

# PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

VOLUME XVI

OCTOBER, 1937

NUMBER 4

## TENNYSON AND THE BIOLOGICAL THEORY OF MUTABILITY IN SPECIES

By GEORGE REUBEN POTTER

University of California

Ever since the later years of their own lives, Tennyson and Browning have had the reputation of being poets outstanding for their attempts to assimilate the doctrines of evolution; and this general estimate of their significance is sound enough, if it is not applied too closely to specific scientific concepts. But to think of the two as profoundly affected by the "Darwinian hypothesis" is a mistake. By 1859 Tennyson was fifty years old, and Browning was forty-seven. Their ideas about the nature of the living world had pretty well crystallized. They accepted Darwin's evidence, with different degrees of sympathy, called themselves evolutionists, and put his *Origin of Species* into pigeon-holes of their respective minds, with only slight attempts to reorganize their ideas in the light of its findings. As thinkers, they belong as definitely to the pre-Darwinian period as Meredith and Hardy do to the post-Darwinian. And the scientific ideas which most profoundly affected their philosophies of life cannot be clearly understood without some knowledge of what was going on in astronomy, geology, and biology, during the half-century *before* Darwin published his great work.

A great deal has been written about the effect of "evolution" on Tennyson. Practically every one of his critics and biographers has had his say on the subject; with the result that the more obvious facts and inferences have been repeated again and again till they are commonplaces. But very few of the critics have gone to the trouble of studying the history of scientific thought in the earlier half of the nineteenth century; so that while the importance which the general

philosophy of evolution had in Tennyson's thinking is fairly well understood, the more particular relations between his ideas and those of the men who were developing natural science during the decades from 1820 to 1860 have by no means yet been made clear. Some illuminating work has been done, but there is plenty of room for profitable further investigation.

Two questions surely need to be answered if one is to understand clearly Tennyson's relations to evolutionary philosophy. First, where did he obtain his knowledge of the sciences? And second, what is the precise significance of his different allusions to them? Yet less work has thus far been done on these questions than on any others connected with the subject. A few significant facts have been pointed out. That Tennyson was especially interested in geology and astronomy is plain even from a cursory reading of his works, and has been stated many times. That, in spite of his occasional personification of "Nature," in *In Memoriam* and elsewhere, he usually viewed the physical world realistically rather than idealistically, is a decidedly important fact, and has been noted by a number of writers from his lifetime down to our own day. His dicta about science, remains of many a conversation noted down by his friends, are on record and well known. His acquaintance with most of his contemporaries who were famous for their scientific studies is apparent from every biography. And finally, there have been some attempts, more or less successful, to find the sources for one or another idea in his poems that is related to natural science. But nobody has yet tried to give a detailed picture of the milieu out of which came such verses as the so-called "evolutionary" stanzas of *In Memoriam*, which have furnished more than one phrase still in popular use, and which continually by their early date surprise students making a first attempt to study the poet critically. Such a picture is necessary, if one is interested to determine as accurately as possible what were Tennyson's ideas relating to evolution. To paint it in detail is obviously impossible in a single article; but I shall try to make a rough sketch, and to state some of the facts which seem essential and which have not already been brought to bear on the subject by other writers.

## I

First, the question naturally arises as to what opportunities Tennyson may have had during his university career to come in contact with the natural sciences. Very little has been written on this topic. A.

Lionel Stevenson, in his *Darwin Among the Poets*,<sup>1</sup> mentions the matter, and is as far as I know the only one of Tennyson's critics to see significance in Hallam Tennyson's statement that his father's tutor at Cambridge was William Whewell. Even Mr. Stevenson says simply that Whewell, being a historian of the inductive sciences, would be likely to have encouraged the young Tennyson to think inductively. But Whewell was a remarkable man, and for much more than being a historian of inductive science. Tennyson matriculated at Cambridge on February 20, 1828, entering Trinity College, as his brothers did.<sup>2</sup> He remained there until February, 1831. During those years Whewell was, in addition to being a tutor at Trinity, Professor of Mineralogy for the University, having become so the year of Tennyson's matriculation. He had by that time become a member of the Royal Society (in 1820), of the Royal Astronomical Society (in 1821), and of the Geological Society (in 1827). He was throughout the 1820's enthusiastic about geology. One among numerous signs of this fact is the statement by a biographer of his that "In 1821 Mr. Whewell passed a few days at Oxford, and was rejoiced to find that geology was cultivated there even more vigorously than at Cambridge."<sup>3</sup> He had been a college friend of the famous astronomer John Frederick Herschel; and among his life-long acquaintances were most of the men at Cambridge who had special interests in natural science. He was chosen to write one of the "Bridgewater Treatises," and did so on the topic *Astronomy and General Physics Considered with Reference to Natural Theology*. In January, 1831, he reviewed the first volume of Lyell's epoch-making *Principles of Geology*, expressing high admiration for Lyell's abilities but disagreeing with his main principle of uniformity. He had already been corresponding with Lyell, and the two men became personal acquaintances. Later in life Whewell became Master of Trinity, and busy in a multitude of different fields. He wrote books on education, morality, mathematics, dynamics, astronomy, geology, and architecture.

This was the man who was Tennyson's tutor. He was at that time disliked by many of the undergraduates because of his rough manner.

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 58-59.

<sup>2</sup>See *Admissions to Trinity College, Cambridge* (edited by W. W. Rouse Ball and J. A. Venn, London, 1911), Vol. IV. My evidence for facts referred to in the following paragraphs of the text comes from the various catalogues, and the histories, of Cambridge and Trinity College; also from the *Dict. of National Biography*, and from Isaac Todhunter's biography of Whewell.

<sup>3</sup>Isaac Todhunter, *William Whewell*, I, 29.

But Hallam Tennyson presents abundant evidence that his father highly respected "the lion-like man," as he called Whewell.<sup>4</sup> Can there be any question as to one of the sources from which Tennyson drew his enthusiasm for astronomy and geology? Also, considering these facts, it is at least a striking coincidence, if not more, that in *The Princess* (1847) he dealt at least half-seriously with the problem of how large a place the natural sciences should have in a college curriculum, while in 1845 Whewell, in his book entitled *Of a Liberal Education*, had argued in favor of his university's giving more extended recognition to natural science.

Trinity College, indeed, during the years Tennyson was a student, cannot have been entirely uncongenial to any youth interested in such matters. Of the eight university professorships having any relation to natural science, five were at that time held by Trinity men: W. Clark being Professor of Anatomy, Adam Sedgwick Professor of Geology, George Peacock Professor of Astronomy and Geometry, Whewell Professor of Mineralogy, and G. B. Airy (afterwards Astronomer Royal) Professor of Astronomy and Experimental Philosophy. Furthermore, two of Alfred's three brothers had Whewell and Peacock respectively as tutors; and among the fifteen intimate college friends of Tennyson's that Hallam Tennyson lists in his memoir, four (Milnes, Brookfield, Monteith, and Arthur Hallam) had Whewell for a tutor, while at least six had Peacock.<sup>5</sup> Peacock was a successful lecturer and tutor, and was personally acquainted with Sedgwick, Whewell, and Herschel. Sedgwick is well enough known to students of nineteenth-century geology. He is said to have been an attractive lecturer, and more than one of Tennyson's friends, perhaps Tennyson himself, may have heard his lectures. Like Whewell, Sedgwick opposed Lyell's uniformitarianism; and when as an old man he learned of Darwin's theories, he opposed them also. Airy was a markedly active worker in astronomy. How popular he was as a lecturer I cannot determine.

Another Professor, not a Trinity man, Tennyson might well have known through his lectures. This was J. S. Henslow, of John's, Professor of Botany. Henslow made at least one geological expedition

<sup>4</sup>Hallam Tennyson's memoir of his father's life, in the edition of Tennyson's *Life and Works* published London, 1898, I, 50.

<sup>5</sup>Hallam Tennyson lists "Thompson" by his last name only. One Thompson who attended Trinity College at the time Alfred Tennyson was there had Peacock as a tutor; but more than one man with that surname was in the college during those years.

with Sedgwick to the Isle of Wight (scene of many geologizing trips by Tennyson and his friends), and was, if one may judge from his works and the memoirs of his life, a delightful and markedly tolerant man. Charles Darwin was a student of Henslow's, and while on his famous voyage in the *Beagle* sent back the specimens he collected to his former instructor, who kept and filed them. Henslow's discussion of hybrids, and the question of the limits of species, in his *Principles of Descriptive and Physiological Botany*, is markedly open-minded, though he nowhere asserts any belief in mutability. Later in the century, after the publication of *The Origin of Species*, Darwin wrote to Asa Gray, "Henslow will go a very little way with me, and is not shocked with me."<sup>6</sup>

It is not at present possible for me to prove the influence of Henslow, Airy, Sedgwick, Peacock, or even Whewell on Tennyson's scientific interests. But it is at least possible to assert confidently that though Tennyson said some harsh things about the dullness of his Cambridge studies, his stay there must have fostered whatever enthusiasm for natural science he had before, and probably created fresh interests as well.

One other possible influence on Tennyson's thought while he was at the university must be considered; for it very likely explains some ideas that appear in his later writings. That is the influence of Samuel Taylor Coleridge's philosophical thinking. Hallam Tennyson says, to be sure, that his father, while devoted to Coleridge's poetry, never much cared for his prose.<sup>7</sup> And one can easily see that Tennyson was not temperamentally likely to be fascinated by the idealistic transcendental metaphysics which Coleridge and his German masters stood for. But it is also true that undergraduates of those years at both Cambridge and Oxford talked much in Coleridgean terms. As E. L. Cary says in her life of Tennyson,<sup>8</sup> Coleridge was in the ascendant at Cambridge—as indeed he was in other centers of youthful minds, both in England and in the United States. One suspects, not that Tennyson consciously took ideas direct from Coleridge, but that they were in the minds and on the tongues of his friends, acquaintances, and even teachers, and he heard them from or read them in dozens of different sources.

<sup>6</sup>See Francis Darwin's *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, II (Chapter for year 1860), 81.

<sup>7</sup>Hallam Tennyson's memoir (see *ante*, Note 4), I, 66.

<sup>8</sup>Pp. 16-17.

Tennyson must have been acquainted with the work of the most important astronomers, geologists, and paleontologists during and immediately before the period 1820-1840. Buffon was in his father's library,<sup>9</sup> and presumably the boy looked into the volumes; though whether he would at that age have perceived the significance of Buffon's hints at the mutability of species is more than doubtful, considering the large number of more mature minds who read the *Histoire Naturelle* without noticing those hints.<sup>10</sup> Some of William Herschel's writings, Tennyson undoubtedly knew.<sup>11</sup> He may have read Erasmus Darwin, but there is no positive evidence that he did. We know that he read Lyell, and through Lyell's criticism of Lamarck (hostile criticism, it should be noted) came into contact with the Frenchman's theory of mutability in species. He read some of Hugh Miller's writings.<sup>12</sup> He read Chambers's *Vestiges of Creation*, as nearly everybody did when that much-discussed book appeared in 1844. But the few references which he makes to specific books give us an absurdly inadequate picture of his knowledge; for he must have read hundreds that he never directly mentioned in writing.

The picture we are beginning to form, then, of the background out of which rose Tennyson's opinions about science is one in which the astronomers and geologists figure largely. It shows us the University of Cambridge, still conservative and not a little dull, but offering many more opportunities for students of natural science than most historians are willing to admit. It shows us men like Whewell, Herschel, Sedgwick, Henslow, Lyell, Owen, and Miller, who were working busily and rapidly in the fields of astronomy, geology, and biology. It shows us the transcendental idealism of Coleridge widely influential, but becoming less transcendental and more complexly mixed with realism and scientific empiricism as the years went on. And it shows us, finally, men growing increasingly troubled and doubtful, as the facts collected and the hypotheses multiplied which seemed to tear down many of the ideals they lived by.

This, however, is not the whole story of those years. If a twentieth-century reader is acquainted with nineteenth-century evolutionary thought only through the various histories—such as H. F. Osborn's

<sup>9</sup>See Hallam Tennyson's memoir, I, 21.

<sup>10</sup>See, for instance, Oliver Goldsmith's *History of the Earth and Animated Nature*, and his preface to Richard Brookes's *System of Natural History*.

<sup>11</sup>See Hallam Tennyson's memoir, I, 26.

<sup>12</sup>See *Ibid.*, II, 59.

*From the Greeks to Darwin*—that have isolated that concept and traced it through the work of the men who embodied it in their thinking, he is apt to consider the period from 1820 to 1860 as one during which the most intelligent students in natural science were moving closer and closer to a belief in the mutability of species.<sup>13</sup> Such an impression is false. The “mutationists,” as such believers were called then, were very few, and were not the men with the highest reputations in their respective fields of study. Erasmus Darwin, Lamarck, Goethe, Lorenz Oken, Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, W. C. Wells, Patrick Matthew, and Robert Chambers, whose names figure in the histories of evolutionary theory, were not the most famous men in scientific work of their day, and were by no means the most learned or intelligent, except perhaps in respect to that one idea which they were developing. If any well-informed Englishman had in the year 1850 been asked to name the best minds among workers in the natural sciences during the past twenty years, he would probably have mentioned none of these names, but rather Cuvier, Richard Owen, Lyell, the Herschels, Sedgwick, Henslow, and Louis Agassiz—not one of whom had the slightest belief in the mutability of species before Darwin published his *Origin*, and most of whom refused to agree with the hypothesis even after Darwin had argued in its favor.

The general concept which *was* coming more and more to be accepted during and before those decades was that of unity in the living world; the idea that all the parts of that world are interrelated. Men came to recognize very widely the fact that there is some fundamental unity of organization among plants and animals; that the anatomical similarities (to use a familiar illustration) of man's hand to the paw of the dog, the hoof of the horse, the flipper of the seal, and the fin of the fish are signs that all animals are built upon the same archetypal plan. The “mutationists” and their opponents were for the most part at one on this particular matter. But very few Englishmen before 1860

<sup>13</sup>A recent example of this mistaken reasoning is in R. H. Snow's book, *Thomas Lovell Beddoes* (New York, 1928), p. 156: “If he [Beddoes] believed in the theory of evolution, and I rather think he did; after Lyell's *Principles of Geology* all science was drifting fast that way, and Beddoes was no slattern in his work”—

In contrast, Charles Darwin's own statement is interesting (from his “Autobiography,” published in Francis Darwin's *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*): “It has sometimes been said that the success of the ‘Origin’ proved ‘that the subject was in the air,’ or ‘that men's minds were prepared for it.’ I do not think that this is strictly true, for I occasionally sounded not a few naturalists, and never happened to come across a single one who seemed to doubt about the permanence of species.”

were willing to accept the theory that this unity exists because the varying species are descended from common ancestors. The authority of most of the reputable men of science was behind another explanation. According to Owen, Agassiz, and many others, the higher forms of life have appeared after the lower, all the forms have been created by the Deity according to one vast underlying plan, and one clear sign of this underlying plan is the fact that the embryonic stages of the higher organisms as they develop resemble successively different lower organisms. There has, these men agreed, been evolution in the living world; but that evolution exists only in *natura naturans*, or in the mind of God, or in the totality of life. Once a given species has appeared on this earth, they insisted, its descendants will forever remain within the bounds of that species.

It is very easy for us, looking back on a conception like this, to confuse it with the theory of mutability in species, or the "Darwinian hypothesis." And it is also tempting, if one does recognize a distinction at all, to think of it as unimportant. But to the men of that earlier half of the nineteenth century the distinction between a belief in *Nature's* evolution and a belief in an evolution of *species* was of very great importance. Nobody can understand at all clearly the history of evolutionary thought between the time of Erasmus Darwin and the publication of Charles Darwin's *Origin* unless he appreciates the fact. Two fairly late typical passages, one from Lyell and one from a less famous but thoroughly reputable geologist of the mid-century, Hugh Miller, will be enough to show that men were quite conscious then of a difference between the two beliefs. In *The Testimony of the Rocks* (1856) Miller argues at length against the possibility of mutation in species, but repeatedly emphasizes the fact that the more ancient fossil forms prophesy the appearance of higher species in later geologic ages. The theory of mutability is, he says, a "misapplication of what, emboldened by the views of Owen and Agassiz, I shall venture to term the *Geologic Prophecies*."<sup>14</sup> Lyell, in *The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man* (1863) is even more explicit in recognizing both the resemblance and the difference between a belief in mutability and one in a progression of Nature in producing successively higher and more perfect forms. He says:

It may be thought almost paradoxical that writers who are most in favor of transmutation (Mr. C. Darwin and Dr. J. Hooker, for example) are nevertheless

<sup>14</sup>*The Testimony of the Rocks*, Lecture Fifth, Part 1.

among those who are most cautious, and one would say timid, in their mode of espousing the doctrine of progression; while, on the other hand, the most zealous advocates of progression are oftener than not very vehement opponents of transmutation.<sup>15</sup>

The fact that the human embryo goes through stages in which it resembles successively a protozoan, a sponge, a worm, a fish, and a reptile, was observed early in the 1820's, by Meckel<sup>16</sup> and Von Baer, and was, a little later, widely disseminated in England and the United States through the writings of Agassiz. The generalization from that fact—that is, the theory that all higher organisms in their embryonic forms go through stages in which they resemble lower organisms—came in the latter half of the nineteenth century to be termed the "theory of recapitulation" and to be used as important evidence in favor of the idea that species are mutable. But none of the three men who first proclaimed the fact believed in such mutability. To them the phenomenon meant that nature, or God, developed on the earth successively higher forms, building all on the same general plan, and that the individuals high on the vital scale show in their embryonic development the way in which the Almighty's hand worked. Agassiz puts the point of view clearly:

Modern Embryology leads at once to the consideration of the most occult problem, as to the origin of animals, suggested by these comparisons. . . If we put a material interpretation upon them, and believe that even man himself has been gradually developed out of a fish, they are repugnant to our better nature. But looked at in their intellectual significance, they truly reveal the unity of the organic conception of which man himself is a part. . . To me the fact that the embryonic form of the highest vertebrate recalls in its earlier stage the first representatives of its type in geological times and its lowest representatives at the present day, speaks only of an ideal relation, existing, not in the things themselves but in the mind that made them. . . I cannot repeat too emphatically, that there is not a single fact in Embryology to justify the assumption that the laws of development, now known to be so precise and definite for every animal, have ever been less so, or have ever been allowed to run into each other. . . We shall seek as vainly to transform the lower animal types into the higher ones by any of our theories, as did the alchemists of old to change the baser metals into gold.<sup>17</sup>

If we keep all these facts in mind, we can turn to Tennyson's verse with some comprehension of the ideas which *he* was acquainted with in natural science, rather than those which *we* know best today. And

<sup>15</sup>*The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man* (my reference is to the second edition), Chapter xx, p. 405.

<sup>16</sup>Meckel I include on the authority of H. E. Jordan and J. E. Kindred's *Textbook of Embryology* (p. 501).

<sup>17</sup>Louis Agassiz, *Methods of Study in Natural History* (1863), concluding pages.

then two facts become clear: that not every statement of Tennyson's which suggests "evolution" to us meant the same thing to him when he made it; and that the burden of proof is decidedly on the critic who asserts that any particular statement which Tennyson made (before 1859, that is) indicates his belief in the mutability of species.

## II

Alfred Tennyson's son, Hallam, is our main source of information about the poet's ideas during his boyhood. Hallam Tennyson informs us that his father had even in his earliest years a love of observing nature, which led him later to his earnest study of science; and publishes, among various immature verses, one passage which seems significant:

The quick-winged gnat doth make a boat  
Of his old husk wherewith to float  
To a new life! All low things range  
To higher! But I cannot change.<sup>18</sup>

What Alfred meant, however, by the phrase "All low things range to higher" is doubtful. Mr. Stevenson speaks of it as "a direct statement of evolution, in six words";<sup>19</sup> but while the general spirit of evolutionary thought is there, I feel more than doubtful whether Tennyson was thinking of any mutation of species when he wrote the lines. He might so much more probably have been referring to that commonplace of the latter eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the vital scale, or to some vaguely conceived idea of spiritual progress, that I cannot regard the passage as important. The one other fact which Hallam Tennyson makes clear to us about this early period is that his father's interest in astronomy began then. Two other boyish verses indicate such an interest, and an often-repeated anecdote confirms it. Alfred, says Hallam Tennyson, said once to his brother Frederick, who was shy of going to a dinner-party, "Fred, think of Herschel's great star-patches, and you will soon get over all that."<sup>20</sup>

The indirect evidence for supposing that Tennyson developed his interest in natural science while an undergraduate in the University of Cambridge is, as we have already seen, considerable. But direct expressions of such an interest are not many. Hallam Tennyson says that the "Apostles," the club to which Alfred and most of his friends

<sup>18</sup>Hallam Tennyson's memoir, I, 24.

<sup>19</sup>Stevenson's *Darwin Among the Poets*, p. 65.

<sup>20</sup>Hallam Tennyson's memoir, I, 26.

belonged, discussed science as well as philosophy, religion, and politics. References to astronomy occur in Tennyson's patched-up prize poem, *Timbuctoo*. And finally, we have one very interesting bit of information, which Hallam Tennyson seems to have derived from a letter by Arthur Hallam, that Alfred in "some college discussion" propounded the theory that the "development of the human body might possibly be traced from the radiated, vermicular, molluscous, and vertebrate organisms."<sup>21</sup> The language, as quoted at third hand by Hallam Tennyson, is none too explicit. But if Alfred meant what Arthur Hallam thought he did, he was reflecting Von Baer's recent theories of embryology. For Hallam Tennyson gives Arthur Hallam's rejoinder as: "Do you mean that the human brain is at first like a madrepore's, then like a worm's, etc.? But this cannot be, for they have no brain."

Pretty certainly Tennyson was referring to the idea that an individual in its embryonic development passes through stages that resemble lower forms of animal life. Van Baer had published his work on that subject in 1828, the year Tennyson entered Cambridge; but I can find no evidence that it was widely familiar to Englishmen until later in the century. Arthur Hallam's surprised expostulation would indicate his unfamiliarity with it. And Alfred's knowledge can in that particular respect be thought of, certainly, as up to the minute. But evidence is completely lacking that he connected that theory with "mutability." Certainly Von Baer did not.

When we turn to Tennyson's poems published in 1833, we discover, as we might expect considering his early interest in Herschel, that he knew about and was impressed by the nebular theory, which applied the general concept of evolution to astronomy. In a set of stanzas which he rejected from *The Palace of Art*, but in the edition of 1833 published in a footnote, he pictures the soul studying astronomy up in the central tower of her palace:

Hither, when all the deep unsounded skies  
Shuddered with silent stars, she climb,  
And as with optic glasses her keen eyes  
Pierced through the mystic dome,  
  
Regions of lucid matter taking forms,  
Brushes of fire, hazy gleams,  
Clusters and beds of worlds, and bee-like swarms  
Of suns, and starry streams.

<sup>21</sup>Hallam Tennyson cites this proposition, and Arthur Hallam's reply, in quotation marks. It is hard to tell, precisely, from his rather vague statements, but it would seem that he quotes both passages from Arthur Hallam's letter.

Again, in *The Princess*, we find Lady Psyche describing to her girl undergraduates the origin of the universe in terms of the same theory:

This world was once a fluid haze of light,  
Till toward the center set the starry tides,  
And eddied into suns, that wheeling cast  
The planets: then the monster, then the man;  
Tattooed or woaded, winter-clad in skins,  
Raw from the prime, and crushing down his mate;  
As yet we find in barbarous isles, and here  
Among the lowest.<sup>22</sup>

Tennyson always maintained, and quite rightly, that as a poet he had no concern with particular facts and speculations of science, unless they entered into the very germ of a poem. From Hallam Tennyson's memoirs we know that Tennyson spent a good deal more time in the study of astronomy than his poems alone give evidence for.

But his favorite science, geology, was so closely linked to his philosophical doubts and emotional crises, and also to his pleasant memories of fossil-hunting expeditions with friends, that it thrust itself again and again into his verses, especially those published from 1842 to 1860. Fossils, and geological terms, appear frequently in *The Epic, Audley Court, Edwin Morris: or The Lake, The Princess, In Memoriam, and Maud*; all of them, it is interesting to notice, poems which intimately reflect the poet's every-day life.

We do not, however, find him committing himself, either in verse or in his recorded conversations, to any particular geological theory. Perhaps one might argue that the reference to "some new deluge" in the tenth of his *Early Sonnets* indicates a youthful leaning toward catastrophism, while the phrase, "many a million of ages," in *Maud*,<sup>23</sup> indicates a later turning to Lyell's doctrine of uniformitarianism. But such arguing is too tenuous to be worth much. In all probability, for years following the appearance of Lyell's *Principles* Tennyson did not feel himself enough of an expert to avow publicly a belief in either Lyell's ideas or those of his opponents. The facts of geology—its proof that long ages stretch back of historic time, and that species of life now are not the same as those which used to inhabit the earth—he accepted and used. But he very possibly did not try to decide among the geologists' special theories. Even the nebular theory, so widely held by astronomers, is described by Princess Ida with a cautious "If

<sup>22</sup>*The Princess*, Part II.

<sup>23</sup>*Maud*, IV, 6.

that hypothesis of theirs be sound."<sup>24</sup> Tennyson did not consider himself an astronomer, a geologist, or a biologist, but a layman looking on those sciences from the outside and attempting to assimilate their significance. I can find no certain indication whether or when Tennyson rejected catastrophism, or even whether he ever actively believed in it.

With two biological concepts which everyone today connects with the doctrines of evolution, Tennyson was familiar and anxiously concerned: the theories, that is, of the prodigality of nature and of the struggle for existence. And though Charles Darwin later in the century made the most famous application of these two ideas to biological science, Tennyson earlier gave to them their best-known phrasing, and impressed them most forcefully on the popular mind. Even today few of us are likely to think of them without some recollection of

finding that of fifty seeds  
She often brings but one to bear,

and

Nature red in tooth and claw.

One can hardly doubt that Tennyson had come into contact with both concepts by the middle 1830's, if not before. They appear again and again in English prose and verse back at least as far as the seventeenth century. But the first appearance of the former concept in Tennyson's work is in *The Two Voices*, and of the latter in the famous Section LVI of *In Memoriam*. If the date "1833," which was placed after *The Two Voices* in the 1842 edition (afterwards removed) means that the whole poem dates from that year, we can place Tennyson's appreciation of the fact that nature is prodigal close to his Cambridge days. The voice which urges despair on the poet points one of its first arguments with the sentence,

Though thou wert scattered to the wind,  
Yet is there plenty of the kind.

The idea is not, however, by any means as clearly put as it is in Section LV of *In Memoriam*:

The wish, that of the living whole  
No life may fail beyond the grave,  
Derives it not from what we have  
The likeliest God within the soul?

<sup>24</sup>*The Princess*, Part IV, line 2.

Are God and Nature then at strife,  
That Nature lends such evil dreams?  
So careful of the type she seems,  
So careless of the single life,

That I, considering everywhere  
Her secret meaning in her deeds,  
And finding that of fifty seeds  
She often brings but one to bear,  
I falter where I firmly trod, etc.

The verse is so excellently clear and vivid, and the wide implications of the fact to the poet are so apparent and so widely recognized, that comment is hardly necessary. Even clearer, and even better known, are the great stanzas of Section LVI, which counterpoise in striking contrast man's belief, or desire to believe, that God is

love indeed  
And love Creation's final law,

with the dark fact in nature of universal struggle, warfare, and death which "shrieked against his creed." If ever a poet wrote "What oft was thought, but ne'er so well expressed," if ever he voiced the inarticulate anxiety in thousands of minds, Tennyson did in those verses. I treat them briefly, not because they are unimportant, but because all criticism of Tennyson—even the common experience of thinking people from his time down to our own—stands as an open commentary on them.

Now it is of course true that the nebular theory, the various discoveries of geology and paleontology, the facts of the prodigality of nature and the struggle for existence, all play an important part in the development of nineteenth-century evolutionary thought. But the central concept in that thought is the theory that species are mutable, that the present forms of life have descended from common ancestors, and that we can express the relations among present and past species by placing them on a family tree. Just what does Tennyson have to say, and just what was his attitude, on this particular matter? To consider the question is not merely to split hairs; for, as I have already tried to make clear, people today seriously misunderstand the ideas of their nineteenth-century forebears in supposing that everybody then connected the doctrine of mutability in species with the same phenomena and generalizations that students of science do at the present time.

In *Love Thou thy Land* (probably written in 1833) occur two stanzas which seem pertinent. The poet urges one who loves his coun-

try to stimulate change, but gradual and firmly based, not revolutionary:

For Nature also, cold and warm,  
And moist and dry, devising long,  
Through many agents making strong,  
Matures the individual form.

Meet is it changes should control  
Our being, lest we rust in ease.  
We all are changed by still degrees,  
All but the basis of the soul.

That the spirit of nineteenth-century evolutionary philosophy is in the lines nobody can question. But the actual concept of organic evolution is another matter. Nature "devising long" and maturing "the individual form" sounds very much like the idea of unity in animal organization and the theory of an evolving *Nature*. As we have previously seen, it was perfectly possible for a thinker to believe that Nature matured the form of individuals and even of species, without believing that one specific form developed from another. "We all are changed by still degrees" refers, of course, simply to the changes in an individual's body and mind between birth and death.

In *The Two Voices* is another passage that immediately suggests to a later generation the mutation of species. The poet is speculating concerning three possible modes of pre-existence; either our state may have been the same before birth as now, or we may have "lapsed from nobler place," or, finally:

If through lower lives I came—  
Though all experience past became  
Consolidate in mind and frame—

But Tennyson is writing about the transmigration of souls, and the lines refer not so much to material as to spiritual progress—a sort of semi-evolutionary idea that appears more than once in the writings of eighteenth-century thinkers.<sup>25</sup> The idea of past experience becoming consolidate in the *frame* as well as the mind is distinctly important, as Mr. Stevenson well observes,<sup>26</sup> and injects the idea of physical change into these speculations concerning the soul. But from the lines themselves we cannot be at all sure whether Tennyson was thinking of changes in species, or of the same idea that he reflects

<sup>25</sup>For instance, in James Thomson's verse. See an article by the present writer, "James Thomson and the Evolution of Spirits," *Englische Studien*, LVI, 57ff.

<sup>26</sup>Darwin Among the Poets, p. 81.

in his Cambridge discussion, that the human body in its embryonic stages has resemblances to lower organisms. Finally, the whole idea is given as a possibility only, no more probable than either of the two described in the preceding stanzas.

Next come some verses from *The Palace of Art* which were included in the editions of 1833 and (with some alterations)<sup>27</sup> of 1842 and subsequent years, until 1853, when Tennyson removed them:

'From shape to shape at first within the womb  
The brain is modelled,' she began,  
'And through all phases of all thought I come  
Into the perfect man.'

All Nature widens upward. Evermore  
The simpler essence lower lies:  
More complex is more perfect, owning more  
Discourse, more widely wise.'

Here we have again the idea reflected that embryonic stages of higher organisms resemble adult phases of lower. And the second of the two stanzas puts vividly the conception that the simpler organisms are the less perfect, that as the ages go on the forms of life become more varied, more complex, and closer to perfection. But as to the method by which "Nature widens upward" Tennyson does not commit himself. Coleridge, in his *Theory of Life*, had gone as far toward the theory of mutability as these lines go; and Coleridge objected strongly to the mutation theory itself. To say that Nature widens upward implied to a thinker before 1859 nothing one way or the other as to a possible evolution of species.

It is, of course, in the various sections of *In Memoriam* that modern readers find most of the passages which they consider prophetic of the Darwinian theory. Precisely when each section of this poem was written is not certain. But Hallam Tennyson asserts that "the sections about evolution" were written before the publication of *The Vestiges of Creation*, in 1844;<sup>28</sup> and Tennyson in a letter to his publisher referred to the *Vestiges* in a way to confirm his son's later assertion: "I want you to get me a book [the *Vestiges*] which I see advertised in the Examiner: it seems to contain many speculations

<sup>27</sup>The first stanza in 1833 read:

'From change to change four times within the womb  
The brain is moulded,' she began,  
'So through all phases of all thought I come  
Into the perfect man.'

<sup>28</sup>Hallam Tennyson's memoir, I, 288.

with which I have been familiar for years, and on which I have written more than one poem."<sup>29</sup>

(May I point out that Tennyson says nothing here as to his *belief* about these speculations?)

In the first section of *In Memoriam*, he says:

I held it truth, with him who sings  
To one clear harp in divers tones,  
That men may rise on stepping-stones  
Of their dead selves to higher things;

and in a letter written many years later he explains that he had referred to Goethe and his words, "Von Änderungen zu höheren Änderungen."<sup>30</sup> We are left in complete doubt, however, as to whether Tennyson connected Goethe's phrase with anything more than the idea of progress.

The best known sections of the poem concern themselves not with the mutability of species but with the prodigality of nature, the struggle for existence, and the evidence from geology that "a thousand types are gone." We now inevitably call such ideas "evolutionary," because Darwin linked them to his hypothesis of natural selection. But Tennyson knew nothing about Darwin's hypothesis when he wrote the sections. And what is more, the emphasis in them on the *type*—even the negative emphasis in the assertion that types which used to exist are now gone—points rather toward the theory of an evolving Nature, that produces successively higher forms of life on earth.

Section CXVIII brings us more directly toward the concept of mutability than anything we have yet seen in Tennyson:

Contemplate all this work of Time.  
      . . . They say  
The solid earth whereon we tread  
In tracts of fluent heat began,  
      And grew to seeming-random forms,  
      The seeming prey of cyclic storms,  
Till at the last arose the man;  
Who threw and branched from clime to clime,  
      The herald of a higher race,  
      And of himself in higher place,  
If so he type this work of time  
Within himself, from more to more;  
      . . . Arise and fly  
The reeling Faun, the sensual feast;  
      Move upward, working out the beast,  
And let the ape and tiger die.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup>Letter of November 3, 1891 (see Hallam Tennyson's memoir, iv, 172).

The idea of astronomical, or cosmic, evolution is here, beyond a doubt; and mingled with it the idea of progress. But the stanzas are still based upon the concept of an evolving Nature, not that of the mutability of species. Man "branched from clime to clime"—i.e., divided into different races—but branched only as man. He is a "herald of a higher race"; but the implication in the lines is plain that he is *Nature's* herald—is to the supposititious higher race what Hugh Miller called a "Geologic Prophecy"—<sup>31</sup> not that his species will itself change. For note that Tennyson conceives of man's improvement of himself as a process by which he can *parallel*, or "type," the process by which Nature produces higher forms; while a believer in the doctrine of specific mutability would consider man's self-improvement as *part of* the process by which a higher race comes into being, not simply as typical of that process. As for the last two lines of the passage: the idea that man contains in himself all beasts, and needs to subdue and discipline them, is as old as Plato. Excellent statements of the concept can be found in the seventeenth-century writings of Donne and George Herbert.<sup>32</sup> What Tennyson is saying is that the way God has worked in producing the present living world can teach man how to improve himself (*as man*) by subduing and rising above the baser tendencies within him.

The same comments apply to the last stanza of Section CXX:

Let him, the wiser man who springs  
Hereafter, up from childhood shape  
His actions like the greater ape,  
But I was born to other things.

Tennyson said many years later that this was "spoken ironically against mere materialism, not against evolution." There is no particular reason for doubting the accuracy of his memory on that occasion. But the lines are surely not directed *in favor of* evolution. In them Tennyson was simply emphasizing a contrast between his own belief in man's kinship with the Divine and the materialistic belief that man is simply a "greater" animal.

Finally, there are the lines at the very end of the poem. The poet, singing of his sister's marriage, foresees the conceiving of a child:

<sup>31</sup>See the quotation from Miller's *The Testimony of the Rocks*, cited above, on p. 10.

<sup>32</sup>See, for instance, Donne's verse letter *To Sir Edward Herbert, at Julyers*, and George Herbert's poem *Man*.

—star and system rolling past,  
 A soul shall draw from out the vast  
 And strike his being into bounds,

And, moved through life of lower phase,  
 Result in man, be born and think,  
 And act and love, a closer link  
 Betwixt us and the crowning race

Of those that, eye to eye, shall look  
 On knowledge; under whose command  
 Is Earth and Earth's, and in their hand  
 Is Nature like an open book;

No longer half-akin to brute,  
 For all we thought and loved and did,  
 And hoped, and suffered, is but seed  
 Of what in them is flower and fruit;

Whereof the man that with me trod  
 This planet was a noble type  
 Appearing ere the times were ripe,  
 That friend of mine who lives in God,

That God, which ever lives and loves,  
 One God, one law, one element,  
 And one far-off divine event,  
 To which the whole creation moves.

The idea that the soul is moved (in the embryo of man) "through life of lower phase" is Von Baer's theory.<sup>33</sup> The possibility that this soul may become a "closer link betwixt us and the crowning race" seems perhaps closest to the concept of mutability of all the passages I have thus far quoted. Yet there is no clear implication in it that the author believed man's *species* will change. It is rather a race of superior *men* that he foresees. Arthur Hallam, it should be noted, is spoken of as a "noble type appearing ere the times were ripe," of that superior race. Tennyson comes at last, after all, to the idea of man's progress as man. Interesting, too, is the cautious phrase, "half-akin to brute."

Ideas similar to these appear in *The Princess*, where Lady Psyche pictures, first "the monster, then the man," and ancient man as a savage. A believer in organic evolution would have agreed with her speech; but so also would any nineteenth-century student versed in geology, whether a mutationist or not. How the monster and the man came into being Lady Psyche does not specify.

We find, in a passage from *Maud* (published 1855):

<sup>33</sup>William North Rice perceived this fact some years ago. See his *A Poet of Science and other Addresses* (New York and Cincinnati, 1919).

A monstrous eft was of old the lord and master of earth,  
For him did his high sun flame, and his river billowing ran,  
And he felt himself in his force to be Nature's crowning race.

As nine months go to the shaping an infant ripe for his birth,  
So many a million of ages have gone to the making of man:  
He now is first, but is he the last? is he not too base?<sup>34</sup>

(Tennyson explains in his notes that in the phrase "a monstrous eft" he was referring to "the great old lizards of geology.") The succession of forms of life in geologic ages appears clearly in the lines; and Von Baer's idea, already familiar to us, that "many a million of ages have gone to the making of man." But Lyell, Agassiz, and Miller would all have agreed to such a statement at the time it was published.

So, in our chronological survey, we come to the years after Darwin published his *Origin*. In Hallam Tennyson's memoirs we have record of several comments which Tennyson made about that epochal book:

Of Evolution he said: 'That makes no difference to me, even if the Darwinians did not, as they do, exaggerate Darwinism. To God all is present. He sees present, past, and future as one.'<sup>35</sup>

To Tyndall he once said, 'No evolutionist is able to explain the mind of Man or how any possible physiological change of tissue can produce conscious thought.' Yet he was inclined to think that the theory of Evolution caused the world to regard more clearly the 'Life of Nature as a lower stage in the manifestation of a principle which is more fully manifested in the spiritual life of man, with the idea that in this process of Evolution the lower is to be regarded as a means to the higher.'<sup>36</sup>

(Interesting parallels to this last sentence can be found in Coleridge's prose.)<sup>37</sup>

Hallam Tennyson also published some reminiscences by William Allingham, who says that on his visit to Tennyson in 1863, "Tennyson now took Barnes and me to his top room. 'Darwinism, Man from Ape, would that really make any difference?'"<sup>38</sup>

Finally, in Mrs. Tennyson's journal for August 17, 1868, we have an account of one remark which Tennyson made to Darwin himself:

Mr. Darwin called, and seemed to be very kindly, unworldly, and agreeable. Alfred said to him, 'Your theory of Evolution does not make against Christianity'; and Darwin answered, 'No, certainly not.'<sup>39</sup>

A striking feature of all these remarks is that Tennyson speaks—

<sup>34</sup>*Maud*, IV, 6.

<sup>35</sup>Hallam Tennyson's memoir, II, 120.

<sup>36</sup>Hallam Tennyson's memoir, II, 121.

<sup>37</sup>See Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*: "Moral and Religious Aphorisms," No. xxxvi: "Comment"; also J. A. Heraud's *Oration on the Death of Coleridge*.

<sup>38</sup>Hallam Tennyson's memoir, II, 355.

<sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*, III, 74.

not simply of the theory of natural selection, but of "Evolution"—as Darwin's, as something about which he is giving an opinion, rather than as an idea which he himself has held from youth. And what he meant by "Evolution" seems plain enough (if we can trust Allingham's memory) from the explanatory phrase, "Darwinism, man from ape." He talks as if he were coming to the idea of the mutability of species, not for the first time, but with a feeling that for the first time he had to take it seriously and give his opinion about it. His later poem, *By an Evolutionist*, shows that he accepted Darwin's main contention, and saw its intimate connection with his own previous thinking; but he always writes a little distantly, in the same tone as his spoken comment—"Would that really make any difference?"

In sum, I am driven to doubt extremely whether before the publication of *The Origin of Species* Tennyson believed in "mutability." He naturally knew that such a theory existed—the *Vestiges* could have told him that, to say nothing of his earlier reading and study. And it is not at all to his discredit to assert that he did not definitely accept the theory before 1859. It rather shows in him a cautious and judicious mind. It is easy to find fault with professional workers in the natural sciences during those decades for failing to perceive the force of the evidence in favor of that doctrine. But Tennyson was not an original or a professional scientific worker. He was a poet, concerned with many other subjects besides science. And if it is true, as I contend, that like so many of his contemporaries he withheld belief in the theory till Darwin showed its complete scientific credibility, he appears simply as a sane and clear thinker. Very possibly—even probably—he did not think it necessary to fix a belief one way or the other on the question whether species change into other species or appear suddenly as Nature chooses to bring them into existence. What he was interested in was the whole general concept of change and progress in the living world. *How* this progress was brought about seemed to him a secondary matter; and the theories of the mutationists about the means were, before Charles Darwin added himself to their number, pretty thoroughly speculative. None of the workers in natural science whom Tennyson knew personally, as a college student and for three decades afterward—with the single exception of Herbert Spencer—admitted the validity of such theories; and neither did the writers for whose intelligence he had the most respect, Sedgwick, for example, and Lyell, Owen, and Agassiz.

What Tennyson more probably held in the back of his mind, before 1860, was a belief that Nature or God brought the various species of living things into existence suddenly, at different points in time, creating successively higher types, and prophesying in the lower forms the higher ones which were to appear in later ages. This belief was in general that which Coleridge, Owen, and Miller all held. Tennyson probably went through a perfectly understandable change in opinion. He accepted the theories of evolutionary astronomy from his college days on, as did most of his contemporaries with any scientific training. He was receptive to the facts which the geologists and paleontologists were discovering, and struggled to assimilate them; though he was unwilling to enlist himself actively as a champion of any particular geological theory. He believed that the living world is unified, and that as time has gone on higher forms of life have appeared. Into such a framework of ideas he could fit nearly all of the particular scientific facts he learned. He had also an intense desire for human progress toward perfection. There was no necessity for him, before 1860, to take any further step toward a belief in the mutability of species; no urgent requirement, in fact, that he decide one way or the other on the matter. He may even have been ready to take the step, if the doctrine of mutability could be shown to be more than a speculative dream. But that he *did* definitely take it, before Darwin's book was published, there is no certain evidence. And to think that Tennyson was the spokesman of English thought in the 1830's and 1840's when he wrote during those years, to think that he believed what most of the best known scientific reasoners of his time did, is surely more in accord with the rest we know of his temperament than to suppose, as nearly every writer about him thus far has, that he turned to a biological theory against which practically all of his scientifically minded friends could have made cogent arguments. If in those decades he believed in the mutability of species, why do we not hear of more objections to his ideas from the natural scientists? We hear of protests from the theologians, but the geologists and biologists seem to have approved. Hallam Tennyson says that "scientific leaders like Herschel, Owen, Sedgwick, and Tyndall regarded him as champion of Science."<sup>40</sup> Of these men, only Tyndall ever accepted the theory of mutability. That Tyndall should have approved such passages as those in *In Memoriam* concerning past geologic ages, the prodigality of nature, and the struggle

<sup>40</sup>Hallam Tennyson's memoir, II, 88-89.

for existence, is natural enough. But that Owen and Sedgwick would have become enthusiastic if they thought that Tennyson meant to uphold the theory of mutability is decidedly improbable.

It is easy enough to understand why Tennyson accepted Darwin with little question, and thought that the theories in *The Origin of Species* made slight difference to his own beliefs. Nature could have produced successively higher types by the alteration of species as well as by any other method. Tennyson's dearly cherished ideals of progress and of man's eventual purging of the beast in him seemed to fit perfectly with Darwin's ideas. And, as Mr. Stevenson has discerningly remarked,<sup>41</sup> Tennyson was always more of a deist than an orthodox Christian of his time. He had given up belief in the Garden of Eden decades before; and he had fought through his personal doubts relating to the immortality of the soul to a point where it seemed to him the additional fact of man's lineal descent from other animals would make no difference. He did not pursue very far the new questions, doubts, and terrors which Darwin's hypothesis brought to an already troubled world. "Natural selection" simply made credible a theory which he had up to that time not taken seriously; and he was convinced, I suspect, mainly because increasing numbers of his scientific acquaintances became convinced also.

Tennyson's attitude toward ideas like these, and his mental processes when dealing with them, were very much like those which any highly educated person living in those years would have had, if he had studied the subjects that Tennyson studied. If the verses which involve the general philosophy of evolution, in Tennyson's earlier poems, were prophetic of thought in the latter half of the century, they were so only in the same sense that the statements of Coleridge, Lyell, and Owen were. Tennyson was not seeing by a mystic intuition the proofs of organic evolution that Darwin was to produce later; nor was he jumping past the factual evidence by the light of a transcendental metaphysic. He was following, in a sane and clear-headed fashion, the most enlightened scientific thinkers of those decades; taking the results of his study into his own mind, and there struggling to mould them into some satisfactory working philosophy of life.

<sup>41</sup>*Darwin Among the Poets*, p. 95.

## HERMAN MELVILLE IN TAHITI

By ROBERT S. FORSYTHE

The Newberry Library

In another paper,<sup>1</sup> I have dealt with Herman Melville's sojourn on and about the northwestern group of the Marquesas Islands in the summer of 1842, as he has described it in *Typee* and *Omoo*. I expect in this and in a following article to discuss his stay on Tahiti, the largest of the Society Islands, during the latter part of the same year. I shall use as the basis for my study the account of his experiences which he has given us in *Omoo*. I shall pay some attention to the rather confused time system of *Omoo*, and I shall allot a few pages to a consideration of the criticism of Melville and his book by visitors to the South Seas, as well as to that of residents in the islands, in the years immediately following the publication of the novel. Neither of these topics seems to me to have been treated previously with the care which it merits.

In the paper which I have just mentioned, August 14, 1842, is suggested<sup>2</sup> as probably close to the day on which Melville, as a member of the crew of the whaling-bark *Julia*,<sup>3</sup> had his last view of the Marquesas.<sup>4</sup> That this probability is a strong one is indicated by an examination of the statements made by Melville as to the passage of time in the course of chapters IX to XVIII of *Omoo*. As these do not seem to have been discussed by any other student of the book, I believe that I may give them some attention here as a kind of introduction to what I have to say regarding Melville's life on Tahiti and Eimeo.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>"Herman Melville in the Marquesas," *Philological Quarterly*, xv, 1-15 (January, 1936).

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 10.

<sup>3</sup>Actually the vessel which rescued Melville from the Typees was the *Lucy Ann*, of Sydney, New South Wales, commanded by Captain Vinton. I prefer the "Captain Vinton" of Lieutenant Henry A. Wise, in *Los Gringos* (London: R. Bentley, 1849), p. 358, to the "Captain Ventom" of the trader Lucett, in his *Rovings in the Pacific* (Two vols. London: Longmans, 1851), I, 294.

<sup>4</sup>*Omoo*, pp. 34-35. All references to Melville's works are to the volumes of the Standard Edition, London: Constable and Company, 1922-24.

<sup>5</sup>I design to treat Melville's sojourn on Imeoo, as he calls it (more properly Eimeo, or Moorea), in a separate article to be published later. It should be observed that in the course of the present paper I use the form Eimeo in my refer-

If, then, Sunday, August 14, 1842, was the day on which Wymontoo, the Marquesan, was signed and on which the *Julia* began her cruise, August 15 would have been the day on which the crew discussed what appellation should be granted the seasick and homesick new hand.<sup>6</sup> The next reference to a date relates to the sudden deaths of two of the invalids on board the *Julia*. These, according to Melville, occurred about an hour apart, one night when the vessel "had been at sea about twenty days."<sup>7</sup> September 3, 1842, would seem, therefore, close to the date of these tragic events. It was on the night of September 3, then, that Van, the Finlander, made his prophecy—which, as Melville says, "was none the less remarkable from its absolute fulfillment"—that in less than three weeks more not one quarter of the *Julia's* crew would remain aboard her.<sup>8</sup> Several days of quiet followed,<sup>9</sup> but within a week—by September 10—the crew had resumed their jests upon the *Julia's* unseaworthiness.<sup>10</sup> Thus matters went "some four weeks or more after leaving Hannamanoo."<sup>11</sup>

Not "long after the death of the two men"—say on September 13<sup>12</sup>—Captain Guy<sup>13</sup> was reported as "fast declining."<sup>14</sup> In "a day or two more," he was said to be dying.<sup>15</sup> This would be on September 14 or 15. It was on the evening of one of these days that Jermin, the mate, proposed to Melville and Dr. Long Ghost that, in the event of the captain's death, he, Jermin, should, contrary to his duty, take the *Julia* for a cruise to a sperm whale ground instead of navigating her

ences to the small island of the Society group on which Melville spent some weeks, rather than Melville's preferred Imeo (which is an attempt at phonetic spelling) or the alternative name, Moorea. I may remark here that in the 1906 edition of *A Complete Pronouncing Gazetteer . . . of the World* (*Lippincott's New Gazetteer*) (Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company), Eimeo and Moorea are entered without cross-references, apparently as two distinct and different islands of the Society group.

<sup>6</sup>*Omoo*, p. 41.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 53.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 56.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 57.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 59. The reference here is to Hanamenu Bay, Island of Hivaoa, in the Marquesas, whence the *Julia* had sailed.

<sup>12</sup>Ten days is a period hardly accurately described as "not long after," yet Captain Guy's relapse would seem to have occurred more than four weeks after leaving "Hannamanoo" on August 14. If Melville's "not long after" actually meant less than ten days, the task of reconciling events and time references for the remainder of the journey to Tahiti would be much simpler.

<sup>13</sup>Actually Captain Vinton.

<sup>14</sup>*Omoo*, p. 61. The commander of the *Julia* had been ill for some time (see *ibid.*, p. 16..

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 60.

into the nearest civilized port.<sup>16</sup> Upon their displaying a lack of interest in this project, he agreed to head for Tahiti, if in twenty-four hours the captain was no better.<sup>17</sup> It would have been, then, the night of September 15 or 16 that Melville observed, when he went upon deck, that the vessel had changed her course and was bound for Tahiti.<sup>18</sup> As the *Julia* ran further south, she encountered rough weather, and her caboose was swept by a "tremendous sea." This event may be placed perhaps on September 16 or 17. It occurred, at any rate, as the ship's cook was preparing supper one evening after the change in the course was made.<sup>19</sup> The next morning (that of September 17 or 18?) the damage was repaired as well as it could be.<sup>20</sup> Melville's next time-reference can hardly apply to the period between the storm and the first sight of land. I should suppose it rather to refer to the time between the *Julia*'s directing her way to Tahiti and the arrival off the Paumotu Islands. Commenting upon Jermin's extraordinary manner of taking his observations while navigating the *Julia*, Melville concludes: ". . . before many days, a fellow sent aloft . . . bawled out, 'Land ho!'"<sup>21</sup> The "before many days" refers, I think, to the period between September 15 or 16 and September 19, which appears to have been the date upon which the Paumotus were first seen.

Having made the Paumotus, Jermin announced that Tahiti was only twenty-four hours away.<sup>22</sup> His prophecy was correct. The next morning, that of September 20, the mountains of Tahiti were in view.<sup>23</sup> The *Julia* continued on her way, and eventually Papeete, "the village metropolis" came into sight.<sup>24</sup> In the harbor lay the French frigate *La Reine Blanche*, which, as the crew of the *Julia* sighted her, fired a salute in honor of the treaty concluded that morning between France and the Tahitan kingdom.<sup>25</sup>

As the *Julia* approached the Tahitan coast and the harbor of Pa-

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 60-61.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 61.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 69.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 70.

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 72.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 76.

<sup>24</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 79.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 80. Here, for the sake of a dramatic touch, Melville makes free with history. The treaty was signed and the salute fired on September 9, 1842. See, for a discussion of this point, my "Herman Melville in the Marquesas," *Philological Quarterly*, xv, 13-14 (January, 1936).

peete, her crew looked forward with eager expectancy to many pleasant days on shore.<sup>26</sup> But these hopes were crushed, when the vessel was brought to outside the harbor and preparations were made to take the captain ashore in a boat.<sup>27</sup> Mutiny not only was threatened but actually broke out, to be halted by the arguments of Long Ghost and Melville.<sup>28</sup> The captain was landed, and the mate returned to the ship.<sup>29</sup> When toward evening Jermin again went ashore, the cook, Baltimore, bore with him a "round robin,"<sup>30</sup> prepared by Melville and addressed to the English consul at Tahiti, in which the members of the *Julia*'s crew urged that official to board the vessel and investigate matters there.<sup>31</sup>

On the next morning, that of September 21, 1842, the Acting<sup>32</sup>

<sup>26</sup>*Omoo*, p. 79.

<sup>27</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 80.

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 81, 85-86.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 86-87.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid.* For a facsimile of the signatures to the round robin, see *ibid.*, p. 90. An interesting variant of this portion of the document was included in the two pages of the manuscript of *Omoo* offered for sale in May, 1935, by the late Thomas H. Madigan, the well-known New York dealer in autographs and manuscripts. In a reproduction of the round robin, at p. 101 of Mr. Madigan's catalogue, certain differences from the final form are to be noted. The signatures as published in *Omoo* are sixteen in number; in the Madigan MS. they are but fifteen. Van and Long Jim are among the signers in *Omoo*; neither name appears in the Madigan MS., but upon it in the place finally occupied by Long Jim's signature is the name Smut, which is not among the signatures found in the published form. In the manuscript, the name Blue Dick has been written, but is crossed out, and for it Black Dan is substituted. Likewise, Chips has been cancelled, and for the carpenter's conventional nickname, the individual's personal nickname, Beauty, has been entered. With the exceptions noted above, the manuscript and published signatures agree as to the order of names. It may be said that Mr. Madigan describes the page of the text of *Omoo*, which accompanied the round robin, as containing many corrections.

<sup>31</sup>*Omoo*, pp. 86-87.

<sup>32</sup>Consul George Pritchard had set out for England, on February 2, 1841, leaving his office in Wilson's care. He returned to Tahiti on the British man-of-war *Vindictive*, commanded by Commodore Toup Nicolas, landing on either February 24 or 25, 1843. On March 5, 1843, he was arrested, and was imprisoned by the French, until his deportation from the Society Islands on board the British warship *Cormorant*, which occurred on March 13. He later was British Consul in the Navigators Islands. After living many years in England, he died in 1883, at the age of eighty-six. See James Sibree, D. D., *A Register of Missionaries, Deputations, etc., [of the London Missionary Society] from 1796 to 1923* (Fourth ed. London: London Missionary Society, 1923), p. 25; W. T. Pritchard, *Polyesian Reminiscences; or, Life in the South Pacific Islands* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1866), pp. 35, 46; William Ellis, *History of the London Missionary Society . . .* (London: John Snow, 1844), I [all published], 415; Samuel Timmins, in *Dictionary of National Biography* (New York: Macmillan and Company, 1896), xlvi, 407.

It may be said here that Melville's story, in *Typee* (pp. 22-23), of Mrs. George Pritchard's heroic defiance of the French Admiral Du Petit Thouars, when he requested that she haul down the British flag which was flying above the consulate,

British Consul, Mr. Wilson, and Dr. Johnson,<sup>33</sup> the English physician in Papeete, boarded the *Julia*.<sup>34</sup> The hearing of the sailors' complaints proved a farce.<sup>35</sup> The sick, all but two, were ordered to remain on the ship.<sup>36</sup> And then the consul and the doctor went ashore, followed by the execrations of the angry seamen.<sup>37</sup> That night was an exciting one. A Maori harpooner, Bembo, who, early in the evening, had fought savagely with one of the white sailors, took advantage of his being posted at the helm to try to revenge himself by running the *Julia* on the coral reef which encircles Tahiti. His design was foiled, through Melville's wakefulness and the seamanship of another American, Salem, who took command in the emergency.<sup>38</sup>

The next day, which was September 22, 1842, passed peacefully enough, with only the visit of an old shipmate of Jermin to break its monotony.<sup>39</sup> But just after midnight, early, that is, in the morning of September 23, all hands were called to work the ship into port.<sup>40</sup> Only four or five of the crew took their stations. These few, it may be said, included Melville; and Dr. Long Ghost also gave his assistance.<sup>41</sup>

The *Julia* finally was brought into Papeete Bay where she dropped

---

is probably apocryphal. Although, contrary to Dr. Sibree's statement (*A Register of Missionaries*, p. 25), Pritchard left his wife in Tahiti when he returned to England (see W. T. Pritchard, *Polynesian Reminiscences*, p. 22), nowhere save in *Typee* have I met with any account of such an incident. It is not recorded by W. T. Pritchard, who certainly did not minimize either the difficulties or the courage of his parents. Probably Melville in some way derived the story from the circumstances of Queen Pomare's passive defiance of Admiral Du Petit Thouars and his soldiers and sailors on November 6, 1843, when that officer proclaimed the dethronement of the native monarch and the assumption of sovereignty over the islands by the King of the French (see a letter of Eugene Gosse, from Papeete, dated November 9, 1843, published in translation in the *London Times*, of February 21, 1844, from the *Journal des Débats*, of Paris, for February 18, 1844; as also *L'Intermédiaire des Chercheurs et Curieux*, xcix, cols. 731-732, October 15, 1936, where extracts from the *Courrier de la Semaine*, of Paris, for February 24 and March 2, 1844, are reprinted; and cf. W. T. Pritchard, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-39, where the discrepancy in dates between his and the French narratives may be accounted for by the different time systems used, as explained in note 61 *post*).

<sup>33</sup>Johnston seems, however, to be the correct form of the physician's name. No writer except Melville calls him Johnson consistently, and although some voyagers refer to him as "Johnstone," he most frequently appears as "Johnston." Such is the spelling used by men whose knowledge of him seems the closest.

<sup>34</sup>*Omoo*, p. 88.

<sup>35</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 91-96.

<sup>36</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 97.

<sup>37</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 103-105

<sup>38</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 110-112

<sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 113.

<sup>40</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 113-114

<sup>41</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 114.

anchor, "more than forty days after leaving the Marquesas."<sup>42</sup> Consul Wilson boarded the ship to learn the cause of her having come into harbor without orders, to be told by Jermin that he could not remain at sea with a mutinous crew. The men were called on deck and those who had refused duty were told off, among them Melville, who had shipped only from port to port, and Long Ghost, who had been signed as ship's surgeon. Melville's authorship of the round robin was apparently evidence enough to satisfy the consul of his mutinous disposition.<sup>43</sup>

Consul Wilson now boarded *La Reine Blanche*, the French frigate which lay near by. The men "suspected his object" and began to prepare for the next step by loading themselves with all the clothes they could wear. Their expectations were fulfilled, as a boat from the man-of-war, manned by armed sailors, put off from her and came alongside the *Julia*. Formally, as their names were called, the mutineers persisted in their refusal to work the *Julia*, and as promptly they were ordered into the French boat. When all were aboard, amid cheers from the departing mutineers, the boat was pulled to the frigate, where the men from the *Julia* were disembarked and put in irons.<sup>44</sup>

It is concerning this event, the removal of the ten mutineers from the *Julia* to *La Reine Blanche*, that we have what should be a piece of reliable evidence from a source exterior to *Omoo*. By it not only is the date of the incident fixed, but Melville's story is corroborated at certain points. Although this passage from the *Casernet de Bord* of *La Reine Blanche* has been published in my previous article,<sup>45</sup> I may, I believe, properly quote it here again for the convenience of the reader. It is a part of the entry for September 23, 1842:

... À 1h.½ expédi le canot major armé en guerre avec un officier, à bord du baleinier anglais *la Lucy-Ann*, mouillé sur rade le matin, à l'effet de rétablir l'ordre dérangé par plusieurs matelots. Le canot revient avec 10 des ces hommes.<sup>46</sup>

It will be noted that in every particular the details of this entry corroborate Melville's account of the transfer of himself and his com-

<sup>42</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 119.

<sup>43</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 119-120.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 121-123.

<sup>45</sup>See "Herman Melville in the Marquesas," *Philological Quarterly*, xv, 9, n. 66 (January, 1936).

<sup>46</sup>The original is preserved in the National Archives of France. The manuscript is catalogued as Marine 4 JJ 222. For the transcription above drawn upon, I am indebted to the Office de Documentation of the Société des Amis de la Bibliothèque Nationale et des Grandes Bibliothèques de France.

panions from the whaler to the man-of-war. It was "toward noon" when Jermin brought the *Julia* into the harbor of Papeete.<sup>47</sup> The events which occurred after she anchored need not have taken long, and Melville does not indicate that they did. He does seem to suggest that it was early in the afternoon that the prisoners were taken to the frigate; for, says he, "We fasted till night."<sup>48</sup> According to Melville, it was the first cutter of the French vessel which boarded the *Julia*. The boat was manned by eighteen or twenty sailors armed with cutlasses and boarding pistols. Ten of the *Julia's* crew were taken off.<sup>49</sup> These the later pages of *Omoo* identify as Melville, Dr. Long Ghost, Flash Jack, Navy Bob, Black Dan, Salem, Jingling Joe, Pat, McGee, and Liverpool.<sup>50</sup> Only nine men from the *Julia* are named by Melville as his companions on the frigate and in the calaboose ashore.<sup>51</sup>

Here seems a good opportunity for discussing Melville's accuracy in another portion of his narrative. He allows "more than forty days" for the *Julia's* cruise after her leaving the Marquesas.<sup>52</sup> Forty-one days (or forty-two, according to Melville's system of reckoning)<sup>53</sup> would have set the *Julia's* departure from Hanamenu Bay on Sunday, August 14, since she anchored, as we have seen, at Papeete, on the morning of September 23. A careful check of the voyage between the Marquesas and the Society Islands, making a reasonable allowance of time for the few vague references which occur, with Melville's allusions to the passage of days and weeks during this period results in an almost perfect agreement in chronology between the general statement and the detailed narrative. It differs very noticeably from the situation in regard to the time-system of *Typee*.<sup>54</sup> Since there is this consistency, then, between Melville's "more than forty days" and the particulars of his story, it seems reasonable to suppose that his

<sup>47</sup>*Omoo*, p. 115.

<sup>48</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 124.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 121.

<sup>50</sup>*Passim*.

<sup>51</sup>Those who stayed with the *Julia* were Bembo, the Maori; Wymontoo, the Marquesan; Dunk, the Dane; Antone, the Portuguese; Van, the Finn; Sydney Ben, the ticket-of-leave man; Long Jim; Bungs, the cooper; Baltimore, the cook; Beauty, the carpenter; the steward; and Rope Yarn, the landsman, who died not long after (*Omoo*, p. 175). From these perhaps, two men seem to have been selected to be sent ashore by the consul as ill (*ibid.*, p. 97). The officers, Captain Guy, and Jermin, the mate, are, of course, not counted with the crew.

<sup>52</sup>*Omoo*, p. 119.

<sup>53</sup>He made a practice of including both terminal days in his count.

<sup>54</sup>For a discussion of the chronology of *Typee*, see my "Herman Melville in the Marquesas." *Philological Quarterly*, xv, 1-15 (January, 1936).

only serious departure from fact was in his making the *Julia* sight Papeete just as *La Reine Blanche* saluted the conclusion of the treaty signed September 9—eleven days before.<sup>55</sup>

Once in irons on *La Reine Blanche*, Melville's grasp on the calendar appears to weaken for a time. He reckons the stay of himself and his nine companions on the frigate at five days and nights, qualified significantly by "if I remember right."<sup>56</sup> On the sixth day, the ship was to sail for Valparaiso. Earlier<sup>57</sup> he had observed that in a day or two<sup>58</sup> she was to depart. The date set in this reference was nearer that on which *La Reine Blanche* actually left Papeete. In fact, she sailed on September 26, as the *Casernet de Borde*, already quoted, shows in this entry:

26 sept. . . . À 6h.½, dérapé l'ancre, hissé les focs en abattant par tribord. A 7h.½ nous étions hors des passes.<sup>59</sup>

Melville says that the prisoners were transferred to the prison on shore—the Calabooza Beretanee<sup>60</sup>—on the afternoon preceding the de-

<sup>55</sup>In the paper just cited, I have not treated the time element in the earlier chapters of *Omoo*, but have accepted tentatively Melville's statement regarding the length of the *Julia*'s cruise, reserving a detailed discussion for this paper.

<sup>56</sup>*Omoo*, p. 131. For a comment upon Melville's use of saving qualifying clauses in his references to the passage of time, see my "Herman Melville in the Marquesas," *Philological Quarterly*, xv, 14 (January, 1936).

<sup>57</sup>*Omoo*, p. 121.

<sup>58</sup>Computed from September 23.

<sup>59</sup>Again I gratefully acknowledge my dependence upon the transcription of passages from this journal made for me by the Office de Documentation of the Société des Amis de la Bibliothèque Nationale et des Grands Bibliothèques de France. It will be noted that Captain Pierre de Coral is in error when he gives the date of the sailing of *La Reine Blanche* as September 19, 1842, as he does in his *Esquisse Historique de Tahiti* (Paris: H. Lacène et H. Oudin, 1886), p. 28.

<sup>60</sup>It would appear that the stocks were instituted between 1839 and 1841, the years of two visits of Commodore Wilkes's vessels to Tahiti (see Charles Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard, 1845, iv, 276). The calaboose, which contained the stocks was certainly in existence by January, 1842, when E. Lucett, of whom more will be said later first arrived at Papeete. Lucett refers to the prison in his *Rovings in the Pacific* (London: Longmans, 1851), i, 225. In his description of Papeete and its neighborhood, Lieutenant the Honorable Frederick Walpole thus describes this penal institution and its surroundings:

"There is a delightful walk to the right [from the boatlanding at Papeete] along the Broom Road. After passing the settlement, the road winds through a grove of cocoa-nut trees, which, reaching to the beach on the one hand, merge into the jungle and mountain on the other, throwing a deep shade over the ground that defies even the vertical sun. On emerging from this grove, you pass the large garden called Britannia, or rather, once called so; it was a grant from Pomare to the captain and crew of Her Majesty's ship *Vindictive*. On the other side is her own large garden with the *carabouze*, or State-prison of former times where Omo [sic] passed, according to his own account, a most disagreeable

parture of *La Reine Blanche*. It also seems unlikely that they would have been landed before six thirty in the morning amid the preparations for the sailing of the frigate. Consequently, it would appear that we must cut the mutineers' stay on her to three days—September 23 to September 25. It may be observed that the events of only three clearly defined and separate days are indicated in Melville's account of his imprisonment on the man-of-war. Obviously, in any case, he and his fellows could not have remained on board *La Reine Blanche* after September 26. It seems likely, then, that they were sent ashore on Sunday, September 25, or, according to the chronology of the English missionaries in Tahiti, on Monday, September 26.<sup>61</sup>

It was probably the morning of Tuesday, September 27, on which, after their first night in the stocks, the ten sailors were escorted by their jailor, the amiable Captain Bob, to a near-by stream for a bath.<sup>62</sup> The prisoners were visited on the second day of their confinement—Wednesday, September 28—by the wild Tahitian girl whose mirth was so mightily aroused at the sight of Melville's disconsolate pose.<sup>63</sup> After about two weeks of incarceration during which their lot became considerably easier, the mutineers were brought before Consul Wilson, and they again refused duty.<sup>64</sup> This event may be placed on Monday, October 10. At this time, he announced that a week from the day of

---

captivity. Now the other party [the French] gather the fruits of the garden, and very nice order they keep it in . . ."

Walpole's first visit to Tahiti, in the recollections of which, as we see, he followed the traces of Melville, occurred in 1845-1846, and is recorded in his *Four Years in the Pacific* (Two vols., London: R. Bentley, 1849), II 82ff. The above passage occurs at *ibid.*, II, 111. Walpole returned to Tahiti for a second stay in the winter of 1846-1847 (*ibid.*, 302-319).

<sup>61</sup>It is reasonable to suppose that while ashore in the Society islands—more specifically on Tahiti and Eimeo, Melville used the local chronology, to the peculiarities of which he calls attention in *Omoo*, chap. XLII (p. 194). From the arrival of Melville and his companions on shore, therefore, I shall advance the days of the week and month one day, in accord with local custom. It should be observed, by the way, that through this adjustment, Melville would have been on board *La Reine Blanche* nominally four days, from Friday to Monday inclusive. The fact that the Tahitian calendar, according to missionary usage, was one day of the week in advance of that observed on board ships where proper changes in time had been made has been remarked upon by other visitors to the Society group. See, for example, Captain F. W. Beechey, *Narrative of a Voyage to the Pacific and Beering's Strait . . .* (London: H. Colburn and R. Bentley, 1831), I, 271; Captain Charles Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, II, 7; Lieutenant Frederick Walpole, *Four Years in the Pacific*, II, 89.

<sup>62</sup>*Omoo*, p. 137.

<sup>63</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 151-152.

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 162.

their hearing the *Julia* would sail from Papeete—that is to say, on October 17.<sup>65</sup>

It was a day or two after the hearing before the consul that the inmates of the Calabooza were visited by three priests from the French mission.<sup>66</sup> This took place probably on October 11 or 12. It would have been October 12 or 13—the next day, then,—that Father Murphy presented the prisoners with a supply of bread and visited them again.<sup>67</sup> The Irish priest's next appearance, this time with a report upon Wilson's obduracy regarding Pat, the young Irish sailor, was two or three days later,<sup>68</sup> let us say upon a date between October 14 and October 16. The following day—October 15-17—Pat, at Wilson's order, went to Papeete,<sup>69</sup> whence he returned only after three days, or about October 18-20.<sup>70</sup> Possibly it was during Pat's absence, certainly it was before the date set for the *Julia's* sailing (October 17), that Wilson again called the sailors before him and again received their refusal to return to the ship.<sup>71</sup> After a new crew had been signed, the *Julia* did sail “about three weeks after entering the harbour,” according to Melville. It is said specifically that her departure took place on a Sunday.<sup>72</sup>

Here we have what is obviously a slip on Melville's part. Had the *Julia* sailed exactly three weeks after anchoring in Papeete Bay, she would have left on Saturday, October 15, 1842. If we make an allowance for Melville's approximation as expressed by his “about three weeks” and accept Sunday as the day of the *Julia's* sailing, then October 16 might well be taken as the date of that event. This date would also come close to agreeing with that announced by Consul Wilson when the prisoners were brought before him on October 10. But had the *Julia* sailed on Sunday, October 16, Pat could surely not have

<sup>65</sup>*Omoo*, pp. 164-165.

<sup>66</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 166. These priests are identifiable as Father Francois-d' Assisi Caret, Father Armand Chausson, and Father Columba Murphy. See *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi* (Lyon: chez l'Editeur, 1845), xvii, 129, 131-132, 154, 157, 158ff. It may be said in support of Melville's description of the persons of the priests that Father Murphy's unusual height and commanding appearance caused the natives of the Gambier Islands on his arrival among them in the summer of 1834 to greet him as a great chief. Father Caret and Father Honoré Laval, whom he then accompanied as a lay-brother, were at first much less noticed by the islanders because of their slighter physique (*ibid.*, viii [1835], 49-50).

<sup>67</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 168-169.

<sup>68</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 169.

<sup>69</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>70</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>71</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 171.

<sup>72</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 176.

been feasted in her cabin and confined in her hold<sup>73</sup> some time at earliest, between October 15 and October 18, as she lay in Papeete Harbor. From Melville's chronology of Pat's adventures, then, it would seem unlikely that the *Julia* left Papeete on October 16.

And there is apparently other evidence, also, that the ship remained at Papeete until after the date just mentioned. Eighty-eight years ago, Lieutenant Henry A. Wise, of the United States frigate *Independence*, an admirer of *Typee* and *Omoo*, on his way back to the United States from the west coast of North America, employed his time during his ship's stay at Papeete in verifying Melville's story of his adventures there. His findings are reported in his amusing and interesting book, *Los Gringos*.<sup>74</sup> At the end of his forty-eighth chapter, Wise has appended a note concerning Melville's novels and the persons described in them. Dr. Johnstone, as he calls the physician, who was among Wise's acquaintances at Papeete, permitted the naval officer to make some extracts from his "dose-book," one of which is printed in *Los Gringos*.<sup>75</sup> Herein "Melvil Herman," whose address is given briefly as "Stocks," is debited seventy-five cents for each of two bottles of "Embrocation." The first entry was dated October 15, 1842, the second, October 19. There seems to be no reason for doubting Melville's statement that Dr. Johnston's last routine visit to the crew of the *Julia* occurred on the day before she sailed;<sup>76</sup> and there is no mention of his returning to the Calabooza after her departure save once to minister to the waggish Long Ghost.<sup>77</sup> Consequently, in the physician's memorandum, as preserved by Lieutenant Wise, there would seem to be evidence that the *Julia* was still at Papeete on October 19. These dates of October 15 and 19 might be taken as referring to the days on which the doctor prescribed the embrocation for Melville, after examining him, or to the days on which the medicines were delivered to the prisoners.<sup>78</sup>

Or these dates may mean nothing at all. They may even have been inserted as random approximations to the actual dates by Dr.

<sup>73</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 169.

<sup>74</sup>*Los Gringos: or an Inside View of Mexico and California, with Wanderings in Peru, Chili, and Polynesia* (London: R. Bentley, 1849), pp. 357-358. Wise also devoted the time allowed him in the Marquesas, by the stay of the *Independence* in Taiohae Bay, Island of Nukahiva, in investigating Melville's account of the island and its inhabitants. See pp. 341-352.

<sup>75</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 358.

<sup>76</sup>*Omoo*, p. 230.

<sup>77</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 231ff.

<sup>78</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 157-158, 159.

Johnston, or they may have been miscopied by Lieutenant Wise from the former's "dose-book." Melville tells us that he and his companions "had not been many days ashore," when the physician paid them his first visit at the Calabooza.<sup>79</sup> The period between September 26 and October 15 is just under three weeks, which certainly would not ordinarily be understood as "not many days." Nor does it seem likely that Dr. Johnston would have waited so long before beginning to run up his bill for medical services to the *Julia*'s crew. There is, however, a simple explanation of this apparent discrepancy in dates which may be advanced. October 15 may be merely the date of the doctor's last visit before the *Julia*'s sailing, an event which concluded Dr. Johnston's official connection with the mutineers, and October 19 may have been that of the physician's last visit to the sailors, when he was hoaxed by Long Ghost. According to Melville, Johnston's final call as physician to the Consul occurred on the day before the *Julia*'s departure,<sup>80</sup> and his visit to treat Long Ghost was "a few days after."<sup>81</sup> It may be that these are the occasions noted in Dr. Johnston's memorandum. There is certainly some probability that such is the case.

The operations of signing a new crew for the *Julia*, of revictualing her, and of repairing her might appear sufficient to have delayed her departure beyond October 16. But the first of these—which did occur after the final refusal of the mutineers to return to the ship<sup>82</sup>—was accelerated by the prisoners' desire to see the *Julia* sail.<sup>83</sup> The reprovisioning, according to Melville, was only partial, and the repairs were not extensive.<sup>84</sup> Furthermore, there is no reason to believe that these two tasks had not been begun soon after the *Julia* cast anchor, on September 24 (Papeete calendar).

The only fact, then, which would prevent our accepting Sunday, October 16, 1842, as the day upon which the *Julia* sailed from Papeete, is the length of the period given by Melville to Father Murphy's efforts to secure Pat's freedom. This is about a week. But I feel that here, as elsewhere, implicit confidence cannot be placed in Melville's approximations of lapsed time.<sup>85</sup> And I am disposed to believe

<sup>79</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 156.

<sup>80</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 230.

<sup>81</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 231.

<sup>82</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 174. The date of Captain Guy's going back on board the *Julia* would have been Tuesday, October 11.

<sup>83</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 174-175.

<sup>84</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 175.

<sup>85</sup>See my "Herman Melville in the Marquesas," *Philological Quarterly*, xv, 14 (January, 1936).

that the various terms of two or three days were assigned by the novelist for the purposes of his narrative, or possibly merely at random. Consequently, I shall take Sunday, October 16, as the day of the *Julia's* departure.

According to this time system, then, it was on Monday, October 17, that Captain Bob notified the prisoners of Consul Wilson's refusal to contribute further to their maintenance.<sup>86</sup> In scarcely a week, that is, about October 22, some of the sailors, now free to go where they would, but remaining voluntary guests of their affable jailor, began to try, with no success, to ship on the vessels in Papeete Bay.<sup>87</sup> Probably it was on October 23, the next Sunday after the sailing of the *Julia*, that, arrayed in the remains of their finery, the men attended services at the Protestant chapel in Papeete, and in so doing still further annoyed Consul Wilson.<sup>88</sup> The contents of their sea-chests had not as yet been entirely bartered away; and this was the first time, according to Melville, that the party had entered Papeete unescorted. Both facts would point to a date not far from that of the *Julia's* departure. It was probably shortly after this first visit to the chapel that Melville made his unlucky excursion to the royal island of Motoo-Otoo.<sup>89</sup>

The next definite reference to a date occurs when Melville describes the mutineers' last call upon Consul Wilson. This occurred "about three weeks after the *Julia's* sailing," when the situation of the men, with no regular supply of food, less ready hospitality from the natives, and no opportunity for leaving the island, was threatening to become desperate.<sup>90</sup> The day of this expedition to Papeete would hardly have been on the Sunday which an exact three weeks from October 16 would establish, but rather Saturday, November 5, or Monday, November 7. It would seem not unlikely that Melville's "about three weeks"

<sup>86</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 177.

<sup>87</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 188.

<sup>88</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 186-187. Melville perhaps attended services again, on October 29 (see *ibid.*, pp. 198-205). It may be suggested that the somewhat inhospitable attitude of the missionaries toward Melville and his shipmates was due not only to the belief that they were desperate characters, but as well to the fact that they had attended mass at the Catholic mission on sundry occasions (*ibid.*, 169-170).

<sup>89</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 193-194. This experience of Melville is alluded to by the German traveller Friedrich Gerstäcker, who found no difficulty in landing upon the island in 1851. See Gerstäcker's *Reisen*, II, 22 (*Gesammelte Schriften*, VI [Forty-three vols. Jena: H. Costenoble, 1872-1879]), or the English translation, *Narrative of a Journal round the World* (Three vols. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1853), II, 245. In the second work cited, the translator, apparently on his own responsibility, has introduced a complimentary reference to Melville's description of Motoo-Otoo.

<sup>90</sup>*Omoo*, pp. 235-236.

fell short of that period, since in the course of their search for Wilson, the men discovered a missionary subjecting himself to a "tonsilorial operation" on the consular porch.<sup>91</sup> Human nature being what it is—and was—such a rite would probably have been performed the day *before* Sunday rather than *after* it.

The appeal to the consul, when that person was finally found, was without effect. Its failure confirmed Melville in his resolution to accept an opportunity of escaping from Tahiti which had first presented itself a few days earlier. As he was at liberty to select a companion, he chose Dr. Long Ghost, and at midnight, at least a day or two after the meeting with Wilson, the two, having bidden their companions farewell, embarked with the planters, Zeke and Shorty, for the home of the latter on the neighboring island of Eimeo to try their hand at farming.<sup>92</sup>

<sup>91</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 236.

<sup>92</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 237-238. In another paper, I shall bring to an end my consideration of Melville's story of his adventures on Tahiti. I shall endeavor therein also to draw such conclusions regarding the authenticity of his narrative as seem justified by internal and external evidence. I must here express my thanks to the American Council of Learned Societies for the grant in aid of the Melville Bibliography upon which Mr. John H. Birss, Jr., and I are engaged. This article is founded upon materials turned up in my bibliographical researches.

## INNOCENCE AND ARTIFICE: OR, MRS. CENTLIVRE AND *THE FEMALE TATLER*

By PAUL BUNYAN ANDERSON

Otterbein College

### I

Mrs. Susanna Centlivre is first given attention in *The Female Tatler* in Mrs. Crackenthorpe's time when that robust and omniscient lady decides against writing for the stage and declares—

that the *Treatment Authors* meet with from the *Play'rs*, is too gross for a *Woman* to bear, since at the getting up of so successful a *Comedy* as the *Busy Body*, Sir *Harry Wi'd-Air* in great *dudgeon* flung his *Part* into the *Pitt* for damn'd Stuff, before the Lady's Face that wrote it.<sup>1</sup>

*The Busy-Body* had been played at Drury Lane in May 1709 and again in November, and Mrs. Centlivre had received Steele's support and encouragement (even more generously than Mrs. Crackenthorpe's) in *The Tatler*, Nos. 15 and 19. But the most circumstantial and complimentary notice of the playwright and her plays appeared December 14 in *Female Tatler* No. 69, an issue describing the visit of "the *Ingenicus* Mrs. Centlivre" to Emilia and all the other ladies concerned in the later *Female Tatler*.<sup>2</sup> Since Mrs. Centlivre's second comedy of 1709, *The Man's bewitch'd or, The Devil to do about Her*, had had its first performance at the Haymarket, December 12, 1709, Emilia's review of the production in the next issue of *The Female Tatler*, December 14, was nothing if not prompt. She gave an unusually detailed account of the acting on the first night, and like a modern press-agent provided complimentary publicity and an open bid for popular support. The company visiting Emilia in her "*Lodgings in Greek*"

<sup>1</sup>No. 41, Oct. 10, 1709. Cf. Delariviere Manley's discussion of theatrical conditions, *New Atalantis* (1709), I, 207-10, and also No. 37.

<sup>2</sup>There are supposedly six ladies in the society and hence six pseudonyms attached to the sixty-five issues of *The Female Tatler*, *Written by a Society of Ladies*: Lucinda (17), Artesia (15), Emilia (16), Rosella (10), Arabella (3), and Sophronia (3); and in addition No. 51, the first of the issues under the new but unacknowledged management, still attributed to Mrs. Crackenthorpe. In my article, "Splendor out of Scandal: the Lucinda-Artesia Papers in *The Female Tatler*," *PQ*, xv (1936), 286-300, I have shown that Dr. Bernard Mandeville was two of the ladies; the others remain to be identified.

street, Soho,"<sup>3</sup> congratulated the author on the success of *The Man's bewitch'd* and rejoiced to see the inimitable Mrs. Behn so nearly revived in Mrs. Centlivre:

some there, who are esteem'd no ill Judges, were pleased to say, they thought it a Genteel, Easy and Diverting Comedy: That it had a better Plot, and as many Turns in it as her Celebrated *Buisy-Body*; and tho' the two first Acts were not so roar'd at as the rest, yet they were well Wrought Scenes, tending to Business: The Squire out did himself throughout the whole Action; nor is Mrs. Saunders, tho' rank'd below *Belinda*, to be less applauded for her Natural Trembling and Faultering in her speech, when she apprehended Sir Jeffrey to be a Ghost. The Ladies highly commended the Author, as what cou'd they expect less from one of their own Sex, for the Care she had taken not to Offend the nicest Ear, with the least Double Entendre, and press'd me to acquaint the Town, that ev'n Dissenters may be seen at this Play; and tho' Emilia has not the assurance of some Tatlers, to Licence one Man to Ruin all the rest of his Trade, yet she wou'd intreat the Ladies, especially those of Quality, to engage her such an Appearance the Third and Sixth Night, as to show they have a Generous Sense of the Pains she is daily taking, so Wittily and Innocently to Entertain them.<sup>4</sup>

Patting one's self on the back is awkward, whether in person or by proxy, and does not always lead to a favorable response from the onlookers. Moreover Emilia had imprudently continued with Mrs. Centlivre's account of the difficulties of an author:

The Society had the Curiosity of knowing the Nature of introducing a Play into the House; Mrs. Centlivre told 'em, 'twas much easier to Write a Play than to get it Represented; that their Factions and Divisions were so great, they seldom continued in the same mind two Hours together; that they treated her, (tho' a Woman) in the Masculine Gender; and as they do all Authors with Wrangling and Confusion, which has made most Gentlemen that have a Genius to Scribbling, employ their Pens another way; that to show their Judgment in Plays, they had actually cut out the Scene in the Fifth Act, between the Countryman and the Ghost, which the Audience receiv'd with that wonderful Applause; and 'twas with very great strugling the Author prevail'd to have it in again; one made Faces at his Part, another was Witty upon her's: But as the whole was very well perform'd at last, she has Condescension to pass over the Affronts of a Set of People, who have it not in their Natures to be grateful to their Supporters.

A more reprehensible paragraph could not very well be conceived by a member of one profession and directed to the members of another. So ample a measure of virtuous self-congratulation from any author when combined with a candid exposure of the defects of actors could be counted on to generate a devil's brew, as Mrs. Centlivre undoubtedly discovered before *Female Tatler* No. 69 had been in the coffee-

<sup>3</sup>Rosella, No. 73, writes from her "Lodgings in Channel-Row, Westminster."

<sup>4</sup>Some of the actors, Mrs. Saunders (Dorothy), and Doggett (Squire Num) at least, deserved praise from the first; others got it belatedly in the preface to the published play.

houses many hours. When she printed the play, December 31, 1709,<sup>5</sup> she did her best in the preface to undo the damage that had been done when she had allowed her personal irritation to overflow in *The Female Tatler*. She desired to deny all connection with the periodical and was ready to entertain and advance any plausible explanation other than the most direct and damaging one—that she herself was the author of the offensive article. She suggested that in any case no one but an idiot would have expressed himself openly. She explained that she had willingly submitted to Mr. Cibber's superior judgment in shortening the ghost scene in the last act but she had protested against Mr. Estcourt's slicing out most of it. Since it was "Natural to have a kind of a *Tender for our own Productions*," she admitted that she had talked about the matter among her acquaintances:

*Now, if from this the Author of the Tattler gather'd his Account, I am guilty of speaking, but not designedly; for who they are that Wrote that Paper, or how Distinguish'd, I am perfectly ignorant, and declare I never was concern'd, either in Writing, or Publishing, any of the Tattlers.*

In her anxiety did the lady protest too much?

## II

The journalist Emilia-Rosella, with the lesser planets Arabella and Sophronia, moved through Queen Anne's London with intimate knowledge of the stage, Grub street, the City, and the court. She knew authors and actors, theatrical managers, clergymen in black coats and soldiers in red, Quakers and fine ladies; and when she called for her niece Sylvia newly arrived from Virginia, she boldly provided contrast from the lower orders by sketching with rough, vigorous strokes two "amphibious" characters from "Blue Apron Bay"—Swarthy Forecastle and Dame Forecastle.<sup>6</sup> Although the range and variety of her experience are impressive, she was particularly at home in two worlds, normally separated but not incapable of being joined in the experience of

---

<sup>5</sup>*Daily Courant*. I am indebted to Professor J. W. Bowyer's unpublished Harvard dissertation, "Susanna Freeman Centlivre's Life, Works, and Stage History," Cambridge, 1928, for a most serviceable and comprehensive presentation of the facts known at present about Mrs. Centlivre's plays and her career. Accepting the common belief that Thomas Baker was the author of *The Female Tatler*, he is gentleman enough (p. 59 and p. 357) as far as Mrs. Centlivre is concerned to take the lady at her word, though he does remark that: "It seems unreasonable that she should have had a friend editing the paper and not know it. That she is showing little gratitude for an attempted service to her is the impression that the whole affair leaves on the modern reader."

<sup>6</sup>No. 75, Dec. 28, 1709.

a single individual if specially situated: the contemporary theatre and the court circle.

Her day-by-day familiarity with the contemporary theatre is demonstrated in a paper like No. 82, January 13, 1710, with its shower of allusions to plays which are shown by a moment's attention to Genest's listing of performances to have been fresh in her mind because they had recently been produced. In this issue she reproved "two or three leading Ladies" for their "Ungenerous Proceedings with the Virgin Poet," apparently in contributing to the failure of Aaron Hill's *Elfrid*, first played at Drury Lane, January 3, 1710:

'tis barbarous to engage a Party against an Author's Third Day, had the famous *Ben* met such usage in his time, the *Hay Market* wou'd have wanted the *Fox*, *Alchimist*, and *Silent Woman* now.—Our Sex, form'd for Modesty and Innocence, ought to encourage *Tragedy*, whose well wrought Scenes raise the Soul to Glory, and stamps the Notions of true Honour in it; whilst most *Comedies* draw Conscious Blushes from the Cheek, and covers the Face with Scarlet dye.<sup>7</sup>

Though imperfect sympathies disturbed the relations between authors and the race of actors and actresses, Emilia-Rosella looked with favor upon one actress, Mrs. Francis Maria Knight, and perhaps enjoyed a degree of intimacy with her, for in No. 110<sup>-2</sup>, March 29, 1710, Rosella announced that she had "with some difficulty procur'd a Copy of a New *Epilogue*, which was last Week incomparably spoke by Mrs. Knight," and then printed the text of the entire epilogue<sup>8</sup> presumably as given at the Drury Lane revival of *The Woman-Captain*.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup>Steele's *Tender Husband* was the rival production at the Haymarket, January 5, 1710. Aaron Hill, a confident young playwright and a precocious theatrical manager, was worth propitiating at that moment since he was in charge at Drury Lane from its opening Nov. 23, 1709, until June 1710. I think it likely that this future correspondent and admirer of Richardson was the author of the facetious letters, signed A. H., in *Female Tatler* Nos. 42 and 82.

<sup>8</sup>Rosella's 'difficulty' in securing the epilogue may have been due to Aaron Hill and her final success to Mrs. Knight. *The British Apollo*, in part at least one of Hill's projects, printed on April 3, 1710, a grandiloquent "Ode Inscrib'd to Aaron Hill, Esq; Upon his being appointed Governor of the Royal-Theater." He apparently hoped to give *The British Apollo* a virtual monopoly of the printing of new prologues and epilogues: the prologue to *Valentinian* performed for the benefit of Mr. Keene appeared Feb. 20, 1710, and the epilogue as spoken by Miss Santlow, who had been in demand since she spoke her first epilogue at the performance of *Elfrid* in January, Feb. 23; the new prologue for the performance of Durfey's *Don Quixote* for Mr. Bickerstaff, March 1, the epilogue spoken by Miss Santlow, March 3; the epilogue to *A Bickerstaff's Burying*, April 5; the prologue spoken by Mrs. Bradshaw to *The Royal Merchant*, April 15; finally as a culmination to the series, some heady verses of compliment, "Writ on the Backside of a Ticket for Elfrid, or The Fair Inconstant, where Tragedy is represented in a Weeping Posture, with this Inscription. Spero Meliora, April 26, 1710. These prologues and epilogues were invariably announced as not published in any other paper.

<sup>9</sup>John Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage, From the Restoration in*

Mrs. Centlivre, as well as Emilia-Rosella, was on good terms with Mrs. Knight. There is evidence from an allusion in Joseph Trapp's *The Players turn'd Academicks* (1703) and from Lintot's accounts that Mrs. Centlivre gave her fourth play, *Love's Contrivance; or, Le Médecin Malgré Lui* (1703) to Mrs. Knight, value £10, May 14, 1703, with the intention of securing an influential friend inside the play-house.<sup>10</sup> Mrs. Knight did not ordinarily create the rôles in Mrs. Centlivre's plays though she often played in them in revivals.<sup>11</sup> But on March 27, 1710, six days after her delivery of the new epilogue to *The Woman-Captain*, she played Lady Mezro in the first performance of Mrs. Centlivre's farce *A Bickerstaff's Burying*, which was destined to enjoy great popularity and be acted many times.

The court as seen from 'below-stairs' was the second world in which Mrs. Centlivre carried on her harassed life. To pass from her public career to her domestic situation is to leave the friendships and enmities of the theatre for the social intrigues of the maids of honor and the smaller ambitions of a woman whose status was actually several degrees below that assigned to her in Pope's contemptuous phrase—"the Cook's wife in Buckingham-court." As a member of a troupe of strolling players visiting Windsor she is thought to have attracted the attention of Joseph Centlivre and to have married him about 1706. To be more technically correct than Pope, Joseph Centlivre's office in his wife's lifetime was neither First Clerk, nor Second Clerk, nor Master Cook, nor Second Master Cook, but merely Yeoman of the Mouth in the Queen's Privy Kitchen with an allowance of £55 board-wages and £5 wages. In 1707 and successive years his name appeared in

1660 to 1830, II (1832), 437; T., March 21, 1710, D. L., "with a new Prologue and Epilogue." Mrs. Knight's epilogue had less to do with *The Woman-Captain* than with the England of Sacheverell where even the fair sex had gone mad over politics.

<sup>10</sup>Joseph Trapp, *The Players turn'd Academicks* (1703), p. 3: [The antecedent of her is Mrs. Pix.]

While Carrol, her Sister-Adventurer in Print,  
Took her Leave all in Tears, with a *Curt'sie* and *Squint*,  
And would certainly take the same Journey as she,  
Had she not giv'n away *Medicin Malgre Lui*.

John Nichols, *The Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, VIII (1812), 294:

1703, May 14. Paid Mrs. Knight for Love's Contrivance	£10 0 0.
1709, May 14. The Busy Body	£10 0 0.

Cf. J. W. Bowyer, pp. 42-43.

<sup>11</sup>For a selected list of Mrs. Knight's rôles see Genest, *op. cit.*, III, 151-53. There is some interesting characterization of this actress in *The Female Wits* (1704). For an exhaustive study of the stage history and lists of the casts of Mrs. Centlivre's plays see J. W. Bowyer, Chapter III, pp. 266-478, and pp. xciv-ccxii.

its proper place far down towards the bottom of the neat hierarchy given in "A List of her Majesty's Household Offices below Stairs, under the Command of his Grace William Duke of Devonshire, Lord Steward."<sup>12</sup> In 1709 Mrs. Centlivre dedicated *The Man's bewitch'd* to the Lord Steward, as she said, to show at once her gratitude and her ambition since her husband was now serving the queen under the Duke of Devonshire as he had previously served the late king of glorious memory under the duke's father.<sup>13</sup> Two of Mrs. Centlivre's occasional poems of courtly compliment coming soon after the Hanoverian succession were of a more intimate and personal order and both were concerned with Caroline, the Princess of Wales, and her circle of ladies in waiting.<sup>14</sup> Is it unreasonable to suppose that Mrs. Centlivre would have been almost as eager to show herself gracious to the leading member of this circle when she was still only a maid of honor to Queen Anne? If a cat may look at a queen, a woman writer may keep an eye on the maids of honor and chance to pick a winner in the race for social distinction.

The journalists of *The Female Tatler* were the avowed champions of "Altamira the Reigning Beauty" of the last years of the court of Queen Anne. Her identity becomes clear from references in Narcissus Luttrell's diary. Mrs. Elizabeth Colyear, daughter of Lieutenant-General Philip Colyear, and niece of David, 1st Earl of Portmore, had been maid of honor to Queen Anne since July 20, 1703.<sup>15</sup> Her intimacy with Lionel Cranfield Sackville, 7th Earl of Dorset (later 1st Duke of Dorset), seems to have caused talk in view of the fact that her prospective marriage to him was not publicly acknowledged until November

<sup>12</sup>John Chamberlayne, *Angliae-Notitia; or The Present State of England* (1707), p. 537; (1708), p. 605; (1710), p. 536. After the accession of George I he kept his same post in the King's Kitchen—*ibid.*, (1716), p. 556. The Yeomen of the Mouth were also entitled to receive £1. 6s. from all persons who were knighted—Guy Miege, *The Present State of Great-Britain and Ireland* (1718), p. 352.

<sup>13</sup>For a realistic and roughly humorous picture of her conversations with her husband and her schemes to increase the family income, see *A Woman's Case: in an Epistle to Charles Joye, Esq., Deputy-Governor of the South-Sea* (London, 1720). Defoe gave her epistle and her comedies warm praise in a friendly notice, *Mercurius Politicus*, July 1720, pp. 61-62.

<sup>14</sup>"An Epistle to Mrs. Wallup, now in the Train of her Royal Highness, The Princess of Wales. As it was sent to her to the Hague." This poem was advertised, *Daily Courant*, Oct. 14, 1714. "To her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, At her Toylet, on New-Years Day," appeared in *The Patriot*, Jan. 15-18, 1715. J. W. Bowyer, pp. lxii-lxiv, and pp. lxiv-lxv, gives complete texts of both pieces.

<sup>15</sup>Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs* (Oxford, 1857), v, 321.

26, 1709.<sup>16</sup> After Queen Anne's death, she became first lady of the bed-chamber to Caroline, as Princess of Wales and as Queen.

Although there were sympathetic references to Altamira in Nos. 61 and 71, and even in Lucinda-Artesia's No. 76, the cleverest tribute to the lovely Altamira was published December 5, 1709—Emilia's No. 65. It began with a letter, partly in prose, but containing amusing verses written by the Court Mice, well-behaved and modest creatures, plagued and put quite out of countenance by the Redcoat Rats. Emilia, in the spirit and manner of a Queen Anne Dorothy Dix, reproved the rats indignantly and comforted their gentler rivals—

*Poor Court Mice, I pity your lamentable Condition! that the Red-Coat Rats shou'd get all the Ladies good Graces from you, but I promise you I'll Scourge them for you, and tell of all their Pranks for Altamira's sake; she whom they have disturbed with their Rendezvous at Night, by scaleing her Chamber, and peeping into her Windows at the undecent hour of Bed-time, and whom they have pelted with their Scandal over their Bottles all Day,<sup>17</sup> for no other Reason, but because the Bait she laid to Catch 'em, was too tempting; that tho' ev'ry one was for Nibbling at it, none durst attempt to take it, for fear of the Trap,<sup>18</sup> which she always laid ready as her Guard . . . if the Court Mice are discourag'd . . . I will at once dissipate their Fears . . . she has banish'd all the Rats and to free herself from their Scandal, has made choice of a Mouse of Quality to put a stop on her part, to all their Complaints for the future so that I hope the Gentlemen Mice of the Court will be satisfy'd with the Choice Altamira has made, which without doubt will influence the rest of the Ladies, to have a tender Regard to all the Considerate and Reserv'd Lovers of that Species. . .*

It was a piece of occasional prose, or rather prose-verse, that rendered a real service to Altamira at the time when it was needed. Eighteenth century writers of ponderous poems of consolation or of compliment would have done well, had they abandoned their formality occasionally to follow Emilia's example.

### III

The sixty-five issues of the later *Female Tatler* were almost equally divided between Dr. Bernard Mandeville (with the thirty-two Lucinda-Artesia issues) and his unidentified collaborator or collaborators with

<sup>16</sup>Luttrell, vi, 516. Cf. V. Sackville-West, *Knole and the Sackvilles* (London, 1923), especially pp. 152-72. Though it contains nothing about Elizabeth Colyear's troubled romance, this book has charm. The satirical verses by the Restoration 6th Earl of Dorset (quoted p. 146) directed to her aunt, Catherine Sedley, married to Sir David Colyear, give a pungent glimpse of relations between several members of the Restoration generation of the Colyears and Sackvilles.

<sup>17</sup>It may be significant that Emilia (like Iago's Emilia), though she has extensive knowledge of soldiers and is without illusions about masculine nature, does not disdain to live in a rough-and-ready comradeship with men. Redcoats from Marlborough's Europe swarm over the pages of *The Female Tatler*.

<sup>18</sup>In the allegory here, as the verses indicate, the trap is marriage.

the remaining thirty-three. Since these papers were closely connected with the personalities, activities, and peculiar interests which made up Mrs. Centlivre's world, she is at least a strong candidate for the authorship of about half of the periodical. Emilia-Rosella's five months of journalism, November 2, 1709, to March 31, 1710, fell between the first performance of Mrs. Centlivre's *The Busy-Body*, May 12, 1709, and of its sequel *Mar-Plot*, December 30, 1710, and was contemporary, as we have seen, with the playing of *The Man's bewitch'd* and *A Bickerstaff's Burying*. Since eight of her dramatic productions preceded, and seven followed the four plays just mentioned, the period of the later *Female Tatler* was nearly central in her career. If she made contributions to the periodical at this time, they should contain relations and parallels both to what came before and what followed after. The essays, anecdotes, and short pieces of fiction in *The Female Tatler* ought to reveal the preferences in subject matter of the mind which conceived them, its awareness of critical issues, and its groping for a pattern to give adequate form to the author's experience of life. *The Female Tatler* in its humbler way can serve the study of Mrs. Centlivre as Ibsen's *Workshop* has served the study of Ibsen, for if not exactly a dramatist's note-book, it was at least necessary copy turned out regularly against the hour of the printer's demand. Five months of compulsory writing is sure to reveal a good deal about any one. The journalism of a dramatist is likely to throw light on features of his dramatic art which might otherwise be left ambiguous and indeterminate, and to settle many a debate on the precise nature of his intention and achievement.<sup>19</sup>

Writing for a periodical in the age of Jeremy Collier, Emilia-Rosella

<sup>19</sup>Cf. Ernest Bernbaum, *The Drama of Sensibility* (Cambridge, 1925), pp. 97-100, and 121-22; and J. W. Bowyer, pp. 169-74, and 291-93. In opposition to Professor Bernbaum, Professor Bowyer credited Mrs. Centlivre with important contributions to sentimental comedy: *The Gamester*, *The Basset Table*, and *The Artifice*. The critical issue which he raised turns on the interpretation and evaluation of the use of a trick, stratagem, or artifice by which the reformation of an erring character is effected. Bernbaum believed that *The Artifice* (along with Taverner's *The Artful Husband*) used the methods of true comedy in contrast to the methods of true sentimental comedy which were but slowly emerging: "In these two plays, as the titles suggest, the personages achieved their happiness by means of more or less dishonest artifices rather than by virtuous intentions or sacrifices." Bowyer would reply: "So long as the character reforming does not know that an artifice has been used, I see no real difference between his repentance and the repentance of one who is converted as a result of events not consciously controlled by others." It was a critical issue which Bernbaum and Bowyer were not the first to debate, for it troubled the author of *The Female Tatler* papers which we are considering until she finally found a satisfying solution.

could hardly be innocent of moral forethought. She tried to write something that would not come too far short of what was expected of her. In fact her earnest preoccupation with the ethical theory and the motives underlying conduct in the usual situations of contemporary life and literature gave something like continuity and purpose to badly-assorted materials. Working in the slightly more dignified medium of the drama, Mrs. Centlivre was moved by similar compulsions in the construction of her sentimental comedies, or at least of her intermediate kind of comedy occupying firm ground somewhere between Professor Bernbaum's absolutes: true comedy and true sentimental comedy.

A spirited debate is conducted in No. 53 between Emilia and Eudoxa on an old but perennially practical problem: how should a wife manage a husband and obtain the mastery in marriage. Laura and Sagax in Emilia's narrative have enjoyed happiness in marriage because of the wise and conscious management of Laura (at once a patient and a clever Griselda). She ruled without seeming to rule and had philosophy enough to keep everything in its own time and place. She knew how to make use alternately of wit and beauty:

*Laura . . . manag'd her Wit with so much Conduct, that she laid her Tongue by as an useless Talent, as long as her Charms were fresh and inviting. Sagax found her the Silent Woman, all Submission and Obedience.*

Eudoxa, who was inclined to rail against marriage, protested that this was "but Dissimulation, and not Love," but Emilia answered wisely "'tis a Counterfeit worth more than the Original." The secret of this successful marriage was the *artifice of love*:

for *Laura* had to do with a Man of Sense, who, tho' he was to be won, and as I might say yok'd with the Artifice of Love and seeming Complaisance, yet he wou'd easily break his Fetters, shou'd you endeavour to Chain him by force.

Resuming Emilia's argument in No. 55 the next Emilia-Rosella issue, Rosella supported women's use of management, artifice, politic stratagems, and innocent dissimulation<sup>20</sup> despite Lucinda's fear that many women were not masters enough of philosophy to subdue their passions

<sup>20</sup>Rosella does not trust "Native Charms and Virtue, without the assistance of Female Policy, and innocent Dissimulation; for I call that so which cheats a Man into his own Happiness . . . we may be permitted under the closest Ties of Religion, to make use of Politick Stratagems to engage the Love and Fidelity of our Husbands towards us, tho' the same are made use of by bad Women to ill purposes. . ." It should soon be plain that this practical journalist is continually seeking the answer to her favorite question: "What may a woman legitimately do to make herself and her man happy?"

and exercise their reason so completely.<sup>21</sup> Eager young Arabella received good advice from her wise aunt:

the Artifice I talk of, that's the Knowledge we are to study, the Language of the Eyes, the motion of the Hands and Feet, and all the little Turns of seducing Man to catch us; if we ward our selves off from their Snares, we surely catch 'em in our own, and there the slenderest Thread of Art, if fairly Woven, will secure them.

The discussion in No. 55 is completed with a story from contemporary life which can scarcely be made to fit the pattern of Emilia-Rosella's ethical fiction. She warns her readers that she does not present the ill design of the succeeding story for their imitation, but asks them "to take notice, that if a Vicious Stratagem, cou'd so far prevail, what greater Influence must a Virtuous one have over the Heart of a Generous confiding Husband." The motives of this Miranda, who speaks so mildly and so slyly, and persuades her husband to secure for a second time her young friend Cyprinus' release from his difficulties, are questionable indeed for a moral story. To be sure the scene between Miranda and her husband would do admirably in a comedy of intrigue and deception!

It is amusing to discover that in the light of fuller information, Emilia-Rosella had to apologize in No. 63 for the first version of the story, "related faithfully according to the Information she receiv'd of it," and to retell it (not without a sense of relief because of its greater suitability for her purposes) in a decidedly different version. She granted that in the first version virtue and generosity were injured and villainy triumphed.<sup>22</sup> The new story was very much improved. Now

<sup>21</sup>The remark is characteristic of Bernard Mandeville. In No. 53 Emilia had shown her interest in her colleague's demonstration in the preceding issue of the utility of dueling and suggested on her part "that *Fencing* and *Dancing* must consequently be of great use." Compare Notes 22 and 30, and *Female Tatler* No. 59.

<sup>22</sup>She "hop'd the end for which she introduc'd her Story, wou'd plead sufficiently for her excuse; because she only represented her as a Wise and Prudent Wife, that knew how to manage her Husband with the Conduct of an agreeable Complaisance and good Humor, that prevail'd over his Passion, and got the Masterhead of his Power, which she made no other use of but to persuade him to an entire Confidence in her, and at the same time to rest satisfy'd he had a full Command over her, which wou'd make 'em both easy . . ." This is perhaps her definitive answer to the weighty problem which she had approached in issue after issue of *The Female Tatler*. She applied a similar philosophy to a very different situation in No. 59 when she settled the question of dueling, or at least provided an ingenious substitute or compromise—this time a very odd artifice indeed: "*Fierceness* is proper to nothing but *Beasts*, whereas a neat *Evasion* or clean come off, belongs peculiarly to a *Smart Fellow*; of which I shall instance this Story that now comes fresh into my memory: A Gentleman lying like *Orontes* under the Dis-

her heroine could become a radiant Miranda not unlike Desdemona (with the substantial advantages however of £600 a year in land and above £10,000 in money) helping in Cyprinus, a new and equally unlucky Cassio. Moreover the good Cardanus, an improvement on Othello, rose to his opportunity and shared his wife's sympathy for the young man. It was of the stuff of which sentimental comedies are made.

Two characteristic pieces of fiction remain: Sophronia's No. 87 and Emilia's No. 106. Either might very well have been turned into a sentimental comedy; Sophronia's actually was, for it became the basis for the central incident in Mrs. Centlivre's *The Artifice* (1722). Although both stories contained stratagems, the devices of Emilia's "hero" Fernando (unlike the deserted girl's "honest Artifice" in Sophronia's story) were so contemptible, and the injured wife's measures so direct and unspectacular that Mrs. Centlivre perhaps found them unsuitable for treatment in her kind of comedy.

Pretending to be facing bankruptcy, Fernando persuaded his faithful wife to consent to a mock-funeral and to retire to an obscure village in Yorkshire, that he might be free to marry the rich Lawra and mend his fortunes. For three years he sent his first wife £50 a year until his avarice convinced him that this expense was needless and he cut off her allowance.

Sne bore as long as it was possible, ashamed and vex'd at her Romantick Folly, that had reduc'd her to such Misery, but able to endure no longer, she made the best of her way to Town, and at an hour when she might conclude he was upon Change, she went to Lawra, who immediately knew her, tho' chang'd greatly with her Misfortune, and fitted to confirm at first sight the Error she had liv'd in, being but the Ghost of what she was.

The two women, as so often in Mrs. Centlivre's plays, made common cause against the ungrateful and treacherous man. Again the scene belongs to the stage:

*Fernando* little suspecting his Welcome, returned, but was the most confounded of Men, when he saw those two whom he believed so far divided, prepared to receive him: . . . By Turns they accus'd him, the first with his Ingratitude, and the last with his Treachery. . . They convinc'd him, that *England* was no Place for him to stay in . . . 'twas in vain to Contend, he was in their Power; therefore he comply'd. . . He went over to *Holland*, and there by his own Estate and Effects may grow Rich as he pleases, while the two Ladies enjoy a perfect Friendship, and live in uninterrupted Peace, *Lawra* having prevail'd on the Unfortunate to partake of her Plenty, and let all Things be in Common between them.

---

honour of an Injury offer'd him, met his Enemy and Shot him with a Pistol stop'd full of Cow-Dung. . ." The duel ended harmlessly in the laughter of the seconds and the mortification of the challenger.

Mrs. Centlivre returned in 1722 for the most important plot of *The Artifice*<sup>23</sup> to Sophronia's story of Philaster and the "unwary Innocent," a Roman Catholic girl without fortune or prospects, who was led to trust Philaster's promise of marriage and bear him a son. But Philaster's father, succeeding in his "design to insnare his Son's Heart," induced him to agree to marry a handsome lady not yet sixteen and his equal in birth and fortune. When Philaster told the news to the girl who had already become the mother of his child, "this was Thunder to the poor dismay'd,"<sup>24</sup> yet she was not without resourcefulness—

She being well resolv'd what to do, told him . . . that all she ask'd for ruin'd Virtue, and for injur'd Trust, was leave to take her last farewell; she begg'd he wou'd Sup with her that Evening and Constrain himself to suffer a few Hours, since he knew they were the last she ever shou'd make tedious to him; this was so obliging a Request that he readily granted, viewing her still with pity and imperfect gratitude; at Night he . . . confess'd his shame and regret for what he was about to do, and wish'd there was a power on Earth cou'd snatch him from the Tyranny of the ungenerous Passion that destroy'd him; she had prepar'd the Wine he lov'd, and gave it him often; about the midst of the Entertainment, he complain'd of Sickness, and Unusual Heat, upon which she fell upon her Knees, implor'd his Pardon, and bid him think of Eternity, for he was poison'd.

Philaster's father, an apothecary, a physician, and a priest were summoned, but the services of the priest alone were needed, not as might be expected merely to administer the last rites, but to marry Philaster to the clever lady (who knew how to reform him) that they might belong to each other before death. The physician and apothecary "were for pouring down Oyl, but the Lady Clasping the Knees of *Philaster*, and shedding Tears of Joy, besought him to forgive her honest Artifice, for he had drank nothing but a large quantity of Gore-Stone." Once the marriage was completed the happy ending was inevitable. Every one was miraculously changed for the better. Her father-in-law-against-his-will was touched and impressed, and "applauded her Pious Cheat; *Philaster* Embrac'd her with more tenderness than till that moment he had ever known, nor lives there a happier Pair."

For *The Artifice* Mrs. Centlivre provided her usual plethora of plots and situations but for her principal plot she took over this story with perhaps only two striking changes: (1) a Dutch father for the orphan girl, Dutch background and customs, and the name Louisa, and (2)

<sup>23</sup>See Susanna Centlivre, *The Artifice* (1723) pp. 7-8, 16-19, 64-71, 95-96, 100-03.

<sup>24</sup>Compare the phrasing on a similar occasion in Emilia's story in No. 106 when Fernando is announcing his infamous plan to his wife: "This was unsuspected Thunder to the Unhappy List'ner." It is hard to believe that Sophronia's No. 87 and Emilia's No. 106 were written by different authors.

effective assistance from Octavia, Ned Freeman's intended bride, in carrying out the stratagem Louisa had devised to make him right the wrong he expected to do her. Women usually had to stand together in Mrs. Centlivre's plays as in Emilia-Rosella's periodical essays.

## IV

The major patterns of Mrs. Centlivre's comedies and the critical problems which gave the dramatist trouble are often written larger in Emilia-Rosella's more loosely-constructed and more personally-revealing periodical essays than in the plays themselves. Since Mrs. Centlivre was above everything else a practical playwright whose humble aim was to be effective in the theatre, it is not without importance that *The Female Tatler* can throw light on some subsidiary features of her practice, particularly on her interest in: (1) dreams, visions, or apparitions, and (2) Quakers. It is evident that she had considerable intellectual curiosity, and perhaps some private feelings with regard to both subjects, but at her best she controlled her impulses and tried to turn these materials to account in giving pleasure to her audience. Despite her strong Whig convictions in politics she was sometimes old-fashioned enough to prefer literature to propaganda.

Her treatment of dreams and related phenomena may be considered first since her activity in this field, though no less persistent than her use of Quaker materials, was less distinguished. As we have noticed she was partial to ghosts and defended her ghost scene in *The Man's bewitch'd* against Cibber and Estcourt. In an age not yet out of touch with the traditions of their terrific moral and super-natural import, whether of God or devil, dreams were only a degree less satisfactory than ghosts for 'shivery effects.'<sup>25</sup> Dreams had distinct advantages over ghosts for comic purposes. In her comedies three sufficiently varied examples can be pointed out: Ogle's crude poltroon's dreams in *The Beau's Duel* (1702), Colonel Fainwell's Quaker vision in 'Quaker' language in *A Bold Stroke for a Wife* (1718), and Mrs. Watchit's Freudian dream of a corn-cutter in *The Artifice* (1722).<sup>26</sup>

Devoting all of *Female Tatler* No. 57 to the subject, Emilia gave a brief theoretical discussion of the causes and classifications of dreams

<sup>25</sup>For help in the necessarily difficult act of imaginative reorientation I recommend a serious and exhaustive treatise by a clergyman of a previous generation who held the traditional views: Philip Goodwin, *The Mystery of Dreames, Historically Discoursed*. London, 1658.

<sup>26</sup>*The Dramatic Works of the Celebrated Mrs. Centlivre, with A New Account of her Life* (London, 1872), I, 112-13; III, 253-54; 347-48.

and generously provided five sample dreams: first her own imaginary journey including a vision of the antipodes; then, more briefly, three famous medieval *exempla*; and finally a contemporary example related to her by Sir Thomas Pendergrass<sup>27</sup> about a soldier who had met death in battle on the very day and hour of which he had had warning in a dream—the dream was found carefully recorded in a book which the soldier carried in his pocket. She ended the paper with a promise (which she did not keep) to entertain the ladies on some future occasion with several stories of dreams which had been fulfilled in her own experience.

Mrs. Centlivre's use of Quaker materials is so important that it should not be neglected in any discussion of her work. With the possible exception of Defoe, she gave more sustained attention to Quakers than any other author of literary significance in the early eighteenth century.<sup>28</sup> The Quakerism of the Mrs. Plotwell part of *The Beau's Duel* (1702) originated in the development of the comedy from Jasper Mayne's *The City Match* and from the model for *The City Match*—Ben Jonson's *Silent Woman*—by a process of successive imitations by Mayne and Mrs. Centlivre of their common master in comedy. Because of his aversion to noise, Jonson's Morose could be tricked into marrying a silent woman who was no such thing. Mayne, needing to show some originality, varied the situation by having Dorcas gull Warehouse with a feigned Puritanism. For Mrs. Centlivre, Dorcas the Puritan became the supposed Quakeress Mrs. Plotwell, ready to encourage Careful in his delusion that he would find aid and comfort in her Quaker beliefs for his sordid parsimony. In his delighted endorsement and exploitation of her Quakerism there is a crude comic distortion of the Quaker concern for plainness and simplicity in dress and of their radical impulse to strip human nature bare of its finery and all adventitious coverings:

Pr'y thee shew me one Text of Scripture for the Fashions, or where Jewels are commanded, or what Holy Matron ever had a Valet to dress 'em, as they say

<sup>27</sup> His father (consult the article in *D. N. B.*) was mortally wounded at Malplaquet, Sept. 11, 1709. Emilia's friend was the second baronet. See an anecdote which gives the flavor, if not of his personality, at least of the society in which he moved, *The Fashionable Tell-Tale* 1 (1778), 137-40.

<sup>28</sup> See E. K. Maxfield, "The Quakers in English Stage Plays before 1800," *PMLA*, xlv (1930), 256-73; and "Daniel Defoe and the Quakers," *PMLA*, xlvi (1932), 179-90. In *PMLA*, xlvi (1930), 957-58, J. W. Bowyer made important and entertaining additions to E. K. Maxfield's account of Mrs. Centlivre. For the idealized Quakers on the stage in the nineteenth century see E. Philips, "Le Personnage du Quaker sur la Scène Française," *RLC*, ix (1929), 432-46.

the French Ladies have, (oh monstrous Fashion—No, no, our devoutest Women wore coarse Linen, or rather none at all.<sup>29</sup>

On the other hand, knowing the value of contrast, Mrs. Centlivre did not hesitate to show a Quaker in a favorable light when she introduced the honest and sturdy Scruple among the rascally politicians in *A Gotham Election* (1715). Scruple, though a Quaker wine-seller, would not vote for a man he knew to be dishonest and stood firm even against threats to take away his customers and to ruin his standing with his wholesaler.

Mrs. Centlivre's most successful use of Quaker materials (known to the late W. P. Ker and to Professor Bowyer if not to Professor Maxfield) came in *A Bold Stroke for a Wife* (1718) and gave the expression—‘Simon Pure’—to the English language. Obadiah Prim, according to the letter addressed to him by his friend Aminadab Holdfast of Bristol, a hosier near the building called the Monument in London, was one of the four guardians who made life difficult for Nancy Lovely. (To the Quakers she was merely Anne.) Obadiah Prim and his wife Sarah tried to make Anne conform to their ways. In a lively scene in Act II, and another in Act V, they debated the question with her of covering her breasts with a handkerchief. Mrs. Centlivre did not allow Nancy Lovely to evade the issue by arguing that she appeared with them covered or uncovered purely for reasons of convenience or comfort (in the sun—protection from sunburn, but out of the sun—coolness)—indeed any arguments from utility were shown to be irrelevant compared to the motive of attracting men by her loveliness. The material is very close to that of the first dialogue of Bernard Mandeville's *The Virgin Unmask'd: or, Female Dialogues Betwixt an Elderly Maiden Lady and her Niece* (1709)—which together with *The Female Tatler* of 1709-10 was Mandeville's earliest published work in English prose. Such skill in the relentless pursuit of motives may very well have been learned from her colleague in *The Female Tatler*.<sup>30</sup> Finally, the most striking of Colonel Fainwell's many disguises and impersonations in *A Bold Stroke for a Wife* was his posing as the false Simon Pure (even when confronted with the true Simon Pure) and his delivery of the prophetic dream which commanded him to take the

<sup>29</sup>Dramatic Works (1872), I, 105.

<sup>30</sup>See also Notes 21 and 22. It would have been strange if Mandeville and Mrs. Centlivre had not had some interest in each other's work. Her farce *A Bickerstaff's Burying* was in part a fantastic retort to Steele's *Tatlers* No. 96 and No. 99, just as Mandeville's Lucinda-Artesia papers No. 64 and No. 86 were cogent replies to the same issues of *The Tatler*.

maiden Anne to himself. She too played up to the role expected of her and when filled with the spirit spoke revelations.

Three *Female Tatler* papers are as successful in their satirical treatment of Quaker materials as anything in Defoe or in Mrs. Centlivre's plays: Rosella's No. 83, Sophronia's No. 93, and Arabella's No. 67. With its selection of striking contemporary types grouped in picturesque contrast, and its brisk action and brief snatches of dialogue No. 83 created a scene fit for the stage. Rosella presented three characters in impassioned conversation: a miracle of a soldier in a red coat, a man in black "properly distinguish'd a High-Flying Clergyman," and a young Bourignian who was a violent and bitter critic of the universities. A fourth figure soon joined them:

a Quaker passing by (*the Door being upon the Jar*) and hearing some of the Young Fellow's Puritanical Expressions, took it for a Meeting House, and enter'd without any manner of Ceremony. At first he sigh'd, and his Spirit groan'd exceedingly, but lifting up his Eyes upon the Company, and discovering his Error by our Dress, and turning quick upon the Doctor, whose black Gown made him Jump from the Place where he stood, he roar'd out.—Avoid *Satan*, thou Enemy to the Spiritual Man, avoid I say, and come not near these Corporal Parts of mine; then suddenly caught hold of the Parsons Antagonist, crying, What dost thou Taper of Light do in the Tabernacle of the Wicked? Why dost thou vex thy Religious Spirit, in preaching to the Congregation of the Whore of *Babylon*? With that tugg'd him quite down Stairs, and the Company burst out into such a Fit of Laughter, that the other was ashame'd of the Disturbance which he had occasioned, and took the opportunity to sneak off.

Like Mrs. Centlivre in her use of Scruple, the Quaker wine-seller, Sophronia in No. 93 showed a Quaker to advantage by way of contrast to a tradesman in silk whose habits she disliked:

Nor was Eloquence ever more unhappily misapplied than by Mr. *Cringe the Silkman*. . . . that Elaborate Stile and high sounding Rhetorick of such prevailing Force at the Bar, does from behind a Counter but breed a Suspicion that his Goods are damag'd, and sends most of his Customers to *Nathaniel Brief*, the Quaker, they preferring Formality to Impertinence.

But the most masterly of these papers in its shrewd observation of Quaker behavior and its malicious feminine insight was Arabella's No. 67 describing the two quality Quakers, Susanna and Rachel, whom she met on a visit with Emilia to an India-house. It is robust comedy with nothing of the delicate discrimination of Chaucer in drawing the portrait of the Prioress, who in forsaking the world had so innocently retained her good breeding and fine womanliness. Queen Anne Quakers were not to be allowed to make themselves 'easy' in this world without sharp comment. Though grossly offensive in tone, Arabella's paper is impressive in its detailed knowledge of Quaker peculiarities and in

its satirical penetration to the fundamental issues. It is unfortunately too long for quotation, but deserves to be read in its entirety since it contains all the qualities of the other Quaker issues with heightened intensity. Because of its use of realistic detail, bits of imitative dialogue, and farcical action, it is specially suited in technique as well as content for transfer to one of Mrs. Centlivre's comedies. Arabella's No. 67 must have been written by the same hand as the other Quaker papers<sup>31</sup> and like much of her best work is a fulfillment of Mrs. Centlivre's most characteristic and not least profitable ambition—to resurrect, though in the age of Queen Anne and in the person of a woman, the masculine observation and the comic penetration of Ben Jonson.

The maze of pseudonyms in the later *Female Tatler* begins to clear. If I am correct in my explanations, the new editors, taking over the enterprise with No. 51 (after the disappearance of Mrs. Crackenthorpe), published their first issue as usual under her portrait and sponsorship, but revealed the true state of affairs by the story of Arabella falling ill in the theatre at a performance of *Hamlet*. Mrs. Centlivre probably wrote Mrs. Crackenthorpe's No. 51. Then Dr. Mandeville arrived with No. 52 as Lucinda, and a plan was formed for each collaborator to write as two women: Mandeville as Lucinda and Artesia, and Mrs. Centlivre as Emilia and Rosella. Since Arabella had already been used, it was convenient to adopt her as a "niece" and to give her a paper now and then—Nos. 54, 67, and 71. After thirty-six issues it was decided to complicate matters somewhat by introducing a new contributor—Sophronia. Her declaration of an impressively moral editorial policy in her first paper, No. 87, was matched by a scornful reply at the beginning of Emilia's next issue: "Sophronia may go on her formal way, and entertain the Old and the Insipid, for my part I am one of those that withdrew upon her Ridiculous Speech." It was Mrs. Centlivre sportively replying to herself!

There is no good evidence for a contributor other than Mrs. Centlivre back of the three Arabella papers or the three Sophronia papers. In general the scheme of publication called for alternate contributions

<sup>31</sup>After the scene in the India-house is over, the final verdict is "That *Quakers* are the most designing, deceitful Sect of Creatures in the World, who assume more *Pride* and exact more *Homage* from their seeming Sanctity, than the truly Pious, who are always easy and unconstrain'd. . ." For Mrs. Centlivre to be 'easy' served as an ideal and was almost sufficient for a philosophy. See also No. 99-1, Feb. 22, 1710, for a specially intimate statement of her attitude towards the practical problems of her work in Grub street (even to her weariness with her own similes, and her awareness that others had been weary with them).

from Mandeville and Mrs. Centlivre with only an occasional variation from the plan which pressing business for one collaborator or the other might readily explain. Five of the six papers from the minor contributors Arabella and Sophronia appeared on the days when the normal plan would call for a contribution from Mrs. Centlivre—the sixth paper, Arabella's No. 54, could be explained as one of the occasional exceptions. Sophronia's No. 87 is under strong suspicion of being Mrs. Centlivre's because it contained the story of "the honest Artifice" which she recalled and used in 1722 for her comedy *The Artifice*. Both Sophronia in No. 93 and Arabella in No. 67, as we have seen, contributed to the Quaker material in *The Female Tatler*, and Arabella indeed wrote the masterpiece in the series.

*The Female Tatler, Written by a Society of Ladies* as a successor to Mrs. Crackenthorpe's *Female Tatler* was actually a collaboration of Mrs. Susanna Centlivre and Dr. Bernard Mandeville.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>32</sup>I believe that Mrs. Centlivre was the author of five letters signed "S. C." which appeared in *The Weekly Journal or, British Gazeteer* in September and October 1720. Her first letter to Mr. Read, dated Sept. 7 and published Sept 10, praised his journal for inspiring loyalty to the best of kings and told of her discovery of a new author to whom she proposed to render an enthusiastic service: "I doubt not but the selected Thoughts of an Ingenuous Author, will be accepted by your Readers . . . as the Stile of the Gentleman, whoever he is, is pure, sharp, and masculine, I shall not deviate from it, but keep close, (tho' by the Way of Abstract) in his own Words; which if you please to permit a Place in your Paper, I shall not fail sending it you Weekly in due Time: So I rest your humble Servant; S. C."

This first contribution (like the others a selection of paragraphs and sentences from Thomas Gordon's lively journalism as it was appearing each week) was a cut-down "Reader's Digest" version of *The Independent Whig*, No. 33, for Wednesday, Aug. 31, 1720. S. C.'s letters introducing her four succeeding contributions (she referred to another that was not printed) bore in each case the date of the issue of *The Independent Whig* which she was 'abstracting.'

The five issues of *The Independent Whig* printed in S. C.'s compressed versions in *The Weekly Journal or, British Gazeteer* (with the dates of publication for both periodicals) were as follows: No. 33, Aug. 31, (Sept. 10); No. 35, Sept. 14, (Sept. 17); No. 37, Sept. 28, (Oct. 1); No. 38, Oct. 5, (Oct. 8); No. 39, Oct. 12, (Oct. 15).

## WILLIAM JOSEPH SNELLING, FORGOTTEN CRITIC

By JOHN T. FLANAGAN

University of Minnesota

In the year 1820 a young Eastern lad recently cashiered from West Point for some breach of discipline struck out for the plains, heading for the confluence of the Mississippi and Minnesota rivers where his father, Colonel Josiah Snelling, was in charge of a military post. After months of wandering and of fraternizing with the Indians, the boy, William Joseph Snelling, reached the fort and received the warm greetings of his parent. In the years that followed, young Snelling grew famous as a frontiersman, scout, interpreter;<sup>1</sup> he knew the northwest from personal experience as few white men did, and he combined with his practical knowledge a certain flair for the artistic presentation of it. So it was that when Colonel Snelling died and his son returned to Boston in 1828, young Joseph was ready to play a not inconspicuous part in the world of letters.<sup>2</sup> His background gave him a certain critical authority in treating works that dealt with the aborigines, and the publication of his satire *Truth* was an outstanding event in early American criticism.<sup>3</sup>

Upon his return from the northwest Snelling plunged immediately into journalism, where he succeeded brilliantly when not under the incubus of drink. But he also found occasion to comment on the imaginative literature of his time, especially when it contained delinea-

<sup>1</sup>For an account of his life see my edition of *Tales of the Northwest* (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1936). There is a short sketch of Snelling by Allen Woodall in the *Dictionary of American Biography* (New York, 1935), xvii, 381-2.

<sup>2</sup>*Tales of the Northwest* (Boston, 1830) is his chief artistic achievement.

<sup>3</sup>*Truth; A New Year's Gift For Scribblers* was published in Boston in 1831. A second edition, *Truth, A Gift For Scribblers; With Additions and Emendments* (Boston: Printed for the Author) appeared in the same year. The following year another issue of the book saw the light; this bore the notation "With Additions and Emendations" and was published in Boston by B. B. Mussey, 63, Cornhill. For a discussion of this bibliographical problem, see *post*. To facilitate reference I shall cite the volumes as follows: the first edition as *Truth*, I; the 1832 edition, which I consider the genuine second edition, as *Truth*, II.

tions of the Indian and the frontier. These he naturally took for his particular province. Although many writers had chosen the red men as fit material for romance by 1830, few if any wrote of him with real understanding. Either they were apologists of the Rousseauistic stamp, or they shaped their stories as if New England as well as Kentucky were still a dark and bloody ground. Personal acquaintance with their subject they had none: the tribes they wrote about were extinct or remote and the Indians they knew were too frequently, like Cooper's Indian John, a degenerate set who hovered around the fringe of civilization. Cooper never saw the prairies where Leatherstocking died so nobly and Longfellow had to create Minnehaha Falls from fancy and Schoolcraft together; but Snelling had lived in the wigwams of the Sioux. Hence in the preface to *Tales of the Northwest*, one of the first volumes of short stories to appear in America, he took exception to the portrait painted by the romanticist. Insisting on the necessity of personal observation if one wished to write correctly about the aborigines, he ridiculed the books which drew red men as heroes, insensible to fear and to weakness alike. "It would appear that their strongest passions are hourly called into exercise; that their lips never part but to give utterance to a sentiment, and that glory and honor are to them all as the breath of their nostrils."<sup>4</sup> He declared that after all Indians are human, and have the same faculties, the same passions, as other members of the *genus homo*. If they had any one trait which was developed to a higher degree than usual, Snelling opined, it was inconsistency. As for those authors who constantly made their native characters speak in tropes and parables, the critic had only contempt. For the Indians actually "speak with as little circumlocution, and as directly to the point as any people."<sup>5</sup> It is ignorance only that explains the impossible red men of fiction.

Obviously Snelling had little tolerance for the romancers of his day. Cooper and Paulding he condemned equally for their portrayal of the frontier. Reviewing the life of Black Hawk (published in Boston, 1834) he reiterated his contention that Indians do not naturally use figures of speech. "The term *pale faces*, often applied to the whites in this book, was, we think, never in the mouth of any American savage, excepting in the fanciful pages of Mr. Cooper."<sup>6</sup> Then followed

<sup>4</sup>*Tales of the Northwest* (Boston, 1830), p. vi.

<sup>5</sup>*Idem*, viii.

<sup>6</sup>*North American Review* (January, 1835), XL, 70. Of Snelling's own book Alexander Everett wrote in the same periodical: "The representation given by our

a tangential discussion of the two races, much in the manner of a Macaulay book review, in which Snelling discussed the compassion and the magnanimity which he himself had experienced among the Indians and the cruel exploitation which produced such havoc along the frontier.<sup>7</sup> As for Paulding, Snelling averred that his red men were of a species unique, while Nimrod Wildfire, hero of *The Lion of the West*, was

A libel on the land he represents;  
Extravagance, vulgarity and rant,  
The hackney'd gleanings of a hackney'd cant,  
Make up his speech.<sup>8</sup>

Bitterly hostile to any attempt to romanticize the Indian, Snelling demonstrated his preference for realistic treatment in such a work as *Tales of Travel West of the Mississippi* (Boston, 1831), one of several redactions for juvenile readers which he wrote under the pseudonym of Solomon Bell. In this volume he summarized in the most objective fashion the exploits of famed travelers such as Lewis and Clark, contenting himself with an unadorned recital of the facts and portraying the Shoshones and Blackfeet exactly as the explorers found them.

Even for the adventurers who had traversed the territory and who pretended to be familiar with the savage tribes of the northwest, Snelling had scant respect. Indeed he went out of his way to revile his predecessors in exploration if he suspected them of shallowness or deceit. Thus in an account of an Indian uprising at Prairie du Chien in 1827 in which he had played a respectable part, he wrote:

Perhaps some of our readers may have seen Carver or Schoolcraft's Travels. If they have, it may be that they know, *albeit neither of the books is worth a brass pin as authority*, that the Chippewa and Dakota or Sioux tribes have waged war against each other so long that the origin of their hostility is beyond the ken of Man.<sup>9</sup>

Snelling obviously wasted no words in his indictment of what he held to be spurious or inaccurate portrayals of the Indian and his life. And there were few in the 1830's with the information and the courage to gainsay the critic.

author of the manners of the native is somewhat less poetical, but *probably more true* than that of Cooper. The leading traits of the picture are, however, substantially the same which appear in his delineations. . ." (*op. cit.*, July, 1830, xxxi, 200). The italics are mine.

<sup>7</sup>*North American Review* (January, 1835), XL, 73-6.

<sup>8</sup>*Truth*, II, 31.

<sup>9</sup>*Collections of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin* (Madison, 1907), v, 123. The italics are mine.

A second literary medium to which Snelling directed his attention was the drama. Thus in 1835 he condemned the "star" system even then well established in the United States. He thought that the chief cause for the degradation of the drama was the practice of writing a piece exclusively for some popular actor. As a result of such a method the play was apt to be full of trickery and bombast.

If the Star have a stentorian voice, he must be provided with an opportunity to rant, rave, and bellow. If he have a stalwart arm and leg, he must have an opportunity to fight in single combat, and kill his antagonist upon the stage—an exhibition as gratifying to the mob as it is repugnant to good taste.<sup>10</sup>

American drama, of course, was hardly a vigorous stock at the time when Snelling wrote. As he observed,

Our Yankee play-wrights write like Shakespeare, fast;  
But that's the first resemblance, and the last.<sup>11</sup>

Among the authors whom he regarded with contempt were J. N. Barker, Richard Penn Smith, and John A. Stone, the last the author of the notorious *Metamora*. For Barker, author of *Tears and Smiles*, Snelling had "Tears for his rashness, for his folly smiles."<sup>12</sup> Smith's tragedy of *Caius Marius*, written for Edwin Forrest, he termed the "principal of his abortions."<sup>13</sup> But Snelling reserved the roundest of his maledictions for *Metamora*. Forrest had, it will be recalled, offered a prize of \$500 for a good tragedy.

The prize was awarded to a piece entitled *Metamora*, called, by courtesy, a tragedy; and so, in some sense, it was. Common sense, historical truth, human nature, and the king's English, were alike butchered without remorse.<sup>14</sup>

And in another passage he further ridiculed the drama which, happily or unhappily, has since passed out of existence.

Here's St-ne, for instance, with his Indian piece,  
His broken English, clap-traps, paint, and grease,  
Throws mother Nature into ague fits,  
And for his pains five hundred dollars gets;  
Then, conscience smitten, for forgiveness prays,—  
His work, he says, but cost him forty days.<sup>15</sup>

One suspects that although Snelling detested the rhetoric and the bombast, it was the historical misrepresentation which exasperated him.

<sup>10</sup>*New-England Magazine* (February, 1835), VIII, 106.

<sup>11</sup>*Truth*, I, 38.

<sup>12</sup>*Truth*, I, 47.

<sup>13</sup>*Truth*, I, 48.

<sup>14</sup>*New-England Magazine* (February, 1835), VIII, 106.

<sup>15</sup>*Truth*, I, 38.

Certainly the magniloquence spouted nightly by Forrest was as rare among red men as among whites.

There were two American playwrights whom the critic regarded with some favor. Upon one, James Hillhouse, he called hopefully to produce a native drama of which citizens need not be ashamed, a drama which was not sycophantically written for "stars" like Forrest and Kean.<sup>16</sup> The other, Richard Montgomery Bird, had already produced a play of which Snelling tentatively approved, but the *Gladiator* alone could hardly give the critic a high opinion of American drama. Among British playwrights he regarded Sheridan Knowles and Joanna Baillie as respectable talents. But he bitterly rebuked the public for its vulgar taste, accusing it of preferring acrobats and charlatans to legitimate actors and of regarding the circus more highly than the theater.<sup>17</sup>

Snelling's more sustained power as a critic, however, is best shown in his reviews of contemporary poetry. He was the author, for example, of a brilliant estimate of William Cullen Bryant's *Poems* of 1832, a review in which he acclaimed the book as the "best volume of American poetry that has yet appeared,"<sup>18</sup> but in which he was not led by patriotic zeal to espouse virtues which were nonexistent. Thus he pointed out Bryant's fidelity to external nature, his close observation, the essentially contemplative bent of his mind, his tenderness and delicacy; but he also recognized the poet's fundamental coldness and he remarked astutely that Bryant's verse "never makes the cheek glow, and the veins tingle. He is never carried out of sight of common sense by his imagination. His strength is never impetuous, his boldness never extravagant."<sup>19</sup> Nor did Snelling fail to adduce examples. If "The Rivulet" revealed the poet's careful scrutiny of nature, "Monument Mountain" and "The Forest Hymn" were distinctly superior achievements. His most fervent praise he reserved for "To the Evening Wind," a poem which he appreciated for its delicacy and sweetness and purity.<sup>20</sup> Yet Snelling saw at once that Bryant would never appeal to the unthinking. His muse was too abashed, too reticent, too unwilling to expose herself to vibrant or martial scenes. As a popular poet, the critic averred, Bryant could never succeed: he lacked plot, bloodshed, novelty, all the time-honored devices that the multitude de-

<sup>16</sup>*Truth*, I, 39.

<sup>17</sup>*New-England Magazine* (February, 1835), VIII, 106-7.

<sup>18</sup>*North American Review* (April, 1832), xxxiv, 512.

<sup>19</sup>*Idem*, pp. 504-5.

<sup>20</sup>*Idem*, p. 508.

manded.<sup>21</sup> Bryant's charm lay rather in his spirituality; he would delight men of judgment and taste.<sup>22</sup>

At the close of his review of Bryant, Snelling returned to a theme which at that time needed considerable support: namely, that American literary craftsmen could find ample material at home without seeking castles and moats and hoary legends. It will be remembered that at the beginning of the nineteenth century it was common among the literati to bewail the lack of suitable subjects for romance. Native scenes were insufficiently glamorous; American civilization was as yet too young. Irving and Cooper among others subscribed to this view, but to Snelling it seemed preposterous. "The materials of poetry lie scattered about us in boundless profusion." The great rivers of the west, the Missouri and the Mississippi, he thought superior in artistic potentiality to the Isis and the Cam, while the denizens of their banks were at least as romantic as Turks and Highlanders.<sup>23</sup> Snelling realized that American literature, if it was to be original, would have to embrace native subjects frankly and sincerely. One suspects that part of his admiration for Bryant was a result of the New England poet's adoption of autochthonous material, even though Bryant's knowledge of the Indian was clearly superficial.<sup>24</sup> And yet, as an examination of *Truth* will reveal, Snelling was not one to celebrate the shoddy simply because the author wrought upon an American theme.

It is, after all, on the long satirical poem that he published in 1831 that his real reputation as a critic rests. In the preface Snelling asserted that his splenetic outbursts were dictated by no personal resentment and that private quarrels did not enter into the discussion. Rather the continual irritation of petty poets numerous as gadflies moved him to essay a critical examination of their performances. The charge that sharp censure might wound real genius, as the *Quarterly* was once thought to have clipped the wings of Keats, he brushed aside testily. Genuine ability could not be hurt in any way by sincere

<sup>21</sup>*Idem*, p. 513.

<sup>22</sup>*Idem*, p. 514. The neglect into which Snelling has fallen is well exemplified by the complete omission of his name in William Charvat's scholarly volume, *The Origins of American Critical Thought 1810-1835* (Philadelphia, 1936). Charvat discusses a review of Bryant's poetry by Willard Phillips but inexplicably ignores Snelling.

<sup>23</sup>*North American Review* (April, 1832), xxxiv, 513.

<sup>24</sup>Cf. Tremaine McDowell, *William Cullen Bryant* (New York, 1935), pp. xlvi-xlvii.

criticism; the lesser fry should be exterminated. Thus in the admirable closing paragraph:

Wherever I have found ability at all above mediocrity, I have acknowledged it, though obscured by a thousand blots. Where talent does not exist, the literary hopes of the writer ought to be blasted, even for his own welfare; and it will give me pleasure to perform the service.

From the opening line, in which he burlesqued the traditional epic beginning,

Moths, millers, gnats, and butterflies, I sing,

to the very end he made havoc with the crowd of poetasters preserved in Samuel Kettell's *Specimens of American Poetry*, always retaining his figure borrowed from the insect world. Indeed the hum of many of the unfortunates would long since have ceased to trouble the world were it not for Snelling's literary impaling. Let us examine some of the victims.

First to be honored in the American *Dunciad* was Rufus Dawes. Author of a work called "The Spirit of Beauty," Dawes committed the error of claiming ubiquity for his goddess. Said Snelling:

He's wrong; for "Beauty's Spirit" never shines  
Through the impervious dulness of his lines.<sup>25</sup>

The young poet also had had the temerity to publish a gentle satire of his own, of which the critic fell foul:

His Strokes and Strictures meet with equal scorn,  
And, like his poems, leave the press still-born.<sup>26</sup>

Obscure poetasters like George Doane and William Peabody the satirist disdained to treat severally; instead he lumped them together in a group

Who thrive upon their mother's milk so well,  
They chirp in numbers ere they chip the shell.<sup>27</sup>

For John Pierpont, author of the "howling Airs of Palestine" and an esteemed clergyman of the day, Snelling had little more respect.

Scarce any food to Yankees comes amiss;  
But saw-dust better relishes than this.  
P—rp—nt, a man may be of judgment clear,  
Have taste, and talent, and a faultless ear,  
Yet be no poet: be advised by me;  
Stick to thy pulpit; let the Muses be.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>25</sup>*Truth*, I, 9.

<sup>26</sup>*Truth*, I, 10.

<sup>27</sup>*Truth*, I, 11.

<sup>28</sup>*Truth*, I, 11. In the edition of 1832 Snelling added a footnote: "To judge by

Grenville Mellen, Maine poet and author of a volume of stories with the cacophonous title of *Glad Tales and Sad Tales*, was branded as one who offended the taste and patience of his hearers with works compounded of milk and water, "His native fogs condensed within his brain."<sup>29</sup>

James K. Paulding, whom Snelling condemned as an inaccurate portrayer of the frontier, was also ridiculed as a poet. His was

A name well worthy of no second place  
On the dark record of the land's disgrace.<sup>30</sup>

Snelling deemed the *Lay of the Scottish Fiddle* a "very miserable parody" while all he could positively say for *The Backwoodsman* was that "many of the lines appear to have been intended for pentameters." Indeed,

His coach poetic next goes jolting on,  
Until the passengers, with tears and groans,  
Complain of aching heads and broken bones...<sup>31</sup>

In a footnote Snelling added a comment which may well represent his final estimate of Paulding's ability: "Repeated failures have not convinced this man of his imbecility. He still continues to write, and may be considered incorrigible."<sup>32</sup>

Nor did other minor scribblers escape the critic's lash. Even Richard Henry Dana, Snelling complained, wasted his time disgracefully on inferior topics: "His powers are really respectable, and should be better employed."<sup>33</sup> On the other hand, George Lunt attempted a theme beyond his powers; striving to praise Byron, he beat out his brains on the great poet's headstone:

L—nt is no poet, he has no pretence  
To taste or talent—scarce to common sense:<sup>34</sup>

---

the plurality of voices, I have done Mr. Pierpont injustice. I would fain make him the *amende honorable*, and am willing to say that no one can respect his person, profession, character and talents more than I do. However, when I read his *Portrait*, and *Airs of Palestine*, I thought their chance of immortality very small. . . ." (*Truth*, II, 23). It is significant, however, that Snelling did not alter a line of his original estimate, although he did add a caution:

Again if thou set'st out for Palestine,  
The fate of Icarus, good man, is thine.

Pierpont, the critic thought, should limit his verse to lesser themes (*op. cit.*, p. 24).

<sup>29</sup>*Truth*, I, 17.

<sup>30</sup>*Truth*, I, 19.

<sup>31</sup>*Truth*, I, 20.

<sup>32</sup>*Truth*, I, 19.

<sup>33</sup>*Truth*, I, 20. Cf. 31: "And croaking D-na strains his screech-owl throat!"

<sup>34</sup>*Truth*, I, 23.

Isaac McLellan drew even bitterer condemnation. Author of a poem entitled "The Fall of the Indian," his work was summed up in four terse lines:

Yet Isaac's book may boast of merits two;  
His paltry pieces are both short and few:  
And still the work would be the more improved,  
The more the number of the lines removed.<sup>35</sup>

Indeed, Snelling opined, "The Indian never fell so low before. Still, it is to be hoped that he will recover from his bruises."<sup>36</sup> Henry Finn was found guilty of syntactical errors, for which Snelling had no mercy.

Heaven help the grammar! He assaults the verbs,  
And conquering on, the A. B. C. disturbs;  
Puts adverbs, nouns, and adjectives to rout,  
And turns the tripes of syntax inside out.<sup>37</sup>

The critic believed that Samuel Woodworth merited praise for one lyric, which has since gained more than a modicum of fame, "The Old Oaken Bucket," but apparently Woodworth was a man of one achievement only, for "From that bright haystack fire no phoenix rose."<sup>38</sup> James McHenry the satirist called an Irish owl saluting his auditors in the wilderness.

Beside, the fashion never was in vogue  
To woo the Muses in the Munster brogue.<sup>39</sup>

And the best thing that can be said about Alonzo Lewis and Prosper Wetmore and Henry Pickering is that Snelling's contempt has partially preserved their names.<sup>40</sup> Even John Neal was gibed at mercilessly and depicted as growling and snapping like a bulldog. The only virtue Snelling saw in his poetry was *novelty*:

His freaks and pranks were his, and his alone;  
His faults were infinite, but all his own.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>35</sup>*Truth*, I, 26. McLellan, oddly enough, was omitted from the second edition and the stinging couplets were transferred to Doane (*Truth*, II, 26).

<sup>36</sup>*Truth*, I, 26.

<sup>37</sup>*Truth*, I, 36.

<sup>38</sup>*Truth*, I, 45.

<sup>39</sup>*Truth*, I, 46, 47.

<sup>40</sup>Wetmore's reaction is suggested by an epigram supposedly by him which appears written in the copy of the 1832 edition of *Truth* in the library of the Minnesota Historical Society (p. 61):

Thou Snarling Critic! Cease thy cur-like Yelling!  
Oh Hapless Muse! Compelled to own a Snelling!

<sup>41</sup>*Truth*, I, 30.

Nor was Neal's pilgrimage abroad deemed beneficial. Indeed Snelling excoriated him all the more for his departure and for his contributions to English reviews.

A raving lunatic he crossed the main,  
A raging madman he returns again.  
Spasmodic energy, galvanic starts,  
Make the sum total of his wit and parts.  
Look at his poems, where each ray of light  
Is by a veil of tinsel hid from sight;  
Where wondering nominatives strain their eyes,  
And call for verbs;—in vain—no verb replies.<sup>42</sup>

Any reader of such a novel as *Brother Jonathan* cannot fail to appreciate the pun at the close of this excerpt. Surely Snelling hit off to perfection Neal's feverish and distorted style.

Unlike Pope, the satirist crowned no king in his collection of dunces but he did reserve some individuals for special treatment. Chief among these was Nathaniel Willis, who got such rough handling that Holmes declared that Snelling "tomahawked him in heroics, ran him through in prose, and scalped him in barbarous epigrams."<sup>43</sup> Why, the critic questioned, did the nose of every man turn up as if scenting carrion when Willis was seen on the street; why did all the critics "claw his shallow pate"? He was of course a fool, but so were Prentice, Mellen, *et al.* Continuing his coarse abuse Snelling asserted that at Willis's birth the sex of the child was doubtful and remained doubtful to the time of the writing, but that Willis's parents, desiring a son, simply clad their offspring in coat and breeches.<sup>44</sup> Impelled then by the *cacoëthes scribendi* Willis plunged into print and shocked his readers with his obscenity.

Awhile he graced the Statesman's ribald page  
With the rank breathings of his prurient age;  
And told the world how many a half-bred miss,  
Like Shakespeare's fairy, gave an ass a kiss.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>42</sup>*Truth*, I, 29.

<sup>43</sup>O. W. Holmes, *A Mortal Antipathy* (Boston & New York, 1894), p. 6.

<sup>44</sup>*Truth*, I, 13.

<sup>45</sup>*Truth*, II, 34. Willis did not let this violent attack go unanswered but replied with a pasquinade addressed to "Smelling" Joseph, a term which, remarked S. G. Goodrich, stuck to the satirist for the rest of his life (*Recollections of a Lifetime* (New York, n.d.), p. 707, footnote). Snelling himself quoted the verses in *Truth*, II, 12:

Oh Smelling Joseph! Thou art like a cur,  
(I'm told thou once didst live by hunting fur)  
Of bigger dogs thou smellest, and in sooth,  
Of one extreme, perhaps, canst tell the "Truth;"  
'Tis a wise thrif, and shows thou know'st thy powers,  
*To leave thy "North West Tales" and take to smelling ours!*

Termed "dishonest critic, and ungrateful friend" Willis was then advised to live on, repeating his accustomed follies.

Strut out thy fleeting hour upon the stage,  
Amidst the hisses of the passing age.<sup>46</sup>

Finally Snelling exhorted his victim to continue his writing, since despite low credit some hope remained, particularly as Willis seemed to write better for having had his epidermis pricked.

About certain poets Snelling had difficulty in deciding whether praise or censure should triumph in his estimate. Thus the young Whittier, then the author only of insignificant pieces like "The Sicilian Vespers,"<sup>47</sup> was reproved for his youthful conceit in pronouncing editorially. He

. . . . . , with God-only-knows-how-gotten light,  
Informs the nation what is wrong or right.  
On men and things alike his strictures fall,  
The self-appointed judge decides on all.<sup>48</sup>

What especially provoked Snelling was that Whittier, then editor of the *American Manufacturer*, a Boston newspaper, should use his editorial chair as a pulpit, the more so since the youthful journalist had secured what training was his in a desultory and accidental fashion. James Gates Percival was also something of a puzzle to the satirist, his work, half wheat and half chaff, being strangely and yet not unwholesomely mixed. Snelling was alive to Percival's faults, but appreciated his devotion to poetry and his rare success in transcending the achievements of his contemporaries.

Diffuse, long-winded, feeble, out of joint,  
Some of his verses lack both edge and point.  
The rest for many a mortal sin atone;  
Such even Bryant might be proud to own.<sup>49</sup>

In a footnote Snelling explained that Percival's lack of popularity might be accounted for by his poetic pride, "which will not allow him

In reply Snelling declared that he hated to be in debt, and struck off three epigrams which match Willis's in both wit and vulgarity. I quote the best:

Our tails?—thou own'st, then, to a tail—  
I've scann'd thee o'er and o'er;  
But though I guess'd thy species right  
I was not *sure* before.

<sup>46</sup>*Truth*, I, 15.

<sup>47</sup>This is the only Whittier poem printed by Samuel Kettell in his *Specimens of American Poetry* (Boston, 1829), III, 373-5.

<sup>48</sup>*Truth*, I, 33.

<sup>49</sup>*Truth*, I, 43.

to descend to cater for the prevailing taste. He will not deviate from his own standard of excellence, and what is worse, will bestow no care on his pieces." The critic believed that Percival had genuine talent but that he was degrading his muse by refusing to discipline it.

Among the multitude of dabblers in numbers whom Snelling thought it his duty to castigate he perceived a very, very few who seemed to have drunk of the divine source. These were, in ascending order, Brainard, Halleck, and Bryant. Brainard's early death, another victim of consumption, deprived America, Snelling declared, of a first-rate artist. But in addition to fighting the dread disease the poet suffered from public neglect, so much so that only a few men of taste and judgment realized what the country had lost in his passing. Brainard remained true, however, to his muse.

With faltering hand his master harp he strung,  
While music echoed from his dying tongue,  
Then winged his passage to a higher sphere,  
To seek the glory we denied him here.<sup>50</sup>

In a footnote Snelling was even more specifically laudatory. Brainard, he said,

wrote under every disadvantage, and, as might be expected, the faults of his writings were neither few nor small. At the same time he had the stamina of poetry. Had he received encouragement sufficient to awaken his energies, his name would have lived forever. He was wholly unconscious of his own strength, and threw off his best pieces without hesitation or premeditation. To this carelessness his literary faults must be attributed.<sup>51</sup>

Snelling accorded the poet an additional tribute in the 1832 edition of *Truth*, in which Brainard was adjured to rest peacefully despite the lack of a marble memorial.

Though not in graven brass thy praises shine,  
A nobler epitaph, sweet bard, is thine:  
Still be the sod where others moulder known  
By such memorials—Brainard rear'd his own.<sup>52</sup>

Fitz Greene Halleck, the "bard of Bozzaris," was one of Snelling's favorite poets, one who, he claimed in his enthusiasm, made Yankee scribblers jealous and Britons imitative. Indeed it was such verse as Halleck's that made the importation of poetry from abroad unnecessary.

<sup>50</sup>*Truth*, I, 22.

<sup>51</sup>*Truth*, I, 21.

<sup>52</sup>*Truth*, II, 38.

T is he whose strong-winged genius never halts;  
 We love him better for his very faults;  
 For faults in Halleck's glowing measure run:  
 So spots obscure the surface of the sun.  
 Still the hot spirit, the pervading soul  
 Breathes through each number, and redeems the whole.<sup>53</sup>

Snelling felt that the national honor made it imperative for Halleck to write more, not to languish in the sinecure provided him by John Jacob Astor. His apostrophe to the poet ended with the significant line, "T is pity one like thee so long should sleep."<sup>54</sup>

But the climax of *Truth*, if the term is pertinent here, is the praise meted William Cullen Bryant. Bryant, as we have seen, loomed large on the critic's horizon. And when Snelling called the roll of poets and scribblers, "The last and greatest name remains alone."<sup>55</sup> The poet in fact produced nothing but spun gold; he was "the brightest star that lights our hemisphere."

Clear, smooth, and strong, with classic beauty graced,  
 He writes no line his friends could wish effaced.<sup>56</sup>

The satire was of course no place for an elaborate analysis of Bryant's merits and demerits, such as Snelling was to write in the *North American Review*, but he made it eminently clear that in his estimation Bryant ranked head and shoulders above all the bards whom Samuel Kettell chose to embalm for posterity. The poet not only lacked the insincerity and flatulence for which Snelling so belabored his rivals, but he had inherited the true poetic fire: About Bryant's position on Olympus there could be no doubt.

With the New England poet Snelling concluded his long account of his versifying contemporaries. He had thumped each lout he meant to thump in honest anger, feeling that the mediocrity and affectation of the times required stern measures. Personally he had no fear. Neither reprisal nor a venal press could intimidate him. Finally, he reiterated the statements of his preface and considered himself justified:

To those who listen to my humble lay,  
 Untouched and unattempted, this I say;  
 No private malice on my course propelled,  
 No anger spurred me, and no fear withheld;  
 In these my strictures on my fellow men,  
 TRUTH held the light, and CONSCIENCE drove the pen.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>53</sup>*Truth*, I, 31.

<sup>54</sup>*Truth*, I, 32. In the edition of 1832 this line was altered to read: "While Paulding wakes and writes, shall Halleck sleep?" (*Truth*, II, 47).

<sup>55</sup>*Truth*, I, 50.

<sup>56</sup>*Truth*, I, 50.

<sup>57</sup>*Truth*, I, 52.

Considering the obscurity into which Snelling has fallen today one may find it hard to realize that three separate issues of *Truth* appeared. And because of the bibliographical problems involved I have thought it necessary to distinguish them as carefully as possible.<sup>58</sup> The first edition, printed by Stephen Foster, was published in Boston in 1831. This was a thin duodecimo, numbering vi plus 52 pages. Later in the same year appeared a tall octavo volume inscribed "Second Edition" and "Printed for the Author," Boston again being the place of publication.<sup>59</sup> Then in 1832 B. B. Mussey published in Boston a duodecimo volume entitled *Truth* and marked "Second Edition." This was bulkier than either of the other issues, the pages numbering v plus 72; obviously it contained a considerable amount of new material. A clue to the mystery is afforded by Snelling's note to his "Preface To The Second Edition," a note omitted from the octavo, privately printed volume: "A new edition of *Truth* was printed some time since, but was so badly executed that the author was obliged to suppress it. He hopes the statement of this fact will be sufficient apology for the delay."<sup>60</sup> In other words, Snelling disclaimed the second 1831 edition of his satire because of shoddy workmanship and considered the 1832 volume as the genuine second edition. An examination of the octavo volume reveals ample cause for his complaint: many typographical errors, omission of capitals and italics, and a few bad rhymes and awkward phrases (afterward deleted) for which he could not conscientiously blame the printer.

Collating the 1831 and 1832 editions of *Truth* one discovers some interesting discrepancies although there are no major alterations; the chief difference is the addition of new material. In general Snelling retained what he had originally written. Whatever reason he had in 1831 for disguising the names of his victims he later deemed invalid, however, for in the reissue the complete name is everywhere printed without asterisks or omitted letters. The second edition, moreover, contains the names of Washington Allston, Hannah Gould, Longfellow, and Holmes, while Isaac McLellan is omitted.<sup>61</sup> As a result of these

<sup>58</sup>I am indebted to Professor Howard Mumford Jones for aid in clarifying the various issues of *Truth*.

<sup>59</sup>Because of the difference in size, the pagination is different. This volume also contains a page of errata which is elsewhere missing.

<sup>60</sup>*Truth*, II, 8.

<sup>61</sup>Although Kettell printed three poems by Longfellow in *Specimens of American Poetry*, Snelling ignored their author in the first edition of *Truth*. Later he re-

changes some of the lines of the earlier edition were later transposed and a few transitional passages were added. The tone of these supplementary passages is, if anything, a little less caustic than that of the original. One observes too, especially in the footnotes, that Snelling was not deaf to the protests and denunciations that had been voiced after the first appearance of the satire, and that as a consequence he often added lines or explanations to the initial portrait. But, and this is a crucial point, he never altered the original estimate, violent and bitter as it may have been. For Snelling was not one to apologize gracefully. In the preface to the second edition of *Truth* he remarked:

Nothing is farther from the intention of the author of *Truth* than to offer aught like apology for any part of the contents of his first edition. He could not condescend to deprecate the enmity of his maligners, even did he hold them in less contempt than he does. He has had abuse enough to satisfy a moderate appetite already, and he expects more.

He also repeated his denial of such motives as vanity and personal animosity. If his tone was malicious, he argued, the objects of his attacks richly merited what they got.

In one further way does the second edition of *Truth* differ from the original. Snelling added a verse prologue, in dramatic guise; the scene was the author's garret, the *dramatis personae* the Author and a Friend. The argument of this prologue was the attempt of the Friend to dissuade the Author from attacking with such vehemence and to urge him not only to temper his criticism but to bestow praise wherever he could. The Author himself, the Friend remarked, might have some youthful indiscretions which were better hidden. Could he not show tolerance? But the Author, impetuous and strong-minded, refused to desist. He did not deny that he himself lived in a glass house but he professed himself able to handle the stones cast by his neighbors. Otherwise,

I wish, indeed, some abler hand than mine  
Would vindicate our country and the Nine;  
But since none offers, since I stand alone,  
Corago! be the thankless task my own.<sup>62</sup>

*Truth* did not pass unnoticed in its own day. Among writers who either worshipped devoutly and blindly at European shrines or encour-

---

fered to Longfellow as a worthy addition (*Truth*, II, 69) and paid Holmes a neat compliment (*Truth*, II, 70):

... the muses' youngest son,  
Equal'd by few, surpass'd by none, not one—  
A dawn of worth, in whose meridian blaze  
Bryant with effort shall retain his bays.

<sup>62</sup>*Truth*, II, 17.

aged native genius indiscriminately, Snelling, with his biting candor, was a *rara avis* which could not be overlooked. One reviewer, although admitting that the satire contained a certain amount of truth, deprecated its scurrilousness. "There is sometimes a coarseness in the language that seems to be unmannerly,—unnecessarily or carelessly indecorous,—which is more offensive to good taste and to the subject on which the castigation is inflicted, than all the wounds it makes." The author was accused of using "more wit than justice" in his depictions and of choosing weapons a good deal more deadly than were actually required. Furthermore, the reviewer thought that Snelling had handled some of the "clerical gentlemen," notably Pierpont, too roughly.<sup>63</sup> In another notice, also anonymous, *Truth* was censured severely and its author derided as a person who wanted both taste and judgment.

We find little in Mr. Snelling's book which shows him to be a good judge of poetry, and much that proves the contrary. Some of the noblest of our poets he praises; all the meanest he satirizes; but it requires no great acuteness to do this; he has simply followed the voice of public opinion.<sup>64</sup>

The critic advised Snelling to go to school to Horace and Juvenal and to remember that vulgarity was hardly a fit substitute for genuine wit.<sup>65</sup> In fine the reviewer admitted that Snelling had talent but condemned him for prostituting that very talent, and urged him to mend his ways in the future.<sup>66</sup> The publisher S. G. Goodrich also referred to the satire. Although Snelling, in his estimation, sought chiefly notoriety, he could write with force and skill. *Truth*, Goodrich declared, "was little more than a string of abuse without regard to justice; yet it was executed with point and vigor, and as it attacked everybody who had written verses, it caused a good deal of wincing."<sup>67</sup> At least one foreign observer was impressed by Snelling's arraignment of his contemporaries, for Captain Frederick Marryat praised him strongly as the author of "the very best satirical poem I ever read by an American, full of force, and remarkable for energetic versification."<sup>68</sup>

<sup>63</sup> *New-England Magazine* (March, 1832), II, 267. We have already seen Snelling's reaction to this criticism.

<sup>64</sup> *The American Monthly Review* (May, 1832), I, 408.

<sup>65</sup> *Idem*, p. 410.

<sup>66</sup> *Idem*, p. 412.

<sup>67</sup> Goodrich, *Recollections of a Lifetime*, p. 705.

<sup>68</sup> Frederick Marryat, *A Diary in America* (London, 1839), First Series, II, 282.

Of all the notices that Snelling received, however, that by Oliver Wendell Holmes was at once the friendliest and the most perceptive. Like the other reviewers Holmes thought that the satirist had exceeded good taste, yet could not fail to admit the unusual vigor of the strictures. Moreover, he believed that such castigation had its effect in reprobating sleazy performances and in stimulating improvement.

What dreadful work Snelling made among those slight reputations, floating in swollen tenuity on the surface of the stream, and mirroring each other in reciprocal reflections! Violent, abusive as he was, unjust to any against whom he happened to have a prejudice, his castigation of the small *litterateurs* of that day was not harmful, but rather of use.<sup>69</sup>

Willis, for example, was possibly in need of some such prodding as he got from Snelling; Holmes argued Jesuitically that if the end did not justify, it at least explained the means.<sup>70</sup> He also observed that Snelling performed a slighter service; he indicated to posterity what small appreciation of poetry our forefathers had and how many slender bubbles of reputation, gay with prismatic colors, were floating half a century ago (Holmes wrote in 1885).<sup>71</sup>

It might be alleged that the final effect of *Truth* is weakened because the majority of the poets assailed therein were such mediocrities. The charge, in fact, could not be denied. Most of the scribblers whom Snelling attacked have grown so obscure that there are many libraries today on whose shelves their works find no place. But it must be remembered that in general the victims of *Dunciads* are indeed humble residents on the slopes of Mount Olympus. The vigor and effect of a satire are not to be contravened by the relative unimportance of its objects. Another possible weakness is the ill-temper which, despite the author's denial, seems so obvious. There was certainly need for such an indictment of meretricious work as *Truth* afforded, but neither the personal abuse nor the violence was indispensable. Not only guilty of excessive egoism, Snelling evinced the same inability to control his temper that had once made his father feared in the garrison. As a result, *Truth* is marked by a certain splenetic force which, if it makes for interest, adds little to the artistic effect. Hatred may be an essential weapon in the arsenal of the satirist but it is not the only weapon.

<sup>69</sup>Holmes, *A Mortal Antipathy*, pp. 7-8.

<sup>70</sup>*Idem*, p. 8.

<sup>71</sup>*Idem*, p. 6.

On the other hand, Snelling had gusto, a quality which was rarer in the 1830's than it is today, and a penetrating eye which detected at once faults and virtues. Critics like H. L. Mencken have made us forget how anemic much of the earlier criticism was. Even today the thrusts with which Snelling impaled his victims retain their edge. Nor did he want perception. Years before Poe flayed the Broadway literati Snelling wrote scorchingly about the poetasters who preened themselves in public and he indicted American poets almost *in toto* for a want of discipline. Halleck, Brainard, and Percival in particular he criticized for failing to revise or perfect their lines, arguing that in each case the besetting sin was carelessness. Moreover, although we should hardly attach such importance to Halleck and Percival as Snelling did in 1831, his verdicts have been substantially those of posterity. The satirist had the vision and critical power to filter the mass of writers then courting public favor and to isolate the chosen few whom Americans have not allowed to perish. Not only did he do this, but he phrased his estimates in heroic couplets which, if they lack Dryden's finish and subtlety, have a sting all their own.

Indeed it is hard to see why Snelling's name has been so completely forgotten. Ignored by the anthologists he has also been ignored by students of our national criticism.<sup>72</sup> Thus Van Wyck Brooks in his brilliant recent survey of New England personalities remarks that Boston was full of petty bards who were generally overpraised and whom no critic before Lowell and Poe had the courage to treat as they deserved.<sup>73</sup> On the contrary, Snelling had literary and critical ability of a high order. If it was his misfortune to exercise it chiefly on writers who have since faded into oblivion, he has at least left a satire which is a worthy forerunner of *A Fable for Critics*. American literary criticism may not have reached full maturity until Lowell and Poe but these men certainly did not lack predecessors, and among them the name of William Joseph Snelling deserves to stand high.

<sup>72</sup>Evert A. Duyckinck and George L. Duyckinck fail to mention Snelling at all in their *Cyclopaedia of American Literature* (New York, 1856). R. W. Griswold in his *Poets and Poetry of America* (Philadelphia, 1842) refers to him only as the author of a poem on a Sioux legend. Snelling is likewise omitted in George B. Cheever's *The Poets of America* (Hartford, 1852). In the hands of more recent critics he fares no better. Charvat, as we have seen, ignores him; so do George E. DeMille in his *Literary Criticism in America* (New York, 1931) and Alfred Kreymborg in *A History of American Poetry* (New York, 1934).

<sup>73</sup>Van Wyck Brooks, *The Flowering of New England* (New York, 1936), p. 158. See also other passages, notably pp. 159, 321.

## THE HAMLET FIRST QUARTO PIRATE

By HENRY DAVID GRAY

Stanford University

Mr. A. S. Cairncross has builded better than he knew. He has written a book<sup>1</sup> with the purpose of showing, primarily, that we must readjust our whole idea of the Shakespearean chronology, and what he has really shown is something entirely different from that and of high value. I cannot in a brief paper go into the argument in its details, but I trust I am not unjust if I say that the whole case depends upon the contention that the *Ur-Hamlet* was not Kyd's but Shakespeare's own, and that the proof of this is made by Mr. Cairncross to depend upon the fact that the pirate who provided the play as we have it in Q<sub>1</sub> was presumably an actor who was indebted to the parts he played for the non-Shakespearean matter which he put into that much discussed Bad Quarto. We may well agree that the parallels between Q<sub>1</sub> and *The Spanish Tragedy* may be adequately accounted for on the hypothesis that the pirate had recently played Lorenzo in Kyd's drama, and that these parallels do not imply Kyd's authorship of any part of Q<sub>1</sub>. But the idea that the non-Shakespearean verse of Q<sub>1</sub> was taken from Kyd's *Hamlet* had already been pretty generally discarded without in the least upsetting the natural belief that Kyd wrote the *Hamlet* to which Nash refers in 1589, and that Shakespeare had used it as a source play. We would think this even if Q<sub>1</sub> had never been published. What the pirate did afterwards to Shakespeare's *Hamlet* has nothing to do with it.

So it was not necessary for Mr. Cairncross to force back to an impossible time all the other plays in which the pirate had acted; and in bringing together the echoes from these plays he has gone far toward proving that the pirate was with the Chamberlain's company in 1598-99, and with the Admiral's men in 1601. For though the echoes from an individual play might in most cases be disregarded, the large number from a group of plays belonging together cannot be set aside as

---

<sup>1</sup>*The Problem of Hamlet*, by A. S. Cairncross. 1936.

due to mere coincidence. *2 Henry IV*, *Henry V* and *Merry Wives*, from which Mr. Cairncross draws largely, were all of 1598-99; and the three parts of *Henry VI*, which are also in evidence, were almost certainly revived in connection with them. The *Henry V* Epilogue would not refer to plays gone and forgotten so many years before. There is little or no reason to doubt that Shakespeare added the Temple Garden scene to *1 Henry VI* for this occasion, and indeed he may then have done whatever he did to that old play to bring it into line with the whole sequence. It would be almost inevitable that some touching up of *2* and *3 Henry VI* would also be done, for old plays were always (so far as we can judge) freshened with something that the audience would then relish, while the more old-fashioned matter was revamped or eliminated.<sup>2</sup> The one unescapable echo from *Twelfth Night*, though 1601 is not too late for it to come into the Q<sub>1</sub> *Hamlet*, may have been due to a 1598-99 performance of that play in an earlier version than we now have it.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup>It would be entirely consistent with what we know of the busy and valuable Shakespeare, hard at work on things of greater consequence, if he readily consented to such a touching-up by some less gifted associate. This would account for some things in *2 Henry VI* which do not seem quite like him, and complicates the relationship of the "Bad" *Contention* and *True Tragedy* to the plays from which they were derived.

<sup>3</sup>I cannot believe that Shakespeare would give the subtitle *What You Will* to a romantic comedy which had nothing to do with the War of the Theatres immediately after Marston had used it for a Theatre War play, though he might retain the original title as a subtitle for the purpose of identification. I have noted evidences of revision in *T.N.* (*Original Version of LLL*, supplement on *LLW*), and though I have withdrawn the conclusion I there reached, the fact that the play was revised still seems evident to me. Scholars have often noted that Jonson in *E.M.O.* (1599) distinctly suggests *T.N.* in the speech: "That the argument of his comedy might have been of some other nature, as of a duke to be in love with a countess, and that countess to be in love with the duke's son, and the son to love the lady's waiting-maid; some such cross wooing, with a clown to their servingman." Jonson was not so crude as to make the correspondence exact, though it may have been nearer to an earlier version of *T.N.* In II, 1, of the same play Jonson has the following bit of dialogue:

*Punt.* Of what years is the knight, fair damsel?  
*Gent.* Faith, much about your years, sir.  
*Punt.* What complexion, or what stature bears he?  
*Gent.* Of your stature, and very near upon your complexion.  
*Punt.* Mine is melancholy . . .  
*Car.* 'Slud, he takes an inventory of his own good parts . . .  
*Punt.* Most debonair, and lucent lady . . .

In a play by Jonson in which references to contemporary dramatists are a feature, these cannot be ignored. We must remember that it has also: "I might be a

The other plays of Shakespeare in which Mr. Cairncross finds parallels need not detain us long. The echoes from *King John* are faint and far away, but there is no reason why an old memory may not have lingered on.<sup>4</sup> Those from *Othello*, if we are to regard them as significant, would be as fatal to the present hypothesis as to that of Mr. Cairncross, since we are practically unanimous in dating *Othello* 1604, unless we fall back on the usual alternative and pronounce Shakespeare in this instance the debtor to his pirate. Absurd as that seems at first blush, it is not impossible. Shakespeare must have felt intense indignation and anger when the 1603 quarto came out and he saw what had been done to his masterpiece. It would not be surprising if some phrases from it clung to his memory as he went on with his tragedy of *Othello*. These parallels, however, are not particularly significant. *Pericles*, to complete the list, was an old play revised by Shakespeare. I have called attention to the fact that it was thinly overlaid by him in the earlier part of V, 1, from which Mr. Cairncross derives an echo.<sup>5</sup>

Let us now consider the non-Shakespearean plays cited by Mr. Cairncross. The one word "clouts" from Chapman's *Humourous Day's Mirth*<sup>6</sup> I must set aside as not sufficient to show that the pirate acted in that play. With *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Edward II* the evidence

---

justice of peace. Ay, and a constable for your wit." "As reason long since is fled to animals, you know." "Et tu, Brute." "Let the word be, *Not without mustard.*" "This is a kinsman to justice Silence." "As fat as sir John Falstaff."

<sup>4</sup>The dating of *John* is a difficult matter. In Act I the percentage of feminine endings is fairly high, but the rest of the play falls below the percentage in any other drama of Shakespeare. So far as this one "test" is concerned, we can say only that the contrast is sufficient to warrant a reconsideration of the date. In *LLL*, if I am not mistaken, the presence side by side of earlier and later work has led to a dating to which neither the earlier nor later work belongs.

<sup>5</sup>I seize this opportunity to disclaim some (but not all) of the things I said in my paper on "Heywood's *Pericles* Revised by Shakespeare" (*PMLA*, XL, 507) though my disclaimer does not touch the particular point in question. As a warning to others against over-confidence in parallels as an authorship test, I might remark that mine were as numerous and as close as those usually offered in such a case. Noticing similarities between I, 4, and II, 1 and 2 of *Pericles* and some of the earlier plays of Heywood, I read those scenes as Heywood's, and I still read them so. Now when one takes the impression of a certain style into his consciousness he will usually read on with this impression still in his mind. This may explain how it was that the late Mr. Robertson was able to read more and more of Shakespeare as Chapman's, and how Mr. Sykes could read *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* as Massinger's. Lowell thought it would be forever impossible to distinguish Beaumont from Fletcher, because his eyes had not been opened to the obvious differences between them. Wilhelm Wundt accounted for the reading over of a typographical error without seeing it as due to our really seeing what was already in our minds.

<sup>6</sup>Acted by the Admiral's men in 1597 and published in 1599.

is worth serious attention.<sup>7</sup> If we regard it as convincing, it leads to the natural conclusion that the pirate was acting with the Admiral's company in the late autumn and early winter of 1601. On Sept. 25, 1601, Henslowe paid Jonson for his first additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*. On Nov. 20, 1601, he bought from Alleyn the play *Mortimer*. So good a play as *Edward II* would need little revision to satisfy Henslowe, and we need not assume that Alleyn had any other play on this subject to sell to his father-in-law.<sup>8</sup> Henslowe had *all the rest* of Marlowe's plays.

But it was surely at the very time when the Admiral's men were giving *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Mortimer* that the Chamberlain's men were giving *Hamlet*! The pirate could not be with both companies at the same time. Two men must therefore have been engaged in the task. This is precisely what I have maintained from the start. I have contended<sup>9</sup> that the actor who appeared as Marcellus in Act I, the Second Player in Acts II and III, and who was used as a supernumerary in the rest of the play, wrote out from memory what he could, and that his report was so poor in the scenes in which he did not appear that his work had to be put into presentable shape by a hack poet. The concensus of critical opinion has sustained my view except that the actor and the revising playwright have usually been merged into a single thief. Sir E. K. Chambers, for example, combatting the variations introduced by Mr. Dover Wilson, comes back to precisely my original position except that he combines the Marcellus actor with the revising hack dramatist. The reason I would not have done so, if it had occurred to me at the time (which it did not), is that M (as I have called this actor) seems to have had no idea of the nature of blank verse. In other parts than his own (which he learned from his part as written) he goes wildly astray. The revising

<sup>7</sup>I might add another to the list. In the "To be or not to be" soliloquy Q1 has the outrageous line,

No, to sleep, to dream, ay, marry, there it goes.

It helps us to understand how any human being could put in such a line in such a place if we realize that the pirate in acting *Edward II* had exclaimed (in I, 4, when they talk of depositing him) "Ay, there it goes!"

<sup>8</sup>Chambers suggests (*William Shakespeare*, I, 148) that the Chamberlain's may also have produced *S.T.* since Burbadge had acted in it. But it seems probable that Burbadge's connection with it was at a much earlier time, and that the Chamberlain's company respected the ownership of the Admiral's. Chambers immediately goes on to oppose the idea that such ownership was not usually respected.

<sup>9</sup>"The First Quarto *Hamlet*," *MLR*, x, 171; "Thomas Kyd and the First Quarto of *Hamlet*," *PMLA*, XLII, 721.

and a serious split in their ranks. This faction seems to have held together. Dr. Greg writes: "Now when the Chamberlain's men moved to the Globe in 1599, four of the company, Kemp, Beeston, Duke and Pallant, separated themselves from the rest and reappear among Worcester's men in 1602."<sup>13</sup> There may have been others as well. Kemp went abroad; but John Duke borrowed money of Henslowe on Sept. 21, 1600; so he was no doubt with the Admiral's men before joining Worcester's; and the others may also have been picked up by Henslowe. If X was one of these men he quite possibly brought the stolen *Hamlet* to Worcester's company.

Before 1602 Worcester's men had been playing in the provinces. In that year they probably reorganized, and acted in London. After August 17 they were at the Rose under Henslowe's management. Their provincial tours for 1602-03 as given in Murray's *Dramatic Companies* are:

Apr. 3, '02—Aug. 18, '03, Leicester (twice)  
Dec. 20, '02—Nov. 27, '03, Coventry (twice), Barnstaple.

Now the Bad Quarto of *Hamlet* was obviously intended to deceive the purchasers, and the title page was a part of that deception. Its statement that this is Shakespeare's *Hamlet* as given by his Highness's servants in the city of London, "as also in the two Vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxford, and else-where," has, I think deceived us as well. The man who had this stolen play and sold it to Ling would probably not have known whether or not the company from which he stole it had produced the true *Hamlet* at Cambridge and Oxford. What he would know was that *his* company had played *Hamlet* in the University towns, and he would have no scruples in putting that down as playing at the two Universities. It is surely not Shakespeare's but the thieving company for whose travels we must search.<sup>14</sup> I have not access to the records which may possibly reveal the names of the companies which visited both the University towns in 1602-03; but I note that in 1603-04 Worcester's (then Queen Anne's) men were given "the unusually large sum of forty shillings" not to play at Oxford.<sup>15</sup>

It is possible that the entry of *Hamlet* on the Stationers' Register, July 26, 1602, by Roberts, the company's printer, was an attempt to

<sup>13</sup>Henslowe Papers, p. 133.

<sup>14</sup>A reference in *Hamlet* itself to the company's travels could not refer to a tour in which *Hamlet* was given.

<sup>15</sup>Boas, *Shakespeare and the Universities*, p. 18.

hack poet was a fluent versifier and rhymster, who was careless enough to leave his lines faulty when his material did not readily lend itself to correct and easy verse, but I can find no reason for supposing that with a speech already metrical as he had it in his memory he would set it down as anything else than the blank verse that it was.<sup>10</sup> M seems to have been a heavy and stupid person, who made crude mistakes with words he did not understand: invelmorable for invulnerable, ceremonies for cerements, Plato for Plautus, guise for gules; the revising poet was a facile and trivial writer who apparently dodged difficulties instead of stumbling over them. He has no such mistakes as those just cited, and their appearance in Q<sub>1</sub> is apparently due to his turning in M's pages when they would do well enough for the purpose.

This revising poet, X, if the parallels given by Mr. Cairncross are sufficient evidence, had been a member of the Chamberlain's company in 1599, in which year the *Merry Wives* and *Henry V* had been acted. Both were stolen and, like *Hamlet*, cut down into acting versions with a great deal of technical skill. Compared with Shakespeare's dramas as we know them, all three are outrageous; but we must admit that for the purpose of a thieving company they are surprisingly well done. If X was guilty in the case of either of these earlier thefts, he was a logical choice for the *Hamlet*, and he certainly would not be in the cast of that drama.

Among the "Principal Comedians" in *Every Man in his Humour* were Christopher Beeston and John Duke, who left the company, Chambers suggests, conceivably "as a result of some disagreement," and he asks in a footnote, "Is it possible that they sold the company's plays?"<sup>11</sup> I had also wondered as to that. It is certain that the theft of two plays would be thoroughly investigated and the guilty men discharged. Dr. Greg has shown in his edition of the Bad Quarto of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* that the actor of the "merry Host" was a culprit in this case, and I have supplemented this with a charge against Kemp as his confederate.<sup>12</sup> *Henry V* was not stolen by an actor in the cast. The book-holder might conceivably have done it. Apparently there was a dissatisfied faction in the Chamberlain's men,

<sup>10</sup>He might start a passage with a full line where the original started with a half line, and so continue for a time with verse differently divided, as happens often in the Bad Quarto of *Henry V*; but it would still be blank verse that he set down.

<sup>11</sup>William Shakespeare, I, 80.

<sup>12</sup>"The Rôles of William Kemp," *MLR*, xxv, 261.

only that Shakespeare *as a person* was a subject of conversation in the family after William Beeston was old enough to have it impressed upon his mind. The fact would have come out, I think, and been somewhat discussed when Marston's *What You Will* introduced a pedant with Holofernes and Nathaniel among his boys.<sup>18</sup> The story seems to me to deserve more credit than is sometimes given it. Such Stratford traditions and yarns as the killing of a calf in high style and making a speech, or the deer-stealing episode, are of the very stuff that townsmen tell; but there was no occasion for the invention of a lie of this particular sort.

It does not follow that the hack dramatist and mediocre poet who worked over the stolen *Hamlet* was the same hack dramatist and mediocre poet who did a similar task with one or two other stolen plays, even if he was with the Chamberlain's company when those plays were stolen. I find nothing in the plays themselves to indicate identity of authorship. Beeston and Pallant were both mediocre poets, judging by the verses they contributed to Heywood's *Apology for Actors*; but again I find nothing in those verses to arouse suspicion—unless it is that Beeston goes out of his way to talk about his own virtue; I am always a little suspicious of anyone who does that. It does not follow that because Kemp (if I am right about it) was one of those who sold the company's plays,<sup>19</sup> the others who left with him and then reappeared with him in Worcester's company were the other guilty men. But if not, we must suppose that these men left for some other reason, and some other men left for that reason at just that time.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>18</sup>See my letter, "Schoolmaster Shakespeare" in *TLS*, Feb. 5, 1931.

<sup>19</sup>August 22, 1602, Henslowe gave Kemp five shillings "to buy buckram to make a pair of giant's hose." One wonders if Kemp appeared again as Falstaff with his stolen version of the *Merry Wives*. But the attitude of the authorities toward Worcester's company must be taken into account before any of my suggestions can be fairly considered.

<sup>20</sup>It may be said that M was caught and discharged while stealing *Hamlet*, and that this would account both for the inferiority of the latter part of Q<sub>1</sub> and for his presence immediately afterwards among the Admiral's men. It is certain that the play was still being acted when he did his work, for otherwise he could not have secured the small part of Voltimand, which he had either in the original or a careful transcript. We have no echoes by which to place him between 1599 and the autumn of 1601. This would make possible the identification of M and X. But if Mr. Cairncross is right in giving X such rôles as Lorenzo in *S.T.* and the King in *Edward II*, he must have been an outstanding actor and would not have been assigned such a combination of rôles as was given to M.

defend the ownership by copyright, in order to prevent a production of the stolen play thereafter, and especially in London. I do not think there is warrant for believing that it was the stolen *Hamlet* which Roberts entered.<sup>16</sup> If it had not been done on the company's sanction, it would probably have been made provisional, as in Roberts' entry of *The Merchant of Venice*, in 1600.

Mr. Cairncross, then, has shown us, somewhat in his own despite, that the hack dramatist and versifier who put *Hamlet* into the form in which we find it in the First Quarto, based upon M's rendition of it, may possibly have been the actor who did a similar task with the *Merry Wives* or with *Henry V*, or with both. One of the *Merry Wives* thieves, as I have said, played the Host's part. This man, Kemp tells us, in the "Humble Request" appended to his *Nine Days' Wonder*, was "a penny poet." He was, though a married man, extremely youthful in 1600, and his father also had a part in the *Merry Wives*. It seems that the young scalawag, probably under the guise of horseplay, had taken advantage of his rôle to cuff or trip the old man. This must be what Kemp means by saying that "his mother-in-law was eye and ear witness of his father's abuse by this blessed child on a public stage, in a merry Host of an Inn's part." Robert Beeston, who appears with Worcester's men in 1603 and died in 1615, might conceivably have been this abused father. Records of 1604-1611 show the baptism of Christopher's children; and his son William, the Restoration actor, may have been younger yet. Christopher Beeston, therefore, was apparently of about the age of the actor of the Host's part, and could scarcely have been Kit in the plot of the *Seven Deadly Sins*. (Duke and Pallant, who are included in this plot, must have been older men.)<sup>17</sup> Augustine Phillips in his will (1605) includes Beeston as his "servant," which seems to mean that he had been Phillips' apprentice till he grew beyond it; but it is a strong point in his defense that he is included in that will. I wish to emphasize this, because it goes directly against my argument. In handing down to his son the information that Shakespeare was in his younger years a schoolmaster in the country, Beeston shows neither hostility nor friendliness, but

<sup>16</sup>That Ling published the stolen play and the next year the true and perfect copy should be considered in connection with the fact that Nathaniel Butter published both the "Bad" First Part of Heywood's *If You Know Not Me* and the "Good" Second Part.

<sup>17</sup>Fleay in his *Chronicle History*, probably on the basis of that plot, gives all three as Strange's men in 1592, and records Beeston as in the Chamberlain's company 1594-98.

The same night the Miners were set to worke againe, who by the second day after had wrought very well into the foundation of the wall. Against which time the companies aforesayd being in readinesse for both places . . . fire was given to the traine of the mine, which blew up halfe the tower under which the powder was planted. The assailants having in charge upon the effecting of the mine presently to give the assault, performed it accordingly: but too soone: for having entred the top of the breach, the other halfe of the tower, which with the first force of the powder was onely shaken and made loose, fell upon our men: under which were buried about twenty or thirty, then being under that part of the tower. This so amazed our men that stood in the breach, not knowing from whence that terror came, as they forsooke their Commanders, and left them among the ruines of the mine. . . Amongst them that the wall fell upon, was Captaine Sydenham pitifully lost; who having three or four great stones upon his lower parts, was held so fast, as neither himselfe could stirre, nor any reasonable company recover him. Notwithstanding the next day being found to be alive, there was ten or twelve lost in attempting to relieve him.<sup>5</sup>

Since it was the general opinion that the city was saved from capture by the sudden collapse of this wall, it is no wonder that the incident was remembered.

Donne's epigram, therefore, probably refers not to the campaign in which he was engaged but to the earlier one. Whether the incident was recalled by old campaigners with whom he associated on the 1596 expedition, or whether he himself had written the lines soon after the news of the original incident reached England, cannot be determined. But there is nothing in the epigram that could not have been written by a brilliant boy of seventeen, and the possibility that this may be the earliest poem Donne wrote that can be dated must not be ignored.

## II

In his 'Introductory Note' to the selection from Thomas Beedome's *Poems, Divine and Humane*, published by the Nonesuch Press, Mr. Francis Meynell singles out for praise an epigram on Sir Francis Drake which appears in Latin, with an English translation below it, on the verso of F6 of Beedome's octavo volume of 1641. The Latin epigram, as corrected by Mr. Meynell, and the English version are as follows:

*To the Noble Sr Francis Drake.*

*Drake, pererrati novit quem terminus orbis,  
Et cuius faciem vidit uterque polus:  
Si taceant homines facient te sidera notum;  
Sol nescit comitis non memor esse sui.*

<sup>5</sup>*Principal Navigations, Voyages, etc.* (Glasgow, 1903), vi, 489-490.

## BRIEF ARTICLES AND NOTES

### THREE METAPHYSICAL EPIGRAMS

#### I

In his edition of Donne's *Poems*, Sir Herbert Grierson, in commenting on the Epigrams, states:

The series of Epigrams *A burnt ship*, *Fall of a wall*, *A lame begger*, *Cales and Guyana*, *Sir John Wingfield* seem to me all to have been composed during the Cadiz expedition. . . . The *Fall of a wall* may mark an incident in the attack of the landing party which forced its way into the town.<sup>1</sup>

However, an incident in which the collapse of a wall had killed various English soldiers campaigning against Spain, which was remembered for some time after it occurred, happened not in the 1596 expedition against Cadiz, in which Donne took part, but in the earlier expedition of 1589 against Spain and Portugal. It was to this incident that Sir George Buc referred in 1614 when writing his sober commentary on *Doomsday Book*:

This Will L. Montchensty was very valiant & active, & served K. Ed. 1. in his warres in Wales, & he & some other noble & valiant English gentlemen were slayn an. dñi 1287. at the siege of the Castell of Droslan, by the sodayn fall of a wall w<sup>ch</sup> was vnd<sup>r</sup>mined, & fell befor the tyme appointed: as the wall at the Coruña in Spayn dyd vnd<sup>r</sup> the w<sup>ch</sup> many brave English soldiours wer sodainly overwhelmd serving und<sup>r</sup> the comand of S<sup>r</sup> Jon Noreis & S<sup>r</sup> fr. Drake añ. Dñi. 1589. sub Elizab. Regina.<sup>2</sup>

If any similar incident had occurred on the 1596 campaign we may be sure that Buc would have noted it and commented on it, for not only did he, like Donne, take part in the expedition, but, as Mr. Mark Eccles has shown,<sup>3</sup> he also wrote an account of it which was afterwards printed in Stow's *Annals*. The 1589 campaign is also described in Stow,<sup>4</sup> in an account abbreviated from that already printed by Hakluyt, which, being written by an eye-witness, is worth quoting from:

<sup>1</sup>II, 59.

<sup>2</sup>A Manuscript Work by Sir George Buc', *M. L. R.* xxx (1935), 7.

<sup>3</sup>C. J. Sisson, etc., *Thomas Lodge and other Elizabethans*, pp. 429-431.

<sup>4</sup>Ed. 1615, pp. 752-753.

## III

In my copy of the 1668 folio edition of Cowley's *Works* some verses have been added in a contemporary hand on a blank leaf at the end of the book. As they are not included in any edition of Cowley's poems, nor, as far as I know, have they been printed elsewhere, they seem to be worth recording:

Found in Mr Petits study. 1682.

In Petrum negantem.  
 Art thou, ye only Roc'k, wch X<sup>t</sup> did find  
 To build his church on, shook by every wind?  
 How shall yt Rock e're long stand firm alone  
 Wch doth yus easily lose it's Corner stone?  
 Of X<sup>t</sup> his little flock Oh! how shall he  
 Who thus denies ye Lamb ye Shepherd be?  
 p[er] Abr. Cowley.

"Mr Petit" I take to be William Petty (1641-1707) the antiquary, whose collection of manuscripts is preserved in the Library of the Inner Temple.

The Folger Shakespeare Library.

R. C. BALD.

## MERCUTIO AND SPENSER'S PHANTASTES

Nothing can be more certain than the fact, recently re-emphasized by Professor Kittredge,<sup>1</sup> that Mercutio is "one of the most original of all Shakespeare's characters." Mercutio is "barely foreshadowed" in Arthur Brooke, Boastua, and Painter: they describe him as "a courtier . . . highly had in prycce . . . coortious of . . . speche . . . pleasant of devise;" "a courtlyke gentleman very well be loved . . . by reason of his pleasaunt and curteous behavior."<sup>2</sup> In short, it is undeniable that "the elaboration of [Mercutio's] character and his wit are Shakespeare's."<sup>3</sup> I have not the least desire to question these facts, but I wish to call attention to the possibility that Shakespeare may have drawn suggestions for a touch or two in his portrait from a source not hitherto considered in this connection—that it to say, from *The Faerie Queene*. Apparently it has not previously been noticed that Mercutio, the prince of fantasy, blushes with identically the same "beetle brows" as Spenser's Phantastes, keeper of the cham-

<sup>1</sup>Complete Works of Shakespeare, 1936, p. 1006.

<sup>2</sup>I quote from Brooke and Painter, Furness Variorum *Romeo and Juliet*, p. 52.

<sup>3</sup>Neilson, Cambridge Poets *Shakespeare*, p. 834.

*The Translation.*

Drake, who the world hast conquer'd like a scrole;  
 Who saw'st the Articke, and Antarticke Pole;  
 If men were silent, starres would make thee knowne,  
 Phoebus forgets not his companion.

Another translation of the same epigram appeared in print only a year before the publication of Beedome's posthumous volume, and is to be found on D7 of *Witts Recreations* (1640), numbered 146:

*On Fr. Drake.*

Sir *Drake* [sic] whom well the world's end knew,  
 Which thou did'st compasse round,  
 And whom both Poles of heaven once saw  
 Which North and South do bound,  
  
 The stars above, would make thee known,  
 If men here silent were;  
 The Sun himself cannot forget  
 His fellow traveller.

The Latin epigram was, in fact, well known, and was not originally written by Beedome at all. It is a variant of a poem by the popular epigrammatist, John Owen, and first appeared in *Epigrammatum Ioannis Owen Cambro-Britanni Libri Tres* (1607) where it is no. 39 in Book II, and consists of six lines instead of four. It is there given as follows:

*Franciscus Drakus.*

Drake, pererrati nouit quem terminus orbis,  
 Quēque semel mundi vidit vtrūque latus;  
 Si taceant homines, facient te sidera notum;  
 Atque Polus de te disret vterque loqui.  
 Plus ultrā Herculeis inscribas, Drake, columnis;  
 Et, magno, dicas, Hercule maior Ego.

The four-line version probably obtained a wide circulation owing to its inclusion at the foot of the engraved frontispiece of *The World Encompassed by Sir Francis Drake . . . Carefully collected out of the notes of Master Francis Fletcher* (1628). Here the lines appear in a form closer to that known to Beedome than to the original, although the second line is "Et quem bis mundi vidit uteque Polus," and in the first line "perorati" is erroneously substituted for "pererrati." It only remains to add that Owen's epigrams were translated into English no less than four times during the seventeenth century, but these translators naturally followed Owen's fuller version, and not the shorter and more poetical one which had attracted Beedome and the anonymous translator of *Witts Recreations*.

word below—they also have their differences. Unlike Phantastes, for instance, Mercutio is choleric rather than melancholic. Yet his temperament leads him to just such an ending as that indicated for Phantastes. Both are born under "ill-disposed skies." In the warmth of the noonday, Mercutio, too hot in his moods, too incapable of reasoning calmly when offense is given, falls too ready a victim to "black fate"—the plague o' both your houses. And perhaps, as I have already intimated, the family resemblance between the two characters does not end here. Possibly it may be seen also in their progeny, the children of their fancy. At any rate, it would seem to appear in the sense of disillusionment, in the saddened second-thoughts with which their true progenitors—Spenser and Shakespeare themselves—bid them hail and farewell. Queen Mab is the fairest and perhaps the gayest of Mercutio's dream-children, but the Queen Mab speech closes on an almost solemn note. True, says Mercutio, in response to Romeo—Her elfin majesty is a frail dream-vision: insubstantial, begot of nothing but vain fantasy; as thin of substance, one might add, as the dream-children painted by Phantastes upon the walls of his chamber:

His chamber was dispainted all with in  
With sondry colours, in the which were writ  
*Infinite shapes of thinges dispersed thin,*  
Some such as in the world were never yit . . .  
*Such as in idle fantasies doe flit . . .*  
All those were *idle thoughtes and fantasies,*  
Devices, *dreames . . .* And all that fained is . . .<sup>10</sup>

Or, in Mercutio's words,—

True, I talk of *dreams;*  
Which are the *children of an idle brain,*  
*Begot of nothing but vain fantasy;*  
Which is *as thin of substance as the air,*  
And more inconstant than the wind, who wooes  
Even now the frozen bosom of the North  
And, being anger'd, puffs away from thence,  
Turning his face to the dew-dropping South.<sup>11</sup>

I do not mean to say that Mercutio was begot of nothing but vain Phantastes! *The Faerie Queene*, however, was one of the books "familiar to every Elizabethan who read anything,"<sup>12</sup> and the passages here discussed suggest that Shakespeare may have remembered something of it in creating Mercutio.

University of Tennessee

ALWIN THALER

<sup>10</sup>Stanzas 50-51.

<sup>11</sup>R. & J., I, iv, 96-103.

<sup>12</sup>Kittredge, p. 1195; cf. the writer's "Shakspere and Spenser," *Shakespeare Association Bulletin* (1935-36) X, 192-211; XI, 33-40.

ber of vain imaginings in the House of Alma,<sup>4</sup> and that these two bear certain other more or less curious if not deep-seated resemblances, physical and temperamental.

Spenser presents Phantastes sitting in the midst of the fantastic outpourings of his wit:

Emongst them all sate he which wonned there,  
That hight Phantastes by his nature trew,  
A man of yeares yet fresh, as mote appere,  
Of swarth complexion, and of crabbed hew,  
That him full of melancholy did shew;  
Bent hollow *beetle browes*, sharpe staring eyes,  
That mad or foolish seemd: one by his vew  
Mote deeme him borne with ill-disposed skyes  
When oblique Saturne sate in the house of agonies.<sup>5</sup>

I do not suggest that he and Mercutio are identical twins! And yet, so far as outward appearances go, the two surely have some interesting points in common. Both are "of yeares yet fresh" and of swarthy (melancholy or choleric) "complexion;" both are moody, sharp-eyed,<sup>6</sup> and beetle-browed.<sup>7</sup> They lack the mild, conventional graces of countenance. Both, if not positively ill-favored, are marked by such crabbed-hewed "deformities" of feature as might easily have enabled either of them to dispense with masks, even at a masquerade, where freakish false-faces are expected. "Give me a case to put my visage in?" says Mercutio as he refuses the mask offered him,—

A visor for a visor! What care I  
What curious eye doth quote deformities?  
Here are the *beetle brows* shall blush for me!<sup>8</sup>

Mercutio, of course, is no mere Phantastes. And though the two have certain likenesses beyond outward appearance—restless wit,<sup>9</sup> for example, and high but moody fancies such as will require another

<sup>4</sup>*Faerie Queene*, II, ix, 49-52 (Cambridge Poets Spenser, ed. Dodge, p. 295).

<sup>5</sup>Stanza 52.

<sup>6</sup>See the exchange between Mercutio and Benvolio (*Romeo and Juliet*, III, i, 12-34), from which it appears, directly or indirectly, that Mercutio is "moody," "apt to quarrel," and, generally, the antithesis of the mild, "hazel"-eyed Benvolio.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. note 8 and text.

<sup>8</sup>*R. & J.*, I, iv, 29-32.—Professor M. P. Tilley, without touching upon Mercutio, has shown that Phantastes was literally copied by T. Tomkis into his play, *Lingua* (1607), where he retains the name Phantastes and is described as a "fantastic gallant, with hollow eyes, sharp look . . . quick-eyed . . . swart complexion" (*Modern Language Notes*, XLII (1927), 153).

<sup>9</sup>Phantastes had

"a sharpe foresight, and working wit  
That never idle was, ne once would rest a whit" (stanza 49),  
with which compare *R. & J.*, II, iv, 75—where Mercutio's "wits run the wild goose chase"—and III, i.

dental omission of another word than *well*. As the line first stood in the manuscript on the "trial sheet" which stands before *Lycidas* and upon which Milton wrote dubious passages before transferring them to the main text of the poem, the line read,

Who would sing for Lycidas he well knew,

a decasyllable.<sup>6</sup> *Not* is inserted between the lines, its position between *would* and *sing* indicated by means of a caret. In the main text of the poem in the manuscript it is transcribed,

who would not sing for Lycidas? he well knew,

and this transcription must of course carry with it the weight of considerable authority. Nevertheless, we cannot but wonder whether Milton would have written except inadvertently such a hendecasyllable as this in *Lycidas*, and with the probable inadvertence before us in the original omission of *not* we have additional evidence in favor of the reading of the printed texts and the assumption that Milton, after inserting *well* in the text he was preparing for the printer, removed it in proof.

The conjecture is that Milton, having written the line in the first instance, noticed that he had omitted the negative and at once inserted it, not noticing or for the moment not greatly caring that it give him eleven syllables; and so the line was transcribed into the main text of the poem. Then either Milton or his copyist preparing copy for the 1638 edition, or the printer of that edition, omitted the word *well*, making the line a normal decasyllable. But in preparing a text for Ruth Raworth, printer of the 1645 edition of the minor poems, Milton in his memory or from reference to the manuscript noticed the discrepancy between his manuscript and the 1638 edition and inserted the word *well* to agree with the manuscript. Later, perhaps realizing for the first time the reason for the omission of *well* in 1638 (or if he was himself responsible for it, recalling the reason) and perhaps by

<sup>6</sup>I do not mean to suggest that the line as it here occurred with the negative missing is normal, prosodically, with its trochaic metre through the third foot, although it is a possible line—and more probable than the hendecasyllable. I am suggesting, in effect, not that the omission of the word *not* made the line prosodically acceptable to Milton, but that it obscured the pattern of the line as he wrote it.

## LYCIDAS, LINE 10

The printed editions of *Lycidas* of Milton's lifetime all read in line 10,

Who would not sing for Lycidas? He knew,  
but in the Trinity College manuscript of Milton's minor poems<sup>1</sup> the line occurs twice as

who would not sing for Lycidas? he well knew.

On the basis of this double authority of the manuscript, and because there exists (in the Cambridge University Library) a copy of the 1638 edition in which, among other corrections,<sup>2</sup> the word *well* is inserted in the line in Milton's hand, the traditional reading "he knew" has of late fallen into disrepute, Wright, for example, in his edition<sup>3</sup> following the manuscript in this line instead of the printed texts. Hanford explains the failure of the 1645 edition to include the correction by suggesting that "Milton must have mislaid and forgotten his corrected copy of the 1638 text!"<sup>4</sup>

Simpson, however, believes that in the corrected copy of the 1638 edition Milton "was preparing copy for a printer"—for Ruth Raworth, indeed—and that "Milton in his final revision rejected a metrical audacity and accepted . . . the error of his first printer,"<sup>5</sup> in which case the reading of the printed texts is taken as representing Milton's final judgment. The probability that this is so is heightened when we learn from the Trinity Manuscript that Milton may in the first place have been betrayed into the "metrical audacity" by the acci-

<sup>1</sup>William Aldis Wright, *Facsimile of the Manuscript of Milton's Minor Poems* . . ., The University Press: Cambridge, 1899.

<sup>2</sup>Of six corrections made in the Cambridge University Library copy of *Justa Edouardo King*, this is the only one not followed in the 1645 edition of Milton's Poems.

<sup>3</sup>W. A. Wright, *The Poetical Works of John Milton*, The University Press: Cambridge, 1903.

<sup>4</sup>James Holly Hanford, *A Milton Handbook*, F. S. Crofts: New York, 1933, p. 336.

<sup>5</sup>Percy Simpson, "Proof-reading by English Authors of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," *Proceedings and Papers of the Oxford Bibliographical Society* (1927), II, pt. I, 19-20. That the substitution of "whelming tide" for "humming tide" in line 157 is, unlike the other corrections to *Lycidas* in the Cambridge University copy a change from instead of back to the reading of the manuscript adds to the probability that the Cambridge University copy was a text prepared for the printer (since the 1645 edition follows the correction). A comparison of the 1638 and 1645 texts makes it clear that the 1645 edition was set from a copy of that of 1638. The corrections in the copy of the 1638 text in question make it likely that we have the actual copy that the printer used.

*Durgen*, if not still-born from the press, certainly was not a great success, for *The Cudgel* is a re-issue of left-over sheets, with the six-page prefatory matter omitted, and with, of course, a new title-page. The first leaf of the poem had to be cancelled because of the title *Durgen* on page 1; hence the first two pages were re-set. This leaf was printed (probably as a quarter-sheet with the new title-page), then attached to the remaining and unaltered fifty-four pages, and placed on sale.<sup>5</sup>

The only relevance this poem might conceivably have had in 1742 is certainly not that it is pro-Cibber (for Cibber's name does not come into the poem), but that it is anti-Pope. Much of it was, indeed, irrelevant in 1742, particularly the three-page concluding plea for public support of Theobald's promised additional emendations on the text of Shakespeare — a project finally resulting in a complete edition of the plays in 1734.<sup>6</sup>

The other satire (*Blast upon Blast, And Lick for Lick; or a New Lesson for P-pe. A Parody on the Fourth Chapter of Genesis. By Capt. H---s Vinegar.*)<sup>7</sup> which Horace Walpole appears to have enjoyed so heartily as to copy the poem entire in a letter to Mann,<sup>8</sup> had, like *The Cudgel*, been printed before — in 1729, under the title of *Dean Jonathan's Parody On the 4th Chap. of Genesis*.<sup>9</sup> This folio, Pope attributed to the pen of Edward Roome.<sup>10</sup>

In this case, even if there were left-over sheets for the printer to dispose of, such a trick would not work. The short parody was originally bound up so closely with the conflict between Pope and Theobald over Shakespeare that it would be brazen to issue it as new. Three verses (3-5) will illustrate this point:

<sup>5</sup>The prose preface was omitted as it was closely related to the Theobald-Pope Shakespeare controversy and to the original edition of the *Dunciad*. In re-setting the first two pages of the poem, the printer paged them 3 and 4, so that the pagination is 3-4, 3-56. In *Durgen*, the pagination is correct, i.e., 1-56. There were no changes of any consequence in the text.

<sup>6</sup>T. R. Lounsbury, *The Text of Shakespeare* (New York: Charles Scribner's, 1906), p. 444.

<sup>7</sup>"Printed for W. Webb, near St. Paul's; and sold by the Booksellers and Pamphlet-Shops of London and Westminster, 1742."

<sup>8</sup>*Letters*, ed. Toynbee, I, 274-76.

<sup>9</sup>"Printed for Timothy Atkins, and Sold by the Booksellers of London and of Westminster. 1729."

<sup>10</sup>First attributed to Roome in 1735 (for, presumably, it was not published early enough to be included in the 1729 quarto *Dunciad*). Roome's support of Theobald may be responsible for the friendship of the two. Theobald wrote Warburton, December 16, 1729, "He [Roome] was but a recent friend to me; but had so many amiable qualities to recommend him . . ." (Nichols, *Illustrations*, II, 326).

reference to the manuscript even realizing the source of the irregularity, he returned to the reading of the 1638 edition—in the proof, we have assumed, of that of 1645.

Oberlin College

JOHN S. DIEKHOFF

#### TWO "FIELDING" PAMPHLETS

One result of the publication of Cibber's well-known *Letter to Pope* in July, 1742, was the renewal of the attacks against the poet on the part of the pilloried dunces. With two of these attacks — both published in August, 1742 — Fielding has at one time or another been associated, solely because they both employed his *Champion* pseudonym of "Hercules Vinegar." Recent scholars, however, have made clear that they do not believe Fielding was implicated. "These facetious pamphlets," wrote Prof. Cross, "which the town was disposed to lay at Fielding's door, so annoyed him that he took occasion, in the publication of his 'Miscellanies' the next spring, to give a list of all his works, since June, 1741, not included in that collection."<sup>1</sup>

That there was a disposition to lay these pamphlets at Fielding's door is proof of the short memory of "the town," though in this case we should not blame it overmuch. One of them (*The Cudgel, or, A Crab-tree Lecture. To the Author of the Dunciad. By Hercules Vinegar, Esq.*,<sup>2</sup> had appeared in 1728 under the title, *Durgen. Or, A Plain Satyr Upon A Pompous Satyrist. . . . Amicably Inscriv'd, by the Author, to those Worthy and Ingenious Gentlemen misrepresented in a late invective Poem, call'd The Dunciad.*<sup>3</sup>) Its author, apparently, was Edward Ward, for he appears to own it in the preface, Pope attributed it to him, and the authorship has never, I believe, been questioned.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*The History of Henry Fielding* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918), I, 367-68. Both the items are listed in Cross's bibliography (III, 342-43) among "Works erroneously attributed to Fielding." See also, Austin Dobson, *Fielding* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1909), p. 93.

<sup>2</sup>"Printed for the Author, and Sold at his House, the *Crab-Tree*, in *Vinegar-yard*, in *Drury-Lane*."

<sup>3</sup>"Printed for T. Warner at the *Black-Boy* in *Pater-noster-Row*. MDCCXXIX." Though the title-page is dated 1729, the pamphlet was published on December 12, 1728 (*Monthly Chronicle*, I, 281).

<sup>4</sup>See sig. A3<sup>v</sup>. Pope listed it in his bibliography of attacks upon him in the 1729 *Dunciad* (quarto, p. 94), as "By Edw. Ward, with a little of James Moore."

bury later traced the story back to its appearance, without names, in the *Historiettes* of Tallemant des Réaux, which were compiled about 1658, or five years before Dryden's marriage. Mr Hooker in turn found the tale in Samuel Rowland's *Humour's Looking-Glass* (1608), where it is already in dialogue form.

But Malone, the first perpetrator of the story, had found an even earlier version. In his own copy of his life of Dryden<sup>1</sup> he entered a great many additions and corrections in preparation for a second edition. This volume came to the Bodleian<sup>2</sup> with Malone's other treasures, but has been strangely neglected by later Dryden scholars. He inserted the following note concerning the Almanac story:

This anecdote I have no doubt was communicated by one of his contemporaries to Lord Orford, as he related it to me; but it is unquestionably a fiction. It is curious to observe how frequently old stories are revived, and attributed to modern and distinguished persons, from the love which many people have of giving an air of truth and circumstantiality to relation of this kind. Who is there, who has not often heard stories circumstantially told of facts which are said to have happened to the relaters or their friends, which have been in print for more than half a century? Such is the case with respect to this pretended conversation between Dryden and his wife: for not long after the publication of the former edition, I found almost the same tale in a book entitled *Jests to make you merrie &c By T. D. [Thomas Dekker] and George Wilkins 4 to 1607*; of which the only copy that I have seen is one which belonged to the celebrated Robert Burton, and is now in the Bodleian Library (Art. 4to. G. BS.)

"The 23d Jest. A gentlewoman coming to one that stood at a window reading a booke, 'Sir' saies she, 'I would I were your booke,' because she loved the gentleman. So would I, quoth he—I wish you were. But what booke would you have me to bee, sayd the other, if I were to be so. Mary, an Almanack, quoth the gentleman; because I would change every yeare."<sup>3</sup>

It is of further interest to observe that Malone later purchased a copy of Rowland's *Humour's Looking-Glass*. The volume, now in Bodleian, contains the inscription:

Bought at the sale of M<sup>r</sup> Brand's books in 1807, at the price of £3.9.0. Afterwards bound.

E. Malone

I have never seen  
another copy.

Part one of the Reverend John Brand's library was sold by W. Stewart on thirty-seven days following 6 May 1807, as appears from

<sup>1</sup>Vol. I, part i, of his edition of *The Critical and Miscellaneous Prose Works of John Dryden, now first collected*, 3 vols. in 4, 1800.

<sup>2</sup>Now Malone E. 61. Vol. I, part ii, is missing from the set. If it is ever found again, this volume might provide the key to several Dryden problems.

<sup>3</sup>At page 498.

And in Process of Time it came to pass, that *Pope* brought of the Fruits of his Leisure, an Edition of *Shakespear*, as an Offering to the Town.

And *Theobald* he also brought of the Firstlings of his Study, even a *Specimen* of *Shakespeare*. And the Town had Respect unto *Theobald* and his *Shakespeare*.

But unto *Pope* and his *Shakespear* the Town had not Respect; and *Pope* was very wroth, and his Countenance fell.

But, obviously, this could be "adapted" to the currently exciting Pope-Cibber feud. Hence the stanzas became:

And in Process of time it came to pass, That *P-pe* brought the Fruits of his Leisure, a Farce for the Stage, as an Offering to the Town, and lo! it was called, *Th-ee H-rs Af-r M-rr-ge*.

And *C-bb-r* he also brought of the Firstlings of his Study, even a Play for the Stage; and he called it the *C-l-ss H-sb-d*, and the Town had respect unto *C-bb-r* and his Play.

But unto *P-pe* and his Farce the Town had not Respect; and *P-pe* was very wroth, and his Countenance fell.

This version certainly had point to the 1742 audience. What did it matter that Cibber's *Careless Husband* (1704) preceded Pope's farce (1717) by thirteen years and was in no manner competitive? It did not even matter that *Three Hours after Marriage* was twenty-five years old, for the parody of the Abel-Cain relationship capitalized on the reason Cibber gave in his *Letter* of 1742 for animosity between himself and Pope — his gibe when acting the *Rehearsal* in 1717 at an episode in *Three Hours*.<sup>11</sup>

The responsibility for the publication of these satires under new titles cannot be attributed to the original authors, for Roome died on December 19, 1729, and "Ned" Ward two years later. No doubt the responsibility rested on the publishers, who, capitalizing not only on the freshly provoked "War of the Dunces," but also on the popularity of Fielding's "Hercules Vinegar," attempted to augment their fortunes.

Harvard University

KNOX CHANDLER

#### EDMOND MALONE AND THE DRYDEN ALMANAC STORY

In the July 1934 issue of the *Philological Quarterly* Mr. E. N. Hooker contributed a brief summary of the genealogy of the "Dryden Almanac Story." As he pointed out, Malone was the first to print the anecdote, which he did on the authority of Horace Walpole. Professor Saints-

<sup>11</sup>See, George Sherburn, *The Early Career of Alexander Pope* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934), pp. 196-97.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*The Waverly Novels and Their Critics* by James T. Hillhouse. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1936. \$3.50.

In his preface Professor Hillhouse announces that, "The purpose of this book is to show what was thought about the novels [of Scott], and why, during the various periods since 1814, and also to gauge their position with successive reading publics." Almost half the volume is devoted to comment that appeared in the eighteen years before Scott's death; the second half of the study covering something more than a century. During Scott's lifetime he finds that reviews follow a "typical arc, rising from 1814 to 1820 and thereafter falling rapidly away," that is to say, that the Scotch novels were considered his best, even by his contemporaries. "Indeed, it is surprising to find how many of the faults that are charged against Sir Walter today and that we think are revealed to us because of our greater experience in the novel are merely echoes of remarks by the more critical readers in Scott's own time." There is a chapter on Scott's own criticism of his novels, one on the reviews in the *Edinburgh*, the *Quarterly*, and *Blackwoods*, a chapter on "Other Periodicals," another on "A Group of Radical and Liberal Periodicals," one on comments by "Poets of the Period, especially Coleridge," and one for "Letters and Journals; Novelists and Essayists." He decides that Hazlitt gives us "the most interesting body of matter ever written about Sir Walter," that he is "above all others, prose writers or poets, the man of the age to whom Scott was most a living force." For the history of fiction, the most important conclusion of this half of the study is probably the confirmation of our impression that the Waverly novels, "practically by themselves opened pious middle-class households to the novel. Scott was not only thrilling, he was pure. . . ."

This interpretation becomes the theme of the section on "Victorian Critical Prejudices"—to use the title of one of the chapters which betrays the prejudice that vitiates this part of the study. He tells us what "tone one would expect the minor and more conventional Victorian critic to take" but gives insufficient proof of what "tone" they did "take." To prove that "the moral emphasis is pervasive" he quotes from an unimportant history of English literature and then from the *Christian Examiner* (not a critical journal) of Boston, for 1839. He does not distinguish between attitudes two generations apart and with the Atlantic between. References from New York, 1840, and Liverpool, 1886, are lumped together, and four pages later we jump (backwards) from 1882 to 1856—this time from New York to Edinburgh. The dates of the references that follow are 1847, 1872, 1867, 1885, 1851, 1866, 1878, 1861, 1835. (Just how does the *North American Review* of January 1835 illustrate Victorian "critical prejudices?") We have a generalization concerning "the unbelievable position that Bulwer held in the minds of many dignified critics at the mid-century" supported only by two references to *Blackwoods* for 1873 and 1874. Then we are told that Trollope "about this time" (1874 or mid-century?) was told by publishers that historical romances "are not worth a damn." Then Professor Hillhouse continues, "but the form was certainly regarded as noble." Was it? By whom? When?

the catalogue. There is no indication that Malone recognized the almanac story in it, although it is equally possible that he saw no need to record a version later than that of Dekker and Wilkins.

*Jests to make you merrie* is number 6541 in the *Short Title Catalogue*. The preface to this volume contains a highly interesting illustration of the relations between the booksellers and the authors of Shakespeare's day:

To the Reader.

Bookies are a strange commoditie, the estimation of them riseth and falleth faster then the exchange of money in the Low-countries, which alters more often then the english man doth the fashion of his apparell. Men that write to feede fantastike humors, are no better then Apes, that shew their trickes to others, the doing of which is painefull to themselues, and at going away are but laught at, and so nice are our Paules Churchyard-walkers in beholding these pictures, that to day they cry excellent at the drawing of that, vpon which to morrow they will cast a mewing countenance, ther's no one Stationer stall can fit all customers with bookees to their dyet, nor can all men that write (if all that can but speake should write) fit some Stationers. Go to one and offer a copy, if it be merrie, the man likes no light stufte, if sad, it will not sell. Another meddles with nothing but what fits the time, I wold haue his shop stuft with nothing but proclamations, because he lyes i'th winde only for the change of weather. Since therefore that neither hot nor colde can please, neither straight nor crooked, can serue as a measure, to some mouthes; what a miserable and endlesse labour does he vndertake that in a few scribld sheetes hopes to wrap vp the loues of all men. Better it were for him in my judgment to turne his leaues into such paper-kites as boyes runne after, whilst they flye in the Ayre, then to publish his wits in Follio, and yet be counted but a foole for his labour: yet notwithstanding, with such a tickling Itch is this printed Ambition troubled, that some are neuer at better ease then when they are scratching vpon paper, and finde no sweetnesse but in drawing blood. Of those sharp-toothed dogs you shall finde me none, I hould no whip in my hande, but a soft fether, and there drops rather water then gall out of my quill, if you taste it and finde it pleasing, I am glad, if not, I cannot be much sorry, because the Cooke knew not your dyet, so that his error was his ignorance, and ignorance is a veniall sinne to be pardoned.

*Nam veniam pro laude peto: Laudatus abundè  
Non fastiditus si tibi (Lector) ero.*

T.D. and G. W.<sup>4</sup>

The I. Jest.

A Fellow that (to be a foole in print) had spent the stocke of his wits upon inke and paper, and made it into a booke, offered it to sell at diverse Stationers stals, but none would buy it: At the length he came to one of the company, and swore to him he shoud not neede to feare to venture money upon it, for it woud be to him an euerlasting booke. Oh sayes the other then I will not meddle with it; euerlasting bookees are ill commodities in our trade, bring me a booke that will go away, and I am for you.

Oxford

JAMES M. OSBORN

<sup>4</sup>The first Jest carries additional evidence that the succeeding three centuries have little changed the attitude of booksellers:



Where? In this manner of dating he could be speaking of any period twenty-five years before or after 1850 in a period of rapid revolutionary change. We can get only general impressions from this part of the study—that “really slashing criticism of Scott is practically non-existent in the Victorian period,” that “it is safe to say that the Victorian critics, by and large, tended to keep up the tradition that Scott was the greatest of British novelists,” and “there is no doubt at all of Scott’s tremendous popularity with a broad reading public until nearly 1900, nor of his secure position with the critics for as long or nearly as long.” One may accept these summaries and still wish that Professor Hillhouse had given the Victorian period of two generations as adequate treatment as he gave to the half-generation after *Waverly*.

Having abandoned chronological arrangement in his treatment of the Victorians (where it is absolutely necessary), he abandons even author-by-author arrangement when it comes to the period “Since 1880,” and divides the discussion into abstractions that overlap in the most confusing way: “Foreign Influences; the Reading Public,” “Depreciation and Defense,” “Style, Philosophy, and Character” and “Scott’s Treatment of History.” Any reviewer, any review, any one statement, might possibly belong under all four of these categories. He tells us that it is Virginia Woolf “who has written what is possibly the most brilliant tribute to Scott in recent years” and the reference to this brilliant tribute is simply, *op. cit.* Later he says “it is left to Virginia Woolf to defend Scott most brilliantly” and the footnote tells us to see *op. cit.* The index lists eight places where Virginia Woolf’s criticism is referred to, but on none of these pages is the work actually named which is being given first place in modern Scott criticism—in spite of the fact that the special purpose of the index is announced as being “to clarify *op. cit.* references.” Moreover, this study is without a bibliography. It is unfortunate that this book was not better organized and provided with the apparatus necessary to make it really useful, for Professor Hillhouse has combed through a vast amount of what he calls “Scott material” and has assembled quotations from scores of authors and periodicals, important and ephemeral. He has shown us beyond the shadow of a doubt that even in the twentieth century Scott (as a Scotch novelist rather than as historical novelist) has had very sincere admiration from a very large number of very good critics and novelists.

The University of Iowa

JOSEPH E. BAKER