Studies in English

Volume 5 Article 11

1964

Vol. 5 (1964): Full issue

Journal Editors

Follow this and additional works at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/ms_studies_eng

Part of the American Literature Commons, and the English Language and Literature Commons

Recommended Citation
Editors, Journal (1964) "Vol. 5 (1964): Full issue," *Studies in English*: Vol. 5 , Article 11.
Available at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/ms_studies_eng/vol5/iss1/11

This Complete Issue is brought to you for free and open access by the English at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Studies in English by an authorized editor of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

Studies in English

The University of Mississippi Department of English

The University of Mississippi

Studies in English

Volume Five

[library stamp]

University, Mississippi

1964

The University of Mississippi

Studies in English

EDITOR

JOHN PILKINGTON

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

TOM J. TRUSS, JR.

ADVISORY BOARD

A. WIGFALL GREEN

JAMES E. SAVAGE

JAMES W. WEBB

The University of Mississippi Studies in English is published annually by the Department of English of the University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi. The subscription price for each volume is two dollars.

CONTENTS

Browning's Ambiguities And *The Ring and The Book* — 1
Tom J. Truss, Jr.

The Perfidy of The Devils' Council — 9
William J. Knightley

The Religion of the Anglo-Saxons — 15
Charles Dale Cannon

Stark Young at the Southern Literary Festival — 35
John Pilkington

Troilus and Cressida And Elizabethan Court Factions — 43
James E. Savage

Alleluia: A Word and Its Effect — 67
Allen Cabaniss

On Translating Greek Lyric Poetry — 75
Lucy Turnbull

William Archer, W. T. Stead, and The Theatre. Some Unpublished Letters — 91
Joseph O. Baylen

BROWNING'S AMBIGUITIES AND *THE RING AND THE BOOK*

by Tom J. Truss, Jr.

The greatness of *Pippa Passes* is readily acknowledged by readers of Browning, but where the greatness lies is open to considerable discussion. Apart from the difficulties involved in its sprawling, unusual plots, the moral structure of the world of the play leaves unresolved problems. For instance, the song which concludes with "God's in his heaven—/All's right with the world"[1] inspires a murder and a suicide. In another episode, the perpetrators of a practical joke on Jules are not granted, as they had expected, an opportunity to laugh. Their failure to have their laugh notwithstanding, Browning does not make them suffer corrections for having tried to inflict pain. Furthermore, from their attempted evil springs a possible good for Jules. The morality of the situations of the play is quite complex. In the internal logic of the plot, the sins of Ottima's and Sebald's self-destructiveness should prey on Pippa's conscience. Browning keeps her innocent, however; she is the ingenuous and unwitting agent of various acts of violence. The soliloquy which Browning gives her concerning her influence on other people is fitting and accurate:

> I should like to really know:
> How near I ever might approach all these
> . . .
> so as to touch them, so
> As to . . .
> Do good or evil to them some slight way.
> (III, 78-79)

Whether Pippa did good or evil to the characters in the play is left in doubt. By creating ethical dilemmas, the play raises rather than solves moral problems; and Pippa herself becomes Browning's

[1]Robert Browning, *Poetical Works* (16 vols.; London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1889), III, 24. All references are to this edition.

parallel for the power of art on the beholder—art in its loosest sense, such as music, painting, song, argument, poetry. The ethics of the impact of art, for Browning, is ambiguously controlled by the personality of the beholder.

Browning dramatizes the point frequently. Galuppi's musical portrait of sensual Venice, for good or evil, makes the scientist-speaker of the "Toccata" feel "chilly and grown old" (VI, 76). The artistry of Blougram's ambiguous self-characterization inspires Mr. Gigadibs, for good or evil, to abandon his precepts and begin working out new ones. Even the cleverness of Sludge's evil hoaxes uncovers a crime to gnaw on Hiram H. Horsefall's conscience. The systems of ethics emerging from the imagery of "Mr. Sludge: The Medium" contradict each other. The ambiguity of a work of art is perhaps most succinctly illustrated by the Renaissance Duke's interpretation of his last Duchess's portrait. Her liking whatever she looked on with looks which went everywhere makes her subject to almost any interpretation—anything from a sainted wife to a flirtatious hussy. The personality of the beholder distorts the reality of the thing beheld. Actually, the real character of the last Duchess is beside the point. The Duke's major concern is that the next Duchess be more to his taste, and Browning concentrates on the Duke's consciousness of the interview with the ambassador. In a discussion of Browning, the question of what a poem *means* needs to be partly reduced to a consideration of what an object means to a beholder. The dramatic monologue contains a beholder's consciousness of and responses to objects, human and material, in an ever-changing world.[2]

A central problem in studying a speaker's consciousness is assessing its limitations. Browning's characters, in varying degrees, struggle like the Grammarian for permanent, objective truth; but because of their humanity, they never completely apprehend it: "Truth remains true, the fault's in the prover."[3] The Duke's humanity distorts the truth of his Duchess's portrait and places its meaning outside the reader's range of inquiry. The appeal of Browning's characters thus lies not necessarily in what they find

[2]It is impossible to acknowledge the extent of the indebtedness I owe to Robert Langbaum, *The Poetry of Experience* (New York: Random House, 1957).

[3]"Christmas Eve and Easter Day," *Works*, V, 218.

in their search for truth, but in the mode of their search—not in their discourse, but in the unique consciousness revealed by their discourse. The *meaning* of the "Epistle . . . of Karsish," for instance, lies not in what the speaker says about Lazarus, Jerusalem, or blue-flowering borage, but in the open-minded artless bewilderment which discoveries excite in his consciousness. Karsish's identical observations about the madman Lazarus's report and about borage—"It is strange" (IV, 197, 198)—are ambiguous. With characteristically adroit handling of details, Browning controls two consciousnesses: the narrator's and the reader's. The strangeness which Karsish is aware of is different from the strangeness which the reader is aware of. Browning's readers have a completer view of the world of a poem than do his speakers; and a statement may have one meaning for a speaker of it, another for a reader, and still others for fictional listeners in the poem.

The Ring and the Book is a brilliant mosaic of variously contradictory consciousnesses of a vast series of horrible events. Apart from an obscurely brief and hence rather meaningless account of the events in Book I, Browning never tells his readers what in truth happened. We merely think we know what happened by studying the components of the limited consciousnesses of the beholders of the events. Whether they are participants or bystanders is ultimately beside the point. The accounts are not mutually supporting, and the reader never knows with complete confidence what happened. He knows only the personalities of the beholders.

Caponsacchi's and Pompilia's trip in the carriage furnishes a good illustration. The accounts of the priest and of the heroine differ in many details. According to Pompilia, Caponsacchi pointed out famous places in route; Caponsacchi made no mention of them in his account. According to Caponsacchi, Pompilia asked about the women in his life; Pompilia apparently forgot about making the inquiry. The speakers do not misrepresent details or fabricate them; they take different memories away from a common event, and the reader views the components of their consciousnesses. Caponsacchi, the priest on guard for Guido's pursuit, was quite alert to the passage of time; Pompilia, safe in his care, was oblivious of the passage of time, even during her waking periods. Browning left us in doubt concerning the facts of the trip. The meaning of the trip to those who made it, however, is clear enough.

The impact of Pompilia's presence on Caponsacchi's life is well known; in his contemptuous testimony to the judges, he showed contempt for himself and for the world. In teaching the court, he ingenuously served the function which the Pope later attributed to him—"the first experimentalist/In the new order of things" (X, 139, ll. 1910-1911). He was an experimentalist which the reader knows to be for good or for evil and which the Pope hoped to be for good. The impact of Caponsacchi on Pompilia is similarly important. His presence gave her strength and repose—strength to repel Guido at Castelnuovo and to bring Gaetano into the world, and repose for the remainder of her short life. Each passenger in the carriage between Arezzo and Castelnuovo made meaningful inroads into the consciousness of the other, and ironically, neither knew the extent of his influence on the other. Caponsacchi's view of himself indicates his limited consciousness: "I was born, have lived, shall die, a fool!" (IX, 90, l. 181). The Pope, Pompilia, and Browning's readers have a different view of him. The meaning of the trip in the carriage is ambiguous; it depends on the consciousness of those taking the trip.

Ambiguities in the character of a bystander are apparent in an analysis of Other Half-Rome. He is a shy bachelor who significantly keeps at the edge of the crowd. His version of the story perhaps most nearly approximates what happened; but in his elevation of Pompilia, he almost overlooked Caponsacchi. His insights into Guido and Pompilia are almost identical to Caponsacchi's and the Pope's. His sensitiveness to Guido and to Pompilia and his blindness to Caponsacchi are unmistakeable clues to his consciousness. He obviously knew some artists, for he seems to have a first-hand acquaintance with the comments of the painter Carlo Maratta, who drew sketches at Pompilia's side during her final moments; and he had a keen sense of meaningfully ironic dramatic situations. In his reconstruction of the scene of the murders, he carefully fused the goodwill message of Christmas with acts of violence; and like a writer planning an ominous description, he made the bell toll periodically during the night of the murders. The language of the stage is used in his account: he speaks like one who has a first-hand acquaintance with acts and scenes, in discourse which contrasts sharply with the superficial and foppish awareness of the dilettante Tertium Quid for the theater. Tertium

Quid, in fact, ultimately connects the violence with a Punch-and-Judy show. Other Half-Rome has the characteristics of a person who is interested in painting, in the stage, and in writing; and he brings an artist's sensitiveness to bear on his search for truth. He is acutely aware of goodness, of villainy, of pain, of the need for a moral order in the world; but a person's capacity to rise to deeds of daring is beyond his consciousness. His own manhood has not developed enough for him to feel a need to give close attention to Caponsacchi's part in the story. The ambiguity of Other Half-Rome's character is apparent. He is a timid, feckless, would-be artist, and at the same time a careful, generous observer. Like the anti-heroes of "Dis Aliter Visum" and "Too Late," Other Half-Rome would not risk everything at a moment of crisis. His anger does not rise until he reaches the end of his account, and the deeds which it might inspire would provide too little too late.

The ambiguity of Pompilia is less apparent and perhaps more contrived. She becomes ambiguous in proportion to the distance from her at which reports are made. Browning assigns her lines which, taken at face value, might be easily misinterpreted by someone like Half-Rome. In her innocence and goodness, she does not wish to associate her memory of Guido with her son; but out of context, without reference to her artlessness, her words are self-incriminating: "My babe nor was, nor is, nor yet shall be/Count Guido Franceschini's child at all" (IX, 238, ll. 1762-1763). In Bottini's description of her, Pompilia liked whatever she looked on, with looks which went everywhere:

> The lady, foes allege, put forth each charm
> And proper floweret of feminity
> To whosoever had a nose to smell.
>
> . . .
>
> . . . first come was first served.
> (X, 13, ll. 298-306)

By carefully delineating Pompilia as a person about whom a variety of opinions might be held, Browning created a character who was ambiguous to those who did not know her as Caponsacchi knew her or the readers of her monologue know her. Browning furthermore placed her in the nunnery of the Convertites, where prostitutes were cared for. Bottini planned to parade Pompilia as

a chief of sinners after the excitement of the Carnival and the executions died away. The final impression of her in the Roman mind would have been erroneous, but the truth of its existence is central to the meaning of the poem.

The manner of Guido's death provides a clearer ambiguity. His final words, in which he desperately called for the intercession of what to him was an arch-fiend, Pompilia, indicate that he went to his death impenitent. According to the letter from a "Venetian visitor at Rome" (X, 245, 1. 28), his confessors reported that he ended well. The reader is left in the dark. The gambling letter-writer could have been misinformed, the confessors could have lied, or Guido could have had an unaccountable change of heart between the appearance of the executioners at his cell and his conveyance through the crowds.

At the level of abstractions, Browning makes certain precepts ambiguous. Half-Rome drew his defense of Guido from nature. For him, the law of nature took precedence over the law of the court. Modern man, he alleged, had become effete, and respect for human law had made him inert. A return to righteousness and order necessitated a return to masculine dominance, to the point of brutality: "Who is it dares impugn the natural law,/" he asked; "Deny God's word, 'the faithless wife shall die'?" (VIII, 117, 11. 1477-1478). For the sake of his argument, specious though it might be, Half-Rome made the forces of nature and divinity coincide, and thereby defended Guido's slaying of his wife. The Pope referred to nature and divinity in explaining Pompilia's compulsion to escape from Arezzo:

> Thou at first prompting of what I call God,
> And fools call Nature, didst hear, comprehend,
> Accept the obligation laid on thee,
> Mother elect, to save the unborn child.
> (X, 106-107, 11. 1073-1076)

In the first instance, the law of nature requires a violent end of life, and in the second, a meaningful beginning of life. Although the Pope's designation of "fool" puts Half-Rome's statement in perspective, the prelate's assertion does not clarify the matter, for it has the effect of overlooking the existence of nature. The meaning of nature in the poem remains ambiguous.

The study of causal relations reveals additional subtleties. Inquiry into the source of the mischief in the poem takes one back to the shadowy and remote regions of the life of Pompilia's mother. Of itself, this origin is hardly enough to foreshadow the violence which develops. With a less villainous Guido or, ironically, a less virtuous Pompilia, the poem would not have been worth writing. The architecture of *The Ring and the Book* is peculiarly similar to that of the single short monologues. They are all spoken at moments of crisis: Fra Lippo Lippi, for instance, on his being found in an embarrassing situation; Andrea, in a domestic argument; Blougram, on his being subjected to an agnostic's inquisition; St. Praxed's bishop, on the occasion of his death; and Sludge, on his hoaxes being discovered. *The Ring and the Book* occurs at a moment of crisis. The crisis comes not in the life of an individual but in the life of a society. The forces for good or evil, like Pippa's influence, are at work in the world. Their origins and their results remain unknown. Since, for example, one never knows whether Lucrezia is the source or the symptom of Andrea's decline, the poem about the faultless painter is a fragment with neither beginning nor end; it is all middle, which starts and stops. *The Ring and the Book* is an artistically conceived fragment of human history at a moment of crisis, which is all middle. Half-Rome's sentiments reached back into the social order of the past, and the Pope looked in vain for precedents in the past. Facing the judges, Guido looked into the future and envisioned, despite his villainy, a Utopia of noble manners, pure laws; according to the Pope, Caponsacchi was a first experimentalist in a new order of things. And Pompilia looked to the future in giving her son the name of a new saint, Gaetano. Whether good or evil is predominant in the new order, Browning left unanswered, and he similarly placed the ultimate origins of good and evil beyond man's range of inquiry.

Browning takes the long way of art to speak the truth that the human condition is ambiguous. The crisis of the warfare between good and evil is resolved artistically in Gaetano, whose destiny is unknown. Yet one's hopes for him are high. His life was lived in a new century, with a new pope, although it became the age of Voltaire. Gaetano is thus the ambiguous legacy of the crisis, and as such he parallels the destiny of humanity. The Truth contained in Browning's long way is dramatized in the form of a sustained multiple ambiguity.

THE PERFIDY OF THE DEVILS' COUNCIL

by *William J. Knightley*

There are two familiar and equally probable readings of the devils' debate in council that opens the second book of *Paradise Lost*. By the far more easy reading, it may be perceived that the devils have a surpassing command of whatever political arts men subsequently have learned and relied upon to present falsehood as truth, or more accurately, to make the worse appear the better cause. This view appears now to have become a commonplace in modern studies of the poem that have unmasked Satan's pretensions and exposed the synchophantic acclaim of his fallen peers. Certain critics, notably Broadbent, Kermode, Allen, and Cope, have demonstrated the gauzy fabric of Satan's kingdom against the solider brilliance of Heaven; and it would be out of place to reconsider here the proofs of their demonstrations. It is sufficient to point out that no reader today can be in the least deceived by the sophistry of Hell, no matter how grudgingly he may admire its more than human skill. Yet in this last admission there may lie an implicit sense of compounded deceptions, because of the way in which the devils explore, refashion, and seek continually for a purpose in their experience. Moloch, oversimplifying Satan's reasons for disregarding the obvious conditions of their fall, imagines an easy ascent and perpetual inroads to alarm Heaven. As he has persuaded himself, the war in Heaven is proof of the devils' ability to make war, consequently the attack may be renewed with impunity and continue without fear of anything worse than annihilation. Belial too, with urbane diplomacy, blinks the obvious. He assumes that the change in their condition argues unprecedented change in God's will. In consequence, he will await the chance that absolute Justice may relent; or, that failing, he imagines the devils of themselves may adjust to their fiery torments and by becoming like the heat, cease to feel it. Mammon, attracted to this last alternative, proposes to escape God entirely and "live to ourselves" that "our torments also may in length of time/Become our Elements." To this point the devils' argument has amply

demonstrated St. Augustine's view of evil as a tendency toward non-being; it has also demonstrated the patent falsity of the devils' assumptions. Yet Beelzebub's concluding speech is of a different sort. The scheme it proposes is soundly realistic, even dynamic; it corrects the fantasies of the other demons' arguments; and it takes into consideration all known conditions of the devils' torments. As for its falsity, this appears to be no more than a mildly theatrical deception whereby Beelzebub is made to propose a scheme devised originally by Satan. Once the reader has understood the shabbiness of this imposture, he is free to believe he has discovered all that is false within Hell.

Yet by a somewhat more worldly reading the devils' imaginings, despite their impostures, may be understood to possess a degree of truth. In Satan's first speech at the opening of the council we find, for example, the view followed by the other devils, that the infernal kingdom, if only in a negative sense, rivals Heaven. In Hell, as Satan argues, there can be no envy, no wrathful strife, no ambition, no covetousness. And the debate that follows is an ambitious effort to vizualize the creation of Satan's rival kingdom. Beginning with Moloch's wish to see perpetuated that moment when Satan's host was at the high tide of its endeavor the debate soars to the much more comprehensive dream proposed by Beelzebub. Ridiculing those who would sit conjuring kingdoms, Beelzebub does not however deny their desire for an infernal empire; nor does he describe that empire in the limited sense that Belial and Mammon conceive of it; he maintains rather that Satan's power may be indefinitely extended either by laying waste or seizing God's new creation or by seducing "some new Race call'd *Man*" to the devils' party. And although he scorns the crudity and materialism of his fellows' projects, his own designs do not preclude theirs. His appears at first to be a simple extension of the boundaries of Hell, but it is to be ultimately a kingdom of the mind which the lesser devils may objectify as they wish. As a kingdom of the mind Hell is real enough, but a creation of the mind depends in such a way upon other realities that there is no question of its existing apart from them. Since Satan's empire is to be a negation of God's kingdom, Hell will have the endlessly negative capability of proving that God "In highth or depth, still first and last will Reign/Sole King, and of his Kingdom lose no part. . ."

Studies in English, Vol. 5 [1964], Art. 11

We may note that Beelzebub's proposal, although it is put forward with evident scorn for what he calls the dreams of his fellows is itself a qualified return to Moloch's call for vengeance. Moloch, for example, has argued for perpetual inroads which, he has said, "if not Victory is yet Revenge." And he, like Beelzebub, has argued that the least power the devils possess is the power to disturb Heaven. The torments of Hell too, they both look upon as potential armories that will enable them to lay waste or ravage the periphery of God's kingdom. Both demons show a like desire, regardless of the consequences, to perpetuate the defiance that provoked their expulsion from Heaven. Beelzebub, unlike Moloch, knows their loss of Heaven is irreparable; but he sees a certain advantage in the loss, for now the addition of hostility, hate, reluctance, and slow revenge can intensify their continuing posture of defiance. Hellish torments can breed untamed defiance; and defiance, which has brought the devils these present torments, can bring like torments to others whose desire for revenge will continue the cycle of defiance and defeat. One can say in general that Moloch and Beelzebub, who concentrate their attention on maintaining a *status quo* and on perpetuating the war with Heaven, have doomed themselves to endless defeat while Belial and Mammon, who look more closely to maintaining the effects of that defeat, have doomed themselves to wait endlessly in vain hope of change. Since defiance and defeat are, in Hell at least, isonomic, there is a fundamental sameness to the devils' proposals. The effect of these repetitions is to impart a sinuous movement to the debate as it coils back upon itself in a continuous generation of courbes that do not fashion a perfect circle (a conventional symbol of the divine) but which nevertheless imitate and suggest it.

This imperfect circularity makes clear that the vanity of Hell is to be found in the devils' one uselessly repeated act of defiance. There is no possibility that they can ever impose their will on God, as Satan well knows, for it is he who first despairs the outcome. Yet at this point a distinction must be made between the demons' profitless expectations and the considerable profit which the reader, under Milton's disinterested guidance, can realize from the devils' experience. We must at first agree in part with those readers who would find cause for admiring certain qualities of mind and character displayed in the devils' council, for our ex-

Editors: Vol. 5 (1964): Full issue

pectations of dramatic action and characterization provoke us into discovering these qualities, just as our expectations of dynamic progression enable us to discover the ingenuity with which Satan's scheme comprehends the schemes of the lesser devils. We find it difficult, for example, not to admire the rhetorical skill of the speeches in Pandemonium. And we must conclude that in using the subtleties of a forensic style Milton at the same time developed them, so that his development, far from denying the usefulness of rhetoric, makes of it an exemplary representation of the *corruptionis optimum pessimae* which is the infamy of Hell. Knowing this we may therefore honestly admire, as Milton does, the flawed brilliance of the devils' debate, if at the same time we recognize its utter worthlessness to the devils themselves.

This sense of a disparity of values has led some critics to speak of Satan's kingdom as a parody of Heaven. But an attentive reading of the council scene, even to Satan's announced intent to "seek/Deliverance for us all," makes it clear that the conflicting values of the devils' debate go deeper than satire or parody. Milton's judgment on the council is entirely without irony except for that directed against mankind. He affirms Satan's boast that in Hell there is both unity and firm accord. Satan has argued that Hell possesses a certain

> advantage then
> To union, and firm Faith, and firm accord,

and Milton agrees:

> O shame to men! Devil with Devil damn'd
> Firm concord holds, men only disagree
> Of Creatures rational . . .

If we understand this judgment in the broad sense, it is obvious that the fallen angels possess qualities which are intrinsically good. We know that Satan preserves much of his former luster just as we know that the demons can reason and can sing harmoniously. Yet whatever the particular value of these qualities, there remains the question of their meaning in the poetic scheme of things. In this respect Milton's judgment of the devils' concord is uniform with his practice of introducing the demons' virtues by calling attention to their base motives. The devils live in concord, he says, because they are damned; and they are damned because they are

in concord to disobey God: [to transpose the verse] Firm concord holds Devil with Devil damn'd. Similarly each of the fallen angels exists within the coils of another tautology. Moloch's fiery energy springs from his desperation; Belial's calm reasonableness from his sloth; Mammon's industry derives from his fear; and Beelzebub's princely dignity from his borrowed wisdom. Energy, reasonableness, industry, and dignity are without doubt good qualities; but the nature of their presence in Hell robs them of whatever extrinsic value they may have for the fallen angels. In the reader's judgment these qualities do nevertheless possess an appreciable value for man's moral instruction and the veiled purposes of divine providence:

> men only disagree
> Of Creatures rational, though under hope
> Of heavenly Grace

which is the redeeming ground of virtue.

Still keeping to Milton's concluding judgment one can go on to note that by the time Satan begins preparations for his journey, his kingdom has been fashioned in exactly the manner he imagined. The host of fallen angels has reconstituted itself in Satan's image; and Hell in its entirety can be described in the same words Milton uses to describe Satan at the opening of the council. When the council ends Hell too, is

> rais'd
> To that bad eminence; and from despair
> Thus high uplifted beyond hope, aspires
> Beyond thus high, insatiate to pursue
> Vain War with Heav'n, and by success untaught
> His proud imaginations thus display[s].

Satan's ambition, soaring to awesome proportions, is now manifest not only in his own person but in the body of his followers as well. In effect his character and mind becomes the alpha and omega of the infernal kingdom. For this reason many readers have noticed that Satan's enterprise bears a curious resemblance to the ministry of Christ. There is an obviously general similarity in the fact that Satan, like Christ, founds a kingdom which is "not of this world" in order to deliver the willing members of his body from the bonds of slavery. This nearness of Satan's work to the work of Christ, particularly since it anticipates events totally unknown to

Satan, is the measure of his brilliance as well as his perfidy. Something has been said earlier about the absence of irony in Milton's judgment of the Devil's kingdom; but it may be as well to explain here that since Satan has no model for his imagined deliverance, it is dramatically impossible to regard his invention either as conscious mockery or irreverent burlesque. By any standards it is a brilliant masterwork of the creative imagination, the more so since it is excelled in its scope only by the economy of Christ's redemptive mission. As the poem progresses the luster of Satan's project diminishes, eclipsed by the revelation of a coming redemption; but its initial brilliance remains in Book II, because it possesses the obscure yet genuinely prophetic marks of a divine inspiration. Even so, it is perfidious. It denies the real grounds of the truth to which it bears witness. In this respect Satan's ambition resembles the commonplace medieval instance of perfidy. According to the ordinary authorities of the middle ages, the "perfidious Jews" were those who denied Christ yet persisted in a letter-perfect observance of the Mosaic law. While the Mosaic law is true and unquestionably of divine inspiration, it is sterile when lived apart from the work of redemption it prophesies. Similarly, the work of Satan's council, which culminates in Satan's expressed desire to seek deliverance for his followers, rises to a genuine eminence. Despite its isolate sterility it bears the marks of its divine inspiration; it reveals the brilliance of that mind which next to God shone brightest in Heaven, and it prophesies both a deliverance and a return to the Heavenly kingdom.

THE RELIGION OF THE ANGLO-SAXONS

by Charles Dale Cannon

This paper proposes to treat of religion in Anglo-Saxon England and will include both Christian and Pre-Christian religion within its scope. The special concern of the paper is the period shortly before Augustine's missionary journey to Kent and the years following his mission during which time there was accommodation of the earlier religion to the new, and the new religion was influenced by the old. This accommodation of the religion to the new is exemplified in this paper by the account of a king who, attempting to accommodate both religions, set up altars to both Christ and Woden.

The use in this paper of *heathen and heathenism,* as well as *pagan,* is not intended as a derogation. The choice of these terms is not made because of any desire to label the earlier religion of the Anglo-Saxons with a pejorative tag but because of the fact that the terms occur with such frequency in the literature treating the subject that it seems wiser to use them than to introduce more objective substitutes.

This study is divided into three major parts, though of disparate length, and the order is chronological. Heathen religion is either the sole or partial concern of all three parts. The first part deals with religion in England before Augustine, largely, but not entirely, heathen. The second part is concerned with religion during the conversion and within a few decades thereafter. The final part deals with religion after the conversion with continuing interest in the survival of the earlier religion.

Some of the best contemporary scholars of the Anglo-Saxon past speak with commendable candor about the difficulties involved in arriving at a comprehensive account of the gods worshipped in early Britain and of religion in general. Stenton, who has made notable contributions to the present knowledge of Anglo-Saxon society, says that the "heathen background of Old English history

is impenetrably vague"; and though he does not shrink from attacking the difficulties, he stresses the fact that while "the general stock of knowledge about Germanic paganism is by no means negligible, . . . it is indefinite at almost every crucial point, and . . . is often colored by scriptural reminiscence."[1]

Since the people are of Teutonic stock, it would appear that the annals of Teutonic mythology, wherever available, would seem a good place to begin a study, but there are storm signals from scholars about the free and uncritical use of such material. In the first place Hodgkin believes that there was a lack of unity or stability in the allegiance that the immediate forebears of the Anglo-Saxons paid to gods while they were yet inhabitants of their continental home.[2] Added to the likelihood of an unsettled condition of religion prior to their migration is the fact that the characteristic attributes of some of the gods as worshipped in Britain do not agree with those normally attributed to them as worshipped in the Scandinavian or other countries in which the Teutonic people lived. Hodgkin concludes that there is insufficient information about "gods and mythology of English heathenism" to make a "satisfactory" comparison between the English and the Scandinavian system.[3]

It is the function of research and scholarship, however, to deal with difficulties, and though there are many questions about Anglo-Saxon religion which are now incapable of answer and may remain insoluble problems, there are some matters that may be set forth with some confidence.

Of the gods in Anglo-Saxon Britain "Woden was the chief god of the warriors at the time of the migration to Britain," and Hodgkin says that Woden was "driving out Thunor, the Thunderer, the weather-god beloved by the common people, much as Thunor" had earlier defeated a rival god, "Tiw (the god of our English Tuesday), the oldest of the great gods, so old . . . that by the fifth century he had faded in the background of men's minds."[4]

---

[1]F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 1955), p. 96.

[2]Robert H. Hodgkin, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons* (Oxford, 1935), II, 28-29.

[3]*Ibid.*, pp. 239-40.

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 29.

Stenton says that "Woden, Thunor, Tiw, and Frig are the only deities whose individualized worship in England is beyond dispute."[5] MacCulloch in *The Mythology of All Races* refers to the first three of the deities whose individualized worship in Britain is attested as the "pan-Teutonic deities" with reference to an earlier time when the "Teutons were still an undivided people."[6]

Woden had an especial appeal "to the kingly dynasties and aristocrats," and when there was competition with Tiw and Thunor, among others, it was probably easy for Woden to "dethrone his rivals." The result is that Anglo-Saxon kings typically considered him the progenitor of their line; it was from him that they "traced their descent."[7] It was clearly advantageous to be descended from one under whose tutelage victory in battle might be assured, and, assuming no damaging pollution of the blood lines, the descendants would be of such stamina and prowess that they might require but minimal assistance of a supernatural agency. If they did require it, they could call on one who was both god and ancestor.

One should not infer from the fact that Anglo-Saxon kings trace their ancestry to Woden that this made for a unified or organized religion. Though there is evidence during the first century "in northern Germany . . . that the religion of Nerthus . . . had drawn . . . neighboring tribes together in a bond of common worship," the Germanic settlements in Britain show "no trace of religious centralization . . . and this is true not only for the country as a whole, but there was also little if any organization within the independent states."[8]

A king would have his temple wherein he would place "wooden effigies of his favourite gods on separate altars," but there appears to have been little sense of outrage over the desecration of a temple. With no attempt to minimize the ready availability of wood as material both for the construction of the temple and the gods, wood (or at least trees) is a part of Teutonic worship. "Of

---

[5]Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England,* p. 98.

[6]John A. MacCulloch, *The Mythology of All Races* (Boston, 1930), II, 19.

[7]Hodgkin, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons,* p. 238.

[8]*Ibid.,* p. 238.

the hallowed trees the oak" stood "at the head . . . . Next to the oak, the ash was holy," and these sacred trees would be addressed as people.[9] Though there may have been many sacred groves or holy trees at one time, there apparently was not "an outstanding holy tree or holy pillar which attracted to itself the general devotion of the people" in Britain.[10]

The Teutonic gods were not immortal and were subject to some, but not all, of the infirmities of human flesh. Though they grew older, they did not necessarily lose the strength of their youth. Some of the gods were extraordinarily precocious and able to accomplish prodigious feats of strength in their infancy. A son of Odin was able at the age of one day to avenge the death of Balder; a three-day-old son of Thor was able to lift a giant's foot off his father. These great abilities were not always unmarred, for some of the gods were deformed.[11]

Hodgkin says of Woden in England that he lacks many of the characteristics one notes in Odin and therefore might expect Woden to have. Primarily a god of war, undoubtedly a commendable virtue for the putative ancestor of Anglo-Saxon kings, he has no counterpart "of the Christian deity; he has no well-appointed residence like Valhalla. He is not the one-eyed god who wanders about the world."[12]

If Woden is not simply an Anglicized Odin, Thunor is even less an Anglicized Thor. In fact one opinion is that the gods with the exception of Woden were "little more than mere names," though Frig or Friday "was equated with Venus, and in late chronicles was said to be Woden's wife."[13]

It would be an overstatement, even an untruth, to deny the existence of fertility worship in England, but it was not developed in England as the cult had developed among the ancestors of the Anglo-Saxons. Though the fertility cult of Nerthus did not flourish as heretofore, it appears likely that "the old practices of the fathers were maintained" by the cultivators of the soil, practices es-

---

[9]Jacob Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology* (London, 1883), I, 651.
[10]Hodgkin, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons*, p. 238.
[11]MacCulloch, *The Mythology of All Races*, pp. 21-22.
[12]Hodgkin, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons*, p. 239.
[13]*Ibid.*, p. 240.

sential for prosperity in farming and for good luck in life," whatever god—Thunor, Woden, or Christ—might have official sanction.[14] Practices of farmers and gardeners today are revealing in the reliance of some of them on signs and omens as an aid to fertility. Evidence from the Anglo-Saxon *Charms* appears to substantiate the statement of Hodgkin cited above.

MacCulloch ignores literary texts as a source of evidence about Anglo-Saxon religion when he says that the "only available evidence is that of names of the days of the week, genealogical lists, and place names."[15] While there is no gain saying the fact that these sources are of cardinal importance, it is interesting to note that modern British historians of Anglo-Saxon religion make very free use of literary texts in the course of their study.

That the calendar is a natural place for the honoring of deities and heroes, including kindred celebrations and events, is attested by both present and ancient practices. Of our present days of the week, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday memorialize gods who were indisputably worshipped, and Friday commemorates another, possibly of lesser importance, yet of sufficient currency to impress its name for a day of the week.[16]

Special events memorialized throughout the year evince heathen ceremonials and practices. The eleventh month was referred to as "*Blotmonath*, . . . the month of sacrifice," a term that arose, according to Bede, "because they devoted to their gods the animals which they were about to kill."[17] The third and fourth months were named *Hrethmonath* and *Eosturmonath*, according to Bede, whose veracity has been challenged by scholars without proper warrant, according to Stenton, because they could find no references to the namesakes for these months. Stenton says in chiding the errant scholars for their injustice to Bede that it would be "incredible that Bede, to whom heathenism was sin, would have invented a heathen goddess in order to explain the name of the month of Easter."[18] Besides, equally obscure names of other gods have not

---

[14]*Ibid.*, p. 243.
[15]MacCulloch, *The Mythology of All Races*, p. 19.
[16]*Ibid.*, p. 19.
[17]Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 98.
[18]*Ibid.*, p. 18.

been questioned and there is "no obvious explanation of Erce, the Old English name of Mother Earth."[19]

The year began December 25, and "the following night was called *Modra nect*, the night of mothers, a reference yet obscure." The last month of the old and the first of the new year together comprised what was referred to as "*Giuli*, the modern yule, a name so old that its meaning is quite uncertain," and the second month of the new year was called *Solmonath*, "the months of cakes, which they offered to their gods." Continuing with reference to Bede, the ninth month was called "*Halegmonath*, holy month, which was the month of offerings," interpreted by Stenton as unmistakable evidence of "a heathen festival held at the end of the harvest."[20]

Place names have been and are a source of information about Anglo-Saxon religion, but the evidence has been gained as a result of a considerable amount of work, not because of abundant readily available evidence. Hodgkin says, for example, that of the "thousands of Saxon place-names, only six were compounded with the name of Woden, and only nine with Thunor."[21] Stenton mentions Old English words part of which are *ealh*, which "seems to have the meaning of 'hill sanctuary,' and *weah* or idol, shrine, sacred placed or precinct."[22]

To close this part of the section on Anglo-Saxon religion there is the conjecture of Grimm about the posture of heathen prayer. Despite the fact that this is conjecture, Grimm's wide-ranging knowledge of Teutonic mythology and language bids fair at least to gain a hearing for his opinion. He believes that the posture involved "kneeling, uncovering the head and looking upward, presenting oneself in submission to the mighty god, his conqueror, as a *defenceless victim*."[23] If this supposition is true, the attitude of Christian prayer is but one of a train of instances in which Christian practice has subsumed rather than supplanted outright the earlier religious practices.

---

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 98.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 97.
[21] Hodgkin, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons*, p. 239.
[22] Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 101.
[23] Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology*, p. 31.

The spectacular success of Augustine's missionary trip to Britain at the behest of Pope Gregory has tended to make it appear that Christianity did not exist in Britain prior to his journey. There is, however, evidence of Christianity far earlier than Augustine's arrival. Nora Chadwick says that St. Alban's martyrdom, recorded by Gildas and Constantius and which is now considered "to be historical fact," took place near the middle of the third century.[24]

She believes that as a result of the Roman occupation of Britain, Britons were introduced to Christianity and that "intellectual contacts between Britain and Gaul" had an influence on Britain which was favorable to the Christian religion.[25]

The interest of the future Pope Gregory in the fair-complexioned youth he had seen before his elevation to the papacy when they were about to be sold on the slave market caused him to enquire about their origin and their religion. He learned they were Angles and heathen. Though Smith observes that Bede considered this account a legend, Gregory later sent Augustine to go as a missionary and must have felt some satisfaction in sending a representative in view of the fact that he had requested the opportunity of doing so himself before he was the Pope but had his request denied. Despite Augustine's success, he was not considered an outstanding prospect for the mission. In fact he turned back, having begun the journey, before he arrived and asked to be excused from the mission. He was directed to resume the journey.[26]

For a person so ready to quit before he had started his missionary work, Augustine generated a great deal of enthusiasm once he was in England. Gregory was reputed to have intelligence that "the English people wished to become Christians," and if this was true of any section in Britian it would likely have been Kent where Bertha (Berchta), wife of Aethelbert of Kent, was a Christian. Though their son was not brought up a Christian, at least her husband "tolerated her having her own chaplain . . . and devotions." Her husband had given her "the old Roman church of St. Martin's near Canterbury."[27]

[24]H. M. Chadwick, *et al., Studies in Early British History* (Cambridge, 1954), p. 199.

[25]*Ibid.*, p. 199.

[26]Harold Smith, *Saxon England* (London, 1953), pp. 70-71.

[27]*Ibid.*, p. 72.

The first encounter of Augustine and his fellow missionaries with the heathen took place as an open-air interview conducted outdoors for good reason. "The object of the outdoor interview was to counteract any magic that the preachers of the new faith might be able to practice, for the heathen English believed that evil spells lost much of their potency when woven out of doors."[28]

Most of Augustine's apprehensions about being in England were unfounded. Aethelbert was baptized less than three months after the arrival of Augustine, and there was "not a single martyrdom during the entire period of the Anglo-Saxon conversion."[29] Flushed with early victories in his attempt to Christianize England, Augustine sent a report to Gregory which exaggerated his accomplishments in England. The Pope responded by sending Augustine authority to create more bishops than were needed for the next nine hundred years. This authorization was the result in part of Augustine's exaggeration and in part of the Pope's misunderstanding of the message.[30]

Some sections did not respond so readily and favorably to the new faith as did Kent and Essex. The West Saxons are said to have been free of Christian influence at the time of the death of Augustine in 604. Furthermore, there must have been others whose response was similar to that of Raedwald, King of the East Angles. After his visit to Kent, where he was "persuaded to become a Christian," he returned to his kingdom and set up altars to both Christ and Woden in the same temple.[31]

There were also reversions to heathenism on some occasions, and Grimm says "There can be no doubt that for some time after the conversion people continued to light candles and offer small sacrifices under particular holy trees."[32] There was "apostasy, particularly in times of national disaster," from the Christian religion, and children did not always follow the new faith of their fathers even though they might feign acceptance of it during their parents' lifetime. Eadbald, son of Aethelbert of Kent, not only re-

[28]*Ibid.*, p. 73.

[29]*Ibid.*, p. 72.

[30]*Ibid.*, p. 75.

[31]*Ibid.*, pp. 75-79; Bruce Dickins, "English Names and Old English Heathenism," *Essays and Studies*, XIX (1933), 149.

[32]Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology*, I, 651.

fused baptism but married his stepmother "on the death of his father," a not untypical heathen practice, especially of the Warni on the continent.[33] Sons of Saebert, king of Essex, professed to be Christians during the father's lifetime but on his death declared their heathenism and expelled Bishop Mellitus.[34]

Priests of the ancient religion were not always on the defensive. Dickins says that "when St. Wilfrid was thrown on the Sussex coast a heathen high priest, standing on lofty ground, strove to curse the people of God and bind their hands."[35] Not all heathen priests took this attitude, however; and though there must have been varying degrees of adherence to the old faith, a celebrated account of another heathen priest's attitude toward the new faith is that set forth of Coifi, a heathen priest in the court of King Edwin of the Angles. The King, having been reluctant at first to accept Christianity, had decided to do so, according to Bede, but consulted a council of wise men at which Coifi spoke forth. He said that the religion they had did not appear efficacious, for he noted that others often received greater favors of the king than he though no one else equaled him for devoutness. Another counselor compared this life with a sparrow's brief flight from the stormy outside through the sheltered, heated hall to the ouside again. He recommended that if the new doctrine "contains anything more certain," it should be followed. Coifi having requested and received further explanation from Paulinus, the missionary, declared himself whole-heartedly in favor of the new religion and desired of the king that the temples be burned. In proof of his sincerity Coifi set forth, mounted on a stallion and bearing arms, to destroy his idols, the sex of his mount and the bearing of arms both testimony to the fact that he was renouncing his heathen religion.[36]

The final section of this paper will be devoted to the period after the conversion; and while there will be evidence considered from nonliterary sources and more than one literary source will be used, the main concern of this section will be with evidences of religion, pagan and Christian, found in *Beowulf*.

---

[33]Dickins, "English Names and Old English Heathenism," p. 148.

[34]Smith, *Saxon England*, p. 81.

[35]Dickins, "English Names and Old English Heathenism," p. 150.

[36]G. B. Wood, *et al., The Literature of England* (New York, 1958), I, 63-65.

The assumptions that there was a completely smooth transition from heathenism to Christianity and that the people soon forgot their old practices are hardly tenable. Though the difficulties were of a different order, there was conflict between the new and the old within the Welsh, or pre-Augustinian Christians, and those converts of Augustine over differences in the monastic tonsure and over the different means of computing the day for the observance of Easter. Augustine attempted unsuccessfully to settle the dispute —on his terms. At a later time Pope Honorius himself dispatched a letter to the recalcitrant arm of the church "prudently exhorting them not to hold their congregation, few in number and domiciled in the farthest bounds of the earth, to be wiser than the Church of Christ universal, both ancient and modern." Whether his message alone was sufficient is not known, but shortly after its receipt the desired effect was achieved.[37]

Though "the century after Bede is generally regarded as an age of the increasing degeneracy of the English church," it was well on its way toward degeneracy during his lifetime. Before his death Bede wrote of "sham monasteries" whose members were made up of apostate monks absent from their real monasteries, and laymen who were in these false monasteries "without religious motives" but who wished to "free their lands from military service and other secular burdens." Laymen were in control of these "monasteries."[38]

Osred, a king who was murdered, "was notorious for his immoralities—a ruler who used his position to seduce consecrated women in monasteries," and Boniface, who went to Germany to spend much of his life, became alarmed about the reports of immorality that he heard from the people of his own country when contrasted with what he considered was the stricter morality in Saxony. Along with five German bishops he sent a letter to Ethelbald of Mercia in which he "contrasted the licentiousness of the English king . . . with the severe morality of the continental Saxons" who showed a "great respect for the marriage tie."[39]

---

[37]Eleanor S. Duckett, *Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars* (New York, 1948), pp. 9-11.

[38]Hodgkin, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons*, pp. 417-418.

[39]*Ibid.*, pp. 407-419.

The real monasteries were subjected to stricter control and members were exhorted to "lead a quiet *regular* life," directed not "to wear showy clothes, . . . to be on their guard against drunkenness, . . . and not to keep poets, musicians or comedians."[40]

The poem *Beowulf* has attracted a great deal of study over the years, and one of the problems with which almost everyone who has dealt with the poem has had to come to grips is the fact that both heathen and Christian elements coexist within the poem. The extent to which each of these elements predominates has been studied, especially as additional studies have made clear certain references and patterns found within the poem.

O. F. Emerson in "Legends of Cain . . .," an article published in 1906, refers to the allusions to Cain as coming in the "Christian portion" of *Beowulf*. For first consideration Emerson cites the following passage:

> Danon untydras ealle onwocon,
> eotenas on ylfeon orcneas;
> swylce gigantas, þa wiþ Gode wunnon
> lange þrage; he him ðaes lean forgeald.

He translates it as follows:

> Thence arose all monstrous births,
> etens and elves and spirits of
> hell; the giants likewise, that
> strove against God a long time;
> for this he gave them their reward.[41]

Emerson notes the fact that there are two kinds of descendants from Cain—monsters and giants—and that both Grendel and his mother are identified with Cain,[42] and Kennedy[43] and Spaeth, along with all others, notice this fact, Spaeth observing that Grendel's connection with "the 'powers of darkness' is emphasized by the fact that he takes offense at the gleeman's song of the praise of the Creator."[44]

---

[40]*Ibid.*, p. 417.

[41]O. F. Emerson, "Legends of Cain, Especially in Old and Middle English Literature," PMLA, XXI (1906), 878-879.

[42]*Ibid.*, p. 880.

[43]Charles W. Kennedy (ed.), *Beowulf* (London, 1940), p. xlvii.

[44]John D. Spaeth, *Old English Poetry* (Princeton, 1927), p. 202.

Many of the epithets applied to Grendel are not only explicable but are related in terms of Grendel's putative descent from Cain. Especially suitable in view of Grendel's unholy progenitor are the terms "feond on helle," "feond," and "wiht unhaelo." In addition to such evidence is the added information that many of the terms applied to Grendel in *Beowulf* are used in *Genesis* and *Complaint of the Fallen Angels* to refer to devils. Emerson speaks of the "so-called interpolation regarding Cain" as no interpolation but an integral part of the poem.[45]

In recent scholarship arguments in favor of the essentially heathen nature or the pagan tone of the poem as a whole appear but are rejected. The opinion of Emerson, cited above, dissents from an attitude that the poem is essentially pagan. R. W. Chambers takes up the supposition that in view of the absence of references to Christ and the New Testament and to specific dogma of the church the poet is but a "nominal" Christian or a person of lukewarm adherence to the faith. Chambers rejects such an opinion and says that Hrothgar, Beowulf, Hygd, and Wealhtheow show an influence of Christianity beyond superficiality. He cites the fact that the *Battle of Maldon,* "written when England had been Christian for over three centuries," has a similar vagueness and absence of references to dogma. Furthermore Chambers does not believe the Christian references are interpolations or that the poet was one who "had become Christian because the court had newly become Christian," as Clark Hall suggested, but who had had little instruction in the faith.[46]

Kennedy,[47] Klaeber,[48] Phillpotts,[49] Whitelock,[50] Cabaniss,[51] and Wrenn[52] are in general agreement with Chambers that the overall effect of the poem is Christian. Such an attitude is not a

---

[45]Emerson, "Legends of Cain," pp. 880-883.

[46]R. W. Chambers, *Beowulf: An Introduction to the Study of the Poem . . .* (Cambridge, 1932), p. 126.

[47]Kennedy, *Beowulf,* p. xlix.

[48]F. Klaeber (ed.), *Beowulf* (Boston, 1950), p. xlix.

[49]Bertha Phillpotts, "Wyrd and Providence in Anglo-Saxon Thought," *Essays and Studies,* XIII (1928), 16.

[50]Dorothy Whitelock, *The Audience of Beowulf* (Oxford, 1951), p. 4.

[51]J. Allen Cabaniss, "Beowulf and the Liturgy," *JEGP,* LIV (1955), 199-200.

[52]C. L. Wrenn (ed.), *Beowulf* (London, 1953), p. 36.

denial of the pagan element, and there are problems inherent in this combination of Christianity and paganism.

Though there has generally been remarked the absence of dogma, specific church practices, and references to the New Testament, some scholars profess to fine evidences of these in *Beowulf*. Miss Hamilton, for example, sets forth the thesis that the doctrines of grace and divine providence are found in the poem. She concentrates on the following lines (166-9) of *Beowulf* which are followed by her translation:

> Heorot eardode
> Sincfage sel sweartum nihtem;—
> No he ðone gifstol gretan moste
> Maððum for Metode; ne his myne wisse.
> He might not approach the throne of grace, precious
> treasure, in the presence of God; he knew not His favor.

To her this means that Grendel was "too fast in the toils of crime to repent" and illustrates the "doctrine of grace (including reprobation and election)."[53]

Allen Cabaniss in "Beowulf and the Liturgy" finds part of *Beowulf* "quite heavily laden with a complex of ideas which presuppose familiarity with the baptismal liturgy." He cites St. Cyril of Jerusalem's reference to baptism as "a descent into the waters of death, into the habitat of the sea dragon," Beowulf's forgiving of his enemy Unferth, the "preternatural light" in the depths at the moment of victory, and the departure of all "except Beowulf's own faithful Geats," at the "same hour that Christ, abandoned by all but the most faithful few, died on the cross."[54]

Kennedy speaks of the poet's transmuting primitive material so that it is informed with the Christian spirit. He says, however, that the poem is a secular one in view of the time when it was written. There were some elements that resisted change, though the "original derivation of Grendel and his dam from the Scandinavian waterfall troll has been submerged and lost in the poet's identifica-

---

[53]Marie P. Hamilton, "The Religious Principle of *Beowulf*," *PMLA*, LXI (1946), 321.

[54]Cabaniss, "Beowulf and the Liturgy," pp. 195-198.

tion of the monsters with the fiends . . . of evil, and adversaries of God."[55]

Miss Phillpotts refers to *Beowulf* as the "first English compromise" in that it is a work near enough paganism "that no one will expect him [the poet] to celebrate the past with no references to paganism, but on the other hand, he must have a respectable hero and plot." She disagrees with Klaeber's contention that the poem is intended to "remind the audience of the Redeemer of their new faith" and says that such a theory faces "insurmountable odds," among which she mentions the absence of references to Christ or to anything in the New Testament, the heathen funeral, and a "dying hero who exults in the dragon's gold."[56]

The concept of revenge, especially blood revenge, is an element of heathenism yet surviving in *Beowulf* but not necessarily a concept which Anglo-Saxon Christians had dispensed with. "In 801 no less prominent a churchman than Alcuin himself wrote to Charles the Great in recommendation of a Northumbrian nobleman called Torhtmund that he had 'boldly avenged the blood of his lord.' "[57]

Chambers points out that some of the great Anglo-Saxon leaders could "combine the character of a tough fighting chieftain with that of the saintly churchman." Furthermore

> It is well to remember that Charles the Great, the Catholic and the orthodox, collected ancient lays which his successors thought too heathen to be tolerated; or that St. Olaf (who was so holy that, having absent-mindedly chipped shavings of a stick on Sunday, he burnt them as penance on his open hand) nevertheless allowed to be sung before him, on the morning of his last fight, one of the most wild and utterly heathen of all the old songs—the "Bjarkamal."[58]

Klaeber mentions the burning of the dead and blood revenge

---

[55]Kennedy, *Beowulf*, pp. xlix-liv.
[56]Phillpotts, "Wyrd and Providence," pp. 20-21.
[57]Whitelock, *The Audience of Beowulf*, p. 14.
[58]Chambers, *Beowulf*, p. 122.

as heathen elements in contrast to the Christian,[59] and Wrenn, who mentions the element of revenge, says that the audience of *Beowulf* would be able to accept the "righteous duty of vengeance for a wicked murder—as well as the blood feud—" without its seeming incompatible with Christianity. In Wrenn's opinion "Catholic Christianity and Germanic paganism have met" in lines of *Beowulf* below which are followed by his translation:

> Wyrd oft nereþ
> unfaegne eorl, ðonne his ellen deah.
> If . . . a man is not predestinated or doomed already, then often Fate will save him: . . . But only, we are told, if his valour is strong: and he must be . . . "undoomed."[60]

The final evidence of the meeting of heathenism and Christianity will be noted in brief mention of "The Dream of the Rood" and in consideration of the "Charms." In some respects the charms point up a great conflict, or show the conflict in bolder relief than any other evidence.

It would seem that in an account of the Crucifixion the poet would take pains to suppress evidences of the earlier religion, but it is in some parts of the poem difficult to ignore what may be interpreted as evidence of vestigial heathen worship embodied in the poem. One may readily grant the poetic license or dramatic propriety of having the cross a sentient, articulate being without being prepared for certain features of the poem. Hodgkin speaks of the poem by saying

> The magic of this tree is something other than that of the battle cross of St. Oswald, with its wonder-working qualities. The tree of the vision is animated. It feels, it suffers. In this heroic poetry the Cross as well as the crucified is the hero . . . The Anglo-Saxon devotion to the sacred tree was admittedly part primitive, and animistic, but it was more than that. It was Teutonic, redolent of the vast forests which had been the home

---

[59]Klaeber, *Beowulf,* p. xlviii.
[60]Wrenn, *Beowulf,* pp. 42-43.

Editors: Vol. 5 (1964): Full issue

and defence of the ancient Germans.[61]

The cross as a thinking being is conscious of its responsibility and neither bends nor breaks, for to do so, as the cross interprets it, would be against the wish of Christ. Not only aware of Christ's humiliation and suffering on the cross, the cross speaks concerning its own suffering:

ðurhdrifan he me mid deorcan naeglum: on
me syndon þa dolg gesiene.[62]

If not a certainty, here is again at least the likelihood of a fusion of both heathen and Christian elements, and the charms to be considered appear even clearer evidence of this fusion. Gordon says of the charms that they "preserve much superstition and folk lore." He believes that passages of the charms "untouched by Christianity are probably among the oldest lines in the English language."[63]

Those passages showing the influence of Christianity still preserve heathen elements and are a testimony to the fact that "old beliefs and customs were gradually overlaid and transformed by the new faith." This would be in keeping with Pope Gregory's advice to English missionaries whom he told to destroy the idols of the heathen English but not the temples. Relics were to be placed within the temples and holy water sprinkled inside. It was thought that the Anglo-Saxons, once Christian converts, would more readily attend Christian worship in buildings they had been accustomed to visit for religious purposes at an earlier time. Later church policy, however, was not so lenient.[64]

If observations made in the twentieth century have any relevance to Anglo-Saxon times, the charms relating to medical treatment and agriculture should reveal practices more ancient than the date of their writing. Some people today are more concerned with the moon and its supposed efficacy on farming than they

---

[61]Hodgkin, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons,* p. 461.

[62]James R. Hulbert (ed.), *Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader* (New York, 1959), p. 185.

[63]R. K. Gordon (ed. and trans.), *Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (London, 1930), p. 85.

[64]*Ibid.,* p. 85.

are with terrestrial influence as might be gained from an agricultural experiment station. Other people, and some from the previous group, are more responsive to the modern mountebanks and charlatans and their highly advertised wares than in securing the services of an internist or a Fellow of the American College of Surgeons for the treatment of physical ailments.

The charms to be considered fit the two categories of agriculture and medicine, and the one which may be called "Land Remedy" or "For Fertility" deals with agriculture. It would not take the reference to Erce to remind the reader that this charm, despite its interlarding with Christian terminology, the fact that the turfs are carried to church and have masses sung over them and later cover crosses buried underneath them, is a fertility rite with strong evidence of antedating the conversion of Britain.[65]

It appears almost as if the repeated injunctions to say the Paternoster and the burying of the crosses under the turfs are in a sense supererogations. At the least the situation is reminiscent of the king who had altars to both Christ and Woden in his temple, assuming, perhaps, that he would have the efficacy of each god or, on the other hand, dreading to offend either.

"For Sudden Pain" or "For a Sudden Stitch" is in the medical category. The cause of pain is conceived to be spirits, and the relief of it is their exorcism. The "exorcist has three retaliatory measures—the arrow, the knife . . ., and the spear."[66] The exorcist adjures the "spears," or pains, to leave, the spirits having earlier departed. The command, "Ut lytel spere, gif herinne sy," is repeated. If the spear does not understand the direction, the exorcist is more explicit by saying "Ut spere! naes in, spere!"[67] Gordon believes that there may have been an application of ointment as the practitioner named "the situation and author" of the pain. Gordon suggests further that the knife may be plunged into a "dummy representing the evil spirits" as the charm closes.[68]

In a final note on Anglo-Saxon religion it may be worthwhile to call attention to the adaptability of the Anglo-Saxons in their re-

[65]Hubert, *Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader,* pp. 179-181.

[66]Gordon, *Anglo-Saxon Poetry,* p. 85.

[67]Hubert, *Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader,* p. 182.

[68]Gordon, *Anglo-Saxon Poetry,* p. 85.

ligious practices. The influence of their general Teutonic, specifically Scandinavian, heritage is obvious, but what is also obvious to the student of religion in England is the fact that the Anglo-Saxons were neither bound to the specific gods nor the specific forms of worship of their ancestors once the descendants left their continental home.

The adaptability of the Anglo-Saxons likely resulted in diverse modes of worship among a people who had no unified, organized system of worship prior to the advent of Augustine (this is exclusive of those in communion with the Welsh church). There may well have been innumerable charms, sacred groves, or holy trees, and diverse spirits that were both feared, propitiated, and, on occasion, invoked.

A typical temple had idols to more gods than one, and if the belief that the desecration of a temple was not considered an outrage is true, such a situation would substantiate the thesis of the overall adaptability of the Anglo-Saxons in religious matters.

Finally, a belief in the adaptability of the Anglo-Saxons appears to find support in the result of Augustine's visit. The ready acceptance of the new belief is important, but of greater importance seems to be the absence of a single martyrdom in an area and among a people not noted for freedom from war. Their leaders were by their own claim descended from Woden, a bellicose ancestor.

It is patently impossible to know all the causes for the speed of the conversion or its peaceableness. Moreover, of the causes that are known it is not possible to assign with any measure of certitude the relative weight that a specific cause may have had. Under the rubric of adaptability may be listed certain characteristics favorable to change. First would be the susceptibility if not the hospitality to change implicit in the differences discerned between the characteristics of the gods noted among the earlier Teutonic people on the continent and those in England. Second would be the lack of organization and centralized control with power to establish orthodoxy and interdict and penalize apostasy. Third would be the loose polytheism which apparently had one god defeating another but with more than one honored. Fourth would

be the apparent lack of a sense of outrage at the desecration of a heathen temple.

As a conclusion it may be worth noting again the recommendation of Coifi, heathen priest and counselor, who in his recommendation stated a personal reason for his choice when he told the king that if the new doctrine had in it anything more certain than the old, he favored its acceptance. This counselor and his king were among the many who did accept.

STARK YOUNG AT THE SOUTHERN LITERARY FESTIVAL

by John Pilkington

Although there has been no lack of critical and scholarly interest in the life and work of Stark Young since his death, January 6, 1963, no full length study or biography has yet appeared. When a biographer does undertake this service to the history of American letters, he will undoubtedly recognize the necessity for analyzing Stark Young's attitude or relationship to the South and, in particular, to his native state of Mississippi. One of the keys to an understanding of that relationship may well be provided by an examination of Stark Young's last visit to the University of Mississippi, April 22, 1949, as the featured speaker at the Southern Literary Festival.

Because of Stark Young's long-standing connection with the University of Mississippi, the invitation to speak extended him by Professor W. Alton Bryant, president of the Southern Literary Festival and chairman of the Department of English, was singularly appropriate. In 1901, Stark Young had been graduated from the University of Mississippi with the B. A. degree. He had done well in his major subjects—Greek, Latin, French, and English. Later, in his autobiography, *The Pavilion* (1951), he was to analyze the virtues—and shortcomings—of the education he received.[1] Four years after he was graduated, he returned to the university to serve as assistant professor of English until 1907. During this time he published a volume of poems, *The Blind Man at the Window and Other Poems* (1906), and a verse drama *Guenevere* (1906). The two books indicate the nature of the interests that were to shape the remainder of his life. He left the University of Mississippi to teach first at the University of Texas and afterwards at Amherst College. By 1935, when the Commencement Committee invited him to return to the University of Mississippi as the commencement speaker, Stark Young had already published *So Red the Rose*

[1]Stark Young, *The Pavilion: Of People and Times Remembered, Of Stories and Places* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), pp. 141-159.

Editors: Vol. 5 (1964): Full issue

which, added to his dramatic criticism, had made him perhaps the most distinguished graduate of the university. Regretfully he declined the invitation because of commitments in Europe, but his disappointment at not being able to accept may have made him all the more receptive to another invitation extended to him during the celebration of the centennial of the University of Mississippi during the academic year of 1948-1949.

When Professor Bryant wrote Stark Young in January, 1949, asking him to address the Southern Literary Festival Association, which was to meet on the campus of the University of Mississippi, he responded warmly. "The invitation for April," he wrote, "is very alluring and full of good promises. I appreciate it highly."[2] As the principal address of the festival, Stark Young's lecture was scheduled to follow the morning and afternoon sessions and the banquet. In the morning, John Crowe Ransom was to read selections from his own poetry, and in the afternoon an open forum on creative writing was to feature the following participants: Miss Elizabeth Spencer, a member of the University of Mississippi English Department faculty and author of *Fire in the Morning* (1948); Harry Harrison Kroll, author of *Fury in the Earth* (1945) and other novels; Paul Flowers, literary editor of *The Commercial Appeal* (Memphis); and Barrett C. Keisling, who had done public relations work in Oxford in connection with the filming of the motion picture version of William Faulkner's *Intruder in the Dust.* At the banquet, the speaker was Professor W. L. Kennon, chairman of the Department of Physics and Astronomy of the University of Mississippi.

By early March, Stark Young had made the necessary rearrangements in his schedule to permit him to come to the university and was outlining the contents of his lecture. In a letter to Professor Bryant, he remarked that "the subjcet I would most prefer is Translating as an Aid to writers."[3] He wanted to show, as he said, "various passages and the elements involved when one translates them, as to language, style, detail, emphases, special qualities of a language as distinguished from other languages." Lest Professor Bryant

[2]Letter to W. Alton Bryant, January 17, 1949, in the library of the University of Mississippi. Quotations from the letters of Stark Young have been made with the permission of Mr. William McKnight Bowman, executor of the Stark Young estate.

[3]The same, March 4, 1949.

think that the speech would be too technical for the audience, Stark Young added a significant comment: "This sounds far more academic than it is. In my own case this is the route by which I learned most about writing, the greatest school I have had." A month later, he again wrote Professor Bryant about the nature of the lecture:

> I still think I want to make the address on translating, which to me is a very living subject. I should be talking about other languages as means by which to develop our own and to see the special points in writing, such as emphases, sound, and so on, plus a variety of qualities. I don't think I would be stuffy about all this. I can't think of a promising title. *Translations.* Or *Lights from Strange Lamps.* . . .[4]

The title finally chosen was "Lights from Strange Lamps."

Stark Young's address, delivered in the auditorium of the Alexander L. Bondurant Graduate Building (named for Stark Young's former Latin professor), was a stunning success. Many of the audience of more than two hundred writers and professors who crowded into the small auditorium to hear the lecture were deeply impressed by Stark Young's command of his material and his ability to convey the specifically poetic qualities of individual lines. In his address, he endeavored to show how a knowledge of foreign languages could enrich the study of English poetry. Paul Flowers noted that Stark Young "had not a scrap of paper to prompt his memory—like the peripatetics of old he paced back and forth, from one side of the stage to the other, upstage and down, giving life and eloquence and breath to his performance."[5]

Afterwards, Professor David Horace Bishop, who for many years had been chairman of the Department of English, described the lecture in *The Ole Miss Alumni Review.* Professor Bishop's account reveals how closely Stark Young followed the tentative outline he had earlier suggested to Professor Bryant:

---

[4]The same, April 4, 1949.

[5]"Paul Flowers' Greenhouse," *The Commercial Appeal* (Memphis), January 13, 1964, p. 6.

> The announced subject was mystifying to all: "Lights from Strange Lamps." The speaker at once made clear the secret underlying the cryptic title. It would be his attempt to relate selected English poems to their sources, to reveal the light gained for the poem by knowing an influencing source, and also, alas, to recognize what had been lost in translating. But, over all, the value of Mr. Young's address, it was proved, appeared in the demonstrated importance of foreign languages, classic and modern, in influencing the art and ideas of much English and American poetry.[6]

Evidently, Stark Young, as he had promised Professor Bryant, had been neither "stuffy" nor too technical. After explaining the meaning of the title of the speech, Professor Bishop continued his account:

> All this, as recorded here, sounds forbidding. But the event proved otherwise. The response in attention to the speaker's apt illustrations of his theme and the enjoyment of the wit and humor, casually cropping out or penetrating the expressed fact or idea, manifested an appreciation rarely experienced by one who speaks on a strictly literary theme. Perhaps there was something else, something to a degree extraneous, that added a fascinating feature to the performance. Mr. Young was able to quote, promptly and fluently, extended stretches from French, Italian and Latin, at ease and never hesitating. A few caught phrases kept them in sight of the problem. A very few, perhaps, followed fairly well now and then. But a large part of the audience heard with admiration the agility of Mr. Young's speech, listening as attentively as if whatever language the speaker quoted were their native speech.[7]

---

[6]David H. Bishop, "Stark Young Remembers the University with Gifts," *The Ole Miss Alumni Review*, IV (April, 1950), 3.

[7]The same.

Professor Bishop's final comment seems to summarize the reaction of the audience to Stark Young. Wrote Professor Bishop, "The ovation at the close would have been thrilling to any speaker."

There can be no doubt that Stark Young was pleased with the reception of his address. He had wanted to be appreciated in his own university, and he had succeeded impressively. In a letter written to Miss Ella Somerville a few weeks after the lecture, he commented: "Dr. Bryant has written me a very fine letter saying in his opinion and that of various others that was the finest lecture he had ever heard. Very kind. If anywhere in the world I'd like my words to go right it would be there in my own country."[8] Several months later, he remarked to Miss Somerville that "it will take a good many years to digest that perfect visit to Oxford."[9]

In other letters he emphasized his sense of kinship with the people of the South. During his visit to the University of Mississippi, he had renewed his ties with those he called his own. In November, 1949, he wrote Dean Pete Kyle McCarter: "I still remember my visit there with pleasure and with great pride in my own people. It warms my heart—I who have seen a lot, perhaps too much, of the world—to think of their beautiful manners and gentle bearing, along with an impression of plenty of good sense."[10] To Professor Bryant, he wrote that he had never lectured "to an audience that I liked so much as I did that at the University of Mississippi. My own people, justifying all the good things I have been saying of them for years."[11] To Paul Flowers, he expressed the quality of his feelings in somewhat different terms. Wrote Stark Young:

> Many years ago that dear place seems, and going home again did me good and reinforced my morale. I was very proud of my own people, seeing them again like that—their fine looks, their very good manners and so on. In my time I have

---

[8]Letter to Miss Ella Somerville [May 3, 1949], used by permission of Miss Ella Somerville.

[9]The same [July 21, 1949].

[10]Letter to Pete Kyle McCarter, November 11, 1949, in the library of the University of Mississippi.

[11]Letter to W. Alton Bryant, April 26, 1949, in the library of the University of Mississippi.

Editors: Vol. 5 (1964): Full issue

> seen a good deal of the world, the humble and the grand, so that I have a scale of values that is at least not founded on ignorance. To see in my own people the splendid qualities and to feel a surge of love for them in my heart is a blessed experience.[12]

Was Stark Young overstating his emotional response to his visit to the University of Mississippi? The warmth of the audience's response to his lecture and the praise and admiration expressed in the letters that went to him from members of the Department of English and the administration of the university could be expected to have prompted him to take a courteous, even affectionate tone in reply. Were the comments in the letters already quoted merely the result of his Southern politeness, or did they represent the deeper feelings of Stark Young towards Mississippi and the other parts of the South? The length and forcefulness of language in the following letter, written to Dean McCarter in August, 1949, suggest that he meant what he said:

> Dear Dr. McCarter, since your letter is so warm and cordial and settles so happily into my heart and mind, I want to repeat what I said in Oxford about my talk to that most responsive and gentle audience. I lectured in Italy, in Italian, 1931, on the Westinghouse Foundation, for the Italian-American Society, at the most distinguished places in Italy. The lectures were four, on aspects of American literature and the theatre. The American Ambassador took me under his wing, the newspapers under Fascist orders I imagine were wonderful to me, Mussolini invited me to call at the Palazzo Venezie and kept me two hours or more, Grandi, Minister of Foreign Affairs had me to dinner, and finally the King sent sent me the highest decoration in the Order of the Crown of Italy, *Commendatore.* The great princess left their cards at my hotel, et cetera et cetera.

[12]Letter to Paul Flowers [August, 1951], in the library of the University of Mississippi.

There are two points to that. The first is that the audience there at the University was much closer to my desire and much more blessed in their quality. Nothing could have been easier—though I have long since quit lecturing, because it is so full of tricks and is apt to make one cheap—than to talk to such people. The quotations I used in my talk were already in my mind; only one of them I looked up because I was not sure of the repetitions—that from San Juan de la Cruz—and anything I said of interest was more than half the thing that came to me from such lovely people. I have made it a point in Europe to meet and to observe diverse cultures and social patterns, and always with the purpose in view of seeing our Southern culture in some light different from that here in this Eastern Seaboard. I had a friend in Florence the Marchesa Bacciocchi, Princess Imperiale, great-grand-daughter of Napoleon's sister Elisa, whom he married to Bacciocchi, the more or less king of Bologna. The mother of my friend asked me to come to see her, she wanted to ask me how an Amrican could have written my books. I said it all came from the same thing, a people whose social ideals were based on the land, the love of it and the responsibility. That is an excellent case of the parallel that I wanted to find.

If you knew New York as well as I do, though I don't circulate to any extent these days, you would be horrified to see the people from whose columns they are able to pour the vulgarity and confusion that is abroad. It seems pathetic that our South with its excellent qualities left still, however strangled and fuddled by the general drift, cannot be secure in itself and cannot study what high rightness they may in many respects have inherited.[13]

[13]Letter to Pete Kyle McCarter, August 28, 1949, in the library of the University of Mississippi.

Editors: Vol. 5 (1964): Full issue

Written a year later, Stark Young's letter to Professor Charles Munro Getchell, chairman of the Department of Speech and Theater, shows that he continued to think of his visit to the university in the same way. "I did appreciate and value your too kind and gracious letter more than I can tell you," wrote Stark Young. "It is I who remember all that gentle cordiality and friendly response in that world of my old University, and I recall that visit to your class with a warm heart. It was delightful to me to see that the new men on the faculty are of the calibre they are. One could see at one glance that your class was not taught by anything mediocre, anybody without wit and theatre practice and wisdom."[14] His words were, of course, a graceful tribute from one man of the theatre to another; they were also an indication of the consistency of Stark Young's attitude.

The accounts of Stark Young's address to the Southern Literary Festival and the subsequent references in his letters to his visit to the University of Mississippi tell the story of a successful and gratifying experience and emphasize the closeness of Stark Young's ties to the South as well as his warm response to southern people. It remains for his biographer to determine the extent to which his visit influenced the writing of *The Pavilion* and to place it in terms of his total relationship with the South.

[14]Letter to Charles Munro Getchell, August 28, 1950, used by permission of Mrs. Charles Munro Getchell.

TROILUS AND CRESSIDA AND ELIZABETH COURT FACTIONS

by James E. Savage

It is the purpose of this paper to suggest that there is much more reflection of contemporary events in *Troilus and Cressida* than commentators have noted and that this reference becomes most apparent when the assumption is made that not Achilles, but Hector, offers comment on the character and fate of the Earl of Essex.[1]

Critical efforts to account for this puzzling play have almost always taken note of contemporary affairs, perhaps merely denying their relevance,[2] possibly seeing, as does G. B. Harrison, a rebuke to Essex under the recalcitrance of Achilles.[3] The position which I wish to take is adumbrated, though not fully explored, by C. F. Tucker-Brooke, who sees these kinships: "Cecil-Ulysses" and "Raleigh-Diomed."[4] He also suggests a foreshadowing of Puritan-Cavalier relationships to come. Surely, as Harrison says elsewhere, "no one . . . at the time could have failed to notice the striking

---

[1]Some of the suggestions made in this essay have been put forth tentatively in *The Elizabethan Elements in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida* by Merritt Clare Batchelder (Unpublished dissertation, University of Iowa, 1935). He sees the play as, to some extent, a commentary on the court factions, but his primary interest is in the contemporary ideas embodied in the speeches. He does suggest a strong resemblance between Hector and Essex; he finds in Troilus, in Cressida, and in Pandarus an indictment of the conduct of the courtiers and the ladies of the court. In Ulysses he sees the Machiavelian, the man of policy, with many suggestions of Robert Cecil; Thersites is to him the embodiment of the satirist of the time, under whatever name.

In his recent biography, *William Shakespeare* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), A. L. Rowse sees *Troilus and Cressida* as partly commentary on the court factions. Not only Sir Robert Cecil, but Shakespeare himself, speaks through Ulysses. Shakespeare, though his sympathies lay with the Essex faction, is under Achilles condemning the follies of Essex, and the Achilles-Patrochus relationship of the play is much like that of Essex and Southampton, though there is no "crude transcript" of a whole character. (pp. 338-349)

[2]W. W. Lawrence, *Shakespeare's Problem Comedies* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1960), pp. 122-173, *passim.*

[3]G. B. Harrison, *Shakespeare at Work* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1958), pp. 198-228.

[4]C. F. Tucker-Brooke, *Essays on Shakespeare and Other Elizabethans* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1948), p. 76.

parallels between Essex's story and much of Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*."[5]

The apparent failure of the great Earl's campaign in Ireland, the precipitate return to court, the increasing horde of visitors to Essex house, the abortive sally of Essex and his followers into the city, the trial of Essex, the nobility and the bathos of his death —all these were profoundly moving to the courtier, the Londoner, perhaps to all Englishmen. The uncertainty of the succession, the age and irascibility of the Queen, her grief over the death of her favorite—these too were matters that gave rise to alarm, to fear both personal and national, and to endless intrigues and jockeyings for position. That Shakespeare could write in the midst of them without taking them into account, as I am suggesting, in *Troilus and Cressida,* appears most unlikely.

In 1598, George Chapman dedicated the *Seven Books of the Iliades of Homer* to Essex as "THE MOST HONOURED NOW LIVING INSTANCE OF THE ACHILLEAN VIRTUES ETERNIZED BY THE DIVINE HOMER." In the dedicatory epistle he continues: "in whose unmatched virtues shine the dignities of the soul, and the whole excellence of royal humanity, let not the peasant-common politics of the world, that count all things servile and simple, . . . stir your divine temper from perseverance in godlike pursuit of eternity."[6] While this, of course, has some of the fulsomeness of the usual Elizabethan dedication, it represents with reasonable fairness the attitude of many of Elizabeth's subjects toward her great favorite. But—the Achilles of the *Iliades* is most emphatically not the Achilles of *Troilus and Cressida.* To the Hector of the play such praise is due, and I submit that in the person of Hector the popular conception of Essex is embodied.

Robert Devereaux, the Earl of Essex, was not without the appurtenances in person, in character, and in exploits, to render him a popular hero. He was, to some extent, to the 1590's what Sir Philip Sidney had been to the 1580's. To the magnanimity and bravery of a Sidney, he could add a magnificent personal appear-

---

[5]G. B. Harrison, *The Life and Death of Robert Devereaux Earl of Essex* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1937), p. 347.

[6]Richard Herne Shepherd, ed., *The Works of George Chapman: Homer's Iliad and Odyssey* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1924), pp. 7-8.

ance and a reputation for generosity and kindliness. That he was stepson to the great Earl of Leicester, as Sidney had been nephew, and that his wife was the widow of Philip Sidney were circumstances that contributed to the legend. There were, however, many other reasons for his popular appeal. The common enemy was Spain, and Essex had a great, though possibly undeserved, reputation through his participation in the Spanish expeditions. He was a profoundly religious man, though he extended more sympathy to the Puritan, and perhaps to the disaffected Catholic, than was approved by the policy of the state. His chivalric appeal attracted to him many of the younger nobility and gentry, men such as the Earls of Southampton, Rutland, Bedford. The number of knights he created on the field of battle was well over one hundred. Of those he created in Ireland, John Chamberlain dryly remarks: ". . . for what service I know not, but belike yt be *de bene esse*, in hope they will deserve yt hereafter."[7] Courtiers disaffected to Raleigh and Robert Cecil of the rival court faction swelled the numbers of those who saw in Essex a leader for troublous times.

These court factions were a potent force in the waning days of the reign of Elizabeth. She had tolerated, perhaps even fostered them, as a deliberate means of curbing the power of any too-aspiring courtier or favorite. Their composition had crystallized early in the 1590's, and the principal adherents of each remained constant at least until Essex began to fall into disfavor. On September 28, 1599, after the return of Essex from Ireland, and before he came into complete disgrace, the principal members of both factions dined at court. The following account of that dinner, as gleaned from the *Sidney Papers*, is given by G. B. Harrison:

> Then he [Essex] came down to dinner, where his friends joined him, the Earls of Worcester and Rutland, Mountjoy, Lord Rich, Lord Henry Howard, and many others. . . . The Secretary [Robert Cecil] and his party, the Earl of Shrewsbury, the Lord Admiral, Lord Thomas Howard, Lord Cobham, Grey, and Sir Walter Raleigh dined apart and aloof.[8]

---

[7]Norman Egbert McClure, ed., *The Letters of John Chamberlain* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939), I, 79.
[8]Harrison, *Essex*, p. 249.

Editors: Vol. 5 (1964): Full issue

Only one important name is missing from the list of the friends of Essex, that of Henry Wriothesley, the Earl of Southampton.

Animosity prevailed in varying degrees among the principals. Sir Robert Cecil could and did, by virtue of his office, befriend members of the opposing faction. Nor was the Lord Admiral particularly vindictive. But little quarter was given in the struggle between Raleigh and Essex, after Raleigh was reprimanded by Essex for an unauthorized action during the Cadiz expedition. Equal animosity arose between Essex and Lord Cobham in the struggle for the Wardenship of the Cinque Ports and continued unabated thereafter. Southampton reprimanded Lord Grey of Wilton during the Irish campaign; and thereafter, not even the commands of the Queen could prevent clashes between them.

There could be no neutral ground, no basis of friendship with members of both factions for those who frequented the court. This necessity of allegiance to one or the other can be exemplified by a letter written in 1598 by Lord Grey of Wilton to Lord Cobham:

> Of late my Lord of Essex, doubting whereuppon I should be so well favoured at Court, and especially by her Majesty, has forced me to declare myself either his only, or friend to Mr. Secretary and his enemy: protesting there could be no neutrality.[9]

Yet in all this struggle, the primary antagonists were popularly thought to be, and probably were, Essex and Raleigh. The lengths to which the animosity, at least of Raleigh, could go are suggested by this letter which he wrote to Sir Robert Cecil, probably in February of 1600:

> I am not wise enough to give you advice, but if you take it for a good counsel to relent towards this tyrant, [Essex] you will repent it when it shall be too late. His malice is fixed, and will not evaporate by any your mild courses, for he will ascribe the alteration to her Majesty's pusillanimity and not to your good nature, knowing that

[9]Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Salisbury Papers*, VIII, 269.

> you work but upon her humour, and not out of any love towards him. The less you make him, the less he shall be able to harm you and yours, and if her Majesty's favour fail him, he will again decline to a common person. For after revenges, fear them not . . . . His son shall be the youngest Earl of England but one, and if his father be now kept down, Will Cecill shall be able to keep as many men at his heels as he, and more too. . . . But if the father continue, he will be able to break the branches and pull up the tree, root and all. Lose not your advantage. If you do, I read your destiny.[10]

The factional struggle in Elizabeth's court was literally a struggle to the death, and the multitudes with whom Essex was "popular" believed him to have been unjustly done to death by enemies at court.

What would Shakespeare have known of all these matters, and where would his sympathies lie? Such evidence as there is would suggest sympathy with the Essex faction as the more likely alternative, and even some perhaps inadvertant participation on the periphery of the great events. Some early relationship with Southampton is indicated by the dedications to him, in 1593 and 1594, of *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*. That Shakespeare had some direct and perhaps unpleasant experience with Lord Cobham of the Raleigh faction appears in connection with the Falstaff scenes of the *Henry IV* plays. I quote the analysis of that situation by E. K. Chambers:

> . . . Shakespeare substituted Sir John Falstaff as his leading humorist for Sir John Oldcastle. As to the fact of this substitution there can be no doubt. Tradition as early as about 1625 records it, and it has left traces in the texts . . . . A reason for the change can readily be found in the fact that Sir John Oldcastle married an ancestress

[10] *Ibid.*, X, 439.

> of the Lords Cobham, who were prominent at the Elizabethan court.[11]

A direct and admiring reference to Essex is embodied in the Prologue to Act V of *Henry V*:

> Were now the Generall of our gracious Empress,
> As in good time he may, from Ireland comming,
> Bringing Rebellion broached on his Sword;
> How many would the peacefull Citie quit,
> To welcome him?

The references in these plays would belong to the years 1597-1599.

After the return of Essex from Ireland and his subsequent disgrace, two contemporary records link Shakespeare, as a member of the Lord Chamberlain's Company, to the goings-on of the factions; and the association is with the followers of Essex. A letter of Roland Whyte notes that "My Lord Southampton and Lord Rutland come not to the court, the one doth, but very seldome, they pass the time in London merely in going to plays every day."[12] The other reference is contained in the well known deposition of Augustine Phillips on February 18, 1600:

> . . . on Fryday last was sennyght or Thursday Sr Charles Percy Sr Josclyne Percy and the L. Montegle with some thre more spak to some of the players in the presans of thys examinate to have the play of the deposyng and kyllyng of Kyng Rychard the second to be played the Saterday next promysyng to gete them xls. more then their ordynary to play yt . . . . at their request this Examinate and his fellowes were Content to play yt the Saterday and had their xls. more then their ordynary for yt and so played yt accordyngly.[13]

---

[11] E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare* (2 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1930), I, 381-382.

[12] As quoted by C. C. Stopes, *The Third Earl of Southampton* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1922), from *Sidney Papers*, 25 October, 1599, II, 132.

[13] As quoted by Chambers (*William Shakespeare*, II, 325) from *S. P. Dom. Eliz.* cclxxviii 85.

In view of the circumstances which I have outlined, it seems useful to explore the possibility that under Shakespeare's Hector the Earl of Essex is adumbrated and that certain characters of the play stand in relation to Hector as certain members of the two factions of Elizabeth's court stood in relation to Essex.[14]

Perhaps to no other of his characters has Shakespeare allowed the unqualified praise which in this play is given to Hector. To foe and friend alike, to Ulysses, to Achilles, to Paris, he is "great Hector." To Ulysses he is "the gallant," "the valiant"; to Troilus he is "worthy" and "brave", though with an unfortunate "vice of mercy." He alone of the major characters is not besmirched by the foul tongue of Thersites. Even to Achilles, after the slaying of Patroclus, he is no more than "the bloudy Hector," the "boy-queller."

The Hector of Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* is more gentle, more magnanimous, more terrible in battle, more temperate in council, than the Hector of the *Iliades*, or of Shakespeare's other sources. He is much like the popular, though perhaps mistaken, image of the Earl of Essex. And certainly Shakespeare's arrogant, slothful, treacherous Achilles is not what the myriad friends and followers of Essex believed Essex to be.

One other suggestion of an analogy between the careers of Hector and Essex should be made at this time—the challenge. That issued in the play by Hector was of an essentially military purpose, though couched in terms of a lady's virtue and beauty, and was intended for Achilles. It was by the policy of Ulysses that Achilles was rejected; it was by the chicanery of Ulysses that Ajax was chosen. The essential purpose of Ulysses was the pitting against each other of Achilles and Ajax, rather than any immediate victory over Hector. In the circumstances of its issuance and the chivalric nature of its statement, Hector's challenge is unlike any found in Shakespeare's sources. Its circumstances do resemble those of a duel fought by Essex with Charles Blount, as a consequence of a favor shown to Blount by Queen Elizabeth.[15] Essex

[14]If, as Alexander suggests ("Troilus and Cressida 1609," *Library*, 4th Series, IX; 278-279) *Troilus and Cressida* was written for performance at one of the Inns of Court, Shakespeare could have assumed in his audience a considerable knowledge of the personalities and relationships at court.

[15]J. E. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth* (New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1934), p. 304.

was wounded; but the two were soon reconciled, and thereafter Blount, later to be Lord Mountjoy and Earl of Devonshire, was a member of the Essex faction until the abortive rebellion. Soon after this duel, Essex issued a challenge to Raleigh, but the meeting was prevented by the Privy Council.[16] In the Low Countries, in 1591, through a letter to the Marquis of Villars, Essex offered to maintain "that the King's quarrel is juster than the League's, that I am better than you, and that my Mistress is fairer than yours."[17] Still a fourth challenge by Essex occurred in Spain: "Into one of the gates of the town Essex, as a parting gesture, thrust in his pike, 'demanding aloud if any Spaniard mewed therein durst adventure forth in favour of his mistress to break a lance.' "[18] It is not impossible that Shakespeare had knowledge of some, or all of these circumstances, and that they may have suggested to him the formal and chivalric terms of Hector's challenge.

Hector is almost unique among the heroes of Shakespeare's serious plays in that he fails of being either fully heroic or fully tragic. As has been pointed out above, he is extravagantly lauded by all the characters in the play, Greek and Trojan alike. But he is not so treated in those things which Shakespeare has him say and do. Early in the play we are told that because Ajax has struck him to the ground, "he chid Andromache and struck his armorer." Such petty conduct would seem incongruous in a Brutus, a Macbeth, an Othello. In the Trojan council debating the question of returning Helen to the Greeks, it is Hector who speaks with reason, who sees the opposed factors in their true significance. But, though he knows that Paris and Troilus "on the cause and question now in hand/Have gloz'd, but superficially," he yields to their worser counsels. On the morning of his death, though Priam the King, Cassandra the Prophetess, and Andromache his wife persuade against his going to battle, and though he is urging Troilus to remain in Ilium, he goes forth to "Doe deeds of praise, and tell you them at night." Here too, to Andromache he is most ungracious: "you traine me to offend you: get you gone." In such scenes as these there are strong suggestions of inconsistency and irresponsibility in Hector's character.

---

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] Harrison, *Essex*, p. 62.

[18] As quoted from W. W. Lawrence, *Shakespeare's Problem Comedies* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1960), p. 144.

On the battle field on the fatal day, though Hector performs almost superhuman feats, ("Mangled Myrmidons/That noseless, handlesse, hackt and chipt, come to him/Crying on Hector") he exercises almost to the point of folly his "vice of mercy." Fully armed, he says to Achilles "Pause if thou wilt," a courtesy of which Achilles is glad to avail himself. Then he commits the further folly of pursuing the "One in Armour." After the pursuit, and the admonition "Thy goodly armour thus hath cost thy life," he then commits the further folly of disarming himself, for, "now is my daies work done." With the murderous blows of the Myrmidons, on the orders of Achilles, his day's work is indeed done. Such a sequence of events may well be sound comment on the real character and career of Essex, his peevishness and instability in council, his ill-fated Irish expedition, and the foolish uprising that was indeed a quest for "goodly armour."

If Hector reflects Essex, then Troilus reflects Southampton. His character is given in a set piece by Ulysses, who is quoting Aeneas:

> The youngest Sonne of *Priam;*
> A true Knight; they call him *Troylus*;
> Not yet mature, yet matchlesse, firme of word,
> Speaking in deedes, and deedelesse in his tongue;
> Not soone prouok't, nor being prouok't, soone calm'd;
> His heart and hand both open, and both free:
> For what he has, he giues; what thinkes, he shewes;
> Yet giues he not till judgement guide his bounty,
> Nor dignifies an impaire thought with breath:
> Manly as *Hector*, but more dangerous;
> For *Hector* in his blaze of wrath subscribes
> To tender obiects; but he, in heate of action,
> Is more vindecatiue then jealous loue.
> They call him *Troylus;* and on him erect,
> A second hope, as fairely built as *Hector*.[19] (IV, v, 111-125)

Such a description is undramatic and contrived, but it is not unlike the real character of Southampton, who was generous, loyal, per-

[19] *Variorum*, ed. H. N. Hillebrand (Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1953). Unless reference is made to the Quarto of 1609, or to the Folio, the *Variorum* is the source of all quotations.

haps quick to anger. As early as 1591, he was a follower of Essex; he accompanied him in the attacks on Spain; he served, in spite of the disapproval of Elizabeth and her Council, as his general of the horse in Ireland. He took part in the councils which led to the abortive uprising in London, followed Essex in that sally, and was condemmed at the same time, and by the same tribunal, to the same fate as Essex.

Southampton, as early as 1595, had in Elizabeth Vernon his Cressida. She was a cousin to Essex. John Chamberlain perhaps reflects general opinion of their relationship when he writes in 1598,

> Mistris Vernon is from the court, and lies in Essex House; some say she hath taken a venew under the girdle and swells upon yt, yet she complaines not of fowle play but sayes the erle of Southampton will justifie yt:[20]

Of Cressida, however, more later.

After a brief sojourn in the Fleet Prison, Southampton was on December 8, 1598, made general of the horse, and was soon serving with Essex in Ireland. Under his command was Lord Grey of Wilton. Grey exceeded orders in a charge and was disciplined (one night's arrest) by Southampton. As a result of this "disgrace," Grey became an inveterate enemy to Southampton. Grey returned to Court, and probably as a result of his demands and in view of the fact that Queen Elizabeth had disapproved of the appointment, Essex was forced to relieve Southampton of his command of the horse. In *Troilus and Cressida,* Diomides gets Troilus' horse, as indeed he does in most of the sources. Yet, curiously, in the final battle, though Diomides has also gotten Cressida, Troilus' final word to Diomides is this: "thy life thou owest me for my horse." (V, vi, 13)

The quarrel between Grey and Southampton over the matter of the disgrace in Ireland bore fruit for some months: a spirited exchange of letters about the arrangements for a duel; an encounter in the Low Countries, in spite of an express order forbid-

[20]*Letters,* I, 43-44.

ding such a duel;[21] an encounter in the Strand, on horseback,[22] which resulted in the brief confinement of Lord Grey in the Fleet. He was out in time, however, to sit as one of the group of their "peers" who pronounced on Essex and Southampton the sentence of death. So—if Troilus resembles Southampton, Diomides resembles Lord Grey of Wilton.

Back now to Cressida. The penetrating comment of Ulysses can perhaps be taken in two ways: " 'twere better she were kissed in generall." (IV, v, 26) Certainly it characterizes Cressida, almost viciously—but it may perhaps apply indirectly to many of the ladies of the Queen's Privy Chamber, the "Maids of Honor." Cressida herself perhaps makes such a general association in a speech to Diomides, about the sleeve Troilus has given her:

> By all *Dianas* waiting women yond:
>
> And by her self, I will not tell you whose. (V, ii, 108-109)

Commentators on this passage suggest some such an interpretation as moon and the stars, for Diana and her waiting women, with the actor perhaps pointing toward the heavens.[23] But an audience nourished on the "Cynthia" of *Endymion,* or the Cynthia-Diana of *Cynthia's Revels,*[24] or the "fair vestal" of *Midsummer Night's Dream,* would very likely see a reference to the Queen and the ladies of her privy chamber.

Elizabeth Vernon resembles Cressida in the early stages of courtship, but not thereafter, for she was apparently a good and faithful wife to the Earl. But a prototype for the later Cressida was certainly at court about 1600—in the person of Mary Fitton, who bore the Earl of Pembroke's child, was repudiated by him, and had thereafter a succession of husbands and lovers. I suggest that Cressida, though a magnificent individual portrait in the play, may be a composite of these and other young ladies of the

---

[21]*Ibid.,* I, 107.

[22]*Ibid.,* p. 115.

[23]cf. *Variorum, Troilus and Cressida,* ed. Hillebrand, p. 271.

[24]In that play Jonson has Cynthia defend her action with reference to Actaeon, [Essex]. It is probable that the reference in *Cynthia's Revels* is not to the death of Essex, but to his disgrace after he presumed to "enter sacred bowers,/And hallowed places, with impure aspect,/Most lewdly to pollute." [C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, *Works of Ben Jonson* (10 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932), IV, 176.]

court—even while her career in the play parallels that of her counterparts in Caxton and Chaucer.

Suggestions have been made that Hector, Troilus, and Cressida, of the Trojan group in the play have careers and characters remarkably analogous to those of Essex, Southampton, and Elizabeth Vernon. Almost equally striking is the analogy between the triangle of Penelope (Devereaux) Rich, Lord Rich, and Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy, who later became Earl of Devonshire, and that of Helen, Menelaus, and Paris of the play. Penelope, married against her will to Lord Rich, became as early as 1595 openly mistress to Blount. The attitude of Elizabeth's court to this affair was remarkably like that of the characters in *Troilus and Cressida* to the Helen-Paris domestic arrangement. And throughout the play the utmost contempt is shown by almost all the actors for Menelaus. Cressida refuses to let him kiss her; Thersites would be anything "even a louse of a lazar," rather than Menelaus. Paris is of the Trojan councils—as Blount was of those of the Essex faction until the time of the rebellion, when he was conveniently in Ireland. But in the case of Lord Rich the analogy breaks down—for while Rich was of the Essex faction, Menelaus was of the Greeks. In the relationship in the play between Helen-Penelope and Paris-Blount, Shakespeare seems to be almost prophetic. Diomides says to Paris "that you out of whorish loins are pleased to breed out your inheritors." Blount, after Penelope had been divorced by Lord Rich, married her in 1605. Says Chamberlain:

> The earle of Devonshire is sicke of a burning fever . . . the world thinckes yf he shold go now, yt had ben better for him yf he had gon a yeare or two sooner.[25]

Certainly, his will indicated some doubt as to the paternity of all Penelope's illegitimate children.

Such are the principal analogies between those of the Trojan group in *Troilus and Cressida* and certain prominent figures in Elizabeth's court. There are some almost equally striking parallels among those in the Greek group, in contemporary character and circumstance, to prominent courtiers. It has already been suggest-

[25]*Letters*, I, 222.

ed that Diomides is to Troilus as Lord Grey of Wilton is to the Earl of Southampton.

In *Troilus and Cressida*, the most active of the Greeks in the struggle against the Trojans were Ulysses, Nestor, Achilles, Ajax, Diomides, and Agamemnon. The principals in the Court faction which opposed the Essex faction were Sir Robert Cecil, the Lord Admiral (Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham), Lord Cobham, Sir Walter Raleigh, Lord Grey of Wilton, and Lord Thomas Howard, afterwards Earl of Suffolk.

The relationships among the Raleigh faction in Elizabeth's court were not dissimilar to those outlined among the Greeks of *Troilus and Cressida* by the biting tongue of Thersites to Achilles and Ajax:

> There's *Vlysses* and old *Nestor*, whose Wit was mouldy ere their Grandsires had nails on their toes, yoke you like draft-Oxen, and make you plough vp the warre. (II, i, 101-103)

The Lord Admiral was of an older generation than most of those concerned in the great court struggle. Born in 1536, he was sixteen years older than Raleigh, twenty-one years older than Essex, and thirty-six years older than Southampton. Though of the Raleigh faction, he was not a prime mover in the conspiracy against Essex, nor was he one whom Essex regarded as a pronounced enemy; for though he names Cobham, Cecil, and Raleigh as enemies at the trial, he does not mention the Lord Admiral, Lord Grey, or Lord Thomas Howard.[26] To Nestor is given the only extended metaphor in *Troilus and Cressida* dealing with the sea.

> How many shallow bauble Boates dare saile
> Vpon her patient brest, making their way
> With those of Nobler bulke?
> But let the Ruffian *Boreas* once enrage
> The gentle *Thetis*, and anon behold
> The strong ribb'd Barke through liquid Mountaines cut,
> Bounding betweene the two moyst Elements
> Like *Perseus* Horse. Where's then the sawcy Boate,

[26]Harrison, *Essex*, p. 305.

> Whose weake vntimber'd sides but euen now
> Co-riual'd Greatnesse? Either to harbour fled,
> Or made a Toste for Neptune. (I, iii, 38-48)

Possibly this may be a tribute to the Lord Admiral as the hero of the Armada. If Essex is Hector—then the Lord Admiral may well be Nestor.

It is Ulysses among the Greeks of the play who diagnoses weaknesses in "degree," who devises stratagems, who can give specious advice to Achilles and Ajax, who can befriend Troilus in the camp of the Greeks. Such a man in the Elizabethan court was Sir Robert Cecil, "Mr. Secretary." It was through him that access to the queen might be had; largely through him preferments were granted and punishments alleviated. In fact, this stanza from a lampoon clearly emanating from the Essex faction, might with equal aptness be applied to the Ulysses of Shakespeare.

> littel Cecil tripps up and downe
> he rules both court & croune
> with his brother Burlie clowne
> in his great fox-furred gowne
> with the long proclamation
> hee swore hee sav'd the towne
> is it not likelie?[27]

In Shakespeare's sources, the combat between Ajax and Hector occurs merely in the course of battle. In *Troilus and Cressida* it is prearranged by Ulysses, with the help of Nestor, and only by trickery is Ajax made the combatant. Its purpose is, by setting Achilles and Ajax at odds, to rouse Achilles to battle. The failure of the ruse in the play is recorded by Thersites.

> O'th'tother side, the pollicie of those craftie swearing rascals; that stole old Mouse—eaten dry cheese, *Nestor*: and that same dog-foxe *Vlisses*' is not prou'd worth a Black-berry. They set me vp in pollicy, that mungrill curre *Aias*, against that dogge of as bad a kinde, *Achilles*. And now is the curre *Aias* prouder then the curre *Achilles*, and will not arme to day. Whereupon,

[27]Stopes, *Southampton*, p. 235.

> the Grecians began to proclaime barbarisme; and
> pollicie growes into an ill opinion.[28] (V, iv, 9-17)

In *Troilus and Cressida,* the major antagonist to Hector is Achilles. It is to him that Hector's challenge is directed. Says Ulysses,

> This challenge that the gallant *Hector* sends,
> How euer it is spred in general name,
> Relates in purpose only to *Achilles.* (I, iii,
> 335-337)

It is to Achilles that Hector is in honor bound for the last day's conflict. It is Achilles only who seeks out Hector in the last day's battle, and it is by Achilles' device that Hector is treacherously slain on that day.

In the court of Elizabeth, it was Raleigh who was inveterate foe to Essex. Some of the implacable quality of his hatred has been indicated in the letter to Cecil already quoted—"his son will be the youngest Earl in England." At the trial of Essex, Raleigh was a principal antagonist—"What booteth to swear the fox?"[29]

In the *Iliades,* Achilles keeps his tent because of an injustice perpetrated by Agamemnon. No such cause is given in *Troilus and Cressida*—for pride alone, according to the analysis of Ulysses, has placed Achilles out of "degree."

> Rawleigh doth time bestride
> he sits twixt winde and tide
> yet uppe hill hee cannot ride,
> for all his bloodie pride.
> hee seeks taxes in the tinne
> hee powles the poor to the skinne
> yet hee sweares tis no sinne
> Lord for thy pittie.[30]

This stanza is from the lampoon noticed earlier—and it, like

---

[28]If *Troilus and Cressida* was written in complete form by February 7, 1603, and if my assumptions have any validity, then Shakespeare is prophetic also in the Ulysses-Achilles-Ajax complication. By setting the new king against Raleigh and Cobham, and setting those two against each other in the matter of the "Spanish" plot and the "Bye" plot, Cecil was able most effectively to remove both from the Court.

[29]Harrison, *Essex,* p. 301.

[30]As quoted in Stopes, *Southampton,* p. 235.

Ulysses, makes much of the "bloody pride" of Raleigh. Of that quality in him says John Aubry: "He was a tall, handsome, and bold man; but his naeve was that he was damnable proud."[31]

There are in the text of the play two allusions which may point to Raleigh himself. He is "The great Myrmidon," and his followers are, of course, the Myrmidons. Shakespeare has only one other reference to Myrmidons: in *Twelfth Night*, "the Myrmidons are no bottle-ale houses." Leslie Hotson in *The First Night of Twelfth Night* takes this to be a reference to the Queen's guard.[32] If members of her guard were indeed called "Myrmidons," then the Great Myrmidon could be only Raleigh, who from 1587 had been the captain of her guard.

The second of the two references is more tenuous, but it is perhaps worth mention, since it involves an interpretation of a much disputed passage, present in the Folio but omitted from the Quarto:

Aga. Speak, Prince of *Ithaca*, and be 't of lesse expect:

> That matter needlesse of importlesse burthen
> Diuide thy lips; then we are confident
> When ranke *Thersites* opes his Masticke iawes,
> We shall heare Musicke, Wit, and Oracle.[33]
> (I, iii, 76-80)

The word "Masticke" in this passage has been taken to be the same as that in the title "*Satiromastix*" and other plays; or to refer to the substance used to fill teeth.[34] Among the meanings given for *mastic* in NED are gum, wax, cement, etc. I suggest that the passage is a labored thrust at the incident in *Every Man Out of His Humour* in which Sir Puntaruolo (Puntal-Raleigh?) seals with

---

[31]John Aubrey, *Brief Lives and Other Selected Writings*, ed. Anthony Powell (London The Cresset Press, 1949) p. 323.

[32]Leslie Hotson, *The First Night of Twelfth Night* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954), p. 150.

[33]As quoted from the Folio text *[Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories* & *Tradedies*: A Facsimile, ed. Kokeritz (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), p. 574]. Perhaps this passage is, along with the "*Prologue, arm'd but not in confidence/Of Authors pen, or Actors Voyce,*" of the Folio text, a minor skirmish in the Poetomachia, through a thrust at *Every Man Out of His Humour*. That both this passage of the mastic jawes and the prologue are absent from the Quarto may be due to the fact that by 1609 the Poetomachia is forgotten, and that Shakespeare and Jonson are friends.

[34]cf. *Variorum, Troilus and Cressida*, ed. Hillebrand, p. 50n.

wax the beard of Carlo Buffone to his mustache. That a suggestion of Raleigh may lie under this reference appears from this excerpt from Aubrey's *Brief Lives*:

> In his youthfull time, was one Charles Chester, that often kept company with his acquaintance; he was a bold impertenent fellowe, and they could never be at quiet for him; a perpetuall talker, and made a noyse like a drumme in a roome. So one time at a taverne Sir W. R. beates him and seales up his mouth (*i.e.* his upper and neather beard) with hard wax. From him Ben Johnson takes his Carlo Buffono (*i.e.* 'jester') in *Every Man out of his Humour.*[35]

Achilles is not by any means the fool that Thersites so frequently calls him; a man of wit and reason, he is, however, as the result of the manipulations of Ulysses, a thoroughly puzzled man. While the death of Hector is a good sought by all the Greeks, it is not the result of a concerted effort on their part, or even of anything they as faction have done. The death of Hector is the result of a murderous, treacherous assault, not even by Achilles himself, but by his Myrmidons, a process not sanctioned by any of the sources.

It is further suggested that the Ajax of the play looks remarkably like Henry Brooke, Lord Cobham.[36] Shakespeare may have given us a hint in the Quarto text, which has Thersites call him "Aiax Coblofe." On the other hand, the Folio so handles the speech prefixes that Ajax is made to call Thersites "Coblofe." In many passages the Quarto has the better text, and it may be that

[35]Powell, ed., p. 325.

[36]That under the character of Ajax there is a satirical treatment of Ben Jonson is argued by William Elton in "Shakespeare's Portrait of Ajax in *Troilus and Cressida*" (*PMLA*, LXIII, 744-748). The passage spoken by Alexander, beginning "This man, lady, hath robbed many beasts of their additions", if taken alone, might be an account of Jonson. But the portrait of Ajax generally in *Troilus and Cressida* is that of an excessively stupid man, easily malleable by those of more wit than himself. Such a portrait is not applicable to the real Jonson. It is equally far from that given in Dekker's *Satiromastix*, where the farthest efforts of Crispinus, of Demetrius Fannius, and of the redoubtable Captain Tucca extend only to defending themselves from the barbs of Horace's wit.

Editors: Vol. 5 (1964): Full issue

this is one of them. "Coblofe" certainly has more significance as a suggestion of a title than as a most obscure epithet.[37]

Ajax is regarded by his associates as "blockish," as "having his brains in his belly." Of Cobham, Anthony Weldon says:

> You are now to observe, that *Salisbury* had shaken off all that were great with him, and of his Faction in Queen *Elizabeths* day, as Sir *Walter Rawleigh,* Sir *George Carew,* the Lord *Grey,* the Lord *Cobham*: the three first, very able men as the World had, the last but one degree from a fool, yet served their turns better then a wiser man, by his greatness with the Queen, for they would put him on anything, and make him tell any Lye, with as great confidence as a truth.[38]

Alexander reports to Cressida that "he (Ajax) yesterday cop'd *Hector* in battell and stroke him downe, the disdaind & shame whereof, hath euer since kept *Hector* fasting and waking." (I, ii, 37-39) This encounter is not in any of the sources, and it is my suggestion that it may refer to the contest between Lord Cobham and the Earl of Essex for the wardenship of the Cinque Ports. Cobham wished it for himself, possibly because his father had held it; Essex wanted it for Sir Robert Sidney. That Cobham was

---

[37]The passage in the Quarto reads thus:

Ther. Then gromblest and raylest euery houre on *Achilles,* and thou art as full of enuy at his greatnesse, as *Cerberus* is at *Proserpinas* beauty, I that thou barkst at him.

Ajax. Mistres *Thersites.*

Ther. Thou shouldst strike him. *Aiax Coblofe,* Hee would punne thee into shiuers with his fist, as a sayler breakes a biskit, you horson curre. Do? do? [*Troilus and Cressida,* First Quarto, 1609, with an introductory note by W. W. Greg (Oxford: The Clarendon Press), C4v.]

These are the corresponding lines in the Folio:

Ther. Thou grumblest & railest euery houre on *Achilles,* and thou art as ful of enuy at his greatnes, as *Cerberus* is at *Proserpina's* beauty. I, that thou barkst at him.

Aia. Mistresse *Thersites.*

Ther. Thou should'st strike him.

Aia. Coblofe.

Ther. He would pun thee into shiuers with his fist, as a Sailor breakes a bisket.

Aia. You horson Curre. Ther. Do, do. [*Facsimile,* ed. Kokeritz, p. 576.]

[38]A[nthony] W[eldon], *The Court and Character of King James* (London: 1817), p. 6.

the choice of Elizabeth, perhaps through the offices of Robert Cecil, was a bitter blow to so proud a man as Essex.

It is tempting also to find a Thersites among the Raleigh faction at court. Thersites rails eloquently and viciously when he dares, but is most servile and cowardly when in real danger. He is with the Greeks, but he is not quite of them: he declares himself to "serve here voluntary."

The portrait of Thersites is not unlike another of the Howards, Lord Henry. He was for a long while attached to the Essex faction, but he had no part in the events leading to the rebellion; in fact, he was one of the peers who sat in judgement on Essex. Thereafter, he was closely associated with Robert Cecil in the intrigues to bring James to the throne, and he prospered mightily under the new monarch. The account given of him by Anthony Weldon is echoed in essence by most later historians of the period:

> Northampton, though a great Clerk, yet not a wise man, but the grossest Flatterer of the World, and as *Salisbury* by his Wit, so this by his Flattery, raised himself . . . . . . of so venemous and cankred a disposition that indeed he hated all men of noble parts. . .[39]

At first glance, the suggestions I have made seem to be to some extent brought into question by the fact that both Greeks and Trojans have apparent rulers. But a thoughtful examination of the language of the play reveals a marked difference in words used to, or about, the leaders of the two factions. Agamemnon, of the Greeks, is given none of the reverence due to a sovereign, nor is he addressed in terms other than military. Among the Greeks, Ulysses once makes reference to him in the phrase "topless deputation." Otherwise, he is "great" (five times), "captain-general" (once), "commander" (twice), or "general" (six times). Other references, notably those of Aeneas of the Trojan faction, are in their context deliberately insulting ("This Trojan scorns us"): "God in Office"; "high and mighty"; "most imperial looks."

There were among the Raleigh-Cecil faction in Elizabeth's court two men whose stature in military matters might be com-

[39]*Ibid.*, pp. 5, 7.

parable to that given Agamemnon in the play. Both were Howards. The Lord Admiral, Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham, was certainly the man of most distinction. He was, however, as I have pointed out, of an elder generation. The other Howard was Lord Thomas, Baron Howard de Walden, who was in naval matters second only to the Lord Admiral himself, co-equal with Essex as commander in naval expeditions, and in them always senior to Raleigh. He was the marshal of the forces which beseiged Essex House at the time of the rebellion, and he was one of the peers who judged Essex and Southampton. Whether, like Agamemnon, he had "no more brains than ear wax" I do not know—nor whether he "loved quails." But I suggest that in such a hypothesis as I am building, he falls quite conveniently into the role of Agamemnon.

In Hector, the Trojans have a military leader comparable to Agamemnon. But behind Hector they have also sovereignity, even royalty, in the persons of Priam and Hecuba. Epithets and addresses to Priam are of an entirely different flavor from those accorded Agamemnon: "dread Priam"; "the past proportion of his infinite"; "royal Priam"; "my liege." Yet his authority is not sufficient to sway the council which debated returning Helen to the Greeks, or to dissuade Hector from arming for the final, fatal day .

Troilus predicts the effect of the death of Hector on Priam and Hecuba with these words:

> . . . *Hector* is gone:
> Who shall tell *Priam* so? or *Hecuba*?
> Let him that will a screechoule aye be call'd,
> Goe in to Troy, and say there, *Hector's* dead:
> There is a word will *Priam* turne to stone;
> Make wels, and *Niobes* of the maides and wiues;
> Coole statues of the youth: and in a word,
> Scarre Troy out of it selfe. But march away,
> *Hector* is dead: there is no more to say. (V, x, 17-25)

Compare them with statements of the grief of Elizabeth over the death of Essex:

> The Queen had no comfort after. . . . The people

Studies in English, Vol. 5 [1964], Art. 11

> were wrathful at the death of their favourite, and she lost their honour and glory . . . . The death of Essex, like a melancholy cloud, did shade the prospect of her people's affection. . . .[40]

> As the death of this nobleman was much lamented by the subjects whose love towards him was so ingrafted (as I think I may well say never subject had more), so her Majestie likewise having such a starre falne from her firmament, was inwardly moved and outwardly oftentimes would shew passions of her grief, even till the time of her approaching end, when two yeares after she laid her heade in the Grave, as the most resplendent sunne setteth at last in a western cloud.[41]

The similarities pointed out above between play and contemporary circumstance seem to suggest that *Troilus and Cressida* is not merely a reworking and modernization of classical and medieval sources, but a skillful adaptation of material from those sources toward a didactic and perhaps somewhat personal and embittered commentary on matters of profound and immediate concern to all Englishmen. As Essex was the central figure in the long factional struggle climaxed by the scene at the Tower on February 25, 1601, so is Hector the dominant figure in what is possibly a dramatic recapitulation. And as the great events of his last month overshadow the intrigues of the ladies and gentlemen of the court, so do the camp scenes of *Troilus and Cressida* rank first in importance, with the love scenes as commentary and partial explanation. The love plot, in the light of such an interpretation, appears to be the painting of a background in which such a sequence of events might be expected to occur. The court of Elizabeth did indeed contain, and condone, especially in the last years of her reign, such unwholesome episodes. Essex did, like Hector, countenance them in his sister, his cousin, his close friends.

Is Shakespeare saying in *Troilus and Cressida* that, given rampant court factions, luxury among the courtiers, and the magni-

[40]As quoted in Stopes, *Southampton,* from *Osborne Essays,* p. 353.
[41]*Ibid.*

Editors: Vol. 5 (1964): Full issue

ficent but unstable character of an Essex, the fate of a Hector was inevitable?

Troilus and Cressida was entered in the Stationer's Register on February 7, 1603, to be printed by James Roberts "when he hath gotten sufficient authority for it." Apparently "sufficient authority" was not forthcoming, for printing did not take place until 1609. Is it possible that the matters I have proposed were the reason for the failure to gain authority? Or more plausibly perhaps, was that of Roberts merely a "blocking entry" to assure the suppression of matter dangerous during the life of the Queen?

After a proper entry, not to Roberts, in the Stationer's Register on January 28, 1609, the play came from the press with the title page in two states. On the title page of the first state it is called *"The Historie of Troylus and Cresseida," "acted by the King's Maiesties* seruants at the Globe." In the second state this title page has been replaced by a cancel which omits the statement of performance and substitutes *"Excellently expressing the beginning* of their loues, with the conceited wooing of *Pandarus* Prince of *Licia."* It is this edition which contains "THE EPISTLE." The writer of this foreward says that the play has never been *"clapper-clawd with the palmes of the vulger,"* and implies that it has come to the printer by some means other than *"the grand possessors wills."* Sir E. K. Chambers suggests the Quarto "was printed from a transcript, perhaps made for a private owner"; and that the manuscript used for the Folio was probably the author's original.[42] One wonders why, after the lapse of six years, *Troilus and Cressida* came to press in 1609, the year of the publication of the sonnets.

The court factions were not removed by the death of Essex, or even by that of Elizabeth. Their composition, however, and their leadership changed. In 1603, largely through the machinations of Robert Cecil, Raleigh and Cobham in effect destroyed each other. Lord Grey of Wilton soon joined them in prison, and Cecil and the Lords Howard, Henry and Thomas, had great influence with the new King.

James, who had been of good will toward Essex, did what he could to make restoration. The son of Essex, the young Robert,

[42]*Shakespeare*, I, 440.

Third Earl, was restored in blood and honors; he was taken into the Royal household and became companion and close friend to Prince Henry. The King, in the hope of further resolving the factional quarrel, probably arranged the young Earl's marriage in 1606 to Frances Howard, daughter of that Lord Thomas, now Earl of Suffolk, for whom I have suggested the role of Agamemnon. Southampton was promptly released from the Tower by James, and was much in favor with the monarch, though the councilorship he sought was denied him. Through those years before 1609, James played, and Cecil and the Howards governed.

They governed, at least, until the appearance of the young favorite Robert Carr. The young Earl of Essex, who had been for three years on the continent returned in 1609, only to find his wife Frances indifferent to him, and enamoured of Robert Carr. Late in 1608, the estate of Sir Walter Raleigh, who was still in the Tower, fell "by reason of a flaw in the conveyance" into the hands of the King, who bestowed it on Robert Carr.[43] In 1609 Southampton, with some half dozen others of the old Essex faction, was founding a "Joynt Stocke" company for plantation in Virginia.[44]

If, as I have suggested, *Troilus and Cressida* is an embittered account of matters of concern to Shakespeare, then the release to the printer of the play in the same year as the *Sonnets* was perhaps more than a coincidence. The sonnets were certainly very personal to him. As Chambers suggests—only Shakespeare himself could have kept them together. Could the release of the two works in the same year have been because of the possibility that their content might be considered to have value in the factional struggle which—though changed somewhat in complexion—still severed the English court? Is there something in the factional struggle to account for the considerable variations between Quarto

---

[43]*Letters,* I, 280.

[44]Alexander Brown, *The First Republic in America* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1898), pp. 100-104. Others of the charter members formerly associated with Essex are "Tho. La Warre," imprisoned after the rebellion; "Tho. Smythe," the Sheriff Smith also imprisoned then; "R. Lisle," the Sir Robert Sidney for whom Essex had sought the Wardenship of the Cinque Ports; W. Waade, the Lieutenant of the Tower who made Raleigh's imprisonment more severe; and "Pembroke," William Herbert, the Earl, one of the brothers to whom the Folio was dedicated.

and Folio texts? Is there in these conjectures perhaps a note of confirmation for those who consider Southampton to be indeed the friend of the *Sonnets*?

ALLELUIA: A WORD AND ITS EFFECT

by Allen Cabaniss

"The iron of the heathen gleamed"[1] and the monastery of Jumièges went up in flame. As the brethren fled from the Northmen with whatever they could carry in their hands, one brother, a priest, put in his knapsack an antiphonary. Sometime later, still in the second half of the ninth century, the weary priest trudged up to the gate of the monastery of Saint Gall where he sought and received hospitality. And so after one brief, fleeting moment, the nameless brother disappeared from history, but not before he had left an indelible mark on Western literature. For it chanced that at Saint Gall there was a young brother named Notker, called "the Stammerer" (*Balbulus*), born about 840, who demonstrated interest in the antiphonary rescued by the monk of Jumièges.

Notker tells us that he had great difficulty trying to memorize the long ornate melodies in the Alleluia chant of the church's liturgical music, for the invention of modern musical notation by Guido of Arezzo yet lay more than a century and a half in the future. Modestly attributing failure to his "fickle memory," Notker had, therefore, while still quite young, attempted quietly and privately to devise a scheme by which he could retain the notes in his mind. But he was unsuccessful. It was then that he happened to examine the new brother's antiphonary. He observed that some additional words had been clumsily interpolated at the end of the Alleluia (apparently to assist in memorizing the melody). He was delighted at the convenient method, but disappointed at its rudimentary quality.

Immediately Notker set about to imitate and improve what he had learned. The result was two sequences which he submitted to his teacher, Iso, for criticism. The latter was pleased with his

[1] A well known passage from the Annals of Xanten for the year 852; Reinhold Rau, ed., *Fontes ad historiam regni Francorum aevi Karolini illustrandam,* II (Berlin: Rütten und Loening, n. d., but ca. 158), p. 350.

student's zeal and sympathetic with his lack of skill. In order to help in polishing the work, he made a valuable suggestion. "Every note of the song," he said, "should have its separate syllable." With this important criticism Notker returned to his project for further development.

He discovered that he could easily improve the words inserted at the last syllable of Alleluia. Interpolations at the second and third syllables, however, were so difficult that at first he deemed them impossible, although he later succeeded. The process must have been an extended one of trial and error, for by the time he presented his next sequences to an instructor, it was no longer Iso but Marcellus who was supervising his study. Marcellus was so impressed that he caused them to be officially transcribed and to be sung by the several choirs of the monastic school.[2]

The particular form thus invented is called a *sequence* from the fact that, *following* the Alleluia before the Gospel at Mass, it is a prolongation of the final syllable. Initially it was, as we have seen, a mnemonic device to help singers remember the elaborate wordless melody of that final syllable. At the beginning also it was simply rhythmical prose. And also there was a primary tendency to end each major word (or musical phrase) with the letter *-a*. In time, however, its lines became measured poetry rhyming in *-a*. Later other rhymes were introduced, not only in other letters, but also in more than one syllable. In a still further development, the compositions became dissociated from the Alleluia melody and the poems became independent compositions, reaching a peak in the glorious sequences of the school of Saint Victor. Moreover the sequence had hardly been born when it gave rise to its secular counterpart. It is worth noting that the attachment of sequence to Alleluia is still attested by the trochaic rhythm of both.[3]

In such manner, according to the usual tradition,[4] it came to pass that rhythmical, rhyming lyric verse was launched in Western literature. The perceptive Notker rightly receives credit, but one

---

[2]Summarized from Notker, *Liber sequentiarum, praef.;* PL, cxxi, 1003C-1004C.

[3]F. Brittain, *The Medieval Latin and Romance Lyric to A. D. 1300,* 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951), pp. 10-20.

[4]Emphatically denied by many; P. S. Allen, *Medieval Latin Lyrics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), p. 51.

should not forget that many persons preceded him in the experiment, in particular the nameless brothers of the sacked abbey of Jumièges. Nor should one forget the invaluable suggestion by Master Iso which set Notker on the right track. Neither should one forget the vital encouragement of Master Marcellus who gave it to the public by arranging professional performances. But, above all, one must not forget that back of it all lay one word, the word *Alleluia.*

Etymologically Alleluia is composed of two Hebrew words meaning "praise ye" (*hal'lu*) "the Lord" (*Jah*). It is employed frequently in the book of Psalms,[5] where it is a liturgical chant of jubilation or a joyful response to such a chant used on festival occasions. It would appear that even so early the word was more an expression of vigorous, though formal, exultation than as a devout literal statement. Elsewhere in the Old Testament it occurs only in Tobit 13:18, "All her [Jerusalem's] lanes will cry, 'Alleluia!' and will give praise, saying, 'Blessed is God who has exalted you for ever.' "[6] Another quasi-Biblical reference is III Maccabees 7:13, "Then they applauded his [Ptolemy Philopator's] words, as was proper, their priests and all the people; and they departed with joy, shouting the Alleluia."[7] It is obvious here, too, that, although the word might retain its etymological significance, it had been detached from Psalmody and had possibly embarked on an independent existence in which it was an ecstatic, joyous cry, perhaps spontaneous rather than liturgical. In this respect it is noteworthy that the early Greek and Latin versions generally retained the Hebrew expression by transliteration rather than translation, thus preserving the ambivalence.

Despite the importance of Alleluia in pre-Christian Judaism, its use in Christian circles is strangely attested no earlier than the book of Revelation (Apocalypse).[8] This book was the channel by

[5]The fifteen so-called Alleluiatic Psalms are 104-106, 111-113, 115-117, 135, 146-150 (according to the RSV enumeration).

[6]Cited as in the RSV, except substitution of the spelling "Alleluia" for "Hallelujah."

[7]Cited as translated by Moses Hadas, *The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees* (New York: Harper and Bros. for The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1953), p. 83, except again "Alleluia" instead of "Hallelujah."

[8]Rev. 19:1, 3, 4, 6. In verses 1 and 6 Alleluia is part of a song; in verse 3 it is a shout of victory; and in verse 4 it is associated with another Hebrew word, the "Amen."

Editors: Vol. 5 (1964): Full issue

which the word entered Christian usage, or rather it is presumably evidence that the word was employed in the primitive Christian liturgy. In the Revelation the word is used as it was in Judaism: as a part of (or antiphon on) Psalmody or hymnody and as a detached exclamation. About a century or more later Tertullian witnessed to much the same practice.[9]

So Alleluia began its journey through the centuries under Christian auspices to carry on the glorious tradition of Judaism along with the older religion. To both faiths it was equally a song of angels and men. Both tended to elaborate musically the last syllable until it became a pure, wordless chant of joy, perhaps related to the curious phenomenon called "speaking with tongues" (or technically, "glossolalia").[10] In both religions there were occasions on which the word virtually disappeared, became disembodied, spiritualized, and only its vowels were sung.[11] On the other hand, there appeared an opposing tendency to multiply the word, as in the case of the hundred twenty-three Alleluias in the chanting of Hallel (Psalms 113-118, RSV). In any case it had entered the Western tradition where it had its greatest development.

In the West the employment of Alleluia has been manifold. Not only did it enter the liturgy (both Eucharist and Divine Office), but also popular usage. Near the middle of the fifth century Saint Germanus of Auxerre entered the island of Britain to combat the Pelagian heresy. Having been a soldier before he was a priest, he promptly joined the Britons in their struggle against the Saxons and Picts. Outnumbered he led his troops into a location to prepare an ambush for the enemy. Ordering the priests and others to shout as and when he shouted, at an appropriate moment he raised the cry, "Alleluia!" The resounding noise of the ancient Hebrew word reverberating from the surrounding hills so frightened the foes that they fled.[12] In the second half of the same century the aristocratic bishop of Clermont, Sidonius Apollinaris, tells us about the hurly-burly of traffic on the Rhone and on the

[9]Tertullian, *De oratione,* 27; PL, i, 1301B.

[10]Eric Werner, *The Sacred Bridge* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), pp. 155, 168.

[11]*Ibid.,* p. 303.

[12]Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 20; *Baedae Historia eccelesiastica gentis Anglorum,* ed. and trans. J. E. King, I (Loeb Classical Library; G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1930), p. 92.

highways paralleling it: creaking carriages, weary travelers on foot, and straining longshoremen. Amid all the noise of busy commercial life could be heard the voices of bargemen rhythmically shouting, "Alleluia!" and the river banks echoing the same refrain.[13]

About a half-century or more later the man who would become Pope Gregory I the Great was so fascinated by the information reaching him from the British Isles that he wrote: "Lo, the tongue of Britain which had known how to do nothing but utter barbarous gutturals has already begun to sing the Hebrew Alleluia in divine praises."[14] His famous pun, perhaps the best known in Western literature, is seldom cited beyond its first part ("Not Angles, but angels"). As a matter of fact there were two further parts of it, the third being his query about the Angle king. When Gregory was told that he was Aella, he immediately punned on the name, "Alleluia, the praise of God the Creator must be sung in those lands."[15] Quite properly, therefore, Saint Augustine, his missionary, entered Kent chanting a litany having an antiphon with the Alleluia.[16]

By the ninth century, its place fixed in the liturgy and its joyful expression on many tongues, Alleluia was the subject of exegesis and exposition. The great liturgical scholar, Amalarius, explained that Alleluia before the Gospel at Mass affected inwardly every one who sang it, causing him to meditate how he ought to praise God and how he ought to rejoice in Him. The final note of wordless jubilation reminded one of that ultimate condition when the speaking of words would not be necessary, when the mind by meditation alone would be able to communicate its faith.[17] Alleluia was also a foretaste of the elect's eternal gladness as well as a praise of God. In singing it, therefore, the music should not be somber but exultant, anticipating the joy of the life to

---

[13]Sidonius, *Letters*, II, 10, 4; Sidonius, *Poems and Letters*, trans. W. B. Anderson, I (Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936), p. 466.

[14]Bede, *op. cit.*, II, 1; *Baedae Historia*, p. 196.

[15]*Ibid.*; *Baedae Historia*, p. 202.

[16]*Ibid.*, I, 25; *Baedae Historia*, p. 112.

[17]Amalarius, *Liber Officialis*, III, 16, 3; J. M. Hanssens, *Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica omnia, II* (*studi e Testi*, 139; Cittá del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1948), p. 304.

come, Alleluia being the harvest of all our worship.[18] Amalarius accepted and transmitted the tradition that Alleluia was celestial in origin, a song of angelic beings. He believed that, regardless of the great beauty and sweetness of the Tract (substituted for Alleluia in Lent), Alleluia was far more beautiful, being of a richer and nobler language, namely, Hebrew.[19]

Amalarius is also witness to suppression of Alleluia in the liturgy during the period from Septuagesima to Easter.[20] This particular practice gave rise in a somewhat later time to a formal "farewell to Alleluia" in some of the Western liturgies, usually at Vespers on Saturday before Septuagesima. The tendency was to multiply repetition of Alleluia on that occasion, after which it would not be used again until the first Mass of Easter. For that service the hymn, "Alleluia dulce carmen," was written probably in the eleventh century. Two stanzas (in modern translation from a recently published breviary) illustrate the practice:

Alleluia cannot always
  Be our song while here below;
Alleluia our transgressions
  Make us for a while forego;
For the solemn time is coming
  When our tears for sin must flow.

Therefore in our hymns we pray thee,
  Grant us, blessed Trinity,
At the last to keep thine Easter
  In our home beyond the sky,
There to thee forever singing
  Alleluia joyfully.[21]

This cessation of Alleluia gave rise to excesses including a ceremonial "deposition of Alleluia" which in turn contributed to

[18]*Ibid.*, III, 13; Hanssens, *op. cit.*, p. 301.

[19]*Ibid.*, I, 1, 16ff; Hanssens, op. cit., pp. 32ff.

[20]*Ibid.*

[21]*The Anglican Breviary* (Mount Sinai, L. I., N. Y.; Frank Gavin Liturgical Foundation, 1955), p. 400.

popular folkloristic customs.[22] Inevitably there also arose a corresponding "welcome to Alleluia" or "return of Alleluia." For instance, at a pontifical celebration of the first Mass of Easter the deacon chanted these words, "I announce to you a great joy which is Alleluia." No ceremonial, however, developed for the return comparable to that for the departure of Alleluia. And all of the excrescences were eliminated by the late sixteenth century.[23]

One of the strange uses of Alleluia occurred in the year 1233. In a time of great stress itinerant friars wandered through northern Italy crying incessantly, "Alleluia! Alleluia! Alleluia!" The masses followed them in a revivalistic orgy of penitence and preaching. Reputed miracles were performed to add to the excitement and numerous frauds were perpetrated, all recounted by that garrulous Minorite named Salimbene.[24] The year was called "the great Alleluia." From this point it is only a hop, skip, and jump to the fantastic phenomena of American frontier religion in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and from there to the profane use of the word in the hobo song, "Hallelujah, I'm a bum! Hallelujah, bum again!"

In the present day Alleluia survives in all its splendor in the liturgy (for example, the glorious Alleluia of Mozart's Twelfth Mass) and in such sacred music as the Hallelujah Chorus of Handel's oratorio, "The Messiah." It lives also in its detached usage as ejaculatory prayers and shouts in Pentecostal services. It also continues to appear occasionally in purely secular situations. Down the centuries it has been not only an act of worship, but also a magic formula, a war cry, a signal, a joyous exclamation, a song of plowmen and boatmen, and perhaps a nursery song.[25] One scholar has deemed it the germinal cell of all hymn-singing.[26] And

---

[22]F. Cabrol, "Alleluia, Acclamation liturgique," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* (DACL), I (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1907), cols. 1229-1246, esp. cols. 1241, 1245; J. M. Neale, *Mediaeval Hymns and Sequences*, 2nd ed. (London: Joseph Masters, 1863), pp. 42, 182.

[23]*Ibid.*

[24]G. G. Coulton, *From St. Francis to Dante*, 2nd ed. (London: Duckworth and Co., 1908), pp. 21-37; Ernst Kantorowicz, *Frederick the Second 1194-1250*, trans. E. O. Lorimer (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1957), pp. 396-398.

[25]See Werner, *op. cit.*, p. 311, notes 126, 129, 130; p. 312, notes 131, 132, 133; p. 548, note 93. Werner gives appropriate documentation.

[26]*Ibid.*, p. 301.

the great Cardinal J. B. F. Pitra has well said that the story of Alleluia is itself a poem.[27] The foregoing is only a fragment of that poem.

---

[27] *Ibid.* Werner himself has added greatly to both historical and musicological knowledge of Alleluia. Cabrol's article, cited above in Note 22, is a sound, scholarly presentation. Preceding Cabrol's treatment in DACL, Cols. 1226-1229, is P. Wagner's musicological essay, "Alleluia Chant."

ON TRANSLATING GREEK LYRIC POETRY

by Lucy Turnbull

When the Romans in their eastward expansion conquered the Greek world, they took as spoils not only famous works of art and the treasures of many cities, but also the Greek language and literature. Greek scholars and rhetoricians came to Rome as teachers; the Greek language became the second tongue of educated Romans; and a familiarity with Greek literature became the hallmark of a cultured man. In a few generations, in fact, the Romans found that "Captured Greece has taken her rude conqueror captive."[1] Ever since that time, men of other nations have been reading Greek poetry with delight and attempting to share their pleasure by translating it for their countrymen—not always with entire success. Those who have tried translations into English have had a particularly difficult task. Translators in any language expect to meet certain obstacles, such as the frequent lack of an exact equivalent in one language for a word or idiom in the other, and the fact that such a word, even if found, may have very different overtones and associations in the different languages. But between Greek and English there is another formidable barrier: the underlying principles of English metrical verse are entirely different from those of Greek. Greek verse is quantity verse; that is to say, every syllable of every word is regarded as having a fixed quantity or duration, either long or short, depending largely on the vowel sound it contains. For metrical purposes, one long syllable is equal to two short ones (as, in musical notation, one whole note is equal to two half notes). Greek is a highly inflected language, full of polysyllabic words; thus the poet has at his disposal a wide variety

[1]Horace, *Epistles* II, 1. All the translations used in this article are my own unless otherwise noted. For the poems of Alcman I have followed the readings of J. A. Moore, *Selections from the Greek Elegiac, Iambic and Lyric Poets* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942), I. For the poem of Sappho I have followed the text as given by Denys Page, *Greek Literary Papyri* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1942), I, 374-379.

of combinations of long and short syllables, and can employ a correspondingly wide variety of metrical feet. Moreover, words in Greek are commonly so divided that each syllable ends in a vowel rather than a consonant, and many words end in vowels. Of those that do not, a large number end in *n, r* or *s* (or one of its variants, *x* and *ps*). All these factors work together to produce an extremely fluid and musical language. English verse, on the other hand, finds its rhythms in the combination of stressed and unstressed syllables, and quantity plays little or no part. The language is very rich in words of one syllable, which moreover usually end in consonants. Longer words are so divided that most of their syllables also end in consonants. Thus, compared with the smooth, rapid flow of Greek, English verse is slow-moving and lacking in variety, and a translator, even if he is able to produce some sort of approximation in English stress verse to the metrical scheme of the Greek original, can almost never hope to reproduce the flexibility and musical quality of Greek.

These problems have given rise to three main schools of thought concerning the translation of Greek poetry into English. The arguments of each, though they may be applied to the translation of poetry in general, have perhaps been most clearly expressed in regard to translation of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Homer was the first of Greek poets to be put into English, and has continued to attract more translators than any other poet. Though there is some disagreement about his date (he has been placed in every century from the 11th to the 6th B.C.; I myself prefer to put him in the late 9th or early 8th), it is clear that he was not an isolated genius but the heir to a long poetic tradition. For generations, probably centuries, before his time, his predecessors had been perfecting the techniques of oral composition. From them he received many of the characteristic features of his style: the compound adjective ("long-shadowed spear"); the standard descriptive word or phrase that forms a metrical unit of one more feet ("brilliant Achilleus," "long-suffering Odysseus" etc.); most important of all, the swift-moving, flexible dactylic hexameter line that carries the poet and his listener easily through incident after incident of the close-woven plots. But dactylic hexameter, with its profusion of short syllables, is extremely difficult to reproduce in

English, even with all permissible variations. The translator may manage it for two lines, or ten, but not for twenty thousand.

For this reason, those translators who belong to the first of the three schools mentioned above prefer to abandon any attempt at a verse translation, and try instead to capture the language and spirit of the original in prose. This is the approach favored by many scholars and classicists, and its motives are well expressed by S. H. Butcher and Andrew Lang in the preface to their translation of the *Odyssey*.

> A prose translation cannot give the movement and the fire of a successful translation in verse; it only gathers, as it were, the crumbs which fall from the richer table . . . . Yet to a prose translation is permitted, perhaps, the close adherence to the archaisms of the epic, which in verse become mere oddities . . . . We do not know whether it is necessary to defend our choice of a somewhat antiquated prose. Homer has no ideas which cannot be expressed in words that are "old and plain," and to words that are old and plain, and, as a rule, to such terms as, being used by the Translators of the Bible, are still not unfamiliar, we have tried to restrict ourselves. It may be objected, that the employment of language which does not come spontaneously to the lips, is an affectation out of place in a version of the Odyssey. To this we may answer that the Greek Epic dialect, like the English of our Bible, was a thing of slow growth and composite nature, that it was never a spoken language, nor, except for certain poetical purposes, a written language. Thus the Biblical English seems as nearly analogous to the Epic Greek, as anything that our tongue has to offer.[2]

The other two factions, however, contend that the essential point is that Homer was a poet, though of a kind unfamiliar to

[2]S. H. Butcher and Andrew Lang, translators. *The Odyssey of Homer* (New York: Macmillan, 1883), pp. viii-ix.

modern readers, and that if those readers are not to be cheated, the translator must render Homer's epics into English poetry, not prose. Here the basic difference of opinion is concerned with the proper approach, and the translator's choice of approach will depend both on his personal taste and on the prevailing literary tastes of his time. He may prefer to try to transport the reader to ancient Greece, by reproducing as closely as he can in English both the meaning and the form of the Greek. Or he may try to bring ancient Greece as close as he can to the reader, using conventional English metres and rhyme schemes in an effort to produce something like the sort of poetry that is familiar to the modern reader. This was the approach favored by Alexander Pope in 1715. Pope, though warmly acknowledging and praising the simplicity, fire and "invention" of Homer, felt that many of his characteristic features, such as the repetitious use of standardized epithets and the occasional repetition of longer passages, would be considered blemishes by the eighteenth-century reader.

> Upon the whole, it will be necessary to avoid that perpetual repetition of the same epithets which we find in Homer, and which, though it might be accommodated (as has been clearly shown) to the ear of those times, is by no means so to ours: but one may wait for an opportunity of placing them, where they derive an additional beauty from the occasions on which they are employed; and in doing this properly, a translator may at once show his fancy and his judgment.[3]

In cases where repetitious phrases follow closely upon one another, Pope recommended varying the expression judiciously. In practice, he often did more than vary phrases; he might omit them altogether, or expand and embellish them at length. Moreover, he transformed the flowing, unrhymed dactylic hexameter of Homer into elegant English heroic couplets.

In our own day, another poet-translator, Richmond Lattimore, prefers to follow the third course; in his translation of the *Iliad* he keeps both the sense and the meter of his lines as close to Homer's as is possible in English.

[3]Pope, Alexander, translator. *The Iliad of Homer* (London and New York: Warne and Co., n.d.), p. xxi.

> My aim has been to give a rendering of the Iliad which will convey the meaning of the Greek in a speed and rhythm analogous to the speed and rhythm I find in the original. The best metre for my purpose is a free six-beat line . . . . In 1951 we do not have a poetic dialect, and if I used the language of Spenser or the King James Version, I should feel as if I were working in Apollonius of Rhodes, or at best Arktinos, rather than Homer. I must try to avoid mistranslation, which would be caused by rating the word of my own choice ahead of the word which translates the Greek. Subject to such qualification, I must render Homer into the best English verse I can write; and this will be in my own "poetical language," which is mostly the plain English of today.[4]

The results of these three approaches can be best illustrated by a reading of the same short passage of the *Iliad* (Book XVIII, 599-602) as rendered by each translator. The lines describe a group of dancers depicted on the magical shield that the smith-god Hephaistos made for Achilleus.

Lang, Leaf and Myers:

> And now would they run round with deft feet exceedingly lightly, as when a potter sitting by his wheel that fitteth between his hands maketh trial of it whether it run: and now anon they would run in lines to meet each other.[5]

Pope:

> Now all at once they rise, at once descend
> With well-taught feet; now shape in oblique ways
> Confusedly regular, the moving maze:

---

[4]Lattimore, Richmond, translator. *The Iliad of Homer* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 55. Apollonius of Rhodes wrote a romantic and artificial pseudo-epic, the *Argonautica*, in the 3rd century B.C. Arktinos, if he existed at all, was a minor epic poet who lived a century or two after Homer.

[5]Andrew Lang, Walter Leaf and Ernest Myers, translators. *The Iliad of Homer* (London: Macmillan, 1883), p. 384.

Now forth at once, too swift for sight, they spring,
And undistinguished blend the flying ring:
So whirls a wheel, in giddy circle toss'd,
And, rapid as it runs, the single spokes are lost.[6]

Lattimore:

At whiles on their understanding feet they would run very lightly,
as when a potter crouching makes trial of his wheel, holding
it close in his hands, to see if it will run smooth. At another
time they would form rows, and run, rows crossing each other.[7]

After Homer came the lyric poets, whose poems are more like the sort of poetry familiar to English readers. They are comparatively short; the language need not be Homer's traditional epic dialect, but may range from the colloquial to the highly artificial. The poet often speaks in his own voice and expresses intense personal emotion, in a variety of subtle and complex metres. But in translating these poems, one has not the same choice of approaches as with Homer, whose close-knit plots and rich variety of characterization may be adequately conveyed in a prose translation. A prose translation of Greek lyric poetry, on the other hand, usually destroys more than it conveys. It may reproduce the sense, the imagery, the individual turn of phrase, but it loses what to the Greek poet was at least equally important, the metrical framework of his poem. To the Greek poet, as indeed to Greek artists in every field, the essential beauty in any work of art is beauty of structure and form, without which no other beauty can even exist. The Greek word for the universe, *kosmos,* means first of all *order* and secondly *ornament.* Long before Aristotle wrote it down, Greek artists were acting on the assumption that beauty in an object or a poem depends on a well-defined form with an orderly and harmonious arrangement of parts, and a suppression of all superfluous detail. A Greek statue may show great delicacy in the modeling of the flesh, great richness of texture in the carving of

[6]Pope, *Iliad,* p. 348.
[7]Lattimore, *Iliad,* p. 391.

hair and clothing, but these beauties are subordinate to the beauty of harmonious structure and clear contour. The poet, like the sculptor, must possess directness and intensity of vision combined with technical mastery of his craft; he cannot pour out his soul in untaught rapture, but must subject his experience to analysis, in order to present it most clearly to his audience. Like the painter, he must be able to see so clearly and control his medium so surely that he can run a swift line around a man or an experience and present it whole to the hearer. Prose, however rhythmic and "poetic," is clearly inadequate to render such poetry; here if anywhere one must try to give a poem for a poem.

But what sort of poem? One cast in a form familiar to the contemporary reader of English verse, or one that tries to keep as close as English will allow to the actual metre of the Greek? Here those translators who wish to bring Greece to the modern reader will argue that the place of poetry in the modern world is very different from the place that it had in Greece: that it is for us an occasional pleasure, an embroidery on the surface of life, while for the Greeks it was woven into the fabric. Every social and religious occasion had its appropriate choral songs and dances. Poets wrote songs for weddings, funerals, festivals of the gods; they celebrated victories of the city in war and of the citizens at the Games; they sang for themselves and their friends of their own private loves and hates. They could count on a wide audience of hearers who would be able to detect and appreciate complexities of metre and subtleties of allusion that escape the modern listener (from this point I will refer to both the modern reader and the Greek hearer as "hearer," in order to remind the reader that the translations which follow, like the original poems, must be spoken aloud to gain their full effect). Moreover, Greek poetry was usually meant to be sung to a musical accompaniment, and the poet could thus count on the music both to clarify the intricacies of his metres and to enrich the total effect. This musical element is of course entirely lost to us, and therefore many will argue that it must be replaced in translation by all the familiar ornaments of English verse, including rhyme and a regular stanza form. Some translators seem to be able to manage this feat gracefully enough, but others (myself among them) find it impossible to do without mangling the original. One finds oneself padding the line with

words that are not in the original, or taking out words that are there, straining definitions to the bursting point, and generally falsifying both the letter and the spirit of the Greek. On the whole it seems preferable to keep as close as the English language will allow to the original metre and arrangement of words, to take nothing away that is present in the original, and to add nothing of one's own. The result may not look like the familiar English stanza forms on the printed page, but the reader who takes the trouble to read it aloud will detect its metrical arrangement. In any case, twentieth-century experimentation with English poetry must by now have accustomed the reader to a wide variety of unconventional forms.

As an illustration, here are three translations of a fragment of a choral poem by Alcman, who wrote at Sparta in the seventh century B.C. It is part of a larger poem, now lost; this fragment may describe a night in landlocked Sparta, wherein summer silence and darkness overflow from the mountains to fill the whole valley. First a literal prose translation:

> Asleep are the peaks of the mountains, and the ravines; the ridges and the streambeds, and as many races of creeping things as the black earth nourishes; the wild mountain-dwelling beasts and the tribe of bees and the monsters in the depths of the purple sea. Asleep is the race of long-winged birds.[8]

The metre of this fragment is a shifting combination of dactyls and trochees:

—./—../—../—./—./—.
—./—./—./——
—./—../—../—./—./—.
—../——/—../—./——
—../——/—../—../—.
——/——/——
—../—../—

This poem has been rendered many times into English verse; the following translation, by H. T. Wade-Gery, is one of the best.

[8]Moore, *Selections,* p. 24, fragment 58.

> The far peaks sleep, the great ravines,
> The foot-hills, and the streams.
> Asleep are trees and hivéd bees,
> The mountain beasts, and all that dark earth teems,
> The glooming seas, the monsters in their deeps:
> And every bird, its wide wings folded, sleeps.[9]

Here the translator has found it necessary to insert into the first line two adjectives, "far" and "great," which are not in the original text; to change the "leaves" of the original to "trees" for the sake of his rhyme; to put the bees into hives and fold the wide wings of the birds. The reason for changing the precise color-adjectives "black" and "purple" to the vaguer "dark" and "glooming" is less evident, but I may hazard a guess at it. In the original Greek, the dominant vowel sounds in the poem are long *o*, long *a* and diphthongs containing these two vowels; the most frequent consonants are *n*, *ng* and *s*. Sound is here used to reinforce sense, and the effect, when the poem is spoken aloud, is almost hypnotic. It is hardly possible to convey this particular effect in a translation, but one can suggest it indirectly by choosing words whose connotations are those of darkness, quiet, and rest. Thus "dark," though used here as a color adjective, has overtones of night and sleep; "glooming" combines these overtones with an echo of the sound of the Greek. Certainly the total effect of this translation on the hearer is very close to that of the original as far as mood and atmosphere are concerned. But one wonders if it is not possible to retain the mood and still render the poem so that it strikes the modern hearer as it did the Greeks, to whom form and content were of such equal importance that the loss of either would destroy the poem.

The following translation is an attempt to render an approximation of the Greek metre in as nearly the exact wording of the original as is possible, line for line:

> The mountain peaks are asleep, and asleep the watercourses;
> The ridges slumber, and the valleys;

---

[9]Higham, T. F. and Bowra, C. M. *The Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942), 190, no. 117.

The leaves, and every creeping thing the black earth
breeds;
Wild beasts of the mountains sleep, and the tribe of bees;
The monsters sleep in the deeps of the purple sea;
At rest are all the race
Of wide-winged birds.

A glance at the metrical scheme of the original will show that the correspondence is not exact, even when allowance is made for the fact that in Greek verse it is often permissible to substitute one long (or in English, one stressed) syllable for two short ones. In the last two lines especially, it has been impossible to make the metre correspond exactly, but I have tried to suggest the slow succession of long syllables in these lines of the original. Though it was impossible to reproduce the full slumbrous effect of the Greek sounds, I have attempted to suggest it by repeating the verb, with slight variations (all well within the original meaning of the Greek), in almost every clause. A faint reminder of the original sound effects may be found in the predominance of a single vowel sound, long *e*, in the translation, corresponding to the predominance of long *o* and *a* in the Greek. To enhance the effect, I have preferred the secondary meaning "breeds" to the primary meaning "nourishes, makes grow" of the Greek word *trephei* in line 3, and I have used "deeps" in preference to "depths" in line 5.

Alcman wrote a great many poems for choruses of maidens, and in many of them he speaks to the girls directly, in a light, teasing tone. The following fragment from such a choral poem illustrates still another difficulty of translation.[10] The metre of the original is dactylic hexameter.

No longer, maidens with voices of honey, as sweet as desire, can
My limbs sustain me. I wish—I wish I could be a kingfisher,
One who soars with the halcyons over the bloom of the wave,
Keeping a fearless heart, the holy, the sea-blue bird.

Here there has been no real difficulty in translating the literal

[10]Moore, *Selections,* p. 24, fragment 94.

meaning of the words, line by line; nor has there been any temptation to distort the natural word order for the sake of the metre (though I fear the metre itself limps, as it too often does in English). Rather the problem is one of associations and connotations, for Alcman here is not merely sighing for the wings of the dove. In the Greek, he has made the word for "kingfisher" masculine in gender and that for "halcyons" feminine; by this simple means he reminds his hearers of a familiar Greek legend about halcyons: when an old male bird becomes weary in flight, the young females of the flock will carry him on their backs until he is rested. Alcman is banteringly suggesting to the girls of his choral group that he is too old to keep up with them in the dance, and that they should therefore help him as the young halcyons do their leader. All these overtones, which greatly enrich the original poem, are lost to the English hearer because the legend is unfamiliar, and there is no way for the translator to bring them out without distorting the poem or distracting the hearer with obtrusive footnotes. To anyone familiar with English poetry, however, another legend is almost inextricably associated with the word "halcyon": the legend that these birds nest on the waves of the sea, in a short, holy season of winter calm. This legend was also familiar to the Greeks, and it would have been present in the minds of Alcman's hearers. Therefore I have felt it permissible to try to bring out for the English hearer something of the wealth of associations implied in the Greek words, by translating as "soar" a word that means "fly" or "hover." This suggests the image of calmness and floating associated with halcyons, without making it so strong as to compete with Alcman's own imagery.

Both the foregoing fragments are mere scraps, all that survives of longer poems. Most of Greek lyric poetry, in fact, survives only in bits and pieces. Much perished even in antiquity; as literary tastes changed, manuscripts of early Greek poetry were often neglected or even thrown away. Later the great libraries of the Greek and Roman world were plundered by Romans, or scattered and burned by ignorant barbarians or zealous Christians. Many poets are now represented only by a few lines quoted by later authors or by scraps of papyrus preserved by chance in the dry sands of Egypt. Sometimes a whole poem may be pieced together from several sources, but more often only a few tantalizing phrases re-

main, in a text so corrupt that it must be ingeniously emended before it makes any sense at all. Such fragments often have great beauty and power even in their mutilated state and appear to be well worth the effort of translating. But here the translator confronts the most serious dilemma of all: should he keep strictly to the text as it appears, and give the reader a translation full of holes and loose ends, or should he try to work it into a comprehensible form, following the hints of the text itself and the conjectures of learned men? The dangers of the second course are obvious: he may find himself merely writing a new poem with the old words, in the delusion that he knows what the poet really meant.

The following fragment of a poem by Sappho illustrates this dilemma very well.

> Hither from Cr. . . . to [?] the holy shrine, where there is a pleasant grove of apple trees, and altars smoking with incense. . . . Here too, cold water sounds between the apple branches, and all the ground is shadowed with roses, and from the trembling leaves slumber comes flowing down. Here too a meadow fit for horses to graze is blooming with spring flowers, and the anise breathes out a sweet scent . . . Here do you, Aphrodite, taking up the garlands, gracefully pour us nectar into golden cups, nectar mingled with the joy of festivals.[11]

Even in its mutilated condition, the poem displays all the excellences of Sappho: her intense feeling, combined with clarity of vision; her use of simple words arranged in an apparently natural manner, yet fitted to a regular metrical stanza capable of many subtle modulations; and vivid images interwoven with rich musical sounds. The poem is written in the Sapphic stanza, which Sappho perfected and used with greater skill than any other poet, though she probably did not invent it. The stanza is made up of three lines in the following metre: —./—./—../—./—./, followed by a single shorter line: —../—.; it may be modulated by substitut-

[11]Page, *Papyri*, pp. 375-379. I have followed Page's readings with the exception of two words in lines 9 and 10, where I prefer the readings of Lobel (cited in Page's *apparatus criticus*, p. 377).

ing a long syllable for two short ones, or a dactyl for a spondee, in certain feet. The subject is a favorite one of Sappho's, an invocation to Aphrodite, goddess of love and beauty. Probably here it is the Cretan Aphrodite of the Flowers who is being asked to join her worshippers in a festival at an outdoor shrine.

In any translation of Sappho's poetry, the translator must be particularly careful to preserve the graces of the original by doing everything in his power to reproduce not merely the meaning of the words and the images they express but also their arrangement within the line, and as much as possible of their musical sounds, for the charm of Sappho lies in the artful interweaving of all these beauties. For this reason, I have tried in the following translation to keep each line as she wrote it, only altering the word order where the natural arrangement of Greek seems forced and artificial in English. Where Sappho divides a phrase between one line and the next, I have done the same. Though the metre of the translation does not run as smoothly as that of the original, I have tried to make no substitutions of stresses that would not be permissible in Greek.

Hither, goddess, come to us from the holy
Shrine of Crete; for here is a lovely grove of
Apple trees; and altars are set among them
Smoking with incense.

Here cold water babbles between the apple
Branches; all the ground is shadowed over with
Roses; down from leaves that tremble and whisper, Slumber comes flowing.
Here a meadow, rich for the horses' grazing,
Blooms with flowers of spring, and the pungent anise
Breathes out sweetness; wandering breezes murmur, Drowsy with fragrance.

Come to us here, O Cypris, accept our garlands;
With graceful hands pour out into golden goblets
Nectar mingled like wine for our delight with
Joy of your presence.

It is obvious that I have here made several additions and alterations. Line 1 is very fragmentary and corrupt, but it is highly probable that there was originally some title of Aphrodite or the word "goddess" as a form of address. In line 2, I preferred the adjective "lovely" to its alternatives "charming" or "pleasant," not only for the chime with "grove" but also for the association of love with Aphrodite. In line 4, the word "babble" seemed to come closest to the combination of sense and sound in its Greek equivalent *keladei*, and it also provided a chime with "apple" in the same line. In line 6, I have expanded a single word into the phrase "tremble and whisper," because it seemed the only possible way to convey the full effect of the Greek *aithyssomenōn*, a word which means "trembling" and also, when spoken aloud, suggests the rustle of moving leaves. The whole third stanza is very fragmentary and corrupt; in one reading there is a suggestion of breezes, which I have expanded to fill out lines 11 and 12 in harmony with the general tone of the poem. In line 14 the word "goblets" may seem rather affected to a modern ear. The word Sappho uses, *kylikes*, has been brought over into English by archaeologists as a technical term, to describe a kind of drinking cup with a slender stem and broad bowl. To the non-specialist, however, the word would convey nothing at all, and the alternative "cups" might suggest a false image of something like a modern teacup. "Goblets," a word which describes a drinking vessel of a similar shape to the one Sappho had in mind, at least conveys a fairly exact visual image. The fourth stanza too is incomplete, and here I have taken liberties that may be less justifiable. The Greek word I have rendered as "pour out" may be more accurately translated "pour out like wine"; I have divided it and attached the phrase "like wine" to the word "mingled," in reference to the Greek custom of mixing water, and sometimes fragrant herbs as well, with the wine at their feasts. The Greek hearer would take the custom for granted, but it may need to be emphasized somewhat for the modern hearer, if it is to have a similar effect in his mind. Finally, the phrase "nectar mingled with the joy of festival," which exactly renders the meaning of the Greek words, has been altered for similar reasons. To the Greek, the gods were physically present as guests at the festivals and ceremonies of their worship, and they enjoyed the music and dancing and feasting in exactly the same way as their

mortal worshippers. A large part of the "joy of festival" to the worshipper was the feeling that he and the gods were sharing the same pleasures. This feeling underlies the whole poem, and I believe that for a modern hearer, unaccustomed to such a concept of divinity, it needs to be made more explicit, lest the whole effect of the poem be falsified.

Final judgment, of course, must be left to the reader, as with all translations; if the result strikes him as poetry in English, yet recognizably Greek poetry as well, the translator's work has been successful.

WILLIAM ARCHER, W. T. STEAD, AND THE THEATRE. SOME UNPUBLISHED LETTERS

by Joseph O. Baylen

The success of the editors of the *Pall Mall Gazette,* John Morley and W. T. Stead, in attracting to the journal a brilliant staff during the period 1880-1890 did much to make the *P.M.G.* one of the most important evening papers in London.[1] Morley and his successor, Stead, solicited the contributions of such essayists, novelists, and literary critics as John Ruskin, Frederic Harrison, Oscar Wilde, Rider Haggard, Arthur Conan Doyle, Stopford Brooke, George Meredith, George Bernard Shaw, and the dramatic critic, William Archer. Of this array of talent, Shaw and Archer were regular staff members.

Archer's work as a literary critic for the *P.M.G.* began in 1884, encompassed the years of Stead's stormy editorship (1883-1890), and terminated under Stead's successor, Edward T. Cook.[2] While his efforts for *The World* enabled Archer to establish his reputation as a dramatic critic, the better paying *P.M.G.* advanced his repute as a literary critic. His style of criticism was attractive and won the respect of both the authors of the books he reviewed and the more sophisticated readers of the *P.M.G.*[3] Archer's relations with Stead were cordial, but never intimate; and although they were almost complete opposites in physical appearance, back-

[1]On the *Pall Mall Gazette* under the editorial direction of Morley (1880-83) and Stead (1883-90), see J. W. Robertson Scott, *The Life and Death of a Newspaper . . .* (London, 1952), 13-259.

[2]On the life and career of William Archer (1856-1924), see Lt. Col. C. Archer, *William Archer: Life, Work and Friendships* (New Haven, 1931); St. John Ervine, *Bernard Shaw, His Life, Work and Friends* (London, 1956), 173-75, 179; Archibald Henderson, *Bernard Shaw, Playboy and Prophet* (New York, 1932), 257ff, 338ff.

[3]Ervine, *Bernard Shaw,* 174; Joseph O. Baylen, "A Note on William Archer and the *Pall Mall Gazette,* 1888," *Studies in English* [University of Mississippi], IV (1963), 21-26.

ground, and outlook, their relationship was based upon mutual toleration and, at times, even admiration.[4] Tall and austere in visage, Archer the Scot was a sharp contrast to Stead whose Nonconformist background and Puritan instincts impelled him to avoid the theatre as the source of temptation. Yet, in many ways, they were very much alike. Both were stubborn and uncompromising on matters of principle and wrote with great enthusiasm, clarity, and independence. They were also alike in their open-handed generosity and strong prejudice against hypocrisy and cant in any form.[5] Finally, as Stead in time lost his bias against the theatre, he came to appreciate Archer's reverence of Ibsen and his confidence in the drama as a great potential force for good.

When Stead was imprisoned during 1885 for his attempt to raise the age of consent for young girls in the "Maiden Tribute" agitation, Archer staunchly supported his editor.[6] But, aside from his strong conviction that Stead had erred in his method of challenging the ramparts of Victorian hypocrisy, Archer refused to sever his connection with the paper.[7] He still hoped to persuade the editor to add a regular dramatic critic to the staff of the *P.M.G.* and to enlist Stead's aid in a crusade against the Lord Chamberlain's interference with the development and progress of the drama in England.

Archer's publication of his essay on "The Censorship of the Stage" in 1886 was "the first shot" in his long battle against an institution which he insisted was "one of the chief obstacles" to the

---

[4]Ervine, *Bernard Shaw*, 173. On the life, career, and personality of W. T. Stead (1849-1912), see Frederic Whyte, *Life of W. T. Stead* (London, 1924), 2 vols.; Estelle W. Stead, *My Father, Personal and Spiritual Reminiscences* (London, 1913); Robertson Scott, *Life and Death of a Newspaper*, 72-246. *Re* Stead's early bias against the theatre, see [W. T. Stead], "First Impressions of the Theatre.—I. From the Outside," *Review of Reviews*, XXX (July, 1904), 29-30.

[5]Cf. Archer, *William Archer*, 405-06, 410-11. See also the estimate of Archibald Henderson who knew Archer and also saw him through the eyes of his friend, Shaw, Henderson, *Shaw, Playboy and Prophet*, 257, 341. My comments *re* similarities between Archer and Stead are based upon a study of Stead's papers and the works of his daughter, Miss Estelle W. Stead, and his colleague, J. W. Robertson Scott.

[6]On Stead and the "Maiden Tribute" agitation, see Charles Terrot's sensationalist account in *The Maiden Tribute* (London, 1959), 135-222. See also William Archer to Charles Archer, Nov. 12, 1885. Archer, *William Archer*, 159.

[7]Cf. William Archer to Charles Archer, Sept. 8, 1887, in Archer, *William Archer*, 159.

progress of the English theatre.[8] It was on behalf of this cause that he wrote to Stead in late May and early June, 1886.[9] The argument that the Lord Chamberlain's censorship of the theatre was "perfectly futile as a safeguard against indecency" on the stage and "a source of the gravest inconvenience and injustice" to playwrights was based on the premise that the threatre must not be hampered in its natural development and in its exposition of the social and moral problems of society. Yet, Stead, who had come to know the meaning of censorship by the "respectable public" as a result of its reaction to his frank revelations in the "Maiden Tribute" campaign, could not entirely accept Archer's point of view and especially his proposition that "responsibility for morals of the stage" should be thrown on "the right-minded public, [who require only] to be awakened to a sense of duty in the matter, by the abolition of the [Lord Chamberlain's] office . . . . " Archer's retort that a theatrical "Vigilance Committee" could check "the managers [of theatres] who . . . snap their fingers at the Lord Chamberlain" was a reminder to Stead of how he and other reformers had attempted, following the "Maiden Tribute" agitation, to watch the white slave traffic through their organization of vigilance committees. In regard to Stead's contention that London music halls reflected the low taste of the public to which Archer proposed to entrust censorship of the theatre, Archer tried to draw a distinction between the public which patronized the music halls and that which attended the legitimate theatre. And, while he conceded that "*Greater* indecencies" might result from the abolition of the Lord Chamberlain's censorship, he was confident that eventually "the better instincts of the public would effectually assert themselves."

Since Stead was preoccupied with such matters as the Irish Home Rule question, Archer did not press the issue of theatrical censorship any further. But he continued his work against the Lord Chamberlain's control of the theatre and, in 1892, he appeared before a Select Committee of the Commons reviewing legislation governing the regulation of the theatre to urge the abolition of

[8]*Ibid.*, 132.

[9]Archer to Stead, June 3, 1886. Stead Papers. All quotations cited in this paragraph are from this letter. I am deeply indebted to Miss Estelle W. Stead and Mr. W. K. Stead for permission to publish this and other Archer letters from the Stead Papers.

the censorship animus.[10] Not even the Committee's refusal to end all censorship of the theatre deterred Archer from his purpose, and it was largely due to his efforts that the anti-censorship movement gained sufficient momentum again to challenge the government on the issue in 1907.

When, during 1907, the Lord Chamberlain's office vetoed the production of Granville Barker's tragedy, *Waste,* Archer mobilized leading dramatists and literary figures in a strong protest to the Home Secretary and in forcing the appointment of a Joint Select Committee to investigate the abuses of theatrical censorship. Although the Committee rejected Archer's proposals for the abolition of censorship, the battle was half won when the Committee's report stirred the Lord Chamberlain's office to exercise its powers with greater restraint.[11]

Archer's correspondence with Stead languished until, in early January, 1889, when he attempted to persuade the editor to publish a weekly *feuilleton* as "a running commentary on the theatrical life of the day . . . ." It was a good idea, but Stead was as yet not ready to accept the theatre as "a great social institution." While Archer considered the theatre as a vehicle for the expression of man's life and problems, Stead was at this time more concerned with man's soul and peace of mind. The divergence of their respective points of view was well emphasized in Archer's criticism of Stead's proposal to use his new *Review of Reviews* as "something of a confessional" with which to "doctor" souls.[12]

Archer, nevertheless, did not abandon all hope of winning Stead's support for the theatre. Since 1891, he had seconded Miss Elizabeth Robins in urging Stead to interest himself in the possibilities of the theatre as a great force for good. Thus, thirteen years later, in June, 1904, when Stead announced that he was preparing to embark upon "a pilgrimage of visitation" to the theatre, Archer hailed Stead's decision as "an important piece of theatrical news" and declared that at long last Stead was facing up to a responsibi-

---

[10]Archer, *William Archer,* 178.

[11]*Ibid.,* 308-11.

[12]See William Archer, "A New Profession: Soul-Doctoring," *Daily Graphic,* Jan. 22, 1890. Stead left the *Pall Mall Gazette* in late 1889 to found and edit the *Review of Reviews.*

lity which he had hitherto shirked.[13] "It will be extremely interesting," wrote Archer in *The Morning Leader,* "to see what impression the theatre makes upon his vivid imagination and his keen intelligence, unwarped by tradition. . . ."[14] In his reply to Archer and "other critics in the press," Stead denied having shunned the theatre because of his indifference "to the immense potentiality for good, as for evil, which it possesses." "I have, indeed," he now averred, "been more emphatic in proclaiming the need for the theatre than any of my critics."[15]

Stead, however, was willing to accept advice on his foray into the theatre. Since Archer, dissatisfied with the summer season production, advised Stead to defer until autumn his "round of the theatres," he delayed his "pilgrimage" until September 23, when he viewed Beerbohm Tree's presentation of *The Tempest* at His Majesty's Theatre.[16] It was a highly satisfactory experience, which inspired Stead to write that "If all plays are like this play, then the prejudice against the theatre is absurd . . . ."[17] But the second play, *His Majesty's Servant,* which he attended at the Imperial Theatre on October 4, left Stead cold. It was to him nothing more than "an extravagant contrivance for wasting time by impressing upon the mind false history and absurd conceptions of human nature."[18] Nor did he find Arthur Pinero's *A Wife Without a Smile* at Wyndham's Theatre any more to his liking. Indeed, wrote Stead, "If this be the kind of tonic that enervated playgoers can assimilate, I should fear to attend another play. . . ."[19]

As the theatre was beginning to pall on Stead, Archer urged him to persevere with his experiment by seeing Euripides' *Hippoly-*

---

[13]Archer's comment in *The Morning Leader* as cited in Whyte, *Life of Stead,* II, 247. On the reaction of other dramatic critics and some Nonconformist clerics to Stead's announcement, see [W. T. Stead], "First Impressions of the Theatre.—II. Some Comments, Counsel, and Criticism . . . ," *Review of Reviews,* XXX (Aug., 1904), 141-45.

[14]*Ibid.*

[15][W. T. Stead], "First Impressions of the Theatre.—III. Still from the Outside," *ibid.* (Sept., 1904), 269.

[16][W. T. Stead], "First Impressions of the Theatre. I.—My First Play: 'The Tempest,' at His Majesty's," *ibid.* (Oct., 1904), 360-67.

[17]*Ibid.,* 367.

[18][W. T. Stead], "First Impressions of the Theatre.—II. (2) 'His Majesty's Servant,' . . .," *ibid.* (Nov., 1904), 474.

[19][W. T. Stead], "First Impressions of the Theatre.—II. (3) 'A Wife Without a Smile,' by Mr. Pinero," *ibid.,* 475.

tus at the Court Theatre. Although Stead came to the production "in a complete and disreputable state of ignorance as to the story of the play . . . [and] the character of the leading personages," he found the play "an even more challenging thing than 'The Tempest'. . . ."[20] He was, indeed, grateful to Archer for having directed him to a drama which "challenges the foundations of faith, . . . the eternal principles of divine justice, and dares us to justify the ways of God to man." No one, he was convinced, could see *Hippolytus* without feeling that "he is lifted to a loftier region" and perceiving "a deeper sense of the Divine Reality that is imminent in all immortal things."[21]

And so, Archer completed the "conversion" of W. T. Stead. From 1904 until his tragic death on the *Titanic*, Stead not only took the theatre to heart but aided those working for the establishment of a National Theatre and encouraged his daughter, Miss Estelle W. Stead, in her career as a Shakespearian actress. In his quiet and patient way, Archer had helped Stead understand the theatre as "the palace of light and sound" and the mirror of life that it was to him.[22]

****

16 John Street,
Bedford Row, W. C.
31 May, 1886

My dear Mr. Stead

As I know you are not much interested in theatrical matters I do not trouble you with a private copy of my new book 'About the Theatre',[23] but I have had a special [*sic*] taken of the essay which, in my own mind, gives the book its raison d'être, and I hope that you will one day or other do me the honour of reading it when you half-an-hour's leisure.

---

[20][W. T. Stead], "First Impressions of the Theatre.—III. (4) "The 'Hippolytus' of Euripides (Gilbert Murray's Translation)," *ibid.* (Dec., 1904), 609.

[21]*Ibid.*

[22]Cf. Ervine, *Bernard Shaw,* 173.

[23]Cf. William Archer, *About the Theatre; Essays and Studies* (London, 1886).

I don't know whether you have ever given any thought to the question of the Censorship; and if it has ever occurred to you at all, you may perhaps be under the impression that it is, what it purports to be, a bulwark of public morality. After a good deal of thought on the matter I am strongly of the opinion, that it is perfectly futile as a safeguard against indecency, while it is in other respects a source of the gravest inconvenience and injustice. My opinion is that the responsibility for morals of the stage should be thrown on the public, with whom it ultimately lies, all irresponsible officialism notwithstanding, and who now only require, I believe, to be awakened to a sense of their duty in the matter, by the abolition of the office which nominally relieves them of responsibility.

I venture to ask you to read and weigh my arguments. If they strike you as in the main just, I hope that when the occasion offers you will use the influence by which you have already initiated such great reforms, to further this smaller but not unimportant improvement in the same direction. My essay opens with a sketch of the history of Censorship[24] which, if you have ever anything to say in the matter, you might find it useful.

I am dear Mr. Stead

Yours very sincerely

William Archer

****

16, John St.
Bedford Row W. C.
3 June: 86

Dear Mr. Stead

Many thanks for your note—I trust we may one day have an opportunity of discussing the question of the Censorship, on which, of course, there

[24]"The Censorship of the Stage," *ibid.*, chap. ii.

is a great deal more to be said than can go into a single article.

As to the influence of the public, my argument on that point is merely this: The Censorship having notoriously failed to secure anything like decency, there can at least be no harm in trying whether the right-minded section of the public (minority or majority as the case may be) might not prove a more effective Censor. I argue that what is tolerated by the public *now* is no criterion of what would be tolerated *then* for the simple reason that the existence of the Censorship deadens the public sense of responsibility. I believe that the formal abolition of the Censorship would lead to the formation of a sort of theatrical Vigilance Committee (not formally constituted, perhaps, but none the less effective) which would keep in check the managers who now snap their fingers at the Lord Chamberlain. What is tolerated or demanded at the Music Halls is scarcely an indication of what would be accepted at the theatre, for I think you will find that the Music Hall audience is practically distinct from the theatrical audience, though their edges no doubt overlap a little. And finally, let me point out that the lines you quote are not sung at a Music Hall but at a theatre under the jurisdiction of the Lord Chamberlain. They either *have* or *have not* been licensed by him—in either case proving the futility of the office. It is this futility upon which I chiefly insist. If the Censorship were abolished tomorrow, it is quite conceivable that *greater* indecencies wd. be tolerated than are habitually presented at such a theatre as the Criterion; and on the other hand it is at least conceivable that the better instincts of the better portion of the public would effectually assert themselves.

I was struck on Monday evening by the ab-

Studies in English, Vol. 5 [1964], Art. 11

solute inoffensiveness of the American burlesque Adonis. It is anything but a high-class entertainment but something between an extravaganza, and a variety show—but it is not in the least indecent. Compare, too, the farce played at the Strand Theatre, with a similar production at the Criterion, and I think it is pretty clear that the New York public is a better censor than our Great Irresponsible.

Believe me

Yours very truly

William Archer

26, Gordon Square
W.C.
2 January 89

Dear Mr. Stead

As I see a *feuilleton* is a standard feature of the renewed *P.M.G.*,[25] I write to suggest what has long been in my mind, but has never before taken shape as a distinct proposition.

You know, of course, that several of the leading Paris papers – [*Le*] *Temps* and the [*Journal des*] *Dèbats* among others—treat the drama in a regular weekly *feuilleton* signed by well known writers—Jules Lemaitre [26] in the two cases I have mentioned. Won't you try a somewhat similar experiment here, and put it in my hands? I have a notion that if I could hit the right style, I might make the paper a power in the theatrical world, secure a special *clientèle* for it on my 'day,' and by so doing perceptibly increase its general influence.

[25]A *feuilleton* or two to three pages of essays and short stories was an innovation long desired and finally introduced by Stead in the *Pall Mall Gazette* during August, 1888. See J. A. Godley to Stead, Aug. 21, 1888. Stead Papers.

[26]Francois Élie Jules Lemaitre (1853-1914), French dramatist and dramatic critic, was one of Archer's Continental friends. Jules Lemaitre, *Les Contemporains; études et portraits littéraires* . . . (Paris, 1897-1918), 8 vols.; *Theatrical Impressions* (London, 1924); Archer, *William Archer*, 217.

Editors: Vol. 5 (1964): Full issue

My article need not in any way interfere with Charles Morley's work.[27] On the French papers they have a critic and a paragraphest [*sic*] as well as a *feuilletoniste*. Indeed direct criticism of new pieces would not be the staple of my matter. It would rather be a running commentary on the theatrical life of the day in all its aspects. Today I might treat some question arising out of the Lyceum [Theatre's] Macbeth; next week I might have an interview with some dramatist, actor or manager, with comments thereon; the week after, it might be a *causerie*[28] on some new theatrical book, or some passing event, such as the Gilbert-Scott quarrel[29]—and so forth. I think I may say that during the five years of my connection with the *World*,[30] I have made some reputation; but the space allowed me there is too limited, and my function is too strictly confined to direct criticism of new pieces, to enable me to work up the *influence* which I believe might be acquired—besides, the *World* has not the right *sort* of circulation for my purpose. I am aware that you take little personal interest in the stage; but it exists and will continue to exist, a great social institution—if it is possible to acquire an influence for good among the thousands concerned with and the tens of thousands interested

[27]Charles Morley (1853-1916), nephew of the Liberal politician, John Morley, served as one of Stead's assistant editors in charge of cultural features for the *P.M.G.* and as editor of the weekly *Pall Mall Budget*. On the career of Charles Morley, see his *Travels in London* (London, 1916); Robertson Scott, *Life and Death of a Newspaper*, 123, 207; J. Saxon Mills, *Sir Edward Cook, K.B.E. A Biography* (New York, 1921), 116-17, 123.

[28]An informal or chatty essay or review.

[29]W. S. Gilbert, of Gilbert and Sullivan fame, was well known for his "fractiousness." In 1888, he gave offense to Clement Scott, the dramatic critic and anti-Ibsenite foe of Archer, which provoked Scott to savagely review Gilbert's production of *Brantinghame Hall*. The acrimonious exchange which followed Gilbert's acid response was the talk of London theatre circles. Hesketh Pearson, *Gilbert, His Life and Strife* (New York, 1957), 189, 201. On the conflict between Archer and Scott over Ibsen and the value of traditional drama, see Archer, *William Archer*, 193-94.

[30]Archer served as dramatic critic for *The World* from 1884 to 1905. Cf. Ervine, *Bernard Shaw*, 179.

in the stage,[31] surely the thing is worth doing. I can imagine that it is an experiment the success or failure of which could be pretty easily and conclusively tested though of course it would take a little time to do so. I hope you will give the matter fair consideration, and if you would like to see me about it, I am at your service any day except Friday, at any time.

Will you allow [me] to add a word of congratulations on the new form of the *P.M.G.*?[32] When I first heard of the alteration, I confess I felt doubtful about it; but the first two numbers have converted me. I never saw a more business like or better arranged paper.

Believe me

Yours very truly

William Archer

****

National Liberal Club
Whitehall Place, S.W.
10 June 1904

Dear Mr. Stead

I implore you to defer for some time—say, until the autumn—your round of the theatres.[33] Not

[31]It was not until 1890 that Stead, profoundly moved by the Oberammergau Passion Play, became interested in "the possible potentiality of the theatre as a force for 'good' and [began] to contemplate a 'reform' [which might] make the drama 'the handmaiden of morality.'" Patrick G. Hogan, Jr. and Joseph O. Baylen, "G. Bernard Shaw and W. T. Stead. An Unexplored Relationship," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* [Rice University], I (Autumn, 1961), 128; see also Stead's statement in an interview published in the *Chicago Sunday Tribune,* Nov. 12, 1893.

[32]The format of the *P.M.G.* was increased in size to a longer form at the end of 1888. Cf. *Pall Mall Gazette,* Dec. 30 and 31, 1888.

[33]Although it was not until July, 1904, that Stead publicly announced in the *Review of Reviews* his intention "to undertake a personal tour of inquiry through all the Theatres of London" in the near future, he had communicated his intention to Archer and other dramatic critics before July in order to solicit their advice as to what productions they would recommend as good subjects for his inquiry. [Stead], "First Impressions of the Theatre. —I. From the Outside," *Review of Reviews,* XXX (July, 1904), 29.

Editors: Vol. 5 (1964): Full issue

for ten years has there been a season so barren of interest as the present. By some chance which I cannot explain, all our good men are silent and all our money-grubbers are hard at work—though I believe even they are not grubbing much money. You would get a wholly unfair idea of the English stage, at this gray end of a bad season.

I can easily give you full information as to what goes on in Berlin and Vienna—indeed all over Germany. As for Paris, I should recommend you to procure the last issue of Noel [?] and "Annales (or Annuaire) des Théatre . . ." "Bookshops" (of Arundel Street) will procure it for you. I have not got a copy, or I would bring it to you. If you can get a copy of it, I will gladly come and interpret it to you—I mean I will tell you the class of play and the class of theatres concerned in the different articles. It would take you some time to read them and even then you would probably not be much the wiser.

Yours very truly

W. Archer

****

Langley Rise,
King's Langley, Herts.
19 Oct. 1904

Dear Mr. Stead

Thanks for your note. However exhausting you may find theatre-going, you *must on no account* miss the "Hippolytus" of Euripides at the Court Theatre.[34] It is quite unique. I wd. sug-

[34]Upon reading Professor Gilbert Murray's edition of Euripides' *Hippolytus* in 1900, Archer deemed it the most readable rendition of the Greek drama and urged Murray to have it produced. But it was not until May, 1904, that, on the initiative of Archer, H. Granville Barker and the Stage Society produced Murray's version of "Hippolytus" at the New Century Theatre. It was so highly successful that Granville Barker and J. E. Vedrenne

gest that you shd. go on the Tuesday, Thursday or Friday of next week when the performance may probably be better than it is this week. Go to the middle of the dress circle—that is the place to see it.

Yours very truly

William Archer

---

chose the play to inaugurate their season at the Court Theatre in October, 1904. The day before Archer's letter to Stead, he wrote to Professor Murray: "I like the text of the *Hippolytus* enormously today. You are really enriching English literature with these things," Archer, *William Archer,* 255-56, 265, 276-77.