

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER

NUMBER 24



FALL, 1963

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

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

- Sol Gittleman (*University of Michigan*)
- Robert A. Greenberg (*Cornell University*)
- Edward F. Jost (*Canisius College*)
- Richard A. Lanham (*Dartmouth College*)
- Elsie Leach (*San Jose State College*)
- Paul F. Mattheisen (*Harpur College*)
- Thomas Pinney (*Pomona College*)
- Earl E. Stevens (*Pfeiffer College*)
- Myron Taube (*Long Island University*)
- Arthur C. Young (*Rutgers University*)

Note of apology: In the Spring 1963 issue of *VNL*, the name of Professor Warrington Winters (*Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn*) was misspelled.

I. LEADING ARTICLES

1. NEWMAN AND LIBERALISM: THE LATER PHASE

It may seem remarkably wrong-headed to suggest that Newman was in any way at all a "Liberal," a "Liberal Catholic," or even a "Catholic Liberal." Few words are more ambiguous than "Liberalism," and when we speak of it in connection with an extraordinarily complex man who said that for "thirty, forty, fifty years I have resisted to the best of my power the spirit of Liberalism in religion,"¹ we seem to invite confusion. A close reading of the *Apologia* and the "Note on Liberalism" appended to it will help to clarify Newman's position, but it probably will not quite satisfy the person who wishes to know *precisely* what, in this matter, Dr. Newman means; this despite the fact that, as Fr. Raymond Corrigan rightly says, Newman defined his terms with his "usual clarity."² It must be remembered that he was explaining in the Note "what I meant as a Protestant by Liberalism . . . in connection with the circumstances under which that system of opinion came before me at Oxford."³ In a moment, we will try to show that a clue to Newman's attitude toward Liberalism may be found in his relationship to Oxford, and that, in general, he tended to be more "Liberal" after he became a Catholic in 1845.

Several commentators on Newman have pointed out the grounds on which he and his fellow Tractarians rejected "the anti-dogmatic principle and its developments."⁴ To them the word "Liberalism" referred to a general modern movement, at once intellectual and political. In 1833, it was the intellectual aspect of this movement which disturbed them; it was "the exercise of thought upon matters, in which, from the constitution of the human mind, thought cannot be brought to any successful issue . . . Among such matters are first principles of whatever kind; and of these the most sacred and momentous are especially to be reckoned the truths of Revelation."⁵ The application of what Newman calls "liberal" reason to philosophy and theology results in positivism, in the scientism of popular thought, in the desupernaturalism of the "social Christianity" of Protestantism, and in the general absorption of religion into the secularized culture of the modern world. The political side of Liberalism laid less claim on Newman's attention, but it represented the outer or practical manifestation of the same spirit.⁶ It was summed up by Matthew Arnold in *Culture and Anarchy* as "middle-class liberalism, which had for the cardinal points of its belief the Reform Bill of 1832, and local self-government, in politics; in the social sphere, free trade, unrestricted competition, and the making of large industrial fortunes; in the religious sphere, the Dissidence of Dissent and the Protestantism of the Protestant religion."⁷ Liberalism in either sense represented the effort of man to solve the problem of life "without the aid of Christianity." For a thousand years and more, says Christopher Dawson,

Christianity has been 'the law of the land' in England and in the West: that is to say all the conscious moral effort of society was inspired by Christian ideas and directed to Christian ends. Now all this was changed. Religion was no longer the bond of society. A new principle had taken its place: the principle of utility, the greatest happiness of the greatest number. . . .⁸

This was the Liberalism which, says Arnold, "really broke the Oxford Movement," and that which Newman, in his *Biglietto* speech, declared the principal aim of his life to combat.

Without tracing every step of that well-known journey from Oxford to Rome we can say that Newman's attitude toward Liberalism underwent a steady evolution. It is true that, in a very important sense, he never wavered in his opposition to the "anti-dogmatic principle," but in other respects he was forced to shift his ground. In the first place, his suspicions of Rome were increased during the thirties because, as he thought, it was allied with this very Liberalism. Thus he writes in the *Apologia* that though after 1839 he had a growing dislike "to speak against the Roman Church herself or her formal doctrines," yet he felt he "could not be wrong in striking at her political and social line of action. The alliance of a dogmatic religion with liberals, high or low, seemed to me a providential direction against moving towards Rome." "I had," he continues, "an unspeakable aversion to the policy and acts of Mr. O'Connell, because as I thought, he associated himself with men of all religions and no religion against the Anglican Church, and advanced Catholicism by violence and intrigue."⁹

Even more significant is Newman's view of the dominant continental movements of this period, and especially of such French Catholics as Lamennais, Montalembert, and Lacordaire. Their influence on the Oxford Movement was not generally recognized before Dawson's important study; it is one of the considerable merits of his work that it emphasizes this fact and gives special attention to Hurrell Froude's role as spokesman for certain ideas of these French thinkers. The Oxford Movement, says Dawson, "brought the English tradition out of its spiritual isolation into contact with the main currents of western culture, with Catholicism and Liberalism."¹⁰ That Newman was following the French movement is apparent in his essay "The Fall of De La Mennais," which first appeared in the *Critic* in 1837. Having actively opposed the Erastian element in the Church of England for the past four years, he takes comfort from his conviction that "the poor Gallican Church is in a captivity, not only doctrinal, which we all know, but ecclesiastical, far greater than ours."¹¹ Though he cannot accept Lamennais' interpretation of democracy, concluding that the Frenchman's desire that the Church "throw herself upon the onward course of democracy" and "lead a revolutionary movement"¹² is a fundamental error, he has a growing admiration for the spirit of such men as Lacordaire, Montalembert, and Dupanloup, who carried forward his cause in a less radical way. This aspect of the development of Newman's attitude toward Liberalism culminates in the Note at the end of the *Apologia*. He begins it by saying that an explanation of what he meant during the Oxford Movement by the term "is the more necessary, because such good Catholics and distinguished writers as Count Montalembert and Father Lacordaire use the term in a favorable sense, and claim to be Liberals themselves . . ."¹³

Newman's first important work after he became a Catholic was, says Alvan S. Ryan, "characteristically, concerned with education."¹⁴ The story of the seven years during which, as Rector of the newly-founded Dublin University, he attempted to establish a Catholic University in the face of insurmountable difficulties, has been told many times. The "Campaign in Ireland" is important, however, not only because it gave us the *Idea of a University*, but also for its effect on Newman's increasingly "Liberal" point of view. After this experience Newman was consistently on the Liberal side in the sometimes fierce struggles with Conservative and Ultramontane forces which took place within the Church during the papacy of Pius IX. Any complete treatment of his attitude toward Liberalism must deal with two important controversies, that over the Liberal Catholic reviews, the *Rambler* and the *Home and Foreign Review*, and the extremely heated one which followed Pio Nono's Encyclical *Quanta Cura* and the *Syllabus of Errors*.¹⁵ Limited space, however, must confine our attention to the British Isles, where, as we have said, Newman's Liberalism developed in conjunction with his University ideal. The situation in Ireland is described by Matthew Arnold in language stronger than Newman ever used, but there is reason to believe that here, as in other matters, the two men were in essential agreement. "All the mischiefs of Catholicism are rampant there," said Arnold. "Irish Catholicism is Ultramontane, priest-governed, superstitious, self-confident."¹⁶ From the outset there was friction between Newman and Bishop Cullen, who had invited him to the Rectorship, the chief cause of it being the fact that while Newman insisted that laymen should have a real share in the administration and faculty of the University, Dr. Cullen was suspicious of any lay influence.¹⁷ This conflict was to have a lasting effect upon Newman's attitude towards the laity in later years. Denis Gwynn is right in stressing the change in Newman's attitude during this period. While Manning "was becoming more and more involved in policies which aroused opposition among the laity,"¹⁸ Newman advanced to a position strangely remote from his earlier attitude in the days of the Oxford Movement. Liberalism had then been the foe.

Yet now, after his three years in Ireland, he had returned from Dublin with a real sympathy towards the Irish Catholic democracy; and his conflicts with the Irish bishops over the claims of the laity to representation in the University had made him so far an upholder of the rights of the laity that, within a few years, he was to be denounced in Rome, and even delated to the Holy See, as the most formidable agent of Catholic Liberalism in England.¹⁹

Significantly, toward the end of the *Apologia*, Newman has this to say (we quote at some length because this passage is not often noted):

I am not going to criticize here that vast body of men, in the mass, who at this time would profess to be liberals in religion; and who look towards the discoveries of the age, certain or in progress, as their informants, direct or indirect, as to what they shall think about the unseen and the future. The Liberalism which gives a colour to society now, is very different from that character of thought which bore the name thirty or forty years ago. Now it is scarcely a party; it is the educated lay world. When I was young, I knew the word first as giving name to a periodical, set up by Byron and others. Now, as then, I have no sympathy with the philosophy of Byron. Afterwards, Liberalism was the badge of a theological school, of a dry and repulsive character, not very dangerous in itself, though dangerous as opening the door to evils which it did not itself either anticipate or comprehend. At present it is nothing else than the deep, plausible scepticism, of which I spoke above, as being the development of human reason, as practically exercised by the natural man.

The Liberal religionists of this day are a very mixed body, and therefore I am not intending to speak against them. There may be, and doubtless is, in the hearts of some or many of them a real antipathy or anger against revealed truth, which it is distressing to think of. Again; in many men of science or literature there may be an animosity arising from almost a personal feeling; it being a matter of party, a point of honour, the excitement of a game, or a satisfaction to the soreness or annoyance occasioned by the acrimony or narrowness of apologists for religion, to prove that Christianity or that Scripture is untrustworthy. Many scientific and literary men, on the other hand, go on, I am confident, in a straightforward impartial way, in their own province and on their own line of thought, without any disturbance from religious difficulties in themselves, or any wish at all to give pain to others by the result of their investigations. It would ill become me, as if I were afraid of truth of any kind, to blame those who pursue secular facts, by means of the reason which God has given them, to their logical conclusions: or to be angry with science, because religion is bound in duty to take cognizance of its teaching.²⁰

This passage, put beside *The Idea of a University*, would seem to contradict the view of Michael Tierney that there is "only a remote and indirect connection" between Newman's idea of Liberalism and his "Liberal" idea in education.²¹ We would like to examine this connection in some detail. Newman, as we know, was not trying to define the idea of a Catholic University in his Dublin discourses. He spoke as a Catholic, but as one trying to trace out what a University had been and ought to be, whether within or without the pale of the Church. He emphasizes in the opening discourses on the place of theology that he is concerned with "Natural Theology," not Revelation. But in his concluding discourse he declares: "If the Catholic Faith is true, a University cannot exist externally to the Catholic pale, for it cannot teach Universal Knowledge if it does not teach Catholic theology."²² Even so, "ever so many theological chairs"²³ would not suffice to make it a Catholic University, for theology would be included in its teaching only as a branch of knowledge. This is not enough; a direct jurisdiction of the Church is necessary, to some degree in the sciences, to a much greater degree in literature and such related subjects. Newman describes this jurisdiction with the utmost care. Yet his emphasis is on allowing the intellectual powers of the student to develop in an atmosphere of freedom and openness to the truth rather than in one of constraint or timidity. In "Christianity and Scientific Investigation," he shows that he does not fear that "truth will contradict truth,"²⁴ and elsewhere he argues that the study of literature, "the life and remains of the natural man," is one of the great means of fitting "men of the world for the world,"²⁵ and that narrow proscriptions in the University serve not to shield the student from damage to his faith or morals, but only to "make the world his university." Likewise, the jurisdiction of the Church must rightfully be exercised in relation to the teaching of the faculty, but Newman alludes to the medieval Universities as places where truth was adjusted to truth in a free atmosphere of speculation and controversy. "Why was it," he asks in a letter to his friend Robert Ornsby,

that the Medieval Schools were so vigorous? Because they were allowed free and fair play — because the disputants were not made to feel the bit in their mouths at every other word they spoke, but could move their limbs freely and expatiate at will. Then, when they went wrong, a stronger and truer intellect set them down — and, as time went on, if the dispute got perilous, and a controversialist obstinate, then at length Rome interfered — at length, not at first. Truth is wrought out by many minds working together freely.²⁶

It is in the well-known Discourse VIII, "Knowledge Viewed in Relation to Religion," that we find Newman's Liberal ideal. It is, however, an ambivalent ideal; perhaps the key to his view is his relationship to Oxford and its great University. In this "home of lost causes, and forsaken beliefs, and unpopular names, and impossible loyalties," in this "beautiful city, — so venerable, so lovely, so unravaged by the fierce intellectual life of our century, so serene,"²⁷ both Newman and Arnold found a fortress in which to defend traditional and humane values ("liberal" in the true sense) against the onslaught of modern Liberalism — the chief element of what Arnold termed "anarchy," to which he opposed his "culture." Newman's love of Oxford and of his Oxford friends, and the extent to which he was rooted in the place, were in fact the measure of his sacrifice for the Catholic faith. It is not too much to say that his whole *Idea* is an attempt to restate "the Catholic basis of the traditional Oxonian education."²⁸ Writing of Trinity, his first college, he says in the *Apologia*: "There used to be much snap-dragon growing on the walls opposite my freshmen's rooms there, and I had for years taken it as the emblem of my perpetual residence even unto death in my University." He goes on to say that he "never wished anything better or higher than, in the words of the epitaph, 'to live and die a Fellow of Oriel.'"²⁹ All this had to be given up when the logic of events and doctrines convinced him that the Catholic and not the Anglican was the true Church, and the consequent renunciation and up-rooting must have been for him a kind of martyrdom, more agonizing than St. Benedict's flight from Rome, perhaps, because the things he was leaving were not in any sense sordid or unworthy but things which he had formerly regarded as most sacred.

At the same time, Newman saw that post-medieval Oxford had lapsed to "that level of mere human loveliness, which in its highest perfection we admire in Athens."³⁰ It was, says A. Dwight Culler, "the very type of humanism without religion. Indeed, if there were an official seat or center, a kind of Holy See of the Religion of Philosophy, surely that See was to be found at Oxford, and for twenty years Newman had preached against this religion in the very temple of its worshippers."³¹ One of those worshippers was, of course, Arnold, but again there is ambivalence. Arnold devoted some ten years after *Culture and Anarchy* to an attempt to make religion real and acceptable at a time when, as he believed, it was in danger of being despised and dismissed by many. In these religious writings, says Basil Willey, Arnold "takes up his characteristic position as 'middleman,' standing between and sharing the view both of the 'orthodox,' who rightly hold that we cannot do without religion, and the free-thinking liberals, who rightly hold that we cannot do with it as it is."³² But it is well known that Arnold wished to "save" religion at the price of emptying it of all its traditional meaning, at the price of defining God as "the power not ourselves that makes for righteousness," of throwing over entirely theology, the supernatural, the distinction between "natural" and "revealed," and the historical definitions of such terms as "grace," partly because he saw that great controversies had been waged over all the central doctrines of Christianity, and partly because he was far too hasty in bringing traditional Christianity before the bar of nineteenth-century scientific criticism and the Zeitgeist. It is probable that Arnold's culture (he got the term from Newman's discourses) represents at least one aspect of the "Religion of Philosophy." A much less admirable manifestation of it was the irresponsibility and scandalous behavior of the over-privileged young men of birth and wealth, the Gentlemen Commoners of Oxford. As a Tutor from 1826 to 1831, Newman showed himself something of an educational reformer (one thinks again of Arnold, and his father, who were the great educationists of the Victorian era); he wrote to the Rev. Samuel Rickards in 1829:

... the College is so altered that you would hardly know it again. The tangible improvements of system have been, first, the diminishing the Gentlemen Commoners from twenty to eight or nine; then the dismissal of the Incurables... then the giving chance vacancies to well-recommended and picked men... then the revival of a Chapel sermon at the Sacrament; and the announcement of a prize for Greek composition.³³

The improvements he speaks of are in the direction of what he called "the *beau-ideal* of the world"; in short, Newman draws his ideal of the "gentleman" from Oxford — the Oxford of the classics, traditional beliefs, and moderate Anglican and Tory

"culture."

Much has been written about this portrait of the gentleman, and it has often been pointed out that it is not to be taken as an expression of Newman's positive ideal. His attitude is quite clear in his essays on the "Rise and Progress of Universities." He has not forgotten, he says, "that intellect is helpless, because ungovernable and self-destructive, unless it is regulated by a moral rule and by revealed truth"; speaking of Athens, he acknowledges that, "winning" as the "idea of Athenian life" was, "that life was inseparable from the gravest disorders, in the world as it is, and much more in the pagan world, and that at best it is only ephemeral, if attempted." But he goes on to say that he is "not sorry to be able to pay her some sort of compliment," that "her great orators have put to her credit a beautiful idea, which, though not really fulfilled in her, has literally and unequivocally been realized within the territory of Christianity." He is speaking of that "philosophical democracy, so original and so refined in its idea, of that grace, freedom, nobleness, and liberality of daily life, of which Pericles, in his oration, is specially enamoured." Finally, he says:

... with my tenderness, on the one hand, for Athens (little as I love the radical Greek character), and my devotion to a particular Catholic Institution on the other, I have ever thought I could trace a certain resemblance between Athens, as contrasted with Rome, and the Oratory of St. Philip, as viewed in contrast with the Religious Orders.³⁴

A close scrutiny of this complex, but not ambiguous nor contradictory, position will reveal that Newman is not "dangerously secular" as he seemed to his audience in the fifties.³⁵ He is aware that, though right reason "leads the mind to the Catholic Faith, ... Reason, considered as a real agent in the world, and as an operative principle in man's nature, with an historical course and with definite results, is far from taking so straight and satisfactory a direction."³⁶ "No less than a saint," says Culler, is ultimately Newman's ideal. His personal ideal was St. Philip Neri, who, "if he had not been a saint, might well have been a courtier or a philosopher instead, or rather he already was these things and then erased them in the superaddition of saint."³⁷ Here then we have the *Christian* gentleman.

Newman presents his *worldly* ideal and sets it up, says Harrold, "as a value, in the secular sphere, parallel to soul-development in the religious sphere." With his "unshakable faith" as a Catholic he has little to fear from a program of education for "gentlemanliness."³⁸ Culler reminds us — and this important point has needed to be emphasized — that there was no need to preach in Dublin against the vices of Oxford; there was rather a need to import into Dublin its virtues. By supplying the deficiencies of one group from the excesses of another, Newman "achieved in his writings a kind of reconciliation of opposites which he had already achieved in his own person and which gives to his cultural ideal a rich and interesting ambivalence."³⁹ He leaves no doubt of the possible and almost inevitable evils of liberal knowledge "apart from religious principle," and he grants that "knowledge puffeth up"; but he claims that "this is not a necessary result ... but an incidental evil, a danger which may be realized or may be averted." Culture "does a work, at least *materially* good"; it "expels the excitements of sense by the introduction of those of the intellect." Since it rescues man from "that fearful subjection to sense which is his ordinary state," it is of the utmost "serviceableness to Religion."⁴⁰ It may be said to make of man a truly *rational* animal, and this is no small achievement. Here again, Newman joins hands with Arnold; and in another passage we find, says Harrold, "the essence of whole volumes of Ruskin"⁴¹:

When in the advancement of society men congregate in towns, and multiply in contracted spaces, and law gives them security, and art gives them comforts, and good government robs them of courage and manliness, and monotony of life throws them back upon themselves, who does not see that diversion or protection from evil they have none, that vice is the mere reaction to unhealthy toil, and sensual excess the holiday of resourceless ignorance?⁴²

This true Liberalism, then, may aid religion in doing a great work for an industrial society which could not be done by "cheap literature, libraries of useful knowledge ... lectureships, museums, zoos, and public parks." It develops those Periclean virtues of "veracity, probity, equity, fairness, gentleness, benevolence, and amiableness."⁴³ Like Arnold, Newman seeks "the harmonious development of those qualities and faculties that characterize our humanity."⁴⁴ On the other hand, of course, there is a radical difference between liberal knowledge and religion. Despite the great "utility" of intellectual refinement and of the "philosophic habit," a truly educated mind may be "at once a defense yet a disturbance to the Church." These excellent *natural* qualities "are seen within the pale of the Church and without it, in holy men, and in profigate ... Basil and Julian were fellow-students at the schools of Athens; and one became the Saint and Doctor of the Church, the other her scoffing and relentless foe."⁴⁵ The "Religion of Philosophy," an intellectual counterfeit of true religion, appeals only "to what is in nature, and it falls under the dominion of the old Adam."⁴⁶ But its best product, the gentleman, taken on his own merits, has a genuine and permanent value.

In his study of Newman, Charles Sarolea put the question, "Was Newman a Liberal Catholic?" We can, perhaps, agree with his answer:

... if Newman stands at the antipodes of rationalistic liberalism, he is at an equal distance from ultramontane and bureaucratic sacerdotalism. Catholic liberalism may not be with him a guiding principle as it was with Montalembert, but none the less is the belief in the inviolability of the religious conscience rooted in his temperament and in his inmost soul. And this belief alone in the supremacy of conscience enables us to conclude that Newman is a liberal Catholic in the highest sense of the word.⁴⁷

We have tried to add further evidence for this conclusion from another quarter. Newman was, like other great thinkers, ahead of his time. He was "almost the only Christian thinker," says Christopher Dawson, "who realized the anti-Christian character of the trend to secularism without indulging in wishful thinking or identifying the cause of the Church with that of the political reactionaries." Consequently, he was rejected by both sides and was "condemned by the leaders of the Catholic revival as a Liberal and compromiser and by the Victorian Liberals as an arch reactionary who was misusing his brilliant literary and dialectical powers to serve the cause of obscurantism."⁴⁸ What he attempted to do was to complete the appeal

to authority, to tradition, to the essentially conservative forces in both Church and secular society, by a fearless and open-minded confronting of the manifold problems raised by modern scientific thought, modern religious developments, and modern philosophical speculations. Newman's tremendous work was recognized, shortly before his death, by another great "Catholic Liberal." "It was not easy," Pope Leo XIII told Lord Selborne, "no, it was not easy. They said he was too liberal; but I was determined to honour the Church by honouring Newman."⁴⁹

Canisius College

EDWARD F. JOST

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ Quoted by Wilfrid Ward, *Life of Newman* (London, 1927), II, 460.
- ² Raymond Corrigan, S.J., *The Church and the Nineteenth Century* (Milwaukee, 1948), p. 29. For a partial list of definitions of "Liberalism in religion" scattered throughout Newman's writings, see Joseph Rickaby, S.J., *Index to the Works of Newman* (London, 1914).
- ³ *Apologia*, ed. A. Dwight Culler (Boston, 1956), p. 269. See also Culler's introduction, pp. xiv-xix.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 65-66.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 271.
- ⁶ A recent full-length study of Newman's political thought by Terence Kenny, *The Political Thought of John Henry Newman* (London, 1957), is somewhat disappointing. Briefer studies are A.S. Ryan, "The Development of Newman's Political Thought," *The Review of Politics*, VII (April, 1945), 210-40; Crane Brinton, *English Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1954), pp. 148-64; and H.J. Laski, *Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty* (New Haven, 1927).
- ⁷ *Culture and Anarchy*, ed. J.D. Wilson (Cambridge, 1950), p. 62.
- ⁸ Christopher Dawson, "Newman's Place in History," in *Newman and Littlemore* (Oxford, 1945), p. 34. See also F.R. Hoare, *The Papacy and the Modern State* (London, 1940), p. 159.
- ⁹ *Apologia*, p. 128, p. 129.
- ¹⁰ *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement* (New York, 1934), pp. 3-4.
- ¹¹ Newman, *Essays Critical and Historical* (London, 1890), I, 140.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, p. 156.
- ¹³ *Apologia*, p. 269.
- ¹⁴ Ryan, p. 217.
- ¹⁵ These controversies may be studied in Ward, Corrigan, Ryan, and E.I. Watkin, *Roman Catholicism in England from the Reformation to 1950* (London, 1957), among other sources. It should be pointed out that Lacordaire, Montalembert, and Dupanloup underwent a development in their Ultramontanism and their whole conception of the relation of Church and State which paralleled Newman's.
- ¹⁶ *Mixed Essays* (London, 1903), p. 121. This essay on "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," an extremely interesting one, has been strangely overlooked by commentators on Arnold and Newman.
- ¹⁷ Dr. Cullen had received his early theological training, and had given his public disputation for the doctor's degree, in the Rome of Pope Leo XII. It was, however, Gregory XVI, who came to the throne in 1830, who aroused Dr. Cullen's enthusiasm. It was Pope Gregory who condemned the ideas of Lamennais' *L'Avenir* in the Encyclical *Mirari Vos*, and Lamennais' *Paroles d'un Croquant in Singulari Nos*.
- ¹⁸ Denis Gwynn, *A Hundred Years of Catholic Emancipation (1829-1929)* (London, 1929), p. 169.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 169-70.
- ²⁰ *Apologia*, pp. 246-47.
- ²¹ Michael Tierney, "Newman's Doctrine of University Education," *Studies*, XLII (Summer, 1953), 126.
- ²² *The Idea of a University* (New York, 1947), p. 190.
- ²³ *Ibid.*
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 324.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 205.
- ²⁶ Quoted by Ward, II, 49.
- ²⁷ Preface to *Essays in Criticism, The Portable Matthew Arnold*, ed. Lionel Trilling (New York, 1949), p. 233.
- ²⁸ W.S. Knickerbocker, *Creative Oxford* (Syracuse, N.Y., 1925), 48.
- ²⁹ *Apologia*, p. 225.
- ³⁰ Newman, *Historical Sketches* (London, 1909), III, 28.
- ³¹ A. Dwight Culler, *The Imperial Intellect* (New Haven, 1955), p. 229.

³² Basil Willey, *Nineteenth Century Studies* (New York, 1949), pp. 263-64.

³³ Quoted by Culler, p. 65.

³⁴ *Historical Sketches*, III, 86.

³⁵ C.F. Harrold, *John Henry Newman* (New York, 1945), p. 115.

³⁶ *The Idea of a University*, p. 161.

³⁷ Culler, p. 242.

³⁸ Harrold, p. 113.

³⁹ Culler, p. 229.

⁴⁰ *The Idea of a University*, pp. 165-168.

⁴¹ Harrold, p. 110.

⁴² *The Idea of a University*, p. 167.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

⁴⁴ *Culture and Anarchy*, p. 48.

⁴⁵ *The Idea of a University*, p. 187.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 179.

⁴⁷ Charles Sarolea, *Cardinal Newman* (Edinburgh, 1908), p. 150.

⁴⁸ Dawson, "Newman's Place in History," pp. 34-5.

⁴⁹ Paul Thureau-Dangin, *English Catholic Revival in the Nineteenth Century*, trans. W. Wilberforce (New York, n.d.), II, 362.

2. OUR MUTUAL FRIEND: THE BIRDS OF PREY

Our Mutual Friend's reputation began in the cellar with Henry James' famous review, and climbed steadily in critical esteem until Edmund Wilson's reappraisal established it at the top of the house. The two opinions make a startling contrast. James had begun his review, "*Our Mutual Friend* is, to our perception, the poorest of Mr. Dickens's works. And it is poor with the poverty not of momentary embarrassment, but of permanent exhaustion. It is wanting in inspiration."¹ Dickens was certainly a hard - (if self-) driven man while he was working on the novel, as anyone reviewing the period in Johnson or in the *Letters* will quickly recall. But the pressures of his readings and of his personal life can hardly have been fatal to his writing, to judge from Wilson's verdict on this, his last complete novel: "Dickens has here distilled the mood of his later years, dramatized the tragic discrepancies of his characters, delivered his final judgment on the whole Victorian exploit, in a fashion so impressive that we realize how little the distractions of this period had the power to direct him from the prime purpose of his life: the serious exercise of his art."² One could scarcely find a comparable gulf in esteem for one of the earlier mature novels, *Bleak House* for example. Why for *Our Mutual Friend*? James was put off, to be sure, by the unrelieved grimness of the novel, by a spectrum of characters who seem never to break out of the shades of grey. His principal objection, though, was more comprehensive: the adverse verdict of a realist against a form of the novel which diverged markedly and persistently from the canons of realism: "What a world were this world if the world of 'Our Mutual Friend' were an honest reflection of it!" "Who," he asks later in the same review, "represents nature?" Wilson, more sympathetic perhaps with Dickens' social views, certainly less doctrinaire critically, was willing to credit *Our Mutual Friend* for its successes, rather than reproaching it for a failure in what it hardly even aims at - the recreation of everyday reality. These two positions can stand as the two polar positions taken on the novel in our own time. On the one hand, discussion has centered on the artistic quality of the novel: Had Dickens written himself out? Had he soured the well-springs of joy which transformed the equally forbidding urban landscape of his earlier years into the joyous "world," as it is now called, of the first novels? Is the large cast of minor characters like so many mutilated frogs, as George Henry Lewes charged about the Dickensian characters generally, each capable of but a single response to all stimuli? Is credibility destroyed by Boffin's temporary change of character? And so on. The second locus of debate has been the nature and accuracy of Dickens' social statement: Do we actually learn anything of practical value about the afflictions and evils of the full Victorian prosperity? Or is the novel simply an elaborate emotional, even sentimental, outburst which tells us little more than that something is dreadfully wrong? The latter charge has persisted. Walter Bagehot made it of the earlier novels, in fact, even before *Our Mutual Friend* was written (in the essay on Dickens in Volume II of *Literary Studies*). It has been elaborated from Lewes down to Orwell. Dickens, Orwell writes, seems always to "reach out for an idealised version of the existing thing,"³ rather than analyzing the structure of society in any mature way. The Marxist critics have maintained precisely the opposite. The novel is a brilliant damnation of the capitalist experiment. Reaching down to those levels of primitive myth and symbol available to all, Dickens has laid before us with his unforgettable vivid particulars the ugly surface and worse than ugly heart of an acquisitive society.

What Dickens has tried to do, then, and how well he has done it have been asked of *Our Mutual Friend* more often than the perhaps simpler question: how does Dickens embody his social criticism? None of the three can be considered separately, of course. Each problem constantly modifies our assessment of the other two. But to the extent that any one can be singled out, perhaps it should be method. The shortest path to Dickens' method seems to me to be through theme.

Money, it seems generally agreed, is the central theme of *Our Mutual Friend*. As Robert Morse wrote several years

ago: "Each novel, then, is *about* something, and furthermore about something serious *Our Mutual Friend* deals with Money" Money is embodied in the Dust Heap which is the hub of plot as well as theme. The dead hand which reaches out from the grave to set the novel in motion is the force of money. The minor characters all seek money. It is Bella Wilfer's most compelling goal until she is dissolved in sentimentality at the end of the novel. It is the catalyst in Boffin's fake chemical change from Daddy Warbucks to Simon Legree. It is everywhere and in everything. But what, one is entitled to ask, does it represent? Is it intrinsically bad? Hardly. The upper-middle-class, *rentier* life which Orwell so perceptively isolated as Dickens' version of earthly paradise demands it in quantity. It is the chief force behind the sentimental happy ending in most of the later novels. No, money itself as a central theme would lead to a fundamental inconsistency.

Yet the central theme must be related to money integrally, for its omnipresence in the novel is undeniable. I would like to suggest that money was, for Dickens, symptom rather than disease: the disease, and the real theme, is predation. The thematically typical incident of the novel seems to me that of one man's preying on another. The opening scene of the novel, one few will forget, shows us Gaffer Hexam at his loathsome job of fishing, not for souls, but for bodies. In the Marcus Stone illustration—the first in the novel—we see the Gaffer bent forward in the stern of his dory, watching his taut grappling line like a vulture. He and his daughter are doing something, Dickens remarks bitterly, "that they often did, and were seeking what they often sought. Half savage as the man showed, with no covering on his matted head, with his brown arms bare . . . still there was business-like [a phrase the reader should remember when he meets the respectable business world of Podsnap and Veneering] usage in his steady gaze. So with every lithe action of the girl, with every turn of her wrist, perhaps most of all with her look of dread or horror; they were things of usage."⁵ Not simply the preying upon one's fellow man, but the *habit* of it repels us. This ghastly habit is not, however, the final horror for the reader. The Gaffer's attitude toward his work provides that. Lizzie's shudder of disgust at the faint red outline left in the bottom of the boat by a previous corpse, elicits this single-minded reply from a Gaffer intent on his work: "What ails you? . . . 'I see nothing afloat.'" (p. 2) When the corpse is finally hooked and gaffed (surely the pun, in a novel where word-play is so frequent, is intentional), Lizzie blanches at the prospect of sitting next to it. "'As if it wasn't your living! As if it wasn't meat and drink to you!'" (p. 3) And with this delightfully apt metaphor (which the Gaffer goes on to amplify) the pattern of predation with which Dickens chose to begin the novel comes clearly into focus. Lizzie is not alone in her predicament, the debt her flesh and blood owes to the grisly "business" we have just witnessed. For if the river is the liquid sewer of London, the dust-heap is the dry one, and the two together provide food and drink for the majority of the characters in the novel.

Gaffer's character is not complete as yet. He must encounter a fellow scavenger (Rogue Riderhood) envious of the Gaffer's "luck." The irony here needs emphasis if not elucidation; in this novel "luck" for someone always implies ill-luck for someone else. Every crust of bread consumed must be snatched from another's mouth. Here at the beginning, by describing the "lucky" catch of a sodden corpse, Dickens burns this inescapable pattern of predation into the reader's mind. The scene closes with the Gaffer's indignation at Rogue's calling him "partner." Rogue, we learn, has been caught robbing a *live* man; he is not fit to associate with respectable folk of the Hexams' ilk, who prey off the dead. The blindness here, so ridiculous as almost but not quite to fall over into humor, is widespread in the world of *Our Mutual Friend*. Perfectly respectable "luck" is cherished on more than one level of society. As for Gaffer's explanation:

Has a dead man any use for money? Is it possible for a dead man to have money? What world does a dead man belong to? T'other world. What world does money belong to? This world. How can money be a corpse's? Can a corpse own it, want it, spend it, claim it, miss it? Don't try to go confounding the rights and wrongs of things in that way. (pp. 4-5)

The ripples of irony spread out in ever-larger circles through the novel's plot, a plot about the will of a dead man toward another supposedly "dead" man. Gaffer is speaking of money. But his horrible moral blindness, not the money which occasions it, is what we are meant to attend.

"Gaffer," Dickens tells us, "was no neophyte and had no fancies." (p. 5) When we turn the page we plunge into a world which is nothing but the fancies of neophytes: "Mr. and Mrs. Veneering were bran-new people in a bran-new house in a bran-new quarter of London." (p. 6) And off Dickens goes for another *tour de force* paragraph. The comparison implied by the juxtaposition is clear. The world of Podsnappery and Veneering is scarcely more than a polite form of the predatory behavior we have just left behind. The Veneerings, if we may speak symbolically, have come up from somewhere in the vicinity of the river. As with Gaffer, it is not money, but attitude toward one's fellow-man—cold and mechanical—which is significant. It is the money, though, which attracts that sympathetic and impoverished professional dinner guest, Twemlow. In his own way Twemlow is a "bird of prey," too. Ludicrous and inoffensive aristocratic furniture that he is, still he lives off the bounty of others.

To follow this pattern of predation out in the minor characters is to establish its centrality beyond doubt. Consider the fetching pair of lovers Alfred Lammle and Sophronia Akersham. Each lives on the fringes of the middle-class world watching, like a pike in a pond, for a fat victim, until with fine poetic justice the two pikes fasten on one another. They wake up, willy-nilly, as a team, and immediately turn on the weakest fish in sight, Georgiana Podsnap. That they should choose to feed her to that young-in-years but old-in-guile whiskerless shark, Fledgby, seems, in the world which Dickens builds up, almost inevitable.

James to the contrary notwithstanding, Eugene Wrayburn and Mortimer Lightwood are two of Dickens' more engaging minor characters. They display a sophistication, are drawn with lightness of touch, in which he did not often indulge himself. Though they are present at the Veneerings' first surrealistic feast, we really meet them in the coach riding home:

'I hate,' said Eugene, putting his legs up on the opposite seat, 'I hate my profession.'
'Shall I incommode you if I put mine up too?' returned Mortimer. 'Thank you. I hate mine.'
(pp. 19-20)

In a novel so intimately bound up with "getting ahead," "getting rich," these two are anomalies. The contrast with young Hexam, pushed by Lizzie a step or two up learning's impoverished ladder of respectability, could be deliberate. The

contrast with Headstone is intended beyond doubt. The two lawyers contrast too, though in a different way, with Podsnap and Veneering: failure and success. The men of law are Gentlemen, of course, as the other two are not, but all four live in the same world of scrambling acquisitiveness:

'Then idiots talk,' said Eugene, leaning back, folding his arms, smoking with his eyes shut, and speaking slightly through his nose, 'of Energy. If there is a word in the dictionary under any letter from A to Z that I abominate, it is energy. It is such a conventional superstition, such parrot gabble! What the deuce! Am I to rush out into the street, collar the first man of a wealthy appearance that I meet, shake him, and say, "Go to law upon the spot, you dog, and retain me, or I'll be the death of you?" Yet that would be energy.'

(p. 20)

Though Dickens may simply be drawing two callow young men too lazy even to be wild, such portraits hardly seem adequate motive for their creation. They are, in fact, walking repudiations of that vulgar aggressiveness which has propelled Podsnap and Veneering to wealth and honor in the city. They are against work. Look, for example, at Eugene's rejoinder, when Boffin holds up the bees as a model of pertinacious industry:

'And how do you like the law?'

'A ---- not particularly,' returned Eugene.

'Too dry for you, eh? Well, I suppose it wants some years of sticking to, before you master it. But there's nothing like work. Look at the bees.'

'I beg your pardon,' returned Eugene, with a reluctant smile, 'but will you excuse my mentioning that I always protest against being referred to the bees?'

'Do you!' said Mr. Boffin.

'I object on principle,' said Eugene, 'as a biped----'

'As a what?' asked Mr. Boffin.

'As a two-footed creature;—I object, on principle, as a two-footed creature, to being constantly referred to insects and four-footed creatures. I object to being required to model my proceedings according to the proceedings of the bee, or the dog, or the spider, or the camel.... I am not clear, Mr. Boffin, but that the hive may be satirical.'

'At all events, they work,' said Mr. Boffin.

'Ye-es,' returned Eugene, disparagingly, 'they work; but don't you think they overdo it? They work so much more than they need — they make so much more than they can eat — they are so incessantly boring and buzzing at their one idea till Death comes upon them — that don't you think they overdo it?'

(pp. 93-4)

A curious passage from Dickens, obsessed by work as he was, and still odder in a novel supposedly devoted, as the Marxists would have us believe, to class-hatred. Whom are we to hate? If anyone, surely those who live as unproductive drones on the hive of dutiful proletarian workers. Yet we don't hate Eugene and Mortimer; they are civilization itself compared to that model of energetic work, Bradley Headstone, or even to Podsnap or Veneering. Why? Because they have contracted out of the business of the world. This is admirable, for the business of the world is simply preying on one's fellow man. They are against work. Ergo, they are not predators. The Protestant gospel of work, Dickens seems to be saying through them, is simply apotheosized greed and anyone who has the wit to see it and resign from the rat-race deserves one's admiration, whatever his social class.

If Dickens had been as blinded by the class-struggle as his later Marxist readers, he would hardly have given us Headstone and young Hexam. Of Headstone it is perhaps not fair to speak, since his true place is not in a social class at all but rather among the Dickens gallery of psychological grotesques drawn for their own sakes. But what of young Hexam? He is the stuff young Socialist workers are made of; young, ambitious, earnest. But he is also progressively more unkind, grasping, selfish and insensitive. He ultimately turns on Headstone, his benefactor and teacher, an apostasy which may offend the reader even more than his abuse of his sister, when she refuses to marry Headstone. No, though a proletarian, he is caught up in the same pernicious ethic of "success" which has forced the young solicitor and barrister into their hatred professions, and which allows Rogue Riderhood, and Gaffer himself, to look upon that latter scavenger as, given his calling and opportunities, a "success."

Even down to the least important characters, the pattern of predation is traced. Hard, cold, joyless Silas Wegg, for example. He attaches himself to Boffin like a leech. While still at the old stall, he "speculates," he "invests" a bow in Boffin. It pays off. He spends the rest of the novel in alternate scheming to rob Boffin and comic self-praise for his own virtue and industry in so doing. He replies to Mr. Venus' query about Rokesmith's honesty, after the secretary had stopped by the "Bower" one evening, with: "'Something against him'? repeats Wegg. 'Something? What would the relief be to my feelings — as a fellow-man — if I wasn't the slave of truth, and didn't feel myself compelled to answer, Everything!'" (p. 306) It is a comic repetition, at a lower level, of Podsnap's blind, self-righteous indignation at all which might bring a blush to the cheek of a young person. Still more nightmarish a predator, though he is finally redeemed by authorial fiat, is Wegg's co-conspirator, Mr. Venus. That enamy of the fertility his name implies (he is also, one remembers, an unsuccessful lover) keeps a shop which retails the bones of the dead. In the panorama of birds of prey which Dickens gives us, he makes an honest living by keeping the charnel house. Wegg initially finds his way to Venus' shop because Venus had bought the bone of the leg which Wegg had lost in a hospital amputation. Wegg now wishes to buy the bone back, to retrieve it for a keepsake

from the tray of "human various" where it lives in Venus' shop:

'You're casting your eye round the shop, Mr. Wegg. Let me show you a light. My working bench. My young man's bench. A Wice. Tools. Bones, various. Skulls, various. Preserved Indian baby. African ditto. Bottled preparations, various. Everything within reach of your hand, in good preservation. The mouldy ones a-top. What's in those hampers over them again, I don't quite remember. Say, human various. Cats. Articulated English baby. Dogs. Ducks. Glass eyes, various. Mummied bird. Dried cuticle, various. Oh dear me! That's the general panoramic view.'

(p. 81)

Comic and bizarre as the pair are, their illustration of the general "predation" theme is unmistakable. Venus' shop, like the dust-heap and the river, preys on and purveys a particular variety of human waste.

From the orphan-selling business to the sweat of Rogue Riderhood's brow, the world of *Our Mutual Friend* is full of predators, each trying to live at the expense of the others. Sometimes the earnestness of effort is comic wholly, as with Mortimer Lightwood's clerk, Young Blight. Blight one remembers is driven by his own zeal and his employer's sloth (he has the energy Mortimer and Eugene lack) to invent a whole file of imaginary clients to labor for. Sometimes the moral blindness is as pathetic as repugnant, as with Gaffer Hexam. But in every case, Dickens' verdict is clear: society is so arranged that its members, if they are to survive, must prey off one another. As Mortimer Lightwood says flippantly to Lady Tippins a few pages from the end of the novel:

'Say, how did you leave the savages?' asks Lady Tippins.

'They were becoming civilized when I left Juan Fernandez,' says Lightwood. 'At least they were eating one another, which looked like it.'

(p. 816)

The reader is free to make what he wishes of this kaleidoscopic pattern of predators. He can interpret it as a gasp of horror at the Victorian conception of a flourishing society. He can infer that Dickens felt a change of heart rather than a change of economic system was in order. Or, the novel can be construed as a savage attack on Industrial Capitalism, as a system which converts a presumably benign state of natural society into a jungle. The real core of the Capitalistic malaise, an economy run for private profit, is singled out clearly enough to support such an interpretation. Or, still more grandly, he can credit Dickens with that breadth of philosophic wisdom needful to see that society itself, at all times and places, has been a pike-pond, that mankind is tragically condemned to prey one on the other. Not capitalism, not Victorian vulgarity as a sub-species of it, but drives far older and more difficult to cope with, may be the final theme of the novel.

Dickens forces no one of these constructions on the reader. He presents us with a concrete series of human encounters which together form an abstract pattern of predation. We are free, as we are in life itself, to make of it what we choose. I myself would opt for the last conjecture. Dickens has not, it seems to me, stayed very long or convincingly within the boundaries of topical satire. Victorian England, like the money which most directly represents it, was not the cause of evil but only one of its manifestations. This is but to say that *Our Mutual Friend* is satire, and that satire always uses current abuses as a platform from which to inveigh against eternal evils. Satire owes to society, properly speaking, no explicit rebuilding duties at all. Implicit in its criticism, of course, must be the values society needs to recreate itself in a more pleasing image. But satire is under no constraint to say, "You must tear down slums! You must open homes for unwed mothers!" The satirist is not obliged to be a social worker; still more importantly the social worker's solutions are bound to damage the strength and blur the focus of the satire. Surely this is Dickens' mistake here, indeed in all the satirical novels; he is too explicit. Special abuses, special laws are touted up in passing; not used as building blocks for a larger pattern of indictments but introduced to impel the mass of his readers to specific action. Thus those embarrassing, maudlin passages we should all like to forget: the turgid, inflated rhetorical expostulations to the political powers about Jo, the half-wit crossing sweeper in *Bleak House*; the shouts of pathetic rage at the poor laws which accompany the unforgivable sentimental slaughter of Betty Higden. When Dickens is specific in his social criticism, he commits the satirist's fatal error. He bores us.

What satirist, after all, has ever made really valuable, forward-looking criticisms of the transformations which the Industrial Revolution has brought about? These transformations have been clearly the real subject of satire in England and America since Pope's time. The satirists from Pope onward have all been wrong, backward, blinded. From the beginning they have regarded industrialization as a wild horse which must be beaten but will never be tamed. They have celebrated none of its promises. They have been conservative because it is their business as satirists to conserve. However progressive the satirist may be when he takes up the pen on other occasions, when he sits down as satirist he becomes a partisan of the *status quo ante*. His job is to point out the values in the old scheme of things which are in danger of being lost. However good life may become, however pregnant with hope for all, he is forced to be a prophet of doom. If we are not willing to grant this constraint of the form, satire has been largely a blind alley for the last two and a half centuries. Fielding is, I suppose, the consummate prose satirist of the 18th century, as well as the one most comparable to Dickens (*Jonathan Wild* is clearly an ancestor of *Our Mutual Friend*). Fielding's diagnosis of society's ills was sound, but his remedies were worthless. Wordsworth could point out precisely how the world was too much with us, but his proposals for disengaging us and it were infantile. So with Dickens. Orwell is perfectly right: Dickens wanted not to abolish bosses, but to make them kind. Not to alter society but to make it get along. This advice is not much help to a social planner. The charge that Dickens the social critic is inept, not a thinker but a feeler, has been persistently stated, from Bagehot to Lewes and Orwell. T. S. Eliot will stand as the social critic of our 20th-century poets, yet he is subject to the same strictures. His social remedies begin as repulsive and finish as irrelevant. But this does not really detract from the value of his diagnosis of what is wrong with our society. This diagnosis will remain pertinent, just as Dickens' will, because it is not tied to the particular circumstances which gave it birth.

The fundamental irrelevance of the Orwellian criticism of Dickens' satiric novels can be illustrated from one of

Orwell's own satires, *Coming Up for Air*. This is a longish, rather entertaining narrative by a middling-successful English insurance salesman speaking in 1938. He is nostalgic over the relaxed life-style which prevailed before the War, and which the War partially destroyed and the coming Second War will finish off. What is wrong? What has changed? One doesn't know. The pace of life, the struggle for a phantom "success," the drummed-up competition of capitalism, the obsession with money, all are suggested. They are the same problems which concerned Dickens in *Our Mutual Friend*, in fact. Orwell's protagonist, Bowler by name, is really a feeler not a thinker. He knows that something is very wrong, but cannot quite make out what. He is like Gaffer Hexam when he becomes a suspect character among the "honest" waterfront birds of prey: "Have we got a pest in the house? Is there summ'at deadly sticking to my clothes? What's let loose upon us? Who loosed it?" (p. 76) Isn't this the satirist's perennial, unavoidable question?

We cannot expect Dickens to prescribe the needed changes. This is foolish. No one knows even now what they should be. The most we can legitimately expect is that Dickens will answer Gaffer's question, tell us what has been loosed upon us. The central thesis of the novel does precisely this. What has been loosed is man's natural rapacity, and not only loosed but institutionalized and applauded. To support this central theme, subsidiary ones have been introduced. Here, as elsewhere, critics of Dickens have been tempted to take the symptom for the disease. Robert Morse, for example, points to a sub-theme of "Doubleness."⁶ But this is only an indication of the real problem: loss of identity. The plot turns on mistaken identity, of course. But the theme goes deeper. The Veneering-Podsnap world, all the new arrivals in *Our Mutual Friend*, really are plagued with the doubt of, or with a plain absence of, real identity. The instances of this are nearly endless in the novel: Podsnap and Veneering have trouble in identifying one another in the first of the grisly banquet scenes; the divine Tippins double character—the shrivelled hag and the adolescent mask; the self-doubts that beset Harmon-Hanford-Rokesmith during the course of his deception; the change of identity that Boffin (and, in a different direction, Bella Wilfer) go through. The fear of losing identity, traced often now to a change in social class, is a commonplace in contemporary fiction. Its presence in *Our Mutual Friend* indicates powers of analysis only grudgingly accorded its author.

What of the theme of money? This is scarcely new. But look at the aspects of it Dickens chooses to emphasize: not the traditional hollow rewards of greed, but rather the mechanization of personality and of personal relations. The anonymity of money, its depersonalizing pressures, have been widely discussed in our own time by social scientists and by occasional literary critics, Ian Watt for example. As this novel proves, those pressures Dickens saw clearly. In any society organized primarily for private profit, money is bound to be part of most daily encounters. In Dickens' world, it becomes the primary agent of contact between man and man. People have but two roles to play: buyer and seller. All other human attributes are squeezed out. Human personality becomes a plain matter of poor or rich. The spontaneity which for Dickens constituted essential humanity simply dries up. People tend to become indistinguishable from things, and *vice versa*. The novel is full of imagery making precisely this point. The grisly humor of Twemlow as a table, in the early pages of the novel, is a good illustration:

There was an innocent piece of dinner-furniture that went upon easy castors and was kept over a livery stable-yard in Duke Street, Saint James's, when not in use, to whom the Veneerings were a source of blind confusion. The name of this article was Twemlow . . . Mr. and Mrs. Veneering . . . arranging a dinner, habitually started with Twemlow, and then put leaves in him, or added guests to him. Sometimes, the table consisted of Twemlow and half-a-dozen leaves; sometimes, of Twemlow and a dozen leaves; sometimes Twemlow was pulled out to his utmost extent of twenty leaves. (p. 6)

Bradley Headstone has learned his job purely by rote:

He had acquired mechanically a great store of teacher's knowledge. He could do mental arithmetic mechanically, sing at sight mechanically, blow various wind instruments mechanically, even play the great church organ mechanically. From his early childhood up, his mind had been a place of mechanical stowage. The arrangement of his wholesale warehouse, so that it might be always ready to meet the demands of retail dealers . . . (p. 217)

In metaphor as in character, human personality and potentiality is sacrificed to the demands of commerce. From here, of course, it is but a step to Dickens' persistent theme that society warps and perverts innate—and benign—human capacity. And but a step further to the general mechanization of the spirit which has been a literary theme since the Industrial Revolution began.

The themes could be discussed at great length but the discussion would add little to the point to be proved. Dickens' satire was not brilliantly original, but it aimed at the same targets English satire had shot at for two centuries and more. It hit them as well as most. But it hit them as it were with a new weapon. Dickens' satiric method differed markedly from that of his predecessors. To gain what Kenneth Burke has called a "perspective by incongruity," look for a moment at a novel mentioned earlier in this essay, Fielding's *Jonathan Wild*. The similarities between the two are unexpected, especially if one remembers G. H. Lewes' remark that, "Compared with Fielding or Thackeray . . . [Dickens] was merely an animal intelligence."⁷ Both novels are studies in predatory behavior. The psychology of the pike pond dominates both. In both, all human relations, with the exception of those between the good but put-upon characters who support the sentimental plot, are reduced to terms of gain or loss. The sentimental characters, with nothing to offer more formidable than love and sincerity, are constantly defeated—until the author steps in to set all straight in the end. Both novels use money as a prominent symbol and impetus to plot-development. Especially strong in the two is the awareness that money, because it is anonymous and tells no tales, will be a fundamental agent in the dissolution of the traditional bonds holding society together. Implicit in both novels is the assumption that a civilization knowing no effective principles of regulation higher than dog-eat-dog has really ceased to be a civilization at all. For all the noticeable difference between the two in this respect, the great age of Capitalist economic theory might never have taken place.

Both novels are sentimental, but the sentiment is much less important in Fielding's. The last-page reward is so patent

that it hardly affects the preceding several hundred pages' grim and sustained irony. The path of the heart is plainly a chancy solution—though it may be the only one—and Fielding knows it. Only a thoroughgoing overhaul, a radical revision of society will do any lasting good. And of course Fielding had such a revision in mind; a return to the old ideal agrarian, church-centered, stratified society which had served Christendom for a thousand years. For Fielding, the traditional cosmology still lived and he could present it in his satire as a norm against which to measure the conduct of his "great men." Such a background, still implicitly accepted by most of his readers, enabled him to create a unified, consistent and sustained ironic framework which Dickens could not support. It is the lack of this implicit background, finally, which coarsens so much of Dickens' irony, makes it seem sometimes blunt and abusive. Dickens' characters, like Lightwood and Wrayburn when they do have the sensitivity and intelligence to resign from the rat-race society tries to force upon them, have no place to go. Their traditional roles, whatever they might have been, have evaporated. So Dickens substituted the passive tranquility of the Victorian gentleman of independent means:

His heroes, once they had come into money, and "settled down," would not only do no work; they would not even ride, hunt, shoot, fight duels, elope with actresses or lose money at the races. They would simply live at home, in feather-bed respectability, and preferably next door to a blood-relation living exactly the same life.⁸

It is even more inadequate than that quiet life in the country which was the 18th-century's most common last-page reward. Like the older pastoral dream from which it derives, it is frankly impossible. It is clear from *Jonathan Wild* that Fielding knew this, but not clear from *Our Mutual Friend* that Dickens did. Yet any less passive solution would put a character right back in the ambitious struggle Dickens wished him to escape. In the Dickens world, certainly in the world of *Our Mutual Friend*, there is no room for significant, for effective action. There is the good Reverend Frank Milvey to be sure, but like even the sympathetic do-gooders in Dickens' novels, he is ineffective. Dickens was, in fact, too far on the road to our modern world to turn back, though all his instincts told him he should. His satiric posture was weakened by having no informing world vision behind it. As has been said often enough before, there is no God in any meaningful sense in Dickens' novels—sentimental kindness takes His place, but cannot fill it. Kindness brings no specific social order with it.

The most striking difference between Fielding's view of an acquisitive society and Dickens' is in scope and vividness. Though Dickens' intellectual framework is narrower and thinner, his panoramas of character is vast by the side of Fielding's, and infinitely more vivid. Fielding concentrates on a single group of characters, Dickens on a large array: "There is no central protagonist in *Our Mutual Friend*. Far more even than *Bleak House*, it is multi-plotted novel."⁹ This technique, a spectrum of characters, is one answer to the charge brought by James and others, that the minor characters of *Our Mutual Friend* are flat and incredible. They were meant to be flat, to present but a single facet of the grim predatory world of the novel. Jenny Wren, a cripple trapped by a drunken father who depends upon her like a child, is but one example of the pressure of society on the defenseless in it. Of herself she is not of great importance. As one variation of a pattern repeated again and again, she is highly indicative. Realistically construed, of course, she is incredible. But the novel is not a realistic novel. If she had been credible she would have taken up too large a share of the reader's attention.

Our Mutual Friend has far more in common with allegory than with realism. Dickens hardly even pretends to keep up the realistic mask. The dialogue is frankly incredible most of the time. Riah, for instance, replies to Eugene Wrayburn's rude importunities that he leave the deserted Lizzie Hexam to his care, ". . . Christian gentleman . . . I will hear only one voice to-night desiring me to leave this damsel . . ." (405-6) Allegorically, "damsel" is perfect. Or pick at random any line of Mrs. Wilfer's: it is impossible to believe anyone ever said it. But as the representation not of a person but of an attitude toward wealth and position, her speech is unforgettable. Then too, the novel is far and away the most frankly grotesque of the later novels. The Veneerings' banquets are surrealistically drawn and Dickens never pretends they are not. Not realism, but a pattern of abstractions, is the satiric technique of *Our Mutual Friend*. Making the obvious qualifications, one could call it satiric allegory. Allegory is not far to seek in any of the mature novels, but in this one it is closest to the surface. Boffin lives in a Bower; "sailors to be got the better of" are necessary to Pleasant Riderhood's "Eden"; Jenny calls Riah "Fairy Godmother!"; Fledgby, when he is to be paid off in lashes, is got up in Turkish trousers like a pagan devil. We should be careful not to press these instances of superficial allegory too far. Dickens is not writing a thoroughgoing allegory obviously. Yet, in fact, the novel is closer to the *Fairie Queene* than to a novel by Henry James, in the methods it employs to make us believe in it. Character consistency, for example. One of the standard criticisms of *Our Mutual Friend* is the inconsistency of some of its characters. Yet in a novel which is controlled by theme and not by character consistency of character is largely irrelevant. As with the *Faerie Queene*, it is not the consistency of the whole structure but the vivid scene, the dramatic confrontation, which does the work of the novel. The spiritual cousin of Headstone's grief-scene after being rejected by Lizzie is the Cave of Despair. As with allegory in general, it is not the intellectual subtlety of Dickens' vision which strikes us so much as the unforgettable vividness of its crucially symbolic scenes. A pattern of scenes, each an amplification of the general theme of predation, of joy only at the expense of grief, is Dickens' technique of persuasion. The demands of allegorical intensity completely dominate probability. Dickens' characters were doubtless as real in his own mind as Spenser's were in his—real as only the figments of the pure imagination can be—but they can hardly have seemed real, fully three-dimensional, to his readers then or now. No, the effect is made another way. The birds of prey rise clear of everyday reality, of time and place, and become a vision of man everywhere and at all times.

They do not, unfortunately, rise altogether clear of an overlong, offensively sentimental ending. Dickens' weaknesses in this direction have been so thoroughly illuminated that no more light is needed here. But if the charges of excessive gloominess, of unnaturalism, of failing creative powers, cannot be made to stick, that of sentimental falsification of experience can. The tender-hearted way out offends here as nowhere else in the canon. For the symbolism of the first two-thirds of the novel is too strong to allow the reader, caught up and appalled as he must be by the picture Dickens so powerfully draws, to feel anything but offended when this power is systematically sapped by wishful thinking and an eye to the marketplace.

¹ In a review of the novel in *The Nation* of 1865, reprinted in *The Future of the Novel*, ed. Leon Edel (Vintage Books, 1956), pp. 75-80, and elsewhere.

² "Dickens: The Two Scrooges," in *The Wound and the Bow* (Cambridge, Mass., 1941), p. 75.

³ "Charles Dickens," *Inside the Whale and other essays* (London, 1940), p. 53.

⁴ "Our Mutual Friend," reprinted in *The Dickens Critics* ed. George H. Ford and Lauriat Lane, Jr. (Ithaca, N. Y., 1961), pp. 204-05.

⁵ *Our Mutual Friend* ("The New Oxford Illustrated Dickens"), ed. E. Salter Davies (Oxford University Press, 1952), pp. 1-2. All subsequent citations in the text are to this edition.

⁶ Morse, pp. 206ff.

⁷ "Dickens in Relation to Criticism," *Fortnightly Review*, vol. 17 (Feb. 1872), 151. (Reprinted in Ford and Lane.)

⁸ "Charles Dickens," p. 64.

⁹ J. Hillis Miller, *Charles Dickens, the World of His Novels* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), p. 281.

3. THE RACE FOR THE MONEY IN THE STRUCTURE OF *VANITY FAIR*

Any number of critics could be cited to show how little thought has been given to Thackeray as a creator of plots. But possibly no statement so confuses as "*Vanity Fair* has a plot not wholly unlike that of *The Three Bears*. Becky Sharp proceeds from adventure to adventure up to the great smash-up."¹ To say this is to say that *Vanity Fair* is a picaresque novel and that there is a certain lack of connection between adventures. One notable feature of the picaresque novel is the almost gratuitous nature of the adventures: they arise out of the situation in which the hero finds himself, not out of his character. To compare *Vanity Fair* with the adventure-after-adventure structure of *The Three Bears* is to miss Thackeray's general over-all plan and the specific working out of that plan. Gordon Ray writes of Thackeray's method: "He had to know in advance only which of his characters were to figure as his principals, and what the general pattern of their lives was to be. More detailed planning would have hampered the free and spontaneous invention which gives *Vanity Fair* its supreme naturalness and persuasiveness."² Essentially true, even this view needs some correction. I would like to show that Becky's rise in the world seen in her relations with the Crawley family is a carefully worked out part of the novel, that rather than being a movement from one adventure to another, it shows a thought-out plan on Thackeray's part.

The central fact of the Crawley family's life is Miss Crawley's £70,000. The money is, as Becky tells Amelia, "a charming reconciler and peacemaker";³ but when Miss Crawley is not at Queen's Crawley, the family is torn by hatred and jealousy. Sir Pitt is not on good terms with his half-sister: she has refused to lend him any money, even on mortgage, and has put her capital in the Funds. Moreover, she has expressed "her intention of leaving her inheritance between Sir Pitt's second son [Rawdon] and the family at the Rectory [the Bute Crawleys], and had once or twice paid the debts of Rawdon Crawley in his career at college and in the army" (*Works*, I, 78; Chapter IX). Because Rawdon "was to come in for the bulk of Miss Crawley's property" (*Works*, I, 87; Chapter XI), his brother Pitt disliked him and his aunt. In the manuscript, Thackeray wrote, "This was another reason why he should hate Rawdon Crawley. He thought his brother robbed him. Older brothers often do think so; and curse the conspiracy of the younger children who have deprived them of their fortunes."⁴ If Miss Crawley thought Pitt a hypocrite and "despised him as a milksop," Pitt had an equally violent opinion of his aunt, engendered, Thackeray lets us know, by the hopelessness of his ever inheriting her money:

[H]e did not hesitate to state that her soul was irretrievably lost, and was of opinion that his brother's chance in the next world was not a whit better. "She is a godless woman of the world," would Mr. Crawley say; "she lives with atheists and Frenchmen. My mind shudders when I think of her awful, awful situation, and that, near as she is to the grave, she should be so given up to vanity, licentiousness, profaneness, and folly" (*Works*, I, 83-84; Chapter X).⁵

But brother hatred is not limited to Pitt and Rawdon: business had soured the brothers Sir Pitt and Bute because "Sir Pitt had had the better of Bute in innumerable family transactions" (*Works*, I, 87; Chapter XI). Bute also hated Sir Pitt's two sons: as a clergyman of the Church of England, he resented the "Methodist milksop" of a Pitt; and the licentiousness of a Rawdon—"this scoundrel, gambler, swindler, murderer of a Rawdon Crawley... The infamous dog has got every vice except hypocrisy, and that belongs to this brother." Naturally, the cause of the conflict is money: Miss Crawley's attorney had told Bute that she had Rawdon "down in her will for fifty thousand; and there won't be above thirty to divide" (*Works*, I, 94; Chapter XI). These brother hatreds illustrate one of the major themes of the novel:

These money transactions—these speculations in life and death—these silent battles for reversionsary spoil—make brothers very loving towards each other in *Vanity Fair*. I, for my part, have known a five-pound note to interpose and knock up a half-century's attachment between two brethren; and can't but admire, as I think what a fine and durable thing Love is among worldly people (*Works*, I, 87).

The central situation of the Crawley family is the race for Miss Crawley's money. All the characters are motivated by the proximity of her death and the desire to get into her will. She herself realizes this much later in the novel: "They are all alike, Miss Crawley thought in her heart. They all want me dead, and are hankering for my money" (*Works*, I, 239; Chapter XXV). Their hankering, maneuverings, machinations have been structured by Thackeray into a giant horse race. Miss Crawley's stay at Queen's Crawley is the jockeying for position after the break from the starting post; her departure from

Queen's Crawley for London is the first lap. At the start of this moneysweepstakes, the finish line of which is taking care of Miss Crawley, and thus gaining her fortune, Rawdon is in the lead as his "black charger pawed the straw before his invalid aunt's door" (*Works*, I, 120; Chapter XIV). Later, Thackeray asks of Rawdon, "Where meanwhile was he who had been once first favourite for this race for money?" (*Works*, I, 334; Chapter XXXIV).

Aware that Rawdon is Miss Crawley's favorite, Becky sets out to snare him. Ironically, she is aided in her attempt by Miss Crawley's attitude towards her and by Mrs. Bute's machinations. First, Miss Crawley seems to be bringing the two together:

Miss Crawley ordered that Rawdon Crawley should lead her in to dinner every day, and that Becky should follow with her cushion—or else she would have Becky's arm and Rawdon with the pillow. "We must sit together," she said. "We're the only three Christians in the county, my love," — in which case, it must be confessed, that religion was at a very low ebb in the county of Hants (*Works*, I, 96; Chapter XI).

She scoffs at aristocratic birth and praises Becky:

"You, my love, are a little paragon—positively a little jewel—You have more brains than half the shire—if merit had its reward you ought to be a duchess—no, there ought to be no duchesses at all—but you ought to have no superior, and I consider you, my love, as my equal in every respect" (*Works*, I, 96).

She further encourages Becky with her liberal opinions on elopements and imprudent marriages:

"That was the most beautiful part of dear Lord Nelson's character," Miss Crawley said. "He went to the deuce for a woman. There *must* be good in a man who will do that. I adore all imprudent matches.—What I like best, is for a nobleman to marry a miller's daughter, as Lord Flowerdale did—it makes all the women so angry—I wish some great man would run away with you, my dear; I'm sure you're pretty enough."

"Two post-boys!—Oh, it would be delightful!" Rebecca owned.

"And what I like next best, is, for a poor fellow to run away with a rich girl. I have set my heart on Rawdon running away with some one."

"A rich some one, or a poor some one?"

"Why, you goose! Rawdon has not a shilling but what I give him. He is a *criblé de dettes*—he must repair his fortunes, and succeed in the world!" (*Works*, I, 97).

Thus, although the old lady would like both Becky and Rawdon to run away with some one, she wants a great nobleman for Becky and a rich woman for Rawdon. Marrying Rawdon, Becky was gambling on Rawdon's staying in his aunt's favor and on her own ability to keep in the old reprobate's good graces. She felt that the possibility of £70,000 was worth this double gamble.

While Becky was urged on by Miss Crawley's fine-sounding statements about imprudent marriages, Rawdon was being urged on by Mrs. Bute Crawley. Knowing that Becky's mother was a "dancer at the Opera . . . a person of the *very lowest order and morals*" (*Works*, I, 90; Chapter XI), and gambling that Miss Crawley's professed democratic ideals are hypocrisy, Mrs. Bute takes every opportunity to bring Rawdon and Becky together. She even plays the piano so that Becky and Rawdon can dance together (*Works*, I, 92). Aware of Becky's success with Sir Pitt and Miss Crawley, Mrs. Bute goads Rawdon into a precipitous action by warning him that Becky was "the most clever, droll, odd, good-natured, simple, kindly creature in England," but that he "must not trifle with her affections, though—dear Miss Crawley would never pardon him for that; for she, too, was quite overcome by the little governess, and loved Sharp like a daughter. Rawdon must go away—go back to his regiment and naughty London, and not play with a poor artless girl's feelings" (*Works*, I, 124; Chapter XIV). She even needles him with the idea that he would have Becky as a relative soon—as a mother-in-law—"if anything happens to Lady Crawley."⁶

Rawdon recognizes the truth in Mrs. Bute's hint about Becky and Sir Pitt. In her stay at Queen's Crawley, Becky had become indispensable to Sir Pitt: she did his correspondence and legal mail; she gave advice on estate affairs. She had become his *confidante*, and eventually had "the upper hand of the whole house, my lady, Mr. Crawley, the girls and all" (*Works*, I, 88; Chapter XI). When Becky goes off with Miss Crawley, Sir Pitt is made aware of his need for Becky:

If the Baronet of Queen's Crawley had not had the fear of losing his sister's legacy before his eyes, he never would have permitted his dear girls to lose educational blessings which their invaluable governess was conferring upon them. The old house at home seemed a desert without her, so useful and pleasant had Rebecca made herself there . . . Almost every day brought a frank from the Baronet, enclosing the most urgent prayers to Becky for her return, or conveying pathetic statements to Miss Crawley, regarding the neglected state of his daughters' education; of which documents Miss Crawley took very little heed (*Works*, I, 126; Chapter XIV).

But in this triangle that resembles a similar triangle in *The Brothers Karamazov*, Becky has made her choice: Miss Crawley's favorite. While Miss Crawley was at Queen's Crawley, Sir Pitt's wife was ill; while Becky nurses Miss Crawley, Lady Crawley is dying, "left fading away in her lonely chamber, with no more heed paid to her than to a weed in the park" (*Works*, I, 123; Chapter XIV). When Sir Pitt proposes, Becky is married. That she would not have refused Sir Pitt is seen in her response to his proposal: "Rebecca started back, a picture of consternation. In the course of his history we have never seen her lose her presence of mind; but she did now, and wept some of the most genuine tears that ever fell from her eyes" (*Works*, I, 135; Chapter XIV). When Sir Pitt expresses disbelief, she answers:

"Married! married!" Rebecca said, in an agony of tears—her voice choking with emotion, her handkerchief up to her ready eyes, fainting against the mantelpiece—a figure of woe fit to melt the most obdurate heart (*Works*, I, 136; Chapter XV).

And in her voice is the anguish of knowing that she had missed the prize that could have been hers with the least effort. The old man had to die soon; and she would have been mistress of Queen's Crawley; with her great energy and initiative, she could have made the place pay; and it was all lost because of her own cleverness!

With these relationships established, the novel has an inevitable movement. Assume that instead of her disastrous scheme of leaving a note on the pillow, Becky had confessed to Miss Crawley while she "laid her head upon Miss Crawley's shoulder and wept there so naturally that the old lady, surprised into sympathy, embraced her with an almost maternal kindness, uttered many soothing protests of regard and affection for her, vowed that she loved her as a daughter, and would do anything in her power to serve her" (*Works*, I, 140; Chapter XV). With Miss Crawley in this receptive mood, Becky would have retired with Rawdon to live peacefully on the income from the five per cents. The novel would have then consisted of two parallel stories—Amelia's and Becky's—both quiet and subdued. The contrast between these two narrative lines would have been destroyed: there would have been no moral drawn about the pursuit of riches and worldly wealth. The novel would not have been what Thackeray wanted it to be: "a set of people living without God in the world." The race would have ended at the first turn with the favorite winning.

But Thackeray was making a broad, panoramic picture of society; the coveted garland could not be won by the favorite, for this victory would stop the flow of dramatic action and lower dramatic interest. Therefore, at the first turn, the favorite slips in the mud and loses position. But this is the opening Mrs. Bute has been waiting for: discovering that Becky is married to Rawdon, Miss Crawley suffers a hysterical relapse:

They were forced to take her back to the room which she had just quitted. One fit of hysterics succeeded another. The doctor was sent for—the apothecary arrived. Mrs. Bute took up the post of nurse by her bedside. "Her relations ought to be round about her," that amiable woman said (*Works*, I, 150; Chapter XVI).

Mrs. Bute assumes control of the household. She captivates Miss Crawley's ménage by her good will: she "had told Briggs and Firkin so often of the depth of her affection for them; and what *she* would do, if she had Miss Crawley's fortune, for friends so excellent and attached, that the ladies in question had the deepest regard for her; and felt as much gratitude and confidence as if Mrs. Bute had loaded them with the most expensive favours" (*Works*, I, 171; Chapter XIX). Through this hole slips a new favorite in the race, one who can keep the rail even against so skillful a horseman as Rawdon Crawley: riding in the Park one day, Miss Crawley and Mrs. Bute "cut their nephew pitilessly."

But Mrs. Bute makes one mistake when she takes over the sick room: she does not become the friend of Miss Crawley, as Becky had done, but her oppressor:

She had in the course of a few weeks brought the invalid to such a state of helpless docility, that the poor soul yielded herself entirely to her sister's orders, and did not even dare to complain of her slavery to Briggs or Firkin. . . . If ever the patient faintly resisted, and pleaded for a little bit more dinner or a little drop less medicine, the nurse threatened her with instantaneous death, when Miss Crawley instantly gave in (*Works*, I, 234-235; Chapter XXV).

This oppression only helped to destroy the Bute Crawleys' chances to win the race. Unfortunately for Mrs. Bute, her horse slipped going into the far turn: her husband, "riding home one night, fell with his horse and broke his collar bone. Fever and inflammatory symptoms set in, and Mrs. Bute was forced to leave Sussex for Hampshire" (*Works*, I, 235; Chapter XXV). When Mrs. Bute offers to come back, Miss Crawley sends back a note saying that her "health was greatly improved since Mrs. Bute had left her, and begging the latter on no account to put herself to trouble, or quit her family for Miss Crawley's sake" (*Works*, I, 314; Chapter XXXIII). Thus, the second leader in this race begins to falter, and a dark horse, Pitt Crawley, begins to make a move at the far turn.

When the Bute Crawleys' older son, James, pays a visit to Miss Crawley, the Bute Crawleys are still in the race. But Pitt sees his opportunity. In his handling of James, Pitt reveals a mastery that seals him in the tribe of Machiavel! For Miss Crawley is not at all subtle in her dislike for her austere nephew: when James arrives, Miss Crawley fawns upon him, and, hearing that he is staying at a hotel, insists that he come live with her, and instructs her butler to pay the bill:

She flung Pitt a look of arch triumph, which caused that diplomatist almost to choke with envy. Much as he had ingratiated himself with his aunt, she had never yet invited him to stay under her roof, and here was a young whipper-snapper, who at first sight was made welcome there. . . . Still, by way of punishing her elder nephew, Miss Crawley persisted in being gracious to the young Oxonian. There were no limits to her kindness or her compliments when they once began. She told Pitt he might come to dinner, and insisted that James should accompany her in her barge, and paraded him solemnly up and down the cliff, on the back seat of the bouchée (*Works*, I, Chapter XXXIV).

After supper Pitt entertains James. Like the serpent whispering to Eve, Pitt tells James, "The chief pleasure which my aunt has. . . is that people should do as they like in her house. This is Liberty Hall, James, and you can't do Miss Crawley a greater kindness than to do as you please and ask for what you will" (*Works*, I, 329-330; Chapter XXXIV). With even greater finesse, Pitt gets James drunk:

"You don't drink, James," the ex-attaché continued. "In my time at Oxford, the men passed round the bottle a little quicker than you young fellows seem to do."

"Come, come," said James, putting his hand to his nose and winking at his cousin with a pair of vinous eyes, "no jokes, old boy; no trying it on me. You want to trot me out, but it's no go. In

vino veritas, old boy. Mars, Bacchus, Apollo virorum, hay! I wish my aunt would send down some of this to the governor; it's a precious good tap."

"You had better ask her." Machiavel continued, "or make the best of your time now. What says the bard? 'Nunc vino pellite curas, Cras ingens iterbimus aequor,'" and the Bacchanalian, quoting the above with a House of Commons air, tossed off nearly a thimbleful of wine with an immense flourish of his glass (*Works*, I, 330-331).

Fate and Pitt work together to destroy James's chances. The young boy had bought several rounds of drinks at his inn, and eighteen glasses of gin were charged to his bill; he smelled of the stables; his dog attacked Miss Crawley's spaniel; at the supper table he drank too much wine and became far too familiar with his elders. Later, he smoked a pipe in his room: "The pipe of tobacco finished the business: and the Bute Crawleys never knew how many thousand pounds it cost them" (*Works*, I, 333). And so the second horse to take the lead falters at the far turn, and the long shot, Pitt Crawley, remains the only challenger in the field. Pitt realizes that now is the time for him to make his move, his stretch run:

For Miss Crawley was now quite alone; the monstrous dissipation and alliance of his brother Rawdon had estranged her affections from that reprobate young man; the greedy tyranny and avarice of Mrs. Bute Crawley had caused the old lady to revolt against the exorbitant pretensions of that part of the family; and though he himself had held off all his life from cultivating Miss Crawley's friendship, with perhaps an improper pride, he thought now that every becoming means should be taken, both to save her soul from perdition and to secure her fortune to himself as head of the house of Crawley (*Works*, I, 318; XXXIII).

Pitt brings his fiancée, Lady Jane, to see Miss Crawley, and she is an instantaneous success:

"Come and kiss me. Come and kiss me this instant, you dear good little soul," cried Miss Crawley in an ecstasy: and in this picturesque and friendly occupation Mr. Pitt found the old lady and the young one, when he came upstairs with his pamphlet in his hand. How she did blush all the evening, that poor Lady Jane! (*Works*, I, 325; Chapter XXXIV)

The final triumph of Pitt Crawley occurs after an announcement in the London papers in the spring of 1816: "On the 26th of March—the Lady of Lieutenant-Colonel Crawley, of the Life Guards Green—of a son and heir." Miss Crawley reacts spontaneously and violently:

The spinster's rage rose to its height, and sending instantly for Pitt, her nephew, and for the Lady Southdown, from Brunswick Square, she requested an immediate celebration of the marriage that had been so long pending between the two families. And she announced that it was her intention to allow the young couple a thousand a year during her lifetime, at the expiration of which the bulk of her property would be settled upon her nephew and her dear niece, Lady Jane Crawley (*Works*, I, 336).

With the double triumph of Pitt Crawley in the race for the money—the winning of Miss Crawley's money and his inheritance, upon his father's death, of Queen's Crawley and the title—Becky finds an opportunity to move up in the world. Untiring in her futile efforts to get Rawdon back into his aunt's good graces, Becky finds that the deaths of Sir Pitt and Miss Crawley brighten the future of the Rawdon Crawleys. While the two old people were alive, a paradoxical situation existed: while Becky or Rawdon could have found a home with one of them, together they could have no home with either. After his rejected offer of marriage, Sir Pitt was still willing to take Becky back: "Well, Becky—come back if you like. You can't eat your cake and have it. Any ways, I make you a fair offer. Come back as governess—you shall have it all your own way. . . . Never mind, Becky, I'll take care of 'ee'" (*Works*, I, 136; Chapter XV). In fact, it is on a trip to London to bring Becky back to Queen's Crawley that Sir Pitt finds out who her husband is, and the knowledge that it is his son sends him into a fury (*Works*, I, 151; Chapter XVI). Likewise, Miss Crawley still likes Rawdon, although she regrets deeply his rash action:

"What a pity that young man has taken such an irretrievable step in the world!" his aunt said; "with his rank and distinction he might have married a brewer's daughter with a quarter of a million—like Miss Grains; or have looked to ally himself with the best families in England. He would have had my money some day or other; or his children would—for I'm not in a hurry to go, Miss Briggs, although you may be in a hurry to be rid of me; and instead of that, he is a doomed pauper, with a dancing-girl for a wife!" (*Works*, I, 312; Chapter XXXIII).

But her attitude towards Rawdon is never as negative as that towards Becky; Miss Crawley blames Becky for everything that happened to poor Rawdon:

"I don't mind seeing Rawdon . . . I had just as soon shake hands with him as not. Provided there is no scene, why shouldn't we meet? I don't mind. But human patience has its limits; and mind, my dear, I respectfully decline to receive Mrs. Rawdon—I can't support that quite! . . . Miss Crawley *must* have had some emotion upon seeing him and shaking hands with him after so long a rupture. She mused upon the meeting a considerable time. "Rawdon is getting very fat and old, Briggs," she said to her companion. "His nose has become red, and he is exceedingly coarse in appearance. His marriage to that woman has hopelessly vulgarised him. Mrs. Bute always said they drank together; and I have no doubt they do. Yes: he smelt of gin abominably. . . . [Mrs. Bute] An artful designing woman? Yes, so she is, and she does speak ill of every one, —but I am certain that woman has made Rawdon drink. All those low people do!" (*Works*, I, 239, 240; Chapter XXV).

So long as Rawdon and Becky remain together, they are exiled from both Sir Pitt and Miss Crawley. Yoked together, they must wait for a new means of advancement to open up for them.

Becky does not lose hope. She has plans, but first she must be reconciled to the family:

"My relations won't cry fire upon me," Becky said, with rather a bitter laugh; and she was quite contented to wait until the old aunt should be reconciled, before she claimed her place in society. So she lived at Erompton, and meanwhile saw no one, or only those few of her husband's male companions who were admitted into her little dining-room (*Works*, I, 157; Chapter XVII).

Becky and Rawdon live first in London and then in Paris and establish their reputations. But Becky is dissatisfied with an existence on the fringe of respectability: she wants to be accepted by society. More important, she is tired of living the haphazard, hand-to-mouth existence she and Rawdon have become accustomed to. This was her major reason for leaving her comfortable "nothing a year" life in Paris—this and her knowledge that only in England was there any advancement for her husband:

Easy and pleasant as their life at Paris was, it was after all only an idle dalliance and amiable trifling; and Rebecca saw that she must push Rawdon's fortune in their own country. She must get him a place or appointment at home or in the colonies; and she determined to make a move upon England as soon as the way could be cleared for her. As a first step she made Crawley sell out of the Guards, and go on half-pay . . . she was growing tired of this idle social life: opera-boxes and restaurateur-dinners palled upon her: nose-gays could not be laid by as a provision for future years: and she could not live upon nicknacks, laced handkerchiefs, and kid gloves. She felt the frivolity of pleasure, and longed for more substantial benefits (*Works*, I, 351; Chapter XXXVI).

Even in England, though, Becky wants to move up into the respected world from out of the demi-monde in which she has lived: Becky wants to be respectable. But she knows that she cannot force herself into the respectable world: she must be slowly brought into it by a sponsor. She understands her problem much better than does her husband, who is much more volatile and has less of a sense of humor than Becky:

Rawdon at first felt very acutely the slights which were passed upon his wife, and was inclined to be gloomy and savage. He talked of calling out the husbands or brothers of every one of the insolent women who did not pay a proper respect to his wife; and it was only by the strongest commands and entreaties on her part, that he was brought into keeping a decent behaviour. "You can't shoot me into society," she said good-naturedly. "Remember, my dear, that I was but a governess, and you, you poor silly old man, have the worst reputation for debt, and dice, and all sorts of wickedness. We shall get quite as many friends as we want by-and-by, and in the meanwhile you must be a good boy, and obey your schoolmistress in everything she tells you to do. When we heard that your aunt had left almost everything to Pitt and his wife, do you remember what a rage you were in? . . . All the rage in the world won't get us your aunt's money; and it is much better that we should be friends with your brother's family than enemies, as those foolish Butes are. When your father dies, Queen's Crawley will be a pleasant house for you and me to pass the winter in. If we are ruined, you can carve and take charge of the stable, and I can be a governess to Lady Jane's children. Ruined! fiddlededee! I will get you a good place before that; or Pitt and his boy will die, and we will be Sir Rawdon and my lady. While there is life there is hope, my dear, and I intend to make a man of you yet!" (*Works*, I, 360; Chapter XXXVII).

Thus, we see that Becky has plans for when Miss Crawley and Sir Pitt no longer block the advance of the Rawdon Crawleys in the world. It would take time, but Becky can afford to wait. Her calmness and self-control and intelligence turn disasters into advantages. Although Rawdon and Pitt had not been good friends as brothers, when Miss Crawley died, Becky had Rawdon write a "very frank, manly, good-humoured letter from Paris" in which he congratulated his brother on his good luck, and asked to be remembered "to his sister, and hoped to have her good-will for Mrs. Rawdon"; and Becky added a post script in which she referred to Pitt's kindness to her "in early days when she was a friendless orphan the instructress of his little sisters, in whose welfare she still took the tenderest interest" (*Works*, I, 360, 361; Chapter XXXVII). With this simple missive, Becky establishes friendly relations with her brother-in-law, a friendship that had never existed before between the two brothers. When the new Sir Pitt sends a letter inviting the Rawdon Crawleys to the funeral of old Sir Pitt, Rawdon is only "half-pleased," but Becky is thrilled:

She took up the black-edged missive, and having read it, she jumped up from the chair, crying "Hurray!" and waving the note round her head.

"Hurray?" said Rawdon, wondering at the little figure capering about in a streaming flannel dressing-gown, with tawny locks dishevelled. "He's not left us anything, Becky. I had my share when I came of age."

"You'll never be of age, you silly old man," Becky replied. "Run out now to Madame Brunoy's for I must have some mourning; and get a crape on your hat and a black waistcoat—I don't think you've got one: order it to be brought home to-morrow, so that we may be able to start on Thursday."

"You don't mean to go?" Rawdon interposed.

"Of course I mean to go. I mean that Lady Jane shall present me at Court next year. I mean that your brother shall give you a seat in Parliament, you stupid old creature. I mean that Lord Steyne shall have your vote and his, my dear old silly man; and that you shall be an Irish Secretary, or a West Indian Governor: or a Treasurer, or a Consul, or some such thing (*Works*, I, 395-396; Chapter XL).

And of course Becky is correct. She rises in the world, and is finally ruined by her own ambition.

But Becky's plans for the future reveal that Thackeray worked with a plan in mind. We have seen that he worked out the race for Miss Crawley's money with some care: Rawdon was the favorite, but was eliminated when he married Becky; then came Mrs. Bute, who was eliminated by her own tyranny and her son's impudence; then the winner, Pitt. But once Rawdon is eliminated, Becky starts scheming for the future. As early as Number V (Chapter 16), Becky tells Rawdon she will make his fortune (*Works*, I, 151); soon she realizes that she must do the thinking for both of them: "If he had but a little more brains," she thought to herself, "I might make something of him" (*Works*, I, 157; Chapter 17). Her statement in the same chapter that her "relations won't cry fie" upon her reveals Becky's plan to work through her relatives—and to do so, if necessary, after Miss Crawley was dead. Numbers VIII and IX (Chapters 26-29, 30-32) deal with Brussels and Waterloo; but with the defeat of Napoleon, Becky begins to plan again for a return to England. After Miss Crawley's death (Number X, Chapter XXXIV), Becky decides that she must get Rawdon "a place or appointment at home or in the colonies" (*Works*, I, 351; Number XI, Chapter 36); as for herself, "When Lady Jane comes," thought she, "she shall be my sponsor in London society; and as for the women! bah! the women will ask me when they find the men want to see me" (*Works*, I, 361; Chapter 37). To achieve these ends, she has Rawdon write a letter to Pitt (Chapter 37). When Sir Pitt dies, the friendship re-established after the death of Miss Crawley matures further; more important, Becky receives the invitation she has been waiting for. In Number XII (Chapter 40), when invited to Queen's Crawley, Becky predicts a presentation at Court and an appointment for Rawdon. In Number XIV (Chapter 48) she meets the King; and in the same chapter, she presses Lord Steyne for an appointment for Rawdon (*Works*, I, 468). In Number XVI (Chapter 55) Rawdon receives an appointment as Governor of Coventry Island (*Works*, I, 537). These actions seem to be more than the "general pattern" of the picaresque adventurer; they are part of a plan on the part of Becky—and obviously, on the part of her creator.

Long Island University

MYRON TAUBE

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ Henry Burrows Lathrop, *The Art of the Novelist* (London, 1921), p. 78.
- ² *Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity 1811-1846* (New York, 1955), p. 407.
- ³ *The Works of William Makepeace Thackeray*, ed. Anne Thackeray Ritchie (London, "Biographical Edition," 1897), I, 91; Chapter XI.
- ⁴ MS., p. 74. The manuscript is in the Morgan Library in New York.
- ⁵ In the manuscript, Pitt's attitude, "What is money compared to our souls, sir?" is expressed by a man "who knew he was not to inherit a shilling of his aunt's money" (MS., p. 74).
- ⁶ Mrs. Bute's maneuverings are not so subtle that they go undetected. When the marriage is discovered, Miss Crawley instantly and correctly detects her manipulations, and Mrs. Bute falls back on her knowledge of Becky's background:

"You're in the plot—you made him marry, thinking that I'd leave my money from him—you did, Martha," the poor old lady screamed in hysterical sentences.

"I, ma'am, ask a member of this family to marry a drawing-master's daughter?"

"Her mother was a Montmorency," cried out the old lady, pulling at the bell with all her might.

"Her mother was an opera girl, and she has been on the stage or worse herself," said Mrs. Bute.

Miss Crawley gave a final scream, and fell back in a faint (*Works*, I, 150; Chapter XVI).
- ⁷ *The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepeace Thackeray*, ed. Gordon N. Ray (Cambridge, Mass., 1945), II, 309.

II. NOTES AND BRIEF ARTICLES

1. SOME LETTERS OF MATTHEW ARNOLD

Between 1882 and 1885, a brief exchange of notes took place between Matthew Arnold and Edmund Gosse. Always careful about preserving his part of any correspondence he carried on, Gosse saved the messages from Arnold, two of which are now in the Symington Collection of the Rutgers University Library. Five others are in the Brotherton Collection of Leeds University. An extended search has not uncovered any other letters from Arnold nor have Gosse's notes to him been found. Of the seven letters offered here, those for March 3 and February 9, 1885 are at Rutgers, all others at Leeds.

At the time of the first note printed below, Gosse was thirty-three years old and Arnold was sixty; the former was just gaining considerable prestige as a critic and poet while the latter was nearing the end of a successful career as critic and poet. Although Gosse and Arnold had contributed, as editors, to Ward's *British Poets*, there is no indication of their having met personally as yet. Gosse's writings had not been particularly concerned with the work of his older, well established contemporaries, but had centered on that of men younger than himself. And of course he had been busy in his own creative writing. Yet Gosse was always anxious to meet as many eminent men and women as he could, especially those in literature, not only because he needed material for exercising his gift in creating verbal portraits of such persons, but also because he believed that understanding the writer as an individual was important in understanding the man's writing as art. Certainly Arnold was notable and eminent enough to gain his attention, and to be the recipient of Gosse's book on Gray, a poet with whom Arnold had also been critically concerned.

These letters indicate that Gosse was invited to Arnold's home on at least two occasions, but there is no mention in the Book of Gosse, the famous register of guests entertained in his house, of a visit from Arnold. Gosse was not a close

friend of Arnold. The relationship revealed in these letters is simply a cordial acquaintanceship between two men of letters.

This hitherto unpublished correspondence is printed through the kind permission of Mr. Arnold Whitridge, the literary executor of Matthew Arnold.

June 24th. [1882]

My dear Mr. Gosse

I have just had your book¹ and your very kind letter. I will write to you about the book when I have read it — which perhaps may not be for a week or two, as I am beset with schools. I know before hand that I shall like the book — and Morley² tells me, besides, that it is very good.

Ever sincerely yours
Matthew Arnold

Forelton. Ambleside.

Septbr. 24. [1882]

My dear Mr. Gosse

Your letter has only just reached me here. "Emerson", if I ever write him, is promised to Macmillan; I have several engagements to keep with the editors of English periodicals, and when they have been kept³ I contemplate leaving off writing for periodicals altogether, before th public are quite sick of me.

I hope you got my letter about your Gray; I had not your address at hand, so directed my letter to your publishers.

I bought the "Century"⁴ at a Scotch railway station the other day, in order to see what you had said about Rossetti.⁴ Nothing could be better.

Ever truly yours
Matthew Arnold

7, Grosvenor Crescent.

June 12th. 1884

My dear Mr. Gosse

It is a great pleasure to me to have my name connected with Gray's, and by you, and in such charming terms.⁵

I was delighted to see how good an appointment they had made at Cambridge.⁶

Sincerely yours
Matthew Arnold

[From a copy in Gosse's hand.]

7, Grosvenor Crescent. S.W.

Sunday June 15th '84

My dear Mr. Gosse

Would it [be] possible for you to come and dine with us here on Wednesday next, the 18th., at 8? You would meet the Humphrey Wards⁷ whom you know, and I hope Froude.⁸

Yours sincerely
Matthew Arnold

Athenaeum Club

Pall Mall S.W.

Feb. 9th. 1885

My dear Mr. Gosse

When you announced your Gray, you were just going, and when it arrived you were gone;⁹ so I waited for your return to thank you, which I now do most heartily. I am gratified for the world that it has this excellent new edition, and for myself that I have your dedication.

We had heard from my daughter of her meeting you at Mr. Carnegie's, and from American friends of the interest with which your lectures were followed.¹⁰ It is very much on my mind to arrange a meeting with you during the next few weeks which I am to pass in London.

As soon as I get my Scandinavian friend I will hand him over to Dasent who has promised to put me in the way of writing a proper acknowledgment.¹¹ I wish I knew [] Danish and Dutch — but the hours of life which can remain to me are too few for that, or for many other of the acquirements which tempt me.

Ever sincerely yours

Matthew Arnold

7a, Manchester Square,

March 3rd. 1885

My dear Mr. Gosse

Sir George Dasent, an excellent judge, has read Dr. Ipsen's translation of "Balder Dead" and has compared it in several places with the original. He thinks the poem very well rendered; and he is greatly pleased, too, with the prefatory notice.

When I retire,¹² and get some leisure, I hope to master Danish myself and to read what Dr. Ipsen has written. Meanwhile I shall think it very kind of you if you will convey to him my cordial acknowledgments and thanks, and if you will add that I hope he will allow me to send him the new and complete edition of my poems which is now being printed, and which will appear in the course of the spring.¹³

I am very glad we shall see you here next Monday.

Most truly yours

Matthew Arnold

Cobham, Surrey.

Decr. 30th. 1885

My dear Gosse

I have been abroad to make some enquiries for the Government about school matters; I am going abroad again immediately,¹⁴ and meanwhile I have had my accumulated letters sent to me here, but not yet books and parcels. Thank you for what you have sent me; I shall no doubt find it here on my return at Easter; and meanwhile I am very certain that of nothing said about me by you shall I have either any right or any disposition to complain.¹⁵

Most truly yours,

Matthew Arnold

Harpur College
Rutgers University

PAUL F. MATTHEISEN
ARTHUR C. YOUNG

- ¹ Gosse had sent his new book, *Gray* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1882. English Men of Letters Series).
- ² John Morley (1838-1923), Viscount Morley of Blackburn, statesman and author.
- ³ He continued to contribute to periodicals until his death. The Emerson article was delivered as a lecture in America, 1883-4, and then printed in *Macmillan's Magazine*, L (May 1884), 1-13.
- ⁴ Gosse, "Dante Gabriel Rosetti," *Century Magazine*, XXIV (1882), 718-725.
- ⁵ *Works of Thomas Gray*, ed. by Gosse (London: Macmillan & Co., 1884), 4 vols. The dedication read: "To Matthew Arnold is dedicated this first complete edition of a poet whom no one has judged with a finer or more generous discrimination than he."
- ⁶ Gosse had just been appointed Clark Lecturer at Cambridge, succeeding Leslie Stephen.
- ⁷ Mrs. Ward (1851-1920), the novelist, was Arnold's niece.
- ⁸ James Anthony Froude (1818-1894), the historian.
- ⁹ Gosse had been on a lecture tour of America, from November 1884 through January 1885. His tour followed Arnold's by only a few months.
- ¹⁰ Arnold's eldest daughter, Lucy, had married F. W. Whitridge of New York City. The party at the Carnegies took place on January 17, 1885 (Gosse's American Diary).
- ¹¹ Alfred Ipsen (1852-1922), Danish author and poet, had translated many English and American poems. He had just brought out his translation of Arnold's "Balder Dead." Sir George Webbe Dasent (1817-1896) was a Scandinavian scholar, and at this time was also a Civil Service Commissioner and Commissioner of Historical Manuscripts.
- ¹² Actually, Arnold had, in 1883, been granted a Civil List Pension of £250, conferred by Gladstone, which permitted him to retire from his position of Inspector of Schools and to visit America. However, the government still used his services by having him investigate school systems on the continent.
- ¹³ *Poems by Matthew Arnold* (Macmillan & Co., London 1885), 3 vols.
- ¹⁴ He was to return again to Germany to study the school system there.
- ¹⁵ Gosse was lecturing publicly and privately at the time on Arnold's influence. Perhaps a copy of a lecture had been sent to Arnold.

2. GEORGE ELIOT'S READING OF WORDSWORTH: THE RECORD

I. W. Adam's article in No. 22 of the *Victorian Newsletter* on the Wordsworthian process of "restoration through feeling" that so many of George Eliot's characters undergo is another indication that, following the suggestive remarks of Basil Willey, Mario Praz, and others, students are growing alive to the complex and significant relation that Wordsworth's poetry has to George Eliot's novels. Those interested in this subject may be grateful to have the bare record of George Eliot's knowledge of Wordsworth set forth. Speaking of George Eliot's allusions to the Greek dramatists, Vernon Rendall called them "a garland of Greek which I have not seen equalled in the writings of any author, inside or outside fiction."¹ The Wordsworthian garland to be found in her writings is perhaps equally impressive.

The history of her reading in Wordsworth begins with a letter of 4 September 1839, in which she speaks of her "chaotic" mind with its "scraps of poetry picked up from Shakspeare, Cowper, Wordsworth, and Milton..." (Gordon S. Haight, ed., *The George Eliot Letters*, 7 vols., New Haven, 1954-1955, I, 29). Wordsworth's presence among such distinguished company in her reading so early as 1839 is by itself an indication of her high estimate of the poetry; there were devoted Wordsworthians in the 1830's, but to be one was by no means the fashion. Two months later, in a well known passage from a letter written on her twentieth birthday, George Eliot says:

I have been so self-indulgent as to possess myself of Wordsworth at full length, and I thoroughly like much of the contents of the first three volumes which I fancy are only the low vestibule to the three remaining ones. . . . I never before met with so many of my own feelings, expressed just as I could like them (*Letters*, I, 34).

The edition to which George Eliot refers is the fifth collected edition, in six volumes, published by Moxon in 1836-1837. Her reading of the first three volumes would have given her a full sample of Wordsworth at his very best and very worst, so that the admiring opinion she expresses is based on a representative knowledge of the poetry. In the arrangement followed in the edition, substantially that of the final and authoritative 1849-1850 edition, the first three volumes include the great "Poems of the Imagination," the "Poems Referring to the Period of Childhood," the "Poems Founded on the Affections," "Memorials of a Tour in Scotland, 1803," and the "Miscellaneous Sonnets," besides the feebler Wordsworth of "The Egyptian Main" and "Inscriptions." Also within the compass of the first three volumes George Eliot would have found all of Wordsworth's most important critical statements: the "Preface" to the second edition of "Lyrical Ballads," the "Appendix" on poetic diction, the "Essay, Supplementary to the Preface," and the "Preface" of 1815. She had yet to read, as we may suppose she did soon after, *The Excursion* and the "Poems of Sentiment and Reflection," perhaps the most notable items in the volumes that remain.²

On 1 October 1840 she asks her former teacher Maria Lewis "to read if accessible Wordsworth's short poem on the

Power of Sound with which I have just been delighted" (*Letters*, I, 68: something of the reason for George Eliot's assent to this poem may be seen in the description of Maggie Tulliver's reaction to music. See Gordon S. Haight's introduction to *The Mill on the Floss*, Riverside Edition, p. xiv). There are no further direct statements that she has been reading Wordsworth in her correspondence during the 1840's, but she quotes him in a number of letters from this period.³ In May, 1852, after her move to London as John Chapman's assistant editor on the *Westminster Review*, she writes that she is growing "haggard" in London's atmosphere and asks to have sent to her "my Shakspeare, Goethe, Byron and Wordsworth" (*Letters*, II, 25). Her quotations from and allusions to Wordsworth in the reviews and essays she wrote in the years following attest her continuing interest in his poetry.

On 17 January 1858 George Eliot writes that she and Lewes are "reading [Wordsworth] now with fresh admiration for his beauties and tolerance for his faults" (*Letters*, II, 423). Her Journal entry for the next day notes that "We are reading Wordsworth in the evening—at least G. [H. Lewes] is reading him to me."⁴ And in February, 1858, according to her Journal, "G. has finished the Excursion, which repaid us for going to the end by an occasional fine passage even to the last. He has now begun the other poems of Wordsworth" (2-3 February 1858). From Lewes's Journal⁵ we learn that Lewes was reading Wordsworth to George Eliot on 22, 23, 26, 27, 29, and 30 July, 1858, though not what poems he read to her. Both of these extended readings in Wordsworth during 1858 coincide with George Eliot's writing of *Adam Bede*, begun on 22 October 1857 and finished 16 November 1858.

In the next year, Lewes recorded in his Journal that he read *The Excursion* aloud to George Eliot from 4 to 8 September 1859, when she was at work on *The Mill on the Floss*. Eight years later, Lewes's Journal for 27 and 28 June 1867 shows that he read *The Prelude* to George Eliot.⁶ The copy he read from, the second edition, published in 1851, is now at Yale, and contains a note in his hand at the end: "Read second time (aloud to Polly [i.e., George Eliot]) at Niton, reclining on the cliff or in the long grass, July 1867."⁷ In the front of the book is a note in George Eliot's hand which reads: "Began with J. [W. Cross] at Wildbad in our walk on a Sunday morning, July 1880. Finished Aug. 23." Obviously Wordsworth was an important part of her personal life, since she shared the reading of *The Prelude* with both of her husbands: "Love me, love my Wordsworth," one imagines her saying in effect. Many passages in the Yale copy of *The Prelude* have been marked in pencil, though when and by whose hand it is impossible to say with certainty. But since three of the passages marked—I, 150-157; III, 63; and VIII, 610-615—are quoted by George Eliot in one or another of her writings there is a strong probability that the marks are hers.

The remaining references to her reading occur in the last years of her life. A letter of 4 November 1879 shows that she has inspected Matthew Arnold's selection of Wordsworth's poetry, published in September, 1879 (*Letters*, VII, 221). Later in that year, in a letter to Frederic Harrison discussing the possibility of using passages from Wordsworth as Positivist prayers, she writes that she thinks no selection from Wordsworth can adequately represent him (*Letters*, VII, 261). In the weeks just before their marriage in 1880 George Eliot and Cross were reading "much of Chaucer, Shakspeare, and Wordsworth" (J.W. Cross, *George Eliot's Life as Related in Her Letters and Journals*, . . . , 3 vols., Edinburgh and London, Cabinet Edition, III, 318). After their marriage, as has already been seen from George Eliot's note in her copy of *The Prelude*, they continued reading Wordsworth. Cross states that in the fall of 1880 they "were . . . constantly reading together, Shakspeare, Milton, and Wordsworth" (*Life*, III, 370). And in the last month of her life George Eliot read, according to Cross, F.W.H. Myers's newly published life of Wordsworth in the English Men of Letters series (*Life*, III, 384; see also *Letters*, VII, 342).

The foregoing summary of evidence shows an interest in Wordsworth sustained for the forty-one years of George Eliot's adult life; fragmentary and accidental as any such record must be, it seems to confirm Cross's remark that George Eliot's early burst of enthusiasm for Wordsworth "entirely expresses the feeling she had to him up to the day of her death" (*Life*, I, 49-50).

The number and variety of George Eliot's quotations from or specific references to Wordsworth's poems indicate that she knew and admired some of the out-of-the-way places in his work as well as the more familiar pieces. The following list of poems quoted from or mentioned by name is drawn from all of her writings—letters, journals, articles, and novels—taken together,⁸ the numbers in parentheses after certain titles show the number of times the poem appears in her writings, though of course they tell nothing of the significance of a given reference—"The Power of Sound;" "The Idiot Boy;" *The Excursion* (9); "Michael;" "Tintern Abbey" (7); "London, 1802;" "Ode to Duty;" "The Affliction of Margaret;" "A Poet's Epitaph;" *The Prelude* (5); "Composed upon Westminster Bridge;" "She Was a Phantasm of Delight;" "Ode, Intimations of Immortality" (5); "The Reverie of Poor Susan;" "She Dwelt among the Untrodden Ways;" "Kilchurn Castle;" "Three Years She Grew;" "My Heart Leaps Up;" "These Times Strike;" "Yarrow Unvisited" (2); "To Joanna;" "The World is too much with Us;" "O Friend I Know not which . . .;" "Toussaint L'Ouverture;" "I Grieved for Buonaparte."

A less mechanical indication of Wordsworth's impact on George Eliot may be noted. His poems furnish the mottoes for two of her books, *Adam Bede* and *Silas Marner*, and seven of the chapter headings that, beginning with *Felix Holt*, she used in her novels. Wordsworth's total of nine is by far the largest number of such quotations from the nineteenth-century poets in George Eliot's novels: Browning, Coleridge, and Tennyson supply two each; Mrs. Browning, Keats, Shelley, and Whitman, one each. The preference she shows to Wordsworth in this matter is significant, for George Eliot made her selections carefully, and, like Scott, wrote her own mottoes when the poets failed her. She was, for example, doubtful of her wisdom in quoting Whitman, because, as she wrote to Blackwood, "since I quote so few poets, my selection of a motto from Walt Whitman might be taken as the sign of a special admiration which I am very far from feeling" (*Letters*, VI, 241).

Though a mere summary of evidence such as this is no place to go into the implications for her own work of George Eliot's interest in Wordsworth, I may suggest a few points that seem worth investigating. The Wordsworthian nature of her interest in commonplace character, her conservatism, and her emphasis on the moral value of spontaneous feeling has been noted and discussed in various places, but has not yet been fully defined; there is also much that is implicitly Wordsworthian in the psychology of her characters, especially in their relations to their own pasts and to the forces of nature. Her analysis of duty and of the philosophical reasons that support it, her conception of the historical process in society and of growth in the individual, her view of childhood, her use of setting, her theory of literary realism: these among other topics in the study

of her work might be clarified through seeing them in relation to her favorite poet, Wordsworth.

GEORGE ELIOT'S REFERENCES TO WORDSWORTH

The information in this summary list of the evidence of George Eliot's reading of Wordsworth is taken from all of her published writings, from her notebooks and those of Lewes, and from her marked copy of *The Prelude*. Some of the information from the Journals has been published in the *Letters*: in such cases I include references to both places. The volume and page numbers in the references to the novels are those of the Cabinet Edition.

I. Records of George Eliot's Reading Wordsworth

Letters: I, 29, 34, 68; II, 25, 423, 430; VII, 221, 261, 342.

Journal: 18 Jan., 2-3 Feb. 1858; 3 Dec. 1880.

Lewes Journal: 22-30 July 1858; 5-16 Sept. 1859; 27-28 June 1867.

George Eliot's Copy of The Prelude, 2nd. ed., 1851: p. 302, autograph note by Lewes; in front, autograph note by George Eliot. The following passages have been marked by pencilled underlinings or marginal lines: I, 150-157, 163-164, 190-216, 239-242, 413-414; II, 172-174, 203-209, 216-219, 309-310, 315-319, 368-376, 387-405; III, 63, 381-382, 484-490, 513-516, 600-608; VI, 448-450, 595-596, 608, 622-640; VIII, 67, 255, 332-339, 552-559, 565-573, 610-615; IX, 159-161; X, 208, 470-480; XI, 383-395; XII, 9-10, 15-22, 81-87, 96-98, 240-262, 269-271; XIII, 9, 46-47, 166-168, 245-249; XIV, 189-193, 225-231, 446-449.

II. Quotations from or Specific References to Wordsworth's Poems in George Eliot's Writings

Letters: I, 70, 71, 177, 248, 251; III, 79; IV, 149, 216, 277; V, 78, 132, 437; VI, 17; VII, 211, 261-262, 346.

Essays and Reviews: *Westminster Review*, LIV (1851), 361;

Fraser's, LI (1855), 700; *WR*, LXIV (1855), 611; LXV (1856), 22, 28; *Leader*, 12 Jan. 1856, p. 41; *Saturday Review*, I (1856), 69; *WR*, LXVI (1856), 54, 69, 458, 576.

Novels (including "Leaves from a Note-Book"):

1. *Mottoes*: *Adam Bede*; *Silas Marner*.

2. *Chapter Epigraphs*: *Felix Holt*, Ch. 18; *Middlemarch*, Chs. 52, 80; *Daniel Deronda*, Chs. 24, 40, 47, 69.

3. *Others*: *Janet's Repentance*, Ch. 27, p. 310; *The Mill on the Floss*, Bk. I, Ch. 12, I, 179; *Silas Marner*, Ch. 19, p. 247; *Felix Holt*, Introduction, p. 9; *Middlemarch*, Ch. 51, II, 351, Ch. 76, III, 349; *Daniel Deronda*, Ch. 17, I, 277: "Leaves from a Note-Book," p. 307.

III. Other Allusions to Wordsworth and His Poetry

Letters: I, 99; III, 382; V, 437, 468.

Essays and Reviews: *WR*, LXIV (1855), 298; *Fraser's*, LII (1855), 49; *WR*, LXV (1856), 295, 646, 648; LXVI (1856), 582.

Novels (including *Theophrastus Such*): *Adam Bede*, Ch. 5, I, 94; *Felix Holt*, Ch. 1, p. 40; *Middlemarch*, Ch. 2, first paragraph; *Theophrastus Such*, p. 29.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Notes and Queries*, CXCH (27 December 1947), 565.

² In the arrangement of this edition, the first three volumes contain besides those classifications already mentioned "Juvenile Pieces," "Poems on the Naming of Places," "Memorials of a Tour in Scotland, 1814," "The Waggoner," "Poems of the Fancy," "Peter Bell," and "Sonnets Dedicated to Liberty." Wordsworth made considerable rearrangement in these categories before the edition of 1849-50, but they are already in 1836 approaching their final form.

³ See the summary list of quotations from Wordsworth.

⁴ George Eliot's Journal [1849]-1861, now in the Yale University Library and quoted with the Library's permission.

⁵ For this, and the succeeding references from Lewes's Journals, I am indebted to the Yale University Library, where the Journals now are.

⁶ It is not likely that the impulse to read Wordsworth aloud came from Lewes, who was only lukewarm towards the poetry. See his review of *The Prelude*, *Leader*, 17 August 1850, summarized in Anna T. Kitchel, *George Lewes and George Eliot* (New York, 1933), pp. 111-112.

⁷ The discrepancy between the dates of the Journal entry and that given in the autograph note is perhaps to be explained by supposing that Lewes made his Journal entry some time after the event. He and George Eliot were at Niton from 26 June to 10 July 1867.

⁸ There are doubtless some further quotations from Wordsworth in the notebooks that I have not seen—those, for example, now in the Folger Library, mentioned by B.R. Jerman in *Victorian Newsletter*, No. 22, p. 23.

Knightley.² But Alice is neither naughty nor overly nice. Her curiosity leads her into the initial adventure and most of the later ones of the book, yet she is not punished for it, nor does she regret what she has done. On the other hand, we are not left with the feeling that Alice's experiences have been especially rewarding either. Alice feels great bewilderment and distress when she shoots up rapidly after sampling the cake labelled "Eat Me" and tries to establish her identity by reviewing, in her words, "all the things I used to know": multiplication tables, geography, the improving verse, "How doth the little busy bee." Nothing comes right. Her earlier experience is no help to her, and her education has not prepared her for this experience.

Indeed, one of the most striking features of the book, especially if one reviews what was standard fare for children of the time, is the strong reaction *against* didacticism which so many of the episodes illustrate. Dodgson's parodies of the instructive verse which children were made to memorize and recite ridicule its solemnity and the practice of inflicting it upon the young. Isaac Watts' "How doth the little busy bee" becomes the amiably heartless "How doth the little crocodile," and his highly edifying "The Sluggard" is rendered as a nonsensical narrative about a lobster. Alice's "Father William" is hardly the venerable patriarch of Southey's poem. Some of the characters Alice meets order her to "stand up and repeat" such poems as a test of her memory, and in other ways too they display the usual adult preachy officiousness. The Caterpillar, for example, is very abrupt and irritable with Alice, and orders her to keep her temper. Not five minutes later, the polite Alice inadvertently offends him by expressing dissatisfaction with her present height of three inches. He draws himself up to his full three inches and loses *his* temper. However, a more obvious example of unreasonableness is the Duchess. At her first meeting with Alice, the Duchess has been rude and violent, but perhaps because of her fear of beheading she is wonderfully mellower when Alice encounters her during the croquet game. In her own kitchen, she indulges in baby-beating and brutal candor. "If everybody minded their own business," the Duchess said, in a horse growl, "the world would go round a deal faster than it does." Thus she answers Alice's exclamations about the barrage of pots and pans. At the croquet-ground, she is all sweetness, though not necessarily a bearer of light. When Alice comments politely, "The game's going on rather better now," the Duchess replies,

" 'Tis so, . . . and the moral of that is - 'Oh, 'tis love, 'tis love, that makes the world go round!'"

"Somebody said," Alice whispered, "that it's done by everybody minding their own business!"

"Ah well! It means much the same thing, . . . and the moral of that is - 'Take care of themselves.'"

"How fond she is of finding morals in things!" Alice thought to herself.

In this episode, the Duchess' motto is "Everything's got a moral, if only you can find it," and she becomes more and more extravagant and nonsensical in her application of axioms to everything Alice says and does. When Dodgson makes a ridiculous character like the Duchess praise and practice moralizing in this manner, he clearly indicates his attitude toward didacticism directed against children. I wonder whether he had consciously in mind the comment in *Little Goody Two Shoes* that Mrs. Margery "had the art of moralizing and drawing instructions from every accident," as when the death of a pet dormouse gave her the "opportunity of reading them [the children] a lecture on the uncertainty of life, and the necessity of being always prepared for death."³

Not only is the Duchess inconsistent, unpleasant, and pointlessly didactic, but she is of no help to Alice in her predicament. Nor are the other characters Alice meets: with the exception of the amiable Cheshire Cat, the only one to admit he is mad, they snap at her, preach to her, confuse her, or ignore her. They behave to her as adults behave to a child—they are peremptory and patronizing. Only the eccentric Cat accepts her as an equal. In the guise of dream fantasy, Alice states the plight of a little girl in an adult world. Throughout the book Dodgson describes sympathetically the child's feelings of frustration at the illogical ways of adults—their ponderous didacticism and contradictory behavior. They aren't consistent and they aren't fair. And their puzzling use of language is one very important manifestation of their bullying and condescension; it is primarily a mode of self-exposure rather than an exercise in logic and semantics. The underlying message of Alice then is a rejection of adult authority, a vindication of the rights of the child, even the right of the child to self-assertion. Though the Queen is the most threatening of the figures Alice meets, Alice dares to contradict her at their first meeting and later at the trial; she alone has the courage to call the Queen's bluff. (Contrast with this Margery's easy accommodation to her great difficulties as a child. Margery succeeds by becoming more adult—more sensible and rational—than most of the adults of *Little Goody Two Shoes*. She lectures *them* on their follies and superstitions.) The child-adult conflict of Alice gives direction to the heroine's adventures and controls all the notable features of the work—the kind of character Alice is, her relationships with the other characters, the texture of the dialogue, and the placement of the incidents. The work can be read as a meaningful whole, and its meaning is not so very esoteric after all.

San Jose State College

ELSIE LEACH

FOOTNOTES

¹Roger W. Holmes, "The Philosopher's Alice in Wonderland," *Antioch Review*, XIX (1959), 133-149 (see also C. J. Woolfen, "Lewis Carroll: Philosopher," *Hibbert Journal*, XLVI [1947], 63-68); Alexander L. Taylor, *The White Knight: A Study of C. L. Dodgson* (Edinburgh, London, 1952), p. vi; Phyllis Greenacre, *Swift and Carroll: A Psychoanalytic Study of Two Lives* (New York, 1955); *Some Versions of Pastoral* (London, 1950), pp. 253-294. Empson says, for example, that "the rule" about talking animals in Alice "is that they are always friendly though childishly frank to Alice when she is small, and when she is big (suggesting grown-up) always opposed to her, or by her, or both." (p. 266) But he is sound in saying that they remind one of adults.

²"A Day of Misfortunes," in *Anthology of Children's Literature*, ed. Edna Johnson, Evelyn R. Sickels, and Frances C. Sayers, 3rd ed. (Boston, 1959), pp. 1123-1126.

³Johnson, Sickels, Sayers, p. 1120.

4. ARNOLD'S TYRIAN TRADER

For the immediate appreciation of a literary work the value of source studies is admittedly slight; nevertheless, the pointing out of a possible source can be useful in helping to clarify a particularly controversial passage such as the two concluding stanzas of Arnold's "The Scholar-Gipsy." In these two stanzas Arnold has used the Homeric simile of the Tyrian trader fleeing before the invasions of the Greek commercial traders. Where did Arnold get the image? Although an answer to this question can hardly be more than a reasonable guess, I should like to suggest the following.

The city of Tyre was, of course, a famous city in Biblical times — a city renowned for its trade and great wealth, and renowned for its fall. The Hebrew prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel both dealt with the fall of Tyre.

In chapter 27 Ezekiel laments the fall of Tyre and in the sixth verse he refers to the "isles of Chittim"; these were the isles of Cyprus and those surrounding it.

But the name [Chittim] came to have a much wider and somewhat vague significance. Thus Alexander the Great is said to have come 'out of the land of Chittim' [I Maccabees 1:1], where obviously Macedonia is intended: and Perseus is described as 'king of Chittim' [I Maccabees 8:5].¹

Thus, it would not seem too great an extension of meaning to posit that Arnold's lines:

The fringes of a southward-facing brow
Among the AEGaeian isles; (ll. 235-6)

refer to the isles of Chittim or to the Grecian isles, and that the ship that faces southward, foreshadowing the fall of Tyre, is the Greek coaster on its way south towards Tyre and the center of its trading activities.

In Ezekiel 27:24 there is a reference to the merchandise of Tyre bound in cords; this is similar to Arnold's concluding line, "And on the beach undid his corded bales." M. Louis Bonnerot calls attention to this similarity; moreover, he suggests a parallel between, "The young light-hearted masters of the waves" (l.241) and Ezekiel 27:26 — "Thy rowers have brought thee into great waters: the east wind hath broken thee in the midst of the seas."²

Isaiah in chapter 23 treats in a similar fashion much of this same material. The first verse reads:

The burden of Tyre. Howl, ye ships of Tarshish; for it is laid waste, so that there is no house,
no entering in: from the land of Chittim it is revealed to them.

In this verse the phrase "the ships of Tarshish" has always puzzled Biblical scholars. As a geographical location Tarshish has been identified with Tartessus (Spain), with Carthage, and with Tarsus. The "ships of Tarshish" has been interpreted as referring either to the city of their origin or to the city of their destination. A satisfactory solution to the meaning of Tarshish and the "ships of Tarshish" would be out of the question if Arnold had not explicitly stated how he interpreted these terms:

Tarshish, or Tartessus, is the mining country outside the Straits of Gibraltar, at the mouth
of the Guadalquivir, with which Phoenicia traded.³

In addition, Arnold gives his interpretation of the land of Chittim:

The Tarshish fleet is supposed to have reached Chittim, or Cyprus, on its voyage home,
and there to learn the fall of Tyre.⁴

From these quotations it can be seen that Arnold interpreted the "ships of Tarshish" as being of Tyre returning from Tartessus; the ships had stopped at Cyprus where they learned of the fall of Tyre. The situation here is strikingly similar to that of the last two stanzas of "The Scholar-Gipsy." The Tyrian trader descried the Greek intruders among the AEGaeian isles; he then turned from his ancient home of Tyre and fled west between Sicily and Syrtis on "To where the Atlantic raves" (l.246). He goes through the Straits of Gibraltar and

There, where down cloudy cliffs, through sheets of foam,
Shy traffickers, the dark Iberians come;
And on the beach undid his corded bales.(ll.248-250)

I would suggest that the Tyrian trader in the poem had come to Tartessus at the mouth of the Guadalquivir river.

This interpretation is supported by Arnold's gloss of Isaiah 23:6 — "Pass ye over to Tarshish; howl, ye inhabitants of the isle." Arnold writes:

Tyre was built on an island. The Phoenicians are bidden to betake themselves to Tarshish,
now that they have lost Tyre.⁵

This, of course, is closely similar to Arnold's description of the "grave Tyrian trader" in flight from Tyre and the AEGaeian isles. His version of Isaiah 23:10 reads: "Pass through thy land as a river, O daughter of Tarshish: there is no more

band!"⁶ Concerning this passage he writes:

With Tyre's fall the band of subjection is loosed for the colonies and the countries
dependent on Tyre; they are free.⁷

The important thought is freedom. The fall of Tyre meant freedom for her colonies and subjugation for Tyre itself; in order to avoid subjection to the feverish contact of Grecian commercialism the Tyrian trader fled to Tartessus where he could continue following his own ideal. As the Tyrian trader fled to preserve his freedom, so Arnold bids the Scholar-Gipsy to flee. The contrast between the arrogant commercialism of the Greek intruders and the less embroiling, therefore less self-corrupting, commercialism of the dark Iberians is emphasized by Arnold's use of the adjective "shy" to describe the latter.⁸

Many of the parallels between the Tyrian trader and the Scholar-Gipsy and between the merry Greeks and the "light half-believers" of the poem have been pointed out by previous critics. I should like to suggest two additional points of resemblance. It is noteworthy that Arnold keeps his parallel between the Tyrian trader and the Scholar-Gipsy exact by always referring to the Phoenician in the singular. The second point is that the passage in which Arnold writes of the contrast between the Scholar-Gipsy in his unconquerable hope and "... we, / Light half-believers of our casual creeds," (ll. 171-2) seems parallel and analogous to the contrast between the "grave Tyrian trader" and "The young light-hearted masters of the waves" (l. 241).

It is well known that Arnold's use of the simile of the Tyrian trader has frequently puzzled literary critics, for they have been troubled by the seeming irrelevance of these two concluding stanzas. Professor E. K. Brown has given one of the better interpretations of the relevance and meaning of these two stanzas of the poem:

The Tyrian trader's flight before the clamorous spirited Greeks is exactly analogous to the scholar gipsy's flight before the drink and the clatter of the smock-frock'd boors or before the bathers in the abandoned lasher or before the Oxford riders blithe. Both flights express a desire for calm, a desire for aloofness. And little ingenuity is required to discover a similarity between the gipsies and those "shy traffickers, the dark Iberians" to whom the Tyrian trader flies. There is, at the least, a general relevance to the character of the gipsy in the elaborate simile.⁹

But there is more than just a general relevance between this Homeric simile and the rest of the poem.¹⁰

A closer relevance can best be indicated by summarizing the latter half of the poem. The essence of the Scholar-Gipsy's action is that by his independence from society he has achieved immortality (stanzas 15-16). The opening lines of the next stanza recapitulate the Scholar-Gipsy's story:

For early didst thou leave the world, with powers
Fresh, undiverted to the world without,
Firm to their mark, not spent on other things;
Free from the sick fatigue, the languid doubt,
Which much to have tried, in much been baffled, brings.
O life unlike to ours! (ll. 161-166)

This freedom from "the lapse of hours," "the sick fatigue" has made him immortal by allowing him to strive to fulfill his "one aim, one business, one desire." His aim is to learn the secret of the gipsies' art:

... to rule as they desired
The workings of men's brains, (ll. 45-46)

and then to transmit the secret to the world, presumably for the benefit of mankind.

Stanzas 19-20 (ll. 181-200) establish the point that the wisdom of the wisest man is of no avail in escaping the wretchedness of life, and with this thought Arnold returns to the immortal Scholar-Gipsy who has, because of his unconquerable hope, escaped the wretchedness of life. Once again the poet muses on aspects of the Scholar-Gipsy's life and their significance. Arnold fervently cautions him to retain his immortality by avoiding contact with modern life. At this point the poet concludes the poem with the simile of the Tyrian trader.

From stanza 17 on (ll. 161-231) Arnold has used the device of recapitulation to emphasize the significance of the Scholar-Gipsy's action. As the poem gets closer to the conclusion, Arnold increases the imperativeness of his command to the Scholar-Gipsy by repeating ever more frequently and urgently the commands "Fly hence, fear our contact, keep thy solitude," for otherwise your glory and youth will die.¹¹ This movement logically ends with line 231: "Then fly our greetings, fly our speech and smiles!"

Semantically this is sufficient, but the emotional flatness resulting from such a conclusion would be terribly disconcerting. The momentum that Arnold has been building up would be pointless unless he crystallized that gathering force into a climax.

He therefore uses the two concluding stanzas as a restatement of the meaning of the poem; any further repetition similar to that found in stanzas 21-24 (ll. 201-231) would be poetically ineffective. Consequently he synthesizes and resolves (in the musical sense) the essence of the poem by using the "parable" of the Tyrian trader—a parable which not only completes the emotional effect of the poem but also expands the vision of the poem.¹²

It should, however, be pointed out that Arnold published his interpretation of Isaiah thirty years after he had first published "The Scholar-Gipsy." This fact does not disqualify, for me at least, these passages as a suggested source and as the basis for an interpretation of the Homeric simile of the Tyrian trader for two reasons: (1) the striking similarity between the passages in question; (2) the plausible assumption that Arnold was familiar with the prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel at the time he was writing "The Scholar-Gipsy."

In the light of these Biblical passages and Arnold's comments on them it seems reasonable to conclude that the picture of Tyre as drawn by Ezekiel, chapter 27, and Isaiah, chapter 23, formed the basis for Arnold's parable of the Tyrian trader.

Pfeiffer College

EARL E. STEVENS

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ W. Ewing and J.E.H. Thomson, eds., *The Temple Dictionary of the Bible* (London, 1910), p. 955.
- ² Louis Bonnerot, *Matthew Arnold, Poète* (Paris, 1947), p. 474, footnote 1.
- ³ Matthew Arnold, *Isaiah of Jerusalem in the Authorised English Version*, with an Introduction, Corrections, and Notes (London, 1883), p. 134.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁶ The King James Version reads: "Pass through thy land as a river, O daughter of Tarshish: there is no more strength." It is interesting to note that this image found in Isaiah of an individual passing through the land as a river was used several times by Arnold. See especially "The Future," "The Buried Life," "A Dream," and "Resignation."
- ⁷ Arnold, *loc. cit.*
- ⁸ One last echo is Arnold's "Shy traffickers" (1.249); this resembles Isaiah 23:8, where the Tyrian traders are referred to as "traffickers."
- ⁹ E.K. Brown, "The Scholar Gipsy: An Interpretation," *Revue Anglo-Américaine*, XII (February, 1935), 225.
- ¹⁰ A fuller interpretation and defense, justifying Arnold's use of the simile of the Tyrian trader, is given by M. Bonnerot, pp. 473-477. He writes: "Cette image n'est pas une coda mais une conclusion indispensable." (p. 473) after discussing the relevance of the analogy between the Tyrian trader and the Scholar-Gipsy, M. Bonnerot goes on to say: "Toute cette image s'ajuste fort bien, selon moi, au poème par ses détails et par son intention double qui est, d'une part de nous montrer deux aspects complémentaires de la Grèce antique: L'aspect poétique avec la pastorale Arcadie . . . et L'aspect pratique, commercial avec l'évolution de la rivalité des Phéniciens et des Grecs: et, d'autre part, en élargissant brusquement l'horizon du poème, de diriger la pensée vers les voies de l'action et de libérer l'imagination par une vision d'infini et de mystérieux." (p. 474)
- ¹¹ It seems to me that what Arnold has done here is quite similar to what Keats did in his "Ode on a Grecian Urn." See Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (New York, 1952), pp. 448-450.
- ¹² M. Bonnerot has commented on the poem's ending as an expansion of the poem's vision into the infinite (see above, footnote 10); moreover, he points out that his rhetorical device is quite typical of Arnold's poetry, p. 474.

5. JOHN HAY AS A CRITIC OF *THE RUBAIYAT OF OMAR KHAYYAM*

With the appearance of Brown University's commemorative catalogue of the life and works of John Hay (1838-1905), we are reminded of the poet-statesman's role in "The Cult of Omar" which swept England and America during the last decades of the nineteenth century.¹ From 1897 to 1898 Hay served as Ambassador to the Court of Saint James in London, and while in this capacity found it necessary to participate in many state functions, which required the presence of the American Ambassador. Yet Hay found time to deliver the main talk at the annual dinner of The Omar Khayyam Club of London, on December 8, 1897. The Ambassador was introduced by Henry Norman, secretary of the Club, as "soldier, diplomatist, poet, and Omarian."²

In his speech Hay demonstrated that he was indeed an "Omarian." He noted the impact in America made by the illustrated edition of FitzGerald's poem executed by the American artist Elihu Vedder, and further observed that his appreciation of the English poem was intensified after making a closer comparison with the Persian original. In his evaluation of the two poems, Hay stated:

Omar was a FitzGerald before the letter, or FitzGerald was a reincarnation of Omar . . . A man of extraordinary genius had appeared in the world; had sung a song of incomparable beauty and power in an environment no longer worthy of him, in a language of narrow range; for many generations the song was virtually lost; then by a miracle of creation, a poet, twin-brother in the spirit of the first, was born, who took up the forgotten poem and sang it anew with all its original melody and force, and with all the accumulated refinement of ages of art. It seems to me idle to ask which was the greater master; each seems greater than his work.³

Hay was one of many significant personalities of the age who were more than casually interested in Omar Khayyam, Edward FitzGerald, and the philosophical contents of their collaboration. When Hay gave his address at The Omar Khayyam Club, some of the members of the group were Thomas Hardy, George Meredith, Justin McCarthy, Richard Le Gallienne, Walter Besant, Arthur Conan Doyle, Austin Dobson, Edmund Keene, Grant Allen, and many others far too numerous to mention here. Yet, the main cause of the poem's tremendous popularity was its appeal to the less intellectual social classes, which constituted the bulk of the "Rubaiyat's" audience. This fact is attested to by the widespread use of Omar Khayyam's name for cigarettes, cigars, pipes, tobacco, wines, soaps, pens, and dozens of other commercial items, both in England and in America.⁴

It is an interesting footnote to the story of the poem's extraordinary vogue in English-speaking countries that the American Ambassador to England deemed it appropriate to give such an address to a private club, and in doing so, demonstrated his unconcealed delight in the poem. Hay concluded his remarks as follows: "He [Omar] will hold a place forever among the limited number who, like Lucretius and Epicurus, —without rage or defiance, even without unbecoming mirth, —look deep into the tangled mysteries of things; refuse credence to the absurd, and allegiance to arrogant authority; sufficiently conscious of fallibility to be tolerant of all opinions; with a faith too wide for doctrine and a benevolence untrammelled by creed, too wise to be wholly poets, and yet too surely poets to be implacably wise."⁵

The University of Michigan

SOL GITTLEMAN

FOOTNOTES

¹*The Life and Works of John Hay (1838-1905)* (Providence, Rhode Island, 1961).

²*In Praise of Omar: An Address Before The Omar Khayyam Club of London*, by The Honorable John Hay (Portland, Maine, 1897), 1.

³*Ibid.*, 4-5.

⁴*A Bibliography of "The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam,"* ed. Stephan Potter (Boston, 1929), 205.

⁵*In Praise of Omar*, 10.

III. ENGLISH X NEWS

A. THE CHICAGO MEETING

Chairman, Donald Smalley, *University of Illinois*; Secretary, John T. Fain, *University of Florida*.

I. Business.

II. Papers and Discussion.

1. "Browning and the Question of Myth," Robert Langbaum, *University of Virginia*.
2. "Matthew Arnold's Refuge of Art: 'Tristram and Iseult'," Robert Greenberg, *Cornell University*.
3. "Sun and Shadow: The Nature of Experience in Tennyson's 'The Lady of Shalott'," Lona Mosk Packer, *University of Utah*.

Advisory and Nominating Committee: Chairman, Francis G. Townsend, *Florida State University* (1963); G. Robert Stange, Robert C. Slack, (1962-63); Robert Langbaum, William Madden (1963-64); W. Stacy Johnson, Robert Preyer (1964-65); Donald Smalley, (*ex officio*).

1963 Program Chairman: Boyd Litzinger, *St. Bonaventure University*.

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

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

1964 Officers: Chairman, John T. Fain, *University of Florida*; Secretary, J. Hillis Miller, *Johns Hopkins University*. (Nominations to be voted on.)

B. THE VICTORIAN LUNCHEON

The Victorian Luncheon will be held in the Chicago Room, with cocktails at 12:15 and lunch at 1:15 on Friday. To make reservations, send check or money order for \$4.00 to Professor Joseph J. Wolff, 722 Elmgate Drive, Glenview, Illinois, before 15 December 1963.

C. CENTER FOR NEWMAN STUDIES

The Center for Newman Studies at Fordham University launched its program with a Symposium on the *Apologia* at Fordham on October 12. The full-day Symposium consisted of eight substantial papers, and it was attended by approximately two hundred persons. The papers ranged from that by Martin Svaglic of Loyola on "Why Newman Wrote the *Apologia*" to that by Francis Connolly of Fordham on the "Literary Reputation of the *Apologia*." Professor Connolly's paper was not a reputation study, except incidentally, but rather a most persuasive point of view concerning the literary merits of Newman's spiritual autobiography. The papers will be published as a volume late in the spring of 1964. A precis of the various papers will be published in the spring issue of VNL.

IV. RECENT PUBLICATIONS: A SELECTED LIST

MARCH, 1963 — AUGUST, 1963

I

General

ART AND ARCHITECTURE. Foskett, Daphne. *British Portrait Miniatures*. Methuen. Rev. *TLS*, 5 July, p. 488.

McLean, Ruari. *Victorian Book Design*. Oxford, A mine of detail on the varieties of book design.

Metzdorf, Robert F. "Victorian Book Decoration." *Princeton University Library Chronicle*, Winter, pp. 91-99. The effect of Oriental and medieval motifs on book illustration.

Moir, Esther. "The Architecture of Dissent." *History Today*, June, pp. 383-389. Nonconformist chapels are in the tradition of vernacular architecture—natural, organic, spontaneous.

Roskill, Mark. "Holman Hunt's Differing Versions of the 'Light of the World'." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 229-244. A study of the three versions for implications on the nature of Hunt's development and of pre-Raphaelite art generally.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PUBLISHING. Blagden, Cyprian. "Longman's Magazine," *Review of English Literature*, April, pp. 9-22. Notes on the history of *Longman's* (1882-1905).

Houghton, Esther Rhoads. "The *British Critic* and the Oxford Movement." *Studies in Bibliography* (1963), pp. 119-137. Ascribes more than 150 articles for the period 1836-1843.

Smith, Peter. "The *Cornhill Magazine* — Number 1." *Review of English Literature*, April, pp. 23-34. On the making of the first issue, which appeared December, 1859.

Tobias, R.C. "The Year's Work in Victorian Poetry: 1962." *Victorian Poetry*, August, pp. 223-230. A critical review of selected books and articles.

CRITICISM AND LITERARY HISTORY. Benziger, James. *Images of Eternity: Studies in the Poetry of Religious Vision from Wordsworth to T.S. Eliot*. Southern Illinois. Includes consideration of Tennyson, Arnold, and Browning.

Harden, Edgar F. "The American Girl in British Fiction, 1860-1880." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, May, pp. 263-285. A study of the development of three principal types: "the quadroon, the ingenue, and the title-seeker."

Miller, J. Hillis. "The Theme of the Disappearance of God in Victorian Poetry." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 207-227. The responses of Arnold, Browning, Tennyson, and Hopkins to a universe in which God was no longer immanent.

Nelson, James G. *The Sublime Puritan: Milton and the Victorians*. Wisconsin. Victorian estimates of Milton.

Preyer, Robert. "Victorian Wisdom Literature: Fragments and Maxims." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 245-262. Suggestive comments on the nature and rhetoric of the genre of the sententious fragment.

Smith, D. J. "Music in the Victorian Novel." *Kenyon Review*, Summer, pp. 517-532. Inferences, from selected fiction, on Victorian attitudes towards music.

ECONOMICS AND POLITICS. Fisher, Marvin. "Richard Cobden and the Protestant Ethic." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, Winter, pp. 43-50. In his *England, Ireland, and America* (1835), Cobden assumes a link between "providence and frugality."

McCallum, R.B. *The Liberal Party from Earl Grey to Asquith*. Gollancz. Rev. *TLS*, 3 May, p. 327.

Masse, W.E. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: The British Public and the War-scare of November 1870." *Historical Journal*, vol. VI, no. 1 (1963), pp. 38-58. Gladstone's manipulation of the public outburst against Russia.

DRAMA. Hanratty, Jerome. "Melodrama — Then and Now: Some Possible Lessons from the Nineteenth Century." *Review of English Literature*, April, pp. 108-114. Elements of Victorian melodrama which persist in the modern theater and which, if redefined, could be of major value.

HISTORY. Bartlett, C. J. *Great Britain and Sea Power, 1815-1853*. Rev. *TLS*, 17 May, p. 359.

Blaug, Mark. "The Myth of the Old Poor Law and the Making of the New." *Journal of Economic History*, June, pp. 151-184. Argues for a revision of the traditional view of the pernicious effects of the Old Poor Law.

Butt, John. "David Livingstone and the Idea of African Evolution." *History Today*, June, pp. 376-382. Livingstone's enlightened imperialism opposed both slavery and heathenry.

Clive, John. "British History, 1870-1914, Reconsidered: Recent Trends in the Historiography of the Period." *American Historical Review*, July, pp. 987-1009. The most significant trend is the sense of the interconnection of traditional divisions—political, social, economic, cultural.

Roberts, David. "How Cruel was the Victorian Poor Law?" *Historical Journal*, vol. VI, no. 1 (1963), pp. 97-107. With some exceptions, the New Poor Laws were not anywhere so cruel as tradition (and *Oliver Twist*) would have it.

Ward, J. T. *The Factory Movement, 1830-1855*. Macmillan. Rev. *TLS*, 21 June, p. 458.

RELIGION. Backstrom, Philip N. "The Practical Side of Christian Socialism in Victorian England." *Victorian Studies*, June, pp. 305-324. Emphasizes the effectiveness and continuing influence of Christian Socialism through the work of Ludlow, Neale, and Hughes.

Christensen, Torben. *Origins and History of Christian Socialism, 1848-1854*. Copenhagen.

Inglis, K.S. *Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England*. Routledge. Rev. *TLS*, 19 July, p. 527.

Masterman, N.C. *John Malcolm Ludlow: The Builder of Christian Socialism*. Cambridge.

Sellers, Ian. "Unitarians and Social Change." *Hibbert Journal*, January, pp. 76-80; April, pp. 122-126; July, pp. 177-180. A three-part article: "Benthamism and Liberty, 1815-40"; "English Transcendentalists, 1840-50"; "Dissenting Voices, 1850-1900."

SCIENCE. Reid, Leslie. "Victorian Naturalists in the Tropics." *Quarterly Review*, July, pp. 283-294. The travels and findings of H.W. Bates and Thomas Belt, both contemporaries of Darwin and Wallace.

SOCIAL. Harrison, Brian. "Drunkards and Reformers: Early Victorian Temperance Tracts." *History Today*, March, pp. 178-185. The source, nature, and intended audience of the Tracts.

Lochhead, Marion. "Happy Visits: Victorian Country House and College." *Quarterly Review*, July, pp. 306-317. The pleasures of country house living in mid-century.

Minney, R.J. *No. 10 Downing Street: A House in History*. Cassell. Rev. *TLS*, 26 April, p. 297.

Spring, David. "Aristocracy, Social Structure, and Religion in the Early Victorian Period." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 263-280. Speculations on the forces—social, commercial, religious—that encouraged the "moralizing" of the landowning aristocracy.

Thompson, F.M.L. *English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century*. University of Toronto. Rev. *TLS*, 21 June, p. 458.

Webb, Beatrice. *Beatrice Webb's American Diary, 1898*, ed. David A. Shannon. Wisconsin. Rev. *TLS*, 5 July, p. 485.

Webb, Sidney and Beatrice. *English Local Government*. 11 vols. London: Frank Cass. Among other of their studies, includes the volumes on the Poor Laws. Rev. *TLS*, 5 July, p. 485.

II

INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS

ARNOLD. Allott, Kenneth. "Matthew Arnold's 'The New Sirens' and George Sand." *Victorian Poetry*, April, pp. 156-158. Arnold reissued the poem in 1876 in homage to George Sand, who had been a stimulus to the poem's original composition.

Brooks, Roger L. "The Genesis of Matthew Arnold's 'Thyrsis'." *Review of English Studies*, May, pp. 172-174. The evidence indicates that Arnold worked longer on the poem than has been usually assumed.

Brooks, Roger L. "Some Unaccomplished Projects of Matthew Arnold." *Studies in Bibliography* (1963), pp. 213-216. An annotated list of twenty-one projects that Arnold—so far as we can tell—never completed.

Buckler, William E., ed. *Passages from the Prose Writings of Matthew Arnold: Selected by the Author*. New York University. The first reissue of Arnold's anthologizing (1880) from his own work.

Fairclough, G. Thomas. *A Fugitive and Gracious Light: The Relation of Joseph Joubert to Matthew Arnold's Thought*. University of Nebraska Studies (N.S., no. 23), 1961. A compact and discriminating study.

Fulweiler, Howard M. "Matthew Arnold: The Metamorphosis of a Merman." *Victorian Poetry*, August, pp. 208-222. "The Forsaken Merman," the two versions of "The Neckan," and "Dover Beach" show Arnold rationalizing his decision to leave Marguerite and a life of private esthetic commitment.

Gottfried, Leon. *Matthew Arnold and the Romantics*. Routledge. Successive chapters on Arnold and the Romantics (excluding Blake), and a concluding chapter on Arnold and Romanticism.

Honan, Park. "Matthew Arnold and Cacophony." *Victorian Poetry*, April, pp. 115-122. Arnold's cacophony is most often deliberate and related to the sense of the particular passages.

Kendall, J. L. "The Unity of Arnold's *Tristram and Iseult*." *Victorian Poetry*, April, pp. 140-145. The relationship of the Merlin and Vivian segment to the rest of the poem.

LeRoy, Gaylord C. "Arnold and Aseleia." *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, May, pp. 301-306. Arnold's attack on the Goddess Lubricity in his "Numbers" essay reflects his later political orientation to the right.

Lectures and Essays in Criticism. Ed. R.H. Super, with Sister Thomas Marion Hoxter. Michigan. Vol. III in the complete prose.

- BARNES. Forsyth, R.A. "The Conserving Myth of William Barnes." *Victorian Studies*, June, pp. 325-354. Barnes' rural world stood for him, imaginatively, as a coherent alternative to the urban, scientific revolution of the century.
- BRONTË. Thompson, Wade. "Infanticide and Sadism in *Wuthering Heights*." *PMLA*, March, pp. 69-74. The two motifs run throughout the novel and underlie its vision of life as pain, hate, perversity.
- BROWNING. Gainer, Patrick W. "Hy, Zy, Hine." *Victorian Poetry*, April, pp. 158-161. The phrase at the end of "Soliloquy of the Spanish Cloister" is the speaker's derisive imitation of the chapel bell.
- Guerin, Wilfred L. "Irony and Tension in Browning's 'Karshish'." *Victorian Poetry*, April, pp. 132-139. An analysis of the poem's many ambivalences and tensions, which are the sources of its structure.
- Holloway, Sister Marcella M. "A Further Reading of 'Count Gismond'." *Studies in Philology*, July, pp. 549-553. The Count's nature is similar to the Duke's in "My Last Duchess."
- Maxwell, J.C. "Browning's Conception of the Poet: A Revision in *Pauline*." *Victorian Poetry*, August, pp. 237-238. Questions an interpretation of a Browning revision.
- Monteiro, George. "Browning's 'My Last Duchess'." *Victorian Poetry*, August, pp. 234-237. The Duke has premeditated his encounter with the emissary.
- Page, David. "And so is Browning." *Essays in Criticism*, April, pp. 146-154. Browning was essentially a doubter, and his best poems are the pessimistic ones.
- Ryan, William M. "The Classifications of Browning's 'Difficult' Vocabulary." *Studies in Philology*, July, pp. 542-548. Browning's words, however "difficult," generally derive from responsible usage.
- BURTON. Brodie, Fawn M., ed. *The City of the Saints and Across the Rocky Mountain*. Knopf. A handsome reissue of Burton's account (1861) of his American travels.
- CARLYLE. Sanders, Charles Richard. "The Correspondence and Friendship of Thomas Carlyle and Leigh Hunt: The Early Years." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, March, pp. 439-485. Reviews the friendship of Carlyle and Hunt from 1832 to 1837; includes thirty letters from their correspondence.
- Sanders, Charles Richard. "Some Lost and Unpublished Carlyle-Browning Correspondence." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, April, pp. 323-335. Prints four unpublished letters, and discusses the probable contents of six that are lost.
- Tennyson, G.B. "Carlyle's Poetry to 1840: A Checklist and Discussion, a New Attribution, and Six Unpublished Poems." *Victorian Poetry*, August, pp. 161-181.
- CLOUGH. Houghton, Walter E. *The Poetry of Clough: An Essay in Reevaluation*. Yale.
- Ryals, Clyde De L. "An Interpretation of Clough's *Dipsychus*." *Victorian Poetry*, August, pp. 182-188. The poem is an ironic and humorous dramatization of Clough's own youthful development.
- Timko, Michael. "The Satiric Poetry of Arthur Hugh Clough." *Victorian Poetry*, April, pp. 104-114. Reformative in intent, Clough's shorter satiric poems are successful for their precise diction, apt imagery, intense tone, and skilful use of rhythm.
- DICKENS. Collins, Philip. "Dickens and the *Edinburgh Review*." *Review of English Studies*, May, pp. 167-172. The reasons for Dickens' having failed to fulfill his several promises, in the 1840's, to contribute to the *Edinburgh*.
- Hobsbaum, Philip. "The Critics and *Our Mutual Friend*." *Essays in Criticism*, July, pp. 231-240. A review of critical opinions; the novel must be read for its symbolic and poetic resonance.
- Spilka, Mark. *Dickens and Kafka*. Indiana.
- DOWSON. Longaker, Mark, ed. *Poems of Ernest Dowson*. Pennsylvania.
- DOYLE. Kissane, James and John M. "Sherlock Holmes and the Ritual of Reason." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, March, pp. 353-362. Holmes' use of reason and scientific method reenacts the vanquishment of illusions of supernatural powers.
- ELIOT. Cox, C.B. *The Free Spirit*. Oxford. Includes a discussion on the humanitarianism of George Eliot.
- Daiches, David. *Middlemarch*. Edward Arnold. Another pamphlet in the Studies in English Literature series.
- Isaacs, Neil D. "Middlemarch: Crescendo of Obligatory Drama." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 21-34. On the novel's "multiplicity of perception" and its dramatic structure.
- GASKELL. Dodsworth, Martin. "Women without Men at Cranford." *Essays in Criticism*, April, pp. 132-145. Emphasizes the unity (though flawed) and the psychological perceptions of *Cranford*, and relates both to the novel's underlying concern with sexual repression.
- GISSING. Korg, Jacob. *George Gissing*. University of Washington. Rev. *TLS*, 5 July, p. 494.
- HARDY. Babb, Howard. "Setting and Theme in *Far from the Madding Crowd*." *ELH*, June, pp. 147-161. The setting of the novel enforces its central theme, the natural in conflict with the civilized.
- Bailey, J.O. "Evolutionary Meliorism in the Poetry of Thomas Hardy." *Studies in Philology*, July, pp. 569-587. Follows Hardy's development, in the poetry, from his early pessimism (1862-1886) through his later meliorism (after 1908).
- Beckman, Richard. "A Character Typology for Hardy's Novels." *ELH*, March, pp. 70-87. In their response to his ironic universe, Hardy's characters fall generally into four categories, the qualities of each paralleling the qualities of the four seasons.

- Heywood, C. "The Return of the Native and Miss Braddon's *The Doctor's Wife*: A Probable Source." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 91-94. Notes similarities and contrasts, especially in the heroines.
- Morrell, Roy. "The Dynasts Reconsidered." *Modern Language Review*, April, pp. 161-171. Hardy's determinism is qualified by a belief in effective, though limited, human action.
- Scott, James F. "Thomas Hardy's Use of the Gothic: An Examination of Five Representative Works." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, March, pp. 363-380. The sources—oral and literary—and the nature of Gothic elements in Hardy's minor fiction.
- Weber, Carl J., ed. *Dearest Emmie: Thomas Hardy's Letters to his Wife*. Macmillan. Rev. *TLS*, 26 July, p. 555.
- HOPKINS. Graves, William L. "Gerard Manley Hopkins as Composer: An Interpretive Postscript." *Victorian Poetry*, April, pp. 146-155. Hopkins' ambitions as a musical composer, and the limitations he worked under.
- HOUSMAN. Franklin, Ralph. "Housman's Shropshire." *Modern Language Quarterly*, June, pp. 164-171. The "Shropshire" in Housman's title can be misleading since references to the area in the poetry are few and not always precise.
- KINGSLEY. Waller, John O. "Charles Kingsley and the American Civil War." *Studies in Philology*, July, pp. 554-568. The reasons for, and details of, Kingsley's pro-Southern position.
- MAINE. Smith, Brian. "Maine's Concept of Progress." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, July-September, pp. 407-412. Maine's theory of progress presupposed a condition of laissez-faire freedom.
- MEREDITH. Kernpeck, Harvey. "George Meredith, Sun-Worshipper, and Diana's Redworth." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 77-82. Meredith's symbolism indicates that he was a sun-worshipper, not a sun-hater, as has been argued.
- MILL. Mineka, Francis E. "The Autobiography and the Lady." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, April, pp. 301-306. A highly judicious account of the basis of the relations between Mill and Harriet Taylor.
- NEWMAN. Dessain, Charles Stephen, ed. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*. Vol. XIII. Nelson. For the period January, 1849 to June, 1850.
- Trevor, Meriol. *Newman: Light in Winter*. Macmillan. The second and final volume of an impressive *Life*.
- PATER. West, Paul. "Pater's Cordial Canon." *English*, Summer, pp. 185-188. A general broadside against Pater, for his fragmentariness and inconsistency.
- ROSSETTI. Hyder, Clyde K. "Rossetti's *Rose Mary*: A Study in the Occult." *Victorian Poetry*, August, pp. 197-207. On Rossetti's sources, and on his imaginative commitment to the occult.
- SHAW. Duerksen, Ronald A. "Shelley and Shaw." *PMLA*, March, pp. 114-127. Discriminates the influences of Shelley on Shaw.
- Gerould, Daniel Charles. "George Bernard Shaw's Criticism of Ibsen." *Comparative Literature*, Spring, pp. 130-145. A defense of Shaw's criticism of Ibsen, which is more varied and just than has been recognized.
- Meisel, Martin. *Shaw and the Nineteenth-Century Theatre*. Princeton.
- SWINBURNE. Grosskurth, P.M. "Swinburne and Symonds: An Uneasy Literary Relationship." *Review of English Studies*, August, pp. 257-268. Seen largely from Symonds' side.
- SYMONS. Goldfarb, Russell M. "Arthur Symons' Decadent Poetry." *Victorian Poetry*, August, pp. 231-234. All the elements of end-century decadence are to be found in Symons' poetry.
- TENNYSON. Marshall, George O. "Tennyson's 'Oh! That Twere Possible': A Link between *In Memoriam* and *Maud*." *PMLA*, June, pp. 225-229. The lyric, from which *Maud* grew, was inspired by Hallam's death, and echoes passages and attitudes in *In Memoriam*.
- Metzger, Lore. "The Eternal Process: Some Parallels between Goethe's *Faust* and Tennyson's *In Memoriam*." *Victorian Poetry*, August, pp. 189-196. Both poets assume the upward development of man as an inherent process of nature.
- Ryals, Clyde De L. "The Moral Paradox of the Hero in the *Idylls of the King*." *ELH*, March, pp. 53-69. In the positive act of asserting his own will, Arthur interferes with the will and thus the moral responsibility of others.
- Taafe, James G. "Circle Imagery in Tennyson's *In Memoriam*." *Victorian Poetry*, April, pp. 123-131. The many uses of circle imagery are instances of Tennyson's belief in man's spiritual progress.
- Templeman, William Darby. "A Consideration of the Fame of 'Locksley Hall'." *Victorian Poetry*, April, pp. 81-103. A chronological review of responses to the poem which makes clear its continuing appeal and its importance as an index to Tennyson's reputation.
- "The Tennyson Society." *TLS*, 14 June, p. 451. On the current status and plans of the recently organized Tennyson Society.
- THACKERAY. Williamson, Karina. "A Note on the Function of Castlewood in *Henry Esmond*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 71-77. Castlewood takes its reality from the consciousness of the characters, for whom it is a focus of emotion and association.
- TROLLOPE. Edwards, P.D. "Trollope Changes His Mind: The Death of Melmotte in *The Way We Live Now*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 89-91. In Trollope's earlier plan, Melmotte was to have had a protracted trial leading to his condemnation.

Goldberg, M.A. "Trollope's *The Warden*: A Commentary on the 'Age of Equipose'." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, March, pp. 381-390. The novel reflects the equable virtues of the 1850's.

WILDE. Hyde, H. Montgomery. *Oscar Wilde: The Aftermath*. Methuen. Wilde's experiences while in prison. Rev. *TLS*, 7 June, p. 402.

PROJECTS - REQUESTS FOR AID

AUBREY BEARDSLEY. W.G. Good is interested in learning of unpublished letters and documents. *TLS*, 29 March, p. 222.

ELIZABETH AND ROBERT BROWNING. Philip Kelley and Ronald Hudson announce long-range plans for a many-volume, definitive edition of the letters of the Brownings. *VP*, August, pp. 238-239.

JOHN CHURTON COLLINS. Phyllis M. Grosskurth wishes manuscripts and letters relating to Collins. *TLS*, 7 June, p. 408.

CHARLES LUTWIDGE DODGSON. Morton Cohen and Roger Lancelyn Green have been given exclusive permission by the literary executors of "Lewis Carroll" to collect and edit his correspondence for publication. They would appreciate hearing from anyone who owns, or knows the location of, any letters that Dodgson wrote or received. *Address*: Professor Morton N. Cohen, The City College, New York 31.

ELIZABETH GASKELL. Arthur Pollard desires the location of her letters to the Winkworth family. *TLS*, 29 March, p. 222.

GERARD MANLEY HOPKINS. For a new and enlarged edition of the *Poems*, W.H. Gardner makes two inquiries about sources. *TLS*, 29 March, p. 222.

ALEXANDER W. KINGLAKE. For a study of the literary style of *Eothen*, Iran B. Jewett hopes to locate a first draft or original manuscript, as well as letters or other relevant papers. *TLS*, 8 March, p. 174.

W.H. MALLOCK, Charles C. Nickerson wishes letters or papers relating to Mallock. *TLS*, 29 March, p. 222.

GEORGE MEREDITH. For a critical edition of the poems, Phyllis Bartlett (Queens College of the City University of New York) would like information about manuscripts in the holdings of private collectors and libraries other than the British Museum, Houghton, Huntington, NYPL, Widener, and Yale.

THE READER. John F. Byrne (Chicago Junior College, 4626 N. Knox, Chicago 30) is writing of history of this "review of current literature," 1863-1867. He would be especially indebted to scholars for information regarding marked copies, copies dated after January 12, 1867, or information regarding the editors.

D.G. ROSSETTI. For a catalogue raisonné, Virginia Surtees would like information from owners of Rossetti drawings and oils. *TLS*, 29 March, p. 222.

HERBERT SPENCER. Charles C. Nickerson is searching for Spencer's letters and papers. *TLS*, 10 May, p. 347.

J.A. SYMONDS. Robert L. Peters is interested in Symonds correspondence with a number of people, listed in *TLS*, 7 June, p. 408.

ALFRED TENNYSON. For problems of dating and composition, Christopher Ricks wishes to hear of manuscripts or "unusual sources" of information. *TLS*, 24 May, p. 375.

Cornell University

ROBERT A. GREENBERG

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 \$2.00 for one year and \$3.00 for three years. All checks should be made payable to William E. Buckler, personally, so that they may be easily negotiated.