



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

- Archibald C. Coolidge, Jr. (*State University of Iowa*)
- William M. Gibson (*New York University*)
- Robert A. Greenberg (*Cornell University*)
- Park Honan (*Connecticut College*)
- J. L. Kendall (*University of Oklahoma*)
- Boyd Litzinger (*St. Bonaventure University*)
- William H. Marshall (*University of Pennsylvania*)
- Stephen Mooney (*University of Tennessee*)
- James E. Suiter (*Western Illinois University*)
- Myron Taube (*Staten Island Community College*)
- William D. Templeman (*University of Southern California*)

I. LEADING ARTICLES

THE CHARACTER OF AMELIA IN THE MEANING OF *VANITY FAIR*

Critics have generally agreed that while Becky Sharp is one of Thackeray's greatest creations, Amelia Sedley is one of his worst. We are told that she is "insipid and essentially selfish";¹ that she is a "fool";² or that "with all her virtues, [she] is silly."³ She is "quite frankly depicted as stupid almost to the point of imbecility."⁴ The reason for her failure, we are told, is to be found in the real-life person upon whom she was based. Thus, Thackeray's creation went "limp upon his hands . . . because, apparently, it had not occurred to him that the original of Amelia, his 'poor little wife,' had not enough in her to support the role of a major character." As a result, Amelia prevents *Vanity Fair* from being a really great novel: "had he attained to the same independence and anonymity in his handling of Amelia Sedley [as he did with Becky], *Vanity Fair* might have been one of the first half-dozen novels in European literature."⁵

And yet Thackeray meant Amelia's story to contribute as much as Becky's to the meaning of the novel. Balanced against Becky, who represents the materialism of the age, is Amelia, who has a quality that Becky lacks, "a quality above most people whizz: LOVE—by w^h she shall be saved."⁶ Becky and the two Sir Pitts and Miss Crawley are loveless people, which for Thackeray is the same as godless. For them there is no hope; for Amelia there is, because she has the ability to love. But what kind of love is it? The motivating force in her life, a love which Thackeray meant to be thematic in the novel, renders her susceptible to powerful attack: "The love she bears George Osborne is debasing, after all: for the reader, who sees Osborne plain, is moved first to indignation and at last to dismay by Amelia's inveterate blindness."⁷ But her wifely love is not all: "her mother-love makes her an automaton."⁸

Those critics who have argued whether Amelia is a fool or an idiot have missed the point completely. Thackeray meant Amelia's love for George to be debasing so that she can evolve after "her scoundrel of a husband is well dead with a ball in his odious bowels; when she has had sufferings, a child, and a religion" (*Letters*, II, 309). True, some critics have seen that Thackeray had something in mind when he drew Amelia. Thus, for example, Whibley says (erroneously, I believe) that Amelia is "drawn with a cold contempt, and I am not certain that she is not as savage a piece of satire as Becky herself."⁹ Nearer the truth is Kathleen Tillotson's view that Thackeray "often employs her as a medium for mockery of the sweet insipid contemporary novel-heroine."¹⁰ I will extend this: while Amelia is a satiric comment on Victorian life and social mores, her character is more modern and complex than has hitherto been assumed.

We agree that, to a certain extent, Thackeray was involved with Amelia because she was modelled on his wife. However, to admit this does not explain Amelia's character. Moreover, Thackeray's deep involvement with his wife did not prevent him from seeing her plain. Quite early in his married life, he realized that his dear wife was poorly prepared for marriage. He wrote to his mother, "I am sorry to tell you we are the laziest people in all Paris, my wife has fairly beaten me, and we never breakfast before eleven o'clock. I am ashamed and angry every morning of my life, but do what I will scold or laugh she won't get up, and I am only too glad of an excuse to lie in bed—fancy that out of the 24 hours we spend at least eleven in bed" (*Letters*, I, 320). Besides being lazy, Isabella Thackeray was incapable of handling the family finances. Thackeray told his mother that his daughter knew as much about money as did her mother, "who has a noble

want of the organ of number. The Child is the same, for though she knows all her letters, we can not get her to count to two" (*Letters*, I, 435). I believe that despite a certain degree of involvement with Amelia, Thackeray saw her plain, too, and used her to attack the very same conditions that had produced his own ineffectual wife. For Thackeray saw Amelia—more so than Becky—as a product of her society. Illegitimate, the daughter of artists, half French with Napoleonic sympathies—Becky was, in a word, a foreigner on almost all levels. Amelia, on the other hand, is pure middle class—in thinking, in training, in parental background—and therefore, as a direct product of her society, more of an attack on middle class England than Becky the outsider.

Thackeray commences his development of Amelia's character by showing her family life. One remembers how often the autobiographies of the Victorians reveal that despite Evangelical fervor and talk of Christ as Love, there very often was little love itself. The child was alone. In her home, Amelia is isolated from and incapable of communicating with the other members of her family. Her brother, Jos, who could have been a friend to her, is a dozen years older than she. As early as the second chapter, Amelia tells Becky how little he has had to do with her. Ironically, although Becky is the orphan, Amelia feels the isolation:

When Rebecca saw the two magnificent Cashmere shawls which Joseph Sedley had brought home to his sister, she said, with perfect truth, "that it must be delightful to have a brother," and easily got the pity of the tender-hearted Amelia, for being alone in the world, an orphan without friends or kindred.

"Not alone," said Amelia; "you know, Rebecca, I shall always be your friend, and love you as a sister—indeed I will."

"Ah, but to have parents, as you have—kind, rich, affectionate parents, who give you everything you ask for; and their love, which is more precious than all! My poor papa could give me nothing, and I had but two frocks in all the world! And then to have a brother, a dear brother! Oh, how you must love him!"

Amelia laughed.

"What! *don't* you love him? you, who say you love everybody?"

"Yes, of course, I do—only—"

"Only what?"

"Only Joseph doesn't seem to care much whether I love him or not. He gave me two fingers to shake when he arrived after ten years' absence! He is very kind and good, but he scarcely ever speaks to me; I think he loves his pipe a great deal better than his" * * * but here Amelia checked herself, for why should she speak ill of her brother? "He was very kind to me as a child," she added; "I was but five years old when he went away."

Later, before her marriage, when she is torn by doubts of George's fidelity, Amelia has no one to speak to:

She was lying, awake and unhappy, overhead. In the midst of friends, home, and kind parents, she was alone. To how many people can any one tell all? Who will be open where there is no sympathy, or has call to speak to those who can never understand? Our gentle Amelia was thus solitary. She had no confidante, so to speak, ever since she had anything to confide. She could not tell the old mother her doubts and cares; the would-be sisters seemed every day more strange to her. And she had misgivings and fears which she dared not acknowledge to herself, though she was always secretly brooding over them (Chapter XVII).

Part of Amelia's difficulty is that she is never allowed to assert herself. Her naturally passive personality was re-enforced by an education that did nothing to develop any sense of independence. Instead of learning about life as Becky did, at first hand, Amelia is sent from the protection of her middle class home to Miss Pinkerton's Academy where, with only other adolescent girls or old maids as companions, she never matured properly. As a result, Becky meets life with a challenge: she throws the dictionary out of the coach; Amelia meets it with passivity and silence. What makes Amelia's emotional and intellectual inarticulateness worse is that it is partially forced upon her by her intimates, who stifle her and increase her sense of inadequacy. George Osborne's sisters and Dobbin's sisters agree on one point: "her very trifling merits; and their wonder that their brothers could find any charms in her"; but, Thackeray points out, their opinions are colored by jealousy. George's sisters force stupidity upon Amelia, making her act out what S. I. Hayakawa calls "a self-fulfilling prophecy":-

"We are kind to her," the Misses Osborne said . . . and they treated her with such extreme kindness and condescension, and patronised her so insufferably, that the poor little thing was in fact perfectly dumb in their presence, and to all outward appearance as stupid as they thought her. She made efforts to like them, as in duty bound, and as sisters of her future husband. She passed "long mornings" with them—the most dreary and serious of forenoons. She drove out solemnly in their great family coach with them, and Miss Wirt their governess, that raw-boned vestal. They took her to the ancient concerts by way of a treat, and to the oratorio, and to St. Paul's to see the charity children.

where in such terror was she of her friends, she almost did not dare be affected by the hymn the children sang (Chapter XII).

To make matters worse, the "self-fulfilling prophecy" affects the relationship between Amelia and George. While Amelia's sense of inferiority is intensified by the behavior of George's sisters, George is deluged with comments on Amelia's unworthiness and he develops a new attitude of his own:

Miss Wirt and these two affectionate young women [George's sisters] so earnestly and frequently impressed upon George Osborne's mind the enormity of the sacrifice he was making, and his romantic generosity in throwing himself away upon Amelia, that I'm not sure but that he really thought he was one of the most deserving characters in the British army, and gave himself up to be loved with a good deal of easy resignation (Chapter XII).

There is even a sense of self-sacrifice in George's twitting of his father when asked about his relationship with Amelia: "Why, sir, didn't you order me to marry her, and ain't I a good boy? Haven't our Papis settled it ever so long?" (Chapter XIII).

It is easy to say that Amelia is a fool for loving somebody who is obviously not worth her love. However, she realizes that she is mistreated, that George ignores her for his other interests. It is part of her complexity that she is vaguely aware that George is not worthy of her:

Her heart tried to persist in asserting that George Osborne was worthy and faithful to her, though she knew otherwise. How many a thing she had said, and got no echo from him. How many suspicions of selfishness and indifference had she to encounter and obstinately overcome. To whom could the poor little martyr tell these daily struggles and tortures? Her hero himself only half understood her. She did not dare to own that the man she loved was her inferior; or to feel that she had given her heart away too soon. Given once, the pure bashful maiden was too modest, too tender, too trustful, too weak, too much woman to recall it (Chapter XVIII).

But her emotions have been engaged for too long: "Haven't they been engaged ever since they were children?" Dobbin asks his sisters (Chapter XVIII). Amelia's life has been too entwined with George's for too long a time, and she cannot see him clearly.

In Amelia, it seems to me, are the seeds of a tragic figure, but a tragic figure of the modern day, for she lacks the clarity of perception the tragic figure has, and she is driven by forces beyond her ability to control. Her crime, like that of many tragic figures, is "loving wrongly, too violently, against reason" (Chapter XVIII). Reason would have told her, as is obvious to the reader, that George is worthless. But she had been encouraged—imprudently, Thackeray points out—by her parents, who "abet[ed] her in such idolatry and silly romantic ideas" (Chapter XII). For years she had rationalized his behavior towards her, particularly in his letters to her: "How she used to blush and lighten up when those letters came! How she used to trip away with a beating heart, so that she might read unseen! If they were cold, yet how perversely this fond little soul interpreted them into warmth. If they were short or selfish, what excuses she found for the writer!" (Chapter XVIII). If she had a clearer perception, it is true, Amelia would have been a more striking character; but, like most neurotics, she lacks a clear view of reality, a reality with which she can never quite come to grips.

Even her marriage fails to improve Amelia's lot. A week after the wedding, Amelia is aware, in a vague, unsettling way, that something is wrong:

[she] fell to thinking over the passed week, and the life beyond it. Already to be looking sadly and vaguely back: always to be pining for something which, when obtained, brought doubt and sadness rather than pleasure; here was the lot of our poor little creature, and harmless lost wanderer in the great struggling crowds of Vanity Fair.

Here she sate, and recalled to herself fondly that image of George to which she had knelt before marriage. Did she own to herself how different the real man was from that superb young hero whom she had worshipped? It requires many, many years—and a man must be very bad indeed—before a woman's pride and vanity will let her own to such a confession (Chapter XXVI).

On their honeymoon, she and George meet the Rawdon Crawleys at Brighton, and the relationship between George and Becky deepens. When the two couples meet a few weeks later in Brussels, George is completely infatuated with Becky; he completely ignores Amelia, who is aware that she is losing her husband:

George accepted the invitation [to dinner], although his wife was a little ailing. They were now not quite six weeks married. Another woman was laughing or sneering at her expense, and he not angry. He was not even angry with himself, this good-natured fellow. It is a shame, he owned to himself; but hang it, if a pretty woman will throw herself in your way, why, what can a fellow do, you know? I am rather free about women, he had often said, smiling and nodding knowingly to Stubble and Spooner, and other comrades of the

mess-table, and they rather respected him than otherwise for this prowess. . . . And as Emmy did not say much or plague him with her jealousy, but merely became unhappy and pined over it miserably in secret, he chose to fancy that she was not suspicious of what all his acquaintances were perfectly aware—namely, that he was carrying on a desperate flirtation with Mrs. Crawley. He rode with her whenever she was free. He pretended regimental business to Amelia (by which falsehood she was not in the least deceived), and consigning his wife to solitude or her brother's society, passed his evenings in the Crawleys' company, losing money to the husband and flattering himself that his wife was dying of love for him (Chapter XXIX).

The question arises, Why is Amelia silent when she knows that her husband is chasing after another woman? Her silence is part of her complexity. Amelia has long been jealous of Becky's power over George: "Rebecca's twinkling green eyes and baleful smile" fill Amelia "with dismay" (Chapter XXVI); her "wit, spirits and accomplishments troubled her with a rueful disquiet" (Chapter XXV). When Amelia does try to articulate her feelings, George reprimands her so that she becomes silent and more awkward:

Amelia's manners were such when she and George visited Crawley and his wife at these quarters, that they had very nearly come to their first quarrel; that is George scolded his wife violently for her evident unwillingness to go, and the high and mighty manner in which she comported herself towards Mrs. Crawley, her old friend; and Amelia did not say one single word in reply; but with her husband's eye upon her, and Rebecca scanning her as she felt, was, if possible, more bashful and awkward on the second visit which she paid to Mrs. Rawdon, than on her first call (Chapter XXIX).

Thus, Amelia is forced by the anger of her husband to sit by while he continues his infatuated fawning over Becky.

But while Amelia is jealous of Becky, she also feels inferior to her. She feels incapable of being a fit wife for George: "She trembled for the future. How shall I be a companion for him, she thought—so clever and so brilliant, and I such a humble foolish creature? How noble it was of him to marry me—to give up everything and stoop down to me!" (Chapter XXV). Amelia's sense of George's sacrifice further complicates her problem, for she feels responsible for George's marrying beneath himself and for his being cut off by his father. George, of course, does all he can to keep Amelia aware of the nobility of his sacrifice. Notice the ironic scene in which he tells Amelia that his father has broken off with him:

He came into her room however, holding the attorney's letter in his hand, and with so solemn and important an air that his wife, always ingeniously on the watch for calamity, thought the worst was about to befall, and running up to her husband, besought her dearest George to tell her everything—he was ordered abroad; there would be a battle next week—she knew there would.

Dearest George parried the question about foreign service, and with a melancholy shake of the head said, "No, Emmy; it isn't that: it's not myself I care about: it's *his* you. I have had bad news from my father. He refuses any communication with me; he has flung us off; and leaves us to poverty. *I* can rough it well enough; but you, my dear, how will you bear it? read here." And he handed her over the letter.

Amelia, with a look of tender alarm in her eyes, listened to her noble hero as he uttered the above generous sentiments, and sitting down on the bed, read the letter which George gave her with such a pompous martyr-like air. Her face cleared up as she read the document, however. The idea of sharing poverty and privation in company with the beloved object is, as we have before said, far from being disagreeable to a warm-hearted woman. The notion was actually pleasant to little Amelia. Then, as usual, she was ashamed of herself for feeling happy at such an indecorous moment, and checked her pleasure, saying demurely, "O George, how your poor heart must bleed at the idea of being separated from your papa!"

"It does," said George, with an agonised countenance.

"But he can't be angry with you long," she continued. "Nobody could, I'm sure. He must forgive you, my dearest, kindest husband. Oh, I shall never forgive myself if he does not."

"What vexes me, my poor Emmy, is not *my* misfortune, but yours," George said. "I don't care for a little poverty; and I think, without vanity, I've talents enough to make my own way."

"That you have," interposed his wife, who thought that war should cease, and her husband should be made a general instantly.

"Yes, I shall make my way as well as another," Osborne went on; "but you, my dear girl, how can I bear your being deprived of the comforts and station in society which my wife had a right to expect? My dearest girl in barracks; the wife of a soldier in a marching regiment; subject to all sorts of annoyance and privation! It makes me miserable."

Emmy, quite at ease, as this was her husband's only cause of disquiet, took his hand,

and with a radiant face and smile began to warble that stanza from the favourite song of "Wrapping Old Stairs," in which the heroine, after rebuking her Tom for inattention, promises "his trousers to mend, and his grog too to make," if he will be constant and kind, and not forsake her. "Besides," she said, after a pause, during which she looked as pretty and happy as any young woman need, "isn't two thousand pounds an immense deal of money, George?"

George laughed at her *naivete* (Chapter XXV).

Thus, we see an Amelia who, though she feels her husband is unworthy of her and is angered by his philandering, is made to feel guilt and shame because of the sacrifice he made in marrying her.

But the question is raised, Why, after his death, does Amelia maintain the idolization of a husband she knew was not worthy of her? The answer is that her different guilt feelings and other emotions combine to confuse and distort her perception of reality. Besides the guilt she felt for causing George to marry her and break with his father, Amelia feels guilt for leaving her parents:

I ought to have stopped at home and taken care of poor papa. And her neglect of her parents (and indeed there was some foundation for this charge which the poor child's uneasy conscience brought against her) was now remembered for the first time, and caused her to blush with humiliation. Oh! thought she, I have been very wicked and selfish—selfish for forgetting them in their sorrows—selfish in forcing George to marry me. I know I'm not worthy of him—I know he would have been happy without me—and yet—I tried, I tried to give him up (Chapter XXV).

The guilt created in Amelia in her role as wife-daughter remains, and later, after her son is born, controls her life as a wife-mother. While George is still alive, Amelia can blame Rebecca for trying to take George away. She does not blame George for being an errant husband, for he is good and noble and self-sacrificing. Instead, she blames Becky. But brilliant Becky's snaring of George only emphasizes Amelia's own sense of inferiority, and consequently magnifies the enormity of George's sacrifice. In time, the philandering will be forgotten and the sacrifice will be remembered. Years later, Amelia still remembers George's sacrifice, while the cause of her jealousy, his philandering, is interred with his bones:

All her husband's faults and foibles she had buried in the grave with him: she only remembered the lover, who had married her at all sacrifices: the noble husband so brave and beautiful, in whose arms she had hung on the morning when he had gone away to fight, and die gloriously for his king. From heaven the hero must be smiling down upon that paragon of a boy whom he had left to comfort and console her (Chapter XLVI).

With the death of George ends one phase of Amelia's life and with the birth of her son begins another. Right after her husband's death, Amelia goes into shock. Old Osborne passes her in Brussels and does not even recognize her: "It was Amelia, but how changed from the fresh and comely girl Osborne knew. Her face was white and thin. Her pretty brown hair was parted under a widow's cap—the poor child. Her eyes were fixed, and looking nowhere. They stared blank in the face of Osborne, as the carriages crossed each other, but she did not know him: nor did he recognize her, until looking up, he saw Dobbin riding by her; and then he knew who it was" (Chapter XXXV). During this period of semi-awareness, little George is born, and Amelia is saved. The period of shock is an interregnum between the two adorations: with George dead there is no purpose in Amelia's life; with the birth of little George, there is. In between the death and the birth is the shadow-existence of withdrawal. With the child's birth, Amelia renews her relationship with her husband, this time through the child. For throughout the second half of the novel, George is described as a second George. "O sir," George's sister says to her father, "I've seen little George. He is as beautiful as an angel—and so like him!" (Chapter XLII). Osborne's servants "who remembered the Captain his father, declared Master George was his Pa every inch of him." Even Osborne is touched: "The boy's dashing manners, and offhand rattle about books and learning, his likeness to his father (dead unrequited in Brussels yonder), awed the old gentleman, and gave the young boy the mastery. The old man would start at some hereditary feature or tone unconsciously used by the little lad, and fancy that George's father was again before him" (Chapter LVI). And the new George brings purpose back into Amelia's life: "This child was her being. Her existence was a maternal caress. She enveloped the feeble and unconscious creature with love and worship" (Chapter XXXV).

Thackeray uses the word worship for two good reasons, both of which reveal his skill as a novelist and the depth of meaning of Amelia and the novel. First, Amelia does worship the child. But the new George is a beginning again—with some changes—of the old George, and the image of the dead husband fuses with that of the live child:

The elder George returned in him somehow, only improved, and as if come back from heaven. In a hundred little tones, looks, and movements, the child was so like his father, that the widow's heart thrilled as she held him to it; and he would often ask the cause of her tears. It was because of his likeness to his father, she did not scruple to tell him (Chapter XXXVIII).

In Amelia's relationship with the new George, precisely those emotions which were most thwarted in her relationship with her husband are given the fullest play. Georgy becomes an unknowing lover for Amelia, an object of her worship. But whereas George had little time for his wife because of his wanderings, Georgy is helpless as his mother pours out all the emotion locked up within her from the time of the older George:

She talked constantly to him about his dead father, and spoke of her love for George to the innocent and wondering child; much more than she ever had done to George himself, or to any confidante of her youth. To her parents she never talked about this matter; shrinking from baring her heart to them. Little George very likely could understand no better than they; but in his ears she poured her sentimental secrets unreservedly, and into his only. The very joy of this woman was a sort of grief, or so tender, at least, that its expression was tears (Chapter XXVIII).

Her jealousy of Becky, who was able to take George away from her, is now extended to everyone who comes near little Georgy: "she drove away all nurses, and would scarce allow any hand but her own to touch him" (Chapter XXXV); she even fights with her mother because of her "secret jealousy" (Chapter XXVIII).¹¹ (Amelia's new relationship with the child affects Dobbin, who in the earlier George-Amelia story had worked behind the scenes to bring about the marriage, and who wished only to see as much of Amelia as he could. In the new Georgy-Amelia story, Dobbin "could see with a fatal perspicuity that there was no place there for him" (Chapter XXXV), and so he goes off to India.

Thackeray uses the word worship for yet another reason. Throughout the last half of the novel, Thackeray develops the religious overtones of Amelia's dedication to George. He is Amelia's "saint in heaven" (Chapter LXVI). His miniature on the wall is an icon which no one else can touch, not even to clean. Told that Dobbin loves her, Amelia forbids discussion of the subject, saying "that a woman who had been married to such an angel as that, and she pointed to the wall, could never think of any other union" (Chapter LIX). She rejects the Reverend Mr. Binny's proposal of marriage because "George's picture and dearest memory are there to rebuke her. Shame and love say no to the sacrifice. She shrinks from it as from something unholy" (Chapter L). Naturally, every deity needs holy days, and Amelia has supplied these, too: "On the twenty-fifth of April, and the eighteenth of June, the days of marriage and widowhood, she kept her room entirely, consecrating them, (and we do not know how many hours of solitary night-thought, her little boy sleeping in his crib by her bedside) to the memory of that departed friend" (Chapter XXXVIII).

Thackeray's use of religious material is integral to *Vanity Fair*, which is in part an attack on the narrowness of the Evangelicals. Thus, Thackeray satirizes Pitt Crawley as a "friend of Mr. Wilberforce's, whose politics he admired, and had that famous correspondence with the Reverend Silas Hornblower, on the Ashantee Mission. He was in London, if not for the Parliament session, at least in May, for the religious meetings" (Chapter IX). Lady Emily Sheepshanks, his sister-in-law, who wrote the typical Evangelical tracts, "The Sailor's True Binnacle" and "The Applewoman of Finchley Common," also wrote "that beautiful poem—'Lead us to some sunny isle, / Yonder in the western deep; Where the skies for ever smile, / And the blacks for ever weep'" (Chapter XXXIII). Her mother, Lady Southdown accommodated herself "to a prodigious variety of opinion, taken from all sorts of doctors among the Dissenters," including "the Reverend Saunders M'Nitre, the Scotch divine; or the Reverend Luke Waters, the mild Wesleyan; or the Reverend Giles Jowls, the illuminated Cobbler, who dubbed himself Reverend as Napoleon crowned himself Emperor" (Chapter XXXIII).

Amelia, too, is part of Thackeray's attack on Evangelicalism, for she has been influenced by the Evangelicals and has some of their attitudes. She has read the literature: when Amelia joins George's regiment and meets Mrs. Kirk,

that disciple of Dr. Ranshorn put one or two leading professional questions to Amelia, to see whether she was awakened, whether she was a professing Christian and so forth, and finding from the simplicity of Mrs. Osborne's replies that she was yet in utter darkness, put into her hands three little penny books with pictures, viz., the "Howling Wilderness," the "Washerwoman of Wandsworth Common," and the "British Soldier's Best Bayonet," which, bent upon wakening her before she slept, Mrs. Kirk begged Amelia to read that night ere she went to bed (Chapter XXVII).

Later, we are told that many of her views were taken from "certain theological works like the 'Washerwoman of Finchley Common' and others of that school, with which Mrs. Osborne had been furnished during her life at Brompton" (Chapter LXII). Like the austere Evangelical, she is suspicious of art and beauty, and when she discovers Mozart, a "new world of love and beauty" breaks upon her, but her raptures are such that she wonders "whether it was not wicked to feel so much delight" (Chapter LXII). Like the Evangelical, she is aware of sin, being told by her mother that she has a "wicked ungrateful heart" (Chapter XXXVIII). So great is her sense of guilt that she rationalizes the rightness of and finds some consolation in the loss of her son and husband: "The children running up and down the slopes and broad paths in the gardens, reminded her of George who was taken from her: the first

George was taken from her: her selfish guilty love, in both instances, had been rebuked and bitterly chastised. She strove to think it was right that she should be so punished. She was such a miserable wicked sinner" (Chapter LVII). Her guilt over the two Georges is so entwined with her religious views that to fight back for what is hers is to rebel against the will of a vengeful God. Thus, when Dobbin comes back from India, Amelia talks only about George, but never about her pain at losing him, because "though she was half-killed by the separation from the child, yet thought it was very wicked in her to repine at losing him" (Chapter LVIII).

While Amelia's attitudes are those of the sin-conscious Evangelical, her God is a melding of the Evangelical God and the deified George. Her guilt alternates between what is owed to God and to George, for the two have, as I have shown, become confused in her mind.¹² Like the Evangelical, Amelia sees her God—whether it be George or Jehovah—in immediate, personal terms. Thus, when she has to surrender George to Old Osborne, she reads to the boy the story of Hannah's delivering Samuel to Eli, personalizing the story so that she is Hannah and George is Samuel. Although Amelia (or Thackeray) does not say so, Old Osborne is the High Priest, Eli, who fears no one but God. "In Russell Square everybody was afraid of Mr. Osborne, and Mr. Osborne was afraid of George" (Chapter LVI). Since George has been deified by Amelia, and George is George come back again, Osborne's taking George is (by substitution) his ministering to (Amelia's) God.

Amelia's seeing herself in biblical terms and accepting sacrifices as part of God's will are part of her Evangelicalism. So, too, is her suspicion of beauty and art. But we know that Thackeray rejected the narrow, rigid, austere Christianity of the Evangelicals, considering their doctrines "blasphemous asceticism," and seeing the beauty of this world as "an expression of God's will so to speak" (*Letters*, II, 474). Dobbin presents Thackeray's views when he tells Amelia that "every beauty of art or nature made him thankful as well as happy; and that the pleasure to be had in listening to fine music, as in looking at the stars in the sky, or at a beautiful landscape or picture, was a benefit for which we might thank Heaven as sincerely as for any other worldly blessing" (Chapter LXII). Because of the fusion of God and George, we find in Amelia Thackeray's comment on Evangelicalism: only when Amelia rejects the sin and guilt that goes with Evangelicalism does she find happiness; only when she rejects the false God (George), who insists on sacrifice, does she find fulfillment here. And she is saved by Dobbin, Thackeray's concept of a Christian gentleman. That she held to a false ideal is true; but it was an ideal that existed on a spiritual as well as earthly level.

And thus Thackeray passes judgment on Amelia, whose character makes her far more important and complex in the structure and meaning of *Vanity Fair* than has hitherto been assumed. She is more than the fool she is supposed to be, and we agree that "any one who mistakes her for a simple character has misread *Vanity Fair*."¹³

Staten Island Community College

Myron Taube

FOOTNOTES

- ¹Lambert Ennis, *Thackeray: The Sentimental Cynic* (Evanston, 1950), p. 65.
- ²G. W. Griffin, *Studies in Literature* (Baltimore, 1870), p. 107.
- ³W. J. Dawson, *The Makers of English Fiction* (New York, 1905), p. 84.
- ⁴Walter Allen, *The English Novel* (New York, 1955), pp. 202-203.
- ⁵J. T. I. Greig, *Thackeray: A Reconsideration* (London, 1950), pp. 129, 104.
- ⁶*The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepeace Thackeray*, ed. Gordon N. Ray (Cambridge, 1945), II, 309.
- ⁷Russell A. Fraser, "Pernicious Casuistry: A Study of Character in *Vanity Fair*" in *Nineteenth Century Fiction*, XII (Sept. 1957), p. 137.
- ⁸Robert Morss Lovett and Helen Sard Hughes, *The History of the Novel in England* (Cambridge, 1932), p. 269.
- ⁹Charles Whibley, *William Makepeace Thackeray* (New York, 1903), p. 89.
- ¹⁰*Novels of the Eighteen-Forties* (London, 1954), p. 229.
- ¹¹Three quarters of a century after Thackeray, D. H. Lawrence used a similar death-life sequence in the development of Paul Morel's Oedipus complex. After Arthur's death, Mrs. Morel "could not be persuaded . . . to talk and take her old bright interest in life . . . she could not rouse herself. She could only brood on her dead son." (Amelia, of course, broods on her dead husband.) Then Paul falls ill and Mrs. Morel finds a purpose for living: "I should have watched the living, not the dead," she says to herself. Later, Paul's aunt says that for some things "it was a good thing Paul was ill that Christmas. I believe it saved his mother." (In Amelia's case, the equivalent to Paul's illness is the birth of George.) "The two knitted together in perfect intimacy. Mrs. Morel's life now rooted itself in Paul" (*Sons and Lovers* [New York, Signet Book Edition], pp. 140, 141). The same rooting of one life in that of a son occurs with Amelia and George, although the son responds in a different way from Paul Morel.
- ¹²In several ways, Amelia bears a resemblance to several subsequent characters for whom she may have been the literary prototype. For example, in her simplicity, innocence, and inability to cope with reality, she bears a resemblance to the characters in Flaubert's *Un Coeur Simple* and Gertrude Stein's *Three Lives*. In her confusion of God and her husband, she most closely resembles Madame Bovary, who confuses lover and God: "When

she knelt on her Gothic prie-dieu, she addressed to the Lord the same suave words that she had murmured formerly to her lover in the outpourings of adultery" (Gustave Flaubert, *Madame Bovary* [University Classics, 1939], p. 212.

¹³W. C. Brownell, *Victorian Prose Masters* (New York, 1924), p. 31.

DICKENS'S HUMOR

Dickens's first mature and recognizably creative writing was his humorous articles for newspapers, and it was his newly won fame as a humorous journalist which caused him to be engaged to write copy to go with Seymour's humorous drawings, the project which became *Pickwick Papers*.¹ While it is well known that Dickens was influenced in some general ways by earlier and contemporary humorists, it does not seem generally recognized that much of Dickens's humor may have been an application of the theories of Fielding and Hazlitt and may have been connected with his training as a journalist. I do not wish to deny the considerable influence of other writers, especially Smollett, but intend to show how theories about humor may have directed Dickens's use of it and to show how the structure of his books is partly controlled by humor.

Dickens's clever capturing of idiosyncrasies of speech and his vivid descriptions of places suggest that journalism had a great influence on him. Dickens's uncle owned a newspaper and hired Dickens in 1832. What is more, Dickens's modern Parliamentary reporting was invented in the early years of the nineteenth century by Perry, who was editor of the *Morning Chronicle* (for which Dickens went to work in 1834). William Hazlitt had worked for the *Chronicle* under Perry and wrote for it even later. The way in which Perry's style reached Dickens is not hard to see: it was quickly imitated by other newspapers and was what Dickens learned to do when he became a reporter. The contacts with Hazlitt are less well known, but many, though perhaps indirect.

Aside from his connection with the *Chronicle* (among other papers), Hazlitt seems to have been a kind of intellectual hero to the journalists of the time. Dickens's friend Talfourd heard many of Hazlitt's lectures; Bulwer joined Talfourd in writing an introduction to an edition of Hazlitt's works in 1836; Dickens made a special tour to see Hazlitt's country house or "hut." Dickens must have known Hazlitt's son William fairly well. Hazlitt's son was born the year before Dickens, was early connected with the law, as Dickens was starting in 1827 (the younger Hazlitt worked later with bankruptcy suits), and was married a little before Dickens was. He, too, was a journalist: he brought out in 1836 the edition of his father's works mentioned above; he was also on the "reporting staff" of Dickens's Radical newspaper the *Daily News*. He and Dickens's son Charles and two of the Jerrols were members of a group that called themselves "Our Club." Dickens could have known the younger Hazlitt through their legal work and could even have come to know the elder Hazlitt through his son before the death of the great critic in 1830. The younger Hazlitt may have funneled his father's ideas to Dickens. He was unusually close to his father, who gave up his second marriage for his son, and his edition of his father's works is proof that he knew about his father's ideas and perhaps that he embraced them enthusiastically. But then Dickens was friends with other men who could also have passed on Hazlitt's ideas and who knew Hazlitt well: Hunt, Jeffrey, Landor.²

As for Fielding, Dickens's reading of *Tom Jones* as a child is famous.³ Forster in one place refers to Dickens's agreeing⁴ with an idea of Fielding's which is advanced in Chapter 1 of Book VIII of *Tom Jones*, and Dickens virtually paraphrases part of⁵ Chapter 1 of Book X of *Tom Jones*, though he changes the application. These facts suggest that Dickens was familiar with all of Fielding's critical ideas.

In the preface to *Joseph Andrews* Fielding says that *affectation* is the source of the ridiculous and contends that no one before him has pointed this out. He says affectation comes from vanity or hypocrisy, the latter being more of a lie and causing when discovered more laughter because more surprise (he notes Ben Jonson used this kind of comic situation more); the discovery of affectation produces pleasure. Related to this group of ideas are Fielding's insistence that surprise is good (*Tom Jones*, Chapter 1 of Book VIII), that contrast is important in literature (*Tom Jones*, Chapter 1 of Book V and Chapter 1 of Book X), that genius is the ability to see the *differences* between the essences of things (*Tom Jones*, Chapter 1 of Book IX), and that burlesque is the most enjoyable form of literature. The plays and novels of Fielding are full of distorted parallels to the stories of others as well as materials which are parallel to other parts of the same stories (there must be parallels for contrasts to be seen). In short Fielding's theory of laughter (developed in part out of Locke and Addison on the subject of the comparison of impressions and from his own success in the vein of burlesque) and his plays and novels, which apply his theory, would appear to teach that comedy lies in the exposure of a contrast between true and false behavior.

Dickens could possibly have reached this conclusion after his own observation of life or from reading or seeing older English comedies or in other ways. But the facts remain that he read Fielding and that Fielding explained and demonstrated this kind of comedy. Certainly Dickens used this kind of comedy in every book he wrote. Humorous characters constructed primarily on affectation abound in his books—Winkle, Bumble, Mrs. Nickleby (and Mr. Mantalini), Codlin, Mrs. Varden, Pecksniff, Major Bagstock, Littimer, Skimpole, Mrs. Sparsit, Gowan, Barsad, Wopsle, the Lammles, and Sapsea, to name only a few. *Sketches* and the early books often have whole strings of such characters who are mocked unmercifully. Later works mingle more sympathy with the laughter in some cases, and side by side with these humorous pictures are serious ones of disguise or delusion.

Many of the most important humorous events and series of events in the novels are constructed on affectation: the trial of Pickwick, the treatment of Oliver Twist by Bumble and Sowerberry (certainly partly humorous), Swiveller's winning of the Marchioness, Nicholas Nickleby's life with the actors, the apprentices' revolt, Martin's reception in America, many of the events leading up to Dombey's second marriage, etc., etc. Indeed certain books are permeated by partly humorous affectation: the serious intentions of the Pickwickians, and the feuds with Jingle and Mrs. Bardell, false gentility in *Nicholas Nickleby*, false righteousness in *Barnaby Rudge*, hypocrisy in *Martin Chuzzlewit*, the sham which is the Law in *Bleak House*, Dorrit and Society in *Little Dorrit*, false gentility in *Great Expectations* and *Our Mutual Friend* are involved in the simplest outlines of these novels and hence easily seem to be involved in the ideological structure of them and the burlesque or parody form of parts of their plots. Dickens far outruns even Chaucer and Cervantes in the number of humorous frauds he parades before us. The preface to *Oliver Twist* states that Dickens intends to expose the falsehood of romantic pictures of crime or the idea of vice in ribbons: the subject and treatment are serious, but he is still close to the exposure of affectation.

As a clever reporter of characteristic behavior and speech Dickens was able to give the humor of affectation a vigor it had had but rarely before. As a simple device it was as old as Greek comedy at least, but the frequency with which Dickens used it and the variety of form which he gave it and the depth and complexity he gave it in such abstract forms as the false education which helped kill Paul Dombey suggest that Dickens was applying a theory systematically.

At its best the humor of affectation is very powerful because it presents conflict by showing truth and falsehood together. The difference between what a man does and what he feels, between what he wants to be and what he is, between what he thinks he is and what he is—these can all be explored by this device. In the scene in which Pip uncomfortably receives Joe at his lodgings, which is important to the structure of *Great Expectations* because it indicates the depth to which Pip has fallen, we see in dramatic action the clash of several different states of mind, of several different values, of several different layers of consciousness. Pip affects gentility and pleasure at seeing Joe; Joe alternates awkward attempts to act as he feels he ought in a gentleman's house and uncontrollable reversions to his normal behavior toward Pip as a beloved younger relation. Within Pip there are many different states: he is trying to be a gentleman and the crude behavior of Joe upsets him; he is trying to act as if he were pleased to see Joe, but he is not really pleased on the surface and Joe's actions and his own let this unpleasant truth pop out now and then; he is not happy about the fact that his earlier warmer feelings toward Joe are absent on the surface. Pip thinks (within the incident), that elegant dress and manners are gentility, but as narrator he sees beyond these; true gentility would have put Joe at ease and allowed Pip to preserve and encourage and show his affection for Joe; Joe is more of a gentleman than Pip, for he sees he is causing embarrassment and pain, and therefore he leaves, but he lacks the control to be elegant. In the whole scene we are led to laugh at both, to sympathize with all the feelings of both, to understand both, and to feel what issues are really involved in the conflict. Dickens identifies himself so strongly with most of his characters that he feels and accepts their conflicts and hence mingles mockery and sympathy, humor and pathos, social satire and confession.

Sketches indicates Dickens had developed thoroughly the humor of affectation (and even its pathetic side) very early in his career. There was another basic principle to his humor which developed its full force more slowly. It is easy to see that a sincere character like Fielding's own Parson Adams or like Don Quixote is something beyond mere affectation. Hazlitt has a theory of comedy which explains our laughter at them. In "On Wit and Humor" he says that comedy is the *destruction of the connections* between things, between motive and action, between expectation and fact—the incongruous in short. This theory is based on the idea of a *contrast* with what is serious (the demonstration of relationship). He appears to be building on Locke, Addison, and Fielding here. He goes on to say that "keeping in comic character," persistence in apparently unmotivated action for example, as in the behavior of Don Quixote, intensifies the humor of disconnection⁵ (Fielding had also praised "keeping" in Chapter I of Book VIII of *Tom Jones*).

The humor of disconnection is a more general principle than that of affectation. At first it appears in Dickens's work largely in the form shown in Hazlitt's example. Pickwick has been compared to Don Quixote frequently. It is interesting that the comic characters in many of Dickens's favorite stories are rather like the Don in this respect. Smollett's eccentrics, Goldsmith's

Primrose, Fielding's Parson Adams all are nearly reckless, even uncontrolled, in their pursuit of their various *ideals* (Jonson's humor characters are somewhat automatic, but the weaknesses of recklessness and eccentricity are not in conflict with the directions of the characters, which are selfish and weak at base.) Tom Jones, who is a partly humorous character, is similarly reckless; indeed Fielding in Chapter 1 of Book XV and in his dedication practically insists that the virtuous man is (there is surely precedent for this in many sayings in the Gospels, which several of these writers keep very much in mind). Further Fielding suggest in Chapter 1 of Book X that weaknesses and faults make good characters more realistic and effective and attractive. Recklessness can be used in such a way. Again I am suggesting that Dickens had not only theory but powerful example before him.

Smollett had systematically used many characters with this double quality, with conflicts built into them from the start. The combination was usually an outwardly hard man with a soft heart, as in Truncheon, or an eccentric, apparently selfish man who was mighty in good works, as in Matt Bramble (in this latter case the combination was usually so thorough that dizzy eccentricity and goodness are impossible to separate). Dickens used both frequently. Incidentally, like Smollett, Dickens in using this double kind of character often succeeded in observing and suggesting the unconscious sides of people: Mrs. Varden, Pinch, Dombey are examples.

It may be objected that Pickwick is the only Dickensian character of this kind, but I think a closer look will show that characters like this occur in all the novels. It is true that they are not usually the heroes, for Dickens's main interest shifted, to pathos and protagonists in trouble, among other things, but the eccentric and energetic benevolent appears in novel after novel to comfort or help the main characters. Toots and Boffin and Sleary and even Bucket have a bit of this combination of qualities. Indeed there is to nearly all of Dickens's characters in the novels after *Pickwick* a persistent and confident personality⁶ somewhat disconnected from all else (there can be individuality only when such is the case). This peculiar disconnection or eccentricity makes them all double really and causes all to have humorous and sympathetic aspects (for some reason we are disposed to sympathize a little with all who are eccentric), even when they play villainous parts like Quilp. This part of Dickens's characters may well be an extension of the Quixotic character. It seems to me that it appears in several characters in *Pickwick*, but that most of the minor characters in that book and *Sketches* lack this individualizing touch and the concreteness necessary to make it convincing; the titles of many of the *Sketches* indicate that Dickens is working with types only—for example "The Omnibus Cad"—not individual people (perhaps following the theory of types explained in Chapter 1 of Book III of *Joseph Andrews*).

Both the eccentrics and the types may draw upon old ideas about personality. The general eighteenth-century belief in each man's having a ruling passion probably was passed on to Dickens, if we can judge by the results: most of his characters can have one side of them classified by ruling passions despite the double nature spoken of earlier. The belief in the ruling passion perhaps accounts for the fact that many of the characters in the earlier novelists' works seem too flat and simple. Certainly it explains the revival of Jonsonian humor comedy or something very like it. Another common eighteenth-century belief,⁷ that every man was dominated from birth by pride or love or some mixture of these, a common idea in dramas and in Fielding, could be combined with the belief in the ruling passion, which became then a special kind of pride or love. Dickens seems to have taken over this idea, too. Smollett, as we have seen, had combined Jonsonian humors and an individual sensibility or an individual sense of pride. Perhaps this mixture appealed to Dickens: many of his characters seem to have a generosity or a confidence and pride which is humorous and also admirable.⁸ Incidentally, while ruling passions and fixed tendencies to pride or love or both usually appear in Dickens's characters, as in those of his eighteenth-century predecessors, as causeless disconnected behavior, they also often produce humor of affectation—in this form they help organize the plot of *Pickwick Papers*.

The humor of disconnection, like that of affectation, often involves character and event together. But it can be used so that the suddenness of event and the lack of connection between one event and another are the chief cause of humor. Fielding had said that the more a writer surprised his reader the more he would please him (Chapter 1 of Book VII of *Tom Jones*); so his precept would reinforce Hazlitt's general idea here. The cabbie's account of his horse's habits and his attack on the Pickwickians are examples of events which are humorous largely because of the disconnection of events (each has no apparent cause). The accidents which occur to the club on horseback and in a chaise on the way to Wardle's are others; so are Nell's reception by the waxworks woman and David Copperfield's having his meal eaten by the waiter. These humorous events disconnected from other events are almost always things which happen to a sympathetic character. They are the mainstay of *Pickwick*, but are used more sparingly thereafter, later calamities usually being more pathetic than humorous.

The general charm of surprise and humor of disconnection are given to most events in Dickens's novels, however—even to the primarily pathetic or unhappy ones. Thus odd and unexpected touches like the quarrels of the old men in the graveyard add humor even to the scenes leading to Little

Nell's death. In fact Dickens appears to have used sudden shifts and disconnected scenes systematically and consciously *throughout* all of his novels as *one* principle of structure; in part in doing this he is following the example of the melodrama, but not altogether, and it may be argued that Hazlitt's theory and the example of the picaresque tradition, which uses this device a great deal, counted for as much or more in the end. George Kahrl's book *Tobias Smollett, Traveler-Novelist* shows that contrast is at the core of Smollett's art, for he shows that travel and travel literature had such a governing influence on Smollett that he was interested mainly in "comparative manners" and derived his humor from the incongruity of the traveler and his environment or the act of traveling and from differences of appearance and manners.⁹ Thus Smollett used both the humor of the sudden disconnected event and the general touch of humor of disconnection in all events and may well have served as a model for Dickens in this respect. And even the traveling reappears in many of Dickens's books and is used in the same way.

The humor of disconnection can be used in dialogue, too. Jingle's form of speech is an example. Flora Pinching's is another, but here there is more depth, for the mannerism suggests a humorous and pathetic disconnection of the mind guiding the speech. Disconnected conversations such as that of Pip with Wemmick's father or at the Pockets' are other forms of the same thing. So in other ways are Sam Weller's ironic overstatements, his father's malapropisms, the whimsy of the bagman's first story (and some of the other inserted stories in *Pickwick Papers*).¹⁰ In all, expectation and event or expression are set at odds. At its best this kind of humor can indicate the peculiarity of each human being and of each event and the discontinuity of life. It led to a sensitive awareness of the individuality of people and things.

Both of these kinds of humor are based on contrasts. These contrasts tended to produce pathos as well as *laughter*. Dickens exploited these contrasting responses to the same contrasts by exaggerating the disconnected, alternating structure mentioned above. Let us examine first the linking of humor and pathos and then the use of them in harness together. According to Forster, Ward said that Dickens bound life together, unified it, by seeing analogies¹² (Miss Van Ghent has said something similar in her work on Dickens's animism in our own day).¹³ These analogies were warmed by sympathy (Taine links this associative power to science instead).¹⁴ Forster speaks of the "sympathy" of "great humourists" like Dickens's enabling them to see sides of people "obscure"¹⁵ to most and of Dickens's humor involving analogies.¹⁶ The discussions above of Pip and of characters like Pickwick show how true this is.

A letter of Dickens's demonstrates his awareness of this truth. He says, "I work slowly and with great care, and never give way to my invention recklessly, but constantly restrain it... I think it is my infirmity to fancy or perceive relations in things which are not apparent generally. Also I have such an inexpressible enjoyment of what I see in a droll light, that I dare say I pet it as if it were a spoilt child..."¹⁷ Dickens appears to differ here from Hazlitt's pattern by associating humor and analogy, for Hazlitt saw humor as lack or breaking of connections between things.¹⁸ But both see it as comparative, and the above letter is also evidence that Forster is right in asserting Dickens knew that his greatest "quality was Humour" and that it was responsible for the best and worst in his characterization.¹⁹ Forster said Dickens's humor and pathos were different aspects of one and the same thing, his great sympathy.²⁰ My evidence earlier emphasizes the contrasts at the base of both kinds of humor used by Dickens, and at first this evidence appears to contradict the statements of Dickens and Forster, until we remember that there can be no perception of a difference without a perception of a similarity suggesting that a comparison is possible (the converse is also true). Dickens felt the similarities, and he puckishly imagined and constructed the contrasts or found them existing in fact already (covering up the similarities). The contrast produced both humor and pathos (a feeling dependent on a contrast between wish and fact), and when, especially in certain novels, Dickens felt the contrast very sharply, the pathos became dominant.

The combination of humor and pathos was in his models. Laughter and tears were the conventional eighteenth-century responses to life and books. In Sterne, perhaps the greatest user of humor of disconnection, the delicate balancing of incongruities and sympathies had been exalted to the noblest operation of the sensitive mind. Dickens may well have had the same general ideal. His humorous pathos, however, is nearer to Smollett with his scenes of absurd violence and hypocritical cruelty which are the causes of laughter and tears and anger together. Tabitha Bramble savagely accusing her charitable brother of seducing a woman with £20 is close in its nearly helpless, half-humorous resentment of idiocy to Dombey's instructions to Polly Toodles to keep emotion out of her nursing of Paul. Dickens's intensity meant that like Smollett he was involved.

Dickens felt that the combination of humor and pathos, of sweet and sour, sad and joyful, was very important.²¹ In *Oliver Twist* in one case he defends the practice of shifting as true to life and half seriously claims to be following the precedent of the stage and of other authors.

It is the custom on the stage: in all good murderous melodramas: to present the tragic and the comic scenes, in as regular alternation, as the layers of red and white in the side of streaky, well-cured bacon. The hero sinks upon his straw bed, weighted down by fetters and misfortunes: and, in the next scene, his faithful but unconscious

squire regales the audience with a comic song. We behold, with throbbing bosoms, the heroine in the grasp of a proud and ruthless baron: her virtue and her life alike in danger; drawing forth her dagger to preserve the one at the cost of the other; and just as our expectations are wrought up to the highest pitch, a whistle is heard: and we are straightway transported to the great hall of the castle: where a grey-headed seneschal sings a funny chorus with a funnier body of vassals, who are free of all sorts of places from church vaults to palaces, and roam about in company, carolling perpetually.

Such changes appear absurd; but they are not so unnatural as they would seem at first sight. The transitions in real life from well-spread boards to death-beds, and from mourning weeds to holiday garments, are not a whit less startling; only, there, we are busy actors, instead of passive lookers-on; which makes a vast difference. The actors in the mimic life of the theatre, are blind to violent transitions and abrupt impulses of passion or feeling, which, presented before the eyes of mere spectators, are at once condemned as outrageous and preposterous.

As sudden shiftings of the scene, and rapid changes of time and place, are not only sanctioned in books by long usage, but are by many considered as the great art of authorship: an author's skill in his craft being, by such critics, chiefly estimated with relation to the dilemmas in which he leaves his characters at the end of every chapter: this brief introduction to the present one may perhaps be seeming unnecessary. If so, let it be considered a delicate intimation on the part of the historian that he is going back, directly, to the town in which *Oliver Twist* was born, the reader taking it for granted that there are good and substantial reasons for making the journey, or he would not be invited to proceed upon such an expedition on any account.²²

Dickens advised Collins, as Mr. Engel tells us, "to 'mitigate the severity of your own sticking to' [a story] . . . with 'comicality,' 'whimsicality and humour.'"²³ Later the fact that Collins "combined invention and power, both humorous and pathetic" was one reason Dickens felt Collins would eventually lead all the novelists of his generation.²⁴ There is an article defending the use of the fool in *King Lear* and of comedy in tragedies in general.²⁵ In his own work he was especially proud of the mixture of comedy and tragedy in the death of Paul Dombey²⁶ and in the speech of Flora Finching.²⁷ And *Great Expectations* was based on what Dickens called a "grotesque tragi-comic conception."²⁸

In short, the curious double view of life which was involved in Dickens's humor is fundamental to his art, to the *structure* of his books and characters and incidents, quite as much as to incidental jokes. Those who are interested in Dickens as a symbolist and reformer would do well to take this humor into account, too, before they decide what the symbols mean and what reforms were called for.

It is obvious from the quotation from *Oliver Twist* above that at times Dickens's use of alternation was mechanical. At such times it was not always successful. In the later books Dickens developed the serious, proletarian strain which first appears in the section of *Pickwick Papers* dealing with the Fleet Prison. Often in these books humor and serious reformism are mingled haphazardly. At such times the humor seems superficial and inappropriate, as in Dickens's half-playful treatment in *Barnaby Rudge* of individuals among the rioters, even though the rioters as a group are committing the most revolting crimes, or in his half-humorous treatment in *Hard Times* of Bounderby, who is being very unjust and cruel to all around him. These flaws would not be so apparent if the reader did not feel that Dickens was telling the story and Dickens was joking. If the point of view did not involve Dickens's being omniscient, one might appreciate Bounderby's absurdities more. Humorous contrast, then, was the source of much that is bad in Dickens as well as of much that is good.

Effects like these make one wonder whether there was not some only half-directed inner tendency involved in this love of contrast and change. Forster says of Dickens's acting, "Though Dickens had the title to be called a born comedian, the turn for it being in his very nature, his strength was rather in the vividness and variety of his assumptions than in the completeness, finish, or ideality he could give to any part of them." Later Forster says that a certain part Dickens took "was one of those personation parts requiring five or six changes of face, voice, and gait in the course of it, from which . . . he derived all" his "early theatrical ambition."²⁹

There are a few less important ways in which the humor of Dickens is in line with the theories of Fielding and Hazlitt and with Dickens's journalism. A common eighteenth-century idea about comedy which Dickens adopted was the classical idea of laughing men out of their follies and vices, or of using comedy as a medicine by satirizing evils. Fielding advances this idea of comedy in the dedicatory letter of *Tom Jones*. Hazlitt clearly upholds the idea in "On Modern Comedy," for he says that comedy exposes and destroys.³⁰ Of course many eighteenth-century plays and novels offer examples of the idea in practise. The verse "Your homes the scene, yourselves the actors here!" which was to be put on the title page of *Martin Chuzzlewit* and the verse prologue³¹ which it is from show that Dickens subscribed to this idea. In the preface to *Oliver Twist* Dickens says, "Cervantes laughed Spain's chivalry away by showing Spain its impossible and wild absurdity." What

is more, Dickens admired Goldsmith's partly comic, partly pathetic *Vicar of Wakefield* because he felt it had "done more good and instructed more kinds of people in virtue, than any other fiction."³² (In the dedicatory letter to *Tom Jones* Fielding had said that he intended to encourage virtue.) Clearly Dickens believed that humor had a reforming purpose, and the intensity which led him at times to slide into pathos at others led him to satire.

Not only did Dickens's journalistic reformism merge with his humor, but so did his love of everyday, newspaper material, as the verse mentioned above also indicates. And it is not a coincidence that three great humorists were among the journalist-novelists whom he had referred to in the preface to *Oliver Twist* as being in favor of the realistic representation of crime and vice without the use of exotic coloring: Fielding attacked high-life literature in Chapter 1 of Book XIV of *Tom Jones* and Smollett was also against it;³³ Fielding attacks the idea that humor is "low" and inelegant in Chapter 1 of Book V of *Tom Jones*, and Goldsmith attacks the idea in *She Stoops to Conquer*. Fielding said in the preface to *Joseph Andrews* that comedy is always an imitation of nature (and realistic, unlike burlesque, which is always monstrous) and, paraphrasing Aristotle, that comedy is about low subjects. The idea of humor as medicine and the idea of humor as about low subject matter naturally lead to one another or go together.

The use of humor as a weapon led in Dickens, who had a tendency toward editorial anyway, to a kind of editorial or expository humor. The long passage from *Oliver Twist* is an example. In the subject matter (his own art) and in the playfulness and mockery and irony displayed in this typical passage, Dickens is rather close to the style of those first chapters of Fielding, who was the chief eighteenth-century practitioner of this kind of humor in the novel. Fielding said in the preface of *Joseph Andrews* that humorous diction was permitted in his genre, and Dickens certainly uses it at times when he is discussing a character in his own person in his novels.³⁴ In a letter about *Dombey and Son* Dickens is proud of his own "facetiousness" in this manner.³⁵ Fielding said that burlesque diction was permitted, too, and Dickens uses it at times, primarily in the early novels, I believe, as in the opening of Chapter 2 of *Pickwick Papers* and in the mock-heroic descriptions of Pickwick's reports, investigations, and discoveries.³⁶ Sometimes in his brilliant and surprising shifts in the angle of attack, poking at weakness after weakness after weakness of his opponent, Dickens is like Swift. There is a letter of 1856 "saying something of the limitations placed upon the artist in England." It is about "one of Scott's later novels."

... I have always a fine feeling of the honest state into which we have got, when some smooth gentleman says to me or to some one else when I am by, how odd it is that the hero of an English book is always uninteresting—too good—not natural, &c. I am continually hearing this of Scott from English people here [abroad], who pass their lives with Balzac and Sand. But O my smooth friend, what a shining impostor you must think yourself and what an ass you must think me, when you suppose that by putting a brazen face upon it you can blot out of my knowledge the fact that this same unnatural young gentleman (if to be decent is to be necessarily unnatural), whom you meet in those other books and in mine, must be presented to you in that unnatural aspect by reason of your morality, and is not to have, I will not say any of the indecencies you like, but not even any of the experiences, trials, perplexities, and confusions inseparable from the making or unmaking of all men.³⁷

Wit, Hazlitt says, consists in exposure of contradiction by means of a comparison.³⁸ At times, when Dickens is talking about a subject like writing which he understands in considerable detail, his perception of contradictions, in affectations and disconnections, is so rapid and his logical threshing and exposure of them so severe, and the interplay of pose and unmasked attack are so dazzling, that one can not help but think of Swift's *Modest Proposal* or his one-paragraph assassination of the law in the case of the cow in the fourth voyage of *Gulliver's Travels*.

Humor was also associated by Dickens with entertaining and with happiness, the influence perhaps of his journalism and theatre. In an early speech he talked of his desire "to increase the stock of harmless cheerfulness."³⁹ In 1845 Dickens described a proposed periodical in a letter: "... partly original, partly select; notices of books, notices of theatres, notices of all good things, notices of all bad ones; *Carol* philosophy, cheerful views, sharp anatomization of humbug, jolly good temper; papers always in season, pat to the time of year; and a vein of glowing hearty, generous, mirthful, beaming reference in everything to Home, and Fireside..."⁴⁰ Could any statement better express the dripping public sentimentality, the optimism for policy's sake, the ever-alert criticism, the modernity, the being for everything that is good which is the cheap, easy pose of most newspapers from that day to this? This statement of Dickens's throws light on all his writing and indicates some of the harmful influences of journalism. But the use of the words "humbug" (Dickens's name for affectation) and "mirthful" indicate that humor is associated with all this good cheer.

Dickens has some remarks about cartoons which are interesting in connection with Dickens's journalistic attitudes. In some letters to Forster and a parallel article (1848), Dickens says he does not like the cartoonist who like Rowlandson makes the objects of satire ugly automatically as a

child would: This tactic repels the audience, is an act of spite, and causes people to pay less attention to the detail being satirized at the moment. Dickens was in favor of a cartoonist like Leech, who showed some beauty, too. "His wit is good-natured, and always the wit of a gentleman. He has a becoming sense of responsibility and self-restraint; he delights in agreeable things; he imparts some pleasant air of his own to things not pleasant in themselves [compare Dickens]; he is suggestive and full of matter; and he is always improving. . . ." Leech, he says, has added "elegance" without removing the truth.⁴¹ Comments of Forster's are interesting in connection with this opinion. Dickens, he says, knew how to limit his satire and knew "that what satirizes everything in effect satirizes nothing."⁴² In another place he says that Dickens's earlier, better-natured satire was more effective than the harshness of his later books.⁴³ At any rate in Dickens's practise, as in daily conversation, the technique of delivering a serious social criticism in a humorous manner sometimes, as Freud suggests, makes us accept serious ideas we might not accept if made with less good humor:⁴⁴ Dickens's condemnation of Wemmick's separation of most of his emotional life from his business life is an example.

The external evidence and the parallels that I have pointed out suggest that Fielding and Hazlitt and journalism in general influenced Dickens's humor, which clearly is fundamental to his view of life and to the structure of his novels. Influences, of course, are very difficult to prove, but this discussion has at the least shown to what part of the English tradition of humor Dickens's work belongs.

State University of Iowa

Archibald C. Coolidge, Jr.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ See the preface of *Pickwick Papers*; see also John Butt and Kathleen Tillotson, *Dickens at Work* (Fair Lawn, New Jersey, 1958), p. 62 and notes 1 & 2 there and p. 64.
- ² Edgar Johnson, *Charles Dickens: His Tragedy and Triumph* (New York, 1952), I, 47, 61, 578; P. P. Howe, *The Life of William Hazlitt* (New York, 1922), pp. 149, 392-394; W. Carew Hazlitt, *Four Generations of a Literary Family, The Hazlitts in England, Ireland, and America* (London, 1897), I, 119, II, 23-24; the title page of young William Hazlitt's edition of his father's works (London, 1836); Forster, pp. 59, 523; *Library of Universal Knowledge* [a reprint of the 1880 edition of Chambers's Encyclopaedia], fifteen volumes (New York, 1880), VII, 381 (articles on the two Hazlitts).
- ³ Monroe Engel, *The Maturity of Dickens* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), p. 5, note 3.
- ⁴ John Forster, *The Life of Charles Dickens*, ed. J. W. T. Ley (New York [undated]), p. 620. Forster talks of "that wildly improbable class of realities which Dickens always held, with Fielding, to be (properly) closed to fiction."
- ⁵ *Nicholas Nickleby*, I, xviii. Here Dickens echoes Fielding's discussion of very good or very bad characters and also his insistence in Chapter 1 of Book III of *Joseph Andrews* that his disagreeable characters are types not individuals. All references to Dickens's novels, unless otherwise noted, are to the Gadshill edition, ed. A. Lang (London, 1897-1908, 1911).
- ⁶ William Hazlitt, "On Wit and Humor" in W. J. Bate's anthology *Criticism: the Major Texts* (New York, 1952), pp. 313-322, esp. pp. 314 and 316.
- ⁷ Joseph Warren Beach (in "The Literature of the Nineteenth and the Early Twentieth Centuries 1798 to the First World War," *A History of English Literature*, ed. Hardin Craig [New York, 1950] p. 551) suggests that this is affectation. I do not agree.
- ⁸ George Wiley Sherburn described this belief in a lecture at Harvard College in a course on English literature from about 1700 to 1750 in the autumn of 1950.
- ⁹ See note 7.
- ¹⁰ Edith J. Morley, "The Eighteenth Century," *The Year's Work in English Studies*, ed. F. S. Boas, XXVI (1945) (London, 1947), pp. 169-170.
- ¹¹ *Pickwick Papers*, II, 202; II, 58, 399. Most of the stories are half-romantic, half mock-heroic.
- ¹² Forster, p. 727, in the note.
- ¹³ According to F. W. Boege, "Recent Criticisms of Dickens," *NCP*, ed. B. A. Booth, volume VIII, number 3 (Dec., 1953, Berkeley, California), p. 183.
- ¹⁴ Jack Lindsay, *Charles Dickens, A Biographical and Critical Study* (New York, 1950), p. 321.
- ¹⁵ Forster, p. 727.
- ¹⁶ Forster, p. 721.
- ¹⁷ Forster, p. 721.
- ¹⁸ William Hazlitt, "On Wit and Humor," see Bate, p. 314.
- ¹⁹ Forster, p. 721.
- ²⁰ Forster, p. 713, 721, and elsewhere.
- ²¹ See the discussion of Collins and Dickens in Earle Davis, "Charles Dickens and Wilkie Collins," *The Municipal University of Wichita Bulletin* (Wichita, Kansas), number 16 (June, 1945).
- ²² *Oliver Twist*, pp. 146-147.
- ²³ Engel, p. 19—source: *The Letters of Charles Dickens*, ed. Walter Dexter (Bloomsbury—Nonesuch, 1938), III, 282 (1862).
- ²⁴ Engel, p. 25, note 78—source—*Letters*, III, 304 (1862).
- ²⁵ Charles Dickens, "The Restoration of Shakespeare's *Lear* to the Stage," *The Works of Charles Dickens*, National Library Edition (New York [undated]), XVIII, I, 1-6. This edition is hereafter referred to as "NLE".

- 26 Kathleen Tillotson, *Novels of the Eighteen-Forties* (Oxford, 1956), p. 170.
- 27 Forster, p. 625.
- 28 Forster, pp. 733-734, esp. p. 734.
- 29 Forster, p. 516.
- 30 Bate, p. 295.
- 31 Forster, pp. 291, 311; *Novels of the 1840's*, pp. 112, 113 (and note 2 there); *Dickens at Work*, p. 93; Lindsay, p. 228.
- 32 Engel, p. 29.
- 33 J. R. Foster, *History of the Pre-Romantic Novel in England* (New York, 1949), p. 125. He notes that Smollett expresses these views in the first chapter of *Ferdinand, Count Pathom*.
- 34 As when he describes Mrs. General in Chapter II of Book II of *Little Dorrit* or when he describes Wegg's reading Gibbon to Boffin in *Our Mutual Friend*, I, 73.
- 35 Forster, p. 405.
- 36 See also Chapter II of *Nicholas Nickleby*, Chapter I of *Oliver Twist*, Chapter XXV of *Bleak House*.
- 37 Forster, pp. 715-716.
- 38 "On Wit and Humor," Bate, pp. 314, 316.
- 39 Dickens, NLE, XIX, 370.
- 40 Forster, p. 378.
- 41 Forster, pp. 492-494; Dickens, NLE, XVIII, I, 78-81.
- 42 Forster, p. 171.
- 43 Forster, p. 825.
- 44 See Johnson, II, 883-884.

RICHARD FEVEREL, "THE ORIGINAL MAN"

The critics of *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel* have paid insufficient attention to the theological implications of the story,¹ which certainly reveal one of the significant enveloping themes in the novel.² Such a view of *Richard Feverel* is not allegorical, for it approaches only one aspect of an extremely complex pattern of action and symbols. It merely provides for an assertion that the abundant allusive suggestions require a comparison between the story of Richard's Ordeal and the myth of Adam's Fall—particularly in its more sophisticated forms, such as that given it by Milton—of which the only possible conclusion is that the orthodox theodicy is inadequate.

The explicit references to Eden, which occur particularly through the prelapsarian phase of the story of Richard Feverel, begin with the opening description of *The Pilgrim's Scrip*: "The book was noticeable for its quaint earnestness, and a perversity of view regarding Women, whom the writer seldom extolled, and appeared with all conscience to rank as creatures still doing service to the Serpent" (Chapter I). Such references are organically related to the central doctrine of Sir Austin Feverel's book of aphorisms, called by Adrian Harley for this reason "the Great Shaddock Dogma" (I). In Sir Austin's view the fruit itself is merely instrumental, and only Woman, who first took the fruit, is identifiable with evil. "You know my opinion," Sir Austin remarks to Sir Clifford. "We are pretty secure from the Serpent till Eve sides with him" (IV). As, according to tradition, evil is to be finally conquered at the Millennium, "Women will be the last thing civilized by Man," remarks the Aphorist (I). Hence, Man's basic evil, the Original Sin, is not taking the fruit but yielding to Woman, which of course leads to eating the fruit: "For the tenacity of true passion is terrible," says *The Pilgrim's Scrip*, "it will stand against the hosts of Heaven, God's great array of Facts, rather than surrender its aim, and must be crushed before it will succumb—sent to the lowest pit!" (XXVII) Man's susceptibility to passion, the heritage of Adam, is "the Apple-Disease," by which each Man recapitulates the Adamic Fall. But in the difference between Man and Woman there exists a significant factor: "Each woman is Eve throughout the Ages: whereas the Pilgrim would have us believe that the Adam in men has become warier, if not wiser: and weak as he is, has learnt a lesson from Time. Probably the Pilgrim's meaning may be taken to be, that Man grows, and Woman does not" (XXXVI). Woman must re-enact Eve's Fall, the taking of the fruit, but Man, or a Man, might be developed in such a way that he will be outside the seeming necessity imposed by Original Sin. Upon such assumptions Sir Austin builds his System, which directed toward his son Richard will protect him from corruptness, promote "his animal health," and help him "grow, as he would, like a Tree of Eden"—here the fruit itself appears intrinsically good and merely the object of Eve's compulsive grasp. The boy would be advanced thereby "to a certain moral fortitude ere the Apple-Disease was spontaneously developed, [and] there would be seen something approaching to a perfect Man." Based upon "Science" and working through mind and by insulation, the System assumes that "Sin is an alien element in our blood"; the assumption leads at length to "our divine consolation: that Evil may be separated from Good: but Good cannot be separated from Evil: the Devil may, the Angel will not, be driven out from us.

11.

A truly good man is possible upon Earth: a thoroughly bad man is not possible" (I). Hence, Richard is to be prepared for the "crisis in the Apple-Disease" by a knowledge of good and evil that is theoretical rather than empirical.

At this point it should be perfectly apparent that, within Sir Austin's view and the structure of the System he has conceived, just as all men are general reincarnations of Adam, Richard is specifically so, and his Ordeal must be regarded as a re-enactment of the Temptation, though ideally not the Fall, in Eden. Such is the obvious suggestion of the lapsarian metaphors in *The Pilgrim's Scrip*. Adrian Harley, aware of this, somewhat skeptically describes Richard as "the Original Man" (XXVI, XXXVIII). But the implications of Sir Austin's view of his System are somewhat ominous, for he strives that Richard may succeed where Adam failed. As Sir Austin passes through the halls of Raynham Abbey, Adrian observes, "A monomaniac at large, watching over sane people in slumber" (VII), and this, like many of Adrian's observations,³ should offer a significant lead, in this instance regarding the larger function of the lapsarian metaphor in the novel itself: not only do the symbols of the Fall give structure to *The Pilgrim's Scrip* and the System emerging from it, but they assume significance, of which Sir Austin would at best be but partly aware, in the action and relations of the characters. That Sir Austin reveals what the psychologists call a Jehovah complex is apparent,⁴ but that the part which he plays within the action of *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel* completes the analogy between the story of Richard and the myth of the Fall of Man seems to have escaped notice. Such an analogy, worked out in terms of the full action and symbolism of the novel, implies the inadequacy of the myth itself as a justification of divine ways with Man.

The key to the philosophic position behind the System is suggested by what Adrian calls "the Magian Conflict," implied by Sir Austin's comments on the Angel and the Devil within Man as dramatized by the discussion between the Tinker and the Ploughman whether "God's above the Devil" (VI). In this sense the System is, as has been pointed out, dualistic.⁵ But the difference between Sir Austin's idea of good and evil and that which constitutes the viewpoint of the novel is largely one concerning the content of the dichotomy rather than the form. It centers upon the question whether the idea of Good derives from the image of Deity or precedes and is embodied, though imperfectly, in that image. Sir Austin of course subscribes, even if unconsciously, to the first position, but the viewpoint of the novel supports the second. In his actions Sir Austin becomes Jehovah and ordains the difference between good and evil; in the larger structure of the novel as it proceeds from the analogy described here, the mythic Jehovah is imaged by Sir Austin and must be judged accordingly. In each case, the story of Adam's Fall or of Richard's Ordeal, the criterion for Good emerges from the nature of the originator of the System, but experience directed by Nature and Reason demonstrates that the concept of the difference between good and evil so derived is, if not unjust, at least inadequate.

"The 'System,' you see, had its origin not so much in love for his son, as in wrath at his wife, and so carries its own Nemesis," Merdith wrote in explanation. "The moral is that no System of the sort succeeds with human nature, unless the originator has conceived it purely independent of personal passion."⁶ Like the Father in *Paradise Lost*, Sir Austin rebuilds from the ruins of his first creation, in this instance caused by a wife's desertion and a friend's betrayal rather than by the rebellion of one-third of the Angels. "When his disaster befell him, and his home was suddenly desolate," the narrator remarks of Sir Austin, "it was as though his tree of life had shrunk under a blight." His friend he could forgive, but "the woman he could not forgive. She had sinned everyway" (II). The Creation of Man and his ultimate redemption, in the Miltonic theodicy for example, might appear motivated by the divine will to bring final destruction to evil; *The Pilgrim's Scrip* is "dedicated to the author's enemies" (I). In the matter of foreknowledge the Father and Sir Austin differ, for as one knows that Adam will fall, the other believes that Richard will not. In each instance there must be a test, an ordeal. The subject is to be warned. God sends Raphael to Adam. "You had, in your infancy, a great loss," Sir Austin tells Richard. "To make that good to you, I chose to isolate myself from the world, and devote myself entirely to your welfare; and I think it is not vanity that tells me now, that the son I have reared is one of the most hopeful of God's creatures. But for that reason, you are open to be tempted the most, and to sink the deepest." He adds significantly, "It was the First of the Angels who made the road to hell" (XXV).

Like prelapsarian Adam, however, Richard cannot, within the very nature of the System, be made empirically aware of what he must face, so that he is essentially unprepared. As Adam must be refused the answers that he seeks concerning celestial motions, so Richard must remain ignorant of the real motivations for and activities of the scheme in which he is central. "My father has some sort of System with me, it appears," he remarks to Ripton and then describes the visit to the Grandsons (XXX). In much the way that Adam cannot possibly understand what the word "die" means, Richard is unable to comprehend the solemn warning of his father: "If you care for my love, or love me in return, aid me with all your energies to keep you what I have made you, and guard you from the snares besetting you" (XXV). After this warning and in the light of the System he has created, Sir Austin, like the Father in *Paradise List*, must withdraw. "The stroke will not be dealt by me," Sir Austin remarks as the crisis intensifies (XXVII). And with the Fall, the System seems to pass fully beyond his control. "That I could save him, or any one, from consequences, is asking more than the order of

things will allow to you," Sir Austin replies to a suggestion by Lady Blandish. "Consequences are the natural offspring of acts. . . You ask me to give him a golden age in spite of himself. All that could be done, by keeping him in the paths of Virtue and Truth, I did. He is become a man, as a man he must reap his own sowing" (XXXVII). To the fallen pair comes Adrian, acting as a kind of divine instrument, in the way, after all, that many of the members of the household at Raynham Abbey consistently act.

"Lucy! this is Adrian, my cousin."—"Isn't he an Angel?" his eyes seemed to add; while Lucy's clearly answered, "That he is!"

The full-bodied Angel ceremoniously bowed to her, and acted with reserved unction the Benefactor he saw in their greetings (XXXVIII).

Sir Austin ponders "some indefinite scheme" for the redemption of his son, which "settled to a vague principle that the young man should be tried and tested" (XL). There has derived from his System nothing so elaborate as a paradox of *felix culpa*, for this, as it is present in the theodicy of Milton and others, is not part of the central story from which Sir Austin has taken his symbols; it is, though Sir Austin would be unaware of the fact, a contrivance by which theologians attempt to escape the trap into which, from the point of view of the novel, their myth necessarily leads them. Sir Austin is not aware, just as within the myth of the Fall the Father would not be aware, that his System could be intrinsically deficient and would need such an external support as the paradox. The fault for him lies in the object of his scheme. "You see, Emmeline," he observes to Lady Blandish, "it is useless to base any System on a human being" (XXXVII). Reverting to his original negative impulse, Sir Austin cannot recognize the real evil that the human being in question has committed as that involving Bella rather than Lucy, which occurs because Richard is unprepared by a real knowledge of the difference between good and evil, in this instance love and lust. To Sir Austin, whose view of the analogy between Adam's Fall and Richard's Ordeal is ironically limited, the seduction by Bella would represent not Richard's Fall but the lust that follows the Fall itself. Thus, though in his plans for forgiveness Sir Austin imagines the pair as sinners before an image of Deity—"Richard leading up his wife to him, and both being welcomed by him paternally, and so held one ostentatious minute in his embrace" (XLIV)—it is really "Lucy's mercy" on which must depend "the happiness of Raynham" (XLVIII)—as in *Paradise Lost* it is upon Eve's will to live that the hope for Man's redemption must rest. Forgiven by Lucy, Richard, the product of a System based upon acceptance of "the Magian Conflict," must expiate guilt by destruction of, or self-sacrifice before, one whom he regards as the originator of evil: he assumes the role of Messiah to purge the effects in himself of what seems his Original Sin. In myth Mountfalcon would die, but in the reality of action he escapes, Richard is injured, and Lucy sickens from grief and dies.

It is of course in the failure of the System that the theological implications of the story of the Ordeal are most apparent. In terms of the analogy between Sir Austin's scheme and any theodicy which ignores Nature and compromises Man's brain and spirit, Lady Blandish's viewpoint becomes particularly significant. "And now the author of the System was on trial under the eyes of the lady who loved him," the narrator remarks. Within the structure of the Ordeal, Sir Austin, rather than Richard, is to be judged—and condemned. Beneath the mask he is not superior to other men, Lady Blandish discovers, and "from that moment she grew critical of him, and began to study her Idol,—a process dangerous to Idols." The originator and his System must be regarded as one because the System develops from the idea of Good which in the mind of the initiator derives from his image of Deity, a projection of himself, and in the operation of the System are assimilated all the energies of the initiator and the divine image in his mind. Only as the author of the System does he achieve his significant existence.⁷ "The God of this world is in the machine—not out of it," as Sir Austin observes without fully knowing the meaning of his remark. Despite the ingenious proposals of the System, Richard, "the Original Man," falls because of it rather than in spite of it. "If, instead of saying, Base no system on a human being, he had said, Never experimentalize with one, he would have been nearer the truth of his own case," the narrator remarks, assuming Lady Blandish's viewpoint after she has temporarily departed from Sir Austin. His assertion reveals its full significance in terms of the analogy which has been emphasized: "He had experimented on humanity in the person of the son he loved as his life, and at once when the experiment appeared to have failed, all humanity's failings fell on the shoulders of his son" (XXXVII).

University of Pennsylvania

William H. Marshall

FOOTNOTES

¹ For exceptions, see William R. Mueller, "Theological Dualism and the 'System' in *Richard Feverel*," *ELH*, XVIII (1951), 138-54; Walter P. Wright, *Art and Substance in George Meredith: A Study in Narrative* (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1953), p. 153.

² I refer primarily to the 1859 edition. The quotations which appear are from the Modern Library, the most easily accessible reprint of the 1859 edition. I have, however, indicated the number of the chapter rather than of the page of the source, so that it can be found in any reprint of the first edition.

- ³ For a discussion of the significant function in the novel of the character of the Wise Youth, see Frank D. Curtin, "Adrian Harley: The Limits of Meredith's Comedy," *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, VII (1952), 272-82.
- ⁴ For some significant parallel instances, two from literary sources, see Karl A. Menninger, *The Human Mind* (3rd ed.; New York, 1957), pp. 323-25.
- ⁵ Mueller, pp. 138-54.
- ⁶ To Samuel Lucas of *The Times*, circa. October 1859 (Bertha Coolidge, *A Catalogue of the Altschul Collection of George Meredith in the Yale University Library* [Privately printed, 1931], p. 79).
- ⁷ The opposite view is expressed by Mueller (p. 140): "it was Sir Austin's attitude toward the System, not the System intrinsically, which caused the tragedy."

LIPPO'S VISION

In the ablest commentary on Browning's "Fra Lippo Lippi" that has appeared so far, Professor Roma J. King underscores the movement within the poem "From sensuality to idealism to compromise."¹ He observes that at the beginning of the poem Lippo is caught "between the street where 'sportive ladies leave their doors ajar' and his monastic lodging," and explains that both the situation and the terms are symbolic:

The street and monastery represent apparently contradictory forces, both religious and artistic, which Lippo is challenged to reconcile. They pose a tension between beauty and animal passion, on the one hand, and self-abnegation and spiritual discipline on the other....²

Professor King proceeds presently to give an excellent interpretation, from which it will be convenient to quote at some length, of Lippo's "artistic and moral apology":

He asserts that all of life is good, and that each part of it can lead to a fuller realization of God. He accepts it all—flesh and spirit—and in protest against the monastic dichotomy insists that man achieves his highest development through a process of inclusion and synthesis which dedicates both body and soul to the best of which they are capable.

His artistic concepts develop naturally from this interpretation of life. Nature reveals God when it is interpreted and ordered by a creative mind.... Thus, the artist converts nature into humanly significant forms, discovering God in the process. His purpose is to illuminate the mind, to order the emotions, to sharpen the senses.... The end of art is understanding and sympathy.... To Lippo a proper appreciation of Nature is sacramental in a way that contradicts a great deal of medieval teaching. Actually, his basic quarrel with the monastery is theological even though he discusses it in artistic terms.³

"From the nobility of his conception, however," Professor King continues, "he lapses at the end of the poem into a reality less lofty."

We are checked at the point of persuasion by Lippo himself. After all, to what extent is his argument a rationalization?

It's natural a poor monk out of bounds
Should have his apt word to excuse himself.

As penance for his night out he pledges himself to paint a picture, a description of which brings us once more to recognize his paradox. His motives are mixed: it is conceived as a peace offering, yet, in contemplation of it his imagination kindles and he is swept far beyond his initial objectives. Jocularly gives way to earnestness as he visions a host of pious, pure saints, into whose company he, though unworthy, is drawn.⁴

The painting becomes "a kind of penitential office through which Lippo is cleansed (his particular sin is that he has reduced woman to a mere animal) and made a part of the holy communion."⁵ But Lippo "cannot long abide the rarified atmosphere," and so the spread of angels' wings becomes a kirtle under which he plays hot cockles "with the angelic form now becoming something less."⁶ Professor King concludes that Lippo must be supposed to lack the moral strength and courage to effect a more nearly perfect integration than this last effort achieves.

This represents the usual reading of the closing passage of the poem. There is, however, an alternative reading which, it seems to me, considerably enhances its subtlety and power without diminishing at all the effectiveness of the central street-monastery symbolism, and is besides more in keeping with Browning's outlook. In the first place, Lippo's description of the painting does not bear out the idea that he regards art as a penitential office; rather, it expresses in symbolical terms just that concept of the ties between art, human relations, and religion that Professor King has so well elucidated. Lippo represents himself as being saved by the "sweet angelic slip of a thing" that he has created. He has assisted in the elevation of the human to the divine, and in the process has himself been elevated. More precisely, he has transformed the Prior's niece into a creature of angelic beauty—not merely a physical but also a spiritual loveliness, compounded of aesthetic sensibility and magnanimous, tender sympathy. This symbolizes that through his best art, which promotes

both pleasure and love, Lippo has endeavored to bring into being in others something of the ideal beauty of spirit represented by the angel and that his own spirit—that of the man as well as the artist—has been sustained and exalted by his knowledge of the great potential beauty of mankind.

Lippo has, of course, already argued that artistic creativity and moral sensibility are ideally if not practically inseparable:

Take the prettiest face,
The Prior's niece . . . patron-saint—is it so pretty
You can't discover if it means hope, fear,
Sorrow or joy? won't beauty go with these?
Suppose I've made her eyes all right and blue,
Can't I take breath and try to add life's flash,
And then add soul and heighten them threefold?
Or say there's beauty with no soul at all—
(I never saw it—put the case the same—)
If you get simple beauty and nought else,
You get about the best thing God invents:
That's somewhat . . .

What makes his description of the painting especially significant is that it is not a mere translation of abstractions into symbolism. Through the fantasy of bringing the painting to life—by skillfully projecting his living self into the symbolic setting—he manages to give concrete embodiment to the moral experience that he has before described only somewhat vaguely. And in so doing Lippo ties his defense of realism in art to the defense of his own moral nature, as he is logically bound to do, since his whole case collapses if he finally admits or unconsciously reveals that he is essentially mean and weak in spite of his intellectual acuteness and his mastery of his art. Notwithstanding his pose of humility, the central implication of his whole apology, logically viewed, is that he is not what he seems to be, that his moral experience, in other words, has not centered in a stultifying conflict between aesthetic pleasure and animal passion on the one hand, self-abnegation and spiritual discipline on the other. And now there can be no doubt about the nature of the saving quality, the liberating force: it is his capacity for sympathy. This clearly is the main source of the moral feeling that he associates so closely with the response to beauty. He speaks also, of course, of simple reverent gratitude even for the beauty of inanimate things, but he indicates that such a feeling is of secondary importance. If we suppose, then, that Lippo is not merely rationalizing but analyzing a truth of experience, we will conclude that his personality, like that of Robert Browning himself, is chiefly characterized by a consuming interest in human nature, an interest which is closely bound up with aesthetic sensibility and which is productive of an inveterate optimism. "This world's no blot for us. /Nor blank," says Lippo; "it means intensely, and means good: /To find that meaning is my meat and drink."

Previous commentaries, it seems to me, have not dealt adequately with these implications. To deal with them adequately it will not suffice merely to do justice to the apology, as Professor King has done so brilliantly; before concluding that Lippo's practice, as revealed dramatically in the circumstances that give rise to his apology, belies his preaching, it is incumbent upon us to examine scrupulously all of the evidence concerning his whole nature. Above all, we must answer carefully the question, How does Lippo really feel about people? Now if his whole experience of life outside of his work has amounted mainly to a fleeing from the trap of moral repression to that of sensuality, if he has escaped being a slave only to become a beast, he is not likely to have a very good opinion either of himself or others. He might be expected to be resentful, contemptuous, cynical, or disgusted. Yet to judge by the tone of his description of his early life, it would seem that in spite of his wretched childhood and his virtual slavery as a monk he has remained good-natured and philanthropic. He has not forgotten his rescue from starvation or the patience of the monks. And his tone is not that of a man inclined to be maudlin and self-centered; he begins to seem, after all, humane, magnanimous and tolerant. The trouble is, of course, that it is very hard to reconcile with this estimate the disgust created by the apparent lapse at the very end of his most fervent outburst, the lapse signalled by the incongruous simile with which he concludes his description of the projected painting. If this is a bit of unconscious revelation, a genuine example of the quality of Lippo's imagination, it is disconcerting, to say the least. It belies—and in no very significant way—the whole impression produced by Lippo's apology, an impression of a man of intelligence and sensibility, a keenly observant man whose artistic faculties are ever alert.

All of this brings up the question, never to be dismissed carelessly in dealing with a dramatic monologue, of the relation between the speaker and his audience. On this point Professor King makes the following observation:

As protagonist, the watchman is less fully conceived than Lucrezia, and he elicits from Lippo a narrower range of response than she secures from Andrea. Unlike Lucrezia, he fails to embody, to symbolize the whole to which Lippo feels compelled to respond. Consequently, "Fra Lippo Lippi" is, in one sense, less dramatically intense than "Andrea del Sarto."⁷

This is debatable. Evidently the watch at least symbolizes for Lippo the moral authority with which he is trying to come to terms. Probably its members, a couple of them anyway, also represent for the brutishness in man, including himself, with which his morally oriented art must cope if it is to stand redeemed in the eyes of heaven, of the world, and himself. But if his apology has the meaning which Professor King attributes to it, if Lippo really believes that the end of art is understanding and sympathy, then, unless he is very deficient in imagination, he must above all see in the members of the watch the living symbol of humanity itself, his chief inspiration. If so, it may well be that Lippo throughout is deeply interested in the response of his listeners, and that he feels it quite as important to convince them as himself. There is plenty of evidence that this is so. Several remarks show that Lippo has his eyes constantly on their faces and is reading them closely. At one point, moreover, he makes it absolutely clear that the guard epitomizes for him a kind of authority different from that represented by the monks, and one in which he has a great measure of confidence. He is speaking of what a force Hulking Tom will be, a man regarded by the monks, as he himself was, as a most unpromising specimen:

You be judge!
You speak no Latin more than I, belike;
However, you're my man, you've seen the world....

But to vindicate this faith in "his man" is after all a difficult task—as difficult, one might say, as that which Browning set for himself—and occasionally his remarks reveal that he is aware that communication is failing. At such points a very understandable note of self-doubt appears. Yet his inspiration does not flag; he addresses himself again to his work like the dedicated artist he is. And he is never more conscious of his audience and his task than when he begins to describe the painting which he will do to make amends, for he realizes that he has shocked his hearers in giving vent to his indignation over the response to his painting of Saint Laurence.

Perhaps, then, the metaphor of the kirtle is not a slip but a calculated stroke. It is not after all wholly inappropriate: it simply explains precisely why Lippo represents himself as being so abashed at finding himself in the celestial presence. It merely reaffirms a concession made before ("I'm a beast, I know.") and so is not to be taken as indicating a retreat. At the same time, with the expression "hothead husband," it subtly depreciates, in terms that the watchman can well understand—not the authority of the deep religious feeling represented by the Madonna and her babe—but the harsh, mean, repressive authority that has condemned his most inspired and reverent work. Lippo has by this time sized up his hearer, who is underneath a man much like himself; he has, moreover, carefully prepared him to respond in the right spirit to this apparently half-whimsical, half-serious flight of the imagination. And he seems to be satisfied, finally, with what he observes in the man's face.

Is Lippo, then, in his final appeal to the watch really practicing what he has preached? Is he putting to the test his conviction that artistic inspiration should be drawn from life and that life in turn should be illuminated by the universal use of artistic imagination? For this is what Lippo has preached. "The world and life's too big," he has said, "to pass for a dream," and further, on the function of art, "God uses us to help each other so, / Lending our minds out." The pronouns here obviously do not refer to artists alone, or merely to artists *qua* artists. To credit Lippo with such integrity and conviction as would be evinced by an attempt on his part to make the situation epitomize the working of the ideal he has set forth, an attempt to create his own exemplum—to do this is to call into question the validity of the common assumption that Lippo is primarily motivated by the tension of an unresolved inner conflict between sense and conscience. That there is an inner conflict there can be no doubt, but whether it can be described adequately in Professor King's terms is perhaps not so certain. It may be more accurate to say that the essential conflict is that between faith in the ideal set forth in his fervent sermon and doubt induced by the inevitably imperfect realization of that ideal both in his own life and in his world, where so much power is shared by mortifying authority and anarchic passion. The problem is perfectly symbolized by the present situation, which is both truly and falsely incriminating. Lippo's description of his escape, it will be noted, suggests more than a response to the stirring of animal passion, more even than a response to sensuous beauty; he has been moved also by sheer longing for fellowship:

Here's spring come, and the nights one makes up bands
To roam the town and sing out carnival....

Beset by misgivings that must assail every faith, Lippo has for three weeks bowed his neck to the yoke of an official authority which deep in his heart he finds lacking. Now his profoundest intuition has prevailed again; and despite the fact that the immediate result is something which he cannot by any means simply condone, there is after all not much to indicate that he is overwhelmed by ordinary qualms. The spring night air, song, laughter, the invitation of a human face—Lippo still believes that to be stirred by these, even beyond the power of reflection to restrain oneself, cannot be fundamentally and wholly wrong. He does not discount the possible significance of the fact that the appearance of things admits of a most sordid interpretation. That, indeed, is the challenge that moves him now. He strives with all the resources of intellect, feeling, and imagination to put the situation in its right perspective and, more than that, to effect on the spot a

more satisfactory synthesis of the ideal and the actual and so make amends. He begins in a purposeful and confident manner. The watchman, he sees, has heard of Lippo's doings and they "take" him. Such vulgar approval will not do; the watchman must understand Lippo and himself better: "Let's sit and set things straight now, hip to haunch." As he drives home his argument Lippo does not mince words:

What would men have? Do they like grass or no—
 May they or mayn't they? all I want's the thing
 Settled for ever one way. As it is,
 You tell too many lies and hurt yourself:
 You don't like what you only like too much,
 You do like what, if given you at your word
 You find abundantly detestable.
 For me, I think I speak as I was taught;
 I always see the garden and God there
 A-making man's wife: and, my lesson learned,
 The value and significance of flesh,
 I can't unlearn ten minutes afterwards.

Throughout his discourse Lippo checks himself only when, as in this case, he sees that his words are beginning to have the wrong effect. It is not misgiving but strategy that accounts for his veering and tacking. The whole performance is carefully controlled, and not the less earnest and serious for being so. There is tension, of course, and it derives partly from inner conflict. But the dominant note is one of confidence and power.

University of Oklahoma

J. L. Kendall

FOOTNOTES

¹ *The Bow and the Lyre* (Ann Arbor, 1957), p. 32. See Chapter III, "Sportive Ladies and Patron Saint: Fra Lippo Lippi."

² *Ibid.*, p. 33.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 48-49.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

⁵ *Loc. cit.*

⁶ *Loc. cit.*

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 33.

II. NOTES AND BRIEF ARTICLES

HOPKINS AND COUNTERPOINT

In metrics the question of counterpoint, as an aspect of Hopkins's sprung rhythm, seems to cause perennial semantic difficulty. Paul F. Baum in *PMLA* [LXXIV (September, 1959), 418-425] accurately notes that Hopkins himself clouds the issue by not explaining his terms or his prosodic intentions clearly. What must be explained is the understanding that Hopkins, as a musician, had of counterpoint when he brought the term over into literature as a way of naming metrical phenomena.

Counterpoint in music means nothing but plural melody: two or more melodies working together, dissonantly or consonantly, at the same time. Melody is musical idea; as idea, it has metrical quantity (it is scarcely possible to imagine music without a measurable mathematics, at least in the West). The conception of counterpoint, as a language metaphor, breaks down on the verbal level; one only has to try the experiment of reciting a line of verse while someone else recites a different line, to see that linguistic meaning is quite a different thing from musical meaning. Of course, Joyce ("without rime on my raisins") was able to create successfully two sets of referents in one phonemic line, but we could hardly call this counterpoint. Two sets of spoken words counterpointed produce nothing much but noise.

Yet music and verse have a kindred metric, and there we can see what Hopkins intended when he decided to compose by counterpoint. Counterpoint calls for plurality of metrical lines; it calls for simultaneity. How can a poet get that? The only way is to think of Platonic forms: *ideal metrical pattern* in operation simultaneously with *real metrical embodiment in words*. The real struggles with the ideal. Words struggle with the pattern that holds them. (This is part of Eliot's "intolerable wrestle with words"). But things on earth must not be quite as they are in the Platonic heavens, else poetry—an art of using earth-materials—will scarcely be embodied at all. Hence Hopkins's verbal agons and metrical wrestlings. As an incarnationist Hopkins implies all these ideas, as part of a literary creed derived from a religious creed.

If the real struggles too successfully, the poet gets too many metrical substitutions and consequently prose rhythm. If the ideal struggles too successfully, he gets no substitutions and hence a monotonous metronome-beat that fails to embody the vitality of words in a human way. The vitality is in the conflict. The poet has to decide how much his verse can bear. Hopkins believed that his verse could bear a great deal; the conflict is that of brilliant images from disparate sources fused in one picture, occurring in a contrapuntal metric that carries a conflict between the real and the ideal: patterns of ontological vitality by which the poem makes its effect.

To illustrate simply, we may think of representing the ideal sonnet: fourteen lines of ideal metric:

_____ x / x / x / x / x /

Now take five iambic words: *hello, hello, hello, hello, hello*. Substitute a trochaic name. *Hello, Mary, hello, hello, hello*. Move the name about from the second place to all the other places. Try dactylic, anapestic, and spondaic names in various ways. Bring in other words besides *hello*. There are more fashionable ways of describing metrical phenomena, but this one may still be considered, since Hopkins knew of it.

This practical experiment in counterpoint should show what Hopkins understood. It is perhaps a simple and obvious point, but it seems to need attention every now and then.

University of Tennessee

Stephen Mooney

DID CARDINAL WISEMAN REVIEW *MEN AND WOMEN*?

One of the humorous anecdotes common to most books about Browning is the story of how Cardinal Wiseman commented upon "Bishop Blougram's Apology" in a review of *Men and Women*. Since "Bishop Blougram's Apology" is something of a gentle satire on Wiseman himself, the humor is centered in the idea that Blougram reviewed Blougram. A good tale, if true—and one which promises to perpetuate itself as an anecdote to brighten a lecture occasionally. I have used it myself, indeed, but with the occasional haunting fear that it might not be so.

What is the evidence? The review itself, "Browning's *Men and Women*," appeared in January 1856 in pages 54-71 of *The Rambler, A Catholic Journal and Review*. Like most of the articles in *The Rambler*, this item is unsigned. The review is not unfriendly, nor is it particularly distinguished. Two pertinent passages are worth quoting:

1. "And next, impertinent and satirical as it is, and probably supposed by ninety-nine readers out of a hundred to be a squib on Cardinal Wiseman. . . ." [A description of the poem follows], p. 61.

and

2. "At the same time, it is scandalous in Mr. Browning *first* to show so plainly *whom* he means, when he describes an English Catholic bishop, once bishop *in partibus*, now a member of 'our novel hierarchy,' one who 'plays the part of Pandulph,' one too, who though an Englishman, was born in foreign lands; and *then* to go on sketching a fancy portrait which is abominably untrue, and to draw this person not only as an arch-hypocrite, but also as the frankest of fools." p. 61.

Personally, I can find nothing in the "Blougram" passages—nor in any other part of the review—to support belief in Wiseman's authorship. Indeed, Wiseman's habit was to answer his detractors directly (as, for example, in his *Letter to John Poynden, Esq.*, Philadelphia, 1936). This feeling, however, does not serve as evidence to the contrary.

The evidence upon which the review has been assigned to Wiseman rests, so far as I can discover, only upon a letter Browning wrote to F. J. Furnivall in August, 1881. Wrote Browning,

The most curious notice I ever had was from Cardinal Wiseman on *Blougram*—i. e. himself.

It was in the *Rambler*, a Catholic Journal of those days, and certified to be his by

Father Prout, who said nobody else would have dared put it in.¹

Between the publication of the review in 1856 and Browning's letter in 1881 there seems to be no mention in print that Wiseman was the reviewer. In 1885 Mrs. Sutherland Orr, apparently satisfied that it was so, made the story widely available by mentioning it in her *Handbook*.² From 1885 on, the anecdote enjoyed a curious, developmental history. George Willis Cooke was somewhat more cautious when in his *A Guide-Book to the Poetry and Dramatic Works of Robert Browning* (1891) he stated that the review was attributed to Wiseman. In the 1892 *Browning Studies* Edward Berdoe attributed it "credibly" to Wiseman. In 1904 Edward Dowden's influential *Robert Browning* printed the story without qualification, as did W. H. Griffin and H. C. Minchin in *The Life of Robert Browning* in 1910. Griffin, in fact, suggested that the tone of the review was evidence that Wiseman felt no resentment at the "fancy portrait." Commenting on Griffin's suggestion, Emily Hickey made a very curious statement in 1910, writing,

But why should the Cardinal have been supposed to know it was meant for him, even though, had he known, he might have been quite above noticing it? A man does not necessarily see his own likeness in a lay figure dressed in his official gear.³

One is tempted to conclude from this statement that Miss Hickey had not herself read the now-famous review, in which case she probably was not alone.

In 1911, however, the sole skeptic—Thomas Lounsbury—raised his voice: in *The Early Literary Career of Robert Browning* he refused to give credence to the story. But no one seems to have followed his example. In 1935 William C. DeVane included the anecdote in his valuable *A Browning Handbook*, and in 1950 the editors of *New Letters of Robert Browning* repeated it in a footnote, adding, "It is a curious fact that Cardinal Wiseman in this review writes and argues with the facile erudition of Browning's 'Bishop Blougram'." (p. 88) The final and crowning touch is Item C154 in Broughton, North-up, and Pearsall's *Robert Browning: A Bibliography, 1830-1950* (1953), which begins, "N. P. S. Wiseman, *Men and Women. Rambler*, Jan. 1856, v. 54-71."

Thus an anecdote grew into "fact" and is now presented as such in the best bibliography we have of Browning and the works about him. Was Browning's letter to Furnivall sufficient proof?

Browning's sometimes-imperfect memory probably did not fail him in this case. "Father Prout" (F. J. Mahoney) no doubt did aver that Wiseman wrote the review, but how trustworthy is this? Prout's was a deduction based upon negative evidence: "nobody else would have dared put it in." But the history and nature of the *Rambler* would seem to indicate otherwise. In his two-volume *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* (1899) Wilfred Ward tells us that the *Rambler* was edited by "Mr. Richard Simpson, a convert of original and independent mind, and Sir John Acton" (II, 207). Further, writes Ward,

It was avowedly independent of any special episcopal influence; and it brought out with the utmost frankness—many thought with rashness—the difficulties which existed, in harmonising the traditional Catholic positions with modern thought and science. (II, 208)

Wiseman did, indeed, contribute articles to it (II, 228), but so little control had he over what the *Rambler* printed, and so annoyed was he by its editorial policies, that eventually he dissociated himself from that journal. For it seemed to Wiseman that the editors showed "a habitual contempt even for the best Catholic thought" and "constant criticism of Catholic authorities." (II, 228)

There is good reason therefore to doubt the validity of Prout's reasoning. He was hardly justified in attributing the review to the Cardinal on the ground that "no one else would have dared put it in." Without Wiseman's approval the *Rambler* had dared print materials far more objectionable than a review taking a poet to task for satirizing a Cardinal!

It ought also to be added that although Ward objects to the unfairness of Browning's satire, he seems to have had no inkling that Wiseman had been charged with the review of *Men and Women*.

It would be pleasant to be able to add that I have identified positively the author of the review, but I have been unable to do so. I can only conclude that the question of Wiseman's authorship is moot, at the very least, but it is to be hoped that re-opening the matter may be of interest to Browning scholars and may lead to the eventual disclosure of the reviewer's identity.

St. Bonaventure University

Boyd Litinger

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Letters of Robert Browning*, ed. by T. L. Hood (London, 1933), p. 195.

² She did not use the story in her *Life and Letters of Robert Browning*.

³ "Browning Biography," *The Nineteenth Century*, LVIII (Dec. 1910), 1072n.

BROWNING'S PAULINE: THE ARTISTIC SAFETY DEVICE

Critics of *Pauline* have discounted the rather long note in French that Browning appended to line 811 of the poem. William Clyde DeVane sees it as probable evidence of Browning's early attachment to Shelley, who adorned much of his poetry with prefaces, advertisements and notes.¹ But the *Pauline* note is more than a mere adornment: it functions as a kind of artistic safety device in the poet's first published poem. And it is revealing of the young Browning.

Pauline begins in the manner of a dramatic monologue, with a speaker imploring a listener:

Pauline, mine own, bend o'er me — thy soft breast
Shall pant to mine — bend o'er me — (II. 1-2).²

But later it establishes itself not as a speech, but as an objective poem (supposedly written by a poet other than Browning); there are references to "this lay" (870), "this verse" (992) and "this song" (1004). The supposed poet takes considerable liberties in his discourse and occasionally addresses audiences other than Pauline, as in the lines to Shelley (151-229), to God (822-43) and to

Christ (844-59). Now and then he appears to be writing only for his own benefit, and to be addressing himself (as in 268-80). His discourse often rambles or becomes obscurely personal; generally it seems disorganized and open to the charge of artistic confusion. But the French note after line 811 provides Browning with a perfect excuse for these weaknesses and, at least theoretically, makes *Pauline* virtually invulnerable to critical attack. *Pauline* herself, who purportedly writes it, speaks of the poem *Pauline* as a rather unsuccessful literary exercise from the pen of her "pauvre ami". The poem, she believes, shows traces of charm, but might best be burned after all. She even doubts whether her friend will ever be able to write better verse:

Je n'en crois pas moins au grand principe de toute compôtion — à ce principe de Shakespeare, de Raffaëlle, de Beethoven, d'où il suit que la concentration des idées est dbe bien plus à leur conception, qu'à leur mise en execution . . . j'ai tout lieu de craindre que la première de ces qualités ne soit encore étrangère à mon ami — et je doute fort qu'un redoublement de travail lui fasse acquérir la seconde. Le mieux serait de brûler ceci; mais que faire?

Thus, if there are any faults in *Pauline*, Browning has, as it were, not only acknowledged them — but suggested that they are intentional ones; for the portrait of *Pauline's* artistically immature friend would not be convincing if the "verse" from his pen did not contain such flaws. The French note is revealing of Browning's cleverness and — inadvertently — of his early artistic insecurity, which bred a desire in the poet to appear above and beyond his own composition. Importantly, it helps to account for his choice of a unique dramatic form at this point in his career.

Connecticut College

Park Honan

FOOTNOTES

¹ *A Browning Handbook* (2nd ed.; New York, 1955), p. 43.

² Citations are to the numbered 1833 text in *Pauline* by Robert Browning. *The text of 1833, Compared With That of 1837 and 1888*, ed. M. Hardy Wallis (London, 1931).

III. REVIEWS

SWINBURNE AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES

Cecil Y. Lang, ed., *The Swinburne Letters*, Yale University Press, 1959.

Over a period of years Professor Lang ranged through North America, the British Isles, and as far afield as Spain and Italy in his search for Swinburne's letters. The manifold results of his search have been gathered into six volumes, of which the first two appeared in 1959. In some instances Lang has included unpublished letters of Swinburne's contemporaries, so that anyone studying the mid-Victorian period should consult these volumes for possible source material. Lang himself admits that he does not have all Swinburne's letters, but he does have a large number of them; and he has concentrated in his edition material which was not previously available or which was scattered among twenty or thirty different volumes and periodicals or was to be found only in collections public and private on both sides of the Atlantic.

The question now arises, Do the new letters included in this edition throw a helpful light not only on Swinburne but also on the Victorian period and some of its figures? For several reasons which I shall elaborate below, I think that question may be answered affirmatively. Certainly there is one prominent literary group which comes instantly to mind in this connection; namely, the Pre-Raphaelites, if that vague and inconstant term may be used.

There are in Lang's collection only a few letters concerning William Morris, but there are a number to (and from) Edward Burne Jones which reveal him to have been a prankish confrère of Swinburne's in the eighteen-sixties. That was the period when his friendship with Swinburne was at its closest and brought about the dedication to Jones of *Poems and Ballads*—a dedication which may have done Jones more harm than good. Many more are the letters to William Michael Rossetti, the advocate of Walt Whitman in England; most deal with mundane matters, but some relate to poets and poetry.

The letters to and from Simeon Solomon should not be overlooked; but where the Pre-Raphaelites are concerned, the most important exchange of letters was that which took place between Swinburne and Dante Gabriel Rossetti. The initial references to Dante Gabriel that Swinburne makes in his letters in the eighteen-sixties are mostly noncommittal. But in the fresh exchange of letters which started in October 1869, after Dante had exhumed his MS volume of poems from his wife's grave, Swinburne often assumes the role of adviser as well as comforter; and there is much in the letters of that year and the following which deals with the art of poetry. It also becomes apparent, from the amount of ribaldry in these letters and in those to and from Burne Jones, that it may have been Dante and his

Pre-Raphaelite intimates as much as any of the Old Mortality Group who in 1857 encouraged Swinburne toward women, strong wine, and stronger language. (The late Samuel Chew placed the major blame, probably unjustly, on John Nichol.)

These many letters, gathered into one set by Lang, also show clearly what the Gosse and Wise edition of Swinburne's letters faintly shadowed, and what Gosse and Lafourcade themselves denied—Swinburne's spontaneous interest in Carlyle's thought and style. Swinburne was no sycophantic admirer of Carlyle, many of whose ideas jarred on him, but his estimate of the genius of the old man of Chelsea was accurate and just; and his intensive reading and knowledge of Carlyle become evident in his many paraphrasings of Carlyle's expressions. They reverberate from letter to letter through the 'sixties and well into 'seventies, at a time when Swinburne was far removed from the influence of John Nichol, who has been incorrectly portrayed by several of Swinburne's biographers as a proselyter for Carlyle.

It is possible in this review to mention only a few other correspondents who may be of interest to students of the Victorian period. From the Lang edition we learn that James Whistler's early relationship with Swinburne was a close one and that the young poet sometimes served as an intermediary for Whistler in dealings with Ruskin and Burne Jones. In his turn Whistler served to introduce Swinburne to various French painters and littérateurs. But we have only sketchy evidence of the full relationship between the two men, which deserves further study.

In 1872 appear the first letters to Walter Theodore Watts (who in 1896 appended "Dunton" to his name). Watts was a solicitor who had been of assistance to several people in Pre-Raphaelite circles; and he moved into Swinburne's life on the basis of the business and legal help which he offered. Now his name is little known. However, he was at one time considered a sufficient authority on poetic theory to write the article on poetry in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*; and he became, in the 'seventies and 'eighties, so formidable a critic that he was sometimes called the "ogre of the *Athenaeum*." A number of his unpublished letters reside in the Ashley Collection at the British Museum; and there are a few at the Rutgers Library and elsewhere in the United States. The later volumes of *The Swinburne Letters* will throw a little more light on the question of his influence on Swinburne.

John Morley was a leading literary and political figure who originally did Swinburne great harm by his fierce review of *Poems and Ballads* in the *Saturday Review* of August 1866. Lang makes no special comment in his footnote to the first available letter of Swinburne to Morley, 17 May 1869; but it may be observed that shortly after Morley became editor of the *Fortnightly Review* in 1867, he started publishing occasional poems by Swinburne. The manner of their reconciliation remains a mystery despite some additional letters which Lang has published. Swinburne says almost nothing on this subject; one can only remark that Morley had a winning personality when he chose to exercise it, and that he could hardly have taken seriously all his comments in what was essentially a potboiling review of *Poems and Ballads*.

Richard Monckton Milnes (Lord Houghton), to whom Swinburne addressed over fifty letters and notes, may be worth special attention. Lang sides with James Pope-Hennessy and absolves the baron of the censure which Mario Praz and Georges Lafourcade cast upon him for introducing Swinburne to his library of erotica and for placing in Swinburne's hands various works of the Marquis de Sade. Lang calls Milnes "a bluff hearty franklin" and argues that Milnes delayed for nearly a year before putting Sade's work into Swinburne's hands. However, if we can rely on Swinburne's observation of his friend, it is clear from his letters that he did not find Milnes simply bluff and hearty. In addition, Milnes did not, like Nichol and Watts, cut short Swinburne's excursions into accounts of flagellation in the letters Swinburne wrote him, but instead offered a degree of encouragement. This action was not surprising, because Milnes was known in some quarters for his interest in flagellation (see, for instance, the Hardman papers).

Whatever the reason may be, certain hitherto unpublished letters (or parts of letters) of Swinburne's deal vividly with scenes from Sade's works and with flagellation. Since some readers of Lang's edition may be shocked into a false perspective of Swinburne, I think something should be said on the subject of Swinburne's personality. In addition to the lurid scenes in Sade's *La Nouvelle Justine*, two elements in the work of the marquis appealed to Swinburne—Sade's views on ethics and the place of Providence in the world, and Sade's position as a rebel against the shams of society. As to the "lurid scenes" in Sade's novel, it is evident from the letters that neither Swinburne nor the Pre-Raphaelites to whom he read them took them seriously (an example occurs in the letter of 18 August 1862). If one had a strong stomach and continued on for a number of pages, the succession of horrors became uproarious. Unfortunately, though, Sade did inflame Swinburne's imagination in matters of flagellation, which was a sexual excitant to the poet.

Outside of two or three cursory articles and some brief comments by Lafourcade and Praz, Humphrey Hare's book *Swinburne, a Biographical Approach* (London, 1949) was the first work to discuss in any detail Swinburne's interest in flagellation. What Hare mentioned there becomes even more

apparent as one reads Lang's edition of the letters. What needs to be made clear, however, is that there is ample evidence in the diaries and letters of Swinburne's contemporaries to show not only that whipping was widely indulged in in private homes as well as schools but also that sexual overtones (whether realized or not) were often present. It is evident from Swinburne's letters that he was whipped until he was seventeen; and to judge from *A Year's Letters* and from his unfinished and mistitled novel *Lesbia Brandon*, there is a possibility that one of Swinburne's young female relatives may have come upon him in an intimate flogging scene and left it stamped with a strong sexual significance. But in relation to his times, Swinburne's aberration was by no means so abnormal as it seems now. Moreover, Swinburne exhibited very little sadism of a physical sort; he does not appear to have flogged anyone, male or female.

On the positive side the letters exhibit Swinburne's cool courage and determination. In his boyhood he was a climber of sheer cliffs, and later he became a fearless swimmer. Despite the warnings of his friends, including Dante Gabriel Rossetti, he persisted in his arrangements to bring out *Poems and Ballads*, and despite the defection of his publishers and threats of prosecution, he succeeded. The resulting storm of abuse which he endured in 1866 helped eventually to remind thinking people of the tradition of *Areopagitica* and of freedom of the press. Had it not been for the precedent of *Poems and Ballads*, Rossetti would have been confronted with far more than the one personal attack of Buchanan after the publication of his *Poems* in 1870.

Western Illinois University

James E. Suiter

MARK TWAIN AND THE VICTORIANS

Walter Blair, *Mark Twain and Huck Finn*, University of California Press, 1959.

Mark Twain's relation to Victorian England and its literature is interesting and far from fully explored; so far as it has been determined it runs the gamut from adulation to sardonic distaste and back again. Clemens could not read George Eliot and came to dislike Matthew Arnold intensely, but he had many English friends and was generally fortunate in his English critics, from Sir Walter Besant, Andrew Lang, Kipling, and Stevenson, to Ford Madox Hueffer. Now Walter Blair's *Mark Twain and Huck Finn*, a genetic study of first importance to every student of Victorian American literature, adds greatly almost by the way to one's sense of Clemens's attitudes toward his English contemporaries and of his indebtedness to them. Carlyle's *History of the French Revolution*, for example, a book he read and re-read, helped to inspire his early criticism of the franchise and the democratic process in his "Curious Republic of Gondour" and governs Colonel Grangerford's contemptuous speech to the lynch mob in *Huckleberry Finn*. Dickens's body-snatcher in *A Tale of Two Cities* provided him with the idea for his grave-robbing and murder scene in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, while Jerry Cruncher's cold lecture to his son against religion inspired the elder Finn's ranting advice to Huck on education, the "gov'ment," a free Negro's voting, and the dread possibility that Huck might get religion. *The Cloister and the Hearth* of Charles Reade gave Mark Twain a familiar discovery scene in *Huck Finn*: just as Reade's hero's friend "Marcia" is exposed as a boy, so Huck in girl's clothes reveals himself when Mrs. Loftus drops a piece of lead into his lap. Similarly, the Tichborne trial, which so fascinated Clemens when he was lecturing in England, gave Mark Twain his first idea for the Duke, and S. Baring Gould's novel *In Exitu Israel*, by its criticism of certain odious privileges and traits of the French nobility, helped Mark Twain to characterize his two scoundrels, the Duke of Bilgewater and the "pore disappeared Dauphin, Looey the Seventeen." Mrs. Trollope's *Domestic Manners of the Americans* was distasteful to many American readers, but Mark Twain defended her social and moral criticism strongly in *Life on the Mississippi* and took something very like her attitude for his own in *Huckleberry Finn*, even in such particulars as the current American habit of spitting and the high incidence of lynchings. During the long gestation of *Huckleberry Finn*, then, these and other Victorian writers furnished matter for the novel, perhaps as significantly as Scott and Shakespeare.

But among Victorian writers, the historian W. E. H. Lecky, as Mr. Blair shows with great skill, influenced Mark Twain most profoundly. Lecky's *History of European Morals*, which Mark Twain annotated heavily over a long period, served to crystallize for him two opposing philosophical attitudes which turn up throughout the novel—the two Providences of Miss Watson and the Widow Douglas, the values of the heart in opposition to the conscience (training and mores), altruistic as opposed to self-seeking motives in the making of choices. Clemens's varying responses to Lecky's views, Mr. Blair suggests, find expression from 1874 on, through early works to *Huckleberry Finn*, and on even to *What is Man?* and *The Mysterious Stranger*.

New York University

William M. Gibson

AN ESSENTIAL TOOL

Richard D. Altick and William R. Matthews, compilers, *Guide to Doctoral Dissertations in Victorian Literature 1886-1958*, University of Illinois Press, 1960.

This book, of 119 pages, plus a 3-page preface and a table of contents, is an excellent contribution to students of the Victorian period in English literature. Every research library should have at least one copy. It is an essential tool for any person doing research in the field treated. Furthermore, any professor directing term papers or theses or dissertations in this field will probably have his own copy within reach on his office desk—and he will find before long that his frequent use of it will lead him to replace the paper binding with a more durable one. I hope that the compilers have already made plans for the preparation and publication of a supplement not later than 1970. Because of the great interest students throughout the world are showing and will continue to show in English Victorian literature, supplements will be very helpful.

Until this "central list of doctoral dissertations" on Victorian literary topics appeared, a condition existed that Altick and Matthews indicate accurately as they write in their preface that hitherto "Every attempt to discover what dissertations, if any, have been written on a given subject has occupied many hours and, because of the incompleteness and often the unavailability of printed bibliographies of dissertations, necessarily has resulted only in continuing uncertainty."

The preface states that the criterion followed for the inclusion of a particular author is that he "could be said to be 'established' by 1900." According to this G. M. Hopkins should not be included, but he is, and rightly. Joseph Conrad is not included, and I think that according to the criterion he should be. No cross-reference under Robert Browning is made to Gingerich's dissertation on Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Browning; it is listed under Tennyson. No listing is made of J. B. Liebermann's *Robert Browning and Hebraism*, a 1934 Zürich dissertation listed in 1939 by Forster and Zappe in their *Robert Browning Bibliographie*. I suppose that a few relevant not-listed items might be gleaned from author-bibliographies either separately printed or appended to unpublished or published dissertations. But I believe that they would indeed be few. I have been led to look at my unpublished notes for a Victorian bibliography for December, 1929—November, 1930, and I find that all the dissertations that I listed appear in Altick and Matthews' book. It is inevitable and understandable that a very few 1957 and 1958 dissertations did not come to the compilers' notice in time, and so are not listed. These would be inserted, of course, in the first supplement. Examples are Joseph Richard Nickson's 1957 *The Art and Politics of the Later Plays of Bernard Shaw*, and Charles Leo Rivers' 1957 *Browning's Theory of the Poet, 1833-1841*, two American ones.

Appropriate dissertations are listed under the names of the individual Victorian authors treated in them. This is according to expectation. Furthermore, the compilers have added greatly to the interest and serviceability of the book by grouping other dissertations in eight sections, under the following headings: General Topics, Themes and Intellectual Influences, Fiction, Drama, Poetry, Literary Criticism, Periodicals, and Foreign Relations. Many cross-references are given. This work deserves praise and gratitude from all workers in Victorian literature.

University of Southern California

William D. Templeman

IV. ENGLISH X NEWS: THE PHILADELPHIA MEETING

Chairman, Carl R. Woodring, University of Wisconsin; Secretary, George H. Ford, University of Rochester. [Belv-Rose Garden]

I. Business

II. Papers and Discussion

1. "Hardy's Response to Critics of *Jude*," William J. Hyde, *Wisconsin State College (La Crosse)*. (18 min.)
2. "Corydon Had a Rival," Michael Timko, *University of Illinois*. (18 min.)
3. "Dickens' Plots: 'The Ways of Providence' or the Influence of Collins?" Harland S. Nelson, *University of Connecticut*. (18 min.)

Advisory and Nominating Committee: Chairman, Lionel Stevenson, *Duke University* (1960); A. Dwight Culler, Ada Nisbet (1959-60); William E. Buckler, John T. Fain (1960-61); A. McKinley Terhune, J. Hillis Miller (1961-62); *Carl R. Woodring (*ex officio*).

1960 Program Committee: Chairman, G. Robert Stange, *University of Minnesota*; Martin J. Svaglic; Robert Langbaum.

Bibliography Committee: Chairman, Robert C. Slack, *Carnegie Institute of Technology*; R. A. Donovan; C. T. Dougherty; D. J. Gray; R. C. Tobias; R. E. Freeman.

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

1961 Officers: Chairman, George H. Ford, *University of Rochester*; Secretary, Francis G. Townsend, *Florida State University*. (Nominations to be voted on.)

[Note: Following this meeting, the Victorian Luncheon will be held in the Red Room of the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel. To make reservations, send check or money order for \$3.60 to Professor Clyde de L. Ryals, Department of English, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Pa.]

V. RECENT PUBLICATIONS: A SELECTED LIST

March, 1960 - August, 1960

I

General

- BIBLIOGRAPHY.** Altick, Richard D. and William R. Matthews, edd. *Guide to Doctoral Dissertations in Victorian Literature, 1886-1958*. University of Illinois Press. An invaluable listing of 2105 dissertations roughly on the period 1837 to 1900—in paper covers at \$2.25.
- CRITICISM AND LITERARY HISTORY.** Altick, Richard D. "Four Victorian Poets and an Exploding Island." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 249-260. On the eruption of an island in the Dutch East Indies in 1883, and how Tennyson, Swinburne, Hopkins, and Bridges responded in verse.
- Crompton, Donald W. "The New Criticism: A Caveat." *Essays in Criticism*, July, pp. 359-364. Spirited objections to the assumptions of the "new criticism" rehabilitation of the Victorians—particularly of Dickens.
- Ellmann, Richard, ed. *Edwardians and Late Victorians*. Columbia University Press. These English Institute Essays include studies of George Moore (Graham Hough), the literary criticism of the nineties (Ruth Z. Temple), and the dating and characteristics of the nineties (Helmut E. Gerber).
- Laski, Audrey L. "Myths of Character: An Aspect of the Novel." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, March, pp. 333-343. Four basic "myth" types underlie all fictional characters — Aristocrat, Hero, Burgess, Clown; exemplified in Victorian fiction, especially Trollope.
- Macherness, E. D. *The Heeded Voice: Studies in the Literary Status of the Anglican Sermon, 1830-1900*. Heffer. Rev. *FLS*, 6 May, p. 292.
- May, Derwent. "The Novelist as Moralist and the Moralist as Critic." *Essays in Criticism*, July, pp. 320-328. A suggestive study (drawing on both nineteenth and twentieth-century works) of the province of moral judgment in the novel and in criticism of the novel.
- Mix, Katherine Lyon. *A Study in Yellow: The "Yellow Book" and Its Contributors*. University of Kansas Press.
- Moers, Ellen. *The Dandy: Brummell to Beerbohm*. Secker and Warburg. Rev. *FLS*, 15 April, p. 240.
- Starkie, Enid. *From Gautier to Eliot*. Hutchinson. Rev. *FLS*, 8 April, p. 224.
- EDUCATION.** Cholmondeley, Essex. *The Story of Charlotte Mason, 1842-1923*. Dent. Biography and selected writings. Rev. *FLS*, 27 May, p. 341.

- Simon, Brian. *Studies in the History of Education, 1780-1870*. Lawrence and Wishart. In a series of essays, the author relates the ideas of the reformers and the changes introduced to contemporary social and political conflicts.
- Troughton, Marion. "Schools in Literature." *Contemporary Review*, June, pp. 338-340. Types of schools in some half-dozen Victorian novels.
- HISTORY. Gibbs, Peter. *Crimean Blunder: The Story of War with Russia a Hundred Years Ago*. Holt. A direct narrative account that attempts nothing new in interpretation.
- Lyons, F. S. L. *The Fall of Parnell, 1890-1891*. University of Toronto Press. Rev. *FLS*, 22 April, p. 260.
- Pakenham, Elizabeth. *Jameson's Raid*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. Detailed review of background and events.
- Simmel, Bernard. *Imperialism and Social Reform: English Social-Imperial Thought, 1895-1914*. Harvard. The author brings together and appraises the various attempts to convince the working classes of their self-interest in an expanded empire.
- Taylor, A. J. "Progress and Poverty in Britain, 1780-1850: A Reappraisal." *History*, February, pp. 16-31. A valuable account of scholarship on a thorny problem: whether working-class conditions improved or deteriorated during this period of industrial transition.
- RELIGION. Best, G. F. A. "The Whigs and the Church Establishment in the Age of Grey and Holland." *History*, June, pp. 103-118. A discriminating review of Whig religion and attitudes toward the Establishment.
- Brose, Olive J. *Church and Parliament*. Stanford University Press. A detailed study of threats to the Establishment and of their resolution. Rev. *FLS* (Religious Books Supplement), 15 April, p. vi.
- Pollard, Arthur, and Michael Hennell, edd. *Charles Simeon, 1759-1836*. S.P.C.K. Essays appreciative and evaluative on the bicentenary of Simeon's birth.
- Pugh, Ronald. "Unfortunate Orthodoxy." *Listener*, April, pp. 760-761, 774. This defence of Samuel Wilberforce suggests that his aim was to preserve the Bible as a means of keeping the laity within the religious life of England.
- Reardon, S.M.G. "Essays and Reviews: A Centenary of Liberal Anglicanism." *Quarterly Review*, July, pp. 301-308. A review of the affair, with remarks on the liberal tradition since.
- SCIENCE. Glass, Bentley, Oweisi Temkin, and William L. Strauss, edd. *Forerunners of Darwin, 1745-1859*. Johns Hopkins Press. Essays by various hands on Lamarck, Diderot, Lyell, etc.
- SOCIAL. McMenemy, William H. *Life and Times of Sir Charles Hastings*. Livingstone. Life of the founder of British Medical Association, with considerable detail on the medical profession generally. Rev. *FLS*, 4 March, p. 148.
- Petrie, Sir Charles. *The Victorians*. Eyre and Spottiswood. Aspects of the period.
- Plomer, William, ed. *Kilvert's Diary*. Cape, 3 vols. Reprint, after twenty years, of a curate's diary covering the period 1870-1879. Rev. *FLS*, 19 August, p. 528.

II

Individual Authors

- MATTHEW ARNOLD. "'A Septuagenarian Poet': An Addition to the Matthew Arnold Bibliography." *Modern Philology*, May, pp. 262-263. Identifies a review in the *St. James Gazette* as Arnold's, and includes two unpublished Arnold letters.
- Neiman, Fraser. *Essays, Letters, and Reviews by Matthew Arnold*. Harvard. A collection of out-of-the-way Arnold, including items never reprinted and others newly attributed.
- THOMAS ARNOLD. Bamford, T. W. *Thomas Arnold*. Cresset. Rev. *FLS*, 5 August, p. 591.
- BARING-GOULD. Hyde, William J. "The Stature of Baring-Gould as a Novelist." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 1-16. A general appraisal that affirms posterity's neglect—with the qualification that B.-G. could have done better had his audience been better and he more faith in it.
- BLACKMORE. Budd, Kenneth. *The Last Victorian*. Centaur. Life and critical study. Rev. *FLS*, 18 March, p. 178.
- BRONTËS. Brammer, M. M. "The Manuscript of *The Professor*." *Review of English Studies*, May, pp. 157-170. A study of Charlotte's fair copy, noting her alterations and also errors in the first edition, and subsequently.
- Dean, Christopher. "Joseph's Speech in 'Wuthering Heights'." *Notes and Queries*, Feb., pp. 73-76. A close look at Joseph's West Riding dialect reveals that it is not always consistent.
- Dunbar, George S. "Proper Names in *Villette*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 77-80. Proper names have ironical meanings, deliberately used to convey "scathing sarcasm."

- Heilman, Robert B. "Charlotte Brontë, Reason, and the Moon." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, March, pp. 283-302. The prevalence of moon imagery in the novels, and its relevance to Charlotte's own conflict between reason and intuition, judgment and feeling.
- BROWNING. Pipes, B. N. "The Portrait of 'My Last Duchess'." *Victorian Studies*, June, pp. 381-386. Vindicates the quality of both the portrait and the sitter. Cf. Stanton Millet, "Art and Reality in 'My Last Duchess'." *Victorian Newsletter*, Spring, pp. 25-27.
- Starkman, Miriam K. "The Manichee in the Cloister: A Reading of Browning's 'Soliloquy of the Spanish Cloister'." *Modern Language Notes*, May, pp. 399-405. Set during the Inquisition, the poem concerns the Manichean heresy with the speaker the very type of heretic-inquisitor.
- Wilkinson, D. C. "The Need for Disbelief: A Commentary on *Pippa Passes*." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, Jan., pp. 139-151. *Pippa* serves as a text to question indiscriminate overvaluation of Browning.
- BULWER-LYTTON. Ganzel, Dewey. "Bulwer and His Lady." *Modern Philology*, August, pp. 41-52. A comprehensive study of the *Lady of Lyons*--its genesis, relationship to source, several revisions, reception.
- CARLYLES. Lochhead, Marion. "Jane Welsh Carlyle." *Quarterly Review*, July, pp. 321-332. A highly appreciative sketch of Jane, achieved in places by the darkening of Thomas.
- CLOUGH. Houghton, Walter E. "The Prose Works of Arthur Hugh Clough: A Checklist and Calendar, with Some Unpublished Passages." *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, July, pp. 377-394. A listing of everything known to exist, in print or MS, of Clough's prose, excluding letters and journals; an appendix offers evidence for the possible existence of other items.
- COLLINS. Andrew, R. V. "A Wilkie Collins Check-List." *English Studies in Africa*, March, pp. 79-98. Lists all first publications and, where appropriate, alternative titles used for those items subsequently reissued; arranged both alphabetically and chronologically.
- DARWIN. Stevenson, Lionel. "Darwin and the Novel." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 29-38. Previous influences had prepared the public for Darwin, as may be seen in some fiction for the years 1855-1859.
- Willey, Basil. *Darwin and Butler: Two Versions of Evolution*. Chatto and Windus.
- DICKENS. Collins, P. A. W. "Bleak House and Dickens's Household Narrative." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, March, pp. 345-349. The contents of Dickens's monthly periodical parallel parts of his fiction, and are a source worth studying.
- Dupee, F. W. "The Other Dickens." *Partisan Review*, Winter, pp. 111-122. Drawing principally on the letters, Dupee pictures a vigorous, active Dickens. (This piece serves also as the introduction to Dupee's *Selected Letters of Charles Dickens*, Farrar, Strauss.)
- Fielding, K. J. *The Speeches of Charles Dickens*. Oxford. 115 speeches, 50 of which have been added since the previous edition. Rev. *FLS*, 12 Feb., p. 98.
- Manning, John. *Dickens on Education*. University of Toronto Press. Rev. *FLS*, 4 March, p. 146.
- DOUGHTY. Bishop, Jonathan. "The Heroic Ideal in Doughty's *Arabia Deserta*." *Modern Language Quarterly*, March, pp. 59-68. Doughty consistently reverses the qualities of the usual Victorian hero.
- ELIOT. Carroll, D. R. "An Image of Disenchantment in the Novels of George Eliot." *Review of English Studies*, Feb., pp. 29-41. Moments of disenchantment in the novels are often expressed through the same image--ruins, atoms, fragments.
- FITZGERALD. Cohen, J. M., ed. *Letters of Edward Fitzgerald*. Centaur. A gathering from what has already been published.
- Richardson, Joanna. *Edward Fitzgerald*. Longmans. ("Writers and Their Work" series, no. 125.)
- FROUDE. "The Third Man." *FLS* (Religious Books Supplement), 15 April, pp. 1-11. A sympathetic estimate of Hurrell Froude, inferred largely from the personal portions--letters and journal--of the *Remains*.
- GASKELL. Allott, Miriam. *Mrs. Gaskell*. Longmans. ("Writers and Their Work," no. 124.)
- GISSING. Francis, C. J. "Gissing and Schopenhauer." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 53-63. Schopenhauer influenced the ideas in Gissing's work, its tone, and perhaps too its form and method.
- Wolf, Joseph J. "George Gissing: An Annotated Bibliography of Writings About Him: Supplement." *English Fiction in Transition*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 3-33. Lists items chiefly before 1940; supplements listing of Jacob Korg in *EFF*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 24-28.
- HARDY. Ransom, John Crowe. "Thomas Hardy's Poems, And the Religious Difficulties of a Naturalist." *Kenyon Review*, Spring, pp. 169-193. Sensitive readings of Hardy's "fables" of the Gods in action or in "inaction."
- HOPKINS. Ritz, Jean-Georges. *Robert Bridges and Gerard Hopkins 1863-1889, A Literary Friendship*. Oxford, Rev. *FLS*, 6 May, p. 288.
- HUTTON. Tener, Robert H. "R. H. Hutton's 'Essays Theological and Literary': A Bibliographical Note." *Notes and Queries*, May, pp. 185-187. An important note in which Tener gives 1) the place and date of the original appearances, in whole or part, of each of the pieces in the two volumes, and 2) a brief review of changes made after the first edition of 1871.
- HUXLEY. Irvine, William. *Thomas Henry Huxley*. Longmans. ("Writers and Their Work," no. 119.)
- KINGSLEY. Martin, Robert B. *The Dust of Combat*. Faber. Rev. *FLS*, 29 April, p. 271.
- KIPLING. Annan, Noel. "Kipling's Place in the History of Ideas." *Victorian Studies*, June, pp. 323-348. A notable study of Kipling's analysis and working image of society.
- MACAULAY. Knowles, David. *Lord Macaulay, 1800-1859*. Cambridge, 31 pp. A general and very generous appraisal commemorating the centenary of Macaulay's death.
- MARTINEAU. Webb, R. K. *Harriet Martineau*. Columbia University Press. Rev. *FLS*, 6 May, p. 286.
- MAURICE. Brose, Olive. "F. D. Maurice and the Victorian Crisis of Belief." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 227-248. An account of Maurice's religious position and the nature of his response.

- MEREDITH. Fanger, Donald. "Joyce and Meredith: A Question of Influence and Tradition." *Modern Fiction Studies*, Summer, pp. 125-130. Though Meredith failed to assimilate the new elements he brought to the novel, he both anticipated and influenced Joyce—in his lyricism, use of the *monologue interieur*, unconcern for tight plotting, mythological references, and general stylistic virtuosity.
- Hardy, Barbara. "'A Way to Your Hearts through Fire or Water': The structure of Imagery in *Harry Richmond*." *Essays in Criticism*, April, pp. 163-180. This close analysis of imagery also differentiates James' organic pattern from Meredith's looser, more casual one.
- MILL. Robson, John M. "J. S. Mill's Theory of Poetry." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, July, pp. 420-438. A general review of Mill's views on poetry, arguing that they are an essential part of his makeup from his early crisis onward.
- MOORE. Burkhart, Charles. "George Moore and *Father and Son*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 71-77. Unpublished Moore-Gosse letters make clear that though Moore encouraged Gosse, he did not collaborate on the autobiography.
- Gerber, Helmut E., et al. "George Moore: An Annotated Bibliography of Writings About Him: Supplement." *English Fiction in Transition*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 33-46. This supplements an earlier listing in *EFT*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 1-91.
- MORRIS. Perrine, Lawrence. "Morris's *Guenevere*: An Interpretation." *Philological Quarterly*, April, pp. 234-241. Though Morris takes no explicit moral stand in the poem, *Guenevere* is indeed culpable.
- NEWMAN. Houghton, Walter. "'New' Articles by Cardinal Newman." *FLS*, 15 April, p. 241. Seven "new" articles from the *British Critic*, with brief summaries and commentary. (But see the Rev. C. Stephen Dessain's reply—*FLS*, 22 April, p. 257—noting their earlier attribution to Newman by Joseph Bacchus and Henry Tristram.)
- PATER. Duffey, Bernard. "The Religion of Pater's *Marius*." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, Spring, pp. 103-104. Duffey rejects T. S. Eliot's category, "aesthetic religion," and reads *Marius* as a spiritual autobiography that picks up from the vision in the *Renaissance* of life as flux.
- Turner, Paul. "Pater and Apuleius." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 290-296. Pater's version of Cupid and Psyche differs from that of Apuleius, because based on the literary and ethical assumptions of his day.
- RUSKIN. Walton, Paul H. "Seven Ruskin Drawings in the Fogg Art Museum." *Harvard Library Bulletin*, Spring, pp. 265-282. The seven landscapes reflect and support Ruskin's critical theory.
- SPENCER. Munro, Thomas. "Evolution and Progress in the Arts: A Reappraisal of Herbert Spencer's Theory." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, March, pp. 294-315. A detailed restatement and evaluation of Spencer's theory, which finds it still acceptable in part.
- STEVENSON. Caldwell, Elsie Noble. *Last Witness for Robert Louis Stevenson*. University of Oklahoma Press. Based primarily on the reminiscences of Stevenson's stepdaughter. Rev. *FLS*, 13 May, p. 306.
- SYMONS. Peters, Robert L. "The Salome of Arthur Symons and Aubrey Beardsley." *Criticism*, Spring, pp. 150-163. The method, motives, and implications of Symons' borrowings from Beardsley for his seven-poem sequence, "Studies in Strange Sins."
- TENNYSON. Killham, John, ed. *Critical Essays on the Poetry of Tennyson*. Routledge. A noteworthy collection, representing a variety of approaches to Tennyson; nearly all of the seventeen essays first appeared within the last fifteen years. Rev. *FLS*, 11 March, p. 162.
- Miller, Betty. "Tennyson: The Early Years." *Twentieth Century*, June, pp. 520-529. Tennyson's distressing early years are reflected in the themes and moods of his poetry.
- Shannon, Edgar F. "The History of a Poem: Tennyson's *Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington*." *Studies in Bibliography*, ed. Fredson Bowers. Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, pp. 149-177. A study of the composition, reception, and revision of the *Ode* demonstrates Tennyson's craftsmanship and willingness to speak out. Includes an appendix of variorum readings.
- Truss, Tom J. "Tennysonian Aspects of *Maud*." *Studies in English* (University of Mississippi), I (1960), 105-117.
- TROLLOPE. Davies, Hugh Sykes. *Trollope*. Longmans. ("Writers and Their Work." no. 118.)
- WHISTLER. Colby, Reginald. "Whistler and Miss Cissie." *Quarterly Review*, July, pp. 309-320. A lively sketch of Whistler and his relations with both patron and subject.

Projects -- Requests for Aid:

- CHARLES BULLER. To complete his edition of the Carlyle letters, Charles R. Sanders needs access to the Buller papers and would appreciate hearing of their whereabouts. *FLS*, 5 August, p. 497.
- SAMUEL BUTLER. C. R. H. Taylor and the staff of the Turnbull Library, Wellington, N.Z., are preparing a book on Butler in New Zealand and hope for related documents—letters, diaries, photographs. *FLS*, 6 May, p. 269.
- EDWARD FITZGERALD. A. McKinley Terhune is preparing the definitive edition of Fitzgerald's correspondence and would like to know of other letters to add to his current 3000. *FLS*, 4 March, p. 152.
- MRS. GASKELL. Arthur Folland and A. J. V. Chapple are preparing an edition of the letters. *FLS*, 26 Aug., p. 552.
- RUDYARD KIPING. Morton N. Cohen has been commissioned to do a book on Rudyard Kipling and Rider Haggard, and would be grateful for relevant information. *FLS*, 5 Aug., p. 407.
- W. H. HALLOCK. W. J. Lucas is engaged on a biographical and critical study. *FLS*, 12 Feb., p. 104.
- CARDINAL NEWMAN. C. Stephen Dessain, of the Oratory, is compiling a complete edition of the letters, the first volume to be published in 1961 by Thomas Nelson & Son. *FLS*, 19 Feb., p. 113.

JOHN RUSKIN. Van A. Burd and James S. Dearden are doing a list of present owners of Ruskin letters, manuscripts, and drawings, and would appreciate hearing from or of such owners. *TLS*, 26 Aug., p. 552.

BERNARD SHAW. Dan H. Laurence is collecting the letters in several volumes, the first due to appear in 1962. *TLS*, 5 Feb., p. 85.

Cornell University

Robert A. Greenberg

A TROUBLED EDEN

Nature and Society in the Works of George Meredith

Norman Kelvin

Approaching Meredith's work both chronologically and in terms of controlling ideas, this study discloses a well-defined pattern of intellectual and aesthetic growth. Meredith's first major novel, *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel*, is shown to be dependent for its very structure upon the author's unique conception of nature. His other important novels, as well as his poems, are considered in the order of their composition, and in each case a particular view of nature or society is shown to control both form and content. Ultimately a larger picture emerges, one in which Meredith's many interpretations of nature and society are seen as parts of a coherent vision.

\$5.50

FROM SHYLOCK TO SVENGALI

Jewish Stereotypes in English Fiction

Edgar Rosenberg

The extraordinarily brilliant and original treatment of this theme brings to life some of the most vivid characters in English fiction—Isaac and Rebecca, Fagin, Melmotte, Daniel Deronda, Svengali, Nathan, Mordecai, Sheva. Centuries before Shakespeare gave classic expression to the myth of the Jew-villain, the type had already been fully established in countless ballads and dramatic pageants. It is the central purpose of this critical study to trace the Shylock image as it appears in the novels of Dickens, Trollope, and Bulwer, and to examine the counter-myth of the impeccable Jew as he emerged in the works of such writers as George Eliot.

\$6.50

Order from your bookstore, please

STANFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

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