells John Nichols: "Read when you have time—my article on Whitmania. . . . It is all our good friend W. R. Rossetti's fault; he *would* have it—putting Walt 'only a little below Shakespeare'!!!!!!" (Lang, V, 205). For the Fourth and last time, Whitman is not a subject of his abuse; Rossetti had upset Swinburne's chain of poetic being, and this led to chaos and the victory of verbiage.

"Whitmania" appeared in the August 1887 issue of

19. See Gay Wilson Allen, *Walt Whitman as Man, Poet, and Legend* (Carbondale, 1961), p. 118.

20. Clara Barrus, *The Life and Letters of John Burroughs* (Boston and New York, 1925), pp. 395-96.

21. Horace Traubel, *With Walt Whitman in Camden*, 4 vols. (1806, 1908, 1914; ed. Sculley Bradley, 1953), hereafter cited as Traubel.

22. See Roger Asselineau, *The Evolution of Walt Whitman* (Cambridge, Mass., 1960), p. 351.

The Fortnightly Review. The essay deserves close attention, but suffice it here to say that Swinburne begrudgingly admits Whitman worthy of "occasional notice and occasional respect," yet he cannot sanely be considered "a poet or a thinker in the proper sense."²³ He does hold out hope, however, that with a little schooling he could become a "noticeable lecturer." But all his strongest barbs are reserved for the "Whitmaniacs"; what they are really doing, he says, is acting like very good dunces. Once again, in an essay more Augustan than Victorian, Whitman is used to expose the vanities of English critics and poets. Behind its blistering wit, however, "Whitmania" is a serious attack on the development of free verse and naturalism in English letters.

Where "recanters" err, it seems to me, is to assume that Swinburne was from the beginning an ardent disciple of Whitman. Because in so many ways he has spoken for Whitman, people have assumed he was himself a "Whitmaniac." But I have tried to suggest the limitations of this view. And on this matter Swinburne has written not so much a "recantation" as a disclaimer: "... the present writer at any rate most decidedly never intended to convey by any tribute of sympathy or admiration which may have earned for him the wholly unmerited honour of an imaginary enlistment in the noble army of Whitmaniacs" ("W", p. 121). He does not object to those who feel that Whitman is the only poet who ever lived: they at least have logic on their side. But as indicated in his letter to John Nichol, the "Whitmaniacs," on the other hand, have made ridiculous comparisons. The apostles have lost their heads and will not listen to reason; the situation is really too laughable to admit serious discussion; Swinburne is unable to lodge any serious protest.

We should see the article as a whole. Vituperation is generally directed against the Englishmen who have "debased the genuine metal." He admits Whitman is the genuine article, but he uses him as an example of the ridiculous lengths to which his followers have gone in support. That he abuses Whitman and makes some gratuitous re-

marks is undeniable. But on the whole his aim is not erratic. Even as his own productivity declined, Whitman's attempts to argue for a production of a national literature own an arrogance not likely to win much admiration. Whitman insisted America break poetic ties with England, and Swinburne in the end was willing to let him.

Whitman himself was so reluctant to comment on the essay that he refused Burrough's suggestion and the invitation of the editor of the *North American Review* to write a refutation. His reaction to Burrough's comments are "recorded" by Traubel: "I don't feel like damning Swinburne for saving himself. . . . Swinburne has his own bigness: he is not to be drummed out of all camps because he does not find himself comfortable in our camp" (Traubel, II, 155). It seems curious that all along neither of the poets knew much directly about the other, and, when reacting to constant prodding by others, each reacted in his own personal way. It has been the business of other men to provide the mythic framework.

Perhaps no final assessment of Swinburne's critical views of Whitman is possible. If one is able to penetrate the incense of some of his earlier criticism and the smoke of the later, he is able to acknowledge a consistency often missed by a too uncritical recitation of the old myths about the two poets. Swinburne felt and understood the limitation of Whitman from the start: there should be no talk about "recantation," ungracious or otherwise. He thought he was quelling poetic disorder not by denouncing the genius but by exposing a lunatic fringe.²⁴ We are likely to remember the radical methods and find an "unstable temperament," but we should begin to understand the substance of the judgment. It is unfortunate that Swinburne did not undertake a larger, self-contained study of Whitman; all we have are, in effect, mere passing remarks. That these remarks are still current in our discussions of Whitman is, I think, a remarkable tribute to the correctness of his insight.

University of Victoria

23. "Whitmania," *The Fortnightly Review* (August 1887), p. 171, hereafter cited as "W."

24. See Peters p. 73.

"The Butterfly" and *Wuthering Heights*:

A Mystic's Eschatology

Jo Anne A. Willson

So stood I, in Heaven's glorious sun
And in the glare of Hell
My spirit drank a mingled tone
Of seraph's song and demon's moan—
What my soul bore my soul alone
Within itself may tell.¹

"OLD HOUSES have a way of losing their front door keys, and, for over a hundred years, that of *Wuthering Heights* has been mislaid."² Searchers for it, beginning with Emily Brontë's sister, have found themselves drawn finally to the demoniacal figure of Heathcliff and his consuming love for Catherine; but whereas Charlotte wondered "whether it is right or advisable to create things like Heathcliff,"³ her followers have asked how the daughter of an Anglican vicar, with limited experience and a secluded life, could have created him at all.

Some of these have attempted to explain the novel by postulating biographical and psychological determinants: Emily Brontë had a fit in her mother's death-chamber and produced therefrom a "seraph-comforter" who became a "seraph-demon";⁴ she was in love with her father and in revenge developed "the worst of imaginary characters as a prototype of thwarted devotion";⁵ she learned about passion through an incestuous relationship with her brother Branwell;⁶ she had a secret lover, whom she met on the moors;⁷ one biographer, misreading the title of one of her poems, "Love's Farewell," as "Louis Paresnell," even asserted this was a lover whom Emily betrayed because she was a Lesbian in love with her sister Anne.⁸ The main objection to these theories is that we have no way either to prove or disprove them; except for two "birthday letters," all of Emily's personal writings were destroyed, allegedly by Charlotte. This fact may start justifiable suspicions, but

it renders any hypotheses based upon them irrelevant and idle.

Other searchers for the key to her novel have tried scientifically to identify what literature Emily Brontë read, and isolate from those works the germs of *Wuthering Heights*: the opening scenes and narrative technique come from Hoffman's *Das Majoret*, which she must have read while at school in Brussels in 1842;⁹ the usurpation theme she gleaned from the local history of Law Hill near Halifax, while she taught there in 1837;¹⁰ major elements of plot and of the characters of Heathcliff and Catherine come from a short story entitled "The Bridegroom of Bana" printed in the November 1840 issue of *Blackwood's Magazine*, "that ever-present literary guide and political mentor of the whole Brontë family";¹¹ another writer suggests that "a naturally gloomy imagination, nourished from childhood on too much Byron, may be sufficient explanation."¹² But "Byron was as much like her as the Alhambra is like the Tower of Babel"¹³ and those who believe Heathcliff was created because Emily Brontë heard of the usurper of Law Hill might believe Shakespeare wrote *King Lear* because he noticed the bad effects of a father's indulgence.

"The genius of Emily Brontë found its sources in itself."¹⁴ That she was a mystic is very probable; certainly her poetry, taken as a whole, has as its main theme a desire to escape the imprisonment of the human condition and a yearning for union with her "God of Visions." When these feelings take anthropomorphic form, as they do in the Gondal poems, we find foreshadowings of *Wuthering Heights*: a doomed, "melancholy boy" who becomes an "iron man" loves a golden-haired "child of delight"; sin and exile are combined with laments of sur-

1. Emily Jane Brontë, *Complete Poems*, ed. C. W. Hatfield (New York, 1941), p. 108 ("Well hast thou spoken").
2. G. Elsie Harrison, *The Clue to the Brontës* (London, 1948), p. 164.
3. Charlotte Brontë, "Editor's Preface to *Wuthering Heights*," 1850 ed. Reprinted in 1965 edition (New York), p. xxxi.
4. Romer Wilson, *All Alone: The Life and Private History of Emily Jane Brontë* (London, 1928), p. 27.
5. Ralph Aiken, "Wild-Heart: an Appreciation of Emily Jane Brontë," *So. Atlan. Q.*, XXXIV (April 1935), 203.
6. Eric Solomon, "The Incest Theme in *Wuthering Heights*," *NCE*, XIV (June 1959), 81.

7. Virginia Moore, *The Life and Eager Death of Emily Brontë* (London, 1936), p. 164.
8. Moore, p. 189.
9. Wilson, p. 218.
10. Leicester Bradner, "The Growth of *Wuthering Heights*," *PMLA*, XLVIII (March 1933), 138.
11. Bradner, p. 139.
12. Helen Brown, "The Influence of Byron on Emily Brontë," *MLR*, XXXIV (July 1939), 381.
13. Prince D. S. Mirsky, "Emily Brontë," *The London Mercury*, VII: 39 (January 1923), 268.
14. May Sinclair, *The Three Brontës* (Boston, 1912), p. xvi.

viving lovers for those who are dead; two proud and intractable lovers, Julius and Rosina, thwart each other with the intensity of passion; but the noble heroes and fine ladies of Emily Brontë's Gondal poems, their empires and revolutions, all disappear when one opens the novel. We have the "what" of *Wuthering Heights*, perhaps, but not the "why."

It is the purpose of this paper to suggest that the "why" of *Wuthering Heights* may be found in one of the five seldom-discussed essays written by Emily Brontë while she was a student at the Pensionat Hèger, Brussels, in 1842. These essays represent what are probably her first attempts at formulating a philosophy; like the novel, their appeal is more to perception than to reason, their effect is more that of a spell than an argument. The eschatological ideas in one of them, "The Butterfly," are echoed throughout the story of Heathcliff and Catherine. I regret I cannot say, with the inimitable Arnold Kettle, that "There is nothing vague about this novel."¹⁵ If the key I offer is not the long-lost one that will open the front door to this old house, perhaps it will fit another neglected lock.

Lockwood arrives at the gate of *Wuthering Heights* "just in time to escape the first feathery flakes of a snow shower"¹⁶ and walks into a storm that has been raging for twenty years. The inhabitants of the house, both biped and quadruped, Lockwood finds relating to one another through animal energy and brute force, communicating in proportion to their ability to inflict pain upon one another. The liver-colored bitch is "not accustomed to be spoiled—not kept for a pet" (p. 5), warns Heathcliff; the "young lady" also knows well the blows of her master, and jumps to safety at the threat of his hand, "obviously acquainted with its weight" (p. 30). The comfort of the horses and sheep among them is more important to these people than the ease of a visitor: "Guests are so exceedingly rare in this house," explains Heathcliff, "that I and my dogs . . . hardly know how to receive them" (p. 6). The society at *Wuthering Heights* is a primitive, elemental one, akin to the "atmospheric tumult" that gave the house its name, and sharing the deformity of the "stunted firs" and "gaunt thorns" that surround it.

Ellen Dean informs Lockwood that all this is the consequence of frustrated passion and a titanic revenge. But if *Wuthering Heights* is a revenge story, the weakening of Heathcliff's hatred at the end is inexplicable; if the novel

is only a love story, the importance of Hindley, Hareton, Cathy, and Linton is ill-suited to the central action, and the ending is anticlimactic. For a clue to Emily Brontë's purpose, we must turn to her essay:

All creation is equally insane. There are those flies playing above the stream, swallows and fish diminishing their number each minute; these will become in their turn the prey of some tyrant of air or water; and man for his amusement or for his needs will kill their murderers. Nature is an inexplicable puzzle, life exists on a principle of destruction; every creature must be the relentless instrument of death to the others, or himself cease to live.¹⁷

The world of the novel, formed by the Heights, the Grange, and Gimmerton Kirk, is closed and complete; none of its people is ever followed outside it, and when a character reenters, it is from the unknown. But "it has everything that matters: birth, death, love, hatred, nature, the seasons."¹⁸ In this "creation," this microcosm of the human condition, Heathcliff and Catherine find their love. It is a sexless, consubstantial affinity, born in their childhood and having as its nearest parallel the union with her "slave, comrade, and King," the "God of Visions," Emily Brontë celebrates in her poems. Never had two people loved in such a way, and "never had two people whose passion for each other transcended every human obstacle been so cruel to one another."¹⁹

But creation is insane—"Nature is like a patternless maze created by a madman. Its insanity lies in the fact that the good of one part is the evil of another part."²⁰ So Catherine announces she will marry Edgar Linton—in spite of her avowed intentions she tears asunder the mystical bond between herself and Heathcliff and liberates into the world the elemental energies they held within their union. As Heathcliff disappears into the darkness, a "violent wind" splits a great tree at the corner of the house; what was organically one must now endure, while life lasts, existence as two.

When Heathcliff returns, descriptions of him become uniformly suggestive of savagery and evil. He is a "fierce, pitiless, wolfish man," "a vicious cur," a "tiger or venomous serpent," a "mad dog," an "evil beast prowling between [Hindley] and the fold, waiting his time to spring and destroy" (p. 113). Heathcliff is identified with unyielding and harsh aspects of nature—"rough as a saw edge and hard as whinstone," an "arid wilder-

15. Arnold Kettle, *An Introduction to the English Novel* (London, 1951), I, 139.

16. Emily Brontë, *Wuthering Heights* (New York, 1965), p. 7. All subsequent page numbers given in the text are from this edition.

17. Emily Jane Brontë, *Five Essays Written in French*, trans. Lorine White Nagel (University of Texas, 1948), p. 17.

18. Inga-Stina Ewbank, *Their Proper Sphere* (Göteborg, Sweden, 1966), p. 129.

19. William Stanley Braithwaite, *The Bewitched Parsonage* (New York, 1950), p. 182.

20. J. Hillis Miller, *The Disappearance of God* (Cambridge, Mass., 1953), p. 164.

ness of furze and whinstone," and Catherine warns Isabella, "I'd as soon put that little canary into the park on a winter's day as recommend you to bestow your heart on him!" (p. 107)

In reaction and in defense against Heathcliff's cruelty, the people he affects become more like animals, or are described in those terms: Hareton becomes a "bear," the silly but innocent Isabella is seen by Heathcliff as a "strange, repulsive animal" and later is turned by his violence into enough of a "bloodthirsty monster" that she can half enjoy his fight with Hindley; Edgar Linton is a "sucking leveret" whom Heathcliff provokes to his one act of violence in the book; Heathcliff's son, Linton, is a "puling chicken" who yet can "undertake to torture any number of cats, if their teeth be drawn, and their claws pared" (p. 123). Wuthering Heights is a household under the dispensation of wrath, where "Treachery and violence are a just return for treachery and violence" (p. 186), and forgiveness is possible only when one can "for every wretch of agony, return a wretch" (p. 191).

It may be true, that "with a few adjustments to the plot, Heathcliff need not have entered the story as a human being at all. His part might have been played by fate, or nature, or God, or the Devil,"²¹ but for one important fact: if Catherine "is" Heathcliff, Heathcliff "is" also Catherine—she is his life, his soul, and the instrument of his torture. "If all else remained, and he were annihilated," Catherine says of Heathcliff, "the universe would turn into a mighty stranger" (p. 86). Should Catherine die, Heathcliff asserts, "Two words would comprehend my future—*death* and *hell*; existence, after losing her, would be hell" (p. 158). When her husband demands she choose between him and Heathcliff, Catherine wills to die, as vengeance on them both; but of the two, to Heathcliff this is the unkinder cut, because it is the final betrayal of their necessary love:

You teach me now how cruel you've been—cruel and false. Why did you despise me? Why did you betray your own heart, Cathy? I have not one word of comfort—you deserve this. You have killed yourself. Yes, you may kiss me, and cry; and wring out my kisses and tears. They'll blight you—they'll damn you. You loved me—then what right had you to leave me? What right—answer me—for the poor fancy you felt for Linton? Because misery, and degradation, and death, and nothing that God or Satan could inflict would have parted us, you, of your own will, did it. I have not broken your heart—you have broken it—and in breaking it, you have broken mine. So much

the worse for me, that I am strong. Do I want to live? What of living will it be when you—oh God! would you like to live with your soul in the grave? (p. 171)

Catherine dies on March 20, on the eve of a spring thwarted by the storm that follows her funeral, on the day of the birth of a daughter who will bear her name and share in enduring the hatred which has yet to be discharged. Before the second Cathy meets Heathcliff, on another March 20 sixteen years later, he has driven his wife away with his cruelty, been connected suspiciously with Hindley's death, expropriated Wuthering Heights from young Hareton, its rightful heir, and continued the process of turning the latter into a boorish lout. In the year that follows Cathy's sixteenth birthday Heathcliff forces her to marry the sickly Linton so that he may come into control of Thrushcross Grange when the boy dies, bribes a lawyer away from Edgar Linton's deathbed so that his will cannot be changed to frustrate Heathcliff's plans, allows his son to die of neglect, and apparently kills all kindness and pity in the Cathy whom Lockwood finally meets. He has set upon a career of cruelty—his whole life is concentrated on the suffering caused him by Catherine's loss, and the violence of his desire to find her again.

III

"In the course of my soliloquy," continues Emily Brontë in her essay, "I picked a flower at my side:

it was pretty and newly opened, but an ugly caterpillar had hidden himself among the petals and already they were drawing up and withering. 'Sad image of the earth and its inhabitants' I exclaimed, 'this worm lives only by destroying the plant which protects him; why was he created and why was man created? He torments, he kills, he devours; he suffers, dies, is devoured—that's his whole story.'

I threw the flower to the ground; at that moment the universe appeared to me a vast machine constructed only to bring forth evil: I almost doubted the goodness of God for not annihilating man on the day of his first sin. 'The world should have been destroyed,' I said, 'crushed, just as I crush this reptile, which has done nothing during his life but make everything he touches as disgusting as himself.'²²

By crushing the caterpillar, Emily Brontë became part of the "principle of destruction" that governs the universe she observes, just as Lockwood, horrified by the cruelty at Wuthering Heights, finds that terror makes him cruel in his treatment of the dream—"waif." Both observers have

21. Richard Chase, "The Brontës, or, Myth Domesticated," *Forms of Modern Fiction*, ed. William Van O'Connor (Minneapolis, 1948), p. 109.

22. *Essays*, p. 18.

opened their eyes upon a storm, upon the darkness and thickness of elemental matter in a world that would be chaotic, but for a sort of Necessity that establishes its own terrible order—the order of “an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.” In the more complex world of *Wuthering Heights*, Lockwood finds raging the self-conflicting movements of “the tenderness that would make suffer, and the cruelty that would make glad, the felicity that prayed for death, and the despair that clung to life, the repulsion that desired, the desire drunk with repulsion—love surcharged with hatred, hatred staggering beneath its load of love.”²³ But if the inhabitants of the novel destroy one another with more frustration and ambivalence than does the worm the flower, the results are just as deadly.

“I had scarcely taken my foot off the poor insect,” continues the essay:

when, like a censuring angel sent from heaven, there fluttered through the trees a butterfly with large wings of gleaming gold and purple: it shone only a moment before my eyes, then, rising among the leaves, it vanished into the blue skies above. I was silent, but an inner voice said to me, ‘Let not the creature judge his creator, here is a symbol of the world to come—just as the ugly caterpillar is the beginning of the splendid butterfly, this globe is the embryo of a new heaven and of a new earth. . . .’

God is the God of justice and mercy; then, assuredly, each pain that he inflicts on his creatures, be they human or animal, rational or irrational, each suffering of our unhappy nature is only a seed for that divine harvest which will be gathered when sin having spent its last drop of poison, death having thrown its last dart, both will expire on the funeral pyre of a universe in flame, and will leave their former victims to an eternal realm of happiness and glory.²⁴

Finally master of both *Wuthering Heights* and Thrushcross Grange, with all the representations of his past misery in his power, Heathcliff curiously ceases to be interested in revenge. “It is a poor conclusion, is it not,” he expresses to Nelly Dean, “an absurd termination to my violent exertions? I get levers and mattocks to demolish the two houses, and train myself to be capable of working like Hercules, and when everything is ready. . . I find the will to lift a slate off either roof has vanished” (p. 342). There is a “strange change approaching”; he must remind himself

to breathe; he is troubled by the eyes of Hareton and Cathy, because they are so like Catherine’s, although everything he sees contains her features. “I have a single wish,” he explains, “and my whole being and faculties are yearning to attain it. . . I’m convinced it will be reached—and soon” (p. 344).

Heathcliff begins to disappear at night, and returns with a “strange joyful glitter in his eyes”; he does not eat, will not sleep—he is “a man struggling in the water,” and he cannot rest “within arm’s reach of the shore.” When he dies, it is with exultation—he has at last broken through into death, is at last one again with Catherine. Sin has spent its last drop of poison, death has thrown its last dart, and the storm raised by the separation of these two lovers, the storm that raged around the heads of all the other characters in the novel, subsides, like a sigh of relief after pain.

As the winds begin to die, Hareton and Cathy start to build between them the “new heaven” and the “new earth.” On Easter Monday they make their covenant, and at last make possible a spring of sympathy and compassionate love which hatred and blind passion have blighted for twenty years. But there is no judgment made; the violent love of Heathcliff and Catherine was no more ethically relevant than is an earthquake, or a forest fire, or a windstorm—they have experienced heaven and hell in each other, and if they sinned, their suffering is sufficient expiation. They lived and died with “no sort of fear of . . . Satan or of an outraged God.”²⁵

Every bit of suffering was necessary, every sin necessary and good—each was “only a seed for that divine harvest”; and although the titanic lovers of *Wuthering Heights* find union in death, it is life that asserts itself, blooms again. The country folk may yet see Heathcliff and Catherine wandering on the dark moors, like the spirits of some primitive myth or rude saga, but Hareton and Cathy are afraid of nothing. There is a great attempt felt throughout this novel, “a struggle half thwarted but of superb conviction, to say something through the mouths of characters which is not merely ‘I love’ or ‘I hate’ but ‘we, the whole human race’ and ‘you, the eternal powers. . .’ the sentence remains unfinished”²⁶—but there is a fresh breeze, a move to the Grange, and a new life to begin on New Year’s Day.

Brandeis University

23. Maeterlinck, quoted in Sinclair, p. 248.

24. *Essays*, p. 19.

25. Harrison, p. 135.

26. Virginia Woolf, *The Common Reader* (New York, 1925), p. 158.

The Porcelain-Pattern Leitmotif in Meredith's *The Egoist*

Daniel R. Schwarz

ROBERT D. MAYO has established that Sir Willoughby Patterne's name suggests the Willow pattern of English earthenware, and that the legend of the popular Willow design resembles the plot outline of Meredith's *The Egoist*.¹ Early in its history, Mr. Mayo points out, a romantic legend became associated with the Willow pattern. According to most versions of the widely circulated legend, the house on the right of the plate is occupied by a mandarin who intends to marry his daughter to a wealthy suitor, but she prefers her father's secretary and scribe. She is imprisoned by her father, but her lover manages to release her and carry her over the design's bridge. Mr. Mayo proposes that the roles of tyrannical father and frustrated lover become fused in Sir Willoughby; "a despotic prince," he will not permit Clara to escape a brilliant match with himself and marry the scholar she loves. That Meredith was aware of his use of the legend of England's most popular ceramic design is indicated by Lady Busshe's remark upon her porcelain gift, repeated to Sir Willoughby by Mrs. Mountstuart, and Sir Willoughby's subsequent reaction of horror:

"I shall have that porcelain back," says Lady Busshe to me. . . . "I think . . . it should have been the Willow Pattern. . . . He's in for being jilted a second time!"

Sir Willoughby restrained a bound of his body that would have sent him up some feet into the air. (p. 350)²

And the omniscient narrator reminds us three chapters later that Lady Busshe "had recently played on his name" (p. 381).

In his valuable article, Mr. Mayo goes on to consider some implications of Meredith's use of the porcelain trope before concluding that "this device . . . an *accessory*, . . . an artifice for artifice's sake" by a writer "impelled to dazzle his readers with feats of virtuosity."³ No one, as far as I know, has seen fit to question these conclusions or Mr. Mayo's reading of the porcelain-pattern leitmotif. I should like to demonstrate that the nexus between romantic legend and dramatic action is not an elaborate ornament but the foundation of the novel's most important pattern of figurative language—a pattern that becomes an intrinsic part of the novel's dramatic and verbal action and a rich source of comic irony.

Patterne Hall is, in fact, a porcelain factory where

the lord tries to impose his pattern on everyone dwelling within. Anyone who does not conform to Sir Willoughby's design must be remodeled to suit him. The only alternative to remodeling is to be completely discarded. Indeed, the action of the novel primarily concerns Sir Willoughby's attempt to form Clara according to his pattern. The "will" of Sir Willoughby is emblematic of his dominant characteristic: the exaltation of self to such an extent that he believes what he desires is best and right and thus must inexorably be supported by Providence. Such an antecedent theory is sufficient cause for attempting to mold the world according to his own will. How successful Sir Willoughby can be is demonstrated by his aunts who stand as a macabre reminder to Clara and the reader of the effects of Sir Willoughby's patterns.

The Egoist presents Sir Willoughby's futile efforts to shape Clara to his design. Sir Willoughby believes that his betrothal assures "the survival of the Patternes" (p. 38). He has chosen Clara because he believes her mind is receptive to his efforts to design "a female image of himself," which would "complete him" and add "the softer lines wanting to his portrait before the world" (p. 41). We are told that Willoughby "desired to shape her character to the feminine of his own and betrayed the surprise of a slight disappointment at her advocacy of her ideas" (p. 44). At first instinctively, and then intellectually, Clara realizes that she must escape Willoughby's domination because "those years would soon be outlived, after which he and she would be of a pattern" (p. 424). Mrs. Mountstuart's epithet for Clara, "a dainty rogue in porcelain," forecasts Willoughby's inability to mold Clara to suit his ideal.

Sir Willoughby is not only interested in forming Clara to his design but wishes to mold all those within the environs of Patterne Hall. When Mrs. Mountstuart facetiously links Willoughby's name and "design" ("you need not tell me you have a design in all that you do, Willoughby Patterne"), Sir Willoughby admits that "he can mould and govern the creatures about him" (pp. 349-50). He tries to cut Vernon to the pattern of scholar-in-residence. If Vernon does not wish to occupy that role, Willoughby tells Clara, "he becomes to me at once as if he

1. Robert D. Mayo, "The Egoist and The Willow Pattern," *ELH*, IX (1942), 71-78. My first paragraph is a very brief summary of the findings upon which Mr. Mayo's article is based.

2. Page numbers in parentheses refer to George Meredith, *The Egoist*, rev. ed., 1897 (New York, 1923).

3. Mayo, p. 78. Mr. Mayo puts "accessory" in italics.

had never been" (p. 89). For Crossjay, too, he has a pattern in mind. Contrary to the lad's interests, he wishes to take him "and make a man of him after my own model" (p. 84). Of course, his most grotesque pattern is the ascetic role of self-sacrifice which he almost succeeds in imposing on Laetitia.

But, ironically, while all Sir Willoughby's energies are engaged in his efforts to impose his design on others, the comic imps are imposing a pattern of disappointment and reversal upon him. While Willoughby vigilantly pursues his self-interest, the imps relentlessly stalk "the Egoist." For the imps, "pets" of the Comic Spirit, "malignly do . . . love to uncover ridiculousness in imposing figures" (p. 5). When Fritch comments "I can't help thinking myself, there was a Providence in [the porcelain's breaking], for we all came together so as you might say we was made to do as we did," he recalls the role of the comic imps (p. 167). De Craye says that he has brought the vase "to offer up to the gods of ill luck," and avows that

one must go to the witches for protection to vases, and they're all in the air now, having their way with us, which accounts for the confusion in politics and society. . . . (p. 171)

Here Meredith is having Fritch and De Craye remind the reader that the Comic Spirit and her imps "reject all accessories in the exclusive pursuit" of "the Egoist" (p. 1).

The narrator is on the side of the Comic Spirit and her imps and records every ironic detail to demonstrate the full justice of Sir Willoughby's epitaph, "through very love of self himself he slew" (p. 5). By playing on the word "design" to describe Willoughby's intentions, the narrator translates the epitaph into terms appropriate to the porcelain trope:

. . . we live in an undisciplined world where in our seasons of activity, we are servants of our design, and that this comes of our passions and those of our position. Our design shapes us for the work in hand, the passions man the ship, the position is their apology. . . . (p. 248)

And Willoughby's emotions and reactions are often described in diction appropriate to a porcelain object. Thus Willoughby is concerned lest his "effulgence" be "tarnished" or that his ideal be "shocked to fragments" (pp. 137, 150). (His aunt's dialogue concludes, significantly, with the observation that Willoughby looks "shattered, as we have never seen him look before" [p. 461].) By implicitly equating Willoughby's demise with the breaking of a porcelain object, Meredith calls attention to the qualities Willoughby shares with the inanimate object that bears his name: inflexibility, insensitivity, and imperceptivity.

That Sir Willoughby, "a picture of an English gentleman," is cast to fit the pattern of a wealthy country gen-

tleman is clear from the first sentence of Chapter I. His one-minded concern with his conception of this pattern has the ironic effect of depriving him of his humanity. The implicit suggestion of porcelain in his name is appropriate for a man whose exclusive concern is with the image he projects to himself and others. If Clara is a "rogue in porcelain," then Willoughby is already cast and completely set. Like an inanimate object, he is incapable of listening or of reacting to another's needs. Willoughby does not realize that Clara resists design:

. . . yet, if you looked on Clara as a delicately inimitable porcelain beauty, the suspicion of a delicately inimitable ripple over her features touched a thought of innocent roguery, wildwood roguery; the likeness to the costly and lovely substance appeared to admit a fitness in the dubious epithet. (p. 88)

Although something in Clara does suggest porcelain, there is a movement within her that resists the mold's setting. And Vernon, not Sir Willoughby, "had sense enough to own that her character was yet liquid in the mould" (p. 207).

Porcelain in its association with Patterne not only represents Willoughby's attempts to impose psychic stasis on the people of Patterne Hall, but it comes to symbolize mutability. Its fragility implies the very lack of perfection that Willoughby refuses to admit into his conception of love:

Women of mixed essences shading off the divine to the considerably lower were outside his vision of woman. His mind could as little admit an angel in pottery as a rogue in porcelain. For him they were what they were when fashioned at the beginning; many cracked, many stained, here and there a perfect specimen designed for the elect of men. (p. 109)

The fragility of porcelain is emphasized within the plot. Immediately before Fritch produces the fragments of De Craye's porcelain vase, Mrs. Mountstuart alludes to her epithet for Clara. The breaking of the porcelain symbolically anticipates the rupture of the engagement. Calling their relationship "our magic ring," Sir Willoughby has told Clara, "one small fissure and we have the world with its muddy deluge" (p. 90). And the narrator picks up the image of the broken porcelain, while Sir Willoughby and Clara debate thanking Lady Busshé for her present:

Dr. Middleton, Laetitia, and the ladies Eleanor and Isabel joining them in the hall found two figures linked together in a shadowy indication of halves that have fallen apart and hang on the last thread of junction. (p. 301)

The porcelain trope reappears at other crucial turns in the plot. De Craye, well aware of Mrs. Mountstuart's epi-

thet and suspecting Miss Middleton's impending flight, remarks for his own and the reader's amusement, "I'm haunted by an idea that porcelain always goes to pieces" when he sees Lady Busshe's present (p. 258). De Craye's detention of Willoughby over finished products of his favorite raw material, while his "rogue in porcelain" escapes, is a source of multiple irony. De Craye continues to needle Sir Willoughby when he says to him, after the latter has ordered Lady Busshe's porcelain taken by his servant to a place convenient for Clara's inspection, "you're a bold man. . . . The luck may be with you though. I wouldn't handle the fragile treasure for a trifle" (p. 259). Two lines of excruciating irony follow:

"I believe in my luck," said Willoughby.
Clara was now sought for. (p. 259)

When it is not De Craye who serves as the comic imp's active arm, it is usually Mrs. Mountstuart. For example, after explaining that Colonel De Craye and "our porcelain beauty" will provide her party's sparkle, she tells Sir Willoughby that he will be "but a kind of Jupiter's cup-bearer—Juno's, if you like. . ." (p. 294). Willoughby's epic pretensions and his position as prime mover of Patterne Hall is bathetically reduced by the image of him as serving man to the porcelain rogue whom he conceives to be raw material for his pattern.

Willoughby's sensitivity to the resemblance to the romantic Willow legend is one reason for his revived interest in Laetitia: "At least [Laetitia] would rescue him from the claws of Lady Busshe and her owl's hoot of 'Willow Pattern'" (p. 353). He thinks of Laetitia in terms of the completed design he desired in women. As he explains to Mrs. Mountstuart (although he is not entirely frank about his motives):

Laetitia was invited here to show [Clara] the example of a fixed character—solid as any concrete substance you would choose to build on, and not a whit the less feminine. (p. 349)

Believing her to be a finished pattern of his version of intelligent woman, he says of her: "A woman of intellect is as good as a Greek statue; she is divinely wrought, and she is divinely rare" (p. 342). And, of course, the pattern includes complete devotion; he tells her that she was "a precious cameo, still gazing!" because "no one was [her] match for devotion" (p. 408).

But Laetitia is not a fully formed design. Sir Willoughby has inflicted injuries on her that have prevented her setting according to his design.

Laetitia's habit of wholly subservient sweetness. . . was her ideal of the feminine, [but was] not yet conciliated with her acuter character, owing to the absence of full pleasure from her life—the unhealed wound she had sustained and the cramp of bondage of such old date as to seem iron. . . . (p. 327)

Playing on Willoughby's "statue" simile, the narrator tells us that Laetitia refused to be "that stupid statue Constancy doting on the antic Deception" (p. 336). Ironically, the supposedly finished object imposes a pattern of stupid constancy on the one who intended it for her. To protect the remnants of his ego, Sir Willoughby is prepared to do anything to please Laetitia, and he submits to being reshaped according to her designs.

The porcelain motif, then, is no mere accessory but extends to the center of the novel's dramatic and verbal action. Sir Willoughby's name is taken from the Willow pattern of English earthenware, and his history parallels the romantic legend connected with that pattern. More importantly, Willoughby presides over Patterne Hall, attempting to impose his designs on others, while the comic imp's are shaping a pattern of disappointment and reversal for him. The one whom the expert of moral sculpture conceives to be a completed statue of constancy turns on her creator and stamps a pattern of devoted constancy on him.

Brown University

Gilbertian Humor: Pulling Together a Definition

John Bush Jones

VIRTUALLY EVERYONE who writes on the Gilbert and Sullivan operas refers to their peculiar brand of humor as "topsy-turvy" and to the many worlds of W. S. Gilbert's creation as "Topsy-turvydom." If these writers go on to define the terms (and many do not), they are usually

content to say that topsy-turvydom is the inversion of the world as we know it, and that the humor arises from our seeing convicts become public officials, policemen turn cowards, or gondoliers assume the functions of royalty. The implication is that the humor of topsy-turvydom is the

result of cherished ideas and commonplaces turned upside down. It is from the "humor" thus broadly defined that the adjective "Gilbertian" has evolved and worked its way into the dictionary.

And yet, the simple inversion of the world is not necessarily humorous, nor is it the private claim of a single dramatist. *King Lear* presents a world turned upside down—children governing parents, a king made a virtual subject—but the product is certainly not humor. Similarly, in the sphere of comic drama, writers from Aristophanes on down have delighted in distorting the everyday and examining the consequences. If, then, Gilbert's humor merits a distinguishing adjective of its own (as I believe it does), we must look deeper for those characteristics which may be rightly called Gilbertian.

William Archer wrote in 1881 the first extended criticism of Gilbert, and it was he who came closest to singling out the distinctive quality of the dramatist's humor. Archer maintains that "a strong logical faculty is the basis of this humor. *Reductio ad absurdum* is its favourite method of procedure. Maxims of morality carried to their logical extreme and developed into paradoxes are its chosen playthings. The 'contrast yet kinship,' to use Mr. Carlyle's phrase, between the every-day common-sense application of these principles and Mr. Gilbert's apparently logical deductions from them, forms the basis of our enjoyment."¹ Whereas many later writers only noted Gilbert's inverted world, Archer early discovered how that inversion was brought about. The distinguishing feature of Gilbertian humor is the method, not the end product.

In limiting its remarks to Gilbert's treatment of "maxims of morality," Archer's definition remains incomplete. In fact it has, in part, been contradicted. Walter Sichel observed that the humor is "the triumph of hypothesis, resembling one of those systems that proceed logically from a paradox."² To Archer, then, Gilbert's humor ends in paradox; to Sichel, it begins in it. Neither conclusion is entirely accurate, for regardless of the absurdity of the initial proposition, Gilbert's logical development of it, unlike paradox, is seldom self-contradictory and never at odds with common sense. Rather, Gilbert uses common sense to carry the premise to its ultimate and often preposterous conclusions.

Furthermore, especially in the plots of the operas, there is a two-stage logical development of the basic premise.

The first logical deduction serves to complicate the action; the second—the logic pushed to its farthest limit—functions as the denouement. This may be best illustrated by the plots of *Ruddigore* and *The Mikado*.

The proposition on which the plot of *Ruddigore* is based is the curse placed on Sir Rupert, the first baronet, and all his descendants.

Each lord of Ruddigore,
Despite his best endeavor,
Shall do one crime or more,
Once, every day, for ever!
This doom he can't defy,
However he may try,
For should he stay
His hand, that day
In torture he shall die!³

Each baronet, we learn, duly committed his crimes

Until, with guilt o'erplied,
'T'll sin no more!' he cried,
And on the day
He said that say,
In agony he died!

(p. 406)

In order to avoid the consequences of the curse, Sir Ruthven, the rightful baronet, has disguised himself as the simple farmer Robin Oakapple, leaving his younger brother Despard with the baronetcy. Robin is excessively moral, and when his true identity is disclosed he is not only forced to become a "bad baronet" (in which role he is a miserable failure), but he also loses his promised bride and the respect of the entire community. Conversely, his brother—thoroughly evil while baronet—becomes ridiculously saintly when the title is lifted from him. All of this complicating action proceeds directly and logically from the terms of the curse.

In the concluding moments of the play, all is resolved by logically carrying the first premise to its ultimate conclusion. Sir Roderick, a cursed ancestor of Robin, steps from his picture frame to remonstrate with the new baronet.

ROB.: I can't stop to apologize—an idea has just occurred to me. A Baronet of Ruddigore can only die through refusing to commit his daily crime.

ROD.: No doubt.

1. William Archer, *English Dramatists of Today* (London, 1882), pp. 179, 180. The essay "W. S. Gilbert" originally appeared in *St. James*, XLIX (1881), 287-300.
2. Walter Sichel, "The English Aristophanes," *Fortnightly Review*, XCVI (1911), 681.

3. *The Complete Plays of Gilbert and Sullivan* (New York: Modern Library edition, n.d.). The lines of Gilbert's plays are not numbered in this or any other edition. All subsequent references to Gilbert will be made by page number of this edition.

mount to suicide!

ROB.: It would seem so.

ROB.: But suicide is, itself, a crime—and so, by your own showing, you ought never to have died at all!

ROD.: I see—I understand! Then I'm practically alive!

ROB.: Undoubtedly!

(pp. 455-56)

Thus, through commonsense reasoning, Gilbert has pushed the *same proposition* that complicated the action to its logical extreme, thereby resolving the plot.

The technique employed in bringing the action of *The Mikado* to a happy and logical ending is the same, although there are more complicating elements. The initial premise here is the Mikado's decree that flirting is punishable by decapitation. So that the entire unmarried male population of Titipu will not be in danger of losing their heads, Ko-Ko, a common tailor condemned for flirting, is released and made Lord High Executioner on the grounds of the logical deduction that

"Who's next to be decapitated
Cannot cut off another's head
Until he's cut his own off."

(p. 348)

The complex of events that ensues is almost too familiar to bear repetition: the Mikado's new decree for an immediate execution, Ko-Ko's realization (logically) that it is nearly impossible to cut off one's own head, Nanki-Poo's appointment as Lord High Substitute, and on to the disclosure that Nanki-Poo is the heir apparent. Because of the discovery that Nanki-Poo is not in fact dead, the death sentence is lifted from Ko-Ko and his accomplices, but how to comply with the Mikado's decree for an execution? Once again, it is Gilbert's logic that settles the question and untangles the plot.

ko.: . . . It's like this: When your Majesty says, "Let a thing be done," it's as good as done—practically, it is done—because your Majesty's will is law. Your Majesty says, "Kill a gentleman," and a gentleman is told off to be killed. Consequently, that gentleman is as good as dead—practically he is dead—and if he is dead—why not say so?

MIK.: I see. Nothing could possibly be more satisfactory!

(p. 399)

These two denouements and the propositions from which they evolve are in the realm of pure fantasy, but even within that realm Gilbert follows a course of rigorous logic. If we only accept the fantastic framework and the farfetched initial premise, we can then trace common sense working its way to a comic resolution; everything is consistent, nothing jars.

Occasionally Gilbert slightly varies his method by

placing his characters in a rather "real" world, letting them get befuddled because of the faulty use of their reason, and finally bringing them back to reality once again by the inevitable extension of their logic, showing them where they went astray. Such a situation occurs in *Princess Ida*. The band of "girl graduates" headed by Ida have renounced mankind on the ground that "Man is Nature's sole mistake!" (p. 305). They intend to pursue their advanced academic endeavors as recluses from the world of men (*literally*: males). Ida is an idealist—so much so that in her plan she has overlooked a very basic natural fact.

PRIN.: You ridicule it now!

But if I carried out this glorious scheme,
At my exalted name Posterity
Would bow in gratitude!

HILD.:

But pray reflect—

If you enlist all women in your cause,
And make them all abjure tyrannic Man,
The obvious question then arises, "How
Is this Posterity to be provided?"

PRIN.: I never thought of that!

(p. 340)

Through this logical question posed by Hildebrand, Gilbert has filled in the gap in Ida's thinking and simultaneously untangled the plot by bringing it back to soundly reasoned reality.

Gilbert uses this strictly logical approach not only in the complicating and unraveling of entire plots, but also in the other components of the operas. Character delineation and motivation are often solidly grounded in logic, the result being grotesquely humorous distortions of most aspects of human nature. A good number of characters have implanted in them an *idée fixe* which they accept as a fundamental and inviolable premise on which they methodically and logically base their actions. In *The Pirates of Penzance* it is Frederic's sense of duty; in *Patience* it is the title character's notion of love as unselfishness. In attempting to run their lives purely on logical deductions from these premises, they either run head-on against conflicts with emotion and feeling or they go so far as to work out even these essentially irrational qualities through closely reasoned logic.

In *Ruddigore* Richard Dauntless, the half brother of Robin, lives his entire life on the premise that he must always obey the dictates of his heart. He can thus say when he reveals Robin's true identity

Within this breast there beats a heart
Whose voice can't be gainsaid.
It bade me thy true rank impart,
And I at once obeyed.

I knew 'twould blight thy budding fate—
 I knew 'twould cause thee anguish great—
 But did I therefore hesitate?
 No! I at once obeyed!

(p. 433)

All moral considerations are laid aside in the pursuit of the course established by strict logical adherence to a given principle.

In *Trial by Jury* the Defendant attempts to logically justify a quirk of his character. He is fickle, he says, because "Of nature the laws I obey,/For nature is constantly changing" (p. 53). After giving examples from the moon, time, and the weather, he extends his deductions into a solution to the suit.

But this I am willing to say,
 If it will appease her sorrow,
 I'll marry this lady to-day,
 And I'll marry the other tomorrow!

(p. 54)

By examining the consequences of logic confronting emotions and values, and by submitting irrational human conduct and character to the rules of logic, Gilbert reveals the humor in aspects of humanity too often taken for granted.

The method of Gilbert's satire and social commentary is also a logical process. The single example of the Grand Inquisitor's explosion of socialism in *The Gondoliers* will serve as illustration. The Inquisitor (like Gilbert) believes there is inherent value in traditional distinctions of rank, and with this as his basic premise he can conclude from a logical argument that "When everyone is somebodee,/ Then no one's anybody!" (p. 565).

Finally, Gilbert not only uses logic as his vehicle for the creation of humorous plot, characterization, and com-

mentary, but he often seems to find pure humor in logic itself. In *Iolanthe*, for example, Lord Mountararat makes the false assumption that Strephon's mother—in reality an ageless fairy—is seventeen years old. This assumption becomes the hypothesis for a ludicrous mathematical calculation.

Now listen, pray to me,
 For this paradox will be
 Carried, nobody at all *contradictente*.
 Her age, upon the date
 Of his birth, was *minus* eight,
 If she's seventeen, and he is five-and-twenty!

(p. 261)

These lines, virtually irrelevant to all considerations of plot and character, reveal Gilbert as a man for whom the logical working out of the illogical must have been inherently funny.

Gilbert was trained as a lawyer, and his familiarity with the law is in evidence in many characters and situations in the operas. But even more striking is the way in which the logical legal mind is constantly in play in the creation of the great bulk of the humor. It has become something of a commonplace disparagement of Gilbert to say that his plots and characters are often mechanical. Indeed they are, but this mechanical quality is the direct result of Gilbert's peculiar mechanism—rigorous and consistent logic. Archer first found it in Gilbert's treatment of "maxims of morality," this paper has attempted to show it functioning in all the major components of the operas. It is, then, this method of humor-through-logic that is the real basis for that topsyturvy comic inversion we call Gilbertian.

Northwestern University

Egerton: Forgotten Realist

Wendell V. Harris

As THE 1890's receives more and more attention in the midst of the growing interest in the transitional period between Victorian and twentieth-century literature, it is apparent that one necessary task is a more accurate assessment of the minor writers of the time. One of the minor figures of some consequence who has as yet received almost no critical attention is "George Egerton." Her work deserves examination by anyone interested in the literary currents of the 'nineties if only for what she represented

to her contemporaries. Of all those attempting to give literary form to the themes associated with the "new realism," it was she who was viewed with the greatest animosity by the keepers of conventional morality and the guardians of traditional literary decorum. When *Punch* shrewdly parodied the first story of Egerton's *Keynotes* as "She-Notes" by "Borgia Smudgiton," burlesque exaggeration was applied to the narrative style and dialogue, but the plot and theme were only slightly altered; evidently

these were found quite wicked enough without exaggeration.¹ *Keynotes* (1893), her first volume, and one that immediately established her significance, and infamy, in the eyes of contemporaries, gave its name to the whole successfully bold "Keynotes Series" of John Lane, a publisher who knew how to capitalize on every kind of publicity. In addition, her work provides an excellent example of the contemporary experiments with new techniques in the short-story form—an aspect of the "new realism" that was often unnoticed in the thunder of moral denunciations.

Her real name was Mary Chavelita Dunne, later Clairmonte, and later still Bright. She could also at times lay claim, pragmatic if not legal, to the surnames of Higginson and Melville. Having eloped with one admirer, married two others, politely acknowledged the attentions of a number less importunate, and missed by a reasonably narrow margin adding the illustrious name of Knut Hamsun to her string of conquests, George Egerton was well provided with the raw materials of personal experience whereof to construct her fiction of convention-shattering candor.² Critics have therefore not been slow to consign her to the group of free-living artists of the 'nineties whose work is interesting only for the way it corresponds to their lives. However, though it is true that she drew heavily on her own unusual experiences and that her fiction lost its most meritorious qualities once she had mined out this vein of actual experience, to dismiss her work as cleverly idealized biography is to trip headlong over the critical fallacy of equating antecedent and consequent. Of course, insofar as the style and form of her work can be legitimately argued to be an extension of the style and form in which she chose to live her life, the phenomenon does good service in refuting those who insist that the frankness of "the new fiction" was merely an imitation of later nineteenth-century French realism. With Egerton as an example in the matter of frankness, the subsequent experimentalists hardly stood in need of Maupassant. Actually the major literary influence from over the seas in Egerton's work is Scandinavian. She lived in Norway for two years, learned Norwegian, and read Ibsen, Strindberg, Björnson, and Hamsun; she had begun her translation of Hamsun's *Hunger* before she wrote the six short stories that were to become *Keynotes*. From the Scandinavian dramatists very likely came the encouragement to treat the questions of love and marriage with frankness and to dare to reveal attitudes strongly at variance with conven-

tional morality. To Hamsun she almost certainly owes her interest in reproducing the indirect, at times wayward, progress by which the mind assimilates thoughts and impressions. Now and again in her earlier stories she pauses to analyze the successions of thoughts, images, and associations that, set in motion by some greater or lesser perception or emotion—falling in love or noticing a pebble in the path, ramify unpredictably according to the psychological idiosyncrasies of the particular person. Egerton of course shares this interest in the psychology of the individual with the majority of the other experimental realists, but in the prominence that she gives to the private eccentricities of each mind she is, thanks probably to her acquaintance with Norwegian literature, alone among the English writers in her time.

Never, however, does this become an exclusive interest for her as it was for Hamsun, who, it must be remembered, was still writing in his first, subjective manner. In *Hunger*, Hamsun deliberately chooses for his subject a man whose quicksilver sensibility has been made further unstable by an almost constant hunger, employing such a subject in order to be free to concentrate his art on the presentation of a mind in which erratic eddies of thought, a propensity to indulge in certain unreasonable whims, and a tenderness of feeling both kind and sympathetic all vie constantly with one another. Egerton, in restricting herself to normal, if quick and sensitive, intelligences and to the pursuit of their more ordered meditations and sequences of associations, seems much less striking and original—but she was nevertheless breaking new ground in English fiction. Where, since Sterne's altogether different manner and intent, would one find an exploration of the significant moments in the development of a woman's personality such as Egerton undertook in "A Psychological Moment at Three Periods"? In the first "moment" the young girl's humorless desire to discipline herself for the role of saint and heroine to which she aspires represents a common childish attitude, but such concern with the detailed workings of a child's mind, now only too common in fiction, was an innovation in the 'nineties:

"Shut the book now—now, just when the exciting part begins. No, you may not read to the end of the page—no, not even a line more. If you want to be brave, if you want to be strong, sacrifice; sacrifice, mortify yourself. If you don't want to! No, you are weak, you cannot do that, not even that small thing for God. No, not after supper! Not until tomorrow, tomorrow evening—"³

1. *Punch*, CVI (1894), 109, 129.
2. "A Cross Line" derives partially from her life in a rural retreat with George Egerton Clairmonte; "Now Spring Has Come" has its origin in her relationship with Knut Hamsun; "Under Northern Sky" was suggested partially by her life with Higginson in

Norway. See Terence White, *A Leaf from the Yellow Book* (London, 1958), from which I have taken the biographical details mentioned here.

3. *Discords* (London, 1894), p. 2.

Similarly, the portrayal of the mysterious ways in which the mind responds, in certain overwrought moods, to chance scenes and images is made the entire substance of Egerton's "A Lost Masterpiece": a woman traveling through London one hazy morning feels that the scenes she glimpses in passing are arranging themselves in her mind as the materials of a literary masterpiece until the whole montage is jarred out of harmony by the sight of an old woman who seems decidedly out of place among the other delicately tinted mental impressions of the morning.

The inspiration for this "realistic" treatment of the mind can be found on every page of the introspective narrative of the perversely undisciplined mind of the protagonist of *Hunger*. But while following Hamsun down the alleyways of illogicality, Egerton puts this technique to her own use. Her central interest in tracing the mind's operation is different from his—she is concerned with examining the process by which a human personality absorbs new aspects and makes decisions that alter its future irrevocably. The woman of "A Psychological Moment," seen first as a small child disciplining herself to be strong, is shown later as a schoolgirl training herself to be indifferent to the approval or disapproval of those in authority and refusing to have her precocious and painfully earnest curiosity satisfied by facile and conventional answers. The third "moment" shows her as a woman who finds happiness "the most futile of all our dreams, the pursuit of a shadow" and faces the world with a stoical philosophy of endurance.

There are many elements of originality in Egerton's work. In "The Regeneration of Two" and "Under Northern Sky," as well as in "A Psychological Moment," she experimented with a technique of focusing the narrative on the immediate situation, eliminating most of that information about the past history and present circumstances of the central characters that writers had conventionally found it requisite to insinuate at some point in their narrative. The man who forces the heroine of "A Psychological Moment" to live as his mistress appears first in the second paragraph of the third "moment":

A man came out of the National Conservative Club and stood in the doorway, drawing his hand slowly through his beard. He was evidently weighing a question of some moment. . . .⁴

This is all the introduction given to the man, and later information supplied in the course of the story amounts to little more than that he is married and has some money. The past of the mistress of the man who is the central character of "The Regeneration of Two," though obvi-

ously interesting, is never fully given. We are supplied with a more than usually full account of the tricks of the mind of the woman of "A Cross Line" but nothing of her past and little of the everyday details of her present life with her husband.

Part of the effect of originality in Egerton's stories depends on her technique of constructing a story out of several distinct episodes with no direct link between them, requiring the reader to supply the transitions. Though such contemporary realists as Hubert Crackanthorpe and Henry Harland were also omitting the usual transitional passages in favor of such mechanical devices as rows of asterisks to separate scenes, they were always careful immediately to provide the orienting information needed by the reader. Beginning each new episode, the reader is called upon, to a greater or lesser extent, to disentangle the speakers, relate the situation to the previous one, and fill in the intervening events. This technique, which has the effect of forcing the reader actively to exercise his intelligence from the very beginning, is one familiar enough now, and the slight puzzles posed in Egerton's stories seem transparent beside the lengths to which William Faulkner has carried the device, but it contributed much to the freshness that distinguished her first two collections.

Even more striking is "Under Northern Sky" in which the cursory manner of sketching the immediate background of the scene provides all the details of the situation that are necessary and at the same time creates the desired atmosphere more economically than the usual stage-setting explanation and description:

All yesterday the bells jangled, until one by one a violent jerk snapped the connecting wire, and hurled them with a last echoing crash on the hall floor. The servingmen kept out of it as men do. The horses cowered to the sides of their boxes and set their hind legs hard, and pointed their ears when they heard his halting step. The great hounds shrank shiveringly into their boxes, and refused to come forth to his threatening call; and when he lashed their houses in his rage they winced at each blow, and showed their fangs when he turned away.

Night brought little rest, for lamps and candles were lit in every room; champagne replaced brandy, then brandy champagne, and then both mingled in one glass. And in measure as the liquid fire was tossed down the poor parched throat, the brain grew clearer; the intellect, with its Rabelaisque fertility of diseased imagining, keener; the sting the tongue carried more adder-like, and the ingenuity of its blasphemies more devilish.⁵

Such writing, despite manifest imperfections, was a most effective answer to the charge that realism meant merely pedestrian reporting.

4. *Ibid.* p. 20.

5. *Keynotes* (London, 1894), pp. 124-25.

However, the attention of her contemporaries was largely diverted from her positive technical achievements by her undeviating insistence upon a point of view that was not only a blow in the teeth of the Victorian morality that had equated "virtue" with feminine chastity, but was the reverse even of the usual free-thinkers' arguments that the concept of rigid sexual morality was originated and insisted upon by women as a means of protecting themselves from otherwise wanton treatment. Egerton's view, stated most succinctly in "Now Spring Has Come," argues that woman's anomalous situation has come about "Because men manufactured an artificial morality, made sins of things that were as clean in themselves as the pairing of birds on the wing; crushed nature, robbed it of its beauty and meaning, and established a system that means war, and always war, because it is a struggle between instinctive truths and cultivated lies. . . . In one word, the untrue feminine is of man's making, whilst the strong, the natural, the true womanly is of God's making."⁶ The same theme is sounded again and again. The heroine of "The Regeneration of Two" defends her sex's failings similarly: "The only sign-post man ever raised for her was: 'Please me, that is the road to my heart; curb the voice of your body, dwarf your soul, stifle your genius and the workings of your individual temperament, ay, regulate your conscience in accordance with mine and my church, be good, and I will feed you and clothe you in return for your services; what more can a woman desire?'"⁷ To Egerton, then, a great part of the unhappiness of the world derived directly from the false role a woman was forced to assume in society, a role which demanded that she hide her own desires behind a screen of feminine purity and at the same time find her only power through pandering to men's corresponding desires.

Egerton drew upon two main sources in her early volumes, her own experiences and her conviction that the Victorian ideal of womanhood was pure cant—though undeniably the second grew partly out of the first. Every story in the first two volumes touches in some way upon woman's position in society. But though she had a conviction, she had no program, and it would for the most part be unfair to charge her with intentionally employing fiction in the services of a militant theory. One does weary of this theme, society's demand that woman play the hypocrite, but the failure was, in most cases, not an intentional

prostitution of the medium to propaganda. Her own later statement is relevant here.

Unless one is androgynous, one is bound to look at life through the eyes of one's sex, to toe the limitations imposed on one by its individual physiological functions. I came too soon. If I did not know the technical jargon current to-day of Freud and the psychoanalysts, I did know something of complexes and inhibitions, repressions and the subconscious impulses that determine actions and reactions. I used them in my stories. I recognized that, in the main, woman was the ever-united, unchanging, adapting herself as far as it suited her ends to male expectations; even if repression was altering her subtly. I would use situations or conflicts as I saw them with total disregard of man's opinions. I would unlock a closed door with a key of my own fashioning. I did. My imitators forged theirs to a different end.⁸

She, no less than other realists, attempted to draw the world as she saw it, though, in the first place, her account must inevitably seem more subjective simply because of her greater concentration upon her characters' subjective reactions to reality. Secondly, for all her early concern with the technique of the short story, she could never trust her stories to carry her theme—perhaps because she well knew the public for which she was writing at the close of the nineteenth century, and she therefore fell back far too often on set speeches to carry the weight that the action proper should have carried, and in most cases was quite capable of carrying. Finally, she was in truth guilty of allowing at least one story to become a scarcely disguised tract—"Virgin Soil" is simply a protest against the innocence with which English girls approached the altar, and in two others, "Wedlock" and "Gone Under," her attempt at brutally unblinking realism succumbs to the more easily achieved effects of melodrama.

But English fiction owes her a debt, in the first instance, for her very significant part in ripping the hypocritical bonds imposed on it during the whole of the nineteenth century, and doing this with integrity that allows no imputation of prurience. *Esther Waters* and *Tess* are very examples of reticence beside the discussion of the role of sex in marriage which Egerton feels free to present. "You sent me out to fight the biggest battle of a woman's life, the one in which she ought to know every turn of the game, with a white gauze . . . of maiden purity as a shield."⁹ . . . man demands from a wife as a right, what he must sue from a mistress as a favour; until marriage becomes for many women a legal prostitution, a nightly degradation.¹⁰ Ten

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

7. *Discords*, p. 207.

8. "A Keynote to Keynotes" in John Gawsworth [Terence Armstrong], *Ten Contemporaries: Notes Toward Their Definitive Bibliography* (London, 1932), p. 58.

9. "Virgin Soil," *Discords*, p. 157.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 155.

years before Freud's publications began to appear, she included in her portrait of adolescence the chaotic emotional upsurge of that age and the resultant semi-sexual loves and hates engendered by inchoate urges confusedly beginning to assert their existence. Her simple and moderate description of the flirtations of the young schoolgirls with one another and with the sisters of the convent school filled the *Westminster Gazette's* "Philistine" with loathing: "Here we have a simple and innocent scene, distorted by the pervading sex medium . . . with the writers who regard life thus, even the simplest relations between human beings are liable to the imputation of sex."¹¹ Though Egerton is not the first English fictionist to acknowledge the sexual desires of women, it is perhaps true that she is the first to make these desires forcefully articulate:

Then she fancies she is on the stage of an ancient theatre out in the open air, with hundreds of faces upturned toward her. She is gauze-clad in a cobweb garment of wondrous tissue. . . . She bounds forward and dances, bends her lissom waist, and curves her slender arms, and gives to the soul of each man what he craves, be it good or evil. And she can feel now, lying here in the shade of the Irish hills with her head resting on her scarlet shawl and her eyes closed, the grand intoxicating power of swaying all these human souls to wonder and applause. She can see herself with parted lips and panting, rounded breasts, with a dancing devil in each glowing eye, sway voluptuously to the wild seductive music that rises, now slow, now fast, now deliriously wild, seductive, intoxicating, with a human note of passion in its strain.¹²

One need not call upon the researches Freud was to make to interpret this fantasy.

But though Egerton blazed with indignation at the falseness of woman's role, she was also one of the rare realists who could imagine happiness strongly and sustainedly enough to attempt to sketch it. And though she seemed to approve unsanctioned and unsanctified living arrangements, as in "The Empty Frame," she could also envision supremely happy and enlightened marriage and, somewhat surprisingly perhaps, a supreme satisfaction in motherhood achieved under these circumstances. "A Little Grey Glove," "The Spell of the White Elf," "A Cross Line," and perhaps we may include the irregularly consecrated "marriage" of "The Regeneration of Two," all proclaim a hope-

fulness usually missing from the work of her fellow realists. For her, tenderness and love do exist in the world, but they are not to be found by the shallowly sentimental nor the brutally demanding, only by the strong, selfless, and free.

But if the guardians of conventional morality were well advised to regard Egerton with hostility, the other realists of the nineties were equally well advised in looking to her for suggestions in the mastery of their craft. Too often weakened by her exceeding earnestness in pursuing her theme, her stories nevertheless suggested the possibilities of admitting to fiction the record of the vagaries to be discovered in the operation of every mind, thus belying the idealization involved in depicting the human mind as essentially a reasonably consistent inductive and deductive apparatus. Her penchant for shearing away all detail extraneous to the tensions of the scenes upon which her narrative focused was a useful lesson to those writers under the spell of Henry James who, lacking his special sensibility, spun out their diaphanous situations to tedious lengths. And her ability, admittedly too rarely displayed, to employ the poetic imagination upon the realistic short story was a needed protest against the threatened banishment of that faculty from the pages of the hardened realists.

Unfortunately, Egerton's later volumes of short stories represent not only a change in manner and style but a definite decline as she exchanged the sharp cacophony of *Keynotes* and *Discords* for the blurred euphony of *Symphonies* and *Fantasias*. She was experimenting still, in *Symphonies*, with bringing romantic color into her realism, in *Fantasias* with allegory and obscure symbolism that is removed from the realm of realism altogether, but she did not master either new mode. Three novels followed: *The Wheel of God* (1898), *Rosa Amorosa* (1901), and *Flies in Amber* (1905). Though differing from each other in mood and structure, these simply repeat Egerton's earlier views and techniques in weakened forms. Having spent her originality on her early short stories, she faded from the literary scene, adding another to the striking list of writers whose creativity, inspired by the atmosphere of the early 'nineties, had exhausted itself before the end of the decade.

University of Colorado

11. *The New Fiction* (London, 1895), p. 87.

12. "A Cross Line," *Keynotes*, pp. 19-20.

Hebraism, Hellenism, and *The Picture of Dorian Gray*

Jan B. Gordon

The critic is he who can translate into another manner or a new material his impression of beautiful things.

WHEN OSCAR WILDE included the above among the aphorisms that comprise the preface to his only novel, he was willfully inverting Arnold's dictum that "the function of the critic is to see the object as in itself it really is."¹ This type of inversion is a characteristic feature of Wilde's method, yet the parody of at least one Arnoldian idea recurs with enough frequency in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* to contribute substantially to our understanding of the novel as well as Wilde's humor. Throughout his life there were indications that Oscar Wilde regarded himself, at least partially, as a successor to the "apostle of culture."² Both Arnold and Wilde shared an interest in the classics, both shared Celtic blood and temperament, and the careers of both men indicate the use of the mask of the dandy as a vehicle for disguise. Wilde's familiarity with Arnold is evident throughout his letters. Not only did he request a copy of Arnold's poems while in jail, but on 7 February 1891, he complimented Grant Allen on his essay treating of the Celtic mood in literature by paying direct tribute to Arnold.³ Certainly, however, the greatest tribute is to be seen in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* itself, where Wilde suspends his youthful Adonis between alternating cycles of Hebraism and Hellenism.

Having come into the novel, literally "gray" and without parents, as do so many Victorian heroes, Dorian is quickly taken under wing by Henry Wotton who, quite early in Dorian's career, discusses the bifurcation of conscience to which Arnold had applied the names, Hebraism and Hellenism: "I believe that the world would gain such a fresh impulse of joy that we would forget all the maladies of medievalism, and return to the Hellenic ideal—to something finer than the Hellenic ideal it may be" (Chap. II). Acting as Dorian's preceptor, he quickly establishes the world of artistic indulgence as a Hellenic realm that provides the perfect accompaniment for Dorian, who takes his very Christian name from Greek artifact. Just as Arnold had seen in the Renaissance a Hellenic attitude,

so we are told of Dorian's relatives named Devereux who, along with Wotton, provide a perfect lineage of Renaissance nobility for the young devotee of "lilies and roses" (Chap. II).

Despite such ancestry, however, Dorian Gray is not without concern for the possibility of Hebraistic influence, as evidenced by the account of his reading in Chapter XI. Among the catalog of Renaissance historical figures whose tragic debauchery strikes a sympathetic note in the youth is one Giambattista Cibo, "who in mockery took the name Innocent and into whose torpid veins the blood of three lads was infused by a Jewish doctor." Only a page earlier, Wilde has Dorian muse: "Yet one had ancestors in literature as well as in one's own race, nearer perhaps in type and temperament, many of them, and certainly with an influence of which one was more absolutely conscious" (Chap. XI). In this sentence containing the same confusion of life and art that is emblemized in Basil's portrait, Dorian emphasizes that not only his own soul but the figures with whom he identifies are tainted by Hebraism.

But Dorian's mention of his reading habits is only the first of numerous occasions in which Hebraism threatens to rupture his Hellenic world of artistic reverie. Dorian can be admitted to the performance of Sybil Vane only after he has paid his toll to the Jewish entrepreneur, Isaacs. It is Isaacs who constantly appears in the role of the money-grubbing Philistine, and Wilde makes a point of his disrespect for artistic accomplishment. By inviting Dorian backstage to meet "Juliet," Isaacs ruptures artistic illusion, demonstrating the penchant for literalness that Arnold felt to be such a striking characteristic of Hebraism. Once inside, Dorian must survive the discordant piano of a "young Hebrew" prior to the commencement of the play. And always lurking outside the autotelic paradise of art that Dorian has created for himself are those Jermyn Street moneylenders continually threatening foreclosure. It is almost as if the disinterested contemplation of beauty is always shadowed by Hebraism. Dorian's suspension between these two alternating cycles could be almost iconographically demonstrated if the statue of St. Sebastian in Dorian's room were juxtaposed with the portly Isaacs.⁴ Both were designated sacrificial victims, called to demon-

1. "The Function of Criticism," in *The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold*, ed. R. H. Super, III, 261.
2. T. S. Eliot's designation in "Arnold and Pater," from the *Selected Essays* (New York, 1932).
3. R. Hart-Davis, *The Letters of Oscar Wilde* (London, 1962), p. 217.

4. Dorian's statue is also significant insofar as Wilde often signed his letters with the pseudonym, "Sebastian Melmoth." During his trial, the imagery of crucifixion characteristic of his early poetry recurs in the letters.

strate their faith in divine decree; one in the Christian faith and the other in the Old Testament God. The irony in this contrast between Hebraism and Hellenism stems from the modern use to which each is being put; St. Sebastian reduced to a decorative figurine in an arena of affected art, and Isaacs exploiting an actress in an arena of cheap drama.

Throughout the early stages of Dorian's "education" he is reminded of the conflict between the systoles and diastoles of history. As early as Chapter III, he encounters this Hebraising tendency in Sir Thomas Burdon, a radical member of parliament who, "burdened" with the guilt of the East End-Whitechapel district, a notoriously Jewish section of London, has devoted his life to raising standards of living. By contrast, Lord Henry Wotton, disclaiming any responsibility in favor of the disinterested worship of beauty, replies: "I can sympathize with everything except suffering." The radicalism that Arnold felt to be a part of the Hebraistic concern with justice,⁵ is seen to be antithetical to the "New Hedonism" of Dorian and his master.

But as Dorian progresses along his tortuous journey to self-knowledge, the Hebraism that he encounters at least partially transforms him. He meets Alan Chapman who, although not identified as specifically Jewish, nonetheless appears as the man of science called upon to vaporize the body of the creator of beauty, Basil Hallward. The conflict between science and art was an important corollary to the division of attitude into Hebraism and Hellenism, as is readily apparent from even a cursory reading of *Culture and Anarchy*. And that this meeting between the Hebraic concern with fact and the Hellenic devotion to beauty should take place at a Rubinstein concert, only adds humor to Wilde's use of Arnoldian ideas. This change in Dorian's attitude toward science is alarming. For earlier in the novel, he had expressed disgust at the postmortem examination of Sybil Vane, where medical science seemed to violate beauty. Now, after he has murdered Hallward, he asks Chapman to discount the morality of the act of disposal: "All I ask of you is to perform a certain scientific experiment. You go to hospitals and dead-houses, and the horrors that you do there don't affect you. . . . What I want you to do is merely what you have done before" (Chap. XIV). The Hellenist is forced to call on the Hebraist for assistance.

This gradual movement toward Hebraism illustrated in Dorian's assumption of a scientific attitude reaches a culmination in the penultimate chapter of the novel.

Under an archway, Lord Wotton had encountered a group of Protestant worshippers and relates the experience to Dorian:

A wet Sunday, an uncouth Christian in a mackintosh, a ring of sickly white faces under a broken roof of dripping umbrellas, and a wonderful phrase flung into the air by shrill hysterical lips. . . . I thought of telling the prophet that art had a soul but that man had not. I am afraid, however, he would not have understood me. (Chap. XIX)

The attempt to make art into a kind of religion fails here, and the excuse for failure is the predominance of blind Philistinism symbolized in this group of evangelicals who, like the other members of the Protestant Reformation, always stood on the side of Hebraism for Arnold. It is narrow Puritanism that continues to have its revival, mocking the earlier words of Wotton: "Yes: there was to be. . . a new Hedonism that was to recreate life and to save it from that harsh uncomely puritanism that is having, in our own day, its curious revival" (Chap. XI). And the most extreme mockery is to be seen in Dorian himself, who at the end of the novel has cast his lot with the Hebraists: "Yet it was his duty to confess, to suffer public shame, and make public atonement. There was a God who called upon men to tell their sins to earth as well as heaven" (Chap. XX). The reader is reminded of Arnold's ". . . the space which sin fills in Hebraism as compared with Hellenism, is indeed prodigious."⁶ Contrasting with his refusal earlier in the novel to dine with a "Lord Goodbody" (Chap. I), Dorian Gray in the final chapter twice repeats his wish to perform some good in a world so rife with evil. The disinterested worship of beauty, one of the building blocks of the New Hedonism, has fallen away.

Throughout *Culture and Anarchy*, Matthew Arnold seeks to characterize the Hellenic mood as expansive and spontaneously colorful, whereas the Hebraic, in its adherence to the letter of the law, is talismanic and devoid of both color and harmony. Early in the novel, Dorian Gray had refused to enter the world of the Philistines, so devoid of color, on the advice of his preceptor:

The costume of the nineteenth century is detestable. It is so sombre, so depressing. Sin is the only real colour-element left in modern life. (Chap. II)

Wotton's Manichaean mind even divides the female population into groups, the colored and the plain, one having a reputation as charmers, the other, for respectability.

5. See "Hebraism and Hellenism" in *Prose Works*, V, 175, where Arnold poses the Hebraic emphasis upon the "letter" against the Hellenic stress upon "spirit."

6. "Hebraism and Hellenism" in *Prose Works*, V, 168.

Dorian himself becomes fascinated with the "iridescence of sin." Yet there is a sense in which even the name of Wilde's character—Dorian Gray—suggests a nature divided at the outset between Hellenism and Hebraism.

It was apparently a divided nature that both Dorian and his creator shared.

University of Warwick

Amendments and Additions to the *Complete Poems of Lionel Johnson* (1953)

Ian Fletcher

WHEN I EDITED the poems of Lionel Johnson in 1950 and 1951, I was working without the assistance of any institution and with little or no training in the business of scholarship. There are consequently a number of errors in the volume. These I wish to correct so that readers may not continue to be misled. The errors and additions noted here do not represent the sum of what I would wish to add and amend, but I have thought it better to leave more elaborate comments on sources for another occasion. I should like to thank the Rev. Raymond Roseliep and Mr. Kelsey Thornton for pointing out a number of errors.

In my preliminary note, "Mr. D. H. Miller" should read "Mr. D. H. Millar." The extent of my indebtedness to Mr. Millar, particularly in Part ii of my Introduction, was not made sufficiently clear. On p. xv of my Introduction I state that John Gray was born a Catholic; he was not. In transcribing the letter from Johnson to Arthur Mackmurdo which appears on p. xxix and in which Johnson pleads to be permitted to stay on at 20 Fitzroy Street, I was unable to obtain a photostat, and this contains no less than four errors. Three of these are omitted commas. The most serious error relates to a misreading of a word in line six where Johnson promises to keep no drink in his rooms "but for friends"; this should read "even for friends." Beneath this pathetic letter there is a curt note by Mackmurdo: "Lionel Johnson the poet. I had to tell him he could no longer live in my house. He was so often drunk." P. xxviii and following: Johnson paid his first visit to Ireland not in 1893, but in 1891, and the references to second and fourth and last visits are therefore wrongly enumerated. Johnson's transformation into a mystical Irish Nationalist occurs perhaps as early as 1891, and it is part of his contradictory nature that he should at that time have been writing for the *Anti-Jacobin*, a periodical deeply hostile to Parnell and Home Rule, though to be sure paying tribute to Parnell's genius after his death. On p. xxx I am in error in stating that Johnson and Dowson quarrelled. As the note to one of the letters from Dowson to Horne published by me in *Notes and*

Queries makes clear, the initial "J" in Plarr's Ernest Dowson (1914) refers to Edgar Jepson, not to Johnson.

I have given the date of Johnson's move to Lincoln's Inn as 1899, but it is probable that this took place in August or September 1898. In general, were I re-writing this preface, I should be far more cautious about Johnson's homosexuality. The evidence here is necessarily vestigial.

Notes to the Poems

Winchester (text p. 1., note p. 325). This poem was also published under the title of "Dedication of A Volume of Verse" in *Winchester College, 1393-1893*, by Old Wykehamists, illustrated by Herbert Marshall, 1893.

<i>Winchester</i> l.	5	W	years,	years
	25	W	age	age,
	66	W	mien:	mien;
	72	W	sweet	sweet,
	143	W	yet,	yet

In Falmouth Harbour (p. 8., p. 328n). The second section of this poem contains clear allusions to J. H. Newman and in particular to Newman's famous hymn "Lead, kindly Light."

By the Statue of King Charles (p. 11., p. 330n). This poem was also published in the journal of the Jacobite White Rose League, *The Royalist*, II (February 29, 1892) 169. A note states that the poem has been reprinted from "The Rhymers' Book," but it contains variants both from the printing of 1892 and that of *Poems*, 1895. The second and fourth lines of each stanza are indented.

l.	2	R	plains:	plains.
	6	R	me,	me:
	7	R	Kings	kings
	9	R	calm he	calm, he
	11	R	glides;	glides:
	12	R	crowds nor	crowds, nor
	13	R	Court,	Court:

1.	R yet	yet,
14	R are;	are:
15	R set,	set;
18	R King;	king:
21	R fate;	fate:
22	R stars,	stars;
23	R great;	great.
24	R Those lions,	Those brows;
	R or dark skies?	or the dark skies?
26	R tragedy,	tragedy:
30	R amends;	amends:
35	R Yea!	Yea:
41	R faints	faints,
42	R employ;	employ:
43	R Saints,	saints;
44	R Art	art
46	R tried on	tried in
	R woe,	woel
47	R grace;	grace:
48	R go	go,
49	R sleeps,	sleeps;
50	R still,	still:
52	R their perfect	a perfect will.
	will.	

For lines 15-18, cf. *The General Epistle of Jude*, v. 13. "Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever." An oblique reference to the judicial murderers of Charles. And, less explicit, compare: "S. Jude calleth them *wandering starres*, they keepe not their *Station*." Zacharie Boyd, *The Last Battle of the Soule in Death*, Glasgow, 1831, p. 155.

See also F. R. Leavis "Thought and Emotional Quality: Notes on the Analysis of Poetry," *Scrutiny*, XIII (Spring 1945), 62-65, for comment on the poem. Laleham (p. 13, p. 331n). This poem appeared in the April issue, p. 56, of *The Century Guild Hobby Horse* and not in that of October as stated.

In Memory (p. 15, p. 333n). The name of the young clergyman who is the subject of the poem should read "Cunninghame-Graham."

Gwynedd (p. 21, p. 334n). See Johnson's letter to Dodgson dated March 1888 among B.M. Add MS. 46363. Here he speaks of the poem as having sixteen stanzas, only thirteen of which were published. Mr. Kelsey Thornton suggests that in line 19 Johnson wrote: "True child of Gwynedd, child of winds and fields," which is more euphonious certainly, though the antithesis of "wilds" is lost.

Mystic and Cavalier (p. 29, p. 334n). The note on Herbert Home is inadequate. Home was born in 1864, not in 1865 as stated, and the Museo Home came into existence, in the

Renaissance Palazzo he had restored, after his death as a result of his will.

Parnell (p. 30 p. 335n). In *United Ireland*, lines 2 and 4 of each stanza are indented.

John McGrath born in 1864 after working for *The Freeman's Journal* became sub-editor of *Young Ireland*. He also contributed to *The Westminster Review*. See the MS Minute Book of the National Society. See also Thomas R. Whitaker in *Swan and Shadow, Yeats's dialogue with History*, Durham, N.C., 1964, for some suggested parallels between this poem and *Easter 1916*.

The Roman Stage (p. 39, p. 336n). Nero, as aesthete-emperor, matricide and suicide, going "beyond good and evil" was, like Heliogabalus, a figure of considerable interest to the Decadents. Johnson collaborated with his fellow-Wykehamist H. W. Orange, to whom this poem is dedicated, in an article on "The Character of Nero" which appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine*, LXII (June 1890), 135-39. In that essay, the succession of the twelve Caesars is presented as a tragedy quickly modulating into farce. Augustus Caesar "a man of marble . . . caught up . . . to the nectar and the sacred couches. . . 'Have I not played well my part in life's comedy?' said Augustus, as the curtain fell. Yes, and now call on the satyric drama." The tone of the essay is faintly Beerbohmish. De Quincey, Hawthorne, Stevenson's Mr. Hyde are produced as analogues to be distinguished from Nero, "the beast, since M. Renan will have it so, of the Apocalypse. . . ." Renan's *l'Antéchrist* provides indeed the closest parallel. Compare, for example, of Nero's death: "Applaudissons. Le drame est complet. Une seule fois, nature aux milles visages, tu as su trouver un acteur digne d'un pareil rôle." *Oeuvres Complètes* de Ernest Renan, Tome IV, 1949, 1312. But the whole chapter "Mort de Néron" bears on the poem.

Summer Storm (p. 40, p. 337n). The dedicatee, Harold Child's, second Christian name should read 'Hannyngton.' *In Memory of M. B.* (p. 41). I have not succeeded in tracing the "M. B." of the title. The last two lines are, of course, a reminiscence of the last lines of Catullus' *Carmina* 101. *Harmonies* (p. 51, p. 340n). Vincent O'Sullivan, the dedicatee, lectured for some years at Rennes University, was badly injured in a car accident, and, although a wealthy man until the 1920's, died in poverty in Paris about the time when that city was occupied by the Germans, the summer of 1940. There is an incomplete list of his writings by G. Sims in *The Book Collector*, 6, 4 (Winter 1957), 395-402.

O'Sullivan was an admirer of Johnson's work and praised it in *The Senate*, a magazine to which he was a frequent contributor in prose and verse. The following letter in my possession to Leonard Smithers is perhaps worth quoting from. The volume referred to is O'Sullivan's

Houses of Sin (1897). Herbert Pollitt bought Beardsley's "obscene" drawings.

January 31st 1898.

I herewith return Mr. Pollitt's book, in which I have written my name as you wish.

The review in the "Sun" seems to be good—not in the least laudatory, but the writer has taken pains to say just what he thinks without being offensive. I don't think, however, that I have been influenced by Symons and Johnson. It would be worth while for the reviewer to find out, if he wishes to trace influences, who influenced *them*. Rochester and Verlaine, for instance, in Symons's case, George Herbert and Matthew Arnold in Johnson's. One does not easily mistake the sparrow for the eagle.

A Dream of Youth (p. 53, p. 341n). This poem with its homosexual overtones was dedicated in *Poems*, 1895, to Lord Alfred Douglas, but the dedication was omitted in Pound's 1915 edition. The Greek epigraph has three errors, as I give it.

Corona Crucis (p. 64, p. 345n). l. 15 of note: for "deficia" read "deficit."

The Dark Angel (p. 65, p. 346n). A. W. Patrick in *Lionel Johnson poète et critique*, Paris, 1939, prints two variants and an additional stanza.

ll. 33-34. The reference is to Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, Book IV, Chapter 8, Section 4, and see also Deuteronomy, xxxii, v. 32. "Their grapes are grapes of gall, and their clusters are bitter." The Vinea Sodomorum has been identified as the *Litruillus Colocynthus*, which grows near the Dead Sea and has straggling tendrils like a vine.

ll. 55-56. In *The Cutting of an Agate*, Yeats rather curiously cites the phrase "Lonely to the lone I go" as being from Proclus.

Men of Assisi (p. 69, p. 348n) and *Men of Aquino* (p. 70, p. 348n). Dedicatee: *Men of Assisi*. Lady St. Cyres wrote *The Holy City*, not her husband as I state.

See *Post Liminium*, 30, where Johnson praises Pater for his manner of refreshing dusty memories so that "At Assisi, he would forget neither Propertius, nor St. Francis; at Aquino, neither St. Thomas, nor Juvenal."

Enthusiasts (p. 73, p. 349n). Mr. Kelsey Thornton points to the similarity to Pound's *Sestina: Altaforte*.

At the Burial of Cardinal Manning (p. 80, p. 350n). First published in *The Church Reformer*, XI (March 1892), 3.

CR Title: Upon the Burial of Cardinal Manning.

CR I. 3. A sweeter triumph, than when Rome's mailed might

CR II. 4-5. Only in death bade poor men's sorrow cease: To thousands,

The corrections point away from the concrete historical allusion to Manning's efforts on behalf of the dockers in

1889. Johnson's poem was well adapted to Headlam's Anglo-Catholic mildly socialist magazine.

Ireland (p. 115, p. 356n). This poem gathers up the traditional martyrology, the icons of the struggle for Irish freedom in the nineteenth century, and also, as this and the next stanza witness, appeals to the dim, heroic age in the manner that Yeats learned from Hugo, Renan, De Joubainville, and others. But the political martyrology is seen as coterminous with the Latin Catholic, and it is dubious if Johnson sees any hope in the physical struggle. Ireland will not be redeemed until the Last Day.

Stanza 14, ll. 1-2. Professor D. J. Gordon has pointed out that these lines were in Yeats's mind when he composed *Easter 1916*: "excess of love." The words of Columba were peculiarly appropriate as applied to the "Gaelic" martyrs of that year.

De Amicitia (p. 129, p. 357n). The general influence here seems to be the Patmore of the *Odes* and, more remotely, Crashaw.

The Dawn of Revolution (p. 133, p. 358n). Mr. Kelsey Thornton suggests a comparison of the sixth stanza with Yeats's: "But keep a marble or a bronze repose."

A Descant Upon the Litany of Loretto (p. 136, p. 358n). The revised version of the text that appears in *Merrie England* for October 1887 was first published in *The Church Reformer*, XI, ii (November 1892), 256-57.

1.	9	CR fails,	fails;
	10	CR And	And,
		CR hills	hills,
	11	CR angels of	Angels of
		the morning	the Morning
	13	CR land.	land:
	14	CR song	song,
	15	CR sorrowless	sorrowless,
	16	CR heaven	Heaven
	17	CR angels	Angels
	18	CR God's sword	a sword
	19	CR fire:	fire.
	33	CR house;	house:
	35	CR angels'	Angels'
	37	CR prince of	Prince of
		this world	this World
	42	CR air	air!
	43	CR yet.	yet,
	45	CR longer	longer,
	47	CR heart	heart,
	54	CR skies,	skies;
	57	CR Ah! Mother,	Ah, Mother!
	63-64	CR Star of the Sea! Star of the Morning! Rose	Mystical! Tower of Ivory, our Defence!

Ivory Tower! Star of the Morning! Rose
Mystical! Tower of David! our Defence!

l. 69 CR Ah! Mary, Ah, Mary!
73 CR hath once

In Honorem. B.V.M. de Winton (p. 143, p. 359n). In the centre of the upper storey of "Outer Court," College Street, Winchester, over one of the entrances to the school, there is a figure of the Virgin crowned with the holy child in her arms. It is a splendid example of mediaeval English sculpture.

Christmas (p. 159, p. 364n). The date of first publication should read January and not October 1890.

Magic (p. 168, p. 366n). For the dedicatee: Sir John. L. Myres (1869-1954), see *Obituary in The Times* of 9 March 1954.

Christmas and Ireland (p. 166, p. 366n). This poem was first published in *The Shan Van Vocht*, 14 December 1896. This magazine was edited by the dedicatee, Alice Milligan (1866-1953), along with Ethel Carbery, between 1895 and 1899. It later mutated into the weekly *The United Irishman*. For Miss Milligan, see, *We Sang for Ireland, Dublin, 1950*, which contains some biographical material and selections from the lyrics of Milligan and Carbery. Miss Milligan belonged to the Belfast group of extreme nationalists.

Cromwell (p. 177, p. 368n). First published in *The Speaker*, 12 (September 7, 1895), 262.

l. 5	S violent	menacing
9	S ;	:
10	S sceptre sword	sceptre-sword

Visions (p. 76, p. 349n). Dedicatee: Mrs. Francis de Paravicini should read 'Mrs. Frances de Paravicini.'

The Church of a Dream (p. 82, p. 350n). Mr. Kelsey Thornton observes: "The difficulty that 'certain readers might propose' is one which few would find, but the explaining it away by postulating *three* ministers at a Solemn High Mass entirely ruins the poem which has as its subject an entirely desolate church 'left by mankind.' Then 'only one,' becomes a needless doubling of the singular unless Johnson is stressing the aloneness of the priest. Thus abandoned, any Mass is better than none and the poem was written anyway before Johnson became a practising Catholic. The error proposed was I think made by Johnson, but is in no way detrimental to the poem. The 'alone with Christ' balances the Saints in the windows of the first half of the poem with the ancient Priest of the second half." *The Age of a Dream* (p. 83, p. 351n). For Christopher Whall, see the *Obituary, The Times*, December 30, 1924. See also W. B. Yeats's *Dramatis Personae*. Whall was supposed to have recovered the methods of the mediaeval glass painters.

Consolation (p. 92). First published in *The Leaflet*, 1, n.s. 10 (March 1884) without title. L., l. 3. "But thou the while

art smiling." L., l. 4. omits comma and l. 7 has a comma for a colon. *The Leaflet* was produced at Rugby school, and Johnson's connection with it was through Charles Sayle. *The Day of Coming Days* (p. 98, p. 354n). J. P. Quinn, not to be confused with John Quinn, the American lawyer and friend and patron of W. B. Yeats, was an early and active member of the National Literary Society of Dublin. See the Society's *Minute Book* from the National Library of Ireland. MS. 645.

Harvest (p. 100, p. 354n). Mr. Kelsey Thornton suggests that this poem owes much to Arnold, particularly to *The Scholar Gypsy*. The dedicatee, Nowell Smith's copy of *Poems 1895* is in the library of Manchester University.

Experience (p. 107, p. 107n). The birthdate of George Arthur Greene should be 1852.

Sertorius (p. 110, p. 356n). Dedicatee: A. F. B. Williams' dates are 1867-1950. Johnson would have presumably found the account of Sertorius in Plutarch and Valerius Maximus.

Ninety Eight (p. 181, p. 368n). First published in *The Shan Van Vocht*, 7 February 1898. The reference is to the Irish Revolt of 1798, and the poem is in dialogue with John Kells Ingram's *The Memory of the Dead*, whose first line is "Who fears to speak of Ninety-Eight."

Comrades (p. 182, p. 368n). The note referring to the dedicatee should be cancelled. Marmaduke Langdale was a friend also of John Gray and a fellow Catholic who seems to have led a distinctly wasted life. He was an associate member of the Rhymers' Club, dabbled in writing himself, and died aged about sixty in 1924.

Sursum Corda. 'Gautiesque' in the note to this poem on p. 369 should read 'Gautieresque' and the title of the poem is misspelt.

A Memory (p. 186). In the note to this poem on p. 369, "Dolly" should read "Dollie" Radford.

De profundis (p. 191, p. 370n). The metre of this, *One and All, Brothers, Before the Cloister, the Dead of '98, Walter Pater, and Vita Venturi Saeculi* may well derive from F. W. H. Myers' *In Henry VIII's Chapel*. Johnson admired Myers' poetry in earlier years.

To the Dead of '98 (p. 193). First published in *The Shan Van Vocht*, 7 June 1897.

Vinum Demonum (text p. 194, note p. 370). I should have made it clear that the title refers to poetry, not to alcohol.

Right and Might (p. 204, p. 372n). First published in *The Shan Van Vocht*, 3 April 1896.

l. 1	SVV sea,	sea:
4	SVV omits commas round 'more fierce'	
6	SVV He	He,
8	SVV He	He,

12	SVV foe	right: foe,
14	SVV vanish	vanish,
15	SVV withdraw,	withdraw:
16	SVV justice,	justice:
	SVV But not this infinite justice, not this law!	But not His infinite justice! not His law!

The Red Moon (p. 206, p. 372n). The dedicatee, Thomas Hope McLachlan (1845-1897), was an associate of the Century Guild. Beginning his career as a barrister, McLachlan turned to art in his early thirties. He specialized in evocative landscapes. See the article by J. L. Caw in *Dictionary of National Biography, Supplement*, ed. Sidney Lee, III, 1901.

Hawker of Morwenstow (p. 216, p. 376n). The dedicatee, Mrs. Dalton was possibly the wife of the Rev. Herbert Dalton (1852-1928), assistant master at Winchester 1884-1890 and Chaplain at Winchester Refuge 1884-1886. Mrs. Dalton was the former Mabel Selina Simeon. Johnson refers to the Daltons in his letters to Campbell Dodgson, B.M. Add. MS. 46363.

Munster. A.D. 1534 (p. 217, p. 377n). Johnson was interested in Antinomianism. The reference is to the Anabaptist Theocracy. For a modern Latin Catholic view of these fanatics, see R. A. Knox, *Enthusiasm*, 1950, and for another view, N. Cohn, *Pursuit of the Millennium*, 1957.

July (p. 224, p. 382n). More Adey, the dedicatee, was born in 1858 and died in 1942.

Chances (p. 225, p. 383n). Althea Gyles (1868-1949) makes some appearance in Yeats's *Autobiographies* and is mentioned here and there in the poet's letters. See W. B. Yeats: *Images of a Poet*, ed. D. J. Gordon, Manchester, 1961, for the fullest account. A number of her verses have survived, most of them unprinted.

Lambeth Lyric (p. 243, p. 385n). The transcription of this poem is not satisfactory.

(text p. 243)

l.	3	for well-strung	read well-strung,
	7	" These	" 'These
	16	" stable."	" 'stable.'
	18	" some	" 'some,

(text p. 244)

l.	7	for vague	read vague,
	8	" Tabour	" Tabor
	9	" Establishment	" Establishment,

On the Memorial Verses Upon Matthew Arnold Written by his Friend. . . Arthur Galton (p. 244, p. 385n). Galton's poem appeared originally in *The Century Guild Hobby Horse*, iv, 70.

In a Copy of Sir John Suckling's Fragmenta Aurea. (p. 246, p. 386n). See also: *The Catalogue of the Library of John*

Quinn, II, 1925, Item 4229. There is a semicolon after the word "Image" in the title of the Quinn version.

Songs II (p. 213). On the 24 July 1893, a concert was given at the school by the Winchester College Glee Club. The programme included this song which was specially written for the occasion by Mr. Lionel Johnson and Lord Alfred Douglas. Douglas presumably provided the music. This was part of the 500th anniversary celebrations of the entry of William of Wykeham and his scholars into possession of the College buildings. See *Winchester College, 1393-1893*, by old Wykehamists, 1893.

A "Hideously Moral" Eclogue (p. 247, p. 387n). The reference is clearly to one of the early productions in England of Ibsen's *Hedda Gabler*.

To Alfred Ferrand (p. 247, p. 387n). The book in question was the second not the first *Book of the Rhymers' Club. In Memory of Hubert Crackanthorpe* (p. 252, p. 388n). A further version of this poem has come to light. It seems to me to represent Johnson's holograph more closely. The lines are said to have been written on the end paper of a copy of Crackanthorpe's *Vignettes*.

Ours are the shadows, thine the light:
And yet the haunting thought of thee,
O fair, O cordial friend! makes bright
The shadows; and we surely see
Thyself, thy very form and face,
Filled with a last perfecting grace.

Prologue (p. 259, p. 390n). This poem was written at the request of W. B. Yeats and delivered by Dorothy Paget at the first performance of Yeats's play *The Countess Cathleen* at the Antient Concert Rooms, Brunswick (now Pearse) Street, Dublin, 9 May 1899. See also Johnson's review of the play and *The Dublin Evening Mail*, 9 May 1899. *Ash Wednesday* (p. 262, p. 390n). The refrain: "Memento, homo, quia pulvis es," is the vulgate translation of Genesis iii, v. 19, adapted by the compilers of the Catholic Missal. Dowson uses the phrase in his short story *The Dying of Francis Donne* and Vincent O'Sullivan has a poem of the same title in his *Poems* 1896.

To one in America (p. 283, p. 393n). First published in *Known Signatures*, ed. J. Gawsworth, London, 1932.

Walter Pater (p. 268, p. 391n). The facsimile first page given in *The Catalogue of the Library of John Quinn*, Pt. 1., New York, 1924, involves one important textual difference. L. 27 gives "unworldly" for "worldly," but metrically as well as from the point of view of mere sense this seems an unlikely reading. The other variants are:

l.	10	JQ deeps,	deeps
	15	JQ one;	one:
	20	JQ lament;	lament:
	34	JQ plain;	plain,

1. 51 in my text has an unfortunate dropped letter. Ended, is service should read: Ended, his service.

Paradise Lost (p. 266, p. 391n). The text from Jeremiah xlix, 23. (see the note to *Ireland* p. 356) was popular in the 1890's. See, for example, the poem of that title by Gilbert Beresford in *Poems*, 1891. The opening stanza runs:

I looked upon the mighty main—
Sunless! moonless! as it had lain
A century immersed in woe,
Its black waves curling to and fro:
O word of truth! dark imagery!
That "there is sorrow on the sea."

University of Reading

Carlyle, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, and Madame Cottin

Edwin W. Marris, Jr.

IN 1881 RICHARD HERNE SHEPHERD in his biography of Carlyle¹ published a letter from Carlyle to Major David Lester Richardson, the poet and miscellaneous writer and, at the time Carlyle wrote to him (December 19, 1837), editor of the *Bengal Annual* and the *Calcutta Literary Gazette*. Thanking him for his *Literary Leaves, or Prose and Verse* (Calcutta, 1836)—"a welcome, altogether commendable book," he said—Carlyle noticed Major Richardson's sense of alienation in his Indian outpost. "You have other things to do in the East than grieve," he admonished. "Are there not beautiful things there, glorious things; wanting only an eye to note them, a hand to record them." And by way of example he suggested Jacques Henri Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's *Paul et Virginie* (1788). In a footnote at this point, Shepherd wrote: "It has been vaguely whispered in a memoir of Carlyle published many years ago in a long-defunct journal that Carlyle once, in his early years of journey-work, translated this book in whole or in part." He then quoted from Lucian Paul, "Notable Contemporaries. No. 1. Thomas Carlyle," *The Critic*, X (June 14, 1851), 277: "Edinburgh booksellers still hint to you of minor translations, such as that of *Paul and Virginie*, in which Carlyle had a share; but they may be safely left to the researches of future Boswells." Certain Carlyle family letters (and one other), for the most part unpublished, show that the translation was not Carlyle's but his brother John's, later Dr. Carlyle, who will be remembered in his own right for his fine prose translation of the *Inferno*. In addition, they indicate that John translated Sophie (Risteau) Cottin's *Elisabeth, ou les Exilés de Sibérie* (1806)

as well, and that Carlyle played some part, perhaps some considerable part, in overseeing the work on both.

Five years after Shepherd's biography appeared, Charles Eliot Norton, in the first of his two editions of Carlyle correspondence, published two letters that bear on this matter. The first, dated May 9, 1823, was from Carlyle to John. Having returned at the close of the school year from Edinburgh University to his father's farm house, Mainhill, near Ecclefechan, Dumfriesshire, he was urged by Carlyle, who was still in Edinburgh, to continue with his studies throughout the summer. Such employments, he counseled, are "the only thing[s], as you well know, to keep a rational creature happy. . . ." To this end Carlyle encouraged him:

. . . There is, you mind, another branch of study, that of 'English Composition'; and for this I have also cared. Listen to me. Boyd² and I have talked repeatedly about the French novels *Elizabeth* [sic] and *Paul et Virginie*: we have at length come to a bargain. I have engaged that you, "the Universal Pan", shall translate them both in your best style (I overlooking the MS, and correcting the Press), and receive for so doing the sum of £20; the whole to be ready about August next. You will get the French copies and the existing translations, by Farries,³ and then I read you, betake yourself to the duty with might and main. I have no doubt you will do it in a sufficient manner. You have only to consult the old copy at any dubious point, and never to be squeamish in imitating it. All that Boyd wants is a reasonable translation, which no one can prosecute him for printing.⁴

The second of the two letters, dated June 5, 1824, and addressed to his mother, contained a message for John.

1. *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Carlyle, with Personal Reminiscences and Selections from His Private Letters to Numerous Correspondents*, 2 vols. (London, 1881), I, 224-28.

2. Of the Edinburgh publishing firm of Oliver and Boyd.

3. George Farries, the carrier.

4. *Early Letters of Thomas Carlyle*, ed. Charles Eliot Norton (Lon-

don and New York, 1886), p. 273. MS 522.28-1922, National Library of Scotland (hereafter NLS). Here, as elsewhere, I have transcribed directly from the holograph letters, for the most part made available to me by the generosity of Professor Charles Richard Sanders, editor of the Carlyles' correspondence. (I have silently added a few commas.)

"Tell him," Carlyle said, "Boyd will send two *Pauls* down whenever they are ready."⁵ Norton's footnote reads simply, "John Carlyle's translation of *Paul and Virginia*, published by Boyd." Professor Norton, as I have suggested, should also have included Madame Cottin's novel. His note, furthermore, requires more substantiation than the circumstantial evidence in the first letter cited above, a reservation supported, to some extent, by the fact that David Wilson, who left hardly a stone unturned, avoided any mention of the subject whatever in his painstakingly, painfully detailed biography of Carlyle. It goes without saying that in every biography of Carlyle before Wilson's, notably in Froude's (1882), William Howie Wylie's (1881), in Moncure Daniel Conway's (1881), the topic is never dealt with.

On May 10, 1823, the day after he reported the bargain struck with Boyd, Carlyle again wrote to his brother. Unexpectedly forced to vacate his lodgings at 3 Moray Street, he notified John to expect him home in consequence and told him further that "To-morrow I shall order the French and English novels, and try to bring them with me."⁶

After a brief stay at Mainhill, Carlyle, who had been in the employ of the Charles Buller family since January 1822, as tutor to their sons Charles and Arthur William, left to join them at the house they had taken in Kinnaird, Perthshire. He stopped over in Edinburgh on the way, and in a letter to another brother, Alexander, or Alick, as he was called, written from Kinnaird-House on May 24, requested him to tell John that "I saw his Bookseller, and arranged everything."⁷ Again, on June 10, in a letter to his mother, he asked her to "Tell Jack I hope he proceeds rapidly with his translations. . . ."⁸ But John was doing fine, as his reply of June 20 attests:

. . . I have little to tell you with regard to myself. I am still doing very well at Mainhill, and hoping to make a profitable summer of it. For the last 5 weeks I have been exceedingly busy in translating the *Exiles of Siberia*. . . which task I have accomplished in a way except working some of it over again. . . .—As I understand, it would be somewhat expensive to send the manuscript to you by the post. I have thought it would be better not to send it at all, but wait till you come home again in August, when it will be a much easier task to sweep it clean with your critical 'besom,'⁹ as I may read it over to you while you have the French copy in your hand all the time. At all events there is not the least hurry about it. I shall begin the translation

of *Virginia* as soon as I have read the French fairly over for two or three times. I purpose to devote the forenoon to it, rising about six. . . .¹⁰

Carlyle's answer, from Kinnaird-House on June 24, must have been reassuring: "Your translations, which I see are prospering, may well lie till I come down. I have hopes of seeing you, before the task can be finished."¹¹

The hope was realized, for Carlyle, attending to Charles and Arthur during the day, at night translating *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*, suffering as usual from dyspepsia, "thoughts all wrapt in gloom, in weak dispiritment and discontent, wandering mournfully to my loved ones far away," requested a respite from the harsh regimen and, as he himself put it in the very accents of Milton, from "the great solitude among the rocking winds." He took his leave on July 11, saw to some business in Edinburgh, and within the week was home. For above a month he idled some, "galloped about" some, and returned to Kinnaird refreshed on August 21. That he also saw John's translations through to their completion while he was at Mainhill appears evident from his report to him on September 17, that "Your books are not to be printed till winter, and Boyd will not offer payment till then,"¹² and from John's wish to find more work of a like nature. For after outlining his curriculum for the new school year at Edinburgh, he remarked to Carlyle, in a letter dated November 4,

If I had some translation in the winter, I might without inconvenience devote an hour each day to it, and thus improve myself and at the same time earn a little money. I shall talk with you about this matter when you come to Edinburgh 'about the middle of November.'¹³

In his reply on November 11, Carlyle promised John, now settled in his rooms at 35 Bristo Street, that he would take in Edinburgh on a forthcoming visit to Haddington and Jane Welsh: "Your translation, and a new one if possible we shall arrange about then."¹⁴

On December 24, John informed Alick that "They are printing Paul and Virginia at Oliver & Boyd's and I expect to have the first proofsheet some of these days."¹⁵ It arrived on January 6, 1824, and he announced the occasion to both Alick and Carlyle the next day. Because of the similarity of the two letters, also because of the expanded detail in the one to Carlyle, I quote only from it (Edinburgh, January 7):

5. *Ibid.*, p. 311. MS 519.35-1630, NLS.

6. MS 522.29-1923, NLS.

7. Mrs. Blanche Carlyle Clump MS. See my "Discovery of Some New Carlyle Letters," *Thoth: Journal of the [Syracuse] English Graduate Group*, III (Winter 1962), 3-12.

8. MS 519.30-1625, NLS.

9. Broom. The word is a favorite with Carlyle.

10. MS 1775A-23, NLS.

11. MS 522.30-1924, NLS.

12. MS 522.32-1926, NLS.

13. MS 1775A-25, NLS.

14. MS 522.34, NLS.

15. MS 1775A-27, NLS.

I got the first proof-sheet of Paul yesterday. I shall go over to Murray and get initiated in [the] mysteries of correcting it. M'Diarmid's "Prefatory Remarks" came along with it.¹⁶ I am afraid . . . they will not prove a very valuable appendage to the work. There cannot be a greater difference between any two persons than there is between M'Diarmid and St Pierre. I hate M'Diarmid's flirting, would-be-sentimental style of writing as sincerely as I admire the simple unaffected narrative of Pierre. In truth M'Diarmid is scarcely entitled to aspire to any higher honor than that of being a 'Knight of the Paragraph.'¹⁷

Carlyle proffered his own services, and, characteristically, an evaluation of his brother's work to Boyd two weeks later (Kinnaird-House, January 21):

As to the proof-sheets of *Paul* there is nothing to hinder you from sending them to me, regularly by the post. Fold them as a letter, and mark 'single proof-sheet' on the back. The Edition of *Paul* can scarcely fail to succeed: if it do, the fault will be elsewhere than on the translation; I have little hesitation in calling it, by far the best yet before the public.¹⁸

Just as characteristic was the tone of the letter penned to John the same day:

I have told him to send me up the proof-sheets of Paul if he thinks necessary, which I hardly do. However, we should leave him no room for the echo of a grumble.¹⁹

The message to John in Carlyle's letter to his mother,

June 5, 1824, that "Boyd will send two *Pauls* down whenever they are ready," is the last reference to the subject. Final corroboration of the inferences offered here would be the book itself. It is a scarce item,²⁰ but the British Museum does have a copy. *Paul and Virginia, from the French of St. Pierre, and Elizabeth, by Madame Cottin. New Translations. With Prefatory Remarks by J. McDiarmid* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1824).

A word remains to be said about *Elisabeth*. Dr. Carlyle's work from December 24 on is referred to merely as "*Paul*"; and Carlyle in his letter of November 11 conspicuously employs the singular "translation." This of course admits the possibility that that was the only translation Oliver and Boyd in the end accepted for publication. But the fact that Carlyle bargained with Boyd for his brother to translate both, that John's letter of June 20, 1823, shows him at work on both, that both were bound together in the finished production, and that there is nothing in the correspondence which contradicts these and the other indications that Dr. Carlyle did do both in fact, together provide, it would seem, evidence strong enough to credit him with *Elisabeth* as well as *Paul et Virginie*. And since it is obvious that Carlyle himself did indeed have a share in the undertaking (though certainly not that which was implied by Mr. Paul), it is to be hoped that someday we may be able to determine more precisely than we can now the extent of his contribution.

Syracuse University

16. Thomas Murray (1792-1872), afterwards the Rev. Thomas Murray, by his own early example was one of the first to foster in Carlyle the idea of living by literature. He was a contributor to the *Dumfries and Galloway Courier*, to Sir David Brewster's *Edinburgh Encyclopaedia*, and by this time had seen published his *The Literary History of Galloway* (1822). He and Carlyle met on the road to Edinburgh University in 1810, and there became good friends. John, of course, came to know Murray through his brother. See *Early Letters of Thomas Carlyle and Murray's Autobiographical Notes*, ed. John A. Fairley (Dumfries, 1911).
John M'Diarmid (1790-1852) helped found, in 1817, the *Scotsman*, edited (and in 1837 became owner of) *The Dumfries and Galloway Courier*. He also edited *Cowper's Poems* (1817) and Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield* (1823).

17. MS 1775A-29, NLS. John's (unpublished) letter to Alick is also in the National Library of Scotland, MS 1775A-28.

18. Oliver and Boyd MS. Miss Janetta Houston of Edinburgh University, assistant editor of Professor Sanders' edition of the Carlyles' correspondence, recently turned up this Carlyle letter (and others) at Oliver and Boyd and kindly gave me her permission to use it here.

19. MS 522.38-1932, NLS.

20. I know of no copy in the United States. The catalog of the Harvard College Library lists one, but the book is apparently lost or misplaced.

Reviewer of Browning's *Men and Women* in the *Rambler* Identified

Esther Rhodes Houghton

IN THE NEWSLETTER for the fall of 1960 (No. 18), Professor Boyd Litzinger reexamined the case of Cardinal Wiseman being the author of a famous review of Browning's *Men and Women*, published in the Roman Catholic *Rambler* for January 1856. He concluded that the attribution was "moot, at the very least," and that we had here a prime example of an idle conjecture becoming a rumor and the rumor in turn being consecrated into a fact.

While it is not impossible, as Wilfrid Ward states in his *Life of Wiseman*,¹ that the Cardinal did at one time contribute to the periodical, we have found no confirming evidence that he did so. On the other hand, we know that the *Rambler*, recognized organ of the recent converts, had become more than a little suspect to the Old Catholics some years before the Browning review appeared. Indeed, almost from the outset in 1848 it had aroused anxiety and even distrust when its editor, J. M. Capes, advocated improved education for Catholics, which was interpreted as a criticism of the ecclesiastical administration. In 1850 Richard Simpson, a new recruit to the contributors, inaugurated a four-part discussion of the Church's reactions to the facts of science as they were impinging more and more upon the established teachings of theology; this also was viewed as an implied criticism of the uncompromising position taken by the Old Catholic authorities. Again in 1854 Simpson, and therefore inevitably the *Rambler*, became embroiled with certain old-school theologians and aroused them to denunciate his articles criticizing the metaphysics of St. Thomas Aquinas. Then in the July issue of 1855 appeared Simpson's first letter on original sin, a series which was finally delated to Wiseman for heresy. In such an atmosphere of hostility and suspicion, it is highly unlikely that Cardinal Wiseman, however sympathetic he had been earlier with the general aims of the *Rambler* and however anxious he had originally been to reconcile the Old Catholics and the converts, should have collaborated in any way with Capes and Simpson in January 1856 in the offending periodical.²

The above account proves that there was no lack of daring—even if there was of discretion—among the leading spirits of the *Rambler* staff and completely undermines the assertion of Father Prout (J. H. Mahoney) that no one but the Cardinal would have dared to insert that review of Browning. There was also in both Capes and Simpson a marked delight in ridicule, a touch of the "bad boy." What was more fun than to grasp the opportunity afforded by Browning's characterization of Bishop Blougram to underline its application to the man who in their eyes increasingly typified the opposition to the new demand for intellectual freedom among the liberal Catholics?

By January 1856 Richard Simpson had become a major contributor to the periodical, writing not only on controversial points in theology but also on music and literature. It is no surprise, then, to find that it was he and not Cardinal Wiseman who reviewed Browning. The primary evidence is found in a marked file of the *Rambler*, now at Hawksyard Priory, but at one time clearly the property of J. S. Northcote, close friend of Capes and actually the editor, 1852-1854. In Vol. 5, 2d series, of this file, on page 54, the opening page of the review in question, the attribution is "R. Simpson." This is reinforced by a list pasted into a notebook that had belonged to Richard Simpson himself. It is headed: "Dr. Northcote wrote out for Miss Capes the following list of authors of articles in the *Rambler*." Here the review is again assigned to Simpson.³ It is, of course, possible that Northcote looked back at his file when he drew up this list, but the list is by no means identical with the markings. It seems more probable from the heading that the list was drawn up by Northcote sometime after Capes' death in 1889, and, if so, would only serve to show that Northcote was as sure as he had been earlier that Simpson wrote the review of Browning.

Wellesley College

1. Wilfrid Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, 2 vols., (London, 1898), II, 228.

2. Capes' plea for better education for both lay and clerical Catholics was in the issue of December 1848, "Catholic and Protestant Collegiate Education." Simpson's "Religion and Modern Philosophy" appeared in September, October, November, and December of 1850. The articles that gave such offence in 1854 were those on magic in October and December. Accounts of the deteriorating relations between the *Rambler* and the ecclesiastical authorities

are to be found in a series of letters from J. M. Capes to Richard Simpson at Downside Abbey, in Josef Altholz, *The Liberal Catholic Movement in England* (London, 1962), and in Wilfrid Ward, cited above.

3. We owe our knowledge of both these sources to Father Damian McElrath, O.F.M., who examined the file at Hawksyard Priory and generously provided us with a microfilm of the notebook at Downside Abbey.

Tennyson's "Break, Break, Break" Again

Bert G. Hornback

THE ABILITY to articulate an idea is often assumed to be the test of one's understanding of it. In "Break, Break, Break," Tennyson addresses himself to the problem of voicing his grief over Arthur Hallam's death; and although the poem opens with an assertion that he cannot speak his loss, its achievement is finally not only the articulation of his grief but its understanding as well.

The argument of the poem is intricate, the expression precise. The initial tension is between the quiet melancholy spirit of near-despair spoken at the beginning of the poem as correspondent with the sound of the monotonously breaking sea and the temptation to yield, for relief, to the easy faith suggested in the third stanza. The conclusion goes beyond either of these alternatives, and the final achievement is an assertive resolution that is at once stoical and memorial.

The poem is organized on a structure of thesis-antithesis, and the tension is developed within this structure. The movement of the poem can be diagrammed by underlining the thesis conjunctions "but" and "and." The first stanza opens with the sounding of the sea upon the shore recreated by the meditative speaker as the sound, the expression, of frustration and grief. "And," says the speaker, "I would that my tongue could utter/The thoughts that arise in me"; he would like to be able to articulate his own grief so well.

The second stanza describes, in contrast to the speaker's situation, a safe life, free from pain. This innocent world is described, from the speaker's point of view, in terms of its sounds: "the fisherman's boy . . . shouts with his sister at play," and "the sailor lad . . . sings in his boat on the bay." But this world is irrelevant, from the point of view of the speaker's experience, and he quickly turns his attention elsewhere.

A similarly simple view of this life and its problems is introduced metaphorically in the opening lines of stanza three: "And the stately ships go on/To their haven under the hill." The speaker is offering himself a way out of his misery as he looks at the ships. They are "stately" because they are suggested as going to that "haven," and they belong, thus, in their funereal stateliness, to the metaphor of faith that intrudes here. One way out would be to believe, simply, as one is told to believe: "And the stately ships go on/To their haven under the hill." The conjunction connects these two lines with the irrelevant world of innocence in stanza two, and the suggestion, then, is that as a solution to the speaker's prob-

lem faith is irrelevant also. The response he makes, refusing to be calmed and comforted so easily, is "But O for the touch of a vanish'd hand,/And the sound of a voice that is still!" What is said in these two lines, spoken in antithetical response to the relief offered by innocence and faith, takes us back to the last two lines of the opening stanza: "And I would that my tongue could utter/The thoughts that arise in me." When the speaker cries, "But O for the touch of a vanish'd hand," he is saying what he wanted to say; he "utters" the grief he has wanted to speak. With this, the climax of the poem is suddenly passed, and "Break, Break, Break" moves toward its resolution.

In the final stanza, the speaker takes up the thought of that "voice that is still." The last stanza is almost a repetition of the first—except that it does not say the same thing. As it echoes the first lines of the poem, however, it calls to our attention the progress that has been made. The speaker stands at the same place as he did when he began, but now he sees things differently. The focus of his attention has begun, sympathetically, on the "cold gray stones"; it has moved from there to the shore, to the bay, and to the larger sea; now, in the final stanza, it is back on the stones. In turning back, however, from that distant world beyond the horizon to the immediate world of here and now, the speaker rejects the intimacy of emotional correspondence that he felt with the sea and the stones at the beginning of the poem. The changing of the second line from "On thy cold gray stones, O Sea!" to "At the foot of thy crags, O Sea!" marks the change in the speaker's point of view. He sees the uselessness, now, of tears and the destructiveness as well as the necessary frustration of the sea as it beats the shore. In the opening stanza his response to the sounding of the sea as he "heard" it, metaphorically, was "And I would that my tongue could utter/The thoughts that arise in me." In the last stanza he has already uttered those thoughts, in response to the inspiration of the sea. And from speaking his grief he now comes to an understanding of the nature of grief, and can accept his loss. The final statement of the poem, then, is a positive statement: "But the tender grace of a day that is dead/Will never come back to me."

As the speaker comes to this conclusion, he establishes for himself a point of view that was unavailable to him in the beginning of the poem. He has stated a truth for himself that he could not even think, let alone "utter," in the beginning. In response to the alternatives of melancholy near-despair and blind faith offered in the initial dramatic

tension of the poem he has developed a third alternative. In the end, the speaker comes to the point of accepting his loss. There is only one "declarative" sentence in the whole poem, and it is uttered in response to the expression of romantic agony in the breaking of the sea at the foot of its crags: "But the tender grace of a day is dead/Will never come back to me."

The end, then, is one of painful acceptance of loss. The speaker not only says what he could not say in the begin-

ning, he thinks what could not even be thought—and stoically accepts the thought. The poem is so perfectly managed that it seems simple and small—and it is exactly because of this that we must give it our closest attention. "Break, Break, Break" contains not just Tennyson's emotionalism, but that peculiarly Tennysonian form of progressive emotional argument which is the mark of his best work.

University of Michigan

An Unpublished Housman Letter on the Preface to *Last Poems*

B. J. Leggett

AN UNPUBLISHED HOUSMAN LETTER clarifies an ambiguous reference in the preface to *Last Poems* that has long puzzled scholars. In justifying the title that signaled the end of his poetic production, Housman stated in his preface:

I can no longer expect to be revisited by the continuous excitement under which in the early months of 1895 I wrote the greater part of my other book [*A Shropshire Lad*], nor indeed could I well sustain it if it came.

The phrase "continuous excitement" that Housman used to characterize the period of the composition of a great number of the lyrics of *A Shropshire Lad* has continued to intrigue Housman scholars, several of whom feel that it is an important clue to the understanding of the poet's most important work. Grant Richards, Housman's publisher and biographer, sums up the problem in the following manner: "... this passage from the preface to *Last Poems* concerns *A Shropshire Lad* more closely than it concerns the later book. It is important for the full understanding of *A Shropshire Lad* and its author; and it is provocative in leaving so much to conjecture."¹

The conjectures which the preface has indeed provoked have in common the assumption that Housman's "excitement" was a reference to the emotional state of the poet. And though Richards himself goes no further than to suggest that this excitement was Housman's "sudden conviction ... that he was producing creative work that was just as likely to make him immortal as his scholarship,"² others have read more into Housman's cryptic phrasing. Even though he admitted in an earlier article that he was "un-

able to explain this vague reference,"³ Tom Burns Haber finds that "there are few who can accept Grant Richards' explanation of the emotional element in *A Shropshire Lad*," and offers instead the explanation that "some profound amatory disturbance, or disturbances, in A. E. Housman's youth or early manhood ... made his poetry what it is."⁴ To Haber, Housman's reference to his state of "continuous excitement" supports the theory of an "amatory disturbance." Norman Marlow in his 1958 biography of the poet finds, on the other hand, that Housman's state of "practically continuous excitement" came as the result "partly of his father's death in the winter of 1894 ... and partly of a bitter controversy which he had been waging on some question of scholarship," these combined with the fact that the poet was "somewhat out of health."⁵

A letter written by Housman in 1927, however, reveals that all these conjectures are the result, in part, of a misinterpretation of the word *excitement* as Housman used it in the preface to *Last Poems*. In a short but important letter to Paul V. Love, an American, Housman indicates that by "excitement" he meant nothing more than "inspiration":

Trinity College
Cambridge
England

14 Feb. 1927

Dear Sir,

The excitement was simply what is called poetical inspiration.

Yours sincerely
A. E. Housman.⁶

1. *Housman 1897-1936* (New York, 1942), p. 311.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 312.

3. "Heine and Housman," *JEGP*, XLIII (1944), 330.

4. "A. E. Housman's Downward Eye," *JEGP*, LIII (1954), 318, 308.

5. *A. E. Housman: Poet and Scholar* (Minneapolis, 1958), p. 9.

6. The letter is now in the possession of Mr. Love's sister, Mrs. Theodore T. Tams, and is printed with her permission. The exact nature of the inquiry to which Housman here replied is not known.

This clarification dispels the idea that the words of the preface veil some personal revelation, for *excitement* suggests an emotional state apart from the creation of poetry while *inspiration* does not. The letter is almost certainly in reference to the preface to *Last Poems*. It is attached to the recipient's copy of *Last Poems* immediately preceding the preface, and nowhere else did Housman use the word *excitement* in such a provocative sense. Furthermore, the substitution of "poetical inspiration" for "excitement" fits

perfectly the context of the passage in the preface. A poet would speak naturally of being "revisited" by inspiration and of being able to "sustain it if it came," although these terms would not normally be used to describe the personal emotions which Richards, Haber, and Marlow suggest. Thus Housman's explanation further frustrates the efforts of scholars to discover personal events that triggered the intensely creative period of the early months of 1895.

University of Tennessee

Thomas Hughes's Continuing Memorial: A Treasure Trove for Victorian Scholars

Ben Harris McClary

A REMARKABLE THING happened in the mountains of Tennessee during 1882. Twenty-seven publishing firms volunteered to donate copies of their books in print to the Thomas Hughes Public Library, and consequently Rugby, Tennessee, became the owner of a first-rate library of pre-1883 volumes, both English and American. These publishers wished in this way to honor the man whose dream of an agricultural Utopia for intellectual Englishmen seemed about to become a reality.¹ The dream, as history records, turned into a nightmare when manual labor proved to be backbreaking drudgery and typhoid fever claimed a large percentage of the population.

Before that happened, however, the books had been delivered and the Library, cataloged by Eduard Bertz,² was in operation. Not all the publishers filled their pledges to the exact number of volumes, though none defaulted completely. The pledges as quoted on June 17, 1882, by Estes & Lauriat, the Boston bookselling firm that originated the idea, are as follows with the numbers representing volumes³: James R. Osgood & Co., 200; Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 500; D. Lothrop & Co., 300; Roberts Brothers, 100; Harper Bros., 500; D. Appleton & Co., 300; Macmillan & Co., 200; Chas. Scribner's Sons, 200; E.P. Dutton & Co.,

200; G. P. Putnam's Sons, 100; Henry Holt & Co., 200; A. D. F. Randolph & Co., 100; A. C. Armstrong & Son, 100; R. Worthington, 100; Dodd, Mead & Co., 100; Porter & Coates, 200; J.B. Lippincott & Co., 500; E. Claxton & Co., 100; A. S. Barnes & Co., 25; Orange Judd Co., 100; Thos. Nelson & Son, 200; Geo. Routledge & Co., 200; Cassell, Potter, Galpin, & Co. 100; Fowler & Wells, 75; Estes & Lauriat, 200; G. W. Carlton & Co., 100; Albert Cogswell & Co., 25.

Opening first on October 5, 1882, the collection has changed little since that time. From the beginning the Library has been governed by a Board whose members serve for life and fill vacancies only by unanimous vote; its annual meeting each July is a reunion, bringing descendants of original settlers from far points. For a long while the scattered local residents attempted to keep the Library open, but there was little demand for library services and almost no money to buy additional books. So through the years the books have remained stacked on the shelves.

Exaggerated stories concerning the value of the collection have developed, but no one really knew what was there. During the summer of 1963, Mr. and Mrs. William Archer and I, working under a financial grant from our

1. The closest thing to a scholarly history of Rugby is Marguerite B. Hamer, "Thomas Hughes and His American Rugby," *The North Carolina Historical Review*, V (October 1928). The most readable account, however, is John Maloney, "Town of Cultured Ghosts," *Holiday*, IV (October 1948), 81-92. Available from the Hughes Public Library is a forty-nine-page booklet, *Rugby: A Great Man's Dream*, written by Patricia Guion Wichmann, keeper of the Library keys. The booklets cost \$1.25, proceeds going to the upkeep of the building.

2. Bertz (1853-1931), having attended the Universities of Leipzig and Tübingen, joined the Rugby colonists in the autumn of 1881. Un-

successful in agricultural pursuits, he became the able founding librarian. When it became obvious that the colony would not prosper, he returned to Germany to become an author and critic of some importance. His greatest contribution to literature is perhaps through his friendship with George Gissing (studied in Arthur C. Young's *The Letters of George Gissing to Eduard Bertz, 1887-1903* [New Brunswick, N.J., 1961]).

3. Several different sets of pledge figures exist; this, however, seems to be the authoritative list. It can be found among the miscellaneous papers in the librarian's desk, Hughes Public Library, Rugby, Tenn.

college, cataloged this Library, making available for the first time a readily usable listing of the books.

Although the books cannot circulate under present rules, this catalog has been surprisingly useful to several Victorian scholars in the past year. To cite but one example: Arthur Young, editing *The Letters of George Gissing to Eduard Bertz*, was unable to locate Bertz's novel, *Das Sabinergut*. A quick look at the catalog showed that the Hughes Public Library has this book, perhaps the only copy in this country.

To the publishers' gifts, colonists and English and American friends added a few volumes, and these are usually the most valuable single items. For the first few years—mainly through subscriptions from the residents—the Library enjoyed a periodical collection of over twenty titles including *Punch*, *The Illustrated London News*, *The*

Graphic, *The Strand Magazine*, and *The Spectator*. These are still in fair condition and in a few cases have been carefully bound in hard covers. Because agriculture was the colony's advertised business, there was an impressive array of contemporary periodicals devoted to that subject. Interestingly the collection is especially heavy in contemporary fiction and in children's literature, the latter group being composed of hundreds of obscure but beautiful little volumes. All in all, this Library is a clear index to books in print in 1882.

Anyone trying to locate a specific title from this period might find it worth his while to address an inquiry to: Rugby Library Catalogue, Department of English, Tennessee Wesleyan College, Athens, Tenn.

Wesleyan College
Macon, Georgia

Dramatic Irony in Thackeray's *Catherine*: The Function of Ikey

Solomons, Esq., Jr.

John Christopher Kleis

DESPITE THE VARIETY of approaches that critics have used to explain it, *Catherine* remains one of the least understood of Thackeray's works. It has been analyzed as a Newgate satire, as a commentary on the gentlemanly ideal of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and even as a representation of the Oedipus complex,¹ all to a more or less successful degree, but the same charge has always persisted: that its satirical focus is ambiguous and confusing. Thackeray himself confessed to his mother that "the author had a sneaking kindness for his heroine and did not like to make her utterly worthless," and that the story was "not made disgusting enough" for an effective attack on the Newgate novel.² Saintsbury complains about the lack of sustained tone: "the author either cannot or will not keep on the grimace and gesture of the half-Mephistophelian, half-angelic mentor and is constantly telling a plain tale, by no means disagreeable except for the unusual sordidness of his characters."³ J. Y. T. Greig sees it as a prime example of Thackeray's moral and intellectual indecisiveness, of his inability to decide whether to be preacher or ironist.⁴

Though most of such charges are based on external considerations of subject matter and intentions of the author, it is interesting to see how many references to "the author" there are. For most of Thackeray's work depends on the correlation of external social data with the internal structural device of the narrative *persona*, who is a dramatic character in his own right. It is through the created author-narrator of the novella, Ikey Solomons, that *Catherine* achieves its success; Thackeray was able to imagine the psychology not only of a Newgate novelist but of a human type with remarkable vividness.

Both story and narrator are drawn from the *Newgate Calendar*, but, though Thackeray followed the story fairly closely, the narrator underwent a significant change. The Isaac Solomon of history was a clever fence of the London underworld who rose from petty crime to be the leader of a large ring of thieves which operated along the most efficient, businesslike lines. After a long career, he was finally caught and tried but not before "he had become legendary—a modern businessman who made Jonathan

1. Nicholas A. Salerno, "Catherine: Theme and Structure," *American Imago*, XVIII (Summer 1961), 159-66.

2. *The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepeace Thackeray*, ed. Gordon N. Ray, 4 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1945), I, 443.

3. *A Consideration of Thackeray* (London, 1931), p. 52.

4. *Thackeray: A Reconsideration* (London, 1950), p. 42.

Wild seem a crude amateur."⁵ Like his famous namesake, Ikey is a criminal—but on a distinctly "junior" scale. Indeed at the time of writing he seems to be in jail; he has "his lodgings and food provided for him by the government of his country," and, unheroically, is far from unhappy about it, for it keeps him "(may it ever be so) somewhat removed from want" (chap. VI, p. 582).⁶ He is familiar with low life, especially with the details of starvation ("Some people, I know even, who live on it quite comfortably, and make their daily bread by it" [chap. VI, p. 582] and with the criminal mentality (see his knowing comments on Macshane in Chapter VI). He also shares the cynical attitude of the rogues in the story toward women ("I do believe, after a reasonable degree of pressure, any woman will do to any man: such at least has been my experience in the matter" [chap. VII, p. 597]) and toward property and life ("and who would scarcely be fool enough to pay dearly for that which he can have in a few years for nothing" [chap. IV, p. 563]).

Over against the crassness of such attitudes is Solomons' reverence for the romance of criminality, suggested by the legends surrounding his namesake. He has a deep appreciation for the "sacred dead"—Turpin, Sheppard, MacHeath, Paul Clifford—referring to them as "gallant cavaliers" (chap. VIII, pp. 612-13). Macshane "had a notion—and indeed, I don't know that it was a wrong one—that his profession was . . . strictly military, and according to the rules of war" (chap. VI, p. 583). He even presents quasiphilosophical arguments for the natural dignity of the criminal; *rogus nascitur, non fit*, he says, and proceeds to tell a story from his own family history as substantiation for Tom Billing's prodigious depravity at an early age:

I, Ikey Solomons, once had a dear little brother who could steal before he could walk (and this not from encouragement, for if you know the world, you must know that in families of our profession the point of honour is sacred at home—but from pure nature). . . . Dear, dear Aminadab! I think of you, and laugh these philosophers to scorn. Nature made you for that career which you fulfilled: you were from your birth to your dying a scoundrel; you couldn't have been anything else, however your lot was cast; and blessed it was that you were born among the prigs—for had you been of any other profession, alas! alas! what ills might you have done. (chap. VII, p. 600)

He prefers to think such destiny a "consolatory" doctrine rather than to think of man, with all his faults, as possessed of free will (chap. VII, p. 602).

These two sides of Ikey, the criminal *manqué*, are psychologically valid, as we can see in such disclaimers, and they form the dramatic context of the story. As a misfit, even among other social misfits, he feels a compulsive need to adopt a mind-set through which he can make experience bearable. This involves complex contradictions in itself (how can he praise men for their deeds and yet deprive them of their freedom to perform them?) and establishes him as both creator and victim of the Newgate psychology. The middle-class audience regarded the strong, violent passions of stories such as Catherine's as superhuman; the satirist, on the other hand, is inclined to see them as subhuman. Thackeray reconciles the distorted insights of Solomons into a comic whole; the "author" is deliberately made ambivalent, and his contradictions are incorporated into the narrative fabric itself.

Like most of Thackeray's narrators, he is very conscious of his narrative authority and his function as writer even to the point of referring to circumstances under which "this history would never have been written" (chap. II, p. 551). His attempts to establish his veracity, however, merely serve to highlight his confusion. At times he hews religiously to his source: "If we had not been obliged to follow history in all respects, it is probable that we should have left out the last adventure of Mrs. Catherine and her husband at the inn in Worcester altogether; for, in truth, very little came of it, and it is not very romantic or striking. But we are bound to stick closely, above all, by the TRUTH—the truth, though it be not particularly pleasant to read of or to tell" (chap. VI, p. 581). But he does not hesitate to exercise artistic selection—to skim over a lapse of ten years, to gloss over Hayes's courtship of Catherine, to digress into his own interpretations, or even to taunt the reader and lead him on:

If Count Galgenstein had not married the rich widow, Mrs. Catherine would never have—

Oh, my dear madam! You thought we were going to tell you. Poo! nonsense!—no such thing! not for two or three and seventy more pages or so—when, perhaps, you may know what Mrs. Catherine never would have done. (chap. VII, p. 598)

In equal measure his sources of authority are sometimes

5. Keith Hollingsworth, *The Newgate Novel, 1830-1847: Bulwer, Ainsworth, Dickens, and Thackeray* (Detroit, 1963), p. 113.
6. *The Biographical Edition of the Works of William Makepeace Thackeray*, with Biographical Introductions by his Daughter, Lady Ritchie, 12 vols. (New York, 1898-1903), Vol. IV. Unless otherwise noted, citations refer to chapter and page numbers in this edition.

specific, sometimes vague: he uses his own knowledge of criminal life, *Moll Flanders* (chap. V, p. 574n), and references to history as a source of generalizations about human behavior when he equates the motives of his sordid subjects with those of famous men. At other times he prevaricates: his "experienced reporters" are never named (chap. I, p. 534), and he even claims omniscience.

He is equally confused about his relation to his audience, addressing both "madam" (the polite audience of Newgate literature) and "my son" (the criminal audience). "Your ladyship" may be well aware from her reading that "the Stone Jug" is the "polite name for His Majesty's prison at Newgate" (chap. I, p. 520), but at times he goes to the opposite extreme in assuming that Hayes and Catherine are perfectly normal people: "If your ladyship is anxious to know how Hayes proposed to Catherine, think of the morning when Sir John himself popped the question" (chap. IV, p. 568). Conversely, such patient explanation is balanced by extreme impatience at the reader's ignorance of base motives: "The reader, if he does not now understand why it was that Mr. Hayes agreed to drink the corporal's proffered beer, had better just read the foregoing remarks over again, and if he does not understand *then*, why, small praise to his brains" (chap. I, p. 534).

Stylistically too the variations are considerable. He frequently lapses into what he calls "fine writing" (chap. X, p. 632), and the section where Catherine and Galgenstein discuss the weather is so florid that Nol Yorke has to delete six columns of it in order to get to the facts (chap. X, p. 635n). On a more serious level, he deliberately blunts Catherine's villainy by transferring her strong words into the "genteelst possible language" (chap. XI, p. 645). In other places he shows the strongest aversion to such flummery: he refuses to describe the great London ball in any detail because "our business is not with the breeches and periwigs, with the hoops and patches, but with the divine hearts of men, and the passions which agitate them" (chap. X, p. 632). In his confusion, Solomons mistakes a blend of high and low for the moral and artistic mean.

Such pastiches of the reliable and unreliable are a valid representation of the man caught between realism and romance, and their main contribution to *Catherine* is their relevance to the moral issues of the book—whether the "hearts of men" are "divine" or not. At the outset, he intends to present Newgate material and nothing else,

in the glorious reign of Queen Anne, there existed certain characters, and befell a series of adventures, which, since they are strictly in accordance with the present fashionable style and taste; since they have been already partly described in the "Newgate Calendar"; since they are (as shall

be seen anon) agreeably low, delightfully disgusting, and at the same time pleasing and pathetic, may properly be set down here.

... we give the reader fair notice, that we shall tickle him with a few such scenes of villainy, throat-cutting, and bodily suffering in general. (chap. I, pp. 519-20)

fully aware of the "genius of inordinate stride" necessary to do this (chap. I, p. 520).

By the end of Chapter I, however, this certainty of purpose has been modified, and he makes "some apologies to the public" for presenting his sordid characters without the sugarcoating of Bulwer's *Ernest Maltravers*. There is a suggestion of moral intent here; Ikey hopes that the public, by being exposed to undisguised vice, will reject "not only our rascals, but the rascals of other authors" (chap. I, p. 542): a moral aim surely, but one that to Ikey's mind would not be desirable until, the public having called for "three or four editions," he shall "apply to the Government for a pension, and think that our duty is done" (chap. I, p. 542). This inconsistency points up both his psychological and financial motives; the latter is true of all sensation novelists, but the former strikes at the heart of Ikey himself.

Further, despite his claims of administering this strong medicine to the public, he "has a natural horror of dwelling too long upon such hideous spectacles; nor would the reader be much edified by a full and accurate knowledge of what took place" (chap. XI, p. 664). This is unfair not only to his readers but also to the characters, for both his romanticizing and debunking of them distorts their personalities. Catherine is a vicious, overromantic woman, but, as presented dramatically, she is not lacking in good sense or even the ability to love; Galgenstein's evil nature is balanced by real charm and great competence; Macshane is a thief, but a strangely honorable one. Ikey's ambiguous position allows us to see this from time to time, but his inability to gather all the strands together at any given time brings all his previously announced moral intentions to naught. It is for us to balance his extremes through the ironic distance we have from him; what we would see as somewhat heroic in straightforward omniscient narrative becomes mock-heroic through his eyes. And his final appeal to determinism undermines everything he has said and we have perceived.

This tension reaches its most thematic and formal expression in "Another Last Chapter," which deals with the murder of Hayes. Here a basic imagery which recurs throughout—that of the theatre—is brought into play. Previously, Brock's anger is described in Kean's dramatic terminology (which Ikey says he is not going to use and then goes ahead and does so [chap. II, pp. 551-52]); Macshane delivers an aside (chap. VI, p. 585); scene is judged

superior to summary (just before a long, digressive summary [chap. II, p. 545]); and finally, an intermission, complete with description of the audience, is inserted immediately after one phase of Catherine's life is completed (chap. VII, p. 601). Here too, the murder is described as it might be done in a play,⁷ with posters, stage settings, producers, and audience.

This framework has a historical validity, for the Punch and Judy convention derives from the Newgate strain,⁸ and the Calendar was a common source of plots for plays. In the juxtaposition of realistically accurate newspaper accounts and of Ikey's literal overdramatizing of the romantic element he is compelled, almost in spite of his announced intentions, to see in it the most vivid depiction of the Newgate fallacy in the book. Furthermore, the imagery itself illustrates his self-delusion: Ikey really believes that he has not sweetened evil or falsified the fictional context:

Ring, ding, ding! the gloomy green curtain drops, the dramatis personae are duly disposed of, and the audience goeth pondering home. If the critic take the pains to ask why the author, who had been so diffuse in describing the early and fabulous acts of Mrs. Catherine's existence, should so hurry off the catastrophe where a great deal of

the finest writing may have been employed, Solomons replies that the "ordinary" narrative is far more emphatic than any composition of his own should be, with all the rhetorical graces which he might employ. ("Another Last Chapter," p. 668)

He ends, then, where he began—on a moral note, "using his humble endeavor to cause the public to hate" criminals. The comedy of Solomons is that he does not know how humble his endeavor is after such an overproduced finale.

For Thackeray the budding novelist, *Catherine* was of crucial importance, for here he combined the social and literary satire within a psychological framework and then turned both into an aesthetic structure based on the narrative *persona*, whose own ambiguous personality pervades all aspects of the story and makes it a complex ironic whole. Ikey fools nobody but himself and makes us aware not only of the perils of romanticizing crime but of our need to don masks in order to perceive experience. We accept the latter here not with indignation but with a detached, somewhat amused tolerance. The horror reflected in Catherine Hayes's crime is balanced by a humanity and a wry smile at the vagaries of man.

La Salle College

Dickens and Langland in Adjudication upon Meed

Florence Jones

TAKING UP at the same time Dickens' *Hard Times* and Langland's *The Vision of William Concerning Piers the Plowman*, one is at first astonished at the affinity in subject matter, social analysis, and emotional thrust. Both writers are alarmed and fascinated by the crass hypocrisy of Meed, who goes about subverting the fiduciary relationships that make up the very fabric of society and then demands that society should render gratitude and homage.

One need not, on second thoughts, have been surprised at the affinity. The protest against the irresponsibility of money has won the services of an impressive number of writers from Langland's day to our own, including Jonson

in *Volpone* and *The Alchemist*, Swift as the Drapier and the Modest Proposer, and Matthew Arnold as the reluctant mentor of the Great British Philistine. As a group, these writers are characterized by a conservative cast of mind, a conviction that society is a moral enterprise, and a talent for exploiting the ironies of the situation. Aided by the critical work of Tawney on the rise of capitalism, L. C. Knight on Jonson, and Humphrey House on Dickens, one can discern the historical continuity of the protest. Its moral basis alters little, whether the specific target is the commutation of feudal services in the late medieval period or the Manchester industrialists of the nineteenth century. The under-

7. This significant point in the structure of *Catherine* has unfortunately been obscured because of the delicacy of Lady Ritchie. In a footnote to her edition, she justifies her decision to delete parts of "Another Last Chapter": "The description of the murder and the execution of the culprits, which here follows in the original, was taken from the newspapers of the day. Coming from such a source they have, as may be imagined, no literary merit whatever. The details of the crime are simply horrible, without one touch of even that sort of romance which sometimes gives a little dignity to murder. As such they precisely suited Mr. Thackeray's purpose at the time—which was to show the

real manners and customs of the Sheppards and Turpins who were then the popular heroes of fiction. But nowadays there is no such purpose to serve, and therefore these too literal details are omitted" (p. 668). These literal accounts are, however, important to understanding the story, and Ikey's dramatic imagery, which is swept away with them, casts considerable light on his interpretation of the crime; the expurgation is a strange one indeed. The complete text of *Catherine* is found in Sainsbury's edition, 17 vols. (Oxford, Eng., 1908), Vol. III, which is my source for the deletions.

8. Hollingsworth, p. 11.

lying thesis is that society is properly a commonwealth, and the use of property is to be determined by the welfare of all. The profit motive is no legitimate motive at all: it substitutes aggrandizement for stewardship and violates the collective responsibility of men in society.

Presumably the idea of the commonwealth reached definition in medieval England from the coincidence of Catholic Christianity and feudalism. By the first, church and society had become coextensive, so that the apostolic injunction to love the brethren now affected all social and political relationships, and, by the latter, all property—certainly all realty—was held ultimately in fee simple from the king who was responsible to the *res publica*. It was a matter of mutual belonging, or, to use Swift's phrase, "mutual subjection." Such money as there was circulated as a token of abiding contracts of duty. But the commonwealth, if it ever existed in fact, was broken irreparably by those phenomena that taken together can be called the rise of capitalism. Money got out of hand and proceeded to dictate the course of society. The profit motive was eventually to attain such a degree of respectability that it became possible for *laissez-faire* economists seriously to subscribe to the idea that uninhibited economic speculation would automatically ensure the social good. Swift, full of contempt for Walpole, the South Sea Company, and all such projectors, challenged them in the name of a commonwealth that he still identified as the Church; but for Dickens and Arnold this anachronism was no longer tenable. Holding a more secular definition of the commonwealth, they nevertheless deplored the fragmentation of society and its reversion to a state of savagery, as it were, where economic might made right and the Manchester industrialists dictated the laws of the land.

All these writers were moralists at heart. Their protest that money was subverting the structure of the (ecclesiastical) polity was joined with a moral indictment of its human products—a gallery of tyrants, go-getters, servile flatterers, and hapless victims. Jonson's knaves were lechers, blasphemers, and quick-change artists, masters at maneuvering a scene to trap the gulls in their own cupidity. Swift drew a series of projectors, fops, paranoiacs, and hollow giants. The Wood whom he pictured as Goliath the Philistine, jingling with shekels from head to foot, anticipated in a remarkable way the cultural Philistine who commanded the attention of Arnold.

While Arnold complained that the Philistine had no culture, Dickens complained that he had no heart. Mr. Bounderby of *Hard Times* is, of course, a thorough bounder. He too, like Wood-Goliath, is a man of brass sporting a doorplate with brass letters ("very like himself"). He is as windy as a Swiftian Aeolist. He is, moreover, an upstart who glories in having risen from the gutter (though he did not

ing of the sort); in Langland's terms he is Meed boasting of her illegitimacy. For the rest, Mr. Bounderby behaves as if he were the allegorical Avarice and Pride, with a retinue of other assorted Deadly Sins: Envy (played by Mrs. Sparsit with a predatory glare), Sloth (played by Tom Gradgrind, whiningly), and Lechery (played by Jem Harthouse, who, since this is a Victorian novel as well as a morality, hasn't a chance to get down to business and can merely entertain bad intentions). Dickens' moralizing tone, along with his "allegorical" technique, is very much akin to Langland's. Both Dickens and Langland attack the rich for their heartlessness in their dealings with the common man and have therefore been construed as proletarian writers, but they are more aptly called collectivists who see that the poor must bear the brunt of society's wholesale neglect of collective responsibility. In this they are to be distinguished from Jonson, Swift, and Arnold who, although they are concerned for the plight of the poor (and this is especially true of Swift), nevertheless make the first point of their attack the violation of reason, good sense, and good taste, exposing the intellectual deviation manifested in vulgar sentiment, faddishness, and cant. To point up the hypocrisy of money, Swift brings in the man of good sense; Langland and Dickens bring in the honest workman.

Stephen Blackpool has a surprising number of the traits of Piers Plowman. He is an honest workman. He *knows* that the so-called system is only a muddle, and he is not to be beguiled by false rhetoric from the official spokesmen of the system or from his fellow workers (who in Langland are enthralled by Sloth, and in Dickens by Wrath in the form of the "over-hetted" Slackbridge). By virtue of his insight and personal integrity he should be the leader of society—or at least the designated leaders should check their direction by him. But both Stephen and Piers, having pointed the way (although obscurely), are overwhelmed again by the muddle and deserted by those who had at first given specious support. Through a virtual conspiracy of employer and union leader, Stephen is dismissed from his work and sent into the wilderness as a scapegoat. He disappears, like Piers himself, and society gets along very badly in his absence. When he is found again he is at the bottom of Old Hell Shaft (where presumably he has stayed for three days!) slowly winning through to a clear vision of how things are beyond the muddle. Stirred for once by the plight of the sacrificial victim, his fellow workmen sober up and join in the effort to pull him out. He delivers as it were his resurrection speech of forgiveness and hope, and is then borne aloft toward the stars of heaven, attended by Rachel who has throughout the book been regarded as a kind of angel. His destiny, in short, is that of Piers Plowman—he is hon-

ored in that Christ takes his human flesh as the armor wherein he suffers, fights, and triumphs—in the very midst of the muddle.¹

Increasingly one appreciates the two-way strain of the material Dickens and Langland are working with. On the one hand they must portray the "muddle" realistically, so that not for a moment can the reader escape the sordidness of everyday life. And on the other hand they are celebrating a mystery—could one call it a mystery of atonement?—that is metaphysical, eluding actuality. Langland's poem is singularly realistic for a dream vision, and Dickens' prose all too allegorical for a novel. Dickens' basic difficulty is to manage within the one novel a series of characters conceived at very different levels all the way from the most "realistic" to the most "abstract." Judged on "realism," Bounderby would emerge as the artistic success of the book, and Stephen Blackpool would mark a low point of plausibility. By the same criterion Meed and the Seven Deadly Sins would be the high points of the *Visio*. But the dream vision as a genre put no premium on realism: it might be used from time to time to enhance an episode from low life. Dickens would surely have envied Langland the freedom the dream vision allowed in this respect; and at the same time he was well prepared to meet that demand which the dream vision made and the novel neglects; namely, to provide a complete analysis of the philosophical subject under discussion and have every character and every part of the action contribute to the theme.

II

Of the many ways of detailing the correspondences between the *Visio* and *Hard Times*, I would prefer to rehearse the events and characters of Langland's poem as Dickens might have reconstructed it.

The Dreamer of Langland's Prologue, setting out in search of marvels, is apt to suggest an unbaptized child stumbling by mistake into a dreamworld of Experience.² Dickens opens in a similar way with a room of schoolchildren whose innocent precocity is being initiated into the "system" of this world. Their preceptor is not Holy Church but Bad Philosophy or Utilitarianism: to the child's implicit question, "What is Life?" he answers: "Hard Facts," and

to the question, "Who am I?" : "Girl No. 20, you are a physiological phenomenon and an economic statistic, nothing more."

The Field of Folk is spread out before us. It is called Coketown, and it is a filthy dreary city, uniformly ugly, where mad melancholy mechanical elephants weave up and down, and the pall of dust effectively blinds the eyes of the inhabitants to their true location in spiritual cosmography. Yet up above is the sun, the "Eye of Heaven," and below is the black canal, and these represent respectively the Tower and the Dungeon, Life and Death, Salvation and Damnation. The accredited representatives of heaven on earth are as confused as everybody else, and when they build a church they make it "a pious warehouse of red brick, with sometimes . . . a bell in a birdcage on top of it."

Innocence looks in vain for an authority to explain these appearances and for a spiritual parent and guide. There is no Holy Church, but there is instead a troupe of wandering minstrels ("jongleurs") who live in simplicity, charity, and joy. One of the innocents has been taken from the troupe and still remembers her loving father and the simple life that the jongleurs lead; and the other children, though bound in filial obedience to Bad Philosophy, catch furtive glimpses of simplicity through the fence.

In the Field of Folk the money goes round and round, but it appears that some within the field are entitled to Wealth, and others only to Poverty. "To whom does the money belong?" asks Innocence, and "How shall I save myself in a mercenary world? Show me the way that I may recognize Falsehood." For an answer, in comes the figure of Meed—a bounder, a showy gentleman who is not a gentleman at all, a crass bully and hypocrite with an inflated idea of his own importance, but a formidable figure all the same since he holds a thousand livelihoods in his pocket. Meed has in his pay "Civil," the representative of the law, with a pathetic scramble of parliamentarians, the home secretary and other "national dustmen" who rely entirely upon Meed for their offices and, if they show any sign of independence and criticism, can be brought back into line at once by Meed's threat to "pitch his property into the Atlantic." Along with Civil and the Dustmen comes a rout of Statisticians, Commissioners, Felicific Calculators, Mr. Worldly-wise

1. It is not inevitable that a novel indicating the cash nexus should work this way. *Tono-Bungay*, *Vanity Fair*, and even *Heart of Darkness* present more obvious possibilities. The clue to Dickens' procedure is perhaps the "proletarian" version of the pastoral mode. Empson in his essay on proletarian literature in *Some Versions of Pastoral* suggests that: "The realistic sort of pastoral . . . gives a natural expression for a sense of social injustice. So far as the person described is outside society because too poor for its benefits he is independent, as the artist claims to be; so far as he is forced into this by crime he is the judge of the society that judges him. This is a source of irony both against him and against the society, and if he is a sympathetic criminal he can be made to suggest both

Christ as the scapegoat (so far invoking Christian charity) and the sacrificial tragic hero, who was normally above society rather than below it, which is a further source of irony." Stephen is all but "forced into crime." The marriage laws and Tom Gradgrind might have achieved this. At least Stephen is "judged" and convicted by Bounderby and forgives his judge and persecutors in a Christ-like manner. A reader of the novel could indeed wish that Dickens had employed both facets of the irony Empson describes, and directed some at Stephen's expense.

2. The sentence is paraphrased from Goodridge's introduction to the Penguin edition of *Piers the Ploughman*, p. 16.

Harthouse, Mr. Cunning Bitzer, Mrs. Envy Sparsit, and Mr. Don't-give-me-any-talk-of-Venison-and-the-Silver-Spoon.

They are all in on the conspiracy to marry Meed to Louisa Gradgrind, who has indeed suffered from the tutelage of Bad Philosophy but was once the daughter of Innocence. She is the "best lady" of King Gradgrind, and the king, since he is basically good natured, wants to marry her well. But Reason and Conscience are not there to advise him, or at least they never get a chance to be heard. Meanwhile the king is altogether deceived by Bad Philosophy, who talks of the *utility* of an alliance between Meed and the king's own favorite. And so the marriage goes forward with the king's blessing.

These proceedings at court have however been interrupted by a petitioner called Virtue-and-Peace who comes to complain of a marriage whereby he is held to Degradation. With the approval of Civil, Meed pronounces a judgment against Virtue-and-Peace. He is an honest man and a good worker, but he can avail nothing against the alignment of Education and Avarice.

Bi ihesus, with here ieweles: yowre iustices she shendeth,
And lith agein the lawe: and letteth hym the gate,
That feith may nougte haue his forth . . .
And doth men lese thow hire loue: that lawe mygte wyne,
The mase for a mene man: thoug he mote hir eue. . . .
Barounes and burgeys: she bryngeth in sorwe,
And alle the comune in kare: that coueyten lyue in trewthe;
For clergey and coueitise: she coupleth togideres.³

Virtue-and-Peace must yet suffer a great deal, and though he has the silent approbation of Conscience, he can never expect vindication by the laws of the land while Meed has everything in his power. He is assailed next by Wrath who is a servant of Bad Philosophy (*i.e.*, Slackbridge of the United Aggregate Tribunal), and Wrong takes from him the companionship of his fellow men. Meed seizes the opportunity of his isolation to fasten Crime upon him, and to

throw him out of doors to shift for himself. Virtue-and-Peace thereupon "makes his will"; having little to live for and much to endure, he can look only for Death.

But Louisa, victimized Innocence, who is herself under heavy assault from Envy and Lechery, has already recognized in Virtue-and-Peace her own counterpart, and from observing Meed's dealings with him she comes to understand the speciousness of her husband and her marriage. In distress she returns to the king and appeals to him for her wasted years under the tutelage of Bad Philosophy who had commended her to marry Meed. The king in turn is undeceived and realizes that his previous verdict on the marriage was mistaken since he had not consulted Conscience and Reason. Now even the king can see Meed's hypocrisy, for Envy has unwittingly exposed him when she brought in his own mother to prove his origins. Envy is also shamed, and Lechery repents when Reason and Innocence preach to him.

In the Field of Folk, however, things are as muddled and dusty as before. There are many willing to harbor Meed even when he has been discredited. Only Virtue-and-Peace/Piers could have pointed out the way to the Tower, but he has disappeared. The king puts out a special pardon for him, since he has now belatedly realized that Piers was wronged by one of his own knights, Tom False-Tongue, corrupted by Bad Philosophy and Meed. But the pardon is useless to Piers, for he has already gone on his journey beyond the confines of the Field of Folk and in the direction of the Tower. It is said that Christ, dressed in Piers' armor, has won a victory and harrowed Hell. But the results are not yet apparent in the Field of Folk, and the king knows that his own change of heart will not suffice to defeat Meed and his cronies. He must send out Reason to preach to all the people. . . .

With so little change can Langland's Vision of fourteenth-century England be told again by Dickens in the Victorian Age.

University of Illinois
Chicago Circle

Scenes of Clerical Life: Idea Through Image

David Leon Higdon

ALTHOUGH SHE DESIGNED "The Sad Fortunes of the Reverend Amos Barton," "Mr. Gilfil's Love-Story," and "Janet's Repentance" as distinctly separate stories,¹ George

Eliot carefully provided enough continuity between the three to justify her collective title, *Scenes of Clerical Life*.² A common setting and the appearance in each story of

3. *Visio*, ed. Skeat, (10th ed.; Oxford, 1923), passus 111, ll. 154-64.
1. Eliot's remarks in a letter to John Blackwood (May 1, 1857) indicate a concern for distinguishing the stories: "The third story will be very different from either of the preceding, which will perhaps be an advantage, as poor Tina's sad tale was necessarily rather monotonous in its effects" (*George Eliot's Life as Related*

in *Her Letters and Journals*, ed. John Walter Cross [Boston, n.d.], p. 216).

2. The word "scenes" itself suggests connections, and Eliot several times employed the word "series" suggesting an even more explicit degree of continuity when referring to her works. See Cross, p. 212.

representatives from different generations of the same families link the three "scenes," but the continuity is more pervasive than these fairly obvious devices indicate.³ The metaphoric language of each is markedly similar with one image in particular recurring often enough to call attention to itself. It is this image of the character as a plant, usually a flower, vine, or tree, which provides not only continuity through rhetoric but also continuity through thematic design, for the image reveals Eliot's attitude toward the character and his situation—sometimes to the extreme of overtly specifying. The imagery is not, as has recently been asserted by Daniel P. Deneau, merely decorative and "derived from areas so foreign to the actual surface life of the story."⁴

The characters in the *Scenes* are not superior to the natural world, but rather are a part of it governed by the same forces. Eliot views them as organic "plants" responding to forces in their environment of Milby. Such an image suggests a stance or outlook on the part of the author, and Eliot often resorts to the image when she wishes to underline a point. Explaining Tryan's influence in "Janet's Repentance" she writes,

Blessed influence of one true loving human soul on another. Not calculable by algebra, not deducible by logic, but mysterious, effectual, mighty as the hidden process by which the tiny seed is quickened, and bursts forth into tall stem, and broad leaf, and glowing tasselled flower.⁵

Some months earlier in "Mr. Gilfil's Love-Story" she voiced her belief in the correspondences, if not actual connections, between man and nature.

But it is with men as with trees: if you lop off their finest branches, into which they were pouring their young life-juice, the wounds will be healed over with some rough boss, some odd excrescence; and what might have been a grand tree expanding into liberal shade, is but a whimsical misshapen trunk. Many an irritating fault, many an unlovely oddity, has come of a hard sorrow, which has crushed and maimed the nature just when it was expanding into plenteous beauty; and the trivial erring life which we visit with our harsh blame, may be but as the unsteady motion of a man whose best limb is withered.

(I, 293-94)

Her vision has discerned a correspondence between the human and the natural facts. This vision she expresses through images, which, as can be seen from these passages, are far less decorative than functional.

Control of the image did not come immediately. The

earliest of the *Scenes*, "Amos Barton," lacks the concentrated image clusters which permeate its companion pieces, yet Milly Barton may, with some qualification, be placed alongside Caterina Sarti and Janet Dempster. She shares their physical characteristics and not a little of their suffering. Although not overtly compared to flowers, she is presented in close conjunction to flowers and gardens (I, 61). Perhaps the lack of image clusters may be attributed to the uncertainty of plot and lack of focus, which did not trouble Eliot in the other two stories.

Control of the image depended on a coherent design and purpose. These "Mr. Gilfil's Love-Story" and "Janet's Repentance" have. And, in them, Eliot manages the image easily and confidently. Caterina Sarti is imaged as a primrose (I, 170), a "paich-blossom" (I, 172), and a delicate plant (I, 289, 292). Mr. Bates, the gardener, explains her situation in terms quite naturally drawn from his profession.

"I shouldn't wonder if she fades away laike them cyclamens as I transplanted. She puts me i' mind on 'em somehow, hangin' on their little thin stalks, so whaite an' tinder."

(I, 206)

The Italian-born, orphaned, talented Caterina is indeed a transplanted flower who wilts and dies in the unsympathetic English soil. Being treated as little more than a musical toy by the Cheverels, she lacks a clear understanding of what is involved in "duty" and "sacrifice" when Anthony attempts to explain why their flirtation must end so that he can marry Beatrice Assher. The grafting of English manners on the Italian stem (I, 159) had little chance of success from the first as she was left untended like a wild primrose "which the gardener is not sorry to see within his enclosure but takes no pains to cultivate" (I, 170). Recovering after her collapse following Anthony's death, Caterina marries Gilfil and attempts to begin a new life. She dies, and Eliot returns to the plant image to voice the reasons: "But the delicate plant had been too deeply bruised, and in the struggles to put forth a blossom it died" (I, 292).

"Janet's Repentance" pictures a "plant" withering from lack of care and love, but a "plant" that is revived and recovers fully. Again the comparison of Janet to a flower is rather overt.

She was too like the cistus flowers in the little garden before the window, that, with the shades of evening, might lie with the delicate white and glossy dark of their petals

3. Since the three stories were written between September 22, 1856, and October 9, 1857, it could be argued that proximity in composition also contributed to similarities.

4. "Imagery in *The Scenes of Clerical Life*," *Victorian Newsletter*, No. 28 (Fall 1965), p. 22. Mr. Deneau rightly points out the ob-

viousness of the images, but I do not feel one can dismiss them as mere rhetorical decoration as he does.

5. *The Complete Works of George Eliot* (Boston, n.d.), II, 116-17. All references, hereafter given internally, cite volumes I and II which contain "Scenes of Clerical Life."

trampled in the roadside dust. When the sun had sunk, and the twilight was deepening, Janet might be sitting there, heated, maddened, sobbing out her griefs with selfish passion, and wildly wishing herself dead. (II, 8)

Alcoholism and a brutal husband have "trampled" Janet Dempster, but during the course of the story she finds a divine love and a belief which revive her. Her association with Edgar Tryan brings a new life, one recognized even by people who earlier considered the evangelical doctrines of Tryan heresy.

Even anti-Tryanite prejudice could not resist the fact that Janet Dempster was a changed woman,—changed as

the dusty, bruised, and sun-withered plant is changed when the soft rains of heaven have fallen on it—and that this change was due to Mr. Tryan's influence. (II, 169-70)

From these examples, it may be seen that George Eliot's vision of man and his position in relation to the rest of his world permeated her stories throughout. Through analogy, she suggests a complex process in human life parallel to that operating in nature.⁶ It was not by accident that she chose the epigraph for *Adam Bede* from those lines in Wordsworth's *The Excursion* that mention "flowers that prosper in the shade." She had already investigated these "flowers" on her own.

Washburn University

"Dover Beach" and "Andrea del Sarto"

Burton R. Pollin

OF THE MANY DISCUSSIONS of "Dover Beach" (published in 1867), none, to my knowledge, has indicated that Browning's "Andrea del Sarto" (1855) may have been a source of specific phrases as well as of more generalized attitudes and situations in Arnold's poem. Browning was probably working on his poem in 1853 before it appeared in Volume II of *Men and Women* (1855).¹ There are obvious parallels in the two poems. Andrea del Sarto, the betrayed husband, is watching with his wife the outlines of Mount Morello deepening in the twilight until only the stars and the watch-lights shine out (ll. 211-13). Arnold says, "Come to the window, sweet is the night-air" (l. 6) and reserves a "melancholy" note for the roar of "The Sea of Faith" later. He writes, "Ah love, let us be true/To one another!" Andrea pleads "Let us but love each other" (l. 219). He indicates his social isolation since he has alienated his patron, Francis I, his parents, and his friends who, according to Vasari, Browning's source, disapproved of his marriage. Fear of ostracism may have prevented Arnold's marriage

to Marguerite, his companion of 1848, possibly now being memorialized in "Dover Beach." A slighter verbal parallel is the peculiar use of the adverb "only" in both poems: "Only let me sit/The gray remainder of the evening out . . ." ("Andrea," ll. 226-27) and "Only, from the long line of spray . . . Listen! you hear the grating roar" (ll. 6-8).² Finally we note, "And thus we half-men struggle" (l. 140), slightly suggestive of Arnold's "alarms of struggle and flight."³

The situations are similar. Both are dramatic monologues spoken by the man to the woman, pleading for constancy. Andrew knows about Lucrezia's infidelity with the "cousin." For his hour of peaceful window-watching he says, "You loved me quite enough, it seems, tonight. / This must suffice me here. What would one have?" (ll. 258-59) The parallel in Arnold, concerning being "true to one another," might be read while we bear in mind another poem in the Marguerite series, his 1852 "Parting" with its lines (69-70), "And others, ere I was, / Were clasped to that

6. I find that John Holloway has made much the same point although I believe I insist the metaphors are more functional than he would argue. "These metaphors supplement the world view in various respects. They add to our sense that human affairs are slow-moving, or irrevocable, or frustrated, or governed by unseen forces, or set in a wider pattern; and they do so not merely through being vivid illustrations of these qualities, but through hinting that they are diffused everywhere in nature and hinting also at why" (*The Victorian Sage* [New York, 1953], p. 148).

1. William C. De Vane, *A Browning Handbook* (New York, 1935), pp. 181, 217.
2. Paul F. Baum, *Ten Studies in the Poetry of Matthew Arnold* (Durham, N.C., 1958), p. 87, speaks of the "semi-colloquial tone of language and meter—up to the last stanza."
3. Of course, the ends of the struggle are different; it is the verbal parallel that is of interest. For a possible derivation from Thucydides, see Chauncey B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry, "Letter to the Editor," *Times Literary Supplement*, October 10, 1935, p. 631.

breast." The speakers in both seem equally desperate, even in voicing their hope; Arnold follows his plea with the comment that the apparently beautiful world has neither "love, nor light, nor certitude . . ." (ll. 33-34). In Arnold the love of the sexes seems but a glimmering light that dies out even as one watches or enjoys it. Andrea's Renaissance faith is no more substantial, since it presupposes an eternal attachment to the enervating, parasitical presence of his wife while the truly great painters—Leonardo, Raphael, and Michelangelo—are able to stand alone (ll. 260-66). Each poem is a "twilight piece" about the decline of the sun, of hope, and of passion.

Could Arnold have seen Browning's poem of 1855 before writing "Dover Beach"? Obviously not, if he wrote it in 1848 or 1849, as Buckner B. Trawick suggests, or in 1850 as Chauncey B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry think from the surviving rough scrawl of lines 1-29 on the back of a sheet of note paper used for "Empedocles on Etna."⁴ Later, Tinker and Lowry merely assert, "It was probably composed much earlier" (than 1867).⁵ Other portions of the *Commentary* of Tinker and Lowry offer points that subvert their earlier (1935) view.⁶ Since Arnold published it as late as 1867, why did he wait with a reworked and completed poem of superb quality all those years? The authors of the *Commentary*, upon examining the notes of the Yale Manuscript, affirm that 1843 on the first page "may have been affixed at a later date." They point out, moreover, that Arnold used the blank side of a "discarded communication" for composition (pp. 8-10). Why should not the paper-saving school inspector have done the same with a sheet of "Empedocles on Etna"? Finally, Tinker and Lowry aptly quote a letter of August 15, 1861, from Arnold to his mother, declaring his intention to give "the next ten years earnestly to poetry," lest he "dry up" and become "prosaic altogether" (pp. 307-8).

Relevant is the evidence provided by Professor Bonnerot concerning Arnold's probable use of Sainte-Beuve's connection of the sea and faith in an image of his "Pensée près d'Aigues Mortes" in *Portraits Littéraires* (1852). He argues that the pattern and ideas of "Dover Beach" follow those of Arnold's "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse," which date from September 1851 and were published in the

April 1855 issue of *Fraser's Magazine*. He believes that the poem was written after 1855. Another point of substantiation is Arnold's visit on August 8, 1858, to Dover and particularly to St. Radigard's Abbey there. This might have evoked reflections on the ebbing of medieval faith. In the very letter describing the visit, he speaks of the need for an utter devotion to one's art to produce the highest type of it; this subject occupies much space in the rueful reflections of Andrea del Sarto, conscious of his compromises and shortcomings as was perhaps Arnold.⁷

As for Arnold's borrowing from Browning, William C. De Vane points out the obvious echo in "Growing Old" of Browning's "Rabbi Ben Ezra."⁸ Arnold may have paid Browning the tribute of following his lead in other ways. Duffin says the "Empedocles" bears comparison with *Paracelsus* and that "Philomela" also derives from Browning. About the latter poem of Arnold's, Paull F. Baum remarks on its clear connection with "Dover Beach."⁹

More directly, "Empedocles" raises the question of the relations of the two poets, since it was included in Arnold's 1867 volume "at the request of a man of genius, whom it had the honour and the good fortune to interest—Mr. Robert Browning."¹⁰ This and other expressions of esteem make J. D. Jump assert that Arnold would have been pleased if Browning had followed him in the Oxford Chair of Poetry.¹¹ The relationship of the two poets is underscored in the fourteen letters from Arnold to Browning (1861-1878), printed in the *Cornhill Magazine* in 1923.¹² In the 1840's they exchanged books, as evidenced by the inscription in the work of Glanvill's which was the source of Arnold's "Scholar Gipsy." Their mutual esteem is proved by other documents, several of which relate specifically to Arnold's reading of Browning's poems. For example, he strongly praised Browning's "Artemis Prologises," at the same time that he desired Browning to see his "Merope."¹³ Is it not reasonable to assume that he would also have read with admiration "Andrea del Sarto," the poem which Browning and posterity regard as perhaps "his greatest monologue"¹⁴ Is it amiss to find its traces in Arnold's great lyric?

Bronx Community College
City University of New York

4. *PMLA*, LXV (December 1950), 1282-83. Another study of the effect of Clough's *Bothie* (1848) upon "Dover Beach" is that of David A. Robertson, *PMLA*, LXVI (December 1951), 919-26. See also Paul Turner in *English Studies*, XXVIII (1947), 173-78, as reported by Baum, p. 94. Turner's view that Arnold withheld the poem for fear of offending Clough seems to me untenable.

5. C. B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry, *The Poetry of Matthew Arnold: A Commentary* (London, 1940), p. 173. After completing this paper, I came upon "The Dating of 'Dover Beach'" by R. H. Super, *Notes and Queries*, CCXII (February 1967), 61-62, which offers more support for a date in the late 1850's.

6. Louis Bonnerot, *Matthew Arnold* (Paris, 1947), p. 371.

7. *Letters of Matthew Arnold*, ed. George W. E. Russell (New York, 1895), I, 71-74.

8. *Commentary*, p. 178, and De Vane, p. 260.

9. Charles Duffin, *Arnold the Poet* (London, 1962), pp. 81, 90A and 122-23; Baum, p. 84.

10. *Poetical Works* (London, 1950), p. 502. After appearing in the editions of 1867 and 1868 it was withdrawn by Arnold.

11. J. D. Jump, *Matthew Arnold* (London, 1955), p. 53. Jump dates "Dover Beach" from the mid-fifties.

12. "Some Letters from Matthew Arnold to Robert Browning," *Cornhill Magazine*, LV (1923), 654-64.

13. *Letters of Arnold*, p. 70; cf. De Vane, p. 116.

14. De Vane, p. 220.

Recent Publications: A Selected List

Arthur F. Minerof

SEPTEMBER 1967-FEBRUARY 1968

I

GENERAL

- ARTS. Ames, Winslow. "Prince Albert's Taste." *History Today*, January, pp. 22-29. Albert was interested in the collection of early German and Italian paintings and the encouragement of contemporary artists.
- Brady, T. J. "Fenton and the Crimean War." *History Today*, February, pp. 75-83. An early photographer at a Victorian front.
- Hardie, Martin. *Water-Colour Painting in Britain*. Vol. II. Batsford. Covers the first half of the nineteenth century. Rev. *TLS*, 16 November, p. 1079.
- McLean, Ruari, ed. *The Reminiscences of Edmund Evans*. Oxford. Autobiography of a prominent nineteenth-century wood engraver.
- Thompson, Paul. "Building of the Year: The New Law Courts, London, 1867-82." *Victorian Studies*, September, pp. 83-86. Problems involved in the construction.
- BIBLIOGRAPHY. Bostetter, Edward. "Recent Studies in the Nineteenth Century." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn, pp. 741-66. For the period June 1966-June 1967.
- Boyle, Andrew. *An Index to the Annuals*. Vol. 1: 1820-1850. Andrew Boyle. Rev. *TLS*, 5 October, p. 948.
- Gerber, H. E. "ELT Conference Checklist." *English Literature in Transition*, Vol. X, No. 4, pp. 178-80. Selected checklist of critical writings by Wilde, Symons, Gosse, and others.
- Hemlow, Joyce, "Preparing a Catalogue of The Burney Family Correspondence 1749-1878." *Bulletin of The New York Public Library*, October, pp. 486-95. Description of the project.
- Tobias, R. C. "The Year's Work in Victorian Poetry: 1966." *Victorian Poetry*, Autumn, pp. 183-215.
- CRITICISM AND LITERARY HISTORY. Allingham, William. *William Allingham's Diary*. Intro. Geoffrey Gregson. Centaur. Rev. *TLS*, 4 January, p. 10.
- Baylen, Joseph O. "Sleep and Some Late Victorian and Edwardian Men of Letters." *English Literature in Transition*, Vol. X, No. 4. Abstracts from a 1908 questionnaire on attitudes toward sleep by leading figures, including William Rossetti, Gosse, and Shaw.
- Marshall, William H. *The World of the Victorian Novel*. W. H. Allen. Rev. *TLS*, 1 February, p. 110.
- Nowell-Smith, Simon, ed. *Letters to Macmillan*. Macmillan. Includes letters of Victorian writers. Rev. *TLS*, 7 December, p. 1196.
- Trewin, J. C., ed. *The Journal of William Charles Macready, 1832-1851*. Longmans. Rev. *TLS*, 1 February, p. 107.
- ECONOMICS AND POLITICS. Andrews, James R. "Piety and Pragmatism: Rhetorical Aspects of the Early British Peace Movement." *Speech Monographs*, November, pp. 423-36. Unlike the religious propagandists, the political speakers were sensitive to the values and ideas of their audience.
- Aydelotte, William O. "The Conservative and Radical Interpretation of Early Victorian Social Legislation." *Victorian Studies*, December, pp. 225-36. Both Radicals and Conservatives were inconsistent in supporting social reform.
- Bourke, Marcus. *John O'Leary: A Study in Irish Separatism*. Dublin: Anvil Books. Rev. *TLS*, 18 January, p. 70.
- Crick, Bernard, ed. *Essays on Reform, 1967: A Centenary Tribute*. Oxford. Rev. *TLS*, 29 February, p. 210.
- Jones, Ernest, ed. *Notes to the People, 1851-1852*. 2 vols. Merlin Press. Facsimile edition. Chartist papers. Rev. *TLS*, 25 January, p. 94.
- Low, C. J. *The Reluctant Imperialists*. 2 vols. Routledge and Kegan Paul. British foreign policy, 1878-1902. Rev. *TLS*, 4 January, p. 6.
- McCord, Norman. "Some Difficulties of Parliamentary Reform." *Historical Journal*, Vol. X, No. 3, pp. 376-90. The haphazard nature of parliamentary reform in the nineteenth century.
- Rover, Constance. *Women's Suffrage and Party Politics in Britain, 1866-1914*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. Rev. *TLS*, 29 February, p. 210.
- Rowe, D. J. "Chartism and the Spitalfields Silk-weavers." *Economic History Review*, December, pp. 482-93. Economic distress did not always lead to support of Chartism.
- Salter, F. R. *Dissenters and Public Affairs in Mid-Victorian England*. London: Dr. William's Trust. Rev. *TLS*, 22 February, p. 190.
- Smith, Paul. *Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. Rev. *TLS*, 22 February, p. 176.
- Usherwood, Stephen. "The Tolpuddle Martyrs, 1834-37: A Case of Human Rights." *History Today*, January, pp. 14-21. Six Dorset laborers were heroes of trade unionism.
- Vincent, J. R. *Pollbooks: How Victorians Voted*. Cambridge. Rev. *TLS*, 26 October, p. 1010.
- HISTORY, Burroughs, Peter. *Britain and Australia, 1831-1855*. Clarendon. Rev. *TLS*, 28 December, p. 1263.
- Clark, Peter. "Henry Hallam Reconsidered." *Quarterly Review*, October, pp. 410-19. An appreciation.
- Dutton, Geoffrey. *The Hero as Murderer*. Collins. Edward Eyre and the Jamaica rebellion of 1865. Rev. *TLS*, 4 January, p. 4.
- McCourt, Edward. *Remember Butler*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. Life of Sir William Butler, Victorian military man. Rev. *TLS*, 25 January, p. 86.
- McIntyre, W. David. *The Imperial Frontier in the Tropics, 1865-75*. Macmillan. Rev. *TLS*, 15 February, p. 147.
- Preston, Adrian, ed. *In Relief of Gordon*. Hutchinson. Lord Wolseley's campaign journal of the Khartoum

- relief expedition, 1884-1885. Rev. *TLS*, 23 November, p. 1112.
- Robson, Robert, ed. *Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain*. Bell. Essays. Rev. *TLS*, 26 October, p. 1010.
- RELIGION. Eisen, Sydney. "Frederic Harrison and the Religion of Humanity." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, Autumn, pp. 574-90. Harrison remained a firm believer in the inevitability of progress.
- Hutchings, Arthur. *Church Music in the Nineteenth Century*. Herbert Jenkins. Includes material on the English Cathedral Tradition and the Free Churches. Rev. *TLS*, 2 November, p. 1042.
- Short, H. L. "The Later History of the English Presbyterians." *Hibbert Journal*, Autumn, pp. 31-35. Covers the years 1870-1900.
- Stephenson, Alan M. G. *The First Lambeth Conference, 1867*. S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society. Rev. *TLS*, 26 October, p. 1018.
- Thompson, David M. "The 1851 Religious Census: Problems and Possibilities." *Victorian Studies*, September, pp. 87-97. The main value of the Census is its picture of religious practice.
- SOCIAL. Dyos, H. J. "The Slums of Victorian London." *Victorian Studies*, September, pp. 5-40. Reasons for the existence and survival of the slums.
- Smith, Charles Manby. *The Working Man's Way in the World*. Ed. Ellic Howe. Printing Historical Society. Reprint of 1857 issue; personal account of working conditions in the 1830's in the printing trade.
- Stewart, W. A. C., and W. P. McCann. *The Educational Innovators, 1750-1880*. Macmillan. Rev. *TLS*, 4 January, p. 8.
- Thompson, E. P. "The Political Education of Henry Mayhew." *Victorian Studies*, September, pp. 41-62. The circumstances in which *London Labour and the London Poor* was written.
- II
INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS
- ARNOLD. Alaya, Flavia. "Two Worlds' Revisited: Arnold, Renan, The Monastic Life, and the 'Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Winter, pp. 237-54. The impact of Renan on Arnold.
- Allott, Kenneth, Michael Thorpe and J. C. Maxwell. "The Dating of 'Dover Beach.'" *Notes and Queries*, pp. 374-75. Three points of view.
- Bertram, James, ed. *New Zealand Letters of Thomas Arnold the Younger*. Oxford. Covers 1847-1851. Includes ten letters by Clough. Rev. *TLS*, 9 November, p. 1058.
- Gollin, Richard M. "'Dover Beach': The Background of its Imagery." *English Studies*, December, pp. 493-511. The poem is not so much about the loss of faith as the terrible consequences of keeping vestiges of it.
- Gordon, Jan B. "Matthew Arnold and the Elcho Family: A Record of Correspondence." *Notes and Queries*, October, pp. 376-77. Unpublished letter from Arnold dated March 3, 1882.
- Madden, William A. *Matthew Arnold*. Indiana. Rev. *TLS*, 9 November, p. 1058.
- Raymond, Meredith B. "Apollo and Arnold's 'Empedocles on Etna.'" *Review of English Literature*, July 1967, pp. 22-32. The importance of harmony as the guiding principle of life and art.
- Sundell, M. G. "'Tintern Abbey' and 'Resignation.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Winter, pp. 255-64. The generic similarity between the two poems.
- Watson, George. "Arnold and the Victorian Mind." *Review of English Literature*, July 1967, pp. 33-45. Arnold was an inaccurate critic of Victorian society and culture.
- BROWNING. Fleissner, R. F. "Browning's Last Lost Duchess: A Purview." *Victorian Poetry*, Autumn, pp. 217-19. There is no evidence that the Duke was responsible for his wife's death.
- Gridley, Roy. "Browning's Two Guidos." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, October, pp. 51-68. The "conscious imposture" of Book V vs. the "grotesque candour" of Book XI.
- Grube, John. "Browning's 'The King.'" *University of Toronto Quarterly*, October, pp. 69-74. The use of the poem in *Pippa Passes* throws light on Browning's view of revolutionary activity.
- Honan, Park. "The Texts of Fifteen Fugitives by Robert Browning." *Victorian Poetry*, Autumn, pp. 157-69. Reprints the fifteen, with explanatory notes.
- Kemper, Claudette. "Irony Anew, with Occasional Reference to Byron and Browning." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn, pp. 705-19. Irony as genre, with illustrations from Browning's poetry.
- Langbaum, Robert. "Robert Browning." *Yale Review*, Winter 1968, pp. 303-8. Review-article.
- McNally, James. "Suiting Sight and Sound to Sense in 'Meeting at Night' and 'Parting at Morning.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Autumn, pp. 219-24. The poet's command of the movement of the mind and the senses.
- Melchiori, Barbara. "Robert Browning's Courtship and the Mutilation of Monsieur Léonce Miranda." *Victorian Poetry*, Winter, pp. 303-4. A castration symbol.
- Ricks, Christopher. "An Echo of Tennyson in Browning." *Notes and Queries*, October, p. 374. The possible influence of *The Princess* on "Childe Roland."
- Slakey, Roger L. "A Note on Browning's 'Rabbi Ben Ezra.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Winter, pp. 291-94. Browning subordinates character to message because the Rabbi is delivering a sermon.
- Solimine, Joseph, Jr. "Browning's *My Last Dutchess*." *Explicator*, September, No. 11. The Duke's tenuous hold on reality.
- Sullivan, Ruth Elizabeth. "Browning's 'Childe Roland' and Dante's 'Inferno.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Winter, pp. 296-302. The *Inferno* is a main source for "Childe Roland."
- Thompson, Leslie M. "Biblical Influence in 'Childe Roland to the Dark Tower Came.'" *Papers on Language and Literature*, Fall, pp. 339-53.
- Winter, J. L. "Browning's Piper." *Notes and Queries*, October, p. 373. The possibility that Browning had Chaucer's Pardoner in mind.
- BURTON. Brodie, Fawn M. *The Devil Drives*. Eyre and Spottiswoode. Biography. Rev. *TLS*, 11 January, p. 32.

- BUTLER, Sharma, Govind Narain. "The Way of All Flesh: A Consideration." *Literary Criterion*, Summer 1967, pp. 20-28. The weakness of the last quarter of the novel.
- CARLYLE, Eichler, Udi, and Alan Osler. "A Carlyle MS." *TLS*, 8 February, p. 141. Possible autograph manuscript on a page of an 1820 volume of Leigh Hunt's *Indicator*.
- Keith, W. J. "An Interview with Carlyle." *Notes and Queries*, October, pp. 371-72. Excerpts from a letter by John Ross telling of an interview with Carlyle in December 1868.
- Marrs, Edwin W., Jr. "Dating the Writing of 'Past and Present.'" *Notes and Queries*, October, pp. 370-71. The book was begun shortly before November 13, 1842.
- Mitford, Nancy. "Tam and Fritz: Carlyle and Frederick the Great." *History Today*, January, pp. 3-13. The "oddity" of Carlyle's biography.
- CARROLL, O'Brien, Hugh B. "Alice's Journey in 'Through the Looking Glass.'" *Notes and Queries*, October, pp. 380-82. The journey was from Holyhead eastward.
- CLOUGH, Anon. "The Scholars' Gypsy." *Bulletin of The New York Public Library*, September, p. 413. Bibliographical information.
- Scott, P. G. "The Text and Structure of Clough's 'The Latest Decalogue.'" *Notes and Queries*, October, pp. 378-79. The importance of both versions.
- Stubbs, Joan K. "An Unpublished Letter of A. H. Clough." *Notes and Queries*, October, pp. 377-78. To Mrs. Wedgwood, dated November 27, 1852.
- Harris, Wendell V. "The Curious Provenience of Clough's 'The Longest Day.'" *Notes and Queries*, October, pp. 379-80. The high regard in which Clough's poetical powers were held early in his career.
- DARWIN, Barlow, Nora, ed. *Darwin and Henslow: The Growth of an Idea*. John Murray. Letters from Darwin to Henslow, 1831-1860. Rev. *TLS*, 21 September, p. 837.
- DICKENS, Axton, William. "'Keystone' Structure in Dickens' Serial Novels." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, October, pp. 31-50. Dickens' use of a crucial action or symbolic event near the midpoint of his narrative to tie the two halves of his novel together.
- Berman, Ronald. "The Human Scale: A Note on *Hard Times*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, December, pp. 288-93. Coketown as metaphor.
- Coolidge, Archibald C. *Charles Dickens as Serial Novelist*. Iowa State. Rev. *TLS*, 28 December, p. 1265.
- Dabney, Ross H. *Love and Property in the Novels of Dickens*. Chatto and Windus. Rev. *TLS*, 4 January, p. 10.
- Dyson, A. E. "'Barnaby Rudge': The Genesis of Violence." *Critical Quarterly*, Summer 1967, pp. 142-60. Dickens' study of mob violence.
- . "Martin Chuzzlewit: Howls the Sublime." *Critical Quarterly*, Autumn, pp. 234-53. Dickens' "exuberant, unbridled fancy."
- Gill, Stephen C. "Allusion in *Bleak House*: A Narrative Device." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, September, pp. 145-54. Dickens' use of literary allusion to register point of view.
- . "'Pickwick Papers' and the 'Chronicles by the Line': A Note on Style." *Modern Language Review*, January, pp. 33-36. The possible influence of "penny-aligners" on particular passages and the style of *Pickwick Papers*.
- Gilmour, Robin. "The Gradgrind School: Political Economy in the Classroom." *Victorian Studies*, December, pp. 207-24. *Hard Times* shows Dickens' insight into a changing society.
- Hibbert, Christopher. *The Making of Charles Dickens*. Longmans. Rev. *TLS*, 4 January, p. 10.
- Patten, Robert L. "The Art of *Pickwick's* Interpolated Tales." *ELH*, September, pp. 349-66. The tales are part of an artistic design and have thematic relationship to the main plot.
- Stevens, Joan. "'Woodcuts Dropped into the Text': The Illustrations in *The Old Curiosity Shop* and *Barnaby Rudge*." *Studies in Bibliography: Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia*. Vol. XX, 1967, pp. 113-34. The relevance of the placing of the illustrations in the text of both novels.
- Stone, Harry. "New Writings by Dickens." *Dalhousie Review*, Autumn, pp. 305-25. Analysis of previous uncollected contributions to *Household Words*, showing the wide range of Dickens' interests.
- Thale, Jerome. "The Imagination of Charles Dickens: Some Preliminary Discriminations." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, September, pp. 127-43. Dickens' development from surface to symbol is not a consistent one.
- Williamson, Colin. "Two Missing Links in *Oliver Twist*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, December, pp. 225-34. Violence breeds violence.
- DOWSON, Flower, Desmond, ed. *The Poetical Works of Ernest Dowson*. Cassell. Rev. *TLS*, 2 November, p. 1034.
- , and Henry Maas, eds. *The Letters of Ernest Dowson*. Cassell. Rev. *TLS*, 2 November, p. 1034.
- ELIOT, Hardy, Barbara, ed. *Middlemarch: Critical Approaches to the Novel*. Athlone Press. Collection of eight essays. Rev. *TLS*, 18 January, p. 52.
- Hester, Erwin. "George Eliot's Messengers." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn, pp. 679-90. Characters who convert the protagonists from a purposeless existence to one of service.
- Knoepfelmacher, U. C. "The Post-Romantic Imagination: *Adam Bede*, Wordsworth and Milton." *ELH*, December, pp. 518-40. Eliot's indebtedness to Wordsworth and Milton.
- Mansell, Darrel, Jr. "George Eliot's Conception of Tragedy." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, September, pp. 155-71. Eliot's novels take the form of classic tragedy in some ways.
- Thomson, Fred C. "The Legal Plot in *Felix Holt*." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn, pp. 691-704. The legalism of the novel has a specific relationship to its theme.
- Tye, J. R. "George Eliot's Unscribed Mottoes." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, December, pp. 235-49. These mottoes, probably by Eliot herself, help illuminate the novels.
- FITZGERALD, Cadbury, William. "FitzGerald's *Rubáiyát* as a Poem." *ELH*, December, pp. 541-63. The poem is an "anti-lyric," whose speaker is a rendered character with a variety of attitudes.
- GASKELL, Chapple, J. A. V. "*North and South*: A Reassess-

- ment." *Essays in Criticism*, October, pp. 461-72. The author's finest work.
- Ellis, J. B. "Mrs. Gaskell on the Continent." *Notes and Queries*, October, pp. 372-73. A previously unnoticed Continental edition of *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*, published by Tauchnitz in 1857.
- HARDY, Chapple, J. A. V. "A Short Guide to Hardy Studies." *Critical Survey*, Winter, pp. 166-68. Review of selected Hardy criticism.
- Cox, J., Stevens, ed. *Hardyana*. Toucan. Short memorabilia concerning Hardy's later years. Rev. *TLS*, 16 November, p. 1093.
- DeLaura, David J. "The Ache of Modernism' in Hardy's Later Novels." *ELH*, September, pp. 380-99. Hardy was attacking "neo-Christianity," the position of Angel Clare, whose imperfect modernism made him a slave in the ethical sphere to custom and convention.
- Friedman, Alan Warren. "'Beeny Cliff' and 'Under the Waterfall': An Approach to Hardy's Love Poetry." *Victorian Poetry*, Autumn, pp. 224-28. Hardy's love poems focus on a particular emotional response to a specific love affair.
- Gordon, Walter K. "Father Time's Suicide Note in *Jude the Obscure*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, pp. 298-300. The note expresses the tone of despair and futility in the novel.
- Hogan, Don. "Biography and Mr. Hardy." *Victorian Studies*, September, pp. 98-102. Review-article.
- Kramer, Dale. "Two 'New' Texts of Thomas Hardy's *The Woodlanders*." *Studies in Bibliography: Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia*, Vol. XX, 1967, pp. 135-50. Two previously unidentified printed texts show Hardy to be a conscientious craftsman.
- Pitts, Arthur W., Jr. "Hardy's *Channel Firing*, 9." *Explicator*, November, No. 24. Details in the second stanza contribute to the poem's irony.
- Weber, Carl J. "Hardy's Debt to Sir Frederick Macmillan." *English Language Notes*, December, pp. 120-29. Macmillan helped Hardy become an established writer in America.
- HENLEY, Schaefer, William D. "Henley and 'The Hound of Heaven.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Autumn, pp. 171-81. The influence of "The Hound of Heaven" on Henley's "London Voluntaries."
- HOPKINS, Agrawala, D. C. "Complexities in Hopkins' Onomatopoeic Coinages." *Literary Criterion*, Summer 1967, pp. 1-5. These coinages are integral to the poet's verse structure.
- August, Eugene R. "The Growth of 'The Windhover.'" *PMLA*, October, pp. 465-68. Traces the development of the poem.
- Gardner, W. H., and N. H. MacKenzie, eds. *The Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*. Oxford. Rev. *TLS*, 5 October, p. 937.
- Litzinger, Boyd. "Once More, 'The Windhover.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Autumn, pp. 228-30. The poem "is an act of submission of a Christ-like man."
- HUTTON, Tener, Robert H. "A Clue for Some of R. H. Hutton's Attributions." *Notes and Queries*, October, pp. 382-83. Identifies a group of anonymous *Spectator* articles as Hutton's because of their use of an image based on ripples.
- JEFFRIES, Drew, Philip. "Richard Jeffries and the English Countryside." *Victorian Studies*, December, pp. 181-206. Jeffries' writings constitute a major body of Victorian literature.
- MACAULAY, Clark, Peter. "A Macaulay Letter." *Notes and Queries*, October, p. 369. Unpublished letter to Henry Hallam, 1842.
- MEREDITH, Crunden, Patricia. "'The Woods of Westermain.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Winter, pp. 265-82. Meredith as a skillful poet and an interesting thinker.
- Edwards, P. D. "Education and Nature in 'Tom Jones' and 'The Ordeal of Richard Feverel.'" *Modern Language Review*, January, pp. 23-32. Similarities and Differences.
- Wilkenfeld, Roger B. "Hands Around: Image and Theme in *The Egoist*." *ELH*, September, pp. 367-79. The image of the hand is a key to the novel's meaning.
- MORRIS, Henderson, Philip. *William Morris: His Life, Work and Friends*. Thames and Hudson. Rev. *TLS*, 23 November, p. 1108.
- Watkinson, Ray. *William Morris as Designer*. Studio Vista. Rev. *TLS*, 23 November, p. 1108.
- NEWMAN, Biemer, Günter. *Newman on Tradition*. Trans. and ed. Kevin Smith. Burns and Oates. Rev. *TLS*, 8 February p. 139.
- Dessain, Charles Stephen. *John Henry Newman*. Nelson. Critical biography. Rev. *TLS*, 8 February, p. 139.
- , ed. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. XVII. Nelson. Covers October 1855 to March 1857.
- Hollis, Christopher. *Newman and the Modern World*. Hollis and Carter. Rev. *TLS*, 8 February, p. 139.
- Holmes, J. Derek, and Robert Murray, eds. *On the Inspiration of Scripture*. Geoffrey Chapman. Rev. *TLS*, 8 February, p. 139.
- Svaglić, Martin J., ed. *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*. Oxford. Rev. *TLS*, 8 February, p. 139.
- ROSSETTI, Eldredge, Harrison. "On an Error in a Sonnet of Rossetti's." *Victorian Poetry*, Winter, pp. 302-3. Number XXXIV of *The House of Life*.
- RUSKIN, Levin, Gerald. "The Imagery of Ruskin's 'A Walk in Chamouni.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Winter, pp. 283-90. The poem is a revealing exploration of certain themes in *Praeterita*.
- SHAW, Adams, Elsie B. "The Portrait of the Artist in Bernard Shaw's Novels." *English Literature in Transition*, Vol. X, No. 3, pp. 130-49. Recurring character types relate Shaw to the English aesthetic movement.
- SWINBURNE, Rosenberg, John D. "Swinburne." *Victorian Studies*, December, pp. 131-52. Swinburne is "diffuse" by design.
- SYMONDS, Schueller, Herbert M., and Robert L. Peters, eds. *The Letters of John Addington Symonds*. Wayne State. Vol. I covers 1844-1868. Rev. *TLS*, 22 February, p. 183.
- TENNYSON, Antipapas, Andy P. "Tennyson, Hallam, and *The Palace of Art*." *Victorian Poetry*, Winter, pp. 294-96. "The Palace of Art" and Hallam's "Long hast thou wandered on the happy mountain."
- Jump, John D., ed. *Tennyson: The Critical Heritage*. Rout-

- ledge and Kegan Paul. Critical views, 1831-1891. Rev. *TLS*, 4 January, p. 10.
- Millhauser, Milton. "Magnetic Mockeries: The Background of a Phrase." *English Language Notes*, December, pp. 108-13. Tennyson's protest against the mechanistic inferences from science in *In Memoriam*, Section CX.
- Poston, Lawrence, III. "The Two Provinces of Tennyson's 'Idylls.'" *Criticism*, Fall, pp. 372-82. Tennyson's concern is both moral and aesthetic.
- Reed, John R. "The Design of Tennyson's 'The Two Voices.'" *University of Toronto Quarterly*, January, pp. 186-96. The route to redemption is the design of the poem.
- Sendry, Joseph. "In Memoriam and Lycidas." *PMLA*, October, pp. 437-43. Affinities between the two.
- Shimiefsky, Marvel. "In Memoriam: Its Season Imagery Reconsidered." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn, pp. 721-39. The importance of the rebirth and heaven-hell archetypes.
- THACKERAY. Blodgett, Harriet. "Necessary Presence: The Rhetoric of the Narrator in *Vanity Fair*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, December, pp. 211-23. The narrator as unifying principle.
- Harden, Edgar F. "The Discipline and Significance of Form in *Vanity Fair*." *PMLA*, December, pp. 530-41. The thematic significance depends on parallels among the characters' lives.
- Stokes, Geoffrey C. "Thackeray as Historian: Two Newly Identified Contributions to *Fraser's Magazine*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, December, pp. 281-88. These articles show Thackeray's deep interest in history.
- Tillotson, Geoffrey, and Donald Hawes, eds. *Thackeray: The Critical Heritage*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. Assessments contemporary with Thackeray. Rev. *TLS*, 15 February, p. 152.
- TROLLOPE. Tanner, Tony. "Trollope's *The Way We Live Now*: Its Modern Significance." *Critical Quarterly*, Autumn, pp. 256-71. The novel explores the upheavals that accompanied the emergence of a commercial society from a predominantly rural one.
- WILLIAM HALE WHITE. Davis, W. Eugene. "William Hale White ('Mark Rutherford'): An Annotated Bibliography of Writings about Him." *English Literature in Transition*, Vol. X, No. 3, pp. 150-60. Continued from Vol. X, No. 2.
- WILDE. Gordon, Jan B. "'Parody as Initiation': The Sad Education of 'Dorian Gray.'" *Criticism*, Fall, pp. 355-71. The agents of Dorian's education frequently are parodies of nineteenth-century ideas about the relation of art and life.
- Korg, Jacob. "The Rage of Caliban." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, October, pp. 75-89. *Dorian Gray* anticipates the twentieth-century theme of multiplicity of self.

PROJECTS—REQUESTS FOR AID

- GERARD MANLEY HOPKINS. Tom Dunne requests information for a bibliography. *TLS*, 15 February, p. 165.
- MARY ALLEN MEREDITH. Diane Johnson wishes any information or documents relating to Meredith's wife. *TLS*, 11 January, p. 44.
- WALTER PATER. R. Ivan Zbaraschuk wants correspondence, personal papers, and other biographical details. *TLS*, 11 January, p. 44.
- OSCAR WILDE. Richard Ellman requests relevant material for a biography. *TLS*, 26 October, p. 1022.

Staten Island Community College
City University of New York

English X News

Committee News

- Officers for 1968 are Martin J. Svaglic, Chairman; John D. Rosenberg, Secretary.
- The following nominations were approved at the 1967 meeting: George Levine and John Stasny, Advisory and Nominating Committee Members, 1969-1970; U. C. Knoepfelmacher, 1968 Program Chairman. The topic for the December program has been left open, though papers on authors not represented in recent years are especially encouraged. All inquiries should be addressed to Mr. Knoepfelmacher (Department of English, University of California, Berkeley, California).

Correspondence

- Herbert C. Schulz writes of the completion of his listing of British literary manuscripts at the Hunting Library. This is scheduled to appear in the May issue of the *Huntington Library Quarterly*; some additional copies will be available for purchase by nonsubscribers to the periodical.
- H. E. Gerber tells of the birth of a new periodical, *Conradiana*, "devoted to the study of every aspect and phase of the life and work of Joseph Conrad." Inquiries and subscriptions should be sent to the periodical whose base is the Department of English, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.