

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER

William E. Buckler, *Editor*
New York University

Robert A. Greenberg, *Associate Editor*,
Queens College, City University of New York

Warren R. Herendeen, *Assistant Editor*,
New York University

Arthur F. Minerof, *Assistant Editor for Bibliography*,
Staten Island Community College,
City University of New York

Hugh H. Wilson, *Assistant Editor*,
New York University

Number 32

Contents

Fall 1967

	<u>Page</u>	
Arnold's Dramatic Meditations <i>by M. G. Sundell</i>	1	18 Histories and Flowers: The Organic Unity of William Morris' Late Art <i>by Andrew Von Hendy</i>
Tennyson: Unscholarly Arthurian <i>by Hugh H. Wilson</i>	5	
Gissing, Gosse, and the Civil List <i>by Paul F. Mattheisen and Arthur C. Young</i>	11	20 From Victorian to Modern: A Sketch for a Critical Reappraisal <i>by Norman Friedman</i>
"The Atmosphere . . . from Cyprus": Hardy's Development of Theme in <i>Jude the Obscure</i> <i>by Myron Taube</i>	16	28 Recent Publications: A Selected List <i>by Arthur A. Minerof</i>

INSIDE English X News
BACK
COVER

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER is edited for the English X Group of the Modern Language Association by William E. Buckler, New York University, New York, N. Y. 10003. Subscription rates in the United States and Canada are \$2.00 for one year and \$3.00 for two years. All checks should be made payable to William E. Buckler, personally, so that they may be easily negotiated.

Arnold's Dramatic Meditations

M. G. Sundell

LIONEL TRILLING tells us that at Rugby Dr. Arnold commonly set his pupils to write on the topic: "How far the dramatic faculty is compatible with the love of truth."¹ Characteristically, the Doctor chose a subject that occupied mature writers of his time and was to trouble them increasingly as the century progressed. To no high Victorian poet was the question more difficult than to the headmaster's own son, for Matthew Arnold's conception of the natures of truth and dramatic art made impossible to him any straightforward answer.

Arnold believed that for men reality and truth are flexible and uncertain. He saw this as a central fact of life, and in one way or another he made it an important theme of almost every substantial work that he wrote. His notebooks and papers also reflect this view often. For example, in his outline for "Empedocles on Etna" he remarks at one place that the philosopher "perceives still the truth of the truth."² Even as apparently simple a poem as "Sohrab and Rustum" depends on the idea that a single event can have opposite meanings. Sohrab dies directly because of a misunderstanding: his father misinterprets his demand that Rustum name himself. And Sohrab's death, heavily symbolic of the destruction of beauty and youth, is also the consummation of Sohrab's quest and the means by which Rustum is freed from the burden of war. In a remarkable passage from the Preface to the first series of *Essays in Criticism*, Arnold gives the clearest statement of his view of truth, representing it as accessible to men only if they will accept it as shadowy and multiple in its faces:

To try and approach truth on one side after another, not to strive or cry, nor to persist in pressing forward, on any one side, with violence and self-will,—it is only thus, it seems to me, that mortals may hope to gain any vision of the mysterious Goddess, whom we shall never see except in outline, but only thus even in outline. He who will do nothing but fight impetuously towards her on his own, one, favourite, particular line, is inevitably destined to run his head into the folds of the black robe in which she is wrapped.³

This belief that reality is endlessly complex, irreducible to any formula, necessarily runs counter to Arnold's favorite prescriptions for good poetry. He said numerous times

that a poem should be simple and objective, the recounting of some coherent action. But if no action is self-explanatory, how can any objective narration be other than too simple—and thereby partly false? And if no opinion is wholly correct, how can any commentary from a single point of view tell much of significance about the Goddess Truth? In his literary criticism, Arnold never managed these contradictions quite satisfactorily. He did so, however, in his best poetry, in works which gain richness from his efforts to show the complexity of life without sacrificing the coherence of art. The form he chose most often was the dramatic meditation, a kind of interior dramatic monologue. The speakers of many of these poems are faceless and nameless, but each is defined by the texture of his inner life. As distinct persons, each with his own preoccupation, they provide form for the poems they ostensibly speak. As fallible men, subject to error and confusion despite their intelligence, they show dramatically the elusiveness of truth, even while they develop their opinions. Each of them is, of course, in one sense Arnold himself, but an Arnold created dramatically anew for the purposes of a specific poem.

One such dramatic character gives life to Arnold's most famous poem. "Dover Beach" gains coherence largely from our sense that it is spoken by a particular man in a particular frame of mind. The last stanza, for example, is tightly bound to the rest of the poem only as the conclusion of a dramatic progression of thought and feeling. After describing and discussing the sea for the first twenty-eight lines, the speaker breaks into the cry, "Ah, love, let us be true / To one another!" He then goes on to picture the world as

a darkling plain
Swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight,
Where ignorant armies clash by night.⁴

Critics have pointed out that Arnold maintains in this passage much that he had originated earlier in the poem—notably the theme of battle, the cadence of the surf, and the opposition between sight and sound.⁵ But none of these unites the final stanza to what precedes it so strongly as our awareness of a single speaker whose train of thought leads him to a progressively desolate vision of the world.

1. *Matthew Arnold*, 2d. ed. (New York, 1949), p. 71.
2. C. B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry, *The Poetry of Matthew Arnold: A Commentary* (New York, 1940), p. 291.
3. *The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold*, ed. R. H. Super (Ann Arbor, 1960-), III, 286.

4. I quote Arnold's poetry throughout from *The Poetical Works of Matthew Arnold*, ed. C. B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry (New York, 1950).
5. See especially Murray Krieger, "'Dover Beach' and the Tragic Sense of Eternal Recurrence," *UKCR*, XXIII (1956), 73-79.

Horrified by what he conceives, he must be sure of at least a communion of understanding with his love. In the final lines, he attempts to make her share his vision, apparently fearful that her thoughts may not have followed his. The fact that he must seek new images to do so enhances the poignancy and drama of the poem, for it shows his despair of reaching her.

Caught in a flux of thoughts and emotions, the speaker becomes self-contradictory. He follows his plea for true love with the assertion that the world has "really neither joy, nor love, nor light, / Nor certitude. . . ." He also ceases to trust the evidence of his eyes. When he shifts imagery in the last stanza, he is moved in large part by a sense that perceived reality is illusory. Throughout the bulk of the poem, he has been worrying the sight before him, trying to make it reflect his thoughts. But interpret it as he may, the Channel appears luminous and tranquil in the moonlight, a poor vehicle to express his view that the world is embattled and naked of faith. As a result he must conjure up his own picture, borrowing it from a recollected passage in Thucydides.⁶ His inconsistency and his need to turn for adequate images to his reading and imagination display dramatically, as no straight pronouncement could alone, the extent of his feeling that all beautiful and comforting appearances are false.

Because of its dramatic nature, "Dover Beach" draws whatever authority it possesses as an account of life from the character and circumstances of its speaker. An intelligent man, ignorant of no important facts, he clearly deserves more trust than such persons as Browning's Blougram or even Karshish. Indeed, he is certainly a reflection of Arnold himself. But his opinions are strongly modified by his emotions, partially controlled by his temporary situation. He does not convey in any absolute sense Arnold's beliefs about the possibility of faith, certitude, and love in the middle of the nineteenth century. He shows dramatically what a man like Arnold might have thought at a particularly bleak moment.

The techniques Arnold uses in "Dover Beach" to resolve the demands of form and truth appear less obviously in many other poems. Like "Dover Beach" and—as Robert Langbaum has emphasized—like a great body of Romantic poetry, these works inhabit a generic borderland, not wholly objective or subjective, dramatic or lyric.⁷ In them too Arnold employs as spokesmen dramatizations of his own consciousness, characters who speak often with the sensitivity of their creator, but without the appearance of infallibility Arnold would need if he commented directly. Among such poems are "Resignation," which shows a man working

against his inclinations to define and believe a philosophy of renunciation; "The Youth of Nature"—an account of the loss and recovery of trust in the permanence of Nature's significance to man; and "The Scholar-Gipsy"—the portrayal of the achievement of a faith unsupported by observable facts. Two which I wish to discuss in some detail, as illustrations of Arnold's general method, are "Heine's Grave" and "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse." Often read as straightforward pronouncements by their author, each is more impressive taken as a dramatic meditation. In both Arnold depicts a gradual expansion of his speaker's understanding, leading not to any single conclusion but to a larger awareness of the complexity of the questions they are pondering.

Like many elegies, "Heine's Grave" grows into a comprehensive examination of a general subject, the nature and function of the artist. Although the speaker focuses his attention on Heine throughout, he gradually becomes interested in him less as an individual than as an object of study, an example of mixed failure and success as a poet. But in the opening stanzas, the speaker appears simply a literary pilgrim at the Montmartre Cemetery, musing sentimentally on Heine's heroic battle against tyranny and on his defiance of the sufferings caused by long illness. He sees Heine as a Prometheus, tortured by Heaven and justifiably proud of his determination, as

a weak
Son of mankind, to the earth
Pinn'd by the thunder, to rear
His bolt-scathed front to the stars;
And, undaunted, retort
'Gainst thick-crashing, insane,
Tyrannous tempests of bale,
Arrowy lightnings of soul.

(ll. 29-36)

Even the grave itself, as the speaker colors it in his description, reflects this view of Heine as calmly self-contained under attacks from above. The tombstone—black as though scorched by fire—sits in "Shadow, and verdure, and cool" (l. 8), though the surrounding treetops are "Touch'd with yellow by hot / Summer" (ll. 5-6).

Soon the speaker realizes that he has been falsifying Heine, neglecting his bitterness of spirit in trying to "steep him in calm" (l. 51). This recognition leads him to expand his meditation to a general consideration of poetic excellence as he tries to develop some basis for judging Heine. First he measures him against three of the greatest poets, finding that he lacks their preeminent qualities—Vergil's sweetness, Dante's austerity, and Shakespeare's radiance

6. From the account of the battle of Epipolae (VII, 43-44).

7. *The Poetry of Experience* (New York, 1957). See Chap. I, especially pp. 53-54.

and joy. Then the speaker chides Heine for the spirit in which he attacked England, "The weary Titan" (l. 88), forced to carry a burden unmatched by other countries. Heine, he says, was right in arraigning England, but guilty of failing to comprehend her toils and feel the sympathy due from one Titan, the Prometheus of Poets, to another, the Atlas of Nations. Finally, he castigates Heine for neglecting to help men forget through the charm of verse the "barren knowledge" that "*Hollow and dull are the great, / And artists envious, and the mob profane*" (ll. 119, 113-14).

Clearly the speaker is not wholly satisfied with this definition—that the great poet must possess certain qualities of soul, show brotherly love, and help men forget the harsh facts of the world. For, rather than halt his meditation, he goes on to ponder Heine's account in the *Reisebilder* of his ascent to the Brocken-tower in the Hartz mountains. As he describes the voyage, the speaker suggests the movement of his own thought about the nature of all poets.⁸ Heine first appears climbing with youthful aspiration till he stands alone, like a happier Empedocles, at the very top. Once there, the young poet gazes out over "the wide, / wide, German land" (ll. 172-73), in a scene that brings to mind a notable line from "Resignation": *Not deep the poet sees, but wide*" (l. 214). On the next day, during his descent, Heine strives out to "the dizzily perch'd / Rock—to its iron cross" (ll. 187-88) and then clings "to the Cross / . . . with smiles, with a sigh" (ll. 189-90)! After giving this account of Heine's travels, the speaker generalizes them into something of a Universal Journey of the Artist by invoking another, more famous, poet:

Goethe, too, had been there.
In the long-past winter he came
To the frozen Hartz.

(ll. 191-93)

Two details in the description of the scenery Heine passes may give further hints of the speaker's ideas. On his way up to the Brocken-tower, Heine goes

through the tall dark firs
Warming their heads in the sun,
Chequering the grass with their shade.

(ll. 156-58)

As a gentler version of the picture of the trees over Heine's grave, this passage may reflect a belief that Heine enjoyed the harmonious life necessary to poets before he became

destroyed by bitterness.⁹ The second detail, though worth notice, is even harder to interpret with assurance. Later in his journey, as Heine is approaching the iron cross, he passes the

copse

Of hazels green in whose depth
Ilse, the fairy transform'd,
In a thousand water-breaks light
Pours her petulant youth.

(ll. 181-85)

This passage calls to mind the more acrid transformation of Heine's adulthood into "Arrowy lightnings of soul" (l. 36). The story of Ilse may suggest to the speaker the proper nature of such artistic metamorphosis: charming, magical, and delicate, whereas Heine's was bitter and hard.

Taken together with the comments expressed earlier in the poem, the narration of Heine's trip furnishes a tentative and not wholly consistent general view of artistic greatness: Sweet, joyful, and loving, though austere, the poet must aspire in solitude to gain a broad vision of life. If he succeeds, he will be able to charm men into forgetting their ills. But his function also appears more somber—more sacrificial, for the iron cross to which Heine clings becomes "the Cross" itself. This implicit comparison of the poet to Christ carries forward a theme the speaker hinted at before, when he chastised Heine for being a Prometheus without compassion. Both references suggest that the poet undergoes pain and perhaps some sort of transformation so that he may bring gifts to humanity. Heine suffered the necessary torments, but he did not become by means of them a true benefactor in his art. Goethe apparently did. He, the speaker says, left the Hartz "Destined to work and to live" (l. 196). Heine came down from the Cross "Only to laugh and to die" (l. 198).¹⁰

The synopsis I have just given is more explicit and coherent than the account in the poem itself of the nature and duties of the poet. For I have abstracted and inferred ideas from the musings of a character dramatically conceived so that I might give a general picture of his thoughts. In the poem, Arnold emphasizes not so much the ideas themselves as the process of meditation from which they grow. He depicts a man trying to make sense of his feeling that Heine was a great yet unsatisfactory poet. He shows the speaker working both abstractly and through the images that occur to him toward standards by which he may measure Heine more firmly. The process does not end in any set evaluation.

8. Louis Bonnerot has shown that Arnold greatly modified Heine's own account of the trip, romanticizing the German poet. *Matthew Arnold, poète: Essai de biographie psychologique* (Paris, 1947), p. 70.

9. Arnold uses a similar image for similar purpose in "Mycerinus." He describes "happy trees, / Their smooth tops shining sun-

ward, and beneath / Burying their unsunn'd stems in grass and flowers." (ll. 86-88). These trees, joining heaven and earth, suggest a harmony in nature unavailable to Mycerinus.

10. For discussion of Arnold's most emphatic account of the sacrifice and transformation required of poets, see my "Story and Context in 'The Strayed Reveller,'" *VP*, III (1965), 161-70.

Indeed the speaker's sense of his present circumstances makes impossible any such conclusion. Just as he appears to decide that Heine was to blame for not helping mankind, he suddenly feels such a judgment inappropriate:

But something prompts me: Not thus
Take leave of Heine! not thus
Speak the last word at his grave!

(ll. 199-201)

Going on, he concludes that no man can control his fate, that each is but the manifestation of "A single mood" of the directing "Spirit in whom we exist" (ll. 215-16). Heine's life represented a "Bitter and strange" mood (l. 223); the speaker finishes by hoping his own may embody a happier one. By having his speaker recall his location and fit his last thoughts to the decorum of a graveside visit, Arnold completes his dramatic presentation, reminding us that we are to take it as such. He emphasizes that he has portrayed the thoughts occasioned in a specific man by his immediate circumstances and the feelings they excite.

Like "Heine's Grave," "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse" is read less often as a dramatic poem than as a versified essay, an analysis of the religious issues that enlivened Oxford in the 1830's and 1840's. Despite its striking passages, the poem appears unsatisfactory when taken in this way. As W. Stacy Johnson says, it "comes to seem not only inconclusive but, for all its beauties, fragmentary."¹¹ The poem is, in fact, full of confusion. Near the beginning, when Arnold mentions his first glimpse of the monastery, he makes what appears a gratuitous error as he asks: "What pointed roofs are these advance?— / A palace of the Kings of France" (ll. 23-24)? Later, after asserting that he comes to the Carthusians "Not as their friend, or child" (l. 79), he reverses himself abruptly within a few lines. Turning to the monks very much as parents—or at least friends, he calls out:

Oh, hide me in your gloom profound,
Ye solemn seats of holy pain!
Take me, cowl'd forms, and fence me round,
Till I possess my soul again.

(ll. 91-94)

Furthermore, the various persons he invokes in the course of the poem have no clear relation to one another or to himself. He is somewhat like the Carthusians, but he also resembles many other characters, some of whom have little in common with the monks. He shares the pain of the Romantic poets, the indecision of "The kings of modern thought" (l. 116), and the world-weariness of the children who live "Beneath some old-world abbey wall" (l. 170). If he feels himself in part the monks' child, he is also the son

of their antagonists, the rational and rigorous teachers of his boyhood, who followed "the high, white star of Truth" (l. 69). One could go on and on. It becomes clear that "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse" is incoherent as an analytic commentary on the Oxford Movement, the general nature of religion in England during the middle of the last century, or any other subject. The poem has form and meaning only as a characterization of a young man who, feeling himself lost between two worlds, tries to understand his situation and gain what comfort it permits. Analyzing his state of mind, casting about for analogies, gaining temporary enlightenment, and falling into confusion, he comes to perceive better, though not fully, the true cause and the inevitability of his sense of loss.

Arnold establishes his speaker's mood in the opening stanzas, in the description of the scenery along the path that leads up to the monastery. A rainy, windswept evening in autumn is apt to foster gloomy thoughts. The speaker shows by his observations and choice of words that he is in just such a frame of mind. He notices "dark forges long disused" and "limestone scars" in the hillside. The Guiers Mort seems to him to "complain" with a "strangled sound." Mist "broods" over the "boiling cauldron" of the torrent, then rises in the form of "spectral vapours" (ll. 3-13).

Contrasting with this murky scene, the shining towers of the Grande Chartreuse appear, the goal of some pilgrimage. But in fact the speaker is no pilgrim to the seat of the Carthusians. Like many tourists, he is simply visiting an old building, one which for the moment he even supposes to be secular. By his confusion he shows that he is interested less in religion than in things medieval—a taste he will demonstrate more strongly toward the end of the poem. His mistake also accounts for the turbulence of his thoughts and emotions when, upon his arrival at the monastery, he discovers his sense of kinship with its inhabitants.

Within the walls, the monks are somber and mysterious, taking time from religious duties only to cultivate their herbs. Like the landscape the speaker has described, they are quite in tune with his mood. This affinity seems to shock him, making him first disclaim and then immediately indulge his sense that the Chartreuse is his proper home. As he considers this feeling, analyzing in detail its personal and historical causes, he decides that he was maimed by his education and born in an uncongenial age. The modern world appears to him frivolous and materialistic, lacking both true gaiety and proper nobility. But the analogy by which he tries to explain his sense of isolation in contemporary England betrays this solution as incomplete. He compares himself to a group of children living in medieval times by an abbey wall. Two bands, one of warriors and

11. *The Voices of Matthew Arnold* (New Haven, 1961), p. 70.

the other of hunters, invite the children to join them. The children reply that they have long since been ruined for action or pleasure. Beautiful as this analogy is, it does not aptly express the analysis the speaker has just given. In representing himself by persons still not grown who lived in a far earlier time, the speaker suggests, apparently only half consciously, another reason for his feeling of displacement. The cause is not wholly his upbringing or the era in which he lives. He also senses himself intrinsically unfit for any sort of active life.

By portraying himself as a child, the speaker indicates one further fact about himself. After the rigorous self-examination he has just finished, he wishes to retreat from his adult consciousness, to gain at least a momentary peace from the complex and distressing matters he has been considering. This desire to escape thought becomes especially clear in the final stanza, as the children describe themselves as plants, recalling the herbs tended by the Carthusians.

Tennyson: Unscholarly Arthurian

Hugh H. Wilson

CONCERNING THE SOURCES of the *Idylls of the King*, Hallam Tennyson wrote: "On Malory, and later, on Lady Charlotte Guest's translation of the *Mabinogion*, and on his own imagination, my father said that he chiefly founded his epic; he has made the old legends his own, restored the idealism, and infused into them a spirit of modern thought and an ethical significance . . . as indeed otherwise these archaic stories would not have appealed to the modern world at large."¹ Hallam's statement exemplifies a commonly held opinion resting upon the assumption that Tennyson was intellectually and artistically in control of the *Idylls* throughout the forty years of the composition of its various parts. According to Hallam, by inference, Tennyson did research, so to speak, in a variety of sources in order to realize his Arthurian epic; in this manner he "restored" the original legends as authentically as possible and at the same time exercised his artistic prerogatives and "infused into them a spirit a modern thought." The implications in Hallam Tennyson's statement were made explicit by Tom Peete Cross in his examination of Tennyson's antiquarian interests and their contribution to the *Idylls*. Cross began: "It is improbable that, in composing a series of poems on a theme which fascinated his imagination from

When invited to leave the abbey, the children ask: "How should we grow in other ground? / How can we flower in foreign air" (ll. 207-8)?

Like the endings of "Dover Beach" and "Heine's Grave," the close of "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse" is less rational than emotional, the speech of a particular man at a troubled moment. Though all are faces of Matthew Arnold, the persons who speak the three poems are noticeably different. One a lover, mistrustful of his senses and even of his love; the next, a slightly sentimental literary gentleman; the last, a young man with a case of Byronism, overwhelmed by a sudden feeling of displacement—each, as much as the comments he expresses, is the subject of the poem to which his personality gives form. Each, by his confusion and uncertainty, shows dramatically how elusive is the Goddess whom men call Truth.

Western Reserve University

youth to old age, a writer of Tennyson's scholarly tastes and omnivorous literary habits, should have confined his reading to a few medieval romances and one or two Latin chronicles, when supposedly more authentic sources of information were accessible in the works of Celticists who claimed to present King Arthur as he appeared before he was 'touch'd by the adulterous finger' of a later age." Basing his examination on this assumption, Cross concluded "that Tennyson made an honest effort to ground his *Idylls* on the most reputable authorities of his day."² Cross's opinion has not been seriously questioned, and certainly to prove that Tennyson did or did not read Welsh with scholarly accuracy would be picayune were it not that the opinion bears directly on the definition and estimate of his purposes and achievement in the composition of the *Idylls*. For, in addition to a primary emphasis upon Tennyson's conscious manipulation of legendary material, Hallam's statement says that his father's *Idylls* were "founded" "on his own imagination," that he "made the old legends his own." In other words, by inference, Tennyson also had a personal interest in the legends; to some extent they were "his own" apart from his use of them in his poetry. Superficially, this is not surprising, but the degree to which

1. *Alfred Lord Tennyson: A Memoir* (London, 1897), II, 121-22.

2. "Alfred Tennyson as a Celticist," *Modern Philology*, XVIII (1921), 149, 156.

Tennyson's *Idylls* is a subjective work, indeed the degree to which the poet may have consciously planned the work over the long years of its intermittent composition and publication, has been obscured in part by the acceptance of opinions like those of Hallam Tennyson and Cross. To question these opinions is, therefore, to question the assumption upon which they rest: that as early as 1859, in Hallam's words, Tennyson "had carried a more or less perfected scheme of [the entire *Idylls*] in his head over thirty years" (*Memoir*, II, 125).

Tennyson himself showed more uncertainty in his attitude toward original legendary material than is allowed by the conclusions of his son and Cross. According to Edward FitzGerald, the poet said: "I could not read 'Palmerin of England' nor 'Amadis,' nor any other of those Romances through. The 'Morte d'Arthur' is much the best: there are very fine things in it, but all strung together without Art" (*Memoir*, I, 194). Granting both that Tennyson knew the "Romances" were not necessarily authentic and that he probably made this statement early in his career, still it jars with Cross's description of "Tennyson's scholarly tastes." Another rejection of legendary material appears in "The Epic," which was probably composed in 1838. Utilizing the mask of Everard Hall, Tennyson questioned both the style and substance of his poem, "Morte d'Arthur":

Why take the style of those heroic times?
For nature brings not back the mastodon,
Nor we those times; and why should any man
Remodel models rather than the life?

(Version published in 1842; ll. 35-38)

The most pertinent of similar rejections occurs in the epilogue "To the Queen," which Tennyson composed and added to his *Idylls* (then numbering ten) in 1872:

. . . accept this old imperfect tale,
New-old, and shadowing Sense at war with Soul,
Ideal manhood closed in real man,
Rather than that gray king whose name, a ghost,
Streams like a cloud, man-shaped, from mountain peak,
And cleaves to cairn and cromlech still; or him
Of Geoffrey's book, or him of Malleor's, one
Touch'd by the adulterous finger of a time. . . .

(ll. 36-43)

Here Tennyson rejects the influence of the pseudo-historical Arthur represented in the chronicle of Geoffrey of Monmouth as well as what may be called the literary Arthur represented in Malory's work. He also rejects the Arthur of tradition and memory and significantly makes no mention of the Celtic sources in which Cross

supposed he did research. Although Tennyson calls his poem "new-old," he seems more insistent upon its newness, more insistent upon the singularity of his conception of Arthur than upon its authenticity either historical or legendary.

On the other hand, despite an awareness of the singularity of his conception, Tennyson apparently felt the need to explain it by reference to original authorities. The eight sections of the *Idylls*, completed and published in 1869, were reviewed in the *Spectator* of January 1, 1870, by James Knowles, the architect of Aldworth and among Tennyson's closest associates during the latter part of his career. Knowles's opinions may be taken as Tennyson's own, for, according to Hallam Tennyson, his father considered Knowles's review as among "the best," and Knowles wrote to Hallam: "He [Tennyson] encouraged me to write a short paper . . . which I did, simply upon the lines he himself indicated" (*Memoir*, II, 126, n. 2). In his review Knowles stated: "For so exalting [King Arthur] there is abundant warrant in the language of many old compilers . . . as where, for instance, one says,—'The old world knows not his peer, nor will the future show us his equal,—he alone towers over all other kings, better than the past ones, and greater than those that are to be'; or another, 'In short, God has not made, since Adam was, the man more perfect than Arthur.'"³ These two quotations were favorites of Tennyson; they reappear in an undated note which he made upon the "Morte d'Arthur" of 1842 and left to his son: "'There was no such perfect man since Adam' as an old writer says. 'Major praeteritis futuris Regibus'" (*Memoir*, I, 194). And in order to substantiate the authenticity of his father's *Idylls*, Hallam used the same quotations: "[Tennyson] felt himself justified in having always pictured Arthur as the ideal man by such passages as this from Joseph of Exeter: 'The old world knows not his peer, nor will the future show us his equal: he alone towers over other kings, better than the past ones and greater than those that are to be'. . . . And this from the *Brut ab Arthur*, 'In short God has not made since Adam was, the man more perfect than Arthur'" (*Memoir*, II, 128-29).

Cross, directed by his assumption of Tennyson's scholarly motives, overlooked the poet's contradictory statements and concentrated upon the ostensible knowledge of recondite authors displayed in the justifications for his characterization of King Arthur. In a discussion of the quotation from the *Brut ab Arthur*, Cross wrote: "The portrayal of Arthur as an ideal man, Tennyson justified from early documents, one at least of which he regarded

3. Knowles's review is reprinted in *Tennyson and His Friends*, ed. Hallam Tennyson (London, 1911), pp. 498-99.

as representing ancient Celtic tradition. In support of his position he cited the following passage from 'an old writer': 'In short God has not made since Adam was, a man more perfect than Arthur.' The passage, as Hallam Tennyson indicates, is translated from the Welsh *Brut ab Arthur*, which the poet, in common with a number of respectable authorities of his day, regarded as the source rather than the pendant of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*. After learning Welsh, Tennyson might have consulted the original in the *Myvyrian Archaiology* (II, 229: *Ac ar vyrder ni wnaeth Duw or pan vu Ada un dyn gwblach noc Arthur*); he actually found the translation in Sharon Turner's *History of the Anglo-Saxons*.⁴ Cross's comment implies that Tennyson first came across the quotation in the original sources and then used Turner's translation to authenticate his own. In the summer of 1856, Tennyson "with the help of local schoolmasters in Wales . . . had learned some Welsh" (*Memoir*, I, 416), but this was a dubious preparation for the scholarly process implied by Cross. An examination of the translation in Turner suggests that the process may have been the reverse, if indeed the poet went any further for his knowledge of the quotation than Turner's history. Turner's translation appears in a footnote: "And, in short, God has not made, since Adam was, the man more perfect than Arthur. *Brut G. ab Arthur*." But in the following footnote on the same page in Turner also appears the quotation from Joseph of Exeter which, in each of the statements of Knowles, Hallam Tennyson, and the poet himself, is coupled with that from the *Brut*: "Joseph of Exeter, in his elegant Antiocheis, after contrasting . . . inferior achievements . . . with those of his flos regum Arthurus, adds:

Sed nec pinetum coryli, nec sidera solem
AEquant; annales Latios, Graios que revolve:
Prisca Parem necit, aequalem postera nullum
Exhibitura dies. Reges superminet omnes
Solut; praeteritis melior, majorque futuris."⁵

The conjunction of these quotations in Turner's footnotes and their repeated conjunction in Tennyson's justifications suggest that the poet first found them in Turner where they made their deepest impression upon him, an impression that he may have had no need to amplify by referring to either the original *Brut* or the *Myvyrian Archaiology*.

Other evidence of the misconception to which Cross's assumption led him can be seen in his discussion of the sources of one of Tennyson's early sketches for an Arthurian work, which reads in part:

King Arthur's three Guineveres.
The Lady of the Lake?
Two Guineveres. y^e first prim. X^{ty}. 2nd Roman
Catholicism. (*Memoir*, II, 123)

Cross said: "No better evidence could be adduced of Tennyson's early acquaintance with Welsh Arthurian tradition. The source of the story that Arthur had three wives . . . is the so-called historical Welsh *Triads*, several versions of which had appeared without translation in 1801 in the famous *Myvyrian Archaiology of Wales* (II, 1 ff.). As there is no evidence that Tennyson knew Welsh in 1833, he probably ran across the necessary information in one or both of two works that in his day were widely quoted and were regarded as indispensable to any serious investigator of British antiquities during the first half of the nineteenth century. They are William Owen's *Cambrian Biography* . . . (1803) and Edward Davies' *Mythology and Rites of the British Druids* (1809)."⁶ In the first place, the shift in the sketch from "three Guineveres" to "two" suggests that although Tennyson took the idea of three queens from some source, he did not intend to follow the original but reduced the number to suit his own thoroughly unauthentic purposes. In the second place, Cross was apparently misled by Hallam Tennyson who wrote in the *Memoir* that the sketch was "probably written" about 1833. Tennyson himself said it could have been written between 1829 and 1839 (see *Memoir*, II, 123); had it been written in 1838, he would have had no need to use the sources enumerated by Cross nor to have any knowledge of Welsh. In a footnote, Cross admitted that Tennyson "could have found a reference to Arthur's three queens in the notes to . . . Lady [Charlotte] Guest's *Mabinogion*," Part I of which was published in 1838.⁷ There is other evidence that the material outlined in Tennyson's sketch was influenced by Lady Charlotte's notes. The sketch refers to "Merlin Emrys the enchanter," the "Battle of Camlan," and "Modred . . . [who] pulls Guinevere Arthur's latest wife from the Throne." In Lady Charlotte's notes, "the three wives of Arthur, who all bore the name of Gwenhwyvar," are mentioned immediately following a description of the "battle of Camlan"; Merlin is not called "Emrys" in Malory but is so titled by Nennius in a passage paraphrased by Lady Charlotte who referred to the wizard as "the enchanter Merlin." And in a note to the battle of Camlan, she described how Modred (spelt "Mordred" by Malory) "dragged the queen Gwenhwyvar from her throne."⁸

4. Cross, p. 153.

5. Sharon Turner, *The History of the Anglo-Saxons*, 6th ed. (Philadelphia, 1841), I, 196, nn. k and m.

6. Cross, pp. 150-51.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 151, n. 1.

8. *The Mabinogion*, (New York: Everyman's Library, 1906), pp. 309, 305-6, 344.

There is, therefore, reason to doubt Cross's estimate of Tennyson's knowledge or use of "the most reputable authorities of his day"; on the contrary, the poet apparently went no further for his Arthurian material than immediately available sources "most reputable" or not. Lady Charlotte's translation of the Welsh legends was relatively popular in the middle of the nineteenth century and until recently could be had in the reprints of Everyman's Library. Tennyson probably read the work soon after the publication of its various parts. Part III, published in 1840, contained *Geraint ap Erbin*, upon which in 1856 Tennyson based his "Enid," later divided into the two idylls entitled "The Marriage of Geraint" and "Geraint and Enid." The first two thirds of "Enid"—up to the point where Geraint faints from his wound ("Geraint and Enid," l. 495f.)—follow Lady Charlotte's translation in places almost verbatim.⁹ Sharon Turner's *The History of the Anglo-Saxons* was similarly available to Tennyson; although first published in several parts in 1799 and 1805, by 1841 it had reached its sixth edition.

An examination of the other works that have been established as Tennyson's sources during the composition of the *Idylls* shows that they too were readily available to him and not necessarily chosen because of a concern for authenticity or scholarly accuracy. Gordon Haight suggested that Tennyson was familiar with the Caxton edition of Malory's *Morte d'Arthur* (1485) as it appeared in 1817 under the title *The Byrth, Lyf, and Actes of Kyng Arthur . . .*, edited and annotated by Robert Southey.¹⁰ Although now rare, Southey's edition was popular during the nineteenth century; Matthew Arnold apparently used it as a source for the tale of Merlin contained in his "Tristram and Iseult," first published in 1852. Tennyson was even better acquainted with Malory's work in editions based on the text of 1634, which, aside from textual dissimilarities, differed from the Caxton by omitting that editor's divisions into "Books" and by being entitled *The Most Ancient and Famous History of Prince Arthur*. There were two of these editions published in 1816, which represented Malory's first reappearance after 1634: one was edited by Joseph Haselwood and the other belonged to a series known as "Walker's British Classics." Sir Charles Tennyson said that the library of Tennyson's father "contained the first modern reprint of the *Morte d'Arthur* (1816)."¹¹ It was probably

this volume which Tennyson read "when, little more than a boy, [he] first lighted upon Malory" (*Memoir*, II, 128). In 1835, Leigh Hunt sent or returned a copy of a "Prince Arthur" to Tennyson which Hallam Tennyson identified: "This copy of Malory I have still in my possession, a small book for the pocket, published 1816, by Walker and Edwards, and much used by my father" (*Memoir*, I, 156, n. 2). This book may have been identical with that in Dr. Tennyson's library, inherited by the poet and passed on by him to his son. The text of 1634 used in the Walker edition of 1816 reappeared later in the century in the editions of Malory edited by Thomas Wright.¹²

In the Arthurian prose fragment reproduced in the *Memoir*, which Hallam described as "the earliest fragment of an epic that I can find among my father's MSS . . . probably written about 1833," there is a reference to "the Saxons whom [King Arthur] had overthrown in twelve battles" (*Memoir*, II, 122). The allusion to "twelve battles" indicates Tennyson's knowledge of the *Historia Britonum* of Nennius and reappears in "Guinevere" (l. 429), which was completed in March 1858. Later in the same year, Tennyson used the allusion once more in "Elaine" (now entitled "Lancelot and Elaine"); the allusion, however, was amplified and thus permits a more precise identification of Tennyson's source. Lancelot's naming of the twelve battles differs in two places from the list usually found in translations of Nennius: "the river Gleni" and "Cat Bregon" of Nennius appear in Lancelot's list as "the violent Glem" and "Agned-Cathregonion" (ll. 287, 299); Tennyson apparently saw these alternatives in the footnotes of J. A. Giles who, in 1848, edited a translation of Nennius in *Six Old English Chronicles* for Bohn's Antiquarian Library.¹³ Giles's work also contains the *Historia Regum Britanniae* of Geoffrey of Monmouth as well as the chronicles of Ethelwerd, Gildas, Richard of Cirencester, and Bishop Asser's *Life of King Alfred*. By a comparison between Tennyson's "The Coming of Arthur" and the sources available to the poet, Walther Willenweber established the influence upon the *Idylls* of another volume in Bohn's Antiquarian Library: George Ellis's *Specimens of Early English Metrical Romances*, which was also published in 1848 and contained paraphrases of various "romances" pertaining to Arthur.¹⁴

Contrary to Cross's opinion of Tennyson's supposed

9. For a comparison of Tennyson's poem and Lady Charlotte's translation, see E. Cobham Brewer, "Tennyson's Idylls: 'Geraint and Enid,'" *Notes and Queries*, 5th Ser., XII (July 5, 1897), 1-2; (August 23, 1879), 142-43, and also Herbert G. Wright, "Tennyson and Wales," *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, No. 14 (1929), pp. 71-103.

10. "Tennyson's Merlin," *Studies in Philology*, XLIV (1947), 552-53.

11. *Alfred Tennyson* (New York, 1949), p. 32.

12. *La Morte d'Arthure: The History of King Arthur*, 2d ed., 3 vols. (London, 1866).

13. *Six Old English Chronicles*, ed. J. A. Giles (London, 1848), pp. 408-9.

14. "Über Tennyson Königsidylle," *Herrig's Archiv*, LXXXIII (1889).

researches, what is notable about the works that directly influenced the *Idylls* is that they are translations and were available to Tennyson in easily obtained editions in the middle of the nineteenth century when he began the first parts of the poem. He may have read or at least looked at many of the works Cross mentioned and he no doubt would have liked to be considered a "serious investigator of British antiquities," but these facts had little immediate bearing on his composition of the *Idylls*. This is not to say that Tennyson was a careless scholar but to suggest that scholarly activity was not among his primary cares when he wrote his *Idylls*. Reversing the emphasis in Hallam Tennyson's statement, it might be more correct to say that not only the *Idylls* themselves but the poet's employment of their sources as well was "chiefly founded . . . on his own imagination."

Tennyson's typical process of selection from his sources can be exemplified by the history of King Arthur as it is outlined in various passages in "Guinevere." The novice who sits with the queen "in the holy house at Almesbury" (l. 2) tells of "a Bard" who

. . . rail'd at those
Who called [Arthur] the false son of Gorlois.
For there was no man knew from whence he came;
.....

They found a naked child upon the sands
Of wild Dundagil by the Cornish sea;
And that was Arthur, and thy foster'd him
Till he by miracle was approv'n King.

(Version published in 1859; ll. 285-87, 291-94)

The general tenor of this passage could have been suggested by several works; in addition to those already mentioned, Tennyson might have been influenced by John Colin Dunlop's *The History of Fiction*, a popular compendium that was published at the beginning of the century and that went through several subsequent editions. Matthew Arnold prefaced "Tristram and Iseult" with an extract from Dunlop when the poem was republished in 1853, and Tennyson probably saw it in this form.¹⁵ Of the beginnings of Arthur's reign, Dunlop wrote: "After the death of Uter, there was an interregnum in England, as it was not known that Arthur was his son. This prince, however, was at length chosen king, in consequence of having unfix'd, from a miraculous stone, a sword."¹⁶ The sources of the details in the passage can be more certainly identified. The name "Gorlois" came from Geoffrey of

Monmouth who related Uther's disguising himself to beget Arthur upon the wife of Gorlois (VIII, xix).¹⁷ The discovery of Arthur upon "the sands/ Of wild Dundagil" was suggested by Malory, where the baby Arthur is delivered to Merlin through the "privie posterne" of Tintagil (Caxton, I, iii). In the use of "Dundagil," however, instead of the more usual "Tintagil" of Malory or the "Tintagel" appearing in Giles's *Chronicles*, Tennyson was influenced by his personal acquaintance with the eccentric Stephen Hawker, whom he visited in Cornwall in 1848; in the poem, "The Quest of the Sangrall," Hawker wrote "Of grim Dundagel: throned along the sea!"¹⁸

Later in "Guinevere," King Arthur describes himself as the

. . . first of all the kings who drew
The knighthood-errant under me, their Head,
In that fair Order of my Table Round.

(ll. 458-60)

In the capacity of "Head," Arthur has the "Pendragonship," and bound his knights "To ride abroad redressing human wrongs" and "To lead sweet lives in purest chastity" (ll. 594, 468, 471). The institution of the Round Table is emphasized in Malory, but it also appears in Ellis's *Specimens* where Tennyson could have read how Uther "instituted the round table . . . intended to assemble the best knights in the world . . . [who] were bound by oath . . . to attempt singly the most perilous adventures; to lead, when necessary, a life of monastic solitude." In his introduction, Ellis described the various British "clans, headed by ambitious chieftains always struggling with each other. . . . The successful inroads of the Scots and Picts seem to have forced on the Britons the creation of an elective dictator or Pendragon."¹⁹ Ellis also referred to Turner's history, from which Tennyson apparently took his favorite Arthurian quotations. Turner wrote: "There were several kings at this time [during Arthur's reign] in different parts of Britain. But there appears . . . to have been a paramount sovereign; a Pen-dragon. . . . Arthur is exhibited in this character."²⁰ In addition to the title, Tennyson's Arthur wore "for crest the golden dragon . . . / Of Britain" (ll. 590-91), which elicited an inquiry whether "Pendragon" was related to the English word "dragon" or to the Welsh word "dragon" meaning "chieftain."²¹ But Tennyson either disregarded or was unaware of the word's etymology; he took the dragon crest from Geoffrey of Monmouth where Arthur appears with "a golden helmet

15. See Tennyson's letter of August 25, 1855, to G. G. Bradley, *Memoir*, I, 410.
16. *The History of Fiction*, 4th ed. (London, 1876), p. 71.
17. See Giles, p. 225.
18. *The Cornish Ballads with other Poems*, 2d ed. (London, 1884),

p. 180, l. 6; Cross noted this influence, p. 153, n. 1.
19. *Specimens of Early English Metrical Romances* (London, 1848), pp. 102, 25.
20. Turner, I, 197.
21. *Notes and Queries*, 4th Ser., I (May 2, 1868), 413.

upon his head, on which was engraven the figure of a dragon" (IX, iv).²²

In the notes to the *Idylls* which Tennyson wrote late in his career, he explained the "Pendragonship" as "the headship of the tribes who had confederated against the Lords of the White Horse."²³ In "Guinevere," Modred "tamper'd with the Lords of the White Horse, / Heathen, the brood by Hengist left" (ll. 15-16). Geoffrey of Monmouth wrote that, when Modred had usurped the throne, he promised "Cheldric, the Saxon leader . . . whatever Hengist and Horsa had possessed. . . . So that he, in obedience to his commands, had arrived with . . . pagan soldiers" (XI, i).²⁴ The epithet "Lords of the White Horse," however, was Tennyson's invention; he probably constructed it from the associations connected with "the White Horse on the Berkshire Hills," to which he had referred in "Enid" ("Geraint and Enid," l. 935). Historically this monument commemorated the defeat of the Danes by King Alfred, not King Arthur. In Thomas Miller's *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, which had reached its third edition in 1852 and was essentially a popularization of Turner's history, Miller wrote of Horsa's "banner of the white horse"; he also described "the banner of the red dragon of the Britons" which opposed the "standard of the white horse," and "the Saxon banner, with the white horse" which was brought against King Alfred.²⁵ Tennyson was undoubtedly impressed by the similarities between King Alfred and King Arthur, both of whose histories were contained in Giles's *Chronicles*.

While it is clear from this discussion that, in Cross's word, Tennyson was "omnivorous" in his readings of Arthurian literature, it is also clear that he was not directed by a scholarly interest in authenticity or by any necessity to use his reading to inform his poetry. He apparently read anything that was about King Arthur throughout his life and had substantially formed a conception of the king even before he began the *Idylls*. When he composed the summary of Arthur's history contained in "Guinevere," the various details that had made an impression upon him in his reading over a period of time came to the surface of his mind in a synthesis controlled to a large degree by the subconscious impulses of his imagination. The process of his selection was almost entirely subjective, and, because it was so, it held dangers for a poet in whose mind the question of reality, the debate between "Art" and "Life," was never resolved with stability. These dangers became even more pronounced when he attempted to write a work on

the scale of the *Idylls* over so long a time. For, being so much a part of his subjective mind, Tennyson's imagination and creativity worked for the most part beyond his conscious and intellectual control; in the words of Knowles, "he never accounted for his Poetry in any other way than that 'it came.'"²⁶ Furthermore, as Tennyson matured and aged, his subjective conception of the legendary material and his use of his sources imperceptibly shifted and changed and thus produced discrepancies and fundamental contradictions in the *Idylls* due to the work's discontinuous composition.

Tennyson occasionally was able to adjust these discrepancies; for example, when he republished "Guinevere," he substituted the more familiar "Tintagil" for the "Dundagil" he had borrowed from Hawker. But similar faults more frequently escaped his correction, either because he was interested in matters that appealed more strongly or because the faults had their roots too deep in his mind for him to perceive them objectively. The allusion to the "White Horse" in "Enid," composed in 1856, has no relationship to the epithet "Lords of the White Horse" appearing in "Guinevere"; instead it acts as part of a metaphor whose implication contradicts to some extent the association of the image with the heathen:

[Arthur] . . . look'd and found them wanting; and as now
Men weed the White Horse on the Berkshire hills,
To keep him bright and clean as heretofore,
He rooted out the slothful officer.

("Geraint and Enid," ll. 934-37)

The association of "White Horse" with the heathen apparently occurred to Tennyson during 1858 and 1859 when he composed "Guinevere" and "Elaine," but when, nearly a decade later, he wrote "The Coming of Arthur" and "The Passing of Arthur," the epithet disappeared, even though both of the later idylls describe the same wars against the heathen referred to in the earlier. In a discussion of Tennyson's employment of the *Mabinogion* during the composition of "Enid," Herbert Wright noted that Tennyson's "personages are more like human beings and less like the erratic, unaccountable creations of fairytale."²⁷ While it is true that Tennyson suppressed the elements of magic and "romance" in his original, yet, at the same time, he transformed the character of Geraint to such an extent that even favorable critics are hard put to justify the knight's brutal treatment of his wife:

22. See Giles, p. 234.

23. *The Works of Tennyson*, ed. Hallam Tennyson (New York, 1923), p. 964.

24. See Giles, pp. 268-69.

25. Thomas Miller, *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, 3d ed. (London, 1852), pp. 68, 113, 181.

26. "Aspects of Tennyson," *The Nineteenth Century*, XXXIII (January 1893), 168.

27. H. G. Wright, p. 160.

But evermore it seem'd an easier thing
 At once without remorse to strike her dead
 Than to cry 'Halt,' and to her own bright face
 Accuse her of the least immodesty.

("Geraint and Enid," ll. 108-11)

In constructing a character who believes murder easier than speech, Tennyson substituted for the "unaccountable creations of fairy-tale" a figure even more unaccountable and incredible because he acts by laws arising not from the logic of fairy tales, which many men comprehend, but from the unique and unconscious logic of one man's imagination which to a large degree that man himself did not consciously understand.

These examples are two among many—King Arthur's ambiguous denunciation of his queen being perhaps the most notorious, but they are enough to suggest that in the composition of the *Idylls* Tennyson was fundamentally careless of objective authenticity because the authenticity of his imagination had a more immediate and more power-

ful claim upon his creativity. He read in various sources not for the sake of the legends they contained but for the sake of what those legends inspired in his imagination or echoed there, and the requirements of his research were met when his imaginative needs were satisfied. His use of his sources, rather than establishing him as a "serious investigator of British antiquities," with all that phrase implies of the quality of his creativity, brings into a new light the old question of the artistic integrity of the *Idylls*. Can the work be read as a coherent comment upon a social, a moral, or a theological situation, or might it not more accurately be read as a record of the development of one man's unique imagination? When Tennyson "made the old legends his own," did he "infuse into them a spirit of modern thought" or fundamentally the spirit of his own idiosyncratic and continually evolving psychological impulses? The answers to these questions lie beyond the purpose and scope of this paper, but they are yet to be found.

New York University

Gissing, Gosse, and the Civil List

Paul F. Mattheisen

Arthur C. Young

THE REGULATIONS for the granting of pensions from the Civil List of the British Government include a provision covering persons who "by their Useful Discoveries in Science and Attainments in Literature and the Arts, have merited the gracious consideration of their Sovereign and the Gratitude of their Country."¹ Relatives and descendants may also enjoy the beneficence of the Civil List under certain conditions. Although the process of obtaining such pensions is usually a little more complicated for these persons than it is for an "original," the basic condition imposed is that there should have been some degree of dependence by the applicant upon the person whose work is being recognized. Over the years, "original" pensioners have included such literary men as Wordsworth, Tennyson, Arnold, and Austin Dobson, while "dependent" grants have been made to relatives such as Robert Southey's widow, Keats's sister (Mme. de Llanos), and Gissing's two sons.

Dependent awards are generally made shortly after the death of the distinguished individual, and they frequently

reflect the contemporary reputation of the man with more acuity than do popular notions about him or newspaper and periodical accounts. Requests for pensions, especially in the case of artists, have to pass the critical inspection of disinterested officials who may or may not have any knowledge of the artist or of his work. These officials depend on the opinions of authorities in the field who, since their critical reputations are being recognized in high governmental levels, can be assumed to be judicious in their evaluations. The judgments of the experts are not made public, so that freedom of expression is assured, permitting the writer to be as frank as he desires. The letters of recommendation required for official consideration in the matter of a pension or a grant have, therefore, interest for scholars in any field, but particularly in literature and the arts, where controversy and divergent attitudes are endemic.

When a petition is made on behalf of either an original or a dependent, it is put into the hands of a Private Secretary to the Prime Minister, who is obliged to make a

1. From the Civil List Act resolved by the House of Commons on 18 February 1834.

thorough search for facts and opinions, and then to present the case and to suggest a course of action. The Secretary seeks out authorities on whom he can rely for a qualitative judgment as well as for factual information. At the time of the appeal made on behalf of Gissing's children, shortly after his death on 27 December 1903, Edmund Gosse was still employed as a translator at the Board of Trade, but his literary achievements and his immense circle of influential friends in the art, social, and political worlds gave him wide prestige and power. He was an obvious choice as one of the men to whom the Private Secretary, working on a Civil List appeal, would turn to for sound evaluation: it was a function Gosse was uniquely able to fulfill. When, in 1904, he became Librarian to the House of Lords, a position close to the center of political power, his influence increased. In the Gosse papers at the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds, references appear to nearly fifty pensions toward the granting of which he played some part, and there were undoubtedly others in which he figured less prominently. His fairness and impartiality were granted even by those who personally disliked him: Ezra Pound, for instance, while violently attacking Gosse in 1918, nevertheless admitted that "in at least one" of Gosse's governmental positions of trust, he "has fulfilled his function with great credit and fairness."² For Gissing's children he did an admirable job.

The initial step in getting a pension for the two boys was taken by H. G. Wells, who had become a close friend during Gissing's later years.³ Wells wrote to Gosse asking about the possibility of a pension for the sons, both of whom had been supported by their father but had been separated from him some time before his death. Just a month earlier, in December 1903, Wells had also inquired about getting a grant from the Royal Literary Fund for

Algernon Gissing, George's brother, who tried to live on the small profits from the trifling novels he wrote.⁴ Then George died, and Wells put in his second request: in this instance, Gosse was more eager to be of service. Although he did not quite approve of the subject matter of Gissing's novels, which dealt with what the London *Times* obituary called "modern life under some of its least comfortable aspects,"⁵ Gosse respected the novelist's dedication and talent. In this case he seems even to have taken advantage of his private friendship with Prime Minister Balfour, as some of the letters presented here show.

Some of the correspondence dealing with the affair is either trivial or repetitious, and only important quotations are printed below. The first four letters, however, all written by Gosse, are given in full; they deal directly with the gathering of the material and with the first formulation of the appeal to the Crown. The first two have interest as records of the kind of information Gosse felt he had to know in presenting the case; the next summarizes Wells's missing reply, which reflects his biographical and critical estimate of Gissing as a friend and a contemporary writer; the final letter conveys information given to Gosse by a Mr. G. W. Orme, probably a brother or a nephew of Eliza Orme, who had become a friend of Gissing and had taken care of his second wife, Edith, before she was put into an asylum.⁶

17, Hanover Terrace, / Regent's Park, N.W. / 6.1.04

Private

Dear Wells

As soon as the Prime Minister comes back from Chatsworth I will consult him, and see whether anything can be done.

In the meantime, tell me this. Who are these wives? Is it not true that G. G. had two (or even three) wives living at the same time?⁷ It is no question of blaming or excusing, it

2. See his review of Gosse's *Life of Swinburne*, in *Poetry*, XI (March 1918), 323. It can only be speculated that Gosse's advisory work on literary pensions was the "position of trust" to which Pound referred, but in 1910 Gosse had been instrumental in getting a pension for Pound's friend W. B. Yeats, whom Gosse was suspected of not liking very well.

3. Wells met Gissing in 1895, and remarked on the similarity between his own early life and that of Reardon, in *New Grub Street*. Wells was also a recent friend of Gosse. Their correspondence seems to have begun in 1897, but there is little personal warmth until 1907, when Wells conveyed unbounded admiration for *Father and Son*, noting again the religious similarity between his own early life and that of Gosse (A.L.S., Wells to Gosse, 18 November 1907, in the Brotherton Library).

4. A collection of Well's letters to Gosse is in the Brotherton Library, but most of the letters dealing with this case are missing from it. Of the other letters printed here, those from Gosse to Wells are in the Wells Collection, University of Illinois; those to Gosse from Sir Malcolm Graham Ramsay and Algernon Gissing are in the Brotherton Library; the Public Records Office in London has preserved the official letters to Ramsay (then Private Secretary to the Prime Minister) from Gosse, Wells, and George Whale, as well as some of Ramsay's private notes and minutes. For permission to publish them, the authors are indebted to the Office of the Prime Minister, the Brotherton Library, the Uni-

versity of Illinois Library, Mr. Neil Ramsay, Sir N. A. Ramsay, and Miss Jennifer Gosse, Sir Edmund's granddaughter.

5. *Times* (London), 29 December 1903. Apparently Ramsay thought it an apt phrase, for he quoted it in a memorandum dealing with the case. Much of the information above is inferred from letters that Gosse wrote to Wells. In a letter of 28 November 1903, Gosse apologized for a recent conversation in which he confessed he was somewhat "unsympathetic" to Algernon's case, but he nonetheless offered to help him with the Royal Literary Fund. He pursued the case in a letter of 8 December, and added: "I suppose the *Great Gissing* gets on all right? Tell me in deepest confidence." George died three weeks later, and Gosse's letter to Wells of 6 January 1904 suggests that Wells turned to him immediately for help. Algernon was granted £100 by the Royal Literary Fund and continued his appeals on several other occasions: Gosse acted for him during February and March of 1908, again on 11 April 1917 (when another £100 was granted), and finally on 12 May 1920 (information supplied from the records of the Royal Literary Fund, London).

6. Orme's letter to Gosse, dated 8 January 1904, is in the Brotherton Library.

7. Gissing's first wife, Marianne Harrison, died in 1888; he married Edith Underwood in 1891, leaving her in 1897. In 1899 he went to France to live with Gabrielle Fleury.

is merely a question of fact. Were there not quite a number of events in his life which have to be treated gingerly?

If I am going to try to help I must know the exact facts, particularly about the so-called "marriages". Are the sons you speak of legitimate?⁸ The more frankly I am told the worst, the more easy it will be for me to protect G. G.'s memory from any sudden and fatal exposure.

Yours very sincerely
Edmund Gosse

1. Whitehall / S.W. / 7.1.04

Private

Dear Wells

Your letter is admirably full and useful.

One question more: Who pays for the widow in her private asylum?

Also, tell me what you know of the character, capacity and health of the two boys. What are their names?

I shall have, I think, an unusually [sic] (and unexpected) opportunity of bringing the details of the case before the Prime Minister on Saturday. I am going to lend him "By the Ionian Sea" and the autobiography,⁹ in case I find he has not read them.

If you were in town next week, I should like to have a talk with you.

Ever yours sincerely
Edmund Gosse

Will not the copyrights of G. G.'s earlier books bring in an income? Or did he sell them outright?¹⁰ *Answer this.*

Board of Trade / 7.1.04

My dear Ramsay

The facts about *George Gissing* are these:—

He was born of poor parents at Wakefield in 1857. He was a model boy at school and at Owens College; a brilliant classic. High hopes of his future were entertained. But he was very eccentric, absolutely poor, and at the age of 20 he married a domestic servant. She became a drunkard, and interfered, by her jealousy and her violence, with every effort he made to create a position for himself.¹¹

They had two children, sons, one now 13,¹² the other 8. Soon after the birth of the second, Mrs. Gissing became violently insane, and had to be put into an asylum, where she still is.

The boys were taken by Gissing's two sisters, excellent and decent spinster women, who live by keep-

ing a small preparatory school at their birthplace, Wakefield.¹³ Gissing partly supported them, and also his mother who survives. There is also a brother, Algernon, who was an expense to him.¹⁴

His novels, although of late they have been very enthusiastically admired in a small and strictly literary circle, never appealed to the masses. It was only by the strictest economy that he contrived to help all those helpless people, and to keep out of debt. His whole life was a tragedy of misfortunes and disappointments and deceptions. But his conduct in money matters was most scrupulous. He leaves no liabilities, but the two boys are quiet unprovided for, except by the kindness of their patient, admirable aunts.

I only ask Mr. Balfour to provide help to enable them to be decently educated and taught a trade. For this *I entreat*. George Gissing was a pure artist of very high rank. It is the opinion of the best judges that no one among the younger novel-writers of the day, except Kipling and Barrie, has anything like the chance which George Gissing enjoys of being permanently held an ornament to English Literature.

His career was the most miserable, the most pitiful that has been known in our time in connection with a man of such extraordinary mental powers as he possessed and developed.

I have never brought a case to Mr. Balfour's attention of the propriety of which I was more convinced.

Yours very sincerely
Edmund Gosse

1 Whitehall / S.W. / 8.1.04

My dear Ramsay

Here are some additional particulars about the George Gissing case.

1. Mrs. Gissing (his widow) is confined in Dr. Woods private asylum in Hoxton. No change in her mental condition has been observed for some years. Her physical health is good.

2. Of the boys, the elder is named *Walter*. His age is 12. He is at school in Holt in Norfolk, where £ 60 per annum has been paid for him by his father. There are scholarships at this school, and there is a good chance of Walter Gissing's getting one next June; this would reduce his costs to £ 30. He shows great intellectual capacity.

3. The other boy, Alfred, is between 7 and 8. He re-

anne Harrison, the drunkard, in 1879, separating from her in 1882. Her background is unknown, except that she had become a street girl early in her life. Edith, the second Mrs. Gissing, has been identified in some sources as a domestic, but there is no extant proof. Edith was judged insane and institutionalized in 1902, some years after the birth of Alfred in 1896.

12. Walter was only ten years old at the time.
13. Walter had been taken over by Gissing's sisters shortly after Alfred's birth. The younger boy was kept by his mother until 1902. When she was judged insane, Alfred was placed with a farm family in Cornwall.
14. Algernon frequently borrowed money from George.

8. Walter Gissing was born in 1894; Alfred Charles, in 1896; their legitimacy was never questioned.
9. Gosse probably means *The Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft*, which is not an autobiography, but fiction. Wells had sent Gosse *By the Ionian Sea* when it appeared in 1902. For Gosse's rather surprised approval, see his letter to Wells, in *George Gissing and H. G. Wells*, ed. Royal Gettman (Urbana, Ill., 1961), 205, n. 1.
10. Gissing could not afford to accept royalty arrangements; he always had to sell the copyright immediately on acceptance of the manuscript.
11. In this paragraph, the facts are confused. Gissing married Mari-

mained in the charge of his mother until she was declared insane. He is an intelligent lad, but feeble and neurotic, with a tendency to lung complaint.

4. The charge for Mrs. Gissing at the lunatic asylum is 25/ a week. This has hitherto, of course, been entirely paid by her husband. As she was a servant-girl, she has no relatives of her own to whom an appeal can be made.

If you require any other particulars, please let me know.

Yours very sincerely

Edmund Gosse

In a letter to Wells dated 8 January 1904, Gosse wisely cautioned against an undue optimism: "Do not," he said, "raise the hopes of Gissing's relatives and friends. I would rather they knew nothing at all of what we are trying to do." Both Gosse and Wells knew that Gissing's history had to be "handled gingerly" because of his erratic and unfortunate life. The government might be reluctant to approve a pension for the children of a man who had been convicted of theft, had first married an alcoholic prostitute, and who had then abandoned a second wife to live with a young woman in France. During his own lifetime Gissing tried to keep out of the public eye for fear his transgressions might become popular knowledge. As sordid as the brief tale in the above letters is, it is not exact, but it must have been pretty close to what Gissing himself told his friends; he knew he could not entirely cover his past mistakes, and so he telescoped and omitted the most painful episodes, not exactly distorting the truth, but slightly rearranging it; Gosse himself seems to have chosen to omit any reference to Gabrielle Fleury, the French mistress.

Yet the facts would occasionally creep forth even after Gissing's death. A gregarious lady who spoke of his "French wife" occasioned an exchange of letters that very nearly undid the endeavors of Wells and Gosse. Ramsay mentioned Mlle. Fleury, known as Madame Gissing, in a note dated 11 January 1904, and asked: "Is there any truth in this, or is my lady friend romancing?" The question elicited the following admission from Gosse:

Towards the end of his life a French lady formed a romantic attachment for Gissing, who responded to it. They lived together at St. Jean de Luz, and she nursed him with the most unselfish devotion to the end. She was not his wife, although after French custom in such cases, she may have called herself Madame.

This lady note [sic] fades entirely out of notice; she makes no claim and will be heard of no more.¹⁵ I did not tell you of this relation, because I thought it entirely unnecessary and impertinent. But, if the question is raised again, you have the answer.

I hope you will not fail to put the boys' case warmly before Mr. Balfour. It would be a most popular grant: the

enthusiasm for Gissing's memory rises daily. Do make Mr. Balfour read "By the Ionian Sea."

The last remark was, of course, a diversionary tactic: *By the Ionian Sea* is a travel book and hardly presents "modern life" in a form even slightly uncomfortable. And the fact that Ramsay was taken completely by surprise testifies to Gosse's ability to keep his gossip to himself when the occasion demanded. To his observation that curiosity about such matters was "impertinent," Ramsay replied the same day: "I am sorry in some ways that you did not mention the fact to me, because one likes to have a complete account of the life history of each case, even though part of it may be unnecessary and irrelevant. However, 'tis a trifle." But Gosse was unsettled: he replied instantly, in a note dated 13 January:

If I did wrong in not mentioning (I did not conceal—I simply did not mention) a certain fact in the tormented life of poor Gissing,—and there might be other distressing facts in such a career,—I hope that all the blame may rest upon me, and that the poor orphan boys will not be prejudiced by my fault?

The following day Ramsay set him at rest with a note consisting of a brief disclaimer of prejudice: "Of course poor Gissing's boys will not suffer by any fault of yours. Mind you, 'fault' is your own word, not mine!"

The correspondence with Ramsay was not reopened until 23 February, nearly a month and a half later; the interval seems to be unrecorded by any extant documents, except for a single letter from Gosse to Wells, dated 4 February. It suggests that, while official action lay dormant, private influence had started to operate; Gosse, at least, was beginning to make use of his personal friendship with the Prime Minister:

I have not a very good report to give you of the progress of my efforts for Gissing's boys. On Sunday I had the opportunity of talking very fully with the Prime Minister about the case. I am sorry to say he was not quite favourable. He appears to have been making independent enquiries as to past events, and perhaps has heard things which were better forgotten. I could not get him to say anything definite. I pressed the case of the boys upon him again, but I could feel that some prejudice has intervened.

Ramsay had also been working privately, but he was so dubious of the outcome that he suggested looking elsewhere for help. In the letter to Gosse which reopened the correspondence on 23 February, he explained that he had given Balfour *By the Ionian Sea* to read during the latter's convalescence from an illness, but he evidently saw more hope in a talk he had had with "Trench of the Board of

15. No provision was made for Gabrielle in Gissing's will. She apparently knew and understood that there could be no financial

advantage to her in living with Gissing and that she could not profit after his death.

Education."¹⁶ Trench, he said, was planning a Memorial to Gissing with the help of Wells; and Ramsay urged Gosse to join ranks in raising a sum of money, to which could be added an amount from another fund rather than the Civil List. The rest of Ramsay's letter is summarized in the following note, sent by him to Balfour on 26 February, which formally presented the case to the Prime Minister; it suggests that Ramsay was, in his own mind, rather doubtful of the propriety of the Crown granting a pension and that Gosse was more influential with the Prime Minister than had been suspected:

10, Downing Street,/Whitehall S.W.

First Lord

Another case of which you should be aware.

Gosse declares Gissing is of all modern writers the most likely to live—excepting only Barrie and Kipling.

You must help in one form or another: and the alternatives are

(1) [A grant]¹⁷ plus a testimonial fund for education of two boys.

or

(2) a small CLP of say £25 to each of the boys during their minority, payable to Trustees.

Myself, I rather incline to the latter—as being much the most business like arrangement: but I am rather doubtful whether Gissing is quite big enough.

The case is not complete yet as I believe H. G. Wells and Gosse are considering whether a fund for the education of the boys could be started—but I should much like to know your first thoughts.

MGR/26/2/4

Balfour, perhaps conditioned by conversations with Gosse, was a little more lenient than the doubtful Ramsay; he was "inclined" to give the boys pensions of £25 a year, and that information was conveyed by Ramsay to Gosse on 2 March and by Gosse to Wells on 4 March. The only stipulation was that two trustees be appointed in order to keep the funds out of the reach of Edith Gissing. Gosse himself asked Wells to be a trustee and to name another; for some reason Wells appears to have balked at the notion of sharing the responsibility, and accordingly his name alone was proposed to the Prime Minister.¹⁸

For the moment, at least, all seemed well; in fact, in his final decision, Balfour granted a pension somewhat in excess of the amount previously mentioned. Ramsay communicated the news to Gosse on 28 March and to Wells, in

an official notice, the following day; but Gosse's exuberant note of victory was the first to convey the news to Wells, on 28 March:

The Prime Minister is a brick. He has done our business. He has recommended the Gissing boys to the King for a pension, to continue as long as either is a minor, and the Royal approval has arrived today. And, whereas the highest sum he ever suggested to me was £25 each, he has given them £37 each, £74 in all.

Your name has been put down as Trustee, and the schedule has gone off to the Treasury today.

Are you pleased?

But the misfortunes that plagued Gissing during his life did not end with his death. In the case of the Civil List Pension, peace appears to have existed only for a few months, and then grief intervened in the person of Miss Clara Collett, who had met Gissing in 1893 and had corresponded with him until he died. She had begun the acquaintance by sending him copies of an article she had written on his books and then insisted on meeting him. She visited him and Edith frequently and during his domestic troubles offered advice and suggestions. There is some reason to think that Miss Collett had a more than literary interest in Gissing, an interest that was evidently not very exciting to him, although he found her intellectually stimulating. At one time she offered to be financially responsible for Walter and Alfred if anything happened to their father; he gently declined the offer, but he seems to have been moved by that circumstance to declare her as co-guardian, together with his brother Algernon, of the two boys.¹⁹ Guardianship, of course, had not entered into the plans for the Civil List Pension. But to Clara Collett, co-guardianship established an extraordinary claim to trusteeship of the pension, and she lost no time in interfering with the plans of His Majesty's Government in that regard; at least the letters quoted below suggest that she was, at times, something of a virago, although there is no evidence that she was moved by ungenerous intentions. The controversy was opened in a letter to Wells from Gosse, dated 7 July 1904:

With regard to the Trusteeship which you have kindly undertaken for the Gissing boys, the Prime Minister would be very glad to know whether you would object to adding the name of Miss Collett of the Board of Trade as Co-

16. Frederick Herbert Trench (1865-1923), the minor English poet, was examiner for the Board of Education from 1891 to 1909.

17. This reference to an Institutional Fund is omitted at the request of the Institution.

18. Late in March, Frederic Harrison seems to have heard of Gosse's attempt to help the Gissing boys. Three of his letters to Gosse are in the Brotherton Library; in them he expresses his sympathy and his indebtedness to Gissing, who had taught his sons for three

years, and he suggests that the boys be sent to Fettes College, Edinburgh. Of Gissing himself, Harrison remarked: "He was a strange being with all his genius, and much nonsense is being talked about him by those who really know nothing of the man." 19. For further information on the relationship between Gissing and Clara Collett, see Ruth M. Adams, "George Gissing and Clara Collett," *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, XI (June 1956), 72-77.

trustee with you. The reason of this is that, what none of us knew at the time that the Pension was discussed, G. Gissing has left Miss Collett and his brother Algernon guardians of the boys. Mr. Balfour thinks that it seems only reasonable that one of these guardians should be one of the boys' trustees, and I think you will agree with us that Miss Collett is, of the two, better fitted to act in this way.

Wells did not think so; Gosse in fact felt it necessary to assure him that the Prime Minister did not intend any "slight" by the suggestion. "There shall be," he wrote on 12 July, "no more question of poor Miss Collett,—whose temper I am told, resembles that of the Hyrcanian Leopard"! The Prime Minister, however, still clung to the idea that there should be a second trustee, and Gosse asked Wells either to agree to the appointment of one of Gissing's sisters or to name someone of whom he could approve. At this point Wells himself resigned his commitment, and the Prime Minister reluctantly released him from the charge. Gosse communicated this decision to Wells in a letter of 19 July, and in doing so he hit upon a

plan which ultimately proved to be the solution for which everyone was looking:

Mr. Balfour is disgusted that you should have had such difficulty. Of course he releases you from such a thankless task since you wish it. But we are now concerned about the next development, because if the wretched Miss C. has driven you to despair what would she not do to two defenceless ladies if they were appointed trustees? Would not Mr. Whale be a more fitting antagonist for the fierce C.?

George Whale, a lawyer who was an old friend of Gissing, while admitting to a general dislike for "accepting trustee-ships," finally acceded in a note to Ramsay dated 3 August 1904, and this move evidently caused Wells to reconsider his withdrawal. No further papers give the reasons for the change; but the official documents list George Whale and H. G. Wells as co-trustees, and there appears to have been no further need to provide a "fit antagonist" for "the fierce C."

Harpur College
Rutgers University

"The Atmosphere . . . from Cyprus": Hardy's Development of Theme in *Jude the Obscure*

Myron Taube

I AGREE with much of Ward Hellstrom's interpretation of *Jude the Obscure*; it is quite clear, as Hellstrom states, that *Jude* "is certainly anti-Christian."¹ However, I cannot accept Hellstrom's use of a scene in church to support his argument that *Jude* is an example of pagan assertion in opposition to Sue's Christian self-denial. Hellstrom quotes Hardy's comment on *Jude's* emotions while watching Sue: "Though he was loth to suspect it, some people might have said to him that the atmosphere blew as distinctly from Cyprus as from Galilee."² Hellstrom comments: "Hardy seems to be suggesting that it is the Hellenic element of the church that appeals to *Jude* rather than the Christian, that *Jude* is at heart a Pagan" (p. 27). I think that Hellstrom misses the point. Rather than developing *Jude's* paganism, it seems to me that Hardy is here developing what he himself thought was the theme of the novel: "the fret and fever, derision and disaster, that may press in the wake of the strongest passion known to humanity; to tell, without a mincing of words, a deadly war waged between flesh

and spirit; and to point the tragedy of unfulfilled aims" ("Preface to the First Edition," p. xx). And Hardy develops this theme in the early part of *Jude* with a modernity that has not yet been fully appreciated.

The deadly war between flesh and spirit is seen in symbol and image throughout the early part of the novel. When *Jude* daydreams of a college career, a D.D., an income of £5,000 a year, a thorough background in the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew classics, he is awakened from his reverie by a thrown pig's penis that hits him on the ear (p. 41). He was used to being shocked out of thoughts of the "higher" by the intrusion of the "lower." Before, when he read the classics as he delivered his aunt's breads to her customers, he "would be aroused from the woes of Dido by the stoppage of his cart and the voice of some old woman crying, 'Two to-day, baker, and I return this stale one'" (p. 34). But the pig's penis episode awakens him to the world of sexual desire, the world of Arabella, who "was a complete and substantial female animal—no more,

1. "Jude the Obscure as Pagan Self-Assertion," *Victorian Newsletter*, No. 29 (Spring 1966), pp. 26-27.

2. Thomas Hardy, *Jude the Obscure*, ed. Carl J. Weber (New York: Harper's Modern Classics, 1957), p. 107. Subsequent references to this work will be made in the text.

no less" (p. 42). To this animal magnetism, Jude responds: "The unvoiced call of woman to man, which was uttered very distinctly by Arabella's personality, held Jude to the spot against his intention—almost against his will, and in a way new to his experience" (p. 44). Jude is held by "a fresh and wild pleasure, that of having found a new channel for emotional interest hitherto unsuspected, though it had lain close beside him" (p. 46). The moral comment on the level of this relationship is in the pig's penis; the power of Arabella, or the personified sex urge, over Jude, is seen in Jude's response to her command: "Bring back what is lying there" (p. 43). He returns the pizzle, thus beginning his ensnarement to women.

The role of women in Jude's life is seen symbolically in the picture of Samson and Delilah on the wall of the public house to which Jude and Arabella go on Sunday evening (p. 51). For both Milton (whose divorce tracts Hardy had read³) and Hardy, Samson symbolized their own unhappy marriages and man's sexual enslavement to woman. But to Jude as Samson, both Arabella and Sue are Delilah. Both women are meant to destroy him, the one through her purely physical involvement in his life, the other because of "a constitutional inability to realize normal human reactions."⁴ As Evelyn Hardy puts it, "one of the themes of *Jude the Obscure* is the destruction, the disintegration of a strong, courageous man by two women through the agency of love, physical and intellectual."⁵ In both cases, it is Jude who loves and is destroyed by that love. But in both cases there is a strongly sexual element in Jude's love. While his love for Sue tends to be on a "higher plane," it is still a sexual love, and therein lies the significance of the passage about Cyprus.

Just as the picture of Samson and Delilah is a symbolizing on a higher level than that of the pig's penis the relationship between Arabella and Jude, so too is the reference to Cyprus a higher level reference to the sexual involvement of Jude with Sue. Jude is a strongly sexed fellow, and after his unhappy marriage with Arabella, which ends temporarily with her departure for Australia, he unconsciously seeks another outlet for his libido. He sees a picture of Sue (p. 90) and makes her the object of his sex drive. He writes to his aunt for a picture of Sue, gets it, and being "a ridiculously affectionate fellow," "put the photograph on the mantelpiece, kissed it—he did not know why—and felt more at home" (p. 99). The first time he sees her, lettering "Alleluja," "she was so pretty that he could not believe it possible that she should belong to him"

(p. 103). When Sue and a friend pass him in the street, Jude's response is as sexual as when he met Arabella: "His closeness to her was so suggestive that he trembled'" (p. 104). Of course, Jude rationalizes the impossibility of the relationship that his libido had been conjuring up; three obstacles prevent anything more than a cousinly friendship: first, he is married; second, they are cousins, and it "was not well for cousins to fall in love even when circumstances seemed to favour the passion"; third, "marriage with a blood-relation would duplicate the adverse conditions" (p. 105). Therefore, Jude would have to think of her "with only a relation's mutual interest in one belonging to him" (p. 105).

But Jude protests too much. We cannot accept his conclusions as the rationalizing of an uninvolved man: Why does he conclude that there should be nothing between them when he has not yet met the girl? It is apparent that in his own mind Jude has lusted after Sue, desiring her physically, mentally undressing her, so to speak, and then has rebuked himself. We are watching a sexually aroused male daydreaming possibilities and then concluding against the possibilities, as though the possibilities had become realities. In this part of the war between the flesh and the spirit, the moral part of Jude finds answers to the questions raised by the arousal of his sexual nature.⁶

It is in this mood—of unconscious sexual arousal and conscious attempts to suppress that arousal—that Jude goes to Sunday service. Just as he discovers Sue's seat, the choir sings from the 119th Psalm: "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way?" The Psalm itself develops the theme of flesh at war with spirit, for while the Psalmist strives for purity and a reconciliation with God, his soul "cleaveth unto the dust."⁷ Jude is in the same situation: while in church, he can't take his thoughts from his sex object. The Psalm leads him to think of "What a wicked worthless fellow he had been to give vent as he had done to an animal passion for a woman, and allow it to lead to such disastrous consequences; then to think of putting an end to himself; then to go recklessly and get drunk" (p. 107). But while carried to such depths of remorse for his own carnality, he is not so repentant as to exclude from his thoughts "the girl for whom he was beginning to nourish an extraordinary tenderness," who "was at this time ensphered by the same harmonies as those which floated into his ears; and the thought was a delight to him" (p. 107). Jude's "atmosphere of ecstasy," the result of mingled religious and sexual feelings, is not caused by

3. The passage by Milton that is used to preface Part Four, "At Shaston," is from the "Introduction" to Milton's first divorce tract, *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*.

4. Richard Carpenter, *Thomas Hardy* (New York, 1964), p. 148.

5. *Thomas Hardy: A Critical Biography* (London, 1954), p. 263.

6. Part of Jude's concern about his interest in Sue may come from his

probable awareness of Christ's commentary on the commandment against adultery: "But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Matthew 5 : 28).

7. Psalm 119 : 25.

what seems to be the discovery by an "impressionable and lonely young man" of a "supply [of] both social and spiritual possibilities" (p. 107); it is caused by his sexual attraction to Sue.

Later on, Hardy is even more explicit about this attraction. Jude sees Sue at service again, but "he dared not, in this holy spot, confront the woman who was beginning to influence him in such an indescribable manner. . . . now that his interest in her had shown itself to be unmistakably of a sexual kind" (pp. 113-14). He is just as explicit later on: "For whatever Sue's virtues, talents, or ecclesiastical saturation, it was certain that those items were not at all the cause of his affection for her" (p. 115). Jude's sexual attraction to Sue is a rebound from the animal sexuality of Arabella, associated with the pig's penis, to a higher sexual attraction, associated with Cyprus. Hardy's statement that "the atmosphere blew as distinctly from Cyprus as from Galilee" means that Jude's emotional connection with Sue is a sexual one. The significance of Cyprus is not that it is Hellenic, but that during the Hellenistic period, Cyprus was most intimately connected with the cult of Aphrodite. Most traditions of the birth of Aphrodite have her coming ashore on either Cythera or Cyprus; but it was on Cyprus that the temples to her worship were established. And those who dedicated their lives to the "foam born" were called Cyprians, *i.e.*, prostitutes. Hardy has substituted a

higher sexual symbol for a lower; for the penis of the pig he has substituted Cyprus, the home of Aphrodite, herself created from the severed genitals of Uranus.

In effect, Hardy has balanced the spiritual (Galilean) against the sexual (Cyprus), just as earlier he had balanced the spiritual (thoughts of future) against the sexual (pig's penis). But this development of the theme of the "deadly war waged between flesh and the spirit" is also inherent in the balance of the two women: spiritual Sue against fleshly Arabella. This use of contrasting elements to develop theme is seen in the plaster statues of Venus and Apollo that Sue buys. Most commentators note the significance of their later conversion to Christianity, to St. Peter and St. Mary Magdalen (p. 111). But as far as I know, no one has pointed out the significance of the choice of gods: why Venus and Apollo rather than, say, Neptune and Juno, or Diana and Mars? The significance of the statues is that they are another balancing of forces in the war between flesh and spirit: Venus is the goddess of love, the Roman Aphrodite; Apollo is the god of spirit, of soul, of reason.

I have not exhausted the possibilities of this investigation of Hardy's development of theme, a development that, in some of its techniques, is more modern than generally thought. Indeed, in his use of symbol and myth, Hardy often seems as modern as Joyce.

University of Pittsburgh

Histories and Flowers: The Organic Unity of William Morris' Late Art

Andrew Von Hendy

THE DIVERSITY of Morris' interests is distracting at every stage of his career, but the two major artistic activities of his last years seem to be especially liable to treatment in isolation. I refer to his prose romances and the Kelmscott Press. Morris himself rather encouraged the notion that the romances were unrelated to his serious concerns, the relaxation of a tired businessman. If we examine their consistent themes, however, we find them very closely related to the designs he was producing for the Press. They may, in fact, help us to verbalize the symbolism implicit in these designs. The word "organic" in my title is ambiguous. In one sense the adjective is only an intensive of the noun "unity." In another sense, however, I intend to indicate that Morris' work is unified by his conception of human experience as part of the organic process of nature.

In the romances Morris tells and retells what one of his heroes calls "the tale of Earth." With one exception, the tales commence with heroes and heroines in a state of innocence that must inevitably be ended by induction into a

state of experience. They have to earn what the Bride calls, in *The Roots of the Mountains*, "a defense against the wearing of the days." This means winning through to an idyllic life with the appropriate mate, not by guile as the state of experience would seem at first to require, but by strength and beauty and luck. These qualities are Morris' human ideals. The most significant character in the romances, as Yeats long ago pointed out, is the Goddess Habundia, the elemental spirit of abundance who blesses Morris' heroes and heroines with the grace to attain their earthly paradises.

Morris follows the romantic mystique of glorifying intense absorption in the here and now. His characters learn to repudiate immortality, to see death as the "mother of beauty." They come to accept their lives as continuous with the cycles of nature. In the work of some Romantics, Blake, for example, this endless rotation in the order of nature appears demonic in itself. But Morris stands with Nietzsche. The motto on his Well, in *The Well at the World's*

End, says its waters are for those "strong enough in desire to bear length of days," that is, to accept eternal recurrence. The Well confers, not immortality, as is sometimes claimed, but, in Fitzgerald's phrase, "a heightened sensitivity to the promises of life." Morris' earthly paradises are won in these tales by gentle worship of the organic processes of life.

During the time he wrote these seven tales, Morris produced at the Press books that were themselves mostly romances. George Bernard Shaw called Morris' late tales "a resuscitation of Don Quixote's burnt library," but he might well have been speaking of the Press itself.¹ And for his Press Morris created in these last years "six hundred and fifty-four . . . designs for initials, borders, marginal ornaments, title-pages and inscriptions, printers' marks and line-endings."² Morris himself testifies that this efflorescence is intimately connected with the stories in the books: "All organic art, all art that is genuinely growing . . . has two qualities in common: the epical and the ornamental; its two functions are the telling of a story and the adornment of a space or a tangible object."³ In spite of the typical breezy manner, Morris' claim depends on a rather radical aesthetic assumption—that stories must be decorative and decorations must tell stories.

Morris was not much interested in pursuing aesthetic theory, but when we consider the actual designs of the Kelmscott books, we can see that he acted on his principle that art has two functions. These designs resemble in general, of course, Morris' designs in tapestry and wallpaper. They helped establish what we understand by the word "Preraphaelite" in book design, just as the other work did in interior decoration. Their iconography may be easily characterized from descriptions of artifacts that appear within the romances themselves. The church-like pillars of the great House of the Wolfings are "fairly wrought with base and chapter and wreaths and knots and fighting men and dragons." When Hallblithe, in *The Story of the Glittering Plain*, comes to the pavilion of the Undying King, he finds it "wrought all over with histories and flowers."

These particular details display a general pattern. They express Morris' sense of the human "tale of Earth" as an organic part of nature. Morris creates intentionally in his romances an impression that he could go on endlessly retelling this "tale," because it is an unbroken story. No matter how it is framed, it suggests ongoing life outside the frame. And his decorations, particularly his borders, seem designed to reinforce this sense of continuity. We usually think of a frame as isolating and defining the area it encloses, but Morris' designs may be thought of as a typical symbolist attempt to transcend the limits of the artistic medium. Morris' bound book is a sylvan historian, like Keats' Urn. The leaf-fringed legend that haunts about its shape is there to tease us out of thought.

When Morris implies that there is only one "flowery tale," he refers both to literature as an institution, that is, to a verbal art that men preserve, and to the archetypal patterns of human experience. Perhaps the distinction is clearer in Robert Graves' well-known verses, "There is one story and one story only/ . . . To it all lines and lesser gauds belong." Graves' "one story" is man's archetypal experience of the White Goddess, but all good storytelling is for him a version of this experience. For Morris, the believer, as Yeats said, in *The Well and the Green Tree* and *The Earthly Paradise*, the "one story" is how man binds his days "each to each by natural piety." His tale is always a "tale of Earth." Morris' lovers of Earth are flowers, and their stories are the histories of flowers risen to articulation. There are dumb flowers all around the border of their tale to tell us where they come from. In medieval iconology the ordered flora and fauna of the dream garden signify the abundance of nature in the chain of being. Morris' designs are a sort of postromantic version of the same abundance; they express an evolutionary view of the Goddess Habundia. For Morris, the flowers in the gown and hair of Botticelli's Flora exist in the fading margins of human experience before they exist in the picture.

Boston College

1. For Shaw's remark, see his account, "William Morris as I Knew Him," printed as a preface to May Morris, *William Morris: Artist, Writer, Socialist* (Oxford, 1936), II, xxviii.

2. See the catalog of the William Morris Society exhibit, *The Work of William Morris* (London, 1962), p. 69.

3. Quoted in the catalog of the Morris Society exhibit, *The Typographical Adventures of William Morris* (London, 1957), p. 23.

From Victorian to Modern: A Sketch for a Critical Reappraisal

Norman Friedman

IT WAS ONCE commonly believed that Modernism in literature represented a sharp break from the Romantics and Victorians of the nineteenth century. And one could view this break favorably, as did the modernist himself, or unfavorably, as did the Philistine: the former saw the nineteenth century as cloudy, vague, cosmic, and emotional, while claiming the twentieth century is hard, clear, particular, and intellectual; the latter, on the other hand, saw the twentieth century as obscure, private, meaningless, and morbid, while claiming the nineteenth century is clear, traditional, significant, and healthy.

In the past ten or fifteen years, however, several trends have been reversing this belief. In the first place, critics and scholars who have been taking a second and closer look at what and how the Victorians actually wrote, have come up with the undeniable fact that these men were far from the complacent and optimistic stuffed shirts we had thought they were; that they were, in fact, troubled, alienated, uncertain, and experimental. I refer to such pioneering studies as E. D. H. Johnson's *The Alien Vision of Victorian Poetry* (1952) and Gaylord C. LeRoy's *Perplexed Prophets* (1953). In the second place, several important studies have been published which argue cogently that, as the Victorians were more modern than we had thought (Robert Langbaum, *The Poetry of Experience* [1957], and Frank Kermode, *Romantic Image* [1957]), so too are the Modernists more Romantic than we had thought (Murray Krieger, *The New Apologists* [1956], John Bayley, *The Romantic Survival* [1957], and Richard Foster, *The New Romantics* [1962]).

It is likely, indeed, that the literary history of the past two hundred years will be ultimately written in terms of Romanticism, and it is, as we shall see, because of their common source in Romanticism that Victorianism and Modernism can be more truly regarded as phases of essentially the same movement. As G. D. Klingopulos puts it:

It is probable that in time the titles 'Romantic' and 'Victorian' will be dropped and the whole of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries come to be described as a single epoch, manifesting one special effort and tendency. . . . The works of twentieth-century writers such as Conrad, Yeats, Lawrence, Forster, and Eliot have to be understood as attempts to go beyond Tennyson, or Browning, or George Eliot, and to carry a stage further the great debates about human existence initiated by the Romantic poets.¹

The Modernist revolution, then, as Edward E. Bostetter says, "can be seen not as originating from outside the Romantic tradition and dedicated to replacing it by a totally different 'ism' but as taking place within the tradition itself, a palace revolution as it were."²

These recent critical trends do not necessarily represent, however, a blurring of distinctions. It is always good, as Mill said, to overturn the old categories—even if they are true—for then we are encouraged to examine our convictions afresh and thence keep them alive and meaningful. But there is more to the present case than that: the old categories must give way, not to chaos, but rather to more accurate ones. We are, in effect, redefining and reclassifying so that the differences may be seen more clearly against the background of the similarities. There *are*, admittedly, many differences between Victorianism and Modernism, as well as between both of these and Romanticism—for the Romantic poem does not characteristically seek impersonality, for example—but we need a stricter sense of what these differences really mean. The present essay will attempt to consolidate the preliminary stages of this ongoing reappraisal—an examination of the similarities.

I will begin with a definition of Modernism which I hope will sound familiar, for I want to bring out the obvious points on which everyone can agree. Otherwise, I will be laying myself open to the charge that I am finding Modernist elements in the Victorians only in a special and eccentric sense. But I want to make my definition a bit more coherent than is usually the case, so that its parts will be seen in relation to the whole. Once this is done, the relation of Modernism to Romanticism can be indicated. Then we can come back up through the Victorian period, touching upon a few key points and highlighting the crucial texts that illustrate the continuity of the central poetic doctrine.

I

What, then, is Modernism? We all know that many of its representative works are difficult and—especially to the Philistine—obscure and strange. Indeed, that is normally why we think of twentieth-century literature as being radically different from nineteenth-century literature, for who thinks of Keats or Tennyson as hard to read? If we inquire more deeply into these matters, however, I think we will find not only that Keats and Tennyson *are*

1. *Dickens to Hardy*, ed. Boris Ford (Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1958), pp. 60-61.

2. "The New Romantic Criticism," *Se R*, LXIX (1961), 490-500.

harder to read than we thought, but also that there are very good reasons underlying the distortions found in modern literature, and that these reasons are based on a serious and honest way of looking at the world.

It is best to begin, therefore, with the fundamental metaphysic of Modernism and then to trace step by step its workings in the Modernist aesthetic. A view of art is, after all, part of a larger cultural pattern and should be seen in relation to that context. Before going on, however, I want to qualify my argument on two points. It should be understood, in the first place, that I am using the term "Modernism" in a limited sense and not to refer to all of twentieth-century literature. What I have mainly in mind when I discuss Modernism are the writings of T. E. Hulme, Yeats, Pound, Eliot, Stevens, Auden, Richards, Ransom, Brooks, Warren, Blackmur, and Tate. It may be that the doctrine I ascribe to these men may partially fit others as well, and it may be that it doesn't fit even all these equally well. I do think, however, that there is something central here, and I would like to try to describe it, qualifications notwithstanding. Secondly, it should also be understood, as I try to analyze the Modernist poetic, that I intend to present it from the Modernist point of view and not necessarily from my own, for I do not agree with it on all counts myself.

The Modernist metaphysic is by now a familiar one, and it takes something like the following shape. Due to the combined and pervasive influence of science, democracy, and the industrial revolution, the traditionally fixed and stable values of a Christian, aristocratic, and agrarian culture have been—and are still being—destroyed. Nor are new substitute values easy to come by. We are wandering, as Carlyle and Arnold said and as many other Victorians realized, between two worlds, one dead and the other unable to be born. The Modernist knows, however, that values are not built into the universe and that, if he is to find new ones, they must be constructed on a new basis. He must start, that is, not with a world of certainty but one of doubt. For him, the visionary gleam has fled, and he must begin by confronting the void without as well as the newly sensed abyss within.

His reaction to this confrontation is, of course, initially one of despair. That is why he so often gives the impression of being sterile, negative, destructive, and nihilistic. But that is far from the end of the story, and those who say that Modernism is empty and meaningless are looking only at a small part of the whole picture. Characteristically, his next step is to cast about him for the means of affirmation, only this time it must be an affirmation that incorporates reality as it is. He knows he cannot comfort himself with the old certainty that what he wants is somehow

out there, but he knows nevertheless that what he wants is somehow real too. The trouble, he says, with the old values is that they were mistakenly based on what were taken to be factual truths and that many of these supposed facts have turned out to be false. But science is not the answer either, for the truth of science is only a limited and select kind of truth, and it cannot serve us in the larger purposes of life. That task is reserved for literature, which must try to build values not on what is *supposed* to be out there but what actually *is*: a double task of facing reality and yet transcending it.

And how is this done? The Modernist insists that we give up simple pictures of the world altogether, whether of the old religions or of the new sciences. For him, reality is subtle, complex, many sided, concrete, and hence his approach to it is skeptical, tentative, relativistic, pluralistic. The whole is greater than the sum of its parts, says this organicist and contextualist view, and unity, when it comes in those rare and fleeting moments of vision, can only come by means of multiplicity. Although he knows we cannot make the world be what we want it to be, he also knows that the world—at least in so far as we can know it—comes to us already partly shaped by our imagination, that what we see is partly determined by how we look. Reality, for him, is complex precisely because it involves this interplay between mind and world, being neither one nor the other exclusively. So his interest turns within, and the imagination and sensibility of the poet become central concerns. The focus is not so much on what the mind knows as on how it knows. He realizes that the hard facts of science do not exhaust reality; he neither limits his values to them nor ignores them; his effort is rather to incorporate them into a larger view, to unify reality and the imagination, the natural and the transcendental. Truth, for him, includes what man wants as well as what is out there; it is that dimension in which we believe, as Wallace Stevens says, without belief, beyond belief ("Flyer's Fall"). Or, as Whitehead puts it:

What is wanted is an appreciation of the infinite variety of vivid values achieved by an organism in its proper environment. When you understand all about the sun and all about the atmosphere and all about the rotation of the earth, you may still miss the radiance of the sunset. There is no substitute for the direct perception of the concrete achievement of a thing in its actuality. We want concrete fact with a high light thrown on what is relevant to its preciousness.³

The answer is, therefore, to get as close as possible to "the direct perception of the concrete achievement of a thing in its actuality," to be as inclusive and immediate

3. *Science and the Modern World* (New York, 1925), Ch. XIII.

as possible, for there is no substitute. It is easier to say what this does not amount to than what it does. It means that the methods of logic and of science will never bring us close enough to this subtle and complex reality, for they depend upon generalization and abstraction for their results, and reality is irreducibly concrete and particular. The fullness of truth is, in effect, inexpressible.

But there is a dilemma: are we driven to silence by this doctrine? How can the Modernist express the inexpressible? He cannot, but he is not rendered forever mute thereby. As Yeats wrote at the end of his life: "It seems to me that I have found what I wanted. When I try to put it all into a phrase I say, 'Man can embody truth but he cannot know it.'" And this is precisely literature's function: it cannot tell us what truth is, but it can *embody* it; it can embody truth by being concrete, many sided, and implicit. It must, in short, be indirect, and Modernist literature can be studied in terms of the various means it has discovered and explored for achieving the required suggestiveness. As Eliot explained in his 1921 essay on "The Metaphysical Poets":

We can only say that it appears likely that poets in our civilization, as it exists at present, must be *difficult*. Our civilization comprehends great variety and complexity, and this variety and complexity, playing upon a refined sensibility, must produce various and complex results. The poet must become more and more comprehensive, more allusive, more indirect, in order to force, to dislocate if necessary, language into his meaning.

And just how does the Modernist "dislocate . . . language into his meaning"? For convenience, we may list five ways. There is, first of all, the attempt to exploit the various connotative powers of language—varied levels of meaning, irony, paradox, ambiguity, and the dislocation of syntax. There is, secondly, the increased and self-conscious exploitation of multiplicity of reference in metaphors and symbols. Thirdly, there is the close attention paid to the varied possibilities of word-music, the breakup of formal metrical patterns, tone, and texture. There is, fourthly, the substitution of the "logic" of association for that of reason and plot, the deliberate use of discontinuity and disorder, or of what appears to be discontinuity and disorder when viewed logically—because planned juxtapositions, parallels, allusions, and recurrences create another kind of order of their own. And finally, there is the use of the self-critical speaker, the unheroic hero, the man whose aspirations spring from a knowledge of his own limitations. Yeats's version of this device he called the doctrine of the Mask, for it allows the poet to speak impersonally and dramatically and thereby to be free of explicit moralizing and philosophizing. It is the last two especially, as we shall see, that engaged the attention of many Victorians.

The avoidance of direct statement and the exploitation

of suggestiveness achieved by these devices result in a kind of poem in which *what* is said is a function of *how* it is said, in which the paraphrasable content does not exhaust the meaning of the poem. The reader must make inferences based upon the poem's implications, and his interpretation of its meaning must be found among the interplay of possibilities. The meaning of the poem, in other words, depends upon its design; it is a concrete and subtle thing and cannot be abstracted. Form and content are inseparable; an organicist and contextualist view of the world has led to an organicist and contextualist view of poetry. It is significant that Whitehead's words, quoted above, are part of a defence of Romanticism against scientism, for this view of the world and of poetry—this Modernist doctrine—is none other, as recent trends in criticism and scholarship have been making increasingly clear, than our heritage from the Romantics, and especially Coleridge. Form grows naturally out of the materials and is not imposed mechanically upon them; form, to the Modernist, is part of the meaning and is not an embellishment of a message which could just as easily be put in some other way. It is this doctrine that explains the difference between the nineteenth and the eighteenth centuries, for it holds not so much that the sound should *echo* the sense as help *create* it. And it also explains the similarity between the twentieth and the nineteenth centuries.

What do we have, then, from this metaphysic and its consequent aesthetic? As far as a view of the world is concerned, we have an infinite number of tentative explorations into the truth about man and his universe, explorations that may yield moments of valid insight, and yet these moments must be held in suspension indefinitely, subject to constant modification and revision. It is not much, compared to the aspirations of the past, but it is the best we can do. Better to have true moments, however brief, than centuries of misconceptions. As far as art is concerned, we have a conception that frees the poet from didacticism, yet that gives him a serious and significant role to play. The formalism and aestheticism of the Modernist do not divorce art from life; far from it, for they reserve for art a crucial role in the human enterprise. To free art from moralizing and philosophizing is not equivalent to separating it from life; there are other ways to truth, and the artist's way is his own special way, a way in the long run of more usefulness than more directly utilitarian approaches.

II

And how do these views relate to the Victorians? I want to proceed chronologically, because I believe there is a temporal pattern in the Victorian reactions to aestheticism, but in the present essay—which is already past the one-

third mark—I will have to be rigidly selective and to trust in the reader's indulgence in accepting a part for the whole. These pages represent in reality an outline of my plans for a book-length study of Victorian poetry and poetics, and I intend there to supply the supporting details, the qualifications and the arguments pro and con.

It is customary to see the Victorian period, which was seventy or seventy-five years long, as falling into various distinguishable phases, and I shall follow this custom. The period as a whole was too long to form a natural unit, and the only reason for its being called a period at all is the Queen's long life. But justice to the facts requires a more discriminating approach: in literature, at least, there is no single thing called "Victorianism" that can fit the whole span of the period. I will therefore set up a rough working scheme as follows. The view which opposes aestheticism in saying that there is only one kind of truth and that there is either no difference between poetry and other forms of perceiving and communicating—that poetry should deal clearly and intelligibly with rational and common-sense truth—or contrariwise that poetry is merely a toy having nothing to do with truth, this view I shall call, for the sake of convenience, Philistinism. Unfortunately, it is this view—in either of its two forms—that used to be taken as characteristically Victorian, and what the current reappraisal is trying basically to do is to show that the Victorians themselves never let this view go entirely unchallenged and that it was not necessarily the dominant view throughout. The conflict, in fact, appears early, and I see the first phase of the period, from 1825 to 1840, as laying down the lines of what was to be a long and passionate debate.

The true course of history, however, rarely runs smoothly and is in reality more a matter of fits and starts than streams and tendencies. One poet may hit upon a new device and be neglected by the critics; a critic may formulate a new idea and be neglected by the poets; but such discoveries may either be rediscovered by future writers or discovered all over again independently. The period 1825-1840 does not form a completely detachable unit. The terms of the conflict were, of course, inherited from the Romantics—they are all almost there, for example, in Keats's poems and letters, and it is doubtful whether the twentieth century has finally settled the matter as yet. Modernism, naturally, represents one form of settlement, but it is nevertheless still being questioned and modified.

If any phase of the nineteenth century deserves the name "Victorian" in its common Philistine sense, it is that which falls between 1840 and 1860. Here the common-sense idea of poetry is on the ascendent, largely through the influence of Tennyson. But even here, in the complacent middle of the period, the issue is complicated by dissident voices, even within the breast of the laureate him-

self. The balance shifts, however, after 1860, and by 1891 it has swung entirely to the opposite extreme in Oscar Wilde's dictum, "All art is quite useless."

The first of our three phases begins with those two great Philistines, Bentham and Macaulay. We are all familiar by now with the former's famous reduction of art to a trivial game: "Prejudice apart, the game of push-pin is of equal value with the arts and sciences of music and poetry" ("The Rationale of Reward" [1825]). Bentham's notion of truth is a simple one, for it includes only verifiable matters of fact. Poetry, then, since it obviously does not deal with such matters, is relegated to some cloudland of dreams, a harmless diversion at best: "Indeed, between poetry and truth there is a natural opposition. . . . The poet always stands in need of something false. . . . Truth, exactitude of every kind, is fatal to poetry." Behind Bentham's remarks stands Thomas Love Peacock's essay on "The Four Ages of Poetry" (1820), that not altogether serious attack on poetry that elicited his friend Shelley's famous defence. It also stands behind Macaulay's remarks in his essay on Milton (1825): "We think that, as civilization advances, poetry almost necessarily declines. . . . We cannot unite the incompatible advantages of reality and deception, the clear discernment of truth and the exquisite enjoyment of fiction."

To unite them, however, has always been the aim of aestheticism, and John Stuart Mill, himself a Benthamite, suffered through this effort personally as a young man. The fifth chapter of his *Autobiography*, which deals with "A Crisis in my Mental History" during 1826-1828, is in its own quiet way as important an answer to Bentham and Macaulay as Shelley's essay was to Peacock. Here he relates how, with the help of the Romantic poets, he fought his way out of the nervous depression he fell into as a result of learning and living by the mechanistic and positivistic doctrines of Bentham, his father's master. Basically, what he had to learn was that the feelings and imaginations of men are just as real as verifiable facts, that they are not simply snares and delusions. In this way poetry could be restored to a central role in man's life, and the passage in which he relates his arguments with a utilitarian friend sounds very much like the one quoted above from Whitehead:

It was in vain I urged on him that the imaginative emotion which an idea, when vividly conceived, excites in us, is not an illusion but a fact, as real as any of the other qualities of objects; and far from implying anything erroneous and delusive in our mental apprehension of the object, is quite consistent with the most accurate knowledge and most perfect practical recognition of all its physical and intellectual laws and relations. The intensest feeling of the beauty of a cloud lighted by the setting sun, is no hindrance to my knowing that the cloud is a vapour of water, subject to all

the laws of vapours in a state of suspension; and I am just as likely to allow for, and act on, these physical laws whenever there is occasion to do so, as if I had been incapable of perceiving any distinction between beauty and ugliness.

Arthur Henry Hallam's review in 1831 of his friend Tennyson's first book of poems is an even more subtle defence of aestheticism, and its importance was early recognized by Yeats, who in many ways is a pivotal figure, having one foot solidly planted in each century. Speaking of the 1890's, he says: "The revolt against the literary element in painting was accompanied by a similar revolt in poetry. The doctrine of what the younger Hallam called the Aesthetic School was expounded in his essay on Tennyson. . . ."⁴ And what was that doctrine? Seeing the early Tennyson as stemming from the Romantic tradition, Hallam defends the Romantic poets, in the first place, as creators of beauty as opposed to didactic moralists. He says imagination and sympathy view art more truly than "purely intellectual contemplation." He feels that great art is often necessarily obscure and difficult. He sees the nineteenth century as a period, in Eliot's terms, of dissociated sensibility: "Hence the melancholy which so evidently characterizes the spirit of modern poetry; hence that return of the mind upon itself and the habit of seeking relief in idiosyncracies rather than community of interest." He speaks of the inexpressible complexity of the emotions, of the inability of rational discourse to capture it, and of the corresponding necessity for exploiting the musical suggestiveness of poetic language to do the job. And he praises Tennyson for having discovered and put into practice the new principle of the dramatic lyric.

Tennyson himself, meanwhile, perhaps having taken to heart his friend Richard Trench's remark that "we cannot live in art," and perhaps having been terrified by what he saw when *his* mind returned upon itself, subsequently wrote "The Palace of Art" in which he banished, as Arnold was to do some twenty-one years later, "The abysmal deeps of personality" (l. 223) as being too selfish a concern for art to dwell upon. This poem, which Robert Hillier, one of our modern Philistines, said was "acutely applicable in our own day as a refutation of the aestheticism of the school of Pound and Eliot,"⁵ is not that simple, however. Although the penultimate stanza punishes the soul of the artist for having dwelt too exclusively in the isolated palace of art, the final stanza leaves the palace gates open:

Yet pull not down my palace towers, that are
So lightly, beautifully built;
Perchance I may return with others there
When I have purged my guilt.

✓ Tennyson, we may notice, rejects not art but rather an art which is divorced from life.

III

He does, however, have a hard time reconciling them, for he is both gifted and cursed with a morbidly compelling subjectivity and an overwhelmingly exotic sense of language and imagery against which to contend. So in the 1840's the terms of the conflict shift, for him and for his age during its second phase, by the logic of contrast, to the extremes of Philistinism. The poet must, like Ulysses, strive and seek and find, and not yield. He yearns, like Tithonus, to merge himself with "the kindly race of men." He cries, with the distraught speaker of "Locksley Hall": "I myself must mix with action, lest I wither by despair" (l. 98). This is an ominous note for poetry, for as it turns out, a true reconciliation between art and life will not be achieved until all of life—and not just the objective part—is faced, until that despair is confronted and transformed into art. As is exemplified in the conclusion of Yeats's "A Dialogue of Self and Soul," the poet must realize he cannot master life—or art—until he has learned to master himself. But this is to anticipate our story.

Action as a substitute for despair, Tennyson failed to sense, is an evasion rather than a solution. So his early poems, although full enough of tortured ambivalence, characteristically conclude by bringing in the *deus ex machina* of spurious decisiveness or baseless faith. Only in the 1830 volume, apparently, could he conclude:

O weary life! O weary death!
O spirit and heart made desolate!
O damned vascillating state!

("Supposed Confessions")

✓ This outcry, if somewhat hysterical, is at least more honest than that of "Locksley Hall."

Nor does *In Memoriam*, his magnum opus of 1850 and the poem which established his reputation and made him the darling of the mid-Victorian audience, represent much of an advance in the direction of honesty. It sets up a similar conflict and resolves it by means of a similarly artificial ending. What it does do is expand and elaborate the terms of the conflict almost beyond endurance, both in length as well as scope. Here Tennyson gives himself the task, in a poem of one hundred and thirty sections, of confronting and resolving not only his own ambivalence but also that of the whole Victorian spirit caught between the conflicting claims of religion and science. But all is not lost: there is much in this abortive effort that anticipates many Modernist problems. I think, for example, that it is an attempt, however unsuccessful, to combine the public

4. *Dramatis Personae* (1936) Sec. 47, in *The Autobiography*.

5. *In Pursuit of Poetry* (New York, 1960), p. 158.

and the private, the epic and the lyric, much in the manner of Eliot, Crane, Pound, and Williams in *The Waste Land*, *The Bridge*, *The Cantos*, and *Paterson*. I am not sure that they have solved the problems involved either, for combining epic and lyric has proved a more tenuous enterprise for the Modernists than combining drama and lyric, but at least they have come some distance beyond Tennyson in their use of epic parallels as the objective correlative of a lyric impulse. Similarly, he was as aware as they that, if faith cannot inhere in fact, then faith must go beyond fact, but he ends in a cloudy vapor of groundless hope. And I think the trouble here is that he does not have a sufficiently firm grasp of the notion of the many sides of reality and the other kinds of truth, the notion that meaning and purpose in life, while not built into the universe, are nonetheless real. Tennyson could not find any basis for believing that they are built into the universe, but he hopes they somehow are anyway. He is modern enough, that is, to know that values are not found in facts, but he is not modern enough to surrender his need for such proof. That is why the ambivalence of his poems cannot be resolved, and that is why he constantly resorts to those pasted-on endings.

Meanwhile, Browning, for all his religious and moral earnestness, is writing those wonderfully amoral dramatic monologues. Although he is always on the side of the good, he is interested enough in people and confident enough in art to portray evil from within ("My Last Duchess"), to understand weakness sympathetically ("Andrea del Sarto"), to see how the good can conflict with the pious ("Fra Lippo Lippi"), and to take his stand finally in favor of fulfilling the energies of life as opposed to living conventionally ("The Statue and the Bust"). If Browning did not confront the abyss within, he did understand the abyss in others, and he understood how to transform it into art. To set the confusions of Tennyson's "Ulysses" against the rich ambiguities of Browning's "My Last Duchess" is to highlight the differences between these two poets as regards their handling of the dramatic lyric. Browning, in projecting his voice into the person of another, freed the poem from his own psychology and thereby allowed it to work itself out on its own terms. Consistency, emotional truth, and artistic integrity are the results. These poems are saying, in effect, not that this is how the world is, or that this is how it is to the poet, but rather that this is how it looks to a particular person.

Arnold, embarked on the same search in his 1853 Preface, is as afraid of the abyss within as Tennyson and yet is as concerned with the problem of objectification as Browning. Echoing Hallam, he defines Modernism as the

commencement of "the dialogue of the mind with itself," and yet, echoing Tennyson, he rejects an art "in which the suffering finds no vent in action; in which a continuous state of mental distress is prolonged, unrelieved by incident, hope, or resistance; in which there is everything to be endured, nothing to be done." He, like the Philistines he himself came to criticize, still had a faith that problems could be solved by *doing* something—anything—rather than by getting morbid and looking within. His answer, like Tennyson's, was to mix his protagonists in actions, although he would actually *portray* the actions while Tennyson was content to show his protagonists merely *deciding* to act. This indicates that Arnold had a larger sense of dramatic structure than Tennyson: all that remained for him was to realize that one *could* objectify the subjective and give it form—Browning's lesson, that the lyric can embody an action—and yet he could get only as far as "The Scholar-Gipsy," also of 1853.

Here is a poem, if ever there was one, that cannot meet the requirements of Arnold's own Preface: in the form of a conventional reflective lyric and set in a pastoral frame, it portrays a continuous state of mental distress that finds no vent in action. The distinctive feature of this poem is the irreducible and irremediable divorce that the speaker sees between the private vision and the public life, and it is marked throughout by his clear and profound hostility to civilization and all its works. In this sense, it is a much more honest poem than many of Tennyson's, and it implies that suffering can find a vent not so much in action as in the integrity and structure of its embodiment in art. To this end, the legend of the Scholar-Gipsy, the pastoral frame, and the archaic diction were chosen, as well as the famous and puzzling simile at the end. One can see that Arnold is looking for a correlative to use in objectifying his inner distress. But from a Modernist point of view, it does not quite succeed: the form is too glossy an enamel for the content. Arnold's mistake was to cool, as if out of distaste, the very emotions he was trying to portray, and he mistook coolness for control. Why could he not let the heat of his turmoil have its due; why was he afraid to let the form *express* rather than *repress* his emotions?

An answer is suggested by Yeats who, in speaking of the early deaths of Dowson and Johnson and of the tragedy of the aesthetic movement, quotes from one of Arnold's letters: "Coleridge of the *Ancient Mariner*, and *Kubla Khan*, and Rossetti in all his writing made what Arnold has called that 'morbid effort', that search for 'perfection of thought and feeling, and to unite this to perfection of form', sought this new, pure beauty, and suffered in their lives because of it."⁶ Arnold wrote his sister in 1858:

6. "The Tragic Generation," *The Trembling of the Veil* (1922), Sec. 9, Bk. IV, in *The Autobiography*.

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

✓ In short, Arnold was afraid to make the full commitment, for he was afraid of what he knew it would cost. And he was right, if staying alive and healthy is the test, in view of what happened to Coleridge and Rossetti, Dowson and Johnson. When one realizes that Arnold was born only a year later than Baudelaire and that he lived over twenty years longer, one sees the distance that separated nineteenth-century France from Victorian England.

IV

But the gap was being closed as the balance began to shift with the publication in 1859 of *The Rubaiyat*. Although, as Pound says, "The English Rubaiyat was still born/ In those days" (*Mauberley*, "Yeux Glauques," 1920), it was discovered, as we know, a few years later by Rossetti, Swinburne, and Meredith. And foreign influences began to work afresh on the English sensibility—oriental influences, French and Italian and German influences, and especially revived influences from the English Romantic poets. This poem is commonly considered significant because of its mood of retreat from larger purpose to sensual pleasure, but it is even more significant, it seems to me, because of its retreat from action to skepticism. Those abysmal deeps of personality will not down:

I sent my Soul through the Invisible,
Some letter of that After-life to spell:
And by and by my Soul return'd to me,
And answer'd, "I Myself am Heav'n and Hell."
(LXVI, 5th ed.)

Meredith, too, seems to have sensed more than Arnold what Browning was up to. In *Modern Love* he experimented with a dramatic monologue sequence—somewhat resembling Tennyson's unconventional approach in *Maud*—to objectify the dialogue of the mind with itself. And it almost works: where Tennyson's spasmodic hero simply rushes hysterically off to the wars, Meredith's comes through his suffering to know himself:

In tragic life, God wot,
No villain need be! Passions spin the plot:
We are betrayed by what is false within. (XLIII)

And that despair must finally be faced; the dramatic frame becomes, as Yeats said it should, a device for self-criticism. Meredith, I find, has a very Modernist sensibility: not only is he confronting in this poem the problems of love, sex, and marriage in a very direct and un-"Victorian" way (contemporary Philistines damned it for being prurient); ✓ he is also working out a characteristically relativist and pluralist view of truth. He knows the natural world must be incorporated into our system of values; he knows also that the mind must contribute its share to that view; but he knows further that neither the world nor the mind is sufficient in itself as a source of values. Truth, for him, is never final, never fixed:

Ah, what a dusty answer gets the soul
When hot for certainties in this our life! (L)

And yet, in his later poetry, when he comes more and more to insist dogmatically on his relativist truth, his struggles to express this dark doctrine resemble the lashings of a wounded snake as his lines writhe from rhyme to rhyme. His phrasing, his use of sound, his sense of rhythm, his diction—all are the product of a brilliant sensibility with limited artistic resources exhausting itself in the effort to subdue language to its vision.

One of the other chief events of the 1860's was the appearance in 1866 of Swinburne's first book, *Poems and Ballads*, and of John Morley's subsequent review of it. Morley begins with the "I-don't-want-to-be-a-prude-about-sex" gambit, and then goes on to condemn Swinburne's depiction of "the spurious passion of a putrescent imagination, the unnamed lusts of sated wantons," and concludes that the poet "is the libidinous laureate of a pack of satyrs." Although I am in principle on Swinburne's side, I cannot help but sympathize with Morley's distress. There is something boyish and perverse in Swinburne's treatment of sex; artistic freedom deserves a better test case. And yet, I am made uncomfortable by Morley's Philistine appeal to common sense, which is always a bad way to judge art. What Morley really wants is for sex to remain in its "proper" place, subordinate to reason and purity. It is one thing to object to an unhealthy feverishness, however, but it is quite another thing to require that sexuality yield as a matter of principle to rationality in art.

Swinburne's answer, in "Notes on Poems and Reviews," is much more sensible than his verse. In fact, I find that he is a much better critic than a poet, and I take it as a good sign that his prose is now beginning to receive the

attention it really deserves.⁷ Four years before, in his essay on Baudelaire, he had said "that a poet's business is presumably to write good verses, and by no means to redeem the age and remould society." In his reply to Morley he says that the "work [is] done for the work's sake" and should not be judged by moral standards. Poetry is dramatic, he says, and is not to be read as the personal expression of the poet, nor should its subject matter be limited to that which is acceptable to conventional morality. Literature, he claims, "cannot be chaste if it be prudish." It must "deal with the full life of man and the whole nature of things," otherwise it is a childish and trivial toy indeed.

The Philistines were not yet silenced, however, for—as Pound says in *Mauberley*—"Swinburne/ and Rossetti still abused./ Foetid Buchanan lifted up his voice." Robert Buchanan's infamous review in 1871 of the fifth edition of Rossetti's *Poems* was entitled "The Fleshly School of Poetry," and it took up where Morley left off. Not only is it wrong to put the body over the soul, says Buchanan, it is also wrong to put form over content. "A great and good poet," he says, "is great and good irrespective of manner, and often in spite of manner; he is great because he brings great ideas and new light, because his thought is a revelation. . . ." The real issue here, then, is not moral but aesthetic; to Buchanan a poet is a moralist and philosopher, and his art is an incidental way of expressing his ideas. Unlike Swinburne, however, Rossetti had not the critical wit to grasp the real issue. In his reply, "The Stealthy School of Criticism," he accepts Buchanan's principles, merely denying their applicability to his poems. He does *not*, he says, exalt body over soul, nor does he wish "to create form for its own sake." He has a point, though, for Buchanan was manifestly unfair in quoting and criticizing. About "Jenny," for example, he says "There is not a drop of piteousness in Mr. Rossetti." But the poem concludes with a degree of self-knowledge akin to Meredith's:

And must I mock you to the last,
Ashamed of my own shame,—aghast
Because some thoughts not born amiss
Rose at a poor fair face like this?

The inward gaze now becomes the motif of the times. Pater, in the "Conclusion" to *The Renaissance*, examines the outer world as well as "the inward world of thought and feeling," and finds all perpetually isolated and perpetually in flux. Out of this extreme skepticism, he builds his theory of organic form as the way of capturing our most precious moments of awareness. He speaks, in "The School of Giorgione," of the "imaginative reason"—neither pure

sense nor pure intellect—that art addresses, and of how "all art constantly aspires towards the condition of music." He means by this not that poetry should be melodiously empty of meaning, but rather that the form should be inseparable from the content, "that the sensuous material of each art brings with it a special phase or quality of beauty, untranslatable into the forms of any other, an order of impressions distinct in kind." This, he says, echoing Hallam, "is the beginning of all true aesthetic criticism."

Hopkins, a former student of Pater's and now a Jesuit priest, can, unlike Tennyson, face the absolute despair of his doubt, perhaps *because* of the very firmness of his faith:

O the mind, mind has mountains; cliffs of fall
Frightful, sheer, no-man-fathomed. Hold them cheap
May who ne'er hung there. Nor does long our small
Durance deal with that steep or deep.

("No Worst, There Is None")

Poetry for him, as his theories of sprung rhythm and in-scape indicate, is a matter of intensity, a matter of capturing our most precious moments of awareness at their points of characteristic fulfillment. And so a Victorian hits at last upon one of the main Modernist concerns: the need to experiment with language, with diction, rhythm, and syntax as a way of achieving and rendering such awareness. It is no wonder that he can say in his letters, almost like a latter-day Keats, that "nothing but fine execution survives long" (to R. W. Dixon, 1886).

The Philistines may have thought they had the last word in the Whistler-Ruskin Trial of 1878 or the trial of Oscar Wilde in 1895. But Whistler's "Ten O'Clock" lecture (1885) remains to remind us that art is the result of a creative interplay between nature and the mind, between form and content; and Wilde's "The Decay of Lying" (1889) is still there to tell us that art gives form to nature, that we discover in nature what we bring to her: "Nature is no great mother who has borne us. She is our creation. It is in our brain that she quickens into life. Things are because we see them, and what we see, and how we see it, depends on the Arts that have influenced us." His dictum, therefore, that life imitates art, is no mere witty epigram; beneath the shiny paradox is a hard core of real insight. And when he says that "Truth is entirely and absolutely a matter of style," we should be prepared by now to appreciate the weight and significance of his perception. For again, the issue is primarily aesthetic rather than moral. The moral issue arises only because what the artist sees need not correspond to the conventional categories, for

7. See Robert L. Peters, *The Crowns of Apollo* (1965); and Thomas E. Connolly, *Swinburne's Theory of Poetry* (1965).

they are absolutist and abstract rather than pluralist and concrete. The artist is amoral not because he is a corrupt man but because he values reality more than habit.

It only remained for Arthur Symonds, the friend of Yeats and the other aesthetes of the 1890's, whose *Symbolist Movement in Literature* (1899) first introduced Eliot to Laforgue, to gather up the scattered influences of the French aesthetic movement, provide them with a rationale, and pass them on to the twentieth century. He concludes his chapter on Mallarmé with this prophecy, a prophecy that has largely proved true:

... is it possible for a writer, at the present day, to be quite simple, with the old, objective simplicity, in either thought or expression? ... We find [by means of the Symbolist influence] a new, an older, sense in the so worn out forms of things; the world, which we can no longer believe in as the satisfying material object it was to our grandparents, becomes transfigured with a new light; words, which long usage had darkened almost out of recognition, take fresh lustre. And it is on the lines of that spiritualising of the word, that perfecting of form in its capacity for allusion and suggestion, that confidence in the eternal correspondences between the visible and the invisible universe, which Mallarmé taught, ... that literature must now move, if it is in any sense to move forward.

Here are both the unique end and the special means offered to the poet by the Modernist movement, and we close our examination of the Victorian where we began: with the doctrine of a complex reality that can be grasped only indirectly, and with a notion of truth that acknowledges the cooperation of the mind as well as the necessity of fact. And as we have seen, these ideas were never very far from the Victorian artistic consciousness: Modernism, as is becoming more and more clear, did not spring full blown from the brows of Yeats, Pound, and Eliot, or even from those of Swinburne, Wilde, and Dowson.

A brief coda to this paper is found in Hardy's "Apology," an essay prefacing his *Late Lyrics and Earlier* of 1922. Always going stubbornly on his own way, working out the problems of the age for himself, he called belatedly but insightfully for "an alliance between religion, which must be retained unless the world is to perish, and complete rationality, which must come, unless also the world is to perish, by means of the interfusing effect of poetry." And he goes on to quote Wordsworth. So, too, must we return to the Romantics in the continuing effort to solve this problem, for it was theirs first. Nor was it the Victorians' last.

Queens College
City University of New York

Recent Publications: A Selected List

Arthur F. Minerof

March 1967—August 1967

I

GENERAL

- ARTS. Bennett, Mary. *Millais*. Clowes. Catalog of a recent exhibition. Rev. *TLS*, 16 March, p. 212.
- Crossland, J. Brian. *Victorian Edinburgh*. Wayfair. Drawings of the buildings by nineteenth-century architects. Rev. *TLS*, 27 April, p. 366.
- Laver, James. *Victoriana*. Ward Lock. Rev. *TLS*, 9 March, p. 197.
- Reynolds, Ernest. *Collecting Victorian Porcelain*. Arco. Rev. *TLS*, 31 August, p. 776.

- BIBLIOGRAPHY. Knoepfmacher, U. C. "The Uses of Classification: 'The Wellesley Index.'" *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 263-67. Review-article.
- CRITICISM AND LITERARY HISTORY. Aarsleff, Hans. *The Study of Language in England, 1780-1860*. Princeton. Rev. *TLS*, 27 July, p. 689.
- Barton, Bernard. *The Literary Correspondence of Bernard Barton*. Ed. James E. Barcus. University of Pennsylvania. Minor poet who corresponded with poets, critics, and editors, including FitzGerald. Rev. *TLS*, 27 July, p. 675.
- Booth, Michael. "Queen Victoria and the Theatre." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, April, pp. 249-58.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 312.
3. "Heine and Housman," *JEGP*, XLIII (1944), 330.
4. "A. E. Housman's Downward Eye," *JEGP*, LIII (1954), 318, 308.
5. A. E. Housman: *Poet and Scholar* (Minneapolis, 1958), p. 9.

6. The letter is now in the possession of Mr. Love's sister, Mrs. Theodore T. Tams, and is printed with her permission. The exact nature of the inquiry to which Housman here replied is not known.

- Victoria was interested in the theatre and influenced its course.
- Colby, Robert A. *Fiction with a Purpose*. Indiana. Includes studies of Dickens, Thackeray, Charlotte Brontë, and George Eliot.
- Croker, John. *The Croker Papers 1808-1857*. Ed. Bernard Pool. Batsford. Selection from Croker's journals and correspondence. Rev. *TLS*, 13 April, p. 307.
- Donovan, Robert Alan. *The Shaping Vision*. Cornell. Includes discussion of Dickens and Thackeray. Rev. *TLS*, 11 May, p. 400.
- Downer, Alan S. *The Eminent Tragedian: William Charles Macready*. Harvard. Rev. *TLS*, 27 July, p. 682.
- Fredeman, William E. "A Pre-Raphaelite Gazetteer: The Penkill Letters of Arthur Hughes to William Bell Scott and Alice Boyd, 1886-97." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Spring, pp. 323-62. The letters are important both for the picture they give of Hughes and also for the material they contain on the later activities of the Pre-Raphaelites.
- Haining, Peter, ed. *The Gentlewomen of Evil*. Robert Hale. Selection of supernatural tales of Victorian authoresses, including work by Mrs. Oliphant, George Eliot, and Mrs. Gaskell. Rev. *TLS*, 15 June, p. 545.
- Pearsall, Ronald. "A Corner in Gypsies." *Quarterly Review*, April, pp. 189-95. The interest of some nineteenth-century writers in the romanticized view of the gypsy.
- Peckham, Morse. "Can 'Victorian' Have a Useful Meaning?" *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 271-77. Review-article concerning the use and the misuse of the term "Victorian."
- Sandison, Alan. *The Wheel of Empire*. Macmillan. The imperial idea in some late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century fiction, including work by Haggard and Kipling. Rev. *TLS*, 6 July, p. 596.
- Quayle, Eric. *Ballantyne the Brave*. Rupert Hart-Davis. Study of the Scottish boys' book writer. *TLS*, 13 April, p. 310.
- ECONOMICS AND POLITICS. Adelman, Paul. "The Second Reform Act of 1867." *History Today*, May, pp. 317-20. It was the Conservative party that benefited from Russell's Reform Act.
- Adnitt, Frank W. "The Rise of English Radicalism—Part III." *Contemporary Review*, June, pp. 318-27. Survey of events in the middle and later nineteenth century.
- Anderson, Olive. "The Wensleydale Peerage Case and the Position of the House of Lords in the Mid-Nineteenth Century." *English Historical Review*, July, pp. 486-502. The revival of the power of the House of Lords was more ambiguous than is usually claimed.
- Andrews, James R. "The Ethos of Pacifism: The Problem of Image in the Early British Peace Movement." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, February, pp. 28-33. The problem of personal image was a serious one for the pacifists of the mid-nineteenth century.
- Aydelotte, William O. "The Country Gentlemen and the Repeal of the Corn Laws." *English Historical Review*, January 1967, pp. 47-60. The country gentlemen were split in their attitude toward repeal.
- Cowling, Maurice. *1867: Disraeli, Gladstone and Revolution*. Cambridge. Rev. *TLS*, 31 August, p. 783.
- Derry, John W. *The Radical Tradition*. Macmillan. British radicals of the nineteenth century. Rev. *TLS*, 3 August, p. 710.
- Harrison, Brian, and Patricia Hollis. "Chartism, Liberalism and the Life of Robert Lowery." *English Historical Review*, July, pp. 503-35. Lowery's autobiography emphasizes the many affinities between Chartism and Liberalism.
- Howard, Christopher. "The Policy of Isolation." *Historical Journal*, Vol. X, No. 1, pp. 77-88. The policy of isolation in the later nineteenth century.
- Hurst, Michael. *Joseph Chamberlain and Liberal Reunion*. University of Toronto. Rev. *TLS*, 29 June, p. 571.
- Koss, Stephen E. "Morley in the Middle." *English Historical Review*, July, pp. 553-61. The decisive part played by John Morley in the struggle for the Liberal party succession in 1894.
- Machin, G. I. T. "The Maynooth Grant, the Dissenters and Disestablishment, 1845-1847." *English Historical Review*, January 1967, pp. 61-85. The crisis contributed to both the Conservative split and a division among the Liberals.
- Moore, R. J. *Sir Charles Wood's Indian Policy 1853-66*. Manchester. Rev. *TLS*, 30 March, p. 265.
- Saville, John. *The Red Republican and The Friend of the People, 1850-1851*. Merlin Press. Reprint of one of the most important of the later Chartist journals. Rev. *TLS*, 15 June, p. 528.
- Smith, F. B. *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*. Cambridge. Rev. *TLS*, 2 March, p. 164.
- Somerville, Alexander. *The Autobiography of a Working Man*. MacGibbon and Kee. First published in 1848. Rev. *TLS*, 15 June, p. 531.
- Weston, Corinne Comstock. "The Royal Mediation in 1884." *English Historical Review*, April, pp. 296-322. Queen Victoria's mediation in securing passage of the Third Reform Bill may well have been decisive.
- HISTORY. Albert, Harold A. *Queen Victoria's Sister*. Robert Hale. Life and letters of Princess Feodora. Rev. *TLS*, 9 March, p. 194.
- Grey, General. *The Early Years of the Prince Consort*. Kimber. Compiled for and annotated by Queen Victoria, this reissue was originally published in 1867. Rev. *TLS*, 31 August, p. 783.
- Huxley, Gervais. *Victorian Duke*. Oxford. Biography of the First Duke of Westminster, 1825-1899. Rev. *TLS*, 1 June, p. 488.
- Mac Niven, C. D. "Utilitarianism Old and New." *Queen's Quarterly*, Summer, pp. 330-40. A review article assessing the revival of interest in Utilitarianism.
- O'Neill, James E. "The Victorian Background to the British Welfare State." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, Spring, pp. 204-17. The roots of the British Welfare State lie in Victorian England.
- Pike, E. Royston. *Human Documents of the Industrial Revolution*. Allen and Unwin. Extracts from nineteenth-century materials. Rev. *TLS*, 2 March, p. 160.
- RELIGION. de Waal, Esther. "Revolution in the Church." *Victorian Studies*, June, pp. 435-39. Review-article assessing recent books on religion during the Victorian period.

- Hoppen, K. Theodore. "The Oxford Movement." *History Today*, March, pp. 145-52. Historical account.
- Larkin, Emmet. "Economic Growth, Capital Investment, and the Roman Catholic Church in Nineteenth-Century Ireland." *American Historical Review*, April, pp. 852-75. The Church impeded economic growth in Ireland.
- Lochhead, Marion. *Episcopal Scotland in the Nineteenth Century*. John Murray. Rev. *TLS*, 8 June, p. 513.
- McClelland, Vincent Alan. "The Irish Clergy and Archbishop Manning's Apostolic Visitation of the Western District of Scotland, 1867." *Catholic Historical Review*, April, pp. 1-27; July, pp. 229-50. The ill feeling of the Irish in Glasgow toward Manning.
- Short, H. L. "The Later History of the English Presbyterians." *Hibbert Journal*, Winter, pp. 60-66; Spring, pp. 117-22; Summer, pp. 157-62. Early and mid-nineteenth century survey.
- Vidler, Alec R. F. D. *Maurice and Company*. SCM Press. Revision of the 1948 edition. Rev. *TLS*, 20 April, p. 337.
- Ward, W. R. "The Last Chronicle of Barset; or the Early Victorian Church Revived." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, April, pp. 65-70. Review-article on the Victorian Church before 1860.
- SOCIAL. Comfort, Alex. *The Anxiety Makers*. Nelson. Sexual hygiene in nineteenth-century England. Rev. *TLS*, 20 July, p. 642.
- de Vries, Leonard, ed. *Panorama 1842-1865*. John Murray. Selections from *The Illustrated London News*. Rev. *TLS*, 15 June, p. 528.
- Dyos, H. J. "The Study of Urban History: A Conference Report." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 289-92. Methods and materials of urban history with emphasis on the nineteenth century.
- Harrison, Brian. "Underneath the Victorians." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 239-62. Review-article concerning Victorian attitudes toward sex.
- Lauterbach, Edward S. "Victorian Advertising and Magazine Stripping." *Victorian Studies*, June, pp. 431-34. Magazine advertisements offer insight into the nature of the period.
- Laver, James. *The Age of Optimism*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. Manners and morals in England, 1848-1914. Rev. *TLS*, 9 March, p. 197.
- Pike, E. Royston. *Human Documents of the Victorian Golden Age*. Allen and Unwin. Excerpts, mainly from reports of government commissions, on housing, sanitation, trade unions, and labor conditions. Rev. *TLS*, 31 August, p. 783.
- Romilly, James. *Romilly's Cambridge Diary, 1832-42*. Ed. J. P. T. Bury. The diary of the Registrar of the University of Cambridge. Rev. *TLS*, 17 August, p. 741.
- on questions of epistemology, Arnold emphasizes the quester's emotional state in "The Scholar-Gipsy" and "Thyrsis."
- Frierson, J. W. "The Strayed Reveller of Fox How." *Victorian Poetry*, Summer, pp. 137-40. Several of Arnold's Fox How images derive from Stanley's *Life*.
- Schneider, Mary W. "The Source of Matthew Arnold's 'Balder Dead.'" *Notes and Queries*, February 1967, pp. 56-61. Arnold used one of Percy's editions of Mallet's *Northern Antiquities* as a source for the poem.
- Stange, G. Robert. *Matthew Arnold*. Princeton. Critical study. Rev. *TLS*, 6 July, p. 596.
- Super, R. H. "The Dating of 'Dover Beach.'" *Notes and Queries*, February 1967, pp. 61-62. Suggests a time after the 1855 *Poems*.
- Wright, Charles D. "How Matthew Arnold Altered 'Goethe on Poetry.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 57-61. Arnold differed with Goethe on whether the basis of poetry was intellectual or inspirational.
- BRONTËS. Buchen, Irving H. "Emily Brontë and the Metaphysics of Childhood and Love." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 63-70. The poems reinforce the vision of *Wuthering Heights*; both point to the child's loss of heaven as the prefigurement of the lover's loss of paradise.
- Gérin, Winifred. *Charlotte Brontë*. Oxford. Critical study. Rev. *TLS*, 27 July, p. 675.
- Hagan, John. "Control of Sympathy in *Wuthering Heights*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, March, pp. 305-23. The author sustains the reader's sympathy for both Catherine and Heathcliff even while she evokes moral revulsion for their actions.
- BROWNING. Blackburn, Thomas. *Robert Browning*. Eyre and Spottiswoode. A study of Browning's poetry. Rev. *TLS*, 13 April, p. 310.
- Drew, Philip. "Another View of *Fifine at the Fair*." *Essays in Criticism*, April, pp. 244-55. The poem is an organized whole, dealing with the search for stability.
- Kelley, Robert L. "Dactyls and Curlews: Satire in 'A Grammarian's Funeral.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Summer, pp. 105-12. The satiric point of the poem concerns the students—the discrepancy between their pretensions to nobility and their revealed vulgarity.
- Lewis, Hanna Ballin. "Hofmannsthal and Browning." *Comparative Literature*, Spring, pp. 142-59. Browning's influence.
- Lucie-Smith, Edward, ed. *A Choice of Browning's Verse*. Faber and Faber. Includes introductory essay. Rev. *TLS*, 13 April, p. 310.
- Svaglic, Martin J. "Browning's Grammarian: Apparent Failure or Real?" *Victorian Poetry*, Summer, pp. 93-104. Browning intended to present his apparent pedant as a true hero.
- Williams, Joan M. *Robert Browning*. Evans. Brief study. Rev. *TLS*, 13 April, p. 310.
- CARLYLE. Freeman, Gwendolen. "Notes on Archives: A Carlyle Letter." *History Today*, March, p. 180. An unpublished letter written to his brother James on March 17, 1840, showing Carlyle in a beneficent mood.
- CLOUGH. Gollin, Richard M., Walter E. Houghton, and Michael Timko. "Arthur Hugh Clough: A Descriptive Cata-

II

INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS

- ARNOLD. Brooks, Roger L. "Matthew Arnold's 'Sohrab and Rustum': An Oriental Detail." *English Language Notes*, March, pp. 198-99. Arnold was faithful to his source in using oriental detail.
- Eggenschwiler, David L. "Arnold's Passive Questers." *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 1-11. Instead of centering

- logue." *The New York Public Library*, March, pp. 173-99. Entries concerning biography and criticism.
- DE QUINCEY. Hopkins, Robert. "De Quincey on War and the Pastoral Design of *The English Mail-Coach*." *Studies in Romanticism*, Spring, pp. 129-51. The work is meaningful and coherent, and contains most of the ingredients later to be found in the Victorian activists.
- DICKENS. Anon. "Editing Dickens." *TLS*, 6 April, p. 285. Assesses recent editions of Dickens as well as a new edition of Forster's *Life*.
- Reed, John R. "Some Indefinable Resemblance: Moral Form in Dickens' *Nicholas Nickleby*." *Papers on Language and Literature*, Spring, pp. 134-47. The central characters incarnate Dickens' concept of the necessary consequences of selfish and selfless behavior.
- Stone, Harry. "Dickens and the Idea of a Periodical." *Western Humanities Review*, Summer, pp. 237-56. Dickens' part in *Bentley's Miscellany*, *Master Humphrey's Clock*, and *Household Words*.
- Welsh, Alexander. "Waverly, Pickwick, and Don Quixote." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 19-30. Similarities and differences.
- Wilkenson, Ann Y. "Bleak House: From Faraday to Judgment Day." *ELH*, June, pp. 225-47. The physical world of the novel reflects its moral one.
- DISRAELI. Levine, Richard A. "Disraeli's *Tancred* and 'The Great Asian Mystery.'" *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 71-85. The key to the novel as a coherent and organic work lies in the author's religious philosophy.
- ELIOT. Lerner, Laurence. *The Truth-tellers*. Chatto and Windus. Contains material on Eliot. Rev. *TLS*, 11 May, p. 400.
- Miller, Ian. "Distortion in *Felix Holt*." *Essays in Criticism*, July, pp. 406-7. Some inconsistency in the portrayal of the main character.
- FITZGERALD. Bagley, F. R. C. "Omar Khayyám and FitzGerald." *Durham University Journal*, March, pp. 81-93. Examines the content of the original and FitzGerald's method of translation.
- GASKELL. Chapple, J. A. V., and Arthur Pollard, eds. *The Letters of Mrs. Gaskell*. Manchester. Rev. *TLS*, 16 March, pp. 209-10.
- Handley, Graham. "Mrs. Gaskell's Reading: Some Notes on Echoes and Epigraphs in 'Mary Barton.'" *Durham University Journal*, June, pp. 131-38. Three epigraphs in the novel and their relevance to the text.
- HALLAM. Lees, F. N. "The Dissociation of Sensibility: Arthur Hallam and T. S. Eliot." *Notes and Queries*, August, pp. 308-9. Hallam's diagnosis of what happened to English poetry after the seventeenth century is essentially the same as Eliot's.
- HARDY. Huss, Roy. "Social Change and Moral Decay in the Novels of Thomas Hardy." *Dalhousie Review*, Spring, pp. 28-44. Hardy's view of the world provided him with a cogent philosophy for contriving dramatic situations in his novels.
- Miller, J. Hillis. "Recent Work on Hardy." *Victorian Studies*, March, pp. 278-82. Review-article.
- Sampson, Edward C. "Telling Time by the Stars in 'Far from the Madding Crowd.'" *Notes and Queries*, February 1967, pp. 63-64. Inconsistency in Hardy's chronology.
- Smith, Peter D. "William Cox and 'The Trumpet-Major.'" *Notes and Queries*, February 1967, pp. 64-65. A letter appearing in *The Times* for January 2, 1871, may be another source for Hardy's knowledge of the Napoleonic Wars.
- Zietlow, Paul. "The Tentative Mode of Hardy's Poems." *Victorian Poetry*, Summer, pp. 113-26. The considerable range in attitude toward life found in Hardy's poems indicates his belief that poetry was to record impressions and not convictions.
- HOPKINS. Bates, Ronald. "Downdolphinry." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, April, pp. 229-36. Dauphin-dolphin in "The Windhover."
- Doherty, Paul C. "Hopkins' 'Spring and Fall: To a Young Child.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Summer, pp. 140-43. The speaker of the poem is not the author's spokesman and original sin is but part of the poem's subject.
- Hallgarth, Susan A. "A Study of Hopkins' Use of Nature." *Victorian Poetry*, Summer, pp. 79-92. For Hopkins nature is simultaneously beneficent, beautiful, and representative of some higher reality.
- Rader, Louis. "Hopkins' Dark Sonnets: Another New Expression." *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 13-20. These sonnets indicate that Hopkins' poetic skill and enthusiasm did not wane.
- Sonstroem, David. "Making Earnest of Game: G. M. Hopkins and Nonsense Poetry." *Modern Language Quarterly*, June, pp. 192-206. Hopkins' verbal play is more ingenious, more difficult, and broader in scope than that of his contemporaries.
- Taylor, Michael. "Hopkins' *God's Grandeur*, 3-4." *Explicator*, April, No. 68. Geological interpretation of the "ooze of oil" image.
- HOUSMAN. Pearsall, Robert Brainard. "The Vendible Values of Housman's *Soldiery*." *PMLA*, March, pp. 85-90. Housman's concern with responsibility, comradeship, and courage represents a social choice and their use in his poems was a matter of artistic convention.
- KINGSLEY. Scheuerle, William H. "'Magdalen at Michael's Gate': A Neglected Lyric." *Victorian Poetry*, Summer, pp. 144-46. A critical appreciation.
- KIPLING. Dobré, Bonamy. *Rudyard Kipling*. Oxford. Rev. *TLS*, 1 June, p. 485.
- Tarinayya, M. "East-West Encounter: Kipling." *Literary Criterion*, Winter 1966, pp. 28-41. The interaction in *Kim* of East and West was beneficial for both.
- MACAULAY. Weber, Ronald. "Singer and Seer: Macaulay on the Historian as Poet." *Papers on Language and Literature*, Summer, pp. 210-19. Macaulay saw the historian in the role of poet-philosopher-prophet.
- W. H. MALLOCK. Margolis, John D. "W. H. Mallock's *The New Republic*: A Study in Late Victorian Satire." *English Literature in Transition*, Vol. X, No. 1, pp. 10-25. The author uses the comic method to transmute his despair over the multiplicity of false philosophies in the nineteenth century.
- MEREDITH. Sage, Judith Ann. "George Meredith and Thomas Love Peacock: A Note on Literary Influence." *English Language Notes*, June, pp. 279-83. The similarity between a scene in *Crotchet Castle* and *The Amazing Marriage*.

- MORRIS. McAlindon, T. "The Idea of Byzantium in William Morris and W. B. Yeats." *Modern Philology*, May, pp. 307-19. Morris saw Byzantium as the ideal of a unified culture and this view influenced Yeats' own concept of Byzantium.
- Thompson, Paul. *The Work of William Morris*. Heinemann. Rev. *TLS*, 16 March, p. 214.
- OLIPHANT. Colby, Vineta and Robert A. *The Equivocal Virtue*. Archon Books. Life and works. Rev. *TLS*, 16 March, p. 210.
- MARK PATTISON. Sparrow, John. *Mark Pattison and the Idea of a University*. Cambridge. Rev. *TLS*, 11 May, pp. 389-90.
- ROSSETTI. Howard, Ronnalie Roper. "Rossetti's *A Last Confession*: A Dramatic Monologue." *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 21-29. The poem is a skillful and subtle dramatic monologue.
- RUSKIN. Lutyens, Mary. *Millais and the Ruskins*. John Murray. Rev. *TLS*, 16 March, p. 212.
- Severn, Arthur. *The Professor*. Ed. James S. Dearden. Allen and Unwin. Memoir of Ruskin. Rev. *TLS*, 16 March, p. 212.
- Unrau, John. "A Note on Ruskin's Reading of Pugin." *English Studies*, August, pp. 335-37. Ruskin read more of Pugin than he cared to admit.
- STEVENSON. Eigner, Edwin M. *Robert Louis Stevenson and Romantic Tradition*. Princeton. Rev. *TLS*, 22 June, p. 557.
- SWINBURNE. Kinneavy, Gerald B. "Character and Action in Swinburne's *Chastelard*." *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 31-39. The dynamic action of the play belongs to Mary, who fails in her attempt to overcome her limitations.
- McGhee, Richard D. "'Thalassius': Swinburne's Poetic Myth." *Victorian Poetry*, Summer, pp. 127-36. Imagery and myth are integral with each other in the poem.
- TENNYSON. Chandler, Alice. "Cousin Clara Vere de Vere." *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 55-57. Suggests that "Lady Clara Vere de Vere" is autobiographical despite Tennyson's denial.
- Gray, J. M. "Tennyson and Geoffrey of Monmouth." *Notes and Queries*, February 1967, pp. 52-53. Tennyson drew upon Geoffrey to dignify Arthur and create the necessary illusion of history.
- Ostriker, Alicia. "The Three Modes in Tennyson's Prosody." *PMLA*, May, pp. 273-84. Tennyson's prosodic variety, 1830-1842.
- Shaw, W. David. "The Idealist's Dilemma in *Idylls of the King*." *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 41-53. The Arthurian myth proposes that human order can never be final, for it is always guilty and always in need of redemption.
- . "The Transcendentalist Problem in Tennyson's Poetry of Debate." *Philological Quarterly*, January 1967, pp. 79-94. The poet anticipates the Symbolist Movement in his vision of nature and offers a solution to the transcendentalist problem.
- Short, Clarice. "Tennyson and 'The Lover's Tale.'" *PMLA*, March, pp. 78-84. The source of the poem was in young Tennyson's real or imaginary experiences.
- THACKERAY. Paris, Bernard J. "The Psychic Structure of 'Vanity Fair.'" *Victorian Studies*, June, pp. 389-410.
- While lacking a coherent aesthetic structure, the novel does have another kind of structure—that of its implied author's psyche.
- Sudrann, Jean. "The Philosopher's Property: Thackeray and the Use of Time." *Victorian Studies*, June, pp. 359-88. Time gives shape and point of view to Thackeray's novels.
- TROLLOPE. Dinwiddy, J. R. "Who's Who in Trollope's Political Novels." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June, pp. 31-46. Trollope's statesmen identified with contemporary figures.
- Ganzel, Carol H. "The Times Correspondent and *The Warden*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, March, pp. 325-36. The influence of some letters published in *The Times* in 1853 on *The Warden*.
- Morgan, Kathleen E. "The Relevance of Trollope." *English*, Summer, pp. 173-77. Trollope's novels are still of interest.
- Slakey, Roger L. "Melmotte's Death; A Prism of Meaning in *The Way We Live Now*." *ELH*, June, pp. 248-59. Melmotte's death is a prism through which Trollope examines the meaning of happiness.
- WILDE. Lambert, Eric. *Mad with Much Heart*. Muller. Study of Wilde's parents. Rev. *TLS*, 17 August, p. 741.
- Mason, Stuart (Christopher Millard). *Bibliography of Oscar Wilde*. Bertram Rota. Reissue. Rev. *TLS*, 11 May, p. 408.
- Migdal, Seymour. "The Poseur and the Critic in Some Essays of Oscar Wilde." *Dalhousie Review*, Spring, pp. 65-70. The method by which the pose and the genuine aesthetic concern interact in some of Wilde's critical writings.
- San Juan, Epifanio, Jr. *The Art of Oscar Wilde*. Princeton. Rev. *TLS*, 17 August, p. 741.
- White, Terence de Vere. *The Parents of Oscar Wilde*. Hodder and Stoughton. Rev. *TLS*, 17 August, p. 741.

PROJECTS—REQUESTS FOR AID

- T. B. MACAULAY. Thomas Pinney (Pomona College) invites information about Macaulay's letters, manuscripts, and private papers for an edition of the correspondence.
- F. D. MAURICE. E. Cleve Want is searching for any of Maurice's unpublished letters or papers and any information about his contributions to periodicals. *TLS*, 13 July, p. 624.
- GEORGE MEREDITH. Michael Collie asks for the whereabouts of Meredith manuscripts and correspondence for a descriptive check-list. *TLS*, 4 May, p. 386.
- WILLIAM MORRIS. Norman Kelvin desires knowledge of Morris' letters for a collected edition. *TLS*, 27 April, p. 365.
- CHARLES READE. Thomas D. Claeson wants to gather Reade's letters for a collected correspondence. *TLS*, 4 May, p. 386.
- ALGERNON SWINBURNE. Jean Overton Fuller needs personal reminiscences for a biography. *TLS*, 1 June, p. 493.

Staten Island Community College
City University of New York

English X News

A. THE CHICAGO MEETING

Chairman, Wendell Stacy Johnson, *Hunter College*

Secretary, Martin J. Svaglic, *Loyola University*

I. Business

II. Papers and Discussions

1. "Of Time, Rivers, and Tragedy: George Eliot and Matthew Arnold," U. C. Knoepfelmacher, *University of California, Berkeley*.
2. "Dickens, Mister Pickwick, and Master Humphrey," Carol de Saint Victor, *University of Iowa*.
3. "Dickens' Woman in White," Harry Stone, *San Fernando Valley State College*.

Advisory and Nominating Committee: Chairman, Martin J. Svaglic, *Loyola University* (1967); Michael Wolff, Kenneth Knickerbocker (1966-1967); Park Honan, R. H. Super (1967-1968); Roma A. King, David DeLaura (1968-1969).

1967 Program Chairman: Robert A. Greenberg, *Queens College*.

Bibliography Committee: Chairman, R. E. Freeman, *University of California, Los Angeles*; Robert A. Colby; Charles T. Dougherty; Dale Kramer; Edward S. Lauterbach; Oscar Maurer; Robert C. Slack; Richard C. Tobias.

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

1968 Officers: Chairman, Martin J. Svaglic, *Loyola University*; Secretary, John D. Rosenberg, *Columbia University*.

(Nominations to be voted on.)

B. THE VICTORIAN LUNCHEON

The 1967 Victorian Group luncheon will be held December 27 in the Palmer House, with cocktails at 12:00 and luncheon promptly at 1:00. For a reservation, please send a check for \$6.00 to Professor Martin J. Svaglic, Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois 60626, by 15 December.