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INTRODUCTION

The sheer quantity of printed material on George Eliot forces us to notice her public reception in the nineteenth century. At the urging of George Henry Lewes, she began her career as a writer of fiction inauspiciously in 1857 with a series of three stories for Blackwood's under the general title of *Scenes of Clerical Life*. These stories showed the promise she was so quickly to fulfill, but they went largely unnoticed by the critics, although the few reviews they did get from important critical periodicals were high in their praise. With the publication of *Adam Bede* in 1859, however, George Eliot became the center of English literary attention. From that time through the rest of the century she was criticized, analyzed, gossiped about, and generally examined more extensively than any other Victorian novelist. The publication of one of her works came to be a major literary event. By the time of her death in 1880 she had achieved the status of England's greatest novelist and with it the image of a fascinatingly regal figure, a retiring, tender, unfortunately plain woman of artistic genius and overpowering intellect who lived openly with another woman's husband. Thus, to the Victorians George Eliot presented an intriguing personality, as evidenced by the extensive attention she
received, both personally and artistically, in the British press.

The quantity of written material on George Eliot in her own century, however, is not as important as the quality and significance of the writing itself. Every major Victorian periodical presented numerous essays on her art by the foremost literary critics of her day. Important writers like R. H. Hutton, Sidney Colvin, Leslie Stephen, George Saintsbury, E. S. Dallas, Frederic Harrison, and John Morley discussed and debated her merits as a literary artist in The Athenaeum, The Saturday Review, The Spectator, The Fortnightly Review, and every other significant journal. Because of her controversial way of life, individualistic philosophical viewpoint, and striking creative technique, she was not a figure critics tended to be neutral about. In some quarters her fiction was viewed as a threat to established moral and artistic codes, and in others it was applauded as the work of a visionary who combined intellectual and artistic perception to a degree never before seen in English fiction. The battleground for the debate was quite naturally the press, and the various journals usually reflect their individual editorial biases when dealing with her work. The London Quarterly Review, a staunch defender of religious and ethical orthodoxy, is, for example, quite skeptical of the moral quality of George Eliot's fiction. The staunchly Tory Quarterly Review
and the conservative Catholic *Dublin Review* are just as predictably negative toward her somewhat unorthodox philosophy and technique. *The Times*, conscious of its immense prestige, is careful to be fair, but most often finds sufficient reason to praise her works. Thus, the reception of her fiction provides a steady and clear-cut insight into both the critical approaches of the major Victorian critics and the editorial viewpoints of the most influential periodicals of the last half of the century.

In a brief discussion of a body of material that encompasses over four-hundred separate items and stretches across forty-two years, some subjects must necessarily be omitted. Most of the significant biographical information, for example, has been adequately summarized elsewhere, most extensively in Gordon Haight's recently published biography, *George Eliot* (Oxford, 1968). A point worthy of note here, however, is the attitude of the press toward the fact that George Eliot and George Henry Lewes lived together from 1854 until his death in 1878. During this time the press maintained a discreet silence on the relationship. Lewes is often mentioned in articles on George Eliot's work, and the fact that he had urged her to write fiction and was her most valued critic was well known. The living arrangement itself, however, was not discussed until after George Eliot's death in 1880. Even then, the obituary
articles generally avoided the subject, unless they chose to defend the relationship. It was not until J. W. Cross's publication of George Eliot's life and letters in 1885 that the topic was widely discussed in the press. Detractors were predictably numerous, but defenders were surprisingly even more so. Those who disapproved usually did so on orthodox grounds, but defenders were quick to point out that Lewes was tied to a sordid marriage by a technicality that prevented an otherwise obtainable divorce, and his relationship with George Eliot was honest and respectable in all ways. The literary establishment was split between the opinion that Cross had done a wise thing by suppressing details of the relationship in his Life and Letters, and the conviction that full exposure would have allowed for greater understanding and consequent vindication of the action. For a representative sampling of public reaction to what Cross did include in his biography, one should note the correspondence on the subject in The Pall Mall Gazette in January and February, 1885. [Items 341, 349-352, 357]

Another point of biographical interest that must be noted only in passing is the comical business that resulted from George Eliot's initial desire to conceal her true identity. In 1859 Joseph Liggins, an indigent Nuneaton resident, enjoyed a brief moment of fame by allowing
friends to believe he was the author of *Adam Bede*. The same year, Thomas Newby, a piratical London publisher, attempted to capitalize on the instant success of *Adam Bede* by publishing *Adam Bede, Jr., A Sequel*. These two incidents, plus several random guesses at her identity, were instrumental in forcing George Eliot to identify herself in order to clear up the confusion before she felt quite ready to do so.

Other matters of essentially biographical interest cannot be discussed at length here. Biographical information is at times used in obvious critical contexts, most frequently in discussions of the effect of her philosophical attitudes on her fiction. For the most part, however, the biographical detail in obituary articles follows a standard pattern of discussion of her childhood, early friends and influences, life as a sub-editor for the *Westminster Review*, and publishing career. The full scale biographies of G. W. Cooke (1883), Mathilde Blind (1883), J. W. Cross (1885), and Oscar Browning (1890) drew particularly wide critical attention, but served more to revive interest in George Eliot as an artist than to shed light on her as a person.

The most complex and interesting material in this bibliography is that which attempts to evaluate George Eliot as a literary artist, and it is therefore this material that is most in need of extended discussion. Even in this area, however, there are critical tendencies that
must be viewed as fascinating minor issues rather than major concerns. The insistently negative critical reception of the serialization of *Middlemarch* and *Daniel Deronda*, for example, suggests a developing view of the organic nature of fiction, but the objection is never fully developed nor clearly related to other issues and therefore does not constitute a major trend in nineteenth-century criticism of her work.

The major critical considerations, then, the critical attitudes and subjects that seem most consistently a part of Victorian criticism of George Eliot's work, are the subjects that will here command the most extended examination. Of these, three general subjects seem most pervasive: characterization and plotting, realism, and morality. The reason for their importance is two-fold. First, these categories constitute, in various ways, those considerations Victorian critics deemed worthy of special attention in her work. An examination of them, therefore, will give us a better understanding of why the Victorians elevated her to such prominence and why, for example, many preferred to think of *Adam Bede* and *The Mill on the Floss* as better novels than *Middlemarch*. Second, these critical categories also are prominent in the formulation of Victorian theory of the novel. As will be discussed later, all three of these areas of critical concern are central to a vigorous debate over the nature of fiction itself. George Eliot's
novels are prominent in the debate not only because she was so successful a novelist, but also because of her relatively new technique and provocative subject matter.

From this dual viewpoint, then, Victorian criticism of George Eliot's fiction is important both as an indication of the reasons for her high place in the literature of the period and as a running commentary on the evolution of nineteenth-century theory of the novel.
Character and Plot

Early in 1857 John Blackwood wrote to an author known to him only as "George Eliot" offering suggestions for revisions in a story he was publishing called "Mr. Gilfil's Love Story." Some of the suggestions, such as omission of unnecessary French phrases, were trivial, but some concerned changes of characterization that Blackwood honestly felt would enhance the development of the central figure, Mr. Gilfil. George Eliot readily agreed that the French phrases were "not in keeping" with the story, but her reply to the suggestions on characterization was typical not only of the gentle but firm rejection of misplaced criticism she exhibited throughout her life, but also of her attitude toward character development in fiction:

... I am unable to alter anything in relation to the delineation or development of character, as my stories always grow out of my psychological conception of the dramatic personae. ... My artistic bent is directed, not at all to the presentation of eminently irreproachable characters, but to the presentation of mixed human beings in such a way as to call forth tolerant judgment, pity, and sympathy. And I cannot stir a step aside from what I feel to be true in character. If anything strikes you as untrue to human nature in my delineations, I shall be very glad if you will point it out to me, that I may reconsider the matter. But alas! inconsistencies and weaknesses are not untrue.

By insisting that the success of her fiction depended on her
conception and development of the characters, George Eliot identified herself as a novelist of "character," as opposed to the novelist of "plot," who, like G. P. R. James, Bulwer, or Stevenson, concentrated on development of external action to which the characters were subordinate. Critics of the period generally agreed with her understanding of her own fiction, and, in a critical atmosphere charged with debate over the relative merits of "character versus plot" in the novel, responded in a wide variety of ways.*

Critical admiration for George Eliot's characterization throughout the century often centered on some perceived "truth," or typicality, or universality. From the beginning of her career, she was praised for her "ordinary" characters, sometimes because commonality came to be equated with the natural and the good, but more often because critics felt skillful creation of characters without eccentricities or exceptional personalities a most difficult artistic feat. Characterization is not difficult, The Times comments in a favorable review of Adam Bede, if the author dwells on "contrast," but it becomes much more difficult when the author deals with the "commonality of man," as George Eliot does. In praising George Eliot's characterization

of Maggie Tulliver, The Spectator compares it to Charlotte Bronte's brilliant depiction of Jane Eyre, but notes that Jane is an "exceptional" woman and therefore more easily characterized than Maggie, who is not. Other authors are often unfavorably compared to George Eliot in their depiction of the common man. The Saturday Review notes that Bulwer-Lytton would most typically picture the poor in relationship to some striking rich person, and Dickens would give each poor person an eccentricity, thereby making the whole group "artificial and mechanical," but George Eliot goes far beyond either: her poor each has a "distinct and probable character," and each sustains it. The poor in her books say perfectly "natural" things, and reveal who they are in a perfectly natural manner.

Critical approval of George Eliot's depiction of the common man does not, however, depend solely on truthfulness or naturalness. In a review of Adam Bede, The Saturday Review notes an artistically successful attempt to convey to the reader a sense of the human dignity of the hard working, plain thinking provincial:

It is a real credit for a writer to have made such characters [as the rustics in Adam Bede] realities, and not have made them, as most novelists who attempt the thing do, mere lay figures on which the authors hang their old shooting--jackets, while they walk round in an evening dress smirking and pointing out how jolly and genial they are with their old clothes.

Some of the critical praise for George Eliot's
commonplace characters must be viewed as part of a reaction to what critics felt to be an increasing tendency toward sensationalism in fiction. Her characters are "thoroughly typical," and they do not "surpass by one iota the actuality of life," and she is praised for her "powerful conception and vivid delineation of marked but not unusual characters." In spite of the praise for her "natural" or "ordinary," or "typical" characters, the major focus of critical attention, both positive and negative, was on her psychological method of delineation. The Spectator finds this characteristic of her style instrumental in the success of The Mill on the Floss: "The novelty and interest . . . lie in the fact that in very few works of fiction has the interior of the mind been so keenly analyzed." The Athenaeum says of Silas Marner that it "has no scenes of exciting or painful interest, but the characters are all well and firmly drawn, worked up from within, instead of the mere outward semblance being given." Macmillan's sees in George Eliot's penetrating understanding of the human mind proof that the novel has matured as a literary form: "... the novelist has ceased to be a mere story teller or romanclist. ... He has learned to deduce motives from actions; and to evolve actions from motives." By the mid-1860's and early 1870's, the middle years of George Eliot's career, the analytical technique of
characterization became almost universally esteemed by the critics, and she was invariably presented as its most successful practitioner. "It is in analysis of character that George Eliot so surpasses all her contemporaries," The Westminster Review asserts. By the early 1870's, many critics became so excessive in their praise of "analysis" that "psychological" became synonymous with "great fiction." Indeed, in ecstatically reviewing Middlemarch, The Examiner implies that the psychological is more important than the fictional: "... few readers of the book can feel that they are reading fiction. They are really sharing in a most instructive psychological study..." And again, in a review of a later section of Middlemarch: "[George Eliot] is the foremost novelist of our day, but she is even better as a psychologist than as a novelist." The London Quarterly Review finds this feature of George Eliot's work not only striking and effective, but also a significant movement toward a more complete understanding of the human mind: "What is newest in Middlemarch is that... of paramount importance in the work is the discussion of certain psychological problems of the last consequence to us all, which we follow in learning the inner life of two or three persons." It remains, however, for Edith Simcox, George Eliot's most insistent (and at times uncomfortably fawning) admirer, to present George Eliot's psychological method of
characterization as proof of her artistic genius. In a laudatory and perceptive review under the name of "H. Lawrenny," she writes:

Middlemarch marks an epoch in the history of fiction in so far as its incidents are taken from the inner life, as the action is developed by the direct influence of mind on mind and character on character, as the material circumstances of the outer world are made subordinate and accessory to the artistic presentation of a definite passage of mental experience, but chiefly as giving a background of perfect realistic truth to a profoundly imaginative psychological study.  

In the light of such high praise for her depth of characterization, it is almost inevitable that George Eliot would eventually be compared to Shakespeare. In an obituary article, The Academy makes what becomes a recurrent comparative observation: "... it seems no exaggeration to hold that in the delineation of character and the subtle analysis of human motive, we must go back to Shakespeare to find [George Eliot's] superior." Blackwood's notes that both possessed "penetrating psychological analysis," but that the essentially optimistic nature of his times enabled Shakespeare to conceive more universally human characters. On the other hand, George Eliot had had at her disposal an accumulation of scientific knowledge of human character that Shakespeare obviously could not have had.  

When critics of the latter part of the century felt called upon to praise George Eliot's technique of
characterization (which fewer did as the century drew to a close), they did so much in the manner of the Academy critic who asserts that George Eliot is a great writer because "she displays insight into the motives of human action and imaginative skill to body forth no mere walking characteristics, but full many-sided human characters in their natural environment." But just as her minutely detailed and brilliantly conceived studies of human character and motive contributed significantly to her critical success, the same talent was largely responsible for her disfavor with many critics. In one of the earliest reviews of her work, The Literary Gazette finds Amos Barton "too disgusting a character." Most of the early attacks on George Eliot's characters follow The Literary Gazette's lead. This body of criticism reflects a reluctance to accept the worth of her fictional people as such, and an insistence that they fail to provide what such characters must: an ameliorative view of human nature and a strong moral example.

Among the most vociferous and prestigious advocates of this point of view are The Dublin University Magazine and The Quarterly Review. The Dublin presents its most sustained blast in its review of The Mill on the Floss: "If George Eliot really finds human life, for the most part, as 'narrow, ugly, and grovelling' as she has drawn it here, we neither envy her experiences nor care to see
them detailed in print."21 The review notes a resemblance between George Eliot's technique and Thackeray's, but "Mr. Thackeray, at least, is too good a workman to draw his characters mostly without a heart. But in *The Mill on the Floss* there are few touches of that better nature which makes the whole world kin."22 Thoroughly repelled, the reviewer concludes curtly: "... neither human art nor human morals can be refined or ennobled by examples taken exclusively or even frequently from the meanest, poorest, and grossest types of human character."23 The next year, *The Dublin* complains that the characters in *Silas Marner* are even more disagreeable than those in George Eliot's earlier novels and calls them "mean, boorish, heavy-witted."24

*The Quarterly* kept a simmering silence on George Eliot until late 1860, then burst forth with a largely negative review of all three of her first works. In it, she is charged with being too "bold": she "knowingly forces disagreeable people on us, and insists that we shall be interested in their story by the skill with which it is told." If George Eliot insists on representing these ugly manifestations as the "depth of human nature," the reviewer asks, what good is there in "raking them up?" Ultimately, and perhaps inevitably, the review compares George Eliot to Sir Walter Scott, and, not surprisingly, George Eliot comes out the worse for the encounter. Scott
concentrated on creating characters capable of "heroism," such as Jeanie Deans, but all George Eliot can offer are characters who are frail, miserable, and suffering, like Hetty Sorrel.²⁵

Such negative criticism is not, however, characteristic of the more widespread critical reaction against George Eliot's characterization that set in later in her career. The opinions of The Dublin University Magazine and The Quarterly represent a dissatisfaction with her characters themselves, and are concerned primarily with the moral effect such characters might have on the reader; the later objections generally ignore this approach and focus on the method of psychological delineation itself. Thus, the technique of psychological creation and development of character, which had played a significant role in elevating George Eliot to the status of England's greatest novelist in the 1860's and early 1870's, played an equally significant role, largely because of England's shifting social and artistic attitudes, in detracting from that reputation beginning in the 1870's. Some negative criticism of her means of characterization exists in critical evaluations of most of her works, to be sure, but it does not become insistent until the publication of her last novel and the one destined to remain her most critically controversial throughout the rest of the century, Daniel Deronda.

Many critics saw Deronda as a failure, and that
primarily because of an unhealthy evolution in George Eliot's genius. The Edinburgh Review complains of the static quality of Daniel, noting that in earlier works George Eliot would have put him into action. The review continues, "There are indications, however, in the present work that art, high art, has grown more to [George Eliot] than nature, and that man has become a creature to be analysed rather than a being primarily made for life."26 This idea, that somehow "psychology" had replaced "nature," that "analysis" was essentially artificial and static, pervades the critical reception of Deronda. After George Eliot's death, the notion serves to divide her works into periods. In his well known essay on her only a few months after her death, Leslie Stephen praises "totally" Scenes of Clerical Life, Adam Bede, and The Mill on the Floss, but finds the rest of her works "questionable" because she tended progressively to "substitute elaborate analysis for direct presentation." The result, as Stephen viewed it, was an increasing loss of "charm."27 In 1885, H. R. Fox-Bourne observed that George Eliot did well to write no more novels after Deronda because it exhibited "excess of psychological elaboration and artificiality."28 An 1886 comparison between George Eliot and Charles Kingsley in The Literary World shows how far her method of characterization had fallen in critical esteem. Kingsley's reputation will outlive that of George Eliot, the article
asserts, and chiefly because of characterization:

Carefully as George Eliot's characters are described, and often as the works of their minds is laid bare for our inspection, we can never find in them the human soul with which ours would hold communion. . . . She would have us view human nature from within, not from without; and, therefore, she does not depict men and women, but only machines: machines, it is true, of great beauty and complexity of structure, but still nothing more.²⁹

The reaction against George Eliot's characterization is actually part of a larger critical reaction against the supposed encroachment of science on artistic techniques. Howells, James, and Stendhal are often presented as the chief culprits, but inevitably many critics found George Eliot contaminated in the same way, especially in her later works. What had been praised a decade before as marvellously talented "analysis" became in the 1870's and 1880's mere "motive grinding." As the critical reaction gained support, "psychological" characterization became synonymous with "intellectual" characterization, and, therefore, with the application of an ancient dichotomy, the opposite of "intuitive" characterization. The intuitive method, as defined by the critics, came from the heart; it seized and conveyed a character wholly and sincerely. On the other hand, the psychological method was totally concerned with knowledge; it was not interested in the mysterious entity called life that is somehow beyond mere "analysis." As a result, scientific analysis
ignores the beautiful, the artistic, and the "real."

Because the reaction to George Eliot's characterization is so closely related to a general reaction against science, the terms of the criticism are often scientific. Repeatedly, she is referred to as a "surgeon," an "anatomist," a "vivisectionist." An 1877 review of Deronda expresses a view that was to become common among George Eliot's detractors:

[George Eliot] is too often tempted to kill her characters for the sake of their anatomy. A true artist, with the delight in beauty overpowering all other desires, would sooner keep the freshness of the flower unspoiled than perfect his knowledge of its intricate roots; but with George Eliot it is the root itself that is precious, and she is careless if the blossom fade so long as she is able to lay bare and make known the ways of its growth. Thus it always happens in her work that the presentation of character is limited by her critical knowledge. The life that she images never outruns the control of her analysis, and therefore it never acquires any reflection of that sense of mystery which belongs to the life of the actual world.30

A discussion of Theophrastus Such two years later yields the same complaint: "[George Eliot has] taken to the scalpel instead of the brush, and has made men as 'interesting cases,' instead of human beings, with claims on our admiration, our pity, or contempt. . . . ."31 In 1879 also, The Quarterly triumphantly presents Deronda as proof that its original objection to George Eliot's method of characterization was an accurate one:

... Daniel Deronda, so evidently the work of
a powerful and ingenious mind, shows, in our judgment very conclusively, what an incalculable mistake in art is made by those novelists who sacrifice action to analysis, and manners to metaphysics.32

Shortly after George Eliot's death, John Mortimer made the critical indictment of the characterization in her later novels a general one, a condition that was to plague that portion of her artistic reputation throughout the rest of the century:

[George Eliot] had a power of insight which enabled her to deal with her characters pretty much as a surgeon does with the body he dissects. . . . But it seems to us that in this subtle analytical way of dealing with phenomena she often transgressed the bounds of art. . . . Psychological or metaphysical study in a novel when it is not painful is often more abstruse than edifying.33

Even in those critics who did not view George Eliot's method of characterization as "morbid" or unreal and who viewed science with no apparent alarm, there exists a growing tendency in the late 1870's to find it increasingly boring and overdone. The Guardian reviewer of Deronda complains of the characters:

Their feelings, motives, wishes, are subjected to a subtle—shall we venture to say sometimes a wearisome—analysis, which covers whole pages, and leaves little room for the display of these same feelings in action.34

In reviewing Deronda, Vanity Fair notes the same weakness:

[George Eliot] allows herself to talk about her personages instead of allowing them to develop themselves by the course of the story, and the reader is perpetually subjected to a flood of reflections, by which the illusion is weakened, the characters dwarfed, and the
Interest diminished.  

A discussion of *Deronda* also compels George Saintsbury to deal with George Eliot's technique of characterization. While he finds her in many ways "unparalleled" as a creator of fictional character, he also admits she has a "tendency to talk about personages instead of allowing them to develop themselves."  

The *London Quarterly Review* summarizes this whole critical attitude when it asks, somewhat delicately, "May it not . . . be objected that [George Eliot] overanalyses? We do not, of course, mean that her personages are devoid of life. . . . But have we not constantly the feeling of knowing too much about them?" The article criticizes George Eliot's somewhat "passionless" habit of analysis, and compares it unfavorably with Charlotte Bronte's "hot lava stream of passionate feeling."  

If the matter of critical attitude toward George Eliot's method of characterization is complex, criticism of her plotting, when it exists, usually is not. She was never known for her striking plots, and the kindest critical remarks made about them usually praise them for not intruding on the characters. At times the plots of her novels are praised for correlating naturally with the characters, or for "proceeding by natural sequence" from their interaction, but most critics seem to feel pretty much as *The British Quarterly Review*, which put it
Novel-writers divide into two classes, the dramatic and the narrative; those who make their personages live before us, and those who have the power of constructing an intricate plot. George Eliot is intensely dramatic; her plots are for the most part simple, and where any strong situation is introduced it is one dependent on the persons, and it would not be interesting apart from them.

In discussing George Eliot's plotting, critics often consider it a generally inferior feature of the novel as art. The Eclectic Review notes flaws in the plot of Felix Holt, but observes the plot is subservient to "more artistic studies"—those of English life and social manners. The Guardian praises the accuracy of historical details in Romola, and adds, "... but they are, after all, only the frame of the picture. ... The real matter of intrinsic value is the human life which they enclose ... the development of character which is displayed by their agency." In an observation meant as an obviously positive criticism, Vanity Fair says of Middlemarch, "The plot of the story is nothing, but the people are everything." Late in the century The Academy praises George Eliot as a novelist, but not because of her plotting which is "a different and inferior faculty." Kegan Paul asserts that among first rate novelists George Eliot and Thomas Hardy alone see the proper relationship between character and plot: "... human nature is the supremely interesting study for man, not the outward clothes in which it may be
vested, nor the casual ceremonies in which it may be employed. 45

When the critics disapprove of George Eliot's plotting, they rarely are emphatic, often expressing their disfavor almost as an afterthought, or even somewhat apologetically, as one would point out a badly executed brush stroke in a magnificent painting. "Tame" is a term often used to describe her plots, but many critics, like The British Quarterly reviewer of Middlemarch, hasten to add that the deficiency is more than compensated for by her depth of purpose and humor. 46 Chambers's Journal ordinarily did not review fiction, but found Felix Holt too "extraordinary" to ignore. In the process of declaring George Eliot superior to Thackeray and Fielding and "scarcely inferior" to Shakespeare himself, the reviewer does mention, almost parenthetically, that the plot of Felix Holt is "very uninteresting," but this criticism is of no apparent consequence in a highly laudatory review. 47

Although plotting was widely recognized as a general weakness in George Eliot's fiction, Felix Holt seems to have been a focal point for the criticism. Critics found the plot of this novel too complex, too contrived, and generally detrimental to the characterizations. The Guardian complains, "A perplexed story of a questionable inheritance...is far less in George Eliot's line than portraying the characters who figure in it." 48
Christian Remembrancer puts the criticism more bluntly:

... all critics have given up the plot [of Felix Holt], and no amount of other excellencies can quite atone for defect in this fundamental quality. For want of it the character of the heroine is somewhat sketchy, and needs a field for its development. ..."49

However, the reviewer does attempt to soften the criticism: "Certainly the author of Adam Bede can do better without a plot than most other writers can do with one, but the deficiency is felt."50

Seen as a whole, Victorian criticism of George Eliot's method of characterization and plotting follow several distinct lines. Much more attention is given to her characterization, and her novels are often called "novels of character."51 Many critics feel that characterization is George Eliot's forte as a novelist, and her reputation as a great writer is the result of that genius.52 The critics generally tend to ignore her plots, or dismiss them lightly. The "novel of action" was out of critical favor much of George Eliot's publishing career, and she is often praised for not stooping to this lesser kind of fiction.53

The movement toward the naturalistic fiction of the last decades of the century gathered force in the late 1860's, and by the time of George Eliot's death in 1880 the critical battle was raging fiercely. Her reputation suffered to a degree from the conflict, but it is remarkable
it did not suffer more. The young aesthetes of the 1890's would have little to do with George Eliot, but many critics, as already noted, maintained her position as the foremost English novelist. And of those who did, many justified their evaluation with discussions of her technique of characterization. Typical of the critical view of the relative merit of character and plot in George Eliot's fiction is James T. Foard's assertion:

[George Eliot] had no skill as an artist in the construction or arrangement of plots, no wide range or universality of knowledge in dealing with dramatic character. . . . The chief excellencies of all George Eliot's books are their psychological delineation of her own wrestlings of soul, doubts and trials and tribulations, mental and spiritual, and the autobiographic insight that they afford.54

The concept of George Eliot's novels as psychological autobiography is, to be sure, not a representative critical attitude, but the emphasis on characterization instead of plotting most decidedly is.
Realism

Within the almost bewildering range of individual definitions of fictional realism in the Victorian period, critics generally approached the subject as a matter of the novelist's adherence to or presentation of some form of truth, either material or ideal. The problem of realism in the novel did not become a widespread concern of criticism until the mid-1850's, but George Eliot's emergence as a novelist of note in 1859 served to accelerate critical discussion of the matter, if only because her method would not allow critics to ignore it.* Discussion of the substance and presentation of "realism" in George Eliot's works tends to focus most predictably on her characterization, but much of the criticism reflects a less predictable complexity of opinion on the form and function of realism in the novel.

During her days as sub-editor of John Chapman's Westminster Review, George Eliot herself had occasion to express critical views on realism in the arts, but her theoretical attitude is surprisingly simple when compared with her artistic approach. In an article on Ruskin's Modern Painters, she stresses the need to avoid the

distorted, the fanciful, the grotesque— in short, what she felt to be the "unreal":

The truth of infinite value [Ruskin] teaches is realism—the doctrine that all truth and beauty are to be attained by a humble and faithful study of nature, and not by substituting vague forms, bred by imagination on the mists of feeling, in place of definite, substantial reality.55

Seldom in her expressed views on the subject does she go much beyond this adherence to simple, straightforward veracity in artistic representation.*

George Eliot's insistence on mirrorlike verisimilitude in artistic representation was very much in keeping with a strong Victorian critical tendency, and attitudes similar to hers appear frequently in evaluations of her works. In evaluating Adam Bede, The Edinburgh Review states flatly: "A novel is good in proportion to its truth to nature," and finds Adam Bede very good in this respect.56 Fraser's notes that "A novel has always aimed at depicting everyday scenes," and The Mill on the Floss fulfills this requirement effectively.57 J. M. Ludlow compares Silas Marner and

*George Eliot wrote numerous critical articles and reviews touching upon the subject of realism for The Westminster Review and The Leader in the 1850's, but two of her most important treatments are in "The Natural History of German Life," The Westminster Review, 10 N.S. (1856), 51-79; and "Silly Novels by Lady Novelists," The Westminster Review, 10 N.S. (1856), 442-461. Her best known expression of the mimetic theory occurs as an authorial digression in Chapter 17 of Adam Bede. A valuable discussion of the development of George Eliot's creative practices beyond the scope of her early critical theories may be found in Stang, pp. 160-166.
Elsie Venner and finds the former superior because it dealt with "the ordinary, the normal," not "the abnormal, the improbable, the fantastic." One critic praises Felix Holt for its "truth to nature and fact," and observes, "Of course, this world is the sphere for the novelist's picture of life; we go elsewhere for a glimpse of eternal verities." The new art of photography supplied advocates of exact mimetic representation in the novel with an apt analogy, as in The Guardian's praise of Silas Marner for "photographic pictures of groups and characters, which we have seen and passed by hundreds of times. . . ."60

Although many critics preferred to use this simple yardstick of "truth to life" when praising the realism of George Eliot's novels, others found this characteristic less admirable. The Dublin University Magazine found The Mill on the Floss tedious and boring: "Instead of a well-drawn harmonious picture, we get a series of photographic studies . . . [sometimes] provokingly commonplace . . . [sometimes] tiresomely repellent."61 The attitude behind such criticism was that faithful representation of the observable world is not enough in itself to constitute the makings of a fine novel. Something more is necessary, something "artistic," that does not distort nature, but also does not merely reproduce it. Thus The Edinburgh Review grumbles that Daniel Deronda is ultimately about "the commonplace wretchedness of mere domestic
incompatibility."^62 The Dublin University Magazine concludes its unfavorable review of The Mill on the Floss with the observation that George Eliot will never be a successful novelist until she learns the difference between that "larger insight and sterner self-control which go to the making of a first rate novel, and the microscopic cleverness that evolves a series of faithful but disjointed sketches."^63 In reviewing Silas Marner a year later, The Dublin finds George Eliot's method of representation unimproved. "Even a photograph," it complains, "to bear inspection, must be taken with more or less regard for artistic effect." Silas Marner is "photographic," but not "artistic."^64 The reviewer dismisses the novel's conclusion with, "So may it often be in real life; but art has higher ends than a slavishly literal rendering of chance facts."^65 Years later, however, a critic uses the same attitude to find George Eliot's "strong artistic individuality" superior to Trollope's "pale photographs . . . observed from life."^66

Some critics who oppose the mirror concept of fictional realism do so because they feel there are dangers in dealing with some of life's characteristics in fiction. Typical of this concern is Macmillan's complaint about The Mill on the Floss: "It is true that there occur sometimes in life positions so complex and overwhelming that plain right and wrong become confused . . . but to meet such positions
is one thing, to *invent* them is another." The reviewer concludes that it is wrong for a novelist to breed "uncertainty" as George Eliot had done in *The Mill on the Floss.*

The direction of such criticism is toward a preference for selectivity in realistic representation. An artist need not misrepresent that which he sees as real, but he is obligated to sort out, evaluate, and choose prudently from the great mass of material available to him. Sometimes choice of material is a matter of artistic effectiveness. The *Saturday Review* praises George Eliot's depiction of rustic conversation in *The Rainbow Inn* in *Silas Marner* because of her judicious selection of material. A real group of lower class provincials would not amuse us nearly as much as George Eliot's characters do because she has chosen to include only their most significant remarks. In real life, such remarks would also occur—George Eliot depicts them accurately—but they would be so diluted with banality that they would not even be noticed. With careful editing, therefore, George Eliot has turned the mundane and uninteresting into artistic and humorous scenes.

Although recognizing the effectiveness of artistic selection of material, other critics often consider it less important than moderation of treatment of the material chosen. Especially, a novelist cannot dwell exclusively on the unseemly side of life, real though it may be, without
ultimately distorting that which he is trying to depict realistically. John Morley labels George Eliot "emphatically realist" in her style, but he is careful to qualify this judgment:

... she is realist in a sense to which not many other novelists or dramatists can lay claim, and in which there are none of these characteristics that have made realism in contemporary fiction only another name for a steady and exclusive devotion to a study of all the meanest or nastiest elements in character and conduct. ... With fine artistic moderation, she steers clear of the Charybdis of depraved realism, without falling into the Scylla of sentimentalism. 69

Along with a belief in the need for selectivity and moderation in fictional realism critics often expressed belief in a need for the careful ordering of material. Simple verisimilitude and judicious selection were wasted if the novelist did not put his material together effectively. In discussions of George Eliot's realism, this critical attitude leads in several directions. Some critics imply that she achieves an artistic "harmony" by effectively organizing her realistic material. Edward Dowden calls George Eliot a "personal" writer, but notes that this characteristic of her art does not interfere with the "dramatic truthfulness" of her works, which he describes as a kind of internal realism achieved by careful ordering of events, motives, and actions. 70 This "internal realism," a natural and true evolution of character and plot within the fictional world of the novel, is seen by some critics
as the characteristic of her work that enables George Eliot to break the pattern of the traditional happy ending. Frederick Napier Broome notes in a favorable review of *Middlemarch* that the reader is both impressed and somewhat depressed by the novel's "cruel likeness to life." "Nothing," Broome writes, "happens merely in order that the curtain may fall pleasantly."71 Abby Sage Richardson finds the realistic progression of events in George Eliot's works superior to that of other major novelists:

It is said that Charlotte Bronte was swayed from the tragic ending of one of her novels by the letters from readers, which besought her to bring the heroine to a happy close; and that even Thackeray sometimes averted the sword of fate from over the heads of his favourites. But [George Eliot] is as inexorable as life itself. No weak pity for the suffering she depicts swerves her pen, and she does not shrink from putting before us the saddest of problems as persistently as life presents them.72

At times critics refer to George Eliot's realistic patterning in terms of what contemporary critics would call organic structure—a kind of fidelity of sequence that she spontaneously knows to be true. In most cases this quality is presented in opposition to artificial, and essentially unrealistic, manipulation of character and event. H. R. Fox-Bourne notes that all of George Eliot's novels through *Silas Marner* "came from her heart spontaneously," but with the rest of her novels "authorship was much more of a business with her."73 James Bell makes very
much the same criticism when he asserts that in her earlier works George Eliot's realism was spontaneous, but later it was "manipulated from without rather than evolved from within."74

Melodramatic events are the most obvious violations of realistic sequence in fiction, and critics are almost unanimous in their condemnation of them in George Eliot's novels. The two novels most often criticized for melodrama are George Eliot's first two, Adam Bede and The Mill on the Floss. Some critics objected to the drowning of Maggie in the latter as excessively and unrealistically dramatic,75 but an even larger number found the tragic ending in keeping with the rest of the novel. The near execution of Hetty Sorrel in Adam Bede is much more widely condemned as melodramatic. The Examiner dismisses the near execution and last minute reprieve of Hetty with the sarcastic comment that the scene is melodramatic and a serious defect in a fine novel, unless, of course, "the production of a morbid excitement is the author's aim."76 In discussing George Eliot's first two works, The National Review asserts that she has produced one great novel, Adam Bede, which is a complete masterpiece—except for the flaw of the melodramatic execution scene.77

All of the above criticism—the insistence on "truth to nature"; the demand for selection, moderation, and structure; the anti-melodramatic tendency—views fictional
realism as relating to the visible world. Critics with this point of view tend to praise or censure George Eliot's realism insofar as it accurately reflects observable objects and actions, no matter how edited or organized. Realism as a characteristic of George Eliot's fiction becomes a more complex matter, however, with those critics who see an added dimension, a realism above or beyond that of external nature.

Often, critics express their belief in a "higher" realism in terms of a transcendental dichotomy. The Westminster Review declares that genius can see "realities" where the rest of us see only "appearances," and praises George Eliot as having that power of vision. The Literary World speaks of realism of "accessories" and of "essentials," defining the former in terms of the inferior truth of mirror-like verisimilitude of external action, and the latter in terms of the immutable, universal truth that lies behind such action. R. E. Francillon sees that with Daniel Deronda George Eliot emerges as more than the "natural historian of real life" she has always been and has at last begun to deal with "larger and fuller truth."

Such criticism runs counter to definitions of fictional realism previously described. It posits that fictional representation at its most artistic does not merely reproduce or edit or order the realities of everyday life, but instead aims to create the ideal, which is beyond the
experience of everyday existence but is accessible to
Art. This critical attitude, though using the same
terminology, is essentially anti-realist because what
other critics define as admirably "real" is considered of
no significant artistic worth by the idealist critics.
Although most idealist critics find George Eliot's earlier
works admirable enough, they usually judge her later novels
superior and Daniel Deronda her best fictional work.

In discussing the relative merits of Middlemarch and
Daniel Deronda, Edward Dowden asserts that in Middlemarch
the "prosaic or realistic element occupies a much larger
place . . . and in Daniel Deronda the poetical or ideal
element as decidedly preponderates." Thus, he characterizes
Middlemarch as an essentially "critical" novel because it
shows man and society as flawed as they in fact are, and
Daniel Deronda as "constructive" in aim because it gives
the reader a glimpse of man and society as they can be.81

In distinguishing between the depiction of the real and
the ideal, some idealist critics label the former (and
inferior) "realism" or "realistic fiction," and define
the presentation of exalted nature as "romance," an
artistically superior accomplishment. Vanity Fair describes
Daniel Deronda as "not a history of real life. The
characters are partly those of romance and partly those of
real life, to which the majority of novel-readers and
novel-writers are accustomed."82 Evaluating the same novel,
James Picciotto presents the idealist attitude bluntly:
"Artistic truth in literature, as in painting, is always
sought for by great workmen in preference to mere realistic
truth." Daniel Deronda depicts such artistic truth and is
therefore defined by Picciotto as a romance. He concludes:
"George Eliot has passed from the realism of Middlemarch to
the idealism of [Daniel Deronda]. We cannot judge of
Daniel Deronda and of Mordecai from the matter-of-fact
surroundings of prosaic every-day life."  

R. E. Francillon's article on Daniel Deronda in The
Gentleman's Magazine contains an extended discussion of
George Eliot as a writer of romance. Francillon defines
Deronda as a romance, and declares not only that it is
George Eliot's first, but also that her previous method of
realistic depiction is responsible for the decline of the
romance as a critically esteemed form of fiction. George
Eliot's fault in her novels previous to Deronda was
according to Francillon, that she "hitherto almost timidly
kept to the safe ground of probability." Certain rules of
probability apply to realistic fiction, which Francillon
defines as "the novel of types and manners," but these
rules are not applicable to the romance, which is "the
form of fiction which grapples with fact upon its whole
ground, and deals with the higher and wider truths—the
more occult wisdom—that is not to be picked up by the
side of the highway." Using "probability" as his
touchstone, Francillon is thus able to label all of George Eliot's works prior to Deronda realistic fiction because all of these novels "deal with men and women in the aggregate, as they are or have been." Deronda, on the other hand, deals with "individual men and women as they may be or can be," and is thus a romance. Francillon is careful to point out that the true romance does not deal with the impossible any more than it concentrates on the probable. The key distinction, then, between the realist and idealist points of view as Francillon sees it is the distinction between the concentration on probability by the realistic school and the emphasis on possibility by the idealists.

With the realist and idealist critics each claiming George Eliot as their own, the realists emphasizing the earlier novels and the idealists the later ones, a critical attitude constituting a position between the two extreme interpretations appears in late Victorian evaluations of her realism. Characteristically, this attitude views realism in George Eliot's novels as artistically superior not because it was in some way "true to nature" nor because it was an elevation of the everyday into some realm of higher truth, but precisely because it was a skillful combination of the best of both the real and the ideal. In 1885 The British Quarterly Review praised George Eliot for avoiding extremes in depiction: "In her writings George
Eliot steered a middle course between the two rocks whereon inferior writers make shipwreck, the construction of all character and incident from the resources of imagination, and the actual description of living persons. She blended fact and fiction inextricably. In the same year Time characterized George Eliot's genius as a "scientific analysis and unimpassioned criticism of life, illuminated but not distorted by the ever-felt presence of impassioned ideals." James T. Foard cites as the main feature of her work a "mingled realism and imagination."

Although Henry James was one of the favorite villains of the idealist school, who charged him with a dedication to the depiction of the trivial and the mundane, his view of George Eliot's artistic development really reflects a moderate position. James felt that the figures and situations in her fiction evolved directly from her "moral consciousness" (and therefore were more representative of the "ideal") and only indirectly from her "observation," or representation of external nature. This is the attitude of the idealist critics, but James sees it as an imbalance, and therefore a flaw in her artistic personality. In her early works, James declares, she creates with a balance of "perception" and "reflection." As she develops as an artist, however, her reflective tendency is overdeveloped at the expense of her perceptive. As a result, she ends her career with a badly distorted sense of fictional
representation. Implicit in the whole discussion is James' belief that artistically effective and superior representation is achieved by a careful balancing and blending of the real and the ideal.91

Perhaps the most direct presentation of the moderate critical attitude toward George Eliot's realism is that expressed by James Bell in an 1888 study of her fiction. Bell calls George Eliot an "ideal realist," and uses the tag to distinguish between her and what he considers to be lesser "school" novelists. Most modern "realistic novelists," Bell asserts, deal with a sort of "conversational inventory." They busy themselves with "reproducing the commonplace gossip of society, or with exploring the haunts, the habits, the vicious sores of rampant rascality." It is a fiction characterized by Bell as "either unspeakably wearisome or unspeakably revolting." George Eliot's fiction is realistic, too, but it is not a realism of this sort or any extreme and therefore unrealistic sort; it is not like the realism of Howells or Zola, nor has it anything in common with the wild impossibilities of the school of Rider Haggard. Like any true artist George Eliot possessed a sense of fidelity to real life, but what she did that the "school" novelists do not was "combine in her realism the material form and spiritual idea, aiming at the life itself that lies behind speech and action."92

All of these critical attitudes concentrate on realism
of subject matter, but critics were also at some pains to delineate what they felt were necessary artistic characteristics of the successful realistic novelist. Often, they discuss these traits in general terms, adding only that George Eliot does or does not possess them. In such instances, the realistic novelist is often presented as a "critic of life" whose "insight" or "thought" or "sensitivity" is an artistic faculty capable not only of presenting realities but also of interpreting them. 93 Not only is subjectivity permissible from this point of view, it is also desirable. James Bell characterizes George Eliot's talent as much less a passive mirror, reflecting things outside itself, than a "plastic influence moving everywhere like an informing spirit." 94

As desirable as critics often find the realistic novelist's criticism of life, they are often careful to distinguish between powerfully and artistically effective subjectivity and the purely fanciful. The result of this distinction is a stress on authorial experience as the most solid base for realistic fiction, and experience is consequently placed in opposition to imagination. In its review of Adam Bede, Bentley's Quarterly Review declares: "[George Eliot] is no young genius writing from a teeming imagination full of airy shapes, but one who has learnt from experience... There is no guesswork here, but hard-won knowledge." 95
Most critics who praise George Eliot's realism from the point of view of authorial experience concentrate on her early novels, which are based on her recollections of the provincial life of her childhood. Some critics felt that when she deviated from the depiction of life as she had experienced it George Eliot became less successful. The British Quarterly Review notes that she is best when she is discussing the lower middle class provincial life she knew so well. She is much less effective when she attempts to depict the life of the gentry, a life she knew from the outside only: "In her books she always deserts firm ground when she has to describe [the higher circles of country life], and soars without complete success on the wings of her imagination."96

Another natural corollary of the power of authorial subjectivity was authorial sympathy. Fraser's asserts that "to combine the presentation of an ideal . . . with the culture of sympathy should be the aim of the writer of fiction who desires that his work should be the highest of its kind."97 In this critical context sympathy usually refers to a quality of artistic temperament, not to a quality of fictional representation, despite the fact that critics often use it synonymously with "sentiment." Rather than referring to the tendency to color fictional characters and scenes emotionally, sympathy more often refers to a deeper artistic involvement, a passionate
personal interest the author has for the people and actions in his work. E. S. Dallas finds the depth and range of George Eliot's sympathies to be her chief artistic power. She knows and understands her fictional characters and their situations and consequently gets the reader to care for them.  

In a broader critical sense, however, sympathy refers to authorial attitude toward the human condition. Chambers's Journal praises George Eliot's realism in Felix Holt but criticizes her "cynical delight in holding the too faithful mirror close to our faces." She looks at life perhaps too coldly and pitilessly; she has not, in Chambers's words, "a particle of sentiment." Sidney Colvin sees a similar attitude in George Eliot's work. Most novelists, he notes, write in sympathy with their own characters in their struggle with the inexorable. George Eliot, however, has changed this point of view: "she has a sterner sense of the consequences and responsibilities of human action; she is severe upon her characters and in sympathy, so to speak, with the inexorable." The British Quarterly Review uses sympathy in the same manner in noting that George Eliot's views of duty and human destiny are not shaped by her sympathy with the characters she has created; on the contrary, the characters are created to illustrate, and therefore are subordinate to, George Eliot's theories of the human condition. The British Quarterly saw the results very much as
Colvin did: George Eliot has much more sympathy for the theories her fiction presents than for the individual people that operate within the limits of these theories.\(^{101}\) This lack of authorial sympathy with the lot of her characters often forces George Eliot into artistic failures, as *The British Quarterly* notes when condemning the character of Daniel Deronda as unsatisfactory because lacking in "appeal to common sympathy."\(^{102}\) He lacks such appeal because George Eliot does not write with a sympathetic attitude. The reader is not intended to sympathize with Deronda, only to understand how and where he fits into George Eliot's system of things, and the resulting lack of the common bond of humanity between character and reader is a major flaw in the novel.

From the point of view of one set of critics, George Eliot makes her fiction more real by exhibiting authorial concern for her characters and their situations, thereby creating the same genuine concern in the reader. From a different critical point of view, however, sympathy is implied to be a necessary bond of humanity that makes the author part of what she presents in her fiction. Sympathy, in this critical context, tends to universalize subjective experience, making the novelist's unique viewpoint real and significant in the larger terms of the human condition. George Eliot is often praised for her sympathy in both critical senses. When she is criticized for lack of
sympathy, as in Colvin's and The British Quarterly's evaluations of her work, it is most often because such criticism sees her work as too mechanistic, written too much from the point of view of a disinterested social scientist with too little identification between the author and the fictional world she creates to reflect the conditions of the real one.

At the base of all critical attitudes toward the essential tools of the realistic novelist is the consideration of the artistic imagination. As has been shown, some critics preferred to put imagination in opposition to realism and consider it the producer of the fancifully distorted, and thus a damaging trait in a novelist. Many more critics, however, considered imagination an essential faculty for a novelist, and George Eliot is much praised for the imagination her works reflect.

Discussions of George Eliot's artistic imagination often present her works in opposition to literal realism, and find her imaginative realism artistically superior. The Saturday Review praises the shaping force of her imagination in Adam Bede, and adds as a general observation:

Mere observation is never enough to make even a slight sketch good. There must be something more than the faculty of noting distinct, telling, characteristic points—there must be a central idea of the subject of the sketch around which minutiae are to be grouped. There must be something . . . that comes from the observer, not the observed.103
In a favorable review of *Silas Marner*, *The Westminster Review* notes that (like all good novels) it illustrates the "instructiveness of life," but it does so not only in proportion to the truth of the picture presented, but also in proportion to the light shed on the picture by the novelist.\(^{104}\) *The Times* praises George Eliot for drawing the reader's attention to the hard realities of life, in which "none but a true genius could find the elements of a successful novel," implying the necessity for artistic imagination in the truly fine novelist.\(^{105}\) Indeed, in an obituary article, *The Times* asserts that it is this quality of imagination that guarantees George Eliot's novels will continue to be read. It is the one quality that transcends the locality of literal realism and preserves the essentially real nature of her novels.\(^{106}\)

Indirectly, *Romola* is the work of George Eliot's that most instigates critical discussion of the imagination. Although many critics felt the novel to be dry, pedantic, and unimaginative, *The Church Quarterly Review*'s evaluation is typical of a critical attitude that posited just the contrary as the reason for *Romola*'s failure. *Romola* fails to reach the highest level of art, *The Church Quarterly* asserts, because all historical novels fail in that respect. "That failure is due to the perpetual effort to reconstruct the past by dint of learning, because imagination utterly fails to give the necessary atmosphere to the story, the
numberless minute, probably unconscious, touches which combine to make the main action real by putting it in a real setting. The artistic imagination cannot, in other words, reconstruct the entire milieu of the realistic novel. It must be grounded in the world as the novelist knows it. George Eliot's failure of conception is emphasized by her failure of execution. The Church Quarterly notes the absence of humor in Romola as an inevitable result of her over-dependence on imagination in the novel because her humor is characteristically a product of observation, and observation is an obvious impossibility in a historical novel. Her inability to provide humor results in a corresponding failure to imbue her characters and their actions with reality and life. Consequently, the characters in the novel are only "types," not living individuals. At her most successful, George Eliot conceives characters and their subsequent actions in her artistic imagination, but it is the stimulation of her intimate knowledge of English life that makes them real. It is the creative imagination shaping and presenting that which George Eliot knows intimately that produces living characters and realistic action. Romola fails because in it she has only second-hand material to work with and only her imagination with which to shape it.

Romola, however, is unique in the canon of George Eliot's works, and Victorian critics normally treat it as
a somewhat special critical problem. Generally, they agree that the power of George Eliot's creative imagination was one of her greatest talents as a novelist. Without it, she would have produced meaninglessly literal portraits of English provincial life, devoid of art and significance.

In terms of the whole, Victorian criticism of realism in George Eliot's fiction ultimately engaged critics in illuminating discussions of the nature of the novel as a literary genre. She was clearly the foremost realistic novelist of her day, and critics knew that any discussion of the theory of fictional representation was incomplete without a consideration of her novels. Indeed, quite apart from their individual judgments of the artistic value of her realistic technique, Victorian critics seemed to agree that George Eliot's fiction was the starting point for such discussions.
Morbility

The lack of widespread nineteenth-century critical debate on the subject of morality in George Eliot's work is due in part to general agreement among critics that the novel should have a moral purpose. Although expressed in various and often imprecise ways, this belief in the moral nature of fiction remains surprisingly free from attack throughout the last half of the century. So prevalent was critical insistence on morality in fiction that critics seldom found detailed justification necessary, simply assuming it as an aim of fiction. In reviewing *Adam Bede*, The North British Review asserts that the two principal claims on critical attention in fiction are style and moral purpose, and focuses its evaluation of the novel on these points. Richard Simpson concentrates his examination of George Eliot's novels on her religious and moral views because "no great work can be written without a purpose—religious, political, philosophical, or artistic." The Christian Remembrancer states flatly that the novelist's duty is "confined to enforcing a pure morality," and The Quarterly Review notes the absence of a clear moral lesson in *Middlemarch*, which results in the defect of "incompleteness" in the novel. With critics in agreement that moral purpose is necessary in fiction, discussion of
this feature of George Eliot's work usually concentrates on how well she fulfills this requirement.

The acceptance of moral purpose as a necessary aim of fiction often resulted in critical emphasis on the need for an optimistic and uplifting point of view in the novel, a characteristic critics found particularly lacking in George Eliot's earlier works. This insistence on a "wholesome" moral outlook is often related to pleasure as a necessary aim of the novel. As a consequence, some critics found presentation of complex moral problems incompatible with the nature of the novel. The Saturday Review judges The Mill on the Floss too "painful," and also objects to George Eliot's presentation of complex moral questions because the novel encourages "light" thought on serious subjects. The reviewer advocates that she write something that would do justice to her creative powers and yet "form a pleasing and consistent whole." The Examiner praises Silas Marner for being a more pleasant work than The Mill on the Floss: "What was there shown in gloom is now lighted with sunshine, and we are the better pleased." The Saturday Review complains that Middlemarch is consistently unpleasing, a defect because a novel should please.

The insistence on an uplifting point of view and an element of pleasure in fiction led a few critics to employ the simple standard of poetic justice in criticizing George Eliot's works. The British Quarterly Review says of Adam
Bede that George Eliot should have "recorded in a mark of deeper black her reprobation of the selfish wickedness of [Donnithorne]." Critical concern over good and evil in George Eliot's fiction, however, is more often a matter of recognition and depiction than reward and punishment. The National Review declares that no demand can be made of the novelist to shape his story in a certain way. The only legitimate demand on the writer is that he "discriminate clearly the relative nobility of the characters. . . . An artist who leaves it doubtful whether he recognizes the distinction between good and evil at all . . . is blind to artistic as well as moral laws." George Eliot makes the necessary distinction, and matters of reward and punishment simply are not relevant. Although many Victorian critics argued the necessity of poetic justice in fiction, relatively few seemed to find the device applicable to George Eliot's works. There is the implication that poetic justice is too simple a critical principle to be aptly applied to works as complex as hers, as one reviewer slyly notes by reducing the resolution of Daniel Deronda to such terms: "... Gwendolen's crime, after all, was girlish giddiness and thoughtlessness, and the justice of the circulating library is completely satisfied if her heart is softened, and her wicked husband is drowned."

Because of their insistence on a morally uplifting, essentially optimistic point of view, and their clear
preference of good over evil, many critics found George Eliot's early novels of a more questionable moral quality than her later ones. *The Mill on the Floss* is often attacked from this standpoint. *Macmillan's* finds it as artistically perfect as a novel can be, but questions its moral value. The reviewer criticizes George Eliot's "doctrine of overpowering circumstances" as "perilous," and asks what good will Maggie's story do for anyone: "Will it influence for good any other real lives [or is] death welcomed as the solution of all difficulties, the escape from all pain?" The criticism is a persistent one, and as late as 1889 Sarah Tytler calls the "fatalistic doctrine" of the novel its most serious flaw. *The Eclectic Review* objects to the depiction of Maggie's prayers as powerless to aid her situation, and concludes that if George Eliot's future works are free from the "dangerous tendency to present life as an unexplained and rather unjustifiable mystery," then it will endorse them. *The London Review* criticizes George Eliot's tendency to concentrate only on the consequences of sin and ignore the guilt of yielding to it. This tendency becomes prominent in *The Mill on the Floss*, where "everything is done to throw around Maggie the excusing plea of helplessness." Often, however, criticism of George Eliot's early novels reflects more of a concern for what are essentially matters of taste than for her moral point of view. The
Saturday Review objects to the treatment of pregnancy in Adam Bede and advises George Eliot to "copy the old masters of the art, who, if they gave us a baby, gave it to us all at once. A decent author and a decent public may surely take the premonitory symptoms for granted." The British Quarterly Review takes serious exception to George Eliot's depiction of Hetty's fall in Adam Bede, concluding: "... an author has no more right to obtrude foul descriptions on the public gaze ... than the keeper of a house of ill-fame has to thrust the too authentic arcana of her hateful den upon the public observation." The Dublin University Magazine characterizes the love passages in The Mill on the Floss as "unlikely pictures of animal feelings," and calls for more reticence on George Eliot's part when dealing with such a "perplexing" subject. The London Review finds the secret relationship between Mrs. Transome and Mr. Jermyn in Felix Holt "of an unpleasant nature. ... It reads like an incident in an ordinary French novel," and concludes: "To a certain extent it serves to point a moral, but the same end might have been attained by different means."

The problem of questionable subject matter leads some critics to emphasize tasteful treatment of such material, if it must be used. Typical of this attitude is The Guardian's objection to the handling of Maggie's relationship with Stephen Guest in The Mill on the Floss: "Passion
is one of the legitimate materials of the novelist. But he incurs deep responsibility by the way in which he treats it. And we cannot think that he does good service by bringing into clear and powerful light its perverted and unwholesome growths. . . . We still hold that there are temptations which it is of itself a temptation to scrutinize too closely."\(^{127}\) This insistence on the softening of some of the less morally acceptable subject matter of George Eliot's books is obviously in deference to what one critic calls "that sensitive delicacy which is one of the most honourable characteristics of English society."\(^{128}\)

The preceding critical attitudes toward morality in George Eliot's novels reflect larger familiar Victorian moral attitudes. Much of the Victorian criticism of George Eliot, however, is more concerned with the artfulness of the presentation of such attitudes than with the social mores themselves. The most prevalent characteristic of discussion of George Eliot's depiction of morality is the careful critical distinction between moral purpose and didacticism.

Victorian criticism of George Eliot's works reflects a nearly unanimous disapproval of didacticism in fiction. Although few develop the idea in detail, most critics object to sermonizing and direct lesson teaching, favoring instead some manner of indirect presentation more in
keeping with what they felt the nature of fiction to be. Thus, E. S. Dallas observes that George Eliot's is a very spiritual nature, but adds that "her novels are true novels, not sermons done into dialogue." The London Quarterly asserts that George Eliot "is too true an artist to make her novels merely the vehicle for inculcating a system of philosophy. She teaches, no doubt . . . but her teaching has to be deduced. It is meant to be an influence, not a formulated creed."

More often than not, however, the critics found George Eliot overly didactic. The Examiner complains of her "professorial manner" and says that in Daniel Deronda she is often "a preacher and teacher in the first place, and a novelist in the second." J. Robertson sees a certain "moral pedantry" in George Eliot's works, and H. R. Fox-Bourne notes a "strained didacticism" in her later novels that leads him to conclude that it is better she wrote no more fiction after Daniel Deronda.

The general problem of the artistic presentation of moral lessons led Victorian critics into a dispute over whether morality or art was supreme, and George Eliot was quite naturally one of the novelists whose works were most discussed in the debate. In an obituary article, The Contemporary Review asserts that her literary works refute the notion that a work of art must be lessened by containing a serious moral purpose, and The Westminster
Review finds her morality more important than her art because moral purpose makes her works nobler and more significant. Edward Dowden argues that art and morality are inseparable in George Eliot's works. She is a moral writer, but her works are not didactic treatises: "There is not a hard kernel of dogma at the centre of her art, and around it a sheath or envelope which we break and throw away; the moral significance coalesces with the narrative, and lives through the characters."

These critics, however, were opposed by those who found significant imbalances between art and morality in George Eliot's works. One critic asserts that George Eliot asks her readers to accept The Mill on the Floss as art, not morality, a serious mistake because art is not enough; The Mill on the Floss is tragedy, but it is heathen tragedy and therefore is not morally acceptable. Most objections, however, reveal that critics felt George Eliot sacrificed art for morality in her fiction. Sidney Colvin notes an uneven quality about her work: "We have passages of first-rate art side by side with passages of philosophy; and sometimes the philosophy comes where we want the art, and gives us a character like Daniel Deronda himself, who seems constructed rather than created."

The British Quarterly Review observes that George Eliot's moral purpose has the negative effect on her art of leading her into digressions and disquisitions that mar the drama.
of her fiction. W. J. Dawson asserts that the burden of her teaching is often too great for the resources of her art, and in her novels "it is the voice of the prophet which is sometimes heard instead of the cunning music of the story-teller." George Saintsbury, one of the most influential of Victorian critics, continually argued against morality dominating art, and he found George Eliot allowing such an imbalance in her later novels, especially in *Daniel Deronda*, about which he wrote: "... perhaps [George Eliot] has also once more illustrated the immutable law that no perfect novel can ever be written in designed illustration of a theory, whether moral or immoral, and that art ... will bear no rival near the throne." By the time of George Eliot's death in 1880, literary criticism had begun to emphasize the novel as an instrument of social morality, a trend that was to produce the novels and criticism of Moore and Gissing in the 1890's. While the major trend of critical thought was that George Eliot too often sacrificed art for morality in her fiction, an increasingly insistent critical attitude emerged in the last quarter of the century that viewed George Eliot's moral purpose as essentially social, and asserted her brilliant handling of it made her the foremost novelist of the age. In 1873 George Barnett Smith foreshadows this view of George Eliot when he sees in *Middlemarch* a shift in her thought that could result in her emergence as the
"master spirit" the age so desperately needs. Smith finds too much of the old "hopelessness" of vision still clinging to George Eliot, but he sees her as the only artist with the potential to "gather together . . . tangled threads of our consciousness and of our new conditions." After her death, George Eliot came increasingly to be considered the foremost social moralist of her day. The Standard's obituary article claims her novels will live not because they reflect the superficial manners of her times, but because of the "earnestness and profundity of their dealing with the most serious problems of the age." On the same day, The Academy asserts George Eliot's fame will be that of "the novelist who entered most profoundly into the problems of the day."

The tendency to view George Eliot as a social moralist continued to develop through the mid-eighties. In 1883, Eric Robertson complains that Mathilde Blind's recently published biography of George Eliot concentrated too much on her artistic side and did not adequately emphasize her "correlation with the deepest movements of the century's spirit." In the same year, J. Robertson writes: 

". . . one of the main elements in our conception of George Eliot is that she alone among our great novelists and poets is at once fully abreast of and in sympathy with the thought of the century." In 1885, J. Redford Thomson finds George Eliot's writings "saturated with the intellectual
spirit of her time. . . . Alive to the social problems
. . . of the age in which she lived."147

Few critics were specific about what they found in
George Eliot's writings to prompt their view of her as a
social moralist. Characteristically, general remarks
such as those above trailed away into discussions of
Duty, Responsibility, and Social Awareness, often leaving
the reader to accept or reject this view of George Eliot
as he saw fit. Undoubtedly, George Eliot's insistence on
social consciousness and her depiction of the negative
consequences of irresponsibility contribute to this
critical attitude toward her work, but the critics are more
often willing to assert than they are to substantiate such
claims.

What the critics are increasingly willing to discuss
in the latter part of the century is George Eliot's
personal morality. Somewhat surprisingly, the earlier
critics are often more tolerant of the personal moral
attitudes they find in her work than critics later in
the century. In 1863 Richard Simpson concludes after an
examination of her religious and moral beliefs: "The
positive good of her sensible ethics outweighs the negative
evil of her atheistic theology. . . ."148 Later critics
often were not as charitable. William Barry, writing in
The Dublin Review, grants that George Eliot must claim a
certain admiration for her passionate desire to tell her
readers of the Highest Good, but her atheism ultimately prevents her from seeing the truth, a touching situation that makes her work melancholy. J. Redford Thomson, as noted earlier, finds George Eliot admirably contemporary, but he also finds that the "secularizing influences" of G. H. Lewes, Strauss, Feuerbach, and Spinoza make her moral judgment suspect. James Bell distinguishes two strains of morality in George Eliot: The "theoretical," which falls short of total satisfaction because of her agnosticism, and the "practical," which, because of its devotion to Duty and Self-Sacrifice, was of the highest moral quality.

Perhaps the harshest indictment of George Eliot's personal moral views comes from The London Quarterly Review in 1885. It finds a perplexing discrepancy between the high moral attitudes of her fictional characters and the "vague, nebulous philosophy" she seems to hold herself. So serious does The London Quarterly find the shortcomings of George Eliot's moral outlook to be that it concludes: "It may be held doubtful whether the world will really be the better for the existence of this gifted and, in many respects, admirable woman." 

Perhaps the most accurate explanation for Victorian critics' insistence on discussing George Eliot in moral terms is given by the author of an article on George Eliot and Comtism. Why, he asks, does everyone debate the merits
of her moral viewpoint when few have ever felt the necessity to question Dickens's or Trollope's or even Thackeray's so extensively? The answer, he asserts, is two-fold: in the first place, the other great novelists do not deviate significantly from orthodox moral attitudes, and therefore do not invite such attention; and in the second place, they do not present themselves as moral teachers as explicitly as George Eliot does. The combination of her conscious divergence from accepted morality and her professed moral purpose in fiction makes critical evaluation of her moral attitudes not only acceptable but necessary.¹⁵³
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SCOPE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

The core of the bibliography is derived from three early checklists of George Eliot criticism. The first of these is appended to George Willis Cooke's *George Eliot* (London, 1883). Cooke's list is very brief, omitting material from such obvious and important sources as the *Times*, *Athenaeum*, and *Saturday Review*, and omitting almost all of the items on *Scenes of Clerical Life* and *Silas Marner*. Also, Cooke lists the items by paragraph categories, some of which are misleading (the section labeled "Biographical," for example, contains numerous references that are primarily of critical value) or vague ("Discussions of [George Eliot's] Teachings"). Cooke does not annotate, nor does he use a consistent method of notation, at times resulting in lack of sufficient identification of items.

The next list of material on George Eliot was compiled by John P. Anderson and appended to Oscar Browning's *Life of George Eliot* (London, 1890). Although slightly larger than Cooke's, Anderson's list is admittedly based on it and retains many of the same faults. The most extensive list was compiled by Frank Waldo and G. A. Turkington and appended to the 1904 edition of Mathilde Blind's *George*
Eliot. Waldo and Turkington state that the list is a reproduction of Anderson's together with "such additions as we have been able to collect." Although it adds items from the 1890's and corrects some of the flaws of notation present in the other lists, the Waldo and Turkington bibliography uses the same cryptic paragraph organization and is incomplete in many of the same areas as the Cooke and Anderson lists.

The only important addition to these three lists is a supplement published in 1957 by James D. Barry. Barry includes more than fifty nineteenth-century British items missed by the earlier bibliographers, but his emphasis is chiefly critical, and he therefore omits many items of biographical importance.

These sources were principally supplemented by Gordon Haight, ed., The George Eliot Letters, 7 vols. (New Haven, 1954-55); Gordon Haight, George Eliot (Oxford, 1968); Mathilde Parlett, "The Influence of Contemporary Criticism on George Eliot," SP, 30 (January, 1933), 103-132; the English Catalogue; Poole's; Allibone's Critical Dictionary of English Literature; CBEL; and The Wellesley Index. Cumulative indexes of individual periodicals were searched when conspicuous absence of material, especially reviews, warranted, and in some cases well-known periodicals were searched issue by issue.
Exclusions
1. Editions and reprints of George Eliot's work, including prefatory material in such editions.
2. Dramatizations and plot summaries of the novels.
3. Discussions in books and articles that do not devote a separate chapter to George Eliot or are not primarily about her or her work, except in those instances when she is discussed in an article that deals with several authors in turn (cf. Item 55).
4. Most brief items in publishers' lists and trade journals and announcements of publication.
5. Encyclopedia accounts.
6. Allusions and ana.
7. Essays and reviews exclusively on George Eliot's poetry.

Organization
The bibliography is arranged chronologically in the following manner:
1. Books precede articles in a given year and are dated by year only. They are arranged alphabetically by author.
2. Articles are dated as exactly as possible. When only the year of publication is available, articles are listed alphabetically by periodical immediately following the listing of books. In the case of monthly periodicals or items for which only the month is
available, date of publication is assumed to be the first of the month. Items published on the same day are listed alphabetically by periodical.

3. When items are untitled, title may be assumed to be either the title of a work being reviewed or simply "George Eliot."

4. When part-issue publication prompts a series of reviews, as with Middlemarch and Daniel Deronda, each review is annotated and ordered chronologically, although the initial review includes a reference to the subsequent ones.

5. Reprints of books and articles on George Eliot are included in the notation of an item when available, but they are not mentioned again in chronological sequence nor has an attempt been made to provide a complete publishing history of any of the items in the bibliography. Reprints appearing in American periodicals are noted when available. Although infrequent, a few items are reprinted in British periodicals from American sources. Such reprints are included in proper chronological order.

6. The intent of the annotation is identification, not evaluation. Consequently, annotations do not include discussions of particular characters, themes, or organizational patterns of the individual works unless such discussion contributes significantly to the
identification of the general nature of the item itself. Well-known items, such as the Cooke, Blind, Browning, and Cross biographies, are not annotated.

7. Names of periodicals and newspapers are given as they were at the time the item was published in spite of later changes.

Index
An index following the bibliography locates items by author and George Eliot's individual works, and also according to categories of critical and biographical interest.

Symbols
* indicates unexamined item.
[] around an author's name indicates attributed authorship of unsigned article.

Abbreviations (date in parenthesis is publication date)

GE George Eliot
GHL George Henry Lewes
SCL Scenes of Clerical Life (1857 in Blackwood's; 1858 in 2 vols.)
AB Adam Bede (1859)
MF The Mill on the Floss (1860)
SM Silas Marner (1861)
R Romola (1862-1863 serially; in 3 vols.)
FH Felix Holt (1866)
MM Middlemarch (1872, part-issue; 1873 in 4 vols.)
DD Daniel Deronda (1876, part-issue)
TS The Impressions of Theophrastus Such (1879)
ELN Essays and Leaves from a Notebook (1884)
SG The Spanish Gypsy (1868)
A Agatha (1869)
LJ The Legend of Jubal (1870)
AR Armigart (1871)
Lisa How Lisa Loved the King (1869)
LV The Lifted Veil (1859)
BJ Brother Jacob (1864)
BS Brother and Sister (1874)
CBP A College Breakfast Party (1878)
BB The George Eliot Birthday Book (1877)
AW Felix Holt's Address to the Workingmen (1868)
Main Alexander Main, ed., The Wise, Witty and Tender Sayings in Prose and Verse of George Eliot (1872)
Cooke Cooke, G. W. George Eliot (1883)
Blind Blind, Mathilde. George Eliot (1883)
Cross George Eliot's Life as Related in Her letters and Journals. Arranged and Edited by Her Husband J. W. Cross, 3 vols. (1885)
Browning Browning, Oscar. The Life of George Eliot (1890)
BIBLIOGRAPHY

   One of the earliest major reviews of SCL. The reviewer judges "Mr. Gilfil's Love Story" the best of the three in SCL and says the work as a whole is characterized by "a sobriety which is shown to be compatible with strength, clear and simple descriptions, and a combination of humor with pathos in depicting ordinary situations."

2. The Literary Gazette, January 23, 1858, pp. 82-83.
   Review of SCL. Characterizes GE as "being gifted with a certain capacity for quaint humor." Of the three stories, the reviewer finds Amos Barton "too disgusting a character" for that story to succeed completely; pronounces "Mr. Gilfil's Love Story" "excellent"; and notes that "Janet's Repentance" is "more serious and tragic" than the other two stories. The reviewer summarizes his attitude toward SCL by calling its subject matter "an infinite fund of grotesque and diverting scenes," and GE's style as "enhanced by a certain by-play of pathetic interest."

   Review of SCL. GE characterized as "a new novelist,
who to rare culture adds rare faculty, who can paint homely every-day life and ordinary characters with great humour and pathos, and is content to rely on the truth of his pictures for effect." The reviewer criticizes Mr. Tryan's love episode in "Janet's Repentance" for being "hackneyed," and objects to GE's "too constant elaboration," which mars the simplicity of her style.


Review of *AB*. "*AB* is a novel of the highest class. Full of quiet power . . . it produces a deep impression on the reader." The review points to two or three incidents which are "too melodramatic and traditional," such as Donnithorne's reprieve of Hetty, but concludes: "it is very seldom we are called on to deal with a book in which there is so little to qualify our praise."


Review of *AB*. "The mere reader of fashionable novels will not very much like this work . . . but the reader . . . who can appreciate quiet humour, real wit, pregnant wisdom, and natural character, from a pen of no common order, will read this work once through with thorough relish, and again with increased admiration.
and respect for the writer. . . . The novel has not a weak point about it, nor a commonplace character. . . . We think we may predict for this novel a high place in the standard literature of the country.

Review of AB. "[AB] is a book that goes far to redeem its class. It is worth while to be pestered with a great many poor, and weak, and dull novels, if they are the indispensable complement of a novel like AB." The reviewer praises GE's great powers of analysis, but dislikes Hetty's trial scene and too many lengthy descriptive passages. The review concludes, however, that AB is a "very able, and a very uncommon performance."

8. The Saturday Review. 7(February 26, 1859), 250-251.
Review of AB. "AB is a novel we have no remorse in speaking well of . . . the author has got into an original field of observation, and as he has very great powers of observing, and a happy method of making his detached points of observation into a connected whole, he has given us something we have not had before."

Review of AB. "... the author of AB, if he forswears pen and ink forever, has already achieved no
inconsiderable reputation. It is not often that the power of drawing character is combined with a turn for describing natural objects, and that the development of the tale is not sacrificed to the exhibition of the writer's supposed talent in some particular line; but in this book no faculty oversteps its proper limits, and the interest of the story is set off by a style the most nervous, finished, and picturesque which we have come across for many a day." Objects to Donnithorne's reprieve of Hetty as melodramatic and lacking in purpose, and to Dinah's marriage to Adam as detracting from Dinah's dignity, but concludes: "We should advise Mr. Eliot to beware of startling situations, and to cultivate the admirable style of which he is master, and he may become a classic."

10. [Lyuster, I. M.]. The Examiner, 70 (March 5, 1859), 227-228.

Review of AB. "AB is a proper sequel to SCL. There is the same kindly appreciation of all that is good and true in human nature, the same gentle condemnation of evil and folly; but they are expressed with greater power and earnestness." The reviewer, however, disapproves of the depiction of Hetty's sufferings, concluding: "... it is thought that, by exhibiting the fruits of vice, vice will be made hateful. ... But surely this is a mistake, and, in a work like AB, a
serious defect. Morality will not be taught by melodrama."


Review of AB. In contrast to stock novels about the lower classes, AB seems to be "the real article." Although the story is indeed of interest, "the especial merit of AB lies in its admirable pictures of character. . . ." The review concludes that AB is a book "which, for original power and truth, has rarely been equalled."


Review of AB. "This book evinces a deeper and wider genius than any novel we have read for years. With a delicacy of touch in the quiet descriptions that often reminds us of Goethe, and great masculine vigor of imagination, the author combines a range of observation, an insight into character, and a humorous power, which render his production a really lasting work of art."


Review of AB. Genius can see realities where the rest of us see only appearances; GE has this power
of sight: "His work reads like an authentic history: the actors impress us as real men and women." **AB** has no contrivance of plot: "The persons grow and the events happen, the function of the author being that of a faithful and wise historian who records simply what he has seen or learnt." Review concludes: "We have seldom read a book in which we could find so few faults as are detectable in **AB**."

15. [Dallas, Eneas Sweetland]. *The Times*, April 12, 1859, p. 5.

Review of **AB**. **AB** is a "first rate novel, and its author takes rank at once among the masters of the art . . . very seldom are so much freshness of style and warmth of emotion seen combined with so much solid sense and ripened observations."


Letter from H. Anders, Rector of Kirkby, identifying the author of **SCL** and **AB** as one Joseph Liggins, of Nuneaton. Says his assertion is easily verifiable by asking anyone around Nuneaton, to whom the characters in **SCL** are clearly familiar. [Cf. GE's letter of reply, *The Times*, April 16, 1859, p. 7.]


Note on Anders' claim that Liggins wrote **AB**. Questions GE's "right" to anonymity (which she implied in a
letter to the *Times*). Anonymous authorship is opposed to the letter of the law and "the moral good of society" (with the understandable exception of journalistic anonymity). The note concludes: "... we cannot see the ground for that courtesy to which Mr. Eliot lays claim."


A note on the *AB* authorship controversy, mentioning Anders' claim for Liggins and GE's reply in *The Times*. *The Leader* denies GE's claim to the "right" of anonymity, which it calls a "species of literary fraud." If Liggins did not write *AB*, the note concludes, let the real GE identify himself and silence Anders for good.


Review of *AB*, consisting mostly of summary and excerpts. *AB* gives GE a "higher place" in literature than *SCL* gave her, chiefly because of superior characterization. The reviewer does, however, criticize the portrayal of Hetty; her sin is given "too prominent a place in the tale."


Letter to the editor about the identity of GE, signed "S. G. O." (Sidney Godolphin Osborne). Says
the authorship controversy should be cleared up. The author of AB has been identified as "A Mr. Joseph Leggins, of Attleborough," but Mr. Blackwood denies it. Now is the time for those who claim "Leggins" is the author to show proof.


"Messrs. W. Blackwood and Sons write to a contemporary to state that SCL and AB are not written by Mr. Leggins, or any one with a name like Liggins; and if any person is receiving charitable contributions on the ground of being the author of the said works he is doing so under false pretences."


A note on the AB authorship controversy, called "... the mysterious literary question of the past few weeks." Writer recounts a story from a friend about a barmaid in Aylesbury who recognized characters in SCL as the product of "an old gentleman who had seen better days." The man turned out to be Liggins. Gazette, however, asserts Liggins not the author of AB: If he "had seen better days," he would welcome the publicity attached to the authorship of such a fine novel. Note concludes that Liggins could clear up the matter with a sample of his writing.

Note on the AB authorship controversy. Quotes part of a letter from E. Nicholas, "Student in medicine and undergraduate of the University of London," who says he is Liggins' only male relative in England. The letter attacks "S. G. O." who wrote a letter to The Times doubting Liggins' authorship of AB. Liggins is an honest and honorable man, Nicholas asserts, and above injury by such "scribblers" as S. G. O. The Gazette says Nicholas exhibits little courtesy in labeling "S. G. O." a "scribbler," and adds that Liggins should himself be responsible for any further information on the subject.


AB characterized as "a story which we believe has found its way into hands indifferent to all previous fiction, to readers who welcome it as the voice of their own experience in a sense no other book has ever been." GE, the review states, "is no young genius writing from a teeming imagination full of airy shapes, but one who has learnt from experience . . . there is no guess work here, but hard-won knowledge."

Review of SCL, AB. The merit of reality is conspicuous in AB: "There is not a single character in the book that does not stand out distinct in its own consistent individuality... the story is nothing in comparison." GE's passages of wit and humor in AB resemble those of Hawthorne. SCL also like Hawthorne in its "certain minute, yet not tedious, habit of description." The review concludes: "... we, as readers, have every reason to be grateful to the writer for giving us such a book [as AB]."


A note on the AB authorship controversy. Says the author of AB is no "great unknown" because AB "has no great quality of any kind." Suggests that Liggins is a "mystification, got up by GE" to promote sales of AB. Little can be gained by such a ruse, and besides, the article concludes, the whole controversy has become boring: "the world is fogged with the drone of this private comedy of Much Ado About Nothing."

27. Dublin Review, 47(September, 1859), 33-42.

Review of AB. SCL gave little promise of the great talent to be afterward displayed in AB. AB characterized as "a remarkable book; its depth of
pathos, its piquancy of wit, its minuteness, its lifelike description, will seldom, if ever, be equalled." Hetty's condition in the novel leads the reviewer into a discussion of the conditions in Foundling Hospitals in England and France, concluding with the hope that AB might "impress on the minds of Englishmen the stern necessity of doing something to avert the progress of that frightful crime of infanticide which is spreading . . . over our land."

"Adam Bede.--We are requested to state that the 'Sequel to Adam Bede,' which is now advertised, is not by the author of AB. This unauthorised use of a popular author's title for purely commercial purposes is scarcely fair dealing towards the public."

Praises AB as "a first class novel, and an ornament to English Literature." Attacks Newby as a publisher of cheap literature who is attempting to profit from the success of AB. "Mr. Punch" says Newby does not claim AB, Jr. is by the author of AB, but he expects people to think it is. Mr. Punch does not believe the author of AB has ever seen AB, Jr., and expresses disgust with Newby's tactics.

Letter to the editor from Thomas Newby defending himself against GE's accusation (in a letter to The Times printed November 30, 1859) that he was pirating her name and reputation with his publication of Adam Bede, Jun., A Sequel. Newby says his announcement of the book contains no suggestion that it was written by GE.

31. The Athenaeum, April 7, 1860, pp. 467-468.
Review of MF. "The authoress has not given herself fair play [in MF]. There is the old freedom of hand, but the workmanship is neither so delicate nor so elaborate as in the 'Clerical Scenes' and 'AB'; neither is the story, as a story, at all comparable to AB for interest, or for artistic treatment."

32. The Spectator, 33(April 7, 1860), 330-331.
Review of MF. Praises GE's characterization: "Few persons in the novel-dramas which make so much of our literature now-a-days are so distinctly embodied and vividly coloured as the Maggie Tulliver who has just been introduced as a new guest in so many thousand English homes." The "novelty and interest" in MF lies in its psychological depth: "in very few works of fiction has the interior of the mind been so keenly analyzed." The review concludes: "Inferior to AB in the varied interest of three or four good
characters, it is superior as a work of art; with a higher aim and that aim more artistically worked out."


Review of MF. "... the chief peculiarity of [MF] is the deep knowledge of human nature every where perceptible, and the keen insight into the motives from which the most trivial actions take root and spring." The review complains that GE's psychological characterization, her desire "to trace, with minute exactness, the source, progress, and development, of each distinctive phase of human character," causes a "slight tediousness" and delay of plot progression in MF. The review dismisses this feature of MF, however, as a "little tendency to circumlocution," and praises GE's insight and command of language, which give to MF a "wonderful intensity and accuracy."

34. The Saturday Review, 9 (April 14, 1860), 470-471.

Review of MF. MF may not be as popular as AB, but it "shows no falling off nor any exhaustion of powers." GE has opened up a new field for the novel because "she has, for the first time in fiction, invented or disclosed the family life of the English farmer." "There is nothing in which GE succeeds more conspicuously than in this very nice art of
making her characters like real people. . . . " Reviewer objects to handling of "difficult moral problems" in MF; Maggie Tulliver is "real," but it does not follow that "spiritual doubts and conflicts are a proper subject for a novelist." Summarizes with "as it seems to us, the defect of MF is that there is too much that is painful in it."

35. The Sun [London], April 23, 1860, p. 2.
Review of MF. "It is especially delightful to find that the successor to so wonderful a book as AB is in every way worthy of it. Indeed, in some respects, MF may be considered superior. There is more feeling in it, more softness and sympathy, and thus it possesses more power over the reader. All that seemed harsh in AB appears to have vanished. . . . With all the wealth of fiction that surrounds us, we can and must prize a work that makes us think, and more than that, makes us feel that the author has thought." MF is destined to gain a high rank among "standard fictions."

Review of MF. The reader's impression of MF will probably vary with the progress of his reading. "At first, the feeling will possibly be one of disappointment . . . the doubt whether all this was
worth the painting. . . . But as the chapters go on, we begin to see that there is something more in view than a mere introduction to . . . domestic life. . . . With whatever reserves we may have to make . . . our impulse at the concluding stage of MF is to say that it is one of the grandest and most subduing, as it is one of the boldest pictures ever attempted, of the way in which the soul makes trials for itself, and of the unexplored depths of weakness and of strength, which temptation, as it becomes more intense and decisive, brings to light."

37. Blackwood's Magazine, 87(May, 1860), 611-623. Review of MF. MF is "incontestably superior to AB "in point of dramatic interest." In AB, the story was subordinate to other attractions; in MF, it is one of the greatest charms. "It may possibly disgust some critics to find that, in spite of our rapid progress toward the intellectual, the most striking novel of the day is but 'the old, old story.' Love is still the life of fiction."

38. [Dallas, Eneas Sweetland]. The Times, May 19, 1860, pp. 10-11. Review of MF. "GE is as great as ever. She has produced a second novel, equal to her first in power, although not in interest." "[In MF] GE has invited our attention to the hard realities of a
life in which none but a true genius could find the elements of a successful novel."

39. [Ware, L. G.]. The Examiner, 69 (June, 16, 1860), 145-146.

Review of MF. "It is worth while to inquire why one of the cleverest books of the day should be nearly the most tedious. . . . The great fault of the book and the great source of its tediousness is, that whatever may have been the intention of the writer, it represents life as a maze without a clue." The reviewer praises GE's "shrewd feminine humour and . . . quick perception" and states that only Miss Bronte and Mrs. Gaskell are more widely recognized. The review concludes: "We shall be as quick to praise her next work as we have been slow to censure this, if she do not again weary us by presenting to the world artificial men and women as disjointed pieces of a puzzle to be wrongly put together, and then swept off in despair."


Review of SCL, AB, MF. GE has the "flowing ease of manner, clearness of drawing, delicacy of finish, and absence of excitement which characterize the modern satirical school of novelists." But she differs from that school by showing "less of play.
in the surface-painting, -- more depth in the deeper characters imagined . . . and more of the bare naturalism of human life." There is, however, a kind of "looseness" of narrative texture that causes GE to create characters that stand somewhat outside the thread of the story. AB is GE's greatest work; beside it, MF is a "masterly fragment of fictitious biography in two volumes, followed by a second-rate one volume novel, -- the three connected into a single whole by very inadequate links."

41. The Westminster Review, 18 N.S. (July, 1860), 24-33. Review of MF. "We do not think that MF will increase the author's popularity, but it fully sustains her reputation." The review contains general praise for GE and MF, but also voices negative criticisms: "GE has sacrificed too much to her beloved realism. That realism . . . seems [in MF] inadequate: we revolt at Maggie's weakness, and take up arms against the author in spite of a truth we cannot controvert." "[In MF GE] relinquishes the lofty calm of critical insight for a region of questions to which no complete answer can be given."

42. The Eclectic Review, 112(August, 1860), 222-224. Review of MF. MF characterized as "a very clever and very interesting book. The style is forcible,
yet graceful . . . the characters are true to life.

. . . " In MF there is an absence of "pure and submissive Christianity" that was present in AB; GE's idea that we are "creatures of circumstance" is not acceptable. The review objects to the representation of Maggie's prayers as "powerless" to influence her conduct, and concludes that if GE's future works are free from this "dangerous tendency," the Eclectic Review will endorse them with enthusiasm.


A general discussion of fiction and a review of AB. The reviewer claims present writers lack the "genial humour" of bygone days; the "graceful, playful fun" of the mode of Austen, Ferrier, and Hook has almost disappeared. AB, however, has power, thought, and pathos, relieved by "the most genuine and unmistakable humour." "The close fidelity to natural expression is one great cause of the popularity of AB . . . [it] is an 'old tale and often told,' but never before with such minute knowledge of the modes of thought and language of the actors in the drama."


A discussion of AB and MF, and a comparison of the styles of GE and Hawthorne. Imagination works
differently in different men: "The more powerful intellects keep it in subjection, but it takes the feeble captive. In the one case it vitalizes and exalts; in the other, it discolors and exaggerates. The author of AB represents the first class; Nathaniel Hawthorne, the second." MF, the review asserts, is "directed by a finer and more consistent purpose [than AB]." GE's humor in MF has become "elevated and sustained."


Unfavorable review of SCL, AB, MF. Reviewer notes "uniformly melancholy" endings of all three works and says the tone is an "exaggerated representation of the proportion which sorrow bears to happiness in human life . . . [it] gives a very uncomfortable idea of the tone of our present literature." Accuses GE of delighting in "unpleasant subjects—in the representation of things which are repulsive, coarse, and degrading." Says GE is too "bold": she "knowingly forces disagreeable people on us, and insists that we shall be interested in their story by the skill with which it is told."

46. "Recent Popular Novels." The Dublin University Magazine, 57(February, 1861), 192-200.

Review of MF. MF somewhat more "artistic" than AB,
but it suffers from the same faults: "photographic pettiness . . . sententious satire . . . picturesque animalism . . . unpleasant characters . . . superfluous scenes." GE's "photographic realism" is especially tedious and boring: "instead of a well-drawn harmonious picture, we get a series of photographic studies . . . provocingly commonplace . . . tiresomely repellant. . . . To give half views of life is be besetting sin of our modern realists, but [in MF] the worst side is kept turned to us of set purpose, without any of the saving pretences elsewhere offered."


A general discussion of the modern novel and a review of MF. "Of MF . . . there can be but one opinion—that, as a work of art, it is as perfect as the novel can well be made; superior even to AB." The reviewer, however, criticizes GE's "doctrine of overpowering circumstances" in MF as "perilous": "Will [Maggie's story] influence for good any other real lives [or is] death welcomed as the solution of all difficulties, the escape from all pain?" The reviewer concludes that although MF is an artistically fine novel, it is not right for a novelist to breed "uncertainty."

Review of SM. SM "not unworthy" of the talents of GE: "It has no scenes of exciting or painful interest, but the characters are all well and firmly drawn, worked up from within, instead of the mere outward semblance being given." The review concludes: "Readers who desire only to meet with high society and good company in their novels . . . may leave SM alone . . . those who can feel sympathy with human nature, however humbly embodied it may be, will find SM comfortable reading."

49. The Examiner, April 6, 1861, pp. 213-214.

Review of SM. "In SM we have the same view of life that was presented to us in the MF, with a difference of light. What was there shown in gloom is now lighted with sunshine, and we are the better pleased . . . still [GE] presents the life of man as an insoluble riddle, but now it is with a distinct pointing to the love of man and faith in the Divine goodness for the silencing of all our doubts. . . . In that spirit of trust toward God and good-will towards man the book is written, and it is in the main not only a very clever, but a very wholesome book."


Review of SM. Places SM "very far below" AB and MF.
"In seeking to mellow the tendency to melodramatic exaggeration, visible in both AB and MF, and hurtful to the best interests of both, 'GE' has now run into the opposite extreme. . . . It is not the highest kind of art simply to tell the reader that such and such a man is a villain, then make him do a villainous action suddenly, and without any gradual preparation by events or psychological explanation." The review is nevertheless insistent on the greatness of GE's talent, and concludes: "Still, [SM] has marks of the power and genius of the author, and if not equal to 'GE's' reputation, overtops the fame of half the novelists standing on the stages below."


Review of SM. SM "as good as AB, except that it is shorter," GE's "gift" is so special that her works come to us as a "new revelation of what society in quiet English parishes really is and has been."

GE goes beyond either Lytton or Dickens; her poor each has a "distinct and probable character"—and each sustains it. The errors that marred MF have been eliminated; there is nothing in SM like Maggie's "spiritual conflicts." SM is a success because GE avoids writing about things she does not know.

52. The Guardian, April 24, 1861, pp. 401-402.
Review of SM. "SM is like a bit of work produced for the sake of keeping the hand in, during a period of general rest. It does not aim at much, and there has been no great effort put forth in writing it. . . . The bold moral combinations, the adventurous experiments on our sympathy, which were hazarded in former works, are absent here. . . . It is not the main thread of the story which is its best part. It is the humour, and the vigorous comments on life and its ways. . . . It is the photographic pictures of groups and characters, which we have seen and passed by hundreds of times, without seeing how much there was in them worth observing."


Review of SM. "SM is, like the rest of [GE's] fictions, full of matter and delightful in manner." In SM, GE's moral purpose is an unconscious one -- and it is this sort of moral meaning which belongs to every great work of art. "[GE] tells a simple story without the least idea of inculcating any copy-book lesson, but by merely elevating the reader to her mount of observation she cannot fail to suggest to the mind some profound reflections."

54. The Eclectic Review, 113(May, 1861), 554-556.

Review of SM. SM a "charming story" containing
none of the "moral doubts" of AB. The review concludes: "There is in this volume the matter of many sermons, and its very substance is that which, if sermons want, they lack all for which they are supposed to be delivered—the attempt, at any rate, to answer the dark questions of dark hearts, and to make, in the affairs of life, 'the crooked places straight and the rough places plain.'"


Review of AB and MF. AB is a favorite among "thoughtful and religious people" because of its "exceeding literary merit . . . and the artistic skill which hides its evil beneath its good. . . . Also there is great merit in the charm and ease of the dialogue, in the spirit and correctness with which most of the characters are sketched, and in the real wit and wisdom embodied in Mrs. Poyser and Adam Bede himself." On MF: "The literary merit of MF is very inferior to that of AB. Much of the wisdom, and almost all the wit, has vanished, and the dialogue is tiresome in the extreme; nor is there a character in the book on which the mind rests with pleasure."

Review of *SM*. *SM* is undoubtedly GE's finest work; the thought runs clearer, the structure is more compact, the philosophical insights are deeper than in her other works. Other novelists rely on a well-constructed tale or plot, and, as a result, characterize weakly. In *SM*, GE shows complete correlation of characters and their circumstances.


Compared GE and Oliver Wendell Holmes as novelists; finds them equally talented. GE, however, more immediately and thoroughly "grasps out sympathy" than does Holmes. *SM* "essentially a page of life, so complete and satisfying that we no not care to see the overleaf." Review concludes that GE has reached "the very acme of artistic power among contemporary English novelists, raising herself to a height which places her, within the sphere of art, not far from that queen of fiction, George Sand herself."

58. "A Batch of Last Year's Novels." *The Dublin University Magazine*, 59 (April, 1862), 396-409.

Review of *SM*. *AB*, *MF* gave hope for better things from GE, but *SM* does not fullfil it: "A duller book it has seldom been our lot to read through." A novelist's primary duty is to entertain, but GE does not; she bores us with mundane characters and
low-life gossip. "... A truthful picture of the masses should embrace other samples than the worst; and a truthful picture this of GE's certainly is not."

59. The Englishwoman's Journal, 9(June, 1862), 288.
"Some time ago we mentioned that the author of AB had completed another novel, which we hoped might be published in the course of the spring. It was, however, decided that it should first appear in the pages of Blackwood's Magazine, where it may now be read in monthly sections, under the title of 'The Chronicles of Carlingford.'" [Note: the writer has apparently confused George Eliot with another woman writer, Mrs. Oliphant.]

60. The Publishers' Circular, June 16, 1862, p. 269.
"It is rumoured that the new story by the author of AB, announced to appear in the Cornhill Magazine, will constitute an attempt by the authoress in a new field, and will deal neither with Methodism or the troubles of curates, nor indeed with any other phases of English life. Its title is not yet announced, but the scene will, we believe, be laid in Italy."

A general essay on the contemporary popularity of the novel, calling it the current "favourite vehicle of English genius." The writer acknowledges that
Dickens and Thackeray are "at present the lords of the novel," but notes that GE "has achieved the greatest literary success of recent years... now she stands in the first rank of living novelists."

GE is favorably compared to Jane Austen, and the discussion of her work concludes: "The most striking characteristic of GE as an artist is moderation, and the apparent ease with which results are accomplished."


The review praises GE's research, but says R is somehow dead, petrified; the Renaissance does not come alive. As a whole, however, R does contain "noble things... which will make the reader's heart burn within him." R is not an entertaining novel, not "light reading," but those who do not seek "the mere amusement of an exciting story will find noble things in R." The review concludes: "[R] has not the powerful interest that is to be found in the author's former novels; but there are indications of much higher powers of mind."

63. The Reader, 2(July 11, 1863), 28-29.

Review of R. It has often been observed that English novelists are never thoroughly at home on foreign soil, and this observation is especially true of GE: "What a pity this strong English genius
should go away to Italy in search of a theme. . .  

The review notes that there are general classes of exceptions to this "rule," and $R$ falls into several of them. The review concludes: "... we must pronounce $R$ to be a performance of which no other woman of genius among us would have been capable than precisely GE."


Review of $R$. Although regretting that $R$ had been published "in fragments," the review praises it as GE's greatest work and "one of the greatest of modern fiction." $R$ is a novel that is likely to be permanently identified with English literature, and is one in which both Italy and England may feel a common pride.


Review of $R$. "No reader of $R$ will lay it down without admiration, and few without regret. Great as is the power displayed in it, and varied as is the interest awakened in it, there is still the general impression produced by it that the authoress has been tempted into a field where, indeed, she is not less than she has been, but where her merits are obscured,
and their effect impaired." The review concludes that some authors work better within their own experiences, and GE seems to be one of these.

Review of R. GE has already proved her "great knowledge of the human heart," and in R she shows she is also a historian. "We question whether there is any English book which brings us so close to the Florence of the end of the fifteenth-century, and not only lets us see; but makes us feel what the life of its citizens was like. . . . There is a tragic grandeur and awfulness in [R], and a profound spiritual truth which can only escape the most careless and frivolous reader."

Review of R. "It is to [GE's] powerful conception and vivid delineation of marked but not unusual character that she owes her fame: and it is the same thing which gives vigour and interest to her present tale. . . . If we do not find all that we desire in her story, we find a great deal to rouse and elevate. . . . To those who take it up for mere amusement, it may perhaps be disappointing. . . . but to all who are content to think as well as read . . . R will be a book to be read and kept and cherished."
68. **British Quarterly Review**, 38(October, 1863), 448-465. 
Review of R. "While heartily expressing our admiration of many portions of this fine work, as well as at the skill and beauty with which the character of Romola is brought out, we cannot but feel that as a whole it is very unsatisfactory. . . . Most of the faults, we think, may be traced to GE's unfortunate choice of a foreign locality for her story; unfortunate because wherever she has aimed to make them true to Italian national characteristics, she has removed them wholly from the sympathies of Englishmen. . . . Let us trust that in her next novel GE will place her scene upon English ground."

A general criticism of GE as a novelist, including a brief sketch of phases of her life and publishing career. GE characterized as a "searching but indulgent moralist. She admits neither saints nor devils, but mixes natures. . . ." Although he finds GE's religious views disturbing, the writer concludes: "The positive good of her sensible ethics outweighs the negative evil of her atheistic theology; and her books may be read not only with pleasure and profit, but . . . without a conception of the hidden meaning which lies under their plot, their dialogue, and
their character."

70. The Westminster Review, 80(October, 1863), 344-352.

Review of R. R is less popular than GE's other works, but it is her greatest. The review, however, objects to R's English "coloring," concluding: "We cannot escape from the feeling that the chief interest of R reposes an ideas of moral duty and of right which are of very modern growth, and that they would have been more appropriately displayed on a modern stage."


An essay of general criticism of Thackeray containing a comparison of how Thackeray treated Waterloo in Vanity Fair and how GE would have treated it: "Where GE would have given us the movements of the Brussels mob and of the native society, Thackeray only gives us the pulsations of the hearts of the officer's wives and servants. . . ."


An essay on the proper function of the novel and some of the more prominent English novelists. A comparative discussion of GE and Jane Austen calls them the most successful "realists" in literature and their novels among the most "invulnerable in the language." GE and Jane Austen differ, however: "Jane Austen is
pre-eminently the novelist who attains by observation; GE pre-eminently the novelist who attains by meditation." Although neither is shallow, GE is the most penetrating: "She is an observer of wide range and exquisite delicacy, with an eye for some things Jane Austen never saw, or saw but dimly. . . ."

73. The Christian Remembrancer, 52 N.S. (1866), 445-479.
A combined review of FH and R. "FH belongs to the period of memory and experience. . . . In opposition to this, R is signally an intellectual effort. . . . [R] will never be popular like AB, for it does not come of the first cream and efflorescence of the author's genius, and probably FH will have more readers in spite of the tendency we find there to disquisition and digression, for it does not tally so easily with the universal experience; but R adds largely to our sense of the author's powers, and gives weight to her other works."

74. "Recent Novels: Their Moral and Religious Teaching." The London Quarterly, 27(1866), 100-124.
Review of FH incorporated in reviews of five other novels. The article attacks sensationalism in current fiction, and asserts that even GE, although not as "infected" with this tendency as most others, does not avoid it completely. "FH, one of the greatest and most remarkable books of the day, if
not fatally blemished, is certainly robbed of a great deal of its excellence by her inability to resist the temptation of interweaving a mystery into a tale that, so far from needing such meretricious attraction, is unquestionably degraded by its presence." Later, the article does commend GE's fairness and accuracy in dealing with religious differences in FH and the excellence of her characterizations. Concludes: "As a picture of the times immediately succeeding the Reform Bill [FH] is remarkably faithful and instructive. Its greatest blot is the introduction of Mr. Transome's strange, repulsive, and, in our judgement, most improbable story."

75. [Lancaster, H. H.]. "George Eliot's Novels." The North British Review, 45(1866), 197-228; Rptd. Essays and Reviews, 1876.

GE has been acclaimed a "teacher of morality" far beyond other novelists. NBR proposes to re-examine her fiction to validate the claim. After an extended discussion of GE's style, the writer concludes: "She has it easily within her reach to win no passing reputation . . . she owes it to her rare genius to consider well, whether some sobriety in incident, a closer truth to nature, a greater respect for ordinary morality, would not aid her in the achievement of
this great ambition."

76. [Morley, John]. The Saturday Review, 21(June 16, 1866), 722-724.

Review of FH. "[GE] looks out upon the world with the most entire enjoyment of all the good that there is in it to enjoy, and with an enlarged compassion for all the ill that there is in it to pity. . . . [In FH] the authoress's creative energy has never, we think, been so exuberently exercised before."

77. The Athenaeum, June 23, 1866, p. 828.

Review of FH. "The workmanship of the tale is good, every incident is fitted together in its due proportion, and finished as carefully as though it were a polished corner-stone. The statement of the law matters, on which the title to the estate depends, is a miracle of lucid compression. Interesting as the story is, the wise and noble thoughts make the beauty and the worth of 'FH!'"


Review of FH. "[FH] is the brightest, the least penetrated with inner melancholy, of all GE's stories, and there are wanting in it, perhaps as a consequence, some degrees of that deep-cut purpose graven by a brooding imagination, which gave the
former tales so much grandeur of outline. . . .
[There is] no group in it which towers above the
general personnel of the story, and lays hold of
the imagination with an attraction blended of
force and simplicity. . . ."

79. *The Morning Post* [London], June 26, 1866, p. 3.
Review of FH.

80. [Dallas, Eneas Sweetland]. *The Times*, June 26, 1866,
p. 6.
Review of FH. GE is "a lady who in grasp of thought,
in loftiness of feeling, in subtlety of expression,
and in all those sympathies which go to form the
true artist has never been excelled. . . . We do not
know any Englishwoman who can be placed near her as
a writer of prose." Although style is important,
great style is not GE's best quality: "the secret
of her power is to be found in the depth and range of
her sympathies. She gets to the heart of her
characters, and makes us feel with them, care for
them, like to know about them." The review concludes
that FH is "a work of rare genius."

Review of FH. "In many respects FH is well worthy
of its predecessors. . . . But we doubt whether the
story will be as popular as that of AB or of MF.
Its incidents, though admirably described, are in
themselves somewhat wanting in interest, and the personages with whom it deals do not appeal very strongly to our sympathies."

82. [Collins, W. L.]. *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*, 100 (July, 1866), 94-109.

Review of FH. GE is a "new interpreter of ... common life." R is something of a failure because it does not speak to Englishmen about English life; FH, however, is nicely contemporary and English. The review praises GE's keen observation, quiet humor, and diction, which it terms, "exquisite--a perfection of pure English style to be found in no other writer of fiction."


Review of FH. FH is "the production of a master." The story is subservient to the more "artistic studies" of English life and social manners. "FH has qualities of the noblest poem."


Review of FH. Although remarking on GE's weak plotting and the clumsiness of the lawsuit machinery in FH, the review concludes: "[FH] is decidedly inferior to R, but then R shows the highest tide-mark any novelist, in our generation at least, has reached; FH, however, stands long before all other novels by contemporary writers. It is marked by
such poetry, such humour, such character-painting as no one else but GE can write."


Review of FH. "[FH], like R and its predecessors from the same hand, belongs to the enduring literature of our country, durable not for the fashionableness of its pattern, but for the texture of its stuff. . . . In FH, as in other works of GE, there is not one page that has not stamped upon it the hallmark of true genius in some turn of thought worth fastening upon as in itself subtle and perfect in the wording."


"GE is one of the few thinkers who can see the weakness of humanity, and the comparatively disappointing and mean nature of most objects of pursuit, without being driven by the violence of a common reaction into transcendental artifices. . . . With fine artistic moderation . . . she steers clear of . . . depraved realism without falling into . . . sentimentalism. . . . There cannot be much higher praise for a book than that it tends to bring men nearer to one another . . . there is scarcely another living writer whose influence,
though working eith so little parade of its ultimate significance, is likely to be so effective as GE's in this direction."

87. Chambers's Journal, 43(August 11, 1866), 508-512.
Review of FH. "For knowledge of human nature, combined with philosophic humour, the first volume of this novel is not only superior . . . both to Thackeray and Fielding, but scarcely inferior to Shakespeare himself. . . . [FH] has a rich though slender vein of poetry, and a powerful poetic description to which no English prose-writer has yet attained." The review does, however, criticize GE's philosophy as "not flattering to human nature. . . . He [sic] seems to take a cynical delight in holding the too faithful mirror close to our faces. He [sic] has not a particle of sentiment."

Review of FH. "It would be hard to imagine a success without great faults; but great faults are different from a failure, and FH, with all that it bears with it of the writer's affluence of thought and perfection of skill, appears to us not merely a faulty work, but a failure. She has tried to express and body forth a hero of a definite and peculiar stamp. And when you try to draw a hero and
excite interest in him, and do not succeed, no accompanying excellences of workmanship or ornament can make up for having missed your aim.

Next to the faulty characterization of the hero, the main flaw of FH is "faulty construction and conduct of the story, and clumsy and improbable management of a number of the links in it."

89. The Contemporary Review, 3 (September, 1866), 51-70.
Review of FH. FH gives evidence of "vitality, but not of advance. . . . The fresh vigour of spontaneous action has, we fear, passed away, before an artist condescends to betray so much of painful and importunate toil. A new vein may be hit upon; but where? English life must ever be the working-field of an English writer: but what department of it is there within the grasp of GE on which her power has not been tried to the utmost?"

90. [Venables, George]. The Edinburgh Review, 124 (October, 1866), 435-449; Rptd. Living Age, 91 (1866), 432-443.
Review of FH. "[GE] . . . has, after an excursion into a foreign country and a distant age, happily returned to her own region of provincial English life, in full possession of her former vigour, of her dramatic fidelity to nature, and her unrivalled humour. . . . If FH has none of the tragic depth
of R, it is a truer picture of life, and the changes which have occurred since the date of the story almost give the book a historical value."

Examines the poetic qualities of GE's fiction in order to determine whether or not she might eventually make a significant contribution to English poetry. Finds a strong lyrical "freedom" in SCL, AB, MF and analyzes other poetic traits in GE using passages from AB and the blank verse that heads some of the chapters of FH. Concludes: "... the writer who produces the beautiful episode of Annette, which is embedded in FH, can conceive a story which has in it the concentrated essence of one of the two kinds in which poetry is conceived, and ... a mind which has already shown itself so susceptible to re-impregnation of the most unexpected kind--which has self-consciousness so complete, and a power of self-discipline so peculiar, may have surprises in store for many of us."

92. The British Quarterly Review, 45 (1867), 141-178.
Discussion of GE's novels through FH. Does not discuss SM because such discussion would only repeat the praise of earlier works, and does not
discuss FH extensively because it is a bad job. R is dismissed as a good job with an inferior genre (historical romance). Discussion concentrates on SCL, AB, MF. Concludes: "GE . . . has exhibited in her novels a consciousness and elevation of purpose at least equal to those of Goethe, and, where she is really at home, that is to say, in the delineation of scenes of quiet English life, a sympathy almost as warm, a knowledge almost as accurate, as those evinced in the portraiture of Oldbuck and Dandy Dinmont. . . . In the substance and detail of her works there is abounding evidence of rare intelligence and of singular and exquisite accomplishment."


A letter to The Gazette, signed "a Mouldy Conveyancer," taking exception to The Edinburgh Review's criticism of GE's handling of the law in FH. The writer, himself a lawyer, says GE has accurately represented the nature of estates law at the time of FH, and it is The Edinburgh Review reviewer that is wrong in his conception of it.


A general article on GE as a novelist and poet.
Examines the poetry that heads various chapters of *FH* to determine its poetic worth. Considers GE as a potential poet and dramatist, concluding: "GE is a profound and minute analyst of human nature, with an immense objective perception of externals of scene and action [and] a large faculty for philosophizing; and to bring these various qualities into harmonious action, there is no more excellent vehicle than the contemporary novel in its highest perfection of structure and style."


A critical study of major schools of Victorian poets. Forman includes GE to raise the question of how far the novelist can be regarded as a poet. Although he discusses SG, A, and LJ, Forman is most interested in the poetic nature of GE's prose, which he says is the closest to poetry of any nineteenth-century prose. He sees a progressive poetic tendency in GE's novels:

- **SCL:** Elegant, superior language.
- **AB:** Increase of vigour.
- **MF:** Here is first found the perfect ease, grace, vigour, and propriety of ornament which characterize GE's fully developed power.
- **SM:** Characterized by a "certain large repose" attributed to the subject matter.
- **R:** Same great powers turned to another use. No radical change in style.
- **FH:** Same as R, only GE returns to familiar soil.
Forman concludes, in part: "GE has a special and decided faculty for the prose method of expression: this faculty detracts no jot from the poetry of her novels, but with years of nobly honest art-labour, has been developed into a perfection of utterance impossible to improve on."


Review of Part I of MM. Although it is scanty in dramatic action, GE's new novel exhibits her characteristic "careful and masterly studies of human character." The novel exhibits a richness of character delineation and "the same strange mental conflict which has been visible in other writings of the same author, the strife of a mind essentially analytic, with a purpose distinctly sympathetic and constructive."


"The best and truest estimate of MM is to find that we test it not by the works of other hands, but by other works from the same hand." The review concludes that MM is most like MF, and GE's admirers who liked MF will not be disappointed with MM.

"Every one who reads this first volume of [GE's] new book will close it with something like a feeling of irritation that he must wait two months for the next instalment; but he will gain by the delay if it causes him to look more carefully into the chapters he has at hand, and to get out of them all the meaning he can. The volume ends abruptly... and this arrangement is, perhaps, somewhat inartistic. Yet it does not lessen the value of the book."

99. [Hutton, Richard Holt]. "The Idealism of George Eliot and Mr. Tennyson." The Spectator, 44(December 2, 1871) 1458-1460.

"... the essential contrast between the great poet and the great novelist of our day as artists consists in this, that while both connect together their works with a pure ideal thread on which they string their great pictures, while both see clearly that the ideal thread is not, and never can be, a thread of even predominant joy, while both discern and delineate the power of this high ideal temperament to blind the eyes of those who possess it to the dull
material realities of life, Mr. Tennyson, nevertheless, uniformly gives it a victorious and triumphant euthanasia in spite of all seeming failure, while GE almost as uniformly quenches her ideal light in gloom."

100. Creed, A. "George Eliot's Idealism." The Spectator, 44 (December 9, 1871), 1494-1495.

Letter to the Editor protesting view of GE's "ideal impulse" ending always in sadness and "partial or total quenching." The letter argues that the contrary is true, and draws illustrations from AB (Dinah), R, and SG to make the point. The Editor replies that it is true GE's moral idealism never fails, but it is also true (and The Spectator's intended point) that GE's poems and stories have a melancholy spiritual effect, meant to suggest that "there is no higher providence for noble deeds than the doers of them, and often no results beyond those deeds themselves."

101. "Books to Read and Others." Vanity Fair, December 9, 1871, p. 184. [The first of five Vanity Fair reviews of MM. The others are: April 13, 1872, p. 115; June 15, 1872, p. 188; August 10, 1872, p. 43; January 4, 1873, p. 4.]

Characterizes GE as "one of the first writers of the age" because of her "thoughtful, earnest observation, quaint, quiet humour, subtle analysis of characters, and pure English." After a brief discussion of the
characters, the review concludes that *MM* promises to be a "life-like and most interesting sketch of provincial life."

102. "George Eliot's 'Middlemarch.'" The Spectator, 44 (December 16, 1871), pp. 1528-1529. [The first of five Spectator reviews of *MM*. The others are: February 3, 1872, pp. 147-148; March 30, 1872, pp. 404-406; October 5, 1872, pp. 1262-1264; December 7, 1872, pp. 1554-1556.]

Review of Part I of *MM*. Although favorably impressed with GE's early characterization in the novel, the review criticizes her tendency to inject "rather acrid... disagreeable and not unfrequently heavy sarcasms," in the manner of Thackeray. Thackeray was a satirist, and such sarcasm is quite a part of his whole style, but GE's style is more sympathetic, and it suits that style far better to let human feelings and weaknesses speak for themselves, without "a constant run of jarring little laughs at them."


Review of Part I of *MM*. GE's style is not suited to the serial form of publication (her work is so "organic" that it resists being "doled out by driblems"), but *MM* appears to be a "perfect" work of fiction. "GE here shows that supreme mastery of language which has by common consent been allowed
That the book will be a great book, there cannot be a doubt -- one more noble addition to our English literature."

Review of MM, Book I. Complains of the serialization of MM: a work of art suffers from being broken into fragments, and GE's characterization suffers from the constant need one will have to "gain the intellectual and emotional standpoint from which the characters are meant to be contemplated." Also, there are instances of cynicism and an "obvious straining after unusual and not easily intelligible illustrations." However, this first book of MM contains all the "vigour and delicacy" we have come to expect from GE.

A review of (but mostly a liberal quoting from) Main. GE's wisdom is discussed, as is her humor, which is presented as one of the finest in literature: "... Undoubtedly GE is the only woman of our time whose writings would be remembered for their humour alone, or whose sayings... are at all likely, like Shakespeare's sayings, to pass into the substance of the language."

There is a "grand and simple unity" in Part I of MM, but in Part II "the scene widens and the stage is full." Valid criticism of the novel as yet is impossible.


"In this second instalment of GE's work, our acquaintance with Middlemarch society is still further extended and increased, and we begin to appreciate the full scope and variety of the elements that are to enter into its composition."


Dorothea's story "is just such a one as only GE could either conceive or execute, and so far as she deals with it in this volume, the story is both perfectly original and full of pathos." GE, however, often gives the reader a "rude jar" with satiric remarks made from the point of view of a detached observer, which diminishes the effects of her own best conceptions. The review concludes: "If all MM is as good as its first two parts, it will be full of a wisdom somewhat too acid at times for our taste, but always truthful, and full also of fine and delicate portraiture."

"The action [of MM] does not absorb us, as in AB and MF. There are too many actors for that . . . but as a thoughtful anatomy of English habits and English modes of thought . . . 'Waiting For Death' is worthy its author. Whether MM, as a whole, will suffer from the form which its periodical appearance entails, remains to be seen. Certainly, as yet, each part has been perfect of itself."


"MM, which bids fair to prove its author's masterpiece, maintains the close interest of every reader in altogether legitimate ways. Simpler materials of plot-making could not be brought together; and the book owes everything to the excellent art in portraying the characters that make up her mimic world. She is a shrewd critic and a cunning artist, and her critical and artistic faculties are here both exhibited in perfection."


MM improves as it develops, although it is a "morbidly intellectual tale." The novel is a "running fire of criticisms," but sometimes the reader feels GE is unfairly running down some of her characters (like Celia and Rosamond) because
her intellectual attitudes, not her creative imagination, dictate dislike. In this GE is following Thackeray, but Thackeray was at least impartial, and treated his "puppets" all around with satiric indifference. Still, "this book of MM has certainly as much power in it as either of the others, and more wit."


Review of Main. Main has done GE a great wrong. Characterized as her "worst enemy" because he is her "worshipper." But he does not know what to worship, so he worships everything about GE's fiction, including "Platitudes, Tupperisms, commonplace."

113. "Books To Read and Others." Vanity Fair, April 13, 1872, p. 115.

Review of Part II of MM. Although it is perfect as a study of English life, MM does not "appeal to our hearts" as did AB and MF. Still, MM is perhaps a more powerful study of character with a larger number of important actors. Lydgate seems to be emerging as the character GE loves most to dwell on.


"MM... is not 'falling off.' None the less it is quite clear at last -- it was almost clear at
first — that the mode of publication is injudicious. What suited 'The Pickwick Papers' well enough is here intolerable."


"GE devotes herself to the further portrayal of a character [Dorothea] which promises to be the most wonderful of all her creations. . . . GE's St. Theresa of the nineteenth century unfolds the secret of her life . . . and in watching the unfolding few readers of the book can feel that they are reading fiction. They are really sharing in a most instructive psychological study, under the direction of most competent teacher, who knows how to propound the deepest truths in a way that all must understand." It is too early to judge MM as a whole work of art, but there is no doubt it is a "wonderfully successful study of character."

116. Vanity Fair, June 15, 1872, p. 188.

Review of Book IV of MM. This book maintains the interest created by the preceding books. "There is the same thoughtful, careful writing, the same quiet humour, and the pure, perfect English for which GE is so famous, but at the same time we must regret that the book appears in a serial form. It is too good to be taken in doses."
117. [Stark, Herbert]. The Daily Telegraph (London), June 18, 1872, pp. 6-7.

Review of Books I-IV of MM. "In a certain maturity of power MM seems to transcend anything that GE ever wrote. ... We do not doubt that, with some readers, especially those of a critical turn, the very power which GE shows in passages that might almost be labelled 'asides,' injures the interest of the tale. ... But GE more resembles the best French novelists [than she does Fielding, Scott, and Thackeray] is this, that she brings to the writing of mere stories mental gifts that, in English Literature, have hitherto been devoted to what are called higher works—to books of philosophy or to finished poems."


"It were idle to point out, for the fifth time, that MM is, throughout, equal to itself."


"If the main currents of the plot of MM moved slowly in the last book, in the first chapter of this new instalment they run apace and concentrate very rapidly. ... There is no falling off of power ... and no lack of skill in GE's method of binding up the stories of her various characters."
... And the book is as rich as ever in delicate humour and caustic wit."


An essay on GE's "second self" (the writer). GE is a "personal" writer, but this does not interfere with her "dramatic truthfullness." GE's works are not "didactic treatises," but are primarily works of art. "There is not a hard kernel of dogma at the centre of her art, and around it a sheath or envelope which we break and throw away; the moral significance coalesces with the narrative, and lives through the characters."

121. "Books To Read and Others." Vanity Fair, August 10, 1872, p. 43.

Review of Book V of MM. MM becoming increasingly complicated and intricate. The reader must necessarily await Book VI to learn what is happening.


Book VI shows the disadvantages of publishing in fragments a novel that should be studied as a whole. Still, "The great merit of MM is that it states so very clearly the riddles of life, without offering any shallow guesses at the answers to them..."
As we read this excellent story we feel that it is hardly a novel at all, but rather a subtle psychological analysis, a magic mirror in which the aspects of real life are reflected but with a reflection far more intelligible than could be any direct vision of the objects that we are looking at."

123. "George Eliot's Moral Anatomy." The Spectator, 45 (October 5, 1872), pp. 1262-1264. Review of the middle books of MM. MM "bids more than fair to be one of the great books of the world." GE's scope is larger than Jane Austen's, her depth much greater than Trollope's. "Her characters are so real that they have a life and body of their own quite distinct from her criticisms on them; and one is conscious at times of taking part with her characters against the author, and of accusing her of availing herself unfairly of the privilege of author, by adding a trait that bears out her own criticism rather than her own imaginative conception."

124. Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, 112 (December, 1872), 727-745. Review of MM. Considerable space devoted to summary of the events and characterization of the people of the novel. Concludes that MM by itself constitutes an "era in the literature of fiction," but following
as it does a series of masterpieces by GE it is enough to say MM maintains her reputation. "We shall be surprised if the mature judgment passed upon it by those who can appreciate the work of a true artist . . . does not pronounce it the most perfect of the series."

125. The Standard [London], December 4, 1872, p.5. Review of MM. Much of the last book of MM is monotonous, but is saved by Dorothea, "GE's most brilliantly painted character." Considers Lydgate, Bulstrode, Rosamond, and Ladislaw particularly "uninteresting." Concludes, however: "GE may regard MM as her masterpiece, and we should be inclined to call it the masterpiece of the season were it not that MM is not a work for a season but for all time."

126. "Middlemarch." The Athenaeum, December 7, 1872, pp. 725-726. Review of MM as a whole. MM is a melancholy novel. Also, it is too "laboured," too polished, too much a sense of effort in places. Nonetheless, it is the best novel that has appeared since R. The general novel-reading public will probably care but little for MM, but "if not the best or the pleasantest of GE's works [it] is yet beyond all measure the most powerful."

Review of the completed novel. "The most carefully wrought out of all GE's novels, with the exception perhaps of R, MM is also the most melancholy in its tone. It is a picture drawn by an artist of consummate literary power, and of intellectual strength that among novelists is altogether unique, in which are exhibited all the springs of action and all the motives of character that go to make up our commonplace society, and the impression left by this 'study of provincial life' is one of painful but healthy sadness."

128. The Saturday Review, 34(December 7, 1872), 733-734.

Review of MM. MM has scarcely been equalled as a "didactic novel." It exhibits deep insight into motives and characters. A major defect of MM, however, is that there is a "conspicuously prominent lesson" always before the reader. Consequently, one gets little of the pleasure from MM that belongs to the novel as a genre. This lack of pleasure is heightened by the melancholy tone of MM, which is the result of its religion being all duty without a sufficient mixture of hope.

Review of the complete novel. MM is a great book. The whole tone of the story is thoroughly noble, both morally and intellectually. GE is by far the greatest of English authoresses, standing just below Shakespeare with Fielding and Scott (among others), among the greatest writers of the English language.

130. The Saturday Review, 34(December 21, 1872), 794-796. Review of MM. Chiefly a discussion of the main characters. "Plot is never GE's strong point; but her characters are so real and so true to themselves that we desire to know what becomes of them just as the fate of our friends interests us. . . ."

131. [Milnes, Richard Monckton]. The Edinburgh Review, 137(January, 1873), 246-263. Review of MM. Although MM is often too heavily didactic and GE at times too intrusive, "GE's new enterprise is to be hailed with gratitude for its healthy tone and honest purpose, as well as for the admirable interior action, which makes it almost independent of incident and moulds the outward circumstances to its own spiritual ends."

132. Colvin, Sidney. The Fortnightly Review, 13(January, 1873), 142-147. Review of MM. MM is full of "high feeling, wisdom,
and acuteness. It contains some of the most moving dramatic scenes in our literature." Although GE is at times mildly "coarse" in invention and handling and too hard on some of her characters, she has "taken the lead in expressing and discussing the lives and ways of common folks . . . in terms of scientific thought and the positive synthesis."

133. [Laing, Robert]. The Quarterly Review, 13(1873), 336-369.

Review of MM. MM is much like MF, but has more "stringency of analysis, more moral firmness . . . final and fully matured convictions." Book VIII of MM praised as a study of human motive and action that has rarely been attempted, even by the great dramatists. FH too coarse and theoretical, but MM rehabilitates GE as the "ablest of living novelists." Although MM has "evident and even glaring" defects, it is a unique study of character.


Review of MM and Bulwar-Lytton's Kenelm Chillingly in conjunction with a formulation of purpose in the novel. Concludes that the main function of the novel is "to show us the effect of ideas in their practical working." Discusses the "novel of action," the historical novel, the religious novel, and the
political-social novel, showing the failings of each. The key to the successful novel is "real" characters, and both MM and Kenelm Chillingly exhibit these to a magnificent degree.

135. Lawrenny, H. [pseud. of Edith Simcox], The Academy, 4 (January, 1, 1873), 1-4.

Review of MM. "MM marks an epoch in the history of fiction in so far as tis incidents are taken from the inner life, as the action is developed by the direct influence of mind on mind and character on character, as the material circumstances of the outer world are made subordinate and accessory to the artistic presentation of a definite passage of mental experience, but chiefly as giving a background of perfect realistic truth to a profoundly imaginative psychological study. . . . To say that MM is GE's greatest work is to say that it has scarcely a superior and very few equals in the whole wide range of English fiction."


Review of MM. "Style has never reached such perfection of art. . . . Humour of so rare a quality has not been given to the world since the days of Shakespeare. . . . In fact, the standard of English literature has been raised. . . . No novelist can
for the future write a novel of any pretensions without knowing that it will be weighed in the balance against such a work of art as MM."

137. "Books To Read and Others." Vanity Fair, January 4, 1873, p. 4.

Review of completed MM. MM is "perhaps a more finished study of character than any of this author's former works. . . . The plot of the story is nothing, but the people are everything." Every page is "replete with careful thought, rare touches and delightfully quiet humour."

138. [Broome, Frederick Napier]. The Times, March 7, 1873, pp. 3-4.

Review of MM. "There are few novels in the language that will repay reading over again as well as MM. . . . Under GE's pen a few square miles of fields and villages becomes the world. . . . As a novel proper it is inferior to [AB]; its plot is not exciting; it has not the liveliness, variety and picturesqueness of its great predecessor. In delineation of character it gives us the same round and solid drawing; but it is its philosophical power which is its distinctive and supreme excellence."


Review of MM. "GE has never displayed more
imaginative and intellectual power than in this her latest and, in some important respects, her richest tale. There is more passion and more lofty conception in AB, more affluence of the provincial grotesques of English rural life in MF, more beauty in SM, more curious intellectual subtlety in R; but none of them can really compare with MM for delicacy of detail and completeness of finish . . . and for the breadth of life brought within the field of the story . . . . No doubt it is a little tame in plot, but for that the depth of its purpose and the humour of its conversations sufficiently atone. The melancholy at the heart of it, no criticism of course can attenuate, for that is of its essence."

140. The London Quarterly Review, 40(April, 1873), 99-110. Review of MM. MM is "perhaps more of a masterpiece than any work from the same hand except R. . . . What is newest in MM . . . is the discussion of certain psychological problems of the last consequence to us all, which we follow in learning the inner life of two or three persons."

141. Smith, George Barnett. "George Eliot." The Saint Pauls Magazine, 12(May, 1873), 592-616. Rapidly changing times are in the process of taking care of man's physical needs, but what about his
spiritual needs? The times are lacking a "master spirit"--a genius who will "gather together . . . the tangled threads of our consciousness. . . ." Smith proposes to determine to what extent GE's spiritual force answers the needs of the times. He briefly examines GE's works and concludes that although she is intellectual enough, her "hopelessness" does not meet the spiritual needs of the times: "The Old Truths she has illuminated with vivid and matchless skill; but she does not advocate a new evangel." MM points to a "changing thought" in GE; perhaps she will still satisfy the spiritual cravings of the age.


R and George Sand's Consuelo examined in relationship to Florence and Venice respectively. R is a "very superb guide-book" to Florence, and Romola herself reflects Florence well--"noble, lofty, limited, narrow, splendid." Sand's Consuelo, however, is a "higher" creation than Romola; Romola's grandeur is conventional, whereas Consuelo represents the "truest and highest type of feminine character--real, simple, natural, and true. . . ."

McCrie asserts the professed aim of contemporary novelists is "to subvert the religion taught in our Confessions of Faith and Catechisms." Illustrates the thesis with a discussion of FH, concluding:

"[FH] contains an attempt to undermine evangelical religion by the unjustifiable process of caricature, and to substitute in its place a mere moral sentimentality."


Sub-titled "A Volume of Gossip about Passages and People in the Novels of GE." Identifies Derbyshire as "GE country." Discusses the Derbyshire dialect as it appears in SCL, MF, SM, FH, and AB. Long section attempting to establish Elizabeth Evans as the prototype of Dinah Morris. Among the major conclusions: "In fiction, the novels of GE are unrivalled as studies of English country life.... The early volumes are amongst the best specimens of powerful, simple English, since Shakespeare."


"A report is going the round of the papers that 'GE has a new novel in preparation, illustrating American Life.' The first part of the statement is,
we believe, true; the second part is undoubtedly incorrect."

"GE's new work is, we have reason to know, like MM, a story of English life, but of our own day, and dealing for the most part with a higher sphere of society."

Review of DD. "[GE] never pays much attention to her plots, but [in DD] the subordination of plot to character-drawing is carried to an extreme. . . . The opportunities of the original conception seem to be thrown away. At the end of the eighth book we are left with the threads of the story broken off abruptly." However, DD contains "a moral teaching which, within its own range, is of the very highest, and a spiritual insight which, within the possibilities of mere human vision, is of the very deepest."

Review of DD.

149. Richardson, Abby Sage. The Victoria Magazine, 28 (1876), 227-231.
Review of DD. "We do not intend it as any disparage-
probable that DD will not be so universally liked as MM. . . . [It] is less varied in interest than MM, it is more serious, and in some respects it is more painful than any book which GE has ever written. Yet Dorothea Brooke . . . never so entirely diverts our interest from the other characters and can never move us to so intense a sympathy as Gwendolen Harleth. . . . Like all her stories there is much more in this than the mere story, and the reader will find . . . that the meaning that underlies is deeper and grander than that which is on the surface."

150. "Daniel Deronda.--Book I." The Athenaeum, January 29, 1876, p. 160. [The first of eight 1876 Athenaeum reviews of DD. The others are: March 4, p. 327; April 1, p. 461; April 29, pp. 593-594; June 3, p. 762; July 1, pp. 14-15; July 29, p. 143; September 2, p. 303.]

"In this instalment of DD there is nothing that satisfies, there is nothing that indicates what the future of the story is to be, and there are no passages of individual beauty that can be detached and presented by themselves as gems that are attractive. . . . [With the system of publication by parts] we cannot but feel that GE's fame will suffer. . . . the opening pages of DD are far below those of MF or of FH."
151. The Examiner, January 29, 1876, pp. 124-125. [The first of six 1876 Examiner notices of DD. The others are: March 4, pp. 265-266; April 1, p. 361; June 3, pp. 632-633; August 5, pp. 885-886; September 2, pp. 993-994.]

Review of DD. "[GE] always grasps and places clearly before the eye the individuality of her characters, but she fails to invest them with those attributes of our common humanity which only the very highest art is able to make us feel running through the strongest of personalities. No amount of mere intellect, however great, can compass that highest achievement of art. GE's genius is marvellous, but it comes short of that." Takes exception to GE's "increasing tendency to aim her illustrations and some of her humorous turns of phrase at a small cultured circle, a considerable portion of whose culture is scientific. . . . Science has made considerable inroads on religion, but it should be merciful and spare us something. . . . Our ears are not yet attuned to these strains of the scientific Zion."

152. [Hutton, R. H.]. "Gwendolen Harleth." The Spectator, 49 (January 29, 1876), 138-139. [The first of six Spectator reviews of DD. The others are: February Spectator reviews of DD. The others are: February 12, 1876, pp. 207-208; April 8, 1876, pp. 463-464; June 10, 1876, pp. 733-734; July 29, 1876, p. 948; September 9, 1876, pp. 1131-1133.]

Review of the first part of DD. It seems GE is going to revenge herself on those who said MM was too
melancholy by making DD even more melancholy. DD seems destined to be a tragedy; with such a character as Gwendolen possibilities for tragedy are numerous. Praises "deep reflection and a great store of imaginative power" that early characterization of Gwendolen exhibits. Review concludes that DD promises to be another of GE's "brilliant criticisms on the paradoxes of human life."

153. The Times, January 31, 1876, p. 6. [First of two 1876 Times reviews of DD. The other is June 5, p. 5.] Review of DD, Part I. "Even judging it by the standard its author has accustomed us to, this first book of DD is unusually full of promise. . . . The style is epigrammatic and polished as ever, and the constructive art seems to approach perfection."

154. [Hutton, R. H.]. "George Eliot's Heroines." The Spectator, 49(February 12, 1876), 207-208. Review of the second part of DD and a general discussion of GE's female characters. Rumor has it that Gwendolen is not to be the central female character of DD. If this is so, GE has "struck a wrong note at starting." If Gwendolen is not to be a major character study, she will exist as a flaw in DD. GE's female protagonists are not "airy" creations; there is the "Puritan intensity of feeling, the Miltonic weight of thought, in all
GE's drawings of women.


"The second part of DD is better than the first, and contains one scene almost worthy of the author. There is . . . much pedantry . . . though less than in the first part. . . . If DD should at the last prove to be a novel worthy of its author, she will have only herself to blame for having by an unwise publication in parts made it, up to the present at all events, unpopular with her admirers.


"Among the other advantages of this fragmentary method of publication which [GE] has adopted, is the ample time thus afforded for the study and free social discussion of the characters. . . . It is needless to say that there are few novelists whose work is sufficiently interesting or sufficiently profound and intricate to bear such vivisection; but GE is so full of secondary meanings . . . that every prominent incident in an uncompleted novel is surrounded . . . with all the interest of a puzzle."


"The faults of the first two books are still prominent,--there is the same pedantry, approaching
in some passages to a burlesque of the language of science; and there is the same clumsiness of construction: but, on the other hand, Gwendolen's character is strengthened and begins to have a certain interest. . . . The struggle in her mind is admirably told."

158. "Daniel Deronda.--Book III." The Examiner, April 1, 1876, p. 381.
"The present instalment contains more of beautiful writing and more clever sayings than either of the two preceding--is, in fact, equal and perhaps superior in interest and in workmanship, to anything that the authoress has ever written."

Review of DD. GE's work is tending to fall into periods: early works of rustic life (AB; MF; SCL--she's best in these works); the middle period of R, MM; and now a third period, characterized by DD. In DD she out-does Thackeray by showing "the artistic nature of the poet . . . in passages of supreme beauty, which soften the harsher tones."

160. [Hutton, R. H.]. "Daniel Deronda." The Spectator, 49(April 8, 1876), 463-464.
Review of Part III of DD. Part II of DD was melodramatic--poor and conventional. GE fails to catch
the tone of the high society in DD; the drawing-
room dialogue is ineffective. These faults con-
tributed to a general alarm that GE was in the
process of writing a failure. Part III, however,
is reassuring. Mirah emerges as a perfect foil
to Gwendolen, and there is much more humor. Part
IV gives great promise of a fine novel to come.

161. "Daniel Deronda.—Book IV." The Athenaeum, April
29, 1876, pp. 593-594.

"The new part of DD is full of interest. . . . But
the plan of publication in parts again spoils the
effectiveness of the story, for when the end of
the startling scenes of 'Gwendolen gets her Choice'
is reached, the attention of the reader cannot be
properly fixed upon the quieter Jewish episode
which follows. . . ."

162. "Daniel Deronda.—Book V." The Athenaeum, June 3,
1876, p. 762.

"In the first half of the book, the progress of
Gwendolen's at present unreturned attachment to
Deronda is charmingly sketched; in the second half
we have more of the carefully drawn Jewish scenes,
which are less interesting to the careless reader;
but less within the reach of other novelists than
GE. . . . There is no 'action' in the present book:
but much development of character."

"There are many characters and families introduced into DD . . . but we cannot complain that the canvas is overcrowded till we are in a position to judge finally of the proportions of the different groups. . . . Meantime we can only exercise our receptivity to the utmost, and admire the skill with which the least important characters in the most subordinate households are indicated."

164. The Times, June 5, 1876, p. 5.

Review of DD Parts II-V. "These four parts of the story are admirable for their vivid delineation of scenes from the lives of all ranks and conditions of men as well as for the discriminating analysis of the very various characters."

165. [Hutton, R. H.]. "The Hero of Daniel Deronda." The Spectator, 49(June 10, 1876), 733-734.

An article on GE's characterization of Daniel Deronda based on Books I-IV. Daniel's character is vague, but not for lack of analysis; indeed, he is the most analyzed man in GE's fiction. But all of GE's analysis always leaves the reader with the impression that there is more to him. Deronda lacks, in other words, individuality; he is merely disinterested, receptive, morally elevated, and impressionable --

"The first third of the new art of DD consists of Jewish scenes that will be even more completely wanting in interest to the general reader than were those which have gone before them; but when we come again to the story, its interest becomes more marked. . . . We shall probably be right if we suppose that the seventh book will contain the revelation of Deronda's parentage, while the eighth will lead us to a tragedy."


Second WR review of DD. Plot plays a far more important part in DD than it has in any of GE's previous novels. Each chapter is "dovetailed" into the preceding one. Each sentence is "rounded and polished." All touches in the novel show "the supreme artist."

168. McAlister, Donald. "The 'Philosophers' Club' in 'Daniel Deronda.'" The Academy, 10 (July 29, 1876), 113.

Letter in which McAlister points out that the "Philosophers' Club" episode in Book VI of DD has a real life counterpart, as does Mordecai. Refers to a GHL article of 1866 on a small group of students who met some thirty years before in a tavern in
Red Lion Square, Holborn.* Quotes Lewes' description of the group and several of its members, among them a Jew named "Cohn or Kohn," who strongly resembles Mordecai in DD. (*"Spinoza," The Fortnightly Review, 4(April 1, 1866), 385-406).


"Both the Grandcourt catastrophe and the Princess episode are clumsily treated, and the novel, as a whole may now be finally pronounced unworthy of the past and of the powers of GE, inasmuch as Book VIII cannot now redeem it from failure. We mean, of course, literary failure; for we are aware that it has been a magnificent financial success."

170. [Hutton, R. H.]. "The Strong Side of Daniel Deronda." The Spectator, 49(July 29, 1876), 948.

"What has been mostly wanting in GE's books is faith in the larger purpose which moulds men into something higher than anything into which they could mould themselves. And now that it is powerfully presented in one of her stories [DD] . . . it certainly lends to her writing a force and a unity and a grandeur of effect which make up for many faults of execution. . . . "


Review of Books VI and VII of DD. "We venture to
think [GE] must have derived not a little amusement from thinking of the bewilderment she has caused among the 20,000 readers of DD, some of whom must be simple folk who read her as a social duty, by giving them such a nut to crack as the wonderful Jew Mordecai. . . . Perhaps GE's purpose was to draw a character so uncertainly placed between the crazed fantastic and the noble enthusiast, as to make her readers doubt with which they ought to class him, and, thus doubting, obtain a lesson in profound wisdom and charity."

172. "Daniel Deronda.---Book VIII." The Athenæum, September 2, 1876, p. 303. "As we read through more than half of the eighth and last book of DD, it was with the feeling that GE was not less tired of it than are readers. . . . The whole novel . . . must be pronounced both the least good and least interesting of GE's works."

173. The Examiner, September 2, 1876, pp. 993-994. Review of the completed DD. "In none of GE's novels have her sense of humour and her conviction of the supreme duty of earnestness come so flagrantly into conflict as in the present. . . . It is possible to regard [DD] either as a sermon in disguise or as an impartial picture of existing phases of English
society—a great work, of course, in either view.
On the whole, perhaps, one's impression is that in
DD GE is a preacher and teacher in the first place,
and a novelist in the second. . . . She cannot
leave her characters to explain themselves. She
must always be telling us why they do this and
say the other thing, what principles of their nature
they are illustrating. She is too professorial.

174. The Jewish Chronicle. September 8, 1876, p. 357.
The first of four 1876 Jewish Chronicle reviews
of DD. The others are: September 22, pp. 394-395;
December 15, p. 585; and December 22, pp. 601-602].
Review of DD. "The entire Jewish community cannot
but feel deeply grateful to the writer who has
judged them so honestly and so fairly, and who
has placed their national characteristics and
peculiarities in so favourable a light before the
world. . . . Without glossing over any faults, GE
has certainly shown the most attractive side of the
Jewish character."

175. Saintsbury, George. The Academy, 10(September 9,
1876), 253-254.
Review of DD. "DD is eminently interesting, because
it presents in a fresh and brilliant light the
merits as well as the faults of its writer. . . .
The part of Gwendolen Harleth is throughout an
overwhelming success . . . [but] no one can read
DD without perceiving and regretting the singular way in which the characters are incessantly pushed back in order that the author may talk about them and about everything in heaven and earth while the action stands still."

176. [Hutton, R. H.]. The Spectator, 49(September 9, 1876), 1131-1133.
Final review of DD. DD is GE's most "laboured" book—often forced and feeble with little humour. But no book of hers, except possibly AB, has so strong a plot, and none of her previous works are conceived on lines so noble. DD more unequal than MM—its "summits are higher, but its average level of power is very much lower." DD, however, contains the greatest moral force that GE has ever produced.

177. The Saturday Review, 42(September 16, 1876), 356-358.
Review of DD. DD is a falling off from AB, MM. The reader never feels "at home" in the novel. GE is driving at something foreign to his habits of thought. The leading characters are "guided by interests and motives with which he has never come in contact . . . and not only are these personages outside our interests, but the author seems to go out with them into a world completely foreign to us."

178. The Jewish Chronicle, September 22, 1876, pp. 394-395.
Review of DD. Discusses Judaism in DD. Concludes:
"Considering the manner in which we have been misrepresented, and the superficial view which has been previously put before the public concerning us . . . ought we not feel deeply indebted to an author who has been at the pains to read and reflect concerning Jews and Judaism, and who has placed the conclusions she has arrived at in so favourable a light and in so attractive and scholarly a manner before the world?"

179. The Jewish Chronicle, September 22, 1876, p. 395.
"We find this paragraph making the rounds of the press: The Philosopher's Club in DD is a faithful transcript from real life. In 1866, George Henry Lewes, writing in the Fortnightly, describes such a club as meeting thirty years before at a tavern in Red Lion Square, Holborn. Mordecai was a German Jew named Cohen, 'of a great and calm intellect.' The account in DD is very faithful, and the portrait of Mordecai only slightly idealized."

180. The Saturday Review. 42(September 23, 1876), 390-392. Second review of DD. DD not as good as GE's other novels. Gwendolen is a most unattractive heroine, most resembling Rosamond in MM. Some puzzling failures on GE's part. Her style is often confusing, heavy, inconsistent, especially in scenes involving
Mordecai or Daniel or both together. The novel is also flawed by inconsistency of characterization.

181. The Edinburgh Review, 144 (October, 1876), 442-470.

Review of DD. DD a failure: it fails in interest, in construction, in creative power, and, above all, in that power of expression for which GE is justly famous. GE has taught us to expect much, but DD is, ultimately, about "the commonplace wretchedness of mere domestic incompatibility." Concludes: "There are indications . . . in the present work that art, high art, has grown more to her than nature, and that man has become a creature to be analysed rather than a being primarily made for life."


Review of DD. "DD is essentially, both in conception and in form, a Romance. . . . [It] is a probably unique example of the application of the forms of romance to a rare and difficult problem in human nature, by first stating the problem—(the transformation of Gwendolen)—in its extremest form, and then, with something like scientific precision as well as philosophic insight, arranging circumstance so as to throw upon it the fullest light possible."

Third WR notice of DD. Notes that DD has received much hostile criticism, but the sources of the criticism make it high praise for GE. In DD, GE has invaded the territory of the "fashionable novelists," and they feel threatened because she shows the "fashionable novel" can be used to teach "the highest lessons" of life. Concludes with the hope that DD will help "revolutionise" the tone of novels of fashionable life.

184. The Guardian, October 4, 1876, p. 1312.

Review of final book of DD. Although DD is below the level of GE's previous work, Gwendolen is "quite equal to anything that has been produced before." Deronda himself, however, is "altogether vague, shadowy, and unreal." DD also reveals a growing fault in GE: "a subtle—shall we venture to say sometimes a wearisome—analysis, which covers whole pages, and leaves little room for the display of these same feelings in action"—all of which results in obscurity. It may be that GE exhausted her store of fresh thought and flowing phrase and now has to force herself into activity. If this is so, however, "even her second course is enough to make the wealth of other." DD is inferior to MM, but it contains enough to mark it as a product of a
rare and original mind.

185. *Vanity Fair*, October 14, 1876, pp. 239-240.

Review of *D.D.* "In *MM* one began to perceive the divided allegiance of the author to science and art. In *D.D.* the victory has declared itself on the side of science. The imaginative and poetical nature has been sacrificed to the analytic and critical intellect. We feel throughout the book the close atmosphere of the dissecting room. ... The result is that the story is made subservient to a scientific end, which entails very grave artistic defects."


Review of *D.D.* GE is too "prodigal of her resources, too prone to oversay things, and to turn the same things many ways about." She runs the risk of "fatiguing" the reader. *D.D.* is written with "too little ease and too much insistence." The style is more full than ever and more "charged with allusions and technicalities. ... *D.D.* often seems clogged with superfluous thought."


"GE has passed from the realism of *MM* to the idealism of her present work. ... *D.D.* is no light
novel to while away idle hours. It is a book full of deep thoughts, seeking to convey high lessons.

... GE has laid open before a larger audience than had ever before been summoned for a similar purpose, the aims and scope and innermost thoughts of Judaism, and she has accomplished more for the cause of toleration and enlightenment than could have been achieved by any amount of legislation."


A comparison of the characteristics and achievements of the two writers. Discussion of the differences between them centers on "race and national manners."

Points of comparison include the desire of each to "edify" to the point of prosiness and didacticism, their common love of nature and power to describe it successfully, and similarities of characterization.

189. The Jewish Chronicle, December 15, 1876, p. 585.

Review of DD. "GE in DD worthily takes her place by the side of those greatest of artists of modern time. What she essays is unique. She guages the religious depth of the Jew's holiest feelings. . . . It was a great and noble task she undertook, and she succeeded."

190. The Jewish Chronicle, December 22, 1876, pp. 601-602.
Review of DD. Discusses DD only obliquely.
Concentrates on contemporary Jewish problems.

A general essay on the philosophy of Comte and its influence on GE. "In [GE] the teaching of Comte in its general spirit, and indeed on many individual points, finds . . . a supremely high artistic expression. . . . But she is too true an artist to make her novels merely the vehicle for inculcating a system of philosophy. . . . She teaches . . . but her teaching has to be deduced." The essay discusses all of GE's works in relationship to Comtism, finding the most significant manifestation of Comte in GE to be an "almost entire absence of religious motive . . . in all her later books, and comparative absence in the earlier ones."


Essentially, an essay to assert the belief that Charlotte Bronte possessed "exceptional intellectual power" beyond that of writers presently better thought of. Focuses on GE, calls her work "cheap scientific." "In knowledge, in culture, perhaps in capacity for knowledge and for culture, Charlotte
Bronte was no more comparable to GE than GE is comparable to Charlotte Bronte in purity of passion, in depth and ardour of feeling, in spiritual force and fervour of forthright inspiration. . . . [In] GE [is] a type of intelligence vivified and coloured by a vein of genius, in Charlotte Bronte a type of genius directed and moulded by the touch of intelligence."

194. Dowden, Edward. "'Middlemarch' and 'Daniel Deronda.'" The Contemporary Review, 29(February, 1877), 348-360. "In DD, for the first time, the poetical side of GE's genius obtains adequate expression through the medium which is proper to her—that of prose—and in complete association with the non-poetical elements of her nature." DD contrasts sharply with MM: in MM, the "prosaic or realistic element occupies a much larger place . . . in DD the poetical or ideal element as decidedly preponderates." MM is "critical"; DD aims to be "constructive."

195. "Deronda's Mother: A Literary Parallel." Temple Bar, 49(April, 1877), 542-545; Rptd. Living Age, 133(1877), 248-250; Eclectic Magazine, 25 N.S. (1877), 751-753. Offers the suggestion that Daniel Deronda's mother closely resembles Disraeli's grandmother. Quotes characterizing passages from DD and from Disraeli's The Life and Writings of Isaac Disraeli to show similar traits. Concludes that either Mrs. Disraeli
was the prototype for Deronda's mother, or the resemblance is a striking coincidence.

Review of *DD*. Discusses the growing opinion, centering around *DD*, that GE's artistic "powers" are failing. Chastises *The Athenaeum* for "intellectual foppery" and downright prejudice toward GE, and *The Spectator* for the opposite extreme. Asserts that GE has always labored under the "gravest of all disabilities": the inability to apprehend rightly the distinction between art and science, which often tempts her to "kill her characters for the sake of their anatomy." Concludes, however, that although *DD* is not GE's best effort, it does not prove a waning literary power. "It may not be as good as *R*, but we think that most students of her work will admit that it is very much better than *MM*, which in turn was, by general consent, reckoned a better novel than *FH*.

Attacks critics who have failed to grasp and respond to Judaism as portrayed by Mordecai in *DD*. GE does a fine job of portraying general Jewish character; this is not new or startling. Mordecai, however, is new; he embodies the *inner* life of the Jew and is
a "prophet of the New Exile." The critics, however, have revealed their decided "Judeaophobia" by their inability to see Mordecai as more than a "consumptive workman" with mystic tendencies. Concludes: "GE has endeavoured to raise the novel to heights where it may treat of subjects hitherto reserved for the Drama or the Epic, but instead of encouragement from English Critics she meets with their neglect."


Brief review of DD and discussion of GE as a novelist. GE and Jane Austen compared briefly; GE is wider and deeper. Brief discussion of the nature of GE's earlier works. Throughout her novels, GE shows the need for individual development, and DD is in this spirit. GE stresses the "call" to give "singleness of aim" to life, and is therefore a novelist very much in the spirit of the age.


Cites GE as an "unbeliever" and examines various of her works as representative of "the best and most alluring light the code of atheistic ethics" can be put in. Mallock concludes that GE's morality is "valueless," a lot of fine phrases with no "practical" worth. Contrary to GE's views, we must seek ultimate
ends to action, else there is no "virtue," no
direction. We need to strive for some universal.

from the German by J. W. Ferrier. Edinburgh, 1878.

A long extract from a Chicago Times article on GE
by F. B. Wilkie. The part quoted is almost wholly
biographical, sketching GE's early life, early
writing career, situation with G. H. Lewes, and
general manner of life and appearance in 1878. No
criticism of the novels included, although Wilkie
refers to GE as "the first lady novelist in existence."

110(July, 1878), 105-135.
"While we regard GE as one of the greatest of story-
tellers . . . we confess at once to a much more
deep and sincere admiration of GE's earlier than
of her later writings." In GE's recent works we
find none of that "lusious spontaneity" which
marked her earlier works. "The author seems now
to be doing out of duty what at one time she did
out of love. . . . Her width of thought and feeling
since she has preached . . . a barren philosophy . . .
has been confined within somewhat narrow limits."

203. The Athenaeum, October 26, 1878, p. 530.
Notice of BB. "BB is a pretty little volume
containing extracts from GE's writings, one or more being given for each day in the year."

204. [Buchanan, Robert W.]. "In Memoriam—George Henry Lewes." The Examiner, December 7, 1878, p. 1551.
Obit. on Lewes, who died November 30. Characterizes GE as "the faithful companion, the noble helper and comforter, the great and gentle friend." Brief biography and account of Lewes' literary accomplishments.

Review of TS. "We cannot help ourselves in judging GE by the standard she has raised for herself, and, so judged, we are forced seriously to say that this volume will be of more service to the critic and literary historian than to the general reader, whose interest in much of it must be little else than affectation. . . . The scientific bias has compelled her to set up consciously a circle of mere lay figures, and that process cannot co-exist with the highest creative impulses, and if persevered in, must finally destroy it."

Brown examines all of GE's novels and SE and finds as the central and vitalizing idea in each the "doctrine of the Cross," not as theologically
formulated, but as the symbol of that spirit and
law of self-sacrifice which merges the individual
life in universal ends. "In largeness of Christian
charity, in breadth of human sympathy, in tenderness
toward all human frailty that is not vitally base
and self-seeking, in subtle power of finding 'a
soul of goodness even in things apparently evil,'
GE has not many equals, certainly no superior,
among the writers of the day."

207. The Quarterly Review, 147(January, 1879), 99-100.
Discussion of DD, in which it is contrasted with
Jane Austen's Emma. Major difference is GE's "analy-
sis of consciousness." Concludes: "No man knows
with certainty any other consciousness than his own;
and DD, so evidently the work of a powerful and
ingenious mind, shows, in our judgment very con-
clusively, what an incalculable mistake in art is
made by those novelists who sacrifice action to
analysis, and manners to metaphysics."

208. "Magazine Writers." Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine,
125(February, 1879), 225-247.
A brief history of Blackwood's, including mention of
GE's SCL: "With all our admiration for the extra-
ordinary power which has ripened so wonderfully
with experience and maturity, in our opinion she
has scarcely surpassed them. The intuitive perception
of character; the profound intelligence of human hearts, and the intense sensibility to human moods and feelings; the subdued drollery and the ready sympathy, were all naturally rehausé by a freshness that must almost inevitably fade more or less."


An article about the contemporary novel which includes a brief discussion of GE. "In GE we have a novelist who has brought her art to a perfection that has been attained by very few of her predecessors... A writer like GE is something more than a model and a beacon-light: she is a living protest against the tendency to deterioration of modern literature, under the growing pressure of the age and the inducements to careless workmanship."


Review of a biography of Prince Albert by Theodore Martin. Contains a note on Albert's appreciation of the works of GE, especially the early novels: 

"[Albert] revelled in her humour, and the sayings of Mrs. Poyser especially were often on his lips. ... So highly did he think of AB that he sent a copy of it to Baron Stockmar soon after it was published."
211. The Westminster Review, 111 (June 1, 1879), 287.  
Notice of BB.

212. The Times, June 5, 1879, p. 4.  
Review of TS. "A wide range of subjects more or less abstruse has seldom been handled more succinctly, more lucidly, or more lightly. . . . It is emphatically a work of genius—the fruit of deep thought and ripe experience, of research, observation, and ingenious speculation. . . . [TS] is written with a pregnant force of concentrated expression and with a most discriminating precision of eloquent language."

Review of TS. Any new book of GE's has to endure comparison with her earlier works. "Such a test, however, tells with crushing force against TS, which is slighter in conception, less finished in execution, and altogether of less artistic value than any other work that has appeared under her name. . . . The consummate literary artist has degenerated into the student of social psychology."

Review of TS. In DD, GE "deserted the paths of pure romance" and attempted a "philosophical novel" along the lines of Wilhelm Meister. The result of this combination of story-telling and philosophy
was not an entirely happy one. In TS, GE finally separates philosophical essays from fiction—yet she is not very straightforward about it. Theophrastus himself takes up unnecessary space and becomes merely a peg on which to hang wise and witty remarks—a peg that should have been omitted. However, "it is the peculiar characteristic of GE's observations—and one exemplified in [TS] perhaps more than in any previous [work]—that she always puts in the best language thoughts which appear to have been in the reader's mind often before. . . . In these pages they are crystallised."

215. The Spectator, 52 (June 7, 1879), 727-728.
Review of TS. "... we regret the artificial framework thus invented for a volume of essays which . . . would have flowed much more easily and naturally directly from the pen of a writer who has gained for herself a well justified authority in English Literature. . . . The book is studded with fine thoughts and fine expressions, but the medium in which they are distributed is sometimes so stiff that the effect is injured. . . . The fictitious Theophrastus Such does apparently give [GE] fresh motive for slightly pedantic forms of speech, and we groan under them. . . . On the whole, we admit that this book has greatly disappointed us.
But in few books that disappoint us is there so much which would have delighted us, had it but been freed from the somewhat clumsy setting which deprives it of its charm."

216. "George Eliot's Ideal Ethics." The Spectator, 52 (June 14, 1879), 751-753; Rptd. Littell's Living Age, 142(1879), 123-125.

Labels GE a Positivist and discusses her "ethical ideals" as reflected in TS. Finds the same enthusiasm and high-mindedness in TS as in GE's works of fiction, but discerns a shift in emphasis "from the individual to the social, or as it is the dreadful custom now to call it, the sociological point of view." Rest of the article is an attack on "this new school of moralists [who] subordinate individual life to social life."

217. Saintsbury, George. The Academy, 17(June 28, 1879), 555-557.

Review of TS. "The author has attempted a form which is not an easy one, and has not observed its limitations. . . . The essayist who wishes to utter his opinions through the mouth of a feigned personage must give him at least something of a body for our thoughts to take hold of. Mr. Such is little more than a disembodied shadow with a name attached to it. . . . No one expects [GE] to be easily garrulous; but she might have been expected to be full, and at
the same time terse and clear-cut... On the whole however TS may be pronounced to be a book containing more good things than bad; but spoilt by an insufficient attention to form and an insufficient recognition of its necessity."

218. The Saturday Review, 47(June 28, 1879), 805-806. Review of TS. "If the present volume cannot be said to add to its author's literary reputation, it does not detract from it... [But] analysis of the mind... is the staple of the book, often pursued till the style is oppressed by fulness and weight of thought and farfetched illustration."

219. The Contemporary Review, 35(July, 1879), 765-766. Review of TS. "The moral criticism in the detached essays has too often something corrosive about it, and something over-elaborate too." The chapters on Such have no organic relationship to the rest of the book and are too self-conscious.

220. Allen, Grant. "Some New Books," The Fortnightly Review, 26 N.S. (July 1, 1879), 144-149. Review of TS. "GE allows herself to speak under a thin disguise in her own person; and the result is a series of character sketches, admirable in truthfulness, insight, and power, but almost painful in their elaborateness and weight of matter." TS contains much admirable writing, but probably
will not be popular because GE's readers expect a "story" from her. Also, TS is too intellectual for the average reader.


Combined review of TS, Browning's Dramatic Idyls, and Tennyson's The Lover's Tale. On TS: "The book is indeed soothing more than a collection of essays and sketches, many of them of the slightest kind. It looks, we are sorry to say, more like a clearing out of old drawers, and sweeping together of scattered leaves and scraps, than the last rich and mellow gatherings of a great vintage."


Review of TS. "Although [in TS GE] has taken to the scalpel instead of the brush, and has made men as interesting cases, instead of human beings with claims upon our admiration, our pity or contempt, we question much whether she is doing work at all comparable in excellence in this pathological theatre, to that which she did in the artist's studio in which her earlier works were written."


Review of TS. "It is hardly necessary to say that there are many passages that bear the full stamp of
the author's insight and originality; but nothing she has ever written has, whilst reminding us of her strength, so fully convinced us of her weakness."
The manner of the essays is "timid, dream-like, and shadowy," when it should be "wide-awake and familiar."
The facts presented are typical only of the trivial, not of that which is widely important.

224. The Pall Mall Gazette, December 23, 1880, p. 5.
Obit. on GE. Concludes: "One of her most constant thoughts turned on the waste of force in the world. The same thought is surely uppermost in our minds to-day, as we learn that so commanding an intellect, so noble a spirit has passed away from us."

Obit. notice on GE, containing details of the circumstances of her death, brief summary of her publishing career.

226. The Academy, 18(December 24, 1880), 460.
Obit. on GE. Calls her the "greatest writer of English Romance," and briefly traces her publishing career. Mentions GE as a thinker and a poet, but concludes: "Her fame will be that of a novelist, and of the novelist who entered most profoundly into the problems of the day as they present themselves to the best and most unfettered intelligence
of our time."

Obit. on GE. Discusses the circumstances of her
death, her early life, and publishing career. Con­cludes: "So remarkable a life, so quick with in­tellectual activity, harmonising so closely with all the growing movements of the time in which she lived, cannot but leave a blank behind it, both for those readers to whom the characters in her works were as household words, and to the large circle of private friends who have even more reason to lament her loss."

228. The Pall Mall Gazette, December 24, 1880, p. 8.
Brief note reporting that friends of GE were con­sidering asking Dean Stanley that her remains be buried in Westminster Abbey.

229. The Standard (London), December 24, 1880, p. 3.
Obit. on GE. Calls her the "greatest contemporary writer of English romance"; discusses briefly her early life and publishing career. Concludes: "It is, of course, on the romances of GE that her fame will rest . . . because of the earnestness and profundity of their dealing with the most serious problems of the age. . . . If GE's analysis of life has its deeply-rooted faults, it will at least
always be admitted that it was that of a most grave and gifted inquirer. If the work which began with the SQL and ended with TS has its deficiencies, it was wrought, at all events, by a great artist and a free and wonderful spirit."

Obit. on GE. Brief sketch of her rise to literary fame. Concludes: "... the vividness of her imagination enabled her to present to her generation novels full of the movement, the pains and the recompenses of humanity, which will be read by succeeding generations, not only for their fidelity to the life of our times, but also for their revelations of a human character that will not change, and for the charm of a style that will soothe and gratify the reader even when the page is thick with emotions."

231. The Times, December 24, 1880, p. 9.
Obit. on GE. Brief biographical sketch, review of her publishing career. Her death is an "irreparable loss" to English literature. Her friends feel that a "great and noble spirit, supreme in intellect as in culture, as tender as it was strong, has passed away from the world."

"We regret most deeply to announce the death of 'George Eliot'--Mrs. Cross--which occurred on the night of Wednesday, from pericarditis. The death was announced too late for any comment of ours, but England and the world have sustained a severe intellectual loss. A hundred years hence, we believe, biographers will notice that the greatest man and the greatest woman who have appeared in English literature were both from the 'Midlands.'"

233. The Daily Telegraph (London), December 27, 1880, p. 6. Notice of the date, time and place of GE's funeral (December 29, 12:30 PM, Highgate Cemetery). Includes letter from Herbert Spencer disavowing any significant influence on GE's education, as reported in the Telegraph's obit. on GE. Also includes an account by a correspondent of the reaction in Nuneaton to GE's death.

234. The Daily News (London), December 30, 1880, p. 2. Account of GE's funeral, including list of prominent mourners. Includes the text of the funeral address by Dr. Sadler, which says, in part: "Her place amongst the greatest of the living and the dead in the walks of literature is beyond question. She is 'one of the few, the immortal names that were not born to die.'"
Notice of GE's funeral at Highgate Cemetery. Among those listed as present were Herbert Spencer, Robert Browning, Frederic Harrison, Kegan Paul, Oscar Browning, Sidney Colvin, and Dr. Congreve. The services were conducted by the Rev. Dr. Sadler, a Unitarian minister.

Discusses GE's life up to the time of her association with the Westminster Review.


Obit on GE. "It is not too much to say that with many her works have been far more than novels, have constituted an animating principle co-operating with some of the most powerful spiritual influences of the time." Gives brief review of GE's works, concluding: "Altogether, in range of sympathy, in nobility of tone, in fertility of reflection, and in subtlety of insight these novels of memory [GE's earlier novels, esp. AB, ME] are unique in the history of fiction."

Brief obit. article on GE. "By universal consent she held the first place among living novelists. . . . Poetry in the highest sense was beyond her reach; but on a lower level her creations have a vitality which is hardly surpassed by the conceptions of Shakespeare himself. . . . It may be questioned whether any other novelist, either in England or elsewhere, has made the novel a medium for expressing so many profound truths; for expressing them, too, in a form which appeals more impressively to the imagination than to the reason."

A detailed medical account of GE's fatal illness.

Obit. article on GE. Brief evaluation of the novels. "She was perhaps the greatest female writer who has ever lived. . . . Miss Austen was a more faultless artist than GE, but she never sounded the same comic or tragic depths." Perhaps her best novel is SM. Concludes: "Her youth was wasted on Strauss, and her later days were given to DD and TS; but her divagations from the proper purpose of her life will be forgotten while AB and SM are still ornaments of English literature."
242. [Hutton, Richard H.]. The Spectator. 54(January 1, 1881), 10-11; Rptd. Living Age, 149(1881), 318-320.
Obit. article on GE. "There can be no doubt that GE touched the highest point which, in a woman, has been reached in our literature. . . . We should rank GE second only in her own proper field . . . to Sir Walter Scott, and second to him only because her imagination, though it penetrates far deeper, has neither the same splendid vigour of movement, nor the same bright serenity of tone."

Obit. article on GE. Brief discussion of early life, intellectual development. Does not discuss her works at all. Concludes: " . . . it seems no exaggeration to hold that, in the delineation of character and the subtle analysis of human motive, we must go back to Shakespeare to find her superior. . . . Perhaps no other soul but Shakespeare's is so completely manifested in written words."

A brief biographical sketch of GE. Two pages of ink sketches of scenes associated with GE and her novels, accompanied by a brief description of each scene and its association with the novelist and/or the novels.
245. Bayne, Peter. The Literary World. 23 N.S. (January 14, 1881), 25-26. [The first of thirty-five weekly articles on GE's works, extending from this date to October 7, excepting the issues of June 10, July 8, July 15, and July 22.]

Discusses SCL in general, "Mr. Gilfil" and "Amos Barton" in particular. Before publication in Blackwood's was even completed, "the star-gazers of the literary horizon had found cause to believe that another novelist of genius had appeared. . . ."
The three stories of SCL contain "traces of quaint humour and a profound reflective philosophy which denotes an original mind."


Discusses "Janet's Repentance." "... in this her third story, GE proved herself to have mastered the far more difficult art [than writing pleasantly about pleasant people] of representing persons, who are thoroughly disagreeable and repulsive in life, in such a way that, though their badness and repulsiveness are felt--nay, in part because their obnoxious qualities are felt--they are keenly interesting in fiction."

"GE's use of dialect was distinctly artistic. She used just so much of it as was necessary to give point and finish to the personages of rural life who live and breathe in her pages. . . . With the reticence of genius GE obtains her effects with the slightest possible expenditure of material. She contrives to give the impression of provincial speech without imparting any great number of unfamiliar words into the text." Illustrates with discussion of AB.


Two stanza poem in Italian sonnets in memory of GE. Begins: "Farewell great heart, that liest now so still,/That beat for me, for all of human mould;"


Characterizes GE as "a woman of surpassing genius and wide culture, the basis of whose nature was devotional, but from which there grew a form of skepticism which Goethe [would have] regarded as the noblest. . . . " Asserts, however, that "the drawback to the pleasure of reading GE is her intense subjectiveness and introspectiveness. . . . [Her]
subtle analytical way of dealing with phenomena . . .
often transgressed the bounds of her art . . .
[and] is in danger of trespassing upon the grounds
of science." Concludes, though, that "nowhere
in English literature is there to be found more
honest work of its kind. . . . No Englishwoman
has displayed so comprehensive a mind allied to
such power of expression."

Read Before the Manchester Literary Club, January 24,
1881. Papers of the Manchester Literary Club, 7
(1880-1881), 97-107.
An incomplete identification of GE's writings,
including some WR pieces. Little intensive effort
to identify articles ("Miss Evans was an occasional
ccontributor to the Leader, an 'advanced' newspaper,
edited by Mr. Lewes.") Checklist includes compilations; some French, German, and Dutch translations;
and a brief list of contemporary criticism of GE
expanded from the list compiled by W. E. Foster (The
Library Journal (New York), January, 1881.)

251. Bayne, Peter. The Literary World, 23 N.S. (January
28, 1881), 56-58.
Continued discussion of SCL, concentrating on "the
humorous intensity of desire with which GE attempts
to pass herself off in them for a man, while utterly
unable to hide the fountain of pure and distinctive
womanhood that wells up in her bosom." Concludes
that SCL assured GE's "imperishable contribution" to English literature, even if she had never written another line.


Obit. article on GE. Brief account of her reputation, publications, religious and social views. "Not merely a great writer but a great woman has passed away. . . . Her deep and catholic love for humanity in its broadest and best sense, which was in itself the strongest quickening motive of her genius, will maintain her influence in the future as in the present."


Obit. article on GE. "We do not believe any genius ever received more contemporaneous recognition. . . . She has left no successor." Considers GE's contribution to literature and society. GE refutes the notion that a work of art must be lessened by containing a serious moral purpose. "No preacher of our day . . . has done so much to mould the moral aspirations of her contemporaries as she has. . . . Her influence was as wide as it was profound."
Obit. article on GE. "In losing GE we have probably lost the greatest woman who ever won literary fame, and one of the very few writers of our day to whom the name 'great' could be conceded with any plausibility." Praises GE's earlier works—SCL, AB, SM, MF—as having the mark of high genius—moreso than her later works. As a whole, however, "the works of GE may hereafter appear as marking the termination of the great period of English fiction which began with Scott."

Obit. article on GE. Her reputation was created and will be preserved by her pictures of English rural life. Discusses the settings of MF, AB, SM, and also the dialect and grammar of the midland counties as they appear in GE's "rural novels." Concludes that GE has given us a picture of rural England before the Reform Bill such as no other writer has ever attempted, "or in all probability ever will."

Beginning discussion of AB. Characterizes AB as "the most complete, symmetrical, in one word,
satisfactory novel [GE] has produced. But it could not be justly pronounced her most characteristic, ambitious, or even—though this is more doubtful—powerful book."

Continued discussion of AB. Compares GE's development of the Bede family to Dickens' of the Peggottys and Scott's of the Mucklebackits. Dickens eliminated because a caricaturist; discussion restricted to GE and Scott. Concludes: "On the whole, I suppose, Scott's group must be placed higher in the galleries of immortal art than GE's, but I am not nearly so sure of this as I am that both have in them the stuff of immortality."

258. Bayne, Peter. The Literary World, 23 N.S. (February 18, 1881), 104-106.
Continued discussion of AB. Discusses characters of the Poyzers, Bartle Massey, Hetty, and Arthur. Mrs. Poyser the most popular of GE's characters, but not the most ably drawn: to some extent a "formula" character, easier to draw than other notable characters of GE.

Concluding discussion of AB. Concentrates on Hetty, who ably demonstrates "the method of GE--her
characteristic manner of dealing with her personages."

Objects to Hetty's rescue: "GE, I suppose, could not find it in her heart to let Hetty actually die on the gallows. But we may doubt whether she did not commit a mistake. . . . Art looks severely upon the surrender of natural results and legitimate effects, in deference to popular sentiment."


Beginning discussion of MF. Characterizes it as GE's most "mournful" novel: "An evil fate seems to dominate the book. . . . It is almost with a sense of relief, though with infinite sadness, that we at last see the angel of death spread his wings over the scene, and bring a desolation which at least is peace."


Continued discussion of MF, focusing on the Tulliver family. Finds the Dodsons, Pullets, and Gleggs "wearisome": GE did not have the "sunny, all-brightening laughter" of Shakespeare or the "playful irony" of Thackeray to keep them from being so.


Continued discussion of MF, focusing on the relationship between Maggie and Philip.
Continued discussion of MF, focusing on GE's characterizations. "She proves how hopelessly inferior the brush is to the pen as an instrument of portraiture. ... GE shows you the man all around. ... She shows you the man as deriving, so to speak, a various illumination from different groups with which he stands connected, and in this various illumination, variously revealing himself."


265. The Church Quarterly Review, 12(April, 1881), 242-267. Review of Blackwood's edition of GE's Works. Extended discussion of each of GE's novels. Concludes: "GE dealt with human character and conduct in its whole extent; she saw and recorded facts with unswerving fidelity; but the shrewdness of her observation was ennobled by her conception of moral principles and of the tragedy of moral conflicts; she lit up what is sordid and repulsive by a pervading humour, and, above all, she saw and preserved by imaginative power the abiding principles of life amid the shifting accidents of external conditions and historical changes. This combination
of qualities she shared with Shakespeare, and with him alone."


Personal reminiscence of meeting GE when she resided with the Chapmans. Notes her physical and mental attributes. Despite her "want of spirituality," GE was "the greatest woman of England. . . . the grand, creative mind of Anglo-Saxon womanhood."


Discusses GE's religious significance. Concludes: "The creative genius, the keen eye and loving heart for all things natural, the unselfish tolerance, the grave and serious tone, the spirit of humour subdued by knowledge, the beseeching earnestness, the unwearying sympathy, the evergrowing sadness, that have made GE a familiar great name amongst us, are combined into their peculiar form, and receive a distinct energy from the religion that GE preached, and, in some degree, practised."


Concluding discussion of MF. Concentrates on conclusion of the novel.

Discussion of the comparative merits of GE and Carlyle, of a similarity in "aim and drift."

"... they often say the same thing, for each is speaking to children of the same generation and speaking out of a very sensitive and responsive heart, and out of a brain brimful of the lore of the same forefathers and teachers: ... We can never forget as we are reading them that we are within the relentless grasp of the 'not-ourselves.'"


Beginning discussion of *SM*. "SM may have faults; but I have never been able to detect any. ... I can point to nothing in it which I should call a flaw. ... But if GE had been a Christian, the light to which Marner at last attains might have been much fuller, clearer, brighter than it is, and the whole would have ended in a more rich poetic glory."


Continued discussion of *SM*. "One of the most charming stories ever written."


Concluding discussion of *SM*, concentrating on the
secondary characters, who are created with a "peculiar grace and felicity."

Discussion of GE as a poet. Even had she thrown the whole force of her genius into her poetry as she did in her prose, she might still have failed as a poet; her philosophy was incompatible with "tunefulness," and she did not treat English scenes in her poetry as she did in her prose. Discusses J and SE.

Poem, beginning, "Two souls diverse out of our human sight/Pass, followed one with love and each with wonder. . . ."

Obit. article on GE. Biographical sketch mostly. Brief discussion of her chief works--calls AB GE's "most purely objective" work, but MM may eventually be considered her greatest. Concludes: " . . . precious as the writings of GE are and must be always, her life and character were yet more beautiful than they."

Continued discussion of GE's poetry.

Continued discussion of GE's poetry.


Continued discussion of GE's poetry.


Concluding discussion of SE. "If we must pronounce the work a failure, it is one of the grandest failures in the whole range of literature."


Notes that nearly all the many articles on GE since her death have been by non-Catholics. Concedes GE's greatness as a novelist, but asserts that it is her intellectual and literary eminence that makes it necessary to remember that through many of GE's works "there runs a subtle and impassioned plea against some truth, or truths, embedded in the teachings of the Church, a veiled antagonism to her doctrine, and a spirit of rejection of the faith of Jesus Christ, which culminates in the last, but least great of her works, DD."


Note on why SE failed as a poem, the chief reason
being the essential "sadness" of the subject: it has no hold on reality.

283. Bayne, Peter. The Literary World, 23 N.S. (June 17, 1881), 377-379.

Beginning discussion of R, which is called a "transcendent effort of intellect and imagination. . . . As a sheer exhibition of power, it ought perhaps to take precedence of all GE's works, whether in prose or in verse."


Continued discussion of R, concentrating on Romola and Tito.

285. Bayne, Peter. The Literary World, 24 N.S. (July 1, 1881), 8-10.

Continued discussion of R, concentrating on Tito and Baldassare. "Since Shakespeare's Lear I know not so remarkable a study of the mind diseased as Baldassare. . . . So far as I know, this character is unique."


Most people consider GE a "discoverer and enforcer of moral truth" rather than an artist. Sully asserts that GE was very much an artist. Sully concentrates on her characterization, which "attempts to give something of the complexity of the mental organi-
zation." Concludes: "GE, in her large and exact conception of life, in her truthful and instructive presentation of it, is touched by the scientific spirit of her age. Her fine sense of the determinativeness of human events, of the continuity of our experience, and of the gradations by which character develops, marks her off as the writer of stories who has moved furthest onward in the direction of contemporary ideas."


Extensive biographical sketch and brief critical examination of GE's works. "In culture . . . we may say that GE excels all English novelists. In the power of imaging impressive situations, in portraiture of character, in pathos, in descriptive force, in mastery of language--delicate, apt, lucid, carefully elaborated diction--she ranks with the highest prose writers of her school. In wit and humour she has no superiors, unless they be Lucian, Sterne, Swift, Rabelais, Voltaire."


Continued discussion of R, concentrating on Romola and Savanarola.

Concluding discussion of *R*, concentrating on GE's characterization of Savanarola. Concludes: "*R* is a great book, a masterpiece of genius, embodying a philosophical biography, and studded with diamond-like gems of thought; but it takes three learned men and Macauley's miraculous school-boy to read it, and therefore it is not a good novel."


Beginning discussion of *MM*. "... long ere we have read twenty pages of *MM*, we find that the Hypatia-like authoress of *R* has stepped down from her professorial chair, shut up her erudite manuscripts, and become once more the enchanting storyteller of *SM* and *AB*.


Continued discussion of *MM*. "*MM* is distinguished among GE's novels by variety. Others may equal it in power, but no one can compare with it in the magical felicity with which different classes, interests, and scenes are brought before us."


Continued discussion of *MM*, focusing on Mrs.
Continued discussion of MM, concentrating on
Dorothea's marital difficulties, which "affords, perhaps, the finest illustration of GE's analytic
genius in the whole range of her works. The power
displayed is of a kind seldom exhibited by English
novelists, and in order to find a parallel to it we
should have to go to Balzac and Goethe."

Continued discussion of MM, concentrating on Lydgate
and Rosamond.

Continued discussion of MM, concentrating on Bulstrode.

Concluding discussion of MM.

Next-to-last article in series on GE. Briefly
discusses PH, DD.

Examines the philosophical doctrines most associated
with GE and the manifestation of various creeds in
her stories and characters. Asserts that as anti-Christian feeling grows in GE, her books lose their charm and she becomes increasingly a "proser of proverbs and a tedious moralist." Pities GE's state of mind and admires her moral powers. Concludes: "Assuredly, her chief claim upon our admiration, as upon our pity, is that she anxiously, passionately, incessantly aspires to tell us of the Highest Good. . . . Her noble soul, though turned to Atheism, kept some memories, a fading reminiscence of the truth: and it is the recurring glimpse of holiness and purity that takes us by the heart when we are moved by her exhortations to self-sacrifice, or touched to the quick by her sadness."

299. The London Quarterly Review, 57(October, 1881), 154-170.

Obit. article on GE. Discusses her life briefly, then concentrates on her literary characteristics and accomplishments. Emphasizes a marked difference in "spirit" between the early and late works. Using SCL as an example, says the chief impressions of the early works are of a "large, genial, and kindly tolerance, of a keen sympathy with the sorrows and perplexities of the common and undistinguished among mankind." In TS, GE's last and "least admirable" book, there is a marked change: "For large tolerance
we have contemptuousness; for kindly humour, sarcasm."
Notes also that with FH GE's novels become progressively doctrinaire. Concludes about GE as an artist: "From the very first her writing has a singular character of finish and perfection. . . . there is nothing slipshod, nothing hurried. . . . her standard of finish and completeness was never lowered, her desire of perfection only the more exacting."

Concluding article in series on GE. Concludes that SCL, AB, SM, and MM are "consummately good novels, the last two all but faultless."

Discusses GE's value as a moral teacher. "It is this quality which constitutes her a master of prose-fiction in its noblest aspect, that of virtue teaching truth, and of effort-inspiring revelation."
Briefly discusses each of GE's novels to illustrate this thesis. Concludes: "[GE] breathed an elevating spirit into every subject that she touched, and her highest claim to our gratitude is not her literary excellence, great as that is; not her wit, humour, or pathos; but the noble purpose which gave to her genius a larger life."

Brief biographical sketch of GE, followed by discussion of each of her works and an analysis of the "leading characteristics of her genius and thought." Considers MM the "zenith" of GE's greatness; DD and TS were disappointments. In analyzing GE's "genius and thought," Russell examines her "religious thought" ("We find in her the most marvellous power of putting herself in the position of the holders of all creeds."); her "ethical system" ("This may almost be summed up in one word, Duty. . . . No novelist . . . has dwelt with more insistence or more varied force on this ennobling theme."); her "wit and humour" (". . . if she is deficient in that perfection of form which essential to wit, among humourists GE stands very high."); and her "feeling for nature" ("In GE we find the minutest touches true to life, while the wider and more comprehensive survey is certainly not lacking.").


"Whatever view be taken of GE's ethics, he must be a daring man who will deny that she is possessed of genius; and she has that rare gift of genius, a
creative and sympathetic imagination in regard to children." Discusses GE's characterization and use of children in her novels, concluding with a quote from R which constitutes the thesis of the article: "The little children are still the symbol of the eternal marriage between love and duty.


Personalized, impressionistic sketch, chiefly biographical, of GE by a friend. Stresses development of GE's "strong and serious mind." Myers' view of GE is chiefly Sibylline, as reflected in his well-known description of a meeting with GE at Cambridge: "[GE] taking as her text the three words which have been used so often as the inspiring trumpet-calls of men,—the words God, Immortality, Duty,—pronounced, with terrible earnestness, how inconceivable was the first, how unbelievable the second, and yet how peremptory and absolute the third. . . . Her grave, majestic countenance turned toward me like a Sibyl's in the bloom; it was as though she withdrew from my grasp, one by one, the two scrolls of promise, and left me the third scroll
only, awful with inevitable fates."


Brief sketch of the main outlines of GE's life combined with a personal impression of her personality. Little criticism of her literary accomplishments because "we live too near the dead to guage her place in literature . . . and our great personal affection, may have in some degree dimmed the keen edge of criticism."


Sonnet in remembrance of GE by "K.G." calls her "Mother of noble souls; clear-visioned sage."


Discusses the "Shakespearian" qualities of GE's works: penetrating psychological analysis, fondness for "deep sayings," ability to delineate "corresponding characters." Many points of contrast, however: Renaissance optimism enabled Shakespeare to conceive more widely typical, more universally human characters than GE's skeptical age permitted; GE depended far more than Shakespeare could have on the knowledge and insight of science in her characterizations; Shakespeare presents society and human nature in a comparatively stable equilibrium,
while GE presents a comparatively unstable and temporary equilibrium; GE apprehended evil as a negative power far more than Shakespeare did. Concludes that while doing homage to Shakespeare as supreme, one must also do justice to such great moderns as GE.

Purpose is to show Jane Austen is "unapproached"—even by GE—in the power of describing commonplace characters. Jane Austen had no sense of "mission," but in GE there is always "some great purpose in the background which throws its shade over the story, heightening its effect sometimes . . . but lifting it at once out of the region of comedy." Jane Austen and GE are separated by the gulf between comedy and tragedy.

311. Robertson, Eric. The Academy, 23(April 28, 1883), 286-287.
Review of Blind. " . . . one lays down this study of GE with some disappointment. There are few fresh facts of importance embodied in it. . . . Miss Blind . . . seems to dwell too much on GE as the individual creator or artist. . . . The far reaching intellectual sympathies of this great writer, and their correlation with the deepest movements of the century's spirit,
therefore remain a theme for some other student."

312. The Spectator, 56(April 28, 1883), 547-548.

Review of Blind. "The faults of this book appear to us chiefly two,—one, that Miss Blind has written in anticipation of the materials for a true biography, and has consequently been compelled to make her book more of a literary criticism than of a life.

... The other, that she does not really face the chief act of GE's life, on which it is certain that the estimate of her as a woman must more or less turn. . . ." On the other hand, Blind knows GE's literary weaknesses and is possessed with "extremely sensible" literary judgment. Concludes that the biography is "as good as we could have expected from a competent but not a brilliant writer who has not had access to any original biographic store of material. . . ."


Only a few writers have been able to write about the English laborer with truth and insight and without "false condescension." First among those who have succeeded is Shakespeare, followed by Scott. There are, however, two recent writers whose strength has chiefly been "in touching Mother Earth; who have felt . . . that human nature is the supremely
interesting study for man. . . . " Both GE and Hardy fail to give life to the upper classes, but "they are conspicuously admirable, each in his and her own phase of humbler life, GE in describing the life of the farmer and the village artisan, Hardy that of the labourer . . . although GE and Hardy differ in many attitudes toward the laboring classes, they agree in their attitude toward the "religion of the pure unmixed rustic."

Review of Blind. "The special charm of this book is that it shows more emphatically than anything else that but few of the great women of genius who have lived in any time or country possessed more of that emotional temperament which we associate with genius . . . as distinguished from talent."

315. Robertson, J. Progress, 1(June, 1883), 381-384. [First part of a three-part article. Others are Vol. 2 (July, 1883), 57-61; (August, 1883), 117-123.]
Begins as a review of Blind, which is found to be physically ugly, but commendable "in regard to its essentials." Begins a discussion of GE's intellectual and artistic characteristics, concluding: " . . . one of the main elements in our conception of GE is that she alone among our great novelists and poets is at once fully abreast of and in sympathy with the
thought of the century. . . . She was well nigh as much more subtle a genius than her competitors in fiction as she was their superior in appetite for and range of knowledge." Contrasts GE with Thackeray and Trollope, and briefly attempts to refute the criticisms of GE made by Swinburne in A Note on Charlotte Bronte.

316. Robertson; J. Progress, 2(July, 1883), 57-61.
Second part of an essay on GE. Continues attack on Swinburne's criticisms of GE, centering on his criticism of the Maggie-Stephen love affair in MF. Discusses GE's early life and her relationship with GHL, which are considered important clues to her character: GE's actions in the face of being ostracized by her friends "is as noteworthy as evidence of the moral courage GE had displayed as of the weakness of moral judgment, the superficiality and slavery to convention, that may be found in people who suppose themselves philosophical."

317. Robertson, J. Progress, 2(August, 1883), 117-123.
Concluding installment of a three-part essay on GE prompted by the publication of Blind. Discusses GE's early writing, especially the promise of SCL: "Not since Shakespeare had there been such impartiality of human portraiture in any series of scenes. Yet it is not so much the breadth of view or the grave
superiority of touch and treatment . . . which attracts the reader to the new novelist—-not so much these as that incomparable sympathy which perfumes her every page." Concludes: " . . . the final impression is one of a nature of rare strength and rarely paralleled endowments. . . . Knowledge and love—these are the attributes which make GE's name an enduring one."


Extended critical-biographical sketch of GE, composed in part from other contemporary articles and books. Each novel is discussed at length, as are GE's intellectual attitudes and literary career. Concludes: "If we have seen that GE . . . was not wholly a perfect woman, we have also seen that, in addition to her rare intellectual gifts, she had many gracious qualities which call for our admiration, and that, by her character, her life, and her work, she raised the standard of her sex."


An autobiographical account of Bray's early friendship with GE. Discusses her translation of Strauss, her travels with the Brays, her friendship with J. A. Froude. Includes a phrenological characteri-
zation of GE.


Review of ELN. "These essays will not add to the reputation of their author. . . . Though not all signs of genius are wanting, these articles are essentially chips from the workshop, and give no foreshadowing of the finished product. Their interest is purely relative to the light they may throw on GE's mental development."

321. The Spectator, 57(March 1, 1884), 282-283.

Review of ELN. "On the whole, we cannot say that the publication of this volume will add to GE's great reputation. That reputation will always depend on her fictions, and will not be enhanced by the tendency to dissertation, which has, indeed, done something to injure her stories."

322. The Saturday Review, 57(March 8, 1884), 320-321.

Review of ELN. On the Notes: " . . . interesting specimens of the detached thoughts that may be worked up in a novel or essay later, [but] there is perhaps no single one of them that attains to the full dignity of a representative pensée." On the Essays: " . . . on the whole they exhibit very noticeably their author's merits and defects as a writer and thinker, though, of course, they do not
at all illustrate her narrative faculty or her ability to conceive and draw character."


Review of ELN. "There can be little doubt that if this volume had come before the reviewer anonymously it would have been dismissed with a not unusual formula, 'So far as we can see, there is nothing in these essays which justifies reprinting.' When, however, the name of GE appears upon the title-page, the reasons for such a judgment must be produced. . . . If it be asked why these essays are not better than they are, it would not be easy to give an answer. . . . One reason may be that her powers at the time when most of these essays were written were only beginning to unfold themselves."


Brief account of GE's early religious upbringing and her progress away from it. Mentions only the major known facts of GE's early life, and stops at 1851.


Although severely edited by Cross, this compilation from GE's correspondence and journals was for many
years the chief source of biographical information about GE. The New Edition of 1887 was extensively revised and condensed and contains only a few new items.

326. "Adam Bede's Library." Book-lore, 2(1885), 96-99. Discussion of the significance of books Adam owned and their relationship to GE's characterization of him. Concludes: "Adam Bede's library was select in a sense unknown to the circulating library, and, small as it was, contained far more of the elements of real culture than a roomful of the foolish novels consumed by the 'reading public' . . . ."

327. The British Quarterly Review, 81(1885), 316-333. Review of Cross and a biography of GE's intellectual development. Concludes about Cross: "He had an extremely difficult task, and he has shown skill and judgment both in what is said and in what is left unsaid. All reasonable curiosity is satisfied, all necessary truth is told. . . . And that is all that any should need. The one apparent defect is that the book is somewhat sombre." Concludes about GE: "The central fact of her life's history . . . tended to suggest the thought that there may be one rule of morals for the genius and another for the ordinary woman; a dangerous and misleading thought,"
for ethics know not intellectual distinctions."

328. The Congregationalist, 14(1885), 275-284.
Review of Cross and discussion of GE's moral and religious attitudes. On Cross: "Loving reverence is not perhaps the best qualification in a biographer. ... Mr. Cross simply gives us excerpts which, having been chosen by himself, give us only his idea of his wife's character. ... His work is very artistically done, but we doubt whether it gives us a complete portraiture." On GE: finds in later work a distinct falling off of spontaneity and a general critical exaggeration of GE's talent. Morally, GE suffers from the secularizing influence of her union with GHL.

Review of Cross combined with a brief biography of GE and discussion of her literary works. Concludes about Cross: "He has performed his labour of love with remarkable tact and commendable good taste. The volumes show only too plainly how GE wished to be thought of, and too little of what she really was; but, partial and incomplete as they are, they are of great value and interest, and the opportunity they afford for a brief but at the same time more comprehensive retrospect than they themselves contain.
is worth taking advantage of."


Notes that most of GE's works are not political in nature, yet FH and Cross reveal that GE possessed strong political convictions. Examines FH, and asserts it is as important a contribution to social and political philosophy as Alton Locke and Les Misérables. Concludes that GE was peculiarly adapted to teaching the "severe, although great, truths of politics by means of the art of fiction."


General discussion of GE and her works prompted by publication of Cross. Presents slight moral objection to GE's works: "... we feel bound to assert that there is a higher standard of home-life, and a truer life of love, possible to women than that portrayed in the novels, brilliant though they be, of GE." Concludes, however, that GE is "one of the writers whose works will live, beyond all praise and above all blame."


Review of Cross. On Cross: "His scrupulous taste and accuracy, his admirable self-effacement, even the typographical devices he has adopted for the
comfort of his readers, point him out as an example to future editors." On GE: "GE was not by nature a letter writer... Her inward life was too intense to allow her to dwell on the small outward incidents which form the staple matter of a born letter-writer like Mrs. Carlyle... These letters, then, do not claim attention, in their own right, as literary utterances... Their interest... lies in their revelation, first of the external circumstances of her life... secondly, of her intellectual and moral growth, idiosyncrasies, and even limitations."


Extracts from Charles Bray's just published autobiography dealing with his friendship with GE. Reprinted without comment.


Discussion of Bray's sketch of GE in his autobiography (Phases of Opinion and Experience During a Long Life, London, 1885). "Mr. Bray was one of those who think that they can dispose of the greatest questions in a very trenchant and sledge-hammer fashion; but he was nevertheless a shrewd observer in his way, and also on the whole, and in this case

Pictures of GE and GHL accompanied by a reproduction of one of her letters, written at Blandford Square on some illustrations for R done by Sir Frederick Leighton. Also includes discussion of difficulty of settling financial arrangement for publication of R with the Cornhill Magazine.

Review of Cross. As revealed in the Life, GE "does not fascinate, but she commands respectful homage, and even affectionate admiration." Contrasts her "olympian" calm with the passion of Carlyle as revealed by Froude, but adds: "At the same time is there not just a suspicion in this exceeding calm that a too affectionate hand has pruned away over much?" No mortal woman can live so completely on an "olympian" level, but Cross allows us to see nothing of GE's passions and hatreds. Concludes: "A great and novel woman, with a didactic genius of the first rank, a loving and devoted wife, she will never excite the passionate enthusiasm even of those who admire her most— at least, unless they know more of her life story than Mr. Cross has cared to tell. As it is revealed to us it is not
real, but ideal, and the ideal is almost as colourless as a quaker's garb."

337. The Pall Mall Gazette, 41 (January 27, 1885), 3.
Quotes passage from Cross on GE's telling of the story of how Carlyle showed Emerson "the devil" in the slums of London.

338. The Pall Mall Gazette, 41 (January 27, 1885), 11-12.
Review of Cross. Confined to quoting and commenting on sections of the Life dealing with GE's domestic life. Compares the Life to Froude's Carlyle in London: "Seldom has an editor asserted himself more than Mr. Froude, or effaced himself more than Mr. Cross. . . . The biography of GE has still to be written. All that we have here is but materials for a biography almost entirely autobiographical."
Criticizes "idealisation" of GHL in the Life, absence of discussion of his union with GE.

339. The Times, January 27, 1885, p. 4. [First of three 1885 Times reviews of Cross. The others are January 29, p. 13; February 2, p. 13.]
Review of Cross. A "very remarkable book. . . . Mr. Cross has shown excellent judgment. . . ." Some, however, may find it disappointing: "We miss the multitude of minute touches by the hand of an admiring biographer . . . we miss the trivial every-day incidents . . . and every-day talk. . . ."

Second review of Cross. Concentrates on GE's early "religious experience" as revealed in the Life, and on her publishing career through SCL, AB.

341. The Pall Mall Gazette, 41 (January 30, 1885), 11.

Letter from "A. E. C." on January 27 reviews of Cross in the Gazette. Protests that the reviewers spoke of GE's life only with praise, making no hint of "blame or blemish." Says GE's life, unlike her books (which are "ennobling"), was a failure. Concludes: "We women love and honour GE in her books, but we sadly turn from her mistaken life. . . ."

342. The Athenaeum, January 31, 1885, pp. 145-146. [First of two 1885 Athenaeum reviews of Cross. The other is February 7, pp. 175-176.]

Review of Cross. "... the book is remarkably satisfactory in tone, and is especially noteworthy for a rigid abstinence from anything that could pander to mere curiosity." Discusses at length GE's relationship with GHL.


Notes the absence of humour in Cross with some surprise: GE's "dramatic humour" seems to be of a kind which would have been visible in her personal as well as her artistic life, but Cross' edition of her letters and journals shows this was not so. In
her ordinary life the "reflective and elaborate considerateness" of GE dominated everything else. Finds GE's letters wanting in "life and variety" in her ordinary view of the world. Concludes: "on the whole, we should say that, while GE is an author of singularly large humour, this quality is more completely latent in her correspondence than it is at all easy to understand."

344. The Spectator, 58(January 31, 1885), 151-153.
Review of Cross. "Mr. Cross has accomplished his difficult task with tact and modesty. . . . The letters tell their own tale; and the few connecting links of narrative with which Mr. Cross supplies his readers, certainly do not err in the direction of excess." The letters themselves, however, are of "slow and somewhat too sweet reflectiveness, out of which the vivacity of strong personal impression seems to have vanished altogether. . . . There is [a] want of vivid first-hand feeling."

Review of Cross. "[The reader] will enjoy, for the most part, the immense advantage of finding all these interesting matters of GE's life and thought chronicled by herself; and such additions as Mr. Cross has made, while indispensible to completeness, are
as valuable as they are unobtrusive." The article, however, is largely a biographical sketch of GE, with the *Life* getting only a few paragraphs of attention near the end.


Review of Cross. "A striking success. There will be very little dispute as to the fact that the editor of these memorials to GE has done his work with excellent taste, judgment, and sense... Mr. Cross could not we think, have devised a better way of dealing with his material: it is simple modest, and effective."


A personal account of Christmas week, 1870, spent by the writer on the Isle of Wight with GE and GHL. Notes the "brilliant contrast" of the pair, GE's erudition and benevolent manner, their conversations.


Final review of Cross. Picks up discussion of GE's publishing career at *MF*. Describes her increasing reputation throughout the rest of her life.


Letter by "S." in reference to letter by "A.E.C."
(January 30th). Praises her "brave and true" words. Concludes: "We must gravely face the failure of GE's own personal life ... and remember that the blessing of the Christian faith was in the end denied her." ...

350. The Pall Mall Gazette, 41(February 4, 1885), 2. Letter from "S. C. S." defending GE's life. Discusses GHL's difficulties in regard to his first wife and the "lifelong and faithful union" of GE and GHL, concluding that "legal" marriage is "convenient," but the absence of such a ceremony makes the marriage no less holy. Attacks the attitude of "A. E. C." (letter of January 30).

351. The Pall Mall Gazette, 41(February 6, 1885), 2. Letter from "W" replying to letter by "S. C. S." (February 4th). "S. C. S." lacking in both "fairness and courtesy": GE's life is a poor example for young girls, many of whom have come to love her novels, to follow.

352. The Pall Mall Gazette, 41(February 6, 1885), 2. Letter signed "A Woman of Common Sense" replying to letter by "S. C. S." (February 4th). "S. C. S." makes some glaring errors: monogamy is the law; any woman who disobeys loses her virtue, her position among "virtuous and godly matrons," and the legitimacy of her possible children. There are "extenuating
circumstances" in the relationship between GHL and GE, to be sure, but that does not make their union a "moral" one.

353. Dowden, Edward. The Academy, 27(February 7, 1885), 89-91.

Review of Cross. "Had there been a single jarring or false note struck by [Cross], it would have been particularly hard to forgive it in the present instance. But there is not a single false or jarring note. Mr. Cross has done his work, as far as we can discern, with admirable judgment, fine feeling, and dignified self-subordination to his theme... I have no doubt that he was also fully justified in printing only such parts of GE's letters as seemed to possess solid and enduring value in interpreting her character, setting forth her ruling ideas, or exhibiting the more important facts of her life. We can afford to sacrifice a trivial vivacity for sake of a deeper spiritual interest."


Second review of Cross. As the first review concentrated on biographical discussion, this one centers on GE as an artist. Concludes on Cross: "... the predominance of the philosophic over the artistic spirit in GE has tended to make these volumes, containing the record of her private life,
rather dull and—dare we say it?—commonplace. She was a great woman, but this is not a great book.

... The book as a whole might more easily be the record of a savant than of a literary artist. In every way the total impression is sad and sombre."


Discusses the 1859 Liggins authorship controversy in the light of information revealed in Cross. Brief biographical sketch of Liggins and discussion of the controversy. Concludes that Liggins has gained a kind of "immortality" along with GE: "They will go down to posterity, not exactly hand in hand— for that is not the most convenient attitude for picking a pocket—but side by side; and wherever her name is mentioned with honour, his will—not, indeed, with honour; but that is a detail—be mentioned too."


Review of Cross continued from January 27. Mostly extracts from the biography; recommends Morley's essay in Macmillan's as an excellent critical review. Presents extracts on GE's earnings as an author, her attitude toward life, her receptions at the Priory, her first attempts at fiction, SCL, AB, R, MF, FH,
politics, and judgments of her contemporaries.

357. The Pall Mall Gazette, 41 (February 9, 1885), 2. Letter from "E. R. C." on letter by "S. C. S." (February 4th). Admires and respects GE for her courage, but doubts of it was wise for GE to "thrust upon a world not yet ripe for it" her advanced "moral standpoint."


Review of Cross. A "sombre" book, and a disappointing one in two ways: "The first, that it seems rather to conceal, as under a mask and domino, the vivacity and fertility which one naturally ascribes to the great author who understood labourers and butchers and farriers and sporting clergymen and auctioneers and pedlars better even than she understood scholars and poets and metaphysicians. The second and still greater disappointment was to find that, so far as I can judge from these letters, her heart never seems to have rebelled against her own dim creed. . . ." Extensive discussion of GE's intellectual and emotional makeup.

Review of Cross. "It is pleasant to think that of one of our great English writers we at last have a truly faithful picture—one wherein no man can find offence, and with which her spirit may rest in peace undisturbed. The life which her husband has given to the world is worthy of GE. . . . Loving reverence has drawn a likeness which no literary art could have produced, and which the more familiar kinds of literary art would have cruelly spoiled."


Review of Cross. "If it is true that the most interesting of GE's characters is her own, it may be said also that the most interesting of her books is her Life. . . . Cross possesses that art of concealing the artist, which is still the rarest quality of biographers. . . ." Much of the article devoted to biographical sketch of GE's life and thought.


Observes readers are returning Cross to the libraries so quickly that few must be reading it. Also notes the reviews of the Life are no better than the Life itself. Disappointed in Harrison's Fortnightly review and Hutton's in the Contemporary. Acton's article in the Nineteenth Century seems the best of
the three, even though Acton draws more on his own reading than on reminiscences of GE.

Review of Cross. A "great disappointment. . . . We know as little as ever how it was that suddenly out of the plain of middle life [GE] stood up all at once and made herself an authority and a power--as little, nay much less, for all our previous conceptions are confused and confounded." Part of the fault is in Cross' determination to "exalt" GE, to prove her superiority. The resulting portrait of GE is "large and imposing, but it is lifeless." Contains biographical sketch of GE's early life and publishing career.

Discussion of GE's religious attitudes as gleaned from her novels and Cross. Concludes: "It would seem that she never got beyond that superficiality which marked her earliest dogmatic Christian training. She could never dissociate Christian theology from 'wrangling' . . . because the theology she had once been taught was full of wrangling, and she was not careful to study Catholic theology. . . . In this temper her splendid intellect was worn away--so far as all future hopes were concerned."
Review of Cross and F. W. H. Myers' biographical sketch (The Century Magazine, 1881). Defends Cross' limited treatment of GE's relationship with GHL. Attacks GHL for hiding behind GE's "almost limitless capacity for self-sacrifice."; calls him "a most contemptible specimen of humanity." Little said about the Myers sketch, although it is quoted from.

365. Temple Bar, 73(April, 1885), 512-524.
Review of Cross. "... This 'Life' of our great novelist is in a great measure disappointing to the outside public, and, as a whole, is both meagre and tedious... We are deluged with reflections and aphorisms, and records of trivial matters which could well be spared."

An attempt to evaluate GE's life and social contribution according to her religious attitudes. Finds Strauss, Feuerbach, and Spinoza early "destructive" influences on her Christian faith. From the time of her "union" with G. H. Lewes ("the one blot upon her life"), GE seems to have responded to all religious questions "in a more critical and a less personal spirit." Concludes that GE's intellectual and
imaginative insights, her sympathetic and sensitive interest in human life are to be admired and appreciated. Her judgment, however, is to be distrusted: she was too liable to influence by "persons inferior to herself and by books inferior to her own. . . . [she] saw distinctly the many paths of human life; but she was wanting in the power to discern and to choose the best. . . . Accordingly her mind yielded before influences it should have contended [with]."

367. The London Quarterly Review, 64 (July, 1885), 197-222. Review of Cross attached to a biographical sketch of GE's life and literary career. "Mr. Cross has performed his arduous task as biographer with rare modesty, tact, and ability. He has effaced himself indeed as much as possible, and has virtually constructed an autobiography of GE from her letters and journals. . . . " To many, however, the Life has been a disappointment: "People looked for rich mellow humour, for vivid word-painting . . . for all the wit and wisdom, the mirth and the pathos of their favourite writer's best work; and they find the most delightful of these qualities chiefly conspicuous by their absence."

Review of Cross. "[Cross] has 'pruned' the precious relics in his hands . . . and we cannot hinder the melancholy reflection that the very passages which the author of a correspondence is likely to expunge, are precisely those which would be of most interest to posterity. . . . [However] if Mr. Cross has not told the whole truth, he has at least told nothing but the truth." Much of the article devoted to biographical sketch of GE's life and thought.


An attempt to show that objection on religious grounds to certain of GE's attitudes--particularly her remark that old age is a strong argument against the popular conception of a personal immortality--is essentially irrelevant and absurd.


Begins with brief biography of GE's early life. Discusses GE's thought. Compares GE with Scott, Dickens, and Thackeray, all of whom are great writers and interesting personalities: "But GE is much more. She is a great thinker and a great scholar who chooses to write tales, but who might as readily have written histories and philosophies. . . . The result is that she is so much more than
a novelist that occasionally she is less than one; the burden of her teaching is too great for the resources of her romance, and it is the voice of the prophet which is sometimes heard instead of the cunning music of the story-teller." Another result of such characteristics, however, is a fiction of "majesty and power" that is certain of a noble place in English literature. "It is superb fiction; but it is much more than fiction."

371. Lonsdale, Margaret. George Eliot: Thoughts Upon Her Life, Her Books, and Herself. London, 1886. Initially discusses the impression of GE received from Cross. Then begins biographical presentation, starting with GE's translation of Strauss. Continues with discussion of GE in Coventry and her relationship to the Brays and Hennells; GE as subeditor of the Westminster Review; her union with GHL; and her decision to write fiction. Brief discussion of each of GE's novels in order of publication. Concludes: "Whatever conclusions we may draw from her life, she herself must powerfully interest and attract us, for she presents herself to us as an unsolved problem, a book written in a language to which we have not the key."

Extended discussion of GE's character and thought, based on Cross. Pronounces the Life "a striking success. There will be very little dispute as to the fact that the editor of these memorials of GE has done his work with excellent taste, judgement, and sense. . . . We miss the animation of mixed narrative. There is, too, a touch of monotony in listening for so long to the voice of a single speaker. . . . But Mr. Cross could not, we think, have devised a better way of dealing with his material: it is simple, modest, and effective."

Concludes about GE: " . . . the loftiness of her character is abiding, and it passes nobly through the ordeal of an honest biography. . . . As a wise benignant soul GE will still remain for all right-judging men and women."


Considers to what extent GE was "induced" to give up Christianity. Attacks the influences of Strauss and the "Higher Criticism" ("the mess of pottage for which [she] sold her birthright"). Concludes: "The
defection of GE from Christianity was in itself, and in its bearings on her own life and work, a lamentable thing. Though she carried into her writings many admirable things which she had learned in early days in the Christian school, her books would have had a different complexion and a purer flavour if she had been a believer... Her secession from the Christian ranks was a hasty proceeding, and it was based on a false view of the origin of Christianity."


An extended excerpt from "Realism and Permanence in Literature." The Australian Magazine, August, 1886, comparing Charles Kingsley and GE. Working from the theses that fiction must be realistic in "essentials" as well as in "accessories" to be great, the writer predicts Kingsley's works will outlive GE's: "Kingsley lets us see into the hearts of his men and women, just as we see into those of people we meet every day, by their own acts and their own words. GE, on the contrary, does what never can be done in real life... She would have us view human nature from within, not from without; and, therefore, she does not depict men and women, but only machines... The realism of GE has a false ring, that of Kingsley is genuine."
377. Baildon, H. Bellyse, ed. The Round Table Series, Edinburgh, 1887.

Detailed discussion of GE's moral and religious philosophy, illustrated with passages from her works, chiefly SG, R, MF, and MM. Asserts GE drew her artistic inspiration from "intellectual materials which have been welded together in a wider synthesis than any system has attained—a synthesis in which the deepest problems of human life, the nature of duty, of happiness, of sympathy, of the soul, of God, of immortality, are interpreted and unified by a common-reference to ascertained scientific law." Concludes: "The artist of the present must be content to appeal to the few of his own generation, and the many of the generations that are to come. The influence of GE will widen as we approach the goal of her aspirations."


Reconstructed conversation with GE and GHL at the Priory. Describes GE and GHL. Conversation centers on GE's attitudes toward old age.


Fragment of a review of Cross which was never completed. Mentions Cross' Life as "uninteresting.

... There are wise and good sayings to be found
here and there at long intervals, but these are not of such merit as to add materially to the fame of the writer. . . . A biography may reveal to us a friend or at least a companion--someone whom we know as we know Dorothea or Romola. The present book falls wholly short of any such revelation."

Brief description of GE's personal appearance, pieced together from 1881 Harper's New Monthly Magazine article and William Morgan's George Eliot. No original material.

Asserts that Elizabeth Evans suggested Dinah Morris to GE, although Mrs. Evans was not as "meek-spirited" as her fictional counterpart. Also asserts Robert Evans was not the model for Adam Bede, but William Evans of Ellaston, GE's uncle, was. But criticizes GE's failure in AB to accurately present the atmosphere of "reverend and godly fear" in which the villagers live. In his portrait of Parson Christian, Hall Caine has succeeded where GE failed.

GE's artistic development based upon adequate materials. . . . Prof. Conrad's book is a genuine effort to do justice to a literary figure which belongs not less to Europe than to England; and his gift is not the less valuable that, in England itself, GE's reputation has, since her death, palpably waned. . . . " Concludes: " . . . those in England who have dared to compare GE in mastery of character with Shakespeare will welcome the deliberate adhesion to this verdict of a critic trained in the school of Goethe and Lessing, and wholly unaffected by the idola of English popular aesthetics."

Bell, James. George Eliot as a Novelist. Originally given as two lectures before the Congregational Church Guild of Aberdeen. Aberdeen, 1888.

Divides his discussion of GE into sections on "Early Development" (early life, intellectual influences of the Brays, Spencer, GHL, Chapman); "Her Art" (the moral purpose of her writing, her realism, contrast between early and late novels, comparisons with Jane Austen and Charlotte Bronte, her humor); and "Her Moral Teaching." Critical attitudes are almost always favorable to GE, although the early novels are considered to have a "facility of movement" lacking in the later novels, which suffer somewhat from being "manipulated from without rather than evolved from within."
Cast in the form of an imaginary conversation, the critique offers a variety of viewpoints that tend to present DD as a complex novel. Comments range from complaints of lack of humor and "current" in DD and judgement of it as the weakest of her books to pronouncements of it as the most "intellectually brilliant" of all GE's novels.

Discussion of GE as an artist and of Cross. On the Life: "There is little that is absent that it would have been in Mr. Cross's power to give us... The form [he] has chosen, or invented, becomes... highly agreeable, and his rule of omission... has not prevented his volumes from being as copious as we could wish." James sees GE as not having the "free aesthetic life" that implies the possession of an "artistic mind." The figures and situations in GE's fiction evolve directly from her "moral consciousness" and only indirectly from her observation. James sees GE's artistic development as one from a balance of "perception" and "reflection" in her early works to a progressive overdevelopment of reflection at the
expense of perception beginning with R. Also
discusses GHL's influence on GE.

A review of David Kaufmann's *George Eliot and Judaism*.
The book is "valuable and interesting to English
society not as a critique on the plot or the
characters of the book . . . but as indicating from
a Jewish standpoint in how far and how truly modern
Judaism is therein represented." Discusses modern
Judaism and how it relates to Jewish attitudes
toward DD.

An attempt to "throw light" on the writings of GE
by identifying the real prototypes of GE's fictional
characters and the real locations of her fictional
landscape. Detailed description of the area around
Nuneaton, of conversations with people who remembered
GE as a child, and of GE's life at Foleshill.
Chapters on SCL (one chapter for each story), *AB*
two chapters), *MF, SM, MM, and DD* rely on equation
between descriptions of actual countryside and people
and GE's fictional description.

A series of India proofs of settings and scenes from
GE's novels by "eminent artists" with accompanying descriptive letterpress and an introductory essay. Introduction discusses GE's use of her material and declares her "reality," her "absolute truth" is her great source of power: "She gives us no ideal heroes and heroines of romance, but ordinary men and women in their most ordinary guise, and by the very power of their humanity compels us to an interest in them which no romance could inspire." When she turns aside from these people to paint "ideal or historical portraits" (as in R and DD), her power is diminished.


Notices a similarity of mental and physical suffering by each of these women. Discusses Mrs. Carlyle's warm reception of SCL. Lengthy discussion, based on journals and letters, of the physical and mental ailments GE and Mrs. Carlyle seemed to be suffering from and of the effects they seemed to have on their personalities.


Poses the question of which of GE's novels is her best. AB the most popular with the public, men of
letters favor SM, some prefer R, many influential critics opt for MM. But Browning himself chooses DD—in spite of persistent and well known criticisms of the book. To Browning, DD is "the result of normal and regular growth of unrivalled powers which were ever seeking subjects more and more worthy for their exercise. . . . It is an effort to realise the highest purposes of art, to seize the strongest passions, the loftiest heights and the lowest depths of human nature." If it fails in execution, it still paves the way for eventual accomplishment of such a lofty goal.

392. Tytler, Sarah. "English Men and Women of Letters of the 19th Century. —X. George Eliot." The Atlanta Scholarship and Reading Union, (July, 1889), 682-686. Discussion of GE's rise to fame and of her literary accomplishments. Asserts that GE never surpassed SCL. In MF, GE's "fatalistic doctrine" appears, and it runs throughout the rest of her works and is the one "serious drawback" to her teaching. MF marks the zenith of GE's achievements: "she was still to do splendid work, but not equal to her first work."

Concludes that English literature owes an immense debt to GE, but it is not detracting from her achievements to say her genius was "impaired and injured by defects of temperament, experience, and belief, so that on one side it not only fell short
of its unique promise, it had a misleading tendency all the more insidious and hurtful because of the charm and value of her gifts."


"In GE's exquisite descriptions of the midland country, and vivid character sketches of country folk, we have what is most permanent in her novels. . . . Whatever controversy may arise about her novels and her art, there is an unanimity of opinion that she has done to the midlands what Scott did to the highlands--made them famous." Discussion of the rural scenes and characters in GE's works.


Brief summary of the "Ideal" and "Real" attitudes toward GE's works. "Ideal": "It was thought that with GE the Novel-with-a-Purpose had really come to be an adequate instrument for the regeneration of humanity." "Real": "The skeptic held that GE had carried what he called the 'Death's-Head Style' of art a trifle too far. . . . He detested her technology; her sententiousness revolted while it amused him. . . ."

Personal reminiscence of GE by a man who knew her casually. Focuses on her reputation, manner, appearance, and home life.


Attempts to determine, "apart from momentary influences," GE's proper place in literature. Finds GE's artistic excellence due to the influence of her early Warwickshire surroundings: "Here . . . she gleaned the wealthy storehouse of facts, the features of landscape and of humanity, which she has wedded to fiction and fancy in her novels. . . . " Discusses the country of GE's early life and the correspondence it has to GE's fiction. Concludes: "What she had seen and knew she painted accurately—she painted best, and . . . in spite of very many conspicuous defects, and of a very limited spiritual and metaphysic vision, her works are books that the world will not willingly let die."


Review of Browning. " . . . in many ways the most interesting and satisfactory biography of GE which has yet appeared. . . . True Browning is largely indebted . . . to Cross . . . but he has added to the material thus derived much information previously
scattered or inedited [sic] and has, moreover, been able to supplement these results of research and reading by a record of reminiscences and impressions accumulated through fifteen years of increasingly intimate personal friendship." Review does note, however, that Browning is as reticent about GE's relationship to GHL as was Cross, which Browning discusses as "needless" gratification of "morbid curiosity." Review disavows "morbid curiosity" as a motive and concludes: "If . . . the fact is that of this . . . courtship nothing is really known that is not to be found in GE's published letters, it would be better to say so frankly than to invent an excuse for an inevitable silence which is no excuse at all."


Description of the country around Cheveral Manor--some of the charm and history of the country in which GE was raised. Discusses ways in which GE used this setting in SCL. Wonders why GE did not make more fictional use of the "pretty romance" of the history of her early surroundings, but concludes: " . . . but GE was essentially a delineator of modern manners, not a writer of historical scenes, and so the visitor . . . must look elsewhere for the primeval history of the place."

Review of Gaetano Negri, *GE, La Sua vita ed suoi Romanzi*, Milan, 1891. Discusses why GE is not popular in the Latin countries, quotes and summarizes at length from Negri's book. Concludes: "To translate Signor Negri's work into English would be carrying coals to Newcastle; but all the critical portions of this book certainly merit the attention of English admirers of that greatest novelist of our century, GE."


Chiefly a sketch of GE's early life and publishing career. Concludes: "A great writer, a profound thinker, a marvellous linguist, and a powerful influencer of the minds of others. . . . Equal in gifts to any who went before, she had a wider sphere in which to shine. . . . What place posterity will ultimately assign to her work cannot yet be estimated; she is still too much of a living, breathing influence among us. . . ."


Presents GE as a "character-artist" (one who "seizes
upon the fine gradations that divide the same characteristics into endless varieties") as opposed to a "character-monger"—one who portrays only "definite" characteristics. Develops this idea with a discussion of MM, to which most of the article is devoted.


Selections from twenty previously unpublished letters from GE to Miss Martha Jackson during the period of 1838-1850.


Much of earlier parts of the chapter devoted exclusively to GHL. Discusses the relationship between GHL and GE, and attitudes toward it, particularly those of the Carlyles.


Biographical sketch and brief criticism of each of GE's works. Finds her most prominent features as a writer are the "dominant element of sadness," power of observation, "marvellous insight into the character of women," and great ethical value of her works. Concludes" "The grand influences of a writer
like this are imperishable. If she has no new
gospel to communicate, she has illumined old truths
with vivid and matchless skill. . . . In the eyes
of posterity no small share of the glory that must
attach to the Victorian age of literature will gather
round the name and works of GE.”

General discussion of GE as a writer, included in
discussions of Defoe, Carleton, Walpole, Radcliffe,
and Scott. Says GE, like Scott, has succeeded in
the historic novel. Says of R: “The historical
facts are very skilfully worked up out of authentic
documents; nevertheless we attribute the book’s
success not so much to the medieval painting, or even
to the terrible picture of Savanarola’s mental
anguish and fiery death, as to the careful preservation
of modern feeling, of what may be called naturalistic
treatment, in the fine literary style, the philosophic
sentiments, and the handling of character.”

408. Belloc, Bessie Rayner. “Dorothea Casaubon and George
Eliot.” The Contemporary Review, 65 (February, 1894),
207-216; Rptd. In a Walled Garden. 2 vols., London,

Discusses her relationship with GE, especially the
first meeting in Coventry at the house of Charles
Bray, which she says suggests the setting of MM.
Sees MM as “the plaint of a lost ideal. I do not
think it even a true rendering of life as it was lived in England sixty years ago." Discusses GE's appearance and personality, and her relationship with GHL.


Notes initially, that GE's reputation has declined markedly in recent years, an "inevitable" reaction to the excessive praise her works received during her lifetime. Now her works are excessively condemned by many. What is needed is balance, but with GE this is unusually difficult to achieve: "To carry ethical purpose and erudition into art is indeed a perilous undertaking, wherein but one or two of the greatest have wholly succeeded. The problem with GE is to judge how far she has succeeded in the all but impossible task." As a romance writer, Ge too often makes the reader feel that the picture would have been more enjoyable if she had taken less pains: "To study her more ambitious tales is like an attempt to master some new system of psychology." Discusses GE's works, considers her great period 1858-1863--FH, MM, DD inferior. Concludes: "She raised the whole are of romance to a higher plane . . . and, although in this ambitious aim she too often sacrificed freshness, ease, and
simplicity, the weight of the limits she imposed on herself must fairly be counted in the balance."


GE's prose works contain her best poetry, not her verse. GE had greater "psychological power" than Dickens, deeper insight than Thackeray. "She had a peculiar gift of her own--unique among English writers of romantic fiction--of drawing the individual character of a living soul, of representing it in its complete relations. And that is a note of high poetic genius." Finds GE's work essentially tragic because of her knowledge that tragic sadness is a "fount of purification" and also because of her constant recognition of the "absolute and indefeasible claim of the divine law upon our obedience, and the inexorableness of its penal sanctions." Illustrates that last assertion with discussion of passages in AB and DD. Concludes: "She is the great tragic poet of our age. She was to her day and generation, what Euripides was to his."


Illustrated discussion of GE's knowledge of and connection with the town of St. Oggs. Fraser asserts
GE visited the town in 1845 and 1859, the second time with the deliberate purpose of obtaining "local color" for ME. Discusses some of the ways the real St. Oggs differs from and is like GE's description of it in ME.


413. "Library Notes and News." The Library, 8(1896), 129-130.

Brief note mentioning the aim of the town of Nuneaton to build a new library which would contain at least one room designated "The George Eliot Memorial Library," where GE manuscripts and memorabilia could be collected. Concludes: "The suggestion deserves support, and it is hoped that it will receive it. We have now a Bronté museum, why not a GE memorial?"


A gossipy reminiscence of GE by one who knew her socially during her adult life in London.


Notes the current reaction against GE's fiction in which "men aspiring to be thought clever and critical were as extravagant in censure and depreciation as twenty years ago they had been hyperbolical in praise."
Proposes to review GE's works in order to "steady" GE's admirers "shaken by the storm of recent criticism." Concludes: "I submit that, as far as her writing is concerned, she is entitled to rank with those best benefactors of mankind who, by preaching a pure and exalted morality, and by making the sublime creeds of duty and self-sacrifice lovely and attractive, have conspicuously helped the civilisation of the race, and have enriched the treasury of the common good."


Bemoans the decline of GE's reputation and the rise of decidedly inferior literature. Discusses each of GE's works in turn, asserting that MM is GE at her best, FH at her worst. Concludes: "Whatever GE did bears the impress of massive sincerity—of deep and earnest feeling—of lofty purpose and noble teaching. She was not a fine artist, and she spoilt her later work by pedantry and overlay, but she stands out as the finest woman writer we have had or probably shall have—stands a head and shoulders above the best of the rest. . . . Yet prolific as she was, and the creator of more than one living character, she was not a flexible writer and her range was limited."

Description of the country of GE's childhood "revisited." Notes that few of the country folk remember GE in 1897. Illustrated with drawings of South Farm, Chilvers Coton Church, Cheverel Manor, the Hall Farm, and Nuneaton Church by Frank Dickson.

418. "Reputations Reconsidered--George Eliot." The Academy, 52(December 18, 1897), 551-552. [First of a two-part article. The other is December 25, pp. 573-574.]

An attempt to account for the decline of GE's reputation and reevaluate her work. This article concentrates on her decline. "In the sixties it was an unchallenged belief that GE was one of the glories of English literature; in the nineties it has been the fashion to scoff at her pompous sententiousness, her didacticism, her novel with a purpose." Attributes GE's decline partly to changing times ("... we come after a great movement and embody the reaction from it ..."), partly to the vulgarization of the reading public ("The most disagreeable characteristic of this new public is that it prefers imitation to genius, the lees to wine."). Discusses GE in the context of her times.

419. "Reputations Reconsidered--George Eliot." The Academy, 52(December 25, 1897), 573-574.

An attempt to evaluate GE as a literary artist.
Begins by discussing her defects: "Her initial error lay in misconceiving the essential difference between the philosopher and the novelist. . . . No fault is to be found . . . with GE for being a philosopher. What the reader objects to is the continual and unseasonable obtrusion of her philosophy." Sees GE's truly creative period as 1856-1863: "Her subsequent work is only that of one who is nursing the embers of a slowly dying fire." GE's reputation must ultimately rest on AB, SM, MF, and R, which reveal her as a great creative artist because in them "she displays insight into the motives of human action and imaginative skill to body forth no mere walking characteristics, but full many-sided human characters in their natural environment. And in doing so the artist forgets she is a philosopher."


Discusses various aspects of the author's acquaintance-ship with GE from their first meeting in 1868. Little discussion of GE's literary works. Subjects include life at the Priory, GE's relationship with Madame Bodichon, and Christmas of 1870, spent with GE and GHL on the Isle of Wight.
After an extended history of the Newdegates, the authoress notes GE's fictional use of some of them in her stories. Discusses the real-life prototypes of some of GE's characters and her fictional use of them. Concludes: "... we would cherish a hope that these autobiographical letters, with their charm of individuality and truth, may possibly 'gladden and chasten hearts in years to come' though unidealised by the pen of a GE."

Because GE recognized the importance to novel writing of a clear perception of scope and consistent adherence to individuality of character and environment, she was most anxious to utilize material with which she was thoroughly familiar in the writing of AB. Although, as GE says, her early experiences are "wrought up into new combinations," the resemblances of her fictional characters and places in AB to their real counterparts is not destroyed. Article discusses ways in which AB coincides with or differs from the countryside in which GE grew up.

Portrait of GE.

Describes the author's first meeting with GE at John Chapman's during GE's WR days. Initially, GE impressed her as "essentially under-bred and provincial... badly dressed... unwashed, unbrushed, unkempt." After GE's union with GHL, Mrs. Linton called on her at St. John's Wood and found her to be "frank, genial, natural, and brimful of happiness." Success and adulation, however, eventually had an adverse effect on GE: "She grew to be artificial, posée, pretentious, unreal... Not a line of spontaneity was left in her; not an impulse beyond the reach of self-conscious philosophy... She was so consciously 'George Eliot'--so interpenetrated... with the sense of her importance as the great novelist and profound thinker of her generation, as to make her society a little overwhelming..."


GE offers a fascinating study for the theologian because the bent of her mind was distinctively theological, and underlying all she wrote there was a theological conception of the universe. Detailed discussion of GE's early intellectual formation and
her loss of orthodox faith. Also discusses GE's relationship with GHL, which is called the "misgoverning incident of her career." Concludes:

"Altogether her career is one of those in connection with which the sad words 'might have been' will mournfully suggest themselves. . . . If she had never been thrown into early association with the clique of Coventry Rationalists, if she had never translated Strauss or Feuerbach, if she had never seen the face of GHL, if she had never drunk so deeply at the wells of the Positivist philosophy,—how different it all might have been!. . . . [But] it is useless to torture ourselves by digging wells of supposition from which to drink the brackish waters of regret."
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This index is keyed to the bibliography by item, not page number. The index is not restricted to the annotation itself, but is keyed to the entire item cited. Books are not indexed by subject, but are indexed by author and, in the case of the important biographies, by title. Titles of literary works other than those by or about George Eliot are omitted.

References to periodicals include only mentions in articles and books and do not refer to articles that appear in the named periodical itself. Authors of items in the bibliography are indexed. Familiar forms of names are used when complete or formal forms would not facilitate identification (e.g., Dante, Raphael, Rembrandt, etc). Although the bibliography does not include extensive coverage of George Eliot's poetry, references to her as a poet and to her individual poems are indexed. Abbreviations of George Eliot's works and biographies are used in the index as indicated in the abbreviation key preceding the bibliography.
Acton, Lord John E. 243, 328, 360, 361, 410
Adams, W. H. Davenport. 318
Addison, Joseph. 25, 72, 124, 133, 323
Allardyce, Alexander. 252
Allen, Grant. 220, 398
Allingham, William. 420
Anders, H. 16-18, 22, 24, 231, 287
Aristotle. 25, 213
Arnold, Matthew. 75, 139, 176, 191, 267, 281, 287, 299, 320, 322, 326, 346, 358
Arnold, Thomas. 11, 43
Athenaeum, The. 61, 196
Atlantic Monthly, The. 95
Auerbach, Berthold. 267, 286, 320
Austen, Jane. 32, 34, 40, 43, 45, 46, 61, 69, 72, 75, 80, 84, 89, 90, 92, 105, 123, 139, 154, 198, 207, 223, 241, 242, 246, 255, 267, 275, 287, 310, 313, 317, 320, 328, 346, 347, 359, 365, 372, 384, 408, 409, 419
Axon, William E. A. 247
Aylesford, 5th Earl of. 236
Bacon, Francis. 87, 205, 342
Bagehot, Walter. 197
Baildon, H. Bellyse. 377
Ballentine, George. 25
Barrett, Wilson. 378
Barrie, J. M. 411,418
Barrow, George. 2
Barry, William. 267,298
Baur, Ferdinand C.. 375,425
Baxter, Richard. 29
Bayne, Peter. 245,246,251,256,257-263,268,270-273,
276-279,282-285,288-290,292-296,300
Beecher, Henry Ward. 408
Beeching, H. C. 323
Beethoven, Ludwig von. 72
Behn, Aphra. 69
Bell, James. 383
Belloc, Mme Louis (Bessie Rayner Parkes). 327,408
Benson, R. 234
Bentham, Jeremy. 199,359,360
Blackwood, John. 20,252,318,339,340,345,348,362,
364,367,368,385,418.
Blackwood, William. 234
Blackwood & Sons. 21,27,29,202
Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine. 59,69,75,208,267,
287,331
Blaikie, W. G. 375
Blair, Dr. Hugh. 25
Blanc, Louis. 368
Blind, Mathilde. 304,310,316,317
Blind. 311,312,314-316,318,400,425
Blomfield, Bishop. 2
Boccaccio. 2,95

Bodichon, Mme Eugene (Barbara Leigh Smith). 327, 338, 354, 358, 368, 390, 408, 410, 420

Boswell, James. 61, 370

Bowen, Charles. 414

Brabant, Elizabeth R. 318, 319, 345, 368

Brabant, Dr. Robert H. 287, 318, 319, 365

Brandon, Charles. 399


Brewster, David. 368

Bright, John. 58, 82

Bronte, Anne. 30, 61, 238, 413


Bronte, Emily. 30, 61, 314-318, 328, 346, 359, 372, 413

Brooke, Stopford. 408

Broome, Frederick Napier. 138

Brown, John Crombie. 206

Browne, Matthew. 91


Browning, Oscar. 234, 235, 391, 394

Browning. 398

Buchanan, Robert W. 91, 204, 378
Buckle, George E. 345, 372, 410
Bunyan, John. 141, 381
Burney, Fanny. 25, 40, 43, 61, 310, 403
Burns, Robert. 7, 309
Burton, Frederick. 234, 414
Byron, George (Lord). 25, 58, 61, 133, 141, 253, 309, 330, 344, 354, 359
Caine, Hall. 381
Calderon, Philip H. 347
Call, W. M. W. 287, 314, 398
Call, Mrs. W. M. W. (Rufa Brabant Hennell). 327
Campbell, Thomas. 141
Caro, Elme Marie. 131
Cash, Mrs. John. 314
Chatterton, Thomas. 314
Chaucer, Geoffrey. 133, 182, 367
Christian Observer, The. 345, 366, 370
Clark, Dr. Andrew. 226, 227, 229, 240
Clarke, James. 287
Cobbett, William. 255
Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. 61, 72, 199, 267, 345, 346, 382, 425
Coleridge, Sara. 318
Collins, William Lucas. 11, 82
Collins, Wilkie. 46, 53, 61, 85, 345, 384, 418
Colvin, Sidney. 132, 186, 234, 235
Combe, George. 287, 316, 318
Congreve, Richard. 234, 235, 345, 390
Congreve, Mrs. R. (Marie Bury). 327
Constable, John. 393
Contemporary Review, The. 361
Cooke, George Willis. 305
Cooke. 318
Cooper, J. F. 43, 50, 403
Cornhill Magazine, The. 60, 69, 287
Crabbe, George. 1, 255, 381
Crawford, Marion. 425
Creed, A. 100
Croker, J. W. 25
Cross, A. F. 413
Cross, William. 234
Cruikshank, George. 416
Cumming, John. 320, 322
D'Albert Durade, Francois. 306, 318, 345, 368
Dallas, Eneas Sweetland. 15, 38, 80
Dante. 94, 95, 142, 194, 283, 298, 307, 327, 359, 360
Darmsteeter, J. 412
Darwin, Charles. 133, 238, 267, 315, 393, 425
Daudet, Alphonse. 299, 385
Dawson, George. 316, 318, 425
Dawson, J. S. 248
Defoe, Daniel. 68, 86, 328, 359, 407
DeQuincey, Thomas. 61, 72, 91, 273, 391
Disraeli, Benjamin. 61, 176, 187, 195, 299, 342, 406, 408
Disraeli, Isaac. 195
Dixon, Hepworth. 190
Doman, Frederick. 330
Dowden, Edward. 120, 194, 309, 318, 353
Drama, Greek (and dramatists). 32, 38, 46, 84, 87, 95, 197, 223, 253, 410
Drayton, Michael. 84
Druce, Albert. 234
Dryden, John. 69
Dumas, Alexandre (pere). 245, 257, 385, 418
Edgeworth, Maria. 43, 69, 75, 241, 310, 409
Edinburgh Review, The. 37, 93, 253
Edwards, Jonathan. 408
Edwards, Mathilde Bentham. 347, 420
ELIOT, GEORGE.

I. Biography


Adam Bede, Jr. controversy. 28, 30

autobiographical elements in GE's works. 244, 417, 422
criticism, GE's reaction to. 129, 354, 365, 368, 424

earnings. 356

family.

Evans, Christiana (sister). 345, 406

Evans, Elizabeth (aunt). 256, 318, 324, 364, 367, 368, 370, 381, 391, 396, 415, 422

Evans, F. R. (brother). 234

Evans, Isaac (uncle). 234, 318, 362, 368, 399, 417
Evans, John (cousin). 399, 417


Evans, Samuel (uncle). 381, 397, 415, 422

Evans, William (uncle). 381, 397, 415

fatal illness. 240

financial arrangements with Cornhill. 335

funeral. 233-235


obituaries. 224-227, 229-232

portraits of GE. 335

Positivism, GE and. 299


social views. 252

II. Criticism of as Novelist

artistic mind of. 385

atheism in. 199

cynicism in. 104
decline of creative powers. 184
delineation of children. 92,303
description in. 9,34,41
development as a novelist. 141,286,332
dialect in. 247
dialogue in. 34,98,131
diction in. 3,43,45,47,82,103
didacticism in. 45,95,120,128,140,188,299,321,416
dramatic genius of. 78,94,327
earnestness in. 35,92,171,173
epigrams in. 149
as essayist. 217
femininity in. 41,45,138,154,251
as historian. 66068,70,90,338,407
hopelessness in. 141
imagination in. 185,303
influence as a novelist. 86,222
as innovator in fiction. 34,186
Judaism in (DD). 164,168,171,174,178,179,189,190,197,386
law, use of. 93
masculinity in. 41,251
melancholy in. 117,127,139,260,370
melodrama in. 5
as modern novelist. 94,198,286,311
moral influence. 147
morality in. 10,11,24,40,41,49,53-55,67,70,81,100,123,133,140,186,199,216,219,269,198,199,301,302,328,358,366,377,392,425
morbidity in. 48
motivation in. 41
naturalism in. 7
objectivity in. 41
observation, power of. 92
passion, use of. 36
pedantry in. 155,157,215
philosophy of. 47,186,298,354,370,384
plot in. 5,11,31,33,37,45,50,51,56,69,73,80,85,87,98,110,119,130,137,139,147,167,170,176,186
as poet. 99,120,154,223,273,316
poetic qualities as novelist. 91,94
point of view in. 40,45,75,108,117,131,254,425
psychology in. 122,132,184,207
purpose in. 69,129
realism in. 27,39-41,46,52,53,58,62,133,138,182,376,388
as romance writer. 182,409
sarcasm in. 102,108
satire in. 37,107,111,152
science in. 132,151,185,196,205,222,249,286,391
scope of. 291
sensationalism in. 74,141
sentimentalism in. 259
structure in. 34,36,41,44,47,50,64,106
style of. 3,38,44,75,80,88,96,104,136,138,151,
153,180,215,223,286,312
subject matter of. 80
subjectivity in. 249
symbolism in. 32
sympathy in. 120,299
as teacher. 75,115,173,229,286,290,301,336
tone in. 128,299
tragedy in. 36,55,75,120,410
unity in. 41
wit and humor of. 3,12,25,38-40,44,51-53,55,
61,75,78,82,86,87,92,97,103,105,106,111,119,
120,133,134,138,139,160,171,173,210,251,254,
III. Works
A. 95,133,141,154,227,253,318,406--
AB. 4-12,14,15,17-29,31-48,50,51,53-55,57-61,
64,65,67-70,73,75,76,78,80,81,83,84,86,88-92,
95,99,100,105,109,113,120,124,129,133,135,138-
141,143,159,170,175-177,181,182,185,186,191,
198,201,202,207,209,210,212,214,220,226,227,
229-231,238,239,242,244,247,249,252,254-259,
266,267,275,281,284,286,287,290,298-301,303,
306,307,310,313,314,317,318,320,322,326-332,
338-340,344-347,353-355,360,362-364,367,369,
372,378,381,384,385,388,391-393,396-400,402,
406,408,410,411,414-420,422
AR. 99,120,133
AN. 287,320,330
BB. 203,211,402
Brother Jacob. 318,415
BS. 243,307,327,329
Cabul. 318

A College Breakfast Party. 318,410

DD. 147-191,194-198,201,202,205,207,209,213,214,221,226,227,229-231,238,239,241,243,244,
249,251,252,254,265,267,269,275,281,286,287,297-300,303,312,316,320,322,327-329,331,339,
345,346,348,353,354,359,360,362,363,365,367,
368,372,382,384-386,388,390-393,396-398,400,
402,406,408,410,415,416,419,420,

The Death of Moses. 318

ELN. 320-323

PH. 73-95,120,124,131,133,140,141,143,147,
150,177,182,186,191,194,196,198,202,213,214,
222,227,229,238,241,242,244,252,254,265,267,
275,281,286,287,297-301,303,316,324,329,330,
339,343,345,354,360,368,384,388,392,393,397,
398,400,402,406,415,416,419,420

J. 95,99,120,141,191,226,229,238,242,244,273,

Lisa. 95,318

LV. 213,287,318,406,415

MP. 31-42,44-47,49-51,55,56,61,68-73,75,76,
80,81,84,86,89-92,95,97,109,112,113,120,124,133,
139,141,150,154,175,177,182,185,186,191,202,209,
210,212,214,222,226,227,229-231,238,239,242,244,
249,252,254,255,260,265,267,270,271-273,275,281,
286,287,290,292,298-301,303,306,309,310,312-
314,316-318,327,329,333,345,348,354,359,360,362,
367,368,376,384,385,388,390-393,396-398,400,402,
406,409,411,415-417,419,420,425
A Minor Prophet. 287, 318, 329, 345

Oh May I Join the Choir Invisible. 318, 327

Self and Life. 318

Self and Life. 318
Fortnightly Review, The. 178,179,187,197,238,287,361,
Foster, W. E. 250
Fox-Bourne, H. R. 329
Francillon, R. E. 182
Franklin, Rebecca. 306,307,318,324,362,368,406
Fraser, John Foster. 411
Fraser's Magazine. 187
Furnivall, Frederick J. 309
Gainesborough, Thomas. 25,411
Gaskell, Elizabeth C. (Mrs.). 24,39,45,61,68,131,202,238,241,317,318,418
Gautier, Théophile. 131,191
Gentleman's Magazine, The. 25,190
Gibbon, Edward. 283,355
Gillies, R. P. 25
Godwin, William. 58,327
Goldsmith, Oliver. 24,46,133,229,328,359,381
Gore, Caroline (Mrs.). 68,313
Gray, David. 378
Gray, Thomas. 360
Greg, W. R. 340
Gurney, E. 234

Hall, W. H. 234

Hamilton, Catherine J. 401

Hardy, Thomas. 151, 159, 226, 307, 313, 327, 393, 411

Harper's New Monthly Magazine. 380


Hatton, Joshua (and Guy Roslyn, pseud.). 144

Hawthorne, Nathaniel. 25, 44, 57, 61, 315, 384

Hegel, Georg. 317, 410

Henley, W. E. 395


Hennell, Sara. 287, 311, 314, 316, 318, 320, 324, 345, 358, 362, 364, 367, 368, 390, 398

Henry, Philip. 408

Herford, C. H. 382

Heyse, Paul. 133

Hodgson, Joseph. 408

Hogarth, William. 87, 267

Holmes, Oliver Wendell. 57, 369

Homer. 25, 141, 298

Hood, Thomas. 75

Hook, Theodore. 25, 43

Horace. 267

Howard, G. 234
Hughes, Thomas. 11, 58, 418
Hugo, Victor. 69, 86, 188, 202, 238, 267, 286, 299, 330, 359
Hume, David. 191, 359, 393
Hunt, Thornton. 201
Hutton, Richard Holt. 64, 139, 152, 154, 160, 165, 170, 176, 242, 289, 328, 358, 360, 361, 408, 425
Huxley, Owen. 368
Hyde, John. 422
Inchbald, Mrs. Elizabeth. 69
Ingelow, Jean. 89
Ingram, John H. 314
Ireland, Annie E. 390
Irving, Washington. 197
Jackson, Martha. 404
Jacobs, Joseph. 197, 238
James, G. P. R. 61, 65, 422
James, Henry. 384, 385
Janin, Jules. 131
Jeaffreson, John C. 68
Jenkin, Fleeming. 379
Jerrold, Douglas. 378
Jewsbury, Geraldine. 5
Johnson, Samuel. 25, 61, 73, 75, 151, 255, 272, 359, 403
Jonson, Ben. 151
Joubert, Joseph. 217
Kant, Immanuel. 245, 267, 275, 287, 311, 360, 365, 410, 420
Kaufmann, David. 200, 386
Keats, John. 314, 318
Kebbel, T. E. 255, 310
Kemble, Fanny. 408
Kingsley, Charles. 24, 43, 44, 58, 61, 69, 299, 310, 330, 376, 418, 425
Kingsley, Henry. 43
La Bruyère, Jean de. 213, 218, 223
Laing, Robert. 133
Lamb, Charles. 105, 217, 267, 318, 347, 348, 420
Lancaster, H. H. 75
Landon, Walter Savage. 186
Langtry, Lily. 414
La Rochefoucauld, Francois. 217
Leader. The. 250
Lecky, W. E. H. 287, 320, 323
Leighton, Sir Frederick. 335
Lessing, Gotthold. 382
Lever, Charles. 134
Lewes, C. L. 234, 332, 338, 354
Lewis, Maria. 340, 345, 362, 364, 365, 367, 368, 370, 406
Library Journal, The. 250
Lifford, 3rd Viscount. 236
Lilly, William Samuel. 410
Linton, Lynn. 171,405,408,416,424
Lippincott, Sara J. (and "Grace Greenwood," pseud.). 265,267

LITERATURE

authorship, anonymous. 17,25
biography, literary. 346
criticism, literary. 80,181,202
criticism of the 1890's. 418
critics, aims of. 44
libraries, circulating. 61,126
literature, "light." 19
literature, "popular." 11,212
literature, railway. 11
literature, romance. 44
modes and fashions, literary. 61
reading public, the. 326
reviews, influence of. 397,409
wit, literary. 2
writers, women. 406

Locke, John. 275,311,360
Locker (Lampson), Frederick. 234,414
Lockhart, Lawrence. 414
Longfellow, H. W. 72, 318
Lonsdale, Margaret. 371
Lucas, Samuel. 1
Lucian. 287
Ludlow, J. M. 57
Luyster, I. M. 10
Macaulay, Thomas B. 40, 45, 53, 72, 141, 216, 244, 284, 289, 310, 403
Macdonald, George. 143, 345
Magnus, Lady Katie. 386
Main. 105, 112, 368
Mackay, Robert. 236, 287, 318, 324, 346, 366, 372
Mackenzie, G. W. 227, 229
Mackenzie, Henry. 25
Mallock, W. H. 199, 223, 225
Marlowe, Christopher. 314
Martin, M. B. 331
Martineau, Harriet. 46, 131, 251, 287, 300, 318, 320, 344, 345, 359, 360, 362, 368, 406, 408
Martineau, James. 287
Matheson, Annie. 303
Maurice, F. D. 253
McAlister, Donald. 168
McCrie, George. 143
Michaelangelo. 94, 95, 142
Mill, James. 191
Mill, J. S. 72, 73, 191, 194, 199, 227, 231, 267, 287, 298, 300, 330, 342, 345, 365, 368
Millais, John E. 131, 234, 299, 318
Milman, H. H. 289
Milnes, Richard Monckton. 131
Milton, John. 58, 61, 64, 133, 142, 154, 197, 202, 266, 314, 327, 344, 348, 359, 367, 370, 410
Mitford, Jessica. 131, 318
Moliere. 80, 191, 295, 309
Montague, Mary. 46, 105
More, Hannah. 43, 272, 342, 345, 360, 362, 366, 370, 385
Morgan, William. 264, 380
Morley, George. 399, 417
Morley, Henry. 198
Morris, William. 318
Mortimer, John. 249
Mott, Lucretia. 266
Mudie, Charles E. (and Circulating Library). 7, 61, 87, 91, 117, 214
Murger, Henri. 131
Musset, Alfred de. 191
Myers, F. W. H. 306, 314, 318, 328, 342, 346, 358, 360, 364, 372
Negri, Gaetano. 400
Newby, Thomas. 28, 29, 30
Newdigate, Francis. 397, 406, 422
Newdigate, Sir Roger. 306, 318, 370, 397, 399, 417
Newdigate-Newdegate, Lady Anne. 421
Newdigate-Newdegate, Charles. 236, 399, 417
Newman, Francis. 318, 362, 366
Newman, J. H. 102, 197, 307, 360, 408
Nickolas, E. 23
Nineteenth Century, The. 300, 361
Noble, James Ashcroft. 373, 398
Novalis. 320

THE NOVEL

caracterization of children in. 32
genius in. 5, 14, 56
humor and comedy in. 34, 43
intellectualism in. 37
masculinity and femininity in. 42, 69
melodrama in. 57
morality in. 8, 19, 34, 37, 47, 57, 92, 124, 301
objectivity in. 14
plot in. 14
poetic justice in. 149
point of view in. 57
realism in. 3, 14, 25, 32, 34, 37, 43, 45, 47, 48, 56, 57, 72, 86, 182
religion in. 11,73
sex in. 34
sentimentalism in. 57,86
structure in. 14,56
style in. 43,86
tragedy in. 286
function and purpose of. 14,47,143,286
influence of. 47,73
materials of. 47
popularity of. 24,58,61
serial publication of. 64,98,103,104,109,114,116,117,122,124,129,131,138,150,155,156,159,161,196,227
theory of. 135
trends of. 301
as history. 14,43,63
as literature. 86,134
men versus women novelists. 43
novelist as poet. 95
Novelist as "seer." 47
novelists' faults. 40
satirical novelists. 40
women novelists. 34,46,51
reading public. 126
action novels. 134
American novels. 57
didactic novels. 253
doctrinal novels. 14, 43
domestic novels. 51
fashionable novels. 19, 183
French novels. 142, 299, 301
German novels. 86, 214
historical novels. 134, 301
Jewish novels. 187
philosophical novels. 214
political novels. 134
"purpose" novels. 425
railway novels. 43
religious novels. 134
romance novels. 24, 182
"sensational" novels. 57, 82, 95

Nuneaton Observer. 413

Oliphant, Margaret. 142, 301, 313, 318
Osborne, Sidney Godolphin. 20, 23
Otter, F. 234
"Ouida". 187, 315

Ovid. 25

Paley, William. 375
Palgrave, Francis Turner. 75

 Pall Mall Gazette, The. 178, 243, 287
Parkes, Joseph. 243
Parkinson, S. 387
Pascal. 359
Pattison, Mark. 318
Paul, C. Kegan. 234, 235, 299, 307, 312, 313, 314, 318
Peel, Robert. 408
Picciotto, J. 187
Pigott, E. S. 234
Poe, Edgar Allen. 7, 57, 213, 314
Ponsonby, Lady Mary. 344, 367
Pope, Alexander. 15, 91, 254, 292
Pre-Raphaelitism. 45, 82, 174
Proctor, Richard A. 369
Purves, James. 393
Quarterly Review, The. 37, 73, 75, 247, 289
Rabelais, Francois. 267, 287
Racine. 425
Radcliffe, Ann. 407
Ralston, W. S. 420
Raphael. 58, 64, 78, 94, 95, 142, 256, 410
Reade, Charles. 46, 80, 402
Rembrandt. 46, 154
Renan, Ernest. 191, 327, 354, 360, 375, 410, 419, 425
Reynolds, Joshua. 154, 299
Richardson, Abby Sage. 149
Richardson, Samuel. 69, 75, 154, 242, 254, 318, 328, 346, 359
Robertson, Eric. 311
Robertson, J. 315-317
Rolt, Richard. 25
Rosa, Salvador. 41, 46
Rosetti, D. G. 315, 406
Rousseau, Jean Jacques. 298, 342, 359, 360, 379
Rubens. 41, 410
Ruskin, John. 61, 91, 92, 191, 267, 277, 300, 301, 306, 309, 418
Russell, George W. E. 302, 415
Sadler, Thomas. 234, 235
Sainte-Beuve, Charles A. 191, 299, 320
Saintsbury, George. 175, 196, 217
Sarson, George. 269
Saturday Review, The. 61, 68, 72
Scherer, M. 299
Schiller, Johann C. 61, 292, 317, 321, 347
Schlegel, August W. 75
Schopenhauer, Arthur. 191, 400, 410
Scott, Sir Walter. 24, 25, 40, 43, 50, 51, 58, 63-65, 68, 69, 75, 80, 88, 87, 89, 90, 92, 105, 111, 117, 129, 131, 133, 139, 141, 143, 147, 154, 160, 174, 176, 180, 181, 186, 187, 191, 194, 197, ...
Seguin, L. G.  388
Seller, T.  234
Senior, Nassau W.  75
Sewell, Elizabeth.  11


Shand, Alexander Innes:  209
Sheepshanks, Thomas.  236, 287
Shelley, Mary W.  327
Shelley, Percy Bysshe.  61, 133, 141, 194, 197, 253, 318, 360, 410
Sheridan, Wm. Brinsley.  25
Sibree, John.  353
Siddons, Sarah.  408
Sidney, Sir Philip.  43, 410
Simcox, Edith (and H. Lawrenny, pseud.).  135, 275, 299, 314, 366
Simms, Edward.  236, 287
Simpson, Richard.  69, 71
Skeat, W. W.  247
Smalley, George W.  396
Smith, Adam.  359
Smith, Albert. 2
Smith, Alexander. 378
Smith, George Barnett. 141, 144, 335, 362, 406
Smith, Goldwin. 300
Smith, Sydney. 2, 72, 75, 82, 131, 360
Smith, William. 366
Smollett, Tobias. 241, 246, 256, 267
Solomon, Henry. 192
Somerville, Mary. 406
Spectator, The. 196, 253
Spielhagen, Friedrich. 382
Spenser, Edmund. 133, 194, 202
Staël, Madame Anne Louise de. 69, 128, 311, 314, 318
Stanley, Dean Arthur P. 228, 299, 414
Stanley, Lyulph. 234
Stark, Herbert. 117
Steele, Richard. 133
Stephen, Leslie. 254, 315, 389, 405, 425
Sterne, Laurence. 2, 32, 229, 267
Stevenson, R. L. 418, 419
Stewart, Dugald. 80

Stuart, Lady Louisa. 25

Stuart, R. 234

Suetonius. 298

Sully, James. 286

Sutton, Charles W. 250

Swift, Jonathan. 2, 25, 82, 86, 267, 287, 298, 359

Swinburne, A. C. 94, 95, 193, 202, 267, 274, 315-318, 386, 406

Tauchnitz, Christian B., Baron. 347

Taylor, Isaac. 360, 367, 368

Taylor, Mrs. Peter. 327, 344, 348, 358

Teniers, David (the younger). 41, 75, 87, 141, 256

Tennyson, Alfred. 58, 72, 87, 91, 95, 99, 100, 141, 143, 221, 267, 317, 318, 360, 406, 409, 414, 418, 419, 425

Thackeray, Anne. 105, 318, 338, 348


Theophrastus. 223

Thomson, J. Radford. 366

Times, The. 18, 22, 24, 27, 68, 273, 330

Titian. 197
Trollope, Anthony. 2, 13, 40, 45, 56, 58, 61, 69, 75, 123, 135, 191, 299, 313, 315, 320, 343, 344, 400, 409, 418

Tupper, Martin F. 112, 418

Turgenev, Ivan. 317, 384, 420

Turner, J. M. W. 92, 131, 181, 309

Tyndall, John. 199, 269, 410, 425

Tytler, Sarah. 392

Vandyck. 154

Venables, George. 90

Vigny, Alfred de. 191

Villari, Pasquale. 66, 67, 289

Virgil. 25, 141, 298, 359,

Voltaire, Francois. 69, 133, 269, 287, 314

Walford, Lucy B. 402

Wallington, Mrs. John. 307, 397

Walpole, Horace. 408

Walpole, Hugh. 407

Walton, Izaak. 72

Ward, Mrs. Humphrey. 411

Ward, R. 237

Ware, L. G. 39

Warren, C. H. 234

Wesley, John. 72, 408, 410

Whiting, Mary Bradford. 403
Wilberforce, William. 362
Wilkie, F. B. 201
Wilson, S. Law. 425
Wood, Mrs. Henry. 68
Wotton, Mabel E. 380
Yates, Edmund. 234, 331
Yonge, Charlotte. 11, 384
Zola, Emile. 299, 365, 416