The Victorian Newsletter

Editor

Ward Hellstrom

Managing Editor

Louise R. Hellstrom

Number 111 Contents Spring 2007

Page

	Page
Carlyle's Influemce on Shakespeare *by Robert Sawyer*	1
Imagining *Ophelia* in Christina Rossetti's "Sleeping at Last" *by Mary Faraci*	8
The Poison Within: Robert Browning's "The Laboratrory" *by David Sonstroem*	10
"Her life was in her books": Jean Ingelow in the Literary Marketplace *by Maura Ives*	12
The Buddhist *Sub*-Text and the Imperial Soul-Making in *Kim* *by Young Hee Kwon*	20
"Gliding": A Note On the Exquisite Delicacy of the Religious Glissade Motif in Hopkins's "The Windhover" *by Nathan Cervo*	29
Coming in *The Victorian Newsletter*	29
Books Received	30
Notice	32

Cover: Cartoon of Trollope by Frederick Waddy in *Once a Week*, 1872

The Victorian Newsletter is sponsored for the Victorian Group of the Modern Language Association by Western Kentucky University and is published twice annually. Editorial and business communications should be addressed to Deborah A. Logan, Editor, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY 42101; e-mail deborah.logan@wku.edu. Please use *MLA Handbook* for form of typescript. MSS cannot be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Subscription rates in the United States are $10.00 per year: foreign rates, including Canada, are $12.00 per year. Checks should be made out to *The Victorian Newsletter*.

Carlyle's Influence on Shakespeare

Robert Sawyer

Rope-walking monkeys, riding-masters chased by clowns, an "Aquatic Theatre" flooded with water from the nearby New River in order to stage sensational naval melodramas—these were the entertainments dominating the London theatrical scene as Thomas Carlyle sat down in November of 1837 to assess W. C. Macready's new management of Covent Garden. Referring to Macready as "a classical man wishing to banish the wild beasts" of the less sophisticated performances in London, Carlyle goes on to defend the actor-manager's struggle to "gather 'Intellect' round him" in order to return the playhouse to Shakespeare and its former glory (*Collected Letters* 9: 343). Carlyle also admits that he has taken up Macready on his offer of free admission for the season, confessing that he attends about "once a week" to see "some Shakspear notability or the like" and "not without some enjoyment" (9: 343). While numerous critics have considered Carlyle's interaction with Shakespeare on the page,[1] very little attention has been focused on Carlyle's engagement with Shakespeare on the stage. By examining a number of factors in Carlyle's life, I hope to demonstrate that his interaction with performed Shakespeare also deserves attention. My examination focuses on 1.) Carlyle's notion of Shakespeare as hero; 2.) Carlyle's translation of Goethe and its effect on performances of *Hamlet*; 3.) Carlyle's intimate association with George Henry Lewes, the author of *On Actors and the Art of Acting*, and, finally, 4.) Carlyle's relationship with the actor-manager W. C. Macready. Ultimately, I will show that Carlyle influenced Shakespeare as much as Shakespeare influenced Carlyle.

Shakespeare played a prominent role in Carlyle's life from his earliest years. Even as an adolescent, he read the plays over and over again, and, unlike the other authors he was perusing, "Shakespeare's realistic stoicism expressed truths that seemed compatible with the religious vision that was the foundation of his parents' piety" (Kaplan 26). Later, while attending the University of Edinburgh, he kept the complete works of Shakespeare on the shelf in his small dormitory room. Constantly claiming Shakespeare to be his favorite author, Carlyle would also use him as the preeminent example of the hero as poet.

Carlyle's correspondence also contains numerous instances of direct quotations, as well as allusions to Shakespeare's plays, including *Hamlet, Cymbeline, Julius Caesar, Macbeth, Merchant of Venice, The Merry Wives of Windsor, Othello, The Tempest*, and *The Winter's Tale*. For example, in a letter to John Sterling, a close confidant, Carlyle ranted against the electoral process by borrowing from one of Hamlet's most famous soliloquies: "Most weary, flat, stale seem to me all the electioneerings . . . that the Earth is filled with in these or indeed in any days" (9: 267). Carlyle also echoes Shakespeare in a more indirect manner. David-Everett Blythe perceptively argues that Carlyle's prose is "so thoroughly permeated with Shakespearean rhythm and rewording" that it is even worth examining echoes that do not quote Shakespeare word-for-word. Coining the term "buried insets" to describe such echoes, Blythe goes on to identify passages that, although not direct quotations from Shakespeare, are phrases that call to mind the work of the Bard (36).[2] Later in his life, Carlyle counted on Shakespeare for solace. A long-time friend, Carol Fox, visited him two months after Jane Carlyle had died in 1866, and she found him as "thin and aged, and sad as Jeremiah . . . reading Shakespeare, in a long dressing gown" (qtd. in Origo 181). In 1879, just two years before his own demise, he reread all of Shakespeare in a single month. From his earliest years, then, to the year of his death, Carlyle turned to Shakespeare as a model for his own literary aspirations, as an English poetic hero, and as a literary comfort in times of need.

1. Shakespeare as Hero

Carlyle presented his ideas on the Hero in a series of lectures in 1840, published the following year.[3] As Carlyle admitted in his work, he drew on German philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte's "theory of the literary man" for his ideas on what constituted a hero. Fichte (1762-1814), an important German philosopher situated historically between Kant and Hegel, had articulated his concepts at the turn of the nineteenth century. In the first lecture of the 1840 series on Heroes, Carlyle set out to define the topic of his talks:

> We have undertaken to discourse here for a little while on Great Men, their manner of appearance in our world's business, how they have shaped themselves in the world's history, what ideas men formed of them, what work they did;— on Heroes, namely, and on their reception and performance; what I call hero-worship and the Heroic in human affairs. (Heroes 1)

He then divides his presentations into six lectures, one on each "type" of hero: "The Hero as Divinity," "The Hero as Prophet," "The Hero as Poet," "The Hero as Priest," "The Hero as Man of Letters," and "The Hero as King."

[1]For Shakespeare and Carlyle, see David-Everett Blythe, Michael Harrawood, Samuel Schoenbaum, Richard Schoch, and Carl Niemeyer.

[2]In his discussion of Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Hazlitt, Jonathan Bate has noted a similar type of borrowing, and he argues that such appropriation creates a "creative tension" not found in a simple, direct quotation (31). I think this same theory can be applied to Carlyle's written interaction with Shakespeare.

[3]After the publication of *The French Revolution* in 1837, Carlyle became a much sought-after speaker, and his supporters quickly commissioned him for a series of six lectures on German literature to be presented at Willis' Rooms on King Street in St. James's in the spring of 1837. Funded by 200 paid subscribers, the presentations proved so successful that Carlyle spread his "gospel" in this fashionable district during the height of the London social season for the next three years, culminating in his "Hero" lectures in 1840.

The single most significant presentation for our purposes is the "The Hero as Poet," given Tuesday, 12 May 1840.[4] In this lecture, Carlyle reiterates the subject of looking to the past for heroic characters, but he distinguishes old heroes of Divinity and Prophecy from more recent ones. Proclaiming the ancient heroes "productions of the ages," he posits that they are "not to be repeated in the new," partly because of scientific knowledge. For them to exist, he adds, there needs to be "a world vacant, or almost vacant of scientific forms." He concludes that while "Divinity and Prophet" are past, we "are now to see our hero in the less ambitious, but also less questionable, character of Poet" (*Heroes* 78). Although Carlyle distinguishes between prophet and poet—claiming that the prophet "has seized that sacred mystery rather on the moral side," while the poet functions on what the "Germans call the aesthetic side" (81)—by invoking priests alongside poets, Carlyle anticipates Matthew Arnold's stance by at least half a decade.

Carlyle's comments on Shakespeare in his lecture show his elevation of the poet above all other types of Hero, including monarchs. He claims, for example, that Shakespeare possesses "a true English heart" that "breathes, calm and strong" (110). Not only is Shakespeare a true patriot, but he is even more royal than "an English King" because, Carlyle exclaims, "no time or chance, Parliament or combination of Parliaments, can dethrone [him]!" (114). In fact, Carlyle asks if an Englishman had to choose, whether he would "give-up [his] Indian Empire or [his] Shakspeare?" (113). He answers that Shakespeare is a more important possession than India, as the "Indian Empire will go . . . some day; but this Shakspeare does not go, he lasts for ever with us; we cannot give-up our Shakspeare" (113). "No," he reiterates, "Indian Empire or no Indian Empire; we cannot do without Shakspeare" (113).[5]

Shakespeare, in Carlyle's reading, proves more valuable than princes or colonial possessions, and this privileging of the literary man should come as no surprise from a man of letters and a near worshiper of poets such as Dante and Shakespeare. Significantly, this distinction was clearly Carlyle's. According to Charles Frederick Harrold, although Carlyle followed Fichte's lead in most respects, "he emphasized, at least momentarily, the supremacy of the literary man over the other heroic types" (308). Moreover, two lectures later he returned to the theme of the writer as hero. In his lecture on the literary man, Carlyle stakes out his claim for Johann Wolfgang von Goethe as the premier man of letters. For "the last hundred years," Carlyle continues, "the noblest of all Literary Men is Fichte's countryman, Goethe," because, according to Carlyle, he was given "the Divine idea of the world" that is "a vision of the inward divine mystery" (*Heroes* 157). Indeed, in his discussion of Goethe, Carlyle nearly collapses the distinction between ancient priests and modern poets. Second only to Shakespeare in his constellation of writers, Goethe and his works would be illuminated by Carlyle throughout the century.

2. Carlyle, Goethe, and Hamlet

As Frederick William Roe has argued, "Carlyle deserves a permanent place in English criticism as an introducer of German literature, especially that of Goethe, into England" (146). He posits that from 1828-1850 Carlyle "was the best, indeed almost the only, interpreter of German thought in England"(146). And by all accounts, Carlyle came to be recognized as the single most important critic of German literature and German philosophy during this time. Not unlike many other Victorian writers, Carlyle was immensely influenced by the work he was translating,[6] and Charles Frederick Harrold suggests that Carlyle found in Goethe, particularly in *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*, many important suggestions for a way to live in the world. According to Harrold, Carlyle saw "that to find one's vocation, to dispel illusions of great abilities, and to work at something definite, was one of Wilhelm's earliest lessons" (204). For Carlyle, the dissemination of Goethe's works in Great Britain became one important thing to work at definitely, and his translation of *Meister* set the standard for English versions of German fiction and criticism.

But what other critics found in Carlyle's version of Goethe proves more important for the shaping of Shakespeare and particularly *Hamlet* on the nineteenth-century stage, for it is Goethe's novel that ushers in the age of sensitive Hamlets. Specifically, numerous critics and performers found a new model for Hamlet's character far removed from the eighteenth century's rough-and-tumble Prince of Denmark. Toward the conclusion of the semi-autobiographical *Apprenticeship*, the protagonist is pondering the role of Hamlet and expostulating to his friends about the Prince's psychological condition: "To me it is clear that Shakespeare meant," claims Wilhelm, "to represent the effects of a great action laid upon a soul unfit for the performance of it" (223). Suggesting that Hamlet has a "lovely, pure, noble and most moral nature, without the strength of nerve which forms a hero, [and who] sinks beneath a burden which it cannot bear and must not cast away," Hamlet "winds and turns, and torments himself," according to Meister, as "he advances and recoils." Finally, near-paralysis sets in, and he "does all but lose his purpose from his thoughts, yet still without recovering his peace of mind" (223).

This sensitive and thoughtful Hamlet becomes a prototype not only for many actors playing the Prince, but also the impetus for many actresses portraying him. Indeed, so many critics have singled out this moment, that it has become a critical commonplace.[7] For example, in her casebook on *Hamlet*, Susanne Wofford claims that Goethe's

[4]As we shall see, Macready was present at this lecture as well as two others in 1840.

[5]For a more detailed contrast between Carlyle's conservative views of Shakespeare and a more radical interpretation of the Bard, see my comparison between Carlyle and Swinburne in *Victorian Appropriations of Shakespeare* 52-54.

[6]George Eliot's translation of Ludwig Feuerbach's *The Essence of Christianity* is one striking example.

[7]In addition to Wofford and Rosenberg, see Hugh Grady, who could claim as recently as 2001 that Goethe's version of *Hamlet* "is still perhaps the most influential interpretation of the play ever penned" (272).

work helps to usher in "the weaker but sensitive Hamlet" (185), while the theater critic Marvin Rosenberg argues that Goethe's description of Hamlet began a tradition of "sweet Hamlets" that influenced both critical and theatrical interpretations of the play "well into the twentieth century" (100).[8]

Lawrence Danson has most perceptively traced this theatrical and critical feminization of Hamlet. Arguing that in the late eighteenth century, "Hamlet's rougher, more murderous edges were smoothed away," Danson posits that Hamlet's madness, was softened by the pale cast of thought" (38). One of the first critical allusions to this feminized Hamlet appears in William Hazlitt's description of the prince in the early nineteenth century. Although Hazlitt's criticism was published six years before Carlyle's translation (1824), Hazlitt certainly read Goethe, for his Hamlet parallels the German's version of the Prince. Indeed, it is safe to say that both Goethe and Hazlitt (and others such as Henry Mackenzie) participated in a cultural movement that feminized the Prince on page and stage throughout the nineteenth century, and it also safe to say that most of the English performers and critics got their Goethe by way of Carlyle's translation.

Hazlitt describes Hamlet's character as "made up of undulating lines," possessing a "yielding flexibility of a 'wave o' th' sea,'" and he emphatically contends that even the two best male actors of his day cannot play the prince the way that Shakespeare imagined: "Mr. Kemble plays it like a man in armour, with a determined inveteracy of purpose, in one undeviating straight line." Kemble's interpretation, Hazlitt argues, is "as remote from the natural grace and refined susceptibility of the character, as the sharp angles and abrupt starts which Mr. Kean introduces into the part" (113). Indeed, Hazlitt may then be arguing for some balance between the two portrayals—the "straight line" and the "sharp angles"—a balance that suggests a more curved image, a balance that might be achieved by having a female play the role, a possibility that occurred at least twice in Hazlitt's lifetime. Sarah Siddons first played the prince at Worcester in 1775 when she was twenty years old. She later performed the role again in 1777 and again in Dublin in 1802. In London, Mrs. Powell played Hamlet at Drury Lane in 1802.

This idea of the feminine Hamlet, begun by Goethe, developed by Hazlitt, and introduced into England by Carlyle's translation, accelerated toward the middle and late Victorian period in both criticism and stage portrayals. For instance, Alice Marriott played Hamlet at Marylebone Theatre in 1861, and in 1864, after she assumed the management at Sadler's Wells, she reprised the role (Grebanier 1975, 254-55). Other actresses playing the prince included Kitty Clive, Julia Graves, and Charlotte Cushman. The casting of actresses playing Hamlet would culminate in Sarah Bernhardt's famous portrayal of the Prince at the end of the nineteenth century.[9] This movement toward the "sweet Hamlets" affected both criticism and performance, but the most curious of the sensitive Hamlets may have occurred in Edward Vining's *The Mystery of Hamlet* (1881), in which Vining claims that although when Shakespeare first "conceived and put the drama into shape" his hero was more masculine, there came "the gradual evolution of the feminine element in Hamlet's character" (59). He adds that Hamlet is not only a "womanly man [but] might be in very deed a woman, desperately striving to fill a place for which she was by nature unfitted" (59). After a lengthy detailing of Hamlet's faults (jealousy, distraction, fear of bloodshed, and the like), Vining concludes, "that which before seemed at variance with all ordinary models of thinking now becomes an exhibition of the deepest human feeling" (75). In other words, all the characteristics for which Hamlet has been criticized can now be praised if Hamlet is female.

While this notion may seem extreme, it is not that far removed from Goethe's version of the Prince. More importantly, this concept clearly influenced two of the most respected actors of the nineteenth century: the American Edwin Booth and the British Henry Irving. Booth, who had read Vining, believed that the "feminine" side of his portrayal of Hamlet was essential to his performances. In a mid-century letter to the critic William Winter, Booth claimed, "I have always endeavoured to make prominent the femininity of Hamlet's character and therein lies the secret of my success" (qtd. in Rosenberg, 109). And he added, "I doubt if ever a robust and masculine treatment of the character . . . will be accepted so generally as the more womanly and refined interpretation" (109). Even Henry Irving, England's greatest Hamlet at the close of the nineteenth century, emphasized the feminine in his portrayals (Rosenberg 114).[10] Many reviewers, such as Clement Scott, praised Irving for his "exquisite expression of refinement" (69), while others referred to him as "womanish," "[g]entle," "dreamy," "feminine," and "endearing" (Rosenberg 114). Throughout the century, the feminization of Hamlet was an ongoing process. Without Carlyle's translation of Goethe, however, it would not have been as early, as rapid, or as widespread.

3. Carlyle, G. H. Lewes and Dramatic Shakespeare

George Henry Lewes, the other great champion of Goethe in nineteenth-century England, not only discovered Goethe from Carlyle but also carried letters of introduction from him when he set out to research his biography by traveling to Wiemar and Berlin. After Lewes returned from his trip, Carlyle read a section of the proofs and wrote to Lewes that he found it "an amazing thing to read" and had

[8]In 1920, for example, a German silent film actress named Asta Nielsen portrayed the role of Hamlet. In the 1940s, Laurence Olivier's film version focused on the feminine aspects of the Prince of Denmark, opening with the caption "a man who could not make up his mind." In this version, Hamlet wears a flaxen hair style, bobbed to resemble the style of hair favored by Hollywood starlets of the 1930s and 40s (see Danson, 44ff.).

[9]Bernhardt's five-hour production was praised in both Paris (May 1899) and London (June 1899). Theodore Stanton exclaimed that Bernhardt's "Hamlet is unquestionably one of the great Hamlets" (638), and he added that unlike the "masculine" Hamlets, Bernhardt's version portrayed "a certain delicacy and gentleness not at all out of keeping with a conception of Hamlet" (638).

[10]Vining even cited an anonymous reviewer who had praised Henry Irving's perfonnance—which included "outburst[s] hardly distinguishable from hysteria" (Vining 1881, 78)—to conclude that Irving's portrayal squared with his own thesis of Hamlet as woman

few suggestions for changes (qtd. in Haight 193). When *The Life and Works of Goethe*[11] was published in 1855, Lewes repaid the debt by dedicating the biography "To Thomas Carlyle, who first taught England to appreciate Goethe," and he thanked Carlyle in print for his "intellectual guidance." Equally important, Carlyle and Lewes often debated drama, and while they disagreed on matters of performance, their interaction caused Lewes to consider the connection between the written word and staged performance. More importantly, Lewes's dramatic criticism facilitated the positive changes to performed Shakespeare during the middle- and late-Victorian periods.

Lewes was a man of many talents: a novelist, essayist, critic, actor, philosopher, scientist, playwright, journalist, and biographer. Indeed, Carlyle referred to Lewes as "The Prince of Journalists," and a recent collection of Lewes's writings is aptly entitled *Versatile Victorian*.[12] Although Lewes had diverse interests, his deepest roots lay in the theater. His grandfather was Lee Lewes, a professional actor well known for his comic roles in the eighteenth-century English theater. While there is less biographical information about Lewes's father than Lewes himself, we do know that he acted and for a time managed the Theatre Royal in Liverpool. During the 1840s, Lewes became a close friend of the Carlyles (although he was twenty-eight years younger than Thomas), as well as a successful writer, literary critic, amateur actor, and an ardent admirer of Shakespeare. Lewes even had a brief fling with acting as an amateur in Charles Dickens's company, performing benefit shows in London and the provinces in 1847 and 1848 and raising funds for cultural causes, such as the endowment of a curatorship for Shakespeare's house in Stratford-upon-Avon. Lewes also acted in two of these amateur productions, performing Sir Hugh Evans's role in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and Shylock's in *The Merchant of Venice*.

Throughout the 1840s, Lewes championed Shakespeare on the stage, arguing in numerous essays against the idea of many nineteenth-century critics, including Carlyle, who felt that Shakespeare had haphazardly chosen the drama as his medium of expression. More specifically, Lewes vehemently disagreed with Carlyle's idea that Shakespeare's "great soul had to crush itself" in order to fill the "Globe Playhouse" (*Heroes* 110). Writing in the *Westminster Review* in 1845, for example, Lewes flatly declares that Shakespeare "did not regard his plays as poems" (35). Although Shakespeare "took great pains" with the plays, Lewes argues that Shakespeare "wrote only for theatrical success" (35). In addition, Lewes takes exception to the standard argument of early nineteenth-century critics that Shakespeare's plays were not intended for the stage. "It is vain to object," Lewes states, that because "Shakspeare's plays manifest great literary excellencies," they "must have had a literary purpose" (36). Lewes claims this faulty opinion has "derived from modern usages" and from nineteenth-century dramatists, who are "obviously bent upon literary, no less than theatrical success" (36). Lewes firmly concludes, however, that this attitude "was not so with Shakespeare" (36).

Lewes makes a similar point four years later in the *Edinburgh Review* by arguing that it is ridiculous to "disregard the Stage in treating of the art of Shakspeare" ("Shakspeare's Critics" 41). This approach, for Lewes, is as silly as a man "point[ing] out the mechanism of a watch, without any reference to its powers of indicating time" (41). Lewes attacks such critics as Charles Lamb, who have "gravely maintained that Shakspeare's very excellencies as a dramatic Poet prevented the success of his works on the stage" (62). And while admitting that in the mid-Victorian period the argument against "any stage representation . . . is very generally considered to be a mark of delicate and refined taste," Lewes counters that "Shakspeare would certainly have thought it but a sorry compliment" (62-63). Taking care not to alienate those who chose Shakespeare in the study over the Bard on the boards, Lewes rhetorically mediates between the two by emphasizing that "the same persons who are most delighted with reading the plays at home, will be those who are most delighted to see them well acted" (63).

In the year following this essay, two events occurred that would change the course of Lewes's personal and professional life. He had recently begun a new journal with Thornton Hunt, Leigh Hunt's son, and when his wife Agnes gave birth to a son in 1850, most of their friends, including the Carlyles, realized that Thornton, not Lewes, was the father. In the same year, Carlyle wrote to his sister concerning the new journal, the *Leader*, calling it a "good Paper hitherto." Describing the editors, Carlyle calls Hunt a "really clever" man, and he refers to the other editor as the "*dramatic* G. H. Lewes, an *airy* loose-tongued, merry-hearted being" (*New Letters*, 2: 93-94). Although Carlyle meant only to invoke the less-solemn aspect of Lewes's personality in this description, perhaps the emphasis on his initial italicized adjective also sheds light on their dispute over Shakespeare's work, Carlyle insisting that Shakspeare was a great poet, forced to work for the stage, and Lewes claiming the opposite, that Shakespeare intended his works to be dramatized.

One year later, Lewes was introduced to Marian Evans (George Eliot) by Herbert Spencer, and although he continued to support his illegitimate child (two more would follow), Lewes began to travel and to live with the novelist, much to the dismay of the Carlyles and others.[13] Even after the disagreement with Lewes over his association with Eliot, however, the relationship between the Carlyles and Lewes remained somewhat cordial. But on July 26, 1861, Jane Carlyle was surprised to find herself seated next to Lewes and Eliot at a performance of *Hamlet* at the Princess Theatre. Writing shortly after the encounter, she claimed to be startled by her placement "between Lewes and Miss Evans!—by Destiny and *not* by [her] own Deserving" (Haight 202).

That evening the three were witnessing the French actor Charles Fecter portraying Hamlet, and it was Fechter's *Hamlet* that many considered the pinnacle of Goethe's feminized Dane. While we have no record of Jane Carlyle's opinion of the play, we do have an extensive critique by Lewes, published later in his book *On Actors and the Art of Acting* (1875). Describing Fechter as "lymphatic, delicate, [and] handsome" with "long flaxen curls . . . sensitive nostrils . . . and sympathetic voice," Lewes pronounced that Fechter "perfectly represent[ed] the graceful prince" (119). He concludes his assessment by arguing that Fechter's portrayal is the "nearest approach" to capturing the "realization of Goethe's idea" in *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*, the notion that "there is a burden laid on Hamlet too heavy" for his "feminine delicacy" (121). Once more we see how Carlyle directly and indirectly influenced performed Shakespeare, for the Goethe interpretation held the stage throughout the century, and without Carlyle's mentoring, we can be fairly certain that Lewes, in particular, and other theater critics, in general, would not have championed Goethe's model as the ideal theatrical representation for portrayals of the Danish Prince.

4. Carlyle, Macready, and Victorian Shakespeare

Lewes's book on *Actors and the Art of Acting* also devotes an entire chapter to one of the great actor-mangers of the mid-Victorian period, W. C. Macready (1793-1873). And it is possible that Carlyle may have been even more intellectually intimate with Macready than he was with Lewes. More importantly, Macready's championing of Shakespeare parallels Carlyle's own elevation of the Bard, for both enlisted Shakespeare in their fight against the alleged Philistinism of the middle-Victorian period. Although they chose different venues—Carlyle supporting Shakespeare on the page, Macready promoting performances—they both hoped to educate England's "unenlightened."

Macready's background provided part of the impetus for his lifelong attempt to restore dignity to the theater, as his father had been a provincial actor-manager who attempted to give his son a better life by sending him to Rugby school in hopes of educating him for the legal profession. But when his father went bankrupt, Macready was called on at age sixteen to manage his father's acting troupe. Although he successfully kept the actors together until his father's release from jail, the experience of being suddenly removed from school and thrown into the "disreputable" world of early-nineteenth-century acting profoundly affected him and his feelings toward the theater. Macready would soon attempt to save the theater from itself by returning it to the dignity and prestige of David Garrick and John Kemble. With this goal in mind, he took over Covent Garden in 1837, convinced that performing Shakespeare was the best way to accomplish his objective. In his direction at Covent Garden (1837-39), and then at Drury Lane (1841-43), he worked not only to restore "authentic" Shakespeare, but also to include historically correct costumes and settings in order to produce a visual text of the play.

At about this same time, Carlyle and Macready began a friendship that would last more than a quarter of a century. By March 27th 1839, Macready was dining with Carlyle as well as Browning and Miss Martineau according to his diaries (1: 504), and by December of the same year, Macready was also perusing Carlyle's work. On the eighth of that month, after returning home in the evening, he scribbled that he "went to bed, reading Carlyle's *Revolution*," the writer's best-selling *The French Revolution* published just two years before (2: 34).[14] By reading the literary greats of the age, as well as by performing Shakespeare, Macready worked to cultivate numerous literary associates besides Carlyle, including Browning, John Forster, Charles Dickens, and many others.[15]

In the early 1840s, his relationship with Carlyle intensified,[16] with Carlyle attending Macready's productions and Macready attending Carlyle's lectures on "The Hero." On May 5, 1840, Macready listened to Carlyle's speech "with the utmost attention" and found himself "greatly pleased with it" (2: 59)[17]; and later that evening, he played the lead in *Hamlet* (59). It is hard to imagine that Carlyle's own ideas and those via Goethe's translation would not still be on Macready's mind as he performed that evening, for he had noted in his diary two months earlier (March 8th) that he had been reading sections of *Wilhelm Meister* on a railway journey and found himself "charmed" by it (2: 49). The next day he added that he hoped "to profit by the suggestions [he] had caught from Goethe yesterday" (2: 50). Moreover, he also he began to sense a kinship with Carlyle's personal pronouncements. This empathy becomes even clearer when, three nights later, Macready attended another Carlyle lecture, this one on "The Hero as Prophet." In this entry, Macready claimed that Carlyle spoke with "a fervour and eloquence that only a conviction of truth could give," concluding that he "was charmed, [and] carried away by him." Moreover, Macready felt that Carlyle "uttered thoughts that had been brooding in [his] own heart" (59).

Yet the response to the next lecture he attended on May 12th, 1840, was not nearly as positive. "Went to Carlyle's lecture on Dante and Shakespeare," Macready writes, but claims he "was disappointed in his treatment of the subject" because Carlyle's comments "were not up to the height of his great argument" (2: 60). Macready uncharacteristically concludes that "Carlyle said little that was impressive" (60). Immediately following this negative assessment, however, Macready hints at what may have been the real reason for disliking the lecture, for he notes that Carlyle also "spoke of

[11] The full title is *The Life and Works of Goethe: with sketches of His Age and Contemporaries, from Published and Unpublished Sources* (1855).

[12] This is the title of a collection of Lewes's writings edited by Rosemary Ashton (1992). Lewes published widely, including articles on science, literature, and even metaphysics.

[13] While the Carlyles still accepted Lewes as their friend, his common-law wife was never welcome at the Carlyle home in Chelsea. See Gordon S. Haight's "The Carlyles and the Leweses" for an articulate assessment of the relationship between the two couples.

[14] Richard Schoch makes a convincing case for the "theatricality" of Carlyle's historical writing, including *The French Revolution*.

[15] For a detailed examination of Macready's relationship with Dickens, see Greg Hecimovich's essay in *The Victorian Newsletter*.

[16] On May 31 and September 30, 1840, Macready socialized with the Carlyles. In 1841 and 1842, Jane attended plays and sat with Macready's wife in their private box. There are at least six other notes in Macready's diary of visits with the Carlyles during the early and mid-1840s (2:63,151,155,197,346, and 397).

[17] Although Macready does not mention the topic, the lecture on May 5th was "The Hero as Divinity."

managers of playhouses being the most insignificant of human beings, which made [him] smile, but sent the blood into [his] face" (60). And it is in Macready's response that we see Carlyle's influence on the Bard once more, for it was disparaging comments such as these regarding performed Shakspeare that prompted Macready to devote his time and talents to transforming the theatre into an intellectual venue comparable to the literary circles of the day.

Obviously, Macready hoped to close the distance between Shakespeare on the page and stage. As Alan S. Downer has succinctly stated, "Macready's intention [was] plain, to give stage realization to the images which Shakespeare's poetry called to his mind" (179). To accomplish this goal, Macready often challenged established Shakespearean portrayals, mainly by appealing to textual authority to grant his interpretations legitimacy. For example, Macready not only returned *King Lear*'s tragic ending, but also restored the role of the Fool in 1838. His scholarly efforts were not lost on the critics, as they praised his productions. As early as 1834, for example, *The Athenaeum* called his King Lear "interesting, impressive and instructive," and *The New Monthly Magazine* (June 1834) congratulated Macready for restoring *Lear*'s "unalloyed language and severe passion" (220).[18] In an unsigned review of *King Lear* in 1838, the reviewer (perhaps Dickens, according to Greg Hecimovich) applauds Macready for including the Fool, calling the character "one of the most wonderful creations of Shakespeare's genius" (Dickens 124).

By February 1, 1842, *The Times* felt comfortable claiming that Macready had "done more than any other individual to make SHAKESPEARE popular" and that he "deserve[d] the thanks of every one who wishes to educate the people, and raise the national character." The editorial goes on to credit Macready for driving out the melodramas and "exhibitions fit only for Roman amphitheatres" from the stage. The writer even portrays Macready as a champion of "all who would not see the popular mind brutalized and demoralized" (qtd. in Downer 210). Words such as "educate," "national character," "sobriety," and "intellect" pepper almost all the prose devoted to Macready's performances as well as his efforts on behalf of the Victorian theater.

Yet neither Carlyle nor Macready was content to battle the "illiterate" just in England. In fact, when Macready decided to tour the United States, Carlyle wrote for him a letter of introduction to Ralph Waldo Emerson:

> Mr. Macready's deserts to the English Drama are notable here to all the world; . . . I have often said, looking at him as manager of great London theatres, "This man, presiding over the unstablest, most chaotic province of English things, is the one public man among us who has dared to take his stand on what he understood to be *the truth*, and expect victory from that." (qtd. in Downer 254)

As this letter makes abundantly clear, Carlyle believed that Macready was a powerful ally in his war for literary education, and it is also clear that he credits Macready for transforming the London stage into a venue for edification and enlightenment.

According to most theater critics, when Macready retired in 1851, he could take "personal credit for the greatly enhanced status of the theater, central to which had been his achievements in Shakespeare" (Dobson and Wells 276), and his farewell speech sounds a particularly apt coda to his tenure in the theatre. Although he admits that his "ambition to establish a theatre," with "decorum and taste, worthy of our country, and to leave it in the hands of our divine Shakspeare fitly illustrated, was frustrated," he continues to hope that "corrupt editions and unseemly presentations of past days will never be restored" and that the "purity of our great poet's text will henceforward be held on our English stage in the reverence it should command" (qtd. in Lewes 47-48). Twenty years after his retirement speech, it was obvious, even to his contemporaries such as Lewes, that Shakespeare "occupied more of Macready's time and thoughts than any other subject," and he pronounced Macready to be a "cultivated, honorable, and able man" (*On Actors* 52, 53). By the close of the century, then, Macready had transformed performed Shakespeare, partly due to his "scholarly" portrayals and partly due to his influence on the next generation of Shakespearean performers. This movement to elevate the art of acting would culminate in the knighting of Henry Irving in 1895, only two decades after Macready's death.

5. Aftepiece

In the same letter with which I began this essay, and composed at a time before Carlyle had actually befriended Macready, Carlyle comments on the actor-manager's production he had witnessed a day earlier. As Carlyle relates to his brother, "last night we had Macbeth, deeply impressive in some parts, totally distracted in others" (9: 343). An entry in Macready's diaries relates a similar version of that night's performance: "Felt rather nervous and wearied, but tried my best to act Macbeth well, and did much of it very well—particularly the scene before the banquet." The "audience seemed to appreciate it," however, and Macready adds that he was "very enthusiastically" called for (1: 423). Whether or not Carlyle was one of those calling for Macready in the cavernous Covent Garden auditorium that evening, we cannot be sure, but he ends his letter by claiming that Macready is a "kind of genius," who possesses a "wild rough sincerity," and he confesses that he "hope[s] to know the man personally yet" (9: 344).

Little did Carlyle know then how close an associate Macready would become. In fact, sitting in the darkened theater, listening to the applause, Carlyle could scarcely have imagined how his future encounters with the actor-manager would help compel Macready to restore "authentic" Shakespeare to the stage. Nor could he know, as he rose from his seat that evening in 1837, just how much his translation of Goethe thirteen years earlier, as well as his association with G. H. Lewes, would eventually shape Victorian performances of his beloved Bard.

[18]*The New Monthly Magazine*, however, did chastize Macready for not yet restoring the Fool, a review that may have prompted him to bring back the role. Significantly, Macready was the first to cast a woman in the role (Priscilla Horton), a decision that has often been repeated in 20th-century versions of the play.

Works Cited

Ashton, Rosemary. *Versatile Victorian*. London: Bristol Classic, 1992.

Bate, Jonathan. *Shakespeare and the English Romantic Imagination*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1986.

Blythe, David-Everett. "More Shakespeare in Carlyle." *The Victorian Newsletter* 90 (1996): 36-38.

Carlyle, Thomas. *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle*. General Editor Charles Richard Sanders. 12 Vols. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1981.

_____. *New Letters of Thomas Carlyle*. 2 vols. 1904. Ed. Alexander Carlyle. Rpt. 1970. London & New York: John Lane, 1904.

_____. *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History*. 1841. Ed. Carl Niemeyer. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1966.

_____*Past and Present*. 1843. Ed. Richard Altick. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

_____*The Works of Thomas Carlyle*. Ed. H. D. Traill. New York: AMS Press, 1969.

Danson, Lawrence. "Gazing at Hamlet; or the Danish Cabaret." *Shakespeare Survey* 45 (1993): 37-51.

Dickens, Charles. *Collected Papers*. Dickens Nonesuch Edition vol. 1. London: 1937.

Dobson, Michael and Stanley Wells, eds. *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001.

Downer, Alan Seymour. *The Eminent Tragedian: William Charles Macready*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP. 1966.

Feuerbach, Ludwig. *The Essence of Christianity*. Trans. George Eliot. 1854. New York: Harper, 1957.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Wilhlem Meister's Apprenticeship and Travels*. Trans. Thomas Carlyle. New York: A. L. Burt, 1840.

Grady, Hugh. "Shakespeare Criticism, 1600-1900." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*. Ed. Margreta de Grazia and Stanley Wells. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2001.

Grebanier, Bernard. *Then Came Each Actor*. New York: David MacKay, 1975.

Haight, Gordon S. "The Carlyles and the Leweses." *Carlyle and His Contemporaries: Essays in Honor of Charles Richard Sanders*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1976: 181-204.

Harrawood, Michael. "Shakespeare in the Caribbean: The Morant Bay Massacre, Jamaica, 1865." *Modern Language Quarterly* 65.2 (2004): 269-292.

Harrold, Charles Frederick. *Carlyle and German Thought: 1819-1834*. London: Archon Books, 1963.

Hazlitt, William. *Characters of Shakespear's Plays*. 2d ed. London: Taylor and Hessey, 1818.

Hecimovich, Greg. "Rehearsing *Nicholas Nickleby*: Dickens, Macready, and the Pantomime of Life." *The Victorian Newsletter* 105 (Spring 2004): 16-24.

Kaplan, Fred. *Thomas Carlyle: A Biography*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1983.

Lewes, George Henry. "Shakespeare and His Editors." *Westminster Review* 55 (1845): 21-41.

_____. "Shakspeare's Critics: English and Foreign." *Edinburgh Review* 90 (1849): 39-77.

_____*On Actors and the Art of Acting*. New York: Henry Holt, 1878.

Macready, Charles. *The Diaries of William Charles Macready: 1833-1851*. 2 vols. Ed. William Toynbee. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.

Niemeyer, Carl, ed. *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1966.

Origo, Iris. *A Measure of Love*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1958.

Review of Macready's *King Lear*. *New Monthly Magazine* 41 (June 1834): 218-223.

_____. *The Athenaeum*. 31 May 1834: 419.

Roe, Frederick William. *Thomas Carlyle as a Critic of Literature*. New York: Columbia UP, 1910.

Rosenberg, Marvin. 1992. *The Masks of* **Hamlet**. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1992.

Sawyer, Robert. *Victorian Appropriations of Shakespeare: George Eliot, A. C. Swinburne, Robert Browning and Charles Dickens*. New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson P, 2003.

Schoch, Richard. "'We Do Nothing But Enact History': Thomas Carlyle Stages the Past." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 54.1 (June 1999): 27-52.

Schoenbaum, Samuel. *Shakespeare's Lives*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1970.

Scott, Clement. *Some Notable Hamlets of the Present Time*. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1874.

Stanton, Theodore. "Sara [sic] Bernhardt as Hamlet." *The Critic* (July 1899): 638-640.

Vining, Edward. *The Mystery of Hamlet: An Attempt to Solve an Old Problem*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1881.

Wofford, Susan, ed. *Hamlet: A Casebook in Contemporary Criticism*. New York and Boston: Bedford Books, 1994.

East Tennessee State University

Imagining *Ophelia* in Christina Rossetti's "Sleeping at Last"

Mary Faraci

Published posthumously and given the title, "Sleeping at Last," the verses were represented by William Rossetti as Christina Rossetti's final work. Diane D'Amico in "Christina Rossetti's Last Poem: 'Sleeping at Last' or 'Heaven Overarches'?" has raised questions about the date of composition. In the context of D'Amico's questions about William's notes, the poem returns to its character as untitled verses in Rossetti's handwriting. Rescuing the verses from being reduced to a statement from Rossetti, D'Amico answers her question about the last poem, "Sleeping at Last" or "Heaven Overarches," with respect for Rossetti's place in literary criticism: "In either case, the poem we select may function more as our last statement to Rossetti than her last statement to us"(15). In that spirit, we return to Virginia Woolf's statement to Rossetti, "Your eye, indeed, observed with a sensual pre-Raphaelite intensity that must have surprised Christina the Anglo-Catholic" (263). Reminded of the drama in Rossetti's works, we shall begin to restore to the poem its art as the recreation of the drama of desire for sleep "at last." An elegy in roundel form, the poem becomes the perfect place for "her."

D'Amico explains that having discovered the verses after Rossetti's death, William Rossetti writes, "'I regard these verses (the title again is mine) as being the very last that Christina ever wrote; probably late in 1893, or it may be early in 1894'" (10). D'Amico adds that "quite possibly William saw in the lines speaking of 'the struggle and the horror,' and 'shifting fear' something of the physical and mental suffering that his sister had endured during the long process of her dying" from breast cancer (11). She questions William's conclusions about the date of composition because Rossetti's penmanship deteriorated only at the end, so the "precise penmanship of the 'Sleeping at Last' manuscript places the composition of the poem at some point before the early autumn months of 1894" (10-11). D'Amico notes, furthermore, that "the speaker of 'Sleeping at Last' need not be seen to be writing about her own death." Calling attention to the heretofore unexplained words "out of sight of friend & lover," D'Amico suggests that "her" could refer to William's wife Lucy: "William's wife Lucy died in April of 1894 after a long period of illness. Perhaps Lucy was in Rossetti's thoughts as she composed this poem of the sleeper 'out of sight of friend & of lover'" (15).

As untitled verses, the poem remains open to new connections. The nonfinite clause "Sleeping at Last" is free to suggest any subject and any time or disguise its subject and its time.[1] One possible connection begins with a major event in Rossetti's time, the *Ophelia* painting (1851-52) by John Everett Millais.[2] Remembering Elizabeth Siddal as *Ophelia*, Rossetti honors the sister-in-law who served Millais's interpretation of Ophelia.[3] Elizabeth Siddal, nicknamed Lizzie, the famous model for Millais's *Ophelia*, continues to win praise:

> Ophelia drifts with palms upturned, just breaking the surface of the water, offering herself to death. The face is that of a very young and innocent woman, with delicate ivory-and-rose skin, blue eyes, and blonde brows and lashes. The image is one of utter passivity. One wonders whether Millais chose Lizzie for his model because he saw in her the capacity for such complete surrender.
>
> (Daly 41)

In 1851 Siddal had agreed to marry Rossetti's brother Dante Gabriel "although no formal announcement of an engagement was made" (Daly 40). Finally married in 1860 (Daly 80), Siddal died in February 1862, a probable suicide from an overdose of the opiate laudanum (Daly 89).

A roundel, the poem becomes a quiet and windless space for an elegy dedicated to "her":

> Sleeping at last, the troubles & tumult over,
> Sleeping at last, the struggle & horror past,
> Cold & white out of sight of friend & of lover
> Sleeping at last.
>
> No more a tired heart downcast or overcast,
> No more pangs that wring or shifting fears that
> hover,
> Sleeping at last in a dreamless sleep locked fast.
>
> Fast asleep. Singing birds in their leafy cover
> Cannot wake her, nor shake her the gusty blast.
> Under the purple thyme & the purple clover
> Sleeping at last.
>
> (Crump 3: 339-40)

The phrase, "at last," resonates as the voice of Siddal. Having seen Siddal's poems which her brother had sent her (Daly 426-27), Rossetti could be recalling Siddal's poem entitled, "At Last," the last stanza of which summarizes its theme,

> And mother dear, when the sun has set
> And the pale kirk grass waves,
> Then carry me through the dim twilight
> And hide me among the graves. (Siddal)

In another poem, "Early Death," Siddal repeats the phrase "at last": "And take me in at last" (1.4) and in the final line, "And know thee mine at last" (Lewis 1).

Rossetti could be remembering Siddal's sufferings and Ophelia's in the lines, "Cold and white out of sight of friend & of lover" and "No more a tired heart downcast or overcast." With a suggestive doubling of "her" in line 9,[4] Rossetti imagines Siddal as model for Millais's *Ophelia* in a quiet and windless place.[5]

Reading the verses in the context of Rossetti's poetry, D'Amico reminds us that the roundel form should be connected with Swinburne's production of roundels in his 1883 publication, dedicated to Rossetti (10).[6] The repetition of the words "Sleeping at last" moves "her" closer toward deeper and deeper sleep while letting go of sufferings, one by one, line by line;[7] furthermore, Rossetti creates a lulling effect in repetition and internal rhyme, a break away from Swinburne's pattern for the roundel (Swinburne 113-93): the repetition of "no more," of "-cast," and of "fast"; the internal rhyme of "last" with "past," "-cast," and "fast"; of "white" and "sight"; and of "wake her" and "shake her."

Recalling the image of Siddal's "complete surrender" in the *Ophelia* painting, Rossetti recreates her sister-in-law's final moments as the laudanum began to take effect. In Rossetti's hand, the roundel form becomes a performative act, a call to the god of sleep. The last stanza begins with the phrase, "Fast asleep," a sign that the roundel form has enclosed ("locked fast") "her" in sleep. In the roundel, Christina Rossetti reserves a quiet and windless place, an *elle*-gy, to serve the desire for "dreamless sleep."

Works Cited

Barthes, Roland. "To Write: Intransitive Verb?" *The Structuralist Controversy*. Ed. Richard Macksey and Eugenio Donato. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1972. 134-56.

Benveniste, Emile. *Problems in General Linguistics*. Trans. Mary Elizabeth Meek. Coral Gables: U of Miami P, 1971.

Crump, R. W., ed. *The Complete Poems of Christina Rossetti*. 3 vols. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1979-1990.

Daly, Gay. *Pre-Raphaelites in Love*. New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1989.

D'Amico, Diane. "Christina Rossetti's Last Poem: 'Sleeping at Last' or 'Heaven Overarches'?" *The Victorian Newsletter*. 103 (Spring 2003): 10-16.

Freeman, Lynda W. and G. Frank Lawlis. *Mosby's Complementary & Alternative Medicine: A Research-Based Approach*. St. Louis: Mosby, 2001.

Quirk, Randolph and Sidney Greenbaum. *A Concise Grammar of Contemporary English*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973.

Rhodes, Kimberly. "Degenerate Detail: John Everett Millais and Ophelia's 'Muddy Death.'" *John Everett Millais: Beyond the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood*. Ed. Debra N. Mancoff. New Haven: Yale UP, 2001. 43-68.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974. 1141-86.

Siddal Elizabeth. *Poems and Drawings of Elizabeth Siddal*. Ed. Roger C. Lewis and Mark Samuels Lasner. Wolfville, Nova Scotia: Wombat, 1978.

Sweet, Henry. *A New English Grammar: Logical and Historical*. Part 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891.

Swinburne, Algemon Charles. *The Poems of Algernon Charles Swinburne*. Vol. 5. London: Chatto & Windus, 1904.

Tate Online. "Ophelia's Travels." 26 May 2005 <http ://www.tate.org.uk/ ophelia/travels.htm>.

"Work in Focus: Millais's *Ophelia* 1851-52." 2 June 2005 <http://www .tate.org.uk/ophelia/>.

Woolf, Virginia. *The Second Common Reader*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, [c.1932].

Florida Atlantic University

[1]The nonfinite clause is the grammatical category known for its "structural deficiencies": "The absence of the finite verb from non-finite clauses means that they have no distinction of person, number, or modal auxiliary " (Quirk 311).

[2]The brilliance of the colors comes through on the site, Tate Online. "Work in Focus: Millais's *Ophelia* 1851-52." (2 June 2005 <http://www.tate.org.uk/ophelia.>

[3]The interpretation met with negative criticism from Victorians for "its lack of feeling" (Rhodes 52). The painting had been sold to at least five collectors since 1851. It appealed to Henry Tate, who would purchase it in 1892 and include in the Sir Henry Tate Gift in 1894 ("Ophelia's Travels." 26 May 2005 <http ://www.tate.org.uk/ophelia/travels.htm>).

[4]As early as 1891, Henry Sweet approached pronouns as "shifting mark-words": "They may be transferred from one noun to another. They are thus **shifting** or **moveable mark-words**" (72). About eighty years later, Roland Barthes would seize on the "shifter" as a "core of this linguistic pact which unites the writer and the other": "each moment of discourse is both absolutely new and absolutely understood" (144). Rossetti repeats "her" as a shifting mark-word offering freedom for a reader to see "in each moment" that *her* "may be transferred from one noun to another." Laying the foundation for theories of the Other, Emile Benveniste in *Problems in General Linguistics* draws attention to the third person as "the one who is absent" in grammars of Arabic languages (197-200). Previous readings have not seen "her" as a problem for their interpretations that the poem is about the poet. Once we see "her" in the light of the famous face of Millais's *Ophelia*, we restore to the poem a reading worthy of Rossetti's high place in English literary criticism.

[5]The poem recalls Shakespeare's Ophelia and Siddal as *Ophelia* throughout: There are echoes of themes from Hamlet's famous soliloquy in Rossetti's lines, "No more pangs that wring or shifting fears that hover/Sleeping at last in a dreamless sleep locked fast." Rossetti's faith in Lizzie's right to "dreamless sleep," even after suicide, recalls Laertes's speech on his sister Ophelia's right to escape natural effects of death: "Lay her i'th'earth / And from her fair and unpolluted flesh / May violets spring " (5.1.238-40). In Rossetti's closing images, "Under the purple thyme & the purple clover," the poem recalls the natural setting of Millais's painting influenced by Gertrude's report of Ophelia: "Therewith fantastic garlands did she make / Of crowflowers, nettles, daisies, and long purples" (168-69).

[6]Her brother died in 1882, so Rossetti might have felt free to write "Sleeping at Last" in 1883 or later. Another poem about Siddal also remained unpublished. Gay Daly reports,

> On Christmas Eve, [1856], Christina Rossetti wrote a sonnet she called "In an Artist's Studio," criticizing [Dante] Gabriel for his treatment of the "meek unconscious dove" he had been keeping in a gilded cage for some six years. Much as she loved her brother, she saw the pain his self-absorption had caused. [. . .] Christina may not have made friends with Lizzie, but she had comprehended Lizzie's sadness and also her brother's culpability. (70-71)

Composed in 1856, "In an Artist's Studio" lay unpublished until the posthumous collection in 1896, perhaps out of respect for her brother's feelings. Siddal might have served as an inspiration too for Rossetti's work "Goblin Market," composed in 1859, in which she praises the love between sisters named Laura and Lizzie.

[7]Repetition is recommended as a technique to induce relaxation and hypnosis in textbooks like *Mosby's Complementary & Alternative Medicine*. Freeman's (173, 253).

The Poison Within: Robert Browning's "The Laboratory"

David Sonstroem

Robert Browning's "The Laboratory: *Ancien Régime*" is remarkable if for nothing else than that it is a widely known poem about which almost nothing interpretive has been written.[1] Apparently "The Laboratory" yields its meaning without exegesis—the explicator's worst nightmare. Two writers, however, do recently offer brief interpretive commentary, which invites critical response. Stefan Hawlin sees the speaker of the poem as "a female poisoner striking a blow at the duplicitous civilities of the *ancien régime*" (78), and Sarah Wood claims that "the laboratory acts like a hidden pocket of inventive resistance" against the *Ancien Régime* in particular and "tradition in general" (74). Both remarks stem from a quasi-revolutionary critical vocabulary, in which terms such as *subversive* and *transgressive* invariably signal approval. The remarks imply that the speaker of "The Laboratory" is a pre-revolutionary sansculotte, poisoning members of the king's court in an attempt to overthrow it. I shall argue instead that, although the speaker does indeed subvert the *Ancien Régime*, she does so unwittingly, as a representative member of that régime. In a sense, this member of the king's court is poisoning herself, just as (Browning suggests) the régime is already destroying itself well before the uprising of 1889.

First, the speaker harbors no animosity toward the king or court. Far from opposing the milieu, she relishes her place in it. She tells the apothecary thrice that she is going to dance at the king's, the repetitious name dropping implying pride and pleasure.

Second, the speaker offers no political or social criticism. Her antagonism is wholly personal, directed at her sexual rivals, not at the milieu they all share.

And third, far from rebelling against her society, the speaker personifies it. In what follows I wish to show that the poem may be seen as consisting of three nested layers—the poison, the speaker, and the *Ancien Régime*—each layer mirroring the other two. From the smallest objects to the society as a whole, beauty and deadliness invariably go together. In conforming to this pattern, the speaker typifies the régime rather than defying it.

Up to a point Browning's speaker is richly realized. In the forty-eight lines of the poem she expresses patience ("I am not in haste!"[2]), impatience ("Quick—is it finished?"), anger, sexual jealousy, pride, curiosity, vengefulness, cruelty, incredulity, delight, aesthetic pleasure, rash boldness, officiousness, and wit. Notably missing from this list of traits is a broken heart. She remains, though, more representative than individualized. Nothing in the poem indicates that she is essentially different from her rival or from other members of the court. All are interchangeable components of the same society.

It is a society in which beauty is always linked with injury and, in the extreme, death. The association is obvious but worth developing nevertheless, to show its pervasiveness.

The king's social circle is replete with beautiful people and things. The speaker herself seems beautiful and beautifully dressed, although we might suppose from her former lover's jilting her that she is less enticing than his new paramour, contemptuously referred to throughout by pronoun rather than by name. The speaker also singles out Pauline and Elise ("with her head / And her breast and her arms and her hands"), two other court ladies, for their beauty. The speaker admires a golden gum in the chemist's laboratory as well as a "soft . . . exquisite blue" liquid in a phial. In her musings she imagines "an earring, a casket, / A signet, a fan-mount, a filigree basket" and shortly a "lozenge" and a "pastile." The poison that the chemist prepares for her is a "delicate droplet," in exchange for which she gives him "jewels" and "gold" and offers him her mouth to kiss. The speaker's world—the king's court—centers on sexually alluring women and the trappings of their sexual allure.

But each of these beautiful objects, including the women, is at least potentially harmful. The new mistress of the speaker's former lover makes the speaker miserable and apparently revels in the misery she causes. In the perhaps overheated mind of the speaker, the mistress and former lover heartlessly "laugh" at what they imagine are the speaker's tears. Although the speaker mentions no specific harm caused by Pauline and Elise, clearly their attractiveness threatens her. The speaker asks the chemist whether the golden gum and blue phial are poisonous—we assume they are—and delights in fancying that the aforesaid "earring," "casket," "signet," "fan-mount," and "filigree basket" harbor "pure death." She imagines killing Pauline with a "mere lozenge" and Elise with a "pastile." She rejects the chemist's first poisonous concoction as "too grim," insisting instead that the poison be "soft," "delicate," "enticing and dim." Beauty and injury go together.

The injurious power of beauty is implied in the speaker's description of her rival:

> She's not little, no minion like me!
> That's why she ensnared him: this never will free
> The soul from those masculine eyes,—say, "no!"
> To that pulse's magnificent come-and-go.

The description presents the rival as more overpowering than attractive. We may assume that she is more conventionally feminine and alluring than the description allows.[3] Nevertheless, there is truth in the speaker's description: from the speaker's perspective the rival is a hunter or warrior. The description, presenting the former lover as victim and the rival as conqueror, implies that beneath the feminine surface a very "masculine" war is being waged.

And the speaker is a formidable adversary. In her, too, beauty and destruction go together. She plans to dispatch her successful rival by means of a "delicate droplet," and, as we have seen, she imagines dispatching Pauline and Elise by means of a "lozenge" and a "pastile." The link between beauty and destruction is most telling, though, in her attempt to destroy her rival by casting an evil eye on her:

> . . . I brought
> My own eyes to bear on her so, that I thought
> Could I keep them one half minute fixed, she
> would fall
> Shrivelled. . . .

If looks could kill, her withering stare would destroy her rival. Although the glare fails to kill, it makes more obvious the link between beauty and deadliness: in this world, beauty radiates venom. Another, similar image makes the same point: in the laboratory noxious fumes surround the beautiful speaker, almost as if she herself were exuding them.

In the world of the court the connection between beauty and noxiousness is so pervasive that it has become unremarkable and only to be expected. One objection to the grimness of the chemist's first mixture is that an unappealing drink might be rejected by the intended victim. A broader objection is that such a drink simply has no place in a milieu steeped in aesthetic pleasures: "Let it brighten her drink, let her turn it and stir, / And try it and taste, ere she fix and prefer!" An unappealing drink is simply not part of this world. At the end of the poem the speaker orders the chemist to brush chemical powder off her clothes, "lest horror it brings / . . . —next moment I dance at the king's!" In the King's circle murder apparently causes little general distress. Only slovenliness or unattractiveness induces "horror."

In keeping with this system of values, the speaker wishes not just the death of her rival but her disfigurement:

> Let death be felt and the proof remain:
> Brand, burn up, bite into its grace—
> He is sure to remember her dying face!

In the mind of the speaker, inflicting loss of beauty is even more desirable than inflicting loss of life, because beauty is the source of the rival's allure, power, and perniciousness. A lovely face might be fondly remembered, but disfigurement, like dust, provokes "horror."

Browning often uses a subtitle to signal that a speaker represents the society mentioned in it.[4] Here, too, Browning implies through his subtitle, "*Ancien Régime*," that the *Ancien Régime*, like the speaker, is beautiful but destructive and self-destructive. At the heart of what has gone wrong is that aesthetics has supplanted ethics. The only value that matters is beauty. Consequently the society, infected by internecine warfare, is poisoned from within well before being overthrown from without. And this self-destructive aspect, too, of the *Ancien Régime* is reflected in the speaker. Toward the end of the poem, over the protests of the cautious chemist, the speaker tears off her protective mask, to get a closer look at the droplet. In doing so, she is in danger of poisoning herself with its fumes. She wittily and only half-seriously asserts, "If [the droplet] hurts her, beside, can it ever hurt me?" She implies that she is of an entirely different order of being from her rival. But she is not; they are sisters under the skin. The speaker, too, is in danger of being poisoned, not only by this drop but also by some later one, administered by a future rival. In any event, the speaker's character has already been poisoned by the sweet, deadly perfumes of the courtly milieu.

A "delicate droplet" holds "pure death"; a beautiful woman harbors deadly vengeance; an exquisite court poisons the characters and lives of its members. Over all waft fumes, fragrant and fatal. This triple, nested image unites the poem and directs its meaning.

Works Cited

Berdoe, Edward. *The Browning Cyclopaedia: A Guide to the Works of Robert Browning*. 2nd ed. London: Allen & Unwin, 1897.

Browning, Robert. *The Poetical Works of Robert Browning*. Ed. Ian Jack, Rowena Fowler, & Margaret Smith. Vol 4. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.

Burrows, Leonard. *Browning the Poet: An Introductory Study*. Nedlands: U of Western Australia P, 1969.

Hair, Donald S. *Browning's Experiments with Genre*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1972.

Hawlin, Stefan. *The Complete Critical Guide to Robert Browning*. London & New York: Routledge, 2002.

The Norton Anthology of English Literature. Ed. M. H. Abrams, et al. 7th ed. New York & London: Norton, 2000.

Treuherz, Julian, Elizabeth Prettejohn, and Edwin Becker, eds. *Dante Gabriel Rossetti*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2003.

Wood, Sarah. *Robert Browning: A Literary Life*. London: Palgrave, 2001.

University of Connecticut

[1]Most commentary consists simply of identifying the *Ancien Régime* and noting that under the reign of Louis XIV "an extraordinary number of women and men attached to the king's court had been disposing of rivals and enemies by poisonings" (*Norton* 2: 1354). As early as 1886 Arthur Symons likens the speaker to Marie-Marguerite de Brinvilliers, a notorious poisoner who was a member of the court of Louis XIV (*Works* 4: 84). Edward Berdoe establishes that the poison in the poem consists "principally of arsenic" (244). Several commentators note Elizabeth Barrett Browning's and Tennyson's dissatisfaction with the meter of the poem's original opening lines. Others remark on the poem's associating beauty with noxiousness: for instance, Leonard Burrows mentions "the horrible incongruity of lovely venom" (149), and Donald Hair calls the poem "essentially a picture of aesthetic deformity, of noxious beauty: a dancer bent on murder, a richly coloured liquid disguising a poison . . ." (93).

[2]All quotations from the poem are taken from *Poetical Works* 4: 84-88.

[3]As in almost all Browning's dramatic monologues, we take the speaker's observations with a grain of salt. One of the first to question the accuracy of this speaker's remarks is Dante Gabriel Rossetti, whose "The Laboratory" (1849) depicts the speaker as robust and powerful—no "minion," as she calls herself. Rossetti's watercolor is reproduced in color in Julian Treuherz et al, 162.

[4]See, e.g., "My Last Duchess: Ferrara," "The Bishop Orders His Tomb at Saint Praxed's Church: Rome, 15-," "Pictor Ignotus: Florence, 15-," and "A Grammarian's Funeral: Shortly after the Revival of Learning in Europe."

"Her life was in her books": Jean Ingelow in the Literary Marketplace

Maura Ives

> "There are two reasons why the life of Jean Ingelow should have been uneventful. She was a woman who never married and she was a writer. Her life was in her books, and while these were widely read on two continents, there was little behind them that the world has known or that it was natural the world should know."
>
> New York *Times* (July 21, 1897:5).

During her lifetime, Jean Ingelow enjoyed celebrity status in Britain and the United States. Her friends included John Ruskin (who sent a cross of roses to her funeral) and Christina Rossetti, and her knowledge of the literary market inspired young writers such as Edmund Gosse to seek her advice (Peters 86). Toward the end of her life, Ingelow's American supporters petitioned the Queen to name Ingelow to succeed Tennyson (himself an admirer of Ingelow's early verse) as Poet Laureate. But after her death in 1897, Ingelow's literary reputation diminished and her writings gradually sank into oblivion. Despite sporadic attempts to focus scholarly attention upon Ingelow's life and work, the late 20th-century revival of interest in Victorian women writers has largely bypassed Ingelow, for whom there is still no scholarly biography, nor an adequate listing of her prolific writings.

Biographical research on Ingelow has been hindered both by a lack of primary sources, and by a failure to investigate those sources that do remain. Approximately 200 of Ingelow's letters survive in British and American research libraries, most dating from the 1860s and later; unfortunately, these include very few family letters which could offer useful insight into Ingelow's relationships and personal concerns.[1] And although Ingelow's correspondence with Ruskin has attracted some attention, the bulk of Ingelow's correspondence remains unpublished and unexamined.[2] Another important primary source, Ingelow's publishing history, has received even less attention than her letters. There is no complete bibliography of Ingelow's published work, and studies of Ingelow's printing and publishing history are almost nonexistent.[3] The lack of scholarship on this important aspect of Ingelow's life obscures the scope and impact of Ingelow's literary career, and perpetuates an image of her authorship first formed by Victorian reviewers who viewed Ingelow and her work as an embodiment of the feminine ideal. Nineteenth-century accounts of Ingelow's authorship often represent her as a writer to whom success came early and easily, or as a wealthy woman who wrote at her leisure, eschewing the struggle for fame in favor of the domestic concerns that in their view characterized her poetry and fiction. In keeping with these notions, the few substantive references to Ingelow's publishing history to be found in contemporary and even in recent biographical accounts downplay Ingelow's ambition and agency by focusing attention upon the encouragement and intervention of friends and family at various points in her writing life.

The two biographies of Ingelow—one of which was published only a few years after her death—fail to challenge Victorian representations of Ingelow's life, and writings, as easy, placid and conventional. The first biography, *Recollections of Jean Ingelow and Her Early Friends* (1901) remains the most detailed and useful contemporary account of Ingelow's life. *Recollections of Jean Ingelow* has recently been attributed to Ingelow's sister Eliza Straffen, the wife of Robert Straffen, Vicar of Evesham.[4] As Jennifer Wagner notes, Straffen's biography displays "a clear agenda: to prove Ingelow a model of Victorian propriety and decorum, and thus to distinguish her vigorously from the 'modern woman' by whom [she] is so evidently troubled" (239). For Straffen, Ingelow's life was "singularly retired and uneventful" (118), and she "never put literature for a moment before her duty as a woman in her own home" (125). Maureen Peters's slim 1972 biography, *Jean Ingelow: Victorian Poetess*, provides additional detail about Ingelow's family but offers much the same view of Ingelow as Straffen. Peters says surprisingly little about Ingelow's literary career, and ultimately relegates Ingelow, and her work, to the scrap heap of outmoded Victorian values: Ingelow "lived too long, until her work was out of fashion and her simple moral standards were scorned" (105).

[1] *The Location Register of English Literary Manuscripts* and the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections* list approximately 52 letters in UK repositories. The bulk of Ingelow's correspondence, approximately 118 letters, is scattered among various libraries in the United States, including Princeton University, the University of Texas at Austin, the New York Public Library, and the Huntington Library. Most of Ingelow's correspondence is undated. The earliest dated letters are from 1857, when Ingelow was 38. While some of the undated letters may be earlier, the bulk of the dated letters are from the 1860s onward, which suggests that we may not be able to learn much about Ingelow's early life from her correspondence (with the exception of the letters quoted within this essay).

[2] A relatively large proportion of Ingelow's surviving correspondence consists of letters to and from Ruskin, but little notice has been taken of them, with the exception of Knoepflmacher and Mahl. Given Ingelow's fame, there are probably many more extant letters to Ruskin and others that have not yet found their way into libraries and archives. Of particular interest among unlocated materials is Ingelow's correspondence with Polly Mundella Roby, the mother of Lady Charnworth, who published a book on autograph collecting in which several Ingelow letters appear: Charnworth identifies Ingelow as a close friend of her mother, and indicated that the additional surviving correspondence of Ingelow and Roby was too intimate to publish. There is brief mention of the Mundellas and Roby in Straffen, but beyond that little is known about the relationship of Ingelow and Roby.

[3] The main source for Ingelow is Raymond Kilgour's history of Roberts Brothers, in which she is frequently mentioned. Her books sometimes attract brief mention in studies of the hitory of Victorian book bindings or illustration.

[4] See Ives and Porter. Robert Straffen graduated from St. Catharine's, Cambridge, in 1857 and was ordained shortly thereafter (Venn).

There are, however, glimpses within these same materials of a different life story. Straffen recounts the story of Ingelow's mother discovering that her daughter had written poetry on the window shutters of her room, recounting that "After this unlucky day Jean could no longer hide her poems, and wrote on foolscap instead" (15-16). Although Straffen's presentation of this anecdote emphasizes Ingelow's reluctance to share her verses with her family, it also testifies to the strength of her impulse to write. And while Straffen avoids mentioning the Ingelow family finances, Peters introduces the possibility that Ingelow's family circumstances may have pushed her to write not only for pleasure but for a hoped-for profit that would "ease the family's financial burden" (40). Specifically, the business difficulties of Ingelow's father—a bankruptcy when Ingelow was 6, and a similar catastrophe when she was 25 (Peters 38) could have been the impetus for Ingelow, the oldest of eight surviving children, to seek ways to help keep the family afloat, and to fear the prospect of losing whatever financial security she had, a lesson that was further reinforced in 1868 by the scandalous bankruptcy of Henry Pye, the father of Ingelow's friend Charlotte Barnard (Peters 76-77). And both Straffen and Peters reveal that success did not come immediately to Ingelow, who struggled for over a decade to find her niche among various genres. Ingelow's first attempts at publishing her work—a book of poetry and a religious novel issued in 1850 and 1851, respectively—fell flat, as did her first collection of stories, *Tales of Orris*, in 1860. Ingelow's first commercial success occurred in 1863, when her second volume of poems met with fulsome praise and strong sales. But from then on, Ingelow strove to remain productive and profitable in the face of a changing marketplace. As her knowledge and experience grew, she attempted not only to look after her own interests but to assist other aspiring women writers to do the same. Unfortunately, Ingelow's success in the literary marketplace—hard won as it was—contributed to a critical backlash that slowly undermined her sales along with her literary reputation.

Although this essay can only begin to suggest the different picture that might emerge if Ingelow's life were indeed to be imagined "in her books," it can offer some starting places for further investigation of the relationship between Ingelow's private concerns and public life as revealed through her struggle to master the literary marketplace. Specifically, I will examine three important periods in Ingelow's publishing history: her early career, as viewed through her contributions to and editorship of the *Youth's Magazine* in the 1850's; her attempts to capitalize upon the success of her 1863 *Poems* through her negotiations with American publishers and the republication of her magazine fiction; and Ingelow's revealing responses to the loss of income from American publications in the 1880s.

Jean Ingelow and the *Youth's Magazine*

The surviving accounts of Ingelow's early publishing history frequently emphasize the role played by Ingelow's family and friends in fostering her career. The Ingelow children printed a family newspaper, *St. Stephen's Herald*, of which no copies survive (Peters 22; Straffen 50), and there are no known publications of any of Ingelow's writing prior to the 1850 collection, *A Rhyming Chronicle of Incidents and Feelings*, published when Ingelow was 30 years old. Edited by Edward Harston, a clergyman and friend of the Ingelows, *A Rhyming Chronicle* was published by Longmans, the firm that would eventually issue Ingelow's *Poems* in 1863; it was followed in 1851 by Ingelow's first novel, *Allerton and Dreux*, published by a Wertheim and Macintosh, a London firm that specialized in religious tracts, many with a decidedly Evangelical bent.[5] Both books were noticed in the *Athenaeum*, but it does not seem that either book made much of an impact, critically or otherwise; second editions were not called for, and it is unlikely that Ingelow earned much, if anything, from either.

A more promising opportunity presented itself when Ingelow began to publish in the *Youth's Magazine* under the same pseudonym "Orris" that she had used when writing for the *St. Stephen's Herald*. Straffen recounts that the Ingelows were friendly with the family of Isaac Taylor (1787-1865), whose sons, Henry and Isaac, were playmates of the Ingelow children. In Straffen's account, the Taylors subscribed to and "may have mentioned" the *Youth's Magazine* to Ingelow, who, along with the younger Isaac Taylor and several of her siblings, all sent contributions to the magazine. The only contribution that was accepted was Ingelow's. "After this," writes Straffen, "'Orris' frequently sent contributions, and was paid a small sum for each" (65). In fact, Ingelow was a primary contributor to the *Youth Magazine* from 1851 through 1857.

Straffen's account of Ingelow's decision to submit her work to the *Youth's Magazine* reinforces her depiction of Ingelow as an amateur rather than a professional author by presenting Ingelow's submission as a "sudden" whim undertaken by an indulgent older sister seeking to humor her young siblings and their friends (64), a view that Peters reinforces by referring to the incident as "a family practical joke" (49). Considering that the group included, as Straffen indicates, Isaac Tayor and an unidentified "Cambridge undergraduate, a friend of the Ingelows" (64) the scenario might be read quite differently as a friendly but serious competition, especially since Taylor had already secured publication in the *Magazine* (64). But however it came about, the *Youth's Magazine*, one of the first and most successful Evangelical periodicals for children, was an ideal outlet for Ingelow's work, and seems to be the main (if not the only) periodical to which she contributed at this time.[6] Although

[5] Other titles published in 1851 by the same firm include poetry, fiction, sermons, tracts and polemical pamphlets; anti-Tractarian or anti-Catholic themes are frequent (for example, *The Trial of Tractarianism and Tractarians by the Divine Rule; Blots on the Escutcheon of Rome: a brief historv of the chief Papal Persecutions. by six Protestant ladies)*.

[6] There were, of course, any number of other periodicals to which Ingelow may have contributed in the years before and after her ill-fated books were published, especially if she was hoping to earn money. As of yet no other periodical publications prior to the late 1850s and 1860s have been discovered, but it must be remembered that many early nineteenth-century periodicals, especially the religious and children's periodicals that might have been attractive to Ingelow are, like the *Youth's Magazine*, scarce and poorly (if at all) indexed.

Ingelow's books had not provided the critical or commercial success that she might have hoped for, they were valuable credentials for an author hoping to publish with the *Youth's Magazine*: *A Rhyming Chronicle*, vetted by a clergyman, included poems with religious themes, and the plot of *Allerton and Dreux* concerns the "war of opinions" between High and Low church clergy. The author of such works would be an ideal and undoubtedly a welcome contributor to the *Magazine*, and despite her pseudonym Ingelow probably revealed her authorship, since several of her early contributions are republications of poems attributed to the author of *A Rhyming Chronicle*.

Ingelow may only have earned "a small sum" for her *Youth's Magazine* contributions, but a steady income and the opportunity to see her work in print seem to have provided a strong motivation for Ingelow to continue writing. From 1851 through 1858, Ingelow published no fewer than fifty items, mostly fiction, in the *Youth's Magazine*. Since many of the stories were published serially, almost every monthly issue of the *Magazine* featured something by "Orris." In an 1866 letter to Dora Greenwell, Ingelow comments that it was "an amusement" to write the *Youth's Magazine* stories: "writing for children is so completely its own reward; it obliges one to be simple and straightforward, and clears away some of the mystical fancies in which one is apt to indulge."[7]

In 1857, Ingelow agreed to take on the additional work of serving as the *Magazine*'s editor, beginning her work in January of that year. The constant flow of contributions to the magazine also meant that Ingelow needed (and had an excuse) to establish a place and a time for uninterrupted work:

> For some two or three years she rented a flat in an opposite house . . . to which she used to retire after breakfast, and remain often till one o'clock, to avoid the stream of visitors, the morning being her time for writing. The furnished flat contained three rooms—a good sitting-room, with three windows, a bedroom, and behind the bedroom a dressing-room. Sometimes she would sleep there. (Straffen 78)

Peters mentions Ingelow's rental of the flat as an "unusual step" (54), and indeed, for Ingelow to have set up not only the proverbial "room of one's own" but an apartment of her own is a clear indication that she was now fully engaged in her literary work and aware of herself as a professional writer and editor.

Ingelow served as editor of the *Magazine* for only one year: at the end of 1857, she resigned; the reason for Ingelow's withdrawal, as editor and as contributor, are not satisfactorily explained by Ingelow's biographers. Straffen says only that Ingelow resigned "on account of the difficulty of supplying a sufficient number of articles to fill it" (65), and Peters, noting that Ingelow had to "accept worthless material or else pad it out as best she could," agrees that Ingleow abandoned what had become a "thankless task" (54). She may well have been exhausted: later on, in a letter to Sarah Hale (editor of *Godey's Lady's Book*), Ingelow tellingly comments that "I do not know any thing more tiring than the reading of masses of M. S."[8] It may not only have been overwork that discouraged Ingelow. In 1862, responding to a query from Isabella Mayo, with whom she had corresponded while serving as editor of *Youth's Magazine*, Ingelow informed Mayo that, "not approving altogether of the way in which the publisher managed it," she had "declined to continue my work" and had "not seen or written for this magazine" since (Mayo 135).

While we do not know what aspect of the *Magazine*'s management met with Ingelow's disapproval, it is possible that, after nearly a decade of constant writing for the periodical, she realized that she had accumulated enough material, and established herself well enough as a writer of children's fiction, to again attempt to publish her work in books. Ingelow's first effort to bring out a collection of her stories resulted in the publication of *The Tales of Orris*. Although the book's title was intended to make the most of Ingelow's *Youth's Magazine* connection by featuring her pseudonym, *Tales of Orris* was the first of Ingelow's books to feature her own name ("Miss Ingelow") on the title page. The book was privately published in Bath by Binns and Goodwin in 1860. A publisher's advertisement printed in the back of *Tales of Orris* offers to print books at "moderate prices" with the further promise that they will "be happy to give to works confided to them for printing the advantages and facilities they possess for obtaining an extensive sale, provided the principles of such books are unobjectionable." Although it is commonly assumed that Ingelow published *Tales of Orris* at her own expense, other arrangements were possible: the Binns and Goodwin advertisement mentions that the firm would "in some instances . . . share the expense, and divide the profits of works with Authors"; there was also a "Mutual or Half Profit System" in which the author agreed to buy 250 copies of the work, and share 10% of the profit of sales from the whole edition. Unfortunately, an "extensive sale" seems not to have taken place, for the slim volume, composed entirely of stories published in the *Youth's Magazine*, attracted even less attention than Ingelow's previous works, which had at least merited a mention in the *Athenaeum*. But Ingelow's fortunes would soon change, thanks at least in part to the professional experience and increasing self-confidence that she gained from her apprenticeship at the *Youth's Magazine*.

The Impact of the 1863 Poems

Unquestionably the publication of Ingelow's *Poems* by Longman's in 1863 marked a turning point in Ingelow's career. Edward FitzGerald, recalling Ingelow's 1850 volume, was puzzled by the shift in critical response: "The Reviewer talks of a 'new Poet,' etc., quite unaware that some dozen years ago the 'new Poet' published a Volume (as you may remember) with as distinct indications of sweet, fresh, and original Genius as anything he adduces from this second Volume" (qtd. in Peters 61). But this time, the *Athenaeum* reviewer was Gerald Massey, whose hyperbolic praise for Ingelow's book also extolled the feminine purity and modest domesticity of its author (to whom, according to Mayo, Massey may have proposed in later years).[9] In his July 25 review, Massey found in Ingelow's poems "the presence of Genius," which he defined in vaguely moral and intensely sentimental terms as the "power to fill common earthly facts with heavenly fire; a power to gladden wisely and to sadden nobly; to share the heart, and bring that mist of tears into the eye" (106). Ingelow's genius, however, was not unseemly or excessive: "We see no hectic flush nor strain and collapse of spasm. All is healthy, sound and sweet" (106). And although Massey finds within Ingelow's poetry a breadth of vision that crosses gender lines ("the strength of man's heart, the sweetness of woman's mouth"), Ingelow's capacity for realistic detail is noted in terms of mundane and unequivocally female domesticity: "She is not afraid of the churn, the wash-tub and ironing-board" (107). Ingelow's fulfillment of the feminine poetic ideal is also implied in Massey's assessment of the poems' moral influence: Ingelow's poetry "does not leave us smitten breathless with surprise, but satisfied, and breathing a clearer, ampler ether" (107), and the author "has an earnestness of purpose and attention to business which are not to be turned aside for the usual lures of youthful fancy" (108).

Massey's review is generally acknowledged not only to have launched Ingelow's career in England, but also to have drawn the attention of Thomas Niles, an editor for Roberts Brothers in Boston, Massachusetts. Since Ingelow's *Poems* were to become the "first great success" for Roberts Brothers, the story of Niles's acquisition of the book was often repeated in historical accounts of the firm, including Kilgour's standard history of the firm, *Messrs. Roberts Brothers Publishers*. Kilgour recounts that upon reading the *Athenaeum* review, Niles ordered the book immediately, securing it for Roberts Brothers by announcing it to be in press even before his copy arrived from London (Kilgour 17). However, given the "phenomenal success" (21) that the firm would have with Ingelow's *Poems*, Niles had good reason to circulate a version of events which highlighted the role played by his own sound literary judgment and shrewd business sense.

Ingelow's correspondence indicates that these events may have played out quite differently: she herself had offered her book to at least one American finn, Ticknor and Fields, referring to Massey's review and explaining that she was seeking to avoid having her work "pirated" by making arrangements with a "reputable publisher who if he has the author's sanction for reprinting it will not altogether forget her interests" (63). Peters includes Ingelow's letter in her biography, recognizing the boldness of Ingelow's actions yet downplaying them by implying that they are out of character: such a letter "is rather startling to those readers who cannot imagine poets ever having any business sense, for in it the emerging poetess is completely hidden by the mercenary Scott [sic]" (63). Peters also misreads Ingelow's handwriting: in the manuscript of Ingelow's letter, Ingelow writes that she was "informed by some that this volume is sure to be pirated in America"; Peters quotes this as "informed by him"—an error that deemphasizes Ingelow's agency by drawing attention to Massey's role in advising Ingelow to write.[10]

In fact, Massey did write to Ingelow after finishing his review; his letter to Ingelow, dated July 20, survives among the Roberts Brothers collection at Trinity College.[11] Assuring Ingelow that he had "written such a Notice as will be sure to call attention" to the "extraordinary merit" of her poems, he instructs "the writer of the *Poems*" to "be good enough to post a Copy in Sheets or a book with lids torn off to Messrs Ticknor and Fields . . . for the purpose of reprinting—with Mr. Massey's regards." While Massey's letter urges Ingelow to contact Ticknor and Fields at once, "to prevent Piracy which the Athenaeum Notice will probably lead to," it is worth noting that Ingelow's letter does not specify Massey as the source of what would prove to be valuable advice. Instead, Ingelow presents herself as a successful author who knows how to look after her interests. Acting quickly and strategically, Ingelow contacted Ticknor and Fields in the same week in which Massey's review appeared, sending them her book "by this post" (Peters 63). While Ingelow may not have had certain knowledge of Massey's connection to the firm—Ticknor and Fields had been Massey's American publishers since 1857—she may easily have guessed as much from his letter, which concludes with an assurance that Ticknor and Fields were "amongst the most honble. of Yankee Publishers."

In any event, Ingelow's and Massey's letters, along with other evidence, calls into question the idea that Niles acted alone in pursuing publication of Ingelow's book. At the very least, his pursuit of Ingelow's book was simultaneous with Ingelow's own efforts to find a publisher. Kilgour's claim that "because of his [Niles's] promptness there was probably no other copy of the book in America, at least not in the hands of a publisher," simply isn't true, since Ticknor and Fields must have received their copy at the same time, if not before, Niles's arrived (17). The question to be resolved is whether, and at what point, Ingelow approached Niles. While Peters claims that Ingelow's letter to "Tichson

[7]ALS to Dora Greenwell, February 9 [1866] , Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin. The year of the letter is apparent from Ingelow's reference to the the upcoming publication of Christina Rossetti's poems by Roberts Brothers.

[8]ALS from Ingelow to Sarah Hale, [1868?]. Huntington Library, HM 7133. Ingelow's letter is undated but refers to the receipt of Hale's 'book of Manners,' possibly a reference to Hale's 1868 book *Manners; or, Happy Homes and Good Society All the Year Round.*

[9]Mayo reports that Massey, "who had felt as much admiration for the poet as for her poems, had offered her his hand" (198); when Ingelow rejected him, Massey surmised that Ingelow was involved with someone else, most likely Robert Browning. Peters dates Ingelow's acquaintance with Browning from 1867 (84). Browning denied rumors of a romantic involvement with Ingelow, but Peters speculates that the "persistence of the rumors does suggest that a closer friendship existed between the two than he was willing to admit" (85).

[10]ALS from Ingelow to Ticknor and Fields, [July 1863], bMS Am 2016 (46), Houghton Library, Harvard University .

[11]The memorandum is in the Roberts Brothers collection at Trinity College in Hartford, CT . Unfortunately most of the Roberts Brothers records have been lost or destroyed.

and Fields [sic] met with a favorable response," that cannot be the case, since Ticknor did not publish Ingelow's book. But Ticknor and Fields may perhaps have recommended that Ingelow contact Niles, who had worked at Ticknor and Fields in the 1850s. Since Massey's letter to Ingelow somehow found its way into the Roberts Brothers files,[12] someone—Ingelow, Massey, or Ticknor and Fields—must have been in contact with Niles fairly soon after the *Athenaeum* review was published.

Ingelow's attempts to capitalize upon the strong sales of her *Poems* soon extended to her prose works. Undeterred by the fate of *Tales of Orris*, Ingelow soon found a receptive commercial publisher for her short fiction in Alexander Strahan, and again with Roberts Brothers in the United States. But contemporary accounts of Ingelow's publishing arrangements with Strahan again represent Ingelow as the beneficiary of helpful friends. Mayo, recalling the advice and concern that Ingelow had shown to her when Mayo submitted her work to the *Youth's Magazine*, claims that she sought to repay Ingelow's kindness by alerting Strahan to the existence of Ingelow's short fiction, "which he at once desired to reprint" (146); further, since Ingelow "had kept no copies, either in print or in manuscript" of her stories, Mayo had to "persuade" her mother to loan "seven of her treasured volumes of the *Youth's Magazine*" (146) to Strahan. Mayo claims to have sacrificed her volumes of the magazine to serve as the printer's copy for Strahan's collections of Ingelow's work: *Studies for Stories* (1864) and *Stories Told to a Child* (1865). However, another contemporary source credits Strahan with a Niles-like entrepreneurial spirit: according to Helen Black, the success of Ingelow's 1863 *Poems* prompted Strahan to make "an immediate application for any other work by the same pen" (303). The two accounts may not be irreconcilable: Mayo may well have recommended Ingelow's work to Strahan, and Strahan probably was eager to reprint them. But neither Mayo nor Black allow for the possibility that Ingelow, who had been publishing in the Strahan magazine *Good Words* since at least 1863, and who began publishing in the *Sunday Magazine* shortly thereafter, could well have approached Strahan herself about the possibility of reprinting her stories.

If Mayo did initiate the series of events leading to Strahan's publication of Ingelow's fiction, she may not have done Ingelow as great a favor as she thought. At this time, Strahan was deeply in debt; in 1863, he had offered the copyright of *Good Words* as collateral for a loan, "the first of several such agreements leading eventually to financial disaster" (Srebrnik 63). Five years later, the Strahan company records reveal Strahan sold the copyrights of both *Studies for Stories* (1864) and *Stories Told to a Child* (1865) to Routledge. One assumes that the copyright must have had some value—that is, Ingelow's stories must have sold fairly well—but whether Ingelow made much, if any, profit after the sale of the copyright is unclear, and the books seem not to have fared well after Strahan relinquished them to Routledge. The Routledge records do not mention any payment to Ingelow, and few copies seem to have been published by them.[13] Fortunately for Ingelow, any lost income from Strahan and Routledge was offset by profits from Roberts Brothers, which published *Studies for Stories* simultaneously with Strahan in 1865. *Stories told to a Child* was published in 1866 from sheets of the British edition, which "sold out so rapidly" that the firm soon typeset its own edition (Kilgour 31).

While Roberts Brothers were not legally obligated to pay British authors for the republication of their works, they did so anyway, and strong sales of Ingelow's work guaranteed a steady income for publisher and author alike, as the firm would continue to publish Ingelow's poems and stories after the turn of the century. Ingelow responded to her long-awaited success by sharing it, not only through the charitable activities that were frequently mentioned in press accounts of Ingelow's celebrity, but also by offering advice to other writers. Mayo writes appreciatively of Ingelow's responses to her work, submitted to the *Youth's Magazine* while Ingelow was editor. Ingelow took the responsibility of supporting young writers seriously, going so far as to compose a series for them, "Hints on Composition," which ran for several months during her editorship of the *Youth's Magazine*. After the success of *Poems*, however, Ingelow's sphere of influence broadened as she made acquaintance with other poets such as Dora Greenwell and Christina Rossetti. Ingelow introduced Rossetti to Roberts Brothers in 1866 and she urged Greenwell to contact them as well:

> Is the prose volume nearly ready? who is to publish it? I ask this because you should take an early opportunity of sending it over to America. I know they like your prose. Why not send it to the people who published my poems? [. . .] When you send let me know & I will write. They are going to publish Miss Rossetti's poems.[14]

Meanwhile, the surviving correspondence between Ingelow and her publishers in the 1860s and 1870s shows that she became increasingly involved in the production and marketing of her work: asking Strahan to pass on information about reviews of *Studies for Stories*,[15] stiffly declining a belated offer from Ticknor and Fields to publish poems in a "forthcoming serial"[16]; reminding Strahan that he had neglected to respond to a manuscript she had sent[17] and anxiously requesting in 1875 that Niles not publish Pinwell's

[12]The memorandum is in the Roberts Brothers collection at Trinity College in Hartford, CT.

[13]Routledge seems only to have published *Stories Told To A Child*, of which only one copy, dated 1867, is extant (the book is held in the Department of Special Collections at the University of Florida's George A. Smathers Libraries).

[14]ALS to Greenwell, February 9 [1866], Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.

[15]ALS to Strahan, January 14 [1865], Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.

[16]ALS to Ticknor and Fields. [1864]. bMS Am 2016 (46), Houghton Library, Harvard University. The date is taken from the accompanying envelope. It stands to reason that this letter, written in the third person, followed upon the firm's refusal to publish Ingelow's *Poems*.

[17]ALS to Alexander Strahan. 27 May 1871. MsL I46s. Special Collections Department, University of Iowa Libraries.

illustrations to her novel *Fated to be Free* because "they are such trash."[18]

At the Mercy of the Market: Critical and Commercial Backlash

Recent scholarship on Ingelow has begun to take note of instances in which Ingelow's reviewers have attempted "to put Ingelow 'in her place' as a female poet" (Wagner, 227).[19] What has not been recognized is the early onset of reviews and commentary, some of it vicious, that was not solely aimed at containing Ingelow within the realm of the "poetess" by emphasizing, as Massey does, the feminine characteristics and domestic focus of her work. Massey's extravagant praise for the 1863 *Poems*, and the seemingly instant fame that followed upon it, was almost immediately followed by parody, satire, and at times scathing critique motivated as much by jealousy of Ingelow's success in the literary marketplace as by distaste for the "feminine" content and readership of her poetry. Peters acknowledges one particularly venomous attack in H. Buxton Forman's *Our Living Poets* (1871), regarding it as an exception not to be taken seriously (102), but there was nothing unique about Forman's fixation upon Ingelow's "mercantile success" (Forman 89).

By 1866, Ingelow's fame was well established enough for her to be the only female poet mentioned in Robert Buchanan's satirical "The Session of the Poets," in which she clearly represents the feminine ideals of sweetness ("Among misses, who sweeter than Miss Ingelow?"), propriety, and delicate fragility ("Miss Ingelow fainted in Tennyson's arms"). It is of course no accident that Tennyson catches the fainting Ingelow, both because Tennyson admired her work and because the two poets were often compared, but the implication is also that Ingelow's poetry was derivative, too dependent upon the Tennysonian mode to stand on its own. Two years later, Ingelow was treated more harshly in another satirical poem, Richard Crawley's *Horse & Foot: Or, Pilgrims to Parnassus*. Crawley's book-length poem groups Ingelow, along with Patmore and Buchanan, with the "Pedestrians" (58) whose work pandered to parochial, conservative Britons who preferred to read "Something [. . .]/ Safe, fine; and neither Poetry nor Prose" (61). Crawley differs from Buchanan in condemning Ingelow's commercial success. In Crawley's view, "Great Longman hails the woman of the time" (61) not because of her talent, but because of her appeal to an insatiable and undiscerning female readership: "Editions to editions still succeed, / The men they buy them, and the women read" (62). Unlike Massey and other reviewers who praised Ingelow's emphasis on domestic scenes, Crawley takes special delight in representing Ingelow's subject matter as narrowly focused upon domestic concerns that appeal to the "British matron," especially her treatment of marriage:

> She sang of married and of marrying men,
> And still she pleased, and still she sang again;
> Of sermons, rectors, curates, and their wives
> And all the miseries of single lives
> And still on marriage lavished all her art,
> She sang—and reached the British matron's heart.
> (62-63)

Crawley's attack manages both to disparage Ingelow's conventionality, and to condemn her efforts to move beyond conventional themes in "A Story of Doom," Ingelow's retelling of the Biblical story of the flood. Traditional prohibitions against women commenting upon or interpreting the Bible clearly underscore Crawley's representation of Ingelow's attempt at "mend[ing] Scripture" as intellectually and morally inappropriate, "surpassing all apocrypha" (65), and he concludes with a bit of nasty commercial gossip: "My printer tells me, this is not succeeding" (66).

Ingelow was targeted by Crawley not only because she was a "Pedestrian," but also, and especially, because she sold so many books, a theme that was taken up even more vigorously by Forman, who frames his 1871 attack on Ingelow in terms of the inexplicability of "literary popularity as gauged by mercantile success" (89). For both Crawley and Forman, Ingelow's success is seen as an economic force that works against the interest of male writers and readers. In Crawley's view, writers like Ingelow are subsidized by male bookbuyers who are forced to purchase Ingelow's work for their wives, with the implication that the demands of the female reading public were diverting male buyers from purchasing books according to their own preferences. Forman focuses not on readers but on male writers who cannot compete with the likes of Ingelow. Comparing Ingelow to the "equally worthless" Lord Houghton, Forman is at a loss to explain why only Ingelow's poems "went through fourteen editions in five years" (90), but the clear implication of Forman's comparison is that even a "worthless" female writer could command "a good deal of that very substantial attention paid in purchasing one's books" (91), a feat that male writers could not accomplish.

By the time of Ingelow's death, it was widely believed that she had lived comfortably on the large income from her published work, and references to the number of books sold and the money earned from them are surprisingly common whenever Ingelow's life or works are discussed in print. The *London Times* speculated that the "enormous numbers" of Ingelow books sold in the USA and England "must have brought in down to a fairly recent date a large income for books of verse" (21 July 1897: 8). Ingelow's wealth also continued to be treated negatively by writers such as Sarah Budd, who wrote in *Belgravia* that "Jean Ingelow had ease, leisure, and throughout the whole of her long life, had never once known the want of money." Ironically, Budd's article does not take issue with Ingelow's success per se, but with

[18]ALS to Thomas Niles. April 28 [1875]. *AC85.St317.875vm (II, p. 444). Houghton Library, Harvard University. The year is evident from Ingelow's reference to her book, published the same year.

[19]See also Heidi Johnson's discussion of Ingelow's critical reception in "'Matters that a Woman Rules': Marginalized Maternity in Jean Ingelow's *A Story of Doom*."

the fact that as a single, childless woman, Ingelow must have "delivered her message . . . at her ease" unlike women writers such as Mrs. Trollope or Mrs. Linnaeus Banks, both of whom wrote to provide for their children (221-222). While Budd's obituary might seem to have little in common with critical attacks such as those of Crawley and Forman, Ingelow's success in the marketplace remains the central issue because of her gender. Unaware of Ingelow's history of offering advice and assistance to other female authors, Budd views Ingelow as a fortunate exception whose easy success contrasts with the emotional and financial hardships faced by other women. There is no reason to doubt that Ingelow earned a significant amount from her poetry; as Lee Erickson notes, Ingelow's collected poems earned "over £1.300 between 1863 and 1875, which was a remarkable sum" for poetry (350). Even Straffen, who is usually reticent on the topic of finances, admits that "Jean received for many years large sums for her writings" (80). But the focus upon her later earnings caused her contemporaries to assume, as Budd did, that Ingelow had always been well off. Ingelow's early family circumstances hardly seem as "easy" as Budd and other writers had assumed; as discussed earlier, Ingelow's early attempts to publish books, as well as her extended work for the *Youth's Magazine*, may have been prompted by her father's bankruptcy and eventual unemployment. Ingelow's critics may not have known this, but Ingelow herself seems not to have forgotten it. In addition, Straffen reports that Ingelow spent much of what she earned in charitable activities, claiming that for Ingelow "the pleasure of giving away much of what she earned by her pen, was even greater than the pleasure of composition" (80).

If Ingelow enjoyed giving money away, it was probably because her primary financial support in later years was provided not by her literary earnings but by her brother William Frederick, as indicated within unpublished correspondence between Ingelow and Archbishop Frederick Ferrar. Ingelow seems to have depended upon William's financial support to insulate her from the fluctuations of the marketplace; when he died suddenly in 1886, Ingelow, acting upon the advice of her old friend (now Canon) Isaac Taylor, contacted Ferrar for help in securing a civil list pension. As she explained,

> For a good many years I had abundance both for myself & for bestowal upon others because in addition to a certain success here I had I believe [. . .] about one hundred & fifty pound a year from my American publishers [. . . .] But about four years ago four or five other American publishers one directly after the other brought out the whole of my verse so that in order to undersell them my publishers sold it at almost cost price, & therefore that source of income cannot be counted on, & is very small. This did not matter so long as our deeply-loved brother lived but now I should be very glad of an addition to my income.[20]

It would seem from this that Ingelow's American sales were the source of her former "abundance." But in the early 1880s, other American publishers, especially (but not exclusively) John Lovell, began to offer reprints of Ingelow's work, for which Ingelow received nothing. As Kilgour reports, Roberts Brothers "first reaction was to reduce the prices of all their editions of Ingelow's poetry" (168), and the firm also printed advertisements castigating the dishonorable practice of reprinting Ingelow's work without paying the author. In an 1880 *Publisher's Weekly* advertisement, the firm announced that it had paid Ingelow a semi-annual "copyright" that totaled eighteen thousand dollars (169); the next year, another advertisement in the same periodical quoted Ingelow's belief in "the right of authors, both to power over and to property in their works." Kilgour writes that despite the reprints, Roberts Brothers editions "still sold handsomely (169); Ingelow's letter argues otherwise.

As her American sales weakened, Ingelow began to worry that her financial security was at stake. Ingelow's anxiety and embarrassment about her situation comes across clearly in her letter—"It had seemed impossible to come forward myself but to speak to one's friends is another matter"—and in suggesting the names of those who might write letters of support, she suggests Tennyson and Ruskin yet asks "I hope you will not ask any other poet to sign, ***specially anyone of mark***" [emphasis in original]. At Farrar's suggestion, Ingelow wrote to the First Lord of the Treasury in 1887,[21] but there is no record of her having secured a pension. As it turned out, William Ingelow's financial arrangements, once discovered, allayed Jean Ingelow's initial fears: by January 1887, she reported to Farrar that her younger brother Ben, who had been ill since William's death, had begun to recover, and "now that he has been able to take everything in hand we find all in perfect order. . . . In his life & in the arrangements that were to follow his death he was everything that was loving & considerate it was the suddenness of that great blow which caused such a helpless feeling at first."[22] Even so, Ingelow did not withdraw the pension request.

Conclusion

Viewing Ingelow's life in terms of the literary marketplace suggests that Ingelow was a victim of her own popularity in more ways than one, as both critical and economic tides turned against her. Ingelow represented a real threat in a literary marketplace where male poetic talent seemed to be imperiled by the commercial success of women poets, and in which many other women writers barely earned enough to survive. Ironically, her long-awaited success in England and in the United States eventually prompted a host of American publishers to reprint her books; unlike Roberts Brothers, these publishers did not pay Ingelow, and the damage they did to Roberts Brothers' sales also damaged Ingelow's profits. Commercial success did not necessarily guarantee an author a high and steady income, especially in the days before international copyright. But the assumption that Ingelow had earned a fortune from her publications was enough to paint her, in the eyes of contemporary critics, as overpaid, undertalented, and out of step with the norms not only of professional authorship but of feminine propriety. The "emerging poetess" was indeed eclipsed by the "mercenary Scott": the public image of Ingelow as a wealthy poetess persisted, as did the critical backlash that this image provoked.

In retrospect, Buchanan and Crawley were the bellwethers of a turn in the critical response from which Ingelow has never recovered. In the *Second Common Reader*, Virginia Woolf consigns Ingelow to the "servants' quarters" in the "mansion of literature," a fate she shares with Eliza Cook and Felicia Hemans, two other popular women poets whose fame was fading (203), while a recent entry in an encyclopedia concludes, like Peters, that Ingelow's "verse is artfully composed, pleasantly musical, conventionally moral, and ultimately second-rate" (Susina). To this day, Victorian-inspired representations of Ingelow as the sweet, fainting damsel, the respectable chronicler of propriety and domestic monotony, and the second-rate literary servant remain commonplace, while the life of Ingelow the professional author has yet to be written.

Works Cited

Advertisement for Jean Ingelow's Poems. *Publishers Weekly* 449 (August 21, 1880): 216.

Advertisement for Roberts Brothers New Books. *Publishers Weekly* 504-505 (September 17, 1881): 362.

Budd, Sarah Catherine. "Jean Ingelow." *Belgravia* 95 (1898): 220-224.

[Buchanan, Robert.] "The Session of the Poets." *The Spectator* 39 (15 September 1866): 1028.

Charnwood, Lady [Dorothea Roby Benson]. *An Autograph Collection And The Making of It*. New York: Henry Holt, [1930].

Crawley, Richard. *Horse & Foot; Or, Pilgrims To Parnassus*. London: John Camden Hotten, 1868.

Erickson, Lee. "The Market." *A Companion to Victorian Poetry*. Ed. Richard Cronin, Antony Harrison and Alison Chapman. Aldershot: Blackwell, 2002.

Forman, H. Buxton (Harry Buxton). *Our Living Poets*. 1871. New York: Garland, 1986.

Ives, Maura. "Further Evidence for Eliza Straffen's Authorship of *Some Recollections of Jean Ingelow and Her Early Friends*. 52 (March 2005): 79-80.

Ingelow, Jean. Letter to Archdeacon [Frederick William] Farrar. December 21, 1886. Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.

_____. Letter to Archdeacon [Frederick William] Farrar. February 23 [1886]. Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.

_____. Letter to Sarah Hale. [1868?]. HM 7133. Huntington Library.

_____. Letter to Dora Greenwell, February 9 [1866]. Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.

_____. Letter to Alexander Strahan. 27 May 1871. MsL 146s. Special Collections Department, University of Iowa Libraries.

_____. Letter to Mr. [Alexander] Strahan. January 14 [1865]. Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.

_____. Letter to Thomas Niles. April 28. [1875]. *AC85.St317.875vm (II, p. 444). Houghton Library, Harvard University.

_____. Letter to Ticknor and Fields. [July 1863]. bMS Am 2016 (46), Houghton Library, Harvard University

"Jean Ingelow." Obituary. *London Times*. July 21, 1897: 8, column C.

Johnson, Heidi. "Jean Ingelow (1820-1897)." *Nineteenth-Century British Women Writers: a bio-bibliographical critical sourcebook*. Ed. Abigail Burnham Bloom. Westport, CT: Greenwood P, 2000.

_____. "'Matters that a Woman Rules': Marginalized Maternity in Jean Ingelow's *A Story of Doom*." *Victorian Poetry* 33 (1995): 75-88.

Kilgour, Raymond. *Messrs. Roberts Brothers. Publishers*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1952.

Knoepflmacher, U. C. "Male Patronage and Female Authorship: The Case of John Ruskin and Jean Ingelow." *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 57.1 (Autumn 1995): 13-46.

Lang, Andrew. "Miss Ingelow's Poems." *Longman's Magazine*. 32 (July 1898): 236-249.

Mahl, Mary R. "A Letter from John Ruskin to Jean Ingelow." *Notes and Queries* 217, n.s. 19 (November 1972): 420-421.

Mayo, Isabella Fyvie. *Recollections of What I Saw, What I Lived Through, And What I Learned During More Than Fifty Years of Social and Literary Experience*. London: John Murray, 1910.

Peters, Maureen. *Jean Ingelow: Victorian Poetess*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield: 1972.

Porter, Rosalind. "A Problem Solved: Authorship of *Some Recollections of Jean Ingelow and Her Early Friends*." *Notes and Queries* 49 (December 2002): 492-93.

[Straffen, Eliza]. *Some Recollections of Jean Ingelow and Her Early Friends*. London: Wells, Gardner Darton, 1901.

Srebrnik, Patricia. *Alexander Strahan, Victorian Publisher*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1986.

Susina, Jan. "Ingelow, Jean (1820-1897)." *Victorian Britain*. Ed. Sally Mitchell. New York: Garland Publishing, 1988: 395-396.

Venn, J. A., comp. *Alumni Cantabrigienses*. London: Cambridge UP, 1922-1954. Accessed electronically via ancestry.com.

Wagner, Jennifer. "In Her 'Proper Place': Ingelow's Fable of the Female Poet and Her Community in Gladys and Her Island. *Victorian Poetry* 31 (1993): 227-239.

Woolf, Virginia. *The Second Common Reader*. 1932. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986.

Texas A & M University

[20]ALS to Archdeacon [Frederick William] Farrar, December 21, 1886, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.
[21]ALS to Archdeacon [Frederick William] Farrar, February 23 [1887], Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.
[22]ALS to Archdeacon [Frederick William] Farrar, January 29, 1887, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.

The Buddhist *Sub*-Text and the Imperial Soul-Making in *Kim*

Young Hee Kwon

I. 'Lama, lama, my dear sir; and some of them are gentlemen in their own country': Rereading the lama as an unsettling foreign guest in the empire's house of fiction

In his introduction to *Psychoanalysis of Race*, Christopher Lane succinctly observes the central conundrum of *Kim* by noting that "scholars of Rudyard Kipling's work may recall his notorious pronouncements on the impossibility of "White" and "Black" living together in harmony, but they find it difficult to assess why Kipling's *Kim* (1901) strangely vacillates between disbanding and reinvoking racial hierarchies" (15). I propose the Tibetan lama and his Buddhist discourse as an alternative venue to further speculate on this still bewildering ambivalence. In particular, I re-read the lama figure as a strangely disquieting "foreign" guest, arguing that his apparently domesticated presence in the empire's house of fiction in fact subtly unsettles the pleasure ground of colonialist adventuring. My focal point would be a chain of some counter-hegemonic side effects of the other knowledge, configuring the Buddhist subtext of the novel as a potentially dangerous supplement to the master discourse of the imperial romance.[1]

Kim begins with the eponymous boy's encounter with a Tibetan lama and ends with the lama's extended speech on his Enlightenment. It interweaves Kim's adventure with the lama's spiritual quest, as the boy joins the monk as his *chela* and at the same time begins to be trained as a spy-surveyor for the British Secret Service. What difference, then, does it make that Kipling selected a Tibetan lama and his spiritual quest as a sort of foil to the eponymous boy's adventure among other possible options? One immediate answer to be sure lies in the very core of the adventure plot, namely the Great Game. As the imperial rivalry between Britain and Russia intensified on the British Indian border, Tibet came to have a great strategic significance particularly after the two Afghan wars[2] It is fascinating, in this regard, to see the lama character in the novel resonate with some historical lamas deeply involved in the geopolitics of the Game. A man named Ngawang Dorieff, for instance, acted as Dalai Lama's envoy to the Russian Czar to seek Russia's protection against the imminent British invasion. Russia, in turn, attempted to attract Tibet to its side by means of Dorieff, whose complete mastery of Tibetan Buddhism enabled him to assume the political mission.[3] Seen against this backdrop of the Russo-Tibet diplomatic contact, the Russian agent in *Kim* is exorbitantly ignorant of Tibet. He thinks that the lama is "no more than an unclean old man haggling over a dirty piece of paper" whereas the monk is a sort of demigod to the surrounding Buddhist coolies (202). When the lama refuses to sell his drawing of the Wheel, the agent further commits a blasphemy by tearing the drawing and striking the monk full on the face. By contrast, Kim and Hurree make the best use of the local Buddhist coolies' anger against the Russian agent, which indicates that their knowledge of the lama's power enables them to defeat Russia. Kipling could have made Kim steal into the surveyor's tent or wheedle the desired documents out of them. By making the Russian commit such a clueless bungle, however, Kipling attributes a cross-cultural understanding only to the British, highlighting Britain's epistemic supremacy and its unique stance as a benevolent empire. In this way, Kipling succeeds, if only fictionally, in building an alliance between Britain and Tibet against Russia. This imaginary construction sounds extremely ironic when we consider the fact that Tibet was invaded in 1904 by Britain in an expedition that "ended up massacring an army of poorly armed Buddhist monks" (Kling 303).

Closely related to the Teshoo Lama in *Kim*, another historical lama Ugyen Gyatso deserves our notice as well. According to *The Encyclopedia Britannica of 1910* Gyatso was trained as a native surveyor, and was a British deputy at his monastery when he helped British surveyors penetrate Tibet (924). In 1879, with Gyatso's help, the Bengali schoolmaster Sarat Chandra Das received permission from the local authorities to visit the monastery and joined the survey team. We may draw an intriguing parallel between these two men and Kipling's characters. If Hurree Babu echoes Sarat Chandra Das, Kim and the lama share Gyatso's role as a spy-lama. By setting up a separate lama figure who facilitates Britain's triumph in the Game, we can notice that Kipling considerably reduces the potential risk of Kim's conversion to Buddhism, whether or not he was actually aware of this correlation.[4] In addition, the same split allows the Teshoo Lama in the novel to remain almost completely ignorant of the political actualities of his own country, which intensifies the impression that he is a sort of apolitical, timeless Buddhist monk, and makes it possible for the British surveillance agency to take advantage of the lama's spiritual quest as a handy foil to its espionage activities.

The historical lamas' resonance thus helps us notice the paradoxical demand on Kipling's lama that he should be both empowered and dis-empowered at the same time. As Tibetan lamas actually do, he needs to have political power over the local Tibetans so that the British Empire can use him to beat Russia in the Game. Simultaneously, however, he should be dis-empowered in the sense that he seems to be entirely ignorant of the British imperial maneuvers, and therefore, would never be capable of an intervention. I accentuate that *Kim* addresses this paradoxical demand by tapping into the colonial discursive field, in particular, the late-Victorian construction of Buddhism. While the Teshoo Lama is equipped with a number of apparatus for reality effects, he embodies what late-Victorian Orientalists have inscribed as "Buddhism."[5] One conspicuous aspect is that the lama tends to avoid all worldly things in accordance with his Buddhist principles. Insofar as we take this quietist attitude at face value, I contend that we cannot but implicitly collaborate with the colonialist discourse that underpins the Buddhist subtext in *Kim*. The two aforementioned historical lamas, however, allow us to glimpse a crucial interstice in the representational façade of the character, namely the fact that a Tibetan lama cannot not know the actual contingencies of his country to such a remarkable extent as the lama in *Kim*. Our re-reading of the character thus begins with this proposition that Kipling's lama figure impinges on the "Victorian creation of an ideal textual Buddhism," which had a crucial function in disapproving the contemporary Buddhist practices in the East as degenerated derivatives of its pure ideal version.[6]

As is widely known, Buddhism "hit" Britain from around the 1860s through the last decades of the century, as a major part of the various religious and occult elements flowing into the heart of the empire from all over the world.[7] A significant number of Victorians regarded Buddhism as a powerful competitor to Christianity, and therefore, as a sort of cultural invasion from the East. Simultaneously, they conceived the moral demand of Buddhism to be incompatible with the ideal of material progress, the foundational value of Western capitalism. This fundamental disparity resulted in the Victorian invention of Buddhism as a religion based on extreme mortification and denial of desire. This deep impact of Buddhism in Britain at the turn-of-the-century is indispensable in reading *Kim*. In terms of readership, it signals that Kipling's target audience was eager to consume narratives of Buddhist terminologies, mantra, exotic priests and so on. Further, *Kim* reflects a new level of understanding of the Eastern religion in the age when even a blunt Christian depreciation of Buddhist doctrines was beginning to register a considerable extent of knowledge. This fervent interest, in turn, engendered a new awareness and fear of the dangerous possibility that Buddhism might seriously undermine Christianity. Locating Kipling's inscription of Buddhism in *Kim* within this larger cultural purview of the British Empire, my reading in the following pages seeks to elucidate some of the deeply ambivalent significations of the "other knowledge" beneath the seemingly unproblematic celebration of the Raj.

II "To those who follow the Way there is neither black nor white" : The Buddhist Sub-Text and the Racial Hierarchy

When Kim gladly departs from St. Xavier to re-join the lama on a half-year's leave granted to him by Colonel Creighton so that he can be "de-Englishized," the boy confronts a devastating sense of self-estrangement out of nowhere, not being able to find any reassuring answer to the question: "Who is Kim-Kim-Kim?" (156). A passing Hindu *bairagi* (holy man) intuits the nature of Kim's agony, and he says: "Thou wast wondering there in thy spirit what manner of thing thy soul might be. The seizure came of a sudden. I know" (157). By identifying himself as the same "Seeker" as the holy man in search of the "Road to Enlightenment," Kim recovers from the moment of intense anguish (157). [In this light,] It is important to note that not the Teshoo Lama but the passing Hindu holy man triggers Kim's redefinition of himself as a Seeker. Thus creating a temporary identity crisis for Kim and ostensibly resolving it through a passing holy man's timely help, this apparently extraneous episode symptomatically reveals the potential risk of Kim's conversion into Buddhism. However pleasurable it might be Kim's performing the role of the Friend of all World, the boy's subject formation needs to be supplemented with values taken from the colonial other.

In Chapter 12, Kim brilliantly performs his first spy action by disguising an endangered secret agent, and the lama appears to be completely ignorant of Kim's operation. After the agent leaves, however, it is revealed that the lama was closely observing the operation, and he remonstrates with

[1] I adapt the Derridean notion of "dangerous supplement" with an assumption that the "danger" of the supplementary Buddhist discourse in the novel is deeply bound up with its pontentially unsettling effects on the subject formation of Kim. For Derrida's concept of supplement, see *Of Grammatology* 141-64. The other knowledge refers to the stereotyped version of Buddhism, i.e. the Victorian inscription of the Eastern religion. I discuss Bhabha's notions of the stereotype and ambivalence of the colonial discourse shortly.

[2] For an extensive historical study on the Great Game, see Peter Hopkirk, *The Great Game: on Secret Service in High Asia*. Even before the onset of the imperial rivalry, Tibet had been narrated by a number of explorers and travelers, but the Game accelerated the textual production of Tibet, as is implied in Walter Hough's 1899 list of books about Tibet. It includes Captain Samuel Turner's *An Account of an Embassy to the Court of the Teshoo Lama* (1800), *Narratives of the Mission of George Bogie to Tibet and of the Journey of Thomas Manning to Lhasa* (1876), and no less than nine books published in the nineties.

[3] For details of Dorieff's role, see Tatiana Shaumian's recent study, *Tibet: the Great Game and Tsarist Russia* 21-45. *Encyclopedia Britannica 1910* notes that the "Russian lama" Dorieff had a "commanding influence over the Dalai Lama, impressed upon him the dangers which threatened Tibet from England, and suggested the desirability of securing Russian protection and even the possibility of converting the tsar and his empire to Buddhism" (927).

[4] As far as I know, there is no clear evidence that Kipling was aware of the two historical lamas. Thus, my intention in relating them to the lama character in *Kim* is not so much to make a claim that Kipling's knowledge of them influenced the lama character, as to locate the fictional lama in the turn-of-the-twentieth-century geopolitics surrounding Tibet.

[5] Kipling inserts a number of details about the lama's younger days, say, the time he spent in the monastery, etc. The lama's human weakness that the character often reveals despite his religious principles would also belong to what I call apparatus for reality effects, adapting Roland Barthes's claim that "what we call 'real' is never more than a code of representation" (80).

[6] Almond 40. As Almond notes, the Victorian construction of Buddhism needs to be understood within the larger epistemological framework for the "final analysis of the East itself' (140). In a similar vein, James Thrall's recent analysis of *Kim* examines the Victorian notions of Tibetan Buddhism as "generic, pure, and universal 'original' religion." Kipling's lama figure, Thrall points out, "sidesteps much of the calumny heaped on Lamaism by representing a more rarefied version of Buddhism" and thereby lending to the "enchanting possibility" of a pristine religion "just out of reach, but recoverable through the power of western scholarship" (50-1). My reading likewise attempts to historicize the Buddhist subtext of the novel but with an emphasis on the subtext's disruptive side effects.

[7] For a fine recent study engaged with the cultural impact of Buddhism on the late-Victorian society, see Jeffrey Franklin's "The Life of the Buddha in Victorian England." My following overview is greatly indebted to Franklin's earlier essay, "The Counter-Invasion of Britain by Buddhism in Marie Corelli's *A Romance of Two Worlds* and H. Rider Haggard's *Ayesha: The Return of She*." Regarding Buddhist publications in the late nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth century, see also Christmas Humphreys's *The Development of Buddhism in England: Being a History of the Buddhist Movement in England and Other Provinces*. For the late-nineteenth-century Orientalist understanding of Buddhism, see, for instance, T. W. Rhys Davids's lecture collection *History and Literature of Buddhism*, first published in 1896.

Kim for the first time. In their following conversation that takes place after a while, the lama harks back to his *chela*'s "prideful working" in the train, resuming his Buddhist lessons:

> "Cure them if they are sick," said the lama, when Kim's sporting instincts woke. "Cure them if they have fever, but by no means work charms. Remember what befell the Mahratta."
>
> "Then all Doing is evil?" Kim replied, lying out under a big tree at the fork of the Doon road, watching the little ants run over his hand.
>
> "To abstain from action is well—except to acquire merit."
>
> "At the Gates of Learning we were taught that to abstain from action was unbefitting a Sahib. And I am a Sahib."
>
> "Friend of all the World,"—the lama looked directly at Kim—"I am an old man—pleased with shows as are children. To those who follow the Way there is neither black nor white, Hind nor Bhotiyal. We be all souls seeking escape. No matter what thy wisdom learned among Sahibs, when we come to my River thou wilt be freed from an illusion—at my side." (178)

Kim's question, "Then all Doing is evil?" tellingly echoes the Victorian notion of Buddhism as escapist religion. The lama's desire to make himself and his *chela* "free from an illusion" seems to perfectly fit this prevalent notion of Buddhist escapism. However, what if we put the word "liberation" in the place of "escape," modifying the lama's remark into "we be all souls seeking liberation"? Even this slight change can produce a considerably different nuance, which attests to the central importance of translation in any construction of knowledge of the other. If one of the seminal Buddhist imperatives is to liberate oneself from the illusory ways of seeing the self and the world as permanent in order to follow the Middle Way, this dimension is foreclosed in a stereotypic inscription of the teaching. Significantly, Kim's reply in the above dialogue devolves on the binary opposition of action and non-action. This simplifying binary tends to exclude any consideration of ethical values whereas the lama makes distinction between right actions, like curing a child, and wrong ones like working charms. It is true that the old Buddhist monk is clueless about what his *chela* learns at St. Xavier's, naively believing that the institution provides the boy with "great wisdom." If the lama's speech here is certainly beset by the stereotyping colonial discourse, the very ambivalence of the other knowledge consists in the fact that it nevertheless allows us, if not the lama himself, to glimpse the fundamental lack of ethical vision in the epistemic-ontological groundwork of the empire. To put it simply, the empire's disciples may learn at the "Gates of Learning" how they can do anything effectively and efficiently, but they can never learn what they *should* do.

If racial hierarchy is a major underpinning of any imperial rule, the lama's speech significantly undermines it in the above-quoted scene. When Kim takes up his Sahib identity, harping on the idea of Buddhism as escapist religion, the lama maneuvers the thorny issue of his *chela*'s identity by addressing him as "Friend of all the World." What is ultimately important according to the lama is not really whether Kim is a Sahib or not, but whether he would follow the Way or not. We may remember that there is another father figure in the novel who calls Kim by the same epithet Friend of all the World, that is the thoroughly pragmatic Pathan horse-dealer-cum-secret-agent Mahbub Ali. To him, Kim's amazing capability of passing native in any racial and religious community is a priceless asset for the Great Game. It is true that Mahbub is aware of the fictiveness of racial/cultural classification. Despite his religious identity as a Muslim, he professes, "in my heart the Faiths are like the horses. Each has merit in its own country" (122).

Most likely, Mahbub Ali's remarks here project Kipling's own cultural relativism, as *Kim* bears it out as well as many of the author's other works. Let me take "The Mark of the Beast" for instance. The story features an Englishman who turns into a werewolf after he defiles a temple of Hanuman, the Monkey-god. According to the narrator of the story, the "Monkey-god" is a "leading divinity worthy of respect. All gods have good points, just as have all priests. Personally, I attach much importance to Hanuman, and am kind to his people—the great grey apes of the hills. One never knows when one may want a friend" (227). What I find interesting in this passage is the way in which multiculturalist tolerance functions as an effective means to govern the colonial other without necessarily granting them the same humanity. That is, the logic behind the narrator's remark is that we should respect the gods of the other because we may need some of them as useful friends; all the same, we know that they are still "great grey apes of the hills." Mahbub Ali's cultural relativism in *Kim* is contingent on the same politics of interracial/cross-cultural friendship; it never seriously questions or threatens the foundational racial hierarchy between the British and the colonized. As Patrick Williams notes, part of the power of colonialism had always depended not only on brute force but, more significantly, on "its ability to absorb elements of 'alien' culture (or even entire cultures) without thereby being fundamentally disturbed" (2000, 17).

The key question, then, is whether the lama's Buddhist egalitarianism is no more than an "alien" or even "exotic" ingredient that Kipling's colonialist paradigm succeeds to accommodate without being fundamentally disturbed by it. Or does the lama's Buddhist discourse radically call into question and undercut the racial hierarchy? *Kim* indeed generates the image of "happy imperial family," in which all castes and races seem to peacefully commingle without challenging the "benevolent" white father's right to rule.[8] This vision of peaceful coexistence appears to be consonant with Buddhist egalitarianism, which in turn seems to justify the way of the Raj, as Benita Parry notes: "concepts borrowed from Indian religious teachings have been appropriated to validate the Raj" (217). I would argue, however, that such cooptation is only one, if conspicuous, dimension of the complex, ambivalent effects of the Buddhist subtext in the novel. In other words, Kipling's stereotyping embodiment of the Buddhist discourse does not entirely foreclose some disruptive side effects engendered by the narrative's own subtle web-working, which constructs its own multivalent fictional world beyond the author's ideological control.

I want to clarify that even the exterior discursive field of the novel cannot be seen as monolithically ideological or simply stereotyping. Above all, we need to remember that Buddhism was conceived as a protest not only against the hierarchical caste system in the Indian subcontinent but also against the class inequality in Victorian England, as Jeffrey Franklin notes: a "certain pro-Buddhist strain" became a "part of Victorian anti-Catholic discourse," and more importantly, the religion was "adopted by some socialist advocates for a more egalitarian society" (2003, 22). Contextualized in this "Buddhism-steeped nineties," the lama's remark "To those who follow the Way there is neither black nor white, Hind nor Bhotiyal," has more radical nuances than a protest against the caste system in the colony. Moreover, what is at stake in the lama's remark is the crucial question of subject constitution, i.e. whether Kim should be a "Friend of all the World" in Mahbub Ali's sense or in the lama's sense. In the former sense, Kim is supposed to be a native-born imperialist whose resilient hybridity turns out to be a far more effective tool of colonial governance than rigid Englishness.[9] As Mahbub advises, Kim should remember among the British that he is a Sahib whatever he may be when he commingles with natives. The lama's Buddhist conception, by contrast, requires that Kim should relinquish his imperialist identity to be a "Friend of all the World" as a seeker of the Way. Considering that one of the major threats of Buddhism to the British Empire was its radical critique of racial hierarchy, we may glimpse the far-reaching significance of the seemingly banal Buddhist mantra particularly because its recipient is a boy whose soul is in the process of making.

III. 'I meditate. There is a need greater than thou knowst': The Limit of the Other Knowledge

What strikes us in Kim's first encounter with the lama is the boy's desire to "take possession" of the exotic monk as his treasure "trove" (14). If this is in part a childish desire for novelty, we find its rather sinister echo in the Lahore museum with its wondrous collection symbolically protected by the formidable gun Zam-Zammah. Despite the lama's foreign appearance, the museum implies that the Tibetan monk is already domesticated in the sense that his Buddhist discourse is significantly "known" by the empire. Like other "natives" who come to the "Wonder House" to seek wisdom, the lama likes to hear from the curator of "the labors of European scholars, who by the help of these and a hundred other documents have identified the Holy Places of Buddhism" (10). Moreover, a statue of Buddha overwhelms him, as he exclaims half sobbingly: "He [Buddha] is here! The Most Excellent Law is here also. My pilgrimage is well begun" (9). To be sure, the irony here is that a great lama from Tibet learns from a British ethnologist about Buddhism. All the same, the scene elicits the lama's fervent, if naïve, acknowledgement that the British Empire has exerted itself to preserve the "essence" of Buddhism; more than merely respectful, the empire has borne the white man's laborious burden to preserve the religion. In this way the scene tends to elide the fact that the empire plays the role of a strenuous and benevolent upholder of the "Most Excellent Law" only to assimilate it to its own ends. It made the alien religion commensurable to the Western interpretive apparatuses and techniques, transforming it into "something totally knowable" in order to "preserve" its "essence" (Abe 68).

However dazzled the lama may look by the museum's collections and the curator's in-depth understanding of Buddhism, I argue that the lama's alterity is not entirely subject to the imperial cooptation. Ian Baucom makes a similar point when he comments on the dialogue between the curator and the lama. Assuming that the "Fountain of Wisdom" (the curator) knows everything, even the location of the River of Arrow, in which he believes he can reach Nirvana, the lama keeps asking where the River is. Of course, the curator cannot but reply, "I do not know," which he repeats no less than three times. Out of the lama's "almost uncanny humility" toward the embarrassed curator, Baucom astutely reads an "idiom of civil insubordination and sly mockery" (97). The curator's inability to answer the question exposes the "limit of colonial knowledge" and the "existence of the unmapped and the unmappable within the cartography of imperialism" (97). Adding to this illuminating point, I want to suggest that even before the lama asks the Curator the whereabouts of the River, the lama's speech on his quest has a potentially unsettling aspect. If the lama admires the efforts of the British that "have followed the Blessed Feet in all their wanderings," he does not fail to add: "there are things which they have not sought out—nothing do I know but I go to free myself from the Wheel of Things by a broad and open road" (11). This remark makes a striking contrast between archival knowledge and active seeking. Although he admits that a vast amount of "knowledge" is accumulated and possessed by the empire, his aim is not to absorb it like the curator in the museum. Humbly speaking to curator that he knows nothing, he in fact may imply that "knowledge" in itself is irrelevant to his ultimate goal as a seeker. A subtle irony thus emerges out of the contrast between the museum's stasis and the "broad and open" road's dynamic nature. If the lama is a representative of the religion often accused of its "monastic quietism," it is he who actually wills the opposite; he wants to go out to the world whereas the curator, the representative of the empire's immense information system, remains a passive keeper. In this way does the lama's desire

[8] Patrick Williams, 1989, 53. Before Williams, Lionel Trilling and John McClure, among others, discussed the trope of the expanded family in *Kim*, the first finding it a source of chief delights of the novel, the latter critiquing it as another sign of Kipling's "retiring into a fantasy world" of "fraternity and tolerance."

[9] For an in-depth discussion of "native-born," see John McBratney, *Imperial Subjects and Imperial Space*.

to seek for liberation on the road undercut the stereotype of monastic quietism.

This subtle reversal of action and non-action in the first pages of the novel invites us to reconsider the question of agency throughout the narrative. The lama's childlike naïveté, ignorance of British India as a foreigner, and indifference to things worldly all tend to deny the character independence and agency. As Zohreh T. Sullivan notes, the lama's dependence on Kim becomes explicit, which attests to "his practical inadequacies" (160). Elleke Boehmer similarly argues: "Kim's pragmatism and worldly knowledge—his white rationality—is represented as a more successful strategy in dealing with a dangerous world than the spirituality of the lama" (86). In a larger framework, however, it is not only the lama but also Kim who lacks full-fledged autonomy. The British Secret Service closely monitors and remote controls every direction and action they take as if they were two creeping ants under the magnifying glass of the empire. Interestingly, however, the lama makes some important decisions at some critical moments in the narrative: he negotiates Kim's education with Father Victor and Mr. Bennett, which Sara Suleri aptly notes "dramatically revises the lama's otherworldliness even as it effectively disrupts the texture of the novel" (120); and, at the narrative closure, he decides to come back from the Threshold of Freedom in order to liberate Kim "from all his sin—as he is free," abandoning the life-long cause of his quest (240). It is also noteworthy that the lama's naïveté, as well as dependency, remarkably diminishes once he is left alone and travels in search of the River of Arrow throughout the subcontinent by himself. During the second journey into the Hills, Kipling dramatically enhances the lama's dignity as Kim's discipleship begins in its serious sense when the lama teaches him the "Wheel of the Life" and other Buddhist lessons. Nevertheless, it is not my point that the lama does not lack agency because he does this and that of his own will, or because Kipling presents him in some positive terms. For what ultimately matters in the question of agency is not so much the more or less essentializing and/or moralizing issue of characterization, but rather the binarism of action and inaction itself, on which the notion of Buddhism as an escapist religion is firmly grounded.

Kim touches on the Great Rebellion of 1857 only once in the narrative. Peculiarly enough, none other than the lama responds to a retired sepoy's reminiscence of the major historical turning point of British India. In this regard, it is interesting to see the sepoy and the lama form an antipodal pair in terms of colonial subject constitution. If the retired sepoy is a proven loyal subject of the empire, as he aligned himself with the British during the Rebellion, the lama could be one of the most recalcitrant subjects in the sense that his will to "escape" from the Wheel of Life causes him to passively accept the imperial rule as such, yet at the same time, makes him rather impervious to its specific demands. We may then read the dialogue between the lama and the retired sepoy as an implicit political debate on the question of what a colonial subject should do. By the same token, their talk displaces a possible exchange of opinions on some similar issues between the lama and Kim, which again attests to the central repression in *Kim*, namely the text's barely disguised anxiety about the subversive potential of Kim as a vagrant hybrid of working-class Irish parentage.[10] Without considering this dimension, the lama's Buddhist exhortations to the retired sepoy would surely appear to erase the political edge of the Rebellion. Now recalling the "rumour" of the Black Year, the lama tries to persuade the sepoy into following the Way:

> "Hast thou never desired any other thing?"
>
> "Yes-yes-a thousand times! A straight back and a close-clinging knee once more; a quick wrist and a keen eye; and the marrow that makes a man. Oh, the old days—the good days of my strength!"
>
> "That strength is weakness."
>
> It has turned so; but fifty years since I could have proved it otherwise," the old solider retorted, driving his stirrup-edge into the pony's lean flank.
>
> "But I know a River of great healing."
>
> "I have drank Ganga-water to the edge of dropsy. All she gave me was a flux, and no sort of strength."
>
> "It is not Ganga. The River that I know washes from all taint of sin. . . ." (49)

A series of playful disjunctions characterizes this dialogue, and the sepoy's nonchalant retorts keep undercutting the lama's teaching. The retired sepoy does desire something other than wealth; but it is still physical strength, which has nothing to do with the lama's question. From the lama's standpoint, one's physical robustness is indeed weakness insofar as it keeps one from seeking for the path to Freedom. I want to highlight the word "*strength*" here because it has a central part in the persistent disparity between the lama and the retired sepoy. When we locate this dialogue in the context of colonial subject formation, the sepoy's physical strength is analogous with that of the empire. Then, the "good days" when he was strong enough corresponds to the pre-Mutiny heyday of the Raj. In this chain of signification, the lama's reply, "that strength is weakness," bears on some profound critique of the empire. Among others, the year 1857 revealed the precarious ground of the Raj even in those "good old days"; its ostensible strength was indeed weakness.

If such is the symptomatic way the empire's traumatic memories of the Rebellion surface on the narrative, it is intriguing to see the retired sepoy lead Kim and the lama, soon after the above-quoted talk, to the Grand Trunk Road, the glorified site of Britain's colonial nation-making. In stark contrast with the lama's aloofness, Kim heartily enjoys the pulsating vitality of diverse people and the landscape: "Kim was in the seventh heaven of joy" whereas the lama never "raised his eyes" since "his soul busied elsewhere" (56). The narrator goes on to note: seeing the vibrant sights on the Road, the boy was "*seeing the world in real truth*; this

[10]As Baucom notes, Kim is a "putatively white but performatively Asiatic hybrid" (98). On the subversive potential of Kim's working-class Anglo-Indian identity, see Teresa Hubel, "In Search of the British Indian in British India: White Orphans, Kipling's *Kim*, and Class in Colonial India."

was life as he would have it—bustling and shouting, the buckling of belts, and beating of bullocks and creaking of wheels, lighting of fires and cooking of food, and new *sights* at every turn of *the approving eye*" (65; emphasis added). Against the lama's ascetic attitude, the scene thus accentuates Kim's deep affection for the subcontinent. More significantly, the boy's observant eye echoes the British Secret Service's "imperial eyes," to adopt Mary Louise Pratt's phrase. The eye's quintessential claim is that it sees the world "in real truth." To put it differently, the Kipling narrator fosters the idea that the colonial space is authentically represented in the boy's "approving eye." Beyond the level of individual consciousness or self-reflexivity, the narrator's interpretation in this way rests upon the generic epistemic mode of imperialism that turns the everyday world of a colonial space into an object of seeing, namely a "sight," claiming universal truthfulness of that specific mode of seeing and knowing.

As many critics have noted, the Grand Trunk Road scene renders Britain's colonial rule as if it were a part of a certain natural order.[11] Even the Buddhist monk's quaint presence, despite his obstinate refusal to commingle, is sketched as part of the disorderly, and therefore, the more naturalized "order" of the colonial space. We may re-examine this familiar process of naturalization from the angle of the stereotyped Buddhist discourse. In rendering central the question of whether one should enjoy or evade the throbbing flux of life, the narration resorts to the underlying binary of action and passivity once again. The lama views that the "real truth" does not exist in the objects themselves since the people and the things on the road are subject to endless transmigration. All existence and phenomena in this world are constantly changing; they do not remain the same even for a single moment. The crux of stereotyping in this case lies in the fact that it delimits such a differential worldview within the simplifying opposition between action and non-action. Then, a way of reading against this ideological grain of text will be to pit the truth claim of the "approving eye" against the Buddhist notion. From the lama's view, that truth claim would be unacceptable insofar as it is after all based on the illusion of permanence.[12]

The lama's "asceticism" is once again highlighted when he resolves to leave the Hills, confessing: "I became strong to do evil and to forget. A brawler and a swashbuckler upon the hillsides was I' (216). Whereas he never faltered in the midst of the hustle and bustle of the Road, the lama repents: "I delighted in life and the lust of life. I desired strong slopes to climb. I cast about to find them. I *measured* the strength of my body, which is evil, against the high Hills, I made a mock of thee [Kim] when thy breath came short under Jamnotri" (217; emphasis added). I want to point out the unmistakable implication of the word "*measure*" in this remark in the context of the actual practice of survey and map-making in Tibet. Native surveyors disguised themselves as "Buddhist pilgrims," equipped with "prayer beads to keep track of their measured paces" (Kling 305). We may also recall the aforementioned historical spy-lama Gyatso at this point, who helps us glimpse a subtle significance of what might appear nothing more than the lama's ascetic suppression of bodily pleasures. For the presumptuous act to "measure" the strength of the body "against the high Hills" ultimately embeds the colonial desire to triumph over, subdue, and conquer the land of the other.

IV 'Just is the Wheel! Certain is our deliverance! Come!': Two Endings

In the concluding chapter, we have two parallel denouements for Kim and the lama. Whereas Kipling ends Kim's adventure by symbolically turning him into an automaton or a cogwheel in the empire's governing machinery, it is the dying lama who has last words and even claims Kim's "soul," thus seriously undermining the colonial subject formation.

The closure of the boy's adventure takes place at the moment Kipling rather uncannily resolves Kim's last and the most intense breakdown. Successfully completing his espionage mission and convalescing after days of death-like slumber at the Sahiba's house, Kim gladly hands over the intercepted documents to Hurree Babu. Immediately after, Kim finds himself overwhelmed by the "bigness of the world"; he gazes at the familiar landscape "with strange eyes unable to take up the size and proportion and use of things" (234). The narrator further reflects: his [Kim's] soul was "out of gear with its surroundings—a cogwheel unconnected with any machinery, just like the idle cog-wheel of a cheap Beheea sugar-crusher laid by in a corner" (234). If Kim has been perfectly at home in British India, this peculiar moment of crisis is an instance of extreme alienation, epistemological powerlessness, and profound existential crisis in all respects. Whether connected or disconnected, Kim is after all nothing more than an expendable "cog-wheel" in the "machinery" of the colonial governance. Shortly after, however, a certain invisible force settles Kim into the world again:

> He did not want to cry—had never felt less like crying in his life—but of a sudden easy, stupid tears trickled down his nose, and with an almost audible click he felt the wheels of his being lock up anew on the world without. Things that rode meaningless on the eyeball an instant before slid into proper proportion. Roads were meant to be walked upon, houses to be lived in, cattle to be driven, fields to be tilled, and men and women to be talked to. They were all real and true—solidly planted upon the feet—perfectly comprehensible—clay of his clay, neither more nor less. (234)

This passage signals a closure of the master narrative of imperial romance. Kim feels re-integrated into the world surrounding him, as it seems to be "clay of his clay, neither

[11]Williams makes a convincing point that Kipling makes British political power in India "appear as much a part of the natural order of things as possible" (1989, 51).

[12]The illusion of permanence in the Buddhist context has an analogous relation with the illusion of permanence of Britain's imperial rule in India as Kipling strenuously suggests in the narrative of *Kim*. See, for instance, Francis Hutchins's well-known study on the subject, *The Illusion of Permanence: British Imperialism in India*.

more nor less." The metaphor, which obviously comes from the biblical phrase "flesh of his flesh," is meant to indicate that Kim regains a strong sense of belonging to British India. This almost supernatural or apparently providential scene of reconciliation seems to naturalize the boy's otherwise problematic allegiance to the empire. It appears that the benevolent power of nature healed the boy's exhausted soul, the sense of which is further strengthened when the Sahiba evokes the redemptive power of "Mother Earth."[13]

Highlighting the gear imagery in the above-quoted, Mark Kinkead-Weekes notes that it indicates Kim's "commitment not to the Game, with which we are no longer concerned, but, at a far more fundamental level, to the Wheel of earthly and human life" (231). This interpretation is based on the assumption that the primary contradiction in *Kim* ensues from the conflict between the pleasure of earthly life and Buddhist asceticism. *Kim* certainly fosters this assumption, drawing on the Victorian construction of Buddhism as an escapist religion, as is perhaps most notably evidenced by the contrasting reactions of Kim and the lama to the pulsating vitality of the Grand Trunk Road. It is also true that the extended trope of the wheel in the above-quoted passage resonates with the Buddhist symbol of the Wheel of Life. I argue, however, that the gear imagery in the "wheels of his being" that "lock him [Kim] up anew on the world without" more strongly evokes the governing machinery of the empire, as it plays on the metaphor of "cog-wheel unconnected with any machinery" in the preceding scene of Kim's collapse (234). Notably, Kim's epistemic supremacy over the surrounding colonial space is once again established when the boy enjoys the reassuring notion that things in front of him are "all real and true" and "perfectly comprehensible." This reminds us unmistakably of a similar truth claim we have seen in the boy's "approving eye" on the Grand Trunk Road. Nonetheless, the invisible force that reconciles Kim with the world is rather mechanical than entirely providential, as is implied in the phrase, "almost audible click." For this reason, we cannot but suspect that the process of Kim's soul-making is not successfully complete as long as it repeatedly requires a symbolic re-fitting into the empire.

Kipling offers a complete narration as to the lama's Enlightenment only after he makes it more than once mocked and parodied by several characters. First, the Sahiba tells Kim that the lama informed her that he was "freed from all sin" after he went "roving into the fields for two nights on an empty belly" and then tumbled "into a brook" (229). Then, Hurree adds some more detail, as he speaks to Kim: "he [the lama] jumped up and walked into a brook and he was nearly drowned but for me. I pulled him out" (232). After these caricatures, Kipling presents the lama talking with Mahbub Ali about the discovery of the River and Kim's future. The long tête-à-tête between the two opposing father figures allows us to hear from the lama about his Enlightenment to a certain extent, yet at the same time, qualifies it with Mahbub's sarcasm. To the lama's claim that his *chela* will be free "from all taint of sin," Mahbub asks, "Wilt thou slay him or drown him in that wonderful river from which the Babu dragged thee?" (236). To this mockery, the lama replies that he was "dragged from no river"; he "found it by Knowledge" (236). When the lama eventually offers a full narration of the end of his quest to Kim, Kipling continues to undercut the lama's otherworldly speech with Kim's thoroughly rational response till the very end of the novel. Nevertheless, I would argue that the gradual and carefully layered introduction of the ending of the lama's quest allows us to take it seriously even more than the denouement of Kim's adventure narrative.[14]

Critical debate on the narrative closure of *Kim* has exclusively focused upon whether Kim would follow the lama's Way or leave him to work for the empire. Yet we already know that the latter prospect outweighs the former insofar as Kim's career is concerned. The lama says to Mahbub Ali: "Let him [Kim] be a teacher; let him be a scribe—what matter? He will have attained Freedom at the end. The rest is illusion" (236). What is important from the lama's perspective is not so much Kim's career as it is whether his *chela* will be free from all sin as he is free. Therefore, it would be crucial in our final analysis of the lama and the Buddhist subtext in what ways we can read the lama's narration against the stereotyping force of the colonial discourse. This is not to suggest that we should defend the lama's narration as to his Enlightenment as "authentic" representation of the Buddhist vision. If domestication is indeed what Kipling does in his inscriptions of the lama character and the Buddhist subtext in *Kim*, the lama's last speech exemplifies the extreme difficulty of reading the Buddhist subtext beyond the structure of recognition and disavowal.[15] In my view, Homi K. Bhabha's redefinition of the "stereotype" as the "major discursive strategy" of colonialism has a distinctive merit in casting some crucial light on the subtle dynamics of meaning-making that besets the lama's final speech (94). Discussing why the colonial subject needs to be understood as "effects" of the colonial discourse, Bhabha argues that the stereotype is a simplification not "because it is a false representation of a given reality" (107). Rather, it is "an arrested, fixated form of representation that, in denying the play of difference (which the negation through the Other permits) constitutes a problem for the *representation* of the subject in significations of psychic and social relations" (107). Kipling's characterization of the lama in *Kim* attests to this process of stereotypic subject constitution as the character is denied the "play of difference," fixated within the purview of the Victorian construction of Buddhism. Yet, as Bhabha contends, such a stereotyping process is subject to the underlying ambivalence of a colonial discourse, inevitably infiltrated by fissures and ruptures, which allow us to trace a certain counter-hegemonic trajectory.

When his soul was free from his body, the lama reflects that he "meditated a thousand thousand years, passionless, well aware of the Causes of all Things," and his narration goes on:

> Then a voice cried: "What shall come to the boy if thou art dead?" and I was shaken back and forth in myself with pity for thee; and I said: "I will return to my *chela*, lest he miss the Way." Upon this my Soul, which is the Soul of Teshoo Lama, withdrew itself from the Great Soul with strivings and yearnings and retchings and agonies not to be told. As the egg from the fish, as the fish from the water, as the water from the cloud, as the cloud from the thick air, so put forth, so leaped out, so drew away, so fumed up the Soul of Teshoo Lama from the Great Soul. Then a Voice cried: "The River! Take heed to the River!" and I looked down upon all the world, which was as I had seen it before—one in time, one in place—and I saw plainly the River of the Arrow at my feet." (239)

Whether the lama's experience of Nirvana sounds plausible or not, this eloquent speech vividly illustrates how painful and difficult it was when the lama wrenched his Soul back from the "Threshold of Freedom" to liberate Kim "from all sin" (240). He further makes it clear that his resolution to return from Nirvana for his *chela*'s sake enabled him to complete his quest. As to the lama's return, Zohreh T. Sullivan makes an important point: although the act accords with the Bodhisattva's self-sacrificial love, the lama is "appropriated into the values of action associated with such warriors as Mahbub and the colonial Sahibs" by choosing "the love for the Sahib Kim over freedom from the Wheel of Life" (177). This view however does not sufficiently explain the extraordinary powerfulness of the lama's speech by reading his return from Nirvana as simply equivalent to the "values of activity associated with" the colonial agents.

What, then, can be an alternative way of reading of the lama's Enlightenment that resists the epistemic violence of the text without having to accept the lama's speech as authentic or redemptive?[16] I want to suggest that the key lies in the structural correlation between the ending of Kim's adventure narrative and that of the lama's spiritual quest. Kipling locates Kim's final crisis and its ostensible resolution in the middle of the gradual introduction of how the lama's quest ends, or, more specifically, after the boy comes to know that the lama found the River yet before he hears from the lama about the event. This arrangement not only establishes a structural parallel but also makes possible a certain mirroring and interpenetration of meanings between the two endings. As if Kim were an automaton or a mere part of the governing machinery, we saw Kim's restless soul automatically and mechanically locked onto the Wheel by the invisible force of the empire. In contrast, the lama's enthusiastic determination to return to his *chela* "lest he miss the Way" indicates a mighty performance of will and action. It is not simply that the lama takes the active part by returning to his *chela* whereas Kim undergoes passive reconciliation with the world. The binary of action and non-action, which has thus far characterized Kim and the lama respectively with some underlying ideological implications, is brilliantly deconstructed at this point. The lama's return from Nirvana, therefore, does not signify that the Buddhist monk's quest is eventually contained in the narrative's imperialist scheme of things as Sullivan argues. I want to underline that the lama's return to save Kim's soul has a crucial part in the successful completion of his spiritual quest, as the lama says: "For the merit that I have acquired, the River of the Arrow is here" (240). Clearly, the "merit" in this remark is not a sort of spiritual capital for afterlife but a necessary means to achieve a higher plane of being, the result of the lama's self-sacrificial practice of love for Kim.

To be sure, such a resolution on the lama's part does not promise that Kim will give up his white privilege and follow the lama's Way. Most probably, Kim will continue to work as a cog in the Wheel of the empire. Nevertheless, it is fascinating to note that the last words of the novel are not given to Kim but to the lama. His moving affection for the boy makes it rather impossible to easily dismiss his cheerful belief that he will free Kim from all sin, as the lama exclaims to him, "Just is the Wheel! Certain is our deliverance! Come!" (240). Kipling ends the novel by portraying the lama after this remark: "He crossed his hands on his lap and smiled, as a man may who has won salvation for himself and his beloved" (240). That the narrative ends in this way, strangely refraining from any comment on the boy's reaction or final words about Kim strongly implies a certain irresolvable contradiction still remaining despite the ostensibly successful soul-making of the protagonist. If Kipling makes Kim function as a secret agent for the British Empire and at the same time desire to define himself as the lama's *chela*, this is not merely because of Kipling's fantasy of conflict-free, if hierarchical, symbiosis of the East and the West in British India. More significantly, we confront the difficult question of why Kipling has to have this Buddhist monk who confidently makes a claim for the ultimate direction of the protagonist's soul in the very end of the novel. Insofar as the "invisible force" that relocates Kim into the institutional machinery of the empire cannot satisfactorily resolve the deep-rooted conflicts in the subject constitution of Kim, the lama's belief in Kim's ultimate Freedom is something more

[13]Hearing from Hurree how Kim is doing, the woman from Kulu [the Sahiba] says, "Let him [Kim] go. I have done my share. Mother Earth must do the rest. When the Holy one comes back from meditation, tell him" (235). Whereas the woman of Shamlegh plays the double-edged role of seductress and native assistant, the Sahiba functions as a mother figure, which would be subsumed by the feminized colonial space that, in Kipling's imperialist imaginary, not only awaits the empire's masculine penetration but also "magically" heals its subsequent damages, anxieties, and collapses in the "naturalized order" of things.

[14]By contrast, Brigette Hervoche-Bertho argues that "the lama's discovery of the Sacred River and his subsequent enlightenment are undercut by the Sahiba's and Hurre's accounts of the episode and dismissed as the raving talk of a senile ascetic" (309). Without disregarding this undermining aspect, I suggest that those preceding, repetitive parodies of the lama's discovery of the River can be seen as a wry strategy on Kipling's part to pave a way to the last exalted version of the lama's Enlightenment narrated by the lama himself lest we should easily dismiss it.

[15]I am adopting Homi K. Bhabha's language here. Suggesting the construction of the colonized subject as "effects of stereotypical discourse," Bhabha takes the example that a black person is recognized as a "human" but simultaneously disavowed as "not quite human" within the colonial discursive field (115). The Buddhist subtext in *Kim* is predicated on a similar structure of recognition and disavowal as the other knowledge stereotyped by the imperial romance narrative.

[16] My use of the phrase "epistemic violence" is indebted to Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's elaborate critique of the Foucauldian term in "Can the Subaltern Speak?" See esp. 281-91.

than a futile promise. However dubiously we may take the lama's completion of his quest and his promise of liberation for Kim, they point to the impossibility of a completely securing narrative closure and the strange dilemma that the textual project in fashioning Kim's imperial subjectivity cannot be completed without resorting to the perspective of the other. This last return of the repressed thus once again indicates that the Buddhist subtext in *Kim*, with its potential of a radically different *Weltanschauung* subtly but surely invades the pleasurable discursive field of the imperial adventure narrative.

Works Cited

Abe, Stanley K. "Inside the Wonder House: Buddhist Art and the West." *Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism under Colonialism*. Ed. Donald S. Lopez, Jr. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995.

Almond, Philip. *The British Discovery of Buddhism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.

Barthes, Roland. *S/Z*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1970.

Baucom, Ian. "The Survey of India." *Out of Place: Englishness, Empire and Locations of Identity*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1999.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Boemer, Elleke. "Colonialist Concerns." *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. 60-97.

Davids, T. W. Rhys. *The History and Literature of Buddhism*. 6th edition. Delhi: Bhartiya Publishing House, 1975.

Franklin, Jeffrey. "The Life of the Buddha in Victorian England." *ELH*. 72 (2005): 934-74.

_____. "The Counter-Invasion of Britain by Buddhism in Marie Corelli's *A Romance of Two Worlds* and H. Rider Haggard's *Ayesha: The Return of She*." *Victorian Literature and Culture*. 31:1 (2003): 19-42.

Hervoche-Bertho, Brigitte. "The Wheel and the Way: Kipling's Symbolic Imagination in *Kim*." *Cahiers Victoriens et Edourardiens*. Montpellier. 47 (Spring 1998): 365-73.

Hopkirk, Peter. *The Great Game: On Secret Service in High Asia*. London: John Murray, 1990.

Hough, Walter. "Explorations in Tibet." *Conservative Review*. 1.2 (May 1899): 278-88/

Hubel, Teresa. "In Search of the British Indian in British India: White Orphans, Kipling's *Kim*, and Class in Colonial India." *Modern Asian Studies*. 38.1 (Feb 2004): 227-52.

Humphrey, Christmas. *The Development of Buddhism in England*. London: The Buddhist Lodge, 1937.

Hutchins, Francis. *The Illusion of Permanence: British Imperialism in India*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1967.

Kinkead-Weekes, Mark. "Vision in Kipling's Novels." *Kipling's Mind and Art*. Ed. Andrew Rutherford. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1964.

Kling, Blair. "*Kim* in Historical Context." *Kim*. Ed. by Zohreh T. Sullivan. New York: Norton, 2002.

Kipling, Rudyard. *Kim*. Ed. Zohreh T. Sullivan. New York: Norton, 2002.

_____. "Buddha at Kamakura. *Rudyard Kipling's Verse: Definitive Edition*. New York: Doubleday, 1940.

"The Mark of the Beast." *The Collected Works of Rudyard Kipling*. Vol. 4. New York: AMS P, 1970.

Lane, Christopher. "Introduction." *Psychoanalysis of Race*. Ed. Christopher Lane. New York: Columbia UP, 1998.

"Lamaism." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 11th edition. 1910. 96-100.

Lopez, Jr., Donald. "Foreigner at the Lama's Feet." *Curators of the Buddha*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995.

McBratney, John. *Imperial Subjects, Imperial Space: Rudyard Kipling's Fiction of the Native-Born*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2002.

McClure, John. *Kipling and Conrad: The Colonial Fiction*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1981.

Parry, Benita. *Delusions and Discoveries: Studies on India in British Imagination 1880-1930*. London: Verso, 1998.

Shaumian, Tatiana. *Tibet: The Great Game and Tsarist Russia*. New Delhi: Oxford UP, 2000.

Spivak, Gayatri. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1988. 271-313.

Suleri, Sara. *The Rhetoric of English India*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.

Sullivan, Zohreh T. *Narratives of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

"Tibet." *Enclopaedia Britannica*. 11th edition. 1910. 916-927.

Thrall, James H. "Immersing the *Chela*: Religion and Empire in Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*." *Religion and Literature*. 36.3 (Fall 2004): 45-67.

Williams, Patrick. "*Kim* and Orientalism." *Kipling Considered*. Ed. Phillip Mallet. London: Macmillan, 1989.

_____. "'Simultaneous Uncontemporaneities': Theorising Modernism and Empire." *Modernism and Empire*. Ed. Howard J. Booth and Nigel Rigby. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000.

University of Iowa

"Gliding": A Note On the Exquisite Delicacy of the Religious Glissade Motif in Hopkins's "The Windhover"

Nathan Cervo

Poetry is a fine art. It proceeds by indirection, by a kind of perichoresis (a dancing around by) of all its elements in relation to its main theme. With this in mind, it is clear that readers of Gerard Manley Hopkins's poem "The Windhover" have remained in large measure immobile in a glue, as it were, of conventionalized metaphor safely thickening into some sort of baroque allegory: In "The Windhover," the bird is Christ our Lord who, striking, snatches up souls like a bird of prey and consumes them in the spiritual ardor of total commitment to the graces of the Crucifixion; that is, in the total immolation of the ego in the service of exemplary redemptive witness.

Such readers may be on the right track, but, as would-be connoisseurs of fine art, they fail to understand the aesthetic and referential strategies employed by Hopkins in getting them there.

In what follows, I argue a thesis that is wholly new to Hopkins's criticism; namely, that a unitive glede-glide-gleed ideational punning holds the poem's central meaning in place, as on a frame.

The bird that Hopkins "catches" in the poem's opening lines is a glede, a bird of prey. (For definitions of *glede*, *glide*, and *gleed*, see *OED*.) The word *glede* derives from Anglo-Saxon *glida*, from which we get the word *glide*, akin to Icelandic *glēda*. When Hopkins uses the word "*gliding*" (6), he resonates the semiotics inherent in his tiered language, the tripartite synchronicity of his key thematic paronomasia.

From the inchoate, he moves toward the clearly discernible and assertable. For example, what intimation does he "catch" at dawn?

kin*g*-
dom of day*li*ght's *d*auphin, dappl*e*

The italicized letters spell *glide*. The inchoate character of his emerging theme is then given sharper focus, or saliency, by the rhyming words "riding," "striding," "gliding," and "hiding" (2,3,6,7). (It is interesting to note that one of the synonyms for *glide* in modern Danish as well as in Hopkins's day is *skride*, *stride* (*English and Dano-Norwegian Dictionary* (168.)

When Hopkins uses the word "*gliding*" (6), he is ingeniously gliding flawlessly between one thematic homonym, *glede* (bird of prey), and another, *gleed*, Anglo-Saxon *gled*, from *glowan*, cognate to Danish *gled*, "burning coal, glowing coal": *glede*, "to make burning as red-hot; to glow, to be burning" (Nachfolger, 2: 101). *Gleed* is still used in English dialect today (*OED*).

From the incohate but emerging

kin*g*-
dom of day*li*ght's *d*auphin, dappl*e* (2)

to the introductlion of the dominant rhymes "riding," "striding," "gliding," and "hiding," the stridingly triumphant theme of gliding (which had been hiding under cover of Hopkins's joshing, or riding, his reader) emerges in its metaphorically Christian fulness in the poem's last lines:

and blue-bleak embers, ah my dear,
Fall, gall themselves, and gash gold-vermilion. (13-14)

Franklin Pierce College, ret.

Works Cited

English Dano-Norwegian Dictionary. Leipzig: Otto Machfolger, 1900.

Hopkins, Gerard Manley. *Poems*. Ed. Robert Bridges. New York: Oxford UP, 1944.

Coming in

The Victorian Newsletter

Rodney Stenning Edgecombe, "Gentlemen Saints and Self Tormentors: Leigh Hunt, Dickens, and Nineteenth-Century Asceticism"

Karen Kurt Teal, "Against 'All that rowdy lot': Trollope's Grudge against Disraeli"

Books Received

Craig, David M. *John Ruskin and the Ethics of Consumption*. Studies in Religion and Culture. Charlottesville & London: U of Virginia P, 2006. Pp. x + 422. $60.00. "The book's argument divides into three parts. The two chapters in part 1 introduce the theological structure of Ruskin's early readings of natural beauty and landscape painting and cultural reorientation that occurs in studies of Gothic architecture" (26) . . . . Chapter 3 . . . examines Ruskin's increasingly cultural understanding of 'nature' and his growing appreciation of the shaping power of the imagination on individuals' perception of things . . . . The fourth chapter . . . traces out the dramatic changes resulting from Ruskin's reconception as religions as ensembles of practices dependent upon individual imagination and communal performance to make them meaningful" (27) "Chapter 5 . . . relates Ruskin's advocacy of the virtues of natural and communal piety to a raft of other virtues—justice, most importantly. . . . The sixth chapter . . . demonstrates the constructive role of Ruskin's vocabulary of the virtues in his critique of Mill's classical political economy. . . . Chapter 7 asks, 'Is Good Consumption Possible?' and considers the charges of elitism and paternalism issued to Ruskin's ethics of consumption by Marx and Mill respectively" (28).

Gabin, Jane S. *American Women in Gilded Age London: Expatriots Rediscovered*. Gainesville et al: UP of Florida, 2006. Pp. [xvii] + 195. $39.95. Includes Mary Anderson de Navarro, Gertrude Atherton, Elizabeth Banks, Eleanor Calhoun (later Princess Lazarovich-Hrebelianovich), Pearl Richards Craigie, Edna May, Louise Chandler Moulton, Elizabeth Robins Pennell, Cora Urquaart Brown Potter, Elizabeth Robins, Mary Frances Carter Ronalds, Antoinette Sterling, Genevieve Ward.

Piya Pal-Lapinksi. *Exotic Woman In Nineteenth-Century British Fiction and Culture: A Reconsideration*. Durham: U of New Hampshire P, 2004. Pp. xx + 156. $60.00 (cloth); $24.00 (paper). "Since the first fabled reports of travelers returning from visits to the Ottoman and Mughal empires in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, European culture has been obsessed by the figure of the odelisque, a term initially used to describe a woman living in a Turkish harem or Indian zenana (literally 'woman of the chamber'), but gradually broadening over the course of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to include and connect various iconographies of the exotic woman. Visual and verbal representations of the harem as simultaneously a feminine utopia and a prison, a domestic space and a brothel, and an ethnically complex topos where white, black and brown female bodies became inextricably entangled, point to the multilayered richness of the trope of the female exotic. Like Leila's body [in *The Giaour*] this phantasmatic trope keeps shifting. Moreover, it is important to recognize that although harem odalisques or women 'behind the veil' form a larger part of this trope, they did not constitute all constructions of the exotic feminine. Many of these constructions, while rooted in the cultural space of the harem odalisque and sharing some of her attribute, at the same time move beyond these and connect with other peripheral and central spaces in European culture. Let me clarify at the outset, therefore, that for the purposes of this project, 'odalisque' does not merely designate the inhabitant of a harem. I use 'odalisque' interchangeably 'exotic/exoticized woman' as a fluid. shifting category that transforms itself continually." (xv).

Reed, Jr, Thomas L. *The Transforming Draught:* **Jekyll and Hyde**, *Robert Louis Stevenson and the Victorian Alcohol Debate*. Jefferson, NC & London: McFarland, 2006. Pp. x + 258. $35.00 (paper). "Early in 1874, when he was in his mid-twenties, Robert Louis Stevenson confessed to his friend and sometimes mentor Sidney Colvin, 'Curious how, wherever I go, I come trailing clouds of dipsomania' . . . . Stevenson was writing to Colvin from Menton, on just the first leg of what evolved into a life-long global quest for tolerable health. Yet, as the following pages will consistently reveal, the author's entire journey from cradle to grave was undertaken in the penumbra—if not the full shadow—of Bacchus" (1).

Schroeder, Natalie and Ronald A. *From Sensation to Society: Representations of Marriage in the Fiction of Mary Elizabeth Braddon, 1862-1866*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2006. Pp. 290. $52.50 "Our study investigates Braddon's representations of marriage in six novels published between 1862 and 1866. The first section . . . deals with Braddon's two most famous sensation novels. In chapter 1, we consider *Lady Audley's Secret* (1862) and examine, first, Lucy Audley's marriage to George Talboys, and second, her relation to Sir Michael Audley and the basis for her marriage to him. . . . The next two chapters take up *Aurora Floyd* (1863). Chapter 3 analyzes the happy marriage of Aurora Floyd's father, Aurora's own unhappy marriage to John Conyers, and the gender-based expectations of a man who almost becomes Aurora's second husband." (22). . . . Chapter 4 then examines and contrasts the marriage of Bulstrode to Lucy Floyd with the marriage of Aurora to John Mellish. . . . The second section . . . deals with three novels written between 1863 and 1865. . . . Chapter 5 examines the two most important marriages in *John Marchmont's Legacy* (1863). . . . Chapter 6 considers *Eleanor's Victory* (1863), a weaker novel in which Braddon does not generate a sustained argument about marriage in general but which nonetheless points the development of Braddon's fiction more decidedly in the direction of her novel of society. . . . Chapter 7 examines *The Doctor's Wife* (1864). . . . Once again, the premise of the principal marriage—between Isabel Sleaford and George Gilbert—is its lovelessness and ordinariness" (23-24). "The third and final section . . . considers in depth Braddon's first 'novel of society,' *The Lady's Mile* (1866). . . . Chapter 8 examines the unhappy marriage of Florence Crawford and Thomas Lobyer, one that reflects the prevailing values of the culture: materialism and greed. . . . Chapter 9 focuses on Florence's friends, Lady Cecil Chudleigh and, first, her love for Hector Gordon . . . . The chapter then examines the nature and consequences of Cecil's marriage to Laurence O'Boynville, a prominent lawyer. . . . Finally, chapter 10 analyzes the marriage of Mrs. Georgina Champernowne and William Crawford" (24).

Tromp, Marlene. *Altered States: Sex, Nation, Drugs, and Self-Transformation in Victorian Spiritualism*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2006. Pp. xii + 233. $65.00. "My argument here speaks to the cultural uses of ghosts in nineteenth-century England, of a 'new' religion called Spiritualism, which simply embodied the belief that a sincere seeker could contact those who had crossed over to the 'other side' for comfort or insight. Despite a general social expectation for middle- and upper-class reasonableness, sensibility, and incredulity, the attractive spiritual and material promises of the faith ensured that this religious movement and its metaphors cut across class and gender boundaries and reached a sizeable audience. It is my contention that the effects of Spiritualism and the stories it told were much wider-ranging and more substantial than previous scholarship suggests" (1).

Victorian Sensations: Essays on a Scandalous Genre. Kimberly Harrison and Richard Fantina, eds. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2006. Pp. xxiii + 278. $49.95 (cloth); $9.95 (CD). Includes Ellen Miller Casey, "'Highly Flavoured Dishes' and 'Highly Seasoned Garbage': Sensation in the *Athenaeum*"; Richard Nemesvari, "'Judged by a Purely Literary Standard': Sensation Fiction, Horizons of Expectation, and the Generic Construction of Victorian Realism"; Catherine J. Golden, "Censoring Her Sensationalism: Mary Elizabeth Braddon and *The Doctor's Wife*"; Albert C. Sears, "Mary Elizabeth Braddon and the 'Combination Novel': The Subversion of Sensational Expectation in *Vixen*"; Diana C. Archibald, "'Of All the Horrors . . .The Foulest and Most Cruel': Sensation and Dickens's *Oliver Twist*"; Dianna Vitanza, "Naturalism in Charles Reade's Experimental Novel, *Griffith Gaunt*."; Devin P. Zuber, "Swedenborg and the Disintegration of Language in Sheridan Le Fanu's Sensation Fiction"; Tamar Heller, "'That Muddy, Polluted Flood of Earthly Love': Ambivalence about the Body in Rhoda Broughton's *Not Wisely but Too Well*"; Galia Ofek, "Sensational Hair: Gender, Genre and Fetishism in the Sensational Decade"; Andrew Mangham, "'What Could I Do?': Nineteenth-Century Psychology and the Horrors of Masculinity in *The Woman in White*"; Richard Fantina, "'Chafing at the Social Cobwebs: Gender and Transgender in the Work of Charles Reade"; Nancy Welter, "Women Alone: Le Fanu's 'Camilla' and Rossetti's 'Goblin Market'"; Lindsey Faber, "One Sister's Surrender: Rivalry and Resistance in Rhoda Broughton's *Cometh Up as a Flower*"; Jennifer A. Swartz, "'Personal Property at Her Disposal': Inheritance Law, the Single Woman and *The Moonstone*"; Andrew Maunder "'I Will not Live in Poverty and Neglect': *East Lynne* and the East End Stage"; Lillian Nayder, "'The Threshold of an Open Window': Transparency, Opacity, and Social Boundaries in *Aurora Floyd*"; Tamara S. Wagner, "Sensationalizing Victorian Suburbia: Wilkie Collins's *Basil*"; Kimberly Harrison, "Political Persuasion in Mary Braddon's *The Octaroon; or The Lily of Louisiana*"; Vicki Corcoran Willey, "Wilkie Collins's 'Secret Dictate': *The Moonstone* as a Response to Imperialist Panic"; Monica M. Young-Zook, "Wilkie Collins's Gwilt-y Conscience: Gender and Colonialism in *Armadale*."

Wood, B. Anne. *Evangelical Balance Sheet: Character, Family, and Business in Mid-Victorian Nova Scotia*. Studies in Childhood and Family in Canada. Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2006. Pp. xxix + 197. $65.00. "While the reader may find the mixture of thematic analysis and life chronology somewhat confusing, and effort has been made to introduce the themes early in each chapter and to develop through the narrative of [W. Norman] Rudolf's life. . . . As Taylor emphasizes, it was through their life stories and reflections that Victorian evangelicals explored the meaning of their lives, tried to understand the ideal concept of character appropriate for their day-to-day existence, and arrived at judgments and vocabularies most insightful for their daily moral guidance. By the end of Norman Rudolf's life, his earnest search for God's moral guidance of his character proved of great benefit. While we never learn whether or not he had had a conversion experience, as a deeply mature Christian[,] Rudolf was able to accept his terminal illness. His major concern was for the plight of his family, displaying his altruism [,] another major trait of mature character. Rudolf, guided by his career ideal, had by that time learned to balance effectively his multiple stewardship roles, as well as the conflicting pulls of his outward worldly responsibilities and his inward evangelical search for meaning. His life story, therefore, provides an effective medium through which to analyze the complex Victorian notion of ideal character. (xxix).

Notice

We are pleased to welcome a new editor for *The Victorian Newsletter*. She is Deborah A. Logan. In the future submissions and all correspondence should be directed to her at: Deborah A. Logan, Editor, *The Victorian Newsletter*, 118 Cherry Hall, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY 42101; e-mail deborah.logan@wku.edu.