

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER

NUMBER 16



FALL, 1959

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

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

- Richard D. Altick (*The Ohio State University*)
- John Lindberg (*University of Maine*)
- John L. Bradley (*Mount Holyoke College*)
- Oscar Maurer (*University of Texas*)
- Samuel E. Brown (*University of Maryland*)
- Pansy Pakenham (*London, England*)
- Gordon S. Haight (*Yale University*)
- Robert L. Peters (*Wayne State University*)
- W. Stacy Johnson (*Smith College*)
- Donald Smalley (*University of Illinois*)

I. LEADING ARTICLES

BROWNING'S VIEW OF FACT IN *THE RING AND THE BOOK*

Students of Robert Browning owe their gratitude to Professor Paul Cundiff for raising once again the many-faceted question of Browning's view of his relation to the *Old Yellow Book*, his rich quarry of source material for his most famous poem.¹ This question has challenged the industry and ingenuity of Browning scholars for well over a half-century, during which a rich and voluminous literature has grown up around it. Even though so much has been said on the subject, however, there seems little likelihood that any one will come up with a pronouncement that will settle the matter once and for all; and it is much better so. As Dean W. C. DeVane has implied in framing what is probably the most notable definition, the question is a spacious one, and of a sort that goes on rewarding successive examinations:

From . . . detailed analysis of Browning's indebtedness in each part of his great poem, we rise to the larger question of the poet's fidelity to the spirit of the *Old Yellow Book*. How far did he give truth and truth only as he found it in his source?

How far tenable is his own contention (I, 686-7)² that he merely resuscitated, rather than created, the personages of his drama? How far has his imagination, which he calls Fancy, wrung the fact of the murder-case to fit a preconceived view? How far has the alloy given form and color to the golden ring and how much alloy remains in the finished poem? This question in its many ramifications has troubled scholars since the poem appeared, and it is a question worthy of debate, since through it we attain a knowledge of the essential Browning.³

DeVane here states the problem as it has generally been debated by scholars and as it figures through much of Cundiff's article. However, Cundiff has broadened his focus still further. Taking exception specifically to the positions of A. K. Cook, J. E. Shaw, and Robert Langbaum and, by implication, to the statements of nearly all other scholars of the last forty years upon the subject, Cundiff holds (if I understand him correctly) that Browning did not actually believe or contend that he "merely resuscitated . . . the personages of his drama." Browning, Cundiff maintains, "was fully conscious of the poetic use to which he put his raw material,"⁴ and did not intend to avow in Book I or elsewhere that he was "faithful to the facts of the *Old Yellow Book*."⁵ Browning's ambitious Ring metaphor of Book I, Cundiff argues, must be interpreted in a manner consistent with the facts of ring-making. Browning does not intend to imply that the alloy, his Fancy, disappears from the entire ring in the final step of manufacture; it is only the surface of the ring that again becomes pure gold when the jeweler applies his spurt of acid to remove the alloy.⁶ Browning, in Cundiff's opinion, was aware that he was in large measure creating by means of his Fancy a new personality for the heroine of his poem rather than resuscitating the Pompilia who figures in the *Old Yellow Book*:

With the potential qualities before him, Browning enhanced the character of Pompilia until she became a symbol of Virtue in distress (IX.1002), but in no

place I can find did he assert that another person must see in his Pompilia the Pom-
pilia of his source.⁷

In Cundiff's view, Browning not only felt free on principle to alter the facts of the *Old Yellow Book* when these hampered him in the creation of character; Browning went so far in the opposite direction from that he is usually credited with taking as to display throughout the poem a scorn of the idea that factual knowledge is of any great value. Presenting four passages that he feels illustrate his argument, Cundiff states: "Truth [fact], on which Browning lavishes unnecessary derision in the above passages, seems subjected to belittlement wherever it appears in the poem."⁸

This, I trust (after allowing for the inevitable distortions of summary), is a reasonably accurate summation of Cundiff's argument—or, rather, of a part of it, for he ranges over a wide territory Professor Cundiff's is a boldly original point of view. It is therefore the more stimulating and the more valuable (for the rewards attendant on seeing the poem from a fresh perspective) to survey the amount of material that Cundiff brings forward in support of his view. It is undoubtedly true, for example, as Cundiff points out, that Browning in a letter to Julia Wedgwood speaks in regard to his own work on *The Ring and the Book* of "what one calls, idealization of the characters," and, as Cundiff also points out effectively, there are indeed passages in Books I and XII that are capable of being interpreted as evidence that Browning felt free to give his Fancy a quite loose rein in creating portions of his poem. In going through *The Ring and the Book* with Cundiff's article fresh in mind, the present writer was struck for the first time with the special significance of XII, 233-8, where Browning seems clearly to distinguish between the part of Archangeli's first letter to Cencini that he purports to have found to hand in the *Old Yellow Book* and the part that he has frankly and consciously filled in by mining from his own Fancy:

Here is the first of these [epistles], part fresh as penned,
The sand, that dried the ink, not rubbed away,
Though penned the day whereof it tells the deed:
Part—extant just as plainly, you know where,
Whence came the other stuff, went, you know how,
To make the Ring that's all but round and done.⁹

Cundiff's article, as I have said, seems valuable for its originality, for the author's bringing again into question from a fresh point of view of a good deal in regard to the problem of Browning's relation to the *Old Yellow Book* that many students of Browning (including the present writer) have perhaps taken too much for granted as settled and done with. The validity of a part of Cundiff's conclusions, however, as distinguished from the value of the questions he raises, seems very much open to debate. The passage just quoted, for example, while it impressively supports Cundiff's argument that Browning in creating the substance of his poem was quite conscious of adding alloy from his own Fancy to the gold of the *Old Yellow Book*, seems to undermine another part of Cundiff's case. It illustrates the satisfaction Browning voices so often in Book I, and occasionally in Book XII, with having the *Old Yellow Book*, "part print, part manuscript," the veritable repository of the fact of his subject,¹⁰ before him as he writes. Browning, in a way that reminds one of his Poet of Valladolid, seems to find a special value in the fact that grains of the sand Archangeli had used to blot his letter nearly two centuries earlier still adhere to the sheet, now bound into the *Old Yellow Book*, even as elsewhere he finds it worthy of remark that the creases still appear in the papers, now bound in as pages, that seventeenth-century Roman lawyers had once folded double for their convenience:

Doubled in two, the crease upon them yet,
For more commodity of carriage, see!—
And these are letters, veritable sheets
That brought posthaste the news to Florence, writ
At Rome the day Count Guido died (I, 689-93)

or observes (ironically) how Bottini's eloquence is "sorrowfully dyked and dammed" by the coarse type in which a seventeenth-century printer had set up the pamphlet that, bound into the *Old Yellow Book*, still preserved Bottini's speech (XII, 399-401). It is hard to see how such passages or passages like those that follow can be made to sort with a contention that Browning belittles the importance of the concrete fact of the *Old Yellow Book* in his poem:

Here it is, this I toss and take again;
Small-quarto size, part print part manuscript:
A book in shape but, really, pure crude fact
Secreted from man's life when hearts beat hard,
And brains, high-blooded, ticked two centuries since.
Give it me back! The thing's restorative
I' the touch and sight. (I, 84-90)

Enough of me!

The Book! I turn its medicinable leaves
 In London now till, as in Florence erst,
 A spirit laughs and leaps through every limb,
 And lights my eye, and lifts me by the hair,
 Letting me have my will again with these
 --How title I the dead alive once more? (I, 773-9)

To this Cencini's care I owe the Book,
 The yellow thing I take and toss once more,—
 How will it be, my four-years'-intimate,
 When thou and I part company anon? (XII, 225-8)

It seems clear that Browning set great store by the *Old Yellow Book*. "What a tremendous effort the poet made to transcribe the truth of small details from his sources," DeVane remarks, "can only be appreciated by one who has read the *Old Yellow Book* almost as often as did Browning."¹¹

Even so, I think Cundiff's essay offers a salutary counterstatement to Robert Langbaum's recent enthusiastic overstatement of his case in the often keenly perceptive and always stimulating chapter upon *The Ring and the Book* that appears in his *The Poetry of Experience*.¹² I should agree with Cundiff that Langbaum's representation of Browning's view of his poem in the following passage amounts to a sizeable distortion:

These then are the unprecedented conditions of *The Ring and the Book*—not only that the poem was to be no mere illustration of an external principle from which the facts would derive meaning, but that the facts themselves, all of them, unselected and as they came to hand (their sordidness was all the better as a guarantee that they were unselected), were to yield the meaning.¹³

Browning's pleasure in the *Old Yellow Book*, keen as it obviously is, does not, in my opinion, suggest (as Langbaum seems to feel it does) "the ordinary Philistine's devotion to his facts and figures,"¹⁴ nor does Browning at any time view the *Old Yellow Book* with an attitude as uncomplicated as "naive wonder."¹⁵

On the contrary, Browning's is the view of a profoundly creative artist unobsessed with facts in any way that is connoted by "facts and figures"—so far I should emphatically agree with Cundiff, though in pursuing the details of Browning's view of fact in *The Ring and the Book* I must part company with him. For if Langbaum, as I see it, errs in insisting that Browning believed he was merely projecting the facts of the *Old Yellow Book* without interpreting them, Cundiff, in my opinion, veers an even greater distance in the opposite direction when he asserts that Browning, in line with the intricacies of ring-making, avowed through his Ring metaphor that he meant to create characters of his own without the intention of keeping faithful to the essential truth of the characters of his source. It seems to me that there are perils in leaning too heavily, as I believe Cundiff does, upon a close and particular reading of the Ring metaphor for our interpretation of what Browning has to say in Books I and XII of his poem; and I find instructive Browning's use elsewhere of a similar metaphor in which the poet once more speaks of his factual materials as gold ore and his own imaginative contribution to his work as his fancy. The poem is *The Two Poets of Croisic*, published in 1878, ten years after *The Ring and the Book*:

But truth, truth, that's the gold! and all the good
 I find'in fancy is, it serves to set
 Gold's inmost glint free, gold which comes up rude
 And rayless from the mine. All fume and fret
 Of artistry beyond this point pursued
 Brings out another sort of burnish: yet
 Always the ingot has its very own
 Value, a sparkle struck from truth alone. (1209-16)

The passage warrants consideration, I think, for at least three reasons. First, Browning here seems, on first glance at any rate, to exalt his factual materials at the expense of his own imaginative contribution to his poem, employing the terms *gold* and *fancy* in a way that would bolster a more traditional reading of the Ring metaphor rather than Cundiff's. At least, Browning seems quite free here from any fear such as Cundiff finds in certain lines of Book I of *The Ring and the Book* "that his imaginative contribution . . . would not be considered more valuable than the pristine facts."¹⁶ Second, the passage suggests that Browning a full ten years after he had completed *The Ring and the Book* was still capable of declaring he placed a remarkably high value upon "truth" or the gold ore of objective fact, although Cundiff maintains that even at the time of writing his most famous poem, Browning was already evincing "a distrust of truth [fact]"¹⁷ and was "in the process of

scuttling knowledge.¹⁸ Third—and probably most important—the passage illustrates in miniature the tantalizing problems we run into when we press very hard for an unequivocal meaning from a passage of poetry—or, I think, from a single metaphor, however ambitiously developed. It seems impossible to establish that the passage means exactly one thing or another—a fact that may reflect quite favorably, of course, upon its value as poetry. Let us assume, for the moment, that the passage occurs not in *The Two Poets of Croisic* but in Book I of *The Ring and the Book* and that it is to be examined as evidence for their particular lines of argument by Cundiff, Langbaum, and the present writer. In that event, Cundiff (if I interpret him correctly)¹⁹ might well wish to stress lines 1211-12, in which Browning speaks of his factual materials as “rude and rayless” (an equivalent for the “fanciless fact” of Book I). I myself would want to place special emphasis upon “rude and rayless” but I would consider of special importance (as presumably Cundiff might not) lines 1209-12 as evidence of a belief on Browning’s part that he possessed an actual power to penetrate and interpret accurately the truth latent in objective data—to “set Gold’s inmost glint free.” Langbaum might well assume—at least on first reading—that the whole passage supported his line of argument, as indeed I think it does if it is read as a sober exposition of Browning’s set conviction. Read as a part of *The Two Poets of Croisic*, however, it takes on the tone of light irony that colors the surrounding lines.

It seems to me that Book I of *The Ring and the Book* contains more than a touch of light irony in many passages and that light irony is not absent from passages of Book XII. Browning, as I see it, exploits a half-serious, half-less-than-serious tone for consummate effects in many passages, especially of Book I, heightening, for example, the significance of the moment when he came upon the *Old Yellow Book* in the second-hand market in Florence by throwing in, as if they were subjects of almost equal note, grotesque and comic details of the “odds and ends of ravage” among which the *Old Yellow Book* lay:

Bronze angel-heads once knobs attached to chests,
 (Handled when ancient dames chose forth brocade)
 Modern chalk drawings, studies from the nude,
 Samples of stone, jet, breccia, porphyry
 Polished and rough, sundry amazing busts
 In baked earth, (broken, Providence be praised!)
 A wreck of tapestry, proudly-purposed web
 When reds and blues were indeed red and blue,
 Now offered as a mat to save bare feet
 (Since carpets constitute a cruel cost)
 Treading the chill scagliola bedward . . .
 —these
 I picked the book from. Five compeers in flank
 Stood left and right of it as tempting more—
 A dogseared Spicilegium, the fond tale
 O’ the Frail One of the Flower, by young Dumas,
 Vulgarized Horace for the use of schools,
 The Life, Death, Miracles of Saint Somebody,
 Saint Somebody Else, his miracles, Death and Life,—
 With this, one glance at the lettered back of which,
 And ‘Stall!’ cried I: a lira made it mine. (I, 55-83)

Browning’s professions (half-serious, I think, but only half) of his enormous esteem for the *Old Yellow Book* induce Langbaum, as we have seen, to assign to the poet “naive wonder” and a “reverence and delight” in the book reminiscent of a “Philistine’s devotion to his facts and figures.” Cundiff, on the contrary, apparently interprets such passages as evidence of a desire on Browning’s part to deride or belittle the factual data of his source—a heavy rather than a light irony.²⁰ I myself believe that we must allow Browning the poet’s right to ambiguity and approach such passages warily if we intend to use them as part of our evidence for Browning’s subscribing to a set and specific point of view. Browning in the years intervening between *The Ring and the Book* and *The Two Poets of Croisic* was to assume a similar tone of light irony on several occasions when he was impelled to speak in his poems of the problems of poets or of his own problems as a writer.²¹ Browning once warned John Ruskin against attempting to confine him to a single meaning, and the passage (in which Browning refers to his poem “Popularity” and Keats as he appears in it) may be worth quoting at this point:

Why, you look at my little song as if it were Hobbs’ or Nobbs’ lease of his house, or testament of his devisings, wherein, I grant you, not a ‘then and there,’ ‘to him and his heirs,’ ‘to have and to hold,’ and so on, would be superfluous; and so you begin:—‘Stand still,—why?’ For the reason indicated in the

verse, to be sure,—to let me draw him—and because he is at present going his way, and fancying nobody notices him,—and moreover, 'going on' (as we say) against the injustice of that,—and lastly, inasmuch as one night he'll fall us, as a star is apt to drop out of heaven, in authentic astronomic records, and I want to make the most of my time. So much may be in 'stand still.' And how much more was (for instance) in that 'stay!' of Samuel's (I. xv. 16).²²

In the pages that follow, I should like to make a case for approaching Browning's view of fact in *The Ring and the Book* from another avenue—one that is less liable to lead to equivocal results, I believe, than a study devoted wholly or predominantly to textual analysis of the poem itself without any extensive attempt to place the poem in the context of Browning's life and his other writings. If our aim is to get at what Browning thought he was doing in *The Ring and the Book* (and that is ostensibly Cundiff's aim and at least in part Langbaum's), as opposed to exploring the possibilities of the poem itself independent of a special concern for the author's conscious intent, then I think we must consider carefully to what extent Browning's statements and practice within *The Ring and the Book* can be clarified by comparison with his statements and practice both before and after the composition of his most famous poem. Cundiff remarks that since numerous other enlightened readers of the *Old Yellow Book* have found the evidence "almost equally balanced, it would be odd if Browning had not made the same discovery."²³ He argues (if I understand him) that Browning therefore believed there was no way of arriving at a reliable reading of the truth behind the evidence of the *Old Yellow Book*.²⁴ But this is to assume that Browning viewed the *Old Yellow Book* and the possibility of getting at the essential truth latent in its factual data in much the same way as another person might view them. To do so is to reckon without an important peculiarity in the psychological composition of Robert Browning—one that he had displayed as early as the *Essay on Chatterton* (1842) and that he was to go on exhibiting at least as late as *Red Cotton Night-Cap Country* (1873).

In the *Essay on Chatterton* in 1842 as in *The Ring and the Book* a quarter of a century later, Browning dealt with a mass of evidence—the data of Chatterton's life as it appeared in the various biographies of the boy poet and in Chatterton's own poems and letters—which was full of ambiguities and contradictions. Biographers had argued the evidence from widely contrasting points of view, but the precise motives that led Chatterton into the Rowley forgeries and eventually to suicide in a Holborn garret are still a matter of speculation. The sort of scorn that Browning shows for the lawyers of the *Old Yellow Book* and their coarse and confident methods of dealing with the facts of the case is paralleled in the *Essay on Chatterton* by Browning's scorn for another set of professional motive-mongers—the biographers of Chatterton. Browning's avowed purpose was to "throw a new light" upon the data of Chatterton's life and thus rescue a reputation that had been "foully outraged."²⁵

Browning read into the biographical data of Chatterton's career, even as he later read into the facts of the *Old Yellow Book*, a largely unhistorical spiritual drama, a drama that depended more upon Browning's familiar patterns of thought than upon the characteristics of Chatterton as he appears in the biographies and in his own poems and letters. J. E. Shaw has pointed out how intimately Browning read the truth of Pompilia according to his memories of Elizabeth Barrett Browning.²⁶ The pattern that Browning read into Chatterton's life follows essentially the pattern that he had created for the hero of *The Return of the Druses*, a drama that he had written in 1840.²⁷ Browning tells us at the end of the *Essay* that he has arrived at his reading of Chatterton's life by "balancing conflicting statements, interpreting doubtful passages, and reconciling discrepant utterances."²⁸ The words sound curiously like those William Michael Rossetti reported Browning as employing to describe his work on *The Ring and the Book*. The *Old Yellow Book*, Browning is reported to have said, had offered him a "mass of almost equally balanced evidence," pondering which he was able to arrive at the characters of his poem.²⁹ Perhaps the most important point is that in the *Essay on Chatterton* Browning was willing to present the results of his analysis not as a creative work, a product of his creative imagination, but as a factual study worthy of inclusion in a sober quarterly review. Browning was indeed so sure that he had been able to probe the facts successfully and arrive at the essential truth of Chatterton's career that in concluding his essay he urged others to apply his method of reading factual data to the histories of "other great spirits partially obscured."³⁰

If we turn from the prose essay of 1842 to the letters that Browning wrote Julia Wedgwood¹ in 1868-9 concerning *The Ring and the Book*, we see that Browning continues to hold much the same conception of his power to read truth from objective data as is evident in the *Essay on Chatterton*. Browning, considering Miss Wedgwood's complaint that the first half of his poem (the only part she had yet read) was unduly sordid in subject and detail, replies:

. . . the business has been, AS I SPECIFY, to explain fact—and the fact is what you see and, worse, are to see. The question with me has never been 'Could not one, by changing the factors work out the sum to better result?,' but declare and prove the

actual result, and there an end. Before I die, I hope to purely invent something,— here my pride was concerned to invent nothing: THE MINUTEST CIRCUMSTANCE THAT DENOTES CHARACTER is true: the black is so much—the white, no more.³¹

I have put "as I specify" in capitals because the phrase seems in itself, or rather in the context of the passage, to be an important exhibit in any attempt at a verdict on what Browning is attempting to say in Book I of his poem. The phrase cannot, so far as I can make out, apply to any earlier letter Browning has written Miss Wedgwood or to the earlier part of the letter in which it appears. Browning had not exchanged conversation with Julia Wedgwood for three years, and Richard Curle, the editor of the letters, sees no evidence of any letter's having been lost or destroyed.³² "As I specify" seems, then, pretty clearly to refer to Book I of *The Ring and the Book*, and Browning in that event is saying that he has intended there to intimate that in writing his poem his "business has been . . . to explain fact."

I have put "the minutest circumstance that denotes character" in capitals because the words represent a highly important limitation (and one that Cundiff quite legitimately stresses, though not by means of this quotation) upon the way in which Browning intends to reproduce the fact of the *Old Yellow Book* in his poem. The words warn us, I think, against the sort of interpretation Langbaum makes of the sense in which Browning meant to revive the truth of the *Old Yellow Book*. Browning does not intend, so far as I can see, to imply that he has worked simply "by restoring to the facts their life," employing "the alloy of imagination, not as an interpretive but as a projective function."³³ Browning has attempted to keep faithful to the essence of the facts, which is another thing. Above all, Browning does not, as I see it, believe or intend to imply that "meaning is not separable from the facts."³⁴ It seems clear, both by analogy from the *Essay on Chatterton*, and more directly from Browning's letters to Julia Wedgwood that Browning believed he was presenting in Book VII of his poem the essential Pompilia of the *Old Yellow Book* and not merely projecting the unsorted concrete facts of his source. It is true, I think, that Browning intends the reader of his poem to form his own judgment of the characters and does not insist upon the reader's taking upon authority his own or the Pope's judgment of Pompilia's character—so far (and it is a very significant distance) *The Ring and the Book* is, as Langbaum skillfully and perceptively demonstrates, a "relativist poem." But Browning does not profess to offer in his poem "live fact" but rather

voices we call evidence
Upoar in the echo, live fact deadened down . . . (I, 833-4)

Browning had been composing and offering to the public such "voices" of men and women, to be judged ultimately by the reader, for a good many years—in fact, as early as "Johannes Agricola" (1836) and as recently as *Mr. Sludge*, "The Medium" and the other dramatic monologues of *Dramatis Personae* (1864). *Fra Lippo Lippi*, *Andrea del Sarto*, *Bishop Blougram's Apology*, *Mr. Sludge*—in all such "voices" or dramatic monologues, or in nearly all, Browning intends, as I see it, to give a synthesis of fact—"live fact deadened down"—rather than live concrete fact itself. But Browning would have insisted regarding most of his earlier characters also, I think, that "the minutest circumstance that denotes character is true," at least in the sense that the circumstances he chose afforded a faithful interpretation of, or synthesis of, the essential truth of a personality.

To return once more from the two phrases just discussed to the quotation as a whole: it seems evident that Browning intended to call the essential Pompilia of the *Old Yellow Book* back to life even as he had intended a quarter of a century earlier to restore the truth of the essential Chatterton. However, since Browning wrote *The Ring and the Book* as a dramatic poem rather than as a prose essay, since he intended by means of a series of "voices" or dramatic monologues to re-enact the essential story of the *Old Yellow Book* (I, 824-37), he could write Julia Wedgwood later in their correspondence of a permissible heightening of thought and dialogue of the sort Shakespeare practised "up to the general bettering and intended tone of the whole composition—what one calls, idealization of characters."³⁵ On the other hand, Browning employs idealization, I think, only in the sense of getting at the essence of the character,³⁶ rather than in the sense of creating character that improves upon reality. Browning goes on to defend his portrayal of Pompilia by arguing that unusual insight and eloquence are not uncommon among ignorant Italian women and offers, by way of concrete example, observations displaying such qualities once voiced by Annunziata, former housemaid of the Brownings. Such "idealization" as this seems compatible with Browning's assurances to the Reverend John W. Chadwick that he had found Pompilia in the *Old Yellow Book* "just as she speaks and acts in my poem."³⁷

It is evident in Browning's letters that he did not in any way take lightly the relation of the world of his poem to the world his readers inhabit. He admonishes Miss Wedgwood to remember that "this is God's world, as he made it for reasons of his own, and that to change its conditions is not to account for them—AS YOU WILL PRESENTLY FIND ME TRY TO DO" (that is, in the latter half of his poem, which she has not yet read).³⁸ Later, after Miss Wedgwood has read the remainder of

his work and has made further protests against the unnecessary brutality of subject and treatment in his poem, especially in his depiction of Guido, Browning exclaims, "Why, I almost have you at an unfair disadvantage, in the fact that the whole story is true!"³⁹ And after Julia Wedgwood has replied that she allows him no advantage whatever from "the fact of your material being history," since fate is noted for being a bungler that an artist should improve upon rather than copy,⁴⁰ Browning replies, "I think you are in the wrong about the proper treatment of facts— . . . They want explaining, not altering."⁴¹

Browning's explanations of fact in both the *Essay on Chatterton* and *The Ring and the Book* differ quite widely, of course, from the sort of conclusions other people were likely to reach on the basis of the same evidence. In both works he read high spiritual drama into materials that seem to the uninstructed eye largely composed of baser stuff. There is a good deal to show, however, as we have seen, that Browning believed in both instances that he had indeed explained the truth of his objective data. In *Red Cotton Night-Cap Country* (1873), Browning again undertook to interpret truth from a body of ambiguous evidence, the reports of a French suicide scandal that had taken place on the coast of Normandy a few years earlier. Browning in 1889, the last year of his life, described in a letter to J. T. Nettlehip his view of how he had handled his materials. Browning's friend Joseph Milsand had first given him "the merest sketch of the story," presenting to him the commonly accepted view that Antoine Mellerio (Léonce Miranda in Browning's poem) had "destroyed himself from remorse at having behaved unfilially to his mother."⁴² But Browning, with the sort of confidence in his power to interpret the essential truth beneath the surface of fact that is evident in the *Essay on Chatterton* and in the letters to Julia Wedgwood, perceived another pattern in Mellerio's conduct once he had learned the details of the matter:

In a subsequent visit . . . [Milsand] told me other particulars, and they at once struck me as likely to have been occasioned by religious considerations as well as passionate woman-love,—and I concluded there was no intention of committing suicide; and I said at once that I would myself treat the subject just so.⁴³

Browning set to work to gather further factual data (one remembers DeVane's comment upon the effort Browning had made to transcribe the truth of small details in *The Ring and the Book*) and then proceeded to tell "the exact truth" in his poem:

Afterward [Milsand] procured me the legal documents. I collected the accounts current among the people of the neighborhood, inspected the house and grounds, and convinced myself that I had guessed rightly enough in every respect. Indeed the facts are so exactly put down that, in order to avoid the possibility of prosecution for Libel—that is, telling the exact truth—I changed all the names of persons and places, as they stood in the original 'Proofs,' and gave them as they are to be found in Mrs. Orr's Handbook.⁴⁴

It seems worth noting that Browning is here speaking confidently of his present or former powers to penetrate objective data and get at "the exact truth" of his materials though the letter is inscribed in the last year of his life, long after a date when not only Cundiff (who would have Browning in process of "scuttling knowledge" even in *The Ring and the Book*⁴⁵) but also Henry Jones, the traditional authority upon the poet's philosophical and religious outlook, would assume Browning had entered a period in which he surrendered his belief in man's ability to read anything of much real value from objective data. Jones makes this period later than Cundiff would have it, contrasting *The Ring and the Book*, written "at the high tide of Browning's poetic insight, while he is not as yet concerned with the defence of any theory or the discussion of any abstract question," and the "later poems [presumably *La Saisiaz* (1878) and subsequent poems⁴⁶], where knowledge is dissembling ignorance, faith is blind trust, and love is a mere impulse of the heart."⁴⁷ There is good reason, I think, for placing the shift in Browning's attitude no earlier than 1878, with *La Saisiaz*. In any event, the moral of *Red Cotton Night-Cap Country*—to return to the poem once more—is closely bound up with a belief on Browning's part that one needs to make use of his head in coping with life. Browning's hero, Léonce Miranda, came to a disastrous end, as Browning read the data, because he had acted in line with beliefs he had not tried to reason out but had taken on authority. Miranda's hope in leaping from the pleasure tower of his estate was that angels would save him and a miracle would allow him to keep both his religion and his mistress. What seemed his suicide was really his honest attempt to follow out to the best of his ability the supposed truths he had taken on trust and not tested with his reason:

Miranda hardly did his best with life:
He might have opened eye, exerted brain,
Attained conception as to right and law
In certain points respecting intercourse
Of man with woman
Also, the sense of him should have sufficed

For building up some better theory
 Of how God operates in heaven and earth,
 Than would establish Him participant
 In doings yonder at the Ravissante. (3997-4009)

His failure had been not of the heart but of the brain:
 The heart was wise according to its lights
 And limits; but the head refused more sun,
 And shrank into its mew and craved less space. (4010-12)

All in all, I see no very good reason for concluding that Browning in *The Ring and the Book* was in the process of "scuttling knowledge" or evincing any new or growing belief that one should allow heart rather than head to predominate in attempts to cope with the problems of life. It is undoubtedly true that the Pope of *The Ring and the Book* expresses a profound distrust of human speech; but, as I intend to show more ambitiously in another place before long, the Pope in asserting this distrust of words, in contrast to human action, as reliable testimony for getting at the truth of the case is proceeding to read the facts in full accord with Browning's characteristic system for special-pleading, a system that, I think, does more to color the Pope's Book than has been generally supposed. Browning had avowed the same distrust of speech as opposed to action a quarter of a century earlier in reading the truth of Chatterton. His "whole argument," Browning insisted in the *Essay on Chatterton*, went "not upon what Chatterton said, but what he did: it is part of our proof to show that all his distress arose out of the impossibility of his saying anything to the real purpose."⁴⁸ There is a good deal to show that Browning continued at least well beyond the date of *The Ring and the Book* to hold his belief that a concentration upon line of conduct rather than verbal testimony was the required focus for any one who wished to interpret factual data and arrive at the underlying pattern of human motive.⁴⁹

The motion of this paper has been circular; for the only conclusion I can propose with confidence is that the spacious question of Browning's view of fact in *The Ring and the Book* is likely in its most important and profoundest reaches to continue unanswered, though the serious student of Browning owes his gratitude to Paul Cundiff and, of course, to Robert Langbaum, for their challenging contributions to the rich literature on the subject. They have caused at least one student of Browning to probe carefully for the bases of his own views on the question. My views remain, however, at least in their general contours, those of A. K. Cook and J. E. Shaw: Browning does seem to press his admirable Ring metaphor farther than logic would allow him to go (but with splendid results for his poem);⁵⁰ and Browning does, I believe, intend to assert that "he has not misinterpreted the facts" at the same time that he provides us with a "glorious misinterpretation."⁵¹

University of Illinois

Donald Smalley

Editorial Note: Readers will, of course, recognize that this article is, in large part, a reply to Professor Cundiff's article—"Robert Browning: 'Our Human Speech'"—in the Spring, 1959 issue of *VNL*. Professor Cundiff has promised a rebuttal for the Spring, 1960 issue.

FOOTNOTES

¹"Robert Browning: 'Our Human Speech,'" *VNL*, No. 15 (Spring, 1959), pp. 1-9.

²"How much of the tale was true?"/ I disappeared; the book grew all in all; . . ."

³*A Browning Handbook*, Second Edition (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955), p. 338.

⁴Cundiff, p. 2.

⁵Cundiff, p. 8.

⁶Cundiff, p. 4. Cundiff originally presented this argument in a separate article, "The Clarity of Browning's Ring Metaphor," *PMLA*, LXIII (1948), 1276-82.

⁷Cundiff, p. 8.

⁸Cundiff, p. 6. The word *fact* in brackets appears in the original.

⁹*The Works of Robert Browning* (Centenary Edition), edited with Introductions by F. G. Kenyon (London, 1912), is quoted throughout.

¹⁰Browning is careful to tell us (I,152-7) that since depositions, rather than oral testimony, formed the basis for the Court's judgment, his *Old Yellow Book* contains the "trial itself":

--the trial
 Itself, to all intents, being then as now
 Here in the book and nowise out of it;
 Seeing, there properly was no judgment-bar,
 No bringing of accuser and accused,
 And whoso judged both parties, face to face

See also I. 241-3.

¹¹*Handbook*, p. 338.

- ¹²New York: Random House, 1957. See "The Ring and the Book: A Relativist Poem," pp. 109-36.
- ¹³Langbaum, p. 135.
- ¹⁴Langbaum, p. 132.
- ¹⁵*Ibid.*
- ¹⁶Cundiff, p. 4.
- ¹⁷Cundiff, p. 8. *Fact* in brackets appears thus in the original.
- ¹⁸Cundiff, p. 5.
- ¹⁹Cundiff does, indeed, cite an impressive number of passages in *The Ring and the Book* which seem to stress the idea that fact is helpless without the aid of Fancy as an interpreter.
- ²⁰See Cundiff, p. 6. If, in Cundiff's opinion, "Truth [fact] seems subjected to belittlement wherever it appears in the poem," then I assume that Cundiff interprets Browning's protestations of esteem for his source for his factual data as irony rather than direct statement.
- ²¹See, for example, *Red Cotton Night-Cap Country* (1873), *passim*; *The Inn Album* (1875), lines 1-18; *Of Pacchiarotto, And How He Worked in Distemper* (1876), lines 456-581, where, indeed, the adjective *light* might be questioned.
- ²²W. G. Collingwood, *The Life of John Ruskin* (Boston, 1902), pp. 164-5.
- ²³Cundiff, p. 8.
- ²⁴*Ibid.*
- ²⁵*Browning's "Essay on Chatterton,"* edited with Introductory Chapters and Notes by Donald Smalley, with a Foreword by William C. DeVane (Harvard University Press, 1948), pp. 18 ff. For the history of the *Essay*, which originally appeared anonymously in the July, 1842, issue of *The Foreign Quarterly Review*, see pp. 11.
- ²⁶"The 'Donna Angelicata' in *The Ring and the Book*," *PMLA*, XLI (1926), 55-81.
- ²⁷See *Browning's "Essay on Chatterton,"* pp. 133-4.
- ²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 133. See also pp. 78-101, *passim*.
- ²⁹*Rossetti Papers, 1862 to 1870* (London, 1903), p. 401.
- ³⁰*Browning's "Essay on Chatterton,"* pp. 133-4.
- ³¹Robert Browning and Julia Wedgwood: *A Broken Friendship As Revealed by Their Letters*, ed. Richard Curle (New York, 1937), p. 144.
- ³²*Ibid.*, pp. xi-xii and xvi-xx.
- ³³Langbaum, pp. 132-33.
- ³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 134.
- ³⁵*R. B. and Julia Wedgwood*, p. 163.
- ³⁶"To make ideal" in the sense in which Ruskin employs the adjective in *Modern Painters* (1851): "Any work of art which represents, not a material object, but the mental conception of a material object, is, in the primary sense of the word, ideal."—O.E.D.
- ³⁷*The Christian Register*, January 19, 1888.
- ³⁸*R. B. and Julia Wedgwood*, p. 144. Capitals mine. Miss Wedgwood has based her earlier comments about Pompila in the same letter upon the character as she appears in Book VI.
- ³⁹*Ibid.*, p. 175.
- ⁴⁰*Ibid.*, p. 178.
- ⁴¹*Ibid.*, p. 183.
- ⁴²*Letters of Robert Browning, Collected by Thomas J. Wise*, edited with an Introduction, Notes, and Appendix by Thurman L. Hood (Yale University Press, 1933), p. 309.
- ⁴³*Ibid.*
- ⁴⁴*Ibid.*
- ⁴⁵Cundiff, p. 5.
- ⁴⁶*Browning as a Philosophical and Religious Teacher*, Third Edition (London, 1896), p. 323.
- ⁴⁷*Ibid.*, p. 335.
- ⁴⁸*Browning's "Essay on Chatterton,"* p. 89.
- ⁴⁹See *Ibid.*, pp. 88-91.
- ⁵⁰A. K. Cook, *A Commentary Upon Browning's "The Ring and the Book"* (Oxford University Press, 1920), p. 2.
- ⁵¹Shaw, p. 55.

THE UNPUBLISHED PASSAGES IN THE MANUSCRIPT OF RUSKIN'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY

-i-

Although in recent years a steady flow of new information concerning Ruskin's life has been provided by the publication of letters, diaries, and full-length biographies, many of the passages that Ruskin set aside in the manuscript for his autobiography *Praeterita* and its companion piece *Dilecta* remain unpublished. It has long been known that Ruskin put aside a considerable amount of material intended for them, for in 1908 when Cook and Wedderburn published *Praeterita* and *Dilecta* in the Library Edition of Ruskin's works, Cook announced in his introduction that the editors had selected only some of the interesting passages that Ruskin had omitted.¹ Since in his introduction Cook also reported that Ruskin wrote his autobiography between January 1885 and June 1889 "during the calm between successive brain-storms,"² it is not surprising that the unpublished material has been at times the source of considerable speculation. R. H. Wilenski, for example, in 1933 risked the guess that Ruskin received help from assistants who "doubtless pruned the text a good deal, extracting from it all polemical and unbalanced discursions."³

Fortunately it is no longer necessary to speculate upon the unpublished material, for since 1941 the manuscript for *Praeterita* and *Dilecta* has been available for study in the Yale University Library.⁴ A careful examination of the manuscript shows that an adequate presentation of the unpublished material could best be accomplished by the preparation of a new edition of *Praeterita* and *Dilecta* integrating unpublished passages and significant variant readings with related material in Ruskin's published text. It is feasible, however, to report briefly on the scope and character of most of the material that remains unpublished and to note the standards that Ruskin usually followed in revising his manuscript.

In approaching the unpublished material in the *Praeterita* manuscript, one might expect to find some useful information in Cook's introduction. But Cook had only this to say concerning the use that he and Wedderburn made of the material that Ruskin set aside: "In his re-arrangement of the material, Ruskin omitted many interesting passages, either because they would not conveniently fit in, or because he meant to use them in the intended continuation of *Praeterita* or *Dilecta*. Several of these *additional passages* are printed in the present volume."⁵ The Library Edition itself shows that Cook's information is inaccurate and misleading. Altogether his "several" additional passages fill the equivalent of ninety pages of the text of the autobiography in that edition. Only a few of these additional passages were reserved for use in chapters that Ruskin was never able to write. True, many of them "would not conveniently fit in" when Ruskin divided the material in his rough draft into chapters, but many others could have been fitted into *Praeterita* without great difficulty if Ruskin had been satisfied with them. In particular, one notes that a number of the passages added in the Library Edition lack the concentrated interest of Ruskin's best work, and, further, many of them include an unpleasant element of self-depreciation that goes beyond what Ruskin usually considered satisfactory for his published text.

The "several" passages added by Cook and Wedderburn represent three-fourths of the material that Ruskin set aside. As to the manuscript material that remains unpublished, perhaps half of it was set aside by Ruskin for the reasons that Cook suggests. At the end of the manuscript there are many sheets of rough notes which Ruskin made as a guide for his use in the "intended continuation of *Praeterita* and *Dilecta*," and scattered through the manuscript are a number of passages that would have been difficult to fit in. But at least half of the material that remains unpublished is made up of passages that Ruskin rejected for reasons other than his convenience. Some of these passages were undoubtedly set aside simply because he found them lacking in general interest. Others were revised or rejected because in editing his manuscript, Ruskin tried to eliminate material that might disappoint or annoy his readers either by extravagance of thought or expression, or by the presentation of a needlessly disagreeable or querulous point of view. A still more important group of unpublished passages was rejected or revised because after Ruskin had completed the rough draft of what was to make up most of the first half of his unfinished autobiography, he decided he had often been too candid in what he had said concerning himself and various members of his family in his manuscript. As noted before, Cook and Wedderburn did add a number of passages with an element of self-depreciation; but these passages aside, they consistently avoided adding material from Ruskin's manuscript that was liable to lower the reader's opinion of Ruskin the author or Ruskin the man.

-ii-

Since on several occasions in *Praeterita* Ruskin expressed concern for losing his reader's interest by too much talk of his knowledge of art and his own drawings, it is not surprising that in editing his manuscript he greatly reduced what he had originally said on those subjects. Cook and Wedderburn added most of the unused material, but some of it remains unpublished. In the

following passage, for example, Ruskin described the "grotesque patchwork" of his knowledge of painting in 1837 when he was very much under the influence of his father's taste.⁶

My knowledge of art, though a little more extensive,⁷ was equally baseless and fragmentary. It may be concluded that since my education in figure-drawing began under George Cruikshank, I had little taste for Greek sculpture—of Gothic sculpture, none was to be seen in England—so of course, I thought all architecture consisted in tracery and niches, without the glass in it, or the statues under them. In pictures, my Father cared only for the late bold work, Rubens, Velasquez, Vandyck, Sir Joshua, Rembrandt.⁸ He did not care for Raphael—nor even, unless in bold portraits—for Titian. The early Italian and Flemish masters were merely laughingstocks to us, or at least, the people were so who advised us to look at them⁹

Also, as aforesaid, my Father having an admirable instinct for good art in that kind, and knowing, and knowing that he knew, a good picture at a glance as he knew good sherry at a sip—and I rapidly and unerringly following with him—and no sooner told what was good than fastening on it with honest avidity—and these being them—(as also now, and likely to remain)—extremely rare gifts, whether in merchants or princes my father and I were alike haughty—justly, that is to say, but insolently, proud in them—so that in any picture gallery it was always—"Who but we—" and already I find myself in my diary at 16 giving judgment on art-matters with more easy tranquillity than I should now.

The triumphant cry of the father and son, "Who but we," is echoed later when Ruskin announced that only he and Godfrey Windus, a retired coachmaker living in Tottenham, were fully aware of Turner's powers in the 1830's. A comparison of Ruskin's statement in his manuscript and his statement in *Praeterita* provides a good example of the way in which Ruskin often revised his work to avoid seeming arrogant and egotistical. In his rough draft he had written "Nobody, in all England, at that time,—and Turner was already 60,—cared for Turner, but the retired coachmaker of Tottenham—and I."¹¹ In *Praeterita*, however, Ruskin modified his statement to read as follows: "Nobody, in all England, at that time,—and Turner was already sixty,—cared, in the true sense of the word, for Turner, but the retired coachmaker of Tottenham, and I."¹² And some of the material describing his own work as an artist was condensed or rejected probably not because it was uninteresting but because it was unduly critical of his own capacities and achievements. In *Praeterita*, for example, Ruskin complained more than once of his lack of creative imagination, but he set aside several manuscript passages such as the following which exaggerated his limitations.

I have never seen drawings so dull and stupid made by any child who drew for its own pleasure as those which deface the backs of the prints in my first book-possessions, nor allowing for the quantity of good and graceful literature with which my ears were familiar almost as soon as I could understand its words, any early efforts at composition in which the native fire is so feeble.¹³

-iii-

Ruskin had two very good reasons for trying to make *Praeterita* agreeable and reasonable as well as interesting. First, he knew that in order to keep his mental balance, it was essential that he write chiefly of those things that it gave him "joy to remember." Secondly, he thought that if *Praeterita* were to be popular with his readers—and he was determined to make it so—he would have to avoid extravagant language and the sort of ideas that people would "snap and growl at."¹⁴ As he explained in a letter to his printer, Henry Jowett, "the game has to be played neatly," for "whenever I say anything they don't like, they all immediately declare I must be out of my mind."¹⁵ At times when writing material intended for *Praeterita* Ruskin would not or could not hold fast to his resolutions, but if he had "time or energy to correct in quietness,"¹⁶ passages that failed to meet his standards were rejected or revised. And to the end of the *Praeterita* manuscript the changes are in Ruskin's hand.

Passages that he knew would alienate many of his readers, such as passages sharply critical of the English church, were canceled. For example, the following reference to country clergymen was dropped.

And here I had like to have been tempted into a digression on country clergymen—of which I will set down only the conclusion that they seem to me in England only to exist as the grease to the railroad wheels of society—but that—since society chooses to travel by railroad, it is well for the present that this unction should exist.¹⁷

It is worthy noting that Ruskin was usually successful in resisting the temptation to digress and attack his *bête noire*, railroad enterprise. If he did rush to the attack with excessive

excitement, he usually revised his material later. In a passage denouncing the men who had tunneled Gothard, for example, he eliminated the prediction that they would soon be forgotten as their thoughts and ways "rotted from the face of the earth and its sky—as the lice and locust of Egypt." 18

Extravagant expressions of opinion, such as the following unpublished comment concerning his mature estimate of Shelley's influence upon his youthful thought and poetry, were usually dropped altogether.

This is the first time I have mentioned Shelley, and I interrupt my story to say all I want to, and be done with him. My Father read nothing in poetry but Milton, Pope, Scott and Byron, but I was not allowed Byron for my own, while I was allowed, to my sorrow, a large octavo close printed volume, containing Coleridge—Shelley—and Keats. The latter puzzled me and I let him alone—Coleridge I read as a duty because I had heard he was a philosopher. But with Shelley's descriptions of sea and mountain I had complete sympathy—and after I had once been in Italy, I imagined Pisa and Lucca and La Spezia from him as I did Venice from Byron. In my nascent and vulgarly sensuous taste, liking richness and sweetness, by eyes and lips alike,—as Dr. Andrews' velvet cushion—and Christmas plum cake, Shelley was to me like a grocer's shop full of barley sugar—and I fed upon him like a fly, till I was sick and sticky. He clogged all my faculties and infected all my imagination—he is to me now comparable in memory only to a dream I had—prolonged through the whole of a weary and miserable day in first recovering after my Matlock illness (inflammation of bowels)—a dream of putrid appleblossoms with a smell which was to that of real appleblossom as that of rotten cabbage to fresh lettuce. Worse than this, I began in my own verses to imitate his affected diction, and to make myself miserable over the plots of the *Cenci* and *Prometheus*; mixed up with deadly arsenic out of the juvenil [sic] blasphemies of *Queen Mab*. Voltaire by himself, in his Satanic strength—and Satanic ugliness, will do no one any harm but Voltaire powdered and mixed with red currant jelly and jalap—and swallowed in table spoonfuls! needed something of a constitution to stand against. *Revenons à nos moutons*.¹⁹

Probably Ruskin was in an excited state when he wrote this passage, for his diary entry immediately preceding it ends thus: "Hawk's feather sets me thinking of Mrs. Blackburn's d'd impudence, and I lose ten minutes and a lot of temper in ideally smashing her."²⁰ In *Praeterita* a much more reasonable comment replaced the canceled passage.²¹

Perhaps the best example in the manuscript material of Ruskin's revision of a passage that was needlessly harsh and disagreeable is found in his account of his friend, the Reverend H. G. Liddell, Dean of Christ Church.²² The following passage, which is a part of the second draft of Ruskin's portrait of Liddell, closely follows a slightly more critical rough draft, which Ruskin's diary shows was written on April 4, 1885, when he was "angered fiercely" by Liddell's support of the introduction of vivisection for medical research at Oxford.²³ When Ruskin revised his manuscript much later, all of this passage was set aside.²⁴ One can observe the extraordinary editorial procedure Cook and Wedderburn followed in their treatment of this passage by noting that they published as an addition to Ruskin's text only the material that has been enclosed here in double parentheses.

In his undergraduate days he had laid the foundation of his dictionary, and afterwards had slowly contracted all the faculties of his nature into the focus of his scrutiny of Greek. He had no imagination to disturb the patience of his philology,—but had taste, memory and judgment enough to make his philology faultless. He knew, and felt, just so much of the external world as enabled him to discriminate the sense of words properly,—but not enough to enable, or induce, him to pursue any object in the world itself with fruitful success, unless, it may be, forms of selfish happiness, and the poor ambition, or lowly duty, of dictionary making. So far as he perceived the right in any of his public functions, he has assuredly always done it, unflinchingly;²⁵ but the *δυναμίς* of his fate placed him in a position in which there was little to flinch from, and much to fail in. ((Gifted with true taste for art in his youth, he did not love it enough to learn its elements—the unpractised faculties got first stunted, then vulgarized, and his powers in that kind finally expired in making monotonous sketches on his blotting paper at dull debates in Convocation)) and falling helplessly into the hands of any builder who saw his way to a profit in defacing the college and desecrating its cathedral. ((He was himself built into its wall when he was made its Dean. His honesty, balanced intellectual power, and lofty breeding and taste would have been of invaluable alloy in the baser metal of the British Parliament, and he would have made a magnificently picturesque and usefully practical Bishop—nay, conceivably, could his dictionary have been given up, a great historian or sound investigatory scholar.)) At Oxford, he had patiently corrected the proofs of the successively developed editions of a dictionary which in ten years more, it

seems nobody will want, done an enormous quantity of University business, which might just as well have been done by the clerk of the Waterworks, and become in the University atmosphere a force of enduring frost of the sort which, I was going to have said, rather disintegrates rock than snow-crests it; but it will be a nearer image of the present dignity of the University if I say, rather bursts the pipes in the larder than saves the meat in it. ((I have but further to say of Liddell at that time [1837-1840] that he was always right and serviceable in what notice he took of me, though he took little, and his haughty and reserved, or more accurately, annoyed and careless, manner hindered me from asking for more. So that as the presence of Hussey made the Carolinean symmetry of Peckwater terrific to me, that of Liddell made more rigid to me the Perpendicular of Tom.))²⁶

In *Praeterita*, where Ruskin spoke of Liddell as "one of the rarest types of nobly-presented Englishmen," he expressed his disappointment in Liddell's career by saying that "it was his adverse star that made him an Englishman at all—the prosaic and practical element in him having prevailed over the sensitive one."²⁷ Although Ruskin's harsh criticism of Liddell in his manuscript was provoked by anger, one would probably be wrong if he assumed that his anger seriously distorted his feelings—more likely it released them.²⁸ On several occasions Ruskin followed the same procedure that is illustrated by his treatment of the Liddell material, revising needlessly harsh or unkind appraisals of characters in his autobiography even though what he had written in his manuscript was no doubt as close to his true feelings, as what he published. Even toward the end of his work on the autobiography, when he was finding it almost impossible to maintain his standards, Ruskin took the pains to modify an unkind reference to Frederick Denison Maurice, and he eliminated an unkind reference to the wife of a friend and former neighbor, Richard Whiteman Fall.²⁹

At the very end of his work for his autobiography, however, Ruskin sent three bitter letters to his friend Charles Eliot Norton that indicate he had reached a new stage in his struggle to control his material.³⁰ Ruskin was so exhausted at the time he sent these letters that he had to call upon his cousin, Joan Severn, to write for him. The first letter, dated June 11, 1889, begins thus: I use Joanie's hand to-day, for mine would begin to shake badly as I went on to say—what I've got to say; that it is my ill luck, hapless fate—or perhaps, appointed duty, to give Professor Charles Eliot Norton, editor of *Carlyle's Early Letters*, as thorough a literary dressing, pickling, and conserving, as ever one living scribe got from another,—if only my rod-hand does not fail me before I can get the lash laid on, and my capsicum pickle does not run short before I get it rubbed in.

A passage from the second letter, dated June 13, 1889, will serve to illustrate the violence of Ruskin's attack upon his friend's work:

As you re-read it in print, does the page of your own writing, in which at the close of your second volume of letters you summarize your opinion of Carlyle's married life, strike you, *now*, either as a graceful specimen of English writing, or worthy of your own generally elegant and acute literary manner? I ask you this very earnestly, because, though I always knew that manner to be merely epistolary, therefore more or less feminine, and not implying any capacity of writing a good book, I yet never thought it possible that in any state of temporary obfuscation, fog in the head, or cramp in the stomach, my Charles Eliot Norton could ever have written anything so flat, stale, and unprofitable.

Far more significant than the bitterness of his attack upon Norton, who had angered him by his work in editing Carlyle's early correspondence and by his unfavorable criticism of Froude's work on Carlyle, was Ruskin's loss of the power "to correct in quietness." After dictating the letters, Ruskin promptly ordered them set in type for use in a projected chapter of *Dilecta* to be devoted to correspondence concerning Carlyle.³¹ Even when the galley proofs reached him, he was incapable of realizing how utterly unsatisfactory these letters were for use in a work intended to be as pleasant and agreeable as possible. The proofs were revised carefully and accurately; but soon after this task was completed, Ruskin's mind failed completely. After the illness of 1889 had passed, there was no true recovery, and Ruskin's work for his autobiography was at an end.

-iv-

No doubt the most significant unpublished passages are those in which Ruskin spoke more frankly of himself and various members of his family in his manuscript than in his published work. Almost all of them were written during the first half of 1885 when Ruskin was writing daily passages for *Praeterita* immediately after his diary entries. There is rarely evidence in the diary entries to suggest that Ruskin's personal life influenced the point of view expressed in these unpublished passages, for most of them were written on days when his diary indicates that he was able to work reasonably and skillfully. In brief, there is no reason to think that what Ruskin said in them was not what he normally believed to be true. Apparently in revising these candid passages

he was often doing what he had done elsewhere in his manuscript to eliminate or modify material that seemed to be needlessly unpleasant or overly critical.

In reading over the unpublished passages in which Ruskin showed his disapproval of many things in his parents' way of life, one is often reminded of his complaint that the "main blessings" of his childhood were counterbalanced by "equally dominant calamities"; for several of the passages help to illustrate what he meant by saying that as a boy he had "nothing to love," "nothing to endure," "no precision of etiquette or manners," and no opportunity to exercise his own "judgment of right and wrong" or develop his "powers of independent action."³² In particular, one sees that he felt his own personality had been dangerously stunted and warped by the narrowness, the snobbery, and the morbid pride in his own home and that he believed much of his egotism and his false sense of self-sufficiency had been fostered by the artificial patterns that were imposed upon his boyhood life.

In an unpublished passage showing the influence of his parents upon his relationship with his cousins at Croydon and Perth during the first decade of his life,³³ Ruskin wrote as follows:

I have in two or three cases anticipated the course of years in giving account of my cousins' fates—the reader will observe that during the time of childhood which I have been describing in myself—I had eleven of my cousins living—Mary, and all the four boys of Perth; Margaret, Bridget and all the four boys of Croydon. Without blaming myself less for the faults of my opening life, it is yet to be noted, for the true understanding of it by others, that I was sorely disadvantaged in that of all these young relations, none could be any help to me. The boys were not allowed to be my companions, and were rarely spoken of by my parents without more or less of intimation that they belonged to an inferior grade of life or had faults and obstinacies from which my own amiablest of dispositions had hitherto been entirely free; while of the three girls, not one had any qualities which could secure my affection—even of the poorest cousinly kind,—check my vanity by any strain of competition—or modify by either example or advice, the tone of my daily more selfish character.³⁴

When one of the cousins, Mary Richardson of Perth, came to live with the Ruskins at Herne Hill shortly after she was left an orphan in 1828, Ruskin was aware of a "subtle element of evil" in the home. In his rough draft he described Mary's relationship with his parents and himself as follows:

I have above recorded the domestic changes which—when I was about ten years old, first took away the cheerfulness—then the simplicity of this ideal child life. Mary's entrance into its selfish narrowness which might have infused a healthy leaven into it, had she been of a less gentle nature, a brighter intelligence, brought instead an extremely subtle element of evil, in the difference of feeling with which my parents regarded but too evidently the duties they owed to her and me. They would have been infinitely wiser in placing her at a good school; the girl would have been less indulged indeed, but less mortified; as it was, her life passed between moments of checked affection and repressed indignation in [that] she was really fond of my mother—and my mother of her, yet continually felt herself injured in receiving grudging gift[s] and neglected, though the object of reluctant care. My parents thought they were doing their duty by her in taking her always with us on our Continental journeys. But Mary had small curiosity and no enthusiasm; and would have been really happier in the natural and unvexed life she might have led in a Scottish village, than in being taken to see palaces and cathedrals—while, on cold or wet days in travelling she had always the outside seat. Her companionship with me, though never felt by me as an annoyance, was entirely spiritless and colourless—we neither teased—helped—or much pleased, each other. On the whole, I liked better to have Mary with me in a walk than not, yet our talk was commonplace and I should have seen more, and thought to better purpose, had I been out with my nurse.³⁵

When Ruskin first spoke of Mary's arrival in the household in *Praeterita*, he wrote that "she became a serene additional neutral tint in the household harmony."³⁶ Later he summed up as much of his unpublished passage as he wished to use thus:

Mary, though of a mildly cheerful and entirely amiable disposition, necessarily touched the household heart with the sadness of her orphanage, and something interrupted its harmony by the difference, which my mother could not help showing, between the feeling with which she regarded her niece and her child.³⁷

The following unpublished passage shows the attitude of Ruskin's father toward Mary's brother, William Richardson, when William was struggling to establish himself in London as a medical practitioner.

It is extremely curious to me in looking back on this part of my life [Ruskin was 17], that simpleton as I was in love, and all other matters dependent on imagination, I yet

already had a keen perception of what was just and kind in the dealing and conduct of men to each other in the practical work of life. I saw my cousin in extreme poverty, dining on bread and cheese—or perhaps the bread without the cheese, after having successfully and even triumphantly passed a difficult examination, which meant his having learned thoroughly the main elements of the noblest of the professions. Night and day, he was at the call of the poorest—and in the service of the diseased and the wretched—he was yet despised, even by the lowest of these, because he kept a shop;—he was without father, mother, or helpful friend, in the great city—his sister—travelling with us in Italy—all the pleasures of polite society impossible to him, because he kept a shop;—all the hopes of domestic happiness—ten years off—admitting successful and constant toil in the meantime,—and the certainty that, if, under all these conditions—there came a fortnight when nobody wanted physic—and the taxes called and had to be asked to call again and the two ends of the fortnight wouldn't by any stretching meet, and he had to go to his uncle to ask for five pounds, his uncle would look sulky, and say "he ought to be ashamed of himself." All this I already clearly saw and felt—in a just, though languid way,—attributing it all however—partly to the will of Heaven, partly to the nature of things—it never yet had entered into my head that my Father or mother could be wrong.³⁸

In *Praeterita* Ruskin wrote much more cheerfully of William's struggle to establish himself, and he made no comment upon the fact that at seventeen his views and his father's were very different concerning "what was just and kind in the dealings and conduct of men to each other in the practical work of life." In *Praeterita* the emphasis was upon the fact that his father established William in a small shop in the Bayswater Road and, during a difficult year or two, provided "supplemental pork and apple-sauce from Denmark Hill."³⁹

Although in his manuscript Ruskin wrote a number of passages that show that he, like his parents, was often cold and unsympathetic toward the relatives at Perth and Croydon, he chose not to use these passages in *Praeterita*. In his rough draft, for example, he canceled some rather callous remarks concerning two of his Croydon cousins, Bridget and Margaret Richardson. In the manuscript account of Bridget he struck out these lines:

In her grown up girlhood she was always something of a thorn in my mother's side,—more might have been done for her if we had cared more—perhaps. At last—she married a Mr. Fox, of whom I knew little and remember nothing,—except that we were none of us,—not even Bridget herself, very happy about it. He was something a little above a tradesman, always an uncomfortable rank of life. They went out to Australia, (Sydney, where Bridget's elder brother was prospering—) and in a few years, she died, I believe in, or after childbirth.⁴⁰

And in the manuscript account of Margaret, which is quoted below, he made several changes.

. . . but Margaret in early youth met with some mischance which brought on a crook of the spine hopelessly deformative of her. She was clever—witty and in the face still, though of course by illness more or less blighted and wasted—pretty, and even, good-humoured—her natural disposition kind like her mother's. She married fairly well—but died young: not in any pious pathos or graceful suffering—but in a commonplace, sometimes fretful and troublesome way. She was never of any interest to me—though I gave some affection to all my Croydon relations. But I never cared about invalids,—and she used to wear ringlets, which I hated.⁴¹

When Ruskin first revised this material, he improved the style, softened the coldness of his attitude, and changed "I gave some affection to all my Croydon relations" to "I gave a kind of brotherly, rather than a cousinly, affection to all my Croydon cousins."⁴² Evidently he felt that the total effect of the passage remained unsatisfactory; for when he revised the galley proofs, he canceled the part reading, "She married fairly well, but died young, not in any graceful suffering or pious rapture, but in a fretful, wistful, troublesome way."⁴³

In writing of the troubled years of his youth, as in writing of earlier years, Ruskin presented a less favorable view of himself and his parents in his manuscript than in his published work. Although a number of the unpublished passages are playful in tone, they provide additional evidence to show that he felt his parents were much at fault for some of the frustrations and miseries of his undergraduate years. In his manuscript in writing of his parents' decision that he should matriculate at Oxford in 1836, for example, Ruskin said:

Seeing Chamouni, the Bernese Alps, the Tyrol and Venice all in one year [1835] was extremely pleasant, but not the best preparation for matriculation at Oxford. I got more and more conceited every day, more and more shallowly sentimental; my head was full of embryonic geology and architecture and I forgot nearly all the Latin grammar I ever knew, and as I never had known any Greek to speak of, I was not in a forward

state of preparation for University honours, on my 17th Birthday. But my father and mother were both now persuaded I was a genius who would carry all before me—I suppose they were eager for the beginning of the fray,—how they else thought of matriculating me in that year is inconceivable to me—perhaps by reading of the precocity of 15th and 16th century students.⁴⁴

In *Praeterita*, as in his manuscript, Ruskin complained that when he fell deeply in love with Adele Domecq, the beautiful daughter of his father's partner, he was comically inept in any social situation and was "without a single sisterly or cousinly affection for refuge or lightning rod."⁴⁵ But in *Praeterita* Ruskin did not include a number of passages in his manuscript that suggest how much importance he attached to his belief that his parents' narrow and selfish way of life had warped his relationships even with members of his own family and had left him poorly prepared either to play a lover's part or to endure the miseries of disappointment in first love.

Although Ruskin was very critical of his parents' example and guidance during his childhood and youth, by no means did he mean to suggest that they alone were responsible for the mistakes and follies of his life, for he found much to blame in his own character. There are a considerable number of unpublished passages of self-disparagement scattered through the manuscript in which Ruskin complained—often at the beginning of a new decade or new epoch in his life—of his failure to make better use of his opportunities or of his failure to assume more responsibility for the direction of his own affairs. In *Praeterita* he apologized to his readers for spending too much time on vain regrets, but there he used only part of the material he had written that showed excessive self-depreciation, self-pity, or undue morbidity. For example, he eliminated a number of gloomy passages very much like the unpublished passage that follows:

Enough, for the present, I think about this embryo state of things—though I shall have to return in several particulars to it—as I describe what followed. The transitional period from infancy to youth—for I never knew a boyhood; saddened as above told by the deaths of my aunts, may be considered to extend from ten to sixteen. Our start on the Continental journey of 1835 properly began my youth and made me at least capable of doing something for myself—though I never did it.⁴⁶

In reporting in his manuscript his selfish and morbid conduct during his undergraduate years when he was vexed by his studies and tormented by his hopeless love for Adele Domecq, Ruskin often wrote passages that he later put aside. For example, the following passage, which forms a part of his account of his return to Oxford in 1839, was eliminated.

But with all these judgments of other people, I never judged myself—and was every day less and less what at my age I should have been;—less cheerful—less resolute—less diligent—less dextrous even in the few things I could do—and gradually becoming every way an extremely bad example of the results of home-education.⁴⁷

This passage, and other passages of self-depreciation inspired by memories of his conduct following the loss of Adele in 1840, were left unpublished probably because Ruskin thought that they would "only discomfort and partly mislead the reader" by representing "the exactly worst part" of his character and conduct.⁴⁸ Perhaps the especial value of these unpublished passages is that they help the reader to strike a balance between Ruskin's tendency either to exaggerate or minimize the mistakes and miseries of his college years. In *Praeterita* Ruskin gently mocked the expressions of "general disdain of life" that he had written "in the foolish diaries" begun soon after Adele's marriage; in his rough draft, on the other hand, he wrote that the expressions in his diaries, "in spite of all their absurdity and wickedness," were "verily genuine."⁴⁹

In completing a review of the unpublished passages in which Ruskin criticized his faults and failures with more frankness or more severity than he thought suitable for his autobiography, perhaps one should note that toward the end of *Praeterita* he set aside the following passage intended for the opening paragraph of "Otterburn," the last chapter of the second volume.

Nobody—unless—as aforesaid it was a dog, or a kitten, or a pretty girl of say from ten to fifteen, had the least change of being missed by me when they went away.⁵⁰

This statement—half playful, half serious—originally completed a passage in which Ruskin blamed himself for his "want of affection to other people" and expressed his "wonder that ever anybody had any affection" for him.⁵¹ But Ruskin's purpose in "Otterburn" was to demonstrate his capacity, not his incapacity, for friendship and love. The unpublished passage conflicted with his mood and purpose, and it was put aside. It seems reasonably clear that in writing of his relationships with his friends, and in writing of his relationships with various members of his family, Ruskin was very much concerned not to exaggerate the lack of feeling that he recognized and condemned.

-v-

As suggested at the outset, a comprehensive presentation of the unpublished passages and significant variant readings could best be accomplished by preparing a new edition of the

autobiography presenting them alongside related material in the published text. As a number of the unpublished passages cited in this article have shown, often the unpublished material does not reveal its true significance until it is linked with what Ruskin said in *Praeterita*. It is regrettable that the editors of the Library Edition, having decided to make extensive use of Ruskin's manuscript material, proceeded without warning to make their selections from that material in a most arbitrary way. It is regrettable, too, that they worked with such speed that many unnecessary errors and an almost complete lack of interest in significant variant readings marred the quality of their work. It is only fair to Ruskin as an author to say that his autobiography deserves careful editing on the basis of its literary merits alone. And it is only fair to those who seek to evaluate the significance of the autobiographical information in *Praeterita* to give them all the information that Ruskin's manuscript provides.

University of Maryland

Samuel E. Brown

FOOTNOTES

- ¹The *Works of John Ruskin*, ed. E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn, Library Edition, 39 vols. (London, 1903-12), XXXV, lvii. References to *Works* hereafter will be to this edition.
- ²*Works*, XXXV, xxxiv.
- ³R. H. Wilenski, *John Ruskin, An Introduction to Further Study of His Life and Work* (London, 1933), p. 176.
- ⁴C. B. Hogan has shown that the material at Yale includes almost all the material used by Cook and Wedderburn. (See Hogan, "The Yale Collection of the Manuscripts of John Ruskin," *The Yale University Library Gazette*, XVI [April, 1942], 61-69 and *Works*, XXXV, lvii.) The material at Yale includes three octavo volumes of autograph manuscript (590 leaves), which provide the rough draft for most of the first half of *Praeterita* and three folio volumes (757 leaves), which include a large amount of final copy in Ruskin's hand, some material copied by assistants from Ruskin's manuscripts or various books, and a large number of corrected proof sheets. For reference purposes in this article the three octavo volumes, which include Ruskin's diary for January 1 through July 14, 1885, will be cited as MS. Diary I, II, or III. The three folio volumes, which are foliated as one unit, will be cited simply as MS. Folio. In the octavo volumes the short passages that Ruskin wrote from day to day for his autobiography appear immediately after his diary entries. Since the manuscript material for *Dilecta*, which is found in the third folio volume, is relatively unimportant, the manuscript material at Yale for both *Praeterita* and *Dilecta* will be referred to as the *Praeterita* manuscript.
- ⁵*Works*, XXXV, lvii. Cook used the term *additional passages* to include miscellaneous notes concerning Ruskin's plans for the chapters of *Praeterita* and *Dilecta* that he was unable to write.
- ⁶Transcriptions from the manuscript give careful consideration to Ruskin's punctuation and capitalization, but dots and dashes have often been replaced by normal punctuation and missing apostrophes have been supplied. Italics or quotation marks have been added as needed to indicate titles.
- ⁷Ruskin had previously referred to his complete ignorance of history.
- ⁸Cf. *Works*, XXVII, 170 and XXVIII, 390.
- ⁹In the omitted section of this passage Ruskin discussed what he had learned about Gothic architecture between 1835 and 1845. That material was revised for use in *Praeterita*. See *Works*, XXXV, 348-349.
- ¹⁰MS. Diary II, 76-78.
- ¹¹MS. Diary III, 14.
- ¹²*Works*, XXXV, 253.
- ¹³MS. Folio, 17.
- ¹⁴*Works*, XXVII, 507-508.
- ¹⁵*Works*, XXXV, xxxix.
- ¹⁶*Works*, XXXV, xxxix.
- ¹⁷MS. Diary III, 155.
- ¹⁸MS. Diary II, 136.
- ¹⁹MS. Diary I, 159-161.
- ²⁰MS. Diary I, 158. Possibly Ruskin refers to Mrs. H. B. Blackburn, whose *Birds Drawn from Nature* was published in Edinburgh in 1862.
- ²¹*Works*, XXXV, 183.
- ²²Dean Liddell (1811-1898), a tutor at Christ Church when Ruskin entered the college, took a keen interest in Ruskin's early drawings. As Vice-Chancellor of Oxford (1870-1874) he played an important part in Ruskin's appointment as Slade Professor of Fine Art. He served as Dean of Christ Church from 1855 to 1891.
- ²³See Ruskin's diary entry for April 5, 1885, MS. Diary II, 109.
- ²⁴For Ruskin's account of Dean Liddell in *Praeterita*, see *Works*, XXXV, 203-204.
- ²⁵In his rough draft Ruskin had written "So far as he perceived—or conceived his duty, I suppose he has always done it, unflinchingly." (MS. Diary II, 103).
- ²⁶MS. Folio, 317-318.
- ²⁷*Works*, XXXV, 204.
- ²⁸In a brief unpublished passage written a month later when in good spirits Ruskin wrote concerning his former tutor and friend, the Reverend Osborne Gordon, "It had been well for Ch. Ch. and for Oxford" had Gordon become Dean rather than Liddell (MS. Diary III, 8-9).
- ²⁹See *Works*, XXXV, 441, 486 and MS. Folio 529, 584.

- ³⁰Corrected galley proofs of the three letters are found in MS. Folio 701-704. C. E. Norton (1827-1908), editor, author, and for many years at Harvard professor of the history of art (1874-1898), won the friendship of many of the great literary figures of his time. In 1905 he published in two volumes most of Ruskin's letters to him. Ruskin expressed his gratitude for Norton's friendship in the closing chapters of his autobiography.
- ³¹*Works*, XXXVII, 612.
- ³²*Works*, XXXV, 43-46. It should be noted that this material was first published ten years earlier in *Fors Clavigera*. (See *Works*, XXVIII, 348-352.) Helen Gill Viljoen in *Ruskin's Scottish Heritage* (Urbana, 1956) has used a number of the manuscript passages left unpublished by Cook and Wedderburn to provide new information concerning Ruskin's father and mother.
- ³³As a boy, Ruskin spent many happy days in the home of his father's sister, Janet Richardson (known as Aunt Jessie in *Proaetrita*), in Perth, and he frequently visited in the home of his mother's sister, Bridget Richardson, in Croydon.
- ³⁴MS. Diary I, 61-62. According to A. W. Wedderburn's note in MS. Folio 289, this passage was set up in type before Ruskin decided to cancel it.
- ³⁵MS. Diary I, 93-94.
- ³⁶*Works*, XXXV, 71.
- ³⁷*Works*, XXXV, 131.
- ³⁸MS. Diary II, 2-5.
- ³⁹*Works*, XXXV, 411-412.
- ⁴⁰MS. Diary I, 36. Part of this passage has been published in H. G. Viljoen's *Ruskin's Scottish Heritage*, p. 89.
- ⁴¹MS. Diary I, 34-35.
- ⁴²MS. Folio, 278. Later in revising his manuscript report of his relatives at Perth, Ruskin removed several unpleasant comments, and in introducing his account of his cousins there, he declared "if my heart was cold to them, my mind was often sad for them." (See MS. Diary I, 55-60 and *Works*, XXXV, 409-412).
- ⁴³MS. Folio, 41.
- ⁴⁴MS. Diary I, 154-155.
- ⁴⁵*Works*, XXXV, 179.
- ⁴⁶MS. Diary I, 119.
- ⁴⁷MS. Diary III, 35-36.
- ⁴⁸*Works*, XXXV, 258.
- ⁴⁹*Works*, XXXV, 258 and MS. Diary III, 51.
- ⁵⁰MS. Folio 543.
- ⁵¹*Works*, XXXV, 457.

THE IMAGERY OF GERARD MANLEY HOPKINS: FIRE, LIGHT, AND THE INCARNATION

i

With its nervous rhythm, its persistent but irregular echoing, its elliptical grammar and dazzling rhetoric of series and apposition, the poetry of Gerard Manley Hopkins does not always lend itself to neat analysis. His imagery, in particular, is often too idiosyncratic to form distinct patterns: such a phrase as "he rung upon the rein of a wimpling wing" refuses to be put into any category, just as it defies paraphrase.¹ Nevertheless, much of the stuff of Hopkins' imagery is common, even conventional; whether drawn from precise observation of the natural world or from traditional funds of symbolism, it is substantially like that of his Victorian contemporaries and predecessors. In fact, although Hopkins makes some comparisons that we would not expect to find in Browning or Tennyson or Swinburne, the crucial figures in his poetry, those which are sustained and repeated, evoke the most familiar poetic objects: they are polar images of sound and silence, land and sea, height (rising) and depth (falling), fire and water, light and darkness. Whether introduced as symbolic settings or in metaphors, these are not the momentary bits of "local excitement" which, as Austin Warren complains, force a "discrepancy between texture and structure,"² but central and structural images set in patterns that analysis can clarify.

The clusters of images which associate light and fire with life, and darkness with death, make up the most striking and the most frequently iterated pattern in Hopkins; and we can find in the treatments of these images both a profound ambivalence and the terms for its resolution. Like the Tennyson of *In Memoriam*, Hopkins alternates between glory and gloom. Like the Arnold of "Mycerinus," he feels the sun's harshness and he is concerned with the contrast between the light of beauty and the heat of power—for Hopkins, the contrast between natural lights and divine fire. The relationship between the goodness of physical things and the perfection of their Creator is of the greatest importance to a poet who loves each leaf and limb that delights the senses but who knows that all this world is fallen. For, unlike Christina Rossetti (in her *Goblin Market*), Hopkins will not condemn and renounce that earthly beauty which his every concrete image glorifies. In "Binsey

Poplars," in "The May Magnificat," and in "The Lantern Out of Doors," he distinctly rejects the rejections of a Manichean asceticism. He answers the question of his title, "To What Serves Mortal Beauty?" by asserting that the beauty of earthly forms is a memory and reflection of God's own beauty. And in "Spring" he begs Christ to save and keep pure each lovely natural thing. The light of day is always precious to him, literally as well as symbolically. But, as a religious poet, intensely as he loves the sunlight, moonlight, starlight, even lamplight, he must distinguish among lights literal and symbolic, natural and divine; and he must recognize both the creative and the destructive power in fire, the source of light.³

Very often Hopkins uses images of flashing and flame to reveal a creature's peculiar vitality, or unique selfhood: "Self flashes off frame and face," he declares, and "keeps warm/Men's wits to the things that are; what good means."⁴ Although Hopkins the Christian knows that human beauty is "dangerous" and that the proper correspondence of physical to moral beauty is not always realized in experience, Hopkins the Christian poet, extremely and even painfully susceptible to natural loveliness, follows a symbolic method in imagining that proper correspondence: in "The Handsome Heart," for instance, and frequently elsewhere, he applies aesthetic terms to spiritual phenomena. A man's brilliance, then, his "individually-distinctive beauty," is both beauty of person and personal integrity. In "The Lantern Out of Doors," another poem on the good of mortal forms, light is equated with "beauty bright." And Henry Purcell's "proud fire," too, embodied in music, is his peculiar inward selfhood, his beauty.

Another example of the inner fire is provided by the poem that most explicitly treats of "inescape," "As Kingfishers Catch Fire, Dragonflies Draw Flame," in which creatures and objects express their "indoors" selves. But this poem has to do with more than the unique beauty of all creatures. It uses moral as well as aesthetic terms, asserting that the inescape, or special individuating nature, of "the just man" takes on immortal beauty, catches a divine fire when it is perfectly itself.

Again, according to "The Candle Indoors," whoever mends his "fading fire," his own "first and vital candle in close heart's vault," best glorifies God. Just as the "lantern out of doors" is man's external beauty, so the candle is his inward grace: "its being puts blissful back/With mellow moisture mild night's bleak-all black." This poem would seem to be hardly more than a positive rephrasing of the mote and beam parable, with a pun on the biblical word—"Are you beam-blind, yet to a fault/In a neighbor deft-handed?"—if the image of inner fire did not carry a mixed quality. The literal candle of the first stanza is developed in the second into a symbolic fire which combines associations of heat and "desire" (the rhyme word) with those of light and of life ("vital candle"). About this combination we might feel a little uneasy, just as we might about the line, "You there are master, do your own desire." Paradoxical as it seems that a Jesuit poet should ever be too little concerned with sin, and in spite of the mood which produces terrible poems of despair and blight, there are moments in Hopkins when the natural fire burns so brightly as to appear identical with (not only symbolic of) divine grace—so brightly as to make us forget the possible fall of desire into lust and of self into selfishness. His sense of active sin is never so specifically located as his sense of the vitality of things and of its loss; or as his sense of immortal beauty and of despair in its absence.

But if it does derive from suffering, from absence of felicity rather than a knowledge of profound ugliness and particular evils, the darkness in Hopkins is nevertheless real and deep. As fire and light are vital images, darkness is negation, death; his use of night, with a suggestion of the "dark night of the soul," is not surprising:

That night, that year
Of now done darkness I wretch lay wrestling with (My God!)
My God.

This is the ending of "Carrion Comfort," one of the later poems of darkness, all of which use night to suggest spiritual isolation, the absence of grace divine or natural. (Even daylight is obscured in "I wake and feel the fell of dark, not day.") In "Spelt from Sibyl's Leaves," with its imagery of evening sinking into darkness ("Womb-of-all, home-of-all, hearse-of-all night"), the life of the world is divided into two parts or folds, into black and white, night and day, death and life. The mood is somehow indistinctly fearful, as the sibyl of the title would imply, but the ambiguity of the poem tends only to make its imagery and tone seem all the more ominous: earth's "dapple is at an end," "our night whelms, whelms"; and the duality of light and dark is the distinct and terrible duality, although the strands are everywhere mixed, of spiritual life and spiritual death.

Even if Hopkins seems to make too little of evil fires, of lust and violence, finding good in man's and nature's innermost mortal selves, he is no more a sentimentalizer than he is a facile optimist. He never forgets the infinite distance between creatures and the Creator whose brilliance can awe, baffle and destroy. Because God the Father-Judge is the fiery Source of light so strong as to sear and blind, the divine fire must be transmitted through the Christ if it is to

illuminate, and if it is to strike fire from men. The Virgin Mary serves as both conductor and insulator of this fire, according to a traditional iconographic conception, in "The Blessed Virgin Compared to the Air We Breathe." She carries but does not stain the light (by bearing Christ but without stain, immaculately), and, as mediator between God and man, she brings a divine light visible and not blinding, warm and not blasting.

Did air not make
This bath of blue and slake
His fire, the sun would shake,
A blear and blinding ball
With blackness bound...

"So God was god of old," before the fulfillment of the law: the sun of divine power and justice was strong to be seen, too distant to be humane. It is through Mary, by the Incarnation, that men have come to see the light.

Through her we may see him
Made sweeter, not made dim,
And her hand leaves his light
Sifted to suit our sight.

And so, in "The Windhover," Christ is "daylight's dauphin," from him bursts fire; but this is the fire of God's Self in man's form, and of God not only thus reduced but even broken, buckled.⁵ Only the buckling, the crucifixion, the willing submission to mortal nature of its Master (represented by the bird) can reveal the inner fire and, revealing God's Self to man, show man that sacrifice, for mortal creatures, is the revelation of self, of light:

Sheer plod makes plough down sillion
Shine, and blue-bleak embers, ah my dear,
Fall, gall themselves, and gash gold-vermilion.

These, too, are images of breaking and of flashing.

In poems such as these Hopkins gives certain meanings to his images of light and fire, and these meanings carry over as symbolic associations in poems the settings and metaphorical language of which are more complex. There is the natural fire which is life in a physical sense, the vitality of all things and animals, including men; and above this mundane vitality there is the supernatural fire which represents God's awful power to discipline and destroy. Particular fires or lights, within nature, are the unique and graceful forms of things or men, whereas supernatural light represents God's grace, especially the grace made manifest in Christ, Who transmits the divine fire, as light, to men.

According to several of Hopkins' poems, men can draw flame, can flash forth the very beauty of Christ, simply by being themselves—in Adamic purity, as it were. But "The Windhover" suggests that the divine fire is struck in men by self-sacrifice. Does man, then, have two lights, the natural and the supernatural, or are they ultimately one? Hopkins can emphasize natural vitality so much as to make it seem almost perfectly divine—as in "God's Grandeur"—and he can emphasize the disciplining of nature, the buckling of men, so as to make that way seem the only means of illumination, as he does in "The Wreck of the Deutschland." To be sure, "God's Grandeur" is not simply Wordsworthian: the "freshness deep down things" that will "flame out, like shining from shook foil," is kept alive by the Holy Ghost brooding over the world with "warm breast" and "bright wings." And the poet of the "Deutschland" can, in passing, kiss his hand to the starlight, to the "dappled-with-damson west"; he implies that "stars and storms," our joy in nature and the martyr's suffering, are from the same source. But the grandeur of God consists in the beauty of physical nature for the one poem and, for the other, in His disciplining power.

ii

The shorter poems referred to so far were produced between 1876 and 1885. Written at the beginning of Hopkins' major phase (first version, 1875), "The Wreck of the Deutschland" is plainly, much more than these, a poem of stress and suffering. A narrative celebrating spiritual triumph in physical disaster, it embodies the whole range of reactions, from terror to ecstasy, which attend the appearance of divine fire.

The first reaction, with the recognition and acceptance of God's destructive might, is a sickening fear:

The swoon of a heart that the sweep and the hurl of thee trod
Hard down with a horror of height
And the midriff astrain with leaning of, laced with fire of stress.

As in "The Windhover," it is under strain and stress now that the fire which is human will flash out. Like the windhover, the poet trembles in the heights; his heart, "dovewinged," can "tower from the grace to the grace" because of two terrible stresses: the knowledge of Hell and the vision

of God's condemnation. W. H. Gardner defines Hopkins' stress as "intuitive knowledge by which man . . . apprehends the majesty and terror, the beauty and love of his maker."⁶ Both beauty and terror are involved in "The Deutschland," but in this first part the stress is wholly majestic and terrible.

According to the seventh stanza, all men have had, since Christ's "going in Galilee," the special *in*stress which is at once pain, pressure and glory. Hopkins fills his lines with conjunctions of death and birth, suffering and victory, to suggest this truth: Christ's "warm-laid grave if a womb-life grey," with the adjectives *warm* and *grey* paradoxically reversed, the "sour or sweet" of men's Calvaries, God's "lightning and love," "winter and warm": "Hast thy dark descending and art most merciful then." So the fire that draws forth the human spark is at once destructive and revivifying, and it is directly associated with the incarnation, the coming of divine fire into human form. The Incarnation implies sacrifice, *in*stress, the flashing out of self under pressure: "With an anvil ding / And with fire in him forge thy will."

The second and main part of the poem, the narrative, includes both flat and strained images (the personification of stanza 15 and the lily-and-beast imagery of stanza 20), along with several more richly inscaped figures—especially the descriptions of the sailor's and the nun's bodies as "dreadnought breasts and braids of thew" and "bower of bone." But here again the pattern of fire and light, in contrast with the darkening waters, does most to unify this apparently disjointed work. The first section has emphasized lightning and love, the fire of discipline; and the flame is associated in the beginning of this second section with death itself. But as the poem becomes more specifically Christian, the nature of flame is revealed more fully; God's "all-fire glances" can, we discover, be reflected and rekindled in human selves.

In the twenty-first stanza, God is light, "Orion of light," as well as heat, and light beyond and above that of even the most glorious natural revelation, beyond the sense of the senses. The stanzas in which Hopkins tries to interpret his heroine's cry, "O Christ, Christ, come quickly," depend entirely on this distinction. It is not a martyrdom and a heavenly reward that the nun wishes, neither the jay-blue heavens of May with their light-dappled loveliness nor the sublime heaven of earthly desire which is still a projection into the sky of natural lights. The stanza (30) that specifically evokes that divine light which hers imitates and seeks is calm, in serene contrast with the breathless exclamatory passages that precede it.

Jesu, heart's light,
Jesu, maid's son,

What was the feast followed the night
Thou hadst glory of this nun?

But it is followed soon by the grandly triumphant thirty-fourth stanza which images forth the "Christ of the Father compassionate."

Now burn, new born to the world,
Double-natured name,

The heaven-flung, heart-fleshed, maiden-furled
Miracle-in-Mary-of-flame

Mid-numbered He in three of the thunder-throne!

Not a dooms-day dazzle in his coming nor dark as he came;
Kind, but royally reclaiming his own;

A released shower, let flash to the shire, not a lightning of fire
hard-hurled.

Here once more is the theme of "The Blessed Virgin Compared to the Air We Breathe," the theme of a sun made milder, of God as light at last rather than fire.

The poem ends with a plea for English souls (in effect, for the conversion of England), that they may like the nun combine suffering with acceptance, natural fire with divine light.

Let him easter in us, be a dayspring to the dimness of us,
be a crimson-cresseted east,

More brightening her, rare-dear Britain, as his reign rolls,
Pride, rose, prince, hero of us, high-priest,

Our heart's charity's hearth's fire, our thought's chivalry's
throng's Lord.

iii

Finally, the poem that indicates most clearly Hopkins' conception of how the fires of nature, man and God are related is "That Nature is a Heraclitean Fire and of the Comfort of the Resurrection," written in 1888. This fairly short work can be divided into three stages or parts, the aesthetic, the moral and the religious. It begins with a brilliant description of clouds and of windblown earth and water cleared for the moment of the human traces which (as in "God's

Grandeur") smudge and scar their surfaces. Its intensity is increased with the image from Heraclitus: "Million-fueled, nature's bonfire burns on." But at this point there is a reversal in the attitude taken toward man; his marks may seem to injure the out-of-doors world, but he is nevertheless "her bonniest-dearest to her, her clearest-selved spark." Man has a spark then, a self more distinct than that of cloud, tree or pool, and if his light is quenched the brightest inner light of the great bonfire nature is destroyed.

How fast his firedint, his mark on mind, is gone:
Both are in an unfathomable, all is in an enormous dark
Drowned.

"Both," we may assume, means both man and nature. Without man the glory of that very bonfire world which men tread down and vex would seem to die. So the change is as profound as it is sudden from the first to this second stage of the poem, from the celebration of a physical beauty which man's presence appears only to mar, to the revelation of man in a new and brilliant light—and yet a light that, being peculiar to man, must be mortal.

Manshape, that shone
Sheer off, disseveral, a star, death blots black out; nor mark
Is any of him at all so stark
But vastness blurs and time beats level.

The second part is a relenting from the virtual nature-worship of the commencement, a rising from aesthetic to human or moral values, a discovery that "manmark," although it "foot-fret" the external world, is also a "mark on mind." And the third stage of the poem, beginning with "Enough! the Resurrection," although it leaves nature comparatively desolate, draws out man's fire to distinguish its beauty from that of clouds, earth, pool, the bonfire.

Across my foundering deck shone
A beacon, an eternal beam. Flesh fade, and mortal trash
Fall to the residuary worm; world's wildfire leave but ash:
In a flash, at a trumpet crash,
I am all at once what Christ is, since he was what I am, and
This Jack, joke, poor potsherd, patch, matchwood, immortal
diamond,

Is immortal diamond.

The flash is more than a part of the bonfire; the apparently mortal spark, man's self, is real and immortal in a sense impossible for the less distinct parts of an always living always dying fire; for man lives in a sense that external natural forms do not. And this difference is realized because of the Incarnation and triumph of Christ—in a literal historical sense, matchwood man has been transformed to diamond since that time, since that sign and promise of men's resurrections.

iv

So the two lights, the wildfire of this world and the divine beacon fire, are distinguished in Hopkins' imagery, but in the peculiar spark of light which is man they seem to be conjoined. The poet-priest who must devote himself to both lights satisfies his tense double loyalty when these two can be harmoniously related in his imaginative scheme. Neither a Manichean nor a pantheist, he needs to find symbols of divine and spiritual beauty in the physical beauty of nature and man which delights his senses, and this need is fulfilled by contemplation of the central fact of his religious life, the fact of divine Incarnation. In the person of the human Christ, in the imagery of the inner fire which is light, of physical and moral beauty which, at the moment of sacrifice and at the moment of mystical ecstasy, is united with the divinely created perfect self, Hopkins resolves the tension between earth's loveliness and God's awful purity and power. Apparently this resolution provides one key to a number of his most successful poems: to "The Windhover," "God's Grandeur," "Heraclitean Fire" and "The Wreck of the Deutschland," among others.

Smith College

W. Stacy Johnson

FOOTNOTES

¹For a more or less categorical description of Hopkins' imagery see W. H. Gardner, *Gerard Manley Hopkins* (London, 1944), I, Chapter V.

²*Rage for Order* (Chicago, 1948), p. 65.

³In the first volume of his critical study (pp. 154-55), W. H. Gardner comments on Hopkins' images of fire and light as "symbols of the divine vital principle in all creatures, as their vital activity and their ultimate spiritual goal," and he refers very briefly to "The Deutschland," "The Starlight Night," and other instances.

⁴"To What Serves Mortal Beauty?" This and all other poetic lines are quoted from the (third) edition of Gardner, *The Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins* (New York, 1948).

⁵My reading of *buckled* agrees with that of John Pick, whose interpretation of the poem is the one assumed here. See *Gerard Manley Hopkins, Priest and Poet* (London, 1942), pp. 70-72.

⁶The poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins, p. 220. See also Chapter II in Gardner's first volume of Gerard Manley Hopkins.

II. NOTES AND BRIEF ARTICLES

SAMUEL SMILES' SELF-HELP: FORGOTTEN CENTENARY

In the light of the literary and philosophical accomplishments of the year 1859, it may well seem both presumptuous and dimly anti-climactic further to celebrate that *annus mirabilis* as the centennial of Samuel Smiles' *Self-Help*, a work variously referred to as the "primer of the self-made man"; "the literary ancestor of such contemporary books as *How to Win Friends and Influence People*, *How to Stop Worrying and Start Living*, *Why Not Try God?* and *The Power of Positive Thinking*";⁴ it is also a book slightly spoken of as a "monument to mediocrity," as a "popular handbook for Victorian Dick Whittingtons,"² and as Carlyle "writ plain." Furthermore, *Self-Help* is correctly cited³ as exemplifying the type of publication that prompted Sir Leslie Stephen's question in 1876 when, commenting upon the intellectual climate, he enquired:

How is it that a tacit cooperation is established between minds placed far apart in the scale of culture and natural acuteness? How is it that the thought of the intellectual leaders is obscurely reflected by so many darkened mirrors?⁴

Certainly Samuel Smiles, so often trailing wisps of Carlyle, is one of the most naively critical minds of the Victorian era. But with his reiteration in *Self-Help* of such homely virtues as patience, courage, honesty, energy, cheerfulness, diligence, prudence, industry, individual application and, above all, perseverance, Smiles propounds a blue-print for individual initiative, for advancement, for material progress, and for personal acquisition. In so doing, of course, he strikes a responsive chord among many middle-class Victorians who, in the '50's and '60's especially, placed signal emphasis upon achievement of success through one's own efforts.

Today—if they stop to consider him at all—critics incline to wax merry over the spirit of Samuel Smiles. Connell, for instance, asks derisively, who reads him and, rather unjustly, characterizes him as the exemplification of "The stuffiest, smuggest, most platitudinous of Victorian mercantile and materialist values and principles,"⁵ a reading of Smiles quite at variance with the man who emerges from the pages of his *Autobiography*. Amy Cruse classes Smiles, with the unfortunate Martin Tupper, as the voice of philistinism;⁶ and other comments one encounters about him are invariably derogatory, condescending, or wryly humorous. For all this, Smiles' durability is strikingly apparent when one considers that *Self-Help* last year went into its seventy-third edition in Great Britain.

Indeed, the sales of *Self-Help* soared to astronomical figures—even when one considers the vast circulation of cheaply priced literature at the time of its publication. For this reason it is distressingly, if not strangely, revealing to compare, say, the sales of *Origin of Species* with those of *Self-Help*. As is well known, *Origin* on its initial day of publication sold out its first edition of 1250 copies; by 1876 it had sold 16,000 copies and been translated into six languages.⁷ But beside *Self-Help* this achievement is beggarly. In its first year—1859—*Self-Help* sold 20,000 copies and in its second 15,000;⁸ by 1863 it had sold 55,000 copies;⁹ by 1889, 150,000;¹⁰ and by 1905 approximately 258,000.¹¹ It had been translated into Dutch, Arabic, German, Danish, Turkish, French, Russian, Italian, several Indian dialects, and Japanese (in Japan the book was known as *European Decision of Character Book*) and prompted Smiles' ingenuous observation that:

On looking at the book and its characters, it does not afford matter for surprise that the Japanese should be contemplating the abandonment of their own language and a resort to straightforward, condensed, and sensible English!¹²

When compared with the figures of other 19th century high-selling publications, *Self-Help* will always be found to the fore.

Encomiums poured in—from the middle-classes and below. Many wrote to say *Self-Help* saved them from the "slide downward;" two young ladies became writers under its inspiration;¹³ and a widow testified that it encouraged her to persevere in art.¹⁴ It is known, too, that a Dubliner changed his profession—from wine and spirit merchant to chemist and druggist—through its influence; this same eccentric fellow—prone to refer sentimentally to the book as "dear old *Self-Help*"—also inscribed the name of Samuel Smiles on his business letter-heads.¹⁵ A gentleman from Dundee wrote that *Self-Help* "cheered him and spurred him on in the battle of life."¹⁶ Another remarked that "*Self-Help* has been of extraordinary service to me. I have repeatedly gained hope and courage from its aphorisms and brave sentences; and with them I have tried to encourage others."¹⁷ Indeed, the aphorisms from *Self-Help* became so popular as to appear on the palace walls of an Egyptian Khedive. The story goes that a visiting Englishman asked the Khedive's architect whose were the mottoes on the wall—were they from the Koran? The reply was that they were "principally from Smeelis."

"From whom?" asked the Englishman. "Oh," was the reply, "you are an Englishman; you ought to know Smeelis! They are from his *Self-Help*; they are much better than the texts from the Koran,"¹⁸ Such was the popular reaction—world-wide apparently—to *Self-Help* in the middle of the last century.

But why was the book so popular—particularly in its own time? Why did it outsell its nearest competitors—in any field—by thousands of copies? That question I should like to consider for a few moments.

Numerous reasons can be adduced, of course, for the popularity of *Self-Help*. In fact, a number are suggested—albeit fleetingly—in sundry Victorian intellectual studies. One facet of its success—in the only extensive study of Smiles in recent years—is manifest in Asa Briggs's essay¹⁹ upon its connexion with the doctrine of Work. Another critic²⁰ touches—cursorily but rightly—upon its anti-intellectualism and consequent appeal. Indeed, Smiles reveals his suspicions of the intellectual life, especially on its artistic side, while voicing his belief in Work by saying that "... it is life rather than literature, action rather than study, which tend perpetually to renovate mankind."²¹ And even a casual reading of *Self-Help* discloses numerous reflexions upon other Victorian intellectual problems—reflexions at once re-assuring and encouraging. One notes Smiles underscoring individual, rather than collective, action for social amelioration and asserting that "National progress is the sum of individual industry, energy, and uprightness..."²² all qualities that can be developed in the home rather than in the academic arena. Similarly, he gives courage and hope to thousands by remarking that the education given "at home, in the streets, behind counters, in workshops, at the loom and the plough, in counting houses and manufactories, and in the busy haunts of men"²³ is more influential than the education acquired in schools, colleges or universities. Also, he excoriates the "human idolatry" of Caesarism while advocating self-help, or improvement from within rather than from without. But it is in the final chapter of *Self-Help*—devoted to the Gentleman—that Smiles attains the apogee of adulation for the ordinary. For it is there he glorifies the mediocre and stresses character over ability, industrious plodding over intuition, and talent over genius. He further claims that artistic achievement depends, in the main, upon industry and perseverance. Neither is he above a sneer at the artist when he comments so foolishly upon the mathematical deficiencies of Lamartine. In the same chapter he praises the business man and mollifies the anxieties of the mid-Victorian snob by noting the peerages that have emerged from trade and by trumpeting the attainment of the rank of nobleman regardless of one's humble birth. And, needless to add, a facile optimism is as ubiquitous in this chapter as elsewhere. Thus, by very wide appeals—to snobishness, anti-intellectualism, mediocrity, practicality, aspiration, and individual initiative—Smiles quickly garnered thousands upon thousands of middle— and lower-middle-class readers.

It is unquestionable that this expression of common ideas and concepts—of ideas in the very air people breathed—counts in no modest measure for the popularity of *Self-Help*. But of equal importance, perhaps, is the form in which Smiles cast his book. For, by 1859, that period is reached when large segments of the Victorian public were devouring reading matter—fiction as well as non-fiction—that was easy to comprehend, facile in expression; in a word: simple. And in this respect, at a crucial moment in the evolution of the reading public, Smiles gave that public exactly what it desired, not only in content but, most plainly, in form and style. It is, therefore, of interest to look briefly at the method he employed in the writing of his treatise.

In writing *Self-Help* Smiles employs three devices over and over, in chapter after chapter, to command the reader's attention. These are: economy of style; aphorism; and "capsule" biography strongly flavored with anecdote. This last is reminiscent of the brief—frequently sentimental—incident recorded in the *Reader's Digest* as "Life in These United States." To see Smiles at work, however, one might consider a chapter—the ninth, entitled "Men of Business"—from *Self-Help*. For the technique here employed is reiterated—with only slight modifications—in the twelve other chapters of the book.

In "Men of Business" Smiles commences with an introductory paragraph studded with the engaging qualities of businessmen. He follows this with a plethora of—to him—examples of capable men of business—the gallery is mixed indeed: Thales, Solon, Plato, Chaucer, Spinoza, Linnaeus, Milton, Shakespeare. To nearly every one he attaches the most slender of illuminating facts—each indicating how the quality of self-help is, in these men, coupled with business acumen. Plato, we learn, defrayed his expenses in Egypt by selling oil on his travels; and Linnaeus studied botany while making a living as a cobbler. These sparse facts—each offered in no more than twenty or thirty words and just titillating enough to whet the interest—are followed by generalizations upon common sense in business and the importance of drudgery as making the rest of life seem incomparably sweeter. At this juncture Smiles dispenses with anecdote entirely—for he has netted his reader by the fleeting annotations cited above. But constantly he reminds his audience that, through self-help, it can rise to dizzy commercial heights. Thus he keeps the reader right in focus first by anecdote and then, in a sense, by application. Running through these sentences, too, is the

omnipresent thread of optimism—at times irritatingly breezy—which invariably places the blame for failure on the individual.

It is now—with approximately a third of his chapter completed—that Smiles returns, specifically, to his men of business, extolling their accuracy, despatch, method, punctuality, and attention. To these attributes he gives personal application, illustrating them through anecdotes of such men as Charles James Fox, Sir Walter Scott and others. Here the illustrative material is far more extensive than earlier, more fully developed and, in the case of the men of business, reaches a climax with the concluding example—the Duke of Wellington, a shrewd appeal to national pride. The Iron Duke secures a good third of the chapter. The conclusion comes with more generalities and a patriotic appeal—in this case stressing the soundness of heart of the English business community. Such is the method Smiles uses here and—with modest variations—in his other chapters.

His style throughout is flat, plain, direct, uncomplicated by metaphor or simile—a child could grasp it easily at first reading. Similarly, his anecdotes follow the same pattern for they are simple, have a clear narrative line, are judiciously pointed, and invariably end happily. Add to this a series of aphorisms succinctly and plainly put: e.g. "The path of success in business is usually the path of common sense,"²⁴ or "...defeats do not long cast down the resolute hearted, but only serve to call forth their real powers,"²⁵ and you have the chief means by which Smiles entertained thousands of English men and women—to say nothing of "lesser breeds beyond the law."

It is not possible, of course, to attribute the success of *Self-Help* to any single factor. Certainly, as noted, the book told people what they wanted to hear—about themselves, their chances for success, their forebears and contemporaries who succeeded against odds. But had not all this been put in a form at once simple and direct, entertaining and unsophisticated, it is doubtful that we would be commenting on the centenary of the book today. It is more than possible, too, that we should not be laboring under the excessive number of books for self-improvement that we are now confronted with. And that indeed may be one good reason why this particular centennial would be better recognized by discreet silence.

Mount Holyoke College

John L. Bradley

FOOTNOTES

- ¹Anonymous reviewer, *TLS*, 26 December 1958, p. 750
- ²W. E. Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870* (New Haven, 1958), p. xvi.
- ³*Ibid.*
- ⁴*History of English Thought in the 18th Century* (2 vols., London, 1881), II, p. 2.
- ⁵In "Samuel Smiles, LL.D.," *Cornhill Magazine* (167:321-324), p. 323.
- ⁶*The Victorians and Their Books* (London, 1935), p. 222.
- ⁷Nora Barlow (Ed.), *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin* (London, 1958), pp. 122-3.
- ⁸Thomas Mackay (Ed.), *The Autobiography of Samuel Smiles* (New York, 1905), p. 223.
- ⁹*Ibid.*, p. 390.
- ¹⁰Asa Briggs (Ed.), *Self-Help* (London, 1958), p. 7.
- ¹¹Mackay (Ed.), *Autobiography of Samuel Smiles*, p. 223.
- ¹²*Ibid.*, p. 231.
- ¹³*Ibid.*, p. 226.
- ¹⁴*Ibid.*
- ¹⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 227-8.
- ¹⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 224-5.
- ¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 225.
- ¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 229.
- ¹⁹In *Victorian People* (London, 1954), pp. 124-149.
- ²⁰Houghton, *Victorian Frame of Mind*, p. 117.
- ²¹Briggs (Ed.), *Self-Help*, p. 21.
- ²²*Ibid.*, p. 36.
- ²³*Ibid.*, p. 39.
- ²⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 263-4.
- ²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 186.

GEORGE ELIOT: THE MORALIST AS ARTIST

In *The Novels of George Eliot* (Columbia University Press, \$3.75), Mr. Jerome Thale places George Eliot "at (or very nearly at) the center of the central tradition of English fiction."

composed in general of the novelists of Leavis's Great Tradition, but, since it includes Fielding and Trollope as well as Dickens and Thackeray, looking backward, away from the modern novel. The chapters are given titles that suggest differences rather than similarity or development; they "are each separate studies insofar as the book does not rest upon a single theme." For *Adam Bede* the title is "The Basis of Conduct." Though he does not ignore the Wordsworthian elements, Mr. Thale finds the rural setting less interesting than the examination of moral problems. For George Eliot, he things, a pall had fallen over the world she described so affectionately. "Christianity in Hayslope is bankrupt," and all the characters except Dinah live "lusterless" lives. Arthur, like the kindly rector Mr. Irwine, is a victim of "thoughtless adherence to a creed which provides him with no lofty aims and only conceals the dangers of his selfishness." The analysis of motives in Utilitarian terms is illuminating. Dinah differs from the rest in being free of egotism; her quietism, "though not grace in the Christian sense," produces noble impulses. To many readers a view of the book that ignores its deep humanity and rich humor will seem limited. Some will be surprised that Mr. Thale can find too much of Mrs. Poyser or list Arthur as a "villain." But he points out the moral skeleton of the novel, even though he removes much of the flesh in the process.

"*The Mill on the Floss: The Social View*" relies on somewhat the same ethical argument in discussing the interaction of character and society that is Mr. Thale's principal theme. The Dodsons represent security; the respect the world pays material possessions is the heart of their code. The Tullivers are marked by intense feeling. Tom favors the Dodson side, while Maggie, in her overwhelming need for love, is a Tulliver. It is their misfortune that "the choice before them seems to them an either/or, and a choice not simply of one aspect but the whole way of life." When Maggie learns from Thomas à Kempis to renounce her selfish will, Mr. Thale sees her turning toward the Dodsons, for she has accepted the Calvinistic cleavage between duty and pleasure that they subscribe to. Others may see her renunciation as very different from the penny-pinching of the Dodsons and feel that he has not made quite clear how the "ethic of feeling" that ennobled Dinah should betray Maggie.

In "George Eliot's Fable for Her Times" *Silas Marner* is treated as an allegory. The fairy-tale episode of Eppie's crawling onto the weaver's hearth becomes "a rationalist miracle" that converts Silas from blasphemous denial of God to conventional attendance at the parish church—"not to religion, but to a better state of mind." By this solution of his problem George Eliot reduces theology to psychology; she sees his trouble as an inability to feel, which is overcome by the Wordsworthian appeal of ordinary human emotions. "Godfrey's story is Silas's transposed to a minor key," a realistic parallel to the fairy tale. For Godfrey the world is "greyed throughout"; the atmosphere of Raveloe is "dull and oppressive." To see it so dark one must ignore, as Mr. Thale does, the hearty Christmas festivities, the New Year's Eve party, and the warm motherly goodness of Dolly Winthrop, who plays a major part in the miracle. To split the novel into such extreme contrasts seems a mistake. Old Squire Cass and his sons may live a far from edifying life, but they are no more unhappy than Squire Western. At the end of the story Godfrey and Nancy face the future with better understanding of each other and of the world as it is.

The reader of the chapter on *Romola*, "The Uses of Failure," must conclude that there are no uses. Mr. Thale finds nothing good to say of the book; it is "dull," "labored and often ridiculous," a "colossal failure" beside which *Robert Elsmere*, *Mary Barton*, and *East Lynne* "are more readable and seem to have more to redeem them." Again the Procrustean pattern is imposed. Tito is a melodramatic villain, Romola a heroine idealized beyond credibility. The passages quoted to show George Eliot's "uncritical judgments" and "inept psychologizing" sometimes show Mr. Thale's prejudice rather than her failure; he seems often to have formed his opinion before finding reason to support it. In the absence of logical argument he writes bluster, not criticism. Though it has sold twice as many copies as *Middlemarch*, *Romola* is out of fashion today; but it must be judged as a historical novel, not a Reformation tract. If it did not fit Mr. Thale's scheme, he ought to have omitted it as he does the *Scenes of Clerical Life*. Barbara Hardy's book published this year with the same title as Mr. Thale's shows the subtlety with which the moral triangle of Romola, Tito, and Savonarola has been constructed.

The chapter on *Felix Holt* is better, though again the contrasts seem oversimplified. Esther's choice "is an either/or one—between the Transomes and all that they stand for, and Felix Holt." The principal revelation is not the mystery of her parentage or the title to the estate, but her "discovery of herself through a discovery of the world," her "disenchantment." The statement that Mrs. Transome's disappointment in meeting Harold "is rendered not through dramatic clash" seems to ignore the remarkable dialogue that reveals both their characters so brilliantly in this scene. And by what standard is she "a genuine grande dame," or the illegitimate boor Harold "well-bred"? One sometimes suspects that Mr. Thale is not a very careful reader. The Dis-senter Mr. Lyon is treated very sympathetically, for the discussion of *Felix Holt* turns on politics more than theology. On the whole Mr. Thale concludes that it "succeeds in fusing character and society."

"The Paradox of Individualism: *Middlemarch*" takes its cue from Ian Watt's *The Rise of the Novel*. Like Carlyle, we learn, "George Eliot was a Puritan in everything but formal theology," and *Middlemarch* is an advance over the earlier work in its redefinition of the problem of the Puritan individualist in society. Bridging the gap between them, George Eliot poses the paradox "that a greater concern with the individual . . . leads to a greater concern with everything outside him." The exposition of the unity underlying complexity is sometimes obscure. Aspiration as a manifestation of the individual's conflict is common to Dorothea and Lydgate as well as to Rosamond and Bulstrode, most of whom "come to grief because they are too preoccupied with their aspirations to know themselves." These main characters, "so ardent and committed," are balanced against "the sensible people of Middlemarch," those who are free of aspiration, among whom we find Celia, Sir James, Mrs. Cadwallader, and Mr. Brooke. Curiously, none of the Garth family, who seem to me the most sensible of all, is included. If the novel is "about vocations," "choosing a particular job," Mary Garth and Fred Vinny should be considered.

Though he recognizes that the parallel plots of *Daniel Deronda* have been carefully interwoven, Mr. Thale does not hesitate to follow Leavis in jettisoning the whole *Deronda* part because it "fails to cohere, to add up to something, . . . because even though one half is splendidly done, the other is wretched." Again assertion replaces demonstration:

the character of *Deronda* is nearly a flat failure, for his character rests on a fatal assumption. *Deronda* is the well-bred (and very nice) English gentleman as Alyosha. George Eliot assumes that the simplicity and insight of the one are compatible with the ordinary acquired virtues of the other, and she does not see that *Deronda's* debility of will can be a defect.

The confusion of these sentences can hardly be laid to the printer, for elsewhere we read that *Deronda's* character "is weak and unformed because of his breadth of sympathy and the lack of external necessity." Gwendolen Mr. Thale sees as "a new type, the bitch taken seriously," whose presentation "has nothing of the harsh and actinic quality of *Hetty's* in *Adam Bede*." While her suffering does not ennoble, but only increases her self-hatred, "there can be no doubt that she is a high point" in English fiction. Grandcourt represents a new note too: the sinister and malign, the perversity that makes the darkened world of *Daniel Deronda*.

The comments in the concluding chapter, "Art and Vision in George Eliot," might well have gone into the introduction. In several ways Mr. Thale restates his view that through their experience her characters are forced to some knowledge of themselves. But, he adds, "to name the central moral process does not account for the excellence of the novels." This, indeed, is the critic's function, and many readers will regret that Mr. Thale has not succeeded better.

Yale University

Gordon S. Haight

GRAIL-THEMES IN BROWNING'S "CHILDE ROLAND"

"Childe Roland to the Dark Tower Came" has always impressed me as a poignant reversal of the traditional associations of hope and salvation in the quest for the Grail, the impression only confirming itself the more in the absence of the Grail from the poem. Browning probably did not intend to interpret the Grail according to the attitudes of his time as explicitly as Tennyson did, but through the analytic techniques of psychology and folk-lore applied to subconscious and ritual sources since Browning wrote, he may be shown to be creating a poem embodying the anxieties of Victorian society more compulsively than does the idyl of the laureate because Browning, not being as deliberate as Tennyson in his choice of material, drew on larger sources of legend and myth.

In her concluding summary of the relationship between religious ritual and literature, Miss Bodkin suggests that poetry embodies the remnants of primitive religious ritual, and that older poems may preserve archetypal patterns of experience until they are taken up again into a new poetic convention, which may be a "re-ordering of the powers of the individual mind under a stimulus communicated from the social heritage."¹ The social heritage, as both Miss Bodkin and Miss Weston² emphasize, is composed of ritual and not folk-lore, ritual being the imitation of natural forces in dance, drama, and poetry, and folklore being the instinctive symbols which represent the most primitive apprehensions of the natural world. The items from folk-lore are essentially episodic, and at their most complex only form themselves into simple narratives or dramas, but they comprise the more elaborate patterns of religious ritual. Ritual is the first conscious formulation of inchoate responses to a vaguely threatening external reality, and in its turn furnishes patterns to more secular literature.³

In "Childe Roland," then, I should say that the attitudes of the mid-century have dislocated the traditional patterns of the material Browning works in, and that the strange power of the poem may in part derive from the disparity between the world as Childe Roland sees it⁴ and the world as his prototypes in the medieval romances found it. Roland's quest has a coherent structure because it repudiates the conventional motives of the search for the Grail.

In the fragmentary surviving fertility rituals which Miss Weston has studied, she notes the persistence of a life-giving cup, a protective king, and a mysterious chapel or palace to shrine them both. There are no similar saving presences in Browning's poem; Roland sees no clear object for his quest, no promise of reward from a revived king, no possibilities of mystic faith in the dark tower. Rather than serving the mighty demigod of the palace, as Arthur's knights did, Roland's peers unite around a fatally delusive ideal which betrays them all one by one, because it is the elusive image of their own desire and no divine gleam.⁵ At the last, Roland wins no victory, sees no sign; only the demonic aspect of the tower is vouchsafed to him.

Most critics have sensed that Browning was grappling with evil, an active principle of evil, not just a loss of faith, and they have reconciled this theme with Browning's determined optimism. Nettleship interprets the quest as a pilgrimage. The stark, threatening landscape figures to him as Roland's conviction of sin, and the dark tower as the absence of God. Nettleship feels the obscure force of Roland's quest so strongly that he says the poem must have a "second meaning," that the superficial narrative is "eminently incomplete, eminently suggestive," and concludes: "The purpose with which that band of knights set out may have been any purpose you please which had the truth and purity for its object."⁶

And yet the quest was tragic to those who did not brave the tower; they are lost, while Roland is saved by his own strength. He is humble before his peers, not before God. If the poem were meant to lead to a mystical experience, I think the landscape would be relieved by fitful gleams of clear light, but as the poem reads, the sunset casts a lurid glow and Roland's peers depress him more than they encourage him.

DeVane gives what has become accepted as the best brief interpretation: "*Childe Roland* is one of the most imaginative and noble of Browning's poems, and has taken its place among the great expressions of courage in English literature."⁷ Within the limits of a handbook, DeVane can only hint at more complete conceptions than his actual words convey, and the conceptions of imaginative nobility and courage indicate the nature of Browning's inspiration, which DeVane treated at much greater length in his book on the *Parleyings*, where he finds that Browning is fully sensitive to the malignity of matter and time impeding human efforts toward self-expression: "Earth is man's probation place, in which he is to strive forever onward. This is the meaning of such poems as *Childe Roland* . . . —poems which describe struggle toward no stated end, struggle for the sake of struggle and the ultimate achievement."⁸

While consonant with Browning's doctrine of optimism, DeVane's insight also relates Roland's quest closely to the original ritual from which the Grail romances arose, an attempt to preserve life despite evil forces, to keep a green valley intact from the encroaching waste-land. There now remains to show the mostly subconscious means by which the poem expresses not only a conventional quest but also a personal struggle with despair.

Like every conventional setting for a chivalric quest, Browning's is a waste-land where devils and their familiars threaten the knight and where the only signs of life are the remains of battle and torture. One is reminded of the infernal paintings of Bosch and Breughel, where blood lies in pools on the ground and Catherine's wheels deface the horizon, or of Dürer's etching of "The Knight, Death, and the Devil." DeVane suggests a more direct source in Gerard de Lairesse's *The Art of Painting*, which Browning knew well and which contains instructions for depicting a grotesque landscape that perverts natural order.⁹ Browning himself has told of a miasmal marsh and ruined tower he came across in his Italian wanderings, and of an emaciated horse in a tapestry in Casa Guidi, and he quotes Edgar's song from *Lear* as an epigraph.¹⁰

But no one has been content with this meager list of sources, persuaded by the horrific aura of the poem that it must arise from complex inner urges: "Characteristically, Browning shifts the whole conflict into the subjective realm, by making *Childe Roland* ride alone, with only fragmentary memories and vague dreads to be outfaced."¹¹ Harold Golder in particular has found more personal sources for Roland's trials.¹²

Noting that Edgar's song has phrases from both a ballad (the first line of the song) and from children's tales (the second and third lines), Golder makes clear that Browning's response to the song involves associations with a background of half-remembered romances and tales—from *The Seven Champions of Christendom* to *Jack and the Beanstalk*—which Browning probably read at an early age in his father's library, and which have an outline of action similar to that in "*Childe Roland*." The imagery of the chivalric quest both in the sources and in the poem is "all bound together by a unified aura of feeling,"¹³ a thematic mood indifferent to the variations among the sources and searching out the common elements of folk-lore among them in a subconscious drive toward self-expression.

It is well known that Browning wrote "*Childe Roland*" under the influence of an imaginative dream,¹⁴ and Golder suggests that Browning composed in a compulsive, hypnagogic state which he was ashamed to confess, disinclined to admit his readers into intimate knowledge of his

motives. As ordinary psychological associations can but dimly suggest the creative feeling in the poem, perhaps Browning's subconscious mind gave him access to a far broader inspiration than he suspected. His partial awareness of this deep imaginative process may explain his insistence on Edgar's song as an important hint of the meaning in the poem; he quoted the first line twice—as title and as conclusion.¹⁵

On the deepest subconscious level, the themes of the Grail also inhere in the structure of Browning's vision of the chivalric quest. The most persuasive way to develop this interpretation may be to notice what Browning omits of the Grail-material, then to discuss what he changes, and finally to study what he accepts and makes particularly eloquent as the experience of his own hero.

Of course, the most obviously missing material is the Grail itself, though the shrine remains, empty of its holy relic—the dark tower. But just because the Grail has always been associated with images of hope and life,¹⁶ the absence of the Grail allows the tower to become a center of evil and the land to become desolate. And of equal importance with the Grail is the Grail King. Like Thammuz, Adonis, and the legendary Fisher King, the Grail King is a ritualistic symbol of regeneration “standing between his people and land, and the unseen forces which control their destiny.”¹⁷ With the absence of the Grail and its King as a definite goal for his quest, Roland must face both the forbidding aspect of a waste-land symbolic of lost hope and the unseen forces that sap his spiritual vigor.

The traditional body of attendant knights appears in “Childe Roland,” but like Roland they must quest with no divine goal, no saving sense of a purpose transcending their limitations. In the original fertility rituals, the god was aroused through a ceremonial dance of specially trained attendants,¹⁸ who frequently used a cup or swords as the center of the dance-figure, so that, “as the general ceremonial became . . . used as a vehicle for symbolic Christian teaching, the figures of the attendant warrior-priests underwent a corresponding change.”¹⁹ When Browning reshaped the traditional material into the thematic mood of his poem, the knights fell prey to the demonic forces of the waste-land and proved unable to revive it, leaving as token of their passing only a dew of blood and phantasms of death.

The element of the quest most attractive to Browning was the trial of the untested knight, a fascination that appears in the repeated epithet of “childe,” which in chivalry signifies a young knight who has yet to prove his worth in a fitting demonstration of prowess. The Grail-hero has always quested for the secret of the Grail-chapel, “an adventure in which supernatural, and evil, forces are engaged.”²⁰ Near the chapel frequently the hero must pass a graveyard, like the epic heroes who visit the underworld, and this graveyard is full of evil spirits, so that the hero must not only rouse the Grail King but also must break the enchantment of the Perilous Chapel—Browning's dark tower. Only then may he enter and rest in the influence of the Grail. On his approach to the chapel, the hero finds his quest complicated by a furious storm as well as by the spirits of the graveyard.²¹

These elements of the traditional test were mingled in Browning's mind with Shakespeare's own use of the basic symbols in *Lear*, where Edgar's song appears in the context of a raging storm and a demented king surrounded with parodies of insanity. Subconsciously, Browning found that Shakespeare's use of the symbols—storm, king with impaired vitality, evil companions—made it more plausible to stress the initiation of Roland, especially because in the river full of corpses, the bloody ground, and the haunted dark tower,²² Browning had already revived the main setting of the Grail-trial.

“Childe Roland” does indeed have a “second meaning,” for through the remnant of ritual and the poetic revival of timeless themes, Browning has given to us as well as to his own generation the dare to outface and redeem the inscrutable evil of a society that has escaped from the control of the specifically human sanctions of nobility and good faith among men.

University of Maine

John Lindberg

FOOTNOTES

¹Maud Bodkin, *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry* (New York, 1948), p. 329.

²In her *From Ritual to Romance* (New York, 1941).

³I have put a continuous process into an arbitrary scheme. Complete ghost stories may be folk-lore, for example, and yet have an artistic pattern, but I have noticed that these stories usually have an indubitable fragment of folk-lore as a climax appearing in an ambience of matter-of-fact.

⁴The repetition of the title in italics and in quotation marks as the last words of the poem is an unusual example of Browning speaking in his own person.

⁵The same is true of most of the knights in “The Holy Grail.” Tennyson in his epilogue admits that Arthur, the ethical core of the *Idylls*, is a poetic fiction adapted to a contemporary moral. More explicitly than Browning, he confronts the Victorians with their own dilemma.

⁶T. J. Nettleship, *Robert Browning, Essays and Thoughts* (New York, 1890), pp. 89, 94, 95.

⁷William Clyde DeVane, *A Browning Handbook* (New York, 1955), p. 232.

⁸William Clyde DeVane, *Browning's Parleyings, The Autobiography of a Mind* (New Haven, 1927), p. 32.

⁹*Handbook*, p. 231.

10

Handbook, p. 229.¹¹Lionel Stevenson, "The Pertinacious Victorian Poets," *UTQ* xxii (April, 1952), 240.¹²Harold Golder, "Browning's *Childe Roland*," *PMLA*, xxxix (December, 1924), 963-978.¹³Golder, p. 974.¹⁴... *Childe Roland* came upon me as a kind of dream. I had to write it . . .—*Handbook*, p. 229.¹⁵Golder, pp. 975-978. See note 4.¹⁶Weston, p. 48.¹⁷Weston, p. 129.¹⁸Weston, p. 83.¹⁹Weston, p. 95.²⁰Weston, p. 165.²¹Weston, pp. 167, 169.²²"haunted" because Roland's dead peers gather around the tower to watch him fight, watching him with the same ambiguous regard as that of the half-animate mounds of earth around the tower.

DICKENS AND THE CLASS QUESTION

Miss Ada Nisbet's article (*VNL*, Spring, 1959, pp. 10-13) seeks to prove that at the time Dickens was writing *Great Expectations* he was obsessed by a mania for money, a mania for Ellen Ternan, and a mania for gentility. In support of the last point, she quotes certain snuffy remarks by Carlyle, Meredith, John Stuart Mill, Thackeray, and the Brownings. Some of these critics are of puritanical rather than of social inspiration, and none of the critics was of illustrious origin. When Dickens rose like a rocket in 1836, England was still governed politically and socially by the aristocracy, and the more intelligent aristocrats enjoyed the company of men of genius without bothering about their origins. It was the primer members of the middle class who found Dickens vulgar. To the grantees, the social difference between Dickens and Thackeray was insignificant. Neither would have moved in the high political and social world if he had not been a famous author. Indeed, Dickens had the advantage of reaching it ten years sooner, as a very young man, and seems to have won the affection of such elderly lions as Sydney Smith, Samuel Rogers, Landor, and Francis Jeffrey. The last-named doted on Dickens, and when he talked of plebeian parents, he included himself. He simply meant non-aristocratic. The obsession with gentility was not so acute in Dickens' youth as it became later in the nineteenth century. England was full of self-made men, or the sons of self-made men, occupying prominent positions; and Macaulay said there was no period when a talented young man without family connections would find it easier to make a career.

But let us see what some of the real upper classes thought of Dickens, privately:

The Hon. Richard Watson (in his diary) after spending five months, in 1846, as a neighbor of Dickens' in Switzerland: "The Dickenses leave tomorrow to our great grief. It is impossible to describe the feelings of regard and friendship with which he has inspired us. He certainly is the most natural, unaffected distinguished man I have ever met."

The Hon. Mrs. Sidney Herbert, in 1850, in a letter to Mrs. Chisholm: "He is so singularly clever and agreeable that I hope you will forgive me for having made this appointment without your direct sanction."

The Duke of Devonshire (in his diary) in 1851, after meeting Dickens to arrange the Bulwer-Lytton play at Devonshire House: "I am bewitched by him."

Sir George Russell, Bart., a cultivated lawyer and landowner who frequently stayed at Gadshill (MS reminiscences): "As a charming companion I never knew his equal. He never appeared to lead, still less did he monopolise conversation, but had the peculiar art of drawing out the best from everybody. In his house was perfect comfort, but great simplicity, without display."

Something similar was written, in *Macmillan's Magazine*, by Sir Arthur Helps, Queen Victoria's secretary; but I am quoting only private testimonies and will conclude with a letter to a friend from the fastidious and cultured Charles Eliot Norton on hearing of Dickens' death: "Dickens was loved and will be mourned by greater multitudes than any other man. Sweet, simple, strong in the consciousness and enjoyment of this love, he grew sweeter, simpler and stronger every day. I never knew a famous and flattered man so utterly unhurt by it all—and what man ever was flattered in like measure? The better one knew him, the more one loved him. . . . The loss in his own home is the going out of its joy."

In opposition to these tributes, have we any *contemporary* evidence that Dickens was ever snubbed, resentful, or socially uneasy; or that he cared two hoots for the petty criticisms of the genteel and the envious?

London, England

Pansy Pakenham

SOME ILLUSTRATIONS OF CARLYLE'S SYMBOLIST IMAGERY

Carlyle's *Symbol*, or "small Visible," involved as it is with an amorphous religiosity and wandering abstractions, is most useful when it is least dependent upon a hortatory manner and we can see it apart from any socio-religious context. Professor Teufelsdröckh informs us that "the small Visible" has "high transcendental aspects" which extend into "the infinite deeps of the Invisible."¹ But there are purely artistic aspects, too, and the Professor's "Many painted Devices" and "simple Seal-emblems," despite their allegorical overtones, evoke the visual and the graphic.

The transforming agent is *Fantasy*, who with her "mystic wonderland plays into the small prose domain of Sense, and becomes incorporated therewith." Fantasy, for Carlyle, is the highest of man's faculties and stands quite apart from the logical, "Mensurative" faculty, or the "Understanding." Though the latter, he says, "is indeed thy window" (and, "too clear thou canst not make it"), Fantasy "is thy eye, with its colour-giving retina..." Fantasy's "implement" is Sense, the "vessel it drinks out of," and it is the union of these two that brings about the supreme, the symbolic, manifestation.

The resulting Symbols, through which man, "consciously or unconsciously, lives, works, and has his being," are of two sorts: those primarily *extrinsic*, and those primarily *intrinsic*. The former are the more common and appear as coats-of-arms, military banners, and "generally all national or other sectarian Costumes and Customs." These symbols, lacking intrinsic merit, are devoid of any precise, inherent, "divine idea"; it is only after they have amassed associations that they inspire action. Even so, no matter how much enthusiasm these extrinsic images inspire, they are, Carlyle implies, inferior in origin to and far more transient than intrinsic symbols. Even the Cross, "the highest ensign," Carlyle hastens to add, "that men have ever met and embraced under," has no meaning "save an accidental extrinsic one,"² and is not of itself an *object*³ "fit that men should unite around it."

Through the intrinsic Figure, or *Zeitbild*, as Carlyle calls it, Eternity looks "more or less visibly," and is, in fact, the "visible embodiment of a Thought." On one level, this Thought is gigantic and appears vague, since the whole universe becomes "one vast symbol of God." The next example is a little more graspable but scarcely more specific. Man, Carlyle says, is a symbol of God also; and so are his actions. Even the shelters he builds are visible embodiments, "symbolical as well as real." Such broad illustrations hardly aid us to a specific realization of Carlyle's *intrinsic* symbols. At best, they stress what he felt to be the permanent universal spirit of "harmony" (he develops this idea at length in "The Hero as Poet") behind the "true" Symbols, the spirit which sets them above extrinsic ones.

On another level, he begins to drop his hortatory role to speak more purely as an artist: "All true Works of Art" are *intrinsic* symbols—if, he testily prods his reader, "thou know a Work of Art from a daub of Artifice." "Certain *Iliads*," he believes, are the truest works since they are blessed by adulatory readers who through the ages also bestow extrinsic meanings, a "new divineness," on them. Time and universal appeal are the agents of greatness. The creators of the *Iliads*, the supreme artists, are men who have risen to Prophecy; and it follows, unsurprisingly enough, that the "highest of all Symbols" appear in the works of the Artist-Prophets.

An illuminating passage in "The Hero as Poet" distinguishes between the roles of artist and prophet in the poet. (An interesting implication, sometimes forgotten in the stress on Carlyle's moralism, is that for Carlyle the artist is here in the ascendancy.) Carlyle first distinguishes between his *Vates* as prophet and writer. The *Vates*-Prophet seizes the mystery of the moral nature of the universe—Good and Evil, Duty and Prohibition. The *Vates*-Poet, on the other hand, explores "the aesthetic side," that of the "Beautiful." The first role reveals "what we are to do"; the second "what we are to love." These two natures, though unequal, Carlyle insists, "run into one another and cannot be disjoined." To prove art's supremacy, he quotes Goethe: "The Beautiful... is higher than the Good; the Beautiful includes in it the Good." Carlyle's own Symbol, in its finest manifestations, shares this dual nature; its "aesthetic" transcends its "program" side and reveals an autonomous "Beautiful," which we are to enjoy much as we should "the lilies of the field" against whose bright array Solomon's glory was no match. "A glance, that," says Carlyle, "into the deepest deep of Beauty."

Carlyle, himself, as has been shown, allowed for both vagueness and specificity in his definitions, and he mingles the attributes of both symbol and metaphor. Modern critics, reflecting modern distinctions, have employed those parts of Carlyle's meaning which seem to explain symbol rather than metaphor.⁴ But these elements remain vague at best.⁵ A brief look at Carlyle's best-known figure, the Clothes image from *Sartor*, will help to clarify our terms. This much-noted image refers almost always to classes of objects (Carlyle speaks broadly of aprons, church-clothes and old clothes rather than of specific clothes), and is more accurately an involved metaphor than symbol. Further, the pseudo-philosophic meanings inherent in the Clothes image do not allow for what Robert Langbaum calls the purely "imaginative penetration" characteristic of the true literary

symbol,⁶ which has both a concrete and an imaginative potency of its own, apart from any program or broadly philosophic intent of the writer. The modern symbol inclines to be a concrete entity, the one of the class, and not the class; and it has dimensions of visual appeal entirely its own which spring from the unique mind of the writer and not necessarily from an inherited image belonging to a whole culture.

The elaborate Berline coach in which Carlyle's unfortunate king and queen flee Paris is a symbol of this order; it has "its own 'life', which is to say the observer's life inside it."⁷ Like the other major symbols of *The French Revolution*,⁸ the Bastille, the Guillotine, the Lanterne, and the Execution Cart, it draws much of its power from narrative motion.

Count Fersen, who engineers the escape attempt for Louis and Queen Antoinette, has ordered two coaches built: one is the large four-wheeled, two-seated vehicle with a rear platform for footmen; the other is a considerably smaller one which will be used for the queen's departure from the palace. Late on the night of June 20, 1791, this smaller "glass coach" draws up to the palace, and down the palace steps comes a "Lady" wearing a broad gypsy hat and leaning on her servant's arm. (Carlyle's mock-tepid effort to conceal the Queen's identity reveals the ineffectuality of her disguise, and sets the note of unreality which characterizes Royalty's whole hopeless endeavor). As Marie prepares to enter, another coach speeds out of the darkness, carrying General Lafayette on his way to investigate a chambermaid's report that the king plans to escape. As Lafayette passes, the Queen, oblivious to the identity of the traveller, and intent upon playing the masquerade to the fullest, enjoys a Cinderella-like "whim" to touch the General's carriage with her wand—"light little magic rod which she calls *badine*, such as the Beautiful then wore." These early elements of fantasy and foreboding, quite skillfully set, prepare us to accept the heightenings of theme and object which come later.

When the vehicle is ready, Count Fersen, the "glass coachman," drives it from the palace only to discover after a few blocks that he has taken the wrong street. Since neither he nor the Queen knows the city well—another indication of Royalty's tragic lack of perspective—he is forced to stop the coach to ask directions from a citizen, and valuable minutes are lost. Once on the proper route, he moves swiftly to the huge waiting Berliner and the rest of the royal family: Crack, crack we go incessant, through the slumbering City. Seldom, since Paris rose out of mud, or the Long-haired Kings went in Bullock-carts, was there such a drive. Mortals on each hand of you close by, stretched out horizontal, dormant; and we alive and quaking! Crack, crack, through the Rue de Grammont...⁹

Carlyle's touch of the mock-heroic is heightened by the shift in point of view from an impersonal third in the preceding paragraph to the "we" of this one, a device he uses often, and one which gives a vivid immediacy, almost a visual one, since we metaphorically take our places with the King in the huge lumbering coach; the telescoping of contrasts is another favorite device.

The coaches finally meet and the Queen joins her husband, sister-in-law, and children in the Berliner which Count Fersen, once he has set the small chaise adrift towards the city, chapters on its flight. The King is in masquerade. He is "*Valet*," Carlyle says, a "royal individual" wearing a round hat and peruke. The Queen maintains her story-book gypsy disguise, and the King's sister, Elizabeth, "the other hooded Dame," is "styled *Travelling-Companion*."

An emerging dream quality informs the coach with symbolic meaning as Carlyle sets it in motion against eternity: "with the Royalty of France, the Berline bounds off; forever, as it proved. Deft Fersen dashes obliquely Northward, through the country, towards Bougret, gains Bougret, finds his German Coachman and Chariot waiting there; cracks off, and drives undiscovered into unknown space." This is a voyage through eternity, irreversible and definite, with the rumbling overloaded gilt coach, a coach of fantasy, the visible image of the remoteness of the royal couple from the real truth of their plight, their minds, in a sense, as ornate, as fanciful, as inappropriate to the truth of the time as the ornateness of the vehicle to the crude starkness of the embittered citizen mobs. The Berline rustles on through the sleeping countryside, carrying the unsuspecting travellers "over a Rubicon in their own and France's History." Far behind lay the Tuilleries; ahead wait "France and the Earth itself... a larger kind of doghutch—occasionally going rabid." Madness permeates the entire earth as the fated coach with its concentric rings of space and time pursues its wide circle of destiny, a circle both symbolic and actual, assuming both specific geographic dimensions and heightened poetic ones. The central image, the dog hutch, besides its dissonant, almost crude overtones, embodies a perverse humor—dogs, not hutches, go mad.

Carlyle next provides a new visual dimension for his coach: the mammoth leathern vehicle becomes a "huge argosy" or "Acapulco-Ship" guided on its plunging way by a "heavy stern-boat of Chaise-and-pair." Its "three yellow Pilot-boats of Mounted Bodyguard Couriers" rock "aimless round it and ahead of it, to bewilder, not to guide." It lurches forward, "noted of all the world." The couriers are "loyal but stupid," and in their bright yellow liveries (hardly the proper color for concealment, though they probably accord well with the gilt of the coach) "go

prancing and clatting." The King during the many stops and "breakages" dismounts to walk up the hills and drink in the "blessed sunshine." Hampered by eleven horses, "double drink-money" for the attendants, and "all furtherance of Nature and Art," "it will be found," Carlyle reports in the manner of a cardboard historian, that Royalty travels "Sixty-nine miles in Twenty-two incessant hours." Under such circumstances, Carlyle insists, "one does not stickle about his vehicle."

The Berline, however, was "stickled" about; and so was the array of military escorts posted at Louis' order all along the route to "comfort" the Royal Imagination with a "look of security and rescue." This elite guard, fatigued with waiting hours after the scheduled times for the Berline to arrive, abandon their posts for the local dramshops, and now, where there was otherwise no danger, there is "danger without end." Afar on the road the "Sun-Chariot" (an ironic emblem of aristocracy) of a new Berline moves like "the weightiest dray," at three miles per hour. It may seem curious that Carlyle, who provides so little detailed description of his coach, implants its image so clearly in our vision; we are surprisingly aware of its certain bulk floundering through the countryside, and every new metaphoric reading (the Acapulco-ship image, for example) adds effectively to the sense of concreteness. This variety of suspended disbelief is not at all rare in the work of the users of literary symbol, and particularly of modern ones. Virginia Woolf's lighthouse, a symbol often praised as one of the most successful in modern fiction, shares this apparent amorphousness; and just as we are convinced of the concreteness of her lighthouse, so are we of the clarity of the Berline. Both Mrs. Woolf and Carlyle have chosen figures clearly in the experience of their readers: the Berline is a specific coach in history (an one of a type popular with royalty for over two centuries—the British State coach is a version of it). Similarly, the lighthouse is an object of universal familiarity. Both writers, assuming our knowledge, have supplied metaphoric dimensions dependent upon our visual reconstructions of those images.

When the Acapulco-ship flounders at last into the village of Sainte-Menehould, its truth is detected by an old postmaster who is suspicious of the valet and the lady who responds with a peculiar grace; but it is not until Varennes that the coach is actually stopped by a huge barricade. Now, Carlyle cries, "Hurly-burly has reached the Abyss, Dorff Berliner foremost!" Surrounded by citizens and militia, the King and entourage are forced to decoach and wait for six hours at a nearby inn while ten thousand soldiers and sixty thousand citizens are gathered to escort the unfortunate Berline on "its weary, inevitable" return to Paris. "There is no help either on earth," Carlyle acidly observes, "nor, since this is not an age of miracles, in Heaven; our Berliner Plot, of flight to Metz, has executed itself."

Again in Paris the coach floats through a weird human sea of thousands of strangely silent citizens. The yellow couriers sit high on top of the coach tied with ropes; the unfortunate Louis, peering out of his royal coach, appears by turns either embarrassed or dully sour; and Antoinette rides silently, her expression mingled grief and scorn. Soon, the "Pickle-herring Tragedy" vanishes into the Tuileries, and a "Doom" hangs over the scene.

The new Berline, Carlyle's "small Visible," has served its dramatic-satiric purpose well, having been "most fantastic" and yet "most miserably real." As "Sun-Chariot" and "Acapulco-ship" plunging its slow way through the dog-hutch of a universe, it has represented the tragically passé creed of the divine right of royalty and of aristocracy, which Marie and Louis and Persen persist in believing immutable; it has symbolized the broader theme of man's pathetic inability to come to grips with change and flux, and the pathetic, often ornate shells of security he builds for himself as he moves irretrievably towards his fate; it serves to represent man's innate prizing of material things—even on his doom-journey he encumbers himself with as many symbols and trappings of his worldly station as he can; and, finally, it has provided an exceptional focus for a display of Carlyle's imaginative technics—for a brilliant display of the serious and the ironic, and for stimulating metaphor and figure. Its range as symbol has been truly wide in the sense that a modern image has width: on the one hand it has been highly concrete and particular; and, on the other, unusually stimulating of the Imagination, the highest of human faculties. Beyond this, it has partaken of an exceptional tragic substance—the classic fall of Kings.

Wayne State University

Robert Louis Peters

FOOTNOTES

¹From the "Symbols" chapter of *Sartor Resartus*. All references to *Sartor* are to the Oxford University Press "World's Classics" series, reprinted, 1947.

²A lively contemporary conjecture about the relativity of the dominant Christian symbol appears in Philip Wylie's novel *Finley Wren*, where a character surmises that if Christ were executed today, the electric chair or the guillotine would appear over altars and on top of churches.

³I italicize *object* to emphasize the relatedness of Carlyle's enthusiasm for the concrete, specific attributes of the symbol to our present-day understanding of the term.

⁴See William York Tyndall, *The Literary Symbol* (New York, 1955), p. 12; Northrup Frye, *Fearful Symmetry: A Study of William Blake* (Princeton, 1947), p. 267; and Harry Levin, *James Joyce: A Critical Introduction* (Norfolk, 1941), p. 172.

⁵Tyndall, for example, after discussing Carlyle's theory, takes issue with C. S. Lewis's "confusion" between symbol and allegory (*The Literary Symbol*, p. 31)—Lewis finds they are opposites—, and accepts a definition of symbol by which "one term is presented while the other remains implicit" (p. 35). Frank Kermode, *Romantic*

Image (New York, 1957), p. 5, stresses the "concretion, precision, and oneness" of the Image, and raises the interesting question of the work of art itself as a symbol (p. 44). Robert Lanbaum, in his excellent study of the dramatic monologue, *The Poetry of Experience* (New York, 1957), p. 65, states that "the symbol of allegorical poetry stands in a one-to-one relation for an external idea or system of ideas." But the modern symbol exists as an object for "imaginative penetration." Isabel Hungerland, *Poetic Discourse* (Berkeley, 1958), charts these semantic difficulties with exceptional skill.

⁶*The Poetry of Experience*, p. 65.

⁷*Ibid.*

⁸Isolated symbols do appear in Carlyle's other works, but lack the complex artistry of those in *The French Revolution*: "The Tree Igrasil in 'The Hero as Poet,'" the Shreeckhorn in *Sartor*, the Phalaris' Bull in "Democracy," the Irish widow in the "Gospel of Dilettantism," the "Niagara plunge" of "Shooting Niagara" are examples that come to mind.

⁹I have used the Modern Library edition of *The French Revolution*.

ANOTHER VICTORIAN FIRST

Early next year the University of Illinois Press will publish a *Guide to Doctoral Dissertations in Victorian Literature, 1886-1958*, which I have compiled in collaboration with William R. Matthews, now of Wittenberg University. This volume will, it is hoped, form a worthy companion to the Templeman and Wright cumulations of the annual Victorian Bibliography and provide specialists in the field with a convenient check-list covering a large body of neglected material. Thus Victorian studies will become the first area of English (as distinct from American) literary scholarship to possess a comprehensive bibliography of dissertations.

The classified list includes just over 2,100 doctoral dissertations dealing with Victorian literature specifically or with broader topics which have substantial bearing on Victorian literature. We believe that the compilation will be useful. Its most obvious service will be to Ph.D. candidates and their advisers, since it will provide a quick means of ascertaining just what dissertations have already been written—by whom, where, and when—on any topic.

But the *Guide* is intended to be of value to all students of Victorian literature, no matter how long ago they acquired their own doctoral hoods. Dissertations have, of course, long been a subject of inexpensive humor in American academic circles, no less than in the *Times Literary Supplement*. It would be naive indeed for the compilers of any such bibliography as ours to assert that all or even a majority of the dissertations listed on a given subject will reward the trouble of locating, obtaining, and reading them. Nevertheless, the traditional derogation of dissertation literature, while amply justified in hundreds of individual instances, is unfortunate in that it leads to the overlooking of unpublished, or at best obscurely issued, dissertations which have real value for research and criticism. Whether or not Victorian specialists have been unusually cynical in this regard, it is certainly true that they have made little use of dissertations as sources of material for larger works. Whereas many if not most of the standard biographies, critical works, thematic histories, and other important studies of American literature draw freely and profitably upon unpublished dissertations, remarkably few of the comparable works in Victorian literature do so. It is not that dissertations in American literature are worth mining, while those in Victorian literature aren't. The explanation is, rather, that ever since the inception of the periodical *American Literature*, with its quarterly lists of dissertations in progress and completed, and further aided by the cumulated lists compiled at intervals by Professors Leisy, Hubbell, Leary, and Woodress, specialists in American literature have constantly had at their finger-tips a convenient record of dissertations in the field. They have therefore had quick access to the great amount of fresh research accomplished by doctoral candidates.

We hope that the existence of our own bibliography will, in similar fashion, encourage Victorian specialists to take account of the contributions that dissertations have made to the total fund of information on a given topic. It should remind them that behind all the wit lies the stout fact that some dissertations contain not only valuable data and documents that are otherwise unknown, but also critical insights and interpretations that fully deserve to be absorbed into the main stream of Victorian scholarship. It should remind them, too, of something that probably all scholars accept, absent-mindedly, as a truism but often fail to take practical advantage of: that dissertations sometimes save the researcher much time and labor by providing him with prepackaged and duly documented collections of fact and opinion (obscure biographical details, for example, or extensive excerpts from reviews) which he would otherwise have to gather, laboriously, on his own.

Like some other bibliographies, this one can be read as a kind of short-hand history of taste: in its particular case, a record of the twentieth century's regard for Victorian literature. The eleven Victorian authors most favored as dissertation subjects have been Browning (88), Carlyle (86), Dickens (82), Tennyson (78), Arnold (69), Hardy (63), Shaw (60), Meredith (54), George Eliot (49), Ruskin (47), and Yeats (47)—or, if Shaw and Yeats are to some extent on the chronological fringe, Thackeray (38), Morris (32), and Swinburne (31). There has been wide

variation, however, in the graphs of individual popularity. Dickens, for example, has forged into third place only lately; approximately one-third of all dissertations on him have been written since the Second World War. This is undoubtedly a consequence of the recent critical elevation of the novelist from Everyman's fireside companion to an artist of major significance and a challenging subject for sophisticated analysis. Arnold, although he had a dissertation devoted to him within four years of his death (Yale, 1892), did not come into prominence as a thesis subject until the 1930's; since then there has been an average of two dissertations a year on him. Other latecomers have been Meredith, who, though first written about only in 1911, has now received more attention than George Eliot; and Ruskin, and Samuel Butler, on whom the first of twenty-two dissertations was written only in 1913.

On the other hand, interest in certain Victorian figures has conspicuously faded. There was a bull market on Tennyson, especially in Germany and Austria, between 1910 and 1930, but nowadays he is the subject of only half as many dissertations as Browning. Carlyle, too, has lost most of the interest he once had for doctoral candidates, especially in the era between the world wars. (There is, however, no statistical ground for assuming that he had a particular ideological attraction for German dissertation-writers under the Nazi regime.) Ruskin and Morris no longer invite the amount of study they did in the earlier decades of the century. Kipling enjoyed a boom in the thirties, but his stock has declined severely since then.

In cases like these the curve of dissertation-popularity has coincided roughly with that of the author's reputation at large. But in others the interests of dissertation writers (and the men who suggested their topics) have run counter to the critical fashion. The persistent interest, decade after decade, in Browning is hardly in agreement with the tendency of twentieth-century critical opinion, though the fact that in recent years Browning has been one of the most popular Victorian authors for dissertation purposes—some twenty-five studies have been completed since 1950 alone—may be healthily prophetic. In any event, the number of dissertations written on a certain Victorian figure is not necessarily a measure of his literary stature or the breadth of his critical interest. According to this kind of score-card, Francis Thompson, Gissing, the Brontë sisters, and Trollope are of equal importance (sixteen or seventeen dissertations each); so are Mrs. Humphry Ward and George Borrow (nine or ten each); and, most disturbing of all, so are Felicia Hemans, Robert Buchanan, and Arthur Hugh Clough, with five or six each!

Some of the authors who are usually relegated to omnium-gatherum paragraphs or footnotes in the histories have received their deserts, if not something more: Jerome K. Jerome, Lord de Tabley, and Thomas Noon Talfourd have been the subjects of three dissertations each, and Jean Ingelow two. And at least portions of the barrel's bottom have been explored; there have been dissertations on Sarah Grand, Mrs. Augustus Craven, Lady Georgina Fullerton, Charles Heavysege, and Richard Whiteing. But this does not mean that justice has prevailed so far as more significant authors are concerned. There have been only eight dissertations on Macaulay, two on Lewis Carroll, and one each on Thomas Hughes and George Saintsbury.

Because the information has never before been brought together, few students have been aware how many hundreds of dissertations have been written on Victorian literary topics in European universities. More continental dissertations have been written on the Victorian period, in fact, than on any other era of English literature with the possible, but by no means certain, exception of the Middle Ages and the Elizabethan era. Not all of them have had the seminal influence of Lafourcade's work on Swinburne, Cazamian's on the social novel, or Miss Rosenblatt's on the art for art's sake movement. A great many are brief, ill-formed, pedantic, and pedestrian. But some European dissertations, in particular those produced in recent years, compare well with the best that have been turned out in American institutions, and future research should take them into account.

A study of the topics chosen by continental dissertation writers since one Johannes Fuhrmann addressed himself to the problem of *Die alliterierenden Sprachformeln in Morris' "Early Alliterative Poems" and in "Sir Gawaine and the Greene Knight"* at Kiel in 1886 throws interesting light on the reception Victorian literature has had in Europe. While the analysis of *literaturwissenschaftlicher Zeitgeschmack*, as has been suggested, can give only a partial, and in some respects misleading, account of the fortunes of a given reputation, the very selection of dissertation subjects offers clues to the fame an author has had, at least in academic circles, in France or Germany or Switzerland. More than half of all dissertations on Tennyson, for instance, have been written at continental universities. Teutonic interest in Bulwer-Lytton and Disraeli has been decidedly stronger than their post-Victorian literary reputation in England and America would seem to warrant. Until the last few years, the Germans were far more interested in Dickens as a subject of serious literary examination than were English-speaking nations. And until the Second World War, about two-thirds of the dissertations written on Shaw were of German origin, a reflection, undoubtedly, of the great popularity of Shaw's plays in the German theater.

Whatever its interest as a record of what has so far been written about the Victorians in universities from Seattle to Geneva, the principal usefulness of the *Guide* nevertheless will be to suggest what remains to be written. It would be hazardous to assert that certain Victorian authors have supported just about as many dissertations as they can; the necessities of dissertation writing have a way of inspiring new angles of vision, and no doubt there is still more to be said about every writer. But surely enough attention has been paid to some kinds of subjects. Such topics as "Women [or children or schools or marriage or soldiers or workmen] in the Victorian novel," "Skepticism [or pessimism or social reform or stoicism or mysticism] in Victorian poetry," "Utopias in Victorian literature," and "Victorian Translations of Goethe's *Faust*" have had their day. At least, there are plenty of other subjects to which future dissertation writers might more profitably devote their energies. Every Victorian scholar who leaps through the record of completed dissertations will spot conspicuous areas of neglect so far as his own special interests are concerned. The literature on individual Victorian periodicals can be added to indefinitely, and that on such topics as popular reading tastes, the profession of authorship, the composition of the reading public, and the economics of publishing is so small as to be virtually non-existent. There has been a handful of dissertations on Victorian autobiography, and one or two on biography, but the genre is so rich and its problems so challenging as to accommodate a score of studies. Some fifteen or twenty dissertations have been written on various aspects of Victorian criticism and aesthetics, but there should be many more. And while substantial attention has been given, in the past ten or fifteen years, under the influence of the various modern schools of criticism, to the techniques and philosophic patterns of novelists like Dickens and Eliot and (to a much smaller extent) those of Victorian poets, there is plenty of room for further analysis.

It is in this respect, we believe—in addition to its immediate practical usefulness as a check-list—that the *Guide* will eventually justify the not inconsiderable amount of labor that its compilation has required. Its long-run value will reside in its helping to point the way to new explorations. Thus its silences may prove as instructive as the information it actually contains.

The Ohio State University

Richard D. Altick

III. ENGLISH X NEWS

1. PEOPLE

RICHARD D. ALTICK (*Ohio State*), recipient of an ACLS grant for 1959-1960, is writing a book on English and American literary biography: its history, its various relations to the social and intellectual background, and its artistic problems. There will, of course, be considerable attention to biography in Victorian England, especially as the popularity of the genre sheds light on certain facets of the Victorian mind and, conversely, the concerns and habits of biographers are affected by prevailing ideas and *mores*. Among other things, he plans to do a case-history of the evolving Victorian image of Shakespeare the Man as an exercise in the reading of cultural history through biographical interpretation.

EUGENE J. BRZENK (*Bradley University*) is spending a sabbatical year in Europe, mostly on the Continent.... VAN AKIN BURD (*New York State University Teachers College*) has been appointed chairman of the English Department.... ROBERT A. COLBY (*Queens College, Flushing, N.Y.*) is spending the year in Europe, mainly in the British Museum.... PAUL A. CUNDIFF (*Butler University*), who has returned to teaching from full-time administration, will be on sabbatical leave the second semester—working on Browning in London and Florence.... GEORGIA S. DUNBAR (*Hofstra College, N.Y.*) has been promoted from Assistant to Associate Professor.

FRED H. HIGGINSON (*Kansas State University*) invites papers for the English Language and Literature since 1800 section of the Midwest Modern Language Association, which will hold its meeting at the University of Kansas, April 28-30, 1960.... MELVIN RICHTER (*Hunter College*) is spending the year in Paris as a Fulbright Research Scholar at l'Institut d'Etudes Politiques. He hopes to complete his book on T. H. Green during the year.... G. ROBERT STANGE (*University of Minnesota*) is visiting professor at the University of Chicago this year, replacing Professor Morton D. Zabel. Professor Zabel will be Berg Professor at New York University during the Spring Semester, 1960.

2. PROGRESS

ARNOLD: The University of Michigan Press has begun setting type for the first volume of a critical edition of Arnold's complete prose works, and plans to have it ready for spring publication. The edition is planned for ten volumes, to come out at the rate of about one-a-year. The arrangement is chronological: Volume I will contain the 1853 Prefaces, the Preface to *Merope, England and the Italian Question*, "On the Modern Element in Literature," and the lectures on Homer....

ARNOLD: John Kirby (*Randolph-Macon*) has begun work on a book-length study of Arnold's political and social criticism....

BROWNING: BROWNING, et al.: *The University of Tennessee Studies in Literature*, Vol. IV, now available,

- contains five articles about Victorians: modern appraisals of Browning, Tennyson, and Arnold by, respectively, K. L. Knickerbocker (*Tennessee*), Edgar H. Duncan (*Vanderbilt*), and Lionel Stevenson (*Duke*); "Browning's Reputation as a Thinker, 1889-1900" by Boyd Litzinger (*South Carolina*); "The Nineteenth-Century Cult of Inaction" by Clyde de L. Ryals (*Pennsylvania*). Copies of *Tennessee Studies* may be obtained by writing to the University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.... The great resurgence of interest in *The Ring and the Book* has certainly whetted our appetites for book-length studies of the poem by such scholar-critics as Richard Altick (*Ohio State*) and W. O. Raymond (*Toronto*)....
- BUTLER: Joseph Jones (*University of Texas*) has seen his book on Butler, entitled *The Cradle of Erewhon*, through the press.
- CARLYLE: Charles Richard Sanders (*Duke*) proceeds apace with his projected edition of the complete letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle. Roughly two-thirds of the letters, many unpublished and many others published only in part, with hundreds of letters to the Carlyles, are in the National Library of Scotland at Edinburgh. Work collecting the fugitive letters began in February, 1952. To date, Professor Sanders has found about 8,000 letters by Carlyle and 4,000 by Mrs. Carlyle. He is also collecting letters to the Carlyles when they seem to have special interest or significance. The indefatigable Mr. Sanders also has a book, *The Correspondence of Thomas Carlyle and John Ruskin*, which will contain over 90 unpublished letters by Ruskin, well under way... CARLYLE: Joseph L. Slater (*Rutgers*) has completed his edition of the Carlyle-Emerson correspondence. It awaits publication by the Columbia University Press late in 1960 or early in 1961...
- CLOUGH: The publication of Clough's *Poems* (1951) and a selection from his *Correspondence* (1957) has naturally stimulated a good deal of scholarly and critical activity. F. L. Mulhauser (*Pomona*), editor of both texts, is planning a full-scale biography. Richard Gollin (*Rochester*) has finished his dissertation (at Minnesota) called *The Formative Years of Arthur Hugh Clough*. Buckner Trawick (*Alabama*) has undertaken an edition of the *Prose Works* that will include half a dozen pieces never before printed, notably lectures on Dryden, Scott, and the English language. Walter Houghton (*Wellesley*) has completed a *Checklist of the Prose Writings of Arthur Hugh Clough*, containing more than 50 items, and is at work on a short critical study of the poems designed to encourage and direct the reviving interest in Clough's poetry.
- DICKENS: P. A. W. Collins (Warden, *Vaughan College, University of Leicester*) is working on a book on *Dickens as Editor*. He has just completed a book on *Dickens and Education*...
- DISRAELI: The Princeton University Press will publish next year B. R. Jerman's (*Pennsylvania State*) book on Disraeli. The tentative title is *The Young Disraeli*, a narrative of the pre-Parliament years....
- FARADAY: Alan E. Jeffrey's bibliography, *A List of the Published Work of Michael Faraday*, will be published early next year by Chapman and Hall....
- GISSING: Anthony Curtis hopes to publish his biography of Gissing next year. He spent 1958-1959 in this country gathering material, as a Commonwealth Fellow....
- JOHN GRAY: The *Aylesford Review* (England) will publish a Symposium Issue on Gray in 1960. One of the contributors is Paul A. Winckler (*Glen Cove, N.Y.*)....
- LANKESTER: J. Lester (*Manchester, England*) is completing his biography of Lankester, which will include interesting portraits of Haeckel, Ludwig, Dohrn, and letters from Pasteur, Metchnikoff, H. G. Wells, and Pavlova....
- LeFANU: Frederick Shroyer (*Los Angeles State College*) and Samuel D. Russell (*UCLA*) are collaborating on an authorized biographical and critical study. Tentative title: *The Invisible Prince: Life and Works of Joseph Sheridan LeFanu*.
- MACREADY: Charles Shattuck (*University of Illinois*) has almost completed an annotated facsimile of Macready's prompt-book of *As You Like It* (October, 1842), with original costume designs recently discovered by Macready's granddaughter....
- MANCHESTER POLITICS: Elizabeth Wallace (*University of Toronto*) is working on a study of the Manchester School....
- MEREDITH: C. L. Cline (*University of Texas*) is putting the finishing touches to his edition of Meredith's letters. Professor Cline will also do the chapter on Meredith in the volume on research in Victorian fiction being edited by Professor Lionel Stevenson (*Duke*) for the English X Group of *MLA*....
- RHODES: J. G. Lockhart (*Westminster Hall, Houses of Parliament*) hopes to publish his life of Rhodes about the middle of 1960. Thereafter, he will do a memoir of Lionel Curtis, founder of the *Round Table*....
- RUSKIN: John L. Bradley (*Mount Holyoke College*) hopes to have the Ruskin-Mount-Temple correspondence ready for publication in book form by the end of next summer... RUSKIN: Samuel E. Brown (*University of Maryland*) is working on a new edition of Ruskin's autobiography that will include all of the unpublished manuscript material of any literary or biographical interest....
- STEVENSON: Bradford Booth (*UCLA*) has to date transcribed some 2,500 Stevenson letters, and the task of collection is almost complete. Editorial work on these letters is expected to occupy at least three years of Professor Booth's research time.

SWINBURNE: Thomas E. Connolly (*University of Buffalo*) has just completed a monograph on Swinburne's poetic theory; James E. Suiter completed a dissertation on the same topic at New York University earlier this year.... SWINBURNE: Cecil Lang's edition of the Swinburne letters will be published in six volumes by the Yale University Press and the Oxford University Press. Volumes I and II were announced for September, 1959....

TENNYSON: Jerome Buckley (*Columbia*) has completed a book on Tennyson....

VICTORIAN POSITIONS: Rumor has it that the University of Tennessee has an opening for a specialist in Victorian poetry. Professor John C. Hodges is the appropriate person to contact. ... Rumor is playing similar tricks with *Columbia* and *New York University*....

VICTORIAN TASTE: Robert Peters (*Wayne State University*) has completed a manuscript on this subject which Appleton-Century will publish in the Spring. It is a collection of hard-to-get documents concerning the art-life controversy (Whistler's "Ten O'Clock," Ruskin's "Pre-Raphaelitism," Prince Albert's address to the Royal Academy, and so forth)....

VICTORIAN VIEWS OF AMERICA: Ada Nisbet (*UCLA*) has, for the past 15 years, been compiling a bibliography of British comment on the United States in the Victorian period (1832-1900). She is now preparing it for publication, having accumulated somewhere in the neighborhood of 8,000 titles. The project is not limited to travel comment only, but includes comment of any kind that is concerned with continental United States: social, political, literary, economic, and so forth, by any British or Commonwealth author of the 19th century. Of chief importance, of course, are books and pamphlets devoted to America or American affairs, but the bibliography also includes works of which only a portion is concerned with the United States, if that portion is more than a few pages....

WILDE: Rupert Hart-Davis has now completed the gigantic typescript of the first collected edition of the letters of Oscar Wilde. The book, which will probably be in two volumes, will be published in England by the editor's firm and in the United States by Harcourt Brace. Tentative date: Autumn, 1960.

3. THE CHICAGO PROGRAM

English 10. Victorian Literature. Chairman, Lionel Stevenson, *Duke Univ.*; Secretary, Carl R. Woodring, *Univ. of Wisconsin*. (Room 14).

I. Papers and Discussion.

1. "The Rubaiyat's Neglected Reviewer: A Centennial Recovery." Michael Wolff, *Indiana Univ.* (15 min.)
2. "The Critical Significance of Autobiography in *The Way of All Flesh*," Daniel F. Howard, *Kenyon Coll.* (15 min.)
3. "Browning's View of Art: A Lie Like Truth," Jacob Korg, *Univ. of Washington* (15 min.)

II. Business.

Advisory and Nominating Committee: Ch., Austin Wright, *Carnegie Inst. of Technology* (1959);

Lionel Stevenson (*ex officio*), Bernard Schilling, Francis G. Townsend (1958-59); A. Dwight Culler, Ada Nisbet (1959-60); William E. Buckler, John T. Fain (1960-61).

1959 Program Committee: Ch., George H. Ford, *Univ. of Rochester*; G. Robert Stange; A. McKinley Terhune.

Bibliography Committee: Ch., Robert C. Slack, *Carnegie Inst. of Technology*; Oscar E. Maurer; Robert A. Donovan; Charles T. Dougherty; Donald J. Gray; Richard C. Tobias; Ronald E. Freeman.

Editor, *Victorian Newsletter*: William E. Buckler, *New York Univ.*

1960 Officers: Chairman, Carl R. Woodring, *Univ. of Wisconsin*; Secretary, George H. Ford, *Univ. of Rochester*. (Nominations to be voted on.)

[Note: Immediately following the meeting, a luncheon will be held for this group in Room 15-16 of the Palmer House. To make reservations send check or money order for \$3.75 to Martin J. Svaglic, Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago 26, Illinois.]

IV. RECENT PUBLICATIONS: A SELECTED LIST

MARCH - AUGUST, 1959

GENERAL

- BIBLIOGRAPHY. Walter E. Houghton, "Victorian Periodicals." *TLS*, March 6, p. 133. A description of the projected "Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, 1824-1900."
Walter E. Houghton, "British Periodicals of the Victorian Age: Bibliographies and Indexes." *Library Trends*, April, pp. 554-565.
- ART AND THEATRE. S. R. Boase, *English Art, 1800-1870*. Clarendon Press. Vol. XI of *The Oxford History of English Art*.
Ralph Edwards and L. G. G. Ramsey, eds., *The Connoisseur Period Guides: The Early Victorian Period, 1830-1880*. National Magazine Co. Rev. *TLS*, Aug. 28, p. 492.
Bertram Joseph, *The Pragmatic Actor*. Routledge. Includes discussions of Macready, Irving, and others.
C. Willett and Phyllis Cunningham, *Handbook of English Costume in the Nineteenth Century*. Faber.
- CRITICISM AND LITERARY HISTORY. Vincent O'Sullivan, *Opinions*. Unicorn Press. Critical sketches and biographical reminiscences of Wilde, Gauda, Moore, Rolfe, Gissing, Harris, and others.

- Robert C. Rathburn and Martin Steinman, Jr., eds., *From Jane Austen to Joseph Conrad*. Univ. of Minnesota Press. Twenty essays, each by a different contributor, on the 19th-century English novel. Lytton Strachey, *Eminent Victorians*. Collins. A new edition, with introduction by Noel Annan.
- HISTORY.** Leonard Cooper, *Radical Jack*. Cresset Press. Biography of the Earl of Durham who helped write the Reform Bill of 1832.
- Frank Eyck, *The Prince Consort: A Political Biography*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Robert Rhodes James, *Lord Randolph Churchill*. Weidenfeld and Nicholson. Reviewed enthusiastically in *FLS*, May 29, p. 322.
- James Pope-Hennessy, ed., *Queen Victoria at Windsor and Balmoral: Letters from her Grand-daughter Princess Victoria of Prussia*. Allen and Unwin.
- Frank Thistlethwaite, *The Anglo-American Connection in the Early Nineteenth Century*. Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.
- PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.** W. K. Lowther Clarke, *A History of the S.P.C.K.* London: S. P. C. K. The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge was important in the Victorian Age as publisher of books and periodicals.
- A. O. J. Cockshutt, *Anglican Attitudes*. Collins. A study of three significant mid-Victorian controversies: the Gorham Judgment, the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, and the Colenso affair.
- A. R. Lacey, "Sidgwick's Ethical Maxims." *Philosophy*, July, pp. 217-228.
- James Murphy, *The Religious Problem in English Education*. Liverpool Univ. Press.
- PUBLISHING AND JOURNALISM.** Brian Inglis, "The Thunderer." *Spectator*, July 10, pp. 23-24. "Of all the Grand Chams of English nineteenth-century history, Delane has the most absurdly inflated reputation."
- Reginald Pound and Geoffrey Harmsworth, *Northcliffe*. Cassell. The first fully documented biography (933 pages) of the man who revolutionized English journalism in the nineties.
- SCIENCE.** Milton Millhauser, *Just Before Darwin: Robert Chambers and "Vestiges"*. Wesleyan Univ. Press.
- SOCIAL.** Marion Lochhead, *Young Victorians*. Murray.
- F. Gordon Roe, *The Victorian Child*. Phoenix House.
- INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS**
- ARNOLD.** Paul F. Baum, *Ten Studies in the Poetry of Matthew Arnold*. Duke Univ. Press.
- Vincent Buckley, *Poetry and Morality: Studies on the Criticism of Matthew Arnold, T. S. Eliot, and F. R. Leavis*. Chatto and Windus.
- William Robbins, *The Ethical Idealism of Matthew Arnold*. Heinemann. A well informed and well reasoned defense of Arnold's position (Robbins takes his title-phrase from Burt's *Types of Religious Philosophy*). Valuable chapters on critical responses to Arnold's work and on the relevance of his ideas today.
- BRONTES.** Winifred Gerin, *Anne Brontë: A Biography*. Nelson.
- Ada Harrison and Derek Stanford, *Anne Brontë: Her Life and Work*. Methen.
- W. D. Paden, *An Investigation of Gwendolyn*. Bookman Associates. In response to this book the *FLS* questioned and Phyllis Bentley defended, the value of studies in the Brontë juvenilia (see *FLS*, March 27, p. 178, and April 3, p. 193).
- BROWNING.** John Bryson, *Browning*. Longmans. ("Writers and Their Work," no. 106.) A notice by Jacques Vallette (*Mercure de France*, CCXXV, 152) contains the following comment: "Il semble que de nos jours Browning retrouve moins la faveur que les autres grands poètes victoriens, a cause de son obscurité et de ses défauts de style."
- W. O. Raymond, "Browning's 'The Statue and the Bust.'" *Univ. of Toronto Quarterly*, April, pp. 233-249. Discusses the alleged casuistry in Browning's implied and explicit moral judgment of the lovers.
- Charlotte Crawford Watkins, "The 'Abstruser Themes' in Browning's *Pippin at the Fair*." *PMLA*, Sept., pp. 426-437. Like Raymond, Mrs. Watkins is concerned with Browning's psychological and ethical implications in a deliberately controversial poem.
- CARLYLE.** Grace J. Calder, "Erasmus A. Darwin, Friend of Thomas and Jane Carlyle." *NLQ*, March, pp. 36-48. Unpublished letters to Mrs. Wedgwood.
- DARWIN.** The centenary of the *Origin of Species* has brought forth a number of significant studies, of which a few are listed here:
- "Darwin Anniversary Issue," *Victorian Studies*, September. Eight articles on various aspects of Darwin's work and influence.
- Alvar Ellegard, *Darwin and the General Reader*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell. An account of the reception of Darwin's works, 1859-72.
- Gertrude Himmelstorf, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*. Doubleday. According to a front-page article in *FLS*, July 17, "Until he has read, marked, learnt and inwardly digested this authoritative volume, no one should presume henceforth to speak on Darwin and Darwinism."
- Stanley Edgar Hyman, "The Origin' as Scripture." *VQR*, Autumn, pp. 540-552. Teleology and appeal to faith in Darwin's book.
- Ernst Mayr, "Agassiz, Darwin, and Evolution." *Harvard Library Bulletin*, Spring, pp. 165-194.
- Morse Peckham, ed. *The Origin of Species by Charles Darwin: A Variorum Text*. Univ. of Pennsylvania Press. 816 pages, \$15.
- DICKENS.** Harold F. Folland, "The Doer and the Deed: Theme and Pattern in *Barnaby Rudge*." *PMLA*, Sept., pp. 406-417.
- S. Monod, *Charles Dickens*. Paris: Seghers, 1958. Includes iconography, discography, filmography.
- Harry Stone, "Dickens and Interior Monologue." *PQ*, January, pp. 52-65. A revealing discussion of Dickens' mastery of the form, especially in two *Household Words* sketches.
- Disraeli. Maurice Edelman, "Political Novel: Disraeli Sets a Lively Pace." *FLS*, August 7, supp. pp. vi-vii. On *Contingencies* as "one of the seminal novels of the nineteenth century."
- ELIOT.** David R. Carroll, "Unity through Analogy: An Interpretation of 'Middlemarch.'" *ES*, June, pp. 305-316. Analogy between the various human quests for a cosmos by characters in the novel, as a key to its unity.
- Barbara Hardy, *The Novels of George Eliot*. Athlone Press.
- P. G. Mahu, *La Pensée Religieuse et Morale de George Eliot*. Paris: Didier.
- FITZGERALD.** Another centenary, that of the first publication of the *Rubaiyat*, is marked by the following studies:
- A. J. Arberry, *The Romance of the Rubaiyat*. Allen and Unwin.
- Carl J. Weber, ed., *Fitzgerald's Rubaiyat*. Colby College Press. These two books are reviewed in a special article, "The Rubaiyat After One Hundred Years," *FLS*, March 27, p. 159.
- John Quinlan, "The Centenary of the Rubaiyat." *Contemporary Review*, March, pp. 180-181.
- GRAHAME.** Peter Green, *Kenneth Grahame, 1859-1932*. World Pub. Co.
- Neville Braybrooke, "Kenneth Grahame Centenary." *Contemporary Review*, April, pp. 236-238.
- HARDY.** David Perkins, "Hardy and the Poetry of Isolation." *ELB*, June, pp. 253-270.
- HOPKINS.** Paul F. Baum, "Sprung Rhythm." *PMLA*, September, pp. 418-425. "Sprung Rhythm is not a form of

- verse, to be scanned by feet, but a form not to be explained as verse."
- HOUSMAN. *Complete Poems*. Centennial Edition, with an Introduction and Text by Tom Burns Haber. Henry Holt. On the cover by Carter and Tom Burns Haber, *TLS*, May 29, 1922.
- HUXLEY. Cyril Bibby, *T. H. Huxley: Scientist, Humanist*. An account of Huxley's educational theories.
- CHARLES KINGSLEY. Robert Bernard Martin, ed., *Charles Kingsley's Tour, 1874*. Princeton Univ. Library.
- HENRY KINGSLEY. Robert Lee Wolff, "Henry Kingsley." *Humanities*, philological and critical study, with unpublished letters.
- MEREDITH. David Bonnell Green, "George Meredith's 'A Defence of the Poet' Translations." *MLR*, July, pp. 321-336. *McClure's Magazine*, August, 1852.
- MILL. Still another centenary—*On Liberty*, 1859—has been celebrated. R. V. Lennard, "Mill—and Others—on Liberty." *MLR*, July, pp. 321-336. John William Ward, "Mill, Marx, and Modern Intellectual History," pp. 527-539. Sees Mill's essay as "hortatory, not scientific." Richard H. Powers, "John Stuart Mill: Moralistic and Political," pp. 206-212. On *The Subjection of Women*. Carl Wellman, "A Reinterpretation of Mill's Proposition of Liberty (to which Raphael, Mabbott, Atkinson, and Kruttschnitt object)," pp. 206-212. "desire as proof of desirability."
- PATER. Jean Sudrann, "Victorian Compromise and Modernism: Pater as a landmark in the development of modernism."
- ROSSETTI. "Not All Roses in the Victorian Nursery." *MLR*, July, pp. 321-336. Rossetti's *Speaking Likenesses*, 1874. Lona Mask Packer, "Christina Rossetti and Alice's Letters." Hitherto unpublished letters to William Butler Yeats.
- RUSKIN. Van Akin Burd, "Background to *Modern Painters*." *MLR*, June, pp. 254-267. Reynolds' *Discourses* at Blackwood's which provoked Ruskin's first book.
- SWINBURNE. Paull F. Baum, "The Fitzwilliam Manuscript of *Atalanta in Calydon*." April, pp. 161-178. Successive and extensive editions by a strenuous workman.
- SYNGE. David H. Greene and Edward M. Stephens, *J. M. Synge*.
- TENNYSON. Joan E. Hartman, "The Manuscripts of Tennyson's *Idylls of the King*." Spring, pp. 239-264. On Tennyson's drafts. J. S. Lawry, "Tennyson's 'The Epic': A Gestural Study of the Introduction as Context." John D. Rosenberg, "The Two Kingdoms of *In Memoriam*." A tentative analysis of the symbolic structure of the poem. Critics who take Tennyson seriously, to a certain extent. Clyde de L. Ryals, "The 'Fatal Woman' Symbol in *In Memoriam*." Dame in Tennyson's early work.
- TROLLOPE. John Hagan, "The Divided Mind of Anthony Trollope." *MLR*, July, pp. 321-336. Trollope's seizure of experience boldly and freshly is still a new thing of a conventional formula."
- TRENCH. J. Bromley, *The Man of Ten Talents*. S. P. C. K. translator, philologist, and Archbishop of Canterbury.
- PRINCE
- BRANWELL BRONTË. Daphne du Maurier and Winifred Gertrude Brontës brother. *TLS*, July 24, p. 435.
- CONAN DOYLE. Pierre Weil Nordon is completing a biography of Conan Doyle.
- RICHARD HOLT HUTTON. Robert H. Tener is working on a full bibliography of his writings—political, literary, etc.—6000 items in all. *TLS*, April 24, p. 24.
- JEROME K. JEROME. A centenary celebration was held at the University of Illinois. Trollope's life and work is being published.
- GEORGE MOORE. Helmut Gerber (*Purdue*) is searching out manuscripts written between 1895 and 1906.
- WILLIAM MORRIS. Joseph R. Dunlop asks for unpublished manuscripts, script illumination, type and book design.
- CHARLES READE. Thomas D. Claerson is working on a new edition of *Reade's Works*.
- JOHN STUART MILL. Jack Stillinger announces that an edition of the University of Illinois Library, is being prepared. Another manuscript, mostly in the handwriting of Mill, 1822. *TLS*, August 7, p. 459.
- LORD RAGLAN. Christopher Hibbert is writing a book about the Raglan family.
- LORD ROSEBERY. Robert Rhodes James is engaged on a biography of Lord Rosebery.
- SIR GARNET WOLSELEY. R. C. Miers is about to start a biography of Sir Garnet Wolseley.

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER is edited for the English by William E. Buckler, 737 East Building, New York. Subscription rates in the United States and Canada are \$1.00 per year. All payments should be made payable to William E. Buckler, 737 East Building, New York. The subscription rates for the United Kingdom and other countries should be made payable to K. J. Fielding, Chequer Street, Trent, Staffs. Mr. Fielding is the British representative.

of Prose Rhythm not amenable to scansion and therefore

Introduction by Basil Davenport and a History of the
the text, see an exchange of letters between John
July 24, and August 14.

st, and *Educator*. Watts. Especially valuable for its

s *Kingsley's American Notes. Letters from a Lecture*

arvard *Library Bulletin*, Spring, pp. 195-226. A biogra-
ed letters and a catalogue of books.

ustrian Poets': A Newly Identified Review Essay with
redith's article on Grillparzer, Lenau, and others,

s occasioned some significant articles:

' *Hibbert Journal*, July, pp. 342-348. A centennial es-
f more recent theories.

dividualism." *Virginia Quarterly Review*, Autumn, pp.
not argumentative."

y and Equality." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, Spring, pp.

oof." *Ethics*, July, pp. 268-276. Continues the controversy
etzmann have all contributed) on Mill's famous proposi-
in *Utilitarianism*.

n Revolution." *ELH*, September, pp. 425-444. On *Marius*
n prose fiction.

TLS, May 29, supp. p. xi. An attack on Christina

ce Boyd of Penkill Castle." *TLS*, June 26, p. 389.

ell Scott's friend.

s: The Tradition and the Turner Controversy." *PMLA*,

s the influence behind the anti-Turner articles in
book.

t of Swinburne's 'Atlanta,' Verses 1038-1204." *MLR*,

ive revisions in the third stasimon show Swinburne as

ynge, 1871-1909. Macmillan. The first authoritative biography.

son's 'Gareth and Lynette.'" *Harvard Library Bulletin*,
and revisions of this idyll.

e of Recovered Faith." *MLN*, May, pp. 400-403. The sig-
for the first appearance of "Morte D'Arthur."

moriam." *JEGP*, April, pp. 228-240. An extremely percep-
f the poem. (*Query*: Why the compulsion, in contemporary

dopt a defensive or apologetic tone?)
in Tennyson." *PMLA*, September, pp. 438-443. La Belle

Trollope." *NCF*, June, pp. 1-26. "An incipient ability to
tified by a last minute return to the comforting security

K. A biography of Richard Chenevix Trench, poet, theologian,
f Dublin.

JECTS
in are both working (independently) on books about the

ographical and critical study. *TLS*, May 15, p. 289.

a biographical and critical study of Hutton, to include a
ical, religious, philosophical, and literary—more than

l.

at Walsall in May, and a catalogue of an exhibition illus-
published. *TLS*, April 3, p. 193.

t letters to and from Moore, published and unpublished,

ed letters or documents relating to Morris's work in manu-
n, and printing. *TLS*, April 3, p. 193.

ew biography. *TLS*, August 28, p. 495.

early manuscript (1854) of Mill's *Autobiography*, now in
eing edited for publication, and asks information about

iting of Helen Taylor, which was sold at Sotheby's in

about the Crimean War Field-Marshal. *TLS*, June 26, p. 385.

ography. *TLS*, July 17, p. 423.

work on a biography. *TLS*, May 8, p. 273.

lish X Group of the Modern Language Association by

rk University, New York 3, New York. Subscription

) for one year and \$2.00 for three years. All checks

personally, so that they may be easily negotiated.

are 7/6 for one year and 15/ for three years. Checks

shire County Training College, Alsager, Stoke-on-

representative of VNL.