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Bleak House and the Brothers Grimm

Joseph T. Flibbert

A few weeks after the final part of Bleak House was published in serial form, Charles Dickens printed in Household Words the "Platform profession" edition of Cinderella.1 Criticizing its bastardization of the tale in order to peddle the causes of prohibition, total abstinence, free trade, and feminism, Dickens not only acknowledges in the same article "a very great tenderness for the fairy tale literature of our childhood," but insists on its power to produce "gentleness and mercy . . . forbearance, consideration for the poor and aged . . . abhorrence of tyranny" in those who come under its influence. It is no coincidence that these qualities represent the more positive implications of Bleak House itself. For Dickens' novels frequently reflect the influence of his own experience with fairy-tale literature and sometimes consciously echo this experience. Recent Bleak House criticism has noted in passing the presence of these elements in the novel.2 Harry Stone has studied in detail fairy-tale influences in Great Expectations, David Copperfield, and Dombey and Son.3 No such study exists for Bleak House.

The purpose of this study is to examine the allusions to and motifs of fairy-tale literature in Bleak House to determine their impact on theme, structure, and intention.

That the fairy tale held a continuing fascination for Dickens is suggested in a Household Words article in which he lists Jack the Giant Killer and the stories of the Arabian Nights as indelible memories of his childhood reading.4 It is possible that the yearly enactment of fairy tales on the Victorian stage, particularly in Christmas season interludes and burlesques,5 and the popularity of editions of fairy tales during the period contributed to perpetuating that interest. Moreover, Dickens freely adopted the framework of the fairy tale in some of his briefer writings. For example, he uses the framework of the One Thousand and One Nights in a short tale in which he satirizes the tyranny of law, pensioners, and government officials who squander the public wealth.6 Another satire, on English bureaucratic red tape, is entitled, "Prince Bull. A Fairy Tale."7 In using adaptations of the fairy tale for social criticism, Dickens is not pursuing the course he deplores in the corrupt edition of Cinderella; he is working in the tradition of "pure" fairy tales that make a serious comment on reality. In Bleak House, the motifs of distressed princess, enchantment, and legend fulfillment work toward that end.

In the first chapter in which Esther Summerson serves as narrator, she says she was brought up "like some of the princesses in the fairy stories . . . by my godmother."8 Esther's estimation of her situation is not entirely accurate. Miss Barbary is hardly the image of the good fairy godmother. Through the intensity of her exhortations against Esther's tainted past, she creates a mental climate of restraint, guilt, alienation, loneliness, and confinement. If Esther is like a princess, she is a princess in distress, "different from other children," and terrified by
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4. Dickens, "Where We Stopped Growing," Household Words in Works, XXXV, 386-87. The article appeared January 1, 1853, shortly after Dickens began writing Bleak House.
5. The theatre notes section of The Spectator, for example, records burlesque performances of The Prince of the Happy Land at the Lyceum Theatre, Prince Radiant at Haymarket Theatre, and Little Red Riding Hood at the Adelphi Theatre in the December 27, 1851 issue (p. 1234). Many of the performances were very free adaptations of the original tales. Dickens began to write Bleak House in November, 1851.
6. The December 20, 1851 issue of The Spectator contains an advertisement under "New Christmas Books for Young People" for a book entitled A Treasury of Pleasure-Books for Children. First Series. Comprising Bo-peep, House That Jack Built, Cock Robin, Jenny Wren, Old Mother Hubbard, &c &c. Dickens was, of course, to utilize the name and the spirit of Jenny Wren in a later novel, Our Mutual Friend. There were also advertisements for fourteen other children's books on the same page of this issue, many of them collections of fairy tales. Dickens had an advertisement on the same page for the first volume of A Child's History of England and on the next page for an extra number of Household Words. In the Decembe 20, 1851 issue of The Examiner, a "Books for Christmas" review recommends Dickens' extra number of Household Words, as well as Alice Learmont, A Fairy Tale and a new version of Aesop's Fables.
9. Charles Dickens, Bleak House, ed. Morton Dauwen Zabel (Boston, 1956), p. 11. References to Bleak House are from this edition and will be noted in the text in parentheses.
the “darkened face [that] had such power over me” (p. 13). Miss Barbary’s attitude toward and influence over Esther is extended to Mrs. Rachael, who drops a cold kiss on Esther’s forehead and reminds her of her “misfortune” as Esther leaves Windsor after Miss Barbary’s death. When Esther relates the incident to Jarndyce in the coach to Reading, he replies, “Confound Mrs. Rachael! Let her fly away in a high wind on a broomstick” (p. 18). The emotionless, threatening environment of the cruel stepmother and the witch makes a deep impression on Esther. To the young girl who felt “so sensible of filling a place in her [Miss Barbary’s] house which ought to have been empty” (p. 14), the search for security, recognition, love, and stability becomes urgent.

Even under Jarndyce’s roof, the search is not ended; for though he is initially “guardian” and “protector” to her, the ambiguity of his later role as father-lover perpetuates the conflict in her past and diminishes the security she achieves at Bleak House. As a result, Esther tries to “win some love”: her affection for Ada is adulatory; she accomplishes her duties with exaggerated zeal; and she yields to Jarndyce’s proposal of marriage even though he is not a lover in her eyes. Esther, like many fairy-tale princesses, is afraid of being cast out into a world full of perils. She even makes provision for such a likelihood. The money she uses to help pay one of Skimpole’s debts was to have served as security in case something happened that “would throw me, suddenly, without any relation, or any property, on the world” (p. 58).

If Jarndyce isn’t Esther’s image of the ideal prince, Woodcourt is. Like many a prince, Woodcourt sets out on a journey that will involve establishing his identity and pursuing adventure and fortune before he can woo his princess. Woodcourt returns a hero; meantime, his lady has undergone physical transformation and is being wooed by a more influential man. No contest is necessary. Indeed, no contest is possible, for, unlike Woodcourt, Jarndyce does not confront conflict and crisis. As a physician, Woodcourt has healing powers; as a husband, he increases these powers, for Esther hints that her old beauty begins to return after her marriage.

Esther’s story ends “happily ever after.” The ending has been prefigured in the scene where Esther goes to Boythorn’s house to recuperate from her illness. When she arrives, she notes, “If a fairy had built the house for me with a wave of her wand, and I had been a princess and her favored godchild, I could not have been more considered in it” (p. 381). The good fairy turns out to be Jarndyce, who does build Esther a house, furnish it to suit her tastes, and make “a willing gift” of Esther to Woodcourt. Though the ending is contrived and sentimental if considered on the level of realistic fiction, within the framework of fairy-tale convention it is consistent and necessary, as Esther’s function as storyteller suggests. As a child, Esther frequently told the story of her unhappy birthday to her doll; it was her way of coping with the bewildering experience of being unloved. The story always ended with the projection of a secure and happy future. Esther remembers the comforting effect her tale had when she confronts the chaos of the Jellyby home as a young woman. When the Jellyby children are in danger of being overcome by the bewildering experience of neglect, Esther tells them the story of Little Red Riding Hood (p. 30). Just before they are put to bed by a young girl who charges “into the midst of the little family like a dragon” (p. 32), she tells them the story of Puss in Boots. On another occasion, when she is in danger of being “torn to pieces” in play with the children, she “fall[s] back on my fairy tales” (p. 254). In each case, the telling of the tale imposes order on a potentially chaotic situation. It does, in fact, duplicate the movement of the fairy tale from the threatening to the secure. Esther’s confidence in the power of the fairy tale to produce good effects is similar to Dickens’ sentiments, as suggested in an earlier quoted statement. It is Dickens’ way of asserting the superiority of experience that weds sensitivity and imagination to the “narrow world of fact,” (p. 221) the world of the Smallweeds. Judy Smallweed, unlike Esther, has “never owned a doll, never heard of Cinderella, never played at any game” (p. 220) because the Smallweed family “discontentenanced all story-books, fairy tales, fictions, and fables” (p. 219). Bart Smallweed “knows no more of Jack the Giant Killer, or of Sinbad the Sailor, than he knows of the people in the stars” (p. 221). And his story does not end so happily. As narrator of her own story, Esther patterns much of her account upon the familiar structure of the fairy tale. It is no surprise then that she idealizes the end of her own story.

Esther’s “darling,” Ada, has characteristics that associate her with the princess motif of fairy-tale literature also. Her description as a beautiful girl “with the fire shining upon her . . . with such rich golden hair, such soft blue eyes, and such a bright, innocent, trusting face” (p. 23) is conventional in the depiction of romantic and fairy-tale heroines. As a young, innocent, orphaned “child of the universe,” Ada is prey to the perils of life, as Esther is. For as Jarndyce observes, “the universe . . . makes rather an indifferent parent” (p. 35). The most powerful force she will encounter is prefigured in her first visit to Miss Flite’s room over Krook’s shop. When Krook sees her, he is tempted to cut off her golden locks to add to his collection of hair. The incident is not insignificant. As “Lord Chancellor” of the rag and bottle
shop, Krook collects the refuse of Chancery proceedings. Later, Ada is constantly in danger of being crushed by those proceedings.

Richard intercedes for Ada in Krook's shop. Ironically, he will cause Ada's distress through the real Court of Chancery. Unlike Woodcourt, who confronts and triumphs over real problems (the shipwreck and illness), Richard avoids reality for quixotic encounters with the windmills of Chancery. As a prince-hero, Richard is totally ineffectual, for he “build[s] as many castles in the air as would man the great wall of China” (p. 139). Even Ada, in all her naiveté, sees this. Fortunately, she does not depend entirely upon Richard. Esther, as her lady-in-waiting, and Jarndyce, as the wise old counselor—another prominent type in fairy-tale literature—protect Ada from the destructive influences of Richard's course. Meanwhile, Richard continues to “conjure up some indefinable means by which they were both to be made rich and happy for ever” (p. 260).

Caddy’s rise to the state of princess is primarily in terms of ironic parallels to the Cinderella motif of fairy-tale literature. She is the lowly heroine who marries the prince. She is the Cinder girl who rises out of the ashes. In her case, however, she rises out of the ink. Her life in the Jellyby home is characterized by exploitation and confinement. Moreover, Mrs. Jellyby, though Caddy’s actual mother, is cast as a cruel stepmother; she ignores her children and lavishes her favors on philanthropy, which she calls “a favorite child to me” (p. 253). In the Cinderella story, the prince sees the heroine at a ball and falls in love with her. In Bleak House, Prince sees Caddy at his dancing studio and falls in love with her. Unlike the prince of the fairy tale, Prince is a prince in name only. Ironically, Caddy dislikes the name because it reminds her of a dog. But the result of their marriage is the same. Caddy rises out of an intolerable situation and achieves love, security, and happiness.

Another manifestation of fairy-tale influence in the novel is the presence of the enchantment motif that functions primarily through Skimpole and the Chancery. Esther comments, when she, Ada and Richard meet Skimpole for the first time, “we were all enchanted” (p. 54). Though her meaning is that they find Skimpole delightful, he does quite literally cast a spell over the three young orphans, as well as over their guardian, Jarndyce. He does so primarily by assuming the disguise of a child, by denying any idea of time or money, and by charming them with a mock logic that is a travesty of reality. Skimpole has the reader’s sympathy early in the work. But he gradually loses it as the reader realizes he is taking advantage of the generosity of friends. His influence upon the Bleak House “family,” however, does not diminish until late in the work when Bucket strips him of his disguise and reveals his duplicity. Before that, Skimpole holds power over them by befuddling them with flights of fancy, irrelevant analogies, and spurious rhetoric. When Skimpole expounds his “Drone philosophy,” everyone listens intently. No one attempts to refute him, though Richard and Esther have just had to settle one of his debts for him. Because they assume he is a child, he makes them merry. But Skimpole is no child. Though he denies knowledge of business affairs, he is capable enough, in a practical sense, to keep out of debtor’s prison and shrewd enough to make the most succinct and poignant analysis of Chancery when he calls it “fees, fraud, horsehair wigs, and black gowns” (p. 403). Perhaps the best indication of the power of Skimpole’s glib tongue comes in the scene where he refutes Esther’s accusation that he has accepted a bribe from Bucket with a parody of the nursery rhyme, “The House That Jack Built.” When he completes his defense, Esther can only say, “I had nothing to offer in reply to this exposition” (p. 629). Toward the end of the work, Skimpole creates an east wind for Jarndyce. For, like Vholes, whom Esther likens to a vampire, Skimpole encourages Richard to pursue the Chancery suit and then he exploits him.

But Richard is hardly aware of Skimpole’s treachery, for he is under the influence of a much more compelling force—the Court of Chancery. At first, he goes to the Court out of curiosity. Gradually, the allurement of easy money and fascination with the intricacies of Chancery proceedings extend a tighter hold on him. He is intoxicated by the uncertainty, the frustration-hope cycle, the official jargon and documents, and commitment to a cause. It is as if he has been drugged. The Court of Chancery itself is described as an “oversleeping Rip Van Winkle” and a sleeping beauty “whom the knight will wake one day” (p. 6). Elsewhere, its proceedings are said to be worse than anything ever “dreamed of in the wildest visions of a Witch’s Sabbath” (p. 73). The spell-casting formula is simple: attract without satisfying. Richard is not alone in being charmed by the formula. Kenfe, Guppy, Krook, Snagsby, Tulkemhorn, Vholes, and especially Miss Flite and Gridley are also under its spell. As an orphan, Richard finds a home. But as Esther observes, “The Lord High Chancellor, at his best, appeared so poor a substitute for the love and pride of parents” (p. 24). When Esther visits the Court, Miss Flite welcomes her to her “domain” and Kenfe acts like a “proprietor” (p. 263). Gridley has abandoned his family in Shropshire to live in at the Court. The spell is not only paralyzing; it is also debilitating—physically (Tom Jarndyce, Gridley, Richard), mentally (Miss Flite, Gridley, Krook), and morally (Guppy, Tulkemhorn, Jobling, Vholes). It im-
mobilizes reason; Richard frequently insists that he is saving money by spending it (p. 184). Under the spell of the enchantment, reality is suspended; Esther notes upon her first visit to Chancery, "there seemed to be no reality in the whole scene" (p. 263). Reality returns only after the spell is broken by the dissolution of the Jarndyce and Jarndyce suit. The reality Richard returns to, however, is different from the youth, vigor, and optimism he left when he fell under the spell. The reality Richard must face is death.

Another motif common in fairy-tale literature—the fulfillment of a legend—also involves confrontation with death. It is the Ghost's Walk Legend of Chesney Wold. Chesney Wold itself is an unreal world that "cannot hear the rushing of the larger worlds, and cannot see them as they circle round the sun" (p. 6). It is a world "as old as the hills" (p. 7) in which "a general smell and taste of the ancient Dedlocks in their graves" (p. 6) dominates. It is a world of the past, the Towy world of feudalistic values evident in Sir Leicester's indignation at the "cracking of the framework of society, manifested through Mrs. Rouncewell's son," (p. 305) the ironmaster, and his chivalric pose toward Lady Dedlock, "the one little touch of romantic fancy in him" (p. 7). It is also a sterile world, "Fairy-land to visit, but a desert to live in" (p. 8).

In this world, there is a legend dating back to a conflict between a seventeenth-century owner of Chesney Wold, Sir Morbury Dedlock, and his wife. According to the legend, Lady Morbury Dedlock was crippled in a struggle with her husband while trying to prevent him from riding off to support the King's cause. Thereafter, she paced back and forth on the terrace, painfully, gradually wasting away. One day, she dropped to the pavement and said to her husband, "I will die here where I have walked. And I will walk here, though I am in my grave. I will walk here, until the pride of this house is humbled. And when calamity, or when disgrace is coming to it, let the Dedlocks listen for my step!" (p. 69) Sir Morbury and his wife bear a striking resemblance in circumstances to Sir Leicester and his wife, as Mrs. Rouncewell's description of the earlier Dedlocks suggests. "She was a lady of a haughty temper. They were not well suited to each other in age or character, and they had no children to moderate between them" (p. 69). The fact that Lady Dedlock does, in fact, have a child out of wedlock is the "disgrace" that will humble the pride of the Dedlock house. As Tulkinghorn and Guppy, working independently, near the truth, Lady Dedlock is pictured on the terrace. "Does she listen to the Ghost's Walk, and think what step does it most resemble? A man's? A woman's? The pattering of a little child's feet, ever coming on—on—on?" (p. 304). Tulkinghorn and Guppy seem to work in complicity with the malevolent spirits of the house, "the dead and buried Dedlocks who walk there in the long nights" (p. 305). Even after his death, Tulkinghorn seems to hold a terrible power over Lady Dedlock, for "from this pursuer, living or dead... there is no escape but in death" (p. 576). The following day, Lady Dedlock is dead, at the foot of her lover's grave. George calls the legend "old-story fears," but Lady Morbury Dedlock has the last word. The House of Dedlock has been humbled.

In addition to the major motifs of distressed princess, enchantment, and legend fulfillment, the novel weaves a deliberate pattern of interplay between the fibers of reality and fantasy. Esther's nicknames,10 the allusions to Guppy as an enchanter (p. 221), to Smallweed as a goblin (p. 222), to Krook's cat as "the wolf of the old saying" (p. 43), the rumor that Captain Hawdon has sold his soul to the devil, the confinement of Miss Flite's birds, the superstitions of Guster (p. 271), Miss Flite's omen, the contesting of the will are all part of the pattern of a final texture rich in the allusiveness of nondiscursive symbolism and appealing to the deep impulses of the fairy tale.

In the end, Dickens—teller of tales, enchanter—has not left us in a world of fantasy but through it has made poignant comments on man's relation to reality. Most characters in Bleak House refuse to recognize realities of their own circumstances. Jarndyce refuses to acknowledge the existence of the Jarndyce and Jarndyce suit; Skimpole rejects his responsibility as a parent; Richard disregards the futility of Chancery proceedings; Prince overlooks his father's selfishness; Turveydrop prefers to ignore the demise of Department; Mrs. Jellyby neglects her children; Sir Leicester Dedlock is blind to the new order of things; Miss Flite is unaware of the whole world outside Chancery; Mrs. Snagsby will not accept the integrity of her husband; Mrs. Badger is not conciliated to the death of her first two husbands. Others mistake the world of fact for all of reality (Smallweed, Krook, Tulkinghorn, Vholes, Guppy). Reality is Caddy's deaf-dumb child; it is Ada's orphaned son; it is Esther's scarred face. Reality is painful but not hopeless. Fairy-tale literature has always recognized this. In the reversal of fortune, sudden resurgence, and ultimate victory over in-
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surmountable odds characteristic of the fairy tale, man’s indomitable spirit to rise above illusion and fear is affirmed. In *Bleak House*, the pattern of reversal, resur-

gence, and victory points to the resoluteness, courage, sensitivity, and optimism of Caddy, Ada, and Esther in their final acceptance of reality as it is.

*University of Illinois*

New Perspective on the Companion Poems of Robert Browning

*Nancy B. Rich*

The term “companion” has long been used as a designation of the obvious relationship between certain of Robert Browning’s poems, but this seems strangely incongruous with the accepted notion that whatever else Browning may have been, he was not obvious. In fact, the incongruity may be alleviated only by the conclusion that the relationship between poems is obvious because, like the design in an Oriental rug, every obscure thread in its fabric is skillfully planned and deftly woven. Thus the perfection of the finished article is in direct proportion to the artistry of its construction, and the apparently casual and obvious relationship between poems is due to the intricate and ingenious poetic technique that produced it. A disentanglement of the poetic fiber that constitutes the so-called companion poems results in the emergence of a basic artistic pattern common to all sets of these poems regardless of surface variations. Evaluation of Browning’s work, therefore, cannot be complete without consideration of this pattern.

Its basis is complementary antithesis, for a broad interpretation of any given set of companions reveals that though both poems deal with the same subject, each approaches that subject from an opposite yet complementary position. For instance when, in a set, Browning focuses on the strongly emotional aspects of man’s relation to man, one poem portrays hatred (“Soliloquy in a Spanish Cloister”) while the companion depicts love (“Incident in a French Camp”).

The complementary relationship lends depth and breadth to simple lyric poems. The pair “Meeting at Night” and “Parting at Morning” may be said to render mood. If so, one poem evokes excitement, the other calm. If the poems depict man’s relation to his home, then one poem reflects his approach to it, the other his departure. More subtly suggested in these poems is the larger theme of man’s relation to his world, in which case one poem defines man’s emotional and physical involvement with woman, and the other his more objective and intellectual association with man.

But though the complementary relationship helps to extend the meaning of the shorter poems, it tends to sharpen the focus in longer, more involved ones. “Cleon” and “Karshish” deal essentially with the question of man and God—specifically, how man may arrive at an understanding and acceptance of Christianity. But Cleon reasons, Karshish investigates. As separate poems, each reaches a negative conclusion, one to the effect that man cannot reach God through logical progressions, the other that he cannot through scientific proof. Together, however, the two negative statements add up to one positive, which is the central idea of the set: man can reach God through faith.

The principle of complementary antithesis has, of course, been recognized and even defined. Roma King suggests it in his title *The Bow and the Lyre*, uses it as a basis for his comparison of “Andrea Del Sarto” and “Fra Lippo Lippi,” and states it explicitly when he comments that Browning “avoided the single point of view, preferring rather to approach problems from different intellectual and emotional positions.”

This insight not only describes the result, but also provides a key to the technique with which it was achieved. If the result is two poems dealing with art, this result will have been achieved by the depiction of corresponding or parallel characters, situations, and images, but with different personalities, characteristics, and delineations. Thus in the internal construction of the companion poems, Browning adheres in principle to the same idea he uses as a framework: similarity between poems in the larger aspects, contrast in the smaller.

For instance, the larger aspects, character and situation, in “The Italian in England” and “The Englishman
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in Italy" are the same: each speaker is in a foreign country and is temporarily involved with a local girl. The particulars of character and situation, however, differ, for one man is seeking help, the other giving it; one is engaged in action, the other in talk; one is surrounded by conflict, the other by calm.

In some of the companions even particulars of character and situation will be similar, but in such cases other elements will differ. For instance in "The Laboratory" and "The Confessional" not only are the central characters similar in age and sex and in the general involvement with love, betrayal, intrigue, and counter betrayal, but also each one seeks help and gets it. The contrast is primarily in the irony of situation, for one girl’s lover is true yet she is unhappy; the other’s is false yet she is cheerful. One girl seeks a morally unsound solution (the alchemist’s poison) to her problem and appears to succeed; the other chooses a morally acceptable solution (the confessional) and seems to fail utterly. The murderous girl goes free, while the pious one is imprisoned.

The moral implications of these ironic contrasts seem rather startling in view of Browning Society convictions, but then either poem taken separately is just as startling in the same way. If one reads the two poems together as companions, however, the juxtaposition of alchemist and confessional aligns them as similarly pseudo panaceas and by that very means separates the confessional from essential religious faith, suggesting that it is not the church Browning indicts but only that one aspect of it, the confessional. This interpretation makes sense, for Browning "showed little understanding of, or sympathy for, Roman Catholicism." Reading the poems as companions helps paradoxically to interpret them as individuals.

But at times these contrasting elements have obscured rather than clarified the companion relationship. A case in point is his first published pair, whose apparent dissimilarities in character and situation have resulted in their separation, one to be evaluated as little more than "the reflections of a nineteenth century Presbyterian clergyman, seated in his comfortable library" and the other said to treat "the murder of the beloved purely on psychological grounds." These evaluations are valid as far as they go, but they stop short. The clergyman’s reflections are not Presbyterian but Antinomian. The lover’s neurosis is not that of a "schizoid sexual maniac," but a manifestation of Neoplatonism. Neoplatonic asceticism is never mentioned in “Porphyria’s Lover,” but Neoplatonism is central to much of Browning’s thought, the historical representative of Neoplatonism was Porphyry (the feminine of which is Porphyria), and the poem is explicit. Throughout the entire first section (ll. 1-31) the speaker is, in effect, a nonparticipating observer of the scene. Though a violent storm rages around him, he makes no effort to protect or warm himself. It is the girl who shuts the door against the storm. It is she who removes her own coat, builds a fire, calls to him, moves to his side, and eventually must provide the exertion necessary to raise his arm to a position around her waist. His inertia is so glaringly inconsistent with the titular designation of him as “lover” in the ordinary, unphilosophical sense of the word that the only plausible assumption is that he embodies the concept of the Neoplatonic lover—a conclusion that explains his disinterest as asceticism. Thus, far from being dissimilar, these poems are alike in that they both deal essentially with specific religious doctrines.

If one recognizes the basic thematic correspondence between these poems, then similarity of situation and character becomes a basis for comparison and contrast. Whereas both speakers reach an impasse in attempting to understand their beliefs, each approaches the central concept from an opposing (complementary) position. Agricola soliloquizes on his beliefs; the lover acts on his. Agricola is egocentric; the lover is self-denying. In the first section of both poems (through l. 31) each man is an apparently moral advocate of a common doctrinal code. But in the second section each is guilty of immorality. Neither feels compunction, for both are certain that God is on their side. Agricola says that he is chosen of God and therefore God, not he, is responsible for the consignment of others to damnation. The lover, believing that the "instinct that arises from the soul . . . is literally motivated by God," can feel no blame for the impulsive murder he commits. In effect, Agricola follows Antinomian dogma into an intellectual impasse, while the lover translates Neoplatonic doctrine into a physical impasse, so that the two complement each other in demonstrating the types of distortion fanaticism can bring to religion.

Oddly enough, though these two poems are seldom linked more than cursorily (as “Madhouse Cells”), they parallel each other almost line for line. Each contains

sixty iambic lines that are divisible into an equal number of stanzas that follow the pattern a b a b b, and in each poem there is a four-part division with the turning point at the center (l.31). Introduction of the speaker occurs in the first stanza, in which he comments upon some aspect of nature. Though the comment he makes seems natural, it shows a decided emphasis on self in one poem and undertones of paranoia in the other. The next few stanzas outline his religious convictions, and they appear normal and conventional. In the second half of each poem, however, the speaker reveals how his beliefs affect his relationship with other people and thereby portrays the full extent of the abnormality already hinted at in the opening stanza. The last few lines of both poems pose a question that in tone resembles the first (moral) section but in undertone emphasizes the second (immoral) one.

Most companions are not so closely parallel in structure as are these two early ones; however, Browning manages to maintain unity through comparison-contrast equilibrium in nearly all the sets by establishing similar systems of internal (chiefly imagistic) balance in both poems.

In “Cleon” the general movement is from high to low. Material and aesthetic achievement and close kinship with the Gods are accentuated by the tower image and references to Zeus. Physical and spiritual decadence is depicted by the urn reference and Cleon’s refusal to listen to the preaching of Paul. In “Karshish” the movement is reversed. The lowly physical position of Karshish at the beginning is graphically supported by his descriptions of his weariness, his injuries, his exposure to attack by wild beasts, and his having to sleep in a “lowly covert.” His position in the chain of life is “like a paste,” a phrase suggesting that he is a long way from the spiritual vicinity of God. At the end, however, he is uplifted by wonder and awe. He is specifically associated with the “Blue-flowering borage, the Aleppo sort” which Berdoe says the ancients proclaimed “one of the four ‘cordial flowers’ for cheering the spirits . . . it produces very exhilarating effects.”

Though the imagery in the two poems of a companion pair is generally different in nature so as to support antithetical positions (as in the high-low movements just described), sometimes a corresponding central or focal image occurs in both. The “thread of life” appears in both “Cleon” and “Karshish.” Cleon says,

They praise a fountain in my garden here
Wherein a Naiad sends the water-bow

Thin from her tube; she smiles to see it rise.
What if I told her, it is just a thread
From that great river which the hills shut up,
And mock her with my leave to take the same?
The artificer has given her one small tube
Past power to widen or exchange—what boots
To know she might spout oceans if she could?
She cannot lift beyond her first thin thread:
And so a man can use but a man’s joy
While he sees God’s. (ll. 251-62)

The point of the analogy is clear. Like the Naiad, man aspires to rise, reaches confidently ahead. But also like her, his forward motion is circumscribed, for he is bound by his mortality, given him “past power to widen or exchange.” Unlike her, however, he does not need to be told; he recognizes his limitations and, in the recognition, despairs.

In man there’s failure, only since he left
The lower and inconceivable forms of life.
We called it an advance . . . (ll. 225-27)

We struggle, fain to enlarge
Our bounded physical reciprocity,
Increase our power, supply fresh oil to life. (ll. 245-47)

Who seest the wider but to sigh the more.
Most progress is most failure. (ll. 271-72)

What Cleon means is that the thread of life is a logical progression toward ultimate truth until at last he should reach perfection. But the closer he gets, the clearer it is that he cannot reach the end of the thread.

The imagery in the companion poem depicts the power of God all around the thread of life, not at the end of it.

In describing Lazarus, Karshish says,

He holds on firmly to some thread of life—
(It is the life to lead perforcefully)
Which runs across some vast distracting orb
Of glory on either side that meagre thread,
Which conscious of, he must not enter yet—
The spiritual life around the earthly life:
The law of that is known to him as this,
His heart and brain move there, his feet stay here.
So is the man perplexed with impulses
Sudden to start off crosswise, not straight on,
Proclaiming what is right and wrong across,
And not along, this black thread. . . . (ll. 178-89)

Another image that occurs in both poems is fire. Karshish describes Lazarus’ vacillation between the other

world and this: “then back he sinks at once/To ashes, who was very fire before” (ll. 195-96). Fire represents the essence of life which only God can give to man, and it is the one perfection, according to Cleon, beyond man’s power to reach:

All this joy in natural life is put
Like fire from off thy finger into each,
So exquisitely perfect is the same.
But ‘tis pure fire, and they mere matter are;
It has them, not they it. . . . (ll. 203-7)

Cleon, then, sees this essence as a thing which possesses man, but which man may not possess (ll. 245-47). Karshish, on the other hand, unknowingly obedient to the biblical “Seek and ye shall find,” puts his finger inadvertently on God’s stated requisites for success (“Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child”) when he says to Abib:

Thou and the child have each a veil alike
[By veil he means humility]
Thrown o’er your heads, from under which he doth
Stretch your blind hands and trifle with a match
Over a mine of Greek fire. . . . (ll. 174-77)

Cleon the Greek lacks the spark of humility to ignite the wealth of knowledge he has mined and bring him closer to the essence of God and life. Karshish has the match, if he only knew it.

Thus thread and fire imagery are central to both poems and provide a focal point on which the internal balance of dissimilar images may turn.

As if such carefully balanced construction were not enough, Browning devised no fewer than four external clues to link companion poems. First, he originally published many companion poems together. Second, he often supplied individual poems of a set with one common title. Third, he made separate titles correspond in some way with each other. Fourth, he added subtitles.

Browning’s first published book of poems, Dramatic Lyrics, contains five sets of companion poems, all (except “Johannes Agricola” and “Porphyria’s Lover,” which had already appeared together in the Monthly Repository) published together for the first time and all bearing a superior title common to the two in each companion set. Short of writing a preface, Browning could hardly have been more explicit. He even numbered the separate companion poems to be sure the reader would see that each was only part of a set. “My Last Duchess” and “Count Gismond” were “I. Italy” and “II. France” under the common title Italy and France.

The connection between separate titles of a pair is sometimes obvious, as in “Englishman in Italy” and “Italian in England,” but sometimes it is so subtle it defies recognition. I have already pointed out that the “Madhouse Cells,” “Johannes Agricola,” and “Porphyria’s Lover” appear dissimilar. Once the meaning of the poems is understood, however, the parallelism between the titles becomes quite clear. Johannes Agricola is a lover of Antinomianism; Neoplatonism (Porphyria) also has a lover. The parallel and reverse is characteristic. Another example is Garden Fancies, part I of which is “The Flower’s Name” and part II of which is the flower’s name: “Sibaudus Schafranbargensis.”

The fourth device is the subtitle. Not all companion poems have subtitles. Particularly is this true of the shorter poems (“Meeting at Night”; “Parting at Morning”). Also, some poems that do not have subtitles have instead some sort of lengthy extension to an individual main title that serves the same purpose as does the subtitle (“An Epistle Containing the Strange Medical Experience of Karshish, the Arab Physician”). Then some sets have both a lengthy extension and a subtitle (“Cleon” is subtitled “As certain of your own poets have said—’”).

Though there are no subtitles in “Porphyria’s Lover” and “Johannes Agricola in Meditation” the extension “in Meditation” serves to link the poems by emphasizing a basic contrast. Agricola is in meditation; his soliloquy reveals his religious convictions. Here the opposite of meditation is action, and it is through acting the part of an ascetic that the religious views of the speaker in the companion poem are revealed. In fact, if one fails to see the importance of the action, one misses the point of the poem. Thus the extension comments directly on the poem in which it occurs and focuses on the central aspect of contrast to be found between it and the companion in which it does not occur.

The subtitle of “Andrea Del Sarto” clearly directs the reader to the main difference between the artist in this poem and his counterpart in “Fra Lippo Lippi.” “Called the Faultless Painter,” Andrea’s faultlessness is his greatest weakness. In contrast, Lippo has many faults, but in them lies his greatest strength.

Two of Browning’s poems (“De Gustibus—” and “Up at a Villa—down in the City”) which appear never to have been associated even in a general way (except by the suggestion that their composition might date from the same time and place) are most certainly companion poems, and in this set there is both an extension of title and a subtitle. “De Gustibus—” is only part of the Latin
“De gustibus non est disputandum,” which translated means “There is no disputing about tastes.” The poem consists of two parts, each depicting a different scene, but these parts have one thing in common. Though the persons in both parts have different tastes as to the locales they love, the underlying values that prompt their loves are the same. Each loves the simple “free” things in life. In part one the speaker is a “lover of trees,” and in part two he is a lover of the wild, the natural, in nature and in man. Their tastes, in other words, are essentially the same and in direct contrast to the taste of the speaker in “Up at a Villa—Down in the City” who prefers the artificial, the man-made, and whose descriptions of the two locales in that poem are colored by that taste.

The two locales, villa and city, as outlined in “Up at a Villa—Down in the City” are described by an Italian whose sophisticated viewpoint is suggested by that poem’s subtitle “As Distinguished by an Italian Person of Quality.” We find in him a delight in pomp, noise, gaiety, color, and elegance. Thus the subtitle accurately suggests the central focus of that poem and focuses on the basis of contrast between it and its companion. In the other poem the Italian becomes an Englishman and the quality becomes a love of nature and simple things. Central to both poems, then, is the idea that one’s tastes are based on and therefore distinguished by the quality of one’s values. Incidentally, the two central images of these poems support the focus. The sophisticated speaker dislikes the cypress “that points like death’s lean lifted forefinger” and the cicala because its shrilling is interminable. The speaker in the other poem loves the cypress because to him it represents the permanence of life and the cicala despite its inability to live in certain conditions. Both the title extension and the subtitle clarify the basic contrast and cement the companionship connection.

It has been my intention to show that the method used by Browning in the creation of his companion poems is a palpable artistic technique, capable of definition and analysis, and therefore that it should not be omitted from any serious study of the poet’s work. In comparison with other poetic devices it has one distinct advantage. Its aspects are numerous enough to act as checks and proofs. It is, for instance, less apt to be misleading than imagery. In 1962, Tilton and Tuttle explained “Count Gismond” as a “highly complex and subtle psychological study,” in contrast to former evaluations of the poem as “a story too simple to interest Browning’s intellect.”11 Their insight was based on recognition of the falconry image in the poem, and their proof rested on its repetition throughout the poem. The way Browning constructed the poem, the falcon is only one key, and there are many other aspects to support it.

Also, while the image in “Count Gismond” has indeed proved to be a key, imagery can be misleading. For instance, a recent study states that in “Karshish” the “lustful lynx, the watching spider, and the old lion certainly reflect Karshish’s own passion, shrewd alertness, and that worldly wisdom he has acquired through experience.”12 These characteristics may or may not be somewhat akin to Karshish’s nature—though to me they seem hardly applicable to a man who “blushes,” lets “zeal outrun discretion,” and cannot “discern in what is writ” good cause for having written it. Apparently, the critic has removed the items from context and grouped them as images to suit his thesis. In context, the lion is not in the same section as the other two. In context, the lynx supports the expositional depiction of Karshish’s physical and spiritual state. The spider, also a part of this section of the poem, is used primarily to balance the flower image at the end of the poem. Because this particular spider is a species that “belongs to the Wandering group” they stalk their prey in the open field, or in divers lurking places, and are quite different in their habits from the web-spinners,”13 it is used to parallel the essential contrasts between Karshish, the seeker, and Cleon, the sought. As an internal balance to the uplift of the spiritual suggested by the flower at the end of the poem, the spider “watches on the ledge of Tombs” (resting place of the physical). As a complementary balance to the companion poem, it contrasts Karshish’s position of wandering and lurking with Cleon’s of sitting complacently. As a counterbalance to the image balance in “Cleon,” it associates Karshish with the tomb in juxtaposition to Cleon’s association with the urn.

An awareness of the complementary companion-poem technique lends perspective and dimension to the reading of Browning’s poems. It prevents the separation of poems, which, when read individually, are less than satisfactory, and is a deterrent to the isolation and misuse of individual poetic elements. A tangible, artistic device, the companion-poem technique is a tribute to the genius and skill of Robert Browning.
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Abandon the Day: FitzGerald’s *Rubáiyát* of Omar Khayyám

**David Sonstroem**

*Edward FitzGerald’s Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* bravely offers its famous remedy, “A Book of Verses . . . / A Jug of Wine, a Loaf of Bread—and Thou” (st. 12), as triumphant insulation against the thought of eternal extinction. But this quatrains, like some other passages expressing optimism or satisfaction, is rather out of keeping with the rest of the poem, whose overall impression is of helpless, sodden pessimism and richly melancholic despair. The poem as a whole offers a suggestive departure from the carpe diem sentiments found in this quatrains, introducing the traditional motif only to belie it. By this means the poem achieves an especially poignant—and peculiarly Victorian—pathos.

The typical carpe diem poem expresses limited optimism. It holds that experiencing and enjoying every moment of life to the utmost, usually in pursuit of love, serves to counterbalance the prospect of a short life followed by interminable death. According to the economics of *Catullus V*, for example, the one large debit of death is liquidated by countless kisses. Impending death lends an additional exciting urgency to the poet’s amatory pleasure. And that pleasure makes possible a certain insensitivity toward the prospect of death, as despair is erased in a burst of obfuscating enthusiasm. Horace’s *Ode I, 11* does not exhibit the same enthusiasm or insensitivity in the face of death as does Catullus’ poem, but it, too, presents a purposeful program. More judicious and reasoned than *Catullus V*, it counsels sensibleness rather than ecstasy. Again life and death are viewed partly as an economic matter, a matter of profit and loss (see the verbs *dererint*, *tribuit*, *carpe*). Here the reader does not find the suggestion of victory that he does in *Catullus V* but instead the prudent advice to make a partial recovery of future losses—to take what one can get from a losing proposition. Even dreggy wine is potable when clarified. Whereas Catullus’ poem is a surprise attack upon death, Horace’s is a tenacious holding operation. But, for all their differences, both poems find life and love all the more dear for being under the shadow of death.

Three familiar English poems that employ the motif are Herrick’s “To the Virgins, to Make Much of Time,” Jonson’s “Come, My Celia,” and Marvell’s “To His Coy Mistress.” The first two are marked by a blunted sense of death. In the poem by Herrick, especially, death is still evoked as the reason “to make much of time,” but only *pro forma*, to remind the lady of the hoary argument being proffered, mention alone apparently being considered enough to provoke the appropriate response. The familiarity and informality implied in the line, “Old time is still a-flying,” show that the *argumentum ad mortem* has become stylized, formulaic, incantatory. And Jonson makes dramatic capital of a similar failure to appreciate death duly. The evil Volpone (who sings “Come, My Celia” in his attempt to seduce the grasping Corvino’s wife) cannot successfully contemplate the significance of death but dwells instead upon the meager consideration of “household spires” and detection. His sense of sin is much stronger than his sense of death, as his words “delude,” “beguile,” “wile,” “sin,” “steal,” “thefts,” and “crimes” reveal. Volpone feels merely lustful and guilty, with no larger view of death to justify his lust, in spite of his pretensions.

The distinctiveness of “To His Coy Mistress” lies in its wit in calling attention to the disparity between problem and answer—the disparity between eternal extinction and light-handed seduction. Marvell has the wit to see and present the act of love as something trivial, playful, something to be treated lightly, even as he sees it as man’s most effective retort to death. But for all its distinctiveness, the poem is like those of Catullus and Horace in its vivid appreciation of the fact of death: of “Time’s wingèd chariot” and the “Deserts of vast eternity.” And in its response—making the best of a bad future by seizing upon life with might and main—it shares with all the poems, Latin and English, what might be called the common denominator of the motif.

II

FitzGerald himself sees his *Rubáiyát* as expressing, at least in part, carpe diem sentiments. In a letter of 12 March 1857, continued 20 March, to E. B. Cowell, he remarks that “Hafiz and old Omar Khayyám ring like true Metal. The Philosophy of the Latter is, alas!, one that never fails in the World. ‘To-day is ours, etc.’” In another letter to the same correspondent he does not dif-

---

1. All quotations are from the fifth, posthumous version of 1889, although my reading of the poem applies to the earlier versions as well.
2. I treat the English poem as intimately FitzGerald’s. The question of how faithfully FitzGerald rendered the spirit of the original Omar Khayyám is beside the point of this essay.
ferentiate between Omar’s posture toward life and Anacreon’s: “Omar breathes a sort of Consolation to me! Poor Fellow; I think of him, and Olivier Basselin, and Anacreon; lighter Shadows among the Shades, perhaps, over which Lucretius presides so grimly.” In his Introduction to the Rubáiyát he says that “the old Tent-maker . . . fell back upon TO-DAY . . . as the only Ground he had to stand upon . . .” Earlier in the Introduction he remarks of the speaker of his poem, “Having failed (however mistakenly) of finding any Providence but Destiny, and any World but This, he set about making the most of it . . .”

Indeed the Rubáiyát does present many of the same elements of the other poems: the young lady, who is being instructed in the grim lot of mankind; time fleeting (st. 7: “The Bird of Time has but a little way / To flutter—and the Bird is on the Wing’); flowers withering on the bough; the denial of an afterlife (st. 35: “‘once dead you never shall return’”); the appeal to cosmic economics (st. 13: “Ah, take the Cash, and let the Credit go’”; st. 24: “Ah, make the most of what we yet may spend, / Before we too into the Dust descend”); and the request to “fill the Cup.” But, even allowing for variations within the traditional attitude, we find that these typical elements do not fall into the typical pattern. They do not make the same sense.

The Rubáiyát differs drastically from all the other poems in its crucial gesture—abandoning the day rather than seizing upon it. The gesture of the poem is embedded in the poet’s advice to “lose your fingers in the tresses of / The Cypress-slimed Minister of Wine” (st. 41. I take the lady here to be largely a metaphor for the wine itself). The symbol for the attitude of the poem is a languid hand rather than a grasping one. A sign of the difference is the poet’s turning to wine rather than women for his solace. (Of course, wine and women are together present here as in the other poems, but here the woman’s primary function is to bring wine to the poet, whereas in the typical carpe diem poem the wine brings the woman to the poet.)

5. Omar—really a solitary—is not trying to “roll all our strength and all / Our sweetness up into one ball,” but rather to drink himself into a forgetful stupor. His aim, to put the matter plainly, is to achieve insensibility, not sexual climax. He is trying to dull and destroy, not sharpen his awarenesses:

Oh, many a Cup of this forbidden Wine Must drown the memory of that insolence!

Then to the Lip of this poor earthen Urn
I leaned, the Secret of my Life to learn;
And Lip to Lip it murmured—“While you live,
Drink!—for, once dead, you never shall return.” (st. 35)

Drink, not to enjoy life, or to answer back to impending death, but to drown out the unbearable thought of eternal death.

The poet is quite explicit about the function of wine. In stanza 59 he praises “the Grape” for its power to “confute” the “Two-and-Seventy jarring Sects” and to transmute “Life’s leaden metal into Gold.” Drunkenness has the power, that is, to erase distinctions, to make all one. Drink enough, and even death and life will seem to become one (st. 42). Yet, as we have seen, the carpe diem poem lives upon the difference between life and death.

The imagery of the poem gives a good sense of the blary state that the poet is partly experiencing and partly seeking. The same images swirl through the poem—the Sun, the Stars, the Tavern, the Temple, the Rose, the Cup, the Vine, the Wine, the Wilderness or Desert, Paradise, Dust, the Door, the Lip, the Vessel—capitalization calling our attention to these familiar but wandering buoys in a lower-case sea. Reiteration produces a winy, vertiginous effect; after a while we find ourselves reading the Rubáiyát as “poetry,” in the worst sense of the word, conscious of the rhetorical ride but caring little where we are or where we are being taken.

The effect is furthered by the elaborate way in which images flow in and out of one another, constantly changing their meaning. For example, in stanza 41. “Tomorrow’s tangle” is quickly transmuted into the tangles of a girl’s hair, only to become the tangle-headedness produced by alcohol. In stanza 20, a human lip turns into a river’s lip. The clay for the vessel of stanzas 35 and 36 could have been dug from this same river’s lip; at least the poet thinks that the clay “once did live.” The lips of this vessel speak and murmur, and they take and give kisses. Thus life becomes death becomes life; the train of imagery returns to its starting point. But the most spectacular imagistic odyssey is that connected with the cup shape. Man’s whole world is seen as being beneath a bowl—“that inverted Bowl they call the Sky” (st. 72). The larger image meets with many reflections: in the wine cup, the burial urn, and especially in man himself, seen as potter’s vessel, as (cup-shaped) rose, as tulip, as momentary, superficial bubble of life on the wine of


5. The distinction that I make here does not apply to the poems of Anacreon and his followers—poems that express carelessness as to whether enjoyment comes from wine or women.
existence. The net effect of this extravagant interrelationship is precisely a “tangle,” all things coming to mean all things. And who would seek to comprehend such a state of affairs or strive against it? The drunken vision justifies the drunken state.

The great irony of the Rubáiyát, which removes it even further from the typical carpe diem poem, is that the poet fails in his attempt to abandon the day. In fact, he is a failure in a number of respects. For good dramatic reasons, we are not entirely won over to his point of view, in the sense that a reader provisionally accepts, while he reads, views that he ultimately need not espouse. We sympathize deeply, but we do not forget that the poem is launched in the ironic light of false morning.

A sign of the poet’s failure (I speak of the dramatic character, of course, and not Fitzgerald) is the meandering quality of the poem and its length. Whereas the speaker of the typical carpe diem poem glances once at death and exits toward the love bed, this poet goes on and on, dwelling upon and returning to the considerations he seeks to escape. He drinks to forget, only to find that drinking has turned his painful concern into an obsession. He is a would-be Anacreon who does not rejoice in wine because he sees only the bottom of the cup. He attempts to escape from the ultimate questions by denying their importance (see, for example, sts. 44, 46, and 48); yet the questions keep reappearing. The very stanzaic form (a a b a) serves nicely as a metric metaphor for the poem’s overall movement: a pessimistic pattern is established (a a), the poet attempts to break away from it (b), but he ends by reiterating the original predicament (a). The poem’s most pathetic effect is the speaker’s failure to realize that he has failed, to realize that he is incapable of true diversion.

Another sign of the poet’s failure is his dramatically appropriate inconsistencies. Sometimes death is seen as the end of individual existence (sts. 24, 25, 35, 46, 48, 62); elsewhere it is seen as offering the possibility of further existence (sts. 38, 44); and elsewhere the future is simply seen to be unknown, a “tangle” (sts. 29, 32, 33, 41, 74). By contrast the typical carpe diem poem is very sure of its metaphysics. The poet says, of man (st. 74), “you know not whence you came, nor why; / . . . you know not why you go, nor where”; yet he confidently asserts in the previous and following stanzas that all things are predetermined. He urges man to “Waste not your Hour” (st. 54), yet he prays to death to “make haste” (st. 48). Furthermore, he is inconsistent in where he levels his scorn: at “this sorry Scheme of Things” (sts. 99, 81); at philosophy, which calls attention to it (sts. 27-30, 49-56); and at religion, which seeks to soften man’s sense of its enormity (sts. 59, 62-63, 82-88). He says that he has “divorced old barren Reason” (st. 55), even as he philosophizes. Such inconsistencies, suggestive of semidrunkenness, indicate the unapprehended failure of his argument.

It is in this context that we must read the poet’s carpe diem sentiments. They are just one more of the poses that his deep despair will not permit him to uphold. Almost all of these passages come early in the poem, by stanza 25, and all are effectively contradicted or soon forgotten. We do find the vision of “Paradise enow” (st. 12), and the exhortations to “take the Cash” (st. 13) and to “make the most of what we yet may spend, / Before we too into the Dust descend.” (st. 24) But this position is too optimistic to be sustained, for, as the next stanza declares in apparently unconscious contradiction, there is no Cash, there is no present pleasure, to throw into the face of death:

Alike for those who for TODAY prepare,
And those that after some TOMORROW stare,
A Muezzín from the Tower of Darkness cries,
“Fools, your Reward is neither Here nor There.”

“Here” is just as empty and valueless as “There.” Earlier we find the same pattern of carpe diem sentiment followed by a stanza showing that sentiment to be hollow:

Look to the blowing Rose about us—“Lo,
Laughing,” she says, “into the world I blow,
At once the silken tassel of my Purse
Tear, and its Treasure on the Garden throw.”

And those who husband the Golden Grain,
And those who flung it to the winds like Rain,
Alike to no such aureate Earth are turned
As, buried once, Men want dug up again. (sts. 14, 15)

Under the cover of death (the latter stanza declares), the difference between having seized the day and having hoarded one’s being for the sake of an afterlife is felt to be negligible.

What causes the carpe diem sentiment to collapse is basically the poet’s sense of the bankruptcy of life. For all his talk about making merry (st. 23) and being “joy-cund with the fruitful Grape” (st. 54), he is obviously not enjoying himself. For him there is no real joy in the grape, just as there is no real forgetfulness. As a hedonist, the poet is a failure, a living refutation of the advice that he offers in these passages. He fails because he has answered the carpe diem attitude toward death with the attitude toward life of Ecclesiastes: “vanity of vanities, all is vanity.” And therefore he has no “Cash” of life to put up against death’s toll. Marvell’s witty, complicating, balancing sense of the triviality of life’s activity has grown to such dominance in the
Rubáiyát that life is felt to be valueless, and therefore powerless to offset death. Whereas “Come, My Cellar” and “To the Virgins, to Make Much of Time” weaken the carpe diem sentiment with their blunted sense of death, the Rubáiyát, with its blunted sense of life, destroys it.

In the light of his confusion and his failure to find a vital counterforce to direct against death, it is not surprising that the final irony of the poem shows Omar, in his effort to flee the problems of life and the thought of death, to be seeking them unawares. He drinks to insulate himself from his vision of the future as a “tangle,” but the drunken state only exaggerates his sense of the unbearable and impossible confusion that he is trying to escape. “Tomorrow’s tangle” is actually mirrored and endorsed in wine’s confusion. Again, an “Angel Shape” appears to him, bearing the Grape as the answer to his metaphysical fears—the Grape that

all the misbelieving and black Horde
Of Fears and Sorrows that infest the Soul
Scatters before him with his whirlwind Sword (st. 60)

But death itself will come to the poet in exactly the same form, brought by the same angelic Sákí:

that Angel of the darker Drink
At last shall find you by the river brink,
And offering his Cup, invite your Soul
Forth to your Lips to quaff... (st. 43)

Our realization that a drunken stupor can be seen as a type of death reinforces the metaphorical expression of the vicious cycle. Elsewhere we see again Omar abetting his own failure: the world that distresses the poet is seen in terms of

that inverted Bowl they call the Sky,

Whereunder crawling coopèd we live and die,
Lift not your hands to ḥūr for help... (st. 72)

Yet he proposes precisely the same predicament for himself after death, carrying the same terms with him into the grave: death, too, is an inverted cup (st. 40), and the poet asks his Sákí to “turn down an empty Glass” upon his grave. Thus the inverted bowl is reiterated. Fleeing the prospect of death, the poet runs into the arms of death; fleeing life’s predicament, he bears it with him into the grave.

The poem’s betrayal of the carpe diem attitude proves a very effective way of setting forth poignantly and precisely a Victorian state of mind and feeling. Wandering between two worlds, one death, the other powerless to be life, Omar dramatizes one more version of a pervasive Victorian predicament. In its languid hand; its emphasis on wine rather than women; its search for stupor or giddiness; its meandering inconclusiveness; its philosophical and psychological inconsistency, with attitudes foundering upon one another; its sense of a valueless, shadowy life; its troubled perplexity; and (to borrow again from Arnold) its suffering that finds no effective vent in meaningful action, a state “in which there is everything to be endured, nothing to be done,” the Rubáiyát shows how thoroughly Fitzgerald wove his translation into the fabric of Victorian thought and feeling. To the extent that the poem is a reflection of the Victorian period, I venture to say that the age itself found difficulty in sustaining a genuine carpe diem sentiment. Such feelings were doomed to be frustrated; for, although the age was in no danger of adopting Herrick’s sanguine view toward death, it, like Omar (and, I might add, Fitzgerald himself) often possessed a too blunted view of the stuff of life, or a too distant perspective of it, to appreciate immediately life’s substance, value, and power.

University of Connecticut

6. My own impromptu list of Victorian poems expressing a version of this state of mind includes (in addition to “Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse”) “The Lady of Shalott,” “The Lotos-Eaters,” “Perche pensa? Pensando S’ improntici,” “The House of Life,” “The City of Dreadful Night,” and “An Apology” from The Earthly Paradise. Every reader could easily lengthen the list.

7. Although no recluse, he led a very retired existence, preferring village to city, independence to marriage, and letter to face-to-face confrontation. His flirtation with hedonism—but at one remove—is a sign of the distance that he required between himself and the active life.

8. The reader may wish to compare with the present study William Cadbury’s articulate, well-considered treatment of the personality of Fitzgerald’s fictitious Omar in “FitzGerald’s Rubáiyát as a Poem,” ELH, XXXIV (1967), 541-63—a study that I had not seen when I formulated my own ideas. It, too, notes that “the trivially posturing dependence on wine with which [Omar] attempts a stable attitude... brings on... an undercutting reaction against the very hedonism to which he has been reduced” (556). But whereas Cadbury sees in the poem an exquisitely just series of conflicting postures, which make a logical progression as well as a psychological maturation, my own sense of the poem is that the narrator’s sequence of attitudes is genuinely meandering and confused, and that much of Cadbury’s attempt to order the attitudes is as meaningful and thankless as tracing patterns in cloud formations. The patterns are there, to be sure, but they are neither substantial nor significant.
Thomas Hardy: The Poor Man and the Deterioration of His Ladies

W. J. Hyde

THOMAS HARDY we are told in The Early Life, had no desire as a boy “to be a man, or to possess things,” but rather a “lack of social ambition which followed him through life.”¹ His mature outlook was certainly not that of a striver after high position; Hardy’s clearest recipe for some measure of happiness is always the curtailing of wants, the lessening of expectations. Yet behind the energy of this boy who did not wish to grow up, but whose life nevertheless marks the course from a very humble station to one of wealth and fame, were the ambition of a mother, his own early developed sense of social inferiority,² and, ultimately, the conscious superiority of a wife. Ample evidence is available of Hardy’s durable concern with the values of social position. There are remarks on his birthplace, insistently larger than a cottage, his mother’s ambitious arrangement of his education and her forbidding him to use the local dialect,³ and even his declared possibility, unlike Jude, of attending college.⁴ In later life there were the numerous ladies of London society who, as Weber has lately admitted, were not thrust upon him by Emma’s social proclivities but rather, it would seem from his letters, were sought out by him while sometimes doing his best to avoid her; to them she was “the antidote.”⁵ One observer considered him always “very straight-laced” in following social protocol.⁶ In late years at Max Gate, the parlormaid even noted his especial readiness to hurry down from his study whenever titled guests arrived.⁷ It is in the recurrent poor man and lady theme in all his novels, however, that one can best see the direction of Hardy’s early social ambition, the patterns by which it was modified, and, parallel to his own marital experience, the increasing frustration and renunciation of desire.

Fulfillment of deeply planted social ambitions on the part of a youth of natural unambitiousness comes to be sought first in a kind of fantasy or idealization rather than through a realistic working plan. Thus it is that Alexander Macmillan saw a resemblance of the plot of Hardy’s first novel to “King Cophetua and the beggar-maid”; John Morley found in it scenes that “read like some clever lad’s dream.”⁸ The poor man’s concern to win the lady continued, with significant variations, to be treated by Hardy the novelist from first to last, even though the raw social satire of the first novel was promptly lessened at the behest of Macmillan and Meredith. The ladies, from Miss Allenville through Bathsheba Everdene, remain ideal objects, though in declining order of perfection. Cytherea Graye, a victim of Manston’s powers of fascination, Fancy Day, a willful flirt of slight proportions, Elfride Swancourt, a variable weakling in the hands of a snobbish father, and Bathsheba, whose weakness is labeled vanity from the start, all retain the staunch devotion of simple men of noticeably humble origin. With the curious exception of A Pair of Blue Eyes, the poor man in each of these novels wins his lady, the men revealing a growth of passive but dogged persistency that culminates in Oak’s behavior, in contrast with the abortive dreamlike success of Egbert Mayne. In the above-mentioned exception, the pair of lovers, Smith and Knight, have been observed to represent diverse aspects of Hardy’s own self⁹ (as well as a possible idealization of his friend Horace Moule in the latter) between whom it may have been impossible to decide the victory. Vicarious fulfillment of the “lad’s dream” may be argued in terms of Elfride’s marrying a lord, but her pattern seems closer, again, to that of the dying Geraldine Allenville. The lady’s sincere commitment, first to Smith and then to Knight, might signify as much an achievement as would the poor man’s actual marriage.

During the period of the early novels Hardy’s own quest for a lady was apparently active but for more than half a dozen years unfulfilled. From the time of his return from London and the writing of his first novel down to 1872, he was reportedly engaged to his young cousin Tryphena Sparks, who during part of this time attended Stockwell Teachers’ Training College in London and then became a schoolmistress in Plymouth, from which she sent back his ring.¹⁰ Overlapping the latter

¹⁰. See Deacon, passim. Weber, in Hardy of Wessex (1965), pp. 76-77, acknowledges this material with considerable reservation.
period of this engagement is Hardy’s courtship of Emma, whom he married in 1874, the date of Far from the Madding Crowd, the last novel to celebrate the poor man’s unwavering devotion to a relatively ideal lady. Tryphena was later to remark of Hardy to her daughter: “Oh he’s married a lady; he doesn’t come here.” The subsequent deterioration of his childless marriage to a “lady” is well known in its main outlines if tantaliz-
genously obscure in some details.

A change in the pattern of ladies, already suggested in the explicit vanity of Bathsheba and in her new characteristic of black hair, becomes marked in the novels immediately following Hardy’s marriage. The Hand of Ethelberta, the transitional link in the pattern, may suffer as much from its position as it does from its changed social milieu. Most noticeable is the increasing pre-
tentiousness of the lady’s social position. Unlike the earlier women who begin with superior breeding and continue to appeal with their actual if slightly flawed selves, Ethelberta, a butler’s daughter, passes at first with Christopher Julian and long afterwards with others as “a lady by birth.” Eustacia, a poor handmaster’s daughter, lords it over the heath folk. Paula Power and Lady Constantine rather innocently assume their high position by virtue of inherited wealth or marriage ties rather than family blood and acres; Lucetta and Mrs. Charmond do the same more insidiously, each a lady with a past, the latter a former actress whose false hair may signify the pretence in her position. In Alec Stoke-
d’Urberville (gentleman to Tess’s poor girl and ruined maid) is the culmination of this falsity in a purchased and pretended social position. Finally if, as Weber has observed, Jude is a rendering of Tess with the sexes reversed, the now debased role of Lady must be assigned to Arabella, whose tune finds to have “an instinct towards artificiality in [the] very blood,” including a predilection for false hair like Mrs. Charmond’s, which, she claims, “every lady of position wears” (Jude, p. 67).

Youth, innocence, and slightness of build are no longer much apparent in the later ladies. Ethelberta, eldest daughter of a large family, is plump-armed with a firm white round neck, “a woman slightly heavier than gos-
samer” (p. 7). Eustacia, though able to glide over the heath as freely as Ethelberta does over open country, is full-limbed and heavy (Natte, p. 75). Lady Constantine shares the dark hair and complexion first noticed in Bathsheba and continued in Eustacia, Lucetta, Mrs. Charmond (whose manner seemed that “seen oftenest in women of darker complexion” [Woodlanders, p. 68] but whose hair must match Marty South’s), and Arabella, but her hair, “once darkness visible,” is touched with gray at the close (Tower, p. 311). Alec d’Urberville, too, has an “almost swarthy complexion,” a “black mous-
tache,” and a “bold rolling eye” (Tess, p. 44), one or another of the features common to Manston, Troy, Bob Loveday, Captain de Stancy, and Fitzpiers. Associated with a satanic dark complexion or bright eye is the sexual power to fascinate, shared by the false ladies and the lady-killing gentlemen. Eustacia, whose fire calls up Wildeve, is looked upon as a witch by some of the natives. Even Ethelberta with her “shining bunch of hair” tends to hypnotize Christopher Julian while he plays at her dancing, and the brown-haired Paula Power unintentionally captivates de Stancy with her gymnastic motions. D’Urberville gathers strawberries and roses for Tess, and “she obeyed like one in a dream” (Tess, p. 47). Jude is held to the spot to meet Arabella “almost against his will” and later finds himself “drifting strangely” (Jude, pp. 44-45). Much of the power to fascinate seems to be exercised by sheer whim, for want of an object, since lethargy and boredom are often otherwise the fate of these heavy and sophisticated bodies. Notable instan-
tces of the lady’s deliberately exercising such a fancy are Bathsheba’s sending to Boldwood, Ethelberta’s sending Julian her book of poems, Eustacia’s joining the mummers, Lady Constantine’s initially visiting the nearly inaccessible tower, and Arabella’s throwing the pig’s offal at Jude. Lucetta and Mrs. Charmond share a tendency to be seen reclining in a state of languishing boredom; perhaps Arabella even reflects this ladylike outlook when she leaves Jude because “he was such a slow old coach” (Jude, p. 83).

The promise of fruitful wedlock, implicit at least in the maiden ladies of Hardy’s earliest works, diminishes with broad hints of probable sterility in the later novels. Bathsheba, Eustacia, and Grace Melbury are all given kinship of looks or temperament to the goddess Ar-
temis (Crowd, p. 315; Native, p. 77; Woodlanders, p. 379). Bathsheba’s relation to Troy forms a contrast with that of the yellow-haired Fanny Robin with her child; Eustacia’s childlessness with Clym becomes noticeable in the light of Thomasin’s bearing a daughter to the un-
promising Wildeve. For Bathsheba, who had “instinctively adored” Diana, a new life may open out after her

11. Deacon, p. 28.
12. Weber, Hardy of Wessex (1940), chap. XV; (1965), chap. XVII.
13. The Hand of Ethelberta (London, 1951), p. 11. In the text subsequent references to the novels are given by page num-
final capitulation to Oak. Not such is the hope for Ethelberta, who settles for the money and position of the aged rake, Lord Mountclere. Among the "ladies" of the later novels, children are rarely seen. D’Urberville’s child by Tess soon dies; Arabella’s Father Time scarcely comes alive, and it is meanwhile remembered that Jude has been tricked by Arabella’s claim of pregnancy that proved false. (Sue Bridehead, for all her aversions and hesitations, does more than Arabella to give Jude a family.) Only Lady Constantine among these women of the later novels bears a noteworthy child, a child that was called for by the plot in the first instance, creating a tangible source of affection for her after St. Cleeve’s departure, but which seems a pledge of the woman’s utter sincerity at the close.

St. Cleeve’s inadequate response to Lady Constantine upon his return from the southern hemisphere marks another and most significant shift in the later novels, the poor man’s inclination to reject the lady. The first instance, in the transitional Hand of Ethelberta, is distinctly pronounced: Julian, seeing Ethelberta two and a half years after her marriage to the old lord, “did not wish her his” (Ethelberta, p. 454). Variations of this attitude appear in Clym’s abuse of Eustacia, Farfrae’s cooling memories of his late wife Lucetta, Fitzpiers’ return to Grace after Mrs. Charmond’s death, and finally Tess’s violent separation from d’Urberville and Jude’s mockery of a second marriage with Arabella. Increasingly the poor man is given another alternative. Beginning with Picotee in The Hand of Ethelberta (though perhaps already hinted in Fanny Robin in the preceding novel), a new non-lady figure appears to embody many of the virtues formerly manifested in the lady herself. The earlier Fancy Day, for example, had combined all the freshness of innocent maidenhood with a fickle streak of social ambition, the latter encouraged by a father who, like the later Mr. Melbury, had educated her and saved money to enable her to win some polished gentleman (Greenwood Tree, p. 164). In the later non-ladies is preserved all of the innocence and unreserved devotion of Hardy’s ideal. Some, like Tabitha Lark and Tess’s slight sister Liza-Lu, are sketched in barest outline; others such as Thomasin Yeobright, Marty South, and Picotee are given quite a dominant role in counterpointing the lady; in his last novel Hardy draws the most complex of all his women from this basic type in the character of Sue. Common to the type is youthful “maidenhood,” a slightness of build, an abundance of brown or chestnut hair, the latter shared conspicuously by Thomasin and Marty. Picotee is pink-cheeked and fresh, with even “childish features” (Ethelberta, p. 167); Thomasin is “the maiden” (Native, p. 129). Tabitha Lark, a mere “slubbing maid,” goes to London to study music and returns, sufficiently matured, to bound upon the scene and supplant Lady Constantine (Tower, pp. 306-07). Miss de Stancy, though short, plain, and dumpy, has a tender affectionate face (Laodicean, p. 29) as well as a disposition in common with Picotee to faint or sicken with repressed love in the hero’s presence. Elizabeth-Jane Newson possesses pink cheeks, gray thoughtful eyes, and abundant brown hair (Mayor, pp. 100-01). Finally, in contrast with Arabella, that “substantial human animal,” is Sue, “pretty, liquid-eyed, light-footed young woman”: “She was mobile, living” (Jude, pp. 108, 105).

More important than their features is the character of these non-ladies, in which, when developed, one can generally find a dominant note of silent and unambiguous loyalty. There is no need for the hero to publish his book or succeed as an architect or musician in order to win their total devotion. Venn as either dairyman or redleeman appears to be an inelegant suitor in Mrs. Yeobright’s eyes, but surely it is modesty rather than snobbery that caused Thomasin, before the story opens, to accede to her aunt’s opinion. Julian’s lack of fortune, a major obstacle to Ethelberta’s love, seems none to Picotee. Grace Melbury, as lady, aspires to live with Mrs. Charmond and later is “pride . . . to be the wife of a cultivated man,” Fitzpiers (Woodlanders, p. 207); but the Grace who comes to love the essential virtues of Winterborne wishes herself a fieldworker like Marty South (Woodlanders, p. 267). Sue Bridehead never formally attaches herself to Jude so that a few sticks of furniture might revert by law to her, but we see her working on lettering with Jude in the church at Aldbricham, selling cakes at the Kennetbridge fair, and hunting for lodgings at Christminster in the rain with a loyalty heedless of fortune. In Marty South, however, is the epitome of loyalty, ignoring rivalry and neglect and finally defying death itself in standing by Winterborne.

A few other features than build and character, notable here and there among the non-ladies, might also have much underlying or unconscious significance. One is the condition of cousinship, applying obliquely to the plot of Thomasin and directly to that of Sue. The role of teacher attaches to both Picotee and Sue, the first and last of these women, to Fancy Day, an earlier fusion of lady and non-lady, and, again obliquely, to Elizabeth-Jane and Grace Melbury, who, like the early Cytherea Graye, offer service as readers and intellectual companions. A bright intelligence supports these women in the foregoing occupations; they possess not the scheming powers of genius of an Ethelberta, whose brains are referred to as a “subversive Mephistophelian endow-
ment” (Ethelbertha, p. 263), but the capacity to shed light and understanding. The early Sue, whose brains endow her with the full extent of this capacity, wishes nothing so much as intellectual companionship with a man of intelligence, learning, and sympathy.

It is obviously tempting at this point, though fraught with misrepresentation, to identify Hardy’s women characters with the women in his own life. There is the early Emma, the lady, with the “shining corn yellow” hair of Cytheraea Graye tumbling in curls on her shoulders or the hair of Elfride Swancourt in “a nebulous haze of light, surrounding her crown like an aureola.” The aging Emma may even stand as a prototype for Arabella, the ultimate debasement of the lady, when she is described by an unsympathetic observer in about 1893: “full-blown, with an ample figure, a large rubicund face, and a defiantly jolly expression.” The non-lady, cousin and schoolteacher, has some obvious roots in Tryphena, a maiden of just sixteen when Hardy is said to have become engaged to her, a type of Fancy Day with eyebrows “like two slurs in music,” an expression “with a hint of barely concealed caprice,” and a head of “plentiful dark chestnut hair.” Her intelligence as a pupil teacher led her to London for her education and then to a position as headmistress in Plymouth at the bare age of twenty. For the more sirenlke figures of the later dark ladies there may be combinations of both Emma and the dark-haired Tryphena as well as an idealized Julia Augusta Martin, the lady of the manor of Hardy’s childhood, and perhaps some dark unknown, perhaps even a London actress who had eaten the apple ere Hardy was weaned.

The above speculations focus interesting light on possible methods in Hardy’s working imagination but are otherwise admittedly doubtful attempts at positive identification. To equate lady and non-lady unreservedly with types of Emma and Tryphena is to overstate an essential truth, oversimplifying Hardy’s life into two focal points, without other company in youth of which we may know little. Even if it were true, as Tryphena declared to her daughter (Deacon, p. 29), that Hardy used all “real people” in his novels, the equating of each character with a single flesh-and-blood person was not Hardy’s way of working. As conscious artist (and unconscious seeker of privacy) he must rework the actual into multiple strands of the imaginative. Furthermore, Hardy had the capacity to complicate his sources by cutting across time, as demonstrated in his belated love poems of 1912-1913, where “Time touches her not.” Ethelbertha may have the gray eyes and “shining bunch of hair” (Ethelbertha, p. 40) of the Emma of the poems and then wind up as the stout matron rejected by Christopher Julian; yet the timeless woman of Hardy’s loving memory, “with cheeks whose airy flush outbid/fresh fruit in bloom,” forecasts the apple-cheeked Picotee as well. And the “mobile, living” Sue has precisely that quality that first drew Hardy to Emma: “She was so living, he used to say.”

There is, then, no rigid formula for identifying the women in Hardy’s novels, although some variation of lady attracting poor man can be discovered in each one. Noticeable within the development of this theme is Hardy’s growing tendency, especially after 1874, to concede defeat to the poor man. In fact, taking An Indiscretion as the first and then the thirteen major novels in chronological order, 2-14, one finds the following:

- Poor man wins lady: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7
- Poor man may win non-lady: 6, 7, 10, 13
- Poor man fails: 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14

The Return of the Native (7) offers the at first unintended success of Venn with the non-lady and the actual marriage of Clym to the lady Eustacia, but the course of Clym’s married life would seem to group the work with stories of the poor men who fail. In Tess (13) there is the probable awarding of ‘Liza-Lu to Clare at the end, but Tess’s own failure colors the main theme. The failure of the divided hero, Smith-Knight, in Blue Eyes (4) has already been noted in the midst of the early group of successful poor men. On the other hand, after the marriage of Oak to Bathsheba only one poor man, the young

---

15. Desperate Remedies, p. 8; Blue Eyes, pp. 10, 18, and Paula Power the same in A Laodicean, p. 15.
17. Deacon, frontispiece and commentary, and p. 17.
18. And doubtless many others, revised and refined in Hardy’s mind. Weber, for example (Hardy of Wessex [1965], pp. 12 and 212), finds the original of Bathsheba in Hardy’s mother’s sister and acknowledges a relationship of Mrs. Florence Heniker to the portrait of Sue Bridehead.
21. It is even in mild form in the yet unmentioned Trumpet Major, with its pair of lovers, the loyal and self-denying John Loveday, who losses, and the fickle and captivating Bob Loveday with bright eye and rich complexion, who wins the heroine. Anne Garland shows a frequent ladylike aversion to the low breeding of all the Lovedays and tries hard to think, more than her romantic mother does, “of position or differences” (p. 93).
architect George Somerset in *A Laodicean* (9), wins the lady within the later novels, and this novel, dictated by Hardy to his wife during extreme illness,29 may well form a break in Hardy’s main line of intentions.

That Hardy’s main intentions were to dwell increasingly upon failure, futility of the poor man’s quest, would seem evident from the above pattern of the plots. The darkness implicit in such tendencies is modified, however, when one remembers that the lady is not merely lost but increasingly rejected and her ideal virtues found embodied sometimes in a woman of lower rank or lesser pretension. This later tendency begins distinctly in *Ethelberta* but is more richly developed elsewhere. Hardy’s variations in turning his lady and non-lady types into distinct individuals are infinite; the lines of concatenated affection that can result and the layers of social strata exposed within their workings stand fully revealed in *The Woodlanders*. Here Martyr’s loyalty to Winterborne is matched by Winterborne’s to Grace, each object of affection located in a sphere above, just out of reach. Grace in the eyes of her father has been educated to marry a gentleman, yet Fitzpierds at first assumes that “socially we can never be intimate” (*Woodlanders*, p. 157) and later looks down upon Melbury and his acquaintance much as Melbury had at the folk at Giles’s Christmas party. Mrs. Charnond realizes that Fitzpierds “ought to have done better” than marry Grace (*Woodlanders*, p. 217) but seems blind to what Melbury sees as the audacity of Fitzpierds in looking as high as Mrs. Charnond (*Woodlanders*, p. 257). Tragedy is complete to the last link in the concatenation when Grace, having by now rejected her role of lady with the discovery of her real love for Winterborne, discovers also the genuineness of Mrs. Charnond’s love for the already married Fitzpierds. From her agonizing middle position as lady turned non-lady, Grace drives home Hardy’s ultimate view of class divisions. It is not the poor man’s aspiration that is rejected (Grace in fact voluntarily returns to the “cultivated” Fitzpierds), but the presumption, the element of mean social climbing inherent in her denial of the poor man. She comes to “hate genteel life,” puts off at last all “shamefacedness” with Giles, and learns forcefully from his death “how little acquirements and culture weigh beside sterling personal character” (*Woodlanders*, pp. 267, 373, 404). Furthermore the novel ends on a level of undistracted humility, focused not upon the lady but on Giles and Marty South.

With *The Woodlanders* Hardy’s message on social aspirations is complete. In *Tess* and *Jude* may be found a final debasement of the lady figure in the characters of d’Urberville and Arabella, but the poor man’s specific need to marry a gentlewoman no longer poses central significance; the ambition itself has been changed if not outgrown. It is the erroneous desire of Tess’s mother, not of the daughter, that Tess marry her gentlemanly “kinsman.” The “lad’s dream” is still present in Jude’s longing to enter Christminster, but the workmen forever outside the walls of the colleges are shown to be of no less worth than the scholars within. “Sterling personal character” is again lodged within humblest exteriors. Angel Clare belatedly discovers it in Tess, whereas Christminster, another type of the Lady, fails to see it in Jude. In his personal life Hardy might go on, very straight-laced to the end as he had been bred to be, breaking off his work in deferent haste to pay respects to the many ladies who engaged his outward attention. Perhaps it was done sometimes with the characteristic wry smile. In his imaginative life this deference, where it was a weakness, was overcome. In the overcoming are woven deeply rooted strands of the author’s ambition and disillusionment.

*Wisconsin State University*

---

23. Weber, *Hardy of Wessex* (1940), p. 87, on illness. Somerset, indeed, is one of the least poor of Hardy’s poor men, yet there was Paula’s “social position as a woman of wealth, always felt by Somerset as a perceptible bar” (p. 366).
H. G. Wells's "Jungle Book": The Influence of Kipling on

The Island of Dr. Moreau

Robert L. Platzer

The probable source of at least one striking episode in H. G. Wells's The Island of Dr. Moreau—the narrator's initial meeting with the Beast Folk and the "Saying of the Law"—has been traced by one of the more scholarly and perceptive of Wells's critics, Bernard Bergonzi, to Kipling's Jungle Books. Bergonzi finds Wells drawing upon and perhaps parodying Kipling's image of an articulate beast society, and both the facts of contemporaneity (The Island of Dr. Moreau was published scarcely a year after The Second Jungle Book) and of Wells's known interest, at least at this stage in his career, in popular literary fashion, render this inference based on "internal" evidence even more probable. What I would propose in this essay is something further, however. For one thing, the number of narrative details borrowed or transformed by Wells is greater than most readers are aware of. But more significantly, the relationship between Kipling's Jungle Books and Wells's bleak island fable is built around philosophical as well as literary satire.

If one were to regard the impact of Kipling's tales on Wells's imagination at the level of mere literary invention, it would seem remarkable how much sinister suggestiveness Wells found in Kipling's unoffending nursery tales. For the animal world Kipling describes—I am thinking now specifically of the "Mowgli" tales—is essentially harmonious. In fact, the law of the jungle, its codes of honor and the pervasive hatred of moral treachery (something distinct from animal cunning), is the implicit theme of each of these stories, and the entire course of Mowgli's "natural" education is the discovery of the logic behind jungle instinct. Such is the purpose, for example, of the following passage (taken from "Mowgli's Brothers") in which the narrator attempts to explain the reasonableness of the prohibition against man-eating:

The Law of the Jungle, which never orders anything without a reason, forbids every beast to eat Man except when he is killing to show his children how to kill, and then he must hunt outside the hunting-grounds of his pack or tribe. The real reason for this is that man-killing means, sooner or later, the arrival of white men on elephants, with guns... Then everybody in the jungle suffers. The reason the beasts give among themselves is that Man is the weakest and most defenceless of all living things, and it is unsportsmanlike to touch him. They say too—and it is true—that man-eaters become mangy, and lose their teeth.

Professor Tompkins, in her sensitive analysis of The Jungle Books, describes this sense of natural and communal imperatives as "jungle-righteousness," and for all the half-comic rationalizing of the passage above, the beasts are never wholly devoid of compassion or love. There are outlaws in the jungle, of course, but creatures like Shere Khan, the lame tiger, or the Bandar-log (the Monkey Folk) are regarded as criminals because they lack either conscience or reason. Kipling never attempts to exclude the tooth and claw struggle for food or life that dominates animal life. What he does deny (or simply fails to perceive) is any form of gratuitous cruelty that is part of the "natural" pattern of animal life; even the murderous dholes (in "Red Dog") are terrible only in the way that any calamitous force in nature is terrible. Nature itself may be "fallen"—at least one is obliged to use what may be an irrelevantly theological term in paraphrasing the import of the Garden myth in "How Fear Came"—and death and fear stalk every creature, even the most courageous; but Kipling never suggests that the animal mind or soul is commensurately "fallen." What is absent, then, from Kipling's world is any belief in original sin.

When sin and guilt do enter the jungle, it is man who is usually seen as the carrier of these diseased fears and longings. "The King's Ankus," which studies, in Chaucerian fashion, the effect of greed and the unclean-
ness of material desires, drives home just this lesson with tedious insistence. It is Mowgli’s character as a noble savage that constitutes the major statement of this contrast, however. His indifference to gold, his contempt for the treacherous and hypocritical townspeople, his love for and trust in the life of the jungle are each the primal virtues of a new, uncorrupted Adam in whose person man and nature, society and the jungle meet.

No thematic summary, of course, can even suggest the compelling charm or the final pathos of the Mowgli stories, but even so brief a discussion can accurately convey the sustaining teleology of the whole. For it is just this aspect of *The Jungle Books*—Kipling’s faith in the purposiveness of the natural universe and in man’s place in that universe—that must have appeared so appallingly sentimental and unreflective to Wells. Whatever we have been able to reconstruct of Wells’s world view during the first decade of his career suggests that he must have found *The Jungle Books* grotesquely false, biologically and morally. Whether one attributes the bleakness and recurrent apocalyptic fixations of Wells’s early science fiction to “fin-de-siècle” pessimism or to a more systematically reasoned theory of cosmic degeneration derived from T. H. Huxley, or to both, the explicit metaphysical assumptions of *The Island of Dr. Moreau* are, roughly, antithetical to those of *The Jungle Books*. Man, as Wells saw him, is set adrift in a universe of chance, and in spite of human intelligence and will he can achieve no final victory over a cosmos devoid of Mind; nor can he finally overcome his own evolutionary heritage, those regressive animal instincts that civilization can modify but never eliminate. The moral and even biological insanity of Wells’s mad scientist, Dr. Moreau, consists essentially in his refusal to concede that the “mark of the beast” can never be removed.

Given this grounding of Wells’s imagination in nearly total skepticism, it is not difficult to see why the Mowgli stories were transmogrified in Wells’s desolate parable; what remains is to trace how these changes were made. Let us consider first, then, the jungle society Moreau has established on his nameless island. In what appears to be at once a reduction and inversion of Kipling’s rather subtle metaphoric animal characterizations (Bagheera, Baloo, and Kaa resemble recognizable human types but are never confined allegorically to that resemblance and are therefore acceptable as animal types as well) Wells reduces his Beast Folk to the status of human caricatures; they do not simply remind us of men, they are men, and in an even deeper sense they represent the condition of man. Of course, the process by which the Beast Folk came to be endowed with speech and human emotions (or perhaps one ought to say “humanoid” responses) is “scientifically” elaborated through Moreau’s discourse on the “limits of individual plasticity.” But to Prendick, and I believe ultimately to the reader as well, the Beast Folk appear, at first through ignorance and later in a kind of Swiftian hallucination, to be men who have been somehow animalized.

More precisely, one should describe Wells’s satiric purpose here as an attempt to create an image of *homo sapiens* that is as near the evolutionary threshold of animality as possible, stripped (as are Swift’s Yahoos) almost literally of the protective covering of civilized behavior. Civilization presents itself to Prendick’s “maddened” brain as little more than a disguised jungle, but we are obviously meant to regard his reaction (as we are meant to regard Gulliver’s) as mythically truthful because of its insane revulsions and distortions:

> When I lived in London the horror was well-nigh insupportable. I could not get away from men. . . . I would go into the streets to fight with my delusion, and prowling women would mew after me, furtive craving men glance jealously at me, weary pale workers go coughing by me, with tired eyes and eager paces like wounded deer dripping with blood, old people, bent and dull, pass murmuring to themselves, and all unheeding a ragged tribe of gibing children. Then I would turn aside into some chapel, and even there, such was my disturbance, it seemed that the preacher gibbered Big Thinks even as the Ape Man had done. . . . And even it seemed that I, too, was not a reasonable creature, but only an animal tormented with some strange disorder in its brain, that sent it to wander alone, like a sheep stricken with the gid.

What happens in this passage and at similar moments in *The Island of Dr. Moreau* is what Kipling termed “letting in the jungle,” but in quite another context. For Kipling’s jungle represented a microcosm of order, a

---


10. An earlier form of Moreau’s discourse in chap. 14 is to be found in an unsigned article entitled “The Limits of Individual Plasticity” in the *Saturday Review*, XIX (1895), 89-90.

11. *The Island of Dr. Moreau*, in *Seven Science Fiction Novels of H. G. Wells* (New York, 1934), p. 185. All citations made in my text will be from this edition.
refuge from human inhumanity. Moreau's island, however, has no refuge, for civilization and the jungle are one; the huts and the "society" that has been established there are practically all that can be called remotely human. Moreau, in his godlike, "remorseless" cruelty and madness, is above (or at least beyond) humanity, while Montgomery, in his self-pity and suicidal drunkenness is perhaps more degraded than the beasts that serve him and finally kill him. There is nothing in Prendrick's terrestrial environment, either on the island or back in England (just another "island"), that reflects his internalized image of human reason or compassion or gives evidence of a transcendent purposiveness. In desperation, Prendrick finally turns to both chemistry and astronomy for some assurance of cosmic laws that exist before or beyond animal life. Once again, Wells has inverted Kipling's myth by placing even the possibility of a teleological ordering outside of "Nature."

The "Law" that does in fact exist in the Wellsian jungle—and here we encounter obvious and direct parody—is a grotesque litany of forbidden abominations. In place of the positive urging of Kipling's jungle law, that sense of honor and obligation that forms the basis of the heroic in jungle life, we find a series of commandments that deform and thwart rather than simply control natural impulse:

"Not to go on all-Fours; that is the Law. Are we not Men?"
"Not to suck up Drink; that is the Law. Are we not Men?"
"Not to eat Flesh nor Fish; that is the Law. Are we not Men?"
"Not to claw Bark of Trees; that is the Law. Are we not Men?"
And so from the prohibition of these acts of folly, on to the prohibition of what I thought were the maddest, most impossible and most indecent things one could well imagine. (p. 121)

Law is repression, Prendrick discovers, but no repressive mechanism or ritual can hold out against the force of instinct. And the eruption of animal instinct is horrifying and traumatic to Wellsian sensibilities; so much so, that many of the later Utopian romances exhaust credibility in attempts to escape the ape and tiger within.12

Parody of *The Jungle Books* becomes far more savage once Prendrick has been accepted as a member of the island "family." In a satiric perversion of Mowgli's education, Prendrick is forced to study the bared-teeth reality of the struggle for existence as it appeared to a post-Darwinian intellect. As I have noted, there are moments in *The Jungle Books* when animal ferocity is either dramatized or alluded to, but this realization of the necessary violence of nature is almost always accompanied by a recognition that only through this life-or-death grappling can courage or intelligence be displayed. Think of the trampling of Shere Khan, of Baloo and Bagheera fighting with the Bandar-log at the Cold Lairs, or of the pack warrio to the death with the red dogs, therefore, as both the model and satiric target for the hunting of the Leopard Man in *The Island of Dr. Moreau*:

So, panting, tumbling against rocks, torn by brambles, impeded by ferns and reeds, I helped to pursue the Leopard Man, who had broken the Law, and the Hyena-Swine ran, laughing savagely, by my side. I staggered on, my head reeling, and my heart beating against my ribs, tired almost to death, and yet not daring to lose sight of the chase, lest I should be left alone with this horrible companion. I staggered on in spite of infinite fatigue and the dense heat of the tropical afternoon. (p. 150)

The excitement and blood lust of the Beast Folk, their obvious enjoyment when Moreau chooses a victim onto whom they can transfer their own guilt and hatred, are all physically and morally revolting. The Wolf-Bear's cry of "none escape" is, of course, part of the Law they chant (and it clearly recalls Kipling's precept "Sorrow never stays punishment") but the deeper meaning of this warning—and of the Law itself—becomes clear only at this moment, when "punishment" and gratifying torture are interchangeable. The hunt is thus judged and described in terms of civilized ethics with no sense of incongruity: it is ugly and sadistic and wholly "natural."

This feeling of bitter estrangement from the animal world (or from animality) is experienced even more acutely in the episodes following Moreau's death. Once again, Wells turns to the Mowgli tales for significant details and incidents that can be at once exploited and mocked. Thus Prendrick, in a chapter entitled "Along with the Beast Folk," confronts the animals in a manner reminiscent of the mature Mowgli—now that Moreau is gone he is "master of the jungle"; but in what does his control of these beasts consist? Apart from his revolver and whip, Prendrick finds (as did Mowgli) that he can intimidate some of the animals by staring at them—a piece of fanciful zoology Kipling reiterates continually

---

12. Regard, for example, such works as *The Food of the Gods* and *Men Like Gods*, in which the burden of constructing a scien-
tific eschatology virtually destroys the integrity of Wells's fable.
throughout *The Jungle Books*. But Prendrick's most potent weapon, again like Mowgli's, is his intelligence or, more exactly and ironically, his talent for lying. Realizing that to survive he must somehow establish an ascendency over the beasts that is based on fear, Prendrick pretends that Moreau has not merely died, but that he has also been resurrected:

"He is not dead," said I, in a loud voice. "Even now he watches us."

This startled them. Twenty pairs of eyes regarded me.
"The House of Pain is gone," said I. "It will come again. The Master you cannot see. Yet even now he listens above you."
"True, true!" said the Dog Man.

They were staggered at my assurance. An animal may be ferocious and cunning enough, but it takes a real man to tell a lie. (p. 172)

The almost Gulliver-like naïveté of this confession demonstrates how skillfully Wells grafted Swiftian insight onto Kiplingesque matter.

The isolation that Prendrick experiences is far more terrible than Gulliver's or Mowgli's. Gulliver can at least revive the memory of the Houyhnhnm ideal by speaking with his stable horses, and Mowgli, although he must return to civilization, carries within a code of honor and fidelity that protects him from the moral decay of the village. Prendrick, however, cannot appeal to any norm, without or within. His delusion of universal bestiality—an anthropological variant of original sin—prevents him from turning to the moral consciousness of society.

Nor can he turn inward. In his own way he has been animalized, and he confesses: "I was almost as queer to men as I had been to the Beast People. I may have caught something of the natural wildness of my companions" (p. 180). Although man does "return to man" at the conclusion of *The Island of Dr. Moreau*, he returns in fact to a disfigured yet truthful image of his own "reversion." In Wells's despairing vision there is no way out of the jungle, and the jungle itself is a place of horror.

Neither Wells nor Kipling offers us a more truthful or more verifiable myth in his jungle vision, although I suspect *The Island of Dr. Moreau* is more relevant (if not more congenial) to contemporary philosophical tastes. I feel sure, though, that Wells regarded his romance in just this way: as an act of debunking, a scraping away of the surface illusions of the romantic imagination, an experiment in shock therapy that would communicate vile truths to the uncritical Victorian mind. It should be clear, therefore, why *The Jungle Books* must have seemed so rich a repository of delusions. Kipling's sequestered world of beast and man affirms natural intimacies yet never questions identities: Mowgli may belong and not belong to the jungle, but in either case he is never an outcast. Kipling will not permit him to reject his humanity, for it is only by remaining a half-brother to the animal world that he can effect a reconciliation between the jungle and civilization. For Wells, such a reconciliation evidently portended the nightmare of racial devolution.

*Temple University*
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13. See the following stories: "Mowgli's Brothers," "How Fear Came," "Letting in the Jungle," "The Spring Running."

14. Thus, when Mowgli finally returns to Messua and to the "family" (in "The Spring Running") we are told that Messua cannot help wondering whether he is "some wild god of a jungle legend"—suggesting that even after his reconciliation with the "man pack" he will still retain that natural and incorruptible innocence that is his jungle heritage.

15. Wager, p. 74.
The Italian Renaissance and Some Late Victorians

Alan P. Johnson

The attitude toward the Italian Renaissance expressed in the work of various Victorians has often been recognized as a useful indication of a general shift from the so-called religious pietism of the mid-nineteenth century to a humanism characteristic in the later part of the century. With regard to the Victorians' attitude toward the Italian Renaissance, the shift is usually charted as a movement from Ruskin's denunciations of Renaissance infidelity, pride, sensuality, and rationalism in *The Stones of Venice* (1851-1853) to John Addington Symonds' praise of the Renaissance's "discovery of the world and man" in his five-volume history, *The Renaissance in Italy* (1875-1886) and to Walter Pater's selective and impressionistic appreciations of art and literature in his famous volume of Renaissance studies, which appeared in 1873. Often, George Eliot's *Romola* (1862-1863) is taken as a transitional work, and Vernon Lee's works such as *Euphorion* (1884) are regarded as derivative from Pater and perhaps from Symonds.

In general, the formula of a shift from Ruskin to Symonds and Pater is accurate and useful. The current understanding of the late Victorian attitude toward the Italian Renaissance may be inadequate in two ways, however. First, it may be oversimple in its view of figures of whom Symonds is the leading example. Second, it may be incomplete because of its neglect of two works by Oscar Wilde that are set in the Italian Renaissance. Although the works by Wilde are not of major importance in themselves, they represent the logic of the humanistic appreciation of the Renaissance carried to the extreme of admiration for satanic egotism.

In the past twenty years in two important studies of the history of an Italian Renaissance, Symonds' interest in the period has been characterized as predominantly an admiration for what he supposedly took to be its outburst of intellectual, moral, and political freedom and its cultivation of sensuous pleasure. Despite clearly stated and perceptive qualifications in both studies, their reader may easily conclude that Symonds is the chief spokesman of an attitude that is simply antithetical to Ruskin's denunciation. Symonds himself appears in both studies as a man who turned to the Renaissance to find "the whole lives, the vivid contrasts, the self-reliant individuals he admired" because of a frustrated sense of his own intellectual inferiority, sexual ambiguity, and physical illness. Such a picture captures little more than half of the author of *The Renaissance in Italy*. Symonds, and other late Victorians whose views of the Italian Renaissance resemble his, clearly reveal minds divided between humanistic appreciation of the Renaissance and conventional, even Ruskinian, moral discomfort with its excesses.

Symonds' view of the Italian Renaissance somewhat resembles the view that Arnold adumbrates in *Culture and Anarchy*. Like Arnold, Symonds might be described as a skeptic in religion, antimystical and yet hopeful that by the use of reason man progresses along a "parabola" of human, evolutionary development toward "truth" and the "Divine Mind." And like Arnold, Symonds praises the Renaissance as a time of the reawakening of human capacities for self-development. Symonds also stresses, however, that the period was one of moral corruption and political tyranny. The balance of Symonds' praise and censure is apparent in many of his various descriptions of the Renaissance from his Oxford prize essay in 1863 to such late works as his study of Boccaccio in 1895. The most notable expression of his attitude is the five-volume *Renaissance in Italy*.

The well-known essay with which Symonds introduces his history is a deceptive indication of his attitude because the essay focuses upon "the spirit of the Renaissance" and not upon the broad historical period itself. Symonds limits himself to what he calls the "culture" of the period and of course accords it only praise. In
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the essay, he gives, for example, the often quoted definition of the word "Renaissance" that begins, "What the term Renaissance really means is new birth to liberty..." It is in this essay, too, that he echoes Michelet in describing the "great achievements of the Renaissance" as "the discovery of the world and the discovery of man."  

Although Symonds' praise of the Renaissance is lavish in the introductory essay, the five volumes of *The Renaissance in Italy* repeatedly note that the cost of Renaissance culture was immorality and tyranny that Symonds does not condone. In the first volume, *The Age of Despots*, for example, he rejects the too bright picture of the Italian despot painted in Macaulay's essay on Machiavelli and cites examples of bloody tyrants such as the Visconti, Galeazzo Sforza, and Sigismondo Malatesta. Malatesta, Symonds says, "might be selected as a true type of the princes who united a romantic zeal for culture with the vices of barbarians." Symonds begins his discussion of the popes of the period by affirming the truth of Lorenzo de' Medici's description of Rome as "a sink of all vices." Of Renaissance Italy generally, Symonds declares that "with reference to carnal vice, it cannot be denied that the corruption of Italy was shameful."  

The balance of Symonds' praise and censure is similar in the other volumes. In *The Revival of Learning* the achievements of Petrarch and Lorenzo Valla are praised, while the corrupt wit of Poliziano and Beccadelli is censured. In *The Fine Arts*, Signorelli, Michelangelo, and Raphael are recognized as the culminators of a developing discovery of the world and man in art, while their successors are attacked as practitioners of "a new religious sentiment, emasculated and ecstatic," and a "crude naturalism and cruel sensualism" in painting. In sculpture, Symonds says, "what the Visconti and Borgia practised in their secret chambers, [sixteenth-century] sculptors exposed in marble." In *Italian Literature*, he praises the division of Petrarch's mind between Christian asceticism and classical sensuousness and describes Boccaccio as a beneficial sensualist who "freed the natural instincts from ascetic interdictions," but he indicts later literary men because "they overleaped [Petrarch's] conflict, and satisfied themselves with empty realizations of sensual desire." In Symonds' final volume, his tone generally is critical because his attention has shifted from the Renaissance proper to what he calls the "Catholic reaction" against it.  

The balance of praise and censure apparent in Symonds' history is apparent, too, in writings about Italian Renaissance subjects by his contemporaries, Swinburne, Maurice Hewlett, and Vernon Lee or Violet Paget. Swinburne's regard for the Renaissance as the period of what Symonds calls the discovery of the world and man appears in "Notes on Designs of the Old Masters at Florence" (1875) and in various poems: "Spring in Tuscany," "Lines on the Monument of Giuseppe Mazzini," "For the Feast of Giordano Bruno: Philosopher and Martyr," and "The Monument of Giordano Bruno." Swinburne describes Bruno, for example, as a "rod"  

To scourge off priests, a sword to pierce their God,  
A staff for man's free thought to walk alone,  
A lamp to lead him from the shrine and throne.  

Yet Swinburne implies a critical attitude toward the Italian Renaissance in his introduction to a French translation of Shelley's *The Cenci* and in the dramatization of aristocratic tyranny and immorality that defeat the protagonist in his own play, *Marino Faliero* (1885). Such works by Maurice Hewlett as *A Masque of Dead Florentines* (1895), *Earthwork out of Tuscany* (1895), and *Little Novels of Italy* (1899) show the same balanced attitude one finds in Swinburne and Symonds. Hewlett praises Botticelli and Signorelli, for example, because their painting reveals godlike beauty in human subjects, but he finds Boccaccio to be a limited sensualist and repeatedly attacks the lust and tyranny of the Medici.
Vernon Lee's attitude toward the Italian Renaissance is complicated by her commitment to the impressionistic critical method of Walter Pater. She states her preference for the Pateresque method of selecting historical materials for appreciation rather than working out a "historical mapping" of the Renaissance in the introduction to her first volume of Renaissance studies, *Euphorion*. Later in the volume, she describes the Renaissance as Pater does, that is, as "not a period, but a condition." In general, she is appreciative of Italian painting and sculpture in *Euphorion* and in *Renaissance Fancies and Studies* (1895), *Juvenilia* (1887), and *Limbo and Other Essays* (1908). Like Symonds, she recognizes the "moral gangrene" rampant in the Renaissance, but she softens judgments that are made more harshly by her contemporaries. She exonerates Boiardo and Ariosto from the charge of licentiousness, which Symonds had not altogether done, although she admits the "cynicism and bestiality of men like Machiavelli and Aretino." In general, she appears much more willing than Symonds to excuse the Renaissance's "loss of all moral standard" with the argument that it was "part of the mechanism for producing good...[in the] system of evolution."

Of course the appreciation of the Italian Renaissance expressed by writers such as Symonds, Swinburne, Hewlett, and Vernon Lee is a radical departure from Ruskin's pietistic denunciation of the period, yet the moral censure with which these late Victorians counterpose their praise is often surprisingly reminiscent of Ruskin. The correspondence is especially noticeable between Ruskin and Symonds. Symonds' condemnation of the barbarous vice of Renaissance popes and despots recalls the focus of Ruskin's scorn upon a sensate, cynical Renaissance aristocracy and clergy in such passages of *The Stones of Venice* as his attacks upon the infidelity of Venetian funeral sculpture, the "pride of state" implicit in Renaissance palaces, and the perversions of natural beauty in grotesque art of the later Renaissance. Symonds suggests, too, much the same chronology of decline as Ruskin had depicted in *The Stones of Venice*. Both men locate the decline of Italian art and literature generally in the early sixteenth century when an interest in manner—in rhetoric, wit, and rules of pictorial composition—replaced an interest in subject matter and moral restraint often loosened into license. What Symonds seems to represent, then, in the development of the Victorian attitude toward the Italian Renaissance is a much more Januslike division of mind than has been recently suggested. Symonds and those whose views resemble his were able to substitute delight in the world and man in place of Ruskin's reverence for a transcendent deity and his sacramental attitude toward the material world, but they were far less able to shed their commitment to conventional morality.

With regard to the balance of censure and praise in the work of Symonds and his contemporaries, the inadequacy of recent studies is largely a matter of emphasis. The recent studies, however, have neglected totally Oscar Wilde's two works set in the Italian Renaissance. The relation of Wilde's works to Symonds' and Pater's attitudes toward the Italian Renaissance had been noted by E. M. Braem as early as 1932. Braem points out that a delight like Symonds' in freedom and in "the world and man" and the example set by Pater's selective appreciations of the Renaissance could easily lead to approval of the self-indulgence of an Alexander VI or a Cesare Borgia and specifically to the profligacy of Wilde. "Alle Ethik ist darin aufgelöst," Braem says, "und die Einstellung zur Welt [which one finds in Symonds] gipfelt etwa in Oscar Wildes Worten: 'They do not sin at all/Who sin for love,'" in Wilde's play, *The Duchess of Padua: A Tragedy of the XVI Century*. But Braem mentions another relevant work by Wilde, the dramatic fragment, *A Florentine Tragedy*, written in 1893-1894, but he does not elaborate upon either drama.

Wilde's view of the Italian Renaissance in the two works seems to result from his attempt to find situations in the Renaissance that illustrate his own version of the ethic Pater implies in the famous "Conclusion" of his *Renaissance* volume. Wilde focuses upon what Pater had called in a review of Symonds' *Age of Despots* the "barbarous ferocity of temper, [and] the savage and coarse tastes" of the Renaissance. In his review, Pater criticized Symonds for dwelling upon them and for not concentrating solely upon "the spirit of the Renaissance proper," a spirit whose master motive, Pater felt, was a

203-04; and for further comment on Vernon Lee, see Braem, pp. 71-75.

23. Braem, p. 71; see also pp. 67-69, 75. Braem cites a 1921 edition of the play; his quotation differs from the 1923 edition of Wilde's *Works* which I cite.

24. Ibid., p. 75. *The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, III, 620, gives the date and adds that the play was performed June 10, 1906, and first published in Wilde's *Works*, 14 vols. (London, 1908), "with an opening scene by T. Sturge Moore replacing one lost."
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“liberty to see and feel those things the seeing and feeling of which generate . . . a sympathy with life everywhere.”25 Unlike Symonds, Wilde not only treats, but also sanctions, the “barbarous ferocity of temper,” first as a means toward the enjoyment of beauty and later as an expression of vitality.

In *The Duchess of Padua*, the protagonist, Guido, plans to avenge his father’s death by killing the Duke of Padua, but as Guido insinuates himself into the Duke’s court he falls in love with the Duchess, and his conscience causes him to hesitate in his vengeance. When the Duchess, Beatrice, kills the Duke in order to win Guido, he is horrified, but later he poses as the murderer and wishes to suffer execution in her place. At the play’s end, she takes slow poison and attempts to exchange her freedom for Guido’s place in his death cell, but he refuses to leave and dies in the cell with her. The play’s theme is summed up rather well in Guido’s final line, “Who sins for love, sins not.”26 Guido is moved to love by the Duchess’s physical beauty and believes at first that his love is incompatible with violence. “Can I,” he asks, “with bloodstained hands stroke and caress her hands of innocence?” When Beatrice has killed the Duke, Guido tells her, “Thou hast murdered Love along with him.” Guido later sees, though, that “yet she loved [him] and did the outrage for [his] sake,” and he dedicates himself to her in the strength of his new belief that “sin for love” is not sin at all. The Duchess does not share his certainty at the end of the play, but Wilde affirms the truth of Guido’s lesson in the final stage directions:

... The Chief Justiciar rushes forward and draws away the cloak from the [dead] Duchess, whose countenance is now the marble image of Peace,—showing that God has forgiven her.

Apparently the enjoyment of physical beauty or the preservation of it justifies any means to the end, even murder.

---

If *The Duchess of Padua* represents one step away from Pater’s amoral aestheticism, *A Florentine Tragedy* represents a still bolder step away from Pater’s position. While *The Duchess of Padua* implies what might be called an ethic of beauty, *A Florentine Tragedy* implies an ethic of power. The characters of the dramatic fragment are Simone, a humdrum furrier, his restless wife Bianca, and Guido Bardi, the son of the leader of Florence. Guido finds Bianca alone in Simone’s shop and finds her receptive to his attempt to seduce her. When Simone returns, he obsequiously offers Guido furs, food, and wine but becomes suspicious and offers to test the strength of his sword against Guido’s. Apparently it is the challenge to Simone’s power that motivates him to fight, for he has been apathetic to Bianca’s beauty. As the two men fight, Bianca urges Guido to kill her husband and carry her off, but when Simone is the victor, Bianca falls in love with his newly revealed strength, Simone responds to her beauty, and the play ends with their kiss. Whereas the enjoyment of beauty justified the destructive use of power in *The Duchess of Padua*, in *A Florentine Tragedy* the destructive use of power seems to be a good in itself.

In both plays Wilde advances from the amorality of Pater and places himself in opposition to the conventional morality of Symonds.27 His two plays are important instances in the pattern of late Victorian thinking about the Italian Renaissance because they make manifest the satanic, or in E. M. Braem’s term, the Nietzschean,28 position implicit in the late Victorians’ humanistic appreciation of the Renaissance. The two plays concretely illustrate the easy progression, or perhaps retrogression, from Symonds’ division of mind between delight in “the world and man” and conventional morality and from Pater’s amorality to an ethic of personal power and self-satisfaction.

*Arizona State University*

25. Pater, “Renaissance in Italy; the Age of Despots,” op. cit., note 19 above.
27. In “Mr. Symonds’ History of the Renaissance” (Pall Mall Gazette, XLIV, 6736 [Nov. 10, 1886], 5), Wilde found The Catholic Reaction overly rhetorical and dramatic, but less so than earlier volumes of The Renaissance in Italy, and he rated the series as a work of “value to the student of Humanism,” but he did not comment upon Symonds’ ethical position.
Hopkins' "Spelt from Sibyl's Leaves"

Norman White

The title and its application to this poem have not yet been explained satisfactorily. Professor W. H. Gardner asserts that it refers to "the Cumaean Sibyl . . . who conducted Aeneas into Avernus in . . . book [VI] of the Aeneid."1 The classical scholar Hopkins would certainly have known this passage, but it is not closely related to the poem.

Spelling from leaves was the method of prophesying normally used by the Cumaean Sibyl. She shuffled the palm leaves, on each of which was written an oracle, and then drew some out at random (as a Tarot pack is used for fortune-telling). It was unusual for her to utter warnings by mouth. And yet in Aeneid III (441-60) Helenus warned Aeneas that when consulting the Sibyl he should demand that the oracle be spoken, not spelt from the leaves. This was because the leaves were liable to be scattered in the draught as the cave door was opened by a visitor and not rearranged by the Sibyl. They would then not be truly representative of the will of the gods. When Aeneas, in book VI, does question the Sibyl the answer is not in fact spelt from the leaves.

Another large dissimilarity is in the role of night in the two pieces. It occupies a different stage of the time sequence, and thus has a different significance, in each. The Sibyl warns Aeneas not of the night itself, which is already over him, but of the more terrible dawn that it presages. (He must fulfill his mission in Hell before dawn, when his vision will fade.) Hopkins' warning is uttered at dusk and is of the imminent night, which is the final night of all and so has no dawn.

How can the title be explained then? The answer is that Hopkins is being a seer, taking disordered fragments from what he observes during a sunset that seems awesomely portentous. The first line is of Sibylline epiteths, "Earmest, earthless, equal, attuneable, vauntly, voluminous, . . . stupendous": larger fragments are added, building up to a climax when the subject and significance of the jigsaw puzzle suddenly become plain to Hopkins—"Our tale, O our oracle!"

Again too glibly, Gardner calls the title a pagan one,2 without recognizing that the poem was probably written with a Christian tradition in mind. The early Christians were called Sibyllists (see OED) because they believed that the Sibyl's writings truly prophesied Christian events. Michaelangelo's "Creation of Man," on the Sistine Chapel ceiling, and the medieval nativity plays called Prophetae bear witness to the long tradition in which she was ranked alongside biblical prophets. The Sibylline Books were first known for their prediction of the Messianic birth3 but later and more frequently for their vision of the general Judgment Day. Hopkins would have been familiar with the two best-known Christian examples of this—the old hymn from the burial mass, "Dies Irae," which brackets David and the Sibyl as prophets of doomsday, and The City of God, where Saint Augustine quotes part of the eighth Sibylline Book and says "[the Sibyl] is clearly to be assigned to the number of those who belong to the City of God."4 In both of these instances man is sternly admonished to beware of Judgment Day, which will be presaged by violent and awful terrestrial upheaval. The subject, tone, and purpose of Hopkins' poem are strikingly similar to those of these two passages. The "Dies Irae" also gives a more probable origin for Hopkins' "all in two flocks, two folds—black, white; right, wrong." (l. 12) than the one Gardner suggests from Aeneid VI.5 The path Aeneas is taking suddenly divides into two, one route leading to Elysium and the other to Tartarus. In the "Dies Irae" occurs the more closely appropriate ethical division, using the same metaphor as Hopkins, into two flocks, "Inter oves locum praesta,/Et ab haedis me sequestra" ("make me a place among the sheep, and separate me from the goats").

It is also possible that Hopkins had read those parts of the Oracles that describe doomsday apart from the one quoted by Augustine. The Apocryphal New Testament is among the books he intended to read that are listed in his journal for February to March 1865.6 In the Second Book of the Oracles he may have read the description of Judgment Day that includes:

Woe to them that shall behold that day. For a dark mist shall cover the boundless world . . . . the lights of heaven shall melt together into a void (desolate) shape . . . . And then shall all the elements of the world be laid waste, air, earth, sea, light, poles, days and nights, and no

2. Gardner, p. 311.
3. Vergil's Fourth Eclogue credits the Sibyl with a similar service for a pagan leader.
5. Gardner, p. 311.

more shall the multitudes of birds fly in the air... but he shall fuse all things together into one... then out of the misty darkness they shall bring all the souls of men to judgement... and the righteous shall be saved whole... but the ungodly shall perish therein... and all of them shall the... angels... chastise terribly with flaming scourges, and shall bind them fast above in fiery chains, bonds unbreakable. And then shall they cast them down in the darkness of night into Gehenna among the beasts of hell.'
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II

INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS

ARNOLD. Allott, Kenneth. “An Allusion to Pope in an Early Unpublished Arnold Letter.” Victorian Poetry, Spring, pp. 70-71. Written at age 13, the letter shows Arnold was able to quote Pope accurately from memory.

“Ghost Variants in the Manuscript of ‘Dover Beach.’” Notes and Queries, June, p. 209. Several of the variants of ll. 1-28 do not in fact exist.

“Matthew Arnold and Mary Claude.” Notes and Queries, June, pp. 209-11. Details about Mary Claude, who attracted the “romantic passion” of Arnold.


Fine, Ronald E. “Lockwood's Dreams and the Key to Wuthering Heights.” Nineteenth-Century Fiction, June, pp. 16-30. The dreams are “spasms of realism.”

Lever, Tresham. “Charlotte Brontë and Kitty Bell.” TLS, 13 March, p. 267. Discredits the theory that Kitty Bell, the Orphan was an early draft for Jane Eyre.


De L. Ryals, Clyde. “Browning's Amphibian: Don Juan at Home.” Essays in Criticism, April, pp. 210-17. Prologue, Epilogue, and main monologue of "Fifine at the Fair" are related by Browning's concern with man's dual nature.


Milosevich, Vincent M. “Browning's The Bishop Orders His Tomb at Saint Praxed's Church.” Explicator, May, No. 67. The futile attempt of a dying man to shore
solid, living things against ruins in a world which cannot hold together.


Sage, Victor. ‘Blindness and Folly in Browning’s Child Roland.’ “Critical Survey, Summer, pp. 113–20. The I-figure’s folly and blindness “are vindicated by their perceived relevance to himself.”

Shapiro, Arnold. ‘Participate in Sludgehood’: Browning’s ‘Mr. Sludge,’ the Critics, and the Problem of Morality.” Papers on Language and Literature, Spring, pp. 145–55. In Browning’s monologues, one cannot separate the argument from the man.


Sonstroem, David. “Fettered Fancy in Hard Times.” PMLA, May, pp. 520-29. Imaginative play and fellow feeling, the two meanings ascribed to Fancy by Dickens, are divided rather than coordinate in the novel.

Steig, Michael. “Dickens, Hablot Brown, and the Tradition of English Caricature.” Criticism, Summer, pp. 219-33. Browne’s illustrations, like the novels themselves, show a development from a caricatural style to a more realistic one.


FITZGERALD. Shuchter, J. D. “FitzGerald’s ‘Piety nor Wit.’” Notes and Queries, June, pp. 212-13. Possible source in Dryden.


Lelchuk, Alan. “‘Demos’: The Ordeal of the Two Gissings.” Victorian Studies, March, pp. 357-74. A novel of high merit showing the confrontation between man and writer that frequently energizes an artist’s best work.


Keith, W. J. “Thomas Hardy and the Literary Pilgrims.” Nineteenth-Century Fiction, June, pp. 80-92. Hardy’s
own actions and attitudes were significantly affected by “literary pilgrims” interested in the topography of his novels.


Cotter, James Finn. “‘Altar and Hour’ in The Wreck of the Deutschland.” *Papers on Language and Literature*, Winter, pp. 73-79. The autobiographical material in Part I refers not to Hopkins’ conversion but more likely to his decision to be a priest.

Murphy, Michael W. “Violent Imagery in the Poetry of Gerard Manley Hopkins.” *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 1-16. The violent images throughout Hopkins’ poetry are the source of the energetic quality which characterizes much of it.


White, Norman E. “‘Hearse’ in Hopkins’ ‘Spelt from Sibyl’s Leaves.” *English Studies*, December 1968, pp. 545-47. The importance of the word to the poem’s meaning.


HOUSMAN. Pearsall, Robert Brainard. “Housman’s ‘He Standing Hushed.’” *Victorian Poetry*, Spring, pp. 62-64. The structure is intended as a ligature between classical and biblical allusions.


Gordon, Jan B. “William Morris’s Destiny of Art.” *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Spring, pp. 271-79. Morris was forced to confuse a sociology of the arts with a theory of aestheticism.


RUSKIN. Alexander, Edward. “Ruskin and Science.” *Modern Language Review*, July, pp. 508-21. Whether he accepted or contested them, the claims of science were always in Ruskin’s mind.


Wilson, F. A. C. “Swinburne’s ‘Dearest Cousin’: The Character of Mary Gordon.” Literature and Psychology, Vol. XIX, No. 2, pp. 89-99. The loss of Mary was the turning-point of his life.


Crawford, John W. “A Unifying Element in Tennyson’s Maud.” Victorian Poetry, Spring, pp. 64-66. The war within the young lover toward society and toward Maud results in a war without.

Gray, J. M. “Knighthly Combats in Malory’s Tale of Sir Gareth and Tennyson’s ‘Gareth and Lynette.’” Notes and Queries, June, pp. 207-208. Tennyson reduces the number of combats from 8 to 4 in a skillful reorganization of significant detail.


Ricks, Christopher, ed. The Poems of Tennyson. Longman. The whole of Tennyson’s non-dramatic verse. Rev. TLS, 3 April, pp. 367-68.


Davidson, J. H. “Anthony Trollope and the Colonies.” Victorian Studies, March, pp. 305-30. Trollope’s travel books are unique as a vivid account of the state of the settlement colonies in the mid-nineteenth century.


Thomas, J. D. “The Intentional Strategy in Oscar Wilde’s Dialogues.” English Literature in Transition, Vol. XII, No. 1, pp. 11-20. The dialectic method allowed Wilde to controvert any opinion, including his own, in the search for a better one.

PROJECTS—REQUESTS FOR AID

THOMAS ARNOLD. B. J. Cahalin would like Arnold letters. TLS, 26 June, p. 712.

ROBERT AND ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING. Philip Kelley seeks whereabouts of the Browning’s correspondence, especially in private hands, for a checklist. TLS, 20 March, p. 309.

ROBERT BROWNING AND BENJAMIN JOWETT. Jack W. Herring desires any correspondence between the two men. TLS, 26 June, p. 712.

GEORGE CRUIKSHANK. W. A. Feaver wants letters and collections for a study. TLS, 24 July, p. 841.

HENRY RIDER HAGGARD. F. J. Boardman needs correspondence and manuscripts of Haggard. TLS, 24 July, p. 841.


ARTHUR SYMONS. Julian Ashdown would like letters and documents. TLS, 12 June, p. 645.


Staten Island Community College
City University of New York
English X News

A. THE CHICAGO MEETING
Chairman, John D. Rosenberg, Columbia University
Secretary, Ronald E. Freeman, University of California (Los Angeles)

I. Business
II. Papers and Discussion
1. “The Warp of Mill’s ‘Fabric’ of Thought,” Wendell V. Harris, University of Colorado. (18 min.)
2. “Mill on DeQuincey: Esprit Critique Revoked,” James G. Murray, Adelphi University. (18 min.)
3. “John Stuart Mill on Dogmatism, Liberticide, and Revolution,” Edward Alexander, University of Washington. (18 min.)


1969 Program Chairman: G. B. Tennyson, University of California (Los Angeles).
Bibliography Committee: Chairman, Ronald E. Freeman, University of California (Los Angeles); Allan C. Christensen, University of California (Los Angeles); Ward Hellstrom, University of Florida; Edward S. Lauterbach, Purdue University; David Paroissien, University of Massachusetts; Robert C. Schweik, State University of New York (Fredonia); Robert C. Slack, Carnegie-Mellon University; G. B. Tennyson, University of California (Los Angeles); Richard C. Tobias, University of Pittsburgh.

1970 Officers: Chairman, Ronald E. Freeman, University of California (Los Angeles).
Secretary, David DeLaura, University of Texas.
(Nominations to be voted on.)

B. THE VICTORIAN LUNCHEON
The Group Luncheon will be held December 28 immediately following the program in the Broadway Arms Room of the Cosmopolitan Hotel, with cocktails from 11:45 a.m. to 12:45 p.m., and luncheon promptly at 1:00 p.m. For reservations, please send a check for $5.25 to Professor Wendell Harris, English Department, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302, by December 15.