

# THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER

NUMBER 10, SUPPLEMENT I



AUTUMN, 1956

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

## AUBREY THOMAS DE VERE • 1814-1902

### *A Bibliography*

Of necessity, this bibliography has been selective, but we have tried to list most of the material by or concerning Aubrey De Vere. Our criterion has been to include the items which are of a critical or literary value, and which deal specifically with him.

Although we had to duplicate some items from earlier studies of De Vere, many of our entries are not found in previous bibliographies.

It is our hope that this list will be of value and of use to those interested in Aubrey De Vere, and in the Victorian Age.

### POETICAL WORKS

(Collected and Selected Editions)

*The Poetical Works of Aubrey De Vere.* 6 vols. London, 1884-1898. (v.2, new edition, with imprint: London and New York, 1895; v.4-6, new edition, with imprint: London and New York, 1897-1898.) Contents: - v.I. The Search After Proserpine, and Other Poems Classical and Meditative. - v.II. The Legends of Saint Patrick. Oiseen the Bard and Saint Patrick. Legends of Ireland's Heroic Age. Early Irish Records. -v.III. Alexander the Great, Saint Thomas of Canterbury, and Other Poems. - v.IV. May Carols; or Ancilla Domini. Legends of the Saxon Saints. - v.V. Inisfail, a Lyrical Chronicle of Ireland. The Irish Sisters. Early Poems, Meditative and Devotional. Poems for the Most Part Connected with the Great Irish Famine, 1846-1849. Urbs Roma. Saint Peter's Chains. - v.VI. Legends and Records of the Church and the Empire.

*Aubrey De Vere's Poems*, a selection. Edited by John Dennis. London, 1890. 821.8/D491a (stucks)  
*Selections from the Poems of Aubrey De Vere.* Edited with a preface by George E. Woodberry. New York, 1894.

*Poems from the Works of Aubrey De Vere*, selected and edited by Lady Margaret Dombile. London, 1904.

### POETICAL WORKS

(Separate Editions)

*The Waldenses, or the Fall of Rora; a Lyrical Sketch. With Other Poems.* Oxford, 1842.

*The Search After Proserpine, Recollection of Greece, and Other Poems.* Oxford, 1843.

*Poems.* London, 1855.

*May Carols; or Ancilla Domini.* London, 1857. (New York, 1866 and London, 1881.)

*The Sisters, Inisfail, and Other Poems.* London, 1861.

*Inisfail, a Lyrical Chronicle of Ireland.* 3 pts. Dublin, 1863. 821.8/D491a (same book)

*The Infant Bridal, and Other Poems.* London, 1864. (London, 1876.)

*Irish Odes, and Other Poems.* New York, 1869.

*The Legends of Saint Patrick.* London, 1872. (London, 1889 and 1905.)

*Alexander the Great, A Dramatic Poem.* London, 1874.

*Saint Thomas of Canterbury, a Dramatic Poem.* London, 1876.

*Antar and Zara, an Eastern Romance; Inisfail, and Other Poems, Meditative and Lyrical.* London, 1877.

*Fall of Rora; The Search After Proserpine, and Other Poems, Meditative and Lyrical.* London, 1877.

*Legends of the Saxon Saints.* London, 1879. (London, 1893.)

*The Foray of Queen Meave, and Other Legends of Ireland's Heroic Age.* London, 1882.

*Legends and Records of the Church and the Empire.* London, 1887.

*Saint Peter's Chains; or Rome and the Italian Revolution. A Series of Sonnets.* London, 1888.

*Mediaeval Records and Sonnets.* London, 1893.

## PROSE WORKS

- English Misrule and Irish Misdeeds; Four Letters from Ireland Addressed to an English Member of Parliament.* London, 1848.
- Picturesque Sketches of Greece and Turkey.* 2 vols. London, 1850. (Philadelphia, 1850.)
- The Church Settlement of Ireland, or Hibernia Pacanda.* London, 1866. (2nd edition, London, 1866.)
- The Church Establishment in Ireland, Illustrated Exclusively by Protestant Authorities.* London, 1867.
- Ireland's Church Property, and the Right Use of It.* London, 1867.
- Pleas for Secularization.* London, 1867.
- Ireland's Church Question; Five Essays.* London, 1868.  
Contents: - The Church Settlement of Ireland, or Hibernia Pacanda, 1866. - Ireland's Church Property, and the Right Use of It, 1867. - Pleas for Secularization, 1867. - Reply to Certain Strictures by Myles O'Reilly, Esq., being a Postscript to Pleas for Secularization, 1868. - The Church Establishment in Ireland, 1867.
- Reply to Certain Strictures by Myles O'Reilly, Esq., being a Postscript to Pleas for Secularization.* London, 1868.
- Constitutional and Unconstitutional Political Action.* Limerick, 1881.
- Ireland and Proportionate Representation.* Dublin, 1885.
- Essays, Chiefly on Poetry.* 2 vols. London, 1887.
- Essays, Chiefly Literary and Ethical.* London and New York, 1889.
- Religious Problems of the Nineteenth Century; Essays.* London, 1893.
- Recollections.* New York, 1897.

## MISCELLANEOUS

- O'Brian, (Edward.) *The Lawyer, His Character, and Rule of Holy Life.* With introduction signed A. De V. London, 1842.
- Heroines of Charity.* With a preface by A. T. De Vere. London, 1854.
- Select Specimens of the English Poets.* Edited by A. T. De Vere. London, 1858.
- Proteus and Amadeus, a Correspondence* (with Wilfrid Scawen Blunt.) Edited by A. T. De Vere. London, 1878.
- Fraser (Alice Mary) Baroness Lovat. *Seeds and Sheaves*, with prefatory verses by A. T. De Vere. London, 1892.
- The Household Poetry Book.* Edited by A. T. De Vere. London, 1893.
- Fraser (Alice Mary) Baroness Lovat. *Sown in Tears*, with prefatory verses by A. T. De Vere. London, [1906.]

## CRITICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL WORKS

## Books

- Alexander, Calvert. *Catholic Literary Revival.* Milwaukee, 1935. "The preface to *May Carols* (the 'Mary' poems suggested by Pope Pius IX) is one of the most important critical documents of the century."
- Brégy, Katherine. *Poet's Chantry.* St. Louis, 1912. The author claims that the personality of De Vere overshadowed his literary reputation. "I have lived among poets a great deal, and have known greater poets than he is," wrote Sara Coleridge in a memorable passage, "but a more entire poet, and one more a poet in his whole mind and temperament, I never knew or met with."
- Colby, Elbridge. *English Catholic Poets.* Milwaukee, 1936.
- De Vere, Aubrey. *Recollections of Aubrey De Vere.* London, 1897.  
"Recollections' and 'Autobiographies' are very different things; and this book belongs to the former class, not the latter. We have seen persons and places which have amused or interested us, and it occurs to us that if accurately described they might amuse or interest others also; but this is very different from writing one's biography, with which the world has little concern." (cf. PROSE WORKS.)
- Egan, Maurice F. *Ghost in Hamlet, and Other Essays in Comparative Literature.* Chicago, 1906.  
A comparison of De Vere's *Thomas of Canterbury*, with Tennyson's *Becket*. *Thomas of Canterbury* is responsible for De Vere's reputation in the nineteenth century.
- Gosse, Edmund. *Portraits and Sketches.* New York, 1914.
- Gunning, John P. *Aubrey De Vere, a Memoir.* Limerick, 1902.
- McGuire, Sister Anna Loretta. *Aubrey De Vere; His Position in the Catholic Literary Revival.* Brooklyn, N.Y., St. John's University, (unpublished Master's Thesis) 1943. "The purpose of this work is to consider the merit of Aubrey De Vere as a poet of Catholic inspiration, and the significance of his poetry in the Catholic poetic revival."
- O'Neill, George. *Essays on Poetry.* Dublin, 1919. De Vere's greatest work is *May Carols*. His religious views may explain his lack of popularity.
- ✓ Pijpers, T. A. *Aubrey De Vere as a Man of Letters.* Nijmegen-Utrecht, 1941.

291.167.05  
I 62  
1908



- 821.8  
D 4917R  
Reilly, Sister Mary Paraclita. *Aubrey De Vere, Victorian Observer*. Lincoln, 1953. "Though not a biography in the strict sense, it presents De Vere in his relationships with such people as Wordsworth and Tennyson, Sara Coleridge and Alice Meynell, Lowell and Longfellow, Newman and Manning.... The perceptive observations of a man like De Vere can illuminate for us the nineteenth century literary background because he was so integrally a part of it."
- Schrey, Gustav. *Aubrey De Vere's Alexandertragödie; eine quellen studie*. (Thesis) Strassburg, 1914.
- Sheehan, P. A. *Early Essays and Lectures*. London, 1906.
- Shuster, George N. *Catholic Spirit in Modern English Literature*. New York, 1922. "Chief among the Wordsworthians was Aubrey De Vere, a writer of exquisite mental poise and word control."
- 824.8  
T 242W  
Taylor, Una. *Guests and Memories*. London, 1924.
- Thompson, Francis. *A Renegade Poet and Other Essays*. Boston, 1910.
- Ward, Wilfrid. *Aubrey De Vere: A Memoir, Based on His Unpublished Diaries and Correspondence*. London, 1904. "When, as Mr. De Vere's literary executor under his will, I examined his papers with a view to publishing some of his prose remains, I found that practically nothing was written of the second volume of *Recollections* which he had planned. The letters and diaries, however, which he was revising with a view to their possible posthumous publication, at once struck me as in many cases suitable for this purpose. ... These (diaries and letters) supply, however, as I hope, sufficient material for a true picture of the man."
- Williamson, Claude. *Great Catholics*. New York, 1931.
- Woodberry, George E. *Makers of Literature*. New York, 1900.
- Woodberry, George E. *Studies of a Litterateur*. New York, 1921.

CRITICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL WORKS  
Periodicals

- Almond, T. Leo. "Aubrey De Vere," *Dublin Review*, CXXXVI (April 1905), 389-403. A review of Ward's, *Aubrey De Vere: A Memoir*. OS2 D814
- "Aubrey De Vere," *Living Age*, CCXLIII (1904), 405-410. Book review of Ward's biographical study of De Vere.
- "Aubrey De Vere," *Saturday Review* (England), XCIX (Jan. 21, 1905), 85. Book review.
- "Aubrey De Vere: His Personality and Friendships," *Literary Digest*, XXIX (Nov. 5, 1904), 597-598.
- "Aubrey De Vere, Poet," *Edinburgh Review*, CCI (Jan. 1905), 27-54. Book review of De Vere's, *Poetical Works*, 1892-1893; *Essays*, 1887-1889; *Recollections*, 1897; and Ward's, *Aubrey De Vere: A Memoir*, 1904. OS1 (nothing) L777
- OS1  
C363  
Barnes, John. "Hands Across St. George's Channel," *Catholic World*, CXI (August 1920), 649-658. The author attempts to "show the harmony of thought between two men dear to Catholics all the world over—the great Cardinal Newman, an ardent Englishman, and the amiable Aubrey De Vere, an Irishman by birth and predilection." (Review)
- Barrington, Michael. "Philosophy of Aubrey De Vere," *Temple Bar*, CXXXI (1905), 664-680. A defense of De Vere against those people who felt he was only a "man who wrote minor verse, and joined the Church of Rome."
- OS1  
C363  
Bfégy, Katherine. "Aubrey De Vere in His Prose Work," *Catholic World*, LXXXVI (Oct. 1907), 1-17. "We find this one man bequeathing us eloquent political beliefs, literary and theological criticism of the first order, delightful reminiscences, and a whole body of high and noble poetry."
- Bfégy, Katherine. "Poetry of Aubrey De Vere," *Catholic World*, LXXXIV (March 1907), 788-801. "Aubrey De Vere was one of the most sincere of poets and one of the most consistent." He possesses a "solid and sublime philosophy which underlies his entire poetic utterance." not in library
- "Claims of Aubrey De Vere," *Catholic World*, LXVIII (Oct. 1898), 143. (good)
- OS1  
C363  
Dixon, W. M. "The Poetry of the De Veres," *Quarterly Review*, CLXXXIII (April 1896), 310-338. Contains reviews of De Vere's, *Poetical Works*, 1892; *Legends of the Saxon Saints*, 1893; *Mediaeval Records and Sonnets*, 1893; *Legends and Records of the Church and the Empire*, 1887; *Legends of Saint Patrick*, 1892; *May Carols*, 1881. "Next to Browning's, Mr. De Vere's poetry shows, in our judgement, the fullest vitality, resumes the largest sphere of ideas, covers the broadest intellectual field since the poetry of Wordsworth."
- OS1  
C363  
George, Andrew J. "Aubrey De Vere," *Atlantic*, LXXXIX (June 1902), 829-835. A study of the prose and poetry of De Vere, as well as a few comments on the author's personal acquaintance and remembrance of the man.
- Hess, M. W. "Poet of the Catholic Revival," *America*, LXXXII (Dec. 3, 1949), 282-283.
- Hess, M. W. "Recalling Aubrey De Vere," *Ave Maria*, LXXIV (Nov. 10, 1951), 583-586.
- OS1  
A881  
Higginson, T. W. "Close of the Victorian Epoch," *Atlantic*, XCV (March 1905), 358-359. A portion of this article deals with some personal accounts and anecdotes regarding De Vere. (Review)

- Hutton, Richard H. "Poetical Works of Aubrey De Vere," *The Spectator*, LVII (Oct. 25, 1884), 1407-1409. "Trained in the friendship of Wordsworth, we expect many and good sonnets from his disciple, and we are not disappointed."
- McCarthy, J. "Swinburne and De Vere," *Catholic World*, XX (1874), 346-359. A criticism of Swinburne's *Bothwell*, and De Vere's *Alexander the Great*, with a comparison of these two dramatic poems.
- 052  
D 814  
"Mr. Aubrey De Vere's Irish Odes," *Dublin Review*, LXVI (1870), 79-95. (Deals mainly with "Inisfail.")
- Northrup, Clark S. "Recollections of Aubrey De Vere," *Dial*, XXXVIII (Jan. 1, 1905), 7-9. A review.
- O'Connor, R. F. "A Notable Convert: Aubrey De Vere," *American Catholic Quarterly*, XXXIX (April and July 1914), 215-231 and 394-406. A two-part article concerning the life and poetry of Aubrey De Vere.
- O'Kennedy, R. "A Family of Poets: Mr. Aubrey De Vere," *Ave Maria*, LIV (June 7, 1902), 716.
- O'Kennedy, R. "A Poet and His Home," *Ave Maria*, XLVI (June 15, 1898), 65.
- O'Neill, George. "A Centenary of Aubrey De Vere," *Irish Monthly*, XLII (1914), 237-244.
- 282, 105  
A 512  
Pillips  
Parsons, J. Wilfrid. "Aubrey De Vere," *America*, XIX (May 18, 1918), 145-146. A biographical account of De Vere which states that he is "little read...because his poetry is reflective rather than imagist, of God's world of spirit, rather than of sense."
- "Poems of the De Veres," *Dublin University Magazine*, XXI (Feb. 1843), 199-204. (Article No. 2 on Mr. Aubrey De Vere.) A critical review of De Vere's first published work of poetry, *The Waldenses*, 1842.
- 052  
D 814  
"Recent Irish Poetry," *Dublin Review*, LVI (1865), 323-328. A review of *Inisfail*, in which the reviewer states that it, "comes last on our list (of reviews) but certainly not least in our estimation." (A good article)
- Reilly, Sister Mary Paraclita. "Aubrey De Vere, Tennyson, and Alice Meynell," *Thought*, XXI (March 1946), 109-126. "A close study of the unobtrusive Aubrey De Vere reveals the astonishing, but generally unrecognized fact that he was a most significant figure in the nineteenth century."
- Rudd, F. A. "Aubrey De Vere," *Catholic World*, IV (Oct. 1866), 73-86.
- Russell, Matthew. "Unpublished Letters of Aubrey De Vere," *Irish Monthly*, XXXIX (1911), XL (1912), XLII (1914), XLIII (1915)
- Stevenson  
Smith, Helen Grace. "Aubrey De Vere," *Irish Monthly*, XXVII (1899), 64-71.
- Smith, Helen Grace. "Talks with Aubrey De Vere," *Weekly Register*, (Feb. 11, 1899.)
- Smith, Walter George. "Aubrey De Vere," *Alumni Register*, (University of Pennsylvania) VII (May 1902), 381-392.
- Stokes, Margaret. "The Foray of Queen Meave and Other Legends by Aubrey De Vere," *Academy*, XXII (July 29, 1882), 77-78. Book review.
- Sullivan, F. M. "Aubrey De Vere," *American Catholic Quarterly*, V (July 1880), 509-533. A critical study of De Vere's, *Infant Bridal*, 1864; *The Sisters and Inisfail*, 1867; *May Carols*, 1866; *Irish Odes and Other Poems*, 1869; *Antar and Zara*, 1877, and *The Fall of Rora*, 1877.
- 45 in  
W. J. ...  
Taylor, I. A. "Recollections of Aubrey De Vere," *Catholic World*, LXVI (Feb. 1898), 621-633.
- 052  
A 168  
Thompson, Francis. "Aubrey De Vere," *Academy*, LXII (Jan. 25, 1902), 93-94. "The death of Mr. Aubrey De Vere removes from us not only a poet of distinction but the last link with the poetic past of the 19th century." At his best, De Vere, "was a most inspired and a true poet."
- Towle, E. A. "Aubrey De Vere," *Month*, C (Sept. 1902), 232-243.
- Towle, E. A. "Recollections of Aubrey De Vere," *Sewanee Review*, VII (July 1899), 271-286.
- "Will of Aubrey De Vere," *The Athenaeum*, No. 3884 (April 5, 1902), 436. Lists the literary executors of Aubrey De Vere as Wilfrid Ward, Wilfrid Meynell, Mrs. Towle, and Miss Agnes Lambert. Corrects the daily paper report of a legacy left to the executors. The task of editing De Vere's correspondence which he docketed as "to be published" undertaken by Wilfrid Ward.

St. John's University, New York

Paul A. Winckler and William V. Stone

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



# THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER

NUMBER 10



AUTUMN, 1956

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

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

Bradford A. Booth ( <i>UCLA</i> )	Donald L. Hill ( <i>Michigan</i> )
Mildred G. Christian ( <i>Tulane</i> )	Charles H. Kegel ( <i>Michigan State</i> )
Robert A. Colby ( <i>Queens, Flushing, N.Y.</i> )	Oscar Maurer ( <i>Texas</i> )
A. Dwight Culler ( <i>Illinois</i> )	W. O. Raymond ( <i>Bishop's U., Canada</i> )
Charles T. Dougherty ( <i>St. Louis U.</i> )	Charles Richard Sanders ( <i>Duke</i> )
Royal A. Gettmann ( <i>Illinois</i> )	R. C. Schweik ( <i>Marquette</i> )
Gordon S. Haight ( <i>Yale</i> )	Marian Shalkhauser ( <i>De Pauw</i> )
F. Taylor ( <i>The John Rylands Library</i> )	

## GEORGE ELIOT'S THEORY OF FICTION

James D. Rust, "George Eliot on the *Blithedale Romance*," *Boston Public Library Quarterly*, VII (October 1955), 207-215.  
James D. Rust, "The Art of Fiction in George Eliot's Reviews" *Review of English Studies*, NS, VII (April 1956), 164-172.  
Alice R. Kaminsky, "George Eliot, George Henry Lewes, and the Novel," *PMLA*, LXX (December 1955), 997-1013.

These three recent articles are based in part on George Eliot's contributions to the *Westminster Review* during her first years in London. In 1852-1853 under the editorship of John Chapman notices of new books were gathered into four groups headed Contemporary Literature of England, America, Germany, and France. From Lewes's record of payments made him we know that he wrote the French articles from January 1852 through July 1853; and one of George Eliot's letters reveals that Mrs. Edward Sinnett generally wrote the German articles. But the longer and more important sections on English and American books were composite in authorship. In January 1852, for example, Herbert Spencer (according to his *Autobiography*, I, 384) reviewed Carpenter's *Physiology* and probably the books by Garth Wilkinson, R. G. Latham, and E. P. Thompson that follow (Vol. LVII, pp. 274-281). The donnish account of Browne's *History of Classical Literature* (pp. 253-257) is obviously by a different hand from the pages discussing historical books, while the travel books seem to show still another.

Before definite conclusions are drawn about George Eliot's part in these composite articles, they must be submitted to an intensive study in which vocabulary, spelling, phrasing, and sentence structure are compared closely with contemporary writing known to be hers. Length of sentences offers a rough criterion; page for page her sentences will be found longer than those of most of the other contributors. There are pitfalls in any test, for George Eliot as editor linked the various reviews together so that her distinctive touch may sometimes be found in pages that she did not write. In the absence of positive evidence—acknowledgment in a letter, bibliography, or biography, records of payment, or a marked file of the periodical—the greatest caution should be used in attributing these *Westminster* articles to particular authors. On the basis of style alone I should assign to George Eliot the opening notices of Carlyle's *Life of Sterling*, Macready's *Suwarow*, and Holland's *Memorials of Chantrey* (pp. 247-253) as well as those on Newman's *The Present Position of Catholics*, F. D. Maurice's *The Old Testament*, the novels of the quarter, and Beddoes's *Poems*.

In January 1854 the geographical division was abandoned and the reviews were rearranged by subject: Theology, Philosophy, and Politics; Science; Classics and Philology; History, Travel and Biography; Belles Lettres; and Art. From her Journal we know that in addition to her major articles on Cumming, Riehl, Heine, Young, and the rest, George Eliot wrote the Belles Lettres from July 1855 through January 1857, in which number she also wrote the section entitled History, Biography, Voyages and Travels. At that same moment the first installment of "Amos Barton" appeared in *Blackwood's*, and George Eliot ceased to contribute to the *Westminster*. She was succeeded by George Meredith, whose signed receipts prove him the

author of the Belles Lettres sections from April 1857 through January 1858, reviewing among other interesting books his own novel *Farina!*

Mr. Rust's first article is not quite accurate in its statement about George Eliot's connection with the *Westminster* (p. 207); she could not have become editor in May, 1851, for Chapman did not buy it until October; nor was her reviewing ever limited to American books. Though he gives no reasons, Mr. Rust does not hesitate to accept the review of Hawthorne's *Bliithdale Romance* in October 1852 as George Eliot's. In spite of some journalistic crudities which seem to me below the level of her writing, it is very tempting to ascribe it to her. Mr. Rust gives a clear summary of it and an able analysis of its significance. Appearing five years before the *Scenes of Clerical Life*, it indicates, as he says, that when she came to the writing of fiction, she had "thought long and deeply about the problems of the novelist, and had arrived at definite opinions concerning the form, style, and purpose of the novel." It foreshadows her concern with the moral element in fiction and with realism.

In his second article, published in the *Review of English Studies*, Mr. Rust takes a somewhat broader stand, and drawing more upon articles of 1855-1856 which are known to be hers, he can generalize more safely on George Eliot's theory of fiction. Her "artistic credo" is summarized under four heads: Art (1) widens men's sympathies, (2) has a moral mission, (3) ministers through pleasure, not pain, and (4) presents life realistically. Though readers may disagree with some of these categories and wish for others, they will find here a straightforward statement of George Eliot's views given mainly in her own words. Realism receives the most attention. Mr. Rust properly points out the influence of her favorite poet Wordsworth's interest in the commonplace. Characters must speak and act like real people, from real motives and not for melodramatic or sentimental or didactic effect on the reader. While Mr. Rust quotes from her review of *Modern Painters*, he perhaps gives Ruskin less importance than he deserves in the development of realism. "The truth of infinite value that he teaches," George Eliot wrote in April 1856, "is realism—the doctrine that all truth and beauty are to be attained by a humble and faithful study of nature." In practically every branch of the arts, I believe, the Victorian passion for the exact imitation of nature will be found to derive some impetus from the teachings of Ruskin.

Mrs. Kaminsky, taking Gourl'honne's suggestion of Lewes's influence on George Eliot, extends it by drawing upon the whole body of his literary criticism in an effort to establish Lewes as "the primary influence in aiding George Eliot to formulate her theory of the novel." Lewes's criticism of the novel has already been carefully studied by Professor Morris Greenhut, whose admirable article in *Studies in Philology*, XLV (July 1948), 491-511, though it does not deal with the possible influence on George Eliot, is still the best account. According to Mrs. Kaminsky Lewes believed that a good novel should (1) "enlarge the sympathies and understanding of man"—an aim she associates with his knowledge of Comte and Hegel, though I think it is found in England before either philosopher was known there; (2) represent human life realistically; (3) present "the actual emotions, motives, and thoughts" with psychological truth; (4) have a philosophical or intellectual content; (5) have form, adapting the means to the end with no extraneous or superfluous elements. Discovering all these qualities that Lewes recommended in George Eliot's writings, Mrs. Kaminsky concludes that she adopted his theory and made it the basis of her own.

Some readers will pause before accepting this *post hoc, propter hoc* reasoning. Teachers can point out a fault, propose a more effective expression, encourage, and stimulate; but who ever showed a genius how to create a masterpiece? Lewes, as Mrs. Kaminsky admits, was a mediocre novelist; his reputation was based on his *History of Philosophy*, his columns in the *Leader*, and his plays, not on his novels, neither of which attained a second edition. His novels illustrate everything that Lewes's mature criticism condemns: melodrama, sentimentality, lack of realism in characters and action, lack of intellectual content and social significance, lack of form and unity. The hero of *Rose, Blanche, and Violet* (1848), the preposterous Marmaduke Ashley, a devastatingly handsome "Brazilian Othello," with "the blood of the tropics in his veins," having been jilted by Mary Hardcastle, "a little, humpbacked, golden-haired, coquettish, heartless woman," returns to England three years later to revenge himself by making her love him again and then proposing to one of her stepdaughters. Rejected by the redoubtable Violet, Marmaduke, by a quick reading of Burke and the other orators ancient and modern, learns the art by which the masses are swayed and (though not a British subject) immediately enters Parliament, where he succeeds so well that Violet marries him. This, told in all seriousness, is only one of the four unrelated, rambling threads of plot.



In quoting Blanche Colton Williams's notion that George Eliot took Hetty Sorrel's name from Hester Mason in this novel Mrs. Kaminsky apparently thinks there may be something in it. Hester Mason is a village blue-stocking, "the Sappho of Walton," authoress of *Glooms and Gleams*, By One Who Has Suffered, an emancipated woman of twenty-five, with a "magnificent bust" and "Devonshire legs." Regarding marriage as outmoded and immoral, she cheerfully becomes the mistress of an impossible stagey old fop Sir Chetsom Chetsom, who sets her up in an extravagant house in London, where the smart set flocks to her salon to hear her harangue on "women's rights." No one who had read the book could imagine the remotest connection between Hester Mason and Adam Bede's pathetic little Hetty, whose name, moreover, is a diminutive not of Hester but of Henrietta.

There is a more cogent objection to Mrs. Kaminsky's argument than Lewes's ineptitude as a novelist: George Eliot herself was writing fiction before he was and expounding her well formulated critical views before she knew him. Sara Hennell wrote in 1846: "Mary Ann looks very brilliant just now—we fancy she must be writing her novel" (*The George Eliot Letters*, I, 223). Mrs. Kaminsky passes over George Eliot's earlier remarks to compare her "Silly Novels" (1856) with Lewes's "Lady Novelists" (1852). Actually, all of his cardinal principles can be found in George Eliot's reviews in the *Westminster* for January 1852, two numbers earlier. Few feminine novelists, she declares, "exhibit the subtle penetration into feeling and character, and the truthful delineation of manners, which can alone compensate for the want of philosophical breadth in their views of men and things" (p. 283). She condemns *Spiritual Alchemy* for aiming "at a didactic effect by an inflated style of reflection, and by melodramatic incident, instead of faithfully depicting life and leaving it to teach its own lesson, as the stars do theirs" (p. 284).

Many of the quotations Mrs. Kaminsky uses to establish Lewes's critical theory come from articles written *after* his union with George Eliot. Looking through the perspective of a century we have little doubt that of the two intellects hers was the more powerful. Why, then, is it not equally probable, as Mathilde Blind suggested in the earliest biography (1883, p. 67), that Lewes "with his flexible adaptiveness" had come under George Eliot's influence? Mrs. Kaminsky would doubtless counter this reversal of her argument with passages from George Eliot's *Journal* avowing her dependence on his judgment. She read aloud to him everything she wrote and adopted many of his criticisms. They were not invariably good. His conviction that Dinah rather than Hetty would form the center of interest in *Adam Bede* seems to me a mistake; my students invariably find Hetty the center, and it is possible that the book might have been greater had George Eliot trusted her own instinct. So with *The Spanish Gypsy*, which she laid by and resumed later on Lewes's advice. The poem was really his idea from the start, begun perhaps as a play for Helen Faucit, in subject and plot much closer to the mind of the successful writer of melodramas than to George Eliot's. How gladly would we trade the 350 pages of labored blank verse for another *Middlemarch*! Similar reflections arise from his influence on *Romola* and "Brother Jacob."

Mrs. Kaminsky is careful not to press her thesis too hard: to assert, she says, "that Lewes influenced George Eliot's theory of the novel is not to give him credit for its application." It may however misrepresent the true relations between them. Few couples lived in such close intimacy with greater independence of opinion. The main bias of her mind was set long before she knew Lewes, and neither felt any urge to dominate. She wrote Sara Hennell, 13 November 1860:

If you referred to something in Mrs. Lewes's letter, let me say once for all that you must not impute my opinions to him, nor vice versa. The intense happiness of our union is derived in a high degree from the perfect freedom with which we each follow and declare our own impressions. In this respect I know no man so great as he—that difference of opinion rouses no egotistic irritation in him, and that he is ready to admit that another's argument is the stronger, the moment his intellect recognizes it. (*The George Eliot Letters*, III, 359).

What Lewes gave her was not critical theory nor inspiration but emotional support. Her extraordinary diffidence and self-depreciation, intensified by the equivocal social situation, paralysed her creative faculty. Without Lewes beside her to encourage, approve, admire, she could not write at all. In his zeal he sometimes praised inferior work or proposed tasks remote from her talent. Yet without his generous, self-effacing exertions we should probably have had no George Eliot.

Yale University

----

Gordon S. Haight

## THE REPUTATION OF DICKENS

George H. Ford, *Dickens and His Readers: Aspects of Novel Criticism Since 1836*. Princeton.

By this time the merits of Professor George H. Ford's *Dickens and His Readers* will be known to most students of Victorian fiction, certainly to those who were familiar with the quality of his earlier work on the reputation of Keats. It would be superfluous, then, to give a detailed summary of his account of how Dickens fared with readers—both common and uncommon—and critics from 1836 to the present. The overall structure of his book is a chronological one with three parts. The first deals with Dickens' early emphasis upon laughter, fear, and pity—that is, with the impact of *The Pickwick Papers*, *Martin Chuzzlewit*, and *The Old Curiosity Shop*. The second part describes the reception of the later novels with their appeal to a sense of social justice, and the third section opens with the effect of Forster's biography and then traces the way in which Dickens' novels weathered the criticism of both the aesthetes and the realists and evoked numerous fresh appraisals and appreciations after World War II. At strategic points Professor Ford intermits his chronological course and treats in full a particular problem; for example in the fourth chapter he ranges from Francis Jeffrey to Henry Miller in his inquiry into Dickens' sentimentality. The book is packed with information, which Professor Ford carries gracefully—except for an early passage in which he informs us that the Duke of Wellington was "an eminent Tory"—and which he presents in a prose style that is always lucid and very often pointed and spirited.

Since it would be doing a disservice to readers of *The Victorian Newsletter* if I only lavished praise upon *Dickens and His Readers*, I shall turn to a few minor particulars about which I have just a shadow of a doubt. First a point in literary history: as Professor Ford himself seems to suspect, Victorian earnestness did not obligingly make its first appearance in 1837 or even in that decade. There were other but related sorts of earnestness to which Charles Lamb objected as early as 1802, and the prudery of Ballantyne—or rather his awareness of the increasing prudery—compelled Scott, much against his will, to cancel and rewrite some twenty pages of *St. Ronan's Well* in 1824. When Lamb in 1829 burst out with "Damn the age," he was not being quaint: he was simply objecting to a shift in sensibility which had closed in upon him. Another minor point in literary history: no one will take exception to Professor Ford's statements about the low status of fiction in the early decades of the century and the anarchical condition in the criticism of the genre, but one might hesitate at his further assumption that this state of affairs arose from "the failure to establish qualitative distinctions." Having had occasion to look into some notices of fiction in the 1830's, I am under the impression that the reviewers frequently did try to draw distinctions between good and poor novels. Admittedly some of the attempts were clumsy as in the case of one writer who, in appraising the books in circulating libraries, resorted to such categories as "Novels by Walter Scott and novels in imitation of him"; "Novels of good character, Dr. Johnson, Goldsmith, etc."; "Romances, *Castle of Otranto*, etc."; "Novels of lowest character, being chiefly imitations of fashionable novels, containing no good although probably nothing decidedly bad." The shortcomings in the criticism of fiction were, I suspect, due not simply to unawareness of differences in quality but also to the lack of a critical vocabulary. The reviewers and critics were hampered by a lack of keen-edged tools.

Among the questions to which Professor Ford addresses himself is this important one, "How did their [the Victorian readers'] reactions affect Dickens' own development as a novelist?" Twenty years ago Edwin Muir stated the matter bluntly when he declared that in the works of Scott "the public got the upper hand of the novelist" and that "its most perfect instrument was Dickens, of whom one could not say whether he led his public or was led by it." And in Dickens' own day the problem was graphically illustrated on the cover of Lover's *Handy Dandy*—a broad clumsy hand with the motto "Give us your fist, my darlin' Public." In his second chapter Professor Ford sharply puts the question, but he then blunts it by pointing out that George Eliot and Stevenson managed to be both popular and good and by remarking that Dickens was relished by Oxford dons, prime ministers, and Edinburgh reviewers. To be sure he returns to the problem in later passages and points to a few specific cases of Dickens' writing down to his audience—for example, the marred ending of *Great Expectations* and the veiling of the sexual situations in some of the novels. On the other hand, Professor Ford makes clear, Dickens' choice of low scenes and characters, together with the sharpness of his satire, shows that he did not always defer to the preferences of his readers. But one does not come away from the book with an ordered, full answer to this question, and one wishes that Professor Ford had treated it in a long, continuous discussion in which the focus would have been fixed on the novels themselves. The answer to the question as to how far and in what ways Dickens was the victim of his age would require, I suspect, a close scrutiny of particular works and even a comparison of isolated passages.



Granted that the most fruitful scholarship and criticism spring from respect and affection for the subject, it might be argued that this book would have gained from a touch of skepticism about Dickens. Although Professor Ford is clear-eyed about specific limitations and defects of the novels, his overall view would have been sharpened by a bit of distrust—just as patriotism ought to be strengthened by a drop of treason. To cite an example: taking his cue from Stevenson's remark that most readers "long not to enter the lives of others, but to behold themselves in changed situations," Professor Ford argues, rightly I think, that Dickens' novels do not cater to this desire for vicarious participation. But the argument is something less than convincing, for it does not squarely meet the real question. To say that Dickens does not offer the reader self-satisfaction is not to say that he invites, or better yet, compels him to the kind of self-examination that is required in the reading of Jane Austen or Gogol. I choose *Dead Souls* deliberately because in the very center of that novel, peopled by Dickensian grotesques and caricatures, stands the figure of Chichikov. Apparently respectable and normal, he is the very essence of nothingness; and to grasp his utter good-for-nothingness is to undergo an experience that, so far as I can judge, Dickens does not exact from his reader. It may well be that this self-scrutiny is not a requirement of the great novel, but in any case it cannot, I think, be claimed for Dickens. And this point sheds some light on what Professor Ford regards as "one of the mysteries of his reputation... that it was sustained in spite of his biting satire of Victorian puritanism..." One further example: in the chapter "The Poet and Critics of Probability" Professor Ford remarks that Dickens wasted his prefaces in defending himself against the charge that his characters were grotesques and that his novels were wildly improbable. And he says that Dickens was forced into the "false position of asserting that his imaginary creations are not imaginary and that no element of fantasy exists in his work." The point is well-made, but why say that Dickens was forced into this ineffective defence? Didn't he simply take it or choose it? Meredith, faced with a somewhat similar problem, took his position on "a Rhone island in the summer drought, stony, unattractive, and difficult between the two forceful streams of the unreal and the over-real, which delight mankind." And instead of denying that his style was extravagant, Meredith explained why metaphor was essential to his purpose of throwing light upon the "soul's encounter between Nature and Circumstance."

These are matters of minor detail which do not diminish in the least the large values of Professor Ford's book. It exceeds its manifest purpose: it will serve as a corrective for fragmentary and distorted views of Dickens and as a preparation for critical re-appraisals of the individual novels.

University of Illinois

----

Royal A. Gettmann

#### ON THE THEORY OF TROLLOPE'S PESSIMISM

O. A. J. Cockshut, *Anthony Trollope: A Critical Study*. Collins.

Though the novels of Anthony Trollope continue to be the subject of "appreciations" and the excuse for nostalgic excursions into a cherished, irrecoverable past, they have stimulated fewer solid critical analyses than have the works of any other novelist of similar stature. In recent years there has been nothing more ambitious than Beatrice Curtis Brown's 100-page monograph in the "English Novelists Series." Now, however, A. O. J. Cockshut has come forward with a two-part survey of certain facets of Trollope's interests as they impinge upon his work.

"Trollope and His Times" is the less controversial of the two sections and by far the more satisfactory. Here Mr. Cockshut discusses successively "Human Nature," "Property and Rank," "Father and Son," "Religion and the Clergy," "Death," "Politics," and "Love." Aside from the fact that Mr. Cockshut tends to take Trollope's more whimsical statements in the *Autobiography* and elsewhere too seriously and to argue therefrom his lack of interest in ideas, there is not a great deal here that one would take violent exception to. Mr. Cockshut's chief error, it seems to this reviewer, is in making general statements about Trollope's opinions on the basis of the evidence of the novels only. Thus, for example, he notes Trollope's "vague personal thoughts about rank." In point of fact, Trollope had very precise convictions about rank, but they are not to be found in the novels, the evidence of which, because of the dramatic development of character, can be very misleading.

Section two, called "Progress to Pessimism," offers, in terms of studies of half a dozen novels of the last period, the thesis of the book. The idea that Trollope became increasingly bitter and sardonic, that the novels from 1867 reveal each "a further stage in the steepening curve of the author's pessimism," and that as we watch Trollope we see "a gradual

darkening of the imagination and failure of his hopes" is not new, for it has been argued by the Stebbinses. But I think it is notably wrong-headed and cannot be supported by a close examination of either Trollope's life or his work. I intend shortly in another place to present full evidence against what strikes me as a serious misconception of Trollope's attitudes and purposes. It may suffice here merely to state in general terms the bases of disagreement.

Fundamentally, the theory of Trollope's pessimism arises from the fact that the light-hearted social comedy of the Barsestshire novels was followed, first, by the more sober political studies and, second, by serious social satires, concluding, finally, with such excursions into the demonic as *Mr. Scarborough's Family*. The fallacy, as it seems to me, lies in assuming that a creative artist necessarily reflects his own temper as he writes. It need scarcely be mentioned that some of the gayest novels have been written in the blackest, most desperate circumstances. Further, Mr. Cockshut's theory does not sufficiently consider the force of trends and fashions in art forms. Trollope was an artist, but he was also a businessman-novelist. After 1867 he lived largely by his pen. He would have been very foolish indeed had he not responded to the changes which were occurring in the subject-matter of fiction. In the 'fifties and 'sixties he wrote early Victorian novels, as did every other writer who was trying to be popular. In the 'seventies this kind of novel no longer sufficed; witness the similar change in Dickens.

It is not possible, I think, to establish firmly the theory of Trollope's growing pessimism. Indeed one might argue, quite as fallaciously, the opposite. Nothing, apparently, could be more savage than the indictment of English political and economic life in *The New Zealander* (1855), and nothing could be more gloriously optimistic than the passage in the *Autobiography* which explains how the social philosophy of *The Way We Live Now* should be interpreted. The fact is that Trollope knew and understood most of the disparate elements of English life. In the Barsestshire novels he amused himself and us by picturing one of these. Having said all that he cared to say, or perhaps could say, on this score, he very properly turned his attention in the late novels to another aspect of familiar English life. He did not turn away from Barsest because of any fundamental change in his attitude toward life. When many years later he was asked why he did not write another Barsest story, he replied only that it would require too much work to go back through all the novels to pick up the continuity. Nevertheless, he did write shortly before his death an amusing novelette, "The Two Heroines of Plumplington," which could scarcely be more light-hearted. I do not discount entirely the theory of some late intensification of Trollope's native hatred of sham and dishonesty, but it is seriously misleading to use this as a theory by which to explain his literary career.

Though my quarrel with Mr. Cockshut is a fundamental one, it would be unfair if I did not say that his criticism of individual novels is generally thoughtful and intelligent. His incisive remarks on *The Way We Live Now* and *Mr. Scarborough's Family* have sharpened my own perception of Trollope's achievement in these works. True, we do not agree at all points. Mr. Cockshut seems to regard as a neglected masterpiece *An Eye for an Eye*, which to my mind is one of the worst novels that Trollope, or indeed anybody else, ever wrote. But this may be in some measure a matter of taste. More important, perhaps, are Mr. Cockshut's sound and suggestive observations about certain aspects of technique; for example, his statement that "the Victorian novel owes much to the ancient English tradition of stage comedy," and that Henry James in his criticism of the obtrusive author "did not perhaps realize that the author himself plays a part similar to James's favourite watcher and narrator." These are comments which help us to look both backwards and forwards historically and to understand relationships that may not always have been clear.

In the midst of many cursory and unscholarly essays it is heartening to find a book by a careful student trying to come to grips with an author whose elusive charm continues to defy precise analysis. I am sorry that I cannot accept Mr. Cockshut's thesis, but I appreciate his sincerity, salute his integrity, and welcome his interest.

University of California, Los Angeles

---

Bradford A. Booth

### KIPLING: ONE OF THE BEST WE HAVE

C. E. Carrington, *The Life of Rudyard Kipling*, Doubleday.

Although Mr. Carrington's book will not very much alter our general conception of Kipling's life, reputation, or literary achievement, it will be welcome to readers with a respect for facts and will give scholars a surer base for further research. Mr. Carrington, who is educational secretary of the Cambridge University Press, has been enthusiastic about



Kipling ever since he learned to read. "At times," he says, "I have been infuriated by some facets of Kipling's sparkling talent; but, looking back on my life, I find no other writer who has seen through the eyes of my generation with such a sharpness of observation. I owe far more to Kipling than to some of the great classic figures of literature..." He has sought "to draw out the elusive, retiring figure of Rudyard Kipling from behind the screen of his published works." In doing so he has written a much more fully detailed and reliable account of Kipling's life than any other and has set it more informatively in the current of contemporary political, military and literary events. He has had the help of many people who knew Kipling well and has made good use of unpublished documents. For such material he is most deeply indebted to Mrs. George Bambridge (Kipling's surviving daughter Elsie), who allowed him to use the family papers and advised him along the way, correcting errors and supplying comments, anecdotes, sidelights, episodes, and even several long descriptive passages. The family papers include Kipling's press-cutting books, many portfolios of correspondence, and Caroline Kipling's diaries, which she kept with characteristic diligence from the day of her marriage. "After 18th January 1892," says Mr. Carrington, "there is rarely any doubt where Rudyard was or whom he met." Among his other unprinted sources, the most important are the Henry James and the Charles Eliot Norton letters in the Houghton Library; the Berg collection in the New York Public Library, which includes several early drafts of Kipling's manuscripts; the Carpenter Collection in the Library of Congress, which includes letters of Dr. Conland and many documents formerly belonging to Mrs. S. A. Hill, Kipling's close friend in India and after; the Theodore Roosevelt papers in the Library of Congress; Kipling's letters to Rhodes and Herbert Baker at Rhodes House, Oxford; the Milner papers at New College, Oxford; the Kipling-Barry correspondence in the Toronto Public Library; and papers in the possession of various individuals. Although Mr. Carrington is annoyed by the disposition of highbrows and critics to underestimate or to ignore Kipling, he is not especially contentious, nor is he solemn, nor too ambitious, nor theory-ridden. His writing is lively, sensible, sometimes vivid.

There is not much new information here on the Southsea period, but rather surprisingly Mr. Carrington refuses to dismiss "Aunty Rosa" as "a tyrant, a cruel foster-mother"; without denying that these were wretched years, yet he somewhat discounts Kipling's stories of his wretchedness and makes no case for permanent damage to the boy's psyche. We get a glimpse here of Kipling's restless, clumsy, talkative, trying precocity. The pages on his years at the United Services College leave us with a vivid impression of 'the way in which the astonishing ink-stained boy outgrew the school and left it already a writer, "thirsting," as his father wrote to a friend, "for a man's life and a man's work." Mr. Carrington seems to understand the Indian scene in Kipling's day, and in his chapters on the "Seven Years Hard" (1882-89) his new materials begin to count. Unpublished letters to friends and relatives back home, and especially those addressed to Mrs. Hill whenever she and he were separated in India, supply sidelights on his activities and aspirations, sometimes on the very stuff of the early stories.

It is the Hill letters again that enable Mr. Carrington to outline the course of Kipling's transitory love affair with Caroline Taylor, Mrs. Hill's younger sister, whom he met in Pennsylvania on his journey to London in 1889. Caroline's father was a Methodist minister who appears to have found Rudyard's religious views not entirely satisfactory. Mr. Carrington suspects that the affair would have come to nothing in any case, but he finds it behind Learoyd's story in "On Greenhow Hill" and regards the story as in effect a farewell to Caroline. Kipling was far more deeply moved by his long unrequited attachment to Flo Garrard, who was in some sense the original of Dick's disappointing lover in *The Light That Failed*; he kept her in mind during all the Indian years and when he returned to London met her by chance in the street. This and other episodes from Kipling's personal life were disguised and patched up into the novel, the truculent tone of which was a reflection of his contempt for literary London. Kipling's letters and reports back to India suggest with a marvellous immediacy the mood and flavor of those violently active and enormously productive two years during which he burst into public attention with the loudest report in English literary history. In his study of Kipling's residence in Vermont, Mr. Carrington concludes that it was on the whole a restful, happy, and fruitful experience for Kipling the writer and that the Kiplings' struggle with Beatty Balestier was only one of a number of influences that drew them reluctantly back to England in 1896.

As Kipling's parents grew older, his own family began to replace the "Family Square" of the years before his marriage. He was always a devoted and a much-loved father, as Elsie's "Epilogue" to this book and indeed his own writings amply show, and against this background the deaths of Josephine in New York in 1899 and of John in France in 1915 take on a special poignance. Elsie testifies that "Josephine belonged to his early, happy days, and his life was never the same after her death; a light had gone out that could never be rekindled." The effect of these experiences on his work during the last half of his life cannot be defined with any certainty, but he must at any rate be thought of as a man who had had his share of sorrow.

The height of Kipling's vogue as a public figure coincided ironically with the death of Josephine and the bitterly disappointing showing of the British in the Boer War. Mr. Carrington's documentation will help us appreciate the amazing public response to the series of poems in the *Times* which included "Recessional" and "The White Man's Burden," poems which touched the feelings of a nation as only Winston Churchill has touched them since. This book contains the first well informed account of Kipling's repeated refusals not only of the poet laureateship but of many other titles and honors, on the ground that he wanted to be perfectly free to write as he chose. In general he accepted academic honors—many indeed—but refused governmental honors, and the Order of Merit was awarded him without his consent. It cannot have been generally appreciated how close he was for many years to some of the key figures in the Tory government, nor how prolific and well received his advice to Gwynne of the *Evening Standard*, the Tory newspaper. During the last half of his life he accepted and carried out a great many assignments of public or semi-public character; his membership on the War Graves Commission after the first World War is a good example. Kipling's national significance is something unique and arresting in recent English history, and Mr. Carrington's evidence will help us see more accurately just what it was.

At intervals in the course of his chronicle Mr. Carrington pauses to summarize and define Kipling's views, often taking issue with Kipling's liberal critics and saying what can be said in his defense. Of "Recessional" he reminds us that the poem was "the word given at Britain's proudest moment by the great imperialist, a call to humility and a warning that the proudest empire is ephemeral as a day's pageant." He puts "The White Man's Burden" in its historical context: it was a call in 1898 to the United States, victorious against Spain, to join in the task of imperial rule; but it was "a task to be done without material reward, without thanks, without even a confident hope of success." While Kipling was finishing "The White Man's Burden," he was also writing the Stalky story called "The Flag of His Country," describing the schoolboys' reactions to patriotic propaganda, a story in which "the impeccable conservative M.P." is "cruelly satirized" and "heartily condemned." This story was Kipling's comment on the jingoism of the time. These things need to be said, for it is always tempting to stereotype Kipling into a figure we need for a myth—but, as his writings show, he isn't quite it. It is healthy to have the discrepancies insisted upon. Mr. Carrington insists also that Kipling was not "the poet of orthodox conservatism," but "the very opposite of that; his admiration was always for the irregulars, the Legion that never was 'listed,' That carries no colours or crest, / But, split in a thousand detachments, / Is breaking the road for the rest." He holds that "Even at sea, the engineer, down below, is his hero rather than the gold-laced captain on the bridge," and that the verses entitled "The Sons of Martha" best summarize his social philosophy. It is still possible to say fresh things about Kipling's later work, as Edmund Wilson did; Mr. Carrington sees in *Rewards and Fairies* (1910) "a reverent religious sense which can hardly be paralleled in his early work" and in *Debits and Credits* (1926) a mature humility which succeeded the earlier knowingness out of which he grew, "a more delicate sensibility and a deeper penetration of motive." Kipling's fiction needs to be related more shrewdly than it has been to the most serious fiction of our time, and sometimes Mr. Carrington's comments point out paths for exploration. For instance, he remarks that Kipling's "obsession with the war-dead dwelt [sic] upon his understanding that the soldiers were initiates, admitted to a higher degree of the suffering which is the law of life..." And he notices that "a theme in all the war stories was the 'breaking-strain,' the amount of pressure human beings can stand from physical tortures and mental terrors without a psychological collapse." Although in general his critical comments are admiring, he can speak very sharply of Kipling's occasional cruelty and call "Dayspring Mishandled," for instance, "profound, obscure, and singularly unpleasant."

Mr. Carrington regards Kipling as a great writer who after the War was forgotten in literary circles but whose greatness is proved by the enormous sale of his books. His contempt for hostile critics is very much like Kipling's. "Never was any man buried in Poet's Corner with more clear a title as master in the craft of letters, never any man more worthy to lie beside Charles Dickens and Thomas Hardy. His impact upon the age he lived in had been greater than that of any writer since Dickens, and, like Dickens, Rudyard Kipling had always been a man of the people. Neither had forfeited even a fraction of a vast publicity by reason of the strictures of the fastidious. There had always been critics who said that Dickens was 'vulgar' because sentimental, and Kipling 'vulgar' becomes brutal, but the people knew better." The people bought fifteen million copies of the collected volumes of stories, to say nothing of the other volumes of his work, during Kipling's lifetime. Not many of us will agree that even poor critics are refuted by figures like these; they must be refuted by better critics. Mr. Carrington's own survey of critical comment shows that from Gosse and James to Edmund Wilson, the better critics have acknowledged Kipling's genius and found some of his work to be of the best we have.



## THE LIFE OF JOHN RUSKIN: A "PRELUDE"

Helen Gill Viljoen, *Ruskin's Scottish Heritage*, University of Illinois Press.

In 1954 Professor Helen Gill Viljoen brought Ruskin biographical studies to a halt by announcing in effect that all previous biographies of Ruskin are wrong in their facts, and that her forthcoming biography would radically correct Cook and Wedderburn and all who followed them (*VNL*, April, 1954, pp. 4-6). Although they were adequately warned, Victorian scholars who have been impatiently awaiting the unveiling of her work may be disappointed to discover that *Ruskin's Scottish Heritage* is but the "Prelude" to the biography which has been promised. Mrs. Viljoen has permitted just a tantalizing peek and then danced away again. But we have no choice but to swallow our impatience and to await her pleasure, for she has shown enough in this volume to indicate that if she does not write the definitive biography of Ruskin, it will not be written in our generation.

A 284-page biography which ends with the conception of its subject tempts the reviewer to cry out with Tristram Shandy "Heaven prosper the manufacturerers of paper under this propitious reign," or soberly to calculate that at this rate the full work may require eighty thousand pages. But Professor Viljoen is too serious and able a scholar to be reviewed lightly. She began her studies twenty-five years ago, before the manuscripts collected at Brantwood were scattered. She has evidently worked untiringly, and has shown an uncanny ability to gain access to private collections and to uncatalogued library holdings. Thus her principal qualification for undertaking this biography is the startling boast that she has "read more unpublished Ruskin manuscripts than has any other human being who has ever lived, with the sole exception of their author" (pp. 9-10).

The first fruit of that industry is a study of Ruskin's grandparents and of his parents through the date of their marriage. It seems to me that she has three reasons for devoting so many pages to what she freely confesses would ordinarily occupy only a few pages of a biography. First, she is establishing the validity of her apparatus against the claims of all previous biographers; second, she regards heredity as extremely important in the understanding of personality in general; and third, she regards heredity as peculiarly significant in Ruskin's life.

For the first, Professor Viljoen has not relied upon the biographical material provided in the Library Edition and in Cook's standard *Life*. Her sources are the unpublished materials which have been at her disposal, public records, and contemporary memoirs. Because all the other biographers except Collingwood have relied upon Cook and Wedderburn's biographical data, this is a distinct departure. Consequently she has felt that it was worth while to pause at point after point to show that the standard lives have been mistaken. In one hundred pages of notes she relentlessly builds up the proposition that nothing that is stated in *Praeterita* or in the biographical apparatus in the Library Edition may be accepted without verification. This is an embarrassing conclusion, not so much for Ruskin's biographers, who usually have been English journalists rather than university people, as for Victorian scholarship in general. In retrospect it is ludicrous to watch each biographer repeat that Ruskin's mother was Margaret Cox, the daughter of the captain of a fishing trawler at Yarmouth, when she was, in fact, Margaret Cock, the daughter of a tavern keeper in Croydon, but one cannot but be a bit rueful as he meditates upon the Victorian scholars who have uncritically accepted and passed on this misinformation. One wonders, too, whether Ruskin scholarship is alone in being so uncritical of facts. Did the charm of *Praeterita* leave Ruskinians peculiarly blind, or has Mrs. Viljoen opened a pit down which only the hardiest will dare to peer? Which biographer of a Victorian figure has exhaustively verified every fact against available public records—birth registers, wills, baptismal records, marriage records, town records, city directories—as Mrs. Viljoen has done? She has opened up a new era in Ruskin scholarship, and she is a symptom of a growing responsibility among Victorian scholars. Recent textual studies of poems and certain editions of letters suggest that Victorian studies may be ready to find a rigidity of method comparable to that which has marked the serious Renaissance and Restoration studies for a generation.

Against those who may ask, at this point, what difference it makes what Ruskin's maternal grandfather did for a living, Mrs. Viljoen would reply that it happens, in this case, to have made a great deal of difference in the relation of his parents, and thus in his own life and work, but beyond that she would assert that this error in fact is one of dozens, perhaps hundreds, that have added up to a grotesque distortion of the real John Ruskin.

If I have understood this book, Mrs. Viljoen has intended to place Ruskin's parents exactly within the class structure of the Edinburgh which formed them both. She has showed from their antecedents who and what they were as they arrived in Edinburgh, and from contemporary memoirs she has reconstructed for us the values of that class conscious society. She intends thus to show the relationship between Ruskin's father and mother. This will determine the youth of Ruskin, so the argument runs, and the youth will determine the maturity.

Whether or not Mrs. Viljoen carries through on these lines, the immediate result of this labor has been to deepen our understanding of Ruskin's social thinking. To know precisely what a merchant was in John James Ruskin's Edinburgh, for example, is to illuminate *Unto this Last*, and to understand the efforts his family made in London to divest their speech of the Scottish burr is to clarify the passion for correct speech that marks passages in *Sesame and Lilies*.

But Mrs. Viljoen has made few efforts to anticipate herself by explicating any of Ruskin's writings. That, if it comes at all, will await the full biography. This book, as it stands, throws relatively little light on Ruskin's work or on his life. It would be a complete enigma to anyone not already conversant with the Ruskin literature. But Mrs. Viljoen has accomplished her first purpose. She has shown that every biography since Collingwood's is wrong in its facts, and she has established the validity of her own apparatus for gathering the facts.

This book, of course, cannot be adequately assessed until it is read in the light of the volume[s?] to which it is a prelude. It appears that from the new facts about John Ruskin a personality is going to emerge which is much more consistent with Ruskin's writings than the monstrous caricatures which have come down to us.

However, Mrs. Viljoen apparently intends to build her biography in the light of "a viewpoint cognizant of developments in twentieth-century psychology" (p. 23). "*Ruskin's Scottish Heritage*," she writes, "becomes one product of a period when men have learned to comprehend how forces—family and environmental—which determine the securities and insecurities of parents, likewise determine their subsequent behavior and thus affect their treatment of their children so that, as ancient wisdom knew, the 'sins' of fathers, and of their fathers, can leave a mark from generation unto generation" (p. 24).

I do not know how much Professor Viljoen knows about heredity. She acknowledges in her introduction her indebtedness to Dr. Gotthard C. Booth, "psychiatrist in New York City," for her "general understanding of the complexities involved in 'heritage'" (p. 29). There is no book on the subject in her bibliography. This is ominous. The very heart of Mrs. Viljoen's work is the rigor of her scholarship. It will be a shame if it should now be vitiated by an organization built upon a layman's casual understanding of an infant science. This is not a judgment of the book at hand, but an attempt to forestall a danger anticipated in the work to come.

Let Mrs. Viljoen give us the facts in Ruskin's biography, and let her give them the only meaningful order, that is, as a context for each of Ruskin's works as it was written, and she will have performed an inestimable service to Victorian scholars and to the memory of John Ruskin. If, on the other hand, she makes her book rely in any essential way upon a current theory of psychology, we all may be the losers.

St. Louis University

----

Charles T. Dougherty

### THE QUESTION OF CARLYLE'S "CONVERSION"

Carlisle Moore, "*Sartor Resartus* and the Problem of Carlyle's Conversion," *PMLA*, LXX (September 1955), 662-681.

Professor Moore has made a lucid, orderly, and penetrating study of an extremely difficult problem. Drawing upon evidence of many kinds, he has attempted to trace the stages of progress in the development of Carlyle's mind and spirit during the formative years 1821-1831 and to indicate the relationship between Carlyle's own experiences and those of Teufelsdröckh in *Sartor Resartus*, particularly those described in the chapters entitled "The Everlasting No," "The Centre of Indifference," and "The Everlasting Yea." In dealing with Carlyle himself, he seeks to discover point by point what happened and when it happened. The rejection of the Everlasting No, through which Carlyle freed himself from fear and doubts, involved a struggle which Moore believes did not end in victory until 1825-1826, just before Carlyle's marriage, although it may have begun with the famous Leith Walk experience of 1821 or 1822. The manifold philosophical and spiritual gains which make up the Everlasting Yea were not, according to Moore, achieved in completeness until 1830-1831 while Carlyle was writing *Sartor*; furthermore, the very act of writing *Sartor* had much to do with bringing these to fruition. Moore enumerates six convictions as composing the Everlasting Yea: (1) the belief that the universe is not merely mechanical and that man is not merely animal but that the universe is dynamic and men are spirits and brothers; (2) the belief that man's spirit is divine and free and that it achieves strength in so far as he does good; (3) the belief in renunciation, the annihilation of self; (4) the belief in the holiness of sorrow and the power which it has to ennoble the human spirit; (5) the belief that action clears away doubts and solves spiritual problems; and

(6) the belief in duty as something which prompts man to apply his ideals to the practical concerns of life in so far as his individual talents permit. The article marks a definite advance in our understanding of *Sartor* and Carlyle.

The great merit of Moore's conclusions, particularly with regard to the time-scheme which Carlyle's own development followed, is that they warn us against oversimplifications such as the belief that Carlyle was completely born again in the twinkling of an eye as he strolled down Leith Walk on his way to take a swim or, on the other hand, Grierson's statement that Carlyle never really got beyond the Everlasting No. The shaggy contours of Carlyle's life, mind, and spirit can be made to appear simple only by distortion. As a matter of fact, even Moore's careful, logical study, mainly by merit of the fact that everything works out neatly in the time-pattern and some of the phrasing suggests a fairy-story ending after the mighty struggle, still tends too much toward simplification. A great work of art is usually a victory of the human spirit both for its creator and for those who enter into and assimilate it after him. *Sartor* was this for Carlyle and may be so for us. But artistic triumph and even the formation of philosophical convictions are not the same thing as spiritual stability. Carlyle had made for himself a philosophical frame of reference by 1831 to which he held steadfastly the rest of his life; but 1831 was by no means the end of his spiritual turbulence. The "blessedness" which the Everlasting Yea prefers to "happiness" came to him only by fits and starts. The difficulty of realizing one's ideals he did not himself underestimate, but he struggled bravely with himself throughout his life, and when he failed could only explain that he had done what he could with "the nature of the beast." For instance, there was too much of Swift in Carlyle for him to find love of one's brother man easy to apply as a general doctrine in living or in thinking about society. He could love Emerson, Browning, John Forster, and Leigh Hunt, but not the rogues and fools with which the world was chiefly populated. And there were times when he found it not at all easy to love Emerson. It may stand without argument, moreover, that annihilation of self was not an easy ideal for Thomas Carlyle to live up to consistently. Professor Moore's study hints too broadly that all was well with Carlyle's soul after the writing of *Sartor*. Carlyle was a good man, an unusually good man, but his whole life was characterized by spiritual struggle.

Other pertinent questions may be raised. Why does Carlyle, a Dissenter with a Calvinistic background, have Teufelsdröckh's "conversion" begin, not like Bunyan's with a sense of sin and a contrite spirit, but with a rebellious spirit and a determination to emancipate himself from all that would shackle his own ego? Humanistic self-fulfilment even when coupled with self-renunciation is a far jump from the orthodoxy of Dissent. What is the significance of such a conception of "conversion" and of its influence? And is it not possible to emphasize Teufelsdröckh as an autobiographical figure too much, especially Teufelsdröckh the German Transcendentalist, and thus forget his other side—his side as a *persona* with whom Carlyle delights to play and may even scold and his side as a disciple of Swift, Descendental and bitterly cynical. Furthermore, Teufelsdröckh owes much to Cervantes (it is an important fact that Carlyle and Jane were reading *Don Quixote* in the original Spanish while *Sartor* was being written) with his conception of the mysterious and tricky nature of reality in a world where knights on horseback seen in the distance may suddenly turn into a flock of sheep. In Carlyle's own philosophy instability and stability constantly play a game of hide and seek. It is well to keep in mind here what Carlyle told C. J. Duffy in 1849 about his influence on Emerson (*Conversations with Carlyle*, 1892, p. 93). Emerson, he said, had taken his system out of *Sartor*, but he had worked it out in a way of his own, constantly forgetting that one truth may require to be modified by precisely the opposite truth. Teufelsdröckh does not represent the whole of Carlyle's spiritual development, and the development of Transcendentalism described so dramatically in "The Everlasting No" and "The Everlasting Yea" does not represent the whole of Teufelsdröckh's.

I cannot agree with Professor Moore that Carlyle's notebooks are more trustworthy than his letters in providing evidence of his spiritual development. He wrote in his notebooks very intermittently and, more often than not, when he was in a morbid state of mind. The letters, too, are sometimes morbid; but they reflect all his moods recorded in a fairly continuous sequence. And although he might occasionally put up a bold front and hide his deepest feelings in a letter, he usually wore his heart on his sleeve in writing to his friends and members of his family. What, for instance, in *Sartor* describes the condition of the Everlasting No better than the following passage from a letter to Edward Irving, not quoted by Moore, bearing the significant date 14 August 1821?

No strength of soul can avail you; this malady will turn that very strength against yourself; it banishes all thought from your head, all love from your heart—and doubles your wretchedness by making you discern it. O! the long, solitary, sleepless nights that I have passed—with no employment but to count the pulses of my own sick heart—till the



gloom of external things seemed to extend itself to the very centre of the mind, till I could remember nothing, observe nothing! All this magnificent nature appeared as if blotted out, and a grey, dirty, dismal vapor filled the immensity of space; I stood alone in the universe—alone, and as it were a circle of burning iron enveloped the soul—excluding from it every feeling but a stony-hearted, dead obduracy, more befitting a demon in its place of woe than a man in the land of the living: I tell you, my friend, nothing makes me shudder to the inmost core—nothing but this (*Scribner's Magazine*, XIII (1893), 417-19).

Duke University

Charles Richard Sanders

### TRUTH IN THE RING AND THE BOOK

Robert Langbaum, "*The Ring and the Book: A Relativist Poem.*" *PMLA*, LXXI (March 1956), 131-154.

Mr. Langbaum's article has the merit of an original approach to the study of Browning's aim and method in the composition of *The Ring and the Book*. Much has already been written on the unique and ingenious form of this great poem, including the excellent analyses of it in Professor McElderry's "*The Narrative Structure of The Ring and the Book,*" and Professor DeVane's in the fifth chapter of his *A Browning Handbook*. The originality of Mr. Langbaum's handling of his theme is that he concentrates on the psychological and aesthetic import of the form of the poem rather than on the details of its structure.

At the outset of his article, he regards *The Ring and the Book* as an illustration of "the relativist ethos predominant in Western culture since the Enlightenment." The primary factors which account for the relativist form of the poem seem to me, however, to be individualistic rather than the reflection of a general ethos. The poem's structure was probably first suggested to Browning by the nature of his sources in the *Old Yellow Book*, a collection of legal documents involving different points of view and opposing arguments. It was also in keeping with his passion for case-making, and the psychological subtlety which led him to delight in a many-faceted portrayal of situation and character. Moreover, it gave full scope for his favorite medium of artistic expression, the dramatic monologue.

As Professor Hodell comments on *The Ring and the Book*, "truth is a master word throughout the poem." The centrality of its relativist structure is apparent in Browning's emphasis on his method as being in accord with the nature of Art, and the only way in which man can attain his highest vision of truth. Truth is too large and many-sided to be grasped through an objective view of events or crystallized in a formula. As Mr. Langbaum writes: the relativist assumption is "that truth cannot be apprehended in itself but must be 'induced' from particular points of view." To cite Browning's own words:

Truth nowhere lies yet everywhere in these -  
Not absolutely in a portion, yet  
Evolvable from the whole, evolved at last  
Painfully, held tenaciously by me.

In Langbaum's discussion of the judgments in *The Ring and the Book* there is an element of paradox which makes close reading necessary to disentangle the threads of his arguments. He claims that, in certain respects, these judgments are not relative. The moral contrast between Pompilia and Guido is that of white and black. Pompilia is a saint and Guido the incarnation of evil. There is no relativity in the virtue of the one or the vice of the other. Moreover, though there are characters of "indefinite moral position" in the poem, the judgment of them is quite definite, without qualification. Here Mr. Langbaum would seem to have in mind the poet's own pronouncements. As he writes: "Browning tells the main events of the story in his own voice in Book 1, in such a way as to shape our judgments of the speakers before we have met them."

On the other hand the judgments voiced by the majority of speakers in the dramatic monologues of *The Ring and the Book* are relative, though in varying degrees. They are influenced by their personalities, prejudices, and circumstances. As Mr. Langbaum puts it: the judgments are "relative to the particular conditions of the poem and to the motives and quality of the characters." He illustrates this by a succinct review of the volitions, prepossessions, and milieus of the various speakers in *The Ring and the Book*.

The core of the relativism of the poem, however, according to Mr. Langbaum, is the perception that "social and religious absolutes" are inadequate to lead to the full apprehension of truth. The absolutism embodied in the formulae and dogmas of great institutions, such as the Church and State, would condemn the elopement of Caponsacchi and Pompilia as contrary to moral and legal codes. As Mr. Langbaum comments: "truth is larger and in advance of the

formulations and institutions of any age." There is a disequilibrium between truth as a spiritual principle, truth as God sees it, and the machinery of forms and dogmas which are its temporary and external embodiment. When these become outworn, fresh insights into truth must be gained through its source in the human heart. "Truth is within ourselves," Browning wrote in *Paracelsus*. It is through the "escape" of "imprisoned splendour" in the rightness and purity of motives of individual minds—their intuitions, instincts, and present contact with reality—that a new order of things is born and ampler vision of truth is revealed to mankind. As the Pope in *The Ring and the Book* avows, we must

Correct the portrait by the living face,  
Man's God by God's God in the mind of man.

Mr. Langbaum stresses the basis of Browning's poem in "crude pure fact"—the pristine gold of the ring—and the way in which the alloy of the poet's imagination interprets and illuminates the facts while keeping in touch with their essential truth. After the fusion of fact and imagination, truth is attained on a higher level through reprimation. This at once raises the question, which has always been a critical crux, how far is the poet justified in his claim of absolute fidelity to the facts of the Old Yellow Book? Mr. Langbaum's article stops short of considering a very significant element in *The Ring and the Book*—the relativity of Browning's own judgments.

Judge Gest, weighing evidence with a trained legal mind, has made it clear that Pompilia—an unfortunate Italian peasant girl, whose conduct under terrible duress evokes compassion rather than condemnation—was not the saint of Browning's imagination. Neither was Caponsacchi, though endowed with admirable traits, the knightly St. George of *The Ring and the Book*. The letters of Pompilia were genuine, not forged as Browning maintains. Other factual errors are palpable.

In connection with the poet's relativity of judgment, Professor Shaw and Professor Smalley have dwelt on some of Browning's prepossessions. The chivalric spirit revealed in many of his poems influences his portrayal of the relations between Pompilia and Caponsacchi. More intimately, the story of their romantic elopement recalled the way in which he had rescued Elizabeth Barrett from a tyrannical household bondage. Pompilia becomes in a sense an image of his wife.

In a letter to Julia Wedgwood regarding *The Ring and the Book*, Browning writes: "here my pride was concerned to invent nothing: the minutest circumstance that denotes character is true." Yet, while there is a large element of "pure crude fact" as the basis of the poem, it is clear that Browning transfigures and idealizes his sources with the imaginative freedom of a great poet. Despite his assertion of literal fidelity, he creates rather than merely re-suscitates. The distinction of *The Ring and the Book* lies not in a transcript of its raw material, or even in an artistic illumination of it, but in the fact, as Miss Corrigan has put it, that in the representation of the Franceschini and Comparini families "their story was transmuted by Robert Browning from a sordid tale of greed and treachery into an epic of the human spirit."

Bishop's University

----

W. O. Raymond

### GONDAL'S QUEEN

3

Fannie E. Ratchford, *Gondal's Queen*, University of Texas Press.

In the century since the last of the Brontë sisters died, the most creative critic to illuminate their work has been Fannie Elizabeth Ratchford, Mrs. Gaskell, otherwise perceptive to a marked degree, failed, in her *Life of Charlotte Brontë*, to recognize the significance of the Brontë juvenilia; C. K. Shorter in a series of books on the Brontës, and T. J. Wise and J. Alex Symington in their Shakespeare Head Brontë edition, all printed portions of these youthful works without assessing them. It remained for *The Brontës' Web of Childhood* by Miss Ratchford to make apparent how far those childhood endeavors molded mature practice and revealed the character and mentality of each of the writers it studied. The *Web*, in fact, changed critical history as it concerns the Brontës.

Now *Gondal's Queen* by Dr. Ratchford brilliantly extends her service to critical evaluation, this time penetrating far into the enigma that is Emily Brontë. For the whole of the enigma is not explainable. In her lifetime Emily's determined reticence made her an unsocial being, chilling to most of the few who knew her at all. As poet, represented in her and her sisters' *Poems by Currer, Ellis and Acton Bell*—of whom she was Ellis—she treated intense emotions in a way that clearly did not win readers; the volume sold but two copies in the year that it appeared (1846). She scarcely bettered herself with the Victorians when she published *Wuthering Heights*, for its passionate queerness alienated them. The intensity of Charlotte's grief over

Emily's death, a grief made generally known in the preface that Charlotte prepared for the second (1850) edition of Emily's novel, actually served to make Emily more of an enigma than ever. The picture of her that has come down to us is of a contradictory nature, stormy yet Spartan in its self-control, fiery yet cold—in short, paradoxical. No wonder "explanations" of her have poured forth, and especially in this day of psychiatric preoccupations.

Miss Ratchford's approach is intentionally different. One of its aims, in fact, is to still forever the autobiographical interpretation of the *Poems* and to exhibit them as portions of a larger work of art, the Gondalian "epic," as Miss Ratchford calls it. The nature of the lost prose of that work she sets out to reconstruct from the evidence found in the total body of Emily's surviving manuscripts, chiefly poems, and from other relevant manuscript material. Thus she uncovers the central design of the whole work and the particulars of numerous subsections of it. Her purposes in so doing are also to demonstrate: that the Gondalian narrative has "grandeur" and "unity of meaning" expressed in a "free, wild, grotesque" imaginative-ness; that Emily's and Anne's associated work on the whole narrative consciously paralleled Charlotte's and Branwell's associated creation of the Angrian story, but that Emily's design was "a conscious and studied antithesis of philosophy and moral judgment, advanced, no doubt, in protest against the fallacies of the earlier [Angrian] creation." Miss Ratchford admits that mysteries of plot, character, and meaning in the epic of Gondal remain to be resolved. She points out, also, that so far she has been able to fit only fifty per cent of Emily's poems into the reconstructed narrative described in *Gondal's Queen*.

The creativity of Miss Ratchford as analyst is abundantly evident in this book; the powers of her literary detectiveship are unmistakable. One ends the book convinced of its major contention: that Emily's poetry is no revelation of personal experience other than that of imaginative kind. And time and again conviction claims one as the evidence presented by Miss Ratchford proves the specific point being advanced. Yet the study frankly makes use of intuition too, exercised in what the critic herself describes as an effort to "think Emily's thoughts" and thus discover her intention. The result is a brilliant piece of collaboration between Emily Brontë and her analyst, owing much to Miss Ratchford's own imaginative skill in bridging lacunae. However, since the author has been at pains to tell us precisely how she has pursued her game, we approach this reconstruction with a sense of enthralled participation.

What is the nature of the evidence?

It is chiefly historical and textual. Miss Ratchford reviews the history of Emily's manuscripts and evaluates the editions of her poetry with particular reference to the accuracy of their respective readings. She demonstrates how the birthday notes prepared by Emily and Anne every four years, to be opened and read four years after each writing, not only reveal that a long prose narrative of Gondal and Gaaldine—two island kingdoms—once existed, but even tell something of its subject matter, stages of progress, and significance to its writers. With this evidence—some of it not released to the public till 1951, in the birthday note of June 26, 1837—Miss Ratchford combines what was long thought to be mere scribbling in Anne's hand: a list of Gondalian and Gaaldine names in Anne's school geography, the list proving a key to the geography of Emily's two territories. And to these sources of information Miss Ratchford relates comments in the Angrian writings of Charlotte and Branwell referring to their sisters' semi-parallel tale. Taken together these pieces prove that the lost prose dealt with events and persons to be found also in Emily's poetry. Certain poems could now, Miss Ratchford found, be grouped, and certain groups related to one another. It began to appear also that the poems came after the prose, though not always being composed in the chronological order of the narrative events they enlarged; and that certain incidents received repeated and varying treatment. Initials, as, A. G. A., began to be translatable, sometimes a letter at a time. These translations further helped to clarify unsuspected relationships and show that certain supposedly multiple characters are actually one under varying names and titles. At length Miss Ratchford's long-held suspicion that "many, perhaps all" of Emily's poems "were...units in a flaming epic of a purely imaginary world and its people" could no longer be held as theory; the poems in this volume are provably such units.

The process here described has occupied Miss Ratchford from the early 1920's to the present; puzzle has yielded, in her mind, to theory and then to certainty as mosaic pieces of information have fallen into place. *Gondal's Queen* is the result. It is a book exciting to read because it is a fine example of literary detection but even more because it publishes a virtually new work by Emily Brontë. The powers of genius apparent in *Wuthering Heights* are here enhanced; Emily's imaginative range is much extended, geographically and otherwise; her independence of Branwell, still persistently proposed by some as the "real" author of *Wuthering Heights*, is established beyond debate; and her own standards of value emerge far more clearly than ever before. Her nature, then, is at last more nearly definable. For this book gives solidity to her complexity. She emerges as a clear-eyed realist whose emotions nonetheless surge and swell as powerfully as any Byron's, but whose stern moral sense—not in the least



puritanical—relentlessly depicts the inevitable results of her characters' choices, bad and good. Her interpretation of life shows consistent and rational, while her emotions range wide and deep, in ecstasy or depression, never despair.

But this study is not only a signal achievement in clarification; it is a seedbed of ideas for other students to pursue, pointing out the problems yet unsolved and inviting attack upon them. Nonetheless, one feels that two conditions must be met before further significant work in this kind may be done: more of the manuscripts by Emily must come to light; and another critic as honest, as skillful, as informed and perceptive as Miss Ratchford must appear. It is improbable that the latter condition will be met soon, though the former is at least a possibility.

Newcomb College, Tulane

----

Mildred G. Christian

(Editor's Note: Professor Christian spent the summer in England pushing to its end a definitive edition of the letters of Charlotte Brontë. She has already collected, almost wholly from the manuscripts themselves, the text of some 500-600 of Charlotte Brontë's letters, and wishes to locate many more. She requests the aid of readers of *VNL* in her search. She desires to know the location of any letter by the Brontës, but particularly Charlotte, in either libraries or private hands. Professor Christian has also been asked by the Council of the Brontë Society to catalogue the uncatalogued manuscripts in the Brontë Museum in Yorkshire. The editor welcomes the warmth of Professor Christian's tribute to Professor Fannie Ratchford.)

## METHOD IN THE STUDY OF VICTORIAN PROSE

### *A Criticism*

In his recent criticism of John Holloway's *The Victorian Sage* (*VNL*, No. 9, 1956) A. Dwight Culler rejected, for insufficient reasons I believe, a method which offers real possibilities for increasing our knowledge of prose techniques in the Victorian period. Holloway's method, simply a combination of classical rhetoric and semantics, does pose real theoretical problems, and, like the New Criticism, when applied can go far wide of the mark unless carefully checked with the findings of historical scholarship and restrained by a sense of reasonable proportion. But the method is not at all as faulty as Mr. Culler pictured it, and the alternative which he proposed is liable to the same objections.

Mr. Culler's chief objection was that "the critic who analyzes means of persuasion is obliged to assume that everyone else in the world will be persuaded by things to which he alone is immune." Actually, analysis of the means of persuasion implies no special insight on the part of the critic; it only requires greater attention more carefully directed toward looking for adroit verbal appeals than a reader would normally employ. In short, all that such analysis really assumes—and the assumption is surely valid—is that most readers do not usually approach their reading with the attitudes and training of the rhetorician or the semanticist. The question then centers on whether the readers are really moved by the devices which the critic discovers. Mr. Culler believes not, preferring to hold that "people are normally convinced by a statement which is true rather than by one which is adroit." Now this seems to be leaning somewhat too heavily on the slippery word *normal* in order to indulge in an optimistic view of man which centuries of rhetorical tradition and the recent successful uses of propaganda make doubtful. To accept that view would be to blind oneself to the obvious success of word manipulation everywhere today—in much advertising, for example. Frankly, Mr. Culler bases his objection on an assumption which is, to say the least, dubious.

To avoid what he believes are the pitfalls of Holloway's method, Mr. Culler suggests another which he bases on the premise that "the writer of critical prose is characterized by the fact that he believes," that this belief consists in a relation between the man and his subject, and that the relation "constitutes the totality of his essay." But this assumption is open to the same general objection which Mr. Culler leveled at Holloway's assumption of an audience—it cannot always be shown to be true, and it sometimes may be doubtful if not clearly false. Can we know with certainty, for example, how much of Ruskin's Edinburgh lectures was the subject of his firm belief and how much "gotten up" for the occasion? Can we safely assume that Ruskin believed everything that he said and implied about his own training and experience in the introduction to the first volume of *Modern Painters*? Surely, to begin with the assumption that a Victorian prose writer, by definition, believes exactly what he says is as dangerous as assuming a general audience for the purpose of rhetorical analysis.

As one would suppose, the truth seems to lie somewhere in-between. No one seriously doubts that the major Victorian prose writers sincerely believed that what they advocated was generally good and generally true, but at the same time it is clear that in order to advance their main points they did not hesitate to employ all of the persuasive devices at their

command and one cannot expect them to have firmly believed every last jot and tittle of what they wrote. The analysis of Victorian prose involves, then, a concern with both the belief and the mode of persuasion. The approach which Mr. Culler proposes needs to be qualified by the method employed by Holloway, and, in turn, it can prevent that method from becoming a sterile formalism. They nicely supplement one another and we can hardly, at a time when so little method for the study of prose is available to us, afford to reject either.

Marquette University

----

R. C. Schweik

### A REJOINDER

One despairs of attempting to write precisely when he finds that all the qualifications which he so carefully introduces into his remarks are ignored by one who, nevertheless, is willing to take the trouble and responsibility of criticizing. I did not, as Mr. Schweik asserts, "reject" the method of Holloway's book. I expressed my admiration for that work as "one of the freshest and most attractive studies which I have seen in some time," and I declared that its method was "always appropriate" to the study of Victorian prose. I merely observed that its results were "sometimes disappointing," that it was "reductive" of the literature it attempted to serve, and that, taken by itself, it was "incomplete." And I proceeded to show why I thought this to be so by analyzing the character of Victorian prose. I suggested that this prose was intermediate between poetic vision and scientific statement in that it asserted an emotional relation towards an object, and therefore that criticism of such prose must take account not only of the emotion, as it was verbally constructed, but also of the object. I take it that an adequate criticism of Darwin's *Origin of Species* would not stop short with how the author had recommended to his readers the hypothesis of natural selection. It would have to go beyond the realm of language into the realm of evolutionary fact and consider whether or not this hypothesis was true. And it was my contention that the prose of the major Victorians differs from scientific prose (as also, on the other side, from poetry) only in degree, and therefore that a complete criticism of it is also in part extra-literary.

As to what Mr. Schweik calls my "chief objection" to Holloway, I think that a careful reading of my paper will show that the matter he mentions was actually a minor objection, although one that I still consider valid. And as to the question of belief, it should be obvious that I was using that term in a slightly special sense and that I by no means wish to assert that all Victorian prose is conventionally sincere. Of this one thing I am sure, that if Mr. Holloway had been replying to my remarks instead of Mr. Schweik, he would have taken a very different line of attack and a far sounder one. He would have conceded that of course he was treating these writers as if their work were mere verbal manipulation, for this is exactly what they are. They are the management of words in a metaphysical void. And as to my feeling that these words point to something beyond themselves, he would have called this the merest metaphysics, which in his mouth is a term of disapprobation, and would have spoken pityingly of my naive American idealism. I did not send my paper to Mr. Holloway because I supposed that he and I have no common basis from which to argue. But I should rather imagine that Mr. Schweik and I do, and that if he were to consider carefully the implications of Mr. Holloway's book, he would be far more horrified at it than I am. It certainly includes a thorough-going nominalism.

University of Illinois

----

A. Dwight Culler

### NOTES AND BRIEF ARTICLES

#### I. THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, MANCHESTER

In *VNL*, No. 8, appeared a most useful survey by Mr. K. J. Fielding of manuscript materials of the Victorian period in the John Rylands Library. The information it contains may now be supplemented by reference to the extensive (and expanding) collections of family muniments deposited in the Library, which contain thousands of 19th century letters, diaries and papers. All are fruitful sources for the student of Victorian social and economic life, in particular the muniments of the following families: the Sneyds of Keele Hall, co. Stafford; the Bagshaws of Ford Hall, co. Derby; the Bromley Davenportes of Capesthorpe Hall, co. Chester; the Cornwall-Leghs of High Legh, co. Chester; and the Roundells of Dorfold Hall, co. Chester.

Some of these collections are rich also in political and other correspondence. The Sneyd Muniments, for example, deposited by Mr. Raymond Richards, contain some 4,500 letters of Ralph Sneyd (d. 1870), who moved much in country-house society and was in touch with many leading figures of his day (see David Spring, "Ralph Sneyd: Tory Country Gentleman," ap. *Bull. J. R. L.*, xxxviii, 535-555). Apart from his family letters, there is a large block of peerage correspondence. The largest groups here concern John Fitzgibbon, 2nd Earl of Clare (d. 1851, 754 items), Frances, wife of John, 1st Marquess of Bute (156), George, 1st Baron Dover (394), the

Sutherlands (142), Westminster (114), Granvilles (53), Grevilles (70) and Harrowbys (64). The Fitzgibbon correspondence consists mainly of letters exchanged with Sneyd, but also includes letters of Caroline Lamb, Peel, Lord John Russell, Lord Grenville, Lord Stanley, Wellington and Canning. Other correspondents of Sneyd are Henry Vincent (747), Charles Bertie Percy, grandson of the 1st Duke of Northumberland (279) and Charles Baring Wall (258); the Vincent letters are particularly valuable for their comments on events and personalities. The Rev. Walter Sneyd (d. 1888) is represented by some 900 letters, of which 517 are from Robert Curzon (14th Baron Zouche), author of the minor classic "Visits to Monasteries in the Levant." Other letters and documents relate to the Rev. Walter's library, for he was a keen collector of books and manuscripts. Papers concerning the 19th century rebuilding of Keele Hall in this collection include letters of the architect Salvin.

Among the Bromley Davenport Muniments is correspondence of Edward Davies Davenport (d. 1847), who had a wide circle of friends. Although much has not survived, the muniments still contain letters of Edwin Chadwick, Cobden, Vassal Holland, Joseph Hume, Harriet Martineau, O'Connell, Heber, Sir Charles Napier, Sydney Smith and T. N. Talfourd. In this collection also are 5 vols. of letters (1874-81) of the Gaelic scholar John Francis Campbell of Islay (*DNB*), while among family diaries is the Crimean Diary of William Davenport Bromley. Accounts respecting Capesthorpe Hall include 60 items dealing with its rebuilding by the architect Edward Blore.

The Bagshawe Muniments have been calendared down to 1847, which was fixed as the closing date for the first list; readers are referred to this for details. Beyond this point, however, the family correspondence is voluminous. The Raymond Richards Collection of Miscellaneous Historical Materials contains many 19th century letters and papers; a group relating to the Davy family (Sir Humphry, John and Margaret) includes diaries of Margaret Davy (1851-67) and 3 vols. of her letters. Other diaries of interest in this Collection are two relating to travels in South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and the Mediterranean in the 1880's and 1890's. The "Grecian Diary" of Henry Raikes (d. 1854), Chancellor of the Diocese of Chester, has also been deposited. Gordon, Wellington, Macready, John Bright and Samuel Rogers are represented in the correspondence.

Duplicated Hand-Lists of the Sneyd, Bromley Davenport, Cornwall-Legh and Roundell Muniments may be obtained on application. The *Hand-List of the Bagshawe Muniments*, by F. Taylor, was published in 1955. Manuscript accessions are recorded regularly in the Notes and News Section of the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, published twice yearly (March and September).

The John Rylands Library

----

F. Taylor

## 2. ANONYMOUS AND PSEUDONYMOUS AUTHORS

One of the most difficult problems I have encountered in connection with the Bibliography of Nineteenth Century Fiction that I have been working on (See *VNL*, November, 1954) is the identification of the numerous authors who wrote anonymously or under curious and eccentric pseudonyms. I find that the reference works that specialize in this kind of identification—Cushing, Halkett and Laing, Block and Stonehill, the British Museum Catalogue—have barely scratched the surface, considering the spate of fiction produced during this period.

The editor of *The Victorian Newsletter* has kindly invited me to use some of his space to solicit the cooperation of colleagues interested in minor fiction, who might help me unravel some of the puzzles. Following are some titles that so far I have not been able to find authors for in any of the standard bibliographical sources. It may be that fellow researchers working in some obscure by-ways might have come upon author-information or perhaps can furnish clues that could lead to identification.

All these novels are long forgotten. None, I trust, is a neglected masterpiece. However, from the titles alone, one can recognize affinities with the works of contemporaries like Jane Austen, Maria Edgeworth and Sir Walter Scott. Some of this fiction may have been part of the girlhood reading of the Brontës. In any case, it would be desirable to complete our information on them for the bibliographical record.

Queens College, Flushing, N.Y.

----

Robert A. Colby

ABDUCTION: or *The Adventures of Major Sarney. A Story of the Times of Charles II.* 3 Vols. London: C. Knight, 1825.

THE ABSENT MAN, *A Narrative*. Edited by Sir Peter Plastic, Knight of the Order of The Tower and Sword. London: Baldwin, Cradock and Joy, 1817.

THE ACCOMPLISHED HYPOCRITE; or, *Brass Glitters More Than Gold.* A Moral Tale Founded on Facts. By A. D. 2 Vols. London: Newman, 1821.

THE ACTRESS OF THE PRESENT DAY. 3 Vols. Dublin: Milliken; London: Harper, 1817.



- ADAM AND EVE. *A Margate Story*. London: Hunt, 1824.
- ADAMINA. A Novel. By A Lady. 2 Vols. London: Vernor, 1801.
- ADELAIDE; or, *The Horrors of a Convent*. 1825.
- ADELAIDE; or, *The Rainy Evening*. 1827.
- ADELAIDE DE GRAMMONT. A Romance. 1804.
- ADELAIDE MURRAY. London: Westley, 1824.
- ADELAIDE DE NARBONNE. With Memoirs of Charlotte Corday. By The Author of Henry of Northumberland. 4 Vols. London: Printed at the Minerva Press for A. K. Newman, 1800.
- ADONIA. *A Desultory Study*. Inscribed by Permission to Her Grace The Duchess of Buccleugh. 4 Vols. Edinburgh: Bell and Bradfute; London: Black and Parry, 1801.
- ADRIAN AND THECLA. *Pathetic Tales*. 2 Vols. London: Ogilvy, 1821.
- THE AFFAIR AT CHARLTON HOLT. London: Longman, 1831.
- THE AFFECTIONATE DAUGHTER. *Shewing How When Very Young She Maintained Her Afflicted Mother*. 1820?
- AGNES. A Novel. By The Author of Frederick Risberg. 3 Vols. London: Lane, 1801; Dublin, 1802.
- AGNES; or, *The Triumph of Principles*. London: Holdsworth, 1822.
- AGNES. *A Tale Founded on Facts*. By A Lady. 1829.
- AIMWELL, MISS, (pseud.). GOOD NATURE; or, *Sensibility, and Other Tales*. London: Newman, 1821.
- ALBANY. A Tale. By The Author of Beau Monde. 3 Vols. London: Newman, 1819.
- THE ALEXANDRIANS. *An Egyptian Tale of the Fourth Century*. 2 Vols. London: Whittaker and Treacher, 1830.
- ALFRED DUDLEY; or, *The Australian Settlers*. A Tale for Youth. London: Harvey and Darton, 1830.
- ALGERNON PERCY; or, *The Victim of Envy*. A Romance. 2 Vols. London: Bell, 1803.
- ALICE GRANT, THE TWO COUSINS, AND THE FAIR DAY. London: Harvey, 1835.
- ALITHEA WOODDEY; or, *The Advantages of an Early Friendship Founded on Virtue*. Bath: Hazard; London: Darton, 1805.
- ALLAN McDUGAL; or, *Scenes in The Peninsula*. A Tale. By A Military Officer. 3 Vols. London: Newman, 1831.
- ALLAN MACLEOD; or, *The Highland Soldier*. London: Westley, 1826.
- AN ALPINE TALE. *Suggested by Circumstances Which Occurred Towards the Commencement of the Present Century*. By the Author of Tales from Switzerland. 2 Vols. London: Westley and Seely, 1823.
- ALTAMONT THE LIBERTINE; or, *Death-Bed Scenes of Infidels and Christians*. 1828.
- ARNOLD; or, *A Trait and Its Consequences of Civil War*. 2 Vols. London: Robinson, 1809.
- ARTHUR AND ALICE; or, *The Little Wanderers*. London: Harris, 1814.
- ARTHUR RUSSELL, THE DEAF AND DUMB BOY. London: Hamilton, 1830.
- ARTHUR SEYMOUR. A Novel. 2 Vols. London: Longman, 1823.
- AUGUSTUS; or, *The Ambitious Student*. London: Baldwin, Cradock and Joy, 1830.
- BACHELOR'S BALL; or, *Lawyer E--'s, Dream*. Gloucester: E. Power, 1835.
- BACHELOR'S MISERIES!!! By An Old Maid of Distinction. 4 Vols. London: Printed at The Minerva Press for A. K. Newman, 1814.
- THE BANDIT CHIEF; or, *The Lords of Urvino*. A Romance. 4 Vols. London: Newman, 1818.
- THE BANISHED LORD. A Dramatic Novel. In Twenty Chapters. London: Churton, 1835.
- BANNOCKBURN. A Novel. 3 Vols. London: Warren; Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1821.
- BARBARA MARKHAM; or, *The Profligate Requited*. A Novel. 2 Vols. London: Richardson, 1803.
- BARNARDISTON. *A Tale of the Seventeenth Century*. 3 Vols. London: Saunders and Otley, 1833.
- BARON DE COURCY; or, *Reading Abbey*. A Legendary Tale. 2 Vols. London: n.p., 1807.
- THE BEAU MONDE; or, *Scenes in Fashionable Life*. 3 Vols. London: Newman, 1810.
- BELLE-GARDE, THE ADOPTED INDIAN BOY. A Canadian Tale. 3 Vols. London: Saunders and Otley, 1832.
- BELVILLE HOUSE. A Novel. 2 Vols. London: Symonds, 1805.
- BEN HOWARD; or, *The Pedlar and The Publican*. London: Harvey, 1831.
- BENSON POWLET; or, *The French in Moscow in 1812*. 2 Vols. London: Newman, 1833.
- BERTRAND: MEMOIRS OF A NORTHUMBRIAN NOBLEMAN IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. Written by Himself. 3 Vols. London: Lane, 1808.
- BIGOTRY; or, *The Warning Voice*. A Novel. 4 Vols. London: Newman, 1821.
- THE BLACK CONVENT: A Tale of Feudal Times. 2 Vols. London: Newman, 1819.
- BLACK KNIGHTS. A Tale of the Eighth Century. Somerstown: Neale, 1803.

### 3. AN UNCERTAIN BIOGRAPHICAL FACT

Just how early Ruskin met Carlyle, his senior by almost twenty-five years, is not known. So biographers have either admitted defeat upon the question, as does Cook;<sup>1</sup> have, like Froude, avoided it carefully;<sup>2</sup> or, like Quennell and Albers, have brazened a guess without any basis of fact. Although it would be difficult to pinpoint the exact date of meeting, I believe it possible to arrive at a more accurate approximation than has been previously reached.

In establishing a *terminus a quo* I am assuming that Ruskin met Carlyle's work before he met the man. In a letter which Ruskin wrote to George Richmond in February, 1881, the month of Carlyle's death, we find the following sentence: "Do you know that you were the first person who ever put a book of Carlyle's into my hand?"<sup>4</sup> In another letter Ruskin made it clear that *Past and Present* was the book referred to.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, our *terminus a quo* would be the publication date of *Past and Present*, March, 1843. The *terminus ad quem* also carries an assumption, and that is that Ruskin would not present a gift to Carlyle before he had met him personally. For we know that the Albert Dürer engraving of Frederick the Wise which the Duke of Saxe-Weimar admired on a visit to Carlyle's home in June, 1847, was "a present from John Ruskin."<sup>6</sup> If the assumptions are valid, and they seem reasonably so, then Carlyle and Ruskin met some time between March, 1843 and June, 1847. Furthermore, a check into the physical location of the two men during that period demonstrates that the meeting had to take place during one of two extended periods. From August, 1844 until April, 1845 the two were together in London, as they were during the period between September, 1846 and June of 1847.<sup>7</sup> And since Ruskin was socially active during the latter period, it seems to be the more logical choice.

Michigan State University

----

Charles H. Kegel

<sup>1</sup> "I do not know when, or how, they first met—it was certainly before 1851, as is proved by Carlyle's letter of March 9 in that year, about *The Stones of Venice*." (*The Works of John Ruskin*, ed. E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn [London, 1903-1912], XXXVI, p. xciv).

<sup>2</sup> James A. Froude, *Thomas Carlyle, a History of His Life in London, 1834-1881* (New York, 1885), II, 150.

<sup>3</sup> Speaking of March, 1851, Quennell writes about "Carlyle (whom he [Ruskin] had recently met)." (Peter Quennell, *John Ruskin, the Portrait of a Prophet* [New York, 1949], p. 74). Albers misinterprets a passage by Wood in which he is obviously talking of Ruskin's reading of Carlyle (*Works*, IX, p. xxi) and writes of Carlyle, "mit dem er [Ruskin] seit dem Winter 1849/50 befreundet war." (Helma Albers, *Studien zu Ruskins Sozialismus* [Hamburg, 1938], p. 39).

<sup>4</sup> *Works*, XXXVII, 341.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, XXXVII, 361.

<sup>6</sup> David Alec Wilson, *Carlyle on Cromwell and Others (1837-48)*, (London, 1925), p. 383.

<sup>7</sup> That is, except March, when Ruskin toured the Lake Country.

### 4. THE FEMININE CHRIST

Christina Rossetti's "Goblin Market" is a unique Christian fairy tale in which a feminine cast of characters is substituted for the masculine cast of the Biblical sin-redemption sequence. Lizzie, the pure sister, is the symbol of Christ; Laura represents Adam-Eve and consequently all of sinful mankind.

The basic symbolic pattern begins immediately: "Morning and evening/ Maids heard the goblins cry." Throughout their lives sin beckons to God's creatures. Notice that only maidens are mentioned as hearing the cry of sin, and that they are innocent until corrupted by the animalistic masculine goblins. The cry of these goblins is that of the fruit-hawker, as was Satan's in the Garden of Eden, and their fruit comes from the un-Anglican South. The cry itself is enclosed within lines indicative of early mortality, for it is "evening by evening" that the sisters hear it. Lizzie warns Laura, "We must not look at goblin men,/ We must not buy their fruits." Goblins are creatures of the Devil, symbols of Satan himself, who carry with them all the temptations of the world, as did Satan when he tempted Adam, and later, Christ. How ironic it is then when Laura tries to envision the fair lands from which these goblin fruits come, for of course sin is of Hell. Lizzie intimates as much when she admonishes Laura: "No, no, no;/ Their offers should not charm us,/ Their evil gifts would harm us." Christ closed his ears to the charms of Satan's offers; Lizzie "thrust a dimpled finger/ In each ear, shut eyes and ran." But Laura, and Adam, stayed to listen.

Satan appears typically in the form of depraved animals—cat, rat, snail, wombat—whose eeriness is enhanced by Christina's endowing them with the voices of paradisaical doves. The shock of this contrast between repulsive appearance and heavenly sound produces in the reader a chaos of inverted values such as that produced by hearing from a serpent's mouth the voice of an angel. Laura has the innocent beauty of Adam before the Fall; she is like a swan, a lily, a moonlit poplar branch, a vessel. Satanic goblins offer her the lures of the world:

a crown, wealth, a golden plate of fruit, which Laura says is "too huge for me to hold," and which the goblins later tell Lizzie "no man can carry," for no man can bear alone the burden of sin. Laura, with a golden curl and a tear "more rare than pearl," sells her soul to taste of the fruit, as had Adam and Eve. Immediately her sense of the difference between right and wrong is obscured, for when she turns to go home, she knows not "was it night or day," but she clutches in her hand a seed of the fruit, a seed of sin to which she clings.

Lizzie meets her as God had once met Adam, upbraiding her for listening to Satan, but, like mankind, Laura cannot return to innocence without help. Man persists in feasting greedily upon the pleasures of this world. Laura says, "I ate and ate my fill, / Yet my mouth waters still: / To-morrow night I will / Buy more." Tasks are tedious to Laura next day, for she longs after the sombre, dark, guilt-infested night. At last night comes, and the sisters go back to the sin-haunted glen. Laura is "most like a leaping flame," the unhealthy and destructive fire of guilt. Lizzie begs her to come home, as Christ through His prophets had pleaded with mankind to return to God, "For clouds may gather / Though this is summer weather, / Put out the lights and drench us through"—though this is the summer of life, clouds of evil, brought by the night of sin, may darken the path of mankind—and "then if we lost our way what should we do?"

Laura will not hear Lizzie; she is listening for sin, and when she does not hear its cry, "her tree of life drooped from the root," and the fire of guilt gnaws at her soul until it produces a sterile desert within her: "She dreamed of melons, as a traveller sees / False waves in desert drouth / With shade of leaf-crowned trees, / And burns the thirstier in the sandful breeze." Mankind declines, and Christ sees that He must offer Himself as sacrifice to redeem His brothers. Lizzie goes to the glen, the valley of the shadow, and for the first time in her life begins "to listen and look" when sin appears. The Devil rejoices prematurely in his victory: "Laughed every goblin / When they spied her peeping." As the multitude lauded Christ when He entered Jerusalem, so the goblins fawn on Lizzie, assuring her, "Our feast is but beginning. / Night yet is early..." But when she refuses to taste of sin, they become hostile and Lizzie assumes the stance of Christ buffeted by the mob, upright amidst her tormentors. To the mockery of the Devil, Christ answered never a word, and Lizzie likewise "uttered not a word." And at last evil is routed, as it must be when it challenges complete innocence.

Laura benefits by the sacrifice when she is reborn in tears that drop "like rain / After long and sultry drouth." She "rent all her robe" and "beat her breast" in her agony of repentance; she "loathed the feast" of sin. The fire of purification overcomes the "lesser flame" of guilt in her soul, and Christina Rossetti cannot forebear to point out the wages of sin and its folly: "She gorged on bitterness without a name: / Ah fool, to choose such part / Of soul-consuming care!" Laura faints from the stress of her struggle—"Is it death or is it life?" For the Christian the answer is patent: "Life out of death." Laura dies into life when she renounces her sin, is baptized by tears into salvation, and accepts her sister's sacrifice. All night Lizzie watches over her while Laura gathers strength, and when day comes Laura wakens and laughs "in the innocent old way." Thus does Christ comfort mankind through his darkest hours, bringing him at last to everlasting innocence. Years later, Laura tells her children, the successive generations of mankind, that a sister is one "to cheer one on the tedious way, / To fetch one if one goes astray, / To lift one if one totters down, / To strengthen whilst one stands." Is not this the ideal relationship between mankind and Christ?

Though there are surely many other elements, particularly that of folk-lore, which contribute to the composition of the entire poem, "Goblin Market" sets forth Christina Rossetti's beliefs in original sin and in the sacrificial nature of Christ's death through her creation of a Christian fairy tale in which a feminine Christ redeems a feminine mankind from a masculine Satan.

De Pauw University

----

Marian Shalkhauser

### FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS

**NOTE:** Your editor thought that it would be of interest to you to know what the future months hold in store by way of articles and books on matters Victorian. He therefore sent a form letter to the presses and periodicals in the *PMLA* list of useful addresses. The response to his inquiry will be found below. No item definitely listed for publication before 1 November 1956 is included. Dickens and Hardy continue to hold their own as the two Victorians most written about in our generation.

**GENERAL.** Arthur J. Carr, ed., *An Anthology of Minor Victorian Poets* (title to be determined), Rinehart, Spring 1957.

Lord David Cecil, *The Fine Art of Reading*, Bobbs-Merrill, November 26, 1956.



Hoxie N. Fairchild, *Religious Trends in English Poetry, Volume IV: 1830-1880*, Columbia University Press, December 1956.

## ARNOLD

Geoffrey Carnall, "Matthew Arnold's 'Great Critical Effort,'" *Essays in Criticism*, 1958.  
 Robert A. Donovan, "The Method of Arnold's *Essays in Criticism*," *PMLA*, December 1956.  
 A. E. Dyson, "Last Enchantments ('The Scholar Gipsy')," *RES*, August (?), 1957.  
 Murray Krieger, "'Dover Beach' and the Tragic Sense of Recurrence," *University of Kansas City Review*, Autumn 1956.

## BRADLAUGH

W. L. Armstein, "The Bradlaugh Case," *JHI*, 1957-58.

## THE BRONTES

Miriam Allott, *Wuthering Heights: the Rejection of Heathcliff*," *Essays in Criticism*, 1957-58.  
 Jacob Korg, "The Problem of Unity in *Jhirley*," *NCF*, June 1957.  
 Carl R. Woodring, "The Narrators of *Wuthering Heights*," *NCF*, March 1957.

## BROWNING

B. R. Jerman, "Browning's Witless Duke," *PMLA*, March or June 1957.

## CARLYLE

Carlisle Moore, "The Persistence of Carlyle's Everlasting Yea," *NP*, November 1956 or February 1957.

## CARROLL

W. H. Bond, "The Publication of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*," *Harvard Library Bulletin*, Autumn 1956.

## DICKENS

W. J. Carlton, "The Third Man at Newgate [Sketches by *Boz*]," *RES*, no date.  
 Monroe Engel, "The Politics of Dickens' Novels," *PMLA*, December 1956.  
 Sherman Eoff, "*Oliver Twist* and the Spanish Picaresque Novel," *SP*, 1957 (?).  
 Edgar Johnson, "Dickens and Shaw: Critics of Society," *VQR*, Winter 1956-57.  
 John Manning, "Charles Dickens and the Oswego System," *JHI*, 1957-58.  
 Harry Stone, "Charles Dickens and Harriet Beecher Stowe," *NCF*, December 1958.  
 Harry Stone, "Dickens' Tragic Universe: George Silverman's Explanation," *SP*, 1957 (?).  
 Harry Stone, "Dickens' Use of His American Experiences in *Martin Chuzzlewit*," *PMLA*, March or June 1957.

## ELIOT

Maxwell Goldberg, ed., *The Mill on the Floss*, Pocket Books, Inc., November 1956.  
 William J. Hyde, "George Eliot and the Climate of Realism," *PMLA*, March or June 1957.  
 Jerome Thrale, "The Mill on the Floss: Image and Theme," *University of Kansas City Review*, Winter 1956-57.

## GISSING

Jackson I. Cope, "Definition as Structure in Gissing's *Ryecroft Papers*," *Modern Fiction Studies*, 1957.  
 Royal Gettmann, "Bentley and Gissing," *NCF*, September 1957.

## HARDY

J. O. Bailey, *Thomas Hardy and the Cosmic Mind: A New Reading of "The Dynasts"*, University of North Carolina Press, November 1956.  
 Howard Brogan, "Science and Narrative Structure in Austen, Hardy, and Woolf," *NCF*, December 1956.  
 Emma Clifford, "The Trumpet-Major Notebook and *The Dynasts*," *RES*, May (?) 1957.  
 M. A. Goldberg, "Hardy's Double-Visioned Universe," *Essays in Criticism*, 1957-58.  
 Eugene Goodheart, "Thomas Hardy and the Lyrical Novel," *NCF*, September 1957.  
 Albert Guerard, Jr., ed., *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, Pocket Books, Inc., November 1956.  
 Robert C. Slack, "The Text of Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*," *NCF*, March 1957.

## HOPKINS

Thomas P. Harrison, "The Birds of Gerard Manley Hopkins," *SP*, 1957 (?).  
 Anne R. King, On Hopkins' "The Windhover" and Blake (title to be determined), *ES*, 1957.

## HUXLEY

Oma Stanley, "Mill and Huxley on Nature," *JHI*, 1957-58.

## INGOLDSBY

William Lane, "The Primitive Muse of Thomas Ingoldsby," *Harvard Library Bulletin*, no date.

## KINGSLEY

A. A. Adrian, "Charles Kingsley Visits Boston," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, November 1956 or February 1957.

## LEAR

Philip Hofer, "Edward Lear's *Yonghy Bonghy Bò*," *Harvard Library Bulletin*, no date.

## MILL

Oma Stanley, "Mill and Huxley on Nature," *JHI*, 1957-58.

## PATER

James Hafley, "Marius the Paterian," *Modern Fiction Studies*, 1957.

## STEPHEN

S. O. A. Ullmann, ed., *Men, Books, and Mountains: Essays by Leslie Stephen*, University of Minnesota Press, c. September 1956.

## THACKERAY

Russell Fraser, "Pernicious Casuistry: A Study of Character in *Vanity Fair*," *NCF*, June 1957.  
 John E. Tilford, Jr., "The Untimely Death of Rachel Esmond," June 1957.

## TWIN

Howard G. Baetzhold, "Mark Twain: England's Advocate," *American Literature*, November 1956.

## VOYNICH

Arnold Kettle, "E. L. Voynich: A Forgotten English Novelist," *Essays in Criticism*, 1957.

## ENGLISH X NEWS

## OFFICERS:

*Chairman*, Francis E. Mineka (Cornell); *Secretary*, Jerome H. Buckley (Columbia).

*Advisory and Nominating Committee*: Richard D. Altick (Ohio State, Ch.); Karl Litzenberg (Michigan); Edgar Johnson (CCNY); Carl R. Woodring (Wisconsin); Francis E. Mineka (Cornell, *ex off.*).

1956 *Program Committee*: Bernard N. Schilling (Rochester, Ch.); G. Robert Stange (Minnesota); John E. Tilford (Emory).

*Bibliography Committee*: Francis G. Townsend (Florida State, Ch.); William D. Templeman (Southern California); Oscar Maurer (Texas); Robert C. Slack (Carnegie Tech); Robert A. Donovan (Cornell); Charles T. Dougherty (St. Louis U.).

*Editor, The Victorian Newsletter*: William E. Buckler (NYU).

## PROGRAM FOR 1956:

"The Victorian Rembrandt: Carlyle's Portraits of His Contemporaries." Charles R. Sanders (Duke), 25 minutes.

"The Fiery Antidote: A Reading of 'Goblin Market.'" Fraser Neiman (*William and Mary*), 25 minutes.

"Method in the Study of Victorian Prose: Another View." Martin J. Svaglic (*Loyola, Chicago*), 20 minutes.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS: A SELECTED LIST

(Compiled by Oscar Maurer, University of Texas)

## GENERAL

- BIBLIOGRAPHY.** William Matthews, *British Autobiographies: An Annotated Bibliography of British Autobiographies Published or Written before 1951*. Univ. of California Press. Rev. *FLS* (Feb. 3), p. 74.
- J. C. Trewin, *Versé Drama since 1800*. Cambridge Univ. Press. Rev. *FLS* (April 13), p. 226.
- Alexander D. Wainwright, "The Morris L. Parrish Collection of Victorian Novelists." *Princeton Univ. Libr. Chron.* (Winter, 1956), pp. 59-67. The whole number is devoted to articles on this notable collection at Princeton, including R. F. Metzendorf on "M. L. Parrish and William Makepeace Thackeray," R. H. Taylor on "The Singular Anomalies" (lady novelists), R. B. Martin on "The Reade Collection," R. P. Ashley on "The Wilkie Collins Collection," Warren Weaver on "The Parrish Collection of Carrolliana," and D. A. Randall on "The Stevenson Collection."
- CRITICISM AND LITERARY HISTORY.** Madeleine L. Cazamian, *Le Roman et les Idées en Angleterre, 1860-1914*. Strasbourg, 1955. Rev. by J. H. Buckley, *MLN* (May), pp. 391-3. This instalment deals with "les doctrines d'action et l'aventure": Stevenson, Conrad, Kipling and others.
- Bernard Groom, *The Diction of Poetry from Spenser to Bridges*. Toronto. Chapters on the major Victorians.
- Harold Nicholson, *The English Sense of Humour and Other Essays*. Constable. Rev. *FLS* (April 27), p. 254. Includes essays on Swinburne and Baudelaire, on the humor of Punch, and on Tennyson's two brothers.
- Mario Praz, *The Hero in Eclipse in Victorian Fiction*. Translated by Angus Davidson. Oxford. Rev. *FLS* (June 15), p. 360. The diminishing stature of the hero in Dickens, Thackeray, Trollope, and George Eliot.
- H. N. Wethered, *The Curious Art of Autobiography*. Christopher Johnson. Rev. *FLS* (June 22), p. 375. Includes consideration of Mill, Borrow, Newman, Trollope, and others.
- ECONOMICS AND POLITICS.** G. D. H. Cole, *The Second International*. Macmillan. Rev. *FLS* (June 15), p. 364. This is volume III of *A History of Socialist Thought*, and covers the period 1889-1914.
- Élie Halevy, *Thomas Hodgskin*. Translated and edited by A. J. Taylor. Benn. Rev. *FLS* (March 23), p. 175.
- W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner, "Engels and the England of the 1840s." *History Today* (June), pp. 448-456. Argues that Engels' biased views gave rise to the "legend of the Hungry Forties."
- HISTORY.** Douglas G. Browne, *The Rise of Scotland Yard*. Harrap. Rev. *FLS* (June 29), p. 395. A book begun by Ralph Straus, completed by Browne.
- T. K. Derry and T. L. Jarman, *The Making of Modern Britain: Life and Work from George III to Elizabeth II*. Murray. Rev. *FLS* (Feb. 3), p. 65.

- Gladys Scott Thomson, *Woburn and the Russells*. Pilgrim Press (London). Rev. *FLS* (May 4), p. 274.
- PERIODICALS AND JOURNALISM. J. W. Robertson Scott, "We" and Me. W. H. Allen. Rev. *FLS* (June 1), p. 326. On J. A. Spender, H. W. Massingham, Ernest Parke, W. T. Stead, and other late Victorian editors.
- PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY. L. E. Elliott-Binns, *English Thought, 1880-1900: The Theological Aspect*. Longmans. Rev. *FLS* (March 30), supp., p. 11.
- A. P. Ryan, "Charles Bradlaugh, a Victorian in Revolt." *Listener* (June 14), pp. 797-798.
- A. P. Ryan, "J. W. Colenso, Bishop among the Zulus." *Listener* (June 7), pp. 754-755.
- SOCIAL. E. M. Forster, *Marianne Thornton, 1797-1887: A Domestic Biography*. Arnold (New York: Harcourt). Rev. *FLS* (May 11), p. 282; by Eudora Welty in *NTFR* (May 27), p. 5. A brilliant evocation, based on family papers, of nineteenth-century life in clapham and elsewhere.
- Muriel Jaeger, *Before Victoria*. Chatto. Rev. *FLS* (June 15), p. 356. The change from late eighteenth-century to early Victorian attitudes.
- A. L. Kenedy, ed., *My Dear Duchess: Social and Political Letters to the Duchess of Manchester, 1858-1869*. Murray. Rev. *FLS* (March 9), p. 151. Letters of Lord Clarendon and others.
- Marion Lochhead, *Their First Ten Years*. Murray. Rev. *FLS* (July 27), p. 444. The life of children in the early, mid, and late Victorian eras.
- J. H. Plumb, ed., *Studies in Social History: A Tribute to G. N. Frevelyan*. Longmans. Rev. *NTFR* (March 18), p. 26. Includes an essay by K. Clark on "The Romantic Element, 1830-1850," and by Noel Annan on "The Intellectual Aristocracy" (Arnolds, Stephens, Trevellyans, et al.)
- Aileen Smiles, *Samuel Smiles and his Surroundings*. Hale. Rev. *FLS* (July 27), p. 444. On the leading Victorian exponent of "self-help."
- Hugo Wortham, *Victorian Eton and Cambridge, being the Life and Times of Oscar Browning*. Barker. Rev. *FLS* (Feb. 24), p. 119.

## AUTHORS

- ACTON. G. P. Gooch, "Victorian Memories. VII. Lord Acton." *Contemporary Rev.* (April), pp. 204-209.
- EDWIN ARNOLD. Francis Watson, "Edwin Arnold and 'The Light of Asia.'" *Listener* (June 14), pp. 794-796.
- MATTHEW ARNOLD. Elsie M. Butler, "Heine in England and Matthew Arnold." *German Life and Letters* (April), pp. 157-165. A lively, opinionated attack on Arnold's essay and poem on Heine.
- Francis G. Townsend, "Literature and Dogma: Matthew Arnold's Letters to George Smith." *PQ* (April), pp. 195-198. Shows that the theological implications of Arnold's series were too radical for the Cornhill.
- BEERBOHM. Jenny Nicholson, "Grazie per tutto." *Spectator* (June 1), pp. 754-755. An account of Max's last days.
- Derek Stanford, "Sir Max Beerbohm." *Contemporary Rev.* (July), pp. 11-14. A farewell tribute.
- BESANT. Fred W. Boege, "Sir Walter Besant: Novelist." *NCF* (June), pp. 32-60. Completes a valuable two-part study.
- BLACKMORE. Waldo H. Dunn, *R. D. Blackmore: A Biography*. Hale. Rev. *FLS* (May 25), p. 801.
- BRONTE. Lew Girdler, "Wuthering Heights and Shakespeare." *Huntington Lib. Quarterly* (August), pp. 385-392. Thematic and structural parallels.
- BROWNING. Henry Charles Duffin, *Amphibian: A Reconsideration of Browning*. Bowes and Bowes. Rev. *FLS* (Feb. 24), p. 115. A critical study: "amphibian" in the title symbolizes the intermixture of poetic and prosaic elements in Browning's writings.
- Lloyd N. Jeffrey, "Browning as Psychologist: Three Notes." *CF* (March), pp. 345-348. Browning on "Fact and Truth," on "The Difficulty of Self-Knowledge," and on "The Nature of Evil."
- Edward C. McAleer, "Browning's 'Cleon' and Auguste Comte." *Comp. Lit.* (Spring), pp. 142-145. Cleon presents and refutes the Positivist religion.
- Robert C. Schweik, "Bishop Blougram's Miracles." *MLN*, LXXI, 416-418. On Blougram's "winking virgin," and Newman on miracles.
- Betty Miller, "Elizabeth and Emily Elizabeth." *Twentieth Century* (June), pp. 574-583. Temperamental affinities of Elizabeth Barrett and Emily Dickinson.
- CARLYLE. Julian Symons, ed., *Carlyle: Selected Works, Reminiscences, and Letters*. Hart-Davis. Rev. *FLS* (Feb. 3), pp. 61-62. The selection is "designed to show the stages in which an unorthodox Radical became an advocate of extreme authoritarian rule."
- Robert Pearsall, "Carlyle and Emerson: Horses and Revolutions." *South Atlantic Quarterly* (April), pp. 179-191. On Carlyle's first series of lectures.
- DICKENS. W. H. Bowen, *Charles Dickens and His Family*. Heffer. Rev. *FLS* (July 6), p. 414.
- ELIOT. Bernard J. Paris, "Toward a Reevaluation of George Eliot's 'The Mill on the Floss.'" *NCF* (June), pp. 18-31. Sees Maggie's death as "the culmination of her search for calm."
- James D. Rust, "The Art of Fiction in George Eliot's Reviews." *RES* (April), pp. 164-172. George Eliot's critical work for the *Westminster*, 1852-57, developed her theory of the art which she was shortly to practice.
- Wilfred H. Stone, "Hale White and George Eliot." *Univ. of Toronto Quarterly* (July), pp. 437-451. On the potent influence of Marian Evans as woman and as symbol in "Mark Rutherford's" life.
- GRANVILLE BARKER. Margery M. Morgan and Frederick May, "The Early Plays of Harley Granville Barker." *MLR*, LI, 324-338. On Barker's collaboration with Berte Thomas in the nineties.
- HAGGARD. "Rider Haggard." *FLS* (June 22), p. 377. A centenary tribute to Haggard as adventure-writer.
- HARDY. Emma Clifford, "War and Peace and The Dynasts." *NP* (August), pp. 33-44. Tolstoy's novel as source for details in Hardy's poem.
- William T. Starr, "Romain Rolland and Thomas Hardy." *MLQ* (June), pp. 99-103. Influences and echoes of Hardy, especially of *Jude*, in Rolland's *Jean-Christophe*.



- Carl J. Weber, "Forty Years in an Author's Life: A Dozen Letters (1876-1915) from Thomas Hardy." *Colby Lib. Quarterly* (May), pp. 108-117.
- HUDSON. Richard E. Haymaker, *From Pampas to Hedgerows and Downs*. Bookman Associates. Rev. *TLS* (June 1), p. 329.
- KIPLING. John Beecroft, ed., *Kipling: A Selection of his Stories and Poems*. Doubleday. Rev. by Carlos Baker in *NYTBR* (April 22), p. 5.  
Betty Miller, "Kipling's First Novel." *Cornhill* (Spring), pp. 405-412. *The Light That Failed* as a story of sex antagonism, Maisie as parallel to Hardy's Sue Bridehead.
- MEREDITH. Witter Bynner, "A Young Visit with George Meredith." *Virginia Quarterly Rev.* (Spring), pp. 229-245.  
Jack Lindsay, *George Meredith, His Life and Work*. Bodley Head. Rev. *TLS* (June 22), p. 371. Written from the Marxist point of view.
- MILL. Abram L. Harris, "John Stuart Mill's Theory of Progress." *Ethics* (April), pp. 157-175. Unlike Marx, Mill regarded human progress as moral development.  
J. D. Mabbott, "Interpretations of Mill's 'Utilitarianism.'" *Philosophical Quarterly* (April), pp. 115-120.  
J. C. Rees, *Mill and His Early Critics*. University College, Leicester. Discussed in *TLS* (June 8), p. 345.
- NEWMAN. Martin J. Svaglic, "Charles Newman and His Brothers." *PMLA* (June), pp. 370-385. On J. H. Newman's brilliant, eccentric, and trying brother; based on unpublished material from the Birmingham Oratory.
- OLIPHANT. A. P. Ryan, "Laurence Oliphant: A Rich Victorian Eccentric." *Listener* (May 31), pp. 714-716.
- PATMORE. E. J. Oliver, *Coventry Patmore*. Sheed and Ward. Rev. *NYTBR* (May 13), p. 24. A biographical and critical study.
- PINERO. Hesketh Pearson, "Sir Arthur Pinero and Sir James Barrie." *Listener* (June 21), pp. 847-848.
- RUSKIN. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. New introduction by Sir Arnold Lunn. Dent (Everyman's Library).  
W. H. G. Armytage, "Ruskin as Utopist." *N&Q* (May), pp. 219-224. On various aspects of the Guild of St. George.  
Van Akin Burd, "Ruskin's Quest for a Theory of the Imagination." *MLQ* (March), pp. 60-72. New light on the crucial Italian journey of 1845; based on unpublished letters.  
Stanley Williamson, "Ruskin Redivivus." *Listener* (May 24), p. 674. On the Ruskin Museum in Sheffield.
- STEVENSON. DeLancey Ferguson and Marshall Waingrow, eds., *R. L. S.: Stevenson's Letters to Charles Baxter*. Yale. Rev. by H. M. Jones in *Saturday Rev.* (June 9), p. 19.
- TALFOURD. Vera Watson, "Thomas Noon Talfourd and His Friends." *TLS* (April 20, 27), pp. 244, 260. Based on unpublished letters and diaries.
- TENNYSON. Anna Krause, "Unamuno and Tennyson." *Comp. Lit.* (Spring), pp. 122-135. Parallels (ideas, beliefs) between the two poets.  
Milton Millhauser, "Tennyson: Artifice and Image." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* (March), pp. 333-338. A provocative study, though the dubious criterion of "sincerity" is used as a basis for an examination of Tennyson's imagery.  
Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., and W. H. Bond, "Literary Manuscripts of Alfred Tennyson in the Harvard College Library." *Harvard Lib. Bulletin* (Spring), pp. 254-274. A description and index of what is now the most important collection of Tennyson manuscripts.
- THACKERAY. Maurice Cranston, "Thackeray." *London Magazine* (July), pp. 60-66.  
P. R. Krishnaswami, *In Thackeray's Workshop*. Madras. Rev. *TLS* (April 6), p. 208. Attempts to show that Thackeray used his fictitious characters to vent his personal spleen.
- TROLLOPE. *Barchester Towers*. New introduction on "Anthony Trollope's Clergy" by Sir Michael Sadleir. Dent (Everyman's Library).  
William Coyle, "Trollope as Social Anthropologist." *CE* (April), pp. 392-397. Barchester as a Victorian Middletown; Trollope, "without recourse to questionnaires or any methodology except imaginative observation, might have written 'Cathedral City: An Analysis of Differential Status'!"  
Lance Tingay, "The Publication of Trollope's First Novel." *TLS* (March 30), p. 200. On a misleading attribution of *The Macdermots* to Mrs. Trollope.
- WHITE. Irvin Stock, *William Hale White (Mark Rutherford): A Critical Study*. Introduction by Lionel Trilling. Columbia. Rev. *TLS* (June 8), p. 346.
- WILDE. *The Importance of Being Earnest*. 2 vols. New York Public Library. Reproduces the original manuscript and corrected typescript of the play. Rev. by W. W. Appleton in *Saturday Rev.* (May 12), p. 21.  
Frank Harris, *Mr. and Mrs. Daventry*. Introduction by H. Montgomery Hyde. Richards Press. Based on a scenario by Oscar Wilde.

#### PROJECTS — REQUESTS FOR AID

- Grant Allen and W. H. Mallock. Mrs. Mira Wilkins is writing on Allen and Mallock, and asks for unpublished letters. *TLS* (March 9), p. 149.
- William Archer. Raymond Stanley is writing a biography. *TLS* (June 8), p. 352.
- Mary Kingsley. Olwen W. Campbell is writing a biography. *TLS* (April 6), p. 207.
- Charlotte Mew. Stanley S. Gutin is making a study of this poet and short-story writer, 1869-1928. *TLS* (March 30), p. 195.
- John Morley. Henri le Gallo is preparing a study of Morley's life and works. *TLS* (July 20), p. 435.
- Edmund Yates. Vincent C. De Baum is engaged in a study of *Templar Bar* and asks for letters, etc., relating to Yates's connection with the magazine, 1860-67. *TLS* (June 15), p. 361.

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