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THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

No. CXXXI.—January 1888.

THE PROGRESS OF CREMATION.

In January 1874, exactly fourteen years ago, I ventured to write an article, which appeared in the Contemporary Review, entitled 'Cremation: the Treatment of the Body after Death,' advocating as forcibly as I could its employment instead of the method by burial in the soil. The reason assigned for taking this step was my belief, supported by a striking array of facts, that cremation is now a necessary sanitary precaution against the propagation of disease among a population rapidly increasing, and becoming large in relation to the area it occupies.

The degree of attention which this proposal aroused was remarkable, not only here but abroad, the paper being translated into several European languages. In the course of the first six months of that year I received eight hundred letters on the subject, from persons mostly unknown to me, requiring objections to be answered, explanations to be given, supposed consequences to be provided for; some, indeed, accompanied with much bitter criticism on the 'pagan,' 'anti-Christian,' if not altogether irreligious tendency of the plan. I was encouraged, however, to find that about a fourth of the number were more or less friendly to the proposal. But I confess I had been scarcely prepared to expect that people in general would be so much startled by it, as if it were a novelty hitherto unheard of. Long familiar with it in thought myself, cherishing a natural preference, on sanitary grounds, for its obviously great superiority to burial, and after thoughtful comparison on those also commonly regarded as

1 Then under my editorship.—Ed. Nineteenth Century.
You had better dance all night with a dairy-maid, and sup with a lot of betting-ring men, than spend an evening with Zola, or work through Murie's list of new novels.

P. Come, old man, I shall go back to college. I can stand no more of this. It's worse than going for a walk with Jewett. By the way, what are you going to do with yourself next Long?

W. I am going with Turner of New to spend my autumn in Venice; we want to study the history, as well as the art, archaeology, and language. I shall take my Ruskins; and with the Perkins, Freeman, and Mrs. Jameson, we shall do the churches thoroughly. Last Long, you know, I did the same thing in Florence; the only way to know anything about Italy is to take it province by province. What do you say to joining us?

P. Oh, I have made my plans. I never can stand a foreign town for more than a few days; I am always wanting to get on. I am going in for Cook's tour round the world. We go by the Bay, touch at Gib., stay a day at each of the Mediterranean ports, have twelve hours in the Eternal City, run up to the Acropolis by the tram, half a day at Cairo and the Pyramids, Red Sea, Ceylon, India, China, Japan, and back by San Francisco and the Grand Trunk, Niagara, New York, and all that, and home again in ninety days. One should see something of everything, you know.

W. A regular Jules Verne round! My dear fellow, you will turn into a professional globe-trotter. Well, bye-bye, I shall not go with you. But I suppose it is the right thing to do for a confirmed book-trotter.

Frederic Harrison.

SHELLEY.

Nowadays all things appear in print sooner or later; but I have heard from a lady who knew Mrs. Shelley a story of her which, so far as I know, has not appeared in print hitherto. Mrs. Shelley was choosing a school for her son, and asked the advice of this lady, who gave for advice,—to use her own words to me,—'Just the sort of business, you know, one does come out with: Oh, send him somewhere where they will teach him to think for himself!' I have had far too long a training as a school-inspector to presume to call an utterance of this kind a banality; however, it is not on this advice that I now wish to lay stress, but upon Mrs. Shelley's reply to it. Mrs. Shelley answered: 'Teach him to think for himself? Oh, my God, teach him rather to think like other people!'

To the lips of many and many a reader of Professor Dowden's volumes a cry of this sort will surely rise, called forth by Shelley's life as there delineated. I have read those volumes with the deepest interest, but I regret their publication, and am surprised, I confess, that Shelley's family should have desired or assisted it. For my own part, at any rate, I would gladly have been left with the impression, the ineffaceable impression, made upon me by Mrs. Shelley's first edition of her husband's collected poems. Medwin and Hogg and Trelawny had done little to change the impression made by those four delightful volumes of the original edition of 1839. The text of the poems has in some places been mended since; but Shelley is not a classic, whose various readings are to be noted with earnest attention. The charm of the poems flowed in upon us from that edition, and the charm of the character. Mrs. Shelley had done her work admirably; her introductions to the poems of each year, with Shelley's prefaces and passages from his letters, supplied the very picture of Shelley to be desired. Somewhat idealised by tender regret and exalted memory Mrs. Shelley's representation no doubt was. But without sharing her conviction that Shelley's character, impartially judged, 'would stand in fairer and brighter light than that of any contemporary,' we learned from her to know the soul of affection, of 'gentle and cordial goodness,' of eagerness and ardour for human happiness, which was in this rare spirit—so mere a monster unto
many. Mrs. Shelley said in her general preface to her husband's poems: 'I abstain from any remark on the occurrences of his private life, except inasmuch as the passions which they engendered inspired his poetry; this is not the time to relate the truth.' I for my part could wish, I repeat, that that time had never come.

But come it has, and Professor Dowden has given us the Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley in two very thick volumes. If the work was to be done, Professor Dowden has indeed done it thoroughly. One or two things in his biography of Shelley I could wish different, even waiving the question whether it was desirable to relate in full the occurrences of Shelley's private life. Professor Dowden holds a brief for Shelley; he pleads for Shelley an advocate pleads for his client, and this strain of pleading, united with an attitude of adoration which in Mrs. Shelley had its charm, but which Professor Dowden was not bound to adopt from her, is unserviceable to Shelley, nay, injurious to him, because it inevitably begets, in many readers of the story which Professor Dowden has to tell, impatience and revolt. Further let me remark that the biography before us is of prodigious length, although its hero died before he was thirty years old, and that it might have been considerably shortened if it had been more plainly and simply written. I see that one of Professor Dowden's critics, while praising his style for 'a certain poetic quality of fervour and picturesqueness,' laments that in some important passages Professor Dowden 'fritters away great opportunities for sustained and impassioned narrative.' I am inclined much rather to lament that Professor Dowden has not steadily kept his poetic quality of fervour and picturesqueness more under control. Is it that the Home Rulers have so loaded the language that even an Irishman who is not one of them catches something of their full habit of style? No, it is rather, I believe, that Professor Dowden, of poetic nature himself, and dealing with a poetic nature like Shelley, is too steeped in sentiment by his subject that in almost every page of the biography the sentiment runs over. A curious note of his style, suffused with sentiment, is that it seems incapable of using the common word child. A great many births are mentioned in the biography, but always it is a poetic babe that is born, not a prosaic child. And so, again, André Chénier is, not guilotine'd, but 'too foully done to death.' Again, Shelley after his runaway marriage with Harriet Westbrook was in Edinburgh without money and full of anxieties for the future, and complained of his hard lot in being unable to get away, in being 'chained to the filth and commerce of Edinburgh.' Natural enough; but why should Professor Dowden improve the occasion as follows? 'The most romantic of northern cities could lay no spell upon his spirit. His eye was not fascinated by the presences of mountains and the sea, by the fantastic outlines of aerial piles seen amid the wreathing smoke of Auld Reekie, by the gloom of the Canongate illuminated with shafts of sunlight streaming from its interesting wynds and alleys; nor was his imagination kindled by storied house or palace, and the voices of old, forgotten, far-off things, which haunt their walls.' If Professor Dowden, writing a book in prose, could have brought himself to eschew poetic exuberances of this kind and to tell his story in a plain way, lovers of simplicity, of whom there are some still left in the world, would have been gratified, and at the same time his book would have been the shorter by scores of pages.

These reserves being made, I have little except praise for the manner in which Professor Dowden has performed his task; whether it was a task which ought to be performed at all, probably did not lie with him to decide. His ample materials are used with order and judgment; the history of Shelley's life develops itself clearly before our eyes; the documents of importance for it are given with sufficient fulness, nothing essential seems to have been kept back, although I would gladly, I confess, have seen more of Miss Clairmont's journal, whatever arrangement she may in her later life have chosen to exercise upon it. In general all documents are so fairly and fully cited, that Professor Dowden's pleadings for Shelley, though they may sometimes indiscreetly irritate the reader, produce no obscuring of the truth; the documents manifest it of themselves. Last but not least of Professor Dowden's merits, he has provided his book with an excellent index.

Undoubtedly this biography, with its full account of the occurrences of Shelley's private life, compels one to review one's former impression of him. Undoubtedly the brilliant and attaching rebel who in thinking for himself had of old our sympathy so passionately with him, when we come to read his full biography makes us often and often inclined to cry out: 'My God! he had far better have thought like other people.' There is a passage in Hogg's capitally written and most interesting account of Shelley which I wrote down when I first read it and have borne in mind ever since; so beautifully it seemed to render the true Shelley. Hogg has been speaking of the intellectual expression of Shelley's features, and he goes on: 'Nor was the moral expression less beautiful than the intellectual; for there was a softness, a delicacy, a gentleness, and especially (though this will surprise many) that air of profound religious veneration that characterises the best works and chiefly the frocoses (and into these they infused their whole souls) of the great masters of Florence and of Rome.' What we have of Shelley in poetry and prose suited with this charming picture of him; Mrs. Shelley's account suited with it; it was a possession which one would gladly have kept unimpaired. It still subsists, I must now add; it subsists even after one has read the present biography; it subsists, but so as by fire. It subsists with many a scar and stain; never again will it have the same pureness and beauty which it had formerly. I
regret this, as I have said, and I confess I do not see what has been gained. Our ideal Shelley was the true Shelley after all; what has been gained by forcing us to think of him which is ridiculous and odious, by compelling any fair mind, if it is to retain with a good conscience its ideal Shelley, to do that which I propose to do now? I propose to mark firmly what is ridiculous and odious in the Shelley brought to our knowledge by the new materials, and then to show that our former beautiful and loveable Shelley nevertheless survives.

Almost everybody knows the main outline of the events of Shelley's life. It will be necessary for me, however, up to the date of his second marriage, to go through them here. Percy Bysshe Shelley was born at Field Place, near Horsham, in Sussex, on the 4th of August, 1792. He was of an old family of country gentlemen, and the heir to a baronetcy. He had one brother and five sisters, but the brother so much younger than himself as to be no companion for him in his boyhood at home, and after he was separated from home and England he never saw him. Shelley was brought up at Field Place with his sisters. At ten years old he was sent to a private school at Isleworth, where he read Mrs. Radcliffe's romances and was fascinated by a popular scientific lecturer. After two years of private school he went in 1804 to Eton. Here he took no part in cricket or football, refused to wear his cap, was known as 'mad Shelley' and much tormented; when tormented beyond endurance he would abscond. Certainly he was not happy at Eton; but he had friends, he boasted, he rambled about the country. His school lessons were easy to him, and his reading extended far beyond them; he read books on chemistry, he read Playfair's *Natural History*, Godwin's *Political Justice*, Lucretius, Franklin, Condorcet. It is said he was called 'atheist Shelley' at Eton, but this is not so well established as his having been called 'mad Shelley.' He was full, at any rate, of new and revolutionary ideas, and he declared at a later time that he was twice expelled from the school but recalled through the interference of his father.

In the spring of 1810 Shelley, now in his eighteenth year, entered University College, Oxford, as an exhibitioner. He had already written novels and poems; a poem on the Wandering Jew, in seven or eight cantos, he sent to Campbell, and was told by Campbell that there were but two good lines in it. He had solicited the correspondence of Mrs. Hemans, then Felicia Browne and unmarried; he had fallen in love with a charming cousin, Harriet Grove. In the autumn of 1810 he found a publisher for his verse; he also found a friend in a very clever and free-minded commoner of his college, Thomas Jefferson Hogg, who has admirably described the Shelley of those Oxford days, with his chemistry, his eccentric habits, his charm of look and character, his conversation, his shrill discordant voice. Shelley read incessantly. Hume's *Essays* produced a powerful impression on him; his free speculation led him to what his father, and worse still his cousin Harriet, thought 'detestable principles.' His cousin and his family became estranged from him. He, on his part, became more and more incensed against the 'bigotry' and 'intolerance' which produced such estrangement. 'Here I swear, and as I break my oaths, may Infinity, Eternity, blast me—here I swear that never will I forgive intolerance.' At the beginning of 1811 he prepared and published what he called a 'leaflet for letters,' having for its title *The Necessity of Atheism*. He sent copies to all the bishops, to the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, and to the heads of houses. On Lady Day he was summoned before the authorities of his College, refused to answer the question whether he had written *The Necessity of Atheism*, told the Master and Fellows that 'their proceedings would become a court of inquisitors but not free men in a free country,' and was expelled for contumacy. Hogg wrote a letter of remonstrance to the authorities, was in his turn summoned before them and questioned as to his share in the 'leaflet,' and, refusing to answer, he also was expelled.

Shelley settled with Hogg in lodgings in London. His father, excusably indignant, was not a wise man and managed his son ill. His plan of recommending Shelley to read Paley's *Natural Theology*, and of *reading it with him himself*, makes us smile. Hogg, who a few days before had written of his younger sister, then at school at Clapham, 'There are some hopes of this dear little girl, she would be a divine little scion of infidelity if I could get hold of her,' was not to have been cured by Paley's *Natural Theology* administered through Mr. Timothy Shelley. But by the middle of May Shelley's father had agreed to allow him two hundred pounds a year. Meanwhile, in visiting his sisters at their school in Clapham, Shelley made the acquaintance of a schoolfellow of theirs, Harriet Westbrook. She was a beautiful and lively girl, with a father who had kept a tavern in Mount Street, but had now retired from business, and one sister much older than herself, who encouraged in every possible way the acquaintance of her sister of sixteen with the heir to a baronetcy and a great estate. Soon Shelley heard that Harriet met with cold looks at her school for associating with an atheist; his generosity and his ready indignation against 'intolerance were roused. In the summer Harriet wrote to him that she was persecuted not at school only but at home also, that she was lonely and miserable, and would gladly put an end to her life. Shelley went to see her; she owned her love for him, and he engaged himself to her. He told his cousin Charles (Grove that his happiness had been brightened with the other Harriet, Charles's sister, cast him off; that now the only thing worth living for was self-sacrifice. Harriet's persecutors became yet
more troublesome, and Shelley, at the end of August, went off with her to Edinburgh and they were married. The entry in the register is this —

August 23, 1811. Percy Bysshe Shelley, farmer, Sussex, and Miss Harriet Westbrook, St. Andrew Church Parish, daughter of Mr. John Westbrook, London.

After five weeks in Edinburgh the young farmer and his wife came southwards and took lodgings at York, under the shadow of what Shelley calls that ‘gigantic pile of superstition,’ the Minster. But his friend Hogg was in a lawyer’s office in York, and Hogg’s society made the Minster endurable. Mr. Timothy Shelley’s happiness in his son was not increased by the runaway marriage; he stopped his allowance, and Shelley determined to visit ‘this thoughtless man,’ as he calls his parent, and to ‘try the force of truth’ upon him. Nothing could be effected; Shelley’s mother, too, was now against him. He returned to York to fix that in his absence his friend Hogg had been making love to Harriet, who had indignantly repulsed him. Shelley was shocked, but after a ‘terrible day’ of explanation from Hogg, he ‘fully, freely pardoned him,’ promised to retain him still as ‘his friend, his bosom friend,’ and hoped soon to convince him how lovely virtue was. But for the present it seemed better to separate. In November he and Harriet, with her sister Eliza, took a cottage at Keswick. Shelley was now in great straits for money; the great Sussex neighbor of the Shelles, the Duke of Norfolk, interposed in his favor, and his father and grandfather seem to have offered him at this time an income of 2,000£ a year, if he would consent to entail the family estate. Shelley indignantly refused to ‘forewear his principles,’ by accepting ‘a proposal so insultingly hateful.’ But in December his father agreed, though with an ill grace, to grant him his allowance of 200£ a year again, and Mr. Westbrook promised to allow a like sum to his daughter. So after four months of marriage the Shelles began 1812 with an income of 400£ a year.

Early in February they left Keswick and proceeded to Dublin, where Shelley, who had prepared an address to the Catholics, meant to ‘devote himself towards forwarding the great ends of virtue and happiness in Ireland.’ Before leaving Keswick he wrote to William Godwin, ‘the regulator and former of his mind,’ making profession of his mental obligations to him, of his respect and veneration, and soliciting Godwin’s friendship. A correspondence followed; Godwin pronounced his young disciple’s plans for ‘disseminating the doctrines of philanthropy and freedom’ in Ireland to be unwise; Shelley bowed to his mentor’s decision and gave up his Irish campaign, quitting Dublin on the 4th of April, 1812. He and Harriet wandered first to Nant-Gwili in South Wales, near the upper Wye, and from thence after a month or two to Lynmouth in North Devon, where he busied himself with his poem of Queen Mab, and with sending to sea boxes and bottles containing a Declaration of Rights by him, in the hope that the winds and waves might carry his doctrines where they would do good. But his Irish servant, bearing the prophetic name of Healy, posted the Declaration on the walls of Barnstaple and was taken up; Shelley found himself watched and no longer able to enjoy Lynmouth in peace. He moved in September 1812 to Tremadoc, in North Wales, where he threw himself ardently into an enterprise for recovering a great stretch of drowned land from the sea. But at the beginning of October he and Harriet visited London, and Shelley grasped Godwin by the hand at last. At once an intimacy arose, but the future Mary Shelley — Godwin’s daughter by his first wife, Mary Wollstonecraft — was absent on a visit in Scotland when the Shelles arrived in London. They became acquainted, however, with the second Mrs. Godwin, on whom we have Charles Lamb’s friendly comment: ‘A very disgusting woman, and wears green spectacles!’ with the amiable Fanny, Mary Wollstonecraft’s daughter by Imlay, before her marriage with Godwin; and probably also with Jane Clairmont, the second Mrs. Godwin’s daughter by a first marriage, and herself afterwards the mother of Byron’s Alastor. Complicated relationships, as in the Theban story! and there will be not wanting, presently, something of the Theban horrors. During this visit of six weeks to London Shelley renewed his intimacy with Hogg; in the middle of November he returned to Tremadoc. There he remained until the end of February 1813, perfectly happy with Harriet, reading widely, and working at his Queen Mab and at the notes to that poem. On the 26th of February an attempt was made, or so he fancied, to assassinate him, and in high nervous excitement he hurriedly left Tremadoc and repaired with Harriet to Dublin again. On this visit to Ireland he saw Killarney, but early in April he and Harriet were back again in London.

There in June, 1813, their daughter Ianthe was born; at the end of July they moved to Bracknell, in Berkshire. They had for neighbors there a Mrs. Boineville and her married daughter, whom Shelley found to be fascinating women, with a culture which to his wife was altogether wanting. Cornelia Turner, Mrs. Boineville’s daughter, was melancholy, required consolation, and found it, Hogg tells us, in Petrarch’s poetry; ‘Bysshe entered at once fully into her views and caught the soft infection, breathing the tenderest and sweetest melancholy as every true poet ought.’ Peacock, a man of keen and cultivated mind, joined the circle at Bracknell. He and Harriet, not yet eighteen, used sometimes to laugh at the gushing sentiment and enthusiasm of the Bracknell circle; Harriet had also given offence to Shelley by getting a wet-nurse for her child; in Professor Donwav’s words, ‘the beauty of Harriet’s motherly relation to her babe was marred in Shelley’s eyes by the introduction into his home of a hireling nurse to whom was delegated the mother’s tenderest office.’ But in
September Shelley wrote a sonnet to his child which expresses his deep love for the mother also, to whom in March 1814 he was remarried in London, lest the Scotch marriage should prove to have been in any point irregular. Harriet’s sister Eliza, however, whom Shelley had at first treated with excessive deference, had now become hateful to him. And in the very mouth of the London marriage we find him writing to Hogg that he is staying with the Boinville, having ‘escaped, in the society of all that philosophy and friendship combine, from the dismaying solitude of myself.’ Cornelia Turner, he adds, whom he once thought cold and reserved, ‘is the reverse of this, as she is the reverse of everything bad; she inherits all the divinity of her mother.’ Then comes a stanza, beginning

Thy dewy looks sink in my breast,
Thy gentle words stir poison there.

It has no meaning, he says; it is only written in thought. ‘It is evident from this pathetic letter,’ says Professor Dowden, ‘that Shelley’s happiness in his home had been fatally stricken.’ This is a curious way of putting it. To me what is evident is rather that Shelley had, to use Professor Dowden’s words again—for in these things of high sentiment I gladly let him speak for me—a too vivid sense that here (in the society of the Boinville family) were peace and joy and gentleness and love.’ In April come more verses to the Boinville, which contain the first good stanza that Shelley wrote. In May comes a poem to Harriet, of which Professor Dowden’s prose analysis is as poetic as the poem itself. ‘If she has something to endure (from the Boinville attachment), it is not much, and all her husband’s weak hang upon her loving endurance, for see how pale and wearied anguish has made him!’ Harriet, unconvinced, seems to have gone off to Bath in resentment, from whence, however, she kept up a constant correspondence with Shelley, who was now of age, and busy in London raising money on post-obit bonds for his own wants and those of the friend and former of his mind, Godwin.

And now, indeed, it was to become true that if from the inflammable Shelley’s devotion to the Boinville family poor Harriet had had ‘something to endure,’ yet this was not much, compared with what was to follow. At Godwin’s house Shelley met Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin, his future wife, then in her seventeenth year. She was a gifted person, but, as Professor Dowden says, she ‘had breathed during her entire life an atmosphere of free thought.’ On the 8th of June Hogg called at Godwin’s with Shelley; Godwin was out, but ‘a door was partially and softly opened, a thrilling voice called “Shelley!” a thrilling voice answered “Mary!”’ Shelley’s summoner was ‘a very young female, fair and fair-haired, pale indeed, and with a piercing look, wearing a frock of tartan.’ Already they were ‘Shelley’ and ‘Mary’ to one another; ‘before the close of June they knew and felt,’ says Professor Dowden, ‘that each was to the other

inexpressibly dear.’ The churchyard of St. Pancreas, where her mother was buried, became ‘a place now doubly sacred to Mary, since on one eventful day Byashe here poured forth his griefs, his hopes, his love, and she, in sign of everlasting union, placed her hand in his.’ In July Shelley gave her a copy of Queen Mab, printed but not published, and under the tender dedication to Harriet he wrote: ‘Count Slobendorf was about to marry a woman who, attracted solely by his fortune, proved her selfishness by deserting him in prison.’ Mary added an inscription on her part: ‘I love the author beyond all powers of expression . . . by that love we have promised to each other, although I may not be yours I can never be another’s,—and a good deal more to the same effect.

Amid these excitaments Shelley was for some days without writing to Harriet, who applied to Hookham the publisher to know what had happened. She was expecting her confinement; ‘I always fancy something dreadful has happened,’ she wrote, ‘if I do not hear from him . . . I cannot endure this dreadful state of suspense.’ Shelley then wrote to her, begging her to come to London; and when she arrived there, he told her the state of his feelings, and proposed separation. The shock made Harriet ill; and Shelley, says Peacock, ‘between his old feelings towards Harriet, and his new passion for Mary, showed in his looks, in his gestures, in his speech, the state of a mind “suffering, like a little kingdom, the nature of an insurrection.”’ Godwin grew uneasy about his daughter, and after a serious talk with her, wrote to Shelley. Under such circumstances, Professor Dowden tells us, ‘to youth, swift and decisive measures seem the best.’ In the early morning of the 28th of July, 1814, ‘Mary Godwin stepped across her father’s threshold into the summer air,’ she and Shelley went off together in a post-chaise to Dover, and from thence crossed to the Continent.

On the 14th of August the fugitives were at Troyes on their way to Switzerland. From Troyes Shelley addressed a letter to Harriet, of which the best description I can give is that it is precisely the letter which a man in the writer’s circumstances should not have written.

My dearest Harriet (he begins), I write to you from this destitute town; I write to show that I do not forget you; I write to urge you to come to Switzerland, where you will at last find one firm and constant friend to whom your interests will be always dear—by whom your feelings will never wilfully be injured. From none can you expect this but me—alas! else are either unfeeling or selfish, or have beloved friends of their own.

Then follows a description of his journey with Mary from Paris, ‘through a fertile country, neither interesting from the character of its inhabitants nor the beauty of the scenery, with a mule to carry our baggage, as Mary, who has not been sufficiently well to walk, fears the fatigue of walking.’ Like St. Paul to Timothy, he ends with commissi—
I wish you to bring with you the two deeds which Tabournin has to prepare for you, as also a copy of the settlement. Do not part with any of your money, but whatever be done about the books? You can consult on the spot. With love to my sweet little lausus, ever most affectionately yours,

S.

I write in great haste; we depart directly.

Professor Dowden's flow of sentiment is here so agitating, that I relieve myself by resorting to a drier world. Certainly my comment on this letter shall not be his, that it assumes Harriet that her interests were still dear to her, though now her lives had moved apart.' But neither will I call the letter an odious letter, a hideous letter. I prefer to call it, applying an untranslatable French word, a bête letter. And it is bête from what is the signal, the disastrous want and weakness of Shelley, with all his fine intellectual gifts—his utter deficiency in humour.

Harriet did not accept Shelley's invitation to join him and Mary in Switzerland. Money difficulties drove the travellers back to England in September. Godwin would not see Shelley, but he sorely needed, continually demanded, and eagerly accepted, pecuniary help from his erring 'spiritual son.' Between Godwin's wants and his own, Shelley was hard pressed. He got from Harriet, who still believed that he would return to her, twenty pounds which remained in her hands. In November she was confined; a son and heir was born to Shelley. He went to see Harriet, but 'the interview left husband and wife each embittered against the other.' Friends were severe: 'when Mrs. Boinville wrote, her letter seemed cold and even sarcastic,' says Professor Dowden. 'Sulitude,' he continues, 'unharassed by debts and duns, with Mary's companionship, the society of a few friends, and the delights of study and authorship, would have made these winter months to Shelley months of unusual happiness and calm.' But alas, creditors were pestering, and even Harriet gave trouble. In January 1815 Mary had to write in her journal this entry: 'Harriet sends her creditors here; nasty woman. Now we must change our lodgings.'

One day about this time Shelley asked Peacock: 'Do you think Wordsworth could have written such poetry if he ever had dealings with money-lenders?' Not only had Shelley dealings with money-lenders, he now had dealings with bailiffs also. But still he continued to read largely. In January 1815 his grandfather, Sir Bysshe Shelley, died. Shelley went down into Sussex; his father would not suffer him to enter the house, but he sate outside the door and read Cervantes, while the reading of his grandfather's will went on inside. In February was born Mary's first child, a girl, who lived but a few days. All the spring Shelley was ill and harassed, but by June it was settled that he should have an allowance from his father of 1,000L. a year, and that his debts (including 1,200L. promised by him to Godwin) should be paid. He on his part paid

Harriet's debts and allowed her 200L. a year. In August he took a house on the borders of Windsor Park, and made a boat excursion up the Thames as far as Lechlade, an excursion which produced his first entire poem of value, the beautiful Stanza in Lechlade Churchyard. They were followed, later in the autumn, by Alastor. Henceforth, from this winter of 1815 until he was drowned between Leghorn and Spezia in July 1822, Shelley's literary history is sufficiently given in the delightful introductions prefixed by Mrs. Shelley to the poems of each year. Much of the history of his life is there given also; but with some of those occurrences of his private life on which Mrs. Shelley forbore to touch, and which are now made known to us in Professor Dowden's book, we have still to deal.

Mary's first son, William, was born in January, 1816, and in February we find Shelley declaring himself 'strongly urged, by the perpetual experience of neglect or enmity from almost every one but those who are supported by my resources, to desert my native country, hiding myself and Mary from the contempt which we so unjustly endure.' Early in May he left England with Mary and Miss Clairmont; they met Lord Byron at Geneva and passed the summer by the Lake of Geneva in his company. Miss Clairmont had already in London, without the knowledge of the Shelles, made Byron's acquaintance and become his mistress. Shelley determined, in the course of the summer, to go back to England, and, after all, 'to make that most excellent of nations my perpetual resting-place.' In September he and his ladies returned; Miss Clairmont was then expecting her confinement. Of her being Byron's mistress the Shelles were now aware; but 'the moral indignation,' says Professor Dowden, 'which Byron's act might justly arouse, seems to have been felt by neither Shelley nor Mary.' If Byron and Claire Clairmont, as she was now called, loved and were happy, all was well.

The eldest daughter of the Godwin household, the amiable Fanny, was unhappy at home and in deep dejection of spirits. Godwin was, as usual, in terrible strait for money. The Shelles and Miss Clairmont settled themselves at Bath; early in October Fanny Godwin passed through Bath without knowing it, travelled on to Swansea, took a bedroom at the hotel there, and was found in the morning dead, with a bottle of Laudanum on the table beside her and these words in her handwriting:—

I have long determined that the best thing I could do was to put an end to the existence of a being whose birth was unfortunate, and whose life has only been a series of pain to those persons who have had their health in endeavouring to promote her welfare. Perhaps to bear of my death will give you pain, but you will soon have the blessing of forgetting that such a creature ever existed as . . .

There is no signature.

1 She was Mary Wollstonecraft's natural daughter by Godley.
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A sterner tragedy followed. On the 9th of November, 1816, Harriet Shelley left the house in Brompton where she was then living, and did not return. On the 10th of December her body was found in the Serpentine; she had drowned herself. In one respect Professor Dowden resembles Providence: his ways are inscrutable. His comment on Harriet's death is: 'There is no doubt she wandered from the ways of upright living.' But, he adds: 'That no act of Shelley's, during the two years which immediately preceded her death, tended to cause the rash act which brought her life to its close, seems certain. Shelley had been living with Mary all the time; only that!

On the 30th of December, 1816, Mary Godwin and Shelley were married. I shall pursue 'the occurrences of Shelley's private life' no further. For the five years and a half which remain, Professor Dowden's book adds to our knowledge of Shelley's life much that is interesting; but what was chiefly important we knew already. The new and grave matter which we did not know, or knew in the vaguest way only, but which Shelley's family and Professor Dowden have now thought to give us in full, ends with Shelley's second marriage.

I regret, I say once more, that it has been given. It is a sore trial for our love of Shelley. What a set! what a world! is the exclamation that breaks from us as we come to an end of this history of 'the occurrences of Shelley's private life.' I used the French word bâle for a letter of Shelley's; for the world in which we find him I can only use another French word, sale. Godwin's house of sordid horror, and Godwin preaching and holding the bat, and the green-spectacled Mrs. Godwin, and Hogg the faithful friend, and Hunt the Home of this precious world, and, to go up higher, Sir Timothy Shelley, a great country gentleman, feeling himself safe while the exalted mind of the Duke of Norfolk [the drinking Duke] protects me with the world, and Lord Byron with his deep grain of coarseness and commonness, his affectation, his brutal selfishness—what a set! The history carries us to Oxford, and I think of the clerical and respectable Oxford of those old times, the Oxford of Copleston and the Keble and Hawkins, and a hundred more, with the relief Keble declares himself to experience from Isaac Walton,

When, weared with the tale thy times disclose,
The eye first finds thee out in thy own remote case.

I am not only thinking of morals and the house of Godwin, I am thinking also of tone, bearing, dignity. I appeal to Cardinal Newman, if perchance he does me the honour to read these words, is it possible to imagine Copleston or Hawkins declaring himself safe while the exalted mind of the Duke of Norfolk protects me with the world? I

Mrs. Shelley, after her marriage and during Shelley's closing years, becomes attractive; up to her marriage her letters and journal do not please. Her ability is manifest, but she is not attractive. In the world discovered to us by Professor Dowden as surrounding Shelley up to 1817, the most pleasing figure is poor Fanny Godwin; after Fanny Godwin, the most pleasing figure is Harriet Shelley herself.

Professor Dowden's treatment of Harriet is not worthy—so much he must allow me in all kindness, but also in all seriousness, to say—of either his taste or his judgment. His pleading for Shelley is constant, and he does more harm than good to Shelley by it. But here his championship of Shelley makes him very unjust to a cruelly used and unhappy girl. For several pages he balances the question whether or not Harriet was unfaithful to Shelley before he left her for Mary, and he leaves the question unsettled. As usual Professor Dowden (and it is his signal merit) supplies the evidence decisive against himself. Thornton Hunt, not well disposed to Harriet, Hogg, Peacock, Trelawny, Hookham, and a member of Godwin's own family, are all clear in their evidence that up to her parting from Shelley Harriet was perfectly innocent. But that precious witness, Godwin, wrote in 1817 that she had proved herself unfaithful to her husband before their separation... Peace be to her shade! Why, Godwin was the father of Harriet's successor. But Mary believed the same thing. She was Harriet's successor. But Shelley believed it too. He had it from Godwin. But he was convinced of it earlier. The evidence for this is, that, in writing to Southey in 1820, Shelley declares that 'the single passage of a life, otherwise not only spotless but spent in an unambitious pursuit of virtue, which looks like a blot,' bears that appearance merely because I regulated my domestic arrangements without deferring to the notions of the vulgar, although I might have done so quite as conveniently had I descended to their base thoughts. From this Professor Dowden concludes that Shelley believed he could have got a divorce from Harriet had he so wished. The conclusion is not clear. But even were the evidence perfectly clear that Shelley believed Harriet unfaithful when he parted from her, we should have to take into account Mrs. Shelley's most true sentence in her introduction to Alastor: 'In all Shelley did, he, at the time of doing it, believed himself justified to his own conscience.'

Shelley's asserting a thing vehemently does not prove more than that he chose to believe it and did believe it. His extreme and violent changes of opinion about people show this sufficiently. Eliza Westbrooks is at one time 'a diamond not so large' as her sister Harriet but 'more highly polished,' and then: 'I certainly hate her with all my heart and soul. I sometimes feel faint with the fatigue of checking the overflows of my unbounded abhorrence for this miserable wretch.' The antipathy, Hogg tells us, was as unreasonable as the former excess of deference. To his friend Miss Hitchener he says: 'Never shall that intercourse cease, which has been the
day-dawn of my existence, the sun which has shed warmth on the
cold drear length of the anticipated prospect of life.' A little later,
and she has become 'the Brown Demon, a woman of desperate views
and dreadful passions, but of cool and unavenging revenge.' Even
Professor Dowden admits that this is absurd; that the real Miss
Hitchener was not seen by Shelley, either when he adored or when
he detested.

Shelley's power of persuading himself was equal to any occasion;
but would not his conscientiousness and high feeling have prevented
his exerting this power at poor Harriet's expense? To abandon her
as he did, must he not have known her to be false? Professor
Dowden insists always on Shelley's 'conscientiousness.' Shelley
himself speaks of his 'impassioned pursuit of virtue.' Leigh Hunt
compared his life to that of 'Plato himself, or, still more, a Pytha-
gorean,' and added that he 'never met a being who came nearer,
perhaps so near, to the height of humanity,' to being an 'angel of
charity.' In many respects Shelley really resembled both a Pytha-
gorean and an angel of charity. He loved high thoughts, he cared
nothing for sumptuous lodging, fare, and raiment, he was poignantly
afflicted at the sight of misery, he would have given away his last
farthing, would have suffered in his own person, to relieve it. But
in one important point he was like neither a Pythagorean nor an angel:
he was extremely inflammable. Professor Dowden leaves no doubt
on the matter. After reading his book, one feels sickened for ever
of the subject of irregular relations; God forbid that I should go into
the scandals about Shelley's 'Neapolitan charge,' about Shelley and
Emilia Viviani, about Shelley and Miss Clairmont, and the rest of it!
I will say only that it is visible enough that when the passion of love
was aroused in Shelley (and it was aroused easily) one could not be
sure of him, his friends could not trust him. We have seen him
with the Boinville family. With Emilia Viviani he is the same. If
he is left much alone with Miss Clairmont, he evidently makes Mary
uneasy; nay, he makes Professor Dowden himself uneasy. And I
conclude that an entirely human inflammability, joined to an
human want of humour and a superhuman power of self-deception,
are the causes which chiefly explain Shelley's abandonment of Harriet
in the first place, and then his behaviour to her and his defence of
himself afterward.

His misconduct to Harriet, his want of humour, his self-deception,
are fully brought before us for the first time by Professor Dowden's
book. Good morals and good criticism alike forbid that when all this
is laid bare to us we should deny, or hide, or extenuate it. Neverthe-
less I go back after all to what I said at the beginning: still our
ideal Shelley, the angelic Shelley, subsists. Unhappily the data for
this Shelley we had and knew long ago, while the data for the un-
attractive Shelley are fresh; and what is fresh is likely to fix our at-
tention more than what is familiar. But Professor Dowden's volumes,
which give so much, which give too much, also afford data for picturing
awen the Shelley who delights, as well as for picturing for the first
time a Shelley who, to speak plainly, disgusts; and with what may
suce and restore our impression of the delightful Shelley I shall end.

The winter at Marlow, and the ophthalmia caught among the
cottages of the poor, we knew, but we have from Professor Dowden
more details of this winter and of Shelley's work among the poor; we
have above all, for the first time I believe, a line of verse of Shelley's
own which sums up truly and perfectly this most attractive side of
him:

I am the friend of the unfriended poor.

But that in Shelley on which I would especially dwell is that in
him which contrasts most with the ignobleness of the world in which
we have seen him living, and with the pernicious nonsense which
we have found him talking. The Shelley of 'marvellous gentleness,'
of feminine refinement, with gracious and considerate manners, 'a
perfect gentleman, entirely without arrogance or aggressive egotism,-
completely devoid of the proverbial and ferocious vanity of authors
and poets, always disposed to make little of his own work and to
prefer that of others, of reverent enthusiasm for the great and wise,
of high and tender seriousness, of heroic generosity, and of a delicacy
in rendering services which was equal to his generosity—the Shelley
who was all this is the Shelley with whom I wish to end. He may talk
nonsense about tyrants and priests, but what a high and noble ring
in such a sentence as the following, written by a young man who is
refusing 3,000L a year rather than consent to entail a great property!

That I should entail 120,000L of command over labour, of power to remit this,
to employ it for benevolent purposes, on one whom I know not—who might, insted of being the benefactor of mankind, be its bane, or use this for the worst pur-
pose, which the real delegates of my chance-given property might convert into a
most useful instrument of benevolence! No! this you will not suspect me of.

And again:

I desire money because I think I know the use of it. It commands labour, it
gives leisure; and to give leisure to those who will employ it in the forwarding of
truth is the noblest present an individual can make to the whole.

If there is extravagance here, it is extravagance of a beautiful
and rare sort, like Shelley's 'underhand ways' also, which differed
singularly, the cynic Hogg tells us, from the underhand ways of
other people: 'the latter were concealed because they were mean,
selsh, sordid; Shelley's secrets, on the contrary (kindnesses done by
stealth), were hidden through modesty, delicacy, generosity, refine-
ment of soul.'

His forbearance to Godwin, to Godwin lecturing and renouncing
him and at the same time holding out, as I have said, his hat to him
for Alma, is wonderful; but the dignity with which he at last, in a letter
perfect for propriety of tone, reads a lesson to his ignoble father-in-
law, is in the best possible style:—

Perhaps it is well that you should be informed that I consider your last letter
to be written in a style of hyperboles and reproaches which neither you nor
me may be to your advantage. I have no desire to trespass on your
merits, nor to enter into a discussion about your past conduct or
future prospects. I will make no remarks, but such as arise from the
strict question in discussion.

And again:—

My astonishment, and I may add, when I have been treated with such
harshness and cruelt by you, my indignation, has been extreme, that, knowing
as you do my nature, any considerations should have prevailed on you to have been
as I am, with a heart as kind and willing as mine, you could not have
had the thoughts that were expressed in my last letter.

Moreover, though Shelley has no humour, he can show as quick and
sharp a mind as the most practised man of the world. He has been
with Byron and the Countess Guiccioli, and we have passed the latter:—

La Guiccioli is a very pretty, sentimental, innocent Italian, who has sacrificed
an immense fortune for the sake of Lord Byron, and who, if I may say anything of my
friend, her, and of human nature, will hereafter have plenty of opportunity to
repay her kindness.

Tact also, and something better than tact, he shows in his
dealings, in order to befriend Leigh Hunt, with Lord Byron. He
called by me:—

Particular circumstances, or rather, I should say, particular dispositions in Lord
Byron's character, render the close and exclusive intimacy with him in which I find
myself intolerable to me; thus much, my best friend, I will confess and confide to
you. No feelings of my own shall injure or interfere with what is now nearest to
them—your interest; and I will take care to preserve the little influence I may
have over them, in which strong sentiments are reconciled, until we
meet.

And so we have come back again, at last, to our original Shelley—
to the Shelley of the lovely and well-known picture, to the Shelley
with 'flushed, feminine, artless face,' the Shelley 'blushing like a
girl,' of Trelawny. Professor Dowden gives us some further attempts
at portraiture. One by a Miss Rose, of Shelley at Marlow:—

He was the most interesting figure I have ever seen; his eyes like a deer's, bright
but rather wild; his white throat unstained; his slender line to me almost fault-
less shape; his brown long coat with curling lamb's wool collar and cuffs—in fact,
his whole appearance—are as fresh in my recollection as an occurrence of yesterday.

Feminine enthusiasm may be deemed suspicious, but a Captain
Kennedy must surely be able to keep his head. Captain Kennedy
was quartered at Horsham in 1813, and saw Shelley when he was
on a stolen visit, in his father's absence, at Field Place:—

He received me with frankness and kindliness, as if he had known me from
childhood, and at once won my heart. I fancy I see him now as he sat by the
window, and heard his voice, the tones of which impressed me with his sincerity and
simplicity. His resemblance to his sister Elizabeth was so striking as if they had
been twins. His eyes were most expressive; his complexion beautifully fair, his
features exquisitely fine; his hair was dark, and no peculiar attention to its arrange-
ment was manifest. In person he was slender and gentlemanlike, but inclined to
steep; his gait was clean, and no military attention to his uniform.

Mrs. Gisborne's son, who knew Shelley well at Leigham, declared
Captain Kennedy's description of him to be 'the best and most truth-
ful I have ever seen.'

To all this we have to add the charm of the man's writings—of
Shelley's poetry. It is his poetry, above everything else, which
for many people establishes that he is an angel. Of his poetry I
have no time now to speak. But let us suppose that a want of
humour and a self-involvement such as Shelley's have no effect upon
a man's poetry. The man Shelley, in very truth, is not entirely
sane, and Shelley's poetry is not entirely sane either. The Shelley
of actual life is a vision of beauty and radiance, indeed, but availing
nothing, effecting nothing. And in poetry, no less than in life, he is
'a beautiful and ineffectual angel, beating in the void his luminous
wings in vain.'

Matthew Arnold.