

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER

NUMBER 12



AUTUMN, 1957

Edited by 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

- | | |
|---|---|
| ◆ A. Dwight Culler (<i>University of Illinois</i>) | ◆ Oscar Maurer (<i>University of Texas</i>) |
| ◆ Daniel P. Deneau (<i>University of Notre Dame</i>) | ◆ Carlisle Moore (<i>University of Oregon</i>) |
| ◆ Robert A. Donovan (<i>Cornell University</i>) | ◆ (Father) David F. Rea (<i>New York City</i>) |
| ◆ Stephen F. Fogle (<i>University of Florida</i>) | ◆ Edgar F. Shannon, Jr. (<i>University of Virginia</i>) |
| ◆ Francis Russell Hart (<i>The Ohio State University</i>) | ◆ A. McKinley Terhune (<i>Syracuse University</i>) |
| ◆ W. Stacy Johnson (<i>Smith College</i>) | ◆ Helen Gill Viljoen (<i>Queens College</i>) |
| ◆ Emmet Larkin (<i>Brooklyn College</i>) | ◆ Carl J. Weber (<i>Colby College</i>) |

I. PAPERS READ AT THE MADISON MEETING

PHILOMELA: A MAJOR THEME IN ARNOLD'S POETRY

The discovery that Lord Lansdowne's dashing young secretary and the author of a book of verse called *The Strayed Reveller and Other Poems* were one person came as a surprise to a number of people. Their surprise was perfectly natural. No one could have seemed less the conventional figure of the bard than Matthew Arnold, the young man of the world; yet the austere persona of the poems sees himself in just that role. In fact, one of the most striking features of Arnold's poetry is the earnestness and persistence with which he dwells on the poet's task.

Among Arnold's many poems about poetry, some concern themselves only with the effects achieved, not at all with the labors of composition. Such, for example, are many of the early sonnets, the elegy on Heine, and the "Memorial Verses," comparing Wordsworth as a poet with Byron and Goethe. A number of others, however, deal more or less explicitly with the problem of the poet. "Resignation," one of the most substantial pieces in the 1849 volume, *The Strayed Reveller and Other Poems*, is in the form of a monologue, spoken by the poet to "Fausta," whom Tinker and Lowry identify with Arnold's sister "K." The poet, in a highly significant passage, describes the range and quality of his vision, and he is particularly insistent on the effects on himself of achieving that vision. The poet is represented as a man gifted with a more than ordinary vitality and energy, which he must subdue in order to scan, "not his own course, but that of man." In the process he experiences vicariously all human joy and sorrow, but as an artist he must at the same time remain aloof from mankind if he is to preserve his "sad lucidity of soul."

The poet's aloofness, or loneliness, and his emphatic response to the spectacle of human experience form the substance of two other poems in the 1849 volume—the title poem, "The Strayed Reveller," and "The New Sirens." The former represents a youth who has wandered from the celebration of the Dionysian rites into Circe's palace, where he tastes the enchantress' magic wine and describes the resultant visions to Circe and to Ulysses. This poem yields easily to an allegorical interpretation. The revelry from which the youth strays is probably to be identified, in very general terms, with the life of the world. The youth himself is to be thought of as a simple worldling who has temporarily strayed from his usual haunts. The vision he achieves by means of Circe's wine is the vision of the poet, which may be attained in two ways: by divine help (the intervention of the goddess herself or her magic cup, which, incidentally, is quite distinct from the cup of Iacchus; the poet can never be "charioted by Bacchus and his pards.") or by long and bitter experience (the way symbolized by Ulysses, who is depicted in this poem as the weary adventurer, dressed in the "short coat, travel-tarnished, / With one arm bare." The point of the poem is not that the poet should consciously seek divine inspiration, for the youth's power is achieved accidentally; the normal, the only

practicable, way for the poet is the way of Ulysses, and this way is difficult and painful. So much can be legitimately inferred, I think, from the obvious symbolic meaning of the poem, but Arnold has also made his meaning explicit, by putting into the mouth of the strayed reveller the comparison between inspiration and travail:

These things, Ulysses,
The wise bards also
Behold and sing.
But oh, what labour!
O prince, what pain!

They too can see
Tiresias;—but the Gods,
Who give them vision,
Added this law:
That they should bear too
His groping blindness,
His dark foreboding,
His scorn'd white hairs;
Bear Hera's anger
Through a life lengthen'd
To seven ages.

. . . such a price
The Gods exact for song:
To become what we sing.

It will be noted too that Arnold makes isolation an essential condition of the exercise of the poetic office, for the youth, by virtue of his having "strayed" from the world, and Ulysses, the homeless wanderer, are both cut off from their own kind.

The same themes of pain and isolation recur in another of the 1849 poems, "The New Sirens," but the treatment is here wholly symbolic. The speaker, whose identity the poem never makes quite clear, rejects the blandishments of the new sirens, who represent the love they offer as emotional, not, as with the "old" sirens, merely sensual. He repudiates them on the ground that their emotional love is no more enduring than the sensual love of the sirens of antiquity and, like the latter, leads only to destruction. I rest my assumption that this poem is not merely a moral allegory on Arnold's own interpretation, which he addressed to Clough, with a confession that the poem was a "mumble." Arnold identifies the speaker, first of all, as "one of a band of poets," and proceeds to paraphrase in these terms the poet's rejection of the allurements of a life of passion and sensual pleasure:

Does the remembrance of your vivacity of this morning
suffice to console you in the void and weariness of the
afternoon and evening? or do your thoughts revert to that
life of the spirit to which, like me, you were once at-
tracted, but which, finding it hard and solitary, you soon
abandoned for the vehement emotional life of passion as
'the new Sirens'? (H. F. Lowry, ed., *The Letters of Matthew
Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough*, p. 106)

The poet's preference for his own "hard and solitary" life is based on the ability, a function of his poetic vision, to see the whole of life in a single view, and thus to recognize that the alternation of pleasure and pain will at last wear out the "elasticity of the spirit." But though the life of the spirit is preferable to the life of the passions, the poet clearly recognizes that his choice involves pain and loneliness for himself.

The themes of "The Strayed Reveller" crop up again in "Empedocles on Etna," which even makes use of the same symbols. By a curious coincidence, in fact, Pausanias speaks of Callicles as having strayed from "a gay revelling band." But Callicles, like the youth who wandered into Circe's palace, is not so much the poet as the personification of poetry. It is Empedocles himself who experiences all the bitterness and loneliness of poetic vision, for he is represented in this poem, not only as a philosopher and as a magician, but also as a poet, though in the words of Pausanias, "he has laid the use of music by." Empedocles' last acts, before he plunges into the crater Etna, are to strip himself of the emblems of his power, and the last of these which he discards are the laurel bough and the harp of Apollo. As he does so he calls to mind both the pleasure and the pain that accompany the role of bard:

Scornful Apollo's ensign, lie thou there!
 Though thou hast been my shade in the world's heat—
 Though I have loved thee, lived in honouring thee—
 Yet lie thou there,
 My laurel bough!

I am weary of thee.
 I am weary of the solitude
 Where he who bears thee must abide—
 Of the rocks of Parnassus,
 Of the gorge of Delphi,
 Of the moonlit peaks, and the caves.
 Thou guardest them, Apollo!
 Over the grave of the slain Pytho,
 Though young, intolerably severe!
 Thou keepest aloof the profane,
 But the solitude oppresses thy votary,

The theme which is made quite explicit here is echoed implicitly in the songs of Callicles. These songs, the relevance of which to the development of thought and character in the poem is often obscure, are rather loosely bound together by their common concern with the power of poetry. That "the lyre's voice is lovely everywhere" is the recurrent ground-tone of Callicles' songs, but the power of song, which is represented as divine in origin, emanating now from Zeus, now from Apollo, always entails pain or misfortune. Thus the groans of Typho, last of the Titans,

Begin to roll, and almost drown
 The sweet notes whose lulling spell
 Gods and the race of mortals love so well.

And Marsyas, who rashly vied in song with Apollo, though he charmed the Muses themselves, is doomed to be flayed alive by the god of song. Cadmus and Harmonia, finally, both of whom symbolize the creative power (Cadmus, since he invented the alphabet, of speech; Harmonia, as her name suggests, of music) are depicted by Callicles as aged snakes, into which form they have been changed by the sympathetic gods to avoid the "curse upon curse, pang upon pang," which was their legacy to their descendants. This theme of the pain of poetic vision is presented so often and so insistently in "Empedocles on Etna" that it must be regarded as one of the poem's major themes.

Two other poems, published with "Empedocles" in 1852, provide evidence of Arnold's continuing concern with the travail of the poet. In "The Youth of Nature" Arnold dirges Wordsworth for the second time, making a significant comparison between Wordsworth and Tiresias, who owed his prophetic gift to the very power which blinded him to the joys of the world, and who, with Thebes behind him in flames, "died in his enemies' day." Once again, as in "Resignation" and "The Strayed Reveller," Arnold dwells on the poet's imaginative sympathy with the human life he represents and on the pains and pleasures he must, as a consequence, experience vicariously. And Arnold refines the notion by suggesting that these pains and pleasures, as expressed in poetry, are only faint and feeble echoes of the misery and joy actually experienced by the poet. The "Stanzas in Memory of the Author of 'Obermann'" were written somewhat earlier, in November, 1849, although not published until 1852. In Sénancour Arnold found a specific example of what, in the other poems I have been discussing, he had presented in general terms. Obermann, to use Arnold's own metonymy, is a perfect example of the poet tortured by his poetic vision:

A fever in these pages burns
 Beneath the calm they feign;
 A wounded human spirit turns,
 Here, on its bed of pain.

Making use of a characteristic technique, Arnold compares Obermann to Wordsworth, and finally to Goethe, another good exemplar of his theme, a strong, wise man who "pursued a lonely road." But Arnold does not rest long on the particular; he passes to generalizations about the poet, concluding that the root of his unhappiness is in the disequilibrium between contradictory impulses which are inevitably at work upon him:

Ah! two desires toss about
 The poet's feverish blood.
 One drives him to the world without,
 And one to solitude.

These are apparently the same forces which Arnold had in mind when he said of the poet in "Resignation" that he must seek a detached vantage point, but at the same time cling to his human sympathies and interests. To be a poet, then, involves an irreconcilable conflict between opposing forces, a conflict which tears at the poet and produces intolerable tensions, leading ultimately to destruction, as in the case of Empedocles.

Perhaps the poem which gives the most beautiful expression to the theme I have been discussing is "Philomela," first published in the *Poems* of 1853. Its beauty, its clarity, and its simplicity make it an appropriate and convenient point of reference, and Philomela may accordingly be thought of as an archetype of the poet in whom the keenest delight in his own power of song is inextricably linked to the bitterest sorrow, and in whom pleasure and pain derive from the same source. It is this paradoxical union which constitutes the theme of the poem, introduced in the first four lines:

Hark! ah, the nightingale—
The tawny-throated!
Hark, from that moonlit cedar what a burst!
What triumph! hark! — what pain!

The idea of the bird brings to mind the old story of Philomela, and her "wild, unquench'd, deep-sunken, old-world pain," and Arnold pauses to wonder if no consolation can be provided by the present tranquil scene, which he evokes in a cluster of his favorite images:

And can this fragrant lawn
With its cool trees, and night,
And the sweet, tranquil Thames,
And moonshine, and the dew,
To thy rack'd heart and brain
Afford no balm?

But a renewed burst of song convinces him that the memory of her wrongs is ineffaceable, and the poem ends on the note of:

Eternal passion!
Eternal pain!

What we may conveniently call the Philomela theme has been in constant evidence in Arnold's early poems, and it is no less important in his mature work, though his treatment of the theme is less frequently symbolic or allegorical, more often perfectly explicit. After the volume of 1853 Arnold published no radically new collection of his verse until 1867, when he brought out the book called *New Poems*, containing most of the pieces written during the preceding decade. A half dozen of these again concern the poet and the problems of poetic creativity.

"The Austerity of Poetry" is probably the baldest, and certainly the most graceless, statement of the now familiar theme. I shall quote only the last three lines, which summarize the thought of the entire sonnet:

Such, poets, is your bride, the Muse! young, gay,
Radiant, adorn'd outside; a hidden ground
Of thought and of austerity within.

The "Epilogue to Lessing's *Laocoön*" is another extraordinarily direct statement which is not altogether successful as a poem. It develops the thesis that great poetry is rarer than great art or music, because it exacts a heavier cost in compelling the poet to share the life he would depict. Raphael and Beethoven cannot reach the heights occupied by Homer or Shakespeare, because they have not known the pain and the labor that falls to the poet.

Other poems in the 1867 volume tell the same story, or a part of it—"The Progress of Poesy," "A Caution to Poets," "Bacchanalia"—but it seems unnecessary to offer further documentation of what is already well substantiated, that Arnold has a deep and abiding interest in the Philomela theme. A more challenging problem is to determine the precise nature and cause of the pain which Arnold finds to be inseparable from the exercise of poetic vision. I have already suggested the most obvious source of this pain, in the poet's heightened sensitivity to the evil and suffering of the world, in his empathic response to the human experience which comes within the range of his vision. But this is not a wholly satisfactory solution to the problem, because it does not account for the pain associated even with the spectacle of human joy. Arnold is undoubtedly a pessimist, particularly when we compare him with Tennyson or Browning; he could never seriously offer the consolation of "the wild joys

of living," as David does to Saul, for in his view of life sorrow clearly outweighs joy. But joy is not necessarily illusory; it really exists, and man is to be blamed if he refuses to trust that joy. And as Empedocles propounds, man has resources with which to confront life, and his stoical resignation to the ills of fate, far from being a painful spectacle, is a noble and inspiring one. "Fear not!" Empedocles tells Pausanias, "Life still / Leaves human effort scope. . . . Because thou must not dream, thou need'st not then despair!" Arnold's humor is not melancholy, but phlegm.

An important clue to the source of this pain in poetic vision is that the pain is never postulated of partial or incomplete views of the world. The distinguishing feature of poetic vision is that it enables its possessor to "see life steadily and see it whole," and is thus more closely allied to the vision of the philosopher or the prophet than to that of the painter or the musician. This conception of the poet's vision explains the frequent use of Tiresias as a type of the poet and suggests that Empedocles is a key figure for Arnold in the development of his idea of the poet. The poet's capacity to see life integrally, then, is the essential quality of his genius, and it seems reasonable to assume that the difficulty of attaining that integral vision is the origin of the pain associated with it. But a further distinction must be drawn. The pain of poetic vision is not simply equivalent to labor, though Arnold is constantly reaffirming that the process requires enormous labor. In achieving his lofty vantage point, in freeing himself completely from the mists of illusion, the poet suffers his bitterest pang—not the loss of human sympathy, but the loss of his illusions about himself, and with them the sense of his own identity. As a poet his concern is with what Arnold variously designates as the "general life" or the "buried life," but in discovering it within himself he destroys those superficial aspects of himself which are the distinguishing marks of his own individuality.

Arnold has left, in his letters to Clough and to his sister "K," one of the most candid and revealing records of his own poetic development of any Victorian poet. A recurring motif in these letters is Arnold's passionate desire for self-possession, in a quite literal sense, with the constant awareness that this involves the destruction of personality. "I cannot but think," he writes to Clough in a letter dated from the Baths of Leuk, September 29, 1848, "that our spirits retain their conquests: that from the height they succeed in raising themselves to, they can never fall. Tho: this uti possedetes principle may be compatible with entire loss of individuality and of the power to recognize one another" (Lowry, p. 93). And some years later, to "K":

People do not understand what a temptation there is, if you cannot bear anything not *very good*, to transfer your operations to a region where form is everything. Perfection of a certain kind may there be attained, or at least approached, without knocking yourself to pieces, but to attain or approach perfection in the region of thought and feeling, and to unite this with perfection of form, demands not merely an effort and a labour, but an actual tearing of oneself to pieces, which one does not readily consent to (although one is sometimes forced to it) unless one can devote one's whole life to poetry. (*Letters*, I, 72.)

The self-destruction involved in the act of poetic creation Arnold tested in his own experience and mirrored in his poetry, above all in "Empedocles on Etna." The final suicide of Empedocles, in fact, seems to me to be incomprehensible on any other supposition than that that he is experiencing the same eclipse of personality that Arnold makes inseparable from the effort to achieve the poet's vision. Certainly Empedocles' overt explanations, in his final monologue, are unconvincing, particularly when we remember the stoical resignation which he has been recommending to Pausanias. He seems to be saying no more than that he is prepared to take his own life because he has survived into an age which is alien to him, because he is an anachronism, because, in short, he is lonely. But he gives no indication that he was ever, or could ever be, anything else; his intellect and his temperament condemn him to solitude. And Arnold himself, far from finding loneliness terrifying, discovers in solitude the only practicable way of life for those who crave, like the scholar gipsy, or Thyrsis, or Arnold himself in the "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse," singleness of purpose and complete dedication. I can account for Empedocles' suicide only on the hypothesis that it was for him the inevitable culmination of a process of self-effacement, inaugurated at the beginning of the poem by his refusal to accept the role of magician and healer that the vulgar, led by Pausanias, have attempted to thrust upon him. His distaste for spurious identity leads him to strip from himself

not only his poses and attitudes but the very layers of personality itself. The poem is a record of the successive stages in the depersonalization of Empedocles, stages which are defined by his discarding of the symbols of his various identities—the golden circlet and purple robe emblematic of his physical power, and the harp and the laurel bough emblematic of his spiritual and intellectual power—until nothing remains but “a devouring flame of thought/ . . . a naked, eternally restless mind.”

The poet's loss of identity is depicted symbolically in the songs of Callicles, by the simple device of physical change or metamorphosis. Marsyas, for example, loses his skin, and Cadmus and Harmonia are transformed into serpents. And in “Philomela,” the poem which I have earlier taken as the purest embodiment of the theme, the “eternal pain” of Tereus' outraged bride is forever memorialized by her change into a nightingale. In his most beautiful and most passionate salute to the agonizing glories of poetic inspiration, Arnold once more links the power of Philomela's song to the painful memory of her metamorphosis:

Dost thou once more assay
Thy flight, and feel come over thee,
Poor fugitive, the feathery change
Once more, and once more seem to make resound
With love and hate, triumph and agony,
Lone Daulis, and the high Cephissian vale?

Arnold's firmly rooted conviction that the poet must inevitably sacrifice himself to his art does not necessarily mean that he is doomed to destruction. A truly philosophical spirit may occasionally survive the frightful ordeal of losing his illusions and succeed in doing what Arnold himself vainly strove to do in his Carthusian monastery—possess his own soul. It was Shakespeare's greatest glory that he was “self-school'd, self-scann'd, self-honour'd, self-secure,” and it was the triumph of Sophocles, that “even-balanced soul,” that he could endure to look unblinking at the blaze of truth. Arnold would doubtless excuse himself and his contemporaries for their relative failure in self-possession on the grounds that they, like Empedocles, were struggling between two worlds, that they had no leisure to grow wise in the sick hurry of modern life. But if Arnold's effort at introspection was a self-confessed failure, it at any rate led beyond the narcissism and the self-pity of the Romantic poets, and endowed him with the modern sensibility that is the distinguishing characteristic of his poetry.

Cornell University

Robert A. Donovan

THE THEME OF MARRIAGE IN TENNYSON

“Either sex alone
Is half itself, and in true marriage lies
Nor equal nor unequal. Each fulfills
Defect in each, and always thought in thought,
Purpose in purpose, will in will, they grow,
The single pure and perfect animal,
The two cell'd heart beating, with one full stroke,
Life.”

In this speech of his hero's, near the end of *The Princess*, Tennyson presents one version of an idea which is of primary importance both in that poem and in the *Idylls of the King*. It is an idea implied in other poems, too—implied, for instance, in the metaphors of *In Memoriam*, where the lonely life is a “widowed race,” and the deepest communion of human beings is symbolized by marriage. True marriage, in Tennyson, represents the physically and spiritually fruitful life; and it becomes a kind of counter-theme to the Tennysonian ground-theme of loneliness and mortality. The development of this idea can be traced from the early verse through the *Idylls* and beyond.

In the early verse it is often the frustration of love and the inability of men and women to achieve marriage with which the poet is concerned. The Mariana poems, “Oenone,” “Locksley Hall,” “The Lady of Shalott,” all associate the loss of love with a desire for death; in each of them the main figure is forsaken and emotionally passive. The only one who attempts to break out of her isolation is the Lady of Shalott, the lady who sees life as a

reflection in a mirror. Her turning away from a peace which is self-centered and morbid, to Lancelot in the world outside, is as much a moral action as the poet's retreating from his Palace of Art; but it is doomed, and with the cracking of the mirror, the symbol of her self-conscious imagination, she is destroyed.

The communion with another, represented by marriage, is impossible, too, for the unhappy lover in *Maud*. In that poem, as Professor E. D. H. Johnson has suggested, there is a symbolic use of flowers, the lily standing for passive qualities and the rose representing passion and violence.¹ The lover projects his moods into the image of the beloved: he is quiet and resigned and she seems like a lily; or he is passionate and sensual and she becomes a rose. As sexuality is perverted to lust and destructiveness, the rose comes to be associated with blood; and finally the passion of the speaker leads him, in quite a different way from that of the lady drifting toward Camelot, to his own doom. "The soul of the rose went into my blood," he says, as frustrated desire turns to violence. This is an unhappy antithesis of red, the rose, blood and madness against white, the lily, passivity and peace. For if the rose suggests violence, the lily symbolizes denial and, ultimately, death. But the polarity can be resolved, as it is in other poems.

Marriage as both a spiritual and physical ideal, and as a possibility, is pictured in several of the early pieces, and most significantly in "The Two Voices"—a poem which might be called Tennyson's first document of conversion, comparable with the central three chapters of *Sartor Resartus*. This poem brings to distinct issue the longing for death that pervades so much of the earlier verse, by posing the question of suicide. Although the reader comes to realize very near the end of the piece that the two voices of the title are those of despair and hope, the conflict in most of the poem is between one inner voice urging self-destruction and another that advances rather weak and negative arguments for life. The death urge is having all the best of it until well along in the poem—until, in the light of the Sabbath morning, the poet, like the Lady of Shalott, looks out his window, to see people walking "to God's house." And three people in particular:

One walk'd between his wife and child,
With measured footfall firm and mild,
And now and then he gravely smiled.

The prudent partner of his blood
Lean'd on him, faithful, gentle, good,
Wearing the rose of womanhood.

And in their double love secure,
The little maiden walk'd demure,
Pacing with downward eyelids pure.

These three made unity so sweet,
My frozen heart began to beat,
Remembering its ancient heat.

This is the turning point of the poem. Now, suddenly, the "dull and bitter voice" is gone, and at last the "second voice" is heard, the voice of cheer. The vision of life which prompts that voice is a vision of the married life—in which the woman carries a rose, not a lily. Even the form of the poem helps to create a sense of unity overcoming duality, with its rhyme scheme of triplets that contradicts the notion of an unresolved conflict. In spite of the title, this is a poem about three's: about three voices and about the three figures of man, wife and child.

The Tennysonian idea (suggested elsewhere, too) that marriage is completed in the child can, however, be perverted if the wife is regarded primarily as a means of reproducing the race. In the poem "Edwin Morris," this is the view expressed by the curate, who declares that "God made the woman for the use of man." Still, while the curate may "pitch the pipe too low," the opposite perversion is more dangerous, the affecting to worship woman, as Edwin Morris himself does. There must be a compromise between the physical and spiritual emphases, between the too aggressive and the too passive attitudes toward woman and marriage. And that is at least part of the moral of *The Princess*.

Told within a modern framework, the story of *The Princess* projects its nineteenth-century characters into the forms of fantastic people located in no particular time or place: Princess Ida, a woman more "rosebud set with wilful thorns" than lily, more feminist than feminine; and her suitor, a fair and extremely sensitive young prince who is devoted to his

mother and alienated from his bluff and even brutal father. The Prince's way of wooing is described at first with some humor, but the story becomes increasingly serious as the poem proceeds, even though the situations are sometimes perilously close to those in "Charlie's Aunt." Whatever the unevenness of tone, Tennyson is dealing, in fact, with a subject of importance.

It is a subject on which the added songs, the only parts of *The Princess* that are often read, have been made to comment. All of these lyrics either anticipate or re-emphasize the leading theme of the poem, that of marriage, and several of them do so by embodying Tennyson's notion of the saving and reconciling child. "The child is the link thro' the parts," Tennyson says, "as shown in the songs."² The lullaby "Sweet and Low," the ballad beginning "All thro' the land," in which husband and wife are reunited at their child's grave, and the lyric inserted between Parts Five and Six, which shows a widow reconciled to her life by the sight of her infant, all of them represent this notion, as the narrative itself does. For Princess Ida becomes fully a woman only when she allows her very feminine aide Psyche, her feminine 'soul,' to keep the child who has earlier been taken from her. Then Ida can feel the womanly pity she displays as she sits by the wounded prince's bed and reads, "Now sleeps the crimson petal, now the white."

The red and the white flower, the rose and the lily, are used throughout *The Princess*, as in *Maud*, to suggest the extremes of passion and reticence—not only in the name of the modern heroine Lillia and the rose imagery that characterizes her, but also, within the main story, in the description of Psyche's "lily-shining child" and the passage of Cyril's love-making to Melissa: "Pale one, blush again; than wear / Those lilies, better blush our lives away," says this friend of the hero's to his beloved. Compare with this the approach of the Prince himself, who woos his princess not through any such masculine and even sexual declarations but by saying that he desires her more "than growing boys their manhood." Clearly, the dominating spirit in Ida must be broken or subdued and this boyish passivity of the Prince's somehow outgrown, if theirs is to be a healthy marriage. But that does not mean a reversal of roles. When the hero's father, the old king, states his view that "man is the hunter; woman is his game," that view is by no means Tennyson's: women are flora, not fauna, in his characteristic imagery—they are, especially, roses and lilies. If Melissa needs to be something more of a rose, then Ida needs only to lose some of her "wilful thorns."

The end of the story clearly implies the need for a balance between passion and reticence, between rose and lily, in both the man and the woman, as the prince begs, at last with success, "Accomplish thou my manhood and thyself": he is asking the strong-willed Ida to become a wife—not a mother and nurse, and not a mere dependent, either—so that he can act as a grown-up man and she as a woman.

Commenting on this story, the conclusion of the poem suggests a parallel between instability in the relationships of men and women and instability in society at large. The old King's idea of marriage, man ruling and woman ruled, is like the idea of a feudal society; the transition from that to a more ideal conception (one of unity and equality between persons) may, like the transition from a feudal to a relatively democratic society, mean disorder and confusion. Tennyson's story-teller knows that his are times of radical change and reaction, but he still sees, through sudden heat and mock heroics, the goal of equality in brotherhood, and in true marriage.

The *Idylls of the King* treat once more the subject of the isolated person and his need for love, along with that of confusion and falsehood in society—falsehood that, now quite clearly, has its counterpart in false relationships between men and women. The social failure of Arthur is a failure of marriage, a failure that implies the disintegration of his ideal world. It is also, from another point of view, a failure of the Manichean heresy that would separate the spirit from the flesh; for Tennyson's hero is a god who fails to become man. The first idyll in the sequence (not first, of course, in date of writing or publication), "The Coming of Arthur," emphasizes how important his marriage is to the King: of Guinevere, Arthur says,

Were I joined with her,
Then might we live together as one life,
And reigning with one will in everything
Have power on this dark land to lighten it,
And power on this dead world to make it live.

To Tennyson himself, as to us, this dramatic echo of the notion that marriage can redeem human life must have an ironic point; for it is to be followed by a series of tales about inequality

and falsehood in marriage, and at last by the disastrous revelation of how Arthur's soul has failed to be joined with the body and soul of Guinevere.

Most of the idylls have to do explicitly with false or unbalanced relationships. "Gareth and Lynette" deals with a woman's harsh pride which turns, like Ida's, to something like motherly pity. The two idylls of "Geraint" and "Geraint and Enid" show the jealousy and need for reassurance which make their hero at once brutal and emotionally passive: Geraint's fear of seeming effeminate, his bullying assertions of manhood and vigor, go along with an obsessive need to be wounded, to suffer, to play dead and enjoy his wife's mourning. And an even more extreme instance of an immature attitude toward marriage is the idyll "Balin and Balan," which reveals the contrast between "woman-worship" and its results. When one of the two rude brothers observes a tryst between Guinevere and Lancelot, Guinevere in the roses and Lancelot in the lilies, he is maddened by this revelation of the truth. The truth is that the Queen frankly prefers roses to the symbols of virginity and of death. But when Lancelot describes his vision of a maiden saint with a lily in her hand, who would be stained by the lightest flush, he seems to be plucking his roses with eyes upturned. Certainly a double standard seems to apply here, for it is not Lancelot's falseness but only Guinevere's that horrifies Balin. Learning the base facts about his feminine ideal, he goes into a frenzy and ends by rushing madly at his own twin, piercing his "maiden shield" with a bloody lance. This final scene is the one symbolic representation of intimate personal contact in the *Idylls*, and it is both narcissistic and self-destructive.

Lynette wants someone worthy of her to fight her battles, Geraint wants a wife who will cry for him, and Balin, disillusioned about other idols, wants to embrace and be held by his twin, his own image. Protector, Mother and mirror, each one is an image projected, and the center of each desire is self, not marriage with another. In the next idyll, "Merlin and Vivien," the enchantress Vivien is again selfish—but honestly so. She, at least, is a genuine sinner with no illusions about herself. But if Vivien is not a prig, there are at least two other women in the *Idylls* who share that distinction. Both of them, Guinevere and Elaine, love unselfishly (as Vivien cannot) and both love the same man; but for both of them the goal of love is impossible: marriage is impossible. So "Lancelot and Elaine" deals once more, and once more beautifully, with the Tennysonian subject of frustration and isolation ending in death.

The death of Elaine, like the death of Balin, is indirectly caused by Guinevere's sin; but that sin in turn is caused by the inhuman purity of Arthur, who uses his queen just as Geraint and Lynette use their mates—as an object. This abuse would be a symptom of overwhelming pride, if Arthur were a real man instead of spirit personified in the warfare of soul and sense, as gradually and hazily he comes to be. Such a warfare, divorcing flesh from spirit, inevitably degrades, objectifies and tries to enslave the flesh and the woman. It also leads to spiritual pride and even madness, as the King himself must recognize in the idyll of "The Holy Grail." Nevertheless, the pursuit of the grail is a direct expression of the anti-sensuous principle which Tennyson would have him represent. The grail, "blood-red," "rose-red," "redder than any rose," is the earthly rose sublimated; and it seems appropriate that one of Percivale's temptations on the quest is the mirage of a fair woman who falls, with her house and baby, into dust. The best of Arthur's knights turn from marriage and physical creativity to the unearthly projection and idealization of desire.

To deny any physical basis of the spiritual life is to deny the sacrament of marriage, as it is to deny the dogma of the Incarnation, and this is what Tennyson's Arthurian heroes do. In the last idylls there is an increasingly bitter treatment of sexuality, an increasingly morbid suggestion of disgust with the flesh. "The world," says Dagonet in "The Last Tournament," "is flesh and shadow"—and "Experience, in her kind/Hath fouled me."

Both "Pelleas and Ettarre" and "The Last Tournament" are filled with such bitterness as this, and with a violent imagery. (Comparing "Pelleas and Ettarre" with "Gareth and Lynette," one can observe a deliberate movement toward darkness and disaster in the poems—deliberate, because "Gareth" first appeared some four years after "Pelleas.") When Pelleas finds his lady in the arms of Gawain, he experiences revulsion against the whole physical world—the world of strong towers with "harlot roofs"—and he declares his love merely lust. The story ends with this disillusioned knight's discovery of Lancelot's and Guinevere's affair, but its point is expressed in a song that occurs earlier—"A rose, but one, none other rose had I"—in which the very word *rose* is repeated obsessively: "he dies who loves it,—if the worm be there."

While there is no rose in "The Last Tournament," that idyll is filled with the red

of blood and fire, and it provides another conjunction of tower and harlot in the words of the Red Knight, the sensual anti-Arthur.

My tower is full of harlots, like his court,
But mine are worthier, seeing they profess
To be none other than themselves--
My knights are all adulterers like his own.

In this inverted Camelot, brutally physical, there is no more chance for true marriage than there is in Arthur's realm: the extremes of red and white are nowhere joined but are distinct and at war—at the war of shadow and flesh. In the Tournament of Dead Innocence the contrast between these extremes is repeated insistently. Still, the dead maiden called Innocence is discovered with a ruby necklace; and not until the ruby is offered as a prize does it begin to reflect dark passion and violence: the passion and violence of Tristram, whose hand is gory when he takes it, whose beloved Isolt has a hand as red with blood as his wife Isolt's was flower white. It is true that the idyll is filled with such uses of red, opposed to and overwhelming purity, whiteness. Arthur's own knights, their impulses long sublimated perhaps, indulge at last in an orgy of murder and destruction. But the original association of the pure child with the red jewel may suggest that the two images need not forever be opposed.

This suggestion would be consistent, of course, with the ending of *The Princess*; but it is not consistent with the character of Arthur as it is revealed in the idyll of "Guinevere," where he forgives his wife "as eternal God forgives," but cannot take her hand because "that too is flesh." Is his, then, something other than flesh? Guinevere cannot live with "pure severity of perfect light," she yearns for the "warmth and color" which the King lacks; and yet she insists that Arthur is "highest and most human too." Hers seems like a curious use of the word *human*; for we have to recall the question asked by both Vivien and Isolt: "Is he man at all?" Certainly he is not a husband.

If the *Idylls* are read according to Tennyson's words, as the story of "sense at war with soul," they must be read as a parable of how disastrous that war is for both sides. Arthur's life ends not in tragic exaltation, not in sacrifice, but, for all the magic of the last part, in defeat. As Tennyson points out, *In Memoriam* begins with a death and ends with a marriage, a promise of new life; the *Idylls*, we observe, begin with a marriage and end with, perhaps not a death but at least a passing. The dark conclusion is appropriate for a work, or series of works, that cannot celebrate any true marriage or produce a single living child. The child Innocence, its parents unknown, dies in infancy; the baby in Percivale's vision crumbles to dust; and Arthur reproaches Guinevere by saying, "Well it is that no child is born of thee." Childless, without a future, this world of the King's is self-centered, brutal, sick, because in it there can be no marriage, no bond at once physical and spiritual.

These poems are not the only ones where Tennyson deals directly with the subject of marriage, but they are among the most ambitious. One need not know of the difficulties in his parents' marriage and his brother's to see in them the importance of the subject. It is evident that marriage, in Tennyson, represents a whole life for man, the basis for a whole society. True marriage, for him, means a balancing of aggression and passivity, of physical force with spiritual integrity. The masculine must be complemented by the feminine, although the man and woman cannot successfully reverse their roles, as they do in *The Princess* and, more subtly, in the *Idylls*. When there is a harmony of the two, the result is life; but when there is no such harmony, men and societies are self-centered and they die. These ideas permeate Tennyson's verse, even when they work against his stated intentions, as in the *Idylls*; for they work dramatically to show the results of individual failures. Finally, and characteristically of the poet, Tennyson's notion of true marriage is an ideal which he can rarely imagine as achieved.

Smith College

W. Stacy Johnson

NOTES

¹"The Lily and the Rose: Symbolic Meaning in Tennyson's *Maud*," *PMLA*, LXIV (December, 1949), 1222-1227.

²In Hallam Tennyson's *Nemour*, I, 254.

(EDITOR'S NOTE: "Schopenhauer and Hardy's 'food for final hope' in *The Dynasts*," a paper read by Professor Carl J. Weber of Colby College, is published in the November 1957 issue of the *Colby Library Quarterly*.)

II. REVIEWS

CARLYLE RESARTUS

Julian Symons, ed., *Carlyle: Selected Works, Reminiscences and Letters*, Harvard, 1957.

Carlyle has been re-dressed often enough, with many an ill-fitting suit. He has been be-memoired, and biographed and psychographed; his work has been disapproved and now nearly forgotten except, humorously, as a 30-volume memorial to Silence. One confesses to a liking for him only with an apologetic laugh and alludes cautiously to his remarkable powers of description and his influence on social reform in England. It is a relief, then, to see him presented without the old clothes (or at least parts of him) in this handsome Reynard Library volume, *Carlyle: Selected Works, Reminiscences and Letters*, edited by Julian Symons. Considering the difficulty of making a satisfactory selection from so controversial and sizeable a body of work, the editor has done splendidly. I admire his courage in making the attempt and am grateful for the product, just as I was grateful in 1952 for his biography of Carlyle. Perceptive and sympathetic, that biography nevertheless had a bias. It was therefore another 're-dressing,' but the suit fitted, I think, in all but one respect, about which more later. The present volume, since it offers Carlyle directly, should have the advantage of leaving the reader free to draw his own conclusions.

In many respects it does. All of the major works are represented in 425 of the 746 printed pages in the book; 301 pages contain two early essays, two portions of the *Reminiscences*, and forty-six letters. These are taken from standard editions, and editorial matter is confined to a five-page prefatory essay, a table of dates, and brief introductions to individual selections. The longest selections are from *Reminiscences* (180 pp.), *The French Revolution* (131 pp.), and *Sartor Resartus* (60 pp.). There is a notable lack of the old anthology favorites like the essays on Burns and Boswell's Johnson, the second book of *Sartor*, and the chapters on Work and Democracy. From *The French Revolution* there are the Insurrection of Women and the fall of the Girondins, from *Cromwell* the Battle of Naseby and the destruction of the Levellers' movement, from *Frederick* the Battle of Rossbach. These illustrate Carlyle's special talent for historical narrative and description, and along with the passages from *Past and Present*, *Heroes*, and *Latter-Day Pamphlets*, they also illustrate his political ideas. Indeed, the book as a whole provides a social scientist's, rather than a humanist's, view of Carlyle. There is little to show him as a man of letters, trying to make history poetic, to rise "into the region of creation." The essays on German, French, and British writers, the *Hero as Poet* and *Hero as Man of Letters*, the letters to Emerson and Goethe, are not represented. The essay "Characteristics" with its important insight into the role of the unconscious in man and society is absent. There is little to show Carlyle's religious development. The Leith Walk experience, as re-enacted on the *Rue de l'Enfer*, is essential to an understanding of his later career; —*Sartor*, that most original and influential of his works, is not adequately represented by Book I.

The reader, then, is not really left free to form his own conclusions because important materials are lacking. The selection has been made on the basis of a personal judgment about Carlyle, namely, that his development from "an unorthodox Radical thinker [to] an advocate of extreme authoritarian rule" is the most important thing about him (Introd., p. 10; cf. Symons, *Thomas Carlyle*, pp. 293-294). The editor is, of course, within his rights to do this, but it may be doubted whether such a pointed selection is the best kind of contribution to an effort to arrive at a truer understanding of either Carlyle or his contemporaries.

What appears to be a revival of interest in the Victorians is really, I think, a shift of interest. They are showing an unsuspected range and depth. The term 'Victorianism' is mentioned no more often, perhaps, but is mentioned less pejoratively than it was twenty or thirty years ago. It reminds us of problems still unsolved, which scientific and industrial developments and two world wars have merely intensified. Faced with a similar conjunction of uncertain peace, prosperity, and an ominous future, we look back to the authors of that age for example, which in other realms besides that of religious faith has "compelled [us] to abandon many impossible positions" (Basil Willey, *More Nineteenth Century Studies*, p. 5). To this it must be added that some of their positions were not impossible. As we approach the centenary of that remarkable year 1859 we can see the nature and value of their achievement more clearly, can regard their opinions more objectively, and recognize that they were literary artists often of the highest endowment who were distracted by the dizzying social and spiritual changes of their day. Indeed, as their opinions, wrong or right, gather significance

for us, and take their place in the middle distance of the past, we are finally beginning to study the quality of their imagination and their art as they deserve.

It is a question whether this shift towards objectivity applies to Carlyle. Not only his authoritarian ideas, but his personal life and character (in so far as these are understood), and his eccentric style, have continued to hurt him. Symons remarks that "To appreciate Carlyle the reader today must make a greater effort than is required of him by any other Victorian writer. . ." (Introd., p. 9). To the political scientist, his hero-worship has been tainted retroactively by fascism. To the psychologist, the violence of his work is attributable to his arrested psycho-sexual development at the anal stage, of which his famous dyspepsia and his reputed impotence were the neurotic consequences. To the historian, he is a "bad" historian because of his strong prejudices, his unscientific use of source materials, and a forbidding style. What, then, is he to the literary critic? He is all of these, and a genius *manqué*. Though few deny the force and originality of his character, yet the shift towards impartial, literary judgment of his work has hardly begun. If his early transcendental and social gospel can be regarded as salutary, there is the spectre of his later authoritarianism which, even if it were not dangerous, represents the road not taken and rules him out of consideration as a reliable thinker. He has never been forgiven his ideas. It has been impossible to treat him objectively, as an artist.

In the same predicament there is, of course, a distinguished company of other Victorian writers, like Tennyson, Arnold, and Ruskin, who descended from the palace of art into the social arena hoping to take their art with them intact. Each paid his own penalty, Carlyle most heavily of all. His work, like theirs, poses the problem of finding a satisfactory critical approach to what has been called "non-imaginative" prose.¹ This problem has been admirably discussed by Professor A. Dwight Culler and Professor Martin J. Svaglic in recent issues of *VNL*. I should like to suggest in passing that perhaps too much has been made of the difficulty of studying prose works (at least in Professor Culler's paper) and too little made of the difficulty of studying poems. For in poetry too there are facts and theories that demand a consideration as well as the work itself considered as art. With *In Memoriam*, for example, the critic's attention will be divided between Tennyson's modulation of the traditional elegiac form and his imagery, on the one hand, and his relation with Hallam and his understanding of evolutionary theory on the other. The first consideration will be literary, the second biographical and scientific. To establish a proper relation between them is difficult, but necessary, if one is to do full justice to the poem.

Now to do full justice to prose works like Carlyle's "Shooting Niagara; and After" and "The Nigger Question" poses another difficulty, different only in degree, because the ideas, hyperbolically expressed, run counter to cherished democratic beliefs and hopes which are the more jealously held in our day because they are threatened by a communist enemy. How can the critic willingly suspend his disbelief, ignore the challenge, and regard such works dispassionately? He is faced with a complex of disparate elements in the same work, each requiring a different sort of critical effort, all refusing to be put into any kind of amicable relationship with one another. The critic's lot is not a happy one. We know that he must subdue his personal objections, must resolutely see the work in the context of the author's life, time, and other work. Surely there is a historical fallacy, where our judgment of a political or other theory which was held in a past time is determined by our present considerations instead of by the considerations obtaining in that past time. It is not difficult to see why men like Carlyle, Ruskin, and Arnold feared democracy, or why they grew embittered at the last. If they were wrong, they had reasons, and the disinterested critic, observing this, will be free to contemplate the artistic qualities and forms of their works in their literary relations to such theory.

We should be able from our present vantage point to see Carlyle not as a dangerous precursor of fascism—a social and philosophical system that would have repelled him—but as a tragic figure in the history of letters, a hero-aspirant who could neither become a hero nor find a hero to follow. His ideal was theocratic polity. Let the hero rule over society as God rules over all men, sternly, justly, with a wisdom neither possessed nor understood by ordinary non-heroic creatures. His later extremist emphasis on force sprang from his bitterness. That he did not mean all he said is demonstrated by his faith to the last in the pitiable deservingness of man in a world of necessity, limited vision, and miscarried justice. To the

¹ A. Dwight Culler, "Method in the Study of Victorian Prose," *VNL*, No. 9, pp. 1-4. The term is perhaps misleading: expository prose may be as richly imaginative as the prose of fiction. Simply "non-fictional," or "rhetorical," might better describe the prose of the Victorians in question.

religious mind, his ideal must be considered a noble one. To the political mind, secularized, his ideal will seem wrong because weak in patience and human faith, and hopelessly unrealistic because no such hero as Carlyle imagined ever lived this side of paradise. To the literary mind of the scholar today the best of his work is imaginative literature whose aesthetic and substantive elements may be treated as poetic fiction, created out of the imagination, like an epic of the past, or as Lamb took the world of Restoration drama. One cannot exempt him entirely from responsibility for his ideas because he tried so hard to teach them; nor should we need to. But as we are now able to see them in their historical context, it is of primary importance to define and establish their literary context. We need to know more about his essentially poetic imagination, his rhetorical-poetic expression, and the organic structure of his works. Grace Calder's study of *Past and Present* and John Holloway's *The Victorian Sage* are welcome steps in this direction.

Thus it is of special importance that the work of so thorny a writer as Carlyle should be represented in all its main aspects. When his authoritarianism is allowed to predominate, we lose the more humane and tragic side of his character and the literary quality of his work and career. In both *Thomas Carlyle: The Life and Ideas of a Prophet* and *Carlyle: Selected Works* there is this predominance, but whereas in the biography it is explained and softened against a background of Carlyle's life and times, in the *Selected Works* Carlyle is left defenseless, able to speak only part of himself, with no one to provide the needed critical balance. Not only is he undressed, but he is very nearly stripped of all except his political ideas. Carlyle was no more an Adamite than was Teufelsdröckh. He needs critical clothes to show him in relation to his time as both thinker and artist.

Admitted, this volume was not designed for the scholar. For the beginning student or the general reader it will provide an attractive (if one-sided) preliminary view of Carlyle as Prophet. It contains a wealth of his most superb historical and argumentative writing, and considerably omits the most intemperate. One may find here, at its best, Carlyle's eloquence, his intellectual energy, his near-greatness of soul, and—if one looks close—his still unassessed literary genius.

University of Oregon

Carlyle Moore

NEWMAN: "SUPREME LITERARY"

Geoffrey Tillotson, ed., *Newman: Prose and Poetry*, Harvard, 1957.

John Henry Newman's position as one of the great masters of English prose is secure and indisputable; his writings have become an invaluable part of the canon of English Literature. Of all the great Victorians, he lives on in the present day with a vitality and relevance which few, if any, of his contemporaries can approach. Professor Harrold has estimated that some ten thousand books and articles treating of Newman's life and works appeared in the year 1933 alone, in conjunction with the centenary of the beginning of the Oxford Movement. The year 1945, marking the hundredth anniversary of his conversion, witnessed the publication of a comparable number of studies. The subsequent years have seen no diminution of interest in his personality and writings.

3

In view of the fact that Newman was primarily a religious thinker and devoted himself to the supernatural, his literary longevity in an era that has been predominantly, though not completely, irreligious and naturalistic is all the more remarkable. A further consideration is the fact that, in large part, his writings were occasional and controversial. Such productions are almost inevitably ephemeral. Yet Newman triumphed over this inevitability. The most recent evidence of the magnitude of this triumph and of the continued vitality of the writings of the great Cardinal takes the welcome form of an excellent anthology, *Newman: Prose and Poetry*, edited by Professor Tillotson, and published by the Harvard University Press as the latest volume in the Reynard Library.

It is the traditional prerogative or, perhaps more accurately, the irresistible compulsion of the reviewer of an anthology to enter a demurrer against certain of the selections, and to emit groans of protest against some of the omissions. To do either in this instance would be to indulge in the worst sort of cavilling, for Professor Tillotson, with his sound Newman scholarship and his sure sense of rhetoric, has made an admirably unexceptionable selection. In limiting himself to four of the many sermons of Newman, Professor Tillotson has

wisely passed over those that are familiar even to the general reader, and presents a fresh sampling of his pulpit eloquence, including the crucially important "Implicit and Explicit Reason." Here also we find the indispensable *Tamworth Reading Room*, the Dublin lectures in their 1852 form, the *Apologia* in the edition of 1865, and eight of the more notable letters, happily including the sharply honed and incisive communication to Monsignor Talbot. Four shorter poems and the *Dream of Gerontius* represent Newman's poetic achievement. The inclusion of *Loss and Gain* in unabridged form may strike some readers as a disproportionate acknowledgment of Newman's limited gifts as a novelist, but the present reviewer, on rereading this semi-autobiographical fiction, found it so perfectly reflective of the author's personality and thought that he was not at all disconcerted by the creaks and cracks in the plotting. Here then are presented a number of the facets of this many-sided literary genius—the pulpit orator, the controversialist, the novelist, the educational theorist, the spiritual autobiographer, the correspondent, and the poet. As Professor Tillotson declares in this introduction, Newman was "supremely literary." This volume will serve to confirm that fact for Newman devotees, if indeed they need any such confirmation, and will establish it for those who are about to make their first extensive reading of his works.

The present reviewer has already ventured to suggest that Newman as an intellectual and literary force lives on with a vitality and relevance which few, if any, of his contemporaries can approach. Although the odiousness of comparisons is proverbial, it may be permissible to advert to the present stature of some of the leading figures of the nineteenth century. Macaulay is remembered as the master of a sonorous, if at times over-lush, prose style, but few today regard him seriously as a philosopher of history or as a historian. Matthew Arnold is read as an extraordinarily sensitive poet and perceptive critic, but his theory that the redemption of mankind would be effected through poetry seems almost absurdly naive to a world that has endured the terror and the torture of twentieth-century history. Huxley's radiant confidence in the salvific power of the physical sciences evokes only a hollow and derisive response in a generation haunted by the nightmare of nuclear self-destruction. Neither the "gemlike flame" of Pater nor the "roses and raptures" of Swinburne offer to modern man any substantial hope.

The late Irving Babbitt once said something to the effect that it was not improbable that modern man would ultimately be confronted with the choice of being either a Jesuit or a Bolshevik. Though this may strike many as a rather harsh dilemma, there is an important truth beneath the obvious hyperbole of Professor Babbitt's statement. The ultimate choice that modern man must make is that between supernatural Christianity and naturalism in its various forms. It was Newman's greatness that he saw this fact clearly and that he proclaimed it tirelessly at a time when, to many of his contemporaries in the intellectual world, the God of Christianity seemed obsolete, and supernatural religion seemed irrelevant. As he wrote in the *Apologia* in 1864:

And in these latter days...outside the Catholic Church things are tending,—with far greater rapidity than in that old time from the circumstance of the age—, to atheism in one shape or another. What a scene, what a prospect, does the whole of Europe present at this day! and not only Europe, but every government and every civilization through the world, which is under the influence of the European mind. Especially, for it most concerns us, how sorrowful, in the view of religion, even taken in its most elementary, most attenuated form, is the spectacle presented to us by the educated intellect of England, France, and Germany!

Newman recognized that the tragedy of the nineteenth century was that the European mind had divorced itself from its Christian intellectual tradition. And he warned that, unless this divorce was repaired, "a rising tide of infidelity" would sweep away Western culture. The history of our century thus far has given a terrifying validation to this prediction. A Europe once dominated by the neo-paganism of Nazism, and now half enslaved by the godlessness of Communism, may yet fall a total victim to anti-Christianity.

To the educated intellect of 1957 Newman would proffer the same solution as that he offered in 1864, rebirth through the teachings of Christ:

Such truths as these she [the Church] vigorously reiterates, and pertinaciously inflicts upon mankind; as to such she

observes no half-measures, no economical reserve, no delicacy or prudence. "Ye must be born again," is the simple, direct form of words she uses after her Divine Master: "your whole nature must be re-born; your passions, and your affections, and your aims, and your conscience, and your will must all be bathed in a new element, and reconsecrated to your Maker,—and, the last not the least, your intellect."

In his otherwise excellent introduction to this volume, Professor Tillotson places what appears to the present reviewer as a somewhat unfortunate emphasis on the distinction between the "literary" and the "ecclesiastical" Newman. For the purposes of literary criticism, of course, such a distinction has validity, but one feels that Newman himself would have preferred the word *philosophical* or *theological* to *ecclesiastical*. The latter term carries with it a connotation of the sectarian which would be at odds with Newman's conviction as to the universal validity of Christian revelation. For him, theology was the supreme branch of knowledge. Faith was not an emotion, nor was it a form of wishful thinking. Rather it was the real assent of the whole man to the truth revealed by God.

Writing in the *Apologia* of his youthful conversion at the age of fifteen, he declares:

I fell under the influence of a definite Creed, and received into my intellect impressions of dogma, which, through God's mercy, have never been effaced or obscured.
[Italics mine.]

In "The Second Spring," when he comes to describe the destruction of the Catholic Church in England, he vividly speaks of it as an assault on truth:

Oh, that miserable day, centuries before we were born!
What a martyrdom to live in it and see the fair form of Truth, moral and material, hacked piecemeal, and every limb and organ carried off, and burned in the fire, or cast into the deep! But at last the work was done.
Truth was disposed of, and shoveled away, and there was a calm, a silence, a sort of peace.

In "Theology a Branch of Knowledge" he denounces the practice of ignoring theology in the university, not simply as irreligious, but as "intellectual absurdity." In the same lecture he declares that the true concept of Faith is that it is "an intellectual act, its object truth, and its result knowledge." Speaking as an educator, he issues the prophetic warning:

You will soon break up into fragments the whole circle of secular knowledge, if you begin the mutilation with divine.

In the Biglietto Address in 1879, the old Cardinal, looking back over his long life, declared that he had devoted all his efforts to opposing Liberalism in religion, the erroneous theory that in religion "all was subjective, nothing objective." This insistence on the inseparable connection between Faith and Truth is central to Newman's thinking, and it provides the explanation as to why his writings have continued to exercise such a powerful influence over the educated intellect to which he addressed himself. To that corroding skepticism which, to use his own words, holds that "the good of man consists, not in the possession of truth, but in and interminable search after it," Newman implacably opposed himself.

The final and fatal error of the West would be to beguile itself with the fatuous notions that it can conquer materialism with materialism, that it can beat back the challenge of militant atheism with the already blunted weapons of a pale agnosticism or a diluted Christianity, that it can win a moral victory without first effecting a moral reformation. In the crisis which our civilization now faces, the voice of John Henry Newman, clear, musical, and penetrating, can rescue modern man from these delusions, and direct his gaze towards the vision of immutable truth.

To recur to Professor Tillotson's phrase, Newman was "supremely literary." He was, in the words which he himself used in the lecture on "Literature" to describe the great writer, "the master of the two-fold Logos, the thought and the word, distinct, but inseparable from each other." It is this mastery that has enabled him to command for his own convictions and

teachings a respectful and admiring attention in the contemporary world. It is this mastery that has made it possible for his cultivated voice to penetrate and to be heard above the din and dissonance of the modern Babel.

New York City

(Father) David F. Rea

THE STUFF OF WHICH HISTORY IS MADE

R. Dudley Edwards and T. Desmond Williams, eds., *The Great Famine*, New York University Press, 1957.

The day of the grand historian is done. Gone forever, alas, are the Leckys, Froudes, and Macaulays with their sweeping styles, bold generalizations and grand manner. In this "ice age of monographs and methodology, of millions for technique but not one cent for wisdom," the specialists have certainly come into their own. A chronic myopia seems to have infected those who profess the art of writing history, and another proud discipline, it seems, is about to fall to those who cannot see the woods for the trees. Now, Irish history, the last stronghold of the easy generalization in western Europe, is being reduced, fragmented and atomized by the specialists. No one can seriously regret that an area long haunted by bitterness and dominated chiefly by polemicists should fall finally to the research and objectivity of the specialists. Still, now that they have toppled Humpty-Dumpty from his perch, and shattered him in a thousand pieces, can they, after having examined him "scientifically," put him back together again? The writing of history remains an art, and this demands more than research; it demands understanding and style. All too often, the specialist is no more a historian than the stonemason is a sculptor.

The Great Famine is a collection of seven essays, each by an expert, dealing with a particular aspect of what was the great watershed as well as the great catastrophe in modern Irish history. Between 1845 and 1851, the population of Ireland was reduced, through death and emigration, by over two millions. What were the causes, whose was the responsibility, and what were the results of this enormous disaster? These are the questions raised in these essays, but the reader will have to fashion his own answers out of this vast amount of detailed raw material, for the contributors to this volume generally believe in sticking to their last.

Though it is well known that the immediate cause of the Great Famine was the blight that fell on the potato, and totally destroyed the crop in 1846, the basic underlying cause was over-population. In 1780, the population of Ireland is estimated at about five millions. According to the census of 1841, it was just over eight millions; and by 1845, it is estimated to have increased by another half million. What was the reason for this enormous rate of increase? Even in Britain, then in the throes of the industrial revolution, the population did not increase at so rapid a rate. The increase in Britain is accounted for by a decline in the death rate, the result of an improved standard of living generally attributed to the industrial revolution. Ireland was not much affected by the industrial revolution, and yet the population continued to climb. If the increase cannot be accounted for by a decline in the death rate, it must be due to a rise in the birth rate. The evidence, however, for a change in the social patterns in pre-famine rural Ireland, which would explain a rise in the birth rate (i.e. early marriage), is as scarce as evidence on the beneficent effects of the industrial revolution on the death rate in Ireland. The editors, in their short but able foreword, regret the problem in a sentence, and dismiss a discussion of it because of the vast amount of research necessary before a solution can be assured. Still, while no solution is as yet available, the editors in their foreword, or Dr. R. B. McDowell in his essay, "Ireland on the Eve of the Famine," which serves as the introductory essay to the volume, could have at least explained what was involved, for in the understanding of history, what we do not know is often as significant as what we do know.

One of the most interesting questions raised in this volume is whose was the responsibility for the Great Famine. Nationalist tradition holds that, though God sent the blight, the English sent the Famine. These essays prove, once and for all, what has long been suspected by reasonable people, that there was no "deliberate cruelty or malice" in high places. Genocide as a solution to racial problems has been reserved for more recent and more civilized times. However, the editors write, and the essayists, in general, temperately concur:

If man, the prisoner of time, acts in conformity with the convention of society into which he is born, it is difficult to judge him with an irrevocable harshness. So it is with the men of the famine era. Human limitations and timidity

dominate the story of the Great Famine, but of great and deliberately imposed evil in high positions of responsibility there is little evidence. The really great evil lay in the totality of that social order which made such a famine possible and which could tolerate, to the extent it did, the sufferings and hardship caused by the failure of the potato crop.

Is nothing then to be said of the incompetence, mismanagement, narrowness, miserliness, lack of foresight, doctrinaire economics, and down-right stupidity? Are Lord John Russell, the Prime Minister, who teetered always on the brink of a decision, Sir Charles Wood, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whose niggardliness was notorious, and Sir Charles Trevelyan, a bureaucrat, whose doctrinaire economics dominated a crisis that cried for vision and charity, to be acquitted without a word? Because these men acted in good conscience, and could not be called before the bar of justice, does that mean they are not to be called before the bar of history? To plead that these men were the prisoners of time, that they acted in conformity with convention, that they were dominated by doctrinaire economics may help in the understanding of what happened, but understanding does not necessarily involve either approval or appreciation. What meaning has any response to a challenge, if this is the best possible of all possible worlds?

The question of determining where the responsibility for the Great Famine lies has a wider and deeper significance than just where the blame should be laid. Generations of Irishmen have predicated a good many of their attitudes and actions on the assumption that during the period of the Great Famine, England plotted and very nearly succeeded in encompassing the destruction of the Irish people. How monstrous this assumption is becomes obvious after reading these essays. Still, however monstrous the assumption, it had an enormous effect on the development of Irish nationalism. The contributors to this volume fail to point out, however, that Irish nationalism was nurtured, not only in the bitterness of remembrance, but, far more significantly, in the inability of a Parliament at Westminster to meet with satisfaction Ireland's most pressing needs at any given moment. The Great Famine was a monumental witness to the fact that the Imperial Parliament was incapable of meeting Ireland's needs, and the more aware Irishmen became of their increasing skein of unfulfilled needs, the clearer did their picture of an Irish nation become.

The Imperial Parliament failed Ireland as a governing body largely because it was not genuinely responsible to the Irish electorate. The continual frustration of an electorate by an irresponsible government can only result in revolution. In Britain in the 19th century, since the government was responsible to the electorate, the pendulum swung between two political parties equally devoted to playing the game outlined in the constitution. In Ireland, however, irresponsible government resulted in the pendulum inscribing an arc between the party of revolution and the party of the constitution. Not until Parnell's time was the Imperial Parliament made responsible to an Irish electorate through the medium of the Irish Party, and only then did Ireland's basic needs begin to receive the required attention. In making the Imperial Parliament responsive to Irish needs, Parnell, significantly enough, drew the teeth of the party of revolution in his generation. The period of the Great Famine, then, was decisive in shaping Irish nationalism in both its constitutional and revolutionary aspects. The British imperium in Ireland was held to be impractical by the party of the constitution, and immoral by the party of revolution. Each could find ample illustration of their point of view in the history of Ireland during the period of the Great Famine.

If nationalism is the political theme in Irish history in the 19th century, and the peasants' struggle for the land is the economic theme, then the social theme, undoubtedly, has most to do with the Roman Catholic Church. The influence of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland receives scant attention in this volume. Much needs to be done in modern Irish history, but nothing appears more pressing at the moment than a history of the most powerful and representative institution Ireland has yet produced. The impact of the Great Famine on the Church must have been enormous. How this ministry must have suffered in their attachment to their suffering people! Was it the mass emigration from Ireland that resulted in the Church re-orienting itself in missionary direction? How much easier did the Great Famine make it for the clergy to capture Daniel O'Connell's political machine, which made them a political as well as a social power in the state? All these and more are waiting to be answered. Dr. McDowell, in his introductory essay, includes a section on "The Churches," but devotes little space to the Church of Rome, and then only covers the old ground, adding little that is new. In the other essays there is an occasional reference to the Church, but seldom anything new or significant. This volume makes it all but apparent that no meaningful history of Ireland in any period will be written without a serious consideration of the role in that period of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland.

It is now more than obvious that the most serious defect in this volume is that it lacks almost anything in the way of a conclusion. There is no general concluding essay, and the editors apologize by explaining that the "dearth" of specialized studies in Irish economic history in the late 19th and early 20th centuries made the inclusion of such an essay impossible. This, unfortunately, leaves the reader with a large and awkward bundle to tie up after some five hundred pages of detailed reading. Further, there is little help in the essays themselves as regards conclusions. Three of the seven essays are without conclusions, and of those that include them, with the notable exception of T. P. O'Neill's essay, "The Administration of Relief," they are in no way remarkable. In fact, at the end of several of these essays, and in too many other places in the essays, the reader can only wonder what relationship the material under discussion has to do with the theme—the Great Famine.

This is not a book, then, for the general reader, but a volume for the elect, the specialists in Irish history. The vast amount of patient research that went into these essays approaches the monumental, and the result is an enormous contribution to knowledge. Still, these essays are not history; they are only the stuff of which history is made. The history of the Great Famine has still to be written. There is no doubt that the historian who undertakes the task will find his way that much easier because of the essays in this volume. He will not have to spend a life-time in painstaking research because the sources have now been laid open and partially explored. He will be able to apply himself, thanks to these essays, to the art of writing history, of giving meaning to the past, and concentrate on understanding and style, instead of being buried by the burden of an overwhelming research project.

Brooklyn College

Emmet Larkin

WILKIE COLLINS AND THE PROBLEM OF BIOGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE

Nuell Pharr Davis, *The Life of Wilkie Collins*, University of Illinois Press, 1957.

The genre of Satellite Biography has formal problems all its own, and Dr. Davis, in an ambitiously wrought and skilful narrative, too controversial in its procedures to be definitive, has solved perhaps the most difficult. Malcolm Elwin suggested the difficulty as early as 1934 when he attempted to explain the non-existence of Collins biography:

It may be that his reputation, like his writings, has suffered by indiscriminate comparison with that of his more illustrious friend, with the result that he is regarded in the light of an understrapper, a competent but uninspired imitator, a mere disciple of Dickens [*Victorian Wallflowers*, p. 207].

Davis not only removes these misconceptions, but also, in constructing his narrative, keeps Wilkie Collins at the center of his own World. However "eminent," the Victorians that come and go have their existence as parts of Collins' experience; Dickens, the P.R.B., Reade—all move in and out of the narrative when appropriate, but the book remains, not an adjunct to the life of Dickens or to the history of fiction, neither a Victorian panorama nor an atmospheric evocation, but a *Life of Wilkie Collins*.

Since Collins can be resurrected only as a literary craftsman and experimenter, one wishes it were also a critical appraisal. A slighting reference to the "key in which literary historians have since faithfully sung" (p. 217) suggests that Dr. Davis might have integrated and developed the several provocative suggestions and individual comments into an appraisal of Collins the novelist in a new "key." But he has chosen instead to minimize the works as individual artifacts and to emphasize their genesis, their relation to sources in the author's experience, to his total development, and their effect on a career and an influence. In fact, the picture of Collins the creative artist is everywhere dominated by the three major relationships on which the work as biography is built.

This is not to imply that the novels are neglected; indeed, they are exploited as a principal source for the life, and at times the distinction between their "Actuality" and the actual life of their creator is blurred, even lost, or concealed. It was properly Davis's aim, as Professor Ray expresses it in an introductory essay which anticipates some of the narrator's conclusions, to spell out in detail "the relation between his personal history and his books." But he takes this to include what the introduction elsewhere calls "placing the autobiographical passages in Collins' fiction on their inferences with tact and discernment"

(p. 2). No doubt parts of the early novels "cannot be construed as other than autobiographical" (p. 18), but Davis's transposition of passages of imaginative narrative into an ostensibly factual account is based on either an unorthodox definition of "autobiographical" or a licentious conception of biographical evidence.

It is undeniably pertinent to conjecture that a conflict (real—or ideal) with his father provided the point of departure for Wilkie's early novels, that "when he had selected a story that symbolized his inner resentments and his conflict with his father, the task of writing became easier" (see pp. 9, 18, 44, 66, 134-5, 166). But surely the resulting fiction cannot itself be the principal evidence to prove the existence of such conflict and resentment; and even if the connection is real and close, the biographer is hardly justified in citing as the source for part of an ostensibly historical narrative an "obviously autobiographical" passage in an early story. He is not justified in printing as a description of Wilkie's actual life with father passages from *Hide and Seek*, published years after the events to which they presumably refer, and in revealing the basis for this fusion of the actual with an imaginative recreation only in a footnote at the back of his book:

The crucial battle between Willie and his father is well told in Willie's own words. Passages from *Hide and Seek* quoted in this chapter [with actual names substituted for fictional ones] will be found [how? by whom? on what basis?] so consistently and indiscreetly autobiographical that the story can be presented *uncluttered with scholarly inferences* [n. 67, p. 308; italics mine].

Frank in *Basil* may well have been "a projection of Wilkie's desires for himself" (p. 129), but this does not warrant the use of *Basil* as unquestionable autobiographical record—especially since, we are told, Wilkie "based his novel on the life of the celebrated fourth Earl of Chesterfield and derived almost everything from this source" (see pp. 45, 48-9, 160, and cf. 116). Undoubtedly Caroline Graves inspired much, and Marion Holcomb, for example, may have been a "projection" of her (p. 214); but are chapters of narrative reconstruction to be based on the plots of novels thus inspired? Pity for Caroline's Lizzie, utterly without status in the "unconventional household" at 12 Harley Street, may have "suggested the theme" for *No Name* (p. 228), but shortly an incident presumably involving the actual family on holiday is quoted as "reconstructed only from Wilkie's books" (pp. 237-8). The reader in search of a footnote finds the source to be the "partly autobiographical work" and the explanation to be of general procedural significance:

Except for condensation, the dialogue is reproduced *verbatim* [it is narratively framed by Davis himself]. In the novel the mother and daughter are named Catherine and Kitty instead of Caroline and Lizzie. Conjectural reconstruction is, of course, especially fallible in detail. Nevertheless there seems no reason to doubt that such episodes took place and that this is how they appeared when viewed through Wilkie's eyes [meaning, of course, his imagination; fn. 45, p. 329].

If the reader is not disconcerted, even disoriented, by this procedure of fusing fact, inference, conjecture, and imaginative projection or analogy into an extraordinarily coherent narrative, he will find the book wholly admirable in form. If he is, he will feel greater security in turning back to the "workmanlike" Robinson, who concedes in finishing his own study of Collins that, in effect, *homo biographicus* is and essentially must be distinct from *homo fictus*: "There remains a sense of incompleteness about this picture of one who was in many respects an extraordinary man" (Robinson, p. 333). But Davis's first task, as it is described in the introduction, was to avoid such "incompleteness," to bring "Collins fully to life as a personality" (p. 1); he has succeeded too often by taking for his motto Collins' own preface to *Basil*: "I have not stooped so low as to assure myself of the reader's belief in the probability of my story by never once calling on him for the exercise of his faith." One is reminded of Lockhart's letter to Croker on Macaulay the historian and the revitalizing of historical personality; it blames the novelist of whom Collins thought most highly:

Scott has been the great inspirer and misleader of all our recent history writers French and English. Nothing will do but that they shall make Wm. the Conqueror as alive as he has made Louis the Eleventh [photostat ms. letter (1849) in Nat. Lib. Scotland].

"A personality," wrote Albert Schweitzer, "can only be awakened to life by a personality"; the reanimation will always be colored with the spirit by which it is motivated. For

this reason, too, one may turn back at last to the less ambitious Robinson, whose foreword accurately describes the predominant feeling in his biography: "Despite an affection for my subject which grew with my knowledge of him, I have tried to be objective" (Robinson, p. 10). For, by contrast, Davis's distaste for Collins is apparent, although it may be more apparent than real, may result from the demands of his method. Through selection, juxtaposition, and recurrent inference, he evokes a unified personality completely dominated by certain motives, at times almost "humorously" mechanical in its unpleasant consistency. The announced pre-conception promises more: a "complex and devious spirit" at war with "that fanatical old fool Mudie" (p. 275) and Grundyism, "one of the true originals" possessed of "an unerring sense of what would put him most squarely into opposition to the spirit of [the] age" (p. 263)—and a complex tragic stature appears momentarily in the "macabre vision" of "a stooped, fat, wheezing little man with painfully stiff joints" sipping at a silver flask of laudanum (pp. 4, 277, 263). But generally it is subordinate to the controlled evolution of a character both coldbloodedly hedonistic and obsessively mercenary. No opportunity is lost for the inference (frequently gratuitous) of a commercial motive or a coldly calculating eye, and even in love Wilkie wavers Tartuffe-like "between passior and prudence" (p. 179); the unwarranted asides which continually recall the principal motives become at times almost malicious.

Too often in this spirit, Collins is presented in the major relationships of his life—with father, brother, Dickens, Caroline, even Frank Beard the physician, and with the exception of the first, he consistently suffers by the comparison. The first—the picture of the artist-father—is itself a skilfully exaggerated construct of "toadying toriyism" and cynical pennypinching piety which should be contrasted, especially in its selection and handling of texts of letters, with the more humane, sincere figure in Robinson. But the method of selection and denigrating inference may be illustrated here by only one extended passage, that ostensibly beginning as an evaluation of the French theatre's literary influence on Wilkie:

Scribe was in fact the living playwright in whom Wilkie must have found most to admire. . . . Scribe himself, by becoming several times a millionaire, achieved a career that was the fulfillment of Wilkie's dreams [source?]. Named a commander of the Legion of Honor, Scribe invented a coat of arms consisting of a quill pen with the commentary, "Inde fortuna et libertas." In addition to literary borrowing from Scribe, Wilkie showed his agreement with this proudly bourgeois attitude by appropriating the pen for his own letterhead [p. 76; italics mine].

The account of the Dickens-Collins relationship, for which most readers will go to the *Life*, is only marred by the same insistence on pennypinching, with an added stress on coldly calculating deference. Forster and Percy Fitzgerald would surely have relished the suggestion that Wilkie, having inherited his father's art of toadying, won Dickens by "deft experimentation" and "ingratiating manners," evaluating "the intimacy between them with characteristic coldness" (pp. 174, 97, 166). But the acute and suggestive interpretation of this friendship remains of chief value in the book; one illustrative passage must suffice—that concerning Collins's "Sister Rose" and *A Tale of Two Cities*:

Superficially one could draw up an indictment of Dickens for plagiarizing from Wilkie. The relation between the two minds, however, was more interesting than that. The uncanny pleasure Dickens took in some of Wilkie's writing, as though he saw his own artistic inspirations being achieved for him without labor, had solid grounds. Dickens was in fact drawing the story out of Wilkie at the same time that he was unconsciously filing it away for future use.

The reason Wilkie thought of the tribunal, the prison, and the gesture of sacrifice was that he knew Dickens would like them. Not the least curious aspect of this interplay of talent is the fact that Wilkie's primary purpose was simply to get money from Dickens in a bad year (pp. 170-1).

It is unfortunate that such an account ends with re-emphasis of the mercenary motif, but such stresses are never absent for long. Consequently, having read the basic explanation of the relationship given by Davis: "Wilkie had an inner callousness, a cool skepticism toward Victorian proprieties that made him good company for Dickens" in the latter's "strange restlessness" (p. 97), one should again turn (if only for the total contrast) to comparable accounts—Robinson (pp. 60, 243), Elwin, Ashley, and even Edgar Johnson, who, in his *Charles Dickens*, is more generous to Wilkie Collins than is Collins's own most recent interpreter:

he was amusing, cynical, good-humored, unrestrained to the point of vulgarity... He was lazy, skeptical, slovenly, unpunctual; but he was also gentle, warm-hearted, and unpretentious—he was not at all irritated at being told that his books were “read in every back kitchen.” He hated pugnacity, competition, and cruelty, and was interested only in enjoying himself. All these qualities help to explain the appeal he had for Dickens.... (p. 784).

Of “all these” Dr. Davis slights or omits the favorable.

The Ohio State University

Francis Russell Hart

A RIGHT NOBLE BEGINNING

Victorian Studies, Vol. I, No. 1 (September 1957). Published at Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

First reaction to this new venture among the scholarly journals must be enthusiastic. Certainly there is plenty of space for this quarterly journal of the Humanities, Arts, and Sciences, which “hopes to capture something of the life of that [Victorian] era, to discuss its events and personalities, and to interpret and appraise its achievements.” This capture is to be made through inclusiveness, through a willingness to cut across the relevant disciplines. The problem facing the editors is suggested in the brief preface note (p. 3), for, although a “broad approach” is to be the policy, the articles are to be critical and scholarly. Time alone will tell us whether enough material which meets these criteria can be found to keep such a policy afloat, or whether in a few years, in, say, Volume VII, *Victorian Studies* will be merely a collection of specialists’ articles, each of which would be more at home in a journal devoted to a narrower subject-matter discipline. Certainly it is suggested that the editors are aware of the possible dangers, and in their first issue they have successfully avoided the extremes. The impressive list of consultants and the painstaking of the editors themselves make it reasonable for anyone interested enough in the Victorian period to be reading this newsletter to take the further step of encouraging this new enterprise with a subscription.

From the fact that the Victorian Bibliography sponsored by the Victorian Group of the MLA will appear here in future and from the preponderance of literary specialists among the consultants follows the assumption that literary interests will dominate in *Victorian Studies*. The pattern of the first issue bears out the assumption, with one article (Oscar Maurer, “Punch on Slavery and Civil War in America 1841-1865”) appealing to both the political historian and the historian of literature; one article (René Wellek, “Walter Pater’s Literary Theory and Criticism,” a chapter from the third volume of his *History of Modern Criticism, 1750-1950*, to be published next year) which will appeal chiefly to students of literature; and a third (Henry-Russell Hitchcock, “High Victorian Gothic”) which is of primary interest to historians of art and architecture. Yet each of these justifies its inclusion by an appeal broader than to the specialist in the separate fields. This broader appeal is, in fact, the justification for the publication here of the Wellek chapter, since the literary specialist would normally encounter it in the complete volume to be issued next year. Of the three articles, this one of literary criticism is probably least general in its interest. With the lack of interest in Pater which Professor Wellek finds even among literary specialists, one wonders how many non-specialists will finish his solid, carefully constructed chapter. Notes and Reviews occupy approximately one third of the issue, both of considerable interest. Again, the high quality of the reviewing here leads to great hopes and emphasizes the international character of *Victorian Studies*. In the reviews, those disciplines which could not be touched upon in the limited space available for the main articles of the issue receive their attention. This attention is for the most part compounded of justice and moderation with the latter prevailing where the former is modified. In only a few of the items is there a suggestion that the reviewer prefers to hold himself in check rather than provide a public execution for the first number of a new periodical.

Physically, *Victorian Studies* ranks among the most attractive of the scholarly journals. With a page size larger than that of *PMLA*, it provides wide margins at top and outer edge of the page, an invitation to all who read with pencils in their hands. Actually some of this space might well be sacrificed in the interests of greater readability, with perhaps slightly larger type and more space between the lines. A comparison between the pages of *VS* and of the *Keats-Shelley Journal* shows a less striking appearance but greater ease for the reader in the latter, with exactly the same page size in both. The handsome V, adapted from the crest of Victoria and

Albert, adds to the attraction of the cover and masthead, and the editors have been prodigal of illustrations in this first issue, with no fewer than eleven drawings of Tenniel and others reproduced from *Punch* for the opening article and four pages of photographs inserted for the article on "High Victorian Gothic."

All in all, it is hard to see how any university or college library will be able to do without *Victorian Studies*, and it is likely that many scholars who are content to read the library's copy of other journals will feel stirred to run their own files of this one.

University of Florida

Stephen F. Fogle

III. A GUIDE TO RESEARCH MATERIALS OF THE MAJOR VICTORIANS (Part I).

EDWARD FITZGERALD

After the death of Edward FitzGerald in 1883, the bulk of his papers and a portion of his library passed into the possession of W. Aldis Wright, who edited FitzGerald's *Letters and Literary Remains*. Most of this material was bequeathed by Wright to Trinity College, Cambridge, England, and is now in the library there. None of the manuscripts of FitzGerald's best-known works seem to have survived, but the Trinity collection includes a notebook in which he compiled the vocabulary published as *Sea Words and Phrases along the Suffolk Coast* and a folio of FitzGerald's musical compositions. The music reveals little originality and has never been published. A large portion of the correspondence in the *Literary Remains* is in Trinity Library as well as rough manuscript drafts of projected works, and numerous commonplace books which contain cullings from FitzGerald's wide reading.

The papers and a portion of the library of Edward Byles Cowell, the friend who induced FitzGerald to take up the study of Persian, are now in the University of Cambridge Library. Among the books are a number which FitzGerald gave to Cowell. Some of these contain occasional annotations. In recent years the University Library has acquired substantial portions of FitzGerald's correspondence and is constantly searching for more. Trinity, the University Library, and, of course, the British Museum provide scholars with association items which are extremely difficult to find elsewhere.

The bulk of FitzGerald's correspondence with Fanny Kemble is now in the British Museum. Fortunately, these letters were published by Aldis Wright virtually *in toto*. After their acquisition it was discovered that dampness had affected the legibility of a portion of the manuscripts. At the Christchurch Mansion Museum in Ipswich are deposited a dozen scrap-books compiled by FitzGerald and a variety of association items. The scrap-books reveal the translator's multifarious casual interests.

FitzGerald items which have come to this country have been widely dispersed, so that limited accumulations are found in numerous American libraries. Only the most noteworthy collections can be mentioned here. Harvard owns most of the FitzGerald "firsts" as well as letters to American correspondents. The majority of the letters are to Charles Eliot Norton. The University of Virginia owns the manuscripts of the admirable collection of letters published as *New Letters of Edward FitzGerald to Bernard Barton*. Letters in a collection at the Pierpont Morgan Library are addressed, for the most part, to Suffolk friends.

Two other American collections call for comment. Syracuse University has a small collection of letters to various correspondents, a number of original printings, rare association items, and a store of manuscripts containing FitzGerald data. Among the books are first and second editions of the *Rubáiyát*. One 1859 copy at Syracuse appears to be genuinely unique. It is untrimmed, and in a number of physical features differs from any other copy which I have seen. Colby College at Waterville, Maine, owns the FitzGerald collection originally accumulated by Thomas Sargent Perry. Besides other initial editions, the collection includes the exceptionally rare first American printing of the *Rubáiyát*. This is a reprint of the second edition of the poem "pirated" by a group of Omar enthusiasts in Columbus, Ohio, in 1870 for private distribution. The Colby copy is the only one of the edition listed thus far in the *Union Catalogue* in Washington. The Colby collection includes almost 200 editions of the *Rubáiyát*, about half of them from foreign presses. The volumes permit one to trace the growing fame of the *Rubáiyát* throughout the world.

The most complete bibliography of FitzGerald's works is the catalogue of an extensive collection accumulated by Charles Van Cise Wheeler of Washington, D.C. The Library was sold at auction after Wheeler's death in 1919, and the catalogue was given to the Library of Congress. The title page states that the three volumes were "a single typescript copy." Recently, however, Stanley Pargellis revealed that the Newberry Library in Chicago, of which he is the

librarian, has a carbon copy of the Wheeler catalogue. This list provides a foundation for a FitzGerald bibliography. The entries require careful checking, however, for the manuscript is marred by numerous typing errors.

Syracuse University

A. McFinley Terhune

THOMAS HARDY

Research materials for the study of THOMAS HARDY are widely scattered and there is no broad beaten highway available for such study. This statement applies with equal truth, whether the research is to deal with the novels, the short stories, the poems, or the life of this author.

Manuscripts of Hardy's PROSE FICTION are scattered among one Irish, four American, and seven English libraries. The University College Library in Dublin owns the MS. of *The Return of the Native*. In America, Harvard has *Two on a Tower*, the Huntington Library has "The Melancholy Hussar," the Library of Congress has seven of the ten stories in *A Group of Noble Dames*, and the Morgan Library has *The Romantic Adventures of a Milkmaid*. In England the list of MS. holdings reads thus: the British Museum has *Tess*; the Dorset County Museum in Dorchester has *Under the Greenwood Tree*, *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, and *The Woodlanders*; the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge has *Jude the Obscure*; Manchester Public Library has "On the Western Circuit"; Manchester University Library has "For Conscience' Sake"; *The Trumpet-Major* is in the Royal Library at Windsor Castle, and "A Tragedy of Two Ambitions" (one of *Life's Little Ironies*) is in the Rylands Library in Manchester. Nor are all the prose MSS. in public libraries or museums: a number remain in private hands. Mr. Edwin Thorne owns *Far from the Madding Crowd*, Mr. Howard Bliss owns three (all that have survived) of the eleven installments of *A Pair of Blue Eyes* as well as eight of the stories in *Life's Little Ironies* and *A Changed Man*, and until 1956 *Wessex Tales* was owned by Sir Sydney Cockerell (his Hardy collection was sold at auction last year and I have not yet learned who bought this MS.).

The manuscripts of Hardy's POEMS are not quite as widely dispersed, but (just as in the case of the prose) they are not concentrated in any one place or even in one country. The Birmingham City Museum has the MS. of *Wessex Poems*, the Bodleian Library at Oxford has *Poems of the Past and the Present*, the British Museum has *The Dynasts*; the Dorset County Museum has the MSS. of three books: *Satires...*, *Lyrics and Reveries*, *Late Lyrics and Earlier*, and *The Famous Tragedy of the Queen of Cornwall*. The MS. of *Time's Laughingstocks* is in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge; *Moments of Vision* is in the Magdalene College Library at Cambridge; *Winter Words*, in the Queen's College Library at Oxford; and *Human Shows* is at Yale.

Nor is this record of wide dispersal the end of the difficulties that confront the research worker in Hardy. Although Mr. Thorne (in New York) owns the MS. of *Far from the Madding Crowd*, there are two fragments from this novel in the Dorset County Museum in Dorchester. Although the Library of Congress has the bulk of the *Noble Dames*, the MS. of one of the stories in this book is in the Pierpont Morgan Library. Similarly, although the Dorset County Museum owns *Late Lyrics and Earlier*, the MS. of one of these lyrics, "A Glimpse from the Train," is in the Colby College Library. (This is the poem which Hardy later re-entitled "Faintheart in a Railway Train.")

Hardy's LETTERS are scattered all over the earth and no attempt has yet been made even to list them. Some groups of letters have found their way to librarians: Harvard, e.g., has the letters to Amy Lowell, the Library of Congress those to Louise Chandler Moulton, Colby College those to Rebekah Owen, and the Dorset County Museum those to Mrs. Arthur Henniker. Other scattered letters of Hardy are now found in the New York Public Library, the Morgan Library, and in many others; but hundreds of his letters remain in private hands. There is no easy way to tell the research student how to find them, and yet it is these letters that may provide the best sort of guidance in any study of the author's life. And that life needs study; the published *Life* (no matter by whom) needs correction on many points. In Florence Hardy's *Later Years*, e.g., we are told (p. 164) that Hardy "would readily have suppressed" his *Satires of Circumstance*. However, on August 28, 1914, he wrote to Sydney Cockerell: "What I care most about just now is that the...*Satires of Circumstance*...should be brought out," i.e., published. (This letter, now in the Colby College Library, has been published, along with all the other Hardy letters which had been assembled at Colby up to the date of publication, in *Letters of Thomas Hardy transcribed from the Original Autographs*, Colby College Press, 1954. This book is, however, thus far the only volume exclusively devoted to Hardy's letters, and most of his letters still remain unpublished.) The student of Hardy's life should be warned that a great deal of hunting for letters both in and out of libraries will be necessary before anything like a definitive biography can be attempted.

A warning should also be sounded regarding the published texts of his works, for the Hardy books found in many university libraries in America are not satisfactory. Some are piracies; many are editions wholly unsupervised by the author. There is no need to repeat here what I have said in *Hardy in America* (pages 98-102 and 273-288), but any graduate student who falls to inform himself at the outset regarding what American texts are *not* satisfactory, and why, is likely to waste a great deal of his time in fruitless labor. This warning applies to the texts of the poems (*The Dynasts* included) as much as to the prose fiction. The starting point for any student of Hardy should be to assure himself that the library in which he is to do his work is equipped with Hardy's definitive texts, even if he has to persuade a reluctant librarian to order new books from London. It is unfortunately still possible, in the libraries of many universities where Hardy is taught, to find wholly inadequate and unsatisfactory texts in use. This is not the place in which to try to give details, but see *Booker Memorial Studies*, ed. Hill Shine (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1950), pages 133-153. The Colby College Library possesses an extensive Hardy Collection, including first editions, English and American, and sets of *all* the Collected Editions; but the check-list *Hardy at Colby*, published in 1936, is wholly out of date and no longer indicates with any completeness the extent of the collection in this Maine college library. Inquiry of the librarian is advised.

Colby College

Carl J. Weber

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN

Research on the life or writings of Cardinal Newman is simplified by the fact that most of the essential materials are collected in one place, at the Oratory, in Birmingham, England, where Newman spent the last half of his life. This collection was made in the first instance by Newman himself, but it has been augmented in subsequent years by the succession of his literary executors. The present curator is the Superior of the Oratory, the Reverend C. Stephen Dessain, who should be addressed at the Oratory, Hagley Road, Edgbaston, England. It should be said, to prevent needless inquiries, that there is an almost complete microfilm (in 137 reels) of the Oratory manuscripts deposited at the National Library of Ireland, the Yale University Library, and the Library of the University of Illinois, and also that there is presently in hand a project to publish an edition of Newman's correspondence as complete as circumstances will allow. Nevertheless, the policy of the Oratory has always been most liberal toward all serious inquirers. They permit free access to all documents and unrestricted quotation from them in scholarly works. However, for the privilege of publishing any hitherto unpublished letter or manuscript they require that application shall be made to the Fathers of the Oratory, in whom Newman's literary rights are vested. Scholars travelling in England will find that, if circumstances permit, they will be allowed ample conveniences for working in the Oratory House itself; women, by the rule of the House, are not admitted past the reception parlors and so are at some disadvantage.

The materials at the Oratory may be divided into two groups: manuscripts and printed books. The manuscripts may be further divided into (1) the Letters and (2) the Miscellaneous Papers. The Letters (housed in a room called the Archivum) comprise seven principal collections:

1. Copied Letters: not originals but copies made by Newman's literary executors of letters called in after Newman's death and then returned to their owners. Arranged in chronological order, 1829-90. (22 vols., microfilm reels 81-93)
2. Family Letters: copies made by Newman himself of letters to his family dating 1815-45. (4 vols., reels 80-81)
3. Miscellaneous Letters: chiefly originals, addressed to Newman, chronologically arranged, 1816-90. (68 vols., reels 119-134)
4. Oratory Letters: chiefly originals, to and from members of the Oratory and relating (chiefly) to Oratory affairs, chronologically arranged, 1840-88. (60 vols., reels 107-119)
5. Personal Collection: chiefly originals and rough drafts, more to Newman than from him, arranged by correspondent, of whom there are about 130. (171 vols., reels 31-46, 67-80)
6. Publishers' Letters: arranged by correspondent. (9 vols., reels 134-137)
7. Various Collections: chiefly originals and rough drafts of letters relating to particular writings, episodes, or controversies in Newman's life. (76 vols., reels 93-107)

There are also many letters among the Miscellaneous Papers.

The Miscellaneous Papers (housed in Newman's own room) run to perhaps 50,000 pages and occupy reels 1-29 and 47-66 of the microfilm. They include diaries (mostly of the date-book variety), memoranda, school and college exercises, devotional and pastoral records, sermons, theological notes and collections of scriptural texts, account books and legal papers, literary odds and ends, manuscripts of published writings together with preparatory studies, proof-sheets, autobiographical narratives, official papers relating to the Catholic University and other schemes, transcriptions of correspondence, journals and papers relating to friends and acquaintances. A rough catalogue of all these papers, prepared in 1920 by Edward Bellasis, is to be found in Newman's room, and a typewritten version of it keyed to the microfilm is deposited in the libraries which possess the film. This catalogue, however, does not relieve the scholar of the necessity of digging for himself: it is not an index.

The printed books preserved at the Oratory, which are of essential interest in a study of Newman's intellectual development, may be divided into three categories: (1) a small personal library of about 1,000 volumes which was in Newman's room at the time of his death and which has been preserved exactly as he left it; (2) copies of various editions of Newman's own works, preserved in the Archivum and the room next to Newman's own; (3) the Oratory Library. This last collection, a very fine one which I should estimate at 20,000 volumes, had its nucleus in Newman's personal library and in the collection built up for the Littlemore community, but of course it was increased greatly after 1847. Probably it has not increased so much since 1890. In any case, most of the works cited by Newman in his writings will be found here in the very copy which he used. Some of the lighter works (novels, for instance) are out at Rednal, the summer place of the Oratory, about eight miles distant from Birmingham along the Worcester Road.

MATERIALS OTHER THAN THOSE AT THE ORATORY

The following does not pretend to be an exhaustive list but simply comprises those materials which have come to the attention of the compiler.¹ The starred items are included in the Yale-Illinois microfilm (only item 10 is in the copy of the National Library of Ireland).

ENGLAND

Oxford

- *1. Bodleian Library (over 50 items, chiefly letters to Mark Pattison; much related material in the James Mozley collection)
- 2. Campion Hall (7 letters to G. M. Hopkins)
- 3. Keble College (letters chiefly to Keble and Liddon)
- 4. Magdalen College Library (the Bloxam Collection; see R. D. Middleton, *Newman and Bloxam*, 1947)
- 5. Pusey House (extensive Pusey materials; also the W. J. Copeland and R. W. Church letters)
- *6. Oriel College Library (about 120 letters)
- *7. Trinity College Library (12 letters, chiefly to the Rev. J. Allen)

London and elsewhere

- 8. British Museum (correspondence with Gladstone, W. Maskell, J. Lewis, and a few other items)
- 9. Cambridge University Library (the Blennerhassett letters and some others)
- *10. Geoffrey Faber, Esq., 24 Russell Square, London, W.C.1 (letters to the Rev. Francis A. Faber)
- 11. John Mozley, Esq., Haslemere, Surrey 3
- 12. The London Oratory, Brompton Road (many letters to Oratorians)
- 13. Oscott College, Handsworth, Staffordshire (letters to Lady Chatterton and Mrs. Dering)
- 14. S. Walton, Esq., 4 Chatham Place, Deepdale, Preston (a few letters of 1871)
- 15. Ushaw College Library (correspondence with H. Wilberforce, 1842-49)

Ireland

- 16. Dublin Diocesan Archives, Drumcondra (140 letters, chiefly to Archbishop Cullen)
- 17. Library of the Jesuit Fathers, Lower Leeson Street, Dublin (a small collection of letters to T. Scrutton; related materials in the papers of C. W. Russell)
- 18. National Library of Ireland (2 letters)
- 19. University College, Dublin (correspondence with Dr. B. Woodlock)

Italy

- 20. Chiesa Nova (the Oratory of St. Philip Neri), Rome (a few letters)
- 21. Vatican Library, Rome (1 letter; presumably more when the cataloguing turns them up)

United States

22. Berg Collection, New York Public Library (5 letters)
23. Georgetown University Library, Washington 7, D. C. (300 letters to H. Wilberforce, both earlier and later in date than those in the Ushaw collection mentioned above)
24. J. P. Morgan Library, New York (22 items, mostly letters)
25. Library of St. John's Seminary, Camarillo, California (55 letters chiefly to E. Walford, W. J. O'Neill Daunt, and G. T. Edwards; see *Catalogue of Books and Manuscripts in the Estelle Doheny Collection* (1940-55), Pt. III, pp. 118-119)
26. Yale University Library (11 items, mostly letters; about 60 letters of F. W. Newman; F. Madan's collection of Oxford books is valuable for background)

University of Illinois

A. Dwight Culler

¹ I am indebted for help in compiling this list to the Rev. C. Stephen Dessain of the Oratory and to Prof. Martin J. Svaglic of Loyola University, Chicago.

ALFRED TENNYSON

The author hopes that the following brief survey of the principal deposits of Tennyson materials in the United States and Great Britain will prove useful to those pursuing and directing research in the field. Since it is manifestly impossible to list the whereabouts of minor collections or of relatively insignificant single items, he stands ready to supply whatever additional information he can to anyone who does not find his quarry in the libraries below.

UNITED STATES

American students of nineteenth-century English poetry are fortunate to have in their own country extraordinary resources for research on Alfred Tennyson. Recent acquisition of Sir Charles Tennyson's collection of his grandfather's notebooks and manuscripts has made the Harvard College Library the world's foremost repository of primary materials for study and criticism of the poet.¹ To Harvard's extensive holdings of first editions, trial printings, proofs, and association copies, several autograph manuscripts, such as a complete draft of "Nimue" (eventually "Merlin and Vivien") and two versions of "The Charge of the Light Brigade," and some thirty autograph letters, Sir Charles's papers add (1) 72 notebooks, (2) 275 folders of loose manuscripts, and (3) 42 additional folders containing eighteen autograph letters and other manuscripts, collected by the Rawnsley family and left to Sir Charles. The notebooks and manuscripts, stretching from the "Translation from Claudian's 'Proserpine,'" Tennyson's earliest extant poem, through the poems for the *Death of Oenone* volume, published posthumously, represent, in some form, the bulk of the poet's work. (For a description of the collection and an index of titles and first lines of poems included in it, see Edgar F. Shannon, Jr. and W. H. Bond, "Literary Manuscripts of Alfred Tennyson in the Harvard College Library," *Harvard Lib. Bull.*, X [Spring 1956], 254-274.) While texts in these manuscripts may be quoted in literary and biographical studies and may be employed in variorum notes to an edition, they may not be used to alter or "improve" standard versions of Tennyson's poems, especially those whose final text was established by the poet himself.

After Harvard's, the collection in this country of greatest significance to scholars is probably that in the Yale University Library. It contains, among other valuable pieces, the manuscript of "Locksley Hall," which the poet gave to Frederick G. Tuckerman, and a considerable cache of family papers and letters purchased from Colonel E. S. M. Prinsep, a relation of Mary Emily Prinsep, Hallam Tennyson's second wife.

There is additional important material—manuscripts, letters, proofs, trial copies, or first editions—in the Pierpont Morgan Library, the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library,² and the Henry E. Huntington Library. The Huntington has, for example, *inter alia*, autograph manuscripts of several sections of *In Memoriam*, of thirteen of the poems appearing in *Poems*, 1842, given by Tennyson to Aubrey de Vere, and of twenty-one other poems, formerly the property of Frederick Locker-Lampson. Many other institutional and special libraries, too numerous to mention, throughout the United States and Canada possess one or more letters or miscellaneous items of manuscript or corrected proof. The libraries of the University of Michigan and of Victoria University, Toronto, list collections of printed Tennysoniana.

GREAT BRITAIN

In Great Britain the libraries of particular interest to students of Tennyson are the

Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, the British Museum, the Brotherton Collection of the University of Leeds, the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, the Bodleian, the University Library, Cambridge, and the National Library of Scotland. Trinity College holds a manuscript of *The Devil and the Lady*, that of *Poems by Two Brothers*, the one of *In Memoriam* that Tennyson presented to Sir John Simeon, and other manuscripts as well; but all of them are under an interdict arranged by Hallam Tennyson and may not be examined. There are a few letters and other papers which may be consulted by scholars. Besides useful matter in the Ashley Library, the British Museum has nearly sixty of Tennyson's letters, including most of those to William E. Gladstone. The Brotherton Collection contains about half that number of letters to various correspondents. The Fitzwilliam Museum owns the Heath commonplace Book, in which versions of some of Tennyson's early poems appear; and each of the other libraries previously mentioned offers a few holograph items.

University of Virginia

Edgar F. Shannon, Jr.

NOTES:

¹Another large deposit of Tennysoniana, primarily of biographical importance, which remains in the possession of the Tennyson family, is not open to scholars.

²Scholars may encounter restrictions on the publication of autograph material in the Berg Collection.

IV. BRIEF ARTICLES AND NOTES

NOTES ON THE IMAGE AND THE NOVEL

One of the most disordered phases of modern scholarship has been the definition and analysis of the poetic image. In 1953 Mr. Norman Friedman commenced his rapid but competent survey of the literature devoted to the study of imagery with the comment that "Imagery has come to mean all things to all men."¹ Critics, indeed, sometimes starting from very different points, have attempted to count, to classify, to determine the sensory appeal, and at times to judge how the image actually functions within the local and over-all poetic context. The disagreements in definition and in approach certainly have not been resolved today, and the confusion certainly has not been quieted. As might be expected, this confusion has been intensified by some critics who have attempted to carry over the "imagerial" approach into the realm of prose, into an area where the validity or significance of the very approach may be justly questioned at certain points.² It is my intention here to notice the approaches which have been employed by several critics in recent years in their attempts to discuss the image in the novel genre. Obviously I do not mean any disrespect to those critics whose approaches disappoint me; it is simply my intention to analyze and to suggest in the hope of helping to clear the way in an area where we are all painfully searching for guidance.

The recently published "Art Imagery in Henry James's Fiction"³ serves as an extraordinarily fine example of how disappointing the counting and classifying methods may be. The author, apparently after countless hours of tabulation, is able to identify in the fiction of James nearly two thousand images derived from art. Of these two thousand or so, the tabulator finds that most of the two hundred dealing with books and reading of a very general nature are "not interesting," that the more than four hundred drawn from the theater are "somewhat disappointing and rather general," that over three hundred drawn from music are "usually not elaborate or even interesting," and that the fifty derived from dance and architecture are "ornamental rather than vital to the fiction." By the simple process of addition, to which the author apparently invites us, we find that nearly one thousand of the nearly two thousand images with which the tabulator began are uninteresting, non-functional, or, to be justly pointed, apparently of such passing significance that they do not demand the attention of anyone. If this is actually the case, we are left with the further, very questionable conclusion that Henry James, instead of being a master of imagery, was rather an immature, slipshod artist who chose his imagery carelessly, at least fifty per cent of the time, and, consequently, did not depend on it to carry a significant burden. This is not, of course, the conclusion to which the tabulator arrives. Instead we find: "And so it may readily be concluded that Henry James used his knowledge of many of the arts, especially literature, painting, and the drama, in elaborating a large proportion of the metaphors and similes which add glints of color to his celebrated texture and throw added light upon his absorbing characters." But as the opening sentence of the article reminds us: "We have his entire life as proof that Henry James was passionately devoted to most of the arts." Painstaking study, therefore, simply adds some slight reinforcement to something which even the most casual reader could not help but

discover for himself. Furthermore, though we are told in conclusion that James used art imagery "in elaborating a large proportion of the metaphors and similes which add glints of color to his celebrated texture and throw added light upon his absorbing characters," only a few cursory explanations are offered to show how the images actually fulfill their claimed function. Although we are given the statistics, we are not given any insights, except in a few brief instances, into how the images actually operate, how they speak to us about characters, situations, or themes. But we do meet with the surprising statement that "The numerous references in the imagery to fairy tales and children's stories should convince everyone that James remained young at heart, and very gentle." Are we to conclude then because of the diabolical imagery in *Othello*, let us say, that Shakespeare developed dangerous psychopathic or criminal tendencies in the early 1600's? Personally, in view of the evidence presented, I can not number myself among the "everyone" convinced of James's perennial youthful gaiety and gentleness. The author, however, though obviously confused over *why* he has made his laborious count, does at least know *what* he has counted. Unlike several critics who proceed without establishing their much-needed definitions—and they may even deal without the least hesitation with "dead" metaphors—the critic in this case does offer an adequate and definite statement of what he is counting. It is at least encouraging to find the *what*, if not the *why*.

The approach employed by Barbara Hardy in her two articles, "The Moment of Disenchantment in George Eliot's Novels" and "Imagery in George Eliot's Last Novels,"⁴ stands as a radical contrast to the counting and classifying methods. In this case the critic through her analysis of imagery is able to offer valuable comments on George Eliot's development, her techniques, and her themes. Though the conclusions reached are at times seriously open to question, the method is of such uniform excellence that it well might be emulated by future analysts. In the "Disenchantment" article, for instance, not only does the author carefully endeavor to show that George Eliot repeatedly employed the image of the day-lit room throughout her fiction, but she carefully endeavors to explain exactly what the images tell us about the characters and schemes of the novels and, moreover, even to comment on the appropriateness of the central image. "To point to a common image which links character and theme," concludes the author, "is merely to point to a constant which throws all the variations into relief." And by taking upon herself the burden of genuine interpretation and criticism, the author is able to make the "relief" impressive. In the second of her two articles, Miss Hardy identifies in particular certain running or modified images, in this case in *Middlemarch* and *Daniel Deronda*. The same excellent illumination prevails, though the author, understandably I suppose, neglects certain patterns, as well as the significance and quality of the incidental or non-patterned images, and unfortunately also gives the too strong impression that Eliot employed in her earlier novels a much more "naive" sort of imagery than that found in *Middlemarch* and *Deronda*. Although it is impossible to repeat at secondhand the insights given and conclusions reached by Miss Hardy, it is possible to encourage attention to her method. If there is any doubt that the novel, specifically the Victorian novel, will lend itself to a truly profitable reading of its imagery, here is a concrete illustration of how valuable such an approach can prove. I certainly do not mean to imply that it is my impression that James violated or weakened the "tradition" inherited from George Eliot—for very revealing results may be obtained through a perceptive and careful analysis and evaluation of his imagery—but the obvious conclusion is that one method intensifies our appreciation and understanding of the novelist and the other simply leaves us puzzled and disappointed. One approach seems to tell us that a novel may be scientifically dissected into statistical categories as if it were a tissue of facts capable of undergoing systematizing at the hand of the scientist; the other seems to respect the integrity of the work of art and to open its meaning more completely for our eager eyes. One approach murders, the other enlivens.

There are a few positive points which suggest themselves. If the study of imagery in fiction is to help us in our task of explication and criticism, it must not be simply isolated and tabulated, but must be studied according to its function, both in terms of the local context and in terms of the narrative as a whole. If patterns of imagery are discernible, then these patterns must be interpreted according to the role which they play in the narrative, whether, for instance, they act simply as reinforcements or as additional revelations, whether through repetition they assume symbolic value. However, in searching for patterns, the incidental, non-repeated image cannot be neglected. Sometimes a single image, unrelated to any other in the narrative, may serve to give us a more concrete awareness of character or situation, or even to flood the whole picture with intense light. To study the image in fiction is really to transfer a method which belongs preëminently to poetry; but if we are to make this transfer, we must be willing to assume the task, at least in many cases, of particular and direct analysis. We must, furthermore, on occasion inquire: who is responsible for the imagery we are analyzing? A particular character? A particular character in a moment of great emotional stress? The author

in omniscient commentary? To blur the lines between images which issue from the narrator and from the characters themselves is to ignore the nature of the medium through which the author is working. Professor Gordon S. Haight in his generally informative introduction to the recent Riverside Edition of *Middlemarch* offers a brief comparison of the imagery of Charlotte Brontë and George Eliot. After pointing to several images which appear in *Middlemarch*, images for which George Eliot, the narrator, is responsible, he quotes a speech by Rochester and then concludes: "These images [from *Jane Eyre*]—mermaid, eel, rose, lamb—are mere clichés, expressing only superficial qualities and rambling from one to another without consequence. George Eliot's are always controlled by her intellect and convey nuances of emotion without losing their grasp of underlying reality" (p. xx). *George Eliot's* images well may be of the quality claimed for them by Professor Haight. But the comparison is obviously unfair: there is a fundamental difference between the images which Rochester and which George Eliot may use. If we are to compare, we must compare things susceptible of comparison, in this case Charlotte Brontë and George Eliot, or Rochester and, let us say, Lydgate. If we are to come to fair and substantial conclusions, we must observe, I believe, from whom the images issue, and, as well, how these images function in the local and total context.

My purpose, to repeat, has been to analyze briefly and to suggest, not to formulate a system, unbending and conclusive. To suggest is to seek, and perhaps to seek is to find.

University of Notre Dame

Daniel P. Deneau

NOTES:

- ¹ Norman Friedman, "Imagery: From Sensation to Symbol," *JAAC*, XII (September, 1953), 25-37.
- ² See, for instance, A. Dwight Culler's remarks, *VNL*, No. 9 (Spring, 1956), p. 2.
- ³ Robert L. Gale, "Art Imagery in Henry James's Fiction," *AL*, XXIX (March, 1957), 47-63. See the same author's "Religion Imagery in Henry James's Fiction," *NFS*, III (Spring, 1957), 64-72; "Freudian Imagery in James's Fiction," *American Imago*, XI (Summer, 1954), 181-190. I have not been able to see the article on Freudian imagery.
- ⁴ Barbara Hardy, "The Moment of Disenchantment in George Eliot's Novels," *RES*, L (1954), 256-264; "Imagery in George Eliot's Last Novels," *MLR*, L (1955), 6-14.

SWINBURNE'S "BOO"

Professor Dougherty's remark, in the *VNL*, No. 10, that *Ruskin's Scottish Heritage* may indicate a rather sweeping need for more rigorous methodology in Victorian biography has reminded me of John S. Mayfield's *Swinburne's "Boo"*. This pamphlet was privately published (Rome, 1953) and, I believe, has by and large escaped attention. Bibliographically (so far as I can discern), it was not mentioned in any issue of the *VNL*, and it is not easily accessible, though its content may be considered distinctly relevant to our interests as teachers of Victorian Literature.

In this pamphlet, Mr. Mayfield gives an account of his investigation of public records, covering more than half a century, as he traced events within the families of Sir John Simon (one of Ruskin's most intimate friends) and of Sir John's adopted daughter, Jane Paulkner—to Ruskin also known as "Boo." The result, it seems to me, is quite as surprising as was the result of my analogous investigation of the "Ruskin" records. As Mr. Mayfield observes, Swinburne biographers have contentedly repeated Gosse's fairy-tale about Swinburne's love for Jane—a story likely to be included in Victorian anthologies, year by year to be disseminated, perhaps especially if one discusses Swinburne's *Triumph of Time*. In retrospect, it can therefore be enough to make one feel somewhat absurd (to echo Professor Dougherty), as one realizes—thanks to Mr. Mayfield's study—that in 1862, when Swinburne purportedly "proposed" to Jane, to be so devastatingly rejected, she—his "Boo"—could have been, according to the records, no more than ten years old.

[May I note, incidentally, that (E. T. Cook to the contrary) the "Last Letters" Ruskin ever wrote—presented in the *Heritage*, in *facsimile*—were addressed to Sir John and Lady Simon? Further, as to the date of Ruskin's first knowledge of Carlyle (*VNL*, No. 10, p. 19): it should likewise be noted that his *Diary* entries, as now published by Joan Evans, show that shortly before writing *Modern Painters I*, Ruskin had been reading *Heroes and Hero-Worship*—a book which, in my opinion, significantly influenced the thought and attitudes expressed in *Modern Painters I*. Collingwood was the first to call attention to Ruskin's presumably initial reading of Carlyle; and Collingwood's statements usually turn out to have been reliable, as my own reading of the *Diaries*, long ago, first showed me in regard to this detail.]

Queens College, Flushing, N.Y.

Helen Gill Viljoen

V. ENGLISH X NEWSNOTES

- ◆ The meeting of English X in Madison in September was well attended. Professor Austin Wright was Acting Chairman in the absence of Professor Jerome Buckley.
- ◆ Officers of English X for 1958 are Professor Austin Wright (*Carnegie Institute of Technology*), Chairman; and Professor Edgar Johnson (*City College of New York*), Secretary.
- ◆ The subject adopted by the Advisory and Nominating Committee for papers to be read at the 1958 meeting of English X, in New York, is *fiction*.
- ◆ The chairman of the Program Committee for 1958 is Professor Edgar Shannon (*University of Virginia*). All inquiries concerning the program and all papers offered for reading at that meeting should be sent directly to him.
- ◆ Two members of English X seek the aid of their Victorian colleagues in research projects on which they are working: Paul F. Mattheisen (39 Mine Street, New Brunswick, New Jersey) writes: "I am working on the literary relationships between Sir Edmund Gosse and the British novelists, and would appreciate any information from your readers on the location of any letters or documents by or pertaining to Gosse." Edward S. Lauterbach (743 West Pothill Blvd., Monrovia, California) writes: "For use in the history of the Victorian humor magazine *Pun* (1861-1901), I would like to locate account books, records, diaries, letters, and other pertinent material relating to the periodical. I am particularly interested in such men as Henry James Byron; Tom Hood, the younger; Henry Sampson; W. S. Gilbert; Ambrose Bierce; and James Clayton Clark. I shall be grateful for any help that is forthcoming."

VI. RECENT PUBLICATIONS: A SELECTED LIST

FEBRUARY-AUGUST, 1957

GENERAL

- ART. R. Glynn Grylls, "The Correspondence of F. G. Stephens." *TLS*, April 5, p. 216; "The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood." *TLS*, April 12, p. 232. Letters to Stephens, one of the original seven members of the P. R. B., from Rossetti, Holman Hunt, Patmore and others.
- Cecil Stewart, *The Stones of Manchester*. Edward Arnold. Rev. *TLS*, June 14, p. 370. Chapters on the Victorian architecture of the city: illustrated.
- Percy M. Young, ed., *Letters of Edward Elgar and Other Writings*. Bles. Rev. *TLS*, Feb. 15, p. 92. A selection, covering the years 1882 to 1933.
- CRITICISM AND LITERARY HISTORY. Richard D. Altick, *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900*. Chicago. Rev. by F. L. Mott in *NYFBR*, July 7, p. 5. An extremely valuable and illuminating survey of a neglected phase of literary history, equally significant for the social historian.
- John Bayley, *The Romantic Survival*. Constable. Rev. *TLS*, April 5, p. 208. The fortunes of romanticism through the nineteenth century and after, and essays on twentieth-century romantics.
- Walter E. Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870*. Yale. Soundly conceived and richly illustrated, this is an indispensable book for students of the period. Houghton analyzes the Victorian emotional, intellectual, and moral attitudes, often in conflict with each other, which made up the complex frame of mind referred to in his title. Representative chapters especially recommended deal with "The Critical Spirit—and the Will to Believe," "Hero Worship," and "Hypocrisy."
- Robert Langbaum, *The Poetry of Experience: The Dramatic Monologue in Modern Literary Tradition*. Chatto and Windus. Rev. by John Bayley in *Spectator*, July 26, p. 143.
- Georg Roppen, *Evolution and Poetic Belief*. (Oslo Studies in English, No. 5) Blackwell. Rev. *TLS*, June 14, p. 370. On Victorian and early twentieth-century writers.
- Morton D. Zabel, *Craft and Character in Modern Fiction*. Viking. Rev. by Horace Gregory in *NYFBR*, July 21, p. 10. Includes essays on Dickens, Hardy, and Conrad.
- Note:* The Summer number of *Modern Fiction Studies* includes a brief discussion of the question "When Is Fiction Modern?" (pp. 171-172) in which the following lines are drawn: "A modern novelist is one who wrote fiction after 1864 and who in themes and techniques continues to seem 'modern.' Applying these standards, we would distinguish between major novelists of the nineteenth century as follows:
- | PRE-MODERN | MODERN |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Cooper - Poe - Hawthorne | Melville - Twain - James |
| Dickens - Thackeray - Trollope | Eliot - Meredith - Hardy |
| Gogol | Turgenev - Dostoevsky - Tolstoy |
| Balzac - Stendhal | Flaubert - Maupassant - Zola." |
- ECONOMICS AND POLITICS. Walter L. Arnstein, "The Bradlaugh Case: A Reappraisal." *JHI*, April, pp. 254-69. The political and religious implications of the fight for admission to Parliament by an advocate of atheism, republicanism and birth control.
- John Francis Bray, *A Voyage from Utopia*, ed. by M. F. Lloyd-Prichard. Lawrence and Wishart. A hitherto unpublished revolutionary satire written in the 1840's.
- L. G. Johnson, *General F. Ferronet Thompson, 1783-1869*. Allen and Unwin. Rev. *TLS*, June 28, p. 395. The life of a Utilitarian reformer and editor of the *Westminster Review*.
- HISTORY. Ass Briggs, "Cobden and Bright." *History Today*, August, pp. 495-503.
- Michael Gilbert, *The Claimant: The Fichborne Case Revisited*. Constable. Geddes MacGregor, *The Fichborne Imposter*. Lippincott. Douglas Woodruff, *The Fichborne Claimant: A Victorian Mystery*. Hollis and Carter. Three new studies of this perennially interesting case. Woodruff in effect re-opens the controversy by refusing to accept the identification of the Claimant with Arthur Orton.

Robert Graves, *They Hanged My Saintry Billy*. Cassell. Rev. *FLS*, May 31, p. 336. A defense of the notorious Dr. Palmer of Rugeley, executed for murder in 1857.

Richard Hilton, *The Indian Mutiny*. Hollis and Carter. James Leasor, *The Red Port: The Story of the Indian Mutiny of 1857*. Reynal. William Howard Russell, *My Indian Mutiny Diary*, ed. by Michael Edwardes. Cassell. Jon Manchip White, "The Indian Mutiny." *History Today*, May-July, pp. 301-307, 373-380, 450-457. Surendra Nath Sen, "The 'Mutiny' Reconsidered." *Listener*, May 16, pp. 783-784. The centenary of this crisis in colonial history has called forth a number of re-examinations from various points of view. Russell's diary is especially recommended.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY. Conor Cruise O'Brien, *Parnell and His Party, 1880-1890*. Oxford. Rev. *FLS*, April 12, p. 219. John R. H. Moorman, "Charles Gore and the Religion of the Church." *Church Quarterly Rev.*, April-June, pp. 128-140. On a late Victorian follower of the Tractarians.

PUBLISHING AND JOURNALISM. Juliana Wadham, *The Case of Cornelia Connolly*. Collins. Life of the foundress of an order of nuns, "The Society of the Holy Child Jesus" (1849); English Catholicism at mid-century. H. J. Perkins, "The Origins of the Popular Press." *History Today*, July, pp. 425-435. Argues that the sensational mass-circulation press long antedated Newnes and Harmsworth. Paul West, "The Dome: An Aesthetic Periodical of the 1890's." *Book Collector*, Summer, pp. 160-169.

RELATIONS WITH THE CONTINENT. John S. Andrews, "A Few 'Intermediaries' of German Literature in 19th-Century Britain." *Notes and Queries*, July, pp. 315-316. George Haines, *German Influence upon English Education and Science, 1800-1866*. New London: Connecticut College.

Faine's *Notes on England*, translated with an introduction by Edward Hyams. Thames and Hudson. Rev. by Peter Quennell in *Spectator*, July 26, pp. 138-139.

SCIENCE. Charles S. Blinderman, "The Oxford Debate and After." *Notes and Queries*, March, pp. 126-128. Hitherto unpublished letters from the Huxley papers throw new light on the famous encounter between Huxley and Wilberforce in 1860.

Alvar Ellegard, "The Darwinian Theory and Nineteenth-Century Philosophies of Science." *JHI*, June, 362-369. A discussion of attitudes toward the Darwinian hypotheses among scientists, philosophical theorists, and the general public, 1859-1872.

SOCIAL. Lady Clodagh Anson, *Victorian Days*. Richards.

J. B. Booth, *Palmy Days*. Richards. R. H. Graveson and P. R. Crane, *A Century of Family Law, 1857-1957*. Sweet and Maxwell. Rev. *FLS*, March 29, p. 198. On the changes in legal status of wives and children since the establishment of the Divorce Court in 1857.

Marion Lochhead, "The Victorian Young Lady." *Quarterly Rev.*, July, pp. 323-333. The young Queen and the heroines of Charlotte M. Yonge as prototypes.

O. J. Morris, *Grandfather's London*. Putnam, 1956. Documentary photographs of London in the 1880's.

AUTHORS

ARNOLD. Merton A. Christensen, "Thomas Arnold's Debt to German Theologians: A Prelude to Matthew Arnold's *Literature and Dogma*." *NP*, August, pp. 14-20. On the influence of the "mediating" German critics (Schleiermacher, Bunsen, et al.) on the Arnolds.

A. E. Dyson, "The Last Enchantments." *RSS*, August, pp. 257-265. A highly rewarding analysis of "The Scholar Gipsy"; a reply to Wilson Knight's article of 1955.

John Holloway, "Milton and Arnold." *Essays in Criticism*, April, pp. 226-228. A reply to J. B. Broadbent.

BARHAM. Royal A. Gettmann, "Barham and Bentley." *JEGP*, July, pp. 337-346. Barham's work for Bentley's *Miscellany*, especially the *Ingoldsby Legends*. Based on unpublished letters.

BARING-GOULD. William Purchell, *Omarr Christian Soldier: A Life of Sabine Baring-Gould, 1834-1924*. Longmans. Rev. *FLS*, April 12, p. 223.

BROUGHAM. Frances Hawes, *Henry Brougham*. Jonathan Cape. Rev. *FLS*, June 7, p. 347.

BROWNING. B. R. Jerman, "Browning's Witless Duke." *PMLA*, June, pp. 488-493. Unconscious self-revelation as dramatic irony in "My Last Duchess."

Gardner B. Taplin, *The Life of Elizabeth Barrett Browning*. Yale. Rev. *FLS*, July 26, pp. 449-450; by Betty Miller in *New Statesman*, July 6, pp. 25-26.

CARLYLE. C. R. Sanders, "The Victorian Rembrandt: Carlyle's Portraits of his Contemporaries." *Bull. John Rylands Library*, March, pp. 521-557. New material from unpublished letters.

DICKENS. John Butt and Kathleen Tillotson, *Dickens at Work*. Methuen. Rev. *FLS*, July 26, p. 459. A study of Dickens's methods of composition, with special attention to the effect of serial publication on his work.

William R. Clark, "The Rationale of Dickens' Death Rate." *Boston University Studies in English*, Autumn, 1956, pp. 125-139. A Chestertonian critique of Edmund Wilson's thesis that Dickens was neurotic about deathbeds.

K. J. Fielding and Gerald Grubb, "New Letters from Charles Dickens to John Forster." *Boston University Studies in English*, Autumn, 1956, pp. 140-193. Forty letters, 1837-1841.

Albert Johannsen, *Phiz: Illustrations from the Novels of Charles Dickens*. Chicago. Rev. *FLS*, March 29, p. 190.

Harry Stone, "Dickens' Use of his American Experiences in Martin Chuzzlewit." *PMLA*, June, pp. 464-478. Shows that emotionally charged autobiography, resulting from Dickens's lionization by Americans, was inappropriately transferred to his fictional hero.

ELIOT. Hannah Goldberg, "George Henry Lewes and 'Daniel Deronda.'" *Notes and Queries*, August, pp. 356-358. An autobiographical passage in an essay by Lewes on Spinoza as source for Mordecai and Daniel.

Jerome Thale, "'Deronda': The Darkened World." *Modern Fiction Studies*, Summer, pp. 119-126. The Gwendolen story as demonstrating a matured awareness of evil.

Jerome Thale, "Image and Theme: *The Mill on the Floss*." *Univ. of Kansas City Rev.*, Spring, pp. 227-234. An exposition of the river image, and a suggestion that Maggie's drowning "proves" her innocence as in a witch's ordeal by water.

- GISSING. Jackson I. Cope, "Definition as Structure in Gissing's 'Ryecroft Papers.'" *Modern Fiction Studies*, Summer, pp. 127-40.
- GUTHRIE, THOMAS ANSTEY. Roger Lancelyn Green, "A Neglected Novelist: 'F. Anstey.'" *English*, Summer, pp. 178-181.
- HARDY. Emma Clifford, "The 'Trumpet-Major Notebook' and *The Dynasts*." *RES*, May, pp. 149-161. Hardy's use of historical fact in novel and in epic-drama.
- HOPKINS. Thomas P. Harrison, "The Birds of Gerard Manley Hopkins." *SP*, July, pp. 448-463.
Yvor Winters, *The Function of Criticism: Problems and Exercises*. Denver: Alan Swallow. Rev. *NYTBR*, July 21, p. 10. Includes an essay on "The Poetry of G. M. Hopkins."
- HOUSMAN. George L. Watson, *A. E. Housman: A Divided Life*. Hart-Davis. Rev. by W. H. Auden in *New Statesman*, May 18, pp. 643-644; unfavorably by Stephen Spender in *Listener*, May 23, pp. 841-842.
William White, "A. E. Housman: A Critical and Bibliographical Review of Books about the Poet, 1936-1955." *JEGP*, April, pp. 242-250.
- LEE-HAMILTON. Harvey T. Lyon, "A Publishing History of the Writings of Eugene Lee-Hamilton." *Papers of the Bibl. Soc. of America*, 1957, pp. 141-159. A useful bibliography of a neglected poet.
- MEREDITH. Phyllis Bartlett, "George Meredith: Early Ms. Poems in the Berg Collection." *Bull. N. Y. Public Library*, August, pp. 396-415.
Norman Friedman, "The Jangled Harp: Symbolic Structure in *Modern Love*." *MLQ*, March, pp. 9-26. A study of the imagery of Meredith's sonnet sequence.
- MILL. R. F. Atkinson, "J. S. Mill's 'Proof' of the Principle of Utility." *Philosophy*, April, pp. 158-167. Replies to recent defenses of Mill's "proof" (in Chapter 4 of *Utilitarianism*) and maintains it is fallacious.
Bertrand Russell, *John Stuart Mill*. Oxford. Rev. *Listener*, July 25, p. 142. A pamphlet arguing that Mill is more important as a political theorist than as a logician or economist.
- NEWMAN. *Catholic Sermons of Cardinal Newman*. Edited at the Birmingham Oratory. Burns and Oates. Rev. *TLS*, March 15, p. 165. Manuscript sermons now first published.
Letters of John Henry Newman. Edited by Muriel Spark and Derek Stanford. Peter Owen. Rev. by Sean O'Faolain in *Spectator*, July 5, p. 21.
C. Stephen Dessain, "Newman's First Conversion." *Studies, an Irish Quarterly Rev.*, Spring, pp. 44-59. On Newman's religious experience at the age of fifteen.
Terence Kenny, *The Political Thought of John Henry Newman*. Longmans. Rev. by John Raymond in *New Statesman*, July 6, pp. 27-28.
B. M. G. Reardon, "Newman and the Psychology of Belief." *Church Quarterly Rev.*, July-Sept., pp. 315-332. A penetrating article equating Newman's apologetics with those of Kierkegaard.
- PATER. James Hafley, "Walter Pater's 'Marius' and the Technique of Modern Fiction." *Modern Fiction Studies*, Summer, pp. 99-109. "Modern" themes in Pater's criticism and "modern" techniques (e.g. irony) in *Marius*.
- PATMORE. J. C. Reid, *The Mind and Art of Coventry Patmore*. Routledge. Rev. *TLS*, May 24, p. 320.
- READE, WINWOOD. J. S. L. Gilmour, "Some Uncollected Authors XIII: William Winwood Reade." *Book Collector*, Spring, pp. 62-68. Bibliographical notes on the author of *The Martyrdom of Man*.
- ROSSETTI. Oswald Doughty, *Dante Gabriel Rossetti*. Longmans. A pamphlet in the valuable "Writers and their Work" series.
- RUSSELL. Monk Gibbon, "AE and the Early Days of Theosophy in Dublin." *Dublin Mag.*, July-Sept., pp. 25-37.
- SMITH, GOLDWIN. Elisabeth Wallace, *Goldwin Smith: Victorian Liberal*. Univ. of Toronto Press. Noticed in *NYTBR*, July 7, p. 13.
- STEVENSON. George L. McKay, *A Stevenson Library... Vol. III: Autograph Letters by R. L. Stevenson and his Wife*. Yale.
- SWINBURNE. Alfred Noyes, "Dinner at the Pines: Reminiscences of Swinburne." *Listener*, March 28, pp. 507-508.
- TENNYSON. F. L. Lucas, *Tennyson*. Longmans. Another useful addition to "Writers and their Work."
W. W. Robson, "The Dilemma of Tennyson." *Listener*, June 13, pp. 963-965. A discussion of the discrepancy (a classic problem) between Tennyson "the responsible social being, the admirably serious and 'committed' Victorian intellectual," and Tennyson "the most un-strenuous, lonely, and poignant of poets."
Sir Charles Tennyson, *Stars and Markets*. Chatto and Windus. A book of recollections by the poet's grandson; includes reminiscences of Tennyson, Locker-Lampson, Birrell, and others.
- THACKERAY. Ralph W. Rader, "Thackeray's Injustice to Fielding." *JEGP*, April, pp. 203-212. Argues that Thackeray's unfavorable account of Fielding's life was occasioned by a sense of guilt at his real or imagined shortcomings.
- WARD. Basil Willey, "How Robert Elsmere Struck Some Contemporaries." *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*. Murray.
- WILDE. Manlio Miserocchi, "Attraverso il centenario di G. B. Shaw quello di O. Wilde." *Nuova Antologia*, July, pp. 377-386.

PROJECTS — REQUESTS FOR AID

- ANNE BEALE. G. P. Hopkins Morris asks help in finding twenty-six manuscript diaries of this Victorian novelist (1816-1900). *TLS*, July 5, p. 413.
- T. H. GREEN. Melvin Richter is engaged in a study of the work of the Oxford philosopher. *TLS*, May 24, p. 321.
- LONDON LIBRARY. Simon Nowell-Smith is writing a short story of the institution, which was founded by a group of notable Victorians. *TLS*, March 15, p. 161.
- J. P. MAHAFFY. Shane Leslie, under the auspices of Trinity College, Dublin, is writing a memoir. *TLS*, April 19, p. 241.
- GEORGE MEREDITH. C. L. Cline is completing a collected edition of Meredith's letters. *Library Chronicle of the University of Texas*, Spring, pp. 30-32; *TLS*, July 19, p. 441.
- SIR HENRY M. STANLEY. R. C. K. Woodall is collecting materials for a life of Sir Henry. *TLS*, July 26, p. 457.
- SIR CHARLES WYNDHAM. George Rowell is writing a biography of the Victorian actor-manager, 1837-1919. *Listener*, May 23, p. 833.
- LORD WOLSELEY. Michael Alexander is working on a life of the general. *TLS*, July 5, p. 413.

University of Texas

Oscar Maurer

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*.