

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER

Editors

William E. Buckler
New York University

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

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

J. Edmund Keating, *Assistant Editor,*
New York University

Number 49

Contents

Spring 1976

Page

Desperate Remedies: Sensation Novels of the 1860s <i>by Elaine Showalter</i>	1	22	Arnold's Two Regions of Form <i>by Mary W. Schneider</i>
"Feeling Hot": Victorian Drama and the Censors <i>by John R. Elliott, Jr.</i>	5	24	The Double Narrator in <i>The Amazing Marriage</i> <i>by Robert M. DeGraaff</i>
A Straight Bat and a Modest Mind <i>by Coral Lansbury</i>	9	26	Stammering in the Dodgson Family: An Unpublished Letter by 'Lewis Carroll' <i>by Joseph Sigman and Richard Slobodin</i>
Hymns for Children: Cultural Imperialism in Victorian England <i>by Susan S. Tamke</i>	18	28	Recent Publications: A Selected List <i>by Arthur F. Minerof</i>
		31	Victorian Group News

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER is sponsored for the English X Group of the Modern Language Association by New York University and Queens College, City University of New York. Editorial and business communications should be addressed to William E. Buckler, New York University, Washington Square, New York, N.Y. 10003. Manuscripts cannot be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Subscription rates in the United States and Canada are \$3.00 for one year and \$5.00 for two years. Checks may be made payable to The Victorian Newsletter.

Desperate Remedies: Sensation Novels of the 1860s*

Elaine Showalter

ON DECEMBER 14, 1861, Prince Albert died of typhoid fever at Windsor Castle. "The Prince is dead! It is quite, quite true!" wrote a young female subject in her diary. "The poor Queen; how will she bear it? . . . She loved him so fondly, so devotedly—it will, it must break her heart. God grant it will not upset her reason. . . ."1 Yet at the same time that provincial maidens like the Hall sisters were participating in the national mourning for Victoria's domestic idyll, the same young women were lining up at Mudie's to demand quite another sort of family chronicle. In the sensational best-sellers of the 1860s, such as Mary Braddon's *Lady Audley's Secret* (1862), in which the bigamous heroine deserts her child, pushes husband number one down a well, thinks about poisoning husband number two, and sets fire to a hotel in which her other male acquaintances are residing, we find a fantasy which runs counter to the official mythology of the Albert Memorial. In these novels, the death of a husband or wife comes as a welcome release, and spouses who lack the friendly agency of typhoid find desperate remedies in flight, divorce, and, ultimately, murder. "Jane Eyre's Mr. Rochester!" exclaimed a sensation heroine in 1861. "If I had been Jane Eyre I would have killed him."²

The rise of sensationalism in the 1860s, its immense sales both in England and America, and its impact on popular culture from the theatre to Punch parodies to *Woman in White* perfumes, cloaks, bonnets, waltzes, and quadrilles,³ suggest that beyond its power to amuse, the sensation novel, as John Goode has commented, is "a mode which is responsive to a new situation," reflecting the other side of the tensions which give the decade its reputation for prudery and Podsnappery.⁴ Sensation novelists seem to have grasped the principle of the best-seller, a popular art-form, Leslie Fiedler has recently argued, which embodies the communal unconscious,

"dream-literature, mythic literature, as surely as any tale told over the tribal fire. Its success, too, depends on the degree to which it responds to the shared dreams, the myths which move its intended audience."⁵ The writers admitted that they had learned "to look at everything in a mercantile sense," and to write for "the Circulating Library and the young lady readers who are its chief supporters," but they also insisted that they were artists who drew from "the recorded facts of this Great Age."⁶

While many Victorian critics admired the energy and inventiveness of sensational narrative, most also perceived it as a business rather than an art. "No divine influence can be imagined as presiding over the birth of this work beyond the market-place of demand and supply," wrote Henry Mansel, reviewing twenty-four sensation novels in 1863; "no more immortality is dreamed of for it than the fashions of the current season. A commercial atmosphere floats around works of this class, redolent of the manufactory and the shop."⁷ As Mansel's comments imply, the novelists were tainted by their associations with technology, mass-production, and trade; wishing to insult Wilkie Collins, a gentleman at dinner sneered that his novels were read "in every back-kitchen in England."⁸ What was more alarming was the apparent cultural invasion of the bourgeoisie by lower-class values and interests. In an article on the novels of Mary Braddon, the *North British Review* lamented that the vulgar appetites and zest for sex and violence appropriate to a servant class had spread to the masters, and that Braddon "may boast, without fear of contradiction, of having temporarily succeeded in making the literature of the Kitchen the favourite reading of the Drawing-Room."⁹ Reviewers with any pretensions to high culture claimed contempt for sensationalism and professed urbane astonishment at its popularity. "There is no ac-

* This paper and the two that follow by Professors Elliott and Lansbury were presented at the Victorian Group Meeting of the Modern Language Association, December 1975.

1. A. R. Mills, *Two Victorian Ladies* (London, 1969), pp. 66-67.
2. Henrietta Camilla Jenkin, *Who Breaks, Pays* (1861); quoted in Myron Brightfield, *Victorian England in Its Novels*, 4 vols. (Los Angeles, 1968).
3. See Nuel Pharr Davis, *The Life of Wilkie Collins* (Urbana, 1956). For details on sensation-fiction in the 1860s, see Kathleen Tillotson, "The Lighter Reading of the Eighteen-Sixties," Intro. *The Woman in White* (Boston, 1969).
4. John Goode, "Minor Nineteenth-Century Fiction," *Victorian Studies*, XI (June 1968), 538. Kathleen Tillotson writes that "Podsnappery in all its fulness is a phenomenon of the sixties, and is probably related to the rise of the shilling magazines which

extended the family reading of fiction still further." *Novels of the Eighteen-Forties* (London, 1961), p. 55. I would argue that prudery also reflects an intensification of guilt.

5. "The Death and Rebirth of the Novel," in *The Theory of The Novel*, ed. John Halperin (New York, 1974), p. 191.
6. Mary Braddon, in "Devoted Disciple: The Letters of Mary Elizabeth Braddon to Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton," ed. Robert Lee Wolf, *Harvard Library Bulletin*, XII (January 1974), 14; (April 1974), 132. Charles Reade, quoted in Richard Stang, *The Theory of the Novel in England 1850-1870* (New York, 1961), p. 201.
7. "Sensation Novels," *Quarterly Review*, CXIII (1863), 483.
8. Quoted in *Wilkie Collins: The Critical Heritage*, ed. Norman Page (London, 1974), p. 19.
9. "Sensation Novelists: Miss Braddon," *North British Review*, American Ed., XLIII (September 1865), 104.

counting for tastes," wrote the *Westminster Review* in 1866, "blubber for the Esquimaux, half-hatched eggs for the Chinese, and sensational novels for the English."¹⁰

Yet there were some efforts to account for this embarrassing national predilection. In *Victorian Studies in Scarlet*, Richard Altick points out that the eternal appeal of murder was one simple answer. "I dearly like a murder," confides sweet old Mrs. Mush in Julia Kavanagh's *Sybil's Second Love* (1867); "it is human nature."¹¹ Furthermore, sensationalism was domestic, topical, and contemporary; murder was made modern and suburban, with villas and railways replacing dungeons and tumbrils. Many of the novels were based on newspaper accounts of real and recent crimes, such as the Madeleine Smith and Constance Kent cases. Reviewers appreciated the tremendous power sensation fiction obtained by translating the fantasies of the Gothic imagination into Victorian domestic realism. "Proximity is, indeed, one great element of sensation," Henry Mansel conceded. "We read with little emotion, though it comes in the forms of history, Livy's narrative of the secret poisonings carried on by nearly two hundred Roman ladies . . . but we are thrilled with horror, even in fiction, by the thought that such things may be going on around us and among us."¹²

I would like to suggest that the popularity of sensation fiction in the 1860s came from its exploitation of repressed sexual fantasy and covert protest against the restrictions of domestic respectability. As Kathleen Tillotson defines it, the "purest type of sensation novel is the novel-with-a-secret."¹³ The secrets almost always concern such crimes as forgery, burglary, bigamy, and murder; but usually it is sufficient to have the wish to commit these crimes expressed, or to have unsuccessful attempts made. The best sensation novels get their plots from the kind of family secrets which are more frequently encountered in middle-class life: sibling rivalry, alcoholism, drug addiction, adultery, abortion, illegitimacy, and insanity.

What is significant is not the particular secret, but the emphasis on secrecy as the condition of middle-class life. The sensation novelist's reminder that mysteries might be going on around us and among us, was subversive, as the Archbishop of York suggested in a crusading sermon: "They want to persuade people that in almost every one of the well-ordered houses of their neighbours there was a skeleton shut up in some cupboard; that their comfortable and easy-looking neighbour had in his breast a secret

story which he was always going about trying to conceal. . . ."¹⁴ Of course this was unpleasantly close to the truth, especially if your easy-looking neighbour happened to be Gladstone, Kingsley, Ruskin, Meredith, Munby, Dickens, Wilkie Collins, or Mary Braddon, who, at the time *Lady Audley's Secret* was published, gave birth to the first of her five illegitimate children. But secrecy was basic in the lives of all respectable women, as one novelist remarked in 1860: "Women are greater dissemblers than men . . . by habit, moral training, and modern education, they are obliged to . . . repress their feelings, control their very thoughts."¹⁵ Sensation fiction begins to hint that one's kindly comfortable neighbours, male and female, are in fact the Other Victorians; and worse, that we have met the Other Victorians and they are us. It was in the 1860s, apparently, that "Walter," the mysterious author of *My Secret Life*, first thought of printing the work which, according to Steven Marcus, shows us "that amid and underneath the world of Victorian England as we know it—and as it tended to represent itself to itself—a real, secret social life was being conducted, the secret life of sexuality."¹⁶

The innermost secrets of sensationalism, indeed, deal with unlawful passions. As the Reverend Francis Paget noted in 1868, "all breaches of the Seventh Commandment are provided with apologetic excuses; antenuptial connections are treated of as inevitable; adultery as a social necessity."¹⁷ Both novelists and readers were suspected of the worst. "If the dull people of our district were told tomorrow," wrote Collins, "that my wife, daughter, and nieces had all eloped in different directions leaving just one point of the compass open as a runaway outlet for me and the cook . . . [they would say] 'This is what comes of novel-reading!'"¹⁸ The fear of the subversive influence of sensation novels upon domestic stability went very deep; according to the *London Quarterly Review*, they "shake that mutual confidence by which societies, and above all, families, are held together."¹⁹

Critics revealingly complained that sensation novels "made murder easy to the meanest capacity," providing the "most approved recipe for poisoning" to the interested student of toxicology.²⁰ In his memoir, *As I Remember*, E. E. Kellett recalls that domestic murder was suspected to be much more common than could be proved:

10. *Westminster Review*, LXXXVI (n.s. XXX), October 1866; quoted in Page, p. 158.

11. *Victorian Studies in Scarlet* (New York, 1970), p. 43.

12. Mansel, p. 489.

13. Tillotson, "Lighter Reading," p. xv.

14. Quoted in "Sensation Novelists: Miss Braddon," p. 104.

15. Jane Vaughan Pinkney, *Tacita Tacit* (1860), II, 276.

16. "Publisher's Preface," *My Secret Life*, ed. G. Legman (New

York, 1966), p. 10; Steven Marcus, *The Other Victorians*.

17. *Lucretia: Or the Heroine of the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1868), p. 303.

18. Quoted in Kenneth Graham, *English Criticisms of the Novel 1865-1900*, p. 2.

19. *London Quarterly Review*, XXVII (October 1866); quoted in Page, p. 157.

20. Paget, *Lucretia*; quoted in Altick, p. 81.

What people showed was not always what they felt, and the family home could be a prison-house from which there was a sinister way of escape. . . . A doctor once told me that he did not believe there was a single medical practitioner in London, of twenty years standing, who had not serious reason to believe that wives in his practice had poisoned their husbands, and husbands their wives.²¹

The prominence of women, not just as consumers but also as creators of sensation fiction, was one of its most disturbing elements. In these books, readers found heroines who throb with sexual energy, irresistible Delilahs, with luxuriant Pre-Raphaelite hair (the trademark of Braddon's women) and a "tigerish tingling" in their blood.²² "No man would have dared to write and publish such books as some of these are," sputtered Francis Paget. "No man could have written such delineations of female passion."²³ "What is held up to us as the story of the feminine soul as it really exists underneath its conventional coverings," wrote a shocked Mrs. Oliphant, "is a very fleshly and unlovely record. Women driven wild with love . . . women who marry their grooms in fits of sensual passion; women who pray their lovers to carry them off from husbands and homes they hate; women, at the very least of it, who give and receive burning kisses and frantic embraces. . . ."²⁴ When Rhoda Broughton's first novel came out anonymously, her father forbade her to read it.

The more sophisticated grasped the fact that women were secretly fascinated with these angry, rebellious, and sexually-demanding heroines. Miss Braddon, Henry James commented drily, "knows much that ladies are not accustomed to know but that they are apparently very glad to learn."²⁵ Respectable women's appetite for real and imaginary crime had long been noted as an inexplicable but charming paradox. "It is a noteworthy fact," commented Eliza Stephenson in 1864, "that women of family and position, women who have been brought up in refined society, women who pride themselves upon the delicacy of their sensibilities, who would faint at the sight of a cut finger and go into hysterics if the drowning of a litter of kittens were mentioned in their hearing—such women can sit for hours listening to the details of a cold-blooded murder."²⁶ At the 1857 poisoning trial of Madeleine Smith, herself a "delicate" woman brought up in refined society, court reporters had been shocked by the enthusiasm of the women observers who lined up outside the courtroom every day in order to hear all the gory and erotic details. One historian suggests that the female spectators "most probably found in the trial a kind of

vicarious outlet for their own frustrations."²⁷

We can guess at some of these frustrations by looking at two great best-sellers of the 1860s, *Lady Audley's Secret* and *East Lynne*, interesting novels which have been too long neglected. Like Braddon's other novels, *Lady Audley's Secret* presents us with a carefully controlled and wittily executed female fantasy of escape and revenge. Braddon was credited with founding the subgenre of Bigamy Novels, parodied in such ephemeral efforts as *Laura the Lone One; or The Wife of Seven Husbands*, and *Quintilia the Quadrigamist*. Commenting on Bigamy Novels in 1866, the *Westminster Review* was outspokenly aware of the fantasies they stimulated: "When Richardson, the showman, went about with his menagerie, he had a big black baboon, whose habits were so filthy, and whose behaviour was so disgusting, that respectable people constantly remonstrated with him for exhibiting such an animal. Richardson's answer invariably was, 'Bless you, if it wasn't for that big black baboon I should be ruined; it attracts all the young girls in the country.' Now bigamy has been Miss Braddon's big black baboon, with which she has attracted all the young girls in the country."²⁸

Braddon's bigamists, invariably female, are particularly startling because they actually look very innocent. The brilliance of *Lady Audley's Secret* is that the would-be murderess is the fragile blond angel of Victorian sentiment. Braddon means to show that the dangerous woman is not the rebel or the intellectual, but the pretty little girl whose indoctrination in the feminine role has taught her deceitfulness almost as a secondary sex characteristic.

As a governess, Lucy Graham (one of Lady Audley's aliases) is everyone's ideal:

Wherever she went she seemed to take joy and brightness with her. In the cottages of the poor her fair face shone like a sunbeam. . . . The boy who opened the . . . gate that stood in her pathway ran home to tell his mother of her pretty looks. . . . The verger at the church, who ushered her into the servants pew; the vicar who saw the soft blue eyes uplifted to his face as he preached his simple sermon; the porter from the railway station . . . her employer; his visitors; her pupils; the servants; everybody, high and low, united in the declaring that Lucy Graham was the sweetest girl that ever lived.²⁹

Lady Audley has many secrets. She is not a sweet girl but a determined and resourceful woman who sets out

21. *As I Remember* (London, 1936), pp. 232-33.

22. Lydia Gwilt in Wilkie Collins' *Armada*.

23. *Lucretia*, p. 297.

24. "Novels," *Blackwood's*, CII (1867), 299.

25. "Miss Braddon," *Notes and Reviews* (Cambridge, Mass., 1921), pp. 115-16.

26. Altick, p. 42.

27. Mary S. Hartman, "Murder for Respectability: The Case of Madeleine Smith," *Victorian Studies*, XVI (June 1973), 399.

28. *Westminster Review*, LXXVI (October 1866); quoted in Page, p. 158.

29. *Lady Audley's Secret* (New York, 1974), p. 4.

to liberate herself from economic and emotional bondage. Her secrets, revealed in succession, are increasingly surprising: first, that she has a dual identity; second, that she is a bigamist; third, that she has attempted murder; fourth, that she has not succeeded because her husband manages to crawl out of the well; and finally that she is mad, the victim of insanity hereditary in the female line. But *is* she mad?

The doctor who is consulted by the family at first refuses to give the desired diagnosis:

There is no evidence of madness in anything she has done. She ran away from her home, because her home was not a pleasant one, and she left in the hope of finding a better. There is no madness in that. She committed the crime of bigamy because by that crime she obtained fortune and position. There is no madness there. When she found herself in a desperate position, she did not grow desperate. She employed intelligent means and she carried out a conspiracy which required coolness and deliberation in its execution. There is no madness in that.³⁰

Yet Lady Audley's unfeminine assertiveness must ultimately be defined as madness, not only to spare Braddon the unpleasant necessity of having to execute an attractive heroine with whom she identifies in many ways, but also to spare the woman reader the guilt of identifying with a coldblooded killer. Braddon teases the reader with the explanation that Lady Audley's insanity is latent and intermittent, coming on her only in moments of stress, but as every woman reader must have sensed, Lady Audley's real secret is that she is *sane*, and, moreover, representative.

Mrs. Henry Wood's *East Lynne* (1862) is much more sentimental but equally adroit in tapping female fantasies. Lady Isabel Carlyle is forced by her male relatives to marry a man whom she does not love. Her husband is prosperous, kind, indulgent, and congenial. But, Mrs. Wood hints, where passion is absent, mere goodness cannot suffice. While she adopts a moral and prudential tone, Wood clearly sympathizes with the feelings of the wife who is neither deceived nor mistreated, but sexually frustrated and simply bored to death:

Young lady, when he who is soon to be your lord and master protests to you that he shall always be as ardent a lover as he is now, believe him if you like, but don't reproach him when disappointment comes . . . it is the constitution of man to change, the very essence of his nature. . . .³¹

Lady Isabel deserts her husband and children and runs away with a base seducer. For this surrender to impulsive passion, Wood provides a terrible punishment. Abandoned by her lover, her illegitimate child dead in a train wreck which has disfigured her beyond all recognition, Lady Isabel returns to her home in disguise, and becomes the governess of her own children. Her husband has obtained a divorce and married her worst enemy. She must even weep at the deathbed of her son without revealing her identity. Yet the magnitude of her discipline seems necessary as a deterrent, so tempting is Lady Isabel's flight. Wood even intervenes in her own voice to issue an explicit warning:

Lady-wife-mother! Should you ever be tempted to abandon your home, so will you awaken! Whatever trials may be the lot of your married life, though they may magnify themselves to your crushed spirit as beyond the endurance of women to bear, *resolve* to bear them; fall down on your knees and pray to be enabled to bear them.³²

The urgency of Wood's message suggests that she felt herself to be speaking to a large and desperate audience. When women found it nearly impossible to obtain a divorce and had no means of support outside marriage, fantasies of pure escape must have had some appeal; and thus in sensation novels, as Guinevere Griest tells us in her study of *Mudie's Library*, "fleeing, not always strictly necessary to the plot, was very popular."³³

Sensation fiction certainly records a new kind of family pattern. It portrays an unhappy marriage as a cage, rather than a spiritual opportunity. The explicit accounts in many novels of the sexual frustrations of young women married to old men counter the Victorian idealization of these December-May marriages.³⁴ The cult of motherhood, too, comes under strong, if indirect attack; both Lady Audley and Lady Isabel desert their children; in other novels, the account of the woman's painful childbirth or infertility becomes a metaphor for sexual incompatibility.³⁵ In an essay written for the *East Lynne* centennial, Margaret Maison drew connections between the Divorce Act of 1857 and the sensation novels of the 1860s, many of which denounced divorce, "preached at great length against 'legalized bigamy' . . . [and] castigated it as 'adultery made easy' or 'unwiving unlimited,'" but also "gave their sinners such a good run for their money before subjecting them to the pangs of remorse . . . that they could hardly be said to be serving the true interests

30. *Lady Audley's Secret*, p. 248.

31. *East Lynne* (London, 1895), p. 148.

32. *East Lynne*, p. 217.

33. *Mudie's Circulating Library and the Victorian Novel* (Bloomington, 1970), p. 130.

34. For example, Rhoda Broughton's *Cometh Up As a Flower* (1867) and Florence Marryat's *Love's Conflict* (1865). For a

defense of such marriages in life and literature, see Gordon S. Haight, "Poor Mr. Casaubon," in *Nineteenth Century Literary Perspectives: Essays in Honor of Lionel Stevenson*, ed. Clyde de L. Ryals (Durham, 1974).

35. This interpretation is suggested by Jeanne Rosenmayer Fahnestock, "Geraldine Jewsbury: The Power of the Publisher's Reader," *Nineteenth Century Fiction*, XXVIII (1973).

of morality."³⁶ At the very least the Divorce Novel and the Bigamy Novel imply a criticism of monogamy, even if these were fantasies very far from actualization. As Mansel shrewdly observed, a society more accustomed to divorce would find the novels both tame and unnecessary: "Most of this popularity is, no doubt, due to the particular aptitude of bigamy, at least in monogamous countries, to serve as a vehicle of mysterious interest or poetic justice. It is really painful to think how many an interesting mystery and moral lesson will be lost, if Sir Cresswell Cresswell's Court continues in active work for another generation."³⁷

We may argue that Lady Audley makes little progress in moving out of the doll's house and into the mad house. But her career and the careers of other sensation heroines of the 1860s make a strong statement about the way women confined to the home would take out their frustrations upon the family itself. As long as legal remedies for marital unhappiness were few, tales of desperate remedies would never lack readers.

Douglass College,
Rutgers University

"Feeling Hot": Victorian Drama and the Censors

John R. Elliott, Jr.

THIS PAPER IS DEDICATED to my friends, students, and former colleagues, far and near, who are no longer employed in this profession. While I fear that the paper will do nothing to alleviate their plight, or even to make them more philosophical about their sufferings, it may serve to remind them that there have been, in times gone by, even worse reasons than at present for able-bodied men of letters joining the ranks of the unemployed.

This paper is about Victorian drama. There are few people, I suspect, even *in* the profession, who would travel 3,000 miles to hear a paper about Victorian drama. And perhaps not many more who would travel a more convenient distance to *see* a Victorian play. I myself felt that I was one of the minority, game for anything, until the recent revivals of Boucicault's *London Assurance* and Pinero's *Trelawney of the "Wells"* convinced me that the traditional critical estimate of Victorian drama was indeed right, and that not even the most skillful productions, applied to the most popular works of the period, could breathe life into these comparatively trivial plays. I felt, as a consequence, that a new explanation might be in order as to why Victorian drama, to most of us today, seems so deficient in the normal qualities of wit, vigor, and truth to life that characterize the best plays of almost every other period of English drama.

Victorian *theatre*, we all know, was something very different. The music halls were full. Opera held sway, for those who liked it, and for those who didn't, there was always the Savoy. Shakespearean actors commanded a

public adulation rivaled only by a few daredevil colonels and certain members of the Royal Family; one of them was even admitted, posthumously, to Westminster Abbey.¹

But Victorian *drama* is another matter. The critical oblivion into which it has fallen is not due to the lack of great performers and performances during this period, but to the almost complete lack of great plays. Various reasons for this curious state of affairs have been suggested by theatre historians, ranging from historical accidents to inevitable cultural trends: the monopoly of the patent theatres on "legitimate" drama; the actor-manager system which reduced the playwright to a mere hireling and elevated the actor to the status of creator; opposition to the stage by most religious groups; the aversion to the stage of most of the great writers of the century and their preference for private dramas of the mind.

There is, however, one more cause for the gap between theatre production and contemporary playwrighting in the Victorian period, which I feel is equally important and which has been little studied by theatre historians, and this is censorship. Most of us are aware that censorship of the theatre was executed throughout the nineteenth century in England by the Lord Chamberlain and his deputy, the Examiner of Plays, in accord with parliamentary statute. Just what the censors censored, however, and the extent to which they may have deterred writers from writing for the stage, are questions which are only just now beginning to be studied. The records containing the answers to these questions lie in dusty folders in the Brit-

36. "Adulteresses in Agony," *The Listener* (January 1961), p. 133.

37. Mansel, p. 490. Eight of the twenty-four novels Mansel reviewed were about bigamy. Sir Cresswell Cresswell was the judge of the first Divorce Court in England.

1. I.e., Henry Irving, the first actor to be memorialized in "Poets' Corner" (in 1905).

ish Museum and the Public Record Office in London. To date these records have gone unpublished and, for the Victorian period, almost unlooked at. A doctoral dissertation in 1969 by Marilyn C. Mattson has quoted extensively from one of these sources—the so-called “Day Books” of the Examiner of Plays, containing the official record of all play-licenses granted and denied between 1824 and 1904.² I myself have sifted through more than a hundred volumes of official correspondence, interoffice memos, and random jottings from the Lord Chamberlain’s office, written during the years 1843-1901, and deposited in the Public Record Office. As a result, it is becoming possible, for the first time, to describe with some accuracy the degree of influence exercised by the censors on what Victorian audiences saw and heard in their theatres and music halls. In the time at my disposal here, I can give you only a brief outline of the history of theatre censorship during this period, and a few of the juicier examples of the censor’s art.

The story of theatre censorship in England, as every Shakespearean scholar knows, goes back to Elizabethan times, when it was exercised by officers of the crown, and sometimes directly by the monarch himself. For our purposes, however, we may begin the story with the first legislative incursion into the field of theatre censorship, Horace Walpole’s Theatres Act of 1737. This Act gave responsibility for overseeing English theatre to the Lord Chamberlain, a crown official who in the late seventeenth century had gradually come to replace the Master of the Revels as the King’s regulator of theatrical entertainment. The Act provided that no theatres might lawfully present any “entertainment of the stage” anywhere in Great Britain except in the City of Westminster or in places of royal residence, and that to do so they must have the authority either of letters patent from the King or a license from the Lord Chamberlain. The law further provided that all new playscripts be sent at least 14 days in advance to the Lord Chamberlain for licensing, and gave to this official absolute and arbitrary power to allow or disallow the scripts, or any portions of them, as he pleased. The exact wording of the Walpole Act was as follows: that the Lord Chamberlain was empowered to prohibit plays or portions of plays, “for the time being, from time to time, and when, and as often as he shall think fit.”

Slightly more than 100 years later, in 1843, a revised Theatres Act was passed by Parliament, slightly modifying Walpole’s law. This became the law under which actors, managers, and playwrights were to live for the next 125 years. The main purpose of the 1843 Act was to ex-

tend the Victorian principle of free trade to theatres. The monopoly of the two patent theatres on legitimate drama in London was abolished, and the Lord Chamberlain was empowered to license as many theatres as the city wished to support. But if free trade was to be extended, free speech was not: the system of play-licensing was left intact, with censorial guidelines nearly as vague and absolute as those provided in the 1737 law. It may be noted that nowhere in either Act was there any provision for deputizing the Lord Chamberlain’s powers, or indeed any legal recognition of the existence of the office of Examiner of Plays, a position that had been created soon after the passage of the Walpole Act.

A first glance at the surviving records of the Lord Chamberlain’s office for the period following 1843 might suggest that the Victorian theatre censors were exceedingly tolerant. Out of an annual average of some 200 manuscripts submitted for licensing, it was a rare year in which more than 2 or 3 plays were banned outright. Some of these were no loss to the stage, but a surprisingly large percentage of the works which earned this dubious distinction were plays which have since been credited with high literary merit, as opposed to the hundreds of long-forgotten melodramas and farces which passed through the censors’ hands unscathed. Dickens’ *Oliver Twist*, Dumas’ *Lady of the Camelias*, Sophocles’ *Oedipus Rex*, Shelley’s *The Cenci*, Ibsen’s *Ghosts*, Shaw’s *Blanco Posnet* and *Mrs. Warren’s Profession*, Granville-Barker’s *Waste*—even Gilbert and Sullivan’s *Mikado*—were all, at one time or other, banned from the stage during the reign of Queen Victoria. And these statistics, of course, do not include the countless occasions on which the Examiner of Plays ordered the expunging of words, passages, and whole scenes from the scripts that were submitted to him, carefully copying out the offending passages on the provisional license for each play, thus providing a service much like the bowdlerized Japanese translation of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, which methodically printed all the erotic passages in English in an appendix.

Victorian dramatists thus soon got used to the idea that their working vocabulary should be somewhat slimmer than that of the average man. “Thigh,” “hip,” “syphilis,” “abortion,” “miscarriage,” “mistress,” “breasts”—all these were unmentionable words, let alone subjects, on the Victorian stage. Into the same category fell all references to the Deity, whether father, son, or holy spirit, as well as to all Biblical figures. One Examiner of Plays even had a special aversion to the word “angel,” rigorously blotting it out wherever, and however, it appeared. When queried as to why the common romantic epithet

2. Marilyn Catherine Mattson, “Censorship and the Victorian Drama,” Diss. (University of Southern California, 1969).

"angel" might not decently be applied to a woman, he answered: "An angel is a woman, I grant, but it is a celestial woman. Every man who has read his Bible understands what they are, or if he has not I will refer him to Milton." When challenged on this latter point of erudition, the Examiner conceded that Milton's angels were not ladies, but insisted nonetheless that "some scriptural angels *are* ladies, and if you will look at Johnson's Dictionary, he will tell you they are celestial persons."³

Aside from such personal whimsies, what were the general grounds on which Victorian Examiners of Plays exercised their censorial powers? The Theatres Act of 1843 specified only that they were to be on the look-out for matter that might tend against "good manners, decorum, or the public peace." Needless to say, the vagueness of these guidelines rendered them virtually useless, and succeeded only in giving free reign to the Examiners' own interpretation of what constituted offences against "good manners, decorum, and the public peace." In practice, the taboo areas throughout the century were three: sex, politics, and religion. In 1866 the then-Examiner, a Mr. Pigott, reported to his superior, the Lord Chamberlain, that in the preceding 12 years some 2,800 plays had been submitted to him for licensing, of which 19 had been refused. Of these, he reported, "Two were from Scripture subjects, seven were of the swell mob and burglary school, and the bulk of the remainder were French plays of an immoral tendency or English versions of them."⁴ *Oedipus Rex* was banned because it dealt with incest, as was Shelley's *The Cenci*. "All the genius of all the greatest poets that ever lived," Mr. Pigott declared, "cannot make incest a subject fit for representation in a Christian country."⁵ Mr. Pigott's predecessor in the job of Examiner of Plays, William Bodham Donne, asked his superior for permission to take rigorous measures against "all plays in which the marriage union is trifled with" and "all dramas in which Highway Robbery, Burglary, etc., form a prominent feature in the action."⁶ As a result of the latter decision, the Newgate Novel, so popular as a fictional form, found its way barred to the stage. More importantly, "trifling with the marriage union" became the pretext under which Ibsen and the new serious social drama that he represented was kept out of English theatres until well into the twentieth century. Mr. Pigott's summary dismissal of Ibsen is a miniature masterpiece of critical invective:

All I can say is this. I have studied Ibsen's plays pretty carefully, and all the characters in Ibsen's plays appear to me to be morally deranged. All the heroines are dissatisfied spinsters who look on marriage as a monopoly, or dissatisfied married women in a chronic state of rebellion against not only the conditions which nature has imposed on their sex, but against all the duties and obligations of mothers and wives; and as for the men, they are all rascals or imbeciles.⁷

In fairness to Mr. Pigott and his fellow censors, we must observe that usually they were only speaking for their times. The public pressures to which they were subjected were intense, both from the top and from the bottom of the social scale. Queen Victoria herself took an active interest in the Examiners' efforts to protect the morals of her subjects, and on more than one occasion wrote to them directly to express her approval or disapproval of their decisions. In 1852 she succeeded in obtaining a ban against a play based on Victor Hugo's *Ruy Blas* because it showed the unbecoming spectacle of a "Queen in love with and finally marrying a footman in livery."⁸ This objection was ultimately overcome by changing the footman to a "retainer" and at the end of the play appointing him Prime Minister. Nearly half a century later the Queen was still keeping a watchful eye on the stage. In her eighty-second year she informed the Lord Chamberlain that she had been "scandalised" by the performance of an opera about *Messalina* at Covent Garden.⁹

Attempts to influence the censor from the other end of the social scale were no less frequent, or persuasive. The files of the Lord Chamberlain's Office bulge with letters, usually anonymous and most of them from clergymen or self-styled "English Mothers," urging him to take harsher measures toward both indecency and irreverence in the theatre. Whether the correspondents had actually seen the plays in question appeared to make little difference in their ability to detect pernicious influences in them. I will read you one memorable example:

"My Lord,

Permit me to call your most serious attention to a certain piece which is at the present moment being played at the Royal Theatre.

Being a clergyman, I always feel it is unwise to go myself to a Theater, as insufficient respect appears to be shewn to the matrimonial tie, upon which depends the prosperity and increase of our Empire.

3. *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Dramatic Literature, with the Minutes of Evidence* (London, H.M.S.O., 1832), Appendix.

4. *Report from the Select Committee on Theatrical Licenses and Regulations; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix* (London, H.M.S.O., 1866), p. 306.

5. Public Record Office, London: Records of the Lord Chamberlain's Office, L.C. 1/469.

6. *Ibid.*, L.C. 1/55, 58.

7. *Report from the Select Committee on Theatres and Places of Entertainment* (London, H.M.S.O., 1892), p. 334.

8. Public Record Office, L.C. 1/52.

9. Public Record Office, L.C. 1/731.

I have not therefore seen the piece myself entitled *Mr. and Mrs. Daventry*.

Several persons who have been to see it and whose judgment I have reason to hold in the highest esteem report to me 'that they felt hot from beginning to end.'"¹⁰

Such evidence lends credence to the Examiners' claims that when they erred, it was usually on the side of laxity. Petty as some of their objections to "immoral" material seem to us today, the attitude of the general public toward the theatre was far more stringent. Left to its own devices, there is little doubt that Victorian drama would have perished entirely before the onslaught of English Mothers and Anonymous Clergymen.

Recognizing this, we can better understand the quandary which the Examiners found themselves in when it came to religion on the stage. Unlike sex, which found few adherents brave enough to defend it in public, religion was a topic that occupied the public thoughts of nearly every Victorian and that found expression in every other medium besides the stage. The ban on Scriptural drama and on the treatment of religious doctrine in general, which had been in effect since the seventeenth century, was open to objection in a way that the ban on sex was not. With the advent of the new "serious" drama of the 1890s, which coincided with a renewed interest in the religious drama of the past, it was inevitable that playwrights and producers would wish to add religion to the list of subjects that could be openly treated in the theatre. Against this tide the censorship stood firm, and it is in their intransigence on this matter that we can see most clearly the influence that the censors had in deterring playwrights from tackling serious and controversial subjects. It was, moreover, an intransigence that was eventually to spell the doom of the censorship system as a whole.

There is some evidence that the Examiners themselves would have liked to have seen an easing of the official restrictions on religious drama. One Examiner in the 1850s appealed to his superior for such a change, but was turned down. After this the matter was regarded as a "ruled case" until it came to a head again in the 1890s. In 1895 a proposal was made to perform the Oberammergau Passion Play in London. After consulting directly with the Queen, the Lord Chamberlain ruled against the proposal. His decision had the effect of reconfirming the ban on Biblical plays, and thereafter the Examiner of Plays prepared a form-letter which he sent automatically to any theatre-manager who dared to submit one, declaring that "Scriptural plays, or plays founded on or adopted

from the Scriptures, are ineligible for license in Great Britain."¹¹

The desire for religious drama on the part of the public, however, was great enough that ingenious authors found ways of skirting the Lord Chamberlain's regulations. In so doing they created a type of play whose form was largely dictated by the censorship. There was, for instance, the vogue in the late 1890s and early 1900s for the modern-dress Biblical allegory. A fairly well-known example is *The Passing of the Third Floor Back*, by Jerome K. Jerome, in which the Saviour was disguised as an upstairs lodger. Another was Charles Rann Kennedy's *The Servant in the House*, in which the Lord appeared as a mysterious stranger, whose voice, at the end of the play, is drowned out by a loud Sanctus bell just as he is about to reveal his name. Even more popular were the pseudo-Biblical plays, like *Ben Hur*, which skirted around their scriptural subjects, keeping their genuine gospel figures just offstage and concentrating instead on fictional heroes and heroines who pass within the shadow of the Galilean.

Such plays were at best feeble attempts to do what greater dramatists, like Maeterlinck and Housman, not to mention Ibsen and Shaw, were explicitly prohibited from doing. That the Lord Chamberlain should allow such clever but shallow subterfuges, while denying the stage to genuine talent, was an anomaly that grew eventually to the proportions of a public scandal. In 1909, at the request of more than seventy of the leading writers of the time, including Hardy, Conrad, Galsworthy, Masfield, Yeats, Shaw, and Henry James, the Home Secretary promised to investigate the censorship system. As a result, later in that year a Parliamentary committee interviewed the current Examiner of Plays, one Alexander Redford, and elicited some startling responses. To the question, "What principles do you proceed on in licensing the plays that come before you?" Mr. Redford replied: "Simply bringing to bear an official point of view and keeping up a standard. It is really impossible to define what the principle may be. There are no principles that can be defined. I follow precedent." When asked if it was part of his duty to give a reason for vetoing a play, Mr. Redford answered, "No, it is no part of my duty to give any reason whatsoever for vetoing a play. . . . I have no critical view on plays at all. I simply have to maintain a standard."¹²

The result of the Parliamentary investigation was not the total abolition of the censorship, as many had hoped, but only an alleviation of it. In the years following 1909

10. *Ibid.*, L.C. /731.

11. *Report from the Joint Select Committee of the House of Lords and the House of Commons on Stage Plays (Censorship)*; to-

gether with the *Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, and Appendices* (London, H.M.S.O., 1909), p. 111.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 14, 23-24.

the Lord Chamberlain, embarrassed by the notoriety that Mr. Redford had brought to his office, relaxed his vigilance to the extent of allowing many subjects to be treated on the stage that had heretofore fallen victim to Mr. Redford's "precedents." The spirit of Victorian censorship, however, did not die with the Queen, or even with the removal of Mr. Redford from office in 1910. In many ways its legacy lingered on throughout the first decades of our own century. As late as the 1950s the Lord Chamberlain was still of the opinion that the founder of the nation's official religion should be represented on the stage by nothing more corporeal than a bright spotlight. The statute of 1843 establishing the censorship of plays was not finally repealed by Parliament until 1968. Today, with the absence of any theater censorship in England, we are witnessing a reaction to the centuries of official control over the drama. The flood of *O Calcutta's* that drowned the London stage as soon as the repeal of the

Theatres Act went into effect would have fulfilled the worst fears of the Anonymous Clergymen and English Mothers who for so long formed the chief support of the censors.

But this wave of prurience is already receding and giving way to the solid accomplishments of the new playwrights and new companies that in the twentieth century have done so much to make British theatre serious and responsible. It was this, after all, that most Victorians wanted for the drama. In 1848, eleven years after the accession of the young Queen, the first concrete suggestion was made for the establishment of a National Theatre. Today, nearly a century and a quarter later, its construction is at last underway. We have moved in that time from the state as closer of theatres to the state as builder of them. And that, as good Victorians might say, is progress.

Syracuse University

A Straight Bat and a Modest Mind

Coral Lansbury*

IT WAS A PHRASE THAT EPITOMIZED the English character in the latter nineteenth century. No other country has ever made a sport the expression of its national and religious ethos in the way that cricket embodied the moral atmosphere of England. That it was, and has remained, unintelligible to foreigners is one of its greatest charms and a tribute to its esoteric nature. In a work edited by Anthony Trollope in 1868, it was stated: "Few of those who understand the game at all, and have any knowledge of national character, will fail to recognize, if they cannot define, the inaptitude of aught but the Saxon element for such a sport. At any rate, if the theory lacks precision, the fact is transparent enough."¹ The ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1891) was no less eloquent in its testimony: "Cricket is the national game of Englishmen. The prevalent love of the pastime may perhaps be cited as an instance of the development of the national character, requiring, as it does, such a combination of intellectual and physical qualities—broad and open shoulders, stout arms and quick legs, with patience, calculation, and promptness of execution."² Encyclopedias are generally guides to the past rather than the voice of cur-

rent opinion, and the chauvinism of this definition had already been considerably chastened by the prowess of Indian batsmen like Prince Ranjitsinhji and Duleepsinhji. The emphasis on race clearly required emendation. An England that had suffered defeat from colonial teams could no longer boast the innate superiority of Saxon blood. One could never be quite sure of the racial purity of a Colonial.

It is pleasant now to record that the old arrogance has mellowed. Neville Cardus defined the new boundaries in 1930: "Where the English language is unspoken there can be no real cricket, which is to say that the Americans have never excelled at the game."³ From its initial definitions of race it has become a question of culture. In rough sociological terms, nature has given way to nurture, and cricket has displayed its customary ability to adapt to the temper of the times.

In cricket, sport and morality were synthesized into a uniquely English phenomenon. It was only in English literature that sport, and cricket above all, was made the crucial test of character and a narrative theme. It provided a model for politics and the public profession of

* The author wishes to acknowledge her gratitude to Mrs. Fay Ashmore of the M.C.C. Library at Lord's, and Dr. Howard Comfort and Mrs. M. M. Ogden of the Christopher Morris Library at Haverford College.

1. *British Sports and Pastimes*, ed. Anthony Trollope (London,

1868), p. 291. The work is a compilation of articles from *St. Paul's Magazine*, the Liberal journal. "Cricket" is by J. Mereweather.

2. Edinburgh, VI, 578-79.

3. *Cricket* (London, 1930), p. 6.

the Latitudinarian Church of England at worship. It was "the English game," "the noblest game," "the game of life"—never referred to as a sport and governed by laws, not rules. It is a game of ritual and tradition, celebrated, not played, in honor of certain qualities to be sought in the individual and society.

Eleven men play to a side, one side fielding and bowling, the other side batting in pairs. The batsman at the far wicket from the bowler must defend his stumps from being knocked down by the bowler, and hit the ball past a fielder's hands. The glory of a lofted ball well caught has been recorded by L. P. Hartley in *The Go-Between* and captured in an aureole of light in Harold Pinter's screen play. (Both novelist and dramatist share a devotion to cricket.) The ball is delivered overarm without bending the elbow. It can be bowled slow or fast, and a good fast bowler can speed the ball at more than eighty miles an hour. It can be swerved, bounced at the batsman's feet, sent to spin off the pitch at an angle or as a straight, lifting delivery. Fast or slow, curving and deceptive, it is not always the fast ball that takes a wicket or tempts the batsman into a rash defensive stroke. J. M. Barrie, who founded the Allahakbarries,⁴ a cricket club of friends and literary men, boasted that he bowled so slowly that if he didn't like the look of a ball he could run down the pitch and bring it back.⁵

Runs are scored by the distance the ball travels—a six lands over the boundary line, a four crosses it on the ground. When the ball has been hit and is pursued by a fielder, the batsmen run between the two wickets, collecting as many individual runs as possible. Each side has two innings, and games not infrequently end after several days in a draw. This is a most inadequate and clumsy description of a complex and subtle game, but Dr. Johnson did little better when he defined it as "A sport, at which the contenders drive a ball with sticks in opposition to each other." Lord Chesterfield could not surpass Johnson in wit or scholarship but he did know considerably more about cricket, appreciating its significance when he advised his nine-year-old natural son that "if you have a right ambition, you will desire to excell all boys of your age, at cricket. . . ."⁶

Although it is a competitive game, the emphasis has always been to play well, not necessarily to win. The finest batsman may not always score his fifty or hundred, and

this is accepted. Cricket, as the Reverend James Pycroft wrote in 1865, "baffles all calculation."⁷ Playing well may simply mean holding your wicket to let your partner score. Another cricketing parson of the next generation knew that the measure of a man's achievements on the field might well be unappreciated by his own teammates, but they would be known to the Captain of all Cricketers: "Aye, and when on the resurrection morning you come out of the pavilion, leaving your playing clothes behind you, and robed like your glorious Captain-King, you and all the hosts of God will see and understand your score as you cannot now, and your joy will be full as you hear the Captain, 'the innumerable company of angels,' and the whole redeemed Church of God greet you with the words, 'WELL PLAYED, SIR!'"⁸

It was, and still is, a matter of national pride that the game is a baffling mystery to foreigners. When George Meredith's Countess de Saldar knew that the only way to save the Harrington honor was to proclaim it Portuguese, she wailed that "crieckèt . . . seems very unintelligible."⁹ Such a statement was proof positive that this was no English tailor's daughter speaking but the usual benighted foreigner disturbing the peace of the game. Those who expect to see a sport, who look for the excitement of that juvenile pastime of rounders now known as baseball, will always be disappointed. The appreciation of cricket is an aesthetic, its terminology is that of art and music, "a Corinthian bat," "a Doric thrust to cover point"; the movement on the field is not always allegro but often, and deliberately, andante. Neville Cardus wrote music criticism as though describing cricket and described cricket matches as though they were symphonies. He was, of course, simply writing in the tradition of cricket criticism established in the nineteenth century.

John Ruskin had seen and deplored the association of art and cricket: ". . . I reflect how, as a sculptor, I should feel, if I were asked to design a monument for a dead knight in Westminster Abbey, with a carving of a bat at one end, and a ball at the other. It may be the remains in me only of savage Gothic prejudice; but I had rather carve it with a shield at one end, and a sword at the other."¹⁰ Ruskin knew that his opinion was anachronistic. The Bishop of Hereford was more in tune with the age when he concluded the memorial biography of W. G. Grace, greatest of all cricketers, with the lines: "Had

4. Barrie maintained that the term was of ancient Islamic origin meaning "God Help Us."

5. Quoted in Neville Cardus and John Arlott, *The Noblest Game* (Sydney), p. 17.

6. *Letters written by the late right honourable Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield*. . . . 12th ed. (London, 1806), Letter LXXXI.

7. *Cricketana*, by the author of *The Cricket-Field* [Rev. James Pycroft] (London, 1865), p. 151.

8. Reverend Thomas Waugh, *The Cricket Field of the Christian Life* (Stockport, n.d.), pp. 147-48.

9. *Evan Harrington*, ch. 13.

10. *The Crown of Wild Olive, The Works of John Ruskin*, ed. E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn (London, 1908), XVIII, 470. Ruskin approved of women playing cricket and encouraged Miss Bell to foster the game at Winnington School. Boys, however, should "learn skill in ploughing and seamanship rather than cricket" (XXXIV, 581).

Grace been born in ancient Greece, the *Iliad* would have been a different book. Had he lived in the Middle Ages, he would have been a crusader and would now have been lying with his legs crossed in some ancient abbey, having founded a great family."¹¹ And by implication both ancient Greece and the Middle Ages would have been spiritually and ethically enlightened by the presence of cricket.

The complaints of foreigners remain who still find cricket the most enigmatic public activity of the English, far less comprehensible than the rituals of royalty and parliament. Warily Charles Morgan wrote in explanation: "The nostalgia for cricket seems a kind of madness to those who have it not. They come late in life or from foreign parts willing to be instructed in the mysteries, and, being instructed, are still inexpressibly bored; they cannot understand what we see in the game. The answer is that it is not the game only that we see, but childhood and youth, and peace of mind in the recollection of enduring things."¹² To understand cricket is to appreciate English culture, and without that understanding, much that is English will remain no more than a charade of meaningless and misinterpreted symbols.

Cricket was an ancient game in the British Isles. Parnell only succeeded in abolishing it from Ireland by convincing the Irish that it was public admission of Protestant authority, a feat that Cromwell had not been able to accomplish. It is mentioned by Thomas d'Urfey in *The Richmond Heiress* (1693) and was formally praised in Latin and English by cricketing clerics in the eighteenth century. Quantities of verse of unquestioned banality in every mode were assiduously penned by that English phenomenon, "the cricketing curate." Southey thought the game was unfit for gentlemen,¹³ and Horace Mann complained to Horace Walpole about his brother's gout and his nephew who was "ruining himself at cricket." Nevertheless the association of the aristocracy and the clergy with the game was already apparent in the early years of the century. Walpole imparted the tidbit to Mann that "I could tell you of Lord Mountford's making cricket matches and fetching up parsons by express from different parts of England to play matches on Richmond Green. . . ."¹⁴

It was the association of cricket with gambling that was

deplored together with the not infrequent tipping amongst the spectators. The mixing of classes at the game was regarded as incipient democracy. Sturdy young yokels like Fuller Pilch, who had a talent for bowling and batting, were often bribed to leave their county and reside in another. The bribe could be money or a post as bailiff or gamekeeper on the estate of an aristocratic cricketing enthusiast. Equally so, a fine Oxford or Cambridge cricketer was always assured of a comfortable living by a noble patron.

County cricket was the subject of intense enthusiasms and local passions, as Percy Thomas recalled: "In those days the south-eastern shires were not merely artificial partitionings for conveniently regulating matters pertaining to assessment books and such. They were the demesnes of human entities, once hostile nationalities, still proud of their social distinctions, and always ready to demonstrate their own superiority. . . . County spirit is still far from extinct; and of late years Cricket has probably served more than anything else to perpetuate it."¹⁵ In origin it was a rural game, but could be just as well played in a city park or on a vacant lot, on the lawn of a great country house or in a slum street with a lamp post for a wicket. In *Our Village*, Mary Mitford lauded the "real solid old-fashioned match between neighbouring parishes,"¹⁶ where victory could be assured if a fine batsman from a nearby parish could be encouraged to change his place of residence.

Charles Dickens, playing cricket with his family and friends at Gad's Hill, was emulating the great country house matches where guests, family, and local tenantry would take sides on a summer's afternoon. The first women's club, the White Heather, was founded in 1887 between the Nevill and Brassey families at Normanhurst and Eridge. Women had played in the less inhibited eighteenth century, and Thomas Rowlandson's print records such a match after the turn of the century,¹⁷ but it required the sanction of the aristocracy to permit women to play in the latter years of the nineteenth century, and then only in private.

Gambling was slowly eliminated from the game, but it was not until the 1870s that the last bookmakers were heard shouting the odds at Lord's. Lord Frederick Beauclerk, vicar of St. Alban's from 1828 until his death in

11. *The Memorial Biography of Dr. W. G. Grace*, ed. Lord Hawke, Lord Harris, and Sir Home Gordon, Bart. (London, 1919), p. 354-55. Bishop Hereford's words were taken from a speech to Grace at a ceremonial dinner at Bristol.

12. *Reflections in a Mirror* (London, 1944), p. 178.

13. Quoted by Pycroft in *Cricketana*, p. 7.

14. *Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Sir Horace Mann*, ed. W. S. Lewis, Warren Hunting Smith, George L. Lam (New Haven, 1960—), VII, 495; XX, 74.

15. *Cricket's Prime* (Nottingham, 1925), pp. 3-4.

16. *Our Village. Sketches of Rural Character and Scenery* (London, 1856), p. 172.

17. "Rural Sports or a Cricket Match Extraordinary"; it is subtitled, "On Wednesday October 3rd 1811 a Singular Cricket Match took place at Balls Pond, Newington. The Players on both sides were 22 Women, 11 Hampshire against 11 Surrey. The Match was made between two Amateur Noblemen of the respective Counties for 500 guineas each. The Performers in the Contest were all Ages and Sizes." (M.C.C. Lord's)

1850, epitomized the cricketing parson of the early years. It was said of Beauclerck by "Squire" Osbaldeston that "D. D. can stand for many things besides Doctor of Divinity."¹⁸ The hunting and shooting parson of those years became anomalous, but cricket remained, now transformed into the visible embodiment of the Church of England at public worship. Wordsworth's two nephews were both cricketing clerics. Christopher Wordsworth captained Winchester and later became bishop of Lincoln. His brother Charles played for Harrow in the match of 1825 when he "caught out Manning," and was later made bishop of St. Andrew's.

The Low Church despised cricket and all athletic activities that produced only pleasure, an opinion shared by Ruskin for different reasons. Wesley's denunciation of boys who played as children continuing to play as men echoed down the age. The Lord Rector of Aberdeen saw cricket and athletics assuming "the dimensions of a national calamity."¹⁹ The Sabbatarians exacerbated the dispute since most country games were played on Sunday afternoons after service. Charles Dickens castigated the miserable social meanness of people who would reluctantly permit sport on weekdays but forbade it on Sundays—the only day when working folk had time for relaxation.²⁰ Mary Mitford wrote of the unnatural and unhappy coalition between a high-church curate and an evangelical farmer that "drove our lads from the Sunday even practice."²¹ Mrs. Prime, the devotee of the Reverend Mr. Prong in Trollope's *Rachel Ray*, made her main complaint about Dr. Harford that he kept two curates who went to cricket matches, amongst other moral laxities (ch. 5).

Unfortunately for the Sabbatarians, cricket was not conducive to rowdiness and violent demonstrations. William Howitt commented on the difference cricket had made to the crowds who once thronged "bull-baiting, dog and cock-fightings."²² Frederick Gale had known the time when cricket reflected the manners of the day: "There was a bad time when a village cricket match was an occasion for hard drinking, and boisterous evenings after-

wards; but that was in the days when village holidays were few and far between. There is now no need to shut the windows at a cricket supper for fear ribald songs should be heard on the green. If morals are not better than they were, manners are more decent."²³ The Reverend Thomas Waugh, who epitomized the cricketing parson of the late Victorian period, wrote with fervor: "In local matches I have batted, bowled, looked on as a spectator, or acted as umpire, and *I have never heard an oath on a cricket field.*"²⁴ Perhaps Waugh was deaf or heard only what he chose to hear, but his emphasis on the moral purity of cricket was not incongruous.

The golden age of cricket was between 1870 and 1910 when there was a demand for a more "civilized and more equitable society in place of indefensible survivals or the product of mere primitive savagery,"²⁵ as Kitson Clark has stated. The more brutal blood sports were placed beyond the pale of the law. Respectable men did not attend cock or dog fights, decent men deplored prize fights and the slaughter of game and deer every autumn. Cricket, the one game that avoided all physical violence and overt aggression, that demanded a harmonious accord between the individual and the group, became the model for this new society. Of course the blood sports returned with the codified aggression of football in which the violence on the field is only equalled by the blood spilt by the crowd.

It was an astute American, T. S. Matthews, who defined the essentially religious quality of cricket: "It seems odd that in all the studies that have been made of comparative religion so little consideration should have been given to cricket."²⁶ Cricket had always provided the analogy for the game of life. Byron's "manly toil" degenerated into repeated variations of Disney's *Cricket Lyrics*, or Maunder's "The Game of Life; or Death among the Cricketers."²⁷ It could even evoke an affirmation of equality between the sexes. As early as 1777 the Duke of Dorset asked, "What is life but a game of cricket, and if so, why should not the ladies play as well as we?"²⁸ The allusions became literary commonplaces in a flood of homile-

18. Quoted in *Cricket and the Church*, F. S. Ashley Cooper (London, 1904), p. 6. See also, *Squire Osbaldeston, His Autobiography*, ed. E. D. Cuming, intro. Sir Theodore Kook (London, 1927). George Osbaldeston was popularly known as "Squire of England," for his prowess at sport.

19. Quoted in *British Sports and Pastimes*, p. 322.

20. "Sunday Under Three Heads. . . ." "Let the fields neighbouring London resound to the stroke of the bat, the ring of the quoit, and the sound of laughing voices—and vice would be weakened, true religion strengthened" (London, 1836, pp. 537-38). Dickens was an enthusiastic cricketer if not of outstanding ability. His son Henry played at Wimbledon and became captain of the Higham C.C. adjoining Gad's Hill. See Irving Rosenwater, "Charles Dickens and Cricket," *London Magazine* (June 1970), pp. 46-56.

21. *Our Village*, p. 173.

22. Quoted in F. S. Ashley-Cooper, *Nottinghamshire Cricket and*

Cricketers (Nottingham, 1928), p. 61. Relating his impressions of a Sussex and Nottingham match to Mary Mitford in 1835, Howitt continued: "It is the nearest approach to the athletic games of the Greeks that we have made, and the effect on the general mass of the people by the emulation it will excite must be excellent."

23. *Echoes from Old Cricket Fields* (London, 1871), p. 88.

24. *Cricket Field of the Christian Life*, p. 11.

25. *The Making of Victorian England* (London, 1962), p. 63.

26. "The Rite of Summer," *The American Scholar* (Summer 1970), p. 463.

27. T. Disney, *Cricket Lyrics* (London, n.d.); S. Maunder, "The Game of Life; or, Death among the Cricketers," in *Death's Doings; in Twenty Four Plates* (London, 1826), p. 54.

28. Quoted in Netta Rheinberg, "Women's Cricket—Some Facts and Thoughts," *The Journal of the Cricket Society* (1967), III, 26.

tic works that poured forth after the publication of *Tom Brown's Schooldays*.

Cricket had become the avocation of the public schools, and the distinction between David Newsome's "godliness and good learning" of the first part of the century and the emphasis on manly character building after 1870 is a little forced.²⁹ The "quick and the dead," cricket and Latin, had been the curriculum of many schools before muscular Christianity toned up the English character. Tom Brown's classics master was made to appreciate the equivalent virtues of Greek particles and sound cover drives. But at Tonbridge, when Thomas Knox (1784-1843) was told by the father of the Wadmore brothers that his lads had "brought their bats: the Doctor remarked 'Yes, quite right, quite right; I never knew a boy worth anything who was not fond of cricket.'" ³⁰ It was the advice of Edward Gibbon Wakefield, the noted authority on immigration, who wrote from New Zealand: "I tell the boys in Summer time to play at cricket and play well, that those who are the best cricketers most likely will be the best readers and writers."³¹ Bulwer Lytton's Peisistratus Caxton was as fine a cricketer as Tom Brown. To fail at cricket or to show no interest was a blot on the character and clear indication of a limited intelligence. To be accused, albeit unjustly, of pinching the cricket club funds like Eric in *Eric: or Little by Little*, was more shameful than robbing a poor box.

Charles Wordsworth justified his devotion to cricket quite simply: "I took intense pleasure in games of all kinds, doubtless chiefly for their own sake; but in some measure too for the sake of the distinction which success in them among boys—and, as the world now goes, among men and women too—never fails to bring with it."³² The cricket captain was generally captain of the school, and those who failed at cricket, like Anthony Trollope, H. G. Wells, and Rudyard Kipling, never forgot the social ostracism that accompanied their failure. For Arthur, in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, cricket was "the birthright of British boys old and young, as *habeas corpus* and trial by jury are of British men" (ch. 8).

It should be noted that these boys never became men, but old boys. If the education of an earlier age had proscribed childhood then the system of "muscular learning" extended adolescence into old age. And manliness became dissociated from any sexual connotation. The ideal cricketer was chaste, heroic, and occasionally articulate. Thomas Hughes's speeches, *The Manliness of Christ* (1879), not only stress these qualities, but make constant reference to the game of cricket. With character, not

learning, as the goal of English education, the blushing cricketer, stammering in the presence of a woman became an English stereotype. It could well be argued that celibacy had been transferred from the religious to the sporting life with unfortunate consequences. Nonetheless, sport was regarded as the antidote to homosexuality and masturbation, those two bugbears of English public school life. Homosexuality and cricket were an unthinkable conjunction if only because it was one of the few sports in which no boy ever touched another. Heaven knows what could happen in a football scrum!

The graduate of an English public school knew his cricket. There were numerous manuals to inform him and long hours spent at the nets to acquire the rudiments of the game. These lads became the governing elite of England and dominated the literary world, the government, and the church. Sermons were preached as though they were sporting exhortations. Christ was the captain, and cricket the Christian life. In a work that rivaled *Eric: or Little by Little* in popularity, Professor Henry Drummond's *Baxter's Second Innings*, young Baxter fails miserably in his first innings and is knocked unconscious when he flinches from the second ball from the fast bowler. Still weak and a little light-headed, Baxter wakes to find a figure at his bedside and attempts to explain his failure to stand up to the bowler:

"I believe I could do better if I only knew his form. He's a regular demon."

"I shall begin by telling you his name," said the Captain. "It is Temptation."

"Tim who," said the boy.

"Temptation," repeated the Captain.

"Oh!" said the boy, "I hope you're not going to be religious. I thought we were talking about games."

"So we are," replied the Captain cheerily.

"We are talking of the Game of Life. . . ."

"Life is simply a cricket match—with Temptation as Bowler."³³

The Devil is constantly trying to attack a boy's three stumps of Truth, Purity, and Honor with a variety of balls—swifts, wides, screws, and the dreaded googly, a deceptive ball that breaks in from the off while delivered with a leg-break action. Restored by the homily, Baxter goes in to make a triumphant second innings, and the pattern was set for a school of juvenile literature and homiletic texts.

F. S. Ashley-Cooper recorded that at a Church Congress in Croydon a delegate "urged the country parson not to refuse his place as an active member of the parish eleven,

29. *Godliness and Good Learning* (London, 1961), p. 26.

30. Quoted in H. P. T. [Percy Francis Thomas], *More Old Cricket* (Nottingham), p. 21.

31. Wakefield to Mr. Justice Chapman, 1 April 1850; mss, Alex-

ander Turnbull Library, p. 52.

32. *Annals of My Early Life 1806-1846* (London, 1891), p. 9.

33. *Baxter's Second Innings* (London, 1892), p. 15.

'for so shall he find that the fine hit to leg, which opened the mouths of the rustic spectators on the Saturday, will leave them a little open on the Sunday morning.'"³⁴ Prebendary Yernon found material for his sermons at cricket matches,³⁵ and Thomas Waugh's *The Cricket Field of the Christian Life* is a loosely connected series of cricketing sermons. There was no question of the metaphysical nature of religion in Waugh's mind. The world was simply the material manifestation of an eternal and celestial game of cricket: "Christ is the leader, guide and energiser of his own team, the Christian Church; and Satan is the leader, guide, and energiser of his own team, the un-Christian world. . . . Just as the Christian Church is the *visible* section of the Lord's team in spiritual cricket, the un-Christian world is the *visible* section of Satan's team."³⁶ It is little wonder that English missionaries took cricket and Christianity to the heathen when the game so aptly expressed their faith. And it is perhaps significant that those who have abandoned the Empire and Christianity still play cricket. It was, with language and law, England's most popular and enduring export.

Many clerics were troubled by Sunday play. Some made it a rule that attendance at church in the morning was necessary if a lad wanted to play with the parish team in the afternoon. And ingenious remissions could always be made for outstanding clerical players. To placate their bishops, the Reverend J. Dolphin became J. Coppord in county matches and Canon McCormick played as either J. Bingley or J. Cambridge.³⁷ This casuistry was approved and practiced by bishops who had to accommodate congregations inclined to dissenting social doctrines. The Reverend Edgar Stogden apparently regarded as original a suggestion that had once been a commonplace in county and parish newspapers: "May I make a friendly suggestion that matches played on a Sunday should not be recorded in the papers, or if recorded, that the word yesterday in cursives should be used in the Monday paper, and not Sunday in uncials?"³⁸

Because it was not the prerogative of the aristocracy, because it was never restricted to an exclusive clique as in America, cricket flourished in England. Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire, closely followed by Lancashire, provided some of the finest players and these men had few traditions of gentility. In the southern counties it was customary for "players" to be bowlers while "gentlemen" excelled as batsmen. This was not the case in the north.

Peter Bramley of Nottinghamshire was a professional poacher and a superb bat, William Clarke was a bricklayer who took to cricket and then became a publican. He opened Trent Bridge Ground for cricket on the sound principle that a pub and a playing field would blend as harmoniously as tripe and onions.

Alfred Shaw recorded the background of many north-country cricketers: "In my youthful days the residents were a small community of frame-work stocking knitters. My father, like the rest of the little community, was in humble circumstances, and over-weighted with the cares of his numerous family. Two years schooling was all he was able to permit me. At the age of ten years I had to assume the position of a wage-earner. . . ." The weavers did enjoy the privileges of leisure that were denied factory workers—they "worked when they liked and played when they had a mind to." Shaw made no secret that, like George Parr, "he became a cricketer because he did not care for work."³⁹

Cricket could not only provide a modest income for a professional cricketer; it could, with luck, bring fame and immortality. Lord's, the home ground of the Marylebone Cricket Club, became the sacred and hallowed ground, trod with reverence by all devotees of the game whether aristocrats or weavers from Yorkshire. Membership was more eagerly sought after than entry to any social or political club. Frederick Reynolds recalled the trembling anxieties of a prospective member: ". . . the day I was proposed as a member of the Marylebone Club, then in its highest fashion, I waited at the Portland Coffee House to hear from Tom Lord the result of the ballot with more anxiety than I had experienced the month before while expecting the decision of the audience on my new play."⁴⁰

Wandering clubs like the I Zingari were formed and challenged local and county teams. Membership in these clubs was always an eagerly sought honor. The enterprising William Clarke formed the first All-England Eleven of professional cricketers in 1846, and by 1865 there were three professional teams regularly touring the country and traveling abroad. Cricket became the sport of the Empire and carried its ethical values with it. The phrases "fair play," "not cricket," and "a sticky wicket" were used as familiarly by an educated Indian as they were by an English schoolboy.

Writers came from schools where cricket was taught, and many carried the enthusiasm for it into their work.

34. *Cricket and the Church*, pp. 5-6.

35. *Poppies in the Corn; or Glad Hours in the Grave Years* (London, 1871), p. 159.

36. *Cricket Field of the Christian Life*, pp. 17-26. Norman Bennet in *Our Cricket Match* (Cambridge, 1891) provided a variation on the same theme: "Be true to your Captain, even Christ. Before going to the wicket make straight for Him, and ask Him for THAT BAT, for you can trust it" (p. 16).

37. *Cricket and the Church*, pp. 1-2.

38. *Letters to the Times and the Harrovian* (Vicarage Harrow, n.d.), p. 12. (M.C.C. Lord's)

39. *Alfred Shaw Cricketer*, recorded by A. W. Pullin ("Old Ebor") (London, 1902), pp. 1, 4; *Nottinghamshire Cricket and Cricketers*, p. 83.

40. *The Life and Times of Frederick Reynolds*, 2 vols. (London, 1826), I, 164.

Dickens' cricket match, both the county version between Dingley Dell and the All-Muggletonians, and Jingle's single wicket triumph in the West Indies,⁴¹ set the mode for comic renditions of the game. But Dickens was also capable of evoking the most surreal elements from the game when, in *Martin Chuzzlewit*, he described the Anglo-Bengalee Disinterested Loan and Life Assurance Company with its "green ledgers with red backs, like strong cricket-balls beaten flat" (ch. 27). Or the pastoral theme of "Yoho, beside the village-green, where cricket-players linger yet, and every little indentation made in the fresh grass by bat or wicket, ball or player's foot, sheds out its perfume on the night" (ch. 36). Dickens saw the difference between two games, one masquerading as commerce that crushed and mutilated reality: the other, a sport that left only the sweetness of "enduring things" in the memory.

It is not Dickens in *Pickwick Papers* who made the most of cricket as a literary theme, but Meredith. Love, war, and social tensions are the counterpoint to the cricket matches in *Diana of the Crossways* and *Evan Harrington*. In *The Adventures of Harry Richmond*, happiness is defined at a crucial moment as no more than a game of English cricket by the driver of an omnibus. Harry, who had been "blinded with conceit" now recalled "the ancient raptures of a first of May cricketing-day on a sunny green meadow, with an ocean of a day before us, and well-braced spirits for the match" (ch. 55). Those thoughts of youth and cricket draw him inevitably to his love for Janet. Without a knowledge of cricket these scenes are ambiguous and the symbolic comic nuances lost. In *Diana of the Crossways* it is at Copsley, during a cricket match, that Diana sees Tom Redworth score his fifty and accepts him in her mind as her future husband (ch. 40). And at Beckley, as the cricket match is in progress, the Countess de Saldar "declares" and retires when confronted with the score of the Laxley and Jocelyn side. She knows, like the reader, that there must be a second innings (*Evan Harrington*, ch. 13).

Meredith was a fine athlete and played cricket with delight and understanding. He was even moved to rhyme when he heard that the Prince of Wales had been clean bowled at the Viceregal Lodge at Curragh, and had then vowed never to play again: "At the first ball his wicket fell, and sins/No more has batted your illustrious Prins." The prince was to confine his sporting activities to shooting and horse racing, both sports that tested the stamina

of the animal not the man.

Trollope admired the game but could not play it because of his weak eyesight. Hunting was the means whereby people revealed their true natures in his novels, but when politicians discussed affairs of state they sought the images of cricket. Plantagenet Palliser lamented that his colleagues should think the forming of a cabinet no more arduous than the selection of a good eleven, and by his grief revealed himself as unfit for the position of prime minister. Cricket was as serious as politics. In *Peter Steele, the Cricketer* (1895) by Horace G. Hutchinson, Maurice Crobyn, the spurned suitor of the delectable Lady Emily, gives up cricket and becomes "a mere frivolous Member of Parliament." The best advice the old Duke of St. Bungay could give the discomfited Palliser was that "in this political mill of ours in England, a man cannot always find the way open to do things. It does not often happen that an English statesman can go in and make a great score off his own bat. But not the less is he bound to play the game and to go to the wicket when he finds that his time has come."⁴² Palliser had never played sport and he regretted it in his later years. Cricket would have taught him to play as an individual and as a member of a team. It would have given him the courage to stand alone and to subordinate his own interests to those of his party.

As a subgenre of the pastoral, cricket had a long innings from the early eighteenth century to Byron's evocation of his cricketing days at Harrow and on into the twentieth century. Wordsworth summed up all that was quintessentially English in the lines:

Here, on our native soil, we breathe once more.
The cock that crows, the smoke that curls, that sound
Of bells;—those boys who in yon meadow-ground
In white-sleeved shirts are playing; and the roar
Of the waves breaking on the chalky shore;—
All, all are English.⁴³

Church bells, summer afternoons, and boys at cricket—the same image echoes from the pallid verses of Cotton to Francis Thompson's "At Lord's," and Rupert Brooke's recall of England from the trenches of France. These were Charles Morgan's "enduring things" that would wear out all seasons.

Towering over the game like a bearded Jove was Dr. W. G. Grace. Undoubtedly "he was the best known of all Englishmen and the King of that English game least spoilt by any form of vice."⁴⁴ From 1879 to his death in

41. *Pickwick Papers*, ch. 7.

42. *The Duke's Children*, ch. 22.

43. *Poetical Works*, ed. E. de Selincourt and Helen Darbishire (Oxford, 1954), p. 114. Wordsworth was writing of Kent, one of the early homes of cricket. In 1842 Tom Taylor wrote a prologue to the play *The Poor Gentleman*, performed at the theatre in Can-

terbury before the cricket match. It was spoken in the Kentish dialect: "Besides, in Kent, what should a cricketer fear;/ *Wickets*, you know, are *planted* and grow here;/ *Bats* come up ready made. . . ." (Broadside, M.C.C. Lord's).

44. *The Memorial Biography of Dr. W. G. Grace*, p. 355.

1908 he was the most popular figure in England, and the title G.O.M. was more often accorded Grace than Gladstone. He was the consummate gentleman cricketer who remained an amateur while making a small fortune from the game. (The methods by which he permitted money to be thrust upon him should be studied by the modern shamateurs of sport.) Grace was a national folk hero, replacing the Queen who had retired into mourning and the company of John Brown.

Writers jostled to laud the greatness of Grace. Arthur Conan Doyle was a dedicated cricketer who played for Lord's and named the majority of his English characters from contemporary players—Holmes, Baskerville, Sherlock, and Watson were all county cricketers of his own day. But Doyle's moment of triumph came when he bowled Grace.⁴⁵

Once in my heyday of cricket,
Oh day I shall ever recall,
I captured that glorious wicket,
The greatest, the grandest of all.

Before me he stands like a vision,
Bearded and burly and brown;
A smile of good-humored derision
As he waits for the first to come down.

A statue from Thebes or from Cnossus,
A Hercules shrouded in white,
Assyrian bull-like Colossus,
He stands in his might.⁴⁶

There was always a tendency to run out of superlatives when describing Grace. E. V. Lucas could never find adjectives worthy of the divinity:

The greatest among them must ever give place:
To mighty, transcendent, unparalleled Grace.⁴⁷

Popular sketch books carried the subtitle "Edited in this 38th year of (W. G.) Grace,"⁴⁸ and *Punch* made the bulky black-bearded giant more familiar than any other Englishman. The division in the Church of England was expressed in the joke, variants of which can be found throughout the anecdotal works of the period:

Muscular High Church Curate—"Wonderful things 'Grace' does!"

Low Church Vicar (surprised at the serious observation from his volatile friend)—"Ah, my dear sir, true . . ."

High Church Curate—"Yes. Only fancy, y'know!—Ninety-two, and not out!"⁴⁹

Anything that concerned Grace would find its way into print. Even his less gifted cricketing brothers found an eager market for their reminiscences.⁵⁰ "No game has ever thrown up so many books of reference as cricket,"⁵¹ E. W. Swanton noted recently. The histories and records of cricket produced in the Victorian period always relied upon a few phrases from W. G. Grace's own works to give authority. Cricket manuals were embellished with Grace's sayings as regularly as works of logic and linguistics now draw upon phrases from Lewis Carroll. *Baxter's Second Innings*, for example, has two prefatory notes from Grace and at one point the boy is specifically told to read p. 222 "or somewhere thereabouts," and the mode of quotation is that customarily used in referring to the Bible. Grace was the embodiment of England for *Punch*, indomitable in age, scoring sixes off brash colonial bowlers, constantly affirming the supremacy of the old country in a restive Empire.

The English were not oblivious to their singular devotion to sport and cricket in particular. It continued to be associated with religion and life, but after 1880 it increasingly became the analogue for war. The most popular blood sport has always been war, and there are those who still find more excitement in body counts than goals or runs. At the same time as England was being drawn into the modern age of war, blood sport returned to English public life with the popularity of football. Bears were no longer baited but footballers were mauled and kicked to a bloody pulp for the pleasure of the crowd. Trollope foresaw the day in *The Fixed Period*⁵² when even cricket would become a mechanical and brutal contest with steam-powered bowling machines, and batsmen helmeted and uniformed like the gladiators of gridiron football.

The analogies with war had first been described in the eighteenth century. James Love in his "Cricket an heroic poem with critical observations of Scriblerus Maximus" (1745), and the Reverend Cotton's song in honor of Hambleton's cricketers composed about 1767 had both praised

45. August 25, 1900. "Cricket and Sherlock Holmes," *The Journal of the Cricket Society*, VI, 50.

46. Quoted in *The Poetry of Cricket*, ed. Leslie Frewin (London, 1964), p. 251. Doyle told my father, a member of the Spiritualist Alliance who helped Lady Conan Doyle transcribe the songs she received from her spirit guide, that he chose cricketers' names because of their "Englishness."

47. *Willow and Leather* (Bristol, 1898), p. 12.

48. W. Sapse, *Cricketers Guyed for 1886* (London, 1886).

49. Anon., *Comicalities of the Cricket Field and Cricket Tit-Bits* (Sheffield, 1884), n.p. (M.C.C. Lord's).

50. *The Trip to Australia, Scraps from the Diary of one of the Twelve* (London, 1864). This anonymous work was written by E. M. Grace and hawked at Lord's for sixpence a copy.

51. *The World of Cricket* (London, 1966), p. 143.

52. *The Fixed Period* is set in 1980; the mechanized cricket match is the subject of ch. 5. Trollope disliked football and in his preface to *British Sports and Pastimes* noted: "Football in latter days has been making a name for itself, and has been becoming famous by the strength of its own irregularity and lawlessness" (p. 2). Thus there is no mention of football in the book.

the game of cricket and denounced war.⁵³ And in "Woburn Park" of 1839 the preference is made more emphatically:

The heroes of the bat and ball,
Ne'er caus'd the orphan's tear to fall;
They boast not the ensanguin'd plain,
Or wish it moisten'd with 'red rain';

.....

'War is a game!' come happy day
When 'Kings' no more, at it, shall 'play';
'Their subjects wise,' shall bid it cease,
And reign for aye, sweet smiling peace.
Here we resume our cricket war. . . .⁵⁴

War is a game, the product of leisure, and increasingly it became the favored sport of nations in the nineteenth century. Compulsory military training became an accepted part of civilian life in Europe. But it was distressingly clear to many that if England were called upon to choose between war and cricket as leisure activities, the English were solidly in favor of bats to guns. It was as if they had sensed the principle in much current sociological theory, notably Geoffrey Gorer's thesis that "Mankind is safer when men seek pleasure than when they seek the power and the glory."⁵⁵ With a longstanding distaste for standing armies and suspicion of the professional soldier, the English eschewed compulsory military training despite the patriotic appeals of the jingoists. Meredith's Mr. Romfrey, in *Beauchamp's Career*, saw the English preference for sport as a sophisticated refinement of international diplomacy:

Our Eng'land holds possession of a considerable portion of the globe, and it keeps the world in awe to see her bestowing so considerable a portion of her intelligence upon her recreations. To prosecute them with her whole heart is an ingenious exhibition of her power. Mr. Romfrey was of those who said to his country-men, "Go yachting; go cricketing; go boat-racing; go shooting; go horse-racing, nine months of the year, while the other Europeans go marching and drilling." (ch. 33)

This refusal to glory in war as the game of all true men was infuriating to many English. The legend of being unprepared for war, like Drake at bowls who finished the game and then sauntered off to victory, was a recurring theme in Victorian literature. When Rudyard Kipling wrote that denigrated and unpopular poem, "The Islanders," he was not condemning cricket intrinsically, he was

only pleading with the English to transfer their devotion from cricket to war. Like H. G. Wells in *The New Machiavelli*, he wanted men to play at war, not idle away their time and youth at the wicket.

But each man born in the Island broke to the matter of war.
Soberly and by custom taken and trained for the same,
Each man born in the Island entered at youth to the game—
As it were almost cricket, not to be mastered in haste,
But after trial and labour, by temperance, living chaste.
As it were almost cricket—as it were even your play,
Weighed and pondered and worshipped, and practised day
by day.⁵⁶

The poem marked the decline of Kipling's enormous popularity in England.

Kipling's tone, his call to action, is in precise accord with the satire, "The Noble Cricketers" written at another time of imperial discord, 1778. The Duke of Dorset and the Earl of Tankerville were castigated for being so infatuated with cricket that they cared nothing for the martial arts and the dangers mounting from the American revolution. The tone was as shrill as Kipling's: "For Godsake, fling away your Bats, Kick your Mob-companions out of your House and though you can do your bleeding Country *no service*, cease to accumulate Insult on Misfortune, by making it ridiculous."⁵⁷ Again, the English had shown a distressing preference for "flannelled fools at the wicket" to generals in all their beribboned glory. The satire was dismissed in the press as impertinent, and Dorset and Tankerville continued to play cricket.

Henry Newbolt had made it rousingly clear in "Vitai Lampada" that if men played the game of cricket well as boys then they were adequately trained for all the vicissitudes of war. As Meredith had declared in the choric voice of his omnibus driver, any Frenchman would have to be trained as a soldier before he could summon up the courage to face a fast bowler: "None of them could stand to be bowled at. Hadn't stomachs for it; they'd have to train for soldiers first."⁵⁸ And that was the native wisdom of an omnibus driver who knew the innate superiority of the English came from cricket.

Why did cricket become the "noblest game," the ethical exemplar of English social and spiritual life? Why not football—omitted altogether from Trollope's *British Sports and Pastimes*? Cricket was a game that required skill and courage but it did not entail physical violence,

53. 2nd ed., Temple Exchange. The poem describes the match Kent versus All England at the Artillery Ground. Cotton's "Cricket" appeared in its original form in *Canterbury Journal*, October 1773.

54. "Woburn Park; a fragment in rural rhyme" (Woburn: S. Dodd, 1839), pp. 20-24.

55. "Man has no 'Killer' Instinct" in *Man and Aggression*, ed. M. F.

Ashley Montagu (London, 1968), p. 36.

56. "The Islanders," *Collected Works of Rudyard Kipling* (AMS Edition, 1970), XXVI, 260.

57. *The Noble Cricketers: a Poetical and Familiar epistle address'd to Two of the Idlest Lords in his Majesty's Three Kingdoms* (London, sold by J. Bew, 1778).

58. *The Adventures of Harry Richmond*, ch. 55.

or even physical contact. According to Pycroft, the unimpeachable authority, it was always the onlookers who sustained injuries, not the players. In cricket the classes could mix, but on the basis of friendly cooperation, not familiarity. The squire could be stumped by the village draper, he could be run out by the blacksmith, but he was not mauled in the scrum or rubbed in the mud from a flying tackle. It sustained the class structure of society and transformed it into a harmonious synthesis in which the whole never quite obscured the parts. England has always been a class society, and apparently wishes to remain so, with only slight modifications. There is no point in belaboring the British because they do not cherish the republican sentiments dear to the heart of Americans. In cricket there was, until recent years, a distinction between professional and amateur cricketers. Players and Gentlemen came onto the field at Lord's by separate gates, but on the field they played together as England against the colonies.

Cricket flourished throughout the Empire. It was a national day of mourning when England lost to Australia in 1882 and the "Ashes" commemorate that occasion. In each colony it was adapted to local conditions. The egalitarian Australians never made any distinction between gentlemen and players, being anxious not to be regarded as gentlemen on any occasion. The South Africans soon

became the last defenders of race as a criterion for fitness to play. And the West Indies developed their own style of cricket, fast, enthusiastic, and successful. In the most remote areas of the world wherever the English have been, cricket can be found. Today, on Sunday afternoons in New Caledonia, the local matrons play cricket as the country women did in the eighteenth century villages of England. Israel has just been accepted as a cricketing nation by the M.C.C.

Cricket enabled the English to express their social and religious ethic in a game. Aggression was controlled by a rubric that confined competition within the bounds of law. Essentially it was the ideal of society expressed in a form of play. That the game still exists gives one reason to hope for the future of that society. Andrew Lang wrote with a passing nod to Emerson:

"I am the batsman and the bat,
I am the bowler and the ball,
The umpire, the pavilion cat,
The roller, pitch, and stump and all."⁵⁹

God is unquestionably an Englishman. It is occasionally forgotten that God in his true nature is an English cricketer.

Rutgers University

Hymns for Children: Cultural Imperialism in Victorian England

Susan S. Tamke

Emma Foster
from her very
affectionate Sister
Fanny
Sept. 26th /44

SO READS THE FLYLEAF INSCRIPTION of a small hymnbook entitled *The Christian Year: Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holydays Throughout the Year*. The identities of Emma Foster and her Sister Fanny are lost to time, so we can only imagine Emma's reaction to the gift. The event, however, must have been repeated thousands of times at birthdays, Christmases, or confirmations in nineteenth-century England, judging from the number of

children's hymnbooks printed during the century.

It is commonplace, of course, to note that the Victorian age was characterized by an intense interest in and concern for children: early nineteenth-century legislative and philanthropic reform movements were aimed primarily at protecting children; family life, and particularly the role of motherhood, became the focus of a sentimentalized ideal of English life; childhood was romanticized in

59. "Brahma" (after Emerson), quoted in *The Poetry of Cricket*.

art and literature; and the education of children became a national concern.¹

Traditionally the education of English youth had been the responsibility of the church. Nineteenth-century Englishmen clung so tenaciously to this tradition that Anglicans and Nonconformists alike resisted creating a system of public education until late in the century. Though few Englishmen in the early years of the century advocated that formal education be given to all children, most would have agreed that the churches were responsible for propagating Christian and ethical precepts to the young, particularly for the purpose of ensuring social order. For instance, Adam Smith, who believed that the state should not provide public education, believed, nevertheless, that some kind of instruction should be provided to make the people more orderly:

... the more they are instructed, the less liable they are to the delusions of enthusiasm and superstition, which among ignorant nations, frequently occasion the most dreadful disorders. An instructed and intelligent people besides, are always more decent and orderly than an ignorant and stupid one.²

To further this didactic purpose, the Sunday School movement was begun in the last years of the eighteenth century and by 1888 about three out of every four children in England and Wales attended a Sunday School.³ Although the effectiveness of the Sunday Schools is often debated, many who attended them felt that the ethical precepts they preached had a formative effect on their lives.⁴

One of the churches' favorite vehicles for influencing children was hymns. W. L. Alexander recognized this when he published a plea in 1848 urging the Scottish churches to adopt the practice of singing hymns of human composition. Among reasons Alexander cited was

the opportunity afforded by the psalmody of the church for instilling, in an attractive and memorable manner, religious truth into the minds of the people. In every proper hymn or psalm, there is an embodiment of some great principle or idea of a devotional kind; this is set forth in a poetical or at least rhythmical form, and the words thus put together, being sung to an attractive tune, the idea not only comes to be familiar to the mind, but what is of more importance, it comes to be surrounded with agreeable associations, which tend to make us love it, and cling to it. . . .

In regard to the younger and less instructed part of our congregations, especially, may this beneficial result be expected to display itself.⁵

Hymn-writers, publishers, and parents certainly must have agreed with Alexander, for the hymnbooks for children published during the century outnumber the hymnbooks of any other single category, with the more popular children's hymnbooks reprinted frequently. Cecil Frances Alexander's *Hymns for Little Children*, for instance, ran into one hundred editions.

The forewords of a number of the hymnbooks suggested that the child should be encouraged not only to sing the hymns, but to memorize them on a regular schedule. That this was not an uncommon practice can be seen in Charlotte Brontë's novel, *Villette*. When young Polly wished to win the approval of Graham, her sixteen-year-old friend and substitute father, she memorized hymns:

"Have you learned any hymns this week, Polly?"

"I have learned a very pretty one, four verses long. Shall I say it?"

"Speak nicely, then: don't be in a hurry."

The hymn being rehearsed, or rather half-chanted, in a little singing voice, Graham would take exceptions at the manner, and proceed to give a lesson in recitation.⁶

The child learned hymns because they were approved by the adult world. Like Polly, he was probably praised and, as W. L. Alexander had noted, the ideas contained in the hymns were thus associated with pleasantness. It is likely, therefore, that the hymns were repeated and their ideas retained into adulthood. How deep a psychological impact the hymns had when they were thus learned is uncertain, but judging from the evidence of memoirs of the Victorians, they made a lasting impression of some sort.

What was impressed on the Victorian child's mind was not always pleasant, for the English tradition of children's hymns was a pessimistic one. Calvinism dominated the churches' concept of childhood as it did so many other aspects of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century English religion. In the *Institutes*, Calvin wrote of children:

Infants themselves bring their own damnation with them from their mother's womb. Who, although they have not yet brought forth the fruits of their iniquity, yet have the seed thereof inclosed within them. Yea, their whole nature is a certain seed of sinne, therefore it cannot but be hateful and abominable to God.⁷

1. Philippe Aries, in *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*, trans. Robert Baldick (New York, 1962), p. 32, calls childhood the "privileged age" of the nineteenth century, as adolescence is of the twentieth century.
2. *Wealth of Nations*, Modern Library (New York, 1937), p. 740.
3. Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church* (New York, 1966), II, 257.
4. Kenneth Young, *Chapel* (London, 1972), contains a number of

testimonies to this effect.

5. "Lectures on the Public Psalmody of the Church," *The Scottish Congregational Magazine* (August 1848), p. 254.
6. *Villette* (New York: Derby & Jackson, 1859), p. 25.
7. Quoted by Harry Escott, *Isaac Watts, Hymnographer: A Study of the Beginnings, Development, and Philosophy of the English Hymn* (London, 1962), pp. 201-2.

Isaac Watts, who wrote the first English hymnbook for children, *Divine and Moral Songs, attempted in easy Language for the Use of Children* (1715), apparently accepted Calvin's view of children. "What ferments of spite and envy," he writes, "what native wrath and rage sometimes are found in the little hearts of infants and sufficiently discovered by their little hands and their eyes and their wrathful countenances even before they have learned to speak or to know good and evil."⁸ Although Watts's theology in his hymns for adults was often liberal and humane, in his hymns for children he was, at his most characteristic, harshly Calvinistic. Children were warned of a wrathful God:

What if the Lord grow wroth, and swear,
While I refuse to read and pray,
That He'll refuse to lend an ear
To all my groans another day?
What if His dreadful anger burn
While I refuse His offered grace,
And all His love to anger turn,
And strike me dead upon the place?
'Tis dangerous to provoke a God!
His power and vengeance none can tell:
One stroke of His almighty rod
Shall send young sinners quick to hell.⁹

The punishments of hell were graphically and terrifyingly described in terms of "pains, darkness, fire, and chains." Judging from the number of republications of this book, Watts's hymns for children continued their popularity throughout the nineteenth century.¹⁰

Some nineteenth-century hymnwriters continued this pessimistic, threatening tone,¹¹ but for the most part Victorian hymns for children suppressed the overt motive of fear. Instead, they stressed a blander didacticism, more subtle psychologically, but probably just as effective in winning the child's compliance. One of the most popular children's hymnbooks was *Hymns for Infant Minds*, written by Anne and Jane Taylor. The advertisement for this book states that it surpasses Watts because the subjects are "treated of in a manner more adapted to children, and calculated in every instance to win to what is good by love rather than deter from what is evil by terror." In

stead of fear of eternal punishment, the Taylors' hymns used guilt, as in the following hymn, "A Child's Lamentation for the Death of a Dear Mother":

And now I recollect with pain
The many times I grieved her sore:
Oh! if she would but come again,
I think I'd vex her so no more.

How I would watch her gentle eye!
'T would be my play to do her will!
And she should never have to sigh
Again, for my behaving ill!

But since she's gone so far away,
And cannot profit by my pains,
Let me this childlike duty pay
To that dear parent who remains.

Let me console his broken heart,
And be his comfort by my care;
That when at last we come to part,
I may not have such grief to bear.¹²

Here the child's misbehavior has been punished by the mother's death. The youthful reader is warned, by implication, that his failure to be dutiful may result in the death of a parent.

Although Victorian hymns for children said little of hell's tortures, they spoke a great deal of death. In a public school hymnal death is described vividly and dramatically: "The feeble pulse, the gasping breath, / The clenched teeth, the glazed eye. . . ."¹³ Although the hymns repeatedly call the child's attention to death, they reassure him that he has nothing to fear from death if he has been good: "Safe in our Saviour we fear not the blow." One method of insuring a heavenly reward, the hymns say, is to reject worldly pleasures, which are called "a gaudy dream / Of pride and pomp and luxury," "the pride of sinful flesh," "these trifling pleasures here below." The child is told, in the almost gnostic tradition of the evangelical, that this life is one of "grief and pain." The temptations of this world can only lead to "burning boundless agony." He is, in fact, encouraged to anticipate death which for the good child will be "joyful." The transience of life is reiterated again and again in chil-

8. Quoted by Edwin Wilbur Rice, *The Sunday-School Movement, 1780-1917 and the American Sunday-School Union* (New York: Arno Press), p. 148.

9. Quoted by H. A. L. Jefferson, *Hymns in Christian Worship* (London, 1950), p. 201. Escott, in *Isaac Watts*, argues that Watts's hymns for children are unfairly criticized in comparison to modern views of childhood when they should be praised as more pleasant and bright than children's songs and hymns of Watts's own and previous times (Ch. 8).

10. Phyllis Wetherell Bultmann, "Everybody Sing: The Social Significance of the Eighteenth-Century Hymn," unpub. diss. (University of California at Los Angeles, 1950), p. 145, writes that "between 1715 and 1880 there were over 68 separate editions of

this work, not counting reprints, of which there were a great many."

11. See, for instance, the hymns of Sir Rowland Hill, who viewed children as utterly depraved. Hill says of children's quarrels, "Old Satan is then very nigh, / Delighted that thus they have shown / A murdering spirit; and why? / Because 'tis akin to his own." Quoted by Rice, *Sunday-School Movement*, p. 149.

12. *Hymns for Infant Minds*, rev. ed. (London: Ward, Lock, and Tyler, 1876), pp. 60-61, stanzas 3-6. The popularity of this collection can be surmised from the fact that the London Sunday School Union, which in 1903 reported having 2,252,497 scholars, issued an edition of *Hymns for Infant Minds*.

13. *Hymns for the Chapel of Harrow School* (Harrow: Crossley and Clarke, 1860), Hymn No. 143, stanza 1.

dren's hymns. Death is clearly the final goal which Victorian children are taught to anticipate.

The fate of the dead, the hymns say, will be determined by their earthly actions. Like adults, Victorian children bear full responsibility for their lives:

There's not a child so small and weak
But has his little cross to take,
His little work of love and praise
That he may do for Jesus's sake.¹⁴

Even the smallest individual is responsible for his own salvation. In hymns the concept of "self-help" is applied to religion.

The child is shown very clearly the virtues that he must cultivate to gain the heavenly reward. Chief among them are submissiveness and obedience:

We must meek and gentle be,
Little pain and childish trial
Ever bearing patiently.¹⁵

He must imitate Jesus, who as a child was "mild, obedient, good," and is particularly told to be obedient to his parents. He must suppress his temper and deny thoughts of self. Quick temper and vanity, in fact, seem to be the most frequent specific transgressions of the naughty child.

Forgive my temper, Lord, I pray,
My passion and my pride:
The wicked words I dared to say,
And wicked thoughts beside.

• • •
And who am I, a sinful child,
Such angry words to say?
Make me as mild as He was mild,
And take my pride away.¹⁶

The child is also warned against the temptation of frivolity—he must strive for earnestness. In fact, the image of a perfect Christian child presented by children's hymns is that of a monastic; he is disciplined, contemplates God continually, rejects worldly pleasures, and mortifies himself for any transgression.

In addition to cultivating the passive virtues of obedience, submissiveness, humility, and earnestness, the child is expected actively to resist wrongdoing. He is warned of the temptations of sin, but other than generalizations

about anger, pride, vanity, and sloth, the nature of sin is unspecified. Darker sins than children's sins often are hinted at, but not dwelt upon. In one hymn the child repeats, "Though but children, knowing little / Of the sin we learn to flee," and then proceeds to explain how he can avoid this nameless sin by seeking Jesus.¹⁷ The world depicted in many children's hymns is pervaded by evil spirits, by devils waiting to snatch the child's attention, and he is repeatedly warned to be on guard against this evil eminence:

There's a wicked spirit
Watching round you still
And he tries to tempt you
To all harm and ill.¹⁸

These dark and pessimistic warnings contrast strangely with another prominent category of children's hymns, a type that became more familiar as the century progressed—the sweet and gentle hymns that abounded in nature imagery and promised children that Jesus loved them and would guard and protect them. Hymns of both types are found side by side in Victorian hymnbooks, indicating an obvious ambivalence of attitudes. Children were told that the world was a beautiful place in which to live, one filled with lambs and birds, flowers and sunshine, a benevolent world in which Jesus personally watched over good children. But they were also presented a picture of a dark and ugly world, one filled with sin and evil. The dichotomy between these two world views is often expressed in Manichean terms as a struggle by the forces of good and evil for children's souls.

Children were expected to participate actively in this struggle. Boys, of course, were particularly urged to activity in the name of Jesus.¹⁹ In the multitude of hymns that employ military imagery, boys were warned of their "weary war to wage with sin" and were exhorted to "fight the good fight with all your might," to "stand by your colours and battle with sin." A brief sampling of first lines of children's hymns reveals another prominent set of images used to urge active participation, those of labor: "Come labour on," "Work for the night is coming," "O boys, be strong in Jesus, / To toil for him is gain."

All children were particularly urged to do missionary

14. C. F. Alexander, "We are but little children weak" (1850), stanza 6, in Henry Allen, *Children's Worship: A Book of Sacred Song for Home and School* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1887), Hymn No. 426.

15. C. F. Alexander, "Christian children must be holy" (1859), stanza 4, in *Children's Hymn Book*, rev. ed. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, n.d.), Hymn No. 86.

16. *Hymns for Infant Minds*, pp. 16-17, stanzas 2 and 6.

17. L. Tuttiert, *Original Hymns for Younger Members of the Church*, 2nd ed. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton, & Co., 1889), p. 24, stanza 2.

18. Alexander, *Hymns for Little Children*, Hymn No. 5, stanza 3.

Prince Albert joined in the movement to lead English children from temptation by composing tunes for several children's hymns, one of which reads in part, "My faith is weak, my heart is proud, / And this world's love is strong within; / Youthful temptations round me crowd, / And urge my soul to youthful sin." *Children's Hymn Book*, Hymn No. 180, stanza 3.

19. Girls were expected to be passive rather than active, to cultivate the domestic virtues: "O maidens, live for Jesus, / Who was a maiden's Son; / Be patient, pure, and gentle, / And perfect grace begun." Quoted by Erik Routley, *Hymns and Human Life* (London, 1952), p. 301.

work of some kind. For those who could not make the ultimate sacrifice of spreading the gospel in foreign lands, there was other missionary work at home:

If you cannot cross the ocean,
And the heathen lands explore,
You can find the heathen nearer,
You can help them at your door.
If you cannot give your thousands,
You can give the widow's mite,
And the least you give for Jesus
Will be precious in His sight.²⁰

Whatever one's Christian mission in life was, it was often visualized in terms of struggle for earnestness and truth.

Soul of the Christian, be earnest and true,
God has a mission, a life-work for you;
Kind words to utter, and good deeds to do,
Souls from their error and darkness to woo.²¹

The purpose of this struggle was to build character in children so that when grown they would be strong, patriotic, and Christian Englishmen. Their strength would enable them to resist temptation and live clean lives, to seek truth, and to aid the weak. Kipling summed up these ideals at the end of the century in his "Father in heaven, who lovest all," a hymn originally published in a children's book, *Puck of Pook's Hill*. Here is the Victorian ideal of the Christian child—patriotic, hard-working, steadfast, honest, controlled, and clean, God-fearing, strong but helpful to the weak, and possessing the simple virtues of delight, mirth, forgiveness, and love.

A society's ideals are perhaps nowhere more evident

than in its aspirations for its children, because the younger generation represents the possibility of utopian reform of the world. Victorian children's hymns present a picture of extremely high ideals. Children were exhorted to repress their personal feelings and desires and to achieve the good of others. They were to work for the family, for society, for God, and for England. The ideal of the social ethic taught by the hymns was the pure, altruistic, and unfaltering hero, who fights selflessly for right and wins, an ideal that, in its absolute definition, was impossible of achievement by most men. This discrepancy between the ideal and reality helps, perhaps, to explain one source of what critics of the Victorians have labelled their hypocrisy. The standards that they set almost inevitably doomed all but the strongest to failure, a failure that could only be covered by pretense.

There are, moreover, several ambivalences contained within these ideals. We have already pointed out the paradoxical conflict of world views in the hymns, the unresolved dichotomy between the world as benevolent or malevolent. In addition to this theological conflict, there is a pronounced ambivalence in the hymns' didactic message concerning the child's conduct. Children were taught to be passive—to be submissive, humble, and obedient, to deny their individual impulses. At the same time, they were taught to be vigorously active—to struggle mightily against temptation and sin and for truth and a better world; in other words, to strengthen their individuality and character. This conflict in role models must have created a great deal of tension and psychological confusion for young adults.

Bowling Green State University

Arnold's Two Regions of Form

Mary W. Schneider

IN THE POETIC CAREER of Matthew Arnold there are two changes of direction: the first, an abrupt shift to classical form, announced in the 1853 "Preface"; the second, less definitely marked, his giving up poetry altogether and taking up prose. Both changes, it is generally agreed, are evidence not only of a loss of creative power but of a weakening of will; Arnold, it is supposed, gave up the difficult task of shaping poetry out of his own experience for the easier one of following traditional forms, until, his poetic

energy failing, he turned to writing prose. In establishing this version of Arnold's career scholars rely on the evidence of a letter that Arnold wrote in 1858 to his sister "K," Jane Forster.

In this letter to "K" Arnold seems to confess that in choosing the classical form for *Merope* he had avoided the agony of original creation to work in "a region where form is everything." He seems, moreover, to imply that such formal poetry is not really poetry of the highest kind.

20. J. A. Todd, "Hark! the voice of Jesus crying," stanza 2, in Allon, *Children's Worship*, Hymn No. 496.
21. Allon, *Children's Worship*, Hymn No. 437, stanzas 2 and 3. We have only to look at other popular works of Victorian children's

literature, such as Thomas Hughes's *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, to see the prominence of this image of struggle for truth and earnestness.

This reading of the letter leaves Arnold as a critic in an ambiguous position, for in the 1853 Preface he had recommended the Greek tragic poets as the best guides for young poets, and in the Preface to *Merope* he had asserted that the Greek tragic forms promise the greatest success to the modern dramatist. The letter, however, would suggest that Arnold held private reservations about his advice to poets, at best intending to offer it only to those who did not possess the highest gift.¹

This reading of the letter, I would argue, is not quite fair to Arnold as either a poet or a critic. No one would question, surely, that Arnold genuinely believed what he so often said, that Sophocles was a great poet. Nor is it likely, as the letter seems to imply, that Arnold for a moment held the curious notion that Greek drama is purely formal, or that it was ever easy to compose in that form—for Milton, Goethe, or any other poet. Nor, as I intend to show, did he privately deny what he publicly asserted, that Greek drama offered the best guide for the modern poet, or that he himself in writing *Merope* aimed at the highest kind of poetry. What is usually taken to be a private admission of failure in the letter to "K" is, I would argue, quite the opposite, a claim to heroic courage. In attempting drama in the classical form, Arnold drew, he felt, on all his powers, his *energy*, risking, as a poet, everything. And this is what he says in the letter to "K." Having reviewed the critical reception of *Merope*, he describes the difficulty of writing poetry:

People do not understand what a temptation there is, if you cannot bear anything not *very good*, to transfer your operations to a region where form is everything [italics mine]. Perfection of a certain kind may there be attained, or at least approached, without knocking yourself to pieces, but to attain or approach perfection in the region of thought and feeling [italics mine] and to unite this with perfection of form, demands not merely an effort and a labour, but an actual tearing of oneself to pieces, which one does not readily consent to (although one is sometimes forced to it) unless one can devote one's whole life to poetry.²

Arnold is not saying that in choosing the classical form for *Merope* he had settled for a lesser kind of perfection in "a region where form is everything." He is saying rather that he had aimed at the highest kind of perfection, had indeed knocked himself to pieces in writing *Merope*, and now is tempted to try something easier—writing prose. By "a region where form is everything"

Arnold means prose and not drama.

For Arnold, classical drama and epic always belong in "the region of thought and feeling"—these, if the poet succeeds, are united with "perfection of form." It would never have occurred to Arnold that drama of any kind inhabited "a region where form is everything." No doubt, in writing to Jane Forster, always the most sympathetic of his readers, he could be sure that she shared his assumptions about the two regions and would understand his distinctions without careful definitions. We, in this latter day, can hardly share that community of thought, but we can find a context for the terms in Arnold's critical essays. In these essays he invariably puts drama in the region of thought and feeling. When in the 1854 Preface he calls for a great action, he does not speak of the Rules or the Unities; the great actions are those which "most powerfully appeal to the great primary affections," to "elementary feelings."³ He is here speaking of poetical drama, and, already using the geographical metaphor, he says that "Poetical works belong to the domain of our permanent passions." In 1857 in the lecture "On the Modern Element in Literature," he says that "the dramatic form exhibits, above all, the actions of men as *strictly determined by his thoughts and feelings*" (*PW*, I, 34). In the Preface to *Merope* Arnold refines his dramatic theory, now saying that the Greek tragic forms are most likely to promise success to the modern poet, satisfying as they do the demand of the human spirit for "depth and concentration in its impressions" (*PW*, I, 58-59). Metrical form intensifies this effect: "Powerful thought and emotion, flowing in strongly marked channels, make a stronger impression." All are necessary to the tragic *catharsis*, as Arnold now understood it:

This sense of emphatic distinctness in our impressions rises, as the thought and emotions swell higher and higher without overflowing their boundaries, to a lofty sense of the mastery of the human spirit over its own stormiest agitations; and this, again, conducts us to a state of feeling which it is the highest aim of tragedy to produce, to a *sentiment of sublime acquiescence in the course of fate, and in the dispensations of human life.* (*PW*, I, 34)

The difficulty of producing this effect is surely what Arnold has in mind when in the letter to "K" he says that "to attain or approach perfection in the region of thought and feeling, and to unite this with perfection of form, demands not merely an effort and a labor, but an actual tearing of oneself to pieces." Arnold, in this essay every-

1. See Sidney Coulling, "Matthew Arnold's 1853 Preface," *VS*, 7 (March 1964), 247-48, and *Matthew Arnold and His Critics* (Athens, Ohio, 1974), pp. 41-42; for similar judgments, see Warren D. Anderson, *Matthew Arnold and the Classical Tradition* (Ann Arbor, 1965), pp. 46, 236; Kenneth Allott, "A Background for Empedocles on Etna," *Essays and Studies*, 21 (1968), 97-98, 99.

2. *Letters of Matthew Arnold*, ed. G. W. E. Russell, in *The Works of Matthew Arnold* (London, 1904), XIII, 94-97. (Letter of September 6, 1858.)

3. *The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold*, ed. R. H. Super (Ann Arbor, 1960), I, 4. References to this edition appear hereafter in the text as *PW*.

where extending Aristotle's dramatic theory, may well be thinking of the gifted (*euphuës*) or manic poets, those who feel the emotions of their characters: the gifted poet taking the role of any character, the manic lifted out of his proper self.⁴ As Aristotle says, "the one who is agitated storms, the one who is angry rages," so Arnold suggests that the human spirit, in the poet and his creation, must feel and master the "stormiest agitations." This is good classical poetics. Neither Aristotle nor Arnold supposed that Greek drama was a cold intellectual affair. The region of tragedy is the stormy climate of thought and feeling.

Prose, however, was another matter; it was, as Arnold thought, an intellectual work, and in prose, form, if not everything, is of the first importance. So Arnold himself discovered in writing the 1853 Preface, as he writes Clough:

How difficult it is to write prose: and why? because of the articulations of the discourse: one leaps over these in Poetry—places one thought cheek by jowl with another without introducing them and leaves them—but in prose this will not do. It is of course not right in poetry either—but we all do it. . . .⁵

Arnold again compared the writing of prose and poetry in "The Literary Influence of Academies" (1864). Prose is an intellectual work, requiring "quickness of mind and flexibility of intelligence": "The form, the

method of evolution, the precision, the proportions, the relation of the parts to the whole, in an intellectual work, depend mainly upon them" (*PW*, III, 238). These qualities, it is true, are to be found in poetry: "Even in poetry these requisites are very important"; but they are not everything: "In poetry, however, they are, after all, secondary, and energy is the first thing; but in prose they are of first-rate importance" (238). Or, in the shorthand of the letter to "K," taking "everything" to mean "of first-rate importance," and supposing "form" to include related matters, prose is "a region where form is everything."

The letter to "K" thus marks an important point in Arnold's literary development, the point where he begins to think of turning from poetry to prose. The two phrases in which he maps the regions of literature look back to his poetry, including the imitations of classical epic and tragedy, "regions of thought and feeling," and ahead to prose, "the region where form is everything." The tone of the letter clearly indicates Arnold's feeling that prose is not so important as poetry, but it is easier to write, and one can achieve in it a certain kind of perfection. If this reading of the letter be admitted, then Arnold is not apologizing for *Merope* but confessing what it cost him to write the drama.

Kansas State University

The Double Narrator in *The Amazing Marriage*

Robert M. DeGraaff

IN HIS LAST COMPLETE NOVEL, *The Amazing Marriage*,¹ Meredith makes skillful use of the fertile story-telling device of split narration. The initial effect of dividing the story between two antagonistic storytellers, Dame Gossip and the narrator, is to generate a witty and humorous exchange that enlivens the tale and helps maintain an effective seriocomic perspective. Perhaps Meredith had this interplay in mind when he wrote to Robert Louis Stevenson, while completing *The Amazing Marriage*, that "Dame Gossip pulls one way and I another, and whether the drunken couple will ever come to a haven I don't know."²

But more importantly, and perhaps less obviously, the

Dame's purpose is to serve as a strawman to the Meredithian narrator in the areas of philosophy and literary theory; the Dame consistently illustrates the limitations of popular sentiment as these are contrasted with the enlightened views of the narrator.

Gillian Beer states that

The controlling narrative is divided between Dame Gossip and a modern analytical novelist of the Meredithian kind—though not wholly to be identified with Meredith. There is thus no final authority to whom we may turn for our reading of events. The reader is himself the arbitrator.³

This is a natural first impression, but a more careful look

4. *Poetics*, 1455a, 3014, tr. S. H. Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, 4th ed. (1907; rpt. Dover, 1951), p. 63.
5. *The Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough*, ed. H. F. Lowry (London, 1932), p. 144.

1. Citations are to the Memorial Edition, published by Scribner's Sons (New York, 1910).
2. *Letters of George Meredith*, ed. C. L. Cline (Oxford, 1970), III, 1153.
3. Gillian Beer, "The Amazing Marriage: A Study in Contraries," *Review of English Literature*, VII (1966), 96.

at the novel will show that it is quite inaccurate. In reality, Dame Gossip relates very little of the tale. Repeated references to her readiness to interfere in the narrative obscure the fact that she actually controls only about ten percent of the novel; after her background story of the marriage of Carinthia's parents (the "Old Buccaneer" Captain Kirby and "Countess Fanny"), which occupies the first three chapters, she accounts for only 21 of the remaining 478 pages of the book (less than five percent).

More significantly, both the naive quality of her narration and the narrator's later convincing indictment of her faults demonstrate her unreliability. Initially the reader is inclined to accept Dame Gossip's story at face value because she is his only authority; there are several factors in the first three chapters, however, that should make him uneasy. The Dame exhibits the traits of an experienced spreader of rumors: she is extremely garrulous, often falling into lengthy irrelevant asides; the combination of aristocracy (with which she is overly impressed) and questionable morality (which she unsuccessfully pretends to disdain) appeals to her sense of the romantic; and the homely reflections and interpretations of events which she continually interjects often demonstrate her own ignorance and provincialism. Her refusal to quote the profanity of "Old Showery" Fakenham, for example, reveals all of these characteristics:

He salted his language in a manner I cannot repeat; no epithet ever stood by itself. When I was young the boys relished these dreadful words because they seemed to smell of tar and battle-smoke, when every English boy was for being a sailor and daring the Black Gentleman below. In all truth, the bad words came from him; though an excellent scholar has assured me they should be taken for aspirates, and mean no harm; and so it may be, but heartily do I rejoice that aspirates have been dropped by people of birth; for you might once hear titled ladies guilty of them in polite society, I do assure you. (p. 21)

The Dame's tendency to glamorize events is congruent with her delight in the melodramatic and sentimental. This love of "soap opera" is evident, for example, when she takes advantage of an anecdote in the family history of the Kirbys to launch a eulogy of a sentimental drama called *Saturday Night*:

'The ravished wife of my bosom,' he calls her all through the latter half of the play. It is a real tragedy. The songs of that day have lost their effect now, I suppose. They will ever remain pathetic to me; and to hear the poor coachman William Martin invoking the name of his dear stolen wife Elizabeth, jug in hand, so tearfully, while he joins the song of Saturday, was a most moving thing. You saw nothing but handkerchiefs out all over the theatre. (13)

It becomes clear that she thinks of the story she herself has to tell in similar terms: "Only to think of [Countess Fanny], I could sometimes drop into a chair for a good cry" (pp. 4-5). The tale of the old Buccaneer and his Countess is dressed out in all the machinery of romance: gallant heroes, daring exploits, and moonlit nights. The reader must begin to suspect the Dame's grasp on reality.

The Dame's credibility is further weakened by her apparent compulsion to include details that she finds interesting, though in many cases she either has no real authority for them or admits to not understanding them. Thus she repeatedly cites ballads and squibs (obviously unreliable sources) to enhance her story, and often uses such qualifying phrases as "it has been reported," "they say," or "some conjecture." Faced with the mysteries of human emotions and behavior, as she has conjured them up, she leaves her readers adrift: "I do not profess to understand" (p. 9); "We are in a perfect tangle" (p. 22); and "One does not really know what to think of it" (p. 23).

The reader may question the amount of truth in the opening three chapters, but he has as yet no way of corroborating the details of the Dame's obviously romanticized history. He can only be completely certain of her unreliability later in the novel, when she comments on action that has already been presented with convincing detail and psychological subtlety by the narrator. It then becomes obvious that she consistently distorts facts in order to increase glamor. Thus, she attributes the Earl of Fleetwood's cruise with Lord Feltre to a romantic motive we know to be spurious: he set out, she claims, "to make an inspection of Syrian monasteries, and forget, if he could, the face of all faces, another's possession by the law" (p. 271). The narrator has shown us enough of Fleetwood's thoughts to make it apparent that he is motivated not by unrequited love for Henrietta Fakenham, whom he has pretty much lost interest in by this point, but by wounded pride and malicious cynicism (both of which he seeks to escape). The Dame's final comments reveal that she still stands in awe of Fleetwood, whom we now know well enough to pity, and scorns Gower Woodseer, whom we have learned to respect (pp. 508-10).⁴

In the course of the novel we are led to adopt the narrator's point of view in preference to the Dame's; the book itself demonstrates that wherever they differ, he is right, she wrong. This is most evident in their contrasting concepts of literary theory and technique. The Dame is overcome, at the end of the story, by the narrator's *fait accompli*, but she retains her objections to his methods:

So much I can say: the facts related, with some regretted omissions, by which my story has so skeleton a look, are those that led to the lamentable conclusion. But the melan-

4. "I am not responsible for the Dame at the close," Meredith wrote

to Francis Burnand (*Letters*, III, 1214).

choly, the pathos of it, the heart of all England stirred by it, have been—and the panting excitement it was to every listener—sacrificed in the vain effort to render events as consequent to your understanding as a piece of logic, through an exposure of character! Character must ever be a mystery. . . . (pp. 510-11)

The validity of the narrator's approach, however, is established by the fact that he *has* succeeded in tracing actions to motives and motives to character, and he has done so without destroying emotion: our human sympathy for Fleetwood survives the narrator's exposure of his often ignoble inner machinations. As Jean Sudrann has noted, the narrator, like Meredith himself, advocates a literary method that involves a combination of close observation and careful analysis, a "linked eye and mind."⁵ He tells us directly at one point that

until their senses are dulled, impressionable young men, however precociously philosophical, are mastered by appearances; and they have to reflect under new lights before vision of the linked eye and mind is given them. (p. 344)

The Dame, on the other hand, compromises the accuracy of her presentation by coloring her observations with the rosy tints of sentimental romance.

The careful reader of Meredith will note that the literary theory and technique of the narrator are identical with Meredith's; the literary method is premised on the priority of mind in man. Its aim is the exposure of the inhumanity and folly that result from a failure to dominate

the primitive egocentric animal in human nature. It is not surprising, then, that the thematic norms stated by the narrator are consistent with Meredith's philosophy, so consistent that the narrator may indeed be identified with the voice of Meredith himself. The introduction of Dame Gossip's viewpoint gives the author a "straw figure" in opposition to whom he may air Meredithian literary theory and philosophy.

Dame Gossip boils. Her one idea of animation is to have her *dramatis personae* in violent motion, always the biggest foremost; and, indeed, that is the way to make them credible, for the wind they raise and the succession of collisions. The fault of the method is, that they do not instruct; so the breath is out of them before they are put aside; for the un-instructive are the humanly deficient: they remain with us like the tolerated old aristocracy, which may not govern, and is but socially seductive. The deuteragonist or secondary person can at times tell us more of them than circumstances at furious heat will help them to reveal; and the Dame will have him only as an index-post. Hence her endless ejaculations over the mystery of Life, the inscrutability of character,—in a plain world, in the midst of such readable people! To preserve Romance (we exchange a sky for a ceiling if we let it go), we must be inside the heads of our people as well as the hearts, more than shaking the kaleidoscope of hurried spectacles, in days of a growing activity of the head. (p. 209)

St. Lawrence University

Stammering in the Dodgson Family: An Unpublished Letter by 'Lewis Carroll'

Joseph Sigman and Richard Slobodin

THE FOLLOWING UNPUBLISHED LETTER by C. L. Dodgson to the Rev. Henry F. Rivers was recently acquired by the Library of McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

Ch.Ch. Feb. 2/74

My dear Rivers,

The state of the case regarding my sisters is this. There are 7 in all.

1 does not stammer.

2 stammer very slightly (of these one is such an invalid, you are not likely ever to see her)

2 stammer to a moderate amount (of these one is married & lives in the north of England, you will never see *her*.)
2 stammer rather badly.

So that probably you might have coming to you for lessons *two* rather bad cases, *one* moderate, and *one* very slight. If with this prospect, (plus myself for occasional lessons), you are willing to take 30 guineas as fair remuneration, I have much pleasure in closing with the offer—and I enclose a cheque to the amount.

I hope they will come to you 2 or 3 at a time, as I am pretty sure they are all alike, & need the same rules: and

5. Jean Sudrann, "The Linked Eye and Mind: A Concept of Action in the Novels of George Meredith," *Studies in English Literature*,

if only they will make each other observe the rules, they might make rapid progress, in their own domestic circle.

Sincerely yours,
C. L. Dodgson

I have been speaking lately with almost no hesitation & with great comfort to myself—with the consciousness that the breath was flowing out in an unbroken stream—being *decidedly* better since my last visit to you.

On the same day that he wrote this letter, Dodgson noted in his diary that he had sent the amount of £31.10s to Rivers.¹

Henry F. Rivers (1830-1911) was an Anglican clergyman who in 1863 married Elizabeth Hunt, the sister of James Hunt (1833-1869). Hunt, like his father, Thomas Hunt (1802-1851), was a well-known speech therapist. After his marriage, Rivers also became interested in speech therapy. When James Hunt died in 1869 Rivers took over his practice and in 1870 edited a posthumous seventh edition of Hunt's widely used textbook, *Stammering and Stuttering, Their Nature and Treatment* (original edition, 1854). It is generally known that Dodgson went to Rivers in an attempt to cure his stammer and that he arranged for his sisters to visit him as well.² However, Rivers's relation to Hunt seems to have escaped notice. Since Dodgson earlier sought the help of James Hunt,³ it may be that his choice of Rivers as a speech therapist was the result of his earlier relation with James Hunt. In fact, Dodgson seems to have been in moderately close contact with the Rivers and Hunt families. Greville MacDonald tells us that his father met Dodgson in the late 1850s at Hunt's house near Hastings,⁴ and an unpublished reminiscence by Katharine Rivers, the daughter of Henry F. and Elizabeth Rivers, indicates that Dodgson visited their home near Tonbridge, Kent, on a number of occasions in the late 1870s.⁵

The primary interest of the letter itself lies in the light it casts on an aspect of Dodgson's family history about which there has been some confusion. In 1932, Langford Reed wrote that stammering was a "failing which affected every one of [Dodgson's] brothers and sisters in some degree and was, no doubt, a consequence of their parent's consanguineous marriage."⁶ Reed's statement was repeated in 1945 by Florence Becker Lennon.⁷ In 1953, Phyllis Greenacre wrote, "All of the children had some disturbances of speech and two or three of them had definite stammers."⁸ Also in 1953, R. L. Green made two inconsistent assertions about stammering in the Dodgson family. First, he wrote that "Dodgson's stammer was with him all his life—an affliction which other members of his family shared, notably his sister Henrietta and to a lesser degree, his youngest brother Edwin." Later, however, we read that "Besides Dodgson himself, only Elizabeth, Caroline, and Edwin stammered at all seriously."⁹

There were eleven children in the Dodgson family: four brothers and seven sisters. From Dodgson's letter to Rivers it is clear that six of the sisters stammered in one degree or other and that one did not stammer at all. As a result, it would appear that all of the statements by Dodgson's biographers are to some degree in error. First of all, in spite of the assertions of Reed, Lennon, and Greenacre, not all of the children stammered. Secondly, even if Green's inconsistent statements are taken to mean that three sisters stammered with some degree of seriousness, this still does not correspond with Dodgson's statement that two of his sisters stammered "rather badly" and two others stammered "to a moderate amount."

McMaster University

1. This entry is part of the material not included in Roger Lancelyn Green's edition of the diaries. It was made available by the courtesy of Prof. Morton N. Cohen.
2. See *The Diaries of Lewis Carroll*, ed. Roger Lancelyn Green (London, 1953), pp. 323, 328.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 154.
4. *George MacDonald and His Wife* (London, 1924), p. 301.
5. This typescript is also in the possession of the McMaster University

Library. Also see *The Diaries*, p. 326.
6. *The Life of Lewis Carroll* (London, 1932), p. 36n.
7. *The Life of Lewis Carroll*, 3rd Rev. Ed. (New York, 1972), p. 124. The original 1945 edition was entitled *Victoria Through the Looking Glass*.
8. *Swift and Carroll: A Psychoanalytic Study of Two Lives* (New York, 1955), p. 124; also see p. 190.
9. *The Diaries*, pp. 153, 329.

Recent Publications: A Selected List

Arthur F. Minerof

AUGUST 1975—JANUARY 1976

I

GENERAL

- ARTS. Fitzgerald, Penelope. *Edward Burne-Jones*. Michael Joseph. Rev. *TLS*, 12 December, pp. 1489-90.
- Kemnitz, Thomas Milton. "Matt Morgan of 'Tomahawk' and English Cartooning, 1867-1870." *Victorian Studies*, September, pp. 5-34. Morgan's cartoons mark a major departure from cartooning conventions.
- Steig, Michael. "A Chapter of Noses: George Cruikshank's Psychonography of the Nose." *Criticism*, Fall, pp. 308-25. The artist's repeated use of a single element, the nose, to delineate a range of largely unconscious meaning.
- BIBLIOGRAPHY. Brake, Laurel. "Problems in Victorian Biography: The *DNB* and the *DNB* 'Walter Pater.'" *Modern Language Review*, October, pp. 731-42. The *DNB* articles on Pater specifically illustrate the problems that plague the *Dictionary* as a whole.
- Conolly, L. W., and J. P. Wearing. "Nineteenth-Century Theatre Research: A Bibliography for 1974." *Nineteenth Century Theatre Research*, Autumn, pp. 97-126.
- Jordan, John E. "Recent Studies in the Nineteenth Century." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn, pp. 671-94.
- Madden, Lionel, and Diana Dixon. *The Nineteenth-Century Periodical Press in Britain: A Bibliography of Modern Studies, 1901-1971*. Supplement to *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter*, September. Annotated.
- CRITICISM AND LITERARY HISTORY. Bruns, Gerald L. "The Formal Nature of Victorian Thinking." *PMLA*, October, pp. 904-18. Carlyle, Arnold, and Ruskin took recourse to historical categories of thought in their creations of meaning.
- Davies, James A. "Charles Lamb, John Forster, and a Victorian Shakespeare." *Review of English Studies*, November, pp. 442-50. Lamb's ideas dominate Forster's writings on Shakespeare.
- DeLaura, David J. "Some Victorian Experiments in Closure." *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, Fall, pp. 19-35. Examination of some of the "poetic" kinds of prose that sought to achieve their goals by a concealing of artifice.
- Holloway, John. "Thought, Style and the Idea of Co-Variance in Some Mid-Nineteenth Century Prose." *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, Fall, pp. 1-14. Some widespread features of mid-Victorian prose style may be the result of thinking in terms of co-variance.
- Kroeber, Karl. "Fictional Theory and Social History: The Need for a Synthetic Criticism." *Victorian Studies*, September, pp. 99-106. Review-article.
- Nadelhaft, Janice. "Punch and the Syncretics: An Early Victorian Prologue to the Aesthetic Movement." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn, pp. 627-40. *Punch's* use of "aesthetic" offers evidence that characteristics later associated with the Aesthetic Movement had been attacked as early as the 1840s.
- Reed, John R. *Victorian Conventions*. Ohio University. Nineteenth-century literary conventions. Rev. *TLS*, 3 October, p. 1161.
- Wilson, M. Glen. "Charles Kean and the Victorian Press." *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter*, September, pp. 95-108. Victorian journalistic reviews of Kean were often biased.
- ECONOMICS AND POLITICS. Arnstein, Walter L. "The Murphy Riots: A Victorian Dilemma." *Victorian Studies*, September, pp. 51-71. Many Englishmen shared Murphy's distrust of Catholicism but were repelled by his lack of gentility and his Irishness.
- Barker, Michael. *Gladstone and Radicalism*. Harvester Press. Rev. *TLS*, 22 August, p. 941.
- Perren, Richard. "The Meat and Livestock Trade in Britain, 1850-70." *Economic History Review*, August, pp. 385-400. The failure to adapt the livestock and meat markets to meet urban needs.
- HISTORY. Bristow, Edward. "The Liberty and Property Defence League and Individualism." *Historical Journal*, December, pp. 761-89. The League defended laissez-faire with some effect until the end of the century.
- Feuchtwanger, E. J. *Gladstone*. Allen Lane. Biography. Rev. *TLS*, 21 November, p. 1390.
- Hough, Richard, ed. *Advice to a Grand-daughter*. Heinemann. Letters from Queen Victoria to Princess Victoria of Hesse.
- Lindgren, Charlotte. "Herman Melville and Atlantic Relations." *History Today*, October, pp. 663-70. During troubled times over Hawaii, Oregon, and the West Indies, Melville maintained a sympathetic attitude to Britain, not least to the Chartists.
- Pointon, Marcia. "W. E. Gladstone as an Art Patron and Collector." *Victorian Studies*, September, pp. 73-98. The significance of the visual arts in Gladstone's life.
- Simon, Alan. "Church Disestablishment as a Factor in the General Election of 1885." *Historical Journal*, December, pp. 791-820. The considerable part played by the Church question.
- RELIGION. Drummond, Andrew L., and James Bulloch. *The Church in Victorian Scotland 1843-1874*. Saint Andrew Press. Rev. *TLS*, 22 August, p. 937.
- Fair, John D. "The Irish Disestablishment Conference of 1869." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, October, pp. 379-94. The importance of this Conference to the passage of the Irish Church Bill.
- Griffin, John R. "The Radical Phase of the Oxford Movement." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, January, pp. 47-56. The radicalism of the original leaders of the Movement.
- SOCIAL. Branca, Patricia. *Silent Sisterhood*. Croom Helm. Middle-class women in the Victorian Home. Rev. *TLS*, 28 November, p. 1404.
- Girouard, Mark. *Victorian Pubs*. Studio Vista. Review *TLS*, 19 December, p. 1513.
- Horn, Pamela. *The Rise and Fall of the Victorian Servant*. Gill and Macmillan. Rev. *TLS*, 28 November, p. 1404.

Hyde, Ralph. *Printed Maps of Victorian London 1851-1900*. Dawson. Rev. *TLS*, 8 August, p. 904.

Yonge, C. M. "Victorians by the Sea Shore." *History Today*, September, pp. 602-9. During the nineteenth century the British public began to take a keen interest in the wonders of the native beaches.

II

INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS

ARNOLD. Giordano, Frank, Jr. "Rhythm and Rhyme in 'Self-Dependence.'" *English Language Notes*, September, pp. 29-35. The poem artistically handles a philosophical abstraction.

Holloway, John. "A Patrician Sense of Order." *TLS*, 8 August, pp. 897-98. Review-article.

BRONTË. Beversluis, John. "Love and Self-Knowledge: A Study of *Wuthering Heights*." *English*, Autumn, pp. 77-82. Catherine's impassioned avowals regarding Heathcliff are not consistent with her behavior.

Blondel, Jacques. "Imagery in 'Wuthering Heights.'" *Durham University Journal*, December, pp. 1-7. Imagery is the very life of the book.

BROWNING. McComb, John King. "Beyond the Dark Tower: Childe Roland's Painful Memories." *ELH*, Fall, pp. 460-70. The horror and pain of inescapable memory.

Waddington, Patrick. "Two Unpublished Letters of Robert Browning to Pauline Viardot-Garcia." *English Language Notes*, September, pp. 35-36. Early 1871.

BUTLER. Breuer, Hans-Peter. "Samuel Butler and George Frideric Handel." *Dalhousie Review*, Autumn, pp. 467-90. Butler's enthusiasm is but one instance of a general and most peculiarly English worship of Handel.

CARLYLE. Landow, George P. "'Swim or Drown': Carlyle's World of Shipwrecks, Castaways, and Stranded Voyagers." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn, pp. 641-55. Carlyle's use of the imperiled voyage.

Rosenberg, Philip. *The Seventh Hero: Thomas Carlyle and the Theory of Radical Activism*. Harvard. Rev. *TLS*, 23 January, pp. 87-88.

Tarr, Roger L. "Thomas Carlyle's Libraries at Chelsea and Ecclefechan." *Studies in Bibliography: Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia*, Vol. 27, pp. 249-65. A bibliography of Carlyle's library.

DARWIN. Campbell, John Angus. "The Polemical Mr. Darwin." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, December, pp. 375-90. Darwin was a polemicist of the first order.

DICKENS. Burgan, William. "Tokens of Winter in Dickens's Pastoral Settings." *Modern Language Quarterly*, September, pp. 293-315. In Dickens' last pastoral writing he habitually has winter very much on his mind.

Carlisle, Janice. "Little Dorrit: Necessary Fiction." *Studies in the Novel*, Summer 1975, pp. 195-214. The novel is an inquiry into the moral status of fiction.

Charles Dickens: The J. F. Dexter Collection. British Museum. Rev. *TLS*, 5 December, p. 1464.

Dilnot, A. F. "The Case of Mr. Jaggars." *Essays in Criticism*, October, pp. 437-43. Jaggars is one of the characters who has some success in combating evil.

Kaplan, Fred. *Dickens and Mesmerism*. Princeton. Dickens'

involvement with Mesmerism and its impact on his fiction.

Partlow, Robert B., ed. *Dickens Studies Annual*. Vol. 4. Southern Illinois University. Rev. *TLS*, 23 January, p. 86.

Pratt, Branwen Bailey. "Dickens and Freedom: Young Bailey in *Martin Chuzzlewit*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, September, pp. 185-99. Young Bailey reveals Dickens' unarticulated belief in the possibility of individual freedom.

Rice, Thomas Jackson. "The End of Dickens's Apprenticeship: Variable Focus in *Barnaby Rudge*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, September, pp. 172-84. Dickens' first work to unite technique and meaning.

Slater, Michael, ed. *The Catalogue of the Suzannet Charles Dickens Collection*. Sotheby Parke Bernet/Trustees of the Dickens House. Rev. *TLS*, 5 December, p. 1464.

Stewart, Garrett. *Dickens and the Trials of Imagination*. Harvard. Rev. *TLS*, 19 September, p. 1066.

Tick, Stanley. "The Unfinished Business of *Dombey and Son*." *Modern Language Quarterly*, December, pp. 390-402. Dickens does not answer large questions in the novel; instead he is led to discover them.

ELIOT. Adam, Ian. "The Structure of Realisms in *Adam Bede*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, September, pp. 127-49. The many kinds of procedural realism in the novel.

Auerbach, Nina. "The Power of Hunger: Demonism and Maggie Tulliver." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, September, pp. 150-71. Suggestions of demonism in Maggie.

Baker, William. "John Walter Cross to Herbert Spencer, December 23, 1880: An Unpublished Letter Concerning George Eliot's Death." *English Language Notes*, September, pp. 39-40.

Bullen, J. B. "George Eliot's *Romola* as a Positivist Allegory." *Review of English Studies*, November, pp. 425-35. The influence of Positivist philosophy.

Edwards, Michael. "George Eliot and Negative Form." *Critical Quarterly*, Summer 1975, pp. 171-79. *Felix Holt* fails to make persuasive its affirmation of individual integrity or to carry through its destructive intent.

Newton, K. M. "Historical Prototypes in *Middlemarch*." *English Studies*, October, pp. 403-8. Suggests that historical figures were an important influence on Eliot's characterization.

Putzell, Sara M. "'An Antagonism of Valid Claims': The Dynamics of *The Mill on the Floss*." *Studies in the Novel*, Summer 1975, pp. 227-44. Union as the ultimate product of conflict.

Roberts, Neil. *George Eliot*. Elek. Rev. *TLS*, 3 October, p. 1161.

GASKELL. Lansbury, Coral. *Elizabeth Gaskell*. Elek. Critical study. Rev. *TLS*, 14 November, p. 1352.

HALLAM. Friedman, Norman. "Hallam on Tennyson: An Early Aesthetic Doctrine and Modernism." *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, Fall, pp. 37-62. Hallam's "On Some of the Characteristics of Modern Poetry" is a brilliant piece of work.

HARDY. Dollimore, Jonathan. "The Poetry of Hardy and Edward Thomas." *Critical Quarterly*, Autumn, pp. 203-15. Their considerable differences are best understood in their use of inanimate nature and landscape.

Gerson, Carole. "Canada's Response to Thomas Hardy: A Look at Nineteenth-Century Literary Attitudes." *Dal-*

- housie Review, Summer 1975, pp. 252-62. Late nineteenth-century Canadian literary taste was too traditional to readily accept Hardy.
- Jones, Lawrence. "Thomas Hardy's 'Idiosyncratic Mode of Regard.'" *ELH*, Fall, pp. 433-59. The personal element is a constant and dominant factor in Hardy's work.
- HOPKINS. Freije, George F. "Grace in Hopkins's 'Deutschland.'" *English Language Notes*, September, pp. 37-38. The phrase about the two graces has a specific significance in Jesuit thought.
- HOLMAN HUNT. Landow, George P. "'As Unreserved as a Studio Chat': Holman Hunt's Letters to Ernest Chesneau." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, August, pp. 355-69. Five letters to the French art critic containing Hunt's views of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood.
- KIPLING. Karim, M. Enamul. "Rudyard Kipling's Uncollected Poem: *Alnaschar*." *English Language Notes*, September, pp. 40-42. First appeared in the *Civil and Military Gazette* on November 23, 1886.
- MEREDITH. Baylen, Joseph O. "George Meredith: An Unpublished Letter, 1893." *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, Fall, pp. 103-4. To Edward Cook, supporting Irish Home Rule.
- Shaheen, M. Y. "On the Manuscripts of 'The Amazing Marriage.'" *Notes and Queries*, October, pp. 447-49. Difficulties involved as to chronology or stages of composition.
- Wilt, Judith. *The Readable People of George Meredith*. Princeton. Critical study. Rev. *TLS*, 2 January, p. 4.
- MILL. Ryan, Alan. *J. S. Mill*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. Rev. *TLS*, 15 August, p. 914.
- MORRIS. Brantlinger, Patrick. "'News from Nowhere': Morris's Socialist Anti-Novel." *Victorian Studies*, September, pp. 35-49. *News from Nowhere* is hostile to virtually every aspect of the great tradition of Victorian fiction.
- Lindsay, Jack. *William Morris*. Constable. Rev. *TLS*, 3 October, p. 1124.
- Stallman, Robert L. "The Lovers' Progress: An Investigation of William Morris's 'The Defence of Guenevere' and 'King Arthur's Tomb.'" *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn, pp. 657-70. Both poems keep Guenevere as the focal point.
- NEWMAN. Dessain, Charles Stephen, and Thomas Gornall, eds. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Oxford. Vols. 27 and 28. Rev. *TLS*, 15 August, p. 926.
- Selby, Robin. *The Principle of Reserve in the Writings of John Henry Cardinal Newman*. Oxford. Rev. *TLS*, 26 September, p. 1107.
- Wildman, John Hazard. "Newman in the Pulpit: The Power of Simplicity." *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, Fall, pp. 63-75. Newman's sermons flow from his convictions rather than polemically support them.
- PATER. Bassett, Shirley. "Wordsworth, Pater and the 'Anima Mundi.'" *Criticism*, Summer 1975, pp. 262-75. Pater's essay is remarkable because it acknowledges the diversity of Wordsworth's achievement.
- Hughes, Daniel. "Marius and the Diaphane." *Novel*, Fall, pp. 55-65. The novel fulfills its formal quest in the diaphanous self-realization of its leading character.
- Landow, George P. "Walter Pater to Charles Rowley: A New Letter." *Notes and Queries*, October, p. 441. Apparently 1877.
- PEACOCK. Joukovsky, Nicholas A. "Thomas Love Peacock on Sir Robert Peel: An Unpublished Satire." *Modern Philology*, August, pp. 81-84. Reprints the satire, a scathing attack on Peel; written in 1846.
- READE. Pollard, Arthur. "Griffith Gaunt: Paradox of Victorian Melodrama." *Critical Quarterly*, Autumn, pp. 221-27. *Griffith Gaunt* both overstates and understates.
- RUSKIN. Helsing, Elizabeth. "The Ruskin Renaissance." *Modern Philology*, November, pp. 166-77. Review-article.
- Miller, J. Hillis. "Myth as 'Hieroglyph' in Ruskin." *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, Fall, pp. 15-18. Ruskin used a certain theory of myth to solve the problem posed by the incompatibility of literal fact and all-encompassing system.
- SWINBURNE. Baker, William. "A. C. Swinburne to Herbert Spencer, 12 March 1881: An Unpublished Letter." *Notes and Queries*, October, pp. 445-47.
- Forbes, Jill. "Two Flagellation Poems by Swinburne." *Notes and Queries*, October, pp. 443-45. "Frank Fane—A Ballad" and "Charlie Collingwood's Flogging."
- Henderson, Philip. *Swinburne*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. Biography. Rev. *TLS*, 21 November, p. 1380.
- TENNYSON. Librach, Ronald S. "Myth and Romance in *Idylls of the King*." *Dalhousie Review*, Autumn, pp. 511-25. In the romantic and mythic philosophy and aesthetic tradition of the *Idylls* are the implications of such themes as hope and faith.
- Sait, James E. "Tennyson's *The Princess* and *Queen Mary*: Two Examinations of Sex and Politics." *Durham University Journal*, December, pp. 70-78. Tennyson explored sex in his works, often in a political context.
- THACKERAY. Sheets, Robin Ann. "Art and Artistry in *Vanity Fair*." *ELH*, Fall, pp. 420-32. The characters can be grouped according to their attitudes toward art.
- TROLLOPE. Snow, C. P. *Trollope*. Macmillan. Rev. *TLS*, 5 December, p. 1464.

PROJECTS—REQUESTS FOR AID

- BRONTËS, ELIZABETH GASKELL. Michael Wheeler seeks whereabouts of books owned by them. *TLS*, 22 August, p. 954.
- DICKENS. Philip Collins wants information about manuscripts or proof sheets relating to Dickens' nonfictional prose. *TLS*, 22 August, p. 954.
- ELIOT. David Higdon welcomes offprints of any essays on Eliot's work for an annotated bibliography. *Conradiana*, Texas Tech University, P.O. Box 4530, Lubbock, Texas 79409.
- SWINBURNE. Terry Meyers wishes information on unpublished material by or about Swinburne revealing something of his life and writings at Oxford. *TLS*, 22 August, p. 954.
- TROLLOPE. N. John Hall wishes photocopies of any Trollope letters in private hands for a new edition. *TLS*, 7 November, p. 1342.

Staten Island Community College
City University of New York

Victorian Group News

• With this issue, and not without regret, "English X News" undergoes retitling to reflect the group's new status within the more general MLA restructuring. Apropos of our standing, Ruth apRoberts, 1976 Secretary of the Victorian Division, provides the information that henceforth the Executive Committee will consist of five members, each holding a five-year term, with each serving as Secretary in the third year and Chairman in the fourth. Each year a new member will be elected by mail ballot to replace the retiring member. Officers of the Executive Committee as of 1976 are as follows:

John Stasny, University of West Virginia, *ex-Chairman*

Michael Timko, Queens College, City University of New York, *Chairman*

Ruth apRoberts, University of California, Riverside, *Secretary, Chairman*
1977

Richard C. Tobias, University of Pittsburgh, *Secretary 1977*

J. Hillis Miller, Yale University, *Secretary 1978*

- Readers are reminded that the 1976 program will have as focus the Victorian prose writers and that inquiries and submissions should be addressed to the Program Chairman, John Farrell, University of Texas at Austin.
- Michael Sundell writes that the Arnold Seminar for 1976 will consider the question of what value—if any—Arnold's poetry retains in the last quarter of the twentieth century. A brief panel discussion will be followed by discussion from the floor. Prospective panelists should submit papers and abstracts by September 15. Papers will be distributed to participants in advance, and abstracts published in the fall issue of *The Arnoldian*. Send papers and requests to attend to Professor Sundell, Department of English, George Mason University, 4400 University Drive, Fairfax, Virginia 22030.
- Morris Eaves draws attention to a double issue of the *Blake Newsletter* (nos. 29/30) devoted to the theme of "Blake Among Victorians." Copies may be ordered, at \$3.00 each, from Professor Eaves, Department of English, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131.

Back issues of VNL, at a cost of \$2.00 per copy, are available in limited quantities for the following numbers: 8, 20, 23, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43, 45, 46, and 47.