

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER

NUMBER 22



FALL, 1962

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

Guest Editor, this issue: Robert A. Greenberg, Cornell University*

*Professor Greenberg is the guest editor of this issue of *The Victorian Newsletter*. He has been associated with *VNL* for some years, especially in the onerous and often thankless capacity of bibliographer. It is a pleasure for me to step down and allow him to have full and well-deserved editorial credit.

W.E.B.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

- I. W. Adam (*University of Alberta*)
- John W. Bicknell (*Drew University*)
- Roger L. Brooks (*Texas Technological College*)
- Robert A. Greenberg (*Cornell University*)
- Roy Gridley (*University of Illinois*)
- B. R. Jerman (*University of Maryland*)
- J. L. Kendall (*University of Oklahoma*)
- John Lindberg (*University of Maine*)
- John S. Phillipson (*University of Akron*)
- Douglas J. Robillard (*Wayne State University*)
- Clyde de L. Ryals (*University of Pennsylvania*)
- J. Don Vann (*Texas Technological College*)
- John O. Waller (*Andrews University*)

I. LEADING ARTICLES

MATTHEW ARNOLD AND THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

From time to time, as we shall see, writers have asserted or strongly implied that in the English war of words that paralleled the American Civil War, Matthew Arnold was in the camp of the South. No commentator whom I have discovered has assumed that, to whatever extent Arnold supported either side, he was more pro-Northern than pro-Southern; yet a new look at the evidence suggests that he was.

Writing more than twenty years after the war in his review of General Grant's *Memoirs*, included in *Civilization in the United States* (Boston, 1888), Arnold explained at length that the weak antislavery stand of the Lincoln government in the early years of the war had been responsible for England's reluctance to support the North. Seeing no principle clearly involved, Englishmen were free to follow their sympathies for the gallant fight by the underdog South. However, several times Arnold refers to "far-sighted people" in England who were able to see that a Northern victory would result in emancipation and that the maintenance of the Union was "also on other grounds to be desired for the good of the world." Such "far-sighted" ones, he asserted, did support the North, "coldly, it is true, for the attitude of the North was not such as to call forth enthusiasm, but sincerely" (pp. 16-23). One may suspect that Arnold was recalling his own wartime feelings. Oddly, he did not mention the prominent minority of *enthusiastic* English "Northerners," who as we shall find, included members of his own family.

Aside from this retrospective analysis, evidence for Arnold's wartime attitude includes fewer than a dozen brief allusions to the war in his family letters and a few illustrative digressions in four of his essays on other matters. In none of these places does he explicitly favor either North or South. (The original letters may have said more, but all the letters were severely pruned by the Arnold family before publication.¹) These snippets, however, have given Arnold his pro-Southern reputation. Re-examined closely in context, they seem deliberately neutral with circumstantial indications of restrained Northern sympathy.

Certainly Arnold was never an enthusiastic admirer of things American, but aversion to American society in general, exhibited here and there throughout his writings, cannot be taken as supporting either side of the regional war. Nor does unfavorable criticism of the wartime North, its people, its institutions, its war aims, or conduct of the war necessarily evidence support of the South. Even such wholly committed Northern supporters as John Stuart Mill or Harriet Martineau frequently criticized the North on specific points. Besides, English opinion, public and private, about the American war varied from year to year, or even from crisis to crisis. Arnold's opinion at a particular time, such as during

the war excitement in England over the seizure of the *Trent*, should not be assumed indicative of his sympathies during the entire war, or even a month later.

In matters of specific political controversy, Arnold usually tried to remain neutral as a matter of principle. His famous dictum that "the critic must keep out of the region of immediate practice in the political, social, humanitarian sphere, if he wants to make a beginning for that more free speculative treatment of things,"² was published almost concurrently with the end of the Civil War, at a time when for some four years in England no other recent political issues had been more vigorously discussed. The statement could be read as Arnold's defense for not having openly declared himself.

Englishmen politically committed to the acceleration of democracy in their country during those years tended to support the North, while opponents of democracy tended to be "Southerners." Arnold, true to his profession, had made no commitments to obligate him in either direction. Concerning the democratic movement in its existing form he held strong reservations, but we may search his writings in vain for convincing evidence that he ever wished it dead. Conversely, we will find no convincing indication that he wished to accelerate it. He felt that democracy was coming, in the nature of things, before England was culturally ready for it. One could only try to help prepare people for it, to curb its excremental love of *laissez faire* and substitute within it intelligently conceived institutions.³ These considerations, combined with his dislike of the crasser manifestations of Americanism, would prevent his espousing the North on political grounds. But there seems to be nothing in his general feelings about America to move him to support the South. Politically, he could weigh the war in a fine balance which might be upset by nonpolitical considerations—the slavery question, for instance, or unreasonable and overvulgar pleading by partisans of either side.

Temperamentally, Arnold was especially prone to react against uncritical partisanship. One of his most frequently reiterated ideals was "to see life steadily, and see it whole." He innately detested extreme statements of all kinds: he itched to put right those judgments that he considered to be askew, to return unfairly tilted scales to balance. He described his own method in the introduction to *Popular Education of France* (1861): if he were a Frenchman he would tirelessly point out the advantages of local governmental action and "the evils occasioned in France by the excessive action of the State," but being an Englishman he just as unweariedly emphasized the virtues of "strong State-action of France. . . because I am very sure, that strengthen in England the action of the State as one may, it will always find itself sufficiently controlled."⁴

With such a temperament Arnold was obliged to confront in his own family—the recipients of the very letters on which his pro-Southern reputation has rested—a pro-Northern commitment that would almost certainly strike him as uncritically excessive.

There are nine letters, beginning shortly after the first Southern states seceded and ending with the assassination of Lincoln. Five are to Arnold's mother; three are to his sister, Mrs. William E. Forster; and the remaining one is to his wife.⁵ All the recipients being his close intimates, he did not need to specify to them where his sympathies basically lay.

Arnold's mother lived a retired life at her home in Fox How in the Lake District. The indefatigable Harriet Martineau, the most active of leading pro-Northern writers, lived at Ambleside nearby. A dependable witness, George David Boyle, Dean of Salisbury, declared in his memoirs that Mrs. Arnold was "a most consistent and unflinching friend" of Harriet Martineau.⁶ In 1864, we find Miss Martineau writing to her American abolitionist friend and later biographer, Maria W. Chapman, that Mrs. Arnold was "one of the best sympathizers I have here in the American cause."⁷ This was late in the war, but knowing of Mrs. Arnold's respected son-in-law William Forster's pro-Northern activities and of her association with the relentlessly persuasive Miss Martineau, I suspect that her sympathies extended back at least to the Emancipation Proclamation and probably even farther.

Arnold's sister, Mrs. William E. Forster, was the wife of the Member of Parliament called by the historians Jordan and Pratt "without question the most active pro-Northerner in the Commons."⁸ There is no reason to doubt that Mrs. Forster supported her husband, and we have a statement from Maria W. Chapman that Forster in his pro-Northern activities "had sympathy at home."⁹

Forster requires special attention, to demonstrate how Northern the air was that Arnold had to inhale when he and his brother-in-law came together.¹⁰ During those years Forster virtually lived for the Northern cause. His name pops up almost tiresomely in accounts of Northern American visitors to London and summaries of English pro-Northern activities. Like John Bright, he was of Quaker parentage, with all the Quakers' inherited hatred of slavery. He had written an account of John Brown and Harper's Ferry, idealizing Brown as a fearless Puritan fighter in the tradition of Cromwell and Hampden.¹¹ During the war he kept in almost constant communication with Ambassador Adams and other American officials, regularly basing his Parliamentary speeches on material provided by the United States embassy.¹² After the Emancipation Proclamation, he presided over many emancipation meetings in his home district.¹³ From the journals of Benjamin Moran of the American legation we glean vivid pictures of Forster's busy activities: Forster anxiously hurrying to the American embassy on hearing a rumor that McClellan had surrendered, Forster receiving a medal sent by the Union League of Philadelphia, Forster calling at the embassy to offer his congratulations on the passing of the Thirteenth Amendment, Forster bursting into tears at the news of Lincoln's assassination.¹⁴ Matthew Arnold would find no moderation at all toward America on Forster's part.

Of the nine letters we have to consider, six are either to Forster's wife or refer to Forster, and a seventh may refer to him.

Apparently by January 28, 1861, the Forsters' high praise had already begun. Arnold writes his sister: "Public matters are, as you say, absorbingly interesting. I have not much faith in the nobility of the Northern Americans. I believe they would consent to any compromise sooner than let the Southern States go. However, I believe the latter mean to go, and think they will do better by going, so the baseness of the North will not be tempted too strongly."¹⁵ Though denying nobility to the North, Arnold attributes none to the South. He is not even specifically pro-Southern in saying that the South would "do better by going," for he based his opinion on broader generalities concerning nationality.

He continues:

I myself think that people in general have no notion what widely different nations will develop themselves in America in some fifty years, if the Union breaks up. Climate and mixture of race will then be enabled fully to tell, and I cannot help thinking that the more diversity of nation there is on the American continent the more chance there is of one nation developing itself with grandeur and richness. It has been so in Europe. What should we all be if we had not one another to check us and to be learned from? Imagine an English Europe! How frightfully borne and dull! Or a French Europe either, for that matter. (I, 150-51)

Arnold does not hazard to predict which nation might develop "grandeur and richness." He indicates no real premonition that a civil war might break out, and this statement predates the development of any extensive English debate about the American question. Most significantly, it is the only one of the letters to suggest that secession might be desirable.

The next two of our letters, both to Arnold's mother, were written almost a year later during the excitement following the American seizure of the British vessel, the *Trent*, when most Englishmen expected soon to be at war with the North. Arnold, too, was out of all patience with Americans. In the first letter he sent a needling message to Forster: "Tell him I hope the Americans will not cease to be afflicted until they learn thoroughly that man shall not live by Bunkum alone" (I, 180). The second letter agreed with other Englishmen that "it has become indispensable to give the Americans a moral lesson," and "fervently" hoped that it would be given, but thought that "they will take their lesson without war." (Few Englishmen were so hopeful.) Arnold continued:

The most remarkable thing is that that feeling of sympathy with them (based very much on the ground of their common radicalness, dissentingness, and general mixture of self-assertion and narrowness) which I thought our middle classes entertained seems to be so much weaker than was to be expected. I always thought it was this sympathy, and not cotton, that kept our Government from resenting their insolences, for I don't imagine the feeling of kinship with them exists at all among the higher classes; after immediate blood relationship, the relationship of the soul is the only important thing, and this one has far more with the French, Italians, or Germans than with the Americans. (I, 182)

Curiously, these sentences, while lashing the North, which had just insulted England's pride, seem almost wilfully to ignore the question of the South. They contrast "Americans," not with other Americans, but with Frenchmen, Italians, and Germans. There is simply no Southern sympathy expressed. And these are the last of the nine letters to be definitely anti-Northern.

These three letters, one written before the war broke out and the other two during a short-lived English war excitement, have been repeated by chiding critics and left to represent Arnold's considered view of the war. One American, without pointing to the *Trent* motivation, exhibits the wish that "the Americans will not cease to be afflicted until they learn" as coming during "the great agony of our Civil War" from "this emotional, tenderest-hearted of men, who wrote a page of compassion over a cat that a train over."¹⁶ The English Hugh Kingsmill reviews the three letters and launches upon a lengthy judgment:

Matt is not to be blamed for being unaware, in 1861, that the newly elected president of the United States did not require lessons in morality from Palmerston or any other mid-Victorian. None the less, the tone of these quotations show [sic] how imperfect was Matt's detachment from the popular mood, as soon as that mood became excited; as soon, that is, as detachment became at all difficult. In his attitude toward the American Civil War, he is hardly to be distinguished from *Punch* itself.¹⁷

To anyone who has studied the question, the comparison between Arnold's few comparatively neutral remarks and the tireless pro-Southern campaign waged weekly by *Punch* is too overdrawn for comment.

Before the next of the letters was written, July 1, 1863, the Emancipation Proclamation had convinced many Englishmen of the North's antislavery purpose, and converted large numbers to its cause. The next three letters, significantly, are all in commendation of Forster's pro-Northern speeches. In the July 1 letter Arnold remarks that no public man in England would be damaged by having "even fanaticism" imputed to his hatred of slavery (I, 229), and two letters in January, 1864, praise Forster's ability to put his "soul" or his "goodness, even the gentleness of his nature" into his speeches (I, 249, 251).

The next letter, to Mrs. Forster, January 6, 1865, is particularly interesting because it may be so easily misunderstood. In a paragraph not apparently relevant to anything before it, Arnold begins: "American example is perhaps likely to make most impression on England, though I doubt even this just now. (The students in the Training Colleges had for their composition this year to write a letter from an English emigrant to the United States describing the state of things there, and there is not really 1 percent who does not take the strongest possible side for the Confederates, and you know from what class these students are drawn.)" (I, 285). Kingsmill sees "obvious satisfaction" in this report about the student compositions (pp. 199-200); and Orrick in the *London Mercury* (XX, August, 1929) writes, "And in 1865, he was still agreeably surprised" to find this opinion among the students (p. 392). I fail to see in the statement either "obvious satisfaction" or "agreeable surprise." The sentence preceding the parenthesis seems to suggest that Arnold was instead offering what he considered a gloomy instance of England's continued inability to profit by the lessons of current history, and would thus imply that he favored the North.

The remaining letters, in the closing weeks of the war, tell us nothing new. In one, to his mother, Arnold was characteristically objecting to someone's (Forster's?) immoderately pro-Northern speech. Englishmen praising Americans were overemphasizing purely Anglo-Saxon traits: "To be too much with the Americans is like living with somebody who

has all one's own bad habits and tendencies" (I, 287). The last of the letters, to Arnold's wife, followed the assassination of Lincoln. The killing of the President was "tremendous news," but since Lincoln's work was done, would do no real harm to America, as it would have done "two years ago." "All the recent matters have raised America in one's estimation, I think, and even this assassination brings into their history something of that dash of the tragic, romantic, and imaginative, which it has so little of. *Sic semper tyrannis* is so unlike anything Yankee or English middle class, both for bad and for good" (I, 300). If this is an oddly romantic reaction to the assassination, contrasted with the dedicated Forster's tears, at least it bespeaks a restrained sympathy for the North.

Back in 1861, in the introduction to his *Popular Education of France*, Arnold had supported his argument for state-controlled education by pointing to the example of newly disrupted America:

... What is now passing in the United States of America is full of instruction for us. I hear numberless English lamenting the disruption of the American Union; they esteem it a triumph for the enemies of all freedom, a discouragement for the principles of self-government, as they have been understood and put in practice in this country as well as in America. I, on the contrary, esteem it a great and timely lesson to the overindividualism of the English character. We in England have had, in our great aristocrival and ecclesiastical institutions, a principle of cohesion and unity which the Americans had not; ... self-government here was quite a different thing from self-government there. Our society is probably destined to become much more democratic: who will give the tone to the nation then? That is the question. (p. xxxiii)

This early comment says nothing about the political issues of the war, though it associates the breakdown of the Union with deficiencies in the American social structure. It expresses no fear which I can see that restoring the Union would accelerate democracy in England (the matter is not mentioned). Yet it must have been this essay, of which this passage is the most specific concerning the war, that the historian Burton J. Hendrick had in mind when he wrote, "... Matthew Arnold echoed the fear that Britain, in case of a Federal victory, would be 'Americanized.'"¹⁸ I have not found anywhere in Arnold before his essay of the eighties on General Grant any reference whatsoever to any "Federal victory."

In another educational paper, "The Twice-Revised Code," published less than two months after the settlement of the *Trent* controversy, Arnold complained that the "spectacle offered by America" had caused an "undiscriminating" anti-democratic reaction in Europe that rendered the times inauspicious for further reform in English school curricula.¹⁹ Another application of the American situation to hopes of English school reform was drawn in Arnold's longer discourse, *A French Eton*, published in 1863-64, but this later comment is a good deal more favorable to the United States. For the first time Arnold publicly noted the slavery issue: "I put the question of slavery on one side; so far as the resolution of that question depends on the issue of the conflict between the North and the South, every one may wish this party or that to prevail."²⁰ (Arnold had already privately shown by his letter concerning Forster's speech that he was personally opposed to slavery.) The faults of America, he continued, were almost identical with the faults of the English "middle-class spirit... there, as here, full of rawness, hardness, and imperfection; there, as here, greatly needing to be liberalized, enlarged, and ennobled..." Now, it seemed, Americans were "transforming their spirit in the furnace of civil war," and "lovers of perfection in America itself ought to rejoice... that the national spirit should be compelled, even at any cost of suffering, to transform itself, to become something higher, ampler, more gracious." So to hope was "a homage to perfection... a religious devotion to that providential order which forbids the final supremacy of imperfect things. God keeps tossing back to the human race its failures, and commanding it to try again" (pp. 111-12).

After the war, following a trip to the Continent, Arnold published an article in the *Cornhill Magazine*. Contentiously, he wrote, disdained the ruling English middle class for "being full of coldness, slights, and sermons" for Americans while they were at war, and when they had won, discovering "that it had always wished them well."²¹ Traveling Englishmen were taunted on their treatment of America:

... you scold right and left, you get up a monster memorial to deprecate the further effusion of blood; you lament over the abridgment of civil liberty by people engaged in a struggle for life and death, and meaning to win; and when they turn a deaf ear to you and win, you say, 'Oh, now let us be one great united Anglo-Saxon family and astonish the world'... Do you not see that all these blunders dispose the Americans... who have been succeeding as steadily as you have been failing, to answer, 'We have got the lead, no thanks to you, and we mean to astonish the world without you' (p. 169).

Strictly, Arnold was merely reporting what he had heard Europeans say, but does not his tone imply that he wished to dissociate himself from anti-Northerners? As a reasonably honest man, he probably would not have done so had he been of that party.

I conclude that Arnold, at least after January of 1863, was one of those "sincere" if "cold" Northern sympathizers he later wrote about. His comments, published and private, became progressively less unfavorable to America as the war continued. He refrained almost entirely from mentioning the South, seeming always to think of American civilization as a disrupted unit, one to which certain great events were happening which would transform it—for the better, he hoped. As he was one of a family that included uncritical Northern enthusiasts, and moved among them, an instinctive shunner of extremes, and as he tended to dislike American national behavior, the coolness in his family letters commenting on America overshadows the sympathy. I believe, however, that his family knew, without his being obliged to specify it, that in the showdown between North and South, his dislike of slavery had soon led him to join them in hoping that the North would succeed.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ G. W. E. Russell, *Matthew Arnold* (New York, 1904), p. viii.
- ² "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time," *Essays in Criticism* (London, 1865), p. 26.
- ³ See especially Arnold's *Popular Education of France* (London, 1861), pp. xvii-xxii. Also Benjamin E. Lippincott, *Victorian Critics of Democracy* (Minneapolis, 1938), p. 103; significant comments in J. Dover Wilson, "Matthew Arnold and the Educationists," *The Social and Political Ideas of Some Representative Thinkers of the Victorian Age*, ed. F. J. C. Hearnshaw (London, 1933), pp. 165-93; and James Bentley Orrick, "Matthew Arnold and America," *London Mercury*, XX (August, 1929), 389-97. I disagree with Orrick's interpretation of Arnold and the Civil War.
- ⁴ p. xxxi. Italics are mine. See also H. Herbert Dodwell, "Matthew Arnold as a Social Reformer," *Macmillan's Magazine*, n. s., I (November, 1905), 54-55: "Speaking generally, we may say that wherever Arnold writes of political or social matters, he neglects absolute truth . . . He always restricts his view to a single case. He notes what is lacking and endeavours to persuade us to supply the need. . . . Wherever he found one quality too predominant, he criticized the effects of its predominance."
- ⁵ We do not know what Arnold's wife thought about the war. Fortunately, the question is not very important, for the letter to her was written after the fighting in America had ceased.
- ⁶ *Recollections of the Very Reverend George D. Boyle, Dean of Salisbury* (London, 1895), p. 223.
- ⁷ Martineau, *Autobiography*, ed. Maria W. Chapman (Boston, 1877), II, 520.
- ⁸ *Europe and the American Civil War* (Boston, 1931), p. 90.
- ⁹ Martineau, II, 511.
- ¹⁰ We even have an account, in the diary of Benjamin Moran, undersecretary of the American embassy in London, of a dinner and evening (March 22, 1865) at Forster's which brought together Forster, the very "Philistine" Moran, the Northern American journalist Ellis Yarnall, John Bright - and Matthew Arnold. We may imagine how overshadowed Arnold's favorite interests must have been by all the American talk that night. Arnold seems himself to have said very little, for Moran writes, "I had but little conversation with Matthew Arnold. . . . Altho he has a good head he did not impress me favorably" (Sarah Agnes Wallace and Frances Elma Gillespie, eds., *The Journal of Benjamin Moran, 1857-1865* [Chicago, 1950], II, 1397).
- ¹¹ "Harper's Ferry and 'Old Captain Brown,'" *Macmillan's Magazine*, I (February, 1860), 306-17.
- ¹² Ellis Yarnall, *Wordsworth and the Coloridges: with Other Memories Literary and Political* (New York, 1899), p. 257; T. Wemyss Reid, *Life of the Right Honourable William Edward Forster* (London, 1888), I, 332-70; Moran, II, 961, 1042.
- ¹³ Reid, I, 357.
- ¹⁴ Moran, II, 1037-38, 1244, 1378, 1416.
- ¹⁵ G. W. E. Russell, ed., *The Letters of Matthew Arnold* (New York, 1902), I, 150.
- ¹⁶ Mary Wickliffe Van Ness, "Arnold's Life and Character as Shown in His Letters," *Matthew Arnold and the Spirit of His Age*, ed. Greenough White (New York, 1898), pp. 38-39.
- ¹⁷ *Matthew Arnold* (New York, 1928), p. 127. An indication of Kingsmill's slap-dash scholarship is his assumption (p. 202) that excisions from Arnold's letters were made by the editor, Russell, when by Russell's own prefatory statement they were not.
- ¹⁸ *Statesmen of the Lost Cause: Jefferson Davis and His Cabinet* (Boston, 1939), p. 255. Even more unaccountable is the undocumented assertion of another historian, Jay Monaghan (*Diplomat in Carpet Slippers; Abraham Lincoln Deals with Foreign Affairs* [Indianapolis, 1945], p. 283), that Arnold "felt tears come to his eyes when he considered the brutality of Northern republicans and the bestiality of Abraham Lincoln."
- ¹⁹ *Fraser's Magazine*, LXV (March, 1862), 365.
- ²⁰ *A French Eton, or Middle Class Education and the State*, p. 110. First published in *Macmillan's Magazine*, VIII (September, 1863), 353-62; IX (February, 1864), 343-55; X (May, 1864), 83-96. Arnold sent a copy of this book to Emerson in America, hoping that Emerson would "not be offended by what I have said about America - indeed I cannot help believing you will agree with it" (Ralph L. Rusk, ed., *The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson (1813-1881)* [New York, 1939], V, 362).
- ²¹ "My Countrymen," XIII (February, 1866), 158; this was later published in *Friendship's Garland* (1871).

ROSSETTI'S "WILLOWOOD" SONNETS AND THE STRUCTURE OF *THE HOUSE OF LIFE*

On the whole, little comment is to be found on the formal structure of Dante Gabriel Rossetti's sonnet cycle, *The House of Life*. Swinburne's laudatory review of the 1870 volume, for instance, declared that the then incomplete sequence had "so many mansions, so many halls of state and bowers of music, chapels for worship and chambers for festival that no guest can declare on a first entrance the secret of its scheme."¹

Arthur Benson had an oddly contradictory report to offer: "The *House of Life* is not constructed on a definite plan: the mss., which I have carefully studied, bear witness to the perpetual alterations and rearrangements which took place before the eventual publication, and reveal how hard a task it was for Rossetti to satisfy himself."² One might suppose that "perpetual alterations" suggests some attempt at order. But the usual practice of commentators has been to summarize each sonnet with rather vague comments and say nothing of plan.³

Two writers have dealt interestingly and at length with grouping and dating the sonnets, and have related them to Rossetti's biography.⁴ But by far the most scholarly, explicit, and interesting commentary on structure is to be

found in Paul F. Baum's introduction and notes to his edition of the poem. He expends considerable labor and ingenuity in plotting out the unity of the poem, and his remarks are shrewd and just. But I believe there is more to be said about the structure of *The House of Life*, that there is more unity than Professor Baum will allow. "It has little unity of a formal kind," he says;⁵ but it is precisely formal unity that this paper will attempt to establish.

We should be able to exhibit some evidence about the ordering of the sonnets. Rossetti actually made three attempts at organizing them into a whole, if we count, along with the editions of 1870 and 1881, the group of sixteen sonnets published in *The Fortnightly Review* in 1869; and I believe we must indeed consider them carefully.

I think, too, that the fifty sonnets of the 1870 version represent essentially the pattern Rossetti wanted for his sonnet cycle; and, consequently, his additions of 1881, although they doubled the size of the poem, were simply his attempts to fill in gaps, expand certain parts, embellish others, and sometimes, I suspect, to balance the number of sonnets on each side of the center.

That center is occupied by the "Willowwood" group. They are Sonnets 24, 25, 26, and 27 of the fifty sonnets in the 1870 edition; and in the final version of one hundred and two sonnets, they are 49-52. That they are central as well to the pattern of the work, and indeed act as a pivot on which the whole structure turns, I hope to show later. Let us then consider, first of all, the part that the "Willowwood" group would play in the plan of the cycle, and afterwards look at the pattern of each version of the poem that Rossetti spent so long constructing.

The four "Willowwood" sonnets offer us a highly dramatic scene. There has been a death, a new beloved, and a secret parting. And now, seated with Love at a well in Willowwood, the poet, impelled by the sudden vision of his lost beloved, bends to kiss her rippling image in the water, while above him Love intones a somber song to thwarted lovers:

"O ye, all ye that walk in Willowwood,
That walk with hollow faces burning white;
What fathom-depth of soul-struck widowhood,
What long, what longer hours, one lifelong night,
Ere ye again, who so in vain have wooed
Your last hope lost, who so in vain invite
Your lips to that their unforgotten food,
Ere ye, ere ye again shall see the light!
Alas! the bitter banks in Willowwood,
With tear-spurge wan, with blood-wort burning red:
Alas! if ever such a pillow could
Steep deep the soul in sleep till she were dead, —
Better all life forget her than this thing,
That Willowwood should hold her wandering!"

And, after the vision and the kiss, having drunk from the well his beloved's "breath and all her tears and all her soul," the poet feels the comfort of Love's "pity and grace."

This fantastic little drama achieves successfully a number of important ends. It portrays the kind of lustral rite that Rossetti prescribes in his introductory sonnet. As Baum has pointed out, the drinking from the well has the effect of a kind of catharsis, to relieve the poet, at least momentarily, of his doubts and fears.⁶ Catharsis purges and purifies, and surely there is a ceremony of purification intended in the drinking, in the water imagery, and even, possibly, in the spurge, that shrub yielding the bitter, milky juice of a purge.

But the "Willowwood" group does even more, for it seems to hold a position in *The House of Life* quite similar to that of Section 95 of *In Memoriam*; there is a rapport gained in a powerful, supernatural scene, a kind of epiphany. And, if the analogy holds, Rossetti's poem, like Tennyson's, should take a turning after this scene and begin to suggest ways out of the poet's dilemma.

We might well consider *The House of Life* for its relationship with the elegiac poem. It is not, strictly speaking, an elegy, nor did Rossetti probably mean it to be. But it does partake of some of the machinery of the elegy — notably in its passages of grief for the loss of the beloved, in the constantly personal note of remorse for loss and wasted opportunity, in the range of mood and idea typical of the cyclical poem — and herein lies at least some clue to its pattern.

The writing of this drama of purification appears to have had the effect of making Rossetti seek to impose a pattern upon the sonnets he arranged for magazine publication. Toward the end of 1868 he was suffering from eye trouble and, unable to paint, he looked over his poems "with some floating idea," as his brother reported in a diary on 27 November, "of offering them to *The Fortnightly Review*, and at any rate with a degree of zest which looks promising for some result with them."⁸ On 18 December, William could add that "Gabriel has just written a series of four sonnets — *Willow-Wood* — about the finest thing he has done."⁹

The sonnets which appeared in the March 1869 number of the *Fortnightly* showed the effect of deliberate choice and arrangement. Under the title, "Of Life, Love, and Death: Sixteen Sonnets," Rossetti placed sonnets written as early as 1853 and 1854 with some written very recently.¹⁰ Obviously, he had placed them with care; but what do they show?¹¹

Notice that this sequence begins with the "Willowwood" group. Instead of developing slowly, with proper forebodings, to the death of the beloved, this version thrusts us dramatically into the situation. The poet is grieving and Love comes to comfort him, to offer an image of the girl, and to sing a song, the burden of which is that it is better she be forgotten than wander in Willowwood as another of the shades of his lost days.

Tennyson

In succeeding sonnets the poet seeks further comfort from Love (5); speaks of the desolate brotherhood of all his hopes, now because of his loss (6); contemplates a suicide that Fate will not permit (7); and is addressed by an inner mocking voice calling him Might-Have-Been, No-More, Too-Late, and Farewell because he has destroyed the love he could have had, and threatening to ruin any future happiness (8).

The ninth sonnet of the series doesn't fit very well into the pattern, since it is a poem of foreboding. The next one does, however, as a poem of regret for having failed to see the proper landmarks and having made wrong turns. There are then two poems of grief, the first at the parting, the second at his lost, wasted, murdered days; these animated lost days are much like the haunted, dumb figures in the second "Willowwood" sonnet. Sonnet 13 takes up the lament in a different manner; here he is struck dumb at seeing that the wasted life is slipping away from him.

Sonnet 14, "Inclusiveness," is put in, I think, for technical reasons, as a buffer between what has gone before and what is to come in conclusion. We find a similar method employed near the end of a symphony, say, when the music briefly slackens its momentum in order to underscore the energy of the last notes. Nearly any sonnet of a general enough nature would have sufficed. Rossetti chooses one that remarks the variations in attitudes toward life; what one person finds heaven, the other sees as hell. The concluding sonnets consider the poet's death and end unresolved on the question: After giving me so much—Love, Song, Art—can Life now bear only Death for me?

In its earliest form, then, "Of Life, Love, and Death" is a sequence expressing grief and, more especially, remorse and guilt at the poet's waste of the opportunities offered him by Life and Love. The tension is not resolved in any way and, in the end, the poet has only the ruins of a life and the prospect of bitter death to contemplate. This first attempt at a sonnet sequence is too truncated, too concerned with one emotion. Rossetti had poems of more variety at hand, poems suggestive of another pattern of development. And this development is clearly evident in the arrangement of the fifty sonnets for the 1870 edition of *Poems*.

Looking at this expanded 1870 version of *The House of Life*—for here the title is first used—we see at once that the poem has now evolved into a cycle, much more varied and complicated than the 1869 sequence.¹² Without giving a sonnet-by-sonnet description of what happens, let us try to follow the story.

The twenty-three sonnets before the "Willowwood" centerpiece can be broken down into about six groups, each more or less consistently built around a theme or else used to move the narrative forward. The first group, comprising Sonnets 1, 2, and 3 of the 1870 version,¹³ celebrates Love in religious imagery. In the second group, the physical side of love is treated, and in the third the poet speaks of his beloved's attitude toward love, her deep feeling for both spiritual and physical passion. Succeeding groups treat of a feeling of foreboding that he lose her; then loss, a new love and remorse for the old, a secret parting and grief.

After the poet's vision in Willowwood, he struggles through a pattern of despair, hope, and doubt. Hope is expressed immediately after the scene in Willowwood, in the sonnet called "Stillborn Love." It doesn't seem necessary to record here every turn of the poem's thought; the second half of the cycle is, in any case, less unified than the first. But we might note some of the highlights. Group 7 deals with regret for waste and loss, together with some hope; two intervening sonnets hint at decay and death; Group 8 poses the choices the poet is allowed, set against a pattern of "tomorrow thou shalt die," and ending with an expression of the *carpe diem* theme; Group 9 runs interestingly through a conflict and resolution expressed by the paradox of virtue suffering and betrayed by sin, and wasted days, and the debate over resisting death, and, finally "Retra Me, Sathana!" or resistance of temptation to suicide. The theme is handled again in "The Vase of Life"; he would die, but Fate will not permit. Mocked by an inner voice which threatens to ruin future happiness, he feels as if another person has usurped his life and made it gloomy. And he concludes by asking for hope: will forgetfulness come with death? He asks only to remember Love.

Not the least interesting aspect of the cycle in this form is its pattern of imagery. To life, love, and death, another key word, birth, has been added, and the four recur again and again to give the poem a tightened structure. We are given bridal birth and birth bond at the beginning, stillborn love in the middle, and newborn death at the end of the poem. Titles in the first half find their opposites in the second: "A Day of Love" and "A Dark Day"; "Birth Bond" and "Newborn Death"; "Broken Music" and "Death's Songsters." Even a sequence of titles in the first half is suggestive: "Love's Redemption," "Lovesight," "Love's Lovers," "The Love Letter," "A Day of Love," "Love-Sweetness," "Love's Baubles," "Life-in-Love," "The Love Moon," "Parted Love," and "Death-in-Love." Notice, too, how the terms frequently conjoin, life or death with love and birth with love or death. The image of the Trojan horse carrying death in its womb is set against that of Death the newborn child of life. Love, life and death conjoin in Willowwood as if the center of the poem is also its central point of gravity.

It is interesting, too, and not entirely irrelevant, to speculate upon Rossetti's plan for the lyrics which he had at first thought to include in his projected cycle and later dropped. These eleven poems are simply lumped together at the end of the 1870 sequence.¹⁴ The moods expressed are similar to those of the sonnets and one could imagine "Sudden Light," "The Woodsurge," or the very fine "The Sea-Limits" slipping effortlessly into the whole large work. But the addition of songs might have made for less symmetry, and certainly for more diffusion in the construction of the work, not to speak of repetition, since sonnets and songs often echo the same thoughts.

However, it seems more profitable to see what Rossetti did with the 1870 version of the cycle to double its length and to ask ourselves what has been changed in the plan. It is interesting, first of all, to observe that "Willowwood" still occupies the center of the stage; the four sonnets are 49-52 of this greatly expanded cycle. Next, let us note some points of interest about the grouping of the newly added sonnets. All but one of the twenty-six new sonnets added to that part of the sequence before "Willowwood" were composed around 1870 or 1871. The dating is strongly suggestive of the energy Rossetti must have thrown into putting *The House of Life* in order after the 1870 publication.¹⁵ Notice, however, that the twenty-five sonnets newly added to follow "Willowwood" range in dates of composition from 1849 to 1881. If the 1870 version of this second half of the cycle gives us the impression that it is a grab-bag stuffed with whatever Rossetti had in the way of leftovers, the additions to the final version can do nothing but reinforce our impression.

But what functions do these additions perform in the structure of the work? As I have indicated, the 1870 version has essentially what Rossetti wanted in story and mood. The additions, then, fill a number of gaps in the cycle.

A large gap is filled in the first half, between the sonnets entitled "Winged Hours" and "Life-in-Love" — Sonnets 15 and 16 in 1870, but 25 and 36 in 1881. Ten sonnets are needed to fill what Rossetti must have considered a gaping hole in his structure, and, looking at the poem at this point, we see why it gapes. "Winged Hours" is a poem of foreboding:

What of that hour at last, when for her sake
No wing may fly to me nor song may flow;
When, wandering round my life unleased, I know
The bloodied feathers scattered in the brake,
And think how she, far from me, with like eyes,
Sees through the untuneful bough the wingless skies?

But then, precipitately, we are plunged into a new situation in "Life-in-Love." The beloved of the previous sonnet is dead, and the poet has taken up with someone new and has only a bit of the old love's hair for a keepsake. Well, obviously, the intervening sonnets are intended to repair such a glaring fault, and so they do. We don't know quite when Rossetti disposes of the first love, but it is somewhere in this group of sonnets. The poet is in mid-rapture; he makes his beloved a heart's compass, soul-light, a moonstar — all expressions of her great capacity for love. He celebrates her gifts and then looks for faults so he can love her in spite of them. And we are borne smoothly on, no longer jolted by having death tramping at the heels of foreboding.

Other additions to the first half are interesting. The very first sonnet is a new one and enthrones Love above Truth, Hope, Fame, Oblivion, Youth, Life, and Death. The fifth sonnet, coming as an addition after a trio of poems celebrating love in religious imagery, intensifies the strange joining of the physical and spiritual: "Lady, I fain would tell how evermore/Thy soul I know not from thy body, nor/Thee from myself, neither our love from God."

The three sonnets inserted after "The Love Letter" are pictures of happy, youthful love and neither add to nor take away from the effect of the cycle. After "A Day of Love" four sonnets are inserted to celebrate the beauty of the beloved; she is possessed of varied, rich, and imperishable beauty, the poet says. The two contrasting sonnets at this point, "Gracious Moonlight" and the lovely "Silent Noon," depict her in opposite settings.

A last lengthy insertion comes between "Sleepless Dreams" and "Secret Parting" — Sonnets 19 and 20 in 1870, but 39 and 45 in 1881. Five sonnets are slipped in at this point, again for good reasons. Suffering from remorse, the poet asks in "Sleepless Dreams" for a haven and then remarks the mocking quality of the night. Then there is a brief parting in "Severed Selves"; a difficult sonnet, "Through Death to Love"; a reunion; a blessing for love and hope, now that they are together; and, finally, the fear of having one die before the other. I should say that these sonnets offer a kind of opposition to the earlier celebrations of youthful love; they darken the mood of the whole and prepare us for the climactic drama in Willowood.

In the second half of the cycle, the insertions do not always seem to be dictated by reason, and we are left with the impression that some of the additions are made for the sake of mechanical balance. The first two new sonnets, coming immediately after "Willowood," and, significantly, dated 1871, as though composed and planned for insertion here, form a sequel to that little drama. Then, after a single sonnet, "Stillborn Love," Rossetti put in seven poems, filling this gap with three poems dated around 1871 and four of 1880-1881. First, there is a group of three under the general title of "True Woman," giving us, in order, "Herself," "Her Love," and "Her Heaven." At this point comes Rossetti's own division of the cycle. The first part has been "Youth and Change"; the second is not "Change and Fate." Two of the sonnets here were put in to introduce the second part and are sonnets on poetry. The last addition deals with the poet's doubts and links neatly with "Inclusiveness," which preaches that one mood might have different aspects for different persons.

Another large addition comes between "The Hill Summit" and "Hoarded Joy" — Sonnets 33 and 38 in 1870, but 70 and 82 in 1881. Rossetti moves some of the earlier sonnets about and adds some new ones. Here is surely one place at which the reader may rightly feel that the poems have been added for the sake of balance. The trilogy entitled "Old and New Art," like the trilogy of "The Choice," hardly seems to fit into the whole; and we recall that although "The Choice" was part of the 1870 edition, Rossetti had never felt that these poems belonged.¹⁶ Two sonnets in the group, "Soul's Beauty" and "Body's Beauty," had been originally written for pictures. Indeed, the whole section is a weak spot in the structure of the cycle.

With a few more additions, the expanded version of the cycle is complete and balanced. Without the aid of objective evidence — notes, revisions, or letters — it is difficult to say that Rossetti meant precisely this or intended exactly that. But I believe that too much order is present to dismiss it without consideration.

A word remains to be said on the division Rossetti made in the poem. The first section, "Youth and Change," comprises fifty-nine poems; the second, "Change and Fate," consists of forty-two. So this division rather overshifts the symmetrical balance I have suggested. But if we accept Doughty's account, this change may be explained as a biographical problem rather than a structural one. If Rossetti wanted the love poems, many of which referred to other women, to seem to have been inspired by his dead wife, there had to be an attempt to draw them together in a sequence suggesting youth. To bring about this effect, Rossetti retitled sonnets: "Love's Antiphony," for example, was changed to "Youth's Antiphony." And, in addition, as Doughty tells us, "the frequency with which William Rossetti misquotes the title to the first section of *The House of Life*, 'Youth and Change' as 'Love and Change,' makes one suspect that William's misquotation was its original title."¹⁷

But whether or not Rossetti's plan is a bit of flummery, it hardly seems right to accept at face value the notion that *The House of Life* is a large and rather miscellaneous collection into which were tossed all the sonnets that Rossetti

wrote during his lifetime. We can surely see evidence of a carefully planned construction that brings all of the sonnets into a working arrangement with one another and should give us an aesthetically satisfying whole.

Wayne State University

DOUGLAS J. ROBILLARD

FOOTNOTES

- 1 Algernon Charles Swinburne, "The Poems of Dante Gabriel Rossetti," *Essays and Studies* (London, 1911), p. 64. But note Swinburne's letter to Rossetti, dated 28 February 1870: "Thanks for your new sonnet, which is lovely. It will make no difference to my critical work that you have—very rightly I think—rearranged the cycles of sonnets." *The Swinburne Letters*, ed. Cecil Y. Lang (New Haven, 1959), II, 105.
- 2 Arthur C. Benson, *Rossetti* (New York, 1911), p. 130.
- 3 See, for example, William Sharp, *Dante Gabriel Rossetti* (London, 1882), pp. 406-432; Joseph Knight, *Life of Dante Gabriel Rossetti* (London, 1887), pp. 160-173; and John Masefield, *Thanks Before Going* (New York, 1947), pp. 23-47.
- 4 Ruth C. Wallerstein, "Personal Experience in Rossetti's *House of Life*," *PMLA*, XLII (June 1927), 492-504. This article explicates some of the sonnets of 1869 and 1871 in the light of Rossetti's experiences at those periods. Oswald Doughty's excellent biography, *A Victorian Romantic: Dante Gabriel Rossetti* (London, 1949), speaks much of the dating of the sonnets and their relation to Rossetti's experiences; but again there is not much about structure.
- 5 Paul F. Baum, ed. *The House of Life: A Sonnet-Sequence* (Cambridge, 1928), p. 46. The whole sixth section of the introduction, "Title and Subtitle: Heterogeneity and Unity," pp. 34-46, is worth reading for its comments on the poem's structure.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p. 143.
- 7 I persist in calling the poem a *cycle* even in the face of Rossetti's designation of it as a *sequence*, for it seems to me that much of its virtue lies in its being a cycle rather than a mere sequence. Any cycle—of life, of love, of birth and death and rebirth—implies return, retracing, repeating. In a cycle of poems there should be parallels, oppositions, a circular motion.
- 8 William M. Rossetti, *Rossetti Papers 1862 to 1870* (London, 1903), p. 336.
- 9 *Ibid.*, p. 339. On 24 January 1869, William added in his diary, "Gabriel has written another sonnet, *A Superscription*: has selected sixteen sonnets, and sent them to the *Fortnightly* for the March number. He thinks he must have by him altogether at least fifty sonnets which he would be willing to publish" (p. 380).
- 10 The sixteen sonnets are 49, 50, 51, 52, 39, 91, 95, 97, 25, 67, 47, 86, 65, 63, 99, and 100 in the final version of 1881. For dates, see Baum, pp. 229-230.
- 11 Baum considers the arrangement briefly but concludes only that there is "a kind of unity in time of composition, and certainly a unity of tone, but it is difficult to say that the different arrangement throws any real light on the individual stanzas or on the 'story.'" See Baum, p. 44.
- 12 The fifty sonnets of this version are 2, 3, 4, 6, 6a, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 21, 23, 25, 36, 37, 38, 39, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 63, 65, 67, 68, 70, 83, 71, 72, 73, 82, 85, 86, 87, 90, 91, 92, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, and 101 of the final version of 1881. The sonnet numbered 6a (by Baum) is "Nuptial Sleep," omitted by Rossetti from the 1881 version and sometimes left out of printings of the cycle.
- 13 For convenient reference, I give the numbering of the sonnets in both the 1870 and the 1881 versions. The first set of numbers following each group number is that of the 1881 version; the second, that of the 1870 version.
Group 1 (2, 3, 4), (1, 2, 3); Group 2 (6, 6a, 7), (4, 5, 6); Group 3 (8, 9), (7, 8); Group 4 (15, 16, 21), (11, 12, 13); Group 5 (36, 37, 38), (16, 17, 18); Group 6 (45, 46, 47, 48), (20, 21, 22, 23); Group 7 (65, 67, 68), (30, 31, 32); Group 8 (71, 72, 73, 82), (35, 36, 37, 38); Group 9 (85, 86, 87, 90), (39, 40, 41, 42).
- 14 The songs are: "Love Lily," "First Love Remembered," "Plighted Promise," "Sudden Light," "A Little While," "The Song of the Bower," "The Honeysuckle," "A Young Fir-Wood," "The Sea-Limits," "Penumbra," and "The Woodsurge." Baum, pp. 36-37, has a brief account of Rossetti's changing plan.
- 15 Here, as elsewhere, I have used Baum's dating, which seems about as reliable as any we are likely to have. See Baum, Appendix I, "On the Dating of the Sonnets." Sonnet 24 is dated 1880, and I do not count the introductory sonnet, which is dated 1881.
- 16 Baum, p. 174.
- 17 Doughty, pp. 381-382.

II. NOTES AND BRIEF ARTICLES

1. Restoration through Feeling in George Eliot's Fiction:
A New Look at Hetty Sorrel

Of the many archetypes underlying the fiction of George Eliot that of restoration or spiritual rebirth is among the most prominent. All her novels concern themselves with egoists who re-enter the human family by the adoption of an ethic similar to her own, though usually the character's personality gives the necessary aesthetic disguise to the similarity. This restoration is usually the result of a confluence of factors: the operation of conscience, the identification with suffering humanity which comes from tragic suffering, the influence of a wiser, altruistic adviser (George Eliot's "mentors"), or the influence of place and childhood memory. The last is a theme which, as has been noted, owes a great deal to Wordsworth.¹ Less prominent in the novels, yet equally important, is another Wordsworthian theme: the restorative

effect of direct, unequivocal appeals to the sympathetic feelings.² The notion of the moral benefit of demands made by man in need to other men runs through Wordsworth's work; in "The Old Cumberland Beggar" it is central. There Wordsworth speaks of worthy humans whose goodness stems from

That first mild touch of sympathy and thought,
In which they found their kindred with a world
Where want and sorrow were.³

The quotation could serve as a motto for many chapters of George Eliot. The discovery of suffering, or want, jars many of her egoists outside self.

The outstanding illustration is of course *Silas Marner*, which, George Eliot wrote to Blackwood on February 24, 1861, "is intended to set . . . in a strong light the remedial influences of pure, natural human relations."⁴ We may, however, see the theme at many other points, some minor, some not, in the novels. "Janet's Repentance" gives us Janet Dempster's movement of tenderness and help to her dying husband; *Felix Holt*, Esther Lyon's comforting of Mrs. Transome; *Romola*, the heroine's work in the plague-stricken village; *Adam Bede*, Hetty's return to her dead infant; the *Mill*, Tom's final reconciliation with his sister; and *Daniel Deronda*, Deronda's assistance to Gwendolen and Mirah. Less emphatically we can see the theme underlying the human movement of Adam to Arthur or Hetty, or Dorothea to Lydgate and Rosamond and Casaubon. Lydgate's troubles are lessened as he calls on his patients: "the direct external calls on his judgment and sympathies brought the added impulse needed to draw him out of himself."⁵ George Eliot's positivist priesthood—Deronda, Tryan, or Farebrother, often operate through such appeals, and set off chain reactions as their pupils become mentors. Tryan aids Janet, she responds to Dempster; *Romola* guides the villagers as Savonarola guides her; Esther advises Harold and aids Mrs. Transome as she has been advised and aided; Lydgate, leaving a consultation with Dorothea, turns his pity to Rosamond, though here the parallel is submerged in the heavily underlined futility of the gesture.

George Eliot generalizes from Wordsworth to make the notion a positivist canon. Answering demands on our sympathy is one way of creating the "earthly paradise" and avoiding the abstract ethic she so scathingly denounced in her *Westminster Review* articles on "Dr. Cumming" and "The Poet Young,"⁶ as well as a means of avoiding the egoism implicit in choosing our self-sacrifices. In *Adam Bede* she states that "our highest thoughts and our best deeds are all given to us" (I, 168). Dorothea, after many quixotic schemes of benevolence, discovers in Lydgate's plight that the "objects of her rescue were not to be sought out by her fancy: they were chosen for her" (III, 391). Savonarola tells *Romola* that "man cannot choose his duties" (II, 105), and Daniel informs Gwendolen that "We must find our duties in what comes to us, not in what we imagine might have been" (III, 239). Often we find characters in the novels who are in moral suspense, indecisive, finding necessity forcing the redeeming act, or the act which precipitates a chain of redeeming acts. Thus Janet Dempster, torn between resentment of her husband and a desire for reconciliation, has her choice made by his illness. The emphasis, a far Wordsworthian cry from George Eliot's exaggerated "rationalism," is anti-intellectual. "Here is a duty about which all creeds and all philosophies are at one" (*Scenes*, II, 270). Lawyer Dempster's careful exclusion from too much of our sympathy—there is none of the conventional death-bed repentance—does more than avoid the hackneyed. It places the moral stress on the goodness of Janet's act *per se* and not on utilitarian calculable consequences.

A similar solution to perplexity takes place in *Felix Holt*, where at the close Esther Lyon vacillates between inheritance and renunciation. The issue here is complicated by Harold Transome's new claim on Esther's pity: she knows, now that his parentage is revealed, that he "needs her"; duty and advantage seem to coincide. Esther debates in her bedroom until she is disturbed.

All had been stillness hitherto, except the fitful wind outside. But her ears now caught a sound within—slight, but sudden. She moved near her door, and heard the sweep of something on the matting outside. It came closer, and paused. Then it began again, and seemed to sweep away from her. Then it approached, and paused as it had done before. Esther listened, wondering. The same thing happened again and again, till she could bear it no longer. She opened her door, and in the dim light of the corridor, where the glass above seemed to make a glimmering sky, she saw Mrs. Transome's tall figure pacing slowly, with her cheek upon her hand.⁷

Esther responds to the suffering woman. The emphasis, as with Janet, is on spontaneity and "truth of feeling." "She divined that the son's new trouble must be one with the mother's long sadness. But there was no waiting" (II, 347). "Words could not be quick or strong enough to utter her yearning" (II, 348). Esther's response to human suffering releases her from the irresolution of intellectual debate and evokes the final "vision" to urge her towards the life where the draughts of joy spring from the "unchanging fountains of reverence and devout love" (II, 349). The movement to Mrs. Transome is followed by a similar one to Harold and the chain-reaction conversion of him to tenderness as well. The anti-intellectualism is underlined by the suppression of normal curiosity: Esther is too concerned with others' feelings to ever know or ask or think about what the problem troubling the Transomes is, and the effect of this suppression is to focus our attention on the human situation only.

Romola, a close version of *Silas* in its theme of betrayal, exile, and restoration through feeling,⁸ has an anti-intellectual emphasis as well, though here it is gained by repetition of situation rather than by emphasizing the ease with which a charitable act can resolve an intellectual stalemate. *Romola*'s aiding of the villagers stricken with plague is a simpler version of her earlier aiding of the plague victims in beleaguered Florence. "Madonna" references to *Romola* underline the similarity. The differences are all on the side of spontaneity and feeling: religious debate, intrigue and dogma vitiate the work done in Florence, and *Romola* becomes later aware that even her altruism here had a certain self-conscious taint to it. Now the emphasis is on the sense of duty reduced to its most natural and implicitly most valuable level: "From the moment after waking when the cry had drawn her, she had not even reflected, as she used to do in Florence, that she was glad to live because she could lighten sorrow—she had simply lived, with so energetic an impulse

to share the life around her, to answer the call of need and do the work which cried aloud to be done, that the reasons for living, enduring, labouring, never took the form of argument" (II, 412).

Silas and Hetty are, like Romola, restored by the appeal of a child, but because of their lack of sophistication there cannot be the oblique anti-intellectual statement which comes from the consciousness of an alternative. George Eliot says through them, however, like Wordsworth, that in the experience of these people there is a lesson for everyone: certainly the more conscious Adam, and perhaps Dinah, learn from Hetty. Hetty is in fact, next to Silas, George Eliot's supreme dramatization of this important theme, as well as the most neglected. Hetty's emergence from egoism through the appeal of her helpless child — an emergence checked by the discovery of the child's death — has been strangely overlooked, most critics concentrating on Hetty's second emergence in the prison with Dinah.⁹ If this scene were only about Dinah and her effect on Hetty I don't think it would grip us the way it does: what makes it so moving is the fact that it gives us in intense fictional simultaneity two movements from isolation. Hetty's speaking to Dinah is one of these; what she says is the dramatization of the other. It is a dramatization which George Eliot's craft has kept carefully and ironically from us till now. On our last sight of Hetty before the birth of the child she is still wandering pathetically, and the emphasis is on her hardness and lack of human feeling.

Poor wandering Hetty, with the rounded childish face, and the hard unloving despairing soul looking out of it — with the narrow heart and narrow thoughts, no room in them for any sorrows but her own, and tasting that sorrow with the more intense bitterness! My heart bleeds for her as I see her toiling along on her weary feet, or seated in a cart, with her eyes fixed vacantly on the road before her, never thinking or caring whither it tends, till hunger comes and makes her desire that a village may be near.

What will be the end? — the end of her objectless wandering, apart from all love, caring for human beings only through her pride, clinging to life only as the hunted wounded brute clings to it?

God preserve you and me from being the beginners of such misery! (II, 153)

Here, the author's apparent omniscience — the overwhelming pity, the summary pictures of Hetty's moral and pragmatic dead ends — put off any expectation of what we are to discover in the prison. The next two narratives of Hetty's history, given at the trial by Sarah Stone and John Olding, are retrospective and equally hopeless, gaining authority both from George Eliot's parting view of the "hard unloving despairing soul" and from Hetty's own mute impenetrability. George Eliot is holding fire, with narrative logic, since no one has witnessed Hetty's emergence, but also, since omniscience and omnipresence have been suspended, with a subtle and deliberate calculation of tension and final effect. Rather than have two climaxes and risk a certain bathos and repetitiveness with Dinah in the prison, George Eliot looks the other way — at Adam and at Hayslope and at consequences — while Hetty redeems herself. It seems like the conventional off-staging of painful events notable in Greek tragedy: it is in fact an ironic use of the convention. We learn of the events, and from the actor, and in all painful detail: but later, and the effect is all the more moving, because the narrative is the hitherto uncommunicative Hetty's, because of the physical circumstances of the death cell, and because we discover our mistake about Hetty at the trial.

The story is given in Hetty's simple, faltering vocabulary, but the speech is unlike that of the earlier Hetty both in the suggestive great length and in new, timid feelings of compassion and responsibility. The baby's cry, the appeal to the heart, recurs constantly in the narration, cutting across all distinctions of space and time in Hetty's mind. "I did do it, Dinah . . . I buried it in the wood . . . the little baby . . . and it cried . . . I heard it cry . . . ever such a way off . . . all night . . . and I went back because it cried" (II, 247). This is the opening of Hetty's narration and defines its theme of restoration through feeling; it gives a summary of what is to follow, stressing the haunting cry of the child, in the woods and fields, in and out of earshot, before and after death. Hetty describes her quest, the despair, the birth and abandonment of the baby. In the morning following her first night out with the child we have the first indication of selfless feeling in Hetty; a movement not strong enough to overcome her desire for escape. "I don't know how I felt about the baby. I seemed to hate it — it was like a heavy weight hanging round my neck; and yet its crying went through me, and I daren't look at its little hands and face" (II, 249). The incomprehension of the new feeling is necessary: Hetty is not analytic enough to see her redemption in her own ambivalence. She buries the child, its cry piercing her and punctuating the narrative till the end. She leaves the child "but I could hear it crying all the while"; she eats at a village a long way from the wood: "I heard the baby crying, and thought the other folks heard it too, — and I went on"; exhausted, she finds a barn and sleeps in it: "But oh, the baby's crying kept waking me" (II, 250-251). By now the child is dead and the cry is imaginary. Guilt and fear of discovery are partly responsible for the hallucination, but George Eliot leaves no doubt what the real source of it is. Hetty no longer excludes "any sorrows but her own," or cares for human beings "only through her pride." Her pity for the child makes her turn back to it, accept, despite fear, possible discovery; accept, despite pain, responsibility.

I turned back the way I'd come. I couldn't help it, Dinah; it was the baby's crying made me go; and yet I was frightened to death. I thought that man in the smock-frock 'ud see me, and know I put the baby there. But I went on, for all that: I'd left off thinking about going home — it had gone out o' my mind. I saw nothing but that place in the wood where I'd buried the baby . . . I see it now. O Dinah! shall I allays see it? (II, 251)

This is not tragic choice, though it much resembles it. It is, for one thing, not conscious enough: Hetty is driven by sympathy, against the urges of egoistic judgment; mind and heart conflict. Then, too, Hetty is ready to accept consequences, but not the full consequences of tragic waste. She approaches the place where the child is buried. "I could hear it crying at every step . . . I thought it was alive. . . . I don't know whether I was frightened or glad. . . . I don't know what I felt. I only know I was in the wood, and heard the cry" (II, 251-252). But the child is dead, and Hetty is driven back into her old hardness, her heart, she says (twice), "like a stone." The image echoes many earlier ones, but none of them, significantly, have been used before by Hetty. The image bridges past and present restoration, implying not

only that Hetty is now capable of insight, but that she was also capable earlier. There is a discreet parallel in Hetty's reaction with Arthur, who also will not accept consequences, and, throughout the narration, with Adam, who also moves from hardness to pity. Almost immediately now comes the end of the chapter, which re-enacts Hetty's emergence, and in so doing adds the one thing necessary for the purgation of terror and pity: responsibility, for the confession is acceptance. It is purgation for Hetty too. "At last Hetty burst out, with a sob - 'Dinah, do you think God will take away that crying and the place in the wood, now I've told everything'" (II, 252). It is Dinah who leads Hetty finally out of isolation, but Dinah, evoking confession, has only provided the one thing necessary to complete the hard work Hetty has done herself.

University of Alberta, Canada

I. W. ADAM

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ George Eliot wrote in 1839 after reading the first three volumes of Moxon's 1836-37 six volume edition of Wordsworth "I never before met with so many of my own feelings, expressed just as I could like them." (*Letters*, ed. Gordon S. Haight, I, 34). See Mario Praz, *Hero in Eclipse in Victorian Fiction*, particularly pp. 322-323, for discussion of Wordsworth's influence on George Eliot.
- ² It does not escape, however, Walter Houghton's net. See the *Victorian Frame of Mind*, p. 259, n.
- ³ *Works*, ed. de Selincourt, IV, 238. The references to "cold abstinence from evil deeds" and men "who can hear the Decalogue and feel/No self-reproach" bring to mind Adam Bede and Tom Tulliver.
- ⁴ *Letters*, III, 382. *Silas* and *Adam Bede* are given mottos from Wordsworth.
- ⁵ *Middlemarch*, III, 206. Now and always I refer to the Cabinet Edition of George Eliot's works.
- ⁶ Reprinted, with some revision, in *Essays by George Eliot* (Blackwood, 1884).
- ⁷ *Felix Holt*, II, 342-343.
- ⁸ *Romola* was put aside for *Silas*, but since the drifting and the plague "belonged to my earliest vision of the story" (*Letters*, IV, 104) the ending of *Silas* is, more accurately, a version of the ending of *Romola*.
- ⁹ The three most recent critics of George Eliot overlook this point. It flaws an archetype for one: "It is because of her lack of feeling and hardness that she, like the Ancient Mariner, is unable to pray until Dinah has interceded for her" (R. Stump, *Movement and Vision*, Washington, 1959, p. 56). Jerome Thale states "Only Dinah can take compassion and penetrate the wall Hetty has around her" (*The Novels of George Eliot*, Columbia, 1959, p. 30). Mrs. Barbara Hardy states "the change in Hetty is no more than the breaking of silence in the prison and the defensive movement towards another human being" (*The Novels of George Eliot*, Athlone Press, 1959, p. 39).

2. The Thorn Imagery in *Adam Bede*

Allan Casson's note remarking some of the similarities between *Adam Bede* and *The Scarlet Letter* leads to a consideration of why George Eliot made certain departures from Hawthorne.¹ Like Mr. Casson, I have frequently been struck by the close resemblance of names - Hetty (Hester) Sorrel and Hester Prynne, Arthur Donnithorne and Arthur Dimmesdale; and I have asked myself what, if indeed the given names were taken from *The Scarlet Letter*, suggested the family names of Hetty and Arthur. Such enquiry has led me to discover what is, I think, an important thematic device in the novel.

Upon close examination of *Adam Bede* one finds that the word "thorn" appears in many important passages. Early in the novel one sees the word used several times in connection with Thias Bede. In his younger years Thias had been a good husband and father, but he had latterly taken to drink and become a source of worry to his family, Adam thinking of him "as certain to live to be a thorn in his side" (Ch. IV).² When he drowns he is buried, at his wife's insistence, under the white thorn in the village churchyard, "where once, in a dream, she had thought she lay in the coffin, yet all the while saw the sunshine above, and smelt the white blossoms that were so thick upon the thorn the Sunday she went to be churched after Adam was born" (Ch. X). If this passage is meaningful, its purpose is, I think, to indicate to the reader that Adam, unlike the other two main characters of the novel, is to be associated with the flowers and not with the thorns of the tree.

One of the central themes of *Adam Bede* is the disparity between outward appearances and inner character. In nearly every case outer beauty or polish is but a screen behind which lies some kind of evil or harshness. Mrs. Irwine says to Arthur:

"Thank God you take after your mother's family, Arthur. If you had been a puny, wiry, yellow baby, I wouldn't have stood godmother to you. I should have been sure you would turn out a Donnithorne. But you were such a broad-faced, broad-chested, loud-screaming rascal, I knew you were every inch of you a Tradgett." (Ch. V)

To this, Mr. Irwine comments jokingly that a child may look like its mother but may have "two or three of its father's tricks notwithstanding." As it turns out of course, Arthur is a Donnithorne, insidious and inflicting misery like the unloved and unlovable Squire Donnithorne. As for Hetty, the author comments that if she "had been plain she would have looked very ugly and unamiable. . . and no one's moral judgment upon her would have been in the least beguiled" (Ch. XXIII). Old Squire Donnithorne was courteous and polite, but "this polish was one of the signs of hardness"

(Ch. XXVI). No, says George Eliot, beauty is not to be trusted: all too often beauty and courtly manners are but veils hiding moral impurities.

The most common image in *Adam Bede* for surface beauty is the flower, particularly the rose. Hetty is often compared to a rose. "If ever a girl looked as if she had been made of roses," the narrator observes, "that girl was Hetty..." (Ch. XVIII). Arthur calls her "little blossom" (Ch. XII) and "tearful rose" (Ch. XIII). Arthur, while naturally enough not called a rose, is yet associated with the smell of roses: he wears rose-scent in his hair (Ch. XV), and the letter which he sends to Hetty by Adam has "a faint scent of roses, which made her feel as if Arthur were close to her" (Ch. XXXI). This is not mere decoration: George Eliot wants her readers to be very much aware of the snares that may lurk behind the surface beauty of her characters. Hetty gives pain to Adam: while seeking to pluck the rose he is ensnared by beauty's thorns. And Hetty in turn is the victim of the *Donnithorne* who causes her suffering.

Adam alone is portrayed as consciously retreating from inflicting pain. Associated with the flowers and not with the thorns of prickly plants, he at first refuses to visit Hetty in prison. The author comments:

Energetic natures... will often rush away from a hopeless sufferer.... It is the overmastering sense of pain that drives them. They shrink by an ungovernable instinct, as they would from laceration.... (Ch. XLII)

Arthur, on the other hand, is oblivious to the possibility of his being a cause of pain and suffering. In deciding whether he should avoid Hetty after seeing her at the Poyzers' dairy, he reflects fleetingly on Mr. Irwine's words of warning, "though Arthur, for his part, thought girls were not by any means so soft and easily bruised..." (Ch. XII). But his every contact with Hetty is like a thorn bruising her flesh. When he meets her for the second time in the grove, her eyes full of tears, he speaks to her "in a soft, soothing tone, as if she were a bright-eyed spaniel with a thorn in her foot" (Ch. XIII). The earrings which he gives her leave a tiny hole in Hetty's ears when they are taken out (Ch. XXII). She looks forward to meeting him "with that eager yearning which one may call the 'growing pain' of passion" (Ch. XVIII). After Adam encounters them together in the grove, Arthur wishes to see Hetty again, but "there was... a thorny hedge of hindrances between them..." (Ch. XXIX). Finally, Arthur causes her "'growing pain' of passion" to turn into a "bruised passion" (Ch. XXXI).

Before the consummation of Hetty and Arthur's illicit passion, Dinah provides certain foreshadowings of the direction which their love is to follow, and significantly her fears are expressed in terms of thorns. The first instance occurs during the preaching on the green. Bessy Cranage is a village hoyden who, compared time and again with Hetty, thinks only of finery and outward show. Dinah preaches directly to her and tells her the story of a woman whose only interest was in lace caps and appearances. "And one day," Dinah tells, "when she put her new cap on and looked in the glass, she saw a bleeding Face crowned with thorns" (Ch. II). The second instance occurs as a premonition. Dinah reflects on the lack of warmth and affection in Hetty's nature, and this feeling about Hetty gathers "a painful intensity; her imagination had created a thorny thicket of sin and sorrow, in which she saw the poor thing struggling torn and bleeding, looking with tears for rescue and finding none" (Ch. XV).

For Adam, Dinah is the only rose without a thorn. For the greater part of the novel Dinah is pictured more as an angel than as a person. Lisbeth fancies that she resembles the angel "as is a-sittin' on the grave i' Adam's new Bible" (Ch. X), and the author describes her as "almost like a lovely corpse into which the soul has returned charged with sublimer secrets and a sublimer love" (Ch. XV). But George Eliot knows that one can never marry an angel. She undertakes, therefore, to humanize Dinah by means of the rose image. At the harvest supper, after Adam has declared his love to Dinah, one of the guests sings "My love's a rose without a thorn" (Ch. LIII), the author's intention here being, I feel certain, to indicate that for Adam Dinah is an entirely different kind of woman from Hetty, the rose with thorns, and thus completely suitable as an object of his love.

This use of thorn imagery tells, finally, a good bit about George Eliot's choice of surnames for Arthur and Hetty. If my hypothesis is correct, then the name *Donnithorne* is obvious. But what about *Sorrel*? Here George Eliot showed her genius for verbal irony. For *sorrel* is not only an attractive color, it is also a flowering tree of the heath family having needlelike leaves of sour juice. So both the thorn and *sorrel* tree bear flowers, but they also bear nettles.

One other name is also connected with the thorn imagery. Old Squire *Donnithorne* tries to lease the Chase Farm to a man named *Thurle* by inveigling the Poyzers into giving up some of their crop land. Mrs. Poyser becomes irate at the suggestion and "has her say out" to the Squire (Ch. XXXII). The name *Thurle* is, I think, for "thirl," which means to pierce. In this case, *Thurle* is like a thorn to the Poyzers.

There can be little doubt, I believe, that George Eliot intended the thorn and associated imagery to function as an important device in *Adam Bede*. Certainly, the reader's awareness of the thorn imagery enriches his appreciation of George Eliot's skill in characterization.

University of Pennsylvania

CLYDE DE L. RYALS

FOOTNOTES

1 "The Scarlet Letter and Adam Bede," *The Victorian Newsletter*, No. 20 (Fall, 1961), pp. 18-19.

2 Citations to *Adam Bede* are to the Cabinet Edition of 1867. I have indicated the number of the chapter rather than of the page so that the citations may easily be found in any reprint.

3. Confusion of the Seasons in
Tennyson's "The Last Tournament"

Images of color set the dominant tone for Tennyson's "The Last Tournament," and this paper is an attempt to describe the manner in which Tennyson orders color imagery into a structural pattern which supports the drama of the poem and reinforces the "allegory in the distance."¹ Color images, predominantly red, are in ascendance in the poem replacing white or non-color images which surround the Tournament of the Dead Innocence. This imagery is fused with the seasonal setting of the poem. As Jerome Buckley has recently pointed out, "Each of the parts [idylls] is given an appropriate seasonal setting so that the colors of the background may accent the prevailing temper of the protagonists in the foreground and symbolize the moral condition of the realm itself."² Yet, the setting not only accents and symbolizes action; it also provokes action. The poet has carefully constructed a late autumn setting for the narrative, and the violent colors reinforce the theme of Arthur's dying world. Tristram and many who attend the last tournament, however, confuse the seasons for they read the change from whiteness to bright color as a change from winter to spring. Color to them is a sign of the emergence of new life rather than a sign of disintegration and approaching death. Tristram acts in accordance to this confusion.

"The Last Tournament," in F. E. L. Priestley's concise restatement of a traditional interpretation of the *Idylls*, is an integral scene in the last act of a drama which moves from the establishment of a world of order and virtue toward the complete destruction of that short-lived world by chaotic forces.³ Buckley suggests that Tristram is a disrupting agent—"a source of dissonance"⁴—in Arthur's world. Buckley further states that Tristram "...has no illusions to lose; with a cynical 'realism' he is able to exploit the now hollow conventions of a corrupt society."⁵ On the contrary, by confusing the seasons, Tristram actually builds further illusions—illusions of re-emergent life—and, consequently, becomes a victim rather than an agent or exploiter of the corruption of society in "The Last Tournament." Tristram is not to be placed as an opposing force to Arthur. Tristram, too, is tragic: his blindness and ignorance lead to his violent death just at the moment he is about to act in accordance with a philosophy erected upon a misreading of the signs of change.

Within the context of Tristram's "misreading" of the signs of change, dramatic irony is implicit in the statement Tristram makes to Isolt—to justify his philosophy—a few moments before he is killed by Mark. "[I] know," Tristram says, "The parchment that whitens ere his hour/Woos his own end..." (693-695).⁶ Tristram, of course, is in no danger of making an unseasonable change to white, as is the grouse he uses for illustration. Whiteness, in the logic of Tennyson's imagery, once suggested purity and innocence; but, by the time of the last tournament, it has come to suggest sterility. Tristram has, however, falsely discerned that the imminent season is spring. He has metaphorically sought and put on the garb of late autumn thinking it to be the garb of spring. Tristram has confused the two seasons.

Tennyson, to make the space of time during which the narrative takes place explicitly autumn, frames the action with late autumn scenes. The short opening scene presents Dagonet "high above the yellowing woods, [dancing] like a wither'd leaf before the hall" (3-4). The narrative ends "in a death-dumb autumn-dripping gloom..." (753). It is fitting in terms of Arthur's world that the season be late autumn when decay and death replace fruition. It is a time when Arthur can no longer expect "solid fruit of golden deeds" (100) but must ask himself, as well as Lancelot, this question: "Or whence the fear lest this my realm, uprear'd,/By noble deeds at one with noble vows,/From flat confusion and brute violences,/Reel back into the beast, and be no more?" (122-125). The Tournament of Dead Innocence begins at the "low roll Of Autumn thunder" and ends in "wet and weariness" (152-153, 216). Dagonet, who alone is faithful to Arthur, knows that his king's world is now "rotten" (148).

The spiritual values of Arthur's world are dead or dying; the remnants of the system, as evidenced by the tournament, are empty forms. The "white" imagery surrounding the tournament suggests sterility. For example, the child whom the tournament honors died soon after Guinevere received it, "But coldly acquiescing, in her white arms..." (23) and a ruby necklace now replaces the diamonds, which have been lost, as the prize. Color replaces whiteness which has lost the power of innocence and spiritual idealism. Guinevere comments, with an irony of which she may be aware, that the ruby necklace will perhaps bring "rosier luck" than the diamonds have, and that the "purest of [Arthur's] knights/May win them for the purest of [her] maids" (45, 49-50). To make explicit the value of red, Tennyson immediately presents the challenge of the Red Knight. Red suggests the sensual and chaotic forces of nature; this is the same nature which the poet pictures in *In Memoriam*—"Nature, red in tooth and claw..." The forces of the Red Knight are linked to the bestiality Arthur fears when he subsequently speaks to Lancelot.

After this digression which has served to assign value to color, Tennyson returns to the tournament where white serves as a covering or veneer. The street is draped in "folds of pure White samite" (140-141), the children and the maidens in the galleries are clothed in white; through the whiteness, however, colored jewels shine so that the galleries are "like a bank/Of maiden snow mingled with sparks of fire" (148-149).⁷ Tristram, dressed in forest green and wearing holly sprigs in which the red berries are conspicuous, wins the tournament in which chaos overthrows order. When Tristram's hand is discovered to be red with blood, the green of the forest becomes associated with the red of sensual passion and bestiality. The galleries interpret Tristram's victory as a sign that the winter has been broken and spring has come. One declares:

... "Praise the patient saints,
Our one white day of Innocence hath past,
Tho' somewhat draggled at the skirt. So be it.
The snowdrop only, flowering thro' the year,
Would make the world as blank as Winter-tide.
Come — let us gladden their sad eyes, our Queen's
And Lancelot's, at this night's solemnity,
With all the kindlier colours of the field." (218-225)

Tennyson, having established that the "real" season is late autumn, is careful to make this confusion of the seasons dramatic; or he makes another responsible for such an interpretation, as he does when the night revels are described:

... for he that tells the tale
*Liken'd them, saying, as when an hour of cold
 Falls on the mountain in midsummer snows,
 And all the purple slopes of mountain flowers
 Pass under white, till the warm hour returns
 With veer of wind, and all are flowers again;
 So dame and damsel cast the simple white,
 And glowing in all colours, the live grass,
 Rose-campion, bluebell, kingcup, poppy, glanced
 About the revels . . . (227-236; italics mine)*

The action now returns to the time of the opening scene. The section of the poem from line 10 through line 240 — almost one-third of the poem — has been digression. The effect of the digression has been to order the color imagery in terms of seasons, to assign values to the colors, and to present, dramatically, a confusion of the seasons. Tristram's enunciation of his philosophy to Dagonet, as the two stand in the "yellowing Autumn-tide" (242), must be evaluated in terms of the digression. Tristram's philosophy is expressed in his song:

"Free love — free field — we love but while we may:
 The woods are hush'd, their music is no more:
 The leaf is dead, the yearning past away:
 New leaf, new life — the days of frost are o'er:
 New life, new love, to suit the newer day:
 New loves are sweet as those that went before:
 Free love — free field — we love but while we may." (276-282)

The second and third lines present an image of winter, but this gives way — "the days of frost are o'er" — to spring. It is on this belief that spring is imminent that Tristram bases his hope for a new love. Tristram rejects Dagonet's argument that the times are out of joint and rides through the forest on his journey to Isolt. It is a poetically effective anachronism that he rides "thro' the slowly-mellowing avenues" and "beneath an ever-showering leaf," searching for a renewal of love and passion (361,492).

Tristram enters the forest at almost the exact middle of the poem, and the episode provides an effective prelude to the last half of the poem. First, Tristram's musing in the bower, which he "built for a summer day" with Isolt, strengthens his delusion that renewal of love is possible. Second Tristram's dream represents a kind of subconscious and final capitulation to the "red" forces of sensual desire. Isolt the White stands in complete contrast to Isolt of Britain, in whose hand — "hot With ill desires" (414-415) — the ruby necklace turns to blood. Tristram chooses Isolt of Britain, and he goes to her immediately when he awakes. His final rejection of Arthur's world, as stated to Isolt, is in terms of blood and passion:

. . . a doubtful lord
 To bind [men] by inviolable vows,
 Which flesh and blood perforce would violate:
 For feel this arm of mine — the tide within
 Red with free chase and heather-scented air,
 Pulsing full man; can Arthur make me pure
 As any maiden child? . . .
 And worldling of the world am I, and know
 The ptarmagin that whitens ere his hour
 Woos his own end; we are not angels here
 Nor shall be . . . (683-696)

While Tristram muses and dreams of a renewal of life in the forest, the final corruption of Arthur's world is played out on a larger scene. His knights have turned vengeful beasts in their battle against the forces of the Red Knight. "This Satanic counterpart of the Round Table is indeed easily overthrown," M. W. MacCallum has commented, "but the victory is worse than a defeat."⁸ Again Tennyson associates the season of autumn with the bright redness of destructive and chaotic forces:

. . . they fired the tower,
 Which half that autumn night, like the live North,
 Red-pulsing up thro' Alioth and Alcor,
 Made all above it, and a hundred meres
 About it, as the water Moab saw
 Come round by the East, and out beyond them flush'd
 The long low dune, lazy-plunging sea. (478-484)

Tristram, who had interpreted the re-emergence of bright colors as the breaking up of winter and promise of spring in which there would be a renewal of life, lies dead at the hands of Mark when Arthur returns in the "death-dumb autumn-dripping gloom." Tennyson has effectively ordered his imagery to create a dramatic situation which would test the quality of Tristram's vision and insight. Through early digression from the narrative, the poet has heightened the tragedy of Tristram's ignorance by assigning definite values to the images before Tristram reveals his interpretation of them in the statement of his philosophy. The sudden death of Tristram and the immediate change of scene to Arthur's somber return from an essentially unsuccessful battle against the forces which are corrupting his realm, provides a fitting climax to this carefully structured poem.

University of Illinois

ROY GRIDLEY

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ S. C. Burchell, "Tennyson's 'Allegory in the Distance,'" *PMLA*, LXVIII (1953), 418-424. Burchell's argument for a "symbolic medley" rather than a consistent allegory in the *Idylls*, seems to me to set the proper limits for interpretation.
- ² Jerome H. Buckley, *Tennyson: The Growth of a Poet* (Cambridge, Mass., 1960), p. 173.
- ³ F. E. L. Priestley, "Tennyson's *Idylls*," *University of Toronto Quarterly*, XIX (1949), 47.
- ⁴ Buckley, p. 174.
- ⁵ Buckley, p. 181.
- ⁶ Citations to Tennyson from *Works*, Eversley Edition, ed. Hallam Lord Tennyson (New York, 1908).
- ⁷ It is, perhaps, dramatically significant and testimony to Lancelot's insight that "He look'd but once, and vail'd his eyes again," when he saw the jewels shining through the whiteness of the galleries.
- ⁸ M. W. MacCallum, *Tennyson's "Idylls of the King" and Arthurian Story from the XVth Century* (Glasgow, 1894), p. 399.

4. Browning's *Fifine at the Fair*: Meaning and Method

The most recent study of Browning's *Fifine at the Fair*, an admirably skillful analysis of the dominant metaphors by Charlotte Watkins, concludes as follows:

It is by contrast with Browning's presentation, in the prologue to *Fifine*, of the metaphysical, moral, and aesthetic convictions on which his own work continued to rest, that the subjective and relativistic philosophy of art and of life set forth in the monologue is to be fully evaluated. That contrast is expressed in the opposition between the symbolic language of the prologue and the monologist's carefully arranged metaphors of light and fire, air and sea, the swimmer and the dream within his exposition of his philosophy; and it is by that contrast that the "fleshly" criticism of Browning's "Don Juan" stands condemned.¹

The monologist's circumscribed view of life, we are told, is "polar to the poet's intuitive vision of transcendent truth."² Although Professor Watkins' essay is in many ways illuminating, it involves, I think, some misunderstanding of the meaning of the prologue and epilogue of the poem and a consequent undervaluation of the philosophy set forth in the monologue. She brilliantly exposes the inadequacy of the conclusion of "Don Juan's" argument; but she also reads as mere parody of the "poet's" truth much that is quite in accord with the implications of both the prologue and the epilogue.³

The prologue is subtitled "Amphibian." The speaker, evidently a poet (but not necessarily *the* poet, as Professor Watkins assumes), begins:

The fancy I had to-day,
Fancy which turned a fear!
I swam far out in the bay,
Since waves laughed warm and clear.

I lay and looked at the sun,
The noon-sun looked at me:
Between us two, no one
Live creature, that I could see.

Yes! There came floating by
Me, who lay floating too,
Such a strange butterfly!
Creature as dear as new:

Because the membraned wings
So wonderful, so wide,
So sun-suffused, were things
Like soul and naught beside.

A handbreadth overhead!
 All of the sea my own,
 It owned the sky instead;
 Both of us were alone.

I never shall join its flight,
 For, naught buoys flesh in air.
 If it touch the sea — good night!
 Death sure and swift waits there.⁴

As Professor Watkins says, the poet identifies the butterfly with the spirit of his dead wife. "The poet and his wife, too, are separated — she, the metamorphosed soul in heaven, he still a mortal, content, he insists, to live in the world. . . ."⁵ The speaker continues:

But sometimes when the weather
 Is blue, and warm waves tempt
 To free one's self of tether,
 And try a life exempt
 From worldly noise and dust,
 In the sphere which overbrims
 With passion and thought, — why, just
 Unable to fly, one swims!
 By passion and thought upborne,
 One smiles to one's self — "They fare
 Scarce better, they need not scorn
 Our sea, who live in the air!"⁶
 Emancipate through passion
 And thought, with sea for sky,
 We substitute, in a fashion,
 For heaven — poetry:
 Which sea, to all intent,
 Gives flesh such noon-disport
 As a finer element
 Affords the spirit-sort.
 Whatever they are, we seem:
 Imagine the thing they know;
 All deeds they do, we dream;
 Can heaven be else but so?

Calling the prologue an "allegory of art, presenting poetry as the artist's imaginative vision of truth," Professor Watkins concludes: "He is 'amphibian' because as a mortal he lives in the world of human experience but as an artist, in the 'sea' of poetry, he imitates ideal truth, such as only the immortal souls could certainly know, and his poetry records his imaginative vision of these truths. . . ."⁶

It must be objected that this reading ignores the possible significance of the opening and closing stanzas of the prologue as well as the relation between the prologue and the epilogue. The first words of the prologue, it will be recalled, are "The fancy I had to-day, / Fancy which turned a fear!" Professor Watkins does not say why the fancy should become a fear. The last stanza, however, explains the exclamation:

Does she look, pity, wonder
 At one who mimics flight,
 Swims — heaven above, sea under,
 Yet always earth in sight?

Evidently the speaker does not have complete confidence in poetic inspiration. Indeed, it is apparent that the words "Can heaven be else but so?" are spoken with a strong sense of possible irony. His "fancy" has suggested that the truth known to the spirit of his wife and the vision which buoys up the poet may be as different as air and water, the one wholly inaccessible to the swimmer-poet, the other fatal to the winged spirit that was his wife. What is more, he has to "confess" that when he is tired and dreads the surge of the sea of passion and thought he welcomes the land, "solid and safe."

The prologue, then, raises a question. The question concerns the relation between spiritual aspiration, poetic vision, and human love — human love and love of things human. The speaker has had no great difficulty in reconciling his liking of life's way, the felt temptation of the liberating "sea" of imagined passion and thought, and a reverent regard for the more exalted sphere where his wife dwells. But if he has had faith in the possibility of an earthly-heavenly love and inspiration it has not been a carefully examined faith, for now he is surprised by misgivings. His fancy now suggests that he has been foolishly complacent or, worse, wickedly presumptuous. Perhaps he should be content to remain humbly ashore, to await humbly "the wings unfurled, / That sleep in the worm, *they say*" (italics mine). Neither worms nor butterflies have any business at sea.

Now these are precisely the questions that are explored and—if it is to be regarded as a “fancy” of the poet of the prologue—the fears that are reflected in the monologue. “Don Juan” justifies his interest in *Fifine*, symbol of the lure of earthly (not to say earthy) desire given freedom through imagination, by demonstrating that such pursuit leads ultimately to the one “truth” that at the bottom of all metaphysical and mythic constructs men can conceive of lies “soul.” However we may wend, seeking freedom, he eventually encounters this *cul-de-sac*, as he might as well call it. Hence his interest in the sensual *Fifine* serves to convince him that he cannot possibly free himself from the subjection that his marriage represents. *Fifine* now becomes the dubious symbol of the naked truth that sanctions married love. *Elvire*, one may imagine, is not greatly impressed. But by now she has become, appropriately, a silent “ghost”; she is nothing but spirit, as *Fifine* is nothing but flesh. “We end where we began,” “Don Juan” begins his summation;

All peace and some fatigue, wherever we were nursed
To life, we bosom us on death, find last is first
And thenceforth final too.

In effect, he is saying that earthly love is “naught” and death—that is, heavenly love—is all. “Our honest civic house/Of the earth be earthy too!” he says, promising to go avoyaging no more; and indeed, the dwelling which he envisions has very much the look of the grave.

The “Householder” of the epilogue is reunited with his wife. He feels that the reunion will be permanent as soon as he can take leave of his delapidated earthly home. But the message which his wife brings is “Love is all, and Death is naught.” Her meaning is perfectly clear, though it is evident that it will come as a surprise to the Householder: Heaven and earth are not as far apart as he supposes. She is still her old self—“... what else did you expect?” When he tells her that dwelling “down here” has been an ordeal, she replies, “And was I so better off up there?” In the terms of the major analogy of the poem, the lady is not “metamorphosed.”

Thus the poem’s final words are a denial of the doctrine of absolutely transcendent love. And thus is confirmed the implication of the monologue and answered explicitly the question posed by the prologue.

The strategy behind these developments is perhaps too subtle to be quite effective, but it can be discerned. The issue raised by the prologue is whether or not human love is at all comparable with divine or angelic love or, what is essentially the same thing, whether human imagination in its most sublime efforts approaches true spiritual vision, such as is said to come after death. The monologue is a test. We must infer that the speaker of the prologue, in order to settle his doubts, proposes to envisage a champion of human love who is possessed of extraordinary intellectual and imaginative powers but whose conduct nevertheless undeniably degrades love—one like the legendary *Don Juan*—and let such a personage make the best case for the worth of love that it is conceivable for him to make without changing character. If his argument rings true, then neither human love nor human imagination is to be trusted, and the spirit of his wife may well regard his mimic flight with pity and wonder. Disconcerting as such a discovery may be, piety would seem to demand acceptance of it. Ironically, “*Don Juan*” himself is willing to admit that his case depends upon the inevitability of the discovery of the transcendent nature of spiritual love. And his willingness implies no conversion: it is still quite conceivable that this resolve to leave off adventuring—now that it has served its purpose—become the good householder should be broken in a trice. “Amphibian” is in a quandry. Being a “householder” would seem to be a dreary and dubious course; yet apart from becoming such a pseudo-amphibian as “*Don Juan*” what other course is there? It is “Amphibian’s” plight that is represented in the epilogue. In other words, the poet-figure of the prologue now describes dramatically how he felt after his attempt to settle the issue raised by the “fancy that turned a fear.” We see him momentarily baffled, frustrated, extremely fretful and depressed. But suddenly the truth flashes upon him through another fancy. He sees that it is just that fear of his, the fear that divine love may be unimaginably purer than human love, that is the subtlest underminer of love and faith. It is this surmise that leads men to exalt love only to degrade it. This is the one fatal flaw in “*Don Juan*’s” vision. He talks indeed about love as imaginative soul-discovery which cherishes real humanity with all its changeableness, imperfect but developing because spiritually alive. But he only talks about it; he never demonstrates his ability to do more. His theory is sound except that it does not really envision practice. His poetic flight fails because it does not really take him out of his own mind. (Only dramatic poetry, as Browning felt, does that.) He has never truly loved. The poet of the prologue has; experience comes to his aid when reason falters. But Browning himself knew that reason matters, too, especially in a time like his, when anti-intellectual “householders” and “emancipated” aesthetes and naturalists looked upon each other with increasing distrust and contempt; hence his ventures in casuistry.

Most of those who have read *Fifine* doubtless would agree that it will never be regarded as a masterpiece. Yet since it constitutes a very full and explicit, if designedly warped, expression of Browning’s philosophy, any misinterpretation can be a matter of consequence. One issue involved is of especial importance. Browning was, as Professor Watkins says, not a mere relativist; but neither was he merely an intuitionist. *Fifine* attempts to demonstrate the necessity of a middle way.

University of Oklahoma

J. L. KENDALL

FOOTNOTES

1 Charlotte Crawford Watkins, “The ‘Abstruser Themes’ of Browning’s *Fifine at the Fair*,” *PMLA*, LXXIV (September, 1959), 437.

2 *Loc. cit.*

3 Professor Watkins’ explanation of the over-all structure of *Fifine* probably represents as well as any the generally accepted view. Opinion has varied considerably on particular points. I believe that the reading presented here is, taken as a whole, a novel one. It should be stressed, perhaps, that what is said here does not invalidate Professor Watkins’ analysis of the imagery and monologue.

4 Quotations from *Fifine at the Fair* are taken from *The Complete Poetical Works of Browning*, Cambridge ed. (Boston, 1895).

5 Watkins, p. 427.

6 *Loc. cit.*

5. The Death of Dora Spenlow in *David Copperfield*

David Copperfield appeared in twenty monthly parts between May, 1849, and November, 1850. As A. C. Coolidge¹ has pointed out, Dickens, lacking a detailed outline, was frequently stumped for material to use in his serials. He groped for new episodes in which to involve his heroes and possibly subjected his characters to circumstances which did not fit his later plans.

One such episode appears in Part XIV of *David Copperfield*. At this point in the novel Dickens has begun many strands in his narrative and is faced with the problem of developing the diverse elements of the plot in an orderly manner. The only progression which he can devise in Part XIV is similar to that of a caterpillar: one portion inches forward, stops, and waits for the next portion to make its move. Examining this installment, one finds that it is composed of three chapters in the collected text.

The action of the first chapter, number XLI, has been anticipated. David writes to Dora's aunts, as he has planned in Chapter XXIX, and calls on them. The aunts, Miss Lavinia and Miss Clarissa, examine him and give their permission for him to call each Sunday for dinner and twice each week for tea.

The second chapter of Part XIV has a twofold purpose: it thickens the plot of Heep and company in two ways, and it allows Dora and Agnes to become acquainted. In this chapter Dora has come to London to visit Dr. Strong and Annie. Uriah sends his mother with Agnes to watch over her and to see that she makes no contact with men. The very warm scene of the meeting of Dora and Agnes is followed by a scene showing another aspect of Heep's villainy: as the day closes, David is included in the group in Dr. Strong's study where Uriah Heep is seen accusing Annie Strong of infidelity. Heep's motive is to break up the friendship of Agnes and Annie, so that Agnes will never again have the opportunity to visit London.

The third chapter of Part XIV is a hodge-podge. In this chapter Dickens attempts to show the passage of a great length of time during which David has gone from abject poverty to a considerable degree of prosperity. He is no longer a penniless law student of the commons, but is now a reporter for Parliament because he has at last mastered shorthand. With his new-found income David takes a cottage for his aunt and another for himself, for he is soon to marry Dora. The news of the impending marriage comes as a shock to the reader because there has been no previous hint that the marriage is to occur at this time. Dickens has tediously described David's courting of Dora but employs only a few paragraphs in preparation for the wedding. The entire event is consummated in two or three pages.

The events of the ill-planned third chapter of Part XIV stand in sharp contrast to the carefully planned two previous chapters. Keeping in mind that Dickens probably lacked a detailed outline and probably did not plan the installments far in advance, one easily reaches the conclusion that Dickens was again stumped after completing the first two chapters of this part. He was limited by space, having already written two-thirds of this installment, and was unable to throw *Copperfield* into a suspenseful situation to whet the reader's interest and anticipation for Part XV. Having perhaps neither inspiration nor available space for fresh adventures and being pressed for time, Dickens decided to telescope the events of a year or more into this one chapter which culminates in the nuptials of Dora Spenlow and David Copperfield. He justified the suddenness of the wedding by making it merely one of the many events of the period covered by this chapter. The climax of Chapter XLIII, the marriage of David and Dora, furnishes the high point of interest which the serial writer must provide at the end of each installment.

Although much of this theory, that the marriage has been contrived to provide rising interest, is pure conjecture, one may look further and find evidence to support such a supposition. In proceeding through Part XV, one gets the feeling that Dickens finds the marriage inconvenient to his narrative. There are many loose ends in the plot, loose ends which David needs to tie up, but he cannot have Dora tagging along, and it would be difficult to explain David's participating in these various adventures without his wife. Because of the first person narrative point of view of the novel, David must be present at Dover to witness the settling of the accounts of Uriah Heep; he must appear at Yarmouth to see the simultaneous drownings of Ham Peggotty and James Steerforth; and he must be able to wander the streets of London with Mr. Peggotty in search of Little Em'ly. Finally, throughout the novel, the reader has had little doubt that David will someday possess his guiding light and guardian angel, Agnes Wickfield. There is only one plausible way in which Dickens can release David to participate in these adventures and to permit him to marry Agnes Wickfield: allow Dora to die.

A look at Parts XV, XVI, and XVII, composed of Chapters XLIV through LIII, tends to suggest the veracity of the hypothetical situation in which Dickens may have found himself. In Parts XV and XVII Dora appears in detail only twice, first in Chapter XLIV in which Dickens shows the chaotic domestic situation of David's home—chaotic because Dora is too backward to manage the servants—and finally in Chapter LIII in which Dora dies. The intermediate chapters pull the strands of the narrative forward. In these chapters Dickens prepares the reader for Dora's death as David notices that she is becoming much lighter and easier to carry up and down the stairs, for she is wasting away, slowly dying, presumably of consumption.

Up to this point all evidence in support of this hypothesis has been internal. One must search elsewhere for shreds of external evidence. Such evidence is found in Dickens' correspondence. A statement in a letter dated April 19, 1849, shows that he was having difficulties even in the early stages of the writing, before the first installment appeared in May, 1849. In this letter he said, "My hand is out in the matter of *Copperfield*. To-day and yesterday I have done nothing. Though I know what I want to do, I am lumbering on like a stage-wagon."²

As the writing progressed Dickens was unable to stay far ahead of his typesetter. In a letter to his printer, F. M. Evans, he said, "I send you, by this Post, 9 slips of copy, containing Mr. Browne's second subject. Get it up *with all speed*, and send a proof to him. . . and another to me, that I may know exactly where I am, which is important to the construction of the No."³ That Dickens lagged behind in the composition of the parts is a certainty, but whether he was also behind in planning the plot is impossible to say. A statement in a later letter hints that he was groping for new episodes: "I wrote my paper for H.W. [*Household Words*] yesterday, and have begun *Copperfield* this morning. Still un-

decided about Dora, but MUST decide today."⁴ This letter is dated May 7, 1850, precisely the time at which Dickens would have been preparing Part XIV which appeared the next month, June, 1850.

Now the picture becomes clear: Dickens has contrived the marriage of David and Dora because he has no fresh material at hand. Since he has not planned this section ahead, he is unable to prepare the reader for the nuptials, and the marriage comes as a surprise to the reader. Later, when the union proves inconvenient for the purposes of the narrative, Dickens disposes of Dora, quietly but quickly.

Texas Technological College

J. DON VANN

FOOTNOTES

¹ See the unpublished dissertation (Brown, 1956) by A. C. Coolidge, "Serialization in the Novels of Charles Dickens."

² Dickens to John Forster, April 19, 1849.

³ Dickens to F. M. Evans, July 10, 1849. See also John Butt, "David Copperfield: From Manuscript to Print," *Review of English Studies*, n.s., 1 (1950), 247-251.

⁴ Dickens to John Forster, May 7, 1850. Kathleen Tillotson and John Butt in *Dickens at Work* (Fair Lawn, New Jersey, 1958) think that this statement means that Dickens has to decide whether Dora is to die; but there is no hint of Dora's death in Part XIV, and Dickens would not have had to make the decision, on this very day, to let Dora die, for he was a full month and a half from the publication date of Part XV, in which Dora dies.

6. Rossetti's Cumæan Oracle

101. The One Hope

When vain desire at last and vain regret
Go hand in hand to death, and all is vain,
What shall assuage the unforgotten pain
And teach the forgetful to forget?
Shall Peace be still a sunk stream long unmet, —
Or may the soul at once in a green plain
Stoop through the spray of some sweet life-fountain
And cull the dew-drenched flowering amulet?
Ah! when the wan soul in that golden air
Between the scripted petals softly blown
Peers breathless for the gift of grace unknown,
Ah! let none other alien spell soe'er
But only the one Hope's one name be there, —
Not less nor more, but even that word alone.

In the first part of *The House of Life*, Rossetti commemorates ecstatic moments of love in the artifice of sonnets like pictures; in the second part, he develops his aestheticism into a metaphysical system. All of the sonnets as one poem transpose an individual's preoccupations into a religious faith. "The One Hope" is the last sonnet, on the theme of immortality. In its emphatic final position, it comments on the whole sequence, particularly as it is the climax of the immediately preceding paired sonnets "Newborn Death," which treat death as a mediating step between two forms of life, the temporal passionate and the eternal aesthetic. In its ultimate position, "The One Hope" appropriately echoes classical mythology for the purpose of individual succor and thus imparts a sobriety and sombreness to one hundred sonnets on the theme of one lover's fight against time.

The very fact that it is the one hundred and first sonnet implies that Rossetti's theme is inexhaustible, not to terminate in a round century of times. The sequence might continue in recurring cycles as an aesthetic extension of personality. Such a triumph over time finds numerous echoes in the imagery. "Peace" may be "a sunk stream long unmet" like Acheron, which gives oblivion (11. 3-4) but which unblessed souls may not cross, as Rossetti remembers his frequent infidelities, or he may pass immediately into "that golden air" by grace of "the dew-drenched flowering amulet" with its "scriptured petals," a benison earned by his "one Hope's one name" — presumably his aesthetic faith.

The Pre-Raphaelitic vagueness of these images becomes more clear when one remembers the sonnet "Sibylla Palmifera," with its priestess of Beauty whose charm dominates "sky and sea" and entralls the lover into lifelong devotion. The "amulet" and "scriptured petals," the "sunk stream" and the "green plain" with "golden air" in "The One Hope," when associated with "Sibylla Palmifera," evoke the Cumæan Sibyl, who granted an amulet to her favored devotees which gave them free passage over Acheron into the Elysian Fields, but who as frequently scrawled her life-giving oracles on leaves thrown to the winds, if she felt her questioner to be unworthy.¹ Also, Cumæan Oracles prophesied a recurring golden age, on the occasion of the millennial death of each priestess,² like "The One Hope" with its one more than a round number and its vitalistic images of "some sweet life-fountain," "dew-drenched flowering amulet," and "golden air."

Dies irae, dies illa,
Solvat seclum in favilla,
Teste David cum Sibylla.

That is a potent incantation, well expressing Rossetti's and everyone's horror of death, but the pairing of David with the Sibyl suggests a hope of immortality, as the Jewish Sibylline Books are "partly predictions of the triumph of Christianity."³ Virgil also seemed to be thinking of the Jewish oracles⁴ when he wrote in his *Eclogues*, IV, 4-7:

Ultima Cumaei venit iam carminis aetas;
magnus ab integro saeculorum nascitur ordo.
Iam redit et virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna;
iam nova progenies caelo demittitur alto.⁵

Time and again Rossetti has recurred in the sonnets to Love as creator of a new order within but apart from the world, and in "Newborn Death" he specifically names Death a "nova progenies" to escort him across "the pale wave" — a child born of the "Love," "Song," and "Art" which exalted Rossetti's life, just as the "nova progenies caelo demittitur alto." But in "The One Hope" Rossetti is so unsure of his fate that, with "scriptured petals softly blown," he echoes Aeneas, who begs the Sibyl in *Aeneid* VI, 74-75:

Foliis tantum ne carmina manda,
ne turbata volent rapidis ludibria ventis . . .⁶

In the final sonnet, his faith remains as ambiguously balanced between two worlds as his art has always been.

It is the ambiguity of his fate after death that makes Rossetti's use of classical material so instructive to our modern eyes. Under Augustus, the Cumaean Oracles were consulted as a last resort when other gods had failed, and they did not prophesy distinctly but gave rituals which might help if properly practiced.⁷ Rossetti's idea of art was just as exclusive and talismanic, with the same anxiety as to the issue, since he could never be sure of the effective thaumaturgy of his aesthetic practice.

Especially the participles and adjectives maintain a tension deliberately not resolved, so that the sonnet subsists in uncertainty. Rossetti would believe that his faith in Beauty will survive the vanity of death, but the octet is a question and the sestet is in the subjunctive. "The unforgotten pain" and "the unforgetful" person may apply either to a living artist or to a soul in Hades. If death is the end of all striving, then the living artist sees no help in the struggle to keep his aesthetic integrity, and the soul in Hades has no prospect of an extended life through honor to his art. But if aesthetic service has virtue in Hades, then the soul may pass the "sunk stream long unmet" and forget his imperfect earthly striving, while the living artist may confidently ignore the claims of a Philistine world. Similarly, "unmet" may mean that a faithless artist cannot transcend the grave, or that a true devotee of Beauty welcomes Lethean oblivion to a world which he has tried to ennoble through art.

In the sestet there is no resolution as one might expect in a conventional sonnet. "The wan soul" peers doubtfully, "breathless" either in hope or fear, in a "golden air" either the dun mist of Hades or the aureate glow of Elysium. "Between the scriptured petals softly blown" is particularly ironic. "Between" applies to "the wan soul," so "blown" may too as the only adjective in the line, and the sense is that the soul is wafted through to bliss. But "blown" may also apply to "petals," and the sense is that the soul stands wistfully among the petals inscribed with its doom. The syntax encourages both interpretations; "the gift of grace" is "unknown" and the sonnet ends brilliantly with no conclusion but a proud reliance on "Hope," the solitary faith of the artist.

In the three sonnets entitled "The Choice," Rossetti prefers a life of thought and action to one of sensual indulgence or pious contemplation, death coming to all. The "fundamental brainwork" of his poetry accepts the challenge of the grave. Aestheticism is neither a pretty picture nor a cult of preciosity, but a serious transmutation of sensual passion into enduring artifice. Though "The One Hope" is as eclectic and derivative as any aesthetic poetry can be, it adapts a universal tradition to express an individual anxiety, and in the expression embraces the unknown.

The University of Maine

JOHN LINDBERG

FOOTNOTES

¹ "Sibyls," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1911), XXV-XXVI, 20.

² "Sibyl," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, The R. S. Peale Reprint (1890), XXII, 13.

³ Richard Claverhouse Jebb, "Greek Literature," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, The R. S. Peale Reprint (1890), XI, 144.

⁴ John Henry Arthur Hart, "Sibylline Oracles," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1911), XXV-XXVI, 19.

⁵ *Virgil With An Introduction and Notes*, eds. T. L. Papillon and A. E. Haugh (New York, 1950), vol. I, 6 *ibid.*

⁷ "Sibyls," p. 20.

7. "How Do I Love Thee?" – an Echo of St. Paul

In Sonnet 43 of *Sonnets from the Portuguese*, Elizabeth Barrett Browning seems to echo St. Paul, Ephesians, III, 17-19, in her famous declaration, "I love thee to the depth and breadth and height/ My soul can reach, when feeling out of sight/ For the ends of Being and ideal Grace." Writing of Christ's love for man, St. Paul speaks of his prayer "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God" (Authorized Version).

Much of the imagery in Sonnet 43 is religious; the tone mingles suggestions of divine love with profane, implying a transformation of the latter by or into the former and an ultimate fusion of the two after death. Supplying the religious tone are words and phrases like "soul," "the ends of Being" (salvation, the gaining of Heaven and eternal joy), "ideal Grace" (that which brings salvation), "Right," "turn from Praise" (implying Christian humility: St. Paul at verse 8 of this chapter calls himself "less than the least of all saints"), "faith," "saints," and the prediction of immortality.

Taken as a whole, the sonnet breathes a spirit of mature religious feeling. The phrase referring to the passion of "my childhood's faith" need not imply a loss of belief, as of putting away childish things; rather it can imply the gaining of a faith based upon mature knowledge and reasoning. The love previously accorded "my lost saints" is not necessarily that which the authoress now professes for a man: there has been, not a mere transference of love, but a sharing. In any event, the loss is but a seeming one.

But in what sense are the saints "lost"? If we consider them as the elect – good Christians – the expression in line eleven becomes a lament for men and women of probity whom Mrs. Browning had known in childhood and had lost through death. Or lines eleven and twelve imply a disillusionment at the discovery of human frailties in adults whom the child mind imagined as perfect. Yet now the faith and love have been justified in a new object worthy of them.

In spirit and expression, then, Sonnet 43 echoes St. Paul's thought and phraseology while adapting them to a new context. It extends the temporal to the eternal, mingling the sacred and profane and giving the profane a sacred character. St. Paul implies extension in three dimensions (height and depth being considered as one); Mrs. Browning implies an extension beyond her grasp in two dimensions. For St. Paul, the faithful may comprehend the extent of love – the limitations of human love being set against the limitlessness of God's love. For Mrs. Browning, her love for her husband is limited on earth only by the trammels of her own mortality. Death will remove these "if God choose."

University of Akron

JOHN S. PHILLIPSON

8. The Publication of Matthew Arnold's Early Volumes of Poetry

No exact dates for the publication of Matthew Arnold's early volumes of poetry have been established. The records of B. Fellowes, publisher of *The Strayed Reveller, and Other Poems* (1849) and *Empedocles on Etna, and Other Poems* (1852), and Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, publishers of *Poems* (1853), which would establish such dates have long since disappeared. It is possible, nonetheless, to suggest approximate dates of publication from such evidence as announcements in *The Publisher's Circular*, periodical advertisements, published correspondence, and dated inscriptions in the extant volumes of each collection.

The Strayed Reveller, and Other Poems is listed as having already been published in *The Publisher's Circular* of April 16, 1849 (p. 136). However, the volume was advertised two months earlier in the *Times* on February 26 as "just published" (Supplement, p. 10). The date becomes more nearly determined by references in *The Correspondence of Arthur Hugh Clough* (ed. Frederick L. Mulhauser, Oxford, 1957). In a letter to Ralph Waldo Emerson, dated February 20, Clough wrote, "I shall ask you to look at a volume of verse by my friend Matthew Arnold which is soon to appear" (I, 241), and on February 25, J. A. Froude wrote to Clough, "They say Arnold has published. Is this true?" (I, 246). The two references suggest a publication dated between February 20 and 25. Clough wrote to Thomas Arnold on February 26, "At last our own Matt's book. . . I have been pressing them [the poems] to my bosom for the last 48 hours – no 36 I believe" (I, 244). This statement suggests February 24, possibly, as the date of publication. Seemingly this date is verified by a copy of the poems in the British Museum (11656.K.21), not a presentation copy, with the inscription "[Francis] [Turner] Palgrave, Feb. 24, 1849." It would appear that the volume was purchased and inscribed on the day of publication.

Empedocles on Etna, and Other Poems is listed as having been published between October 15 and 30 in *The Publisher's Circular* of November 1, 1852 (p. 367). The volume was advertised as "published this day" on October 30 by *The Globe* (p. 1) and *The Athenaeum* (p. 1164). Such advertisements, however, sometimes trailed the actual publication. Of the known presentation copies "from the author," the earliest known dated inscription is Francis R. Sandford's (David Holland) who autographed his copy on "25 October 1852." The earliest reference to the work as published appeared in Arnold's letter to Wyndham Slade on October 22, when he wrote, "I have published some poems, which out of friendship, I forbear to send you. . ." (*Letters of Matthew Arnold 1848-88*, ed. G.W.E. Russell, London, 1895, I, 22). It may be, however, that Arnold made no distinction between the "issuing" and "publishing" of his poems. The evidence available suggests a date of publication between October 22 and 30.

Poems (1853) is listed as published between November 14 and 30 in *The Publisher's Circular* of December 1, 1853 (p. 248). The volume was advertised as "just published" on November 19 in *The Britannia* (p. 1) and on November 21 in *The Globe* (p. 1) and *The Standard* (p. 1). The earliest known inscribed copies, Jemima and Rotha Quillinan's (University of Texas) and Stephen Lawley's (Yale University), are dated simply "November 1853." The earliest known reference to the work's appearance is Arnold's letter of November 18 to Mrs. Elizabeth Gaskell, in which he wrote, "I have ventured, although personally unacquainted with you, to send you a volume in which they [the poems] are for the first time collected with my name" (*Letters Addressed to Mrs. Gaskell*, ed. Ross D. Waller, Manchester, 1935, p. 35). Arnold's letter and the advertisement in *The Britannia* suggest that the publication date was November 18.

Texas Technological College

ROGER L. BROOKS

9. Nineteenth-Century Holdings at the Folger

One rarely thinks of the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C., as a repository for books and MSS in the nineteenth century. Although this library was originally established to house works by and about Shakespeare, in the past quarter of a century it has become a distinguished research institution concerned with all areas of study in literature and history. And while the Folger has the largest collection in the Western Hemisphere of books printed before the middle of the seventeenth century, its holdings in other centuries, including the nineteenth, are surprising. It is surely known that the scholar working on the much-neglected nineteenth century drama, for example, could ill afford to neglect this library. In books alone, I found that the Folger has perhaps sixty per cent of those listed on the forty-eight or so pages of the third volume of the CBEL. Many books not here can be found across the street in the Library of Congress.

Nor are books the Folger's only resource, although scholars might find it interesting and profitable to know that the personal copies of editions of Shakespeare previously owned by many figures in our period have found their way to the Library. They include Anne Brontë, Elizabeth Barrett ("with her girlish pencil marks," reads the inscription by her husband), Browning himself, Coleridge (with some annotations), Dickens, Mary Lamb, Pater, Rossetti, Scott, Shelley, Stevenson, Tennyson, Thackeray. There are also about thirty of Trollope's books on a variety of subjects, many of them with his marginalia; a dozen volumes previously owned by Swinburne; Browning's copies of Dryden, Bailey, and Southey; several of Wordsworth's books, and so on.

There are also a number of MS diaries, commonplace books, and notebooks of the following people: Byron, Tom Campbell, Lander, Southey, John Payne Collier, Charles James Matthews, Anne Jackson Matthews, Helen Taylor, Mrs. Ward (daughter of Nelson and Lady Hamilton), J. T. Foard (mostly on George Eliot), Mrs. Inchbald, Jane Porter, and Kingsley.

Gordon S. Haight noted in *VNL* (Spring, 1958, p. 23) that some of George Eliot's "little notebooks" have "dropped from sight." Two are in the Folger, one dated 1868-70 when she was wrestling with *Middlemarch*. In the latter are interesting notes on John Lydgate, Isaac Casaubon, Harvey, Vesalius, apothecaries, fever hospitals, medical school qualifications, the influence of personal character on one's destiny, and several of the chapter mottoes that appear in *Middlemarch*.

Virtually every Romantic and Victorian are represented by at least one MS holding. The largest number, of course, are holographs by people associated with Shakespeare or the drama, but I learned that Mr. Folger may have purchased an entire lot in order to get one or two references or allusions to Shakespeare. Nor do single letters deal solely with Shakespeare. In one such letter, for example, Browning asked Hale White, "Did it not strike you that Matt. Arnold's selection of passages and poems from Byron was a poor one?" Nevertheless, for what they may be worth to the individual scholar, they include: Edwin Booth (199 items), Browning (7), Bulwer (9), Carlyle (5), Coleridge (6), J. P. Collier (284), Collins (5), the Cowden Clarkes (101), J. W. Croker (13), Cruikshank (16), DeQuincey (7), Dickens (9), Furnivall (167), Henry Irving (211), the Keans (415), the Kembles (126), Macready (317), Charles Matthews (65), Shaw (21), Swinburne (69), Ellen Terry (154). Gardner Taplin has already noted (*VNL*, Spring, 1958, p. 21) that the Folger has 37 letters from Elizabeth Barrett to Miss Mitford.

In short, as Louis B. Wright and his staff have been pointing out for the last decade, the student-Victorian included—never knows what he may find at the Folger, until he looks.

University of Maryland

B. R. JERMAN

10. On a Certain Deficiency in Victorian Anthologies

Not long ago I found myself engaged in that well-known game of revising lecture notes. The course I was about to teach was the Victorian Age, and the lectures I was revising were the introductory ones—those in which we all lay down the main lines of social and literary development that dominated the period. Mr. Leavis had recently issued his edition of John Mill's essays on Coleridge and Bentham, and it occurred to me that my lectures might be usefully organized around a discussion of the two streams of tendency which Mill so lucidly defines. In fact I was struck by the notion that a tracing of the flow and intermingling of these two streams might make an excellent thematic focus for the course as a whole. As so often happens with notions of this sort, enchantment with one's perceptiveness was dissipated by hard facts.

This particular enchantment evaporated as soon as I began hunting for adequate and representative examples of Benthamite (or Rationalist) thought in the anthology I had chosen to lay before the students. Naturally, the text contained a certain amount of Mill—the story of his soul crisis and the least exciting chapter of *On Liberty*. It also contained the usual sampling of Huxley. Even granting, however, which I did not, that the selections from Mill and Huxley were adequate, I could find no trace of John Morley, or Frederic Harrison, or Leslie Stephen. The fulminations of Carlyle and Ruskin against materialism and the "pig philosophy" were represented in *plenum*, as were the more urbane attacks of Newman and Arnold. The voice of Coleridge in its many modulations rang loud and clear, but the voice of Bentham and his descendants was scarcely to be heard. I turned to the other anthologies, knowing full well what I would find—the tradition of Victorian rationalism, or Benthamism, or Positivism, whatever you wish to call it, was simply not to be found in any anthology I might have chosen.¹

I was stumped. Of course, it would be possible to summarize the position of the liberal rationalists on the main questions of the day and assign specified readings in the library. But second-hand knowledge is unsatisfactory and you cannot very well send twenty or more students to the library to read the one copy of Morley's *On Compromise*, or the one copy (if any) of Harrison's famous essay on Arnold² or the one copy of Stephen's *An Agnostic's Apology or Essays in Free-Thinking and Plain-Speaking*. Yet the reading of such documents is essential if the student (graduate or undergraduate) is to get a balanced view of the period he is studying and of its great figures. Ever since Ashley Thorndike published his *Literature in a Changing Age*, we have had a whole series of books testifying to the vitality and literary

importance of the rationalist tradition in Victorian letters, yet the means to teach the period in the terms made essential by modern scholarship and criticism are simply not there.

The proposition that I am advancing needs no detailed support. The evidence lies in books written on the subject during the last three decades. Of the various arguments that might be brought to bear on the thesis, I shall mention only three: first, that the rationalist strain in Victorian thought and letters is so important that its omission from standard anthologies results in a serious distortion of the period we teach; second, that the Victorian rationalists produced a body of literary criticism cogent enough to rival that of Arnold; third, that the prose of these writers has sufficient distinction to justify its display as literature.

The first of these arguments needs brief elaboration. The student of contemporary literature, for example, is well aware of the line of development that runs through Arnold and Pater to T. S. Eliot. Should he not be equally aware of the line that runs from Bentham and Mill to the Webbs, the Fabian Society, and Shaw, or of the line that runs from Clapham to Bloomsbury? Or, to put the question another way, is it not essential for the student to read some of the primary sources of those aspects of Victorian rationalism which, in varying and subtle ways, influenced the art of George Eliot, Thomas Hardy, and George Meredith? Moreover, we do violence to the results of our research when we allow our students to assume that the "Coleridgeans" of the nineteenth century had it all their own way and that the rationalist opposition could muster no eloquent or significant spokesmen. That mode of thought that summoned all institutions and ideas to the bar of rigorous criticism in the 1860's and '70's is hardly one that fell by the wayside in 1900. That mode of thought that tended to find the source of human suffering in material conditions rather than in the nature of man's soul is still very much alive among us. That mode of thought that asks, "What is the good of it?" as well as, "What is the meaning of it?" is scarcely moribund. That mode of thought that saw beauty in the sunset despite its knowledge of the spectrum and that was able to find value and significance in life even if God was dead -- this mode of thought was vigorously asserted by some eminent Victorians and is by no means inarticulate today. Wordsworth longed to hear "old Triton blow his wreathed horn," and a century later an old marble Triton among the reeds complained that "the world in youth on dreaming fed/ Grey truth is now her painted toy," but Morley and Stephen would not have admitted that their truth was all gray, and they were quite capable of blowing horns which, if not wreathed, commanded attention.

The vitality of the rationalist view could also be defended by showing how much, despite their formal opposition, the Coleridgeans and the Benthamites had in common. In fact, one of the fascinations of the Victorian period is the experience of observing, to use Mill's phrase, the tendency of "the two systems of concentric circles . . . to meet and intersect." Arnold may have snorted at Bentham's *Deontology*, but as Gaylord LeRoy reminded us in *Perplexed Prophets*, Arnold asked questions about institutions which were Benthamite in mode and point. Moreover, though the early utilitarians were scornful of the theory that society was an organism, their Victorian heirs, Stephen and Morley in particular, embraced the theory and were not afraid to quote Burke. And surely Mill's vision of the ideal life, as embodied in the quotation from von Humboldt that heads *On Liberty*, is not far from that called up by Arnold in and out of season. Likewise, Arnold's view of the aims of culture and the role of literature in education had been presented earlier by Mill and were shared by Morley and Huxley. Nor was Harrison the enemy of culture that Arnold said he was. As their aims had more in common than they sometimes thought, so too they shared common enemies. Though from a different angle and with different tactics, Stephen and Morley directed their barbs at the Philistine rhinoceros as frequently and sharply as Arnold. ("The prodigious block of our Philistinism needs to have wedges driven in from many points," writes Morley, in his essay on Pater.) Ruskin and Arnold on one side, and Stephen and Morley on the other shared an intransigent hostility to a life of petty meanness and poverty of spirit.

That John Mill broke with the more rigid members of his school in his love of literature is a commonplace of Victorian cultural history. That he has some status as a critic has also been recognized, but neither fact is adequately illustrated in our anthologies. The student who takes his final examination in Victorian Literature often labors under the illusion that Arnold was the only critic of stature. Isn't it time we stopped just talking about the significance of Mill's notes on *Pauline* for Browning's development? Isn't it time to print the review, and along with it Mill's essays on Tennyson, de Vigny, and on Poetry. In our own minds we have dispelled the phantom of poor, desiccated John Mill; let us dispell it for our students as well.

The disciples of Mill, Morley, Harrison, and Stephen, also produced a notable body of criticism, the last named being judged as "next to Arnold, the most useful of Victorian critics."³ Surely Stephen's criticism is valuable in its own right as well as being a notable example of a "stream of tendency." His essays on Defoe and Wordsworth, to mention only two, are still classics; his analysis of Massinger has received Eliot's honorable mention; and his critical work as a whole has been awarded the accolade of Q. D. Leavis.⁴ If Arnold is more skillful in handling poets, Stephen must be awarded the palm for his way with novelists. Finally, Stephen develops, as a distinctly original contribution, the theory and practice of historical (or sociological) criticism. Long before the 1930's, Stephen had written *Literature and Society in the Eighteenth Century*, and long before that he had formulated the leading premises of the historical approach. As a theoretician of the method, he anticipated and answered many of the current objections to it; and as a practitioner, he avoided many of its pitfalls while demonstrating its rewarding perceptions.

As matters now stand, however, the student hears the voice of Arnold, as he should; he hears the voice of Pater; but he hears none of the voices of the historical critics who spoke with equal strength at the *fin de siècle*. If the anthologists of the English Romantic writers can enable us to juxtapose Wordsworth and Jeffrey; Hunt and Croker; Hazlitt and the *Quarterly*, why cannot the anthologists of the Victorians perform a similar office?

To demonstrate my third point, that the prose of the rationalists has literary merit, I must resort to the only device that space permits -- representative quotation. The three passages I have selected simultaneously illustrate a characteristic point of view and a characteristic mode of expressing it.

John Morley's *On Compromise* (1874) was a deliberate attempt to arrest what he considered to be a failure of nerve all too prevalent among the educated classes. Translate the terms into the issues of today and *On Compromise*

becomes a challenging tract for our times. From Morley's chapter entitled "Intellectual Responsibility" (which I commend to all intellectuals), I have selected a paragraph in which he castigates some of the complacent critics of the Oxford Movement:

Glaring as were the intellectual faults of the Oxford Movement, it was at any rate a recognition in a very forcible way of the doctrine that spiritual matters are not to be settled by the dicta of a political council. It acknowledged that a man is answerable at his own peril for having found truth. . . . The Tractarian movement . . . had, we repeat, the merit of being an effective protest against what may be called the House of Commons view of human life — a view excellent in its place, but most blighting and dwarfing out of it. It was, what every sincere uprising of the better spirit in men and women must always be, an effective protest against the leaden tyranny of the man of the world and the so-called practical person. The man of the world despises Catholics for taking their religious opinions on trust and being the slaves of tradition. As if he himself formed his own most important opinions either in religion or anything else. He laughs at them for their superstitious awe of the Church. As if his own inward awe of the majority were one whit less of a superstition. He mocks their deference to the past. As if his own absorbing deference to the present were one tittle better bottomed or a jot more respectable. The modern emancipation will profit us very little, if the *status quo* is to be fastened round our necks with the despotic authority of a heavenly dispensation, and if in the stead of ancient scriptures we are to accept the plenary inspiration of majorities. (pp. 91-92)

For lighter fare, we have a brief exchange from Frederic Harrison's dialogue on culture, which made Arnold, the object of its satire, weep with laughter:

"My dear Arminius," [expostulates the apostle of culture] "What . . . has culture to do with all these finalities, rigidities, inadequacies, and immaturities? . . . Do you ask of culture what are its principles and ideas? The *best* principles, the *best* ideas, the *best* knowledge: — the perfect! the ideal! the complete!"

"But how does it recognize these," he asked helplessly, . . . "if it has neither systems, method, nor logic?"

"By Insight," I replied triumphantly. . . .

"Tell me," said Arminius, "are you then of the intuitional school?"

"School," I replied, as contemptuously as was consistent with perfect politeness, "No! nor are we anything intuitional at all. Culture, I say, questions, studies, ponders. But as in other views study follows set methods, in this view study is guided only by perennial curiosity and an innate sense of refinement. There is thus harmony, but no system; instinct, but no logic; eternal growth, and no maturity; everlasting movement, and nothing acquiesced in; perpetual opening of all questions, and answering of none; infinite possibilities of everything; the becoming of all things, the being nothing."

"I am confounded," sighed Arminius.

To illustrate the range and sinewy power of Leslie Stephen's prose, its irony and epigrammatic force, is manifestly impossible. I choose, however, the conclusion of his "An Agnostic's Apology," in which he speaks from the depths of conviction.

Why [Stephen asks], when no honest man will deny in private that every ultimate problem is wrapped in the profoundest mystery, do honest men proclaim in pulpits that unhesitating certainty is the duty of the most foolish and ignorant? Is it not a spectacle to make the angels laugh? We are a company of ignorant beings, feeling our way through mists and darkness, learning only by incessantly-repeated blunders, obtaining a glimmering of truth by falling into every conceivable error, dimly discerning light enough for our daily needs, but hopelessly differing whenever we attempt to describe the ultimate origin or end of our paths; and yet, when one of us ventures to declare that we don't know the map of the universe as well as the map of our infinitesimal parish, he is hooted, reviled, and perhaps told that he will be damned to

all eternity for his faithlessness. Amidst all the endless and hopeless controversies which have left nothing but bare husks of meaningless words, we have been able to discover certain reliable truths. They don't take us very far, and the condition of discovering them has been a distrust of *a priori* guesses, and the systematic interrogation of experience. Let us, say some of us, follow at least this clue. Here we shall find sufficient guidance for the needs of life, though we renounce forever the attempt to get behind the veil which no one has succeeded in raising; if, indeed, there be anything behind. You miserable Agnostics! is the retort; throw aside such rubbish, and cling to the old husks. Stick to the words which profess to explain everything; call your doubts mysteries, and and they won't disturb you any longer; and believe in those necessary truths of which no two philosophers have ever succeeded in giving the same version.

Gentlemen, we can only reply, wait till you have some show of agreement amongst yourselves. Wait till you can give some answer, not palpably a verbal answer, to some of the doubts which oppress us as they oppress you. Wait till you can point to some single truth, however trifling, which has been discovered by your method, and will stand the test of discussion and verification. Wait till you can appeal to reason without in the same breath vilifying reason. Wait till your Divine revelations have something more to reveal than the hope that the hideous doubts which they suggest may possibly be without foundation. Till then we shall be content to admit openly, what you whisper under your breath or hide in technical jargon, that the ancient secret is a secret still; that man knows nothing of the Infinite and Absolute; and that, knowing nothing, he had better not be dogmatic about his ignorance. And, meanwhile, we will endeavor to be as charitable as possible, and whilst you trumpet forth officially your contempt for our scepticism, we will at least try to believe that you are imposed upon by your own bluster.

The defense rests.

Drew University

JOHN W. BICKNELL

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ *English Prose of the Victorian Era*, edited by Harrold and Templeman, is the only possible exception. It contains Huxley's chapter on *Agnosticism and Christianity*, and the appendix includes selections from Lyell, Chambers, Marx, Spencer, and Bagehot. I should also say that the more recent anthology edited by Houghton and Stange includes a passage from Bentham and from Mill's "Inaugural Address," but none of his practical criticism.
- ² "Culture: A Dialogue," *Fortnightly Review*, XIII (1867), 603-614.
- ³ Oscar Maurer, Jr., "Leslie Stephen and the *Cornhill Magazine*," *University of Texas Studies in English*, XXXII (1953), 78. Robert L. Peters, who edited the recent collection *Victorians on Literature and Art* (1961), includes an essay by Mill and admits to omitting Harrison, Morley, and Henley, but seems unaware of Stephen.
- ⁴ *The Sacred Wood*, p. 123; "Leslie Stephen - Cambridge Critic," *Scrutiny*, VII (1939), 407.

III. ENGLISH X NEWS

A. The Washington Meeting

Chairman, Francis G. Townsend, *Florida State University*; Secretary, Donald Smalley, *University of Illinois*.

I. Business.

II. Papers and Discussion.

1. "The Genius of John Ruskin," John D. Rosenberg, *Columbia University*. (18 minutes)
2. "Arnold, the Populace, and the Panic Fear of Revolt," Patrick J. McCarthy, *University of Arizona*. (22 minutes)
3. "The 'Death of Pan' in Victorian Literature," Patricia Merivale, *University of British Columbia*. (15 minutes)

Advisory and Nominating Committee: Chairman, George H. Ford, *University of Rochester* (1962); A. McKinley Terhune, J. Hillis Miller (1961-62); G. Robert Stange, Robert C. Slack (1962-63); Robert Langbaum, William Madden (1963-64); Francis G. Townsend (*ex officio*).

1962 Program Committee: Chairman, Wendell Stacy Johnson, *Hunter College, City University of New York*; Fraser Neiman; Robert Preyer.

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

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

1963 Officers: Chairman, Donald Smalley, *University of Illinois*; Secretary, John T. Fain, *University of Florida*. (Nominations to be voted on.)

B. The Victorian Luncheon

The Victorian luncheon will be held at 12:45 p.m., Friday, December 28, 1962, in the Pan American Room of the Mayflower. As usual, a bar serving cocktails on a cash basis will be opened at noon. Price of the luncheon will be \$4.00. Please send check or money order to Professor B. R. Jerman, Department of English, University of Maryland, College Park, Md., before December 15.

IV. RECENT PUBLICATIONS: A SELECTED LIST

March, 1962 - August, 1962

General

- ARTS. Aslin, Elizabeth. *Nineteenth Century English Furniture*. Faber. Rev. *TLS*, 6 July, p. 488.
- Chadwick, George F. *The Works of Sir Joseph Paxton, 1803-1865*. Architectural Press. An evaluation of Paxton's work in architecture, design, and gardening.
- Gloag, John. *Victorian Taste: Some Social Aspects of Architecture and Industrial Design, 1820-1900*. Black. Rev. *TLS*, 11 May, p. 332.
- Lochhead, Marion. "Victorian Rooms in Fiction." *Quarterly Review*, July, pp. 318-328. The look of rooms in novels by Charlotte Brontë, Charlotte Yonge, Trollope, and Dickens.

- CRITICISM.** Gray, Donald J. "Humor as Poetry in Nineteenth-Century English Criticism." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, April, pp. 249-257. Humor, as distinct from wit, was frequently associated with imaginative effort and so seen as a poetic mode.
- Maison, Margaret M. *Search Your Soul, Eustace: A Survey of the Religious Novel in the Victorian Age*. Sheed and Ward. Rev. *TLS*, 9 March, p. 154.
- DRAMA.** Stratman, Carl J. *A Bibliography of British Dramatic Periodicals, 1720-1960*. New York: Public Library. Describes and gives the location of 674 theatrical periodicals.
- ECONOMICS AND POLITICS.** Arnstein, Walter L. "Gladstone and the Bradlaugh Case." *Victorian Studies*, June, pp. 303-330. Gladstone's motives and actions in his paradoxical role as advocate of Bradlaugh.
- Habakkuk, H. J. *American and British Technology in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge. Rev. *TLS*, 27 July, p. 539.
- MacDonagh, Oliver. "The Anti-Imperialism of Free Trade." *Economic History Review*, April, pp. 489-501. The doctrinaire free-trade movement was one of the severest opponents of mid-Victorian imperialism.
- Sowell, Thomas. "Malthus and the Utilitarians." *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, May, pp. 268-274. Comments on the paradox that Malthus, who differed so substantially from the Utilitarians, should have been uncritically accepted by them.
- EDUCATION.** Stansky, Peter. "Lyttleton and Thring: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Education." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 205-223. A consideration of the contrasting views of Lyttleton and Thring, of the obstacles both men faced, and of the failure finally of both.
- HISTORY.** Bond, Brian. "Recruiting the Victorian Army 1870-92." *Victorian Studies*, June, pp. 331-338. Impediments, social, financial, and otherwise, to the establishing of an adequate recruiting program.
- Clark, G. Kitson. *The Making of Victorian England*. Methuen. Rev. *TLS*, 20 July, p. 524.
- Kemp, Betty. "Reflections on the Repeal of the Corn Laws." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 189-204. Repeal was more a symbolic matter, arousing social and political hopes and fears, than a practical one of economics.
- Lambert, R. J. "A Victorian National Health Service: State Vaccination, 1855-71." *Historical Journal*, vol. V, pp. 1-18. The increase in state administered vaccination is a notable instance of effective government action.
- Schapera, I., ed. *Livingstone's Missionary Correspondence, 1841-1856*. Chatto and Windus. Rev. *TLS*, 2 March, p. 134.
- Southgate, Donald. *The Passing of the Whigs, 1832-86*. Macmillan. Rev. *TLS*, 24 August, p. 638.
- Thomas, W. E. S. "Francis Place and Working Class History." *Historical Journal*, vol. V, pp. 61-70. A re-estimate of Place which finds him less the reformer-hero than the Fabians and subsequent proponents have shown.
- MISCELLANEOUS.** Altick, Richard D. "The Sociology of Authorship: The Social Origins, Education, and Occupations of 1,100 British Writers, 1800-1935." *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, June, pp. 389-404. An invaluable statistical study. The period divisions are: 1800-35, 1835-70, 1870-1900, 1900-35. In addition to the categories mentioned in the title, there is a fourth, the proportion of women writers to men.
- Hall, Trevor H. *The Spiritualists*. Duckworth. A critical estimate of the career and claims of Florence Cook, mid-Victorian medium.
- Swart, Koenraad. "'Individualism' in the Mid-Nineteenth Century (1826-1860)." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, January-March, pp. 77-90. The different uses of the term on the Continent, and resistance to it in England.
- RELIGION.** Altholz, Louis L. *The Liberal Catholic Movement in England*. Burns and Oates. Rev. *TLS*, 24 August, p. 644.
- Reardon, B. M. G. "Faith and Works." *Quarterly Review*, April, pp. 160-164. Argues for a higher estimate of the Evangelicals than Ford K. Brown's recent *Fathers of the Victorians* allows.
- SOCIAL.** Roberts, Charles. *The Radical Countess: The History of the Life of Rosalind Countess of Carlisle*. Steel. Rev. *TLS*, 20 July, p. 524.

II

Individual Authors

- MATTHEW ARNOLD.** Brooks, Roger L. "'A Deptford Poet': An Addition and a Correction to the Matthew Arnold Bibliography." *Philological Quarterly*, April, pp. 515-517. An Arnold review for the *Pall Mall* of June 1875.
- Duffin, H. C. *Arnold the Poet*. Bowes. Rev. *TLS*, 3 August, p. 555.
- Roper, Alan H. "The Moral Landscape of Arnold's Poetry." *PMLA*, June, pp. 289-296. Landscape references (plain, river, mountain) in Arnold's poetry form a consistent symbolic pattern which parallels the "programme of life" he offers in his prose.
- Super, R. H., ed. *Democratic Education*. Michigan. Volume II of the *Complete Prose* includes *The Popular Education of France* and *A French Eton*. Rev. *TLS*, 9 March, p. 156.
- THOMAS ARNOLD.** Jackson, M. J. and J. Rogan, ed. *Principles of Church Reform*. S.P.C.K. A reprint of Arnold's 1833 pamphlet on a National Church.
- BARNES.** Jones, Bernard, ed. *The Poems of William Barnes*. 2 vols. Centaur. Rev. *TLS*, 3 August, p. 558.
- BRONTË.** Livermore, Ann Lapraik. "Byron and Emily Brontë." *Quarterly Review*, July, pp. 336-344. Byron's life and works as a source for the makings of Heathcliff.
- Moser, Thomas. "What is the Matter with Emily Jane? Conflicting Impulses in *Wuthering Heights*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 1-19. The novel's sex-symbolism reveals Emily's true involvement — with "the primitive forces that underlie life."
- BROWNING.** Kenmare, Dallas. *An End to Darkness: A New Approach to Browning and his Work*. Owen. Rev. *TLS*, 27 July, p. 536.
- BUTLER.** Silver, Arnold, ed. *The Family Letters of Samuel Butler, 1841-1886*. Stanford. The bulk of the letters have never before been published in their entirety. Rev. *TLS*, 8 June, p. 422.
- CARROLL.** Green, Roger L. *The Lewis Carroll Handbook*. Oxford. A revision and enlargement of the Williams and Madan *Handbook* (1931).
- CLARE.** Robinson, Eric and Geoffrey Summerfield. "John Clare: An Interpretation of Certain Asylum Letters." *Review of English Studies*, May, pp. 135-146. Clare's asylum letters clarify his preoccupation with love and suffering.
- DARWIN.** Hyman, Stanley Edgar. *The Tangled Bank*. Atheneum. Includes a chapter on Darwin as writer.
- DICKENS.** Collins, Philip. *Dickens and Crime*. Macmillan. Dickens' views on prisons, magistrates, crimes, and punishments. Rev. *TLS*, 17 August, p. 627.
- Coolidge, Archibald C. "Dickens' Use of Characters as Novelty." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, Summer, pp. 404-410. On Dickens' techniques for the introducing of characters.
- Donovan, Robert A. "Structure and Idea in *Bleak House*." *English Literary History*, June, pp. 175-201. The principal themes of the novel, human and social responsibility, are reflected in its structure, which is controlled by a pattern of discovery much as that of the modern detective story is.
- Leavis, F. R. "*Dombey and Son*." *Sewanee Review*, Spring, pp. 177-201. An appreciative general study of *Dombey*, with emphasis on Dickens' strengths as a "popular" novelist.
- Marcus, Steven. "Who is Fagin?" *Commentary*, July, pp. 48-59. Dickens' youthful experiences as they are transformed in the novel, especially with respect to Fagin.
- McMaster, R. D. "Man into Beast in Dickensian Caricature." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, April, pp. 354-361. Dickens' use of animal imagery in presenting character helps constitute his larger symbolic patterns.

- DIXON. Sambrook, James. *A Poet Hidden: The life of Richard Watson Dixon, 1833-1900*. Athlone. Both a record of the facts of Dixon's life, and a critical study of the poetry.
- ELIOT. Levine, George. "Determinism and Responsibility in the Works of George Eliot." *PMLA*, June, pp. 268-279. On George Eliot's reconciliation of determinism and personal responsibility.
- Pinney, Thomas. "Another Note on the Forgotten Past of Will Ladislaw." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 69-73. On references to Will's Jewish lineage (cf. Jerome Beaty in *NCF*, 1958, pp. 159-163; Robert Greenberg in *NCF*, 1961, pp. 355-358).
- FITZGERALD. Richardson, Joanna. *Fitzgerald: Selected Works*. Hart-Davis. A very substantial and representative selection.
- GISSING. Korg, Jacob, ed. *George Gissing's Commonplace Book*. New York Public Library. The source manuscript for the *Ryecroft Papers*.
- GROTE. Clarke, M. L. *George Grote: A Biography*. Athlone. Rev. *TLS*, 27 July, p. 536.
- HARDY. Hardy, Evelyn. "Emma Hardy's Diaries: Some Foreshadowings of *The Dynasts*." *English*, Spring, pp. 9-12. Emma's diaries shortly after her marriage in 1874 reflect her husband's interest in materials he was later to work into *The Dynasts*.
- Hardy, Florence Emily. *The Life of Thomas Hardy, 1840-1928*. Macmillan. A reissue in one volume of Hardy's *Early Life and Later Years*.
- King, R. W. "Verse and Prose Parallels in the Works of Thomas Hardy." *Review of English Studies*, February, pp. 52-61. Lists parallels between the poetry and prose, and argues that each must be examined individually to determine priority of composition.
- Thomson, George H. "The Trumpet-Major Chronicle." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 45-56. Of special note in this "minor masterpiece," is Hardy's treatment of time.
- Toliver, Harold E. "The Dance under the Greenwood Tree: Hardy's Bucolics." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 57-68. *Under the Greenwood Tree* is the first of Hardy's novels to treat the conflict between old and new patterns in a bucolic setting.
- JAMES. Berland, Alwyn. "Henry James and the Aesthetic Tradition." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, July-September, pp. 407-419. The impact of Arnold and Pater on James.
- LEE-HAMILTON. MacBeth, George. "Lee-Hamilton and the Romantic Agony." *Critical Quarterly*, Summer, pp. 141-150. Explores the relationship between Eugene Lee-Hamilton's physical infirmity and his poetry.
- MEREDITH. Fanger, Donald. "George Meredith as Novelist." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, March, pp. 317-328. Meredith's lack of artistic discipline explains the mixture in his work of effects very fine and subtle and also very weak and disappointing.
- NEWMAN. Deen, Leonard W. "The Rhetoric of Newman's *Apologia*." *English Literary History*, June, pp. 224-238. A study of Newman's rhetorical devices, as they are made to convey the development of his mind.
- Trevor, Meriol. *Newman: The Pillar of the Cloud*. Macmillan. The first volume of a very substantial two-volume biography.
- OLIPHANT. Colby, Robert and Vineta. "*A Beleaguered City: A Fable for the Victorian Age*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, March, pp. 283-301. Presents the sources, literary and personal, of Mrs. Oliphant's novel, and its relevance to the religious problems of the day.
- PATER. Inman, Billie Andrew. "The Organic Structure of *Marius the Epicurean*." *Philological Quarterly*, April, pp. 475-491. The novel's structure is circular: its emphases at the end are the same as at the beginning, so that the essential oneness of Marius' temperament is affirmed.

- PINERO. Davies, Cecil W. "Pinero: The Drama of Reputation." *English*, Spring, pp. 13-17. The theme of reputation—what will people say?—is a governing motif in Pinero's work.
- RUSKIN. Curtin, Frank D. "Ruskin in French Criticism: A Possible Reappraisal." *PMLA*, March, pp. 102-108. A review of the major perceptions of the French on Ruskin, from the 1860's onwards.
- SWINBURNE. Lang, Cecil Y. "Atalanta in Manuscript." *Yale University Library Gazette*, July, pp. 19-24. Notes the location of *Atalanta* manuscripts, and reprints from an early autograph manuscript the first half of "Before the beginning of years."
- Lang, Cecil Y., ed. *The Swinburne Letters*, vol. V: 1883-1890; vol. VI: 1890-1909. Yale. The final volumes in this totally admirable edition. Rev. *TLS*, 10 August, p. 593.
- Peters, Robert L. "Algernon Charles Swinburne and the Use of Integral Detail." *Victorian Studies*, June, pp. 289-302. Swinburne's emphasis on integral detail, in the general context of mid-Victorian ornateness.
- TENNYSON. Rader, Ralph W. "Tennyson and Rosa Baring." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 224-260. Tennyson's early love for Rosa Baring was serious and intense, and its mark is in such works as "The Gardener's Daughter," "Locksley Hall," and *Maud*.
- THACKERAY. Talon, Henri-A. "Time and Memory in Thackeray's *Henry Esmond*." *Review of English Studies*, May, pp. 147-156. The novel's mode is that of self-discovery, with Esmond in the role of a student of his own past.
- THOMSON. Forsyth, R. A. "Evolutionism and the Pessimism of James Thomson (B.V.)." *Essays in Criticism*, April, pp. 148-166. Thomson's pessimism resulted from the encounter between his intellectual honesty and the findings of evolutionary science.
- TROLLOPE. Dustin, John E. "Thematic Alternation in Trollope." *PMLA*, June, pp. 280-287. Trollope's development as seen in his use, modification, and rejection of such "mechanical" themes as family rivalry and impediments to love.
- Hawkins, Sherman. "Mr. Harding's Church Music." *English Literary History*, June, pp. 202-223. Mr. Harding is the ideal synthesis of the antithetical Grantly and Bold; this pattern is enforced by the reference to music in the novel.
- VICTORIA. Longford, Elizabeth. "Queen Victoria's Religious Life." *The Wiseman Review*, Summer, pp. 107-126. Details Victoria's religious beliefs, opinions, and acts.
- WILDE. Hart-Davis, Rupert, ed. *The Letters of Oscar Wilde*. Hart-Davis. Well more than a thousand letters are collected in this invaluable edition. Rev. *TLS*, 29 June, pp. 469-471.

Projects — Requests for Aid

- WILLIAM CARLETON. André Boué wishes information on this Irish novelist for a biographical and critical study. *TLS*, 3 August, p. 562.
- WALTER PATER. For a handbook and bibliography, S. Wright would like details on Pater letters and manuscripts. *TLS*, 3 August, p. 562.
- WILLIAM SHARP. William Halloran is preparing a study of Sharp and seeks letters, manuscripts, and information. *TLS*, 29 June, p. 481.

THE FAMILY LETTERS OF SAMUEL BUTLER

1841-1886

Edited by Arnold Silver

Three-fourths of the letters in this volume have never before appeared in print, and others have been available only in excerpt form. With their publication it is now possible to assess the extent to which *The Way of All Flesh* was autobiographical, and to arrive at a fresh evaluation of the book and of Butler's motives in writing it. For the first time we have a full account of Butler's rebellion against his parents, an account which corrects the generally accepted interpretation of that rebellion. Butler's persistent attempts to play the role of dutiful son, the family's chilly response to *Erewhon* and to his other books, the constant wrangling over money matters, Butler's disastrous relations with his parasitic friend Pauli, Canon Butler's final begrudging pride in his son's successes — all these matters and many others are brought out in substantial detail. Since the selection of letters deliberately focuses upon the most important relationship in Butler's life, his relationship with his father, the terminal date is the year of Canon Butler's death. In addition to the letters that passed between father and son, there is a sampling of the letters to and from Butler's mother and sister. The book is illustrated with photographs and the earliest known Butler self-portrait, reproduced here for the first time. About \$6.00

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*.