

THE GISSING NEWSLETTER

“More than most men am I dependent on sympathy to bring out the best that is in me.”
– George Gissing’s *Commonplace Book*.

Volume XVII, Number 2

April, 1981

-- 1 --

The Emancipated:
Gissing’s Treatment of Women and Religious Emancipation

John R. Harrison
Oxford

Gissing’s concern with intellectual emancipation, or the release from the “worn-out fetters” of religious dogmatism and “from the narrow views of morality that go therewith,” (1) is to be found from his first novel (*Workers in the Dawn*) onward, and is a major concern in both *The Emancipated* and *Born in Exile*. It is significant, and in itself somewhat ironic, that Gissing should have chosen his mother’s home as the place in which to write *The Emancipated*, (2) for he had

Editorial Board

Pierre Coustillas, Editor, University of Lille

Shigeru Koike, Tokyo Metropolitan University

Jacob Korg, University of Washington, Seattle

Editorial correspondence should be sent to the Editor:

10, rue Gay-Lussac, 59110-La Madeleine, France,

and all other correspondence to: C. C. KOHLER,

12, Horsham Road, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 2JL, England.

Subscriptions

Private Subscribers: £3.00 per annum

Libraries: £5.00 per annum

-- 2 --

always found Wakefield and its neighbourhood deadening – which is exactly how he describes Bartles in the novel. His mother and two sisters, (3) all of whom had strong religious convictions, disapproved of Gissing’s lack of faith, and consequently the atmosphere of the house always made him feel uncomfortable. In a letter to Bertz (September 5, 1889), Gissing remarks: “... I suffer so much from the absolute lack of conversation. My poor sister is a Puritan, and we can talk of nothing but matter of fact.” (4) It was Margaret’s piety more than her lack of conversation that irritated her

brother, for when he relaxed with Ovid, she busied herself with some “dirty little pietistic work.” (5) Gissing often attempted to make both his sisters broaden their reading habits, just as Mrs. Spence does with Miriam in *The Emancipated*, but, unlike Mrs. Spence, Gissing found all his efforts to be in vain. No doubt the conversation between Spence and Mallard on society’s prudish attitudes to art represents a subtle attack on his sisters’ Philistinism. (6) As Professor Coustillas points out in his introduction to the Harvester Press edition of the novel, Ellen interpreted *The Emancipated* as an attack upon herself, her opinions and mode of life, believing that she had served as the model for Miriam Baske, which does not seem unlikely since the novel’s original title was “The Puritan.” (7)

The spread of religious doubt and the gradual disintegration of established religion during the Victorian era is a subject too large and too well known to be discussed in an essay of this length, though one might mention the enormous popularity of Mrs. Humphry Ward’s *Robert Elsmere* (1888) in which the loss of faith of the clergyman hero is not only condoned but upheld by the author. Though he never held any religious beliefs himself, (8) Gissing did become briefly influenced, like his character, Helen Norman, by Auguste Comte’s Philosophy of Positivism, or the “Religion of Humanity,” shortly before he wrote *Workers in the Dawn*. However, as with Helen Norman, Gissing’s own experiences amongst the poor, and particularly with his wife, Nell,

-- 3 --

gradually taught him to modify his belief that society could be transformed by rational means; and, in less than two years after the publication of his first novel, the conditions of his life brought him to the pessimistic conclusions formulated in an unpublished article entitled “The Hope of Pessimism” (9).

Gissing obviously approves of Helen Norman’s religious emancipation, just as he does Ada Warren’s in *Isabel Clarendon*, whilst Miriam Baske is criticized by the author for the unChristian-like quality of her religious zeal. In a stern letter to her sister-in-law, at the beginning of the novel, she threatens to suspend the employment of a mother and her daughter simply because their church attendance has been inconsistent, and thus feels “they ought to be punished in some way” (p. 5); and she refuses to employ a man because she considers him to be “irreclaimable” – also believing that, “if he is in want, he has only himself to blame.” Gissing comments:

Far from Miriam any desire to abolish the misery which was among the divinely-appointed conditions of this preliminary existence. No; she was uncomfortable, and content that others should be so, for discomfort’s sake.
(p. 55)

Miriam, at first, refuses to enjoy the art and scenery of Italy, because it was her “nature to distrust the beautiful”; and every Sunday she shuts herself up in her room wishing that the Sunday in Naples could be as “universally dolorous as it was in Bartles. It revolted her to hear happy voices in a country abandoned to heathendom” (p. 55).

Through her attraction to Mallard and her introduction to the world of art and culture, Miriam is gradually “freed from those bonds that numb the faculties of mind and heart” (p. 438); her “humanity” is seen to increase in proportion to her religious emancipation, just as Ada Warren’s evolution of character is based on her ability to affirm her own personality; and Mallard soon

-- 4 --

notices, as Kingcote does with Ada, (10) that Miriam looked younger and more feminine; “her eyes no longer had the somewhat sullen gleam which had been wont to harm her aspect, and when she smiled it was without the hint of disdainful reticence” (p. 311). Yet Gissing’s inconsistency concerning the loss of religious belief becomes apparent within the same novel; for, although Miriam’s religious emancipation is seen in a positive light, Gissing’s attitude towards Cecily’s intellectual and moral emancipation is much more ambivalent. Though Cecily does not “represent that extreme type of woman to whom the bearing of children has become in itself repugnant,” as Alma Rolfe clearly does in *The Whirlpool*, she is very far removed from that

other type which the world at large still makes its ideal of the feminine. With what temper would she have heard the lady in her aunt’s drawing-room, who was of opinion that she should “stay at home and mind the baby”! Education had made her an individual; she was nurtured into the disease of thought. This child of hers showed in the frail tenure on which it held its breath how unfit the mother was for fulfilling her natural functions. (p. 271)

Cecily’s failure to fulfil her “natural functions” seems to suggest that Gissing, in this novel at least, sees education – especially of the sort Mrs. Lessingham advocates – as undesirable for women and freedom of thought dangerous. Indeed, the reader is told that if Cecily had not belonged to the “emancipated order,” or been fed “with the new philosophy,” then she might well “have discharged her natural duties,” or the “obligation of her sex” (p. 391). Gissing appears to be contradicting himself, for, earlier in the novel, he had spoken of the “slavery of nature,” and declared that the average maternal woman found motherhood “a relief from the weariness of her unfruitful mind”

-- 5 --

(p. 270). Furthermore, if it could be argued that Gissing means by “natural” functions something nearer “physical” than “rightful,” then his attitudes had clearly changed by the time he came to write *In the Year of Jubilee* and *The Whirlpool* – for both Nancy Lord and Mrs. Morton not only fulfil their natural functions, but also feel it is their rightful duty to bear children and to care for them. (11) However, although Cecily is unwilling “to occupy herself ceaselessly with the demands of babyhood,” she is, nevertheless, deeply concerned about her child’s health and future, and is sincerely stricken with grief at its death.

In *Isabel Clarendon*, Kingcote’s sister, Mrs. Jalland, is shown to “hold with the utmost tenacity to the forms of religious faith,” (12) as does Mrs. Morton in *The Whirlpool* and, as with the latter, it is Mary Jalland’s piety which is seen as the motivating factor behind her devotion to both home and children; whilst Ada Peachey, in *In the Year of Jubilee*, is a virago because she has no authority to guide her in moral matters; for she “had grown up ... without a shadow of religious faith.” (13) Mary Jalland, unlike Miriam Baske, receives the author’s sympathy and admiration rather than his condemnation for adhering to the forms of religious faith – “Few women could have lived as she had done ... and have preserved so much cleanliness of soul.” (14) But education has made religious faith impossible for Cecily (she had thrown “for ever behind her all superstitions and harassing doubts”), as it also had for Helen Norman in *Workers in the Dawn* and it is because she lacks any “religious motive” that Cecily, like Helen, finds it so difficult to cope with the misery and sorrow she must inevitably face, for “Religious devotion is the resource of women in general who suffer...” (p. 341). As one contemporary critic aptly pointed out, *The Emancipated* contains “a curious distinction between men and women”; for Gissing seems to be suggesting that men do not have to rely upon, or be emancipated from, religion “because they are born superior to it. For them

it has no existence.... [Yet] if a woman is not sure of being deeply, devotedly loved, she had best

-- 6 --

cling – if she can – to certain curious old beliefs.” (15) Indeed, whereas Cecily, with the aid of a sound education and the advanced teachings of Mrs. Lessingham, makes a ruin of her life as if in direct consequence of her intellectual emancipation, Miriam, once religion no longer offers her any allegiance or guidance, finds a substitute, as well as an emotional satisfaction, in Mallard. Unlike Cecily’s marriage to the unbearable Reuben Elgar, Miriam does not merely exchange one form of slavery for another, for, through her marriage, she is seen to enjoy a more respectable, as well as a more “emancipated,” way of life, being now rescued from the yoke of an obstructive religion. Like Mrs. Spence, Miriam “allied herself with her husband’s freedom of intellect, and found her nature’s opportunities in life which was to him most suitable” (p. 18). Mallard realizes Gissing’s desire of raising the woman he loved to his own intellectual level – Waymark had previously succeeded with Ida Starr in *The Unclassed*, whereas both Arthur Golding and Julian Casti had failed, as had Gissing himself with his first wife, Nell. In a letter to H. G. Wells, Gissing writes:

In Mallard and his wife, at the end, I wanted to show two people who had settled down to a wholesome, unpretending life of work and duties; having got rid of superstitions (old and new), but too old and too wise to make any fuss about it. (16)

Because Gissing was between marriages while writing this novel, he no doubt was contemplating, through his description of Miriam Baske, the kind of wife he hoped to discover for himself. As he once remarked to a book-selling acquaintance: “One puts into literary form hopes which are not very likely to be realized.” (17)

Mallard stands in contrast to Miriam’s previous husband, who was not only “pietistic,” but who also “did his utmost ... to stimulate [Miriam’s] pride”; for he was “proud of possessing a

-- 7 --

young and handsome wife, and for the first time evoked in her a personal vanity” (pp. 200-201). Miriam, therefore, needed the influence of a strong-minded husband – a man “of brains and blood,” and one “without religion” – to help lessen the degree of her self-assertiveness, which her first marriage had fostered. Miriam “could be saved if only a strong man would take her by the hand” (p. 449). Gissing does not, as C. J. Francis aptly points out, deny to Cecily “the right of self determination, he merely observes that as an individual she is unable to use that freedom.” (18) Indeed, Gissing seems to suggest that what Cecily required was not the kind of education she received from Mrs. Lessingham, but rather that particular form of guidance that Miriam receives from Mallard, who, as his friend Spence observes, is unable “to think of women as independent beings, who must save or lose themselves on their own responsibility” (p. 330). Cecily seems to affirm this herself when she says: “No one read me lectures, or taught me hard arguments ... I followed where my nature led...” (p. 146).

Though there are several reasons why Mallard, during the early stages of the novel, questions Cecily’s suitability as a proper companion for himself, one of the most important is the fact that he “secretly did not like [Cecily’s] outlook upon the world to be so unrestrained; he would have preferred her to view life as a simpler matter” (p. 88). Near the beginning of the novel, Mallard remarks: “When did I say that the modern woman was my ideal?” (p. 11). Mallard is, in fact, more

at home amongst the “crassly conventional” than amongst the emancipated; he is a “curious instance of the Puritan conscience surviving in a man whose intellect is liberated” (p. 15). Despite his anti-clericalism and often-voiced disgust with religious fanaticism, Gissing appears to have retained enough of “the Puritan conscience” to make him subscribe to the version of the “double standard” which holds that a certain degree of religious conviction is becoming in, or potentially beneficial, to a woman, and especially to a mother, as in the case of Mary Jalland in *Isabel*

-- 8 --

Clarendon, or Mrs. Morton in *The Whirlpool*. Gissing throws some useful light on *The Emancipated* and on his feelings concerning Puritanism in a letter to his sister, Ellen:

... I by no means attack all people who hold a supernatural faith. The object of my onslaught is *formalism* ... I mean, of course, Sabbatarianism, and everything connected with it.... If you think over the book, you will see that *formalism* alone is spoken of as deadening; mere spiritual belief, never. That is simply not dealt with at all. It did not enter into my purpose. (19)

Indeed, through his portrayal of Zillah Denyer, Gissing reveals that the sudden loss of spiritual belief can in itself prove “deadening”: Zillah “smothered her impulses to conventional piety, and made believe that her spiritual life supported itself on the postulates of science”; and, as a result, “the poor girl was not very happy, but in that again did she not give proof of belonging to her time?” (p. 39). The fact that Gissing is frequently inconsistent in his attitude towards those of his female characters who possess a supernatural faith, would seem to suggest that he, like Mallard, was probably “one who had no faith but felt the need of it.”

- 1 - Arthur C. Young (ed.), *The Letters of George Gissing to Eduard Bertz* (1961), letter of 4 November 1889, p. 78.
- 2 - When painters descended on 7K Cornwall Residences – Gissing’s home since 1884 – in the latter part of May, 1889, the author was forced to go to his mother’s home in Wakefield.
- 3 - Gissing refers to his family on page 78 of the Harvester Press edition of *The Emancipated*. All page references are to this edition.
- 4 - *Letters to Bertz*, p. 71. The difficulty of intercourse the author always felt with his mother and sisters is plainly illustrated with Kingcote and his sister, Mrs. Jalland, in *Isabel Clarendon*.

-- 9 --

- 5 - *Ibid.* In his *Commonplace Book*, Gissing writes of his sister, Margaret: “What a delusion it is to imagine that the days of sheer Puritanism are over! Think of the hosts of people similar in thought and feeling to poor Madge.” Gissing’s *Commonplace Book*, Jacob Korg (ed.), 1962, p. 47.
- 6 - See pages 327-29.
- 7 - *Letters to Bertz*, p. 56.
- 8 - “I have,” Gissing writes, “never, since first I reasoned on such things, known one moment of enthusiasm for, one instant of belief in, the dogmas of religion.” Jacob Korg, *George Gissing: A Critical Biography*, 1965, p. 44.
- 9 - This essay can now be found in *George Gissing: Essays and Fiction*, P. Coustillas (ed.), 1970, pp. 75-97.

- 10 - Refer to The Harvester Press edition of *Isabel Clarendon*, vol. I, p. 235, and vol. II, p. 221.
- 11 - While writing *In the Year of Jubilee*, Gissing was becoming increasingly disillusioned with his marriage to Edith, and with her failure to care for their child; for, like Ada Peachey, Edith “had no sense of responsibility, no understanding of household duties...” *In the Year of Jubilee*, Harvester Press edition, 1976, p. 243.
- 12 - *Isabel Clarendon*, vol. II, p. 117.
- 13 - *In the Year of Jubilee*, p. 243.
- 14 - *Isabel Clarendon*, vol. II, p. 117.
- 15 - *George Gissing: The Critical Heritage*, P. Coustillas and C. Partridge (eds.), 1972, pp. 271-72.
- 16 - *George Gissing and H. G. Wells*, Royal A. Gettmann (ed.), 1961, p. 49.

-- 10 --

- 17 - Gillian Tindall, *George Gissing: The Born Exile*, 1974, p. 191.
- 18 - *Gissing Newsletter*, “The Emancipated”, vol. XI, no. 1, January, 1975, p. 12.
- 19 - Introduction to *The Emancipated*, p. xii. In his *Commonplace Book*, Gissing writes: “Religious sentiment, *as such*, by no means irritates me. It is the bad, poor, intolerant utterances of it that I cannot endure.” *Op.cit.*, p. 47.

Glimpses of Gissing:
The Recollections of C. Lewis Hind and W. Pett Ridge

Alan Dilnot
Department of English
Monash University

The biographical record of Gissing is now so full that it is difficult for us to imagine the period when he was to the general reader a man of mystery, a creature of fiction rather than the creator of it. Morley Roberts’s *The Private Life of Henry Maitland* (1912) elaborated rather than dissolved the mystery. It brought Gissing’s life into the public domain, and was widely accepted as “the truth” largely because members of the London literary world, who had for several years been quietly hoarding their own private versions of the man, chose to interpret them in the light of Roberts’s imaginative account. Any independent glimpse of Gissing would have some importance for us, but in this connection it is interesting to see how two minor writers of the period, C. Lewis Hind (1862-1927) and William Pett Ridge (1864-1930), “edited” their memories of Gissing.

Both Lewis Hind and Pett Ridge looked on Gissing from the vantage point of those who had

-- 11 --

studied the literary marketplace, entered it, and made it reward them. By the end of their long and prolific literary careers they had over thirty volumes each to their names, and a tremendous number of newspaper and magazine articles, Lewis Hind particularly in art criticism, Pett Ridge in comic studies of London low life. Their careers began a few years after Gissing’s, Lewis Hind being first published in 1887, Pett Ridge in 1891. They were thorough professionals, and their reminiscences illuminate Grub Street and the highways and byways to and from it. Professionalism made them successful, but it also made them think that lack of success was a sign of unprofessional and

therefore undeserving temperament. For example, where for Gissing scholarship and learning were delightful ends in themselves, for Lewis Hind and Pett Ridge “education” was not more than a necessary part of a writer’s equipment. In speaking of Hind, H. G. Wells points, perhaps, unfairly, to a thread of commercial interest running through his life: “He had begun life in the textile trade and at one time he had gone about London with samples of lace. He had been an industrious student, with Clement K. Shorter and W. Pett Ridge, at the Birbeck Institute and he had adventured with them into the expanding field of journalism.” (1) Hind and Ridge came to speak from the inside, as befitting those who “knew the ropes”; and their implied judgement of Gissing is that, not putting himself out to win success, he deserved his fate. For them success was partly a matter of being socially acceptable in fashionable circles.

This is illustrated in their recollections of the gatherings at Merton Abbey, Wimbledon, in the mid-1890s, to which Gissing was invited, and where he may have acquired some of his ideas of the literary good life. This was the home of George Warrington Steevens (1869-1900). He was the star journalist of the period, a man who seemed marked out for fame, his life indeed a remarkable contrast with that of Gissing. He was a classical scholar with a First from Balliol who had been

-- 12 --

elected a Fellow of Pembroke in 1893. But as Hind recalls in *More Authors and I* (1922), “Steevens quickly showed that he could write on anything, usually better than anyone else.” (2) Quite unlike Gissing he chose a wife who was well able to organize his social life for him. H. G. Wells may have been wrong to claim that Gissing was one of those writers who believed that “‘up there somewhere’ there are Great Ladies, of a knowledge, understanding and refinement, passing the wit of common men.” (3) Nevertheless, Mrs. Steevens might well have given rise to such a myth. She was something of a writer herself, (4) but it was her power as a literary hostess that struck her male contemporaries. As Pett Ridge records, “her Sunday afternoon parties were as jolly as one could wish. At six o’clock it was the custom of the hostess to make a tour of the grounds, and in the frankest way she indicated to most of the guests that it was time for them to go; she selected, quite openly, those who were to remain for supper.” (5) Pett Ridge shows that he was picked quite often, with Max Beerbohm and John Sargent among others. Lewis Hind also implies that he was one of the elect, though perhaps he did not make it to the dining-circle so often, speaking rather of meeting his host and his friends “on the lawn on Sunday afternoons.” (6) It was there that he had a memorable talk with George Gissing “that showed me the kind of man he was – a white man, as they say; and I learnt, by inference, the cause of the cloud that encompassed him.” (7) This incidental reference inevitably creates a picture of Gissing as gloom-laden and set apart from the crowd of brilliant men and women. But it also shows that thirty years after the event Lewis Hind recalled that Gissing’s secret had already been let out, and that Gissing was gravely hinting at it himself.

Though one is left with the impression that Gissing was one of those not invited to stay and dine with Mrs. Steevens, he was of course met at other dining-tables fairly frequently. Even so, Pett Ridge manages to suggest that Gissing had not quite the right tone for good Society:

George Gissing was a tall, good-looking man, moustached, with a bushy head of

-- 13 --

hair; he had a deep voice that seemed ill-suited for ordinary remarks.

“Do you know,” he would say at table (and you might think from his tones

he was about to submit a profound and well-thought-out argument, “do you know I am half-inclined to ask for a second helping of that admirable roast mutton!” (8)

This has the authentic ring about it, reminding us of his trouble with Gabrielle Fleury’s mother, “who said he was disgusting because he wanted eggs and bacon for breakfast.” (9) But it exemplifies the second of the means by which Gissing’s contemporaries deflated his seriousness, if it was not dismissed as gloomy, it was presented as part of his ineptitude.

Like Hind, Pett Ridge tells us that Gissing’s secret, or part of it at least, was really no such thing:

He had not – there was no secret about it – the happiness in domestic life which fortunately comes to most of us, and when he did seem to be nearing peacefulness, the end arrived. There was something tragic and wholly interesting about his marital experiments. To every one else they looked hopeless, and they were hopeless. He should have imposed on some trusty and reliable friend the task of choosing a partner for him; even then the results might not have been perfect. You have heard of the man who obtained a wife through the agency of Whiteley. A year later he was heard to express regret that he had not gone to Harrod’s. (10)

Despite the use of the word “tragic,” the effect is to make Gissing’s life appear a comedy of errors, with Gissing “his own worst enemy” – very much the picture given by Roberts.

-- 14 --

Possibly Pett Ridge knew only of the “marital experiments.” But Lewis Hind knew also of Gissing’s acts of theft, for in *More Authors and I*, he gives himself credit for having been the first to state publicly that Henry Maitland was identical with George Gissing. His opportunity had come, he says, when he was given Roberts’s book to review. I quote at length:

I accepted the responsibility, read the book, reflected, and decided to tell the truth. That was an excellent idea, and it worked well. Nobody was hurt; nobody was upset; and I only smiled when literary friends chided me for telling the truth. I smiled because they seemed to regard the truth as something untoward and odd....

Be patient, reader. I dwell upon this secret because the consciousness of it darkened Gissing’s days, made him into a lonely, brooding man, and perhaps explains his elusive desire, shown so plainly in *By the Ionian Sea*, to escape from the present and lose himself in a scholarly appreciation of the past. His secret was, that at school he had stolen small sums of money, books and coats from his fellow-students, not for any personal indulgence, but to supply the financial claims made upon him through an action – kindly philanthropic, quixotic even – in which he allowed himself to be involved.

This sad story was known in literary circles, and to his friends, who were quite aware that most of Gissing’s troubles in life were due to this compassionate, amatory strain in him. He found it so easy to entangle himself, and so hard to untie, or even loosen the knots. His biographers usually glide over

this secret of his youth, and so are unable to give a clue to the life of this recluse, who, even when one met him in the haunts of writers, always seemed to be hovering on the outskirts of companionship.

-- 15 --

In 1912 his old friend, Morley Roberts, who had been at school with Gissing, and who knew the whole story of his trouble from the inside, came upon the scene with *The Private Life of Henry Maitland*, which all of us who were acquainted with Gissing and with Roberts knew, with disguised names and places, was the straightforward story of the Private and Public Life of George Gissing. There was no doubt about it. Every literary journalist was aware of the story. Morley Roberts made no secret of the enterprise, and had this not been so I could check up incidents in the book with incidents in Gissing's life. I even knew the real name of the school. It was Owens College, Manchester, and a friend who had been a student there with Gissing and Roberts had, long before, told me the whole direly trivial tale. And I knew, too, that Gissing had been diverted by his friends to America, and that he had made good in New York, Boston, and Chicago.

So when *The Private Life of Henry Maitland* came to me for review I had to make a decision. I decided to tell the truth. "Henry Maitland is George Gissing," I said, explained how and why, and the literary editor of the *Daily Chronicle* was so pleased that he sent me other difficult books to review and repeated his pleasant phrase – "You will know how to treat them." (11)

Hind's complacent account leads us to suppose that his review had been boldly revelatory, and based on personal knowledge of Gissing. But if we look up the review in question, in the *Daily Chronicle*, 30 October 1912, we find that Hind, far from telling the truth, actually endorsed Roberts's book:

It is no secret. The secret is revealed on every page. This remarkable book, as sincere as it is sorrowful, bald and bold, sympathetic and intuitive, tells the life

-- 16 --

of George Gissing. The names of Gissing's intimates are changed, the titles of his books are altered, places are veiled, but the facts are true.

I am sure that Morley Roberts has not invented a single incident or conversation or letter written by his life-long friend....

If Mr. Morley Roberts had been writing under his own name, and the name of his friend, I doubt if he would have been able to tell his story so openly, to relate the facts so simply and relentlessly as he has here done. What is the result? A great pity, in which love mingles, for Gissing wounded – Gissing wounded alas! by his own almost inexplicable acts; pity for a good man, a fine mind, a fine nature, who had no enemy but himself, who by some curious perversity sought his own troubles, opened his arms to disaster.

Here we can see the Maitland/Gissing legend in the process of being formed, for when Hind,

according to his own claims, could have given an independent account of Gissing's secret, he left the fictional version to hold the field alone: "I have no inclination to enter into detail about his 'first great disaster.'"

What Hind and Pett Ridge allowed themselves to do was make their memories of Gissing conform to the Roberts story. They were not unusual in this: "Even H. G. Wells, in his *Experiment in Autobiography*, seemingly refreshed his memories of Gissing by going to Roberts's book, without being sure of what was fact and what was fiction." (12) But these two went further, for they also accepted the general bearing of Roberts's criticism of Gissing's novels. So in Hind's review we find:

As novelist and man of letters he was adequately successful pecuniarily and he never lacked appreciation from the best judges; but Gissing could never have

-- 17 --

been a popular author. His realism was too grim. Humanity did not nourish him as it nourished Dickens; his roots were in stony soil; his branches absorbed no sunshine. Moreover, he was not a novelist by inclination. He was a scholar, a student, purely a man of letters, who hated anything "which broke up his little semi-classic universe."

Ten years later Hind underlined this in the by then established way:

Morley Roberts also says: "To me it seems that he (Maitland) should never have written fiction at all, although he did it so admirably." I entirely agree with Roberts. I have read most, if not all, of Gissing's novels, and I shall never read another. They are too grey, too depressing. They have no consciousness of the Stars and the Open Gate. (13)

Pett Ridge makes very much the same complaint:

George Gissing and H. G. Wells are coupled in my mind.... They were friends; each had the trick of putting himself into a novel. Gissing's books could not, I imagine, have had a wide circulation, but the circulation was fit, and no man who wrote so gloomily about gloomy people could expect to have a very large number of readers. It is in *The Whirlpool* that a young couple having, after a sufficient number of tribulations, contrived to get married, go to live for two agreeable years in Wales; these years Gissing deals with in hurried pages, and then brings the pair back to London, and to all the discomforts of home. He told me that he wrote his one amusing novel, *The Town Traveller*, during a time of great mental worry. "It was the only thing I could do," he urged excusingly. There was fine work and enormous patience in *Demos* and *The Unclassed* and the rest; published now they would receive an attention they did not encounter in their day. (14)

-- 18 --

Pett Ridge's own work had once been adversely compared with Gissing's: "We may commend the book, in passing, to the special attention of Mr. Pett Ridge, whose painful efforts to make a novel out of Cockneydom we mentioned last week. Mr. Gissing will show him how to do it." (15) It must have been satisfying for him now to be able to commend Gissing's hard work and patience, knowing that these were not necessarily the qualities to tell with the general reader. Their contrasting attitudes to Dickens were significant here. "Pett Ridge ... pinned himself down as a second Dickens to the end of his days." (16) And Dickens's popularity was for Pett Ridge the chief and conclusive sign of his greatness. Gissing's critical study, on the other hand, "showed no blindness to its subject's faults as an artist." (17) And in the same critical spirit, Gissing's novels fastened upon the problems of life, and would not consciously disguise them. It was this that earned Gissing the epithets "gloomy," "depressing," "morbid," "grey," and "boring." This kind of writing was to Hind and Pett Ridge almost treasonable, in that it weakened the public morale; it was deservedly punishable with low sales. Far better not to publish at all, in Hind's view:

I ascribe such success as I had with editors to an innate knowledge of the difference between marketable and unmarketable stuff. Sometimes, of course, I succumbed to the attraction of the unmarketable.... So I produced painful stories I am sure that Messrs. Cassell and *The Family Herald* were right in refusing.... Such things were not suitable themes for the 80's. (18)

Happiness and contentment were a much healthier source for the imagination. As Pett Ridge says, "If, in reading, or skipping, these pages you chance to gain the impression that I have had a jolly

-- 19 --

life, you will be correct." (19) And those writers who weren't "happy" had, in Hind's view, only themselves to blame: "Nobody but himself hindered Gissing ... he threw all away, and never ceased to lament." (20)

While it is conceivable, then, that Hind and Pett Ridge, with personal knowledge of Gissing, could have supported a more objective view of him, we perceive that in fact their pseudo-biographical approach reinforced the Maitland-is-Gissing identification, and helped prepare the ground for Wells's damaging conclusion: "Perhaps Gissing was made to be hunted by Fate. He never turned and fought. He always hid or fled." (21) More damaging still was their lack of enthusiasm for his novels; and despite the progress made in Gissing studies, we still cannot confidently say that Gissing is a popular classic.

1 - *Experiment in Autobiography*, 1934, p. 514.

2 - P. 275.

3 - *Op. cit.*, p. 634.

4 - See her *A Motley Crew: Reminiscences, Observations and Attempts at Play-Writing*, 1901.

5 - *A Story Teller: Forty Years in London*, 1923, p. 17.

6 - *More Authors and I*, p. 278.

7 - *Naphthali*, 1926, p. 71.

8 - *Op. cit.*, p. 24.

9 - *Henry Hick's Recollections of George Gissing*, ed. and intro. by P. Coustillas, 1973, p. 12. Cf. "Oh, an honest bit of English roast beef! Could you put a slice in a letter?? – with gravy?", *ibid.*, p. 58.

- 10 - *Loc. cit.*
 11 - Pp. 129-31.
 12 - Arthur C. Young, "Introduction," *Letters of George Gissing to Eduard Bertz, 1897-1903*

-- 20 --

- 1961, pp. x-xi.
 13 - *More Authors and I*, p. 132.
 14 - *Loc. cit.*
 15 - Unsigned review, *New York Tribune Illustrated Supplement*, 2 October 1898, 15; in *Gissing: The Critical Heritage*, ed. Coustillas and Partridge, 1972, pp. 343-44.
 16 - *Experiment in Autobiography*, p. 508.
 17 - P. Coustillas, "Gissing's Writings on Dickens," *Dickensian*, Vol. LXI, Part 3, 1965, p. 171.
 18 - *Napthali*, pp. 41-42.
 19 - *Op. cit.*, p. 303.
 20 - *More Authors and I*, p. 133.
 21 - *Op. cit.*, p. 575. For Wells's links with Hind see also J. W. Robertson Scott, *The Life and Death of a Newspaper*, 1952, pp. 364-65.

* * * * *

Documentary Realism and Artistic Licence:

A Note on an Emblematic Prison Gate

in *The Nether World* and *Peter Ibbetson*

Richard J. Allen
 Cambridgeshire College of Arts and Technology

The Nether World is the last and bleakest of George Gissing's novels of London working-class life, all five of which were published in the 1880s. Many readers of the book have been impressed by the concentrated power with which it delineates a human condition of hopeless privation and servitude. However, critics have often described in rather misleading terms the fictional purposes

-- 21 --

and methods that Gissing pursued to this end. In particular, the assumption that Gissing's "intentions in *The Nether World* were entirely naturalistic," (1) and the view of the work itself as a "fully realized naturalistic novel," (2) remain surprisingly prevalent.

The naturalistic elements in *The Nether World* are obviously substantial and significant: set in Clerkenwell, the novel documents contemporary life in this depressed inner-city area with topographical, sociological and chronological precision. But, as the very title of the book intimates, this accurate and detailed documentation is interfused with a typological realism reflecting the influence of Gissing's primary artistic models, Hogarth and Dickens. (3)

A blend of literalism and symbolism is powerfully effected in the opening paragraphs of *The Nether World*, which describe the slow progress of an aged, careworn foot-traveller, "in the

troubled twilight of a March evening ten years ago” (p. 1), across Clerkenwell Green, past St. James’s churchyard – at a corner where “the east wind blew with malice such as it never puts forth save where there are poorly clad people to be pierced” (p. 2) – and along to the far end of St. James’s Street, where “an arched gateway closed with black doors” confronts him. This point of entry to the infernal regions offers apt admonition of Dantean eloquence:

He looked at the gateway, then fixed his gaze on something that stood just above – something which the dusk half concealed, and by doing so made more impressive. It was the sculptured counterfeit of a human face, that of a man distraught with agony. The eyes stared wildly from their sockets, the hair struggled (4) in maniac disorder, the forehead was wrung with torture, the cheeks sunken, the throat fearsomely wasted, and from the wide lips there seemed to be issuing a horrible cry. Above this hideous effigy was carved the legend: ‘MIDDLESEX HOUSE OF DETENTION’ (p. 2).

-- 22 --

The impact of this elaborately emblematic image of tortured humanity *in extremis* is all the greater in a general context of literal topographical exactitude. That Gissing was here employing calculatedly non-naturalistic techniques is indirectly confirmed by a passage in Walter Besant’s *London North of the Thames*, published posthumously in 1911 but documenting a topographical survey conducted around the turn of the century. Although the Middlesex House of Detention had been demolished in 1886, an account of this notorious institution (location of the most destructive Fenian bomb explosion of the century in 1867) was included in the chapter on Clerkenwell. Of its forbidding appearance Besant remarked: “The prison has a stern and gloomy stone gate, which figured as one of the illustrations in the late Mr. du Maurier’s popular novel, *Peter Ibbetson*. Those who know the illustration, however, would notice that by artistic licence the lion’s head, which marked the keystone in the real gate, is transformed in the picture of an agonized face.” (5)

No two novels of the same time and place could be more different – in purpose, form and atmosphere – than are *The Nether World* and *Peter Ibbetson*. The melodramatic plotting, nostalgic reminiscence and wishful fantasy of *Peter Ibbetson* frankly offer escape from harsh realities – especially those of an inexorably punitive Law with which Gissing confronts his readers throughout *The Nether World*. Nevertheless, the stroke of artistic licence attributed to du Maurier by Besant was almost certainly borrowed from Gissing’s novel. *The Nether World* was published in April, 1889; du Maurier had begun writing *Peter Ibbetson* only a few days before, and finished it late in the same year. It first appeared in *Harper’s Monthly Magazine* from June to December 1891, with du Maurier, according to his biographer, “executing the drawings piece-meal for each separate instalment.” (6)

The figure in du Maurier’s illustration utterly lacks the dramatic expressiveness of Gissing’s description: so much so that one might suspect Besant’s reference to an “agonized face” to be

-- 23 --

actually an unconscious recollection of the passage in *The Nether World*. However, Besant’s phrase is derived from the text of *Peter Ibbetson*, in which the autobiographical narrator offers belated tribute to a girl whom he silently admired many years before, when she served in the family tripe-shop opposite the prison: “May she try to think not the less of it because since then its writer

has been on the wrong side of that long blank wall, of that dreary portal where the agonised stone face looks down on the desolate slum –

‘Per me si va tra la perduta gente’” (7)

This famous line from Canto III of *L’Inferno* is also the caption to the illustration: in the heavy stress on an allusion which has so much less relevance to du Maurier’s narrative than to Gissing’s we have further evidence of a borrowing. Despite the anticipatory hint in this passage, Peter never refers again to this prison, nor do *la perduta gente* figure prominently either here or later in the novel.

In *The Nether World*, on the other hand, the whole cast of characters constitutes a doomed race whose fate is prefigured and epitomised in the contorted features of the “hideous effigy.” The hair’s “maniac disorder,” for instance, emblematises the anarchic strife which is endemic in the lower depths but which the novel also shows to be a product of social and economic laws imposed from above.

My main object in suggesting a source for du Maurier’s piece of artistic licence has thus been to show that it was by deliberately transcending the constraints of strict naturalism that Gissing had already effected this imaginative modification of a historical landmark in a more memorable and purposeful way.

1 - Walter Allen, “Introduction,” *The Nether World*, Everyman’s Library (London: Dent, 1973), p. ix. Apart from its critical inadequacies, this introductory essay to the most accessible modern edition of *The Nether World* is regrettably full of gross errors in textual and biographical detail.

-- 24 --

The text itself in both this and the other modern edition (introd. John Goode, Brighton: Harvester Press, 1974) is a reprint of the one-volume edition of 1890. All page references in my article are to this text.

2 - Michael Collie, *George Gissing: A Biography* (Folkestone: Dawson, 1977), p. 80. Collie develops this view in *The Alien Art* (Folkestone: Dawson, 1979), *The Nether World* being discussed in a chapter called “Experiments in Naturalism.” Collie there defines naturalism as “the social realism of the determinist” (p. 69), but while thus identifying an ideological matrix for this literary mode, he finds evidence of *The Nether World*’s naturalism in its accuracy and objectivity of documentation: “The myriad detail of Clerkenwell life was precisely observed and precisely stated.... [Gissing] allowed the facts to speak for themselves” (pp. 95-6).

3 - A full analysis of the artistic inter-relationships of Hogarth, Dickens and Gissing is conducted in my doctoral dissertation, “The Rise and Decline of Conscientious Realism in English Fiction” (Diss. Indiana Univ., 1978).

4 - Thus in the 1890 reprint. But the original 3-volume edition (London: Smith, Elder, 1889) has “straggled” (I, 4). This is certainly more probable, but far from being an obvious misprint, the 1890 version has helped to shape two important critical readings of the passage – by John Goode (“George Gissing’s *The Nether World*” in David Howard, John Lucas, John Goode (eds.), *Tradition and Tolerance in Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul,

-- 25 --

1966, p. 211) and by Adrian Poole (*Gissing in Context*, London: Macmillan, 1975). Indeed,

Poole seizes upon Goode's "instructive misreading" of "struggled in" as "struggled with" to argue that in the "original" preposition there is evidence of "the consistency with which we are referred to a central and coherent vision" (pp. 89-90). The actual misprint is therefore of some significance, and I am very grateful to Pierre Coustillas for pointing it out to me.

5 - *London North of the Thames* (London: Adam & Black, 1911), pp. 486-87.

6 - Leonee Ormond, *George du Maurier* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), p. 429. Information earlier in this paragraph about the composition of *Peter Ibbetson* is taken from the same biographical source.

7 - *Peter Ibbetson*, 2 vols., (London: Osgood, McIlvaine, 1892), I, p. 161.

* * * * *

Review

George Gissing, *Denzil Quarrier*, ed. John Halperin, and *The Crown of Life*, ed. Michel Ballard. Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1979 and 1978.

With these two volumes in the Harvester Gissing series, the total reprints with new critical material has been brought up to thirteen and the question now is when *The Town Traveller* (ed. P. Coustillas) and *Will Warburton* (ed. Colin Partridge) are likely to appear. The preceding titles in the series were welcomed by reviewers and there is no decline in Gissing activities, so let us hope that the Harvester Press, which has also published Gissing's Diary and a new edition of Jacob Korg's

-- 26 --

critical biography in hard cover and paperback, will soon make further titles available.

It is good to have *Denzil Quarrier* and *The Crown of Life* in these attractively produced, ably edited volumes. In both cases the text has been reprinted photographically from the first English edition, the best we have sanctioned by Gissing's reading of the proofs. The editors have followed the usual editorial pattern in the series: bibliographical note, introduction, notes to the text and bibliography. John Halperin's edition is made particularly valuable by his comparison between the printed version and the manuscript of the novel. Not that there are substantial differences between the two, but because the cancellations and additions made on the manuscript at the last stage of composition enable us to see what a conscientious writer and exacting artist Gissing was. Halperin's reading of the manuscript has also allowed him to point to a few misprints which badly want correcting. If Michel Ballard has overlooked the Huntington-held manuscript of *The Crown of Life*, the reason would seem to be that, in order to do it justice, he would have needed more space than he had at his disposal. Some Gissing manuscripts, being for the most part fair copies, are comparatively dumb. Colin Partridge showed recently that that of *Will Warburton* rewarded study; *The Crown of Life* is another example.

Although there is no evidence that Gissing ever read Trollope's *Dr. Wortle's School* or was ever tempted, in Jamesian fashion, to write his own version of the story, John Halperin's comparison between *Denzil Quarrier* and Trollope's little known novel, throws fresh light on both books. Besides the differences in attitude between the ageing popular mid-Victorian story-teller (*Dr. Wortle's School* was published in 1881, the year before Trollope's death) and the young struggling late Victorian novelist, the comparison points to the evolution of public taste and of the social climate, and more accurately to what novel-readers, judged through publishers' policies, were prepared to accept. True, neither novel enjoyed a marked success, but Gissing's treatment of

bigamy has a ninetyish flavour quite alien to Trollope's tamer approach. Halperin's discussion of *Denzil Quarrier* testifies to his thorough knowledge of Gissing's works and his allusions to the other novels – *Thyrza*, and *Our Friend the Charlatan* – carry weight. His remarks often invite expansion. When, after examining the anti-Establishment aspects of *Denzil Quarrier*, he observes that Gissing is at once the most radical and the most conventional of the Victorian novelists, one can hardly fail to think of Godwin Peak – indeed more than of Quarrier. Years ago, Allan Monkhouse, that worthy champion of Gissing's cause for some forty years, aptly noted that he was “a writer of revolt, and yet there is in his books a remarkable expression of the yearning to conform.”

It is essentially on the man-woman relationship that Halperin concentrates in the introduction; he grudgingly turns to the political aspects whose substance, by the way, considering the moment when the story was written, cannot owe anything to the 1892 general election, as some commentators have suggested, who confused the dates of composition and publication. Anyway politics is somewhat sharply reduced here to its connection with feminism. But an introduction must not develop into a dissertation. Had some space been given to the genesis of the story – why was it written so quickly and so easily? some readers will wonder – the existence of an *Ur-Denzil Quarrier*, entitled *All for Love*, would have deserved more than a passing mention. My only disagreement with John Halperin would not bear on his assessment of the novel, but on his passing remark that if Gissing wrote a monograph and a number of essays on Dickens, it was because he saw in him an earlier example of his own predicament – “yearning for conventional respectability, yet hating society for not letting him have it.” Not only do the circumstances under which Gissing became a critic of Dickens give the lie to this view, his admiration for the elder writer and his critical reservations about his work spring from largely historical and literary motives.

In his introduction to *The Crown of Life* Michel Ballard had to deal with a very different story even though, on the surface, it is concerned, like *Denzil Quarrier*, with love and politics. After briefly situating the novel in its biographical context, the editor rightly sums up the case: “*The Crown of Life* is a love story written by a man in love, but it is also an anti-imperialist pamphlet written by a convinced pacifist.” The publication of the novel in October 1899 was fatally ill-timed. Gissing never forgave Methuen for having deferred publication from the spring, when imperialist propaganda was still counteracted by the warnings of the opponents to war, until after the outbreak of hostilities. The appearance of a pacifist novel in a country which was suffering a series of military disasters was not likely to be greeted with enthusiasm. When the story was reprinted in 1905 it sold much better, but Methuen never did his duty by this title. If it failed to get back into print until 1927 the reason was a foolish one – Methuen pretended it was too long for a new edition selling at one shilling and would only reissue it in abridged form. Algernon, who was right for once, refused this ignominious compromise.

Michel Ballard devotes much of his introduction to discussing the nature and treatment of love in the novel, and he is anxious to prove that, despite appearances, Gissing gave as candid a picture of the subject as can be found in, say, *Love and Mr. Lewisham*, by H. G. Wells, who oddly described the ideal offered by *The Crown of Life* as “love in a frock-coat.” Morley Roberts put it more correctly when he pointed out in his review of the novel that “almost alone among modern writers he [i.e. Gissing] has dared to delineate the tortures of the undebauched celibate.” A parallel

with *Born in Exile* was assuredly in order, as Irene Derwent shares many characteristics with Sidwell Warricombe. The difference in mood and ending between the two novels can easily be traced to the extraordinary hopefulness which had taken hold of Gissing after his encounter with Gabrielle Fleury.

The rest of the introduction is devoted to the political side of the story, which possibly suffers

-- 29 --

from the author's too obvious commitment to anti-imperialist views. The originality of the book, compared with its predecessor, *The Whirlpool* (*The Town Traveller* is obviously a work of quite another kind), lies in its showing Gissing in a confident mood which his declining health simply could not sustain for long. Harvey Rolfe puts on a brave countenance after Alma's death, but he feels reasonably sure that his son will be blown to bits by a shell in the next war. Henry Rycroft, an older man, has the forced cheerfulness of the weary intellectual who has opted out of the world and relishes his seclusion. In Gissing's last novel of modern life, *Will Warburton* has the feeble optimism of resignation. So *The Crown of Life* really was his ultimate attempt at seeing the world with some degree of confidence. The average view of him is so much that of an inborn pessimist that this strangely sanguine story has never received the attention it deserves. Let us hope the present edition will help to turn the scales. – Pierre Coustillas.

* * * * *

Notes and News

Our readers are reminded that the Gissing Trust has undertaken to arrange a symposium on Gissing's life and work at Wakefield on the week-end of 4th-6th September, 1981. The symposium is to be held at Bretton Hall College, Wakefield. Papers will be given by a number of well-known scholars, Philip Collins, Pierre Coustillas, David Grylls, John Halperin, Christopher Heywood, Peter Keating, Jacob Korg, Gillian Tindall and others. A paper on the Wakefield background of the Gissings will be read by John Goodchild, Wakefield M. D. Archivist, and the programme will include a tour of places in and around Wakefield associated with the Gissings, conducted by Clifford Brook, whose research on the novelist and Wakefield has been remarkably fruitful in

-- 30 --

recent years. Further information may be obtained from either Clifford Brook, 1 Standbridge Lane, Sandal, Wakefield, West Yorks, WF2 7DZ or Ros Stinton, 368 Springvale Road, Sheffield, S10 1LN. The latest Trust publication, Clifford Brook's *George Gissing and Wakefield*, with illustrations not to be found in any other book, is available at £1.80 plus postage from Wakefield Historical Publications, Seckar House, Seckar Lane, Wooley, Wakefield.

Nine letters and postcards from Gissing to James Payn, Walter Raleigh, Herbert Sturmer and Morley Roberts were sold at Sotheby's on December 16, 1980. The letter to Payn about *Thyrza*, dated 16 January 1887, has been acquired by the Gissing Trust. It was hitherto unknown, as were the letters to Morley Roberts of 31 January 1889, and to Walter Raleigh of 19 November 1897, written from a "loathsome" and "indescribably foul" inn which is easy enough to identify. The letters and postcards to Sturmer had been offered for sale at Sotheby's in 1929.

A collection of 21 letters to Algernon, 1883-1893, some of which were published in part in the *Letters to the Family* (1927) and 20 letters to William Morris Colles, one of Gissing's literary agents, is offered by a Philadelphia antiquarian bookdealer for \$18,000. It is to be hoped that these letters will find a home in an institutional library where they can be consulted.

The volume of the *Index of English Literary Manuscripts* (Mansell) containing the substantial entry on Gissing has reached proof stage.

Professor Robert L. Selig, of Purdue University, has completed a critical study of Gissing for the Twayne Press. The book is to begin with a biographical chapter and discuss all Gissing's works, including the short stories.

A new edition of *Eve's Ransom* (Constable/Dover) was announced in the *Times Literary*

-- 31 --

Supplement for February 27, 1981, p. 216, at £1.75. With the exception of the AMS reprint this is the first reprint of the book since 1929 (Benn).

Professor Patrick Bridgwater's monograph on Gissing and Germany (Enitharmon Series) is in the press; so is the volume of short stories in translation edited by Pierre Coustillas (Presses Universitaires de Lille).

Books in Print for 1980-81 lists a number of reprints of Gissing's works by various firms from which it is difficult to obtain a book, even a reply to an enquiry. One may wonder whether a new edition of the letters to Eduard Bertz is necessary, but the new edition of *Ryecroft*, unless it is, like so many of these reprints, mythical, is welcome. An article on this currently neglected book is to appear this year in *English Literature in Transition*.

The Spring number of the *Dickensian* should be purchased by all Gissing scholars. It contains Gissing's lost introduction to *David Copperfield* in the Rochester edition of Dickens's works, and the bibliographical note by F. G. Kitton that was to accompany it. This number of the *Dickensian* is in a way a first Gissing edition. It may be ordered from the Dickens Fellowship, The Dickens House, 48 Doughty Street, London WC1 21F.

* * * * *

Recent Publications

Volumes

Gisela Argyle, *German Elements in the Fiction of George Eliot, Gissing, and Meredith*. Frankfurt-am-Main, Bern and Las Vegas: Peter Lang, 1979. An important part of this book

-- 32 --

(pp. 86-146) is devoted to Gissing.

Jean-Pierre Michaux, ed., *George Gissing: Critical Essays*. London: Vision Press Ltd.; Totowa, N.J.: Barnes & Noble Books, 1981. £11.95. Contains eight reprints of general studies and thirteen essays on *New Grub Street*.

George Gissing, *The Odd Women*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1980. \$3.25. Paperback. This is the seventh impression of the Norton edition. The format is smaller than previously.

Articles, reviews, etc.

- Ernesta and Albert Spencer Mills, "Biografie di Viaggiatori inglesi in Calabria (3): George Gissing (1857-1903)," *Calabria sconosciuta*, Anno III, no. 10, April-June 1980, pp. 24-27. Contains, besides the well-known portrait by William Rothenstein, a facsimile of Gissing's signature in the visitors' book, in the Museo Civico at Reggio.
- Francesco Badolato, "Schede," *Ausonia* (Trieste) XXXV, no. 3-4, May-August 1980, pp. 102-03. Review of *Victorian Writers and the City* (ed. J. P. Hulin and P. Coustillas) with short passage on Gissing.
- Jacob Korg, "Book Reviews," *Victorian Studies*, XXIV, no.1, Autumn 1980, pp. 130-31. Review of Gissing's *Diary* and *The Alien Art*.
- Nigel Cross, "Civil List Pensions," *Times Literary Supplement*, December 19, 1980, p. 1443. Short passage on Gissing.
- C. C. Barfoot, "Current Literature 1979," *English Studies*, vol. 61, no. 6, December 1980, pp. 533-34. Review of *The Alien Art*, *Born in Exile* and *Denzil Quarrier*.

-- 33 --

- Robert L. Selig, "George Gissing," *Times Literary Supplement*, January 9, 1981, p. 34. Letter to the editor.
- Robert Giddings, "Chronicler of the down-trodden," *Tribune*, vol. 45, no.7, February 13, 1981, p. 6. Review of Jacob Korg's *George Gissing: A Critical Study*.
- Peter Keating, "Reviews," *Notes and Queries*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 90-91. Review of *The Alien Art*.
- Richard Dunn, "Gissing's Introduction to the Rochester *David Copperfield*," *Dickensian*, vol. 77, part 1, Spring 1981, pp. 2-11. With portrait of Gissing in 1895. Prints for the first time the lost introduction to *David Copperfield* in the Rochester edition of Dickens's works. The original bibliographical note by F. G. Kitton is also included.
- Sylvère Monod, "Comptes rendus," *Etudes Anglaises*, XXXIV, no. 1, January-March 1981, pp. 100-01. Review of *Born in Exile*.

* * * * *