THE CHARLES LAMB BULLETIN

The Journal of the Charles Lamb Society

NEW SERIES NO. 63 *July 1988*

CONTENTS

		Page
B.R. Haydon on Hazlitt and Lamb: the Novelist's Touch	Stanley Jones	
Lamb and Hazlitt, 1816 - 1826: Somes Notes to a Relationship	Winifred Courtney	226
Rhetoric and Art: George Campbell, William Hazlitt and 'Gusto'	Joel Haefner	234
Speech given to the Charles Lamb Society Luncheon 1988	Christopher Salvesen	243
Alliance of Literary Societies Seminar	M.R. Huxstep	248
Obituary		249
Fifty Years Ago (Continued) Selected by	D.E. Wickham	250
Society Notes and News from Members		251

B.R. HAYDON ON HAZLITT AND LAMB: THE NOVELIST'S TOUCH

Stanley Jones

University of Glasgow

A lecture given to the Society on 5 March 1988

In preparing for this afternoon's talk I have looked very carefully at the recent lectures published in the *Charles Lamb Bulletin*, and I must confess to having found the exercise rather daunting. They are indeed a hard act to follow, both from the point of view of scholarship and of interest, and I am afraid the present offering will seem rather small beer in comparison with its vintage predecessors.

What I am proposing is in the nature of a minor operation (relatively painless, I hope) which will expunge from your conception of the life of Lamb a rather colourful episode which has hitherto been accepted as part of the canon of events. (1) I refer to B.R. Haydon's account in his *Autobiography* of the Hazlitt christening party. I am not competent to make any kind of comment

on Haydon's achievement as an artist. Even among art critics and historians it is still a matter of debate. Part of the difficulty may be that it is very hard to get a sight of his paintings. The most famous, *Christ's Entry into Jerusalem* is in Ohio; others are stored in art-gallery basements; what is by all accounts the best, the *Judgement of Solomon*, was lost to sight for decades, and was sadly inaccessible to his gifted biographer Eric George. It surfaced again briefly at a sale in 1960, and disappeared as abruptly into a private collection at, I think, Richmond. But there is no doubt about his talent as a writer. You will find him in the authoritative *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, if not on the same terms as the Lambs, the Hunts, and the Hazlitts, then at least as the Procters, the Talfourds, and the Reynoldses. It was the extraordinary power of the *Autobiography* as well as his obstinate devotion to his art that impelled Aldous Huxley to cast him as the type of the many-sided Romantic artist in the character of Casimir Lypiatt in *Antic Hay*.

Here I think I should remind you of the outlines of his career. Born in 1786 in the West Country (like so many artists of the time), he came up to London and enrolled in the Royal Academy Schools, resolved to become the greatest historical painter of his age, and, as he never stopped declaring, to reform the artistic taste of his country. But strangely enough, what he aimed at in painting was not so much the eminence of a Raphael, or a Titian, or a Rembrandt, as the fame attending the greatest names of literature, Homer, Virgil, Dante, Tasso, Shakespeare, Milton, whom he constantly invokes in his diary. The admiration he expresses for these writers indicates two things: first, that he was a literary painter; and second, that he was more enamoured of the idea than of its execution (a notion bearing strongly on the case we are going to look at in a moment). However, he had energy, courage, self-confidence, enormous vanity, and a complete conviction of his own genius.

His early pictures, in particular *The Death of Dentatus* (1809), were a great success, and he was taken up by the connoisseurs among the nobility as being the coming young man. He was patronized by rank, beauty, and fashion. He dined two or three times a week with Lord Mulgrave, Lord President of the Council, and met grand people who were, as he thought, eager to recognize the talented young painter and further his career. A fatal error. He soon alienated his patrons by his assumptions of equality, nay of superiority, and his zeal to correct their erroneous opinions on art, and on anything else where they seemed in need of his guidance. Socially speaking, he was an innocent. He never realized what Dr. Johnson could have told him, namely, that 'great lords do not like to have their mouths stopped'. Sir Joshua Reynolds in like case was a much wiser man: as Goldsmith has told us

> To coxcombs averse, yet most civilly steering,
> When they judged without skill, he was still hard of hearing;
> When they talked of their Raphaels, Correggios, and stuff,
> He shifted his trumpet, and only took snuff.

But what was even worse, he alienated the whole of the Royal Academy, all 40 members. He had got it into his head that his *Dentatus* was deliberately hung in a bad place at the exhibition of 1809, so he attacked them publicly. Henceforth he was, professionally speaking, a pariah. He was left to go

his own way. His next two pictures were successful: *The Judgement of Solomon* (1814) and *Christ's Entry into Jerusalem* (1820). But he had got so deep in debt while painting them that the receipts when they were finally exhibited were immediately swallowed up. Those years, 1812 to 1820, were also the years in which he was on intimate terms with Hazlitt, Wordsworth, Leigh Hunt, and Keats, but with all of whom he at some time quarrelled. The triumph of *Christ's Entry* marked the zenith of his career. From then on it was downhill all the way. He was imprisoned for debt in 1823, again in 1827, a third time in 1830, and for the last time in 1836. In 1843, when it was proposed to decorate the new Houses of Parliament, came a bitter humiliation: he had been advocating such official patronage all his life, but he was not consulted by the Committee, nor were his designs among those accepted (although those of a former pupil were). With admirable resilience and courage he recovered even from this. The final blow came in 1846 when he attempted another exhibition, in the Egyptian Hall in Piccadilly, which had seen the triumph of his *Christ's Entry* 26 years earlier. It closed with a loss of £111. If it had merely been neglected that would have been bad enough, but the manner of its failure was a spectacular and appalling irony. People did come in droves to the Egyptian Hall, but they all walked up the stairs, past Haydon on the ground floor to gape at a competing attraction, the celebrated American midget, General Tom Thumb. It was the ultimate, savage, hyperbolical irony: he, the would-be giant, the Colossus among artists, was put down by a midget. Within six months he put an end to his existence.

It is a pitiful story, and we must accord to Haydon the tribute that his spirit and courage deserve, and sympathy for his endless trials. But it is nonetheless true that he was his own enemy. There was a fatal lack of elementary prudence, a complete absence of prophylactic humility, a disastrous conviction of his unassailable superiority.

His *Autobiography*, begun in 1841, was abandoned in 1843, significantly when he had got as far as his moment of triumph in 1820. Published in 1853, it abounds in brilliant passages - the 'Immortal Dinner' of 1817, at which Lamb, Keats, and Wordsworth were present; the Elgin Marbles; Paris in 1814; the news of the Battle of Waterloo, which, according to his story, he was the first in London to hear. Doubt was cast on this story as far back as 1876 (2), a doubt strengthened by the re-discovery of Haydon's long-lost journals in 1960, which do not show that he learned of Waterloo in any other way than any other Londoner. Equally brilliant in the *Autobiography* is the account of the Hazlitt christening-party, which reads as follows.

> In the midst of Hazlitt's weaknesses his parental affections were beautiful. He had one boy. He loved him, doated on him. He told me one night this boy was to be christened. 'Will ye come on Friday?' 'Certainly', said I. His eye glistened. Friday came, but as I knew all parties I lunched heartily first and was there punctually at four. Hazlitt then lived in Milton's House, Westminster, next door to Bentham.
>
> At four I came, but he was out. I walked up and found his wife ill by the fire in a bed gown - nothing ready for guests and everything wearing the appearance of neglect and indifference.

> I said, 'Where is Hazlitt?' 'Oh dear, William has gone to look for a parson'. 'A parson; why, has he not thought of that before?' 'No, he didn't'. 'I'll go and look for him', said I, and out I went into the park through Queen's Square and met Hazlitt in a rage coming home. 'Have ye got a parson?' 'No, sir;' said he, 'these fellows are all out'. 'What will you do?' 'Nothing'. So in we walked, Hazlitt growling at all the parsons and the church. When we came in we sat down - nobody was come; no table laid; - no appearance of dinner.
>
> On my life there is nothing so heartless as going out to dinner and finding no dinner ready.
>
> I sat down; the company began to drop in - Charles Lamb and his poor sister - all sorts of odd clever people. Still no dinner. At last came in a maid who laid a cloth and put down knives and forks in a heap. Then followed a dish of potatoes, cold, waxy and yellow. Then came a great bit of beef with a bone like a battering-ram, toppling on all its corners. Neither Hazlitt nor Lamb seemed at all disturbed, but set to work helping each other; while the boy, half-clean and obstinate, kept squalling to put his fingers into the gravy.
>
> Even Lamb's wit and Hazlitt's disquisitions, in a large room, wainscotted and ancient, where Milton had meditated, could not reconcile me to such violation of all the decencies of life. I returned weary, and placing a candle on the floor of my room soon recovered under the imposing look of my picture and retired to bed filled with thought.

Thus in 1853. (3) It is instructive to see what was made of it by subsequent writers on Hazlitt and Lamb. But before doing so let us glance at one quirky detail that hints a certain inconsistency. Haydon was irritated because the meal was tardy and meagre. Haydon knew what to expect of parties, and had lunched heartily beforehand.

Hazlitt's grandson quotes the account in his *Memoirs of William Hazlitt* (1867), even though he disliked Haydon as a 'disparager', but he stops short half-way, at the word 'nothing', adding only, 'Nothing *was* done that day, but a good deal of company, including Charles and Mary Lamb, dropped in soon afterwards, and there was "good talk", but no victuals that pleased Mr. Haydon'. (4) The next version, in the *Life and Letters of William Bewick* (1871), did not derive from Haydon's *Autobiography*, but it did originate with Haydon, and must be entered here because it differs so strikingly. It was told to Bewick as he and Haydon were leaving York St. after a visit to Hazlitt sometime between 1817 and 1819.

> 'I will tell you', said Haydon, 'of one of the many instances that I know of his absence of mind. When that little boy of his was to be christened, and the day appointed for the ceremony, all preparations were made, and a pheasant provided by him, as an extra course for dinner, the friends and sponsors all arrived and waiting for the officiating minister, the time passing agreeably

> and rapidly away, some one, who began to apprehend the chances of a dilemma, suggested the question, whether the clergyman had been informed of the necessity of his attendance? When our author, first in some confusion, then blank dismay, confessed that there might be some probability of his having forgotten to give that piece of information, so necessary to the consummation of their intended business. He then fell to accusations of himself, of his incomprehensible stupidity, that he never had the least thought of what was proper, &c, &c, adding with more good nature, "Well, never mind; it is too late, I suppose, now, to correct my folly in this affair: let us at all events enjoy the christening dinner, even without the ministerial ceremony".'(5)

In 1902 Augustine Birrell, in his *William Hazlitt*, claims to be quoting Haydon's text, but he is evidently adapting W.C. Hazlitt's cropped version, and cavalierly at that: 'there was good talk, but no victuals that pleased Mr. Haydon' becomes 'there was good talk, but no food', full stop. (6)

E.V.Lucas, *The Life of Charles Lamb* (1905), returns to the *Autobiography*, quoting the whole passage verbatim (except for the last sentence), but making the shrewd observation that Haydon and Lamb could 'never have been very intimate'. (7) There is no reference to the christening in any of Lucas's editions of the Lamb letters (nor in the definitive Marrs edition now appearing).

Nor is it mentioned in Howe's *Life of William Hazlitt* (1922), where Haydon is called 'a witness whom we may fairly be on our guard against'. Howe was evidently offended by the many disobliging things he said about Hazlitt, and could see no recompense in the hearty and generous things he also said at other times.

Hesketh Pearson, in *The Fool of Love* (1934), takes Haydon's brush from his hand to introduce some additonal touches. Mrs. Hazlitt was 'lying on the sofa by the fire, clothed in a dressing-gown'. (He was evidently uneasy about that 'bed-gown', and who can blame him? Eccentricity for eccentricity, a bedgown really would be carrying things a bit far.) '...put down knives and forks in a heap' also seemed a wasted opportunity, so he improved it with, 'The door was flung open by a maid, who laid a cloth and banged down the knives and forks in a heap on the table'. (8)

C.M. Maclean, *Born under Saturn* (1943), adheres to the *Autobiography*, but like everyone else omits the last sentence about the picture. (9)

In 1960 Haydon's *Diary*, rediscovered by Professor W.B. Pope, after a century, was published, and the entry upon which Haydon based his *Autobiography* account became available for the first time. Here it is. (10)

> I dined on Friday last with a man of Genius, William Hazlitt. His child was to be christened, and I was desired to be there punctually at four. At four I came, but he was out! his wife ill by the fire, nothing ready, and all wearing the appearance of neglect & indifference. At last home he came, the cloth began to cover the table, and then followed a plate with a dozen large, waxen, cold, clayy, slaty potatoes. Down they were set, and down we sat also: a young mathematician, who whenever

he spoke, jerked up one side of his mouth, and closed an eye as if seized with a paralytic affection, thus *[a sketch]*; an old Lady of Genius with torn ruffles; his Wife in an influenza, thin, pale & spitty; and his chubby child, squalling, obstinate, & half-cleaned. After waiting a little, all looking forlornly at the potatoes for fear they might be the chief dish, in issued a bit of overdone beef, burnt, toppling about on seven or eight corners, with a great bone sticking out like a battering ram; the great difficulty was to make it stand upright! but the greater to discover a *cuttable* place, for all was jagged, jutting, & irregular. Like a true Genius he forgot to go for a Parson to christen his child, till it was so late that every Parson was out or occupied, so his child was not christened. I soon retired, for tho'beastliness & indifference to the common comforts of life may amuse for a time, they soon weary & disgust those who prefer attention & cleanliness.

As I was going to bed last night, my Picture had an imposing and a grand look. I felt impressed by it.

We have looked at the fortunes of the *Autobiography* version. The strange thing is that the publication of the *Diary* has not made the slightest difference: the old version still continues to be repeated. And yet the anomalies are striking. 1. There is no mention of Milton's house. (nor indeed could there have been: I have examined the Westminster rate-books for those years, and on 3 May 1813, a month after the party, that house was empty; the Hazlitts first appear in May 1814). 2. Mrs. Hazlitt was not in a bedgown. 3. So far from Charles and Mary Lamb and 'all sorts of odd clever people' being present, there were only two guests besides Haydon. 4. Haydon did not go out to look for Hazlitt. 5. He did not stop to contemplate his picture that night, but several nights later: his reference to this is not connected with the party.

Lamb was not there, but apparently Mary was. The guest who, 'whenever he spoke, jerked up one side of his mouth and closed an eye' was evidently Martin Burney, who, although it is not often mentioned, did suffer from a 'paralytic affection', a legacy of a childhood illness. (11) He was godfather when young William was eventually christened the following year.(12) The 'young mathematician' may be explained by his extravagant enthusiasms: he had probably just made some discovery or other which the disdainful Haydon heard without enquiring further. He was Mary Lamb's constant companion, so it is equally certain that she was the 'old Lady of Genius in torn ruffles'. As well as in its present sense, the word 'genius' was used pejoratively in those days to cover oddity, eccentricity, even madness (Hazlitt's brother-in-law Stoddart, in one of their newspaper-column duels, suggested that he had escaped from Bedlam or 'some other receptacle of irregular genius'). (13) Mary had been bridesmaid at the Hazlitts' wedding in 1808; she was undoubtedly Sarah's closest friend in London. Haydon did not bother to ascertain the names of his fellow-guests: if Lamb (who must either have been ill, or detained at the office) had been there we may be sure things would have been different. It is not until December 1817 that Lamb is mentioned in Haydon's diary, or Haydon named in Lamb's letters. It was then that Haydon invited Lamb to the 'Immortal Dinner', with explicit instructions for finding the house, '22 Lisson Grove North, at Rossi's, half-way up, right-hand corner'. Lamb replied, 'My dear Haydon, I will come

with pleasure to 22 Lisson Grove North, at Rossi's half-way up, right hand side...'[here we can almost see him pause, his pen hovering, before yielding to the temptation to add]'...if I can find it'. But the telling fact that emerges from this is that Lamb just didn't know where Haydon lived.

My reasons for dwelling on Haydon's career should now become apparent. He interpolated Lamb and 'all kinds of odd clever people' thirty years on because, after the steep decline in his fortunes, he needed to console himself by summoning up every detail that could bolster up the notion of a brilliant career. His irritation at the 'neglect and indifference' of the Hazlitt *ménage* was, we have seen, in the original diary and is undoubtedly related to the elegance of the world he had moved in some years earlier, and his resentment at the loss of his wealthy patrons (it was, however, a little hard to expect Hazlitt to compete with the Lord President of the Council). He does not reflect that he himself at that very time was working, eating and sleeping in what was effectively one small room, in conditions so squalid that his health nearly foundered. (14) What he came to feel later, in the *Autobiography*, is more complex. Casting about for an explanation of his neglect by the establishment that would absolve himself of personal blame, he had after much pondering, concluded that it was owing to his associating in those years with the like of Hazlitt, Hunt, and Shelley, disreputable characters, Radicals, Reformers, and unbelievers. The lines immediately preceding the account in the *Autobiography* ('it was nothing but natural that ... I should unfortunately come in as one who was as much of a radical and sceptic as those with whom I associated') sufficiently prove this, although he puts it more strongly elsewhere. (15)

Even stronger was his feeling that Hazlitt, the most influential art-critic of the day, had not been as convinced as he himself was of his genius and had not done enough to serve him. It was true that Hazlitt, while he showed a proper regard for Haydon's undoubted talent, also had reservations, which as usual he voiced, and notably about the noisy, aggressive way in which Haydon attempted to force public acclaim. Of the picture in the diary entry, the *Judgement of Solomon*, he said when it was exhibited the following year that although it 'certainly shew[ed] a bold and aspiring mind ... the success [was] not always in proportion to the effort made.' (16) It is interesting to see how Haydon makes an ally of the august shade of Milton, but one cannot help feeling confident that he considered the derogation to Milton on this occasion to be less invidious than the derogation to B.R. Haydon. This is apparent from the last sentence of the *Atuobiography* version. In the passage quoted from the *Diary*, the corresponding last sentence, as we have seen, comes some nights after the party, and is a quite separate entry. But the opportunity in 1843 to heighten the glory of his master-work (and further dishonour his host) by contrasting it (a posthumous act of justice) with the squalid surroundings, suitably exaggerated, of the critic who had failed to exalt it thirty years before was too enticing to be missed.

Suitably exaggerated? The extent of the exaggeration is difficult to determine. One man's elegance is another man's squalor, and this is even more true of one age and the next. The eighteenth century, to which this period was heir, was never particularly nice. Some anecdotes of the Lamb circle come to mind, e.g. 'If dirt were trumps what a hand you would hold!'.

Admiral Burney, when the use of a nail-brush was explained to him, listened intently, and said 'Well, thank God, I never heard of that before'. George Dyer, in the opinion of Bodley's Sub-Librarian, quoted in the last *Charles Lamb Bulletin*, would be unlikely to win a *concours d'élégance*. But we should rather compare the two passages with another savage caricature in the diary, of squalor in the household of another person whom Haydon imagined to have done him disservice, the venerable Benjamin West, President of the Royal Academy. (17)

In conclusion, having thus rudely deprived you of a long-accepted picture of Lamb and Hazlitt together, I will try to make amends by replacing it with an entirely new glimpse of the two friends in similar holiday mood. It is in William Ayrton's unpublished commonplace-book, and reads, 'Charles Lamb, Hazlitt, Martin Burney [and I] took a long walk around Norwood, Dulwich, etc. and dined at the ——— Inn at the latter place. Burney had no purse and when the bill came he said, resting heavily on my shoulder, "Ayrton, pray pay for me" ——— "I will, Martin, but don't fatten and lean on me too".' Ayrton ('the Will Honeycomb of our set', as Hazlitt called him) was so pleased with this stroke that he went on to elaborate it -- 'Put into a doggerel, it may read thus: "Martin, dear Martin, this never will do,
You must not fatten and lean on me too".'(18)

To eke out this brief allusion to a pleasant walk I add the following from Hazlitt: '[In landscape-painting excursions] we catch fading distances on airy downs, and seize on golden sunsets with the fleecy flocks glittering in the evening ray, after a shower of rain has fallen. Or from Norwood's ridgy heights, survey the snake-like Thames, or its smoke-crowned capital'. (19)

NOTES

1. The phrase 'the novelist's touch' is Norman Douglas's. See E.M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (1927), pp. 96-7.
2. *Notes and Queries*, 28 Oct. 1876, p. 344.
3. In the World's Classics edition (Edmund Blunden, 1927), pp. 212-13.
4. i. 213.
5. i. 120-1.
6. p. 110.
7. 4th, revised ed. (1907), pp. 316-17.
8. p. 61.
9. pp. 294-5.
10. *The Diary of Benjamin Robert Haydon*, ed. W.B. Pope (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1960-3), i. 303.
11. Barry Cornwall [B.W. Proctor], *Charles Lamb* (1866), p. 144. See also *The Life and Correspondence of the Late Robert Southey*, ed. C.C. Southey (1850), ii. 292-3.
12. 26 Sept. 1814, a ceremony at which Haydon could not have been present: he was in Hastings.

13. *The Times*, 20 Nov, 1813.
14. *Autobiography*, p. 346; *Diary*, ii. 130-1.
15. See *Diary*, iii. 54 (31 Oct. 1825).
16. *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt*, ed. P.P. Howe (1930-4), xviii.19.
17. *Diary*, i. 91-2.
18. British Library, Add. MS 60358, f.171, (no date is given). The anecdote of Admiral Burney, above, is also quoted from this manuscript, f. 158.
19. Hazlitt, *Complete Works* (see note 16 above), xii. 114.

Dr. Jones's biography *Hazlitt, from Winterslow to Frith Street* is to be published by Oxford University Press in Spring 1989.

LAMB AND HAZLITT, 1816 - 1826: SOME NOTES TO A RELATIONSHIP

Winifred Courtney

Author of *Young Charles Lamb*

A Paper given at the College English Association of America meeting at Charleston, 1987.

I have chosen the decade of my title arbitrarily, because I want to call attention to a very few documents on my subject, some only recently available -- the first from 1816, the last from 1826--and not because the period was the most important in both writers' lives, as indeed it was.

By 1825 both men had acquired a national reputation, in part through their contributions from 1820 to the *London Magazine*. For Lamb the other crucial events were the publication of his early *Works* in 1818; his moves to Russell Street and Islington; his proposal to, and rejection by, the actress Fanny Kelly; the Lambs' adoption of Emma Isola; and Charles's retirement from the East India House on pension. For Hazlitt there were the writing of his widely published reviews, essays, and art and drama criticism; his lectures on English literature; his separation and divorce from the former Sarah Stoddart; his passion for Sarah Walker; many books, including *Table-Talk*, *Liber Amoris*, and *The Spirit of the Age*; his remarriage and stay on the Continent. Both men were at the zenith of their powers. They had known each other well since 1803. There had been one coolness in 1814; there would be another in 1822-3. Their mutual friendship, however, never wavered for long.

This said, we plunge in--first to a very interesting letter of Wordsworth to Lamb, which has lately come to light and is in the Dove Cottage Library at Grasmere. Its date is November 21, 1816. (1) Wordsworth is answering Lamb's letter of September 23. (2) After preamble Lamb has asked if the poet has 'read the review of Coleridges character, person, physiognomy &c in the Examiner-- Leigh Hunt's radical paper. This was Hazlitt's opening salvo against Coleridge, and a fierce one, on the latter's *Lay-sermon*,

whose political slant, come full circle since Coleridge's radical youth, could not fail to arouse Hazlitt's ire. (3) (Though Martin Burney found the praise greater than the blame and Lamb said--well--that was like calling someone a great man and then pulling him by the nose.) (4)

Since Hazlitt's 1814 review of *The Excursion*, which had not pleased the poet, Wordsworth had not cared to meet his critic and had begun to spread what seems to have been an exaggerated account of Hazlitt's amorous adventure in the Lake District in 1803, whither he had gone to paint the portraits of Wordsworth and Coleridge. Southey had decried the Wordsworth portrait but pronounced Coleridge's 'very fine'. (5)

Lamb, while humorous on the Coleridge attack in *his* letter, had shown his Hazlitt-ambivalence--which was certainly real and not put in to please Wordsworth. He had mentioned, among other things, Hazlitt's attacks on Robert Southey too, as 'rubs of the rogue Examiner. A pertinacious foul mouthed villain it is!'. But above in the same letter he had also said, 'however in spite of all, there is something tough in my attachment to H-- which these violent strainings cannot quite dislocate or sever asunder. I get no conversation in London that is absolutely worth attending to but his ... '.

Wordsworth's entertaining reply takes up Hazlitt with venomous glee: 'W.H. is much such a drawer of characters as, judging from the specimens of art which he has left in this country, he is a portrait painter. He tried his hand upon me.' The poet's brother Richard 'happened to come into the room... saw [the painting], stopt, I believe recoiled, and exclaimed *God Zounds*!... never, till that moment, had he conceived that so much of the diabolical lurked under the innocent features of his quondam playmate ...'. The poet then expands on the two types of devil, which, he says, Hazlitt is good at depicting. Each is represented in these two paintings. 'Mine has been burnt', he notes, and Coleridge's (Southey's view notwithstanding) 'is kept in a private room as a special treat for those who may wish to sup upon horrors'. (6) As Hazlitt has served Coleridge's 'person', now he 'has served his mind'.

And this is not all. After a shot at De Quincey, who has lately fathered an illegitimate son called *William* (underlined), and a shot at Gifford the editor, he praises Southey, who, 'if the attainment of just notions be an evidence of ability, ... will be cherished by posterity when the reputation of those, who now so insolently decry him, will be rotted away and dispersed upon the winds'. Then there is a sly shift: 'You are better off than we--inasmuch as London contains one person whose conversation is worth listening to',--Hazlitt yet again!--'we are in an utter desert', whose anonymous talkers he proceeds to describe, with no diminution of wit. There is a final section, about a 'flying Taylor' whom Lamb may know, before Lamb's 'friend to command' (who wishes to hear from him)has done.(7) (The poet has had more fun than usual writing this one.)

An interesting repercussion, surely deriving from this letter, is given by Lucas in his *Life* of Lamb from De Quincey's *London Reminiscences*. The Opium Eater had denigrated Hazlitt to Lamb.

> 'I know not', [Lamb] said, 'where you have been so lucky as to find finer thinkers than Hazlitt... You live, I think, or have lived, in Grasmere. Well, I was once there. I was at Keswick,

> and all over that wild country; yet none such could I find there. But, stay, there are the caves in your neighbourhood, as well as the lakes; these we did not visit. No, Mary,' turning to his sister, 'you know we didn't visit the caves. So, perhaps, these great men live there. Oh! yes, doubtless they live in the caves of Westmorland. But you must allow for us poor Londoners. Hazlitt serves for *our* purposes.' (8)

Hazlitt unwittingly provided his friends, and his enemies, with much humorous sport.

Next on our hurried journey I take up Lamb's abortive analysis of Hazlitt's *Table-Talk*, (First Series, Part I, 1821), a review first published in full in 1980 (9) and perhaps intended for the rogue *Examiner*, for which Lamb, of course, did himself write on occasion. Its editor, Leigh Hunt, was then also embroiled with Hazlitt, usually his friend, over sharp portraits of himself and the poet Shelley he had just come across in 'On People with One Idea' in that new book. His letter of protest to Hazlitt contains the sentence,

> A criticism on Table-Talk was to appear in next Sunday's *Examiner*, but I have thought it best, upon the whole, not to let it appear, for I must have added a quarrelsome note to it; and the sight of acquaintances and brother-reformers cutting and carbonadoing one another in public is, I conceive, no advancement to the cause of Liberal opinion... (10)

So the Lamb review, if this was it, was never published as far as is known, though the Hunt-Hazlitt quarrel was shortly patched up.

Hazlitt, in reply, had listed his grievances against a number of his friends, including Hunt, ending with the plaint Keats had so affectionately observed in *his* Hazlitt: 'I want to know why every body has such a dislike to me'. No. 4 in that list reads:

> I have taken all opportunities of praising Lamb, and I never got a good word from him in return, big or little, till the other day [incident not specified]. He seemed struck all of a heap, if I even hinted at the possibility of his giving me a lift at any time. (11)

That Hazlitt had praised Lamb, even dedicated his book on Shakespeare to him, and that Lamb had not as yet reciprocated is true. Perhaps he simply resisted such suggestions from Hazlitt or perhaps his ambivalence had prevented. And perhaps the review, for reasons I shall discuss, would have exacerbated Hazlitt's Lamb-resentment or revived the quarrel with Hunt, though I hardly think so. I believe we must take Hunt's reason for omission as he gave it, whether the discarded review was Lamb's or not. Commenting on the essay 'On Living to One's-self,' Lamb quotes this 'singular passage' from Hazlitt:

> Even in the common affairs of life, in love, friendship, and marriage, how little security have we when we trust our happiness in the hands of others! Most of the friends I have seen have turned out the bitterest enemies, or cold, uncomfortable

> acquaintance. Old companions are like meats served up too often, that lose their relish and their wholesomeness. (12)

This sets Lamb off: 'We had always thought that Old Friends, and Old Wine were the best ... We suspect that Mr. Hazlitt does not always play quite fairly with his associates...' (13) He goes on in this vein for a longish paragraph, but deletes his sharpest shot:

> Does ... our dispassionate speculator on character hang his walls with flayed skins of his acquaintance *in terrorem*? Or does he keep a room, like Bluebeard's, for his friends? (14)

Oh wise but revealing deletion! The comments Lamb retained were milder, but he was venturing into what was then, though he knew it not, very sensitive territory between Hunt and Hazlitt.

The critique--it should be read in full in Roy Park's *Lamb As Critic* or in the new Penguin *Selected Prose* of Lamb (15)--is to Park 'the most important of Lamb's reviews'(16); one can only agree. Lamb starts off with his own capsule history of the English Essay and what modern essayists such as Hazlitt have contributed to it--mainly the author as *character* who lends colour, feeling, and intimacy to discussion, if I may summarize Lamb's subtleties so crudely. Of great interest, of course, is what the critic reveals about the conscious artistry of Elia along the way. (17) In another section Lamb reveals too--and we can thank Hazlitt for this-- that his own mingling with Radicals was yet more extensive than we had supposed. He takes issue with Hazlitt's consigning the activist Major John Cartwright, one of the earliest proponents of Parliamentary Reform, to 'People with One Idea'. In a pleasant diversion, Lamb says *he* has spent many days with Major C--, who has much to talk about in private conversation besides his Cause. (18) Better, says Lamb, is the essay on Cobbett-that other Radical whose paper Lamb regularly read.

He covers, of course, much more than this, evenhandedly, brilliantly, and with appreciation of Hazlitt's literary genius. Lamb notes, for example, his moments, carefully planned, of poetic flight--which 'break in upon us, amidst the spleen and severity of his commoner tone, like springs bursting out in the desart'. (19) The long critique is a model of perceptive analysis with which we should still mostly agree--and it could hardly, I think, have failed to please Hazlitt in the main, however he might have cared to argue details. Alas, he was never to read it. In its study we observe that Hazlitt stimulated Lamb to his very best, as he had John Keats, and we know from Hazlitt's writings, as well as from his social dependence on both Lambs, that the stimulus was mutual.

Shortly after this, having separated from his wife in 1819, Hazlitt was deeply involved with his landlord's daughter Sarah Walker, whom he hoped to marry, and in 1822 he persuaded Mrs. Hazlitt to engage in collusion with him for a Scottish divorce action in which she was the plaintiff. (20) This the mother of his son carried through gallantly, though not without alimony. Sarah Walker proved a flirt and a jilt--and the subject of endless dissection by her would-be lover in the book *Liber Amoris, Or The New Pygmalion* (1823), and of numerous conversations with anyone at all who would listen.

But not with the Lambs, who had introduced Sarah Stoddart to her husband

and were still her friends. They have often been blamed for promoting the marriage, though the two intelligent Hazlitts, no longer in first youth, could surely have been expected to use their own good judgment. Good judgment had proved to be neither Hazlitt's strong suit. Crabb Robinson, whose relations with Hazlitt ranged regularly from admiration to open hostility, reported in his diary of 1822 that 'Miss Lamb spoke with becoming disgust at this scandalous proceeding' (collusion in divorce), but he feared that she would not have 'strength' to give Hazlitt up altogether.(21) *Liber Amoris* provided a general shock to the reading public--Hazlitt was considered to have made a fool of himself--but in our distant, more permissive age it has been welcomed in some quarters as a minor masterpiece.(22)

Lamb has only one reference to these events, when he describes Mary Hazlitt in a letter of 1824 as 'niece to Pygmalion', (23) and he was soon much more openly distressed at Robert Southey's suggestion in a generally favorable review of the first Elia volume in the same year that the book 'wanted' more religion. That quarrel was patched up too, very rapidly by the Poet Laureate, but not before Lamb had published his 'Letter to Robert Southey' in the *London Magazine*, in which he defended many of his unbelieving friends as well as his somewhat believing self. Among these was Hazlitt, who was delighted, and soon wrote in 'On the Pleasure of Hating' (!), 'I think I must be friends with L[amb] again'. (24) Forthwith the old relationship was resumed. Hazlitt's greatest work, *The Spirit of the Age* (1825), did much to allay the *Liber Amoris* scandal, and by then Hazlitt had found a thoroughly pleasant woman for second wife.

The last document I shall discuss is the manuscript of Hazlitt's essay 'Of Persons One Would Wish to Have Seen', purportedly recounting the conversation at one of the Lambs' 'evenings' a good many years before, though Hazlitt is vague about the date. This essay has been the subject of much speculation and extended correspondence in no less than six *Times Literary Supplements* of 1953. (25) What the usually impeccable P.P. Howe, Hazlitt's biographer and editor of the standard edition of his works, noted, and corrected from Hazlitt's manuscript now at the University of Buffalo, was that Thomas Campbell, editor of *The New Monthly Magazine*, in which the essay first appeared in January, 1826, had changed all Hazlitt's transparent initials--of Lamb's guests--out of excessive caution. These were 'corrected' by William Hazlitt, Jr., often quite wrongly, in editing his father's *Literary Remains* of 1836. The son reprinted the essay in the *Winterslow* volume of 1850, which most later editions have followed. I have compared the Buffalo manuscript with both P.P. Howe's version in the *Works*--hereafter called 'Howe'--and *Winterslow*.

Since Hazlitt was known for writing only one draft which went straight to the editor, it is interesting to note that P.P. Howe did not reject the *Winterslow* editing, which for the most part only smoothes awkwardnesses in the Buffalo manuscript. But conspicuous in *Winterslow* and Howe, though not in 'Buffalo' is the presence of a footnote about why'I' could not include Bacon among those names considered for calling up, which is clearly the senior Hazlitt's own. Therefore he saw the piece again, inserted the poetic excerpts which he had vaguely indicated were to go into certain spaces in the Buffalo ms., smoothed the text, and added the footnote, either in a second draft or in proof. One ascription in Howe has been a particular puzzle--the identity of the person who imagined Shakespeare and Jesus Christ appearing in the room--given by Hazlitt, Jr. to Lamb, who is supposed to have said of Jesus,

'if that person were to come into it, we should all fall down and try to kiss the hem of his garment'. In the magazine the speaker had been 'H--.' presumably Campbell's choice; but Hazlitt, Jr.'s 'Lamb' has persisted in most editions. Howe, however, has the note that the 'manuscript' is 'clear in giving /the Jesus statement/ to "R," whom we identified as John Rickman'. (26) But as Payson G. Gates points out in *TLS*, (27) confirming my own finding, the 'R--' in Howe does not appear at this point in the Buffalo ms., nor any other name. From its provenance, Howe's 'manuscript' appears to be the Buffalo ms. in every other respect. Did Howe, then, see a second manuscript with the later Hazlitt, Sr., corrections, poems, and footnote, or is he assuming something? As Gates says, the puzzle persists. The attribution to Lamb, however, was never Hazlitt, Sr.'s., who possibly implies by omission (in 'Buffalo') that the speaker was the 'R' who had questioned Lamb in the first place, eliciting Guy Faux and Judas Iscariot as Lamb's shocker choices. But since Howe does not clarify his source, or his reasoning, we must take his correction on faith.

In the Buffalo ms. 'a lady present' (last paragraph in *Winterslow* and Howe) is given as 'Mrs R--s'--or Mrs. Reynolds, Lamb's old schoolteacher, whom we must now suppose that Hazlitt Sr., decided later to render anonymous, since Howe accepts this change. Where Hazlitt, Jr., went seriously wrong, however, was in attributing to Mrs. Reynolds the wish to see Pope with Patty Blount, and 'I *have* seen Goldsmith'. (28) In the Buffalo ms. this is clearly attributed to 'Miss L--.' and in Howe to 'Miss Lamb', later characterized anonymously, but certainly, as the 'incomparable person' who would like to have seen Ninon de l'Enclos. (29) (Hazlitt's admiration of Mary Lamb is attested to on many occasions). Payson Gates prints the end of the Hazlitt, Sr., Buffalo ms. in the *TLS* of June 5, 1953, and one can read what Howe thinks is all Hazlitt, Sr.'s, as originally intended, in his edition of Hazlitt's works. (30) Howe's version certainly makes more sense than *Winterslow's* for reasons which the *TLS* correspondence treats in detail. It alters rather crucially the Lambs' role in this essay.

There is, however, a more basic question about 'Of Persons One Would Wish to Have Seen', pointed out by Elizabeth Schneider in the *TLS*. (31) Hazlitt had in 1804-06 abridged *The Light of Nature Pursued* by Abraham Tucker, and in that book was, she says, a chapter 'called "The Vision", which Hazlitt particularly admired'. It tells how each of a group of friends 'fell to consider ... what persons he should evoke from the shades and what questions he should put to them'. The narrator that night dreamt that he was dead and met Locke, Plato, Socrates, and Leibnitz. So, if such a discussion ever took place at Lamb's it was most likely at Hazlitt's prompting, rather than Lamb's (32)--but how much is true (the appearance of ghosts is already a touch of fancy) and how much is Hazlitt playing a game we shall never know. He made his company's conversation plausible, but the suspicion must linger that it was *invented* for Hazlitt's amusement. (I know of no contemporary oomment on this point.) It remains a delightful essay.

Hazlitt's happier marriage did not last either; the same William Hazlitt, Jr., then sixteen and loyal to his mother, is said to have dealt the mortal blow in 1827. The new wife of three years--she had her own income--took the cue and left her fond husband quite suddenly. Hazlitt kept his peace on this sad affair, which we know only at second hand. He had but three years to live.

Yet on his deathbed in 1830 he could say, if we trust his grandson, 'I have had a happy life'. He had always got on with younger men--young Keats and J.H. Knowles the playwright were devoted to him, as were Procter, Patmore, and Martin Burney. The Lambs, Hunt, and a few others stood by him too, to the end. So all his life was not enmity. Nettlesome as he was, he took the bad with the good and left an impressive literary legacy. That Hazlitt is now enjoying a well-earned renaissance (33) from 'posterity' is certainly one of the rewards he had long and diligently sought.

PRINCIPAL SOURCES

Hazlitt, William, *Letters*, Eds. Bonner and Lahey. New York: New York UP,1978.

--- *Liber Amoris, Or, The New Pygmalion*, Ed. Gerald Lahey. New York: New York UP, 1980.

--- "Of Persons One Would Wish to Have Seen", ms., courtesy of the Poetry/ Rare Books Collection, University Libraries, State University of New York at Buffalo.

--- *Table-Talk.* London: Grant Richards, 1902.

--- *Works*, Centenary Edition, Ed., P.P. Howe, Vol. XVII. London, 1930-34.

Hill, Alan G., "Lamb and Wordsworth: The Story of a Remarkable Friendship". *Charles Lamb Bulletin*, Jan. 1982, 85-92.

Howe, P.P., *The Life of William Hazlitt.* 1922. Rev. ed. London: Hamilton, 1940. (This, of many biographies, was most useful for my purposes).

Jack, Ian, *English Literature, 1815-1832.* Oxford: Clarendon 1963.

Lamb, Charles, *Lamb as Critic*, Ed. Roy Park. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.

---, Charles and Mary, *Letters*, Ed. E.V. Lucas, Vol. II. London: Dent, Methuen, 1935.

---, Charles and Mary Anne, *Letters*, Vol. III Ed. Edwin W. Marrs, Jr. Ithaca: Cornell, 1978.

Lindop, Grevel, *The Opium-Eater: A Life of Thomas De Quincey.* London:Dent 1981.

Lucas, E.V., *The Life of Charles Lamb*, 5th ed., 1921, New York:AMS 1968.

Robinson, H.C., *Henry Crabb Robinson on Books and Their Writers*, Vol. I, Ed. Edith J. Morley. London: Dent, 1938.

Wordsworth, William, unpublished ms. of a letter to Lamb, Nov. 21, 1816. Dove Cottage, courtesy of the Trustees.

NOTES

1. This letter, not yet published in full as of January, 1987, will shortly appear in *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: The Middle Years, A Supplement*, Ed. Alan G. Hill (Oxford: Clarendon). I am indebted to Professor Hill for this informtion.
2. Lamb-Marrs, III, 224-26.
3. *Examiner*, Sept. 8, 1816 (Lamb-Marrs III, 227).
4. Robinson, Nov. 2, 1816, 197.

5. Quoted in Howe, *Life*, 78, from C. Southey's *Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey* (New York: Harper, 1851, 167). For Wordsworth's probable exaggeration, see Howe, *Life*, 79-81.

6. The portrait of Coleridge has since disappeared.

7. For more of the text, see Hill, 88, and Lindop, 219. In the former, the date of 1818 appears to be a misprint, since all evidence (his answer to Lamb, birth of De Quincey's son, etc.) points to 1816. The top of Wordsworth's letter shows month and day, but not year. (See also Note 1, above)

8. Quoted in Lucas, 577-78.

9. Lamb-Park, 299-307; and see George L. Barnett, "An Unpublished Review by Charles Lamb", *Modern Language Quarterly*, XVII, 4, Dec. 1956, 352-56.

10. Quoted in Howe, *Life*, 318.

11. Hazlitt, *Letters*, 205-06.

12. Hazlitt, *Table-Talk*, 127.

13. Lamb-Park, 299.

14. Lamb-Park, 311n.

15. Ed. Adam Phillips; as described by Mary Wedd, *Charles Lamb Bulletin*, Jan. 1987, 29.

16. Lamb-Park, 299.

17. See John R. Nabholtz, *My Reader, My Fellow-Labourer: A Study of English Romantic Prose* (Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1986) for a very recent discussion of Lamb--and Hazlitt--as familiar essayists.

18. Lamb-Park, 305-06. Of course Hazlitt, whose politics, as John Scott said, 'come like a mastiff, by his side, into all companies he frequents' (quoted in Howe *Life*, 294) may well have initiated political discussion with Cartwright, and therefore knew nothing of his other conversation. Lamb in general avoided private talk about politics.

19. Lamb-Park, 304.

20. To procure the divorce--or to allow Sarah Hazlitt to procure it--Hazlitt had to be discovered in adultery, which was staged in Scotland: Sarah Walker was not the co-respondent.

21. Robinson, 281.

22. See, for example, Hazlitt-Lahey (*Liber Amoris*), 29-35 *passim*. Another reaction was to find the book "disgusting", as did Crabb Robinson (Robinson, 296).

23. Lamb-Lucas (*Letters*), II, 423. (Marr's *Letters* do not, at this writing, go beyond 1817).

24. Quoted in Howe (*Life*), 363.

25. See the *TLS* for the following dates in 1953: Feb. 27, 137; Mar.6, 153; Mar. 13, 169; May 8, 301; June 5, 365; June 12, 381.

26. Hazlitt, *Works*, XVII, 403n.

27. *TLS*, June 5, 1953, 365.

28. Buffalo ms., 6.

29. Buffalo ms., 12.

30. In Hazlitt *Works*, Vol. XVII.

31. *TLS*, May 8, 1953, 301.

32. Though in both this essay and 'On the Conversation of Authors' Hazlitt claims that Lamb was the initiator.

33. Stanley Jones's forthcoming biography from Oxford UP is the latest work we are promised among several recent books on Hazlitt.

RHETORIC AND ART: GEORGE CAMPBELL, WILLIAM HAZLITT, AND 'GUSTO'

Joel Haefner

University of Iowa

'Gusto' is, as recent critics have noticed, an integral element of William Hazlitt's aesthetics. Like many of Hazlitt's critical concepts, the meaning of 'gusto' transmutes and modulates throughout Hazlitt's *oeuvre*; yet it crops up again and again. Most of Hazlitt's modern commentators interpret 'gusto' as a facet of the Romantic artist's imagination, as 'the state in which the imagination's fusing power comes into play through a strong sympathetic excitement.' (1) But in examining the origins of Hazlitt's concept of 'gusto', we discover that it is a *rhetorical* quality--a persuasive power or response to be awakened in the perceiver of art, not necessarily something inherent in the creator. This investigation of the genealogy of 'gusto' reminds us that Hazlitt's aesthetics are rhetorical at base, and that his thinking needs to be reviewed within the tradition of British rhetorical theory, and particularly within the context of George Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1776).

Hazlitt most succinctly defines gusto in a short essay in *The Round Table*. 'Gusto in art is power or passion defining any object. ... there is hardly any object entirely devoid of expression, without some character of power belongingto it, some precise association with pleasure or pain....'(2) Later, Hazlitt elaborates his definition, writing that gusto

> is the conveying to the eye the impressions of the soul, or the other senses connected with the sense of sight, such as the different passions visible in the countenance, the romantic interest connected with scenes of nature, the character and feelings associated with different objects.
>
> (18.106)

Hazlitt, throughout his criticism, claims that a number of artists evince gusto, among them Titian, Shakespeare, Milton, Chaucer, Rembrandt, Raphael, and Correggio. The kinds of 'gusto' these artists display varies greatly, but in each the 'truth of character' and the 'truth of feeling' are present.

A few observations need to be made here. First, Hazlitt has grounded his idea of gusto on the British empiricists' distinction between pleasure and pain. Hence Hazlitt's aesthetics are at base psychological, and are in some way reliant on materialistic ideas of perception. We should beware, however, of tying Hazlitt too closely to materialistic empiricism. Second, gusto is preeminently an *affective*, not a *creative* power. It is not so much the

artist's mind or imagination at work that creates gusto, but rather the interaction between the piece of art and the viewer. Specifically, it is the emotional manifestations of the visual experience that constitute gusto.

On both scores-- that of psychological associationism and that of the affective nature of art--Hazlitt found at least a confirmation of his own ideas, at most a source for those ideas, in the rhetorical theories of George Campbell. Hazlitt read Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1776) and praised the Scot's treatise in his 1818 *Lectures on the English Comic Writers* (6.62). (3)

Hazlitt, of course, was already well acquainted with British philosophy from his Dissenting childhood in Shropshire. But in Campbell's theories Hazlitt may well have found the germ for his idea of gusto, an idea which not only summarized the aesthetic experience but which may well have underpinned Hazlitt's conception of the criticial transaction.

Campbell's treatise is an amalgamation of eighteenth-century empiricism and theories of human nature derived from Hume and the Philosophical Society of Aberdeen, as well as Aristotelian traditions of rhetoric. Corbett and Golden remark that

> In grounding rhetoric in human nature, Campbell accepted the following tenets advanced by Locke, Hume, and Hartley: (1) the mind is separated into faculties; (2) the experimental method is superior to syllogistic reasoning; (3) ideas are held together by the laws of association; and (4) belief and persuasion are dependent upon the liveliness of an idea and the force of emotional appeals. (4)

While it is important to remember the whole intellectual context in which Campbell was working, it is this last point which most concerns us here; and Campbell's indebtedness to Hume for his notion of 'liveliness' has been charted extensively by Lloyd F. Bitzer. As Bitzer notes, the concept of 'liveliness'-- or 'vivacity', as Campbell labels it-- is derived from Campbell's affirmation of sensationalism and from Hartley's theory of association. When we read Hazlitt's criticism of art and even his familiar essays, we can see traces of these schools, especially empiricism, sensationalism, and the association of ideas. (5)

Campbell, like Hazlitt, undertook to explore the human mind; Campbell, however, integrated his study of human nature with a systematic inquiry into rhetoric. Hazlitt never penned a sustained analysis of rhetoric, and his comments on it are scattered throughout his writings. Campbell makes clear in his Preface that his rhetorical principles will be derived from his 'map' of the human mind:

> It is his purpose in this Work, on the one hand, to exhibit, he does not say, a correct map, but a tolerable sketch of the human mind; and, aided by the lights which the Poet and the Orator so amply furnish, to disclose its secret movements, tracing its principal channels of perception and action... to their source; and, on the other hand, from the science of human nature, to ascertain with greater precision, the radical principles of that art, whose object it is, by the use of language, to operate on the soul of the hearer, in the way of informing, convincing, pleasing, moving or persuading.
>
> (*PR*, xliii)

Campbell considers the poet equally with the orator, hence his general principles can be applied to aesthetics as well as rhetoric. Indeed, Campbell quotes writers extensively, and Hazlitt applauded his quotations from Pope and Butler. As the Preface explains, Campbell sees rhetoric as affective at base, as acting on the soul of the hearer through passion.

Like Campbell, Hazlitt drew a 'map' of the human mind to illuminate morality and human behaviour in his earliest published work, *An Essay on the Principles of Human Action* (1805). His sketch of the human mind parallels Campbell's closely. Campbell divides the mind into three categories: sensation, which 'inform/s/ the mind of the facts, which in the present instant are situated within the sphere of /its/ activity' (*PR*, 47); memory, 'the sole repository of the knowledge received from sense' (*PR*, 47); and imagination, 'the discovery of resemblance' (*PR*, 74) or 'the faculty of apprehending what is neither perceived by the senses, nor remembered'. Similarly, Hazlitt divides the mind into sensations, memory and imagination: 'I have an interest in my own actual feelings or impressions by means of consciousness, and in my past feelings by means of memory...'(1.1).

But there are important differences between Campbell's and Hazlitt's rough maps of the human mind. Hazlitt, unlike Campbell, grounds his division of the mind in time; memory is an agent of the past, sensation of the present, imagination of the future. Because he wanted to prove that humans are not self-interested but rather 'naturally disinterested', that is, inherently empathetic towards others, Hazlitt placed an enormous moral value on the imagination.

> The imagination, by means of which alone I can anticipate future objects, or be interested in them, must carry me out of myself into the feelings of others by one and the same process by which I am thrown forward as it were into my future being, and interested in it.
>
> (1.1-2)

By contrast, Campbell views imagination as a means of commanding attention through striking comparisons, and as a vehicle for gaining belief through 'analogical reasoning'-- a faculty rather like Coleridge's definition of 'fancy' at the end of the thirteenth chapter of the *Biographia Literaria*. Campbell, indeed, interchanges 'fancy' and 'imagination' freely, and indicates that imagination should be used only to supplement, not supplant, reason. 'If the orator would prove successful,' Campbell wrote,

> it is necessary that he engage in his service all these different powers of the mind, the imagination, the memory, and the passions. These are not the supplanters of reason, or even rivals in her sway; they are her handmaidens, by whose ministry she is enabled to usher truth into the heart, and procure it there a favourable reception.
>
> (*PR*, 72)

Certainly Hazlitt, when discussing thought and discourse, assigns a larger role to the imagination, and sometimes gives it primacy over reason or the understanding. In his well-known essay 'On Reason and Imagination', for example, Hazlitt attacks emotionless rationalists, 'persons of the dry and husky class', and he sees reason and imagination as equally indispensable

and symbiotic. But certainly Hazlitt saw imagination as crucial to rhetoric, though he did think reason and imagination were necessary checks on each other--much as Campbell argued. 'Logic should enrich and invigorate its decisions', Hazlitt wrote, 'by the use of imagination; as rhetoric should be governed in its application and guarded from abuse by the checks of the understanding' (12.45). While Campbell clearly saw reason as the major faculty of *thought*, he would agree that imagination as well as reason must be utilized in rhetoric, the art of 'informing, convincing, pleasing, moving, or persuading' an audience and operating on the soul of the hearer.

While Campbell defines imagination in a very limited way--hardly an 'infinite I AM'--imagination plays a much broader role in art and rhetoric. In fact nearly all discourse--with the exception of mathematical proofs--rely on imagination. Truth may be reached through the use of the understanding, but the expression of truth must employ imagination, as Campbell makes clear early in his *Philosophy of Rhetoric*:

> Knowledge, the object of the intellect, furnisheth materials for the fancy; the fancy culls, compounds, and, by her mimic art, disposes these materials so as to affect the passions; the passions are the natural spurs to volition or action, and so need only to be right directed.
>
> (*PR*, 2)

Since the imagination, or fancy, plays such a central role in Campbell's rhetoric, it is only logical that art--epic poetry, drama, and even painting--can properly be considered as kinds of rhetorical discourse. 'The imagination', Campbell writes in the early pages of his treatise,

> is addressed by exhibiting to it a lively and beautiful representation of a suitable object. As in this exhibition, the task of the orator may, in some sort, be said, like that of the painter, to consist in imitation, the merit of the work results entirely from these two sources; dignity, as well in the subject or thing imitated, as in the manner of imitation; and resemblance in the portrait or performance.
>
> (*PR*, 3).

Though Hazlitt and Campbell define imagination differently, for both men imagination is the means of guaranteeing belief in rhetoric and art; and, more specifically, *powerful* or *lively* imaginative representation to which the audience responds is a key element in Hazlitt's aesthetics and Campbell's philosophy of rhetoric. On this last concept--which both men applied to rhetoric, literature, and painting--their theories dovetail.

What is 'vivacity' or 'the lively idea' for Campbell? Like Hazlitt's notion of gusto, it is never precisely defined, and in fact seems undefinable because it remains an almost intuitive quality. He employs a number of terms to express this idea of vivacity: liveliness, energy, force, brilliancy, lustre. Appropriately, since vivacity is a function of the imagination, originally a visual faculty, Campbell describes this quality in visual terms. 'To describe, in words', Campbell admits,

> the difference between those lively signatures of memory, which

> command an unlimited assent, and those fainter traces which raise opinion only, or even doubt, is perhaps impracticable; but no man stands in need of such assistance to enable him in fact to distinguish them, for the direction of his own judgment and conduct.
>
> (*PR*, 41)

For Campbell, vivacity resides preeminently in immediate sensation. As we recall experience or sensation, we feel less vivacity; and when the orator or artist attempts to represent experience, we normally feel the least vivacity. The orator must make life vivid and real to his audience through imagination, Campbell declared. Discourse, in other works, must strive to attain the immediacy and force of actual experience.

> Now, as it is this power [imagination] of which the orator must chiefly avail himself, it is proper to inquire what those circumstances are, which will make the ideas he summons up in the imaginations of his hearers, resemble, in lustre and steadiness, those of sensation and remembrance.
>
> (*PR*, 81)

Campbell clearly borrowed in part from Hume's *Treatise of Human Nature* in fashioning his concept of vivacity, but he expanded its meaning and role greatly in his own philosophy.

The effect and goal of using 'lively ideas', of employing vivacity in discourse, is to affect 'the passions and affections of the heart'. 'This much however is indisputable', Campbell asserts, 'that belief commonly enlivens our ideas; and that lively ideas have a stronger influence than faint ideas to induce belief' (*PR*. 73). Since the vehicle for vivacity in discourse is the imagination, the poet is, for many kinds of discourse, the master rhetorician, the most persuasive writer.

> The ideas raised in my mind by the OEdipus Tyrannus of Sophocles, or the Lear of Shakespeare, are incomparably more lively than those excited by a cold but faithful historiographer. . . . The ideas of the poet give greater pleasure, command closer attention, operate more strongly on the passions, and are longer remembered.
>
> (*PR*, 73-74)

For both Hazlitt and Campbell, the tools of the rhetorician and the artist are basically the same--imagination, vivacity or gusto, and passion. All three are intimately connected. Hazlitt saw passion as crucial both to moral truth and imagination: 'Passion, in short, is the essence, the chief ingredient in moral truth; and the warmth of passion is sure to kindle the light of imagination on the objects around it' (12.46). Or, as he says even more elegantly: 'Those evils that inflame the imagination and make the heart sick, ought not to leave the head cool' (12.47). While Campbell identified imagination, vivacity, and passion as the keys to persuasion, Hazlitt isolated imagination, gusto, and passion as the quint-essence of moral truth. (6)

In Hazlitt's aesthetics, art was not simply the vehicle of beauty; it was the means to moral truth as well. Hence art bears many resemblances to rhetoric--it must convince and move, it is not limited to the representation of the beautiful or the creative powers of the artist. 'Gusto' accordingly assumes unusual importance as both an aesthetic and a rhetorical force.

'Gusto' was, of course, in part a term borrowed from art criticism and in particular from Hazlitt's long tutelage as a portrait painter. *Gusto*, in Italian, *gout* in French, *gustus* in Latin, all denoted that most nebulous quality, *taste*; and Sir Joshua Reynolds himself had instituted *gusto grande* as the Italian equivalent of his *grand style* in his third Discourse. (7) But clearly Hazlitt was not simply following Reynolds in extolling the importance of gusto in art. For one thing, Hazlitt applied gusto to tragedians, poets, sculptors, and even essayists, as well as to painters. For Hazlitt, the writer of most gusto was Shakespeare, who had a 'generic quality', a negative capability to put himself completely into other roles, other souls. In his Shakespearean criticism, the 'gusto' of Shakespeare becomes his passsion--and we recall that Campbell similarly thought the best rhetorician conveyed his passion, his power or energy, to his audience. Shakespeare's passion, Hazlitt wrote,

> is passion modified by passion, by all the other feelings to which the individual is liable, and to which others are liable with him; subject to all the fluctuations of caprice and accident. . . . The human soul is made the sport of fortune, the prey of adversity: it is stretched on the wheel of destiny, in restless ecstasy. The passions are in a state of projection.
>
> (5.51)

Hazlitt did not limit his conception of gusto in literature to dramatic power. Milton, too, possessed gusto, though his verse gusto was not cataclysmic like Shakespeare's. Milton, Hazlitt wrote, 'had as much of what is meant by *gusto* as any poet. He forms the most intense conceptions of things, and then embodies them by a single stroke of his pen' (4.38). Chaucer, too, possessed gusto in the poet's descriptions of nature:

> [Chaucer's verse has] a local truth and freshness, which gives the very feeling of the air, the coolness or moisture of the ground. Inanimate objects are thus made to have a fellow-feeling in the interest of the story; and render back the sentiment of the speaker's mind.
>
> (5.27)

While Hazlitt tended to divide English writers into those possessing gusto and those lacking it--the latter including Spenser, Otway, Addison, Dryden and Lillo--he applied gusto just as frequently to painters. Raphael, Correggio, Rembrandt, Michaelangelo, and especially Titian have gusto; the works of Van Dyke, Rubens, Claude Lorrain, and Benjamin West lack it. In the art of Hogarth and Correggio, for example, Hazlitt finds what he later calls 'the living principle':

> Hogarth's pictures are true history. Every feature, limb, figure, group, is instinct with life and motion.... The scene moves before you: the face is like a frame-work of flexible machinery. ....

> Thus the celebrated Iö of Correggio is imbued, steeped, in a manner in the same voluptuous feeling all over--the same passion languishes in her whole frame, and communicates the infection to the feet, the back, and the reclined position of the head.
>
> (18.161)

Unity of feeling, the presence of life in the painting, seem to be central elements of Hazlitt's definition of gusto. One of his clearest applications of gusto to painting, and, as a corollary, one of his sharpest delineations of the word, falls at the end of his essay on Titian's *Diana and Actaeon*, from *Sketches of the Principal Picture Galleries of England* (1824).

> Every where tone, not form, predominates--there is not a distinct line in the picture--but a gusto, a rich taste of colour is left upon the eye as if it were the palate, and the diapason of picturesque harmony is full to overflowing. 'Oh Titian and Nature! which of you copied the other?'
>
> (10.33)

This passage once again serves to point up the contrast between Hazlitt and Sir Joshua Reynolds. While colour, tone, ambience is everything to Hazlitt, it is an ambience that is drawn from detail and minute working of colouring; for Reynolds, colour and detail must not be overworked, or it will undermine the *gusto grande*. 'Gusto' is not some abstract, ahistorical, impersonal ideal called 'general nature'; it is instead 'a rich taste of colour... left upon the eye as if it were the palate', an impression of tone left upon the viewer. Gusto is something which resides in artist, art object, and audience--a quality or faculty which binds all three together. 'No painter', Hazlitt wrote in an 1822 essay on the Elgin Marbles,

> gives more of intellectual or impassioned appearances than he understands or feels. It is an axiom in painting that sympathy is indispensable to truth of expression. Without it, you get only caricatures, which are not the thing.
>
> (18.162)

While the painter must possess sympathy, imagination, gusto, the audience must exercise the same faculties. 'The art of painting and poetry', Hazlitt asserted, 'are conversant with the world of thought within us, and with the world of sense without us--with what we know, and see, and feel intimately' (4.162). (8)

Having explored some of the instances where Hazlitt evokes 'gusto' in his criticism, it seems appropriate to return to Hazlitt's chief definition of gusto: 'Gusto in art is power or passion defining any object ... there is hardly any object entirely devoid of expression, without some character of power belonging to it, some precise association with pleasure or pain ...' Like George Campbell, Hazlitt was in part drawing on the rich tradition of Dissenting thought and empirical, skeptical philosophy. Both men to some degree are relying upon theories of the association of ideas; a belief in the faculty theory of human behaviour and the mind; a conviction that the rhetorician or artist must, through his speech or artwork, convey passion

to his audience in order to convince them and in order to impel them to experience life as the speaker or artist does.

Campbell's idea of vivacity has its classical heritage, just as Hazlitt's notion of gusto has its roots in the art of painting. Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric* drew many elements from classical rhetoric, particularly in stressing the importance of emotion in the audience. Aristotle, Quintilian, and Cicero all acknowledge that the orator must use emotion in order to convince, and each spends some time analyzing the different types of emotion in men--an analysis which Campbell also briefly undertakes. But Campbell's emphasis is different. He de-emphasizes logic and reason as central features of rhetoric; and he asserts that emotional energy must be integral to the word, to the speech itself, not simply something to be superficially added in the presentation. (9)

Hazlitt, in his turn, took an aesthetic commonplace--gusto--and, drawing in part on the same intellectual context as Campbell and perhaps from Campbell himself, added a rhetorical dimension to his aesthetics.

The implications and consequences of such a re-definition and an amalgamation are vast. In the first place, by seeing the aesthetic transaction as a rhetorical act, Hazlitt affirmed the affective nature of art, that artist, art object, and audience are all linked through the power of passion, through gusto. As a corollary, Hazlitt's conception of art and aesthetics, like Campbell's philosophy of rhetoric, is based on a fairly well-articulated scheme of human psychology. Third, it is not enough for art to please or instruct: it must enforce belief and conviction as well, it must alter perception. Where Campbell points to the tragedies of Sophocles and Shakespeare as examples of passion creating conviction, Hazlitt points to the paintings of Rembrandt, who 'did not discover things *out of* nature, ... but saw things *in* nature that every one had missed before him, and gave others eyes to see them with'. (8.43)

The rhetorical context of Hazlitt's aesthetics demands that we rethink several assumptions about his criticism of art and literature. While 'gusto' certainly did have many connections with eighteenth-century ideas about art, Hazlitt's term was not limited to the aesthetics of painting. Nor did Hazlitt focus only on the artist, and the artist's imagination, in his critical theories. While he does talk of artists as possessing 'gusto', and while he has a great deal to say about the imagination and genius of artists, he clearly says at many points that artist, artwork, and viewer must all participate in the aesthetic experience. Hazlitt's aesthetic theory does not necessarily denote a shift from the lexicon of painting to the lexicon of music, as some historians have suggested; his renovation of 'gusto' may indicate instead a shift to the lexicon of psychology and rhetoric. In addition, it may be an oversimplification to tag Hazlitt's criticism as 'critical impressionism', as M.H. Abrams has written.

In fact one of themost important consequences of Hazlitt's rhetoric of aesthetics, of his many-faceted concept of 'gusto', is that it shaped the nature and function of Hazlitt's ideas of the critic. For the critic to act as intermediary in the aesthetic act, he must manage, as best he is able, to convey the gusto, the emotional impact of the work of art to the reader--he must be, in other words, a rhetorician *par excellence*, a master rhetorician in Campbell's sense. The nuances of the work of art must be

re-experienced, not simply summarized or judged or analyzed, in criticism. Hazlitt's well-known *Table-Talk* essay, 'On Criticism', mainly attacks different schools of criticism, especially 'the modern or metaphysical system of criticism' (8.217). But he does declare that 'A genuine criticism should, as I take it, reflect the colours, the light and shade, the soul and body of a work....' And he adds about Dryden's Prefaces: 'we are left quite in the dark as to the feelings of pleasure or pain to be derived from the genius of the performance or the manner in which it appeals to the imagination...' (8.217). In other words, the true critic must show how art affects the human mind, how art affects the audience. It is probably a lesson from which most of us could profit.

As we listen to endless political harangues, as we wade through critical articles and try to sort art from garbage, it is instructive to remember that both Campbell and Hazlitt felt that rhetoric and art, in order to be effective, in order to be believed, must convey passionate energy--vivacity or gusto of *life*--to the audience. Hazlitt perhaps summed it up best:

> In art, in taste, in life, in speech, you decide from feeling, and not from reason; that is, from the impression of a number of things on the mind, which impression is true and well-founded, though you may not be able to analyse or account for it in the several particulars.
>
> (8.31)

NOTES

1. Walter Jackson Bate, ed., *Criticism: The Major Texts* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1952), p. 285. John L. Mahoney's *The Logic of Passion: The Literary Criticism of William Hazlitt* (Salzburg: Institut für englische Sprache und Literatur, 1978), p.89, enthusiastically echoes Bate's interpretation. John Kinnaird in *William Hazlitt: Critic of Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), pp. 144ff., does note that gusto 'communicate[s] that universality [of human experience] from self to self', but still labels it 'expressive intensity', and suggests that it mediates between the aesthetic notions of the ideal and the picturesque.

2. *Complete Works*, ed. P.P. Howe (London: Dent, 1930-34), 21 vols., 4.77. All citations from Hazlitt's works refer to this edition and hereafter will be noted by volume and page parenthetically in the text.

3. On Hazlitt's reading, see Elisabeth Schneider, *The Aesthetics of William Hazlitt* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933), pp. 181-91; on Hazlitt's debt to Campbell in the formation of his *Principles of Human Action*, see the all-too-brief account in Leonard M. Trawick's 'Sources of Hazlitt's "Metaphysical Discovery",' *PQ* 42 (1963), 281.

4. Edward P.J. Corbett and James R. Golden, ed., *The Rhetoric of Blair, Campbell, and Whately* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), 'Introduction', p. 15.

5. See Bitzer's 'The Lively Idea: A Study of Hume's Influence on George Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric*', unpublished Ph.D. dissertation,

State University of Iowa, 1962, and his 'Editor's Introduction ' to *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, ed. Lloyd F. Bitzer (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1963), ix-xxxvii. All further references to Campbell's treatise will cite this edition parenthetically in the text.

6. Wilbur S. Howell could have said of Hazlitt, as well as of Campbell, that his 'one great principle' is 'that the human soul is not indifferent to the intellectual and moral quality of its ideas.' *Eighteenth-Century British Logic and Rhetoric* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1971), p. 580.

7. *Discourseson Art*, ed. Robert R. Wark (San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1959), p. 43.

8. Some significant works on Hazlitt's aesthetics and art criticism are: J.D. O'Hara, 'Hazlitt and Romantic Criticism of the Fine Arts', *JAAC* 27 (1968), 73-79; Stanley Chase, 'Hazlitt as a Critic of Art', *PMLA* 39 (1924), 189-93; Eugene C. Elliott, 'Reynolds and Hazlitt', *JAAC* 21 (1962), 73-79; and Roy Park, *Hazlitt and the Spirit of theAge: Abstraction and Critical Theory* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971). On Hazlitt's psychological theories and his theatrical criticism, see my ' "The Soul Speaking in the Face": Hazlitt's Concept of Character', forthcoming in *Studies in English Literature*.

9. See Douglas McDermott, 'George Campbell and the Classical Tradition', Quarterly Journal of Speech 49 (1963), 401-09. For passages from the classical rhetoricians that refer to rhetorical appeals to the emotions, see Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, trans. Lane Cooper (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1932), 92-131; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, trans. H.E. Butler (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1921), II, 419; and Cicero, *De Oratore*, trans. E.W. Sutton and H. Rackham (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942), III, 332.

SPEECH GIVEN TO THE CHARLES LAMB SOCIETY AT THE CELEBRATION LUNCHEON ON 23 APRIL 1988 by PROFESSOR CHRISTOPHER SALVESEN

Some writers lend themselves to festive and convivial celebration: Charles Lamb, very evidently, one of them; others (among his contemporaries, Wordsworth, let's say) rather less so. 'I am a water-drinker myself' Wordsworth declared; and in his poem about that convivial character Benjamin the Waggoner, dedicated (I think without irony) to Charles Lamb, he refers in similar terms to himself living at Dove Cottage, once a pub: 'There, where the *Dove* and *Olive Bough*/Once hung, a Poet harbours now,/ A simple water-drinking Bard...' All the same, Wordsworth did on a famous occasion celebrate his great Cambridge predecessor by drinking too much wine in what had once been Milton's rooms. 'O temperate Bard!/ One afternoon.../ Seated with others in a festive ring/... I to thee/ Poured out libations, to th y memory drank,/ ... till my brain reeled/ Never so clouded by the fumes of wine/ Before that hour or since'. He then describes how, realizing he would be late for chapel in his own college, he 'ran Ostrich-like' through the streets - a comic self-caricature you might more readily associate with Lamb than with Wordsworth. Still, essential solemnity prevails; witness Wordsworth's later revision of his state from 'Never *so* clouded by the fumes of wine/ Before that hour, or since' to the categorical '*Never* excited

by the fumes of wine/ Before that hour, or since'. Whatever the truth, it's certainly one of Wordsworth's most economical emendations in the later *Prelude*.

The custom of honouring a writer with a feast and a toast is an excellent one; a Charles Lamb Lunch is as good an idea as a Burns Supper. It might seem almost too-typically Scotch, in a way Lamb and his London contemporaries would have recognized, to claim that the Burns Supper is the archetype of such humane literary festivities; but there is something distinctive in the history of Burns as an object of literary-social commemoration, and in the remarkable local-cum-universal quality of the celebrations. Certainly the first Burns Clubs were founded relatively early (within twenty years or so) after his death - mainly because they were straightforward extensions of the kind of drinking-club that Burns frequented during his lifetime; while the world-wide distribution of interest in Burns is well-known - from cosy gatherings of the Wamphray Fencibles and the Pumpherston Haggis Club to far-flung meetings of the Caledonian Society of Hong Kong, say, or Moscow or Buenos Aires. The Elian spirit of friendliness and humour is likewise universal; but there does seem to be a peculiar rightness in celebrating Charles Lamb in London - he was nothing if not a Londoner: indeed a Cockney. How far would he have welcomed the affinities between a Charles Lamb Lunch and a Burns Supper? Surely - some modesty apart - almost wholeheartedly: on principles of friendship as a supremely necessary element, and theme, of the writing life; on principles of enjoying a drink and of general convivality; and as an admirer - an idolater even - of Burns himself and his poetry. 'Burns was the God of my idolatry' he says in an early letter; and twenty-five years later he is scarcely less extravagant - stating in one of his Essays 'In my early life I had a passionate fondness for the poetry of Burns'. But - that essay is the one called *Imperfect Sympathies*; the one where he also says 'I have been trying all my life to like Scotchmen, and am obliged to desist from the experiment in despair'. That is why he might have been almost but not quite wholehearted in any commemorative alliance with Burns - with the poet, yes; but much more doubtfully with the Scotchman. Lamb is very funny about his reasons for imperfect sympathy with Scotchmen - what he sees as their literal-mindedness and their resistance to jokes. A true Caledonian, says Lamb, 'stops a metaphor like a suspected person in an enemy's country. "A healthy book!" said one of them to me - "did I catch rightly what you said? I have heard of a man in health, and of a healthy state of body, but I do not see how that epithet can be properly applied to a book." Above all.' (Lamb adds) 'you must beware of indirect expressions before a Caledonian. Clap an extinguisher upon your irony, if you are unhappily blest with a vein of it'. He continues: 'Persons of this nation are particularly fond of affirming a truth - which nobody doubts' and he gives a little illustration: 'I was present not long since at a party of North Britons, where a son of Burns was expected; and happened to drop a silly expression (in my South British way), that I wished it were the father instead of the son - when four of them started up at once to inform me that "that was impossible, because he was dead". An impracticable wish, it seems, was more than they could conceive'.

Well, all this is not unrecognizable even today; certain kinds of Scotsmen have the defects of their virtues. And of course the image that Lamb is presenting, of the Scot in the opening decades of the 19th century, is a stereotype as well. Sydney Smith, for example, confirms the image with his witticism: 'It requires a surgical operation to get a joke well into a

Scotch understanding. Their only idea of wit ... is laughing immoderately at stated intervals'. The general pattern of ethnic comment goes well back into the 18th century; the double act of Johnson and Boswell is responsible for some of its more familiar features. When Boswell on first meeting Johnson in England said 'I do indeed come from Scotland, but I cannot help it ...' and Johnson replied 'That, Sir, I find, is what a very great many of your countrymen cannot help' the uneasy relationship between the two countries was epitomised, and protracted, and a long succession of ethnic sarcasms and asperities (often at Boswell's expense) got under way: 'Much may be made of a Scotchman, if he be *caught* young', and the like.

These continued jokes against Scotsmen (but did they understand them? - at least Boswell did) - these jokes eventually produced various forms of retaliation - the best-known of which took the form of abusing certain English writers under the heading of 'the Cockney School of Poetry': an episode by no means to the credit of the country, but an undeniably peculiar fact in literary history. Contrary to popular opinion, it didn't hasten Keats's death. It did produce some money, in damages, for Hazlitt; and, in so far as it contained any specifically literary criticism, its initial and principal target Leigh Hunt wasn't entirely undeserving. But the level of abuse is abysmal - very un-edifying, very unfunny, laced with rancour and snobbery; and the motives behind it remain curiously mixed. However, some points are clear. It begins in *Blackwood's Magazine*, and that was begun in Edinburgh by the eponymous William and very soon taken over by three other Scotsmen, all able enough in their various capacities, John Gibson Lockhart the future biographer of Scott, John Wilson otherwise known as Christopher North, and James Hogg the Ettrick Shepherd. Basically, *Blackwood's* was a good idea - a journal aiming to be livelier than the *Quarterly* (which, as Ian Jack puts it in his Oxford History, gave the impression 'of having been written throughout by a number of very senior and very disgruntled members of the House of Lords'). *Blackwood's*, therefore, was and remained anti-radical, resolutely Tory; but its political attack consisted largely of crude emphasis on the lower-class origins of its victims - though by use of the term Cockney, a North-South, Scotch-English, polarity was plainly established and the claim implied that Edinburgh, as opposed to London, was the true home of culture and still the Athens of the North. The crudity of the journalism was perhaps no more than an indication that, in terms of literary rough-and-tumble, Edinburgh was still living in the 18th century - though there was something personal there, even pathological, as well, if John Wilson's remark 'I like to abuse my friends' is anything to go by.

So, with a mixture of politics and ethnic assertiveness behind it, there is nothing very wonderful or incisive about the inception of 'Cockney' as a term of literary criticism. The word itself had been around for centuries - we remember the Cockney and the eels in *King Lear* - 'down, wantons, down'. It's a medieval word *cokeneye*, a cock's egg: coming to mean a simpleton or namby-pamby; then that effete creature, a town-dweller; and already by Shakespeare's time is applied specifically to a Londoner and even more specifically to one born within the sound of Bow Bells. Lamb enjoys the word - and the state; and in fact has it less applied to him as a term of abuse than most of his fellow-Londoners. The fearsome John Wilson even manages to pay him a compliment, slightly convoluted but nonetheless clear, when he refers. in one of his infinitely garrulous pieces to the text

'familiarity breeds contempt' and goes on to say 'All "the old familiar faces" occasionally come in for a portion of that feeling; and on that account, we are glad that we saw, but for one day and one night, Charles Lamb's.' (I think it's a compliment. They did meet ...) Still, Lamb knew and felt the typical meanness of mentality behind the North British attacks: having alluded to him as a drinking-man, we can show him defending himself, in North British style but a good deal more amusingly, against an over-literal reading (in the *Quarterly)* of the *Confessions of a Drunkard:* 'We deny not that a portion of his own experiences may have passed into the picture (as who, that is not a washy fellow, but must at some times have felt the after-operation of a too-generous cup?)... but it is useless to expostulate with this Quarterly slime, brood of Nilus, watery heads with hearts of jelly, spawned under the sign of Aquarius, incapable of Bacchus, and therefore cold, washy, spiteful, bloodless. - Elia shall string them up one day, and show their colours - or rather how colourless and vapid the whole fry - when he putteth forth his long-promised, but unaccountably hitherto delayed, Confessions of a Water-drinker'.

A much more unequivocally genial piece is Lamb's jeu d'esprit called *Cockney Latin* - a letter to the *London Magazine*, signed Philopatris Londoniensis, identified as Lamb's by Claude Prance. The patriotic Londoner writes about a visit to 'our poor metropolis' by a friend of his from 'the good town of Edinburgh'. This visitor has been making fun of 'certain modes' of London pronunciation. The Londoner admits: 'It is no secret, I fear, to our fellowcountrymen of the northern part of this island, that in all the streets, lanes, courts, alleys, etc. to the east of Temple Bar, we exchange reciprocally the V and the W, and insert or omit the H - in a manner directly at violence with that of our politer provincial brethren.' (A propos of that reversible V and W - does anyone still speak Sam Weller's brand of Cockney?) In any case, our letter-writer goes on: 'My friend Archywas particularly amused with the way of reading Latin, as it is in use at our public grammar schools...' Together they go to a speech-day at one of them and hear the reciter gravely opening the *Aeneid: 'Harma Wirumque cano'* - instead of the A and V 'according to the correcter pronunciation of the models of just speaking at Edinburgh and Glasgow'. But - are these models really more correct? Always an arcane topic, how to pronounce Classical Latin, and Lamb consults a learned doctor - a Midlander, and therefore a suitable umpire between 'the two great, yet distant, metropolises of this country' - who demonstrates with a show of scholarship that the aspirate before *arma* simply represents a return to the classical, 'a recovery of the true old Roman pronunciation, when Rome was mistress of the world ... the true dialect...', in fact, 'the Romano-Cockneian of that day'. And from this Lamb concludes that North Britons are foolish to be amused or for that matter alarmed, as they apparently are, by this linguistic and, after all, classically-correct feature; 'as if', he says, in a nice little topographical twinning, 'the Primrose Hill of modern Mid Lothian could lose anything in height or abruptness by calling it, by what I am convinced is its proper name in purest English - Harthur's Seat'.

So - London is reaffirmed as the true metropolis, the centre of civilization and polite learning; London's honour is vindicated by way of its Cockney accent. Lamb is a Londoner through and through; his fellow-essayist Hazlitt more or less becomes one by adoption - but as a man of the Midlands too (from Wem in Shropshire) he is naturally more sceptical about the unalloyed merit of being a Cockney. Hazlitt, who suffered more than most under the Reviewer's designation of Cockney, gives an extended

account of what he thinks it is to be a Cockney in one of his best essays *On Londoners and Country People.* He begins: 'I do not agree with Mr. Blackwood in his definition of the word "Cockney". He means by it a person who has happened at any time to live in London, and who is not a Tory - I mean by it a person who has never lived out of London, and who has got all his ideas from it.' He continues: 'The true Cockney has never travelled beyond the purlieus of the Metropolis, either in the body or the spirit. Primrose-Hill is the Ultima Thule of his most romantic desires; Greenwich Park stands him in stead of the Vales of Arcady. Time and space are lost to him'. Hazlitt develops the idea that the Cockney lives in a whirl of impressions, all superficial; nothing sticks, everything seems equal. 'The Cockney lives in a go-cart of local prejudices and positive illusions; and when he is turned out of it, he hardly knows how to stand or move. He ventures through Hyde Park Corner, as a cat crosses a gutter. The trees pass by the coach very oddly. The country has a strange blank appearance. It is not lined with houses all the way, like London. He comes to places he never saw or heard of. He finds the world is bigger than he thought for. He might have dropped from the moon, for anything he knows of the matter. He is mightily disposed to laugh, but is half afraid of making some blunder. Between sheepishness and conceit, he is in a very ludicrous situation. He finds that the people walk on two legs, and wonders to hear them talk a dialect so different from his own. He perceives London fashions have got down into the country before him, and that some of the better sorts are dressed as well as he is. A drove of pigs or cattle stopping the road is a very troublesome interruption. A crow in a field, a magpie in a hedge, are to him very odd animals - he can't tell what to make of them, or how they live'. Hazlitt brings his Cockney back to his own territory - how he loves a tea-garden or the Cider-Cellar - and then presents him in another aspect: 'He never has anything to say, and yet is never at a loss for an answer. That is, his pertness keeps exact pace with his dulness... Apply the most cutting remark to him, and his only answer is, "*The same to you, sir.*" If Shakespeare were to rise from the dead to confute him, I firmly believe it would be to no purpose... "Ay", says he, "does the poet say so? *then the same to you, sir!*" '.

Hazlitt didn't, any more than Lamb, have a great opinion of the country either. 'All country people hate each other' was his considered view. But Lamb's negative feelings about the country had their positive corollary in the pleasure he took in London; a feeling which he had expressed in his early essay 'The Londoner' and in various letters - to Robert Lloyd for example: 'Let them talk of lakes and mountains and romantic dales - all that fantastic stuff; give me a ramble by night, in the winter nights in London - the lamps lit - the pavements of the motley Strand crowded with to and fro passengers - the shops all brilliant, and stuffed with obliging customers and obliged tradesmen - give me the old bookstalls of London - a walk in the bright Piazzas of Covent Garden. I defy a man to be dull in such places - perfect Mahometan paradises upon earth! I have lent out my heart with usury to such scenes from my childhood up, and have cried with fullness of joy at the multitudinous scenes of Life in the crowded street of ever dear London... A mob of men is better than a flock of sheep, and a crowd of happy faces justling into the playhouse at the hour of six is a more beautiful spectacle to man than the shepherd driving his "silly" sheep to fold'. And he adds: 'Come to London and learn to sympathise with my unrural notions.' - Well, here we are; and, even if we're dining in

Westminster rather than the City, this seems the right point to present ourselves in homage and raise our glasses: but since we *are* dining in Westminster, and even though Lamb was basically unpolitical, we might just - in the tercentary year of the Glorious Revolution - record an early use of the phrase which contains our toast: Jonathan Swift referring to 'King William the Third of ever glorious and immortal memory...' But now let's utter the words in their proper application today - I give you 'The immortal memory of Charles Lamb'.

ALLIANCE OF LITERARY SOCIETIES SEMINAR

Question: Where could you find Mary Webb rubbing shoulders with Angela Thirkell? Browning, Housman and W.H. Auden exchanging ideas? John Clare taking coffee with Charles Lamb? Thomas Hardy meeting Richard Jefferies?

Answer: At the first Seminar of the Alliance of Literary Societies held in the congenial surroundings of the Birmingham and Midland Institute on 30th April 1988. The indefatigable organiser, Kathleen Adams (George Eliot Fellowship) had invited 50 Societies (34 being Alliance members) of whom 27 were represented at the Seminar, ranging from the very large and old-established, such as the Dickens Fellowship and the Brontë Society, to the smaller (but equally enthusiastic) ones such as the Powys and W.H. Auden Societies - so there was varied experience to share.

After time to explore the displays contributed by members, work started at 11.30 a.m. with Membership. Societies mainly relied on their Journal/ Newsletter to maintain contact with their members. Very impressive was the elegant travelling exhibition on John Clare which tours schools and colleges. Other ideas included Summer Schools - day or week-end events - and varying the location of meetings. Young people might be attracted by essay competitions for school children, lower subscriptions for students, junior branches and informal social activities. Media contacts, such as local radio, links with related Societies, letters to the Press, the 'Book Trust' magazine and the 'Artists' and Writers' Year Book' were quoted as ways of extending membership. Mixed feelings were expressed about computer records which may damage the personal touch.

On the topic of Journals, on which most Societies spent the major part of their budgets, useful information was exchanged on costs and format. One idea which the *CLS* might explore is to add to the (mainly academic) 'Bulletin' an occasional more informal 'Newsletter'.

The third major topic was the future of the Alliance - hitherto run on an entirely ad hoc basis with no subscription, no committee and no meetings! All felt the time had come to form a more structured organisation - representatives would be invited to a meeting later in the year to formalise the Alliance, with a suggested group subscription of £5, and to arrange future seminars.

The formation of local affiliated groups and the celebration of important Anniversaries were discussed, and there was a lively session on Literature and Tourism with examples of tours, festivals and self-guided heritage walks - again an area rich in possibilities for the CLS.

Time was passing - the huge question of the management of libraries, archives

and research papers was deferred to a future occasion. Robin Healey (CLS) evoked a sympathetic response to his plea that curatorships of houses of literary interest should go to those expert in the life and work of the writers concerned.

It was not *all* work, although under the kind but firm Chairmanship of Jo Hunt (Administrator of the BMI) we covered an amazing amount of ground. After an excellent lunch, we settled to enjoy 'Anthology' - a programme of readings by Gabriel Woolf devised from the writings of most of those represented at the Seminar, concluding appropriately with Charles Lamb on 'The two races of men'.

The four 'Lambs' (Mary Wedd, Robin Healey, Madeline Huxstep and Charles Branchini - the latter also representing the Johnson Society of London) all felt this had been a thoroughly worth-while exchange of information and opinions, and congratulate Kathleen Adams on all she has done to set the Alliance on its way. We look forward to the progress of the Alliance - perhaps next time William Wordsworth, S.T. Coleridge, Leigh Hunt, William Hazlitt will be alongside their friend Charles Lamb?

M.R. Huxstep

OBITUARY

PROFESSOR RALPH WARDLE

The Society has suffered a sad loss in the death of Professor Ralph Wardle. He was a member for many years and a keen student of Lamb and indeed he was working on the revision of his biography of Charles Lamb when he died.

Last year I had the great pleasure of meeting Ralph and Mary, his wife, for the second time, at my flat, and it was a great occasion with much talk of the early days of the Charles Lamb Society and members known to us in America and England.

It is a consoling thought that the heart attack rendered him unconscious and he felt no pain. Indeed, as Mary wrote, it was just as he would have wanted - he was getting ready to go to Church.

He was generous in helping others and gave a ready response to their requests. Our love and sympathy go to the family from those members who knew him and appreciated his kindness and his readiness to help. He will be sorely missed.

Florence Reeves

MRS. ERNA RICH

We regret to hear of the death recently of Erna Rich widow of Dr. Sidney Rich. We send our sympathy to Connie Hale and the family.

SISTER LUCY STAUNTON

A long link with Marymount International School is severed with the death last summer of the Principal, Sister Lucy Staunton. Sister Lucy was a regular

visitor to our annual luncheons usually accompanied by several of her staff and students and was a good friend to the Society.

M.R. Huxstep

FIFTY YEARS AGO (Continued)

CLS Bulletin No. 31 (Fourth Year) With Two Supplements May 1938

SUPPLEMENTS

The first is a version by Sainte Beuve of a sonnet by Charles Lamb. This appeared in "Poésies et Pensées de Joseph Delorme", published in 1829. There is a misprint; "de monde", should of course be "du monde".

REVIVAL OF JOAN TEMPLE'S "CHARLES AND MARY"

Eleven performances of "Charles and Mary" will be given at The Players' Theatre, 42 King Street, Covent Garden... with Peter Ridgeway and Joan Temple in their original parts of Charles and Mary Lamb.

CLS Bulletin No. 32 (Fourth Year) With two Supplements June 1938

Mrs. Oglethorpe led seventeen ramblers on Saturday May 13th through lanes frequently traversed by Charles Lamb from Crews Hill to Northaw, where we tead enjoyably at "The two Brewers". On the journey our fair leader encouraged us with 'marching' chocolate, but it didn't make us march. The party included a provincial member, Mr. G.D. Robertson of Preston,... and 3467 small green caterpillars, most of which were picked off Mr. Lewis by Dr. E.C.Ross, for whom the "worms" had a peculiar fascination.

[There is also a long letter from Mr. C.A. Prance, writing from Eastbourne, referring to a metrical version of Elia's essay 'The New Year's Feast on his Coming of Age'.]

FOR THE RECORD From: D.E. Wickham

'I have observed, in regard to all the literary and scientific societies with which I have ever been connected, that, however numerous the members, some dozen or two of them performed all the work'.

Rev. Samuel Miller, co-founder of the New York Historical Society in 1804, advising the founders of the New Jersey Historical Society in 1845, quoted in the Times literary Supplement, 13 November 1970, page 1331.

In an article on 'John Drinkwater & Some of his Books' (The Private Library, Third Series, Vol.9:2, Summer 1986, page 74) our member Mr. Claude A. Prance records that John Drinkwater corrected the proofs of the 1921 six-volume reprint of E.V. Lucas' 'Works of Charles and Mary Lamb'.

FOR THE RECORD From: D.E. Wickham

THOMAS MASSA ALSAGER

Thomas Massa Alsager (1779-1846) was the subject of a long paper by me in Bulletin No, 35, July 1981. In Note 17 I wrote of a full-length testimonial portrait of him, long since lost.

I am delighted to say that Mr. R.E. Ayrton, whose family archives so greatly enriched my paper, has discovered, in a cousin's house in Yorkshire, a small watercolour version of the full-length portrait in oils and that coloured photographs of it are now at Clothworkers' Hall. The painting fits the description given in Margaret Alsager's diary but an old label on the back identifies it exactly. Incidentally it shows that the representation in the watercolour of Clothworkers' Hall mentioned in Note 17 is completely wrong, doubtless because that particular picture was worked up from sketches of the Hall made before its unexpected demolition. Other details were already known to be incorrect and had been attributed to this fact.

LAMB'S PARIS ANECDOTE again

My obsession with the problem of whether or not there was a simple mis-hearing when Charles Lamb was in Paris and was given brandy when he had ordered a boiled egg received a fillip from the 'Daily Telegraph' of 4 April 1988, with Julian Critchley's reminiscences about his visits to Strasbourg as a delegate to the Council of Europe.

He told how a Knight of the Shire, having dined at the Crocodile (presumably implying 'rather well'), telephoned down to the desk of his grand hotel and asked for 'deux oreillers'. This instruction resulted not in the arrival of two extra pillows but of two 'filles de joie'.

SOCIETY NOTES AND NEWS FROM MEMBERS

Peter Wexler of the University of Essex, in the process of working for the Oxford English Dictionary, has made lists of the very many examples O.E.D. takes from *Elia* and from Lamb's letters. The lists are too extensive for inclusion in the *Bulletin* but Dr. Wexler kindly says that he 'could send a copy to enquirers', if they write to him at:

Department of Language and Linguistics,
University of Essex,
Wivenhoe Park,
Colchester, CO4 3SQ.

HAWTHORNDEN CASTLE - International Retreat for Writers

Writers among our members may like to know of this facility. Writers come

to Hawthornden to live and work during either the Spring or Autumn session for periods of four to six weeks. The castle, former home of William Drummond - the cavalier poet -, lies eight miles south of Edinburgh. It provides a refuge free from distractions and duties of daily life, where people can concentrate wholeheartedly on their writing. Any writer who has work already published may apply for a fellowship at Hawthornden.

Applicants should write to:

Alistair Macnaughton,
The Administrator,
Hawthornden Castle,
Lasswade,
Midlothian,
Scotland, EH18 1EG.

'The sweetest names, and which carry a perfume in the mention, are, Kit Marlowe, Drayton, Drummond of Hawthornden and Cowley'. (*Detached Thoughts on Books...*)

'Ben Johnson divided our suffrages pretty equally.... At length his romantic visit to Drummond of Hawthornden was mentioned, and turned the scale in his favour'. (Hazlitt: *Of Persons one would wish to have seen.*)

CHARLES LAMB CELEBRATION LUNCHEON

This year we gave Charles Lamb an 'official birthday' on 23rd April, 1988. It was a delightful occasion and we were happy to have with us as guest-of-honour Professor Christopher Salvesen of Reading University, whose speech we are glad to be able to print here. Our President, Professor John Stevens, conducted the proceedings with his usual urbanity and humour, for which he was thanked by our Chairman, Dr. D.G. Wilson.

The health of Provincial and Overseas Members was proposed by Bill Ruddick and grace before and after meat was spoken for us by Grecians from Christ's Hospital. Grecians with us this year were Alexander Shephard, Daniel O'Neill, Paul Hancock and Isobel Yeats.

BETWEEN CLOISTER AND CLOISTER

Our 1987/8 programme ends with a ramble in Elia's London, including the site of Christ's Hospital and the Temple, on Saturday, 16th July at 2.30 p.m. Edward G. Preston will be organising this walk - assemble at TEMPLE tube station.

1988/9 PROGRAMME

Our friends at the Mary Ward Centre have had some difficulty in accommodating us on our usual first Saturday in the month and members will note that in October, January and February we shall meet on the *second* Saturday.

Our programme starts with a talk from Professor Timothy Webb of York University on 'Editing Leigh Hunt's Autobiography' on Saturday 8th October.

MAILING LIST

We have had to change our method of addressing at very short notice, so please bear with us and, if any member finds we have made a mistake in name or address, inform the Membership Secretary or the Editor and it shall be corrected.