

A Study of George Moore's Revisions of his  
Novels and Short Stories

by

GRAHAM OWENS, M.A.

A thesis presented in candidature for the  
Degree of Ph.D. in the Department of  
English Literature, The University of Leeds,  
August 1966.

## CONTENTS

PREAMBLE	p.1
CHAPTER I: Introduction	p.3
CHAPTER II: Moore's Theory of Prose Fiction and Non-Fiction	p.55
CHAPTER III: Shifting Literary Allegiances: Motives Governing Revisions	p.136
CHAPTER IV: Changes in Narrative, Structure and Style	p.235
CHAPTER V: Irish Period: The Melodic Line	p.297
1. Introduction	
2. Melodic Line Devices	
3. <u>Priscilla and Emily Lofft</u>	
4. <u>The Untilled Field</u>	
5. <u>The Lake</u>	
CHAPTER VI: Conclusion	p.412
BIBLIOGRAPHY	p.416

## PREAMBLE

This piece of research has been undertaken because no bibliography of George Moore's work incorporates even the majority of his revisions, and no comprehensive critical study of his rewritings exists. Such a study has involved an analysis of his method of work and an investigation of his motives for revising. And because, in his search for a new form, Moore rejected virtually the whole of the English novel, it was necessary to examine his theories of prose fiction. Revision of the early realist novels (A Modern Lover, A Mummer's Wife, A Drama in Muslin and A Mere Accident) arose mainly out of Moore's desire to remove French influences and, although other motives (such as improvement in the writing or structure of the story) are present, it was logical to study them as a group. After this came a series of works which were revised to improve structure and style: Spring Days, Vain Fortune, Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa. Esther Waters has been added to this group because its revisions were largely stylistic, though the later versions incorporate melodic line technique. Two other works - A Story-Teller's Holiday/Ulick and Scraha and Aphrodite in Aulis - are included in this group because, though written in Moore's 'melodic line' period, they were rewritten mainly to

2

effect an improvement in their structure. In such texts as these, I have dealt not only with the revision but also with the composition of the first version, which throws interesting light on Moore's methods. Next, the 'melodic line' (examples of which have been taken only from works which were revised in order to improve this aspect) has been studied as a theme in order to avoid a repetitive, chronological approach, and to provide the thesis with a more unified shape: but three books of this period - Priscilla and Emily Lofft, The Untilled Field and The Lake - are in addition examined individually as successful or significant revisions in Moore's later manner. On the other hand, two major works of this same period - The Brook Kerith and Héloïse and Abélard - are not dealt with in detail, because their revisions are confined to minute stylistic changes, and I have limited myself to the significant revisions. For the same reason, few illustrations from these two books appear among the melodic line techniques; the first versions were already written in the 'melodic line' manner. In the conclusion, I have attempted to sum up Moore's motives and methods. Finally, the Bibliography catalogues the available MSS, all the revisions, other works by Moore referred to in the text, and relevant books and articles on Moore.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

"...One of the principal forces of his genius appears in his emendations."(1)

Moore had a fanatical passion for revising and spent most of his life reconstructing and rewriting his books. All his collections of short stories (except the last, Celibate Lives) and all his novels, with the sole exception of Mike Fletcher, were revised at least once; ten of them twice (A Modern Lover, A Mummer's Wife, A Mere Accident, Vain Fortune, Celibates, The Lake, The Brook Kerith, A Story-Teller's Holiday/Ulick and Soracha, Perronik the Fool and Aphrodite in Aulis)(2); three of them three times (Esther Waters, Sister Teresa and The Untilled Field) and one (Evelyn Innes) no fewer than six times in all. Many more rewritings - sometimes more than a dozen - took place before the first editions were issued, and many were slightly revised versions of novels published in magazine form. As yet these revisions have not been catalogued.

- 
1. Charles Morgan, "George Moore at 80", Observer, Sunday 21st February, 1932, p.6.
  2. Royal Gettmann in "George Moore's Revisions of The Lake, The Wild Goose and Esther Waters", PMLA, vol.59, June 1944, p.541, states wrongly that eight (including Moore's autobiography, Confessions of a Young Man) were twice revised.

Joseph M. Hone(1), Moore's official biographer, while generally reliable, in his select bibliography, on dates of first editions, includes hardly any revisions: a criticism equally applicable to Humbert Wolfe(2), Henry Danielson(3), Iolo Williams(4), Batho and Dobrée(5), E. A. Baker(6), The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature(7), the British Museum General Catalogue, and all the standard primary sources and works of reference. Few bibliographies, in fact, mention revisions (especially the early rewritings) unless (as in A Modern Lover/Lewis Seymour and Some Women) the title is changed.

What information there is available is generally misleading. Details given in the main Heinemann, Ebury

1. Joseph Hone, The Life of George Moore, London, Gollancz, 1936, pp.498-502.
2. Humbert Wolfe, George Moore, London, Butterworth, 1933, pp.131-5.
3. Henry Danielson "Bibliography, 1878-1921", in John Freeman, A Portrait of George Moore in a Study of his Work, London, Laurie, 1922, pp.231-283.
4. Iolo A. Williams, "George Moore" (with prefatory letter by Moore), Bibliographies of Modern Authors, no.3, London, Chaundy, 1921.
5. B. Dobrée, Introductions to English Literature, vol.4, E. Batho & B. Dobrée. The Victorians and After, 1830-1914, London, Cresset Press, 1938, p.316.
6. E. A. Baker, The History of the English Novel, vol.9, London, Witherby, 1938, ch.5.
7. The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, ed. by F. W. Bateson, vol.3, 1800-1900, C.U.P., 1940, pp.526-7. No mention is made, for example, of the relationship between Ulick and Soracha and A Story-Teller's Holiday.

and Uniform editions are very unreliable(1), and revisions are not always classified as such: for example, no indication is given in the 1937 Ebury edition(2) that the 1931 Aphrodite in Aulis is a revision; the Ebury edition of The Untilled Field(3) does not make it clear that the 1931 edition(4) is a revision; and the Uniform edition of Heloise and Abelard(5) does not mention that the Uniform edition of 1925 is a revision. And the same is true of other publishers(6). The 1937 Ebury edition of A Mummer's Wife states that the book was first published in 1884, reprinted in 1884 and 1885; the English Catalogue of Books for 1881-9(7) and Royal A. Gettmann(8) give 1884. But the book was first published in 1885, as Hone(9), Quinn(10),

- 
1. References to Moore's autobiographical works contain an even greater number of errors.
  2. London, Heinemann.
  3. London, Heinemann, 1936.
  4. London, Heinemann.
  5. London, Heinemann, 1952.
  6. I am informed by Mr. Rupert Hart-Davis that Mr. Edwin Gilcher, of Cherry Plain, N.Y., has been compiling for many years a definitive bibliography of Moore's works, but nothing has yet been published. See also Malcolm Brown, George Moore: A Reconsideration, Univ. of Washington Press, Seattle, 1955, p.227.
  7. p.401.
  8. op.cit., p.541.
  9. op.cit., p.109. Hone states that the book came out in the Spring.
  10. Complete Catalogue of the Library of John Quinn. Sold by Auction in five parts. The Anderson Galleries, N.Y., 1924, 2 vols. Vol.2, pp.650-661. George Moore. Item 6648.

Cutler and Stiles(1) and Danielson(2) agree. The 1952 Heinemann Uniform edition of Esther Waters gives the following information: first published (Walter Scott) in 1894: new edition (Heinemann) 1920: reprinted 1920, 1922, 1923, 1925; revised and reprinted 1926, 1928, 1929, 1931; Uniform edition 1932, 1936, 1947; Ebury edition 1937. This creates a completely erroneous impression: four versions of the book appeared (1894, 1899, 1917 and 1920) but the Uniform edition mentions neither the second nor the third. As to Perronik the Fool, in book form first published in 1924, and revised in 1926 and 1928, both Cutler and Stiles(3) and Gettman(4) assume that 1926 was the first published version, while Hone does not mention the magazine version.

Vain Fortune, first published in the Lady's Pictorial Magazine in 1891 and then in book form in the same year, revised in 1892 and again in 1895, presented bibliographers with a problem because its first edition was undated. Hone(5) indicates quite clearly that the first version was published in 1891(6), and this date is

- 
1. B. D. Cutler and Villa Stiles, Modern British Authors. Their First Editions, London, Allen & Unwin, 1930, p.118.
  2. op.cit., p.238.
  3. op.cit., p.121.
  4. op.cit., p.541.
  5. op.cit., pp.171, 175.
  6. Yet his Bibliography, op.cit., p.498, gives 1892.

confirmed by the British Museum General Catalogue, the English Catalogue, 1890-97(1), and Gettmann(2). On the other hand, the Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature(3), I. A. Williams(4), Quinn(5) and Cutler and Stiles(6) offer tentatively 1890; are backed up more firmly by the Sphere(7) with 1890: while Danielson(8), W. D. Ferguson(9) and H. Wolfe(10) bring up the rear with 1892(11).

Sister Teresa was equally confusing. First published by Unwin in June 1901, it was revised for Tauchnitz in November or December 1901, again for the German Fleischel edition, 1905, and once more in 1909 for Unwin. Benn reprinted the book from the 1909 edition in his Essex Library in 1929, but this was not a revised version. Yet the Benn 1929 Sister Teresa states that 1909 was the second edition, as do the English Catalogue, 1906-10(12),

1. p.685.
2. op.cit., p.541.
3. p.526.
4. op.cit., p.6.
5. op.cit., items 6662 and 6663, II p.653.
6. op.cit., p.118.
7. "A Literary Letter: Mr. George Moore's Romance of Syria", Vol.lxvi, no. 868, 9th September, 1916, p.238.
8. op.cit., p.246.
9. W. D. Ferguson, The Influence of Flaubert on George Moore, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia; O.U.P., 1934, p.98.
10. op.cit., p.132.
11. The British Museum copy date-stamp, 2nd July, 1892, provides no assistance here.
12. p.889.

and Quinn(1). The Cambridge Bibliography(2) suggests that it is the 1928 version which is entirely rewritten, and the British Museum General Catalogue states that 1928 was the second edition. No bibliography gives all seven versions of Evelyn Innes.

Gettmann is the only critic who has attempted to list in print(3) Moore's revisions, but he includes a number of errors and his table is incomplete. He omits the 1885 and 1916 versions of A Modern Lover, the 1931 edition of The Untilled Field and the 1924 Perronik, as well as all mention of Aphrodite in Aulis and the magazine versions of all books. He mentions only three(1898, 1901, 1908) versions of Evelyn Innes and makes no reference to Ulick and Soracha (1926). He gives Sister Teresa as 1901, 1909 and 1928, thus omitting the 1901 Tauchnitz and wrongly giving 1928 as a revision. He records The Lake's first publication as 1904 (instead of 1905), and In Single Strictness as 1921 (instead of 1922), and refers, mistakenly, to the 1933 Perronik as a revision(4).

How serious this confusion of dates can be in its effects may be seen from the fact that a writer such as

- 
1. op.cit., item 6706, p.657.
  2. p.526.
  3. op.cit., p.541.
  4. For complete details of all revisions, see Bibliography.

Gilbert Phelps, studying Turgenev's influence on Moore(1), makes false deductions owing to a lack of bibliographical information. He confuses disastrously the 1905 and 1921 editions of The Lake (the first edition was not cast in 'imaginative reverie'), and discusses the 1922 In Single Strictness stories as if they, and not Celibates (1895), appeared before The Untilled Field (1903).

The difficulties of establishing the dates of the revisions themselves are paralleled by a lack of agreement among writers on Moore's motives for revising; and, once again, many of their statements are false or misleading. Most hostile to Moore has been Malcolm Elwin, who holds(2) that Moore was written out after his Irish phase and rewrote after that to conceal the vacuum. That this is only a partial truth may be seen from the fact that the revised Lake (1921) - a complete recreation of the 1905 version - is Moore's best work. In any case, Elwin ignores the number of revisions before 1906. Moore did not revise merely in his old age. Even the Cambridge Bibliography(3) and Batho and Dobrée(4) overlook the early

- 
1. Gilbert Phelps, The Russian Novel in English Fiction, London, Hutchinson's University Library, 1956.
  2. Malcolm Elwin, "George Moore: Tragedy or Farce?", Old Gods Falling, London, Collins, 1939, ch.3, e.g. p.101.
  3. p.526.
  4. op.cit., p.316.

revisions of A Modern Lover, A Mummer's Wife, Esther Waters, Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa(1).

But though Elwin misinterprets Moore's motives for revision, he is right in his thesis that Moore was not a great creative artist. Even Desmond MacCarthy, one of Moore's admirers, admits that his experience was thin:

"It is the slenderness of his stock of carefully hoarded experience which, as much as his passion for his craft, has led him to re-write so much of his work(2)."

Moore never wasted material: scraps rejected from earlier work are constantly written up and included elsewhere; a mere hint of a story in one book may turn out to be the main theme of the next. Perronik, for example, appeared first as a couple of pages in Heloise and Abélard (1921)(3).

Elwin also suggests(4) that Moore wished to gratify his vanity about the quest for Beauty and to satisfy his

1. Perhaps it would be truer to say that the Cambridge Bibliography, like Batho and Dobrée, deals with only a few revisions, and does not state the relationships between, e.g., Ulick and Soracha and A Story-Teller's Holiday. Bibliographers who do include revisions deal usually only with later ones. It is interesting in this context to note how early in Moore's career his revisions were advertised: A Mere Accident, Vizetelly, 1887 (Vizetelly's one-volume novels, no.26) announces, on the fly-leaves, the tenth and revised edition of A Mummer's Wife (the book was actually revised for the sixth edition, 1886).
2. Desmond MacCarthy, "George Moore", Portraits, I. Putnam, London and N.Y., 1931, p.201.
3. II, pp.140-143.
4. op.cit., p.101.

admirers. This, too, is an exaggeration, ignoring Moore's early revisions, his fanaticism and his enormous sacrifices. At the same time, there is a grain of truth in Freeman's remark about the 1928 A Story-Teller's Holiday, where Moore mentions to Alec that it is difficult to say which version of the story is the better.

"That is the exact difficulty which will confront Mr. Moore's loyal admirers, and perhaps it is because of this teasing perplexity that their admiration is kept at a constant height(1)."

That is as far as one can fairly go. Frank Swinnerton overstates and falsifies when he says(2) that, after Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa, that is, "from the comparative affluence which came to him with the new century," Moore was less a novelist than an editor, talker and commentator, and began to rewrite his earlier books.

One further charge is made by Elwin(3): that Moore revised for commercial reasons, republishing old books in expensive editions and, to justify this, speaking a great deal about his revisions. A similar charge is made by A. E. Newton in This Book-Collecting Game(4), but it is

- 
1. John Freeman, "A Story-Teller's Holiday", Bookman, London, vol.lxxv, no.449, February 1929, p.267.
  2. Frank Swinnerton, The Georgian Literary Scene. A Panorama. London, Heinemann, 1935, p.186.
  3. op.cit., pp.101-2.
  4. Boston, Little, Brown, 1928, pp.302-3.

demonstrably untrue(1). Moore began publishing expensive private editions in 1918(2) and, by this time, had undertaken approximately twenty revisions of his novels and short story collections(3). The most one can state is that, in later life, Moore realised the financial advantage inherent in his method of work. As Hone says, speaking of Esther Waters' victory over the libraries:

"There is evidence here of the sincerity of Moore's desire to free English fiction from the shackles of the libraries: for after the firm establishment of his reputation in Esther Waters it would no doubt have been to his advantage that the thousands who wished to read his books should have to buy them instead of borrowing. The days when the boycott of the libraries could hurt him were over, but he would not renounce his fight for the principle. And he was shrewd enough to see that a commercial argument would turn the scales more surely than all the idealism in the world(4)."

Moore no doubt laid himself open to the charge of commercialism. He said, for example, in "A Communication to Book Collectors"(5), that hand-set books would increase in value

1. Statements made by Moore, such as the one in the preface to Muslin (London, Heinemann, 1915. p.vi), that his bookseller tells him that any corrections he makes in the new edition will keep up the price of the old, are not to be taken too seriously.
2. A Story-Teller's Holiday. 250 copies of a de-luxe edition of The Brook Kerith were issued in 1916.
3. i.e. not including his autobiographical works, or novels and short stories published in magazine form - Gettmann (op.cit., p.541) is wrong in stating that there were fifteen revisions before 1918.
4. op.cit., pp.205-6.
5. Times Literary Supplement, 10th March, 1921, p.157.

from the collector's point of view. On this, Holbrook Jackson comments:

"George Moore's reference to increasing value from the collector's point of view, and the method of the signed and limited edition adopted by him, almost convict him of profiteering. But his quest of a beautiful format was not fruitless, for towards the end of his life Francis Meynell and Bruce Rogers, in the designs for Ulick and Soracha and Perronik the Fool, gave him the typography of his dreams(1)."

And the real answer to Elwin's charge is to be found in Jackson's account: Francis Meynell records that, while Ulick and Soracha was at the printer's, Moore came with revision after revision:

"... and our feelings were undisturbed by anxieties about the printer's bill, for he had proposed at the outset that he should pay for his own corrections. They exceeded the original cost of the setting(2)."

Moore defended himself in a typical Moorism:

"A strange charge to bring against a man who has worked for thirty years, week in, week out, at a craft in which he is considered a master-craftsman by common consent without ever making two thousand a year, very rarely one thousand, more often merely a few hundreds! But let none read in this statement a complaint of injustice done to me. My recompense was in the full enjoyment of my craft, and in

1. Holbrook Jackson, "George Moore", The Printing of Books, London, Cassell, 1938, ch.7, p.119.
2. op.cit., p.110.

circumstances so favourable that it is often a wonder to me that I did not do better than I have done. To escape from useless regret I fall to thinking of the difficulties that beset every man who goes forth with an ideal in his mind(1)."

On one occasion he told Beverley Nichols:

"The proof corrections on one of my books alone cost me a hundred and twenty pounds."

And Nichols comments that, at a time when literary critics boasted that they did not read proofs, Moore sacrificed a large part of his royalties to make his work perfect(2).

This is hardly the way to make a fortune(3).

- 
1. "A Communication to Book-Collectors", p.157.
  - 2, Beverley Nichols, "George Moore or the Cause of all the Trouble", Are they the same at home?, London, Cape, 1927, ch.45, p.259.
  3. Barrett H. Clark, in Intimate Portraits, N.Y., Dramatists Play Service, 1951, p.67, confirms that Moore was not much interested in the mere making of money. At the same time, James Whitall, with whom Moore collaborated, says that Moore was very mean with money; that he was angry when he gave a conductor a half-crown instead of a penny in the half-light, and again when he opened a bill from his publisher for author corrections:

"His writer's conscience, which never permitted him to hesitate for a moment to make costly changes on final page proofs, must have been a sore trial to a man so close-fisted." ("George Moore", Bookman, N.Y., vol.lxxvi, no.3, March 1933, p.217.)

It is thus clear that Moore did not revise for commercial reasons(1).

Certainly, one of his main motives for rewriting was the search for a style. Yeats says that Moore had no feeling for words or for their historical associations(2),

1. This is not to deny that commercial success and fame were his main motives at the beginning of his career. See e.g. letters to his mother: 1) 3 Danes Inn, Wych Street, Strand, 19th (or 29th) May, 1884, National Library, Dublin, MS 4479. 2) Danes Inn, Wych Street, Strand, Sunday, 6th July, 1885, National Library, Dublin, MS 4479. 3) Danes Inn, Wych Street, Strand, 15th October, 1885, National Library, Dublin, MS 4479. 4) The Green, Southwick, near Brighton, October 1886, National Library, Dublin, MS 4479. 5) Wednesday, 19th January, 1895, National Library, Dublin, MS 4479; the toning down of certain Naturalist elements in his early novels; the deliberate bid for popularity with Spring Days; and the near-Victorian ending of Mike Fletcher (1889) - though his words did not match his actions (see the whole of the Confessions with its claim that nothing mattered to him but his art (London, Laurie, 1904, ed., p.279 - part of an extra chapter not in 1888 ed.), or his statements in the prefaces to A Drama in Muslin and Sister Teresa:

"Regardless of the great difficulties ...

I wrote A Drama in Muslin and A Mere Accident; and it pleases me to think that both of these books show me scorning all facile success, and walking, to the best of my strength, in the way of art." (Pref. to Spring Days, Vizetelly one-vol. novels no.29, London, 1888, p.iv.)

"The book I now offer to the public will not be read till I am dead. I have written for posterity if I have written for anybody except myself." (Pref. to Sister Teresa, London, Benn's Essex Library, 1929, p.vi. Written for the 1909 edition.))

2. W. B. Yeats, "Dramatis Personae (1896-1902)", Autobiographies, London, Macmillan, 1955, p.435.

no sensuous and no rhythmical mind(1), and Beerbohm satirises Moore's style in A Christmas Garland(2), as does H. G. Wells in Boon, The Mind of the Race, The Wild Asses of the Devil and The Last Trump(3). Desmond MacCarthy, however, defends it:

"His style is the most fluid imaginable; the drift of his thought is deflected by chance associations. The surprise is that it ever twists back again into the main channel; yet it does. Like water, his imagination takes the shape of every vessel into which it is poured - it is square in one vessel and round in another -- yet the more it changes the more it is the same(4)."

And William Rothenstein tells us:

"With a pen in his hand, Moore's intelligence was uncanny; without it his hands looked limp and purposeless, his brows were lifted in vacant expectancy, his eyes without depth, his lips loose under the pale moustache. It was as though Moore's pen supplied rectitude, tact and delicacy - virtues which were sometimes discarded when his pen was laid down(5)."

But whatever the merits and demerits of his later style, there can be no doubt about the appalling task Moore set himself. Probably no other writer has begun his

1. Walther Gilomen, "George Moore and his friendship with W. B. Yeats", Aarain, Switzerland. English Studies, Amsterdam, vol.xix, June 1937, p.119.
2. "Dickens", London, 1912, pp.179-185.
3. London, Unwin, 1915, ch.4, sec,2, pp.89-95.
4. Desmond MacCarthy, Portraits, pp.202-3.
5. William Rothenstein, Men and Memories, vol.1, 1872-1900, London, Faber, 1931, p.241.

career with such feeble technical equipment. He never learnt grammar or punctuation, was handicapped throughout his life by his ignorance and was forced often to affect scorn for such humdrum details(1). In the Dublin National Library, there are some interesting letters from Dr. J. Spencer Northcote, Headmaster of St. Mary's College, Oscott, Birmingham, where George was a pupil, to G.H. Moore, the novelist's father. On 22nd December, 1865, for example, the latter was informed that George's spelling was atrocious: he spelt words in two or three different ways in the same sentence(2). He had obviously made little progress fifteen years later. J.B. Booth records how Moore and two fellow contributors to The Bat had on one occasion been sent off to the drawing-room to write fashion and society paragraphs when the editor burst in to ask what the heated argument was about:

"The three worst spellers in journalism yelled at him: 'Here, you decide it! How many "t's" are there in Duchess(3)?'"

The weakness was to continue throughout Moore's life. He told Barrett Clark as late as 1922 (when he was 70) that he still found writing very hard and even spelling troubled him - he wrote 'wrode' for 'rode' in his Esther Waters scenario(4).

1. Cf. his whole attitude to formal education.

2. National Library, Dublin, MS 4479.

3. J.B. Booth, Old Pink 'Un Days, London, Grant Richards, 1924, p.252.

4. op.cit., p.116.

Clark also mentions that, in speech, Moore often hesitated for the right word and often got it wrong; he felt for the word and, unless he was sure of it, deliberately mispronounced it, as though showing his contempt(1). Just how bad Moore's writing was when he did not revise may be seen from the letters he wrote up to the end of his life and the early published articles in The Hawk, his brother Augustus's fatuous magazine - here his near-illiteracy shows how essential was the revision of his published work from the very beginning. Nothing could go to press until he had been over it several times, and even early in his career he was driven to justify himself publicly, sometimes ludicrously - witness the article he wrote for The Hawk, defending another article, on drama, which he had published in the Fortnightly Review(2) of the same month, and which had been attacked by critics for its bad grammar. He explained airily:

"As it is the common lot of all men to die, so it is the common lot of all writers to fall into occasional bad grammar. But incoherent sentences are so frequent in my article that it seems strange that my critics did not guess that the article had been the victim of some unhappy accident.

---

1. op.cit., p.73.

2. "Our Dramatists and their Literature", xlvi, n.s., no.cclxxv, 1st November, 1889, pp.620-32. Later in Impressions and Opinions, London, Nutt, 1891.

The truth is, that I re-write my books and articles upon the proof-sheets. The disadvantages of this method of composition are many; and if revise sheets do not arrive in time for correction, the author had far better be printed from his manuscript without seeing a proof(1)."

It does not seem to have occurred to Moore that no first draft should be so bad.

So Moore rewrote throughout his life because his first drafts were totally unfit for publication. Those critics who claim that Moore's motive for revision is the improvement of the actual writing are at least partly right, though they omit more important reasons. For example, Francis Meynell tells us that while Ulick and Soracha was at the printer's, Moore

"came almost daily, hung up his square bowler hat and settled down to read aloud to us the revisions he had made in his last batch of proofs. Each time it was an entirely new text. The first version was almost illiterate. The second grammatical but undistinguished. The third a transfiguration. It was fascinating to see the process of his composition at close quarters(2)."

David Garnett notes that Moore aired his vanity only with

1. "My Article and my Critics", The Hawk, vol.4, no.93, 12th November, 1889, p.519. Moore wrote, during 1889 and 1890, nearly fifty articles for this obscure, worthless, society magazine and a comparison of their flat style with the complex rhythms of his later prose indicates the measure of his advance.
2. See Holbrook Jackson, op.cit., p.110.

others; when he was alone, he recognised the limitations of his books:

"Otherwise how could he have planned those eternal revisions and corrections, plotting and scheming through his old age to make all the paper houses stand up so that they should endure for ever(1)?"

As we have seen, one can never trust Moore's public pronouncements, but when he says, in the preface to the revised Lake (1921),

"...a writer's aestheticism is his all; he cannot surrender it, for his art is dependent upon it(2),"

this is not merely a public pose; his private letters reveal the same feelings. He wrote to Mark Fisher on 9th January, 1922:

"For some years I have been living a hermit's life, devoting myself entirely to my library edition, for which I have sacrificed everything: trips abroad, visits to exhibitions, and letters to friends(3). I have done nothing since I saw you but one thing, and you, who are so intensely an artist, will understand how necessary it is to renounce a great deal to achieve a little(4)."

And to W. L. Phelps he confided:

"The only thing that worries me is when I have not written well(5)."

1. David Garnett, "Current Literature", New Statesman and Nation, vol.vi, no.124, n.s., Saturday, 8th July, 1933, p.46.
2. London, Heinemann, Ebury edition, 1936, p. ix.
3. He even saw his friends by appointment only.
4. 121 Ebury Street, S.W., National Library, Dublin, MS 1596.
5. W. L. Phelps, "George Moore", Autobiography with Letters, O.U.P., N.Y., 1939, ch.89, p.824.

Humbert Wolfe(1) illustrates lyrically the constant search for perfection which Moore's kind of revision implies:

Moore "will not only wear out his body in Palestine(2), but he will wear out his heart over a single sentence. A man of over seventy years of age, he sat down again to The Brook Kerith and, as he said, re-orchestrated it. No better education could be afforded to a student of letters than to examine the penultimate and the last edition, and to learn from a textual study what Mr. Moore means by re-orchestration. Such a student would find hardly a page in which some word had not been altered, withdrawn, or added. He would find in one or two places passages of real beauty omitted. If the student put all the amendments and alterations together, he would conclude that Mr. Moore's one object was to clear out of the way any obstruction, however small, which might impede the development of the tale. He wants no picturesque pools in the brook, no romantic little eddies. He does not want it to babble, to make sudden rushes, to be coy and go on, like Tennyson's, repeating itself for ever, while men, who unguardedly come, naturally go. He means it to flow evenly, clearly, and strongly to its distant and certain home 'of waters wide'. He clears the channel of stones, as he clears it sometimes of the over-hanging (but still obstructing) beauties of willow and long grasses. His brook is to have no adventitious aids. It must convince by its own

- 
1. Humbert Wolfe, Dialogues and Monologues, London, Gollancz, 1928, pp.30-31.
  2. Reference to Moore's visit to Palestine in 1914 in search of local colour for The Brook Kerith.

merit, the merit of cool water drawn, and drawing by the impulse of its own strength, to the Jordan(1)."

Margery Ross informs us that, up to 1917, Moore occasionally used to send Robert Ross, his painter friend, his MSS for criticism, and his argumentative replies to Ross's suggestions showed the finical care he took in making his books(2). And C. Morgan tells the story of how, in old age, Moore walked from Ebury Street to Chelsea with a paper in his hand with a sentence on it, revised continually but still entangled. He asked Morgan to untie the knot (merely two relative clauses, one choking the other); this was easy, but precisely what Moore could not see:

"He had come with his sentence as a child might have come with a toy. He did not understand the clockwork. Someone else must put that right; then he would play with the toy as no one else could play with it(3)."

As Desmond MacCarthy writes:

1. C. Morgan, "George Moore at 80", p.6, also says that The Brook Kerith was brilliantly transformed in revision. But, in reality, the book is an excellent example of the extremities into which Moore's type of rewriting led him: he revised again and again, but the final version is inevitably still imperfect.
2. See Robert Ross: Friend of Friends, edited by Margery Ross, London, Cape, 1952, p.264.
3. Charles Morgan, "George Moore: A Centenary Appreciation", Listener, vol.xlvii, no.1200, Thursday, 28th February, 1952, p.350.

"It is indeed difficult for Mr. Moore to reprint anything without rewriting it. No writer has ever shown himself more interested, not even Flaubert, in the technical process of approximating to perfection. I believe that if every few months a new edition of some already often-printed book of Mr. Moore's were called for, each fresh opportunity of polishing would give him far greater pleasure than the steady increase in the number of his readers which such a demand would indicate(1)."

Sir William Geary says of him:

"His was no hasty writing. I have regarded his type-script, and its continuous correction; his aim was to attain, not perfection, for he was modest withal, but his very best(2)."

Gosse goes further:

"Mr. George Moore is one of the best living writers of English prose, and I think he is the most conscientious. He is never satisfied with the choice of his language and the structure of his sentences, and he longs, more passionately than any one else, to achieve the impossible perfection(3)."

Not all comment on Moore's rewriting, however, is favourable. The other side of the medal may be seen

- 
1. op.cit., p.201.
  2. See Hone, op.cit., p.428.
  3. Edmund Gosse, "Second Thoughts" (from Sunday Times), More Books on the Table, London, Heinemann, 1923, p.327.

in A. Symons' remark:

"his prose shows the intense labor with which he produced every chapter of every novel: in fact, there is too much of the laborious mind in all his books(1)."

Symons says that throughout his life Moore sought a style and never found one(2).

---

1. A. Symons, "Confessions and Comments", Dramatis Personae, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1923, p.138.
2. ibid., p.158. It will be observed that these statements refer to Moore's later writing. After Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa - the first, especially, a blatant bid for popularity - Moore realised that he would never reach the wide Victorian public and so came to lay ever-increasing stress in practice on those artistic principles which he had held theoretically from the beginning of his career. (The preface to the 1899 Esther Waters (London, Walter Scott, sixpenny ed.) makes very high claims for the book, but he was really aiming for popular success.) In the preface to A Story-Teller's Holiday, A Leave Taking (Ltd. ed. London, Society for Irish Folklore, 1918, p.v.), he explains why he has decided on private publication: the persecution of his books ever since Flowers of Passion (he always claimed to have won this battle with Esther Waters - see e.g. A Communication to my Friends, in A Mummer's Wife, Heinemann, Ebury ed., London, 1937, pp.li-liv.) and the fact that the libraries do not cater exclusively for men and women of letters. By private printing, he says, he has cut himself off from many readers, but the alternative was to cease writing. The real reason for his decision in favour of private publication, however, was quite the reverse: it was his final admission that he would never be read by a wide public (though it was perhaps partly the result of the Lewis Seymour and Some Women (London, Heinemann, 1917) libel suit (see Times Law Reports, 23rd November, 1917)) and, moreover, in private editions he would not be forced to excise his more salacious stories (e.g. Marban's adventures among the nuns in A Story-Teller's Holiday, 1918, which Gosse thought should be privately printed (see Moore's letter to Robert Ross, 121 Ebury Street, S.W., 8th August, 1917. Margery Ross, op.cit., p.314))

Batho and Dobrée, too, state that it was the quest for a perfect style which led Moore to revise(1). And even Hone, while disapproving(2), for example, of the bits of subjective reverie added to the A Mummer's Wife revision (1918) and commenting on the addition of the Edwardian society matter and the intensification of the anti-Catholicism in the revised Sister Teresa (1909)(3), on the whole seems to think that Moore's motives for revision were stylistic only. The Brook Kerith and Héloïse and Abélard revisions, at least, bear him out, Moore himself told Barrett Clark that he had just read parts of the original edition of The Brook Kerith and was shocked by the modernisms which "threw the book out of key"(4).

- 
1. op.cit., p.316.
  2. op.cit., p.347.
  3. ib.p.282.
  4. Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.87.

"There are entire passages that make my blood run cold." The book was written too hurriedly, he said, and so this was inevitable(1). "That is why I am always revising my early books(2)". He told Gosse - speaking about the final version (1927) - that much of the old text of The Brook Kerith had been rewritten because he had been tempted to make the writing worthy of the subject:

"Nobody in English ever attempted so lofty a subject in a prose narrative, and a lofty subject is a vanity if the execution is not on a par with the subject(3)."

- 
1. If the book was written in 14 or 15 months (see letter to Best, 121 Ebury Street, 11th October, 1917, National Library, Dublin, MS 3884) ten years were spent in revising it. In any case, it was revised considerably before its first publication. Moore wrote to C. K. Shorter, telling him that he had spent a fortune on proof correcting (121 Ebury Street, London, S.W., 7th March, 1916, National Library, Dublin, MS 2136. A further letter to Shorter, 121 Ebury Street, London, S.W., 7th November, 1916, mentions sending to him the MS of The Brook Kerith and the corrected proofs, without the chapter describing the wiving of the Essenes, which was written at the last moment when the book was in type), though in 1915 he had told Ross: "I do not see that I can improve it except in one place and there only slightly but in a work of art a slight improvement is a great gain..." (121 Ebury Street, S.W., Monday, 3rd April, 1915 . Margery Ross, op.cit., p.269.)
  2. Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.87.
  3. 121 Ebury Street, 28th June, 1927, Brotherton.

"I did shocking things in that book, and there remain even now many more changes to be made. Yeats, whose business it is to befog everything, told me when I was writing it that he hoped I would use the 'you' form and not the 'Thee' and 'Thou'. I wrote the first chapter that way and it was all, all wrong. What a hell of a time I had putting back the 'Thees' and 'Thous'!"(1)

Heloise and Abelard is in the same category(2). Other works, however, underwent more substantial changes.

Naturally, there were objections to this kind of rewriting. Desmond MacCarthy comments aptly:

"...such weeding is an endless task; and although a man may have spent the whole of yesterday removing small noxious plants, when glancing from his bedroom window next morning, his eyes are likely to be caught by a dandelion on the lawn(3)."

Susan Mitchell says that Moore's passion for rewriting led him astray in The Untilled Field: the first edition possessed a spontaneity and simplicity which are sometimes lost in the latest. Some of his favourite perversities were dragged in, she says - to no purpose, for they merely irritated, and broke up the form of the earlier and clearer narrative. The charm of The Wild Goose, she maintains, was a delicate thing which the 1914 edition of The Untilled Field shattered. She dislikes

1. Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.65.

2. ib. p.88.

3. Desmond MacCarthy, Portraits, p.201.

the concept of rewriting after years have passed: when we pull the structure to pieces, she says, something essential escapes(1). While one would not subscribe to her views on the revision of The Wild Goose, one can agree that her criticisms are, to a certain extent, justified. Frank Swinnerton once remarked that he never thought Moore improved his work by revision; so he left his own alone(2). Gosse, above all, points out the

1. Susan L. Mitchell, George Moore, Maunsell, Dublin, 1916, pp.74-5.
2. Frank Swinnerton, "Written Dialogue", The Writer, vol.17, no.1, n.s., January 1956, p.4. Others have been critical of Moore's method. Norman Anglin says that Moore revised his writings, but never mentions having revised his inspiration (Norman Anglin, "George Moore, Juvenal and Johnson", Manchester Quarterly, no. clvii, January 1921, p.33) and Harold Acton observes that his letters "exhale a fragrant human warmth which is absent from most of Moore's revised writing". (Harold Acton, "George Moore and the Cunard Family". Review of Nancy Cunard, GM: Memories of George Moore, London, 1956, and George Moore, Letters to Lady Cunard, 1895-1933, edited with introd. and notes by Rupert Hart-Davis, London, 1957. London Magazine, vol.5, no.3, March 1958, p.55.) And Norman Collins comments: "His industry has magnified itself in the public eye out of all proportion, and his name has shrunk in the public ear, until George Moore has become a sort of mythical solitary figure, a little shrunk with age and a little out of temper with the world, indefatigably crossing out, and rewriting and amending, in his quiet study in Ebury Street." (Norman Collins, The Facts of Fiction, London, Gollancz, 1932, p.257.)

follies of such revision. While allowing the scruples of the disinterested artist, Gosse objects first to the fact that the rewriting of books is a falsification of history; that the text does not represent the mood of the old time and must therefore be in discord with it and, in addition, with the new time. He argues that rewriting obscures Moore's development as a writer, the advances made since his earliest work. The imperfections of A Mummer's Wife, he says, add peculiar lustre to the beauty of The Brook Kerith:

"Yet when the author, to satisfy the craving for uniform perfection, 're-writes' in the language of 1920 what he composed in 1880, we lose all indication of development, and the gain is far less than would be the composition, in the hours so fantastically spent, of a new work of art, in spirit as well as form, appropriate to the author's maturity(1)."

Gosse raises also a further objection:

"...However generously the new wine is poured into the old bottle, there is always some old wine left in the bottle, and this produces a mixture of dubious gusto. These 'revised' and 're-written' chapters invariably present a confusion of styles, an irregularity of tone. The appended pages do not complete the design of the author, which ought to proceed, if he must be consistent, until nothing of the old is left."

---

1. One argument against this is that often Moore's inspiration really did lie in the corrections.

And he uses a graphic metaphor to illustrate his point:

"The revising author is faced by the familiar dilemma - if you get your umbrella re-covered and then introduce a fresh stick and handle, how much of the old umbrella survives?...we feel no certainty that he may not presently rip off the brown silk cover and give us a green bombazine in exchange(1)."

Moore's revisions, however, were not confined to improving the actual writing. Most of his later work included a rewriting of earlier books in the 'melodic line', oral narrative and 'imaginative reverie' manner, in an attempt to create prose approaching the condition of music(2). There is no doubt that Yeats influenced him here. Moore said that he and Yeats were professed re-writers(3). And Yeats himself states that Moore imitated his style(4). Susan Mitchell, too, says that Moore probably became infected with Yeats' passion for altering work. In his earlier books, she says, Moore was more occupied with matter than with manner but, in his later

1. Reference to Fragments from Héloïse and Abélard, London, Society for Irish Folklore, limited edition, 1921. (The Society was a fiction - see e.g. Hone, op.cit., p.343). All quotations from Gosse here are taken from More Books on the Table, pp.328-30.
2. For details, see Chapter V.
3. Letter from Moore to Mrs. (Nia) Crawford, 4 Upper Ely Place, Dublin, Monday, 1st July, 1901, National Library, Dublin, MS 2645.
4. See Autobiographies, p.438.

ones, manner predominated, so that the reader comes to doubt the author's inspiration(1). A. E. also influenced Moore here in the shaping of narrative towards an inevitable end without any author intervention or abrupt changes of narrative plane.

Malcolm Brown believes(2) that Moore developed a philosophy of revision, based on Gautier's dictum, "The correction of form is virtue"(3). He argues(4) that, "if the essence of the artistic experience is contained in the 'correction' of form, it follows that, the more correction expended, the greater the virtue." And this led, as with Flaubert, he says, to the doctrine of joyless work. Taking Gautier perhaps too literally, Brown says, Moore developed a philosophy of revision, which he came to consider not as a mechanical operation but as an essential, at times suggesting it was the only, creative act.

But it is Charles Morgan's little book that is the only fundamental study of Moore's style. Morgan puts a higher value on Moore's revisions than

1. op.cit., p.75. Two other writers, Malcolm Brown (op. cit.) and Charles Morgan (op.cit.), rightly give prominence to re-creation in the melodic line manner as Moore's motive for revision.

2. op.cit., p.45.

3. Moore often used the words - see e.g. Introductory note to The Untilled Field, London, Heinemann, Ebury edition, 1936.

4. ib. pp.44-5.

mere stylistic changes. They were designed, he says, to recreate himself and to exorcise 'Amico Moorini'(1). Moore's passion for self-renewal was to have been the theme of Morgan's biography(2). Nothing Moore wrote, says Morgan, was of value unless it was revised. Moreover, the immature artist was continually interfering even in his mature work. His early drafts "were not the imperfect beginnings of work that was recognizably a master's": after a mature passage would come a sentence out of a flashy novelette, pretentious, snobbish, sentimental, and hopelessly incompetent. And "in every book he wrote, George Moore went through the whole process of self-renewal: he went back to the beginning and taught himself to write all over again." If he relaxed a little, Amico crept in and then the book had to be rewritten. Those books which failed all attempts at revision were excluded from the 'canon'. This invasion of the new by the dead life was perpetual, and the history of this battle was seen in the revisions, which were not the result of a desire to give a new twist to a tale or paragraph. He was 51 before he wrote

- 
1. A term suggested by Moore himself, in the preface to the 1921 Lake, (see Ebury edition, Heinemann, 1936, p.ix) for the author of his inferior books.
  2. op.cit., p.8. The reasons why Morgan did not undertake the biography are given in his preface.

The Untilled Field and after this never wrote a bad book, though he still had to struggle against many of Amico's bad passages. His conflicts, as Morgan says, were more than the usual ups-and-downs of a literary life: his rewritings were dictated by the desire to silence the voice and eliminate the follies of the young man Shaw knew(1), who kept appearing until the end of his life. His later novels, especially, were a re-creation of his earlier work: in the same way, in his autobiographies, he re-created his own life(2).

Writing later, in 1952(3), Morgan added two further points. Part of the explanation of Amico, he says, was that Moore was a tragic writer in a comic mask, and that he was always a homeless exile. To escape this rootlessness, Morgan suggests, Moore took two contrary courses: in one mood, which finally prevailed, he went into company of real integrity; in another, he haunted first Romano's and the Gaiety Bar, and later, when he was successful, the houses of fashionable society hostesses, where he was expected to be the amusing and 'audacious Moore'. Ironically, and very unfortunately for Moore,

---

1. See Morgan, op.cit., pp.15-16.

2. ib. pp.8ff.

3. C. Morgan, "George Moore: A Centenary Appreciation", p.350.

it was the success of the wholesome, mature Esther Waters (1894) which brought him fame and entry into fashionable society, at the very time when he had fought his way out of immaturity. And, at first, Moore succumbed to its influence: his next books were Celibates and Evelyn Innes. (Morgan, perhaps, underestimates the fact that Moore had always(1) had this craving for 'society', recognition and popular success.)

Above all, then, Moore revised in order to reshape fundamentally his work: a factor omitted by nearly all critics, though Desmond MacCarthy notes something of it when he says: "George Moore is the only writer I know who has not been content with verbal correction, but has proceeded to rewrite from beginning to end what he had written(2)." A Modern Lover, A Drama in Muslin, John Norton, Mildred Lawson, Evelyn Innes, Sister Teresa, Emma Bovary, The Wild Goose and The Lake were, in their various ways, with different degrees of success, and for diverse reasons, fundamentally rewritten(3).

- 
1. cf. e.g., Confessions, London, Swan Sonnenschein, 1888, and his letters throughout the 1880s.
  2. Desmond MacCarthy, "George Moore as a Critic". Review of Conversations in Ebury Street, London, Heinemann, revised ed., 1930, Sunday Times, 23rd March, 1930, p.8.
  3. In addition to these reasons (and the removal of influences - see below Chapter III), there were various immediate inducements to revision: for example, the final version of Evelyn Innes for a Hachette translation, Evelyn Innes/Sister Teresa for Fleischel and the preparation of books for the Carra, Uniform and Ebury editions.

Despite the variety of motives suggested for Moore's rewritings, critics have, at least, been aware of the problem. Geraint Goodwin, a 'disciple' of Moore, tells us that Moore wondered how he could write so fast:

"With him there was the endless process of correction. The first draft was nothing, nothing at all(1)."

Moore's friends speak of the same dedication. J-E. Blanche writes, in More Portraits of a Lifetime (1918-38):

"His articles on art, his essays, his published books, were all served up anew. He bestowed infinite care on them, like a man who considers that every single line he has written, apart from his important works, is of permanent value(2)."

According to Marjorie Battock the description of Derby Day(3) in Esther Waters was written forty times.

- 
1. Geraint Goodwin, Call Back Yesterday, London, Cape, 1935, p.197.
  2. London, Dent, 1939, p.87. Translation by Walter Clement of Mes Modèles, Paris, Stock, 1928. (Incorporated articles from Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 16th June, 1928, p.6 and 23rd June, 1928, p.6).
  3. Uniform edition, vol.4, London, 1952, chs. 32 and 33.

At the end of his life, old and sick,

"He went on suffering and writing. He was advised to rest, but he declared that he must go on and correct his books, for to him each book might be bettered(1)."

However, Moore's own statements, in his prefaces, letters, articles and autobiographical works, instead of clarifying the issues, merely add to the prevailing confusion so that it is impossible to ascertain from them a consistent principle of revision in his work. Sometimes, he misleads by the deliberate omission of facts. For example, in the preface to the revised Lake (1921)(2), he states that, if certain of his books are ever printed, they must be issued as the work of Amico Moorini: these include Mike Fletcher(3), Vain Fortune(4), Parnell and his Island(5), some plays and his two volumes of verse(6). But no mention is made of A Mere Accident(7): perhaps he thought it too bad even for Moorini. Again, in A Communication to my Friends(8), there is no mention of any

1. Sir William Geary, 1928. See Hone, op.cit., p.428.
2. London, Heinemann, Ebury edition, 1936, p.ix.
3. London, Ward and Downey, 1889.
4. London, Henry, 1891.
5. London, Swan Sonnenschein, 1887.
6. Flowers of Passion, London, Provost, 1878, and Pagan Poems, London, Newman, 1881.
7. London, Vizetelly, 1887.
8. With A Mummer's Wife, London, Heinemann, Ebury edition, 1937.

novel between A Mummer's Wife and Esther Waters(1):

A Drama in Muslin, A Mere Accident, Mike Fletcher and Vain Fortune are ignored, thus deliberately creating the impression that A Mummer's Wife (1885) was followed by Esther Waters (1894).

Sometimes, Moore is misleading in other ways. Ave contains a statement about Esther Waters which suggests that the first revision (1899) is more important than it actually is:

"One reads when the passion of composition is over and on the proofs of the original edition one correction alone amounted to the striking out of some twenty or thirty pages(2), and the writing in of as many more new pages, and there were many others nearly as important, for proofs always inspire me, and the enchanted period lasts until the bound copy arrives. Esther Waters was no exception...(3)."

He overstates again in the Advertisement to In Single Strictness(4), where he says that the stories are all new except for ten or twelve pages borrowed from Celibates.

At times, he indulges in blatant falsehood. In the Preface to Muslin, he says that he has re-read A Drama in Muslin,

1. Except the reference, in a footnote, (p.LV,) to Spring Days, and the statement that a few minor things have been omitted.
2. 1894, ch.34 (pp.271-4) and 2½ pp. of ch.35 (pp.275-7). These were not replaced.
3. London, Heinemann, Uniform edition, vol.8, 1947, p.60. 1st vol. of the Hail and Farewell trilogy. 1899 is in fact a hasty, botched revision.
4. London, Heinemann, 1922, p.VII.

"and it needs hardly any editing. A mere re-tying of a few bows that the effluxion of time has untied, or were never tied by the author, who, if I remember right, used to be less careful of his literary appearance than his prefacer, neglecting to examine his sentences, and to scan them as often as one might expect from an admirer, not to say disciple, of Walter Pater(1)."

He then proceeded to carry out wholesale recasting.

Further, he states that A Drama in Muslin was followed by Confessions of a Young Man, thus omitting A Mere Accident, and then gives the impression that Spring Days was followed by Esther Waters(2).

Nor are the fantasies, in his prefaces, about how he came to revise specific books necessarily to be credited(3).

Worse, Moore's statements, and his practice, are often contradictory. Sometimes, he condemns any revision other than stylistic improvement; at other times, he writes a new novel, with a new title, on the old theme(4). In the

1. London, Heinemann, 1915, p.vii.
2. ib., p.vii.
3. See e.g. Evelyn Innes, London, Unwin Adelphi Library, 1908, Spring Days, London, Laurie, 1912 and Muslin, London, Heinemann, 1915. Again, his estimates of the quality of his own work vary considerably; he admitted, "...my opinion regarding my own work is of no value." (Prefatory note to Vain Fortune, London, W. Scott, 1895, p.vii).
4. A Modern Lover (1883) - Lewis Seymour and Some Women (1917); A Mere Accident (1887) - John Norton in Celibates (1895) - Hugh Monfert in In Single Strictness (1922).

Colloquy to Esther Waters, he states that he has revised the book many times, to which the reply comes:

"Thy revisions were limited to the smoothing out of a rugged sentence, and not wishing to seem unfilial in thine eyes, I let thee have thy way with me as a dandy might allow his valet to remove a speck from his embroidered waistcoat, but beware! any larger licence I cannot permit ... I belong to the nineteenth century. All its ideas are incarnate in me... (1)."

But elsewhere, Moore went in for wholesale rebuilding, reconstruction and recasting. The Wild Goose and The Lake were recreated wholly in the style of 'imaginative reverie'; the early naturalistic novels, A Mummer's Wife and A Drama in Muslin, together with A Mere Accident, were purged of large sections of Zolasque material; Vain Fortune was recast twice; while Evelyn Innes/Sister Teresa was rewritten nine times in a vain effort to mould it into shape.

Sometimes, Moore admired others' skill. In an article on Zola's La Bête Humaine (2), he observes that, looking through a revised edition of La Curée, he was struck with the taste and dexterity with which the

1. Uniform edition, vol.4, London, Heinemann, 1952, p.ix.
2. "The Human Animal", The Hawk, vol.5, no.111, 18th March, 1890, p.314.

sentences had been drawn together, with every useless locution suppressed. And he told Gosse:

"You wrote the letter I received yesterday without hesitation, without a correction, a feat more difficult for my mind to entertain than the composition of Hamlet ...A thing only begins to be mine when it has been rewritten four times - you attain yourself at the first bound. How I envy you(1)."

At times, he was depressed:

"To weed a garden so thoroughly that no weed is left behind is impossible, and the reviser of an old text is much the same(2)."

"...the worst of rewriting is that it makes no difference. You suppress whole chapters and write others and yet the book remains the same: neither better nor worse(3)."

"God it is difficult to write well I am at my third or is it the fourth writing of a chapter...(4)."

On other occasions he was half-critical of his own method:

1. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, Sunday, 7th April, 1919, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134, Ashley Library. Moore's letters to Gosse at the National Library, Dublin, are transcripts; those at the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds, are originals.
2. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, Monday, 27th March, 1917, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134. Ashley Library. About A Modern Lover/Lewis Seymour and Some Women.
3. Letter to his brother, Maurice, King's Bench Walk, Temple, 16th December, 1893, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646, after having rewritten the second part of Esther Waters on the proofs.
4. Letter to Maurice, 121 Ebury Street, S.W., 19th April, 1912, National Library, Dublin, MS 2647. About Hail and Farewell.

"'It is a book I hope you will spend a good deal of time upon; not rewriting it as I rewrite my books, for that is madness, Never do that()!'"

More frequently, he strongly defended his practice:

"People tell me not to revise my old books; but am I to allow them to stand as they are? Dear, no(2).."

"I can always improve, my second and third thoughts alone are valid(3).."

Sheer necessity drove him on:

"The proofs(4)", he wrote to Nancy Cunard, "I cannot send you - I rewrite the book on the proof sheets. My books begin to exist when the revise comes in(5)."

And he told Barrett Clark:

"I shudder to think what anyone would say if he saw the first dictated drafts of The Brook Kerith and Héloïse. Inconceivably bad, clumsy, childish. I have to write and rewrite and revise before I can turn out anything halfway decent. Writing in longhand is hardest for me, but even dictating is difficult. You will notice how much better my typed letters are than those in longhand(6).."

1. Letter to James Huneker about the latter's book on Liszt. Franz Liszt, Chapman & Hall, London and N.Y., 1911. See J. G. Huneker, Steeplejack, London, Laurie, (Scribners, N.Y.), 1921, 2 vols, II, p.232.
2. Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.66.
3. Concerning Aphrodite in Aulis. Letter to John Eglinton, 121 Ebury Street, 15th November, 1929. Letters of George Moore, introduction by Eglinton, Svedenham, Bournemouth, 1942, p.85.
4. i.e. of The Lake.
5. Sat. (August-September 1905), Hotel Continental, Paris. George Moore. Letters to Lady Cunard, 1895-1933, p.46.
6. op.cit., p.116.

Statement after statement reveals a recognition of his need to revise:

"I am a victim to the disease of rewriting(1)."

"I have no idea yet if it is a good article. I have only dictated it, it is not yet written(2)."

"My manuscripts are never much more than shadows of the final text(3)."

"Today I am convinced that I have written another masterpiece", but tomorrow he will wish to alter it(4).

"My manuscript is usually corrected so much, so blotted and so scarred that I should not like to send you anything so ugly as my first attempts(5)."

Statement after statement reveals his high opinion of

1. Prefatory note to Vain Fortune, London, Scott, 1895, p.vi.
2. Letter to Mrs. Nia Crawford, 4 Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 27th July, 1901, National Library, Dublin, MS 2645. About his article on Tolstoy for "Avowals", Pall Mall magazine, vol.33, May-August 1904, ch.3, pp.70-77, ch.4, pp.234-40. Later rewritten in Avowals, Society for Irish Folklore, Limited edition, London, 1919, chs. 5, 6 and 7.
3. About The Untilled Field. Letter to Max Meyerfield, 4 Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 24th July, 1902, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460.
4. About The Apostle. Revised (limited) edition, London, Heinemann, 1923. Letter to Nancy Cunard, 121 Ebury Street, 25th February, 1923, National Library, Dublin, MS 2648.
5. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, 17th October, 1917, B.M. MS B 3672. He once told Gosse that he loved the proofs and loathed the printed book (letter to Gosse, 8 King's Bench Walk, Temple, 8th June, 1895, B.M. MS B 1189) and this remained true.

the value of revision. He told W. L. Phelps:

"Just as I believe the worst of all sins is bad writing, so I believe the highest virtue is found in corrections, in an author's revisions. If you wish to estimate the true value of an author's art, study his revisions(1)."

And in the preface to the 1917 edition of Esther Waters he wrote:

"It would perhaps be presumptuous to refer to these revisions were it not that it is these very revisions that in a measure rescue my book from the chaos of cheap publications(2)."

He did indeed go so far as to believe that inspiration has no part except in corrections, that some writers' inspiration comes in the rewriting. Anatole France's one virtue lay here: "All that is invaluable in any work comes", he said, "in the corrections(3)." And he justified himself by reference to France's continual dictation to Brousson, and to the first and second drafts of Shelley's Epipsychedion which showed, said Moore, "that Shelley's inspiration came in the corrections(4)." And yet, periodically, he would appear

1. W. L. Phelps, Autobiography with Letters, N.Y., O.U.P., 1939, ch. 89, Moore, p. 820.
2. Brentano, N.Y., p. viii.
3. G. Goodwin, Conversations with George Moore, London, Benn, 1929, pp. 73-4.
4. See Goodwin, Conversations with George Moore, p. 74.

even publicly to express doubts about the validity of his method, as when he asked the reviewer to be "indulgent for my weakness or my strength, whichever it may be(1)." Even if we do not accept this at its face value - and we must always beware of irony in Moore - it is clear that he must often have felt certain weaknesses in his position vis-a-vis the public: hence his attempts at self-justification in terms of the practice of other writers.

He kept nagging away at this in his prefaces:

"Whether it be altogether seemly for an author to revise books that have been issued to the public is a question often raised in the newspapers: raised, but not settled, for authors go on just as they began, some revising and some refraining from revisions, according to their temperaments(2)."

Of friends who criticised his habit of rewriting, he said:

"A prejudice exists, I know, against the re-writing of books - my friends' faces change expression when I tell them that I have laid aside a new book to re-write old ones; and, though they say nothing, fearing to discourage, it is quite clear that they think I am following a will-o'-the-wisp or am running to seed. They may be right in one or the other, perhaps in both suppositions, but their knowledge of the practice of the masters seems a little vague; and it would be a pleasant and profitable task to go to a library and thumb the whole subject out of encyclopedias and tomes, climbing

1. Preface to Evelyn Innes, popular edition, London, Unwin, 1901, p.vii.
2. Preface to Fragments from Héloïse and Abélard, p.5.

ladders, taking notes, and then compiling a learned article out of much material, showing how all the ancient masters revised their books again and again, their work gaining substance and beauty in every revision(1)."

In the preface to the 1899 edition of Esther Waters, he stated, more precisely, that he had followed the practice of such writers as Shakespeare, Goethe, Balzac, Wordsworth and Yeats(2). And in the preface to the 1901 Evelyn Innes(3), he complained that he could not understand why, in view of the example of this distinguished band, "the alteration of a published text is deprecated in the Press." Similarly, in the preface to the Fragments of Héloïse and Abelard(4), after having explained the new revised parts, he mentioned - in the most naive manner - his authorities:

"But why all this fuss about an additional chapter and the revision of Astrolabe's speech? Have all you who write in newspapers forgotten that Balzac revised and rewrote, yet his works have lived longer than those of George Sand, who neither revised nor corrected? Wagner forgot to write the rushing passage for violins that takes Elizabeth down from her throne to the unfortunate Tannhauser, whose praise of Venus has roused the citizens to fury. It did not satisfy the French musicians who assembled in the Opera House to hear it in 1862, but it

1. Preface to Evelyn Innes, 1908, pp.vi-vii.
2. London, Walter Scott, sixpenny edition. Repeated in 1917 edition, Brentano, N.Y., p.viii.
3. p.vii.
4. p.6.

satisfies those who come after them.  
Landor revised - but why continue a  
list that does not pretend to be  
exhaustive?"

As Gosse points out, none of Landor's extensions to the text constitutes a rewriting of a book in Moore's sense(1).

In his later phase, especially, Moore's revisions are very closely linked up with his unique method of work.

He tells us:

"I dictated 2,000 words every day my preparation before writing. I look upon dictation as a sort of superior thinking(2)."

As Frank Harris says:

"Moore will not study, and cannot read authorities; yet he is industrious in his own way. His method of writing is laborious in the extreme. Before beginning he makes a scenario, divided into chapters, then he writes the book hastily chapter by chapter, putting in all his chief ideas; finally he goes over the whole book, re-writing it as carefully as he can(3)."

When he did run off a story or article at a sitting, he was immensely pleased with himself. He boasted that the

1. E. Gosse, More Books on the Table, pp.330-331.
2. Aut. letter from Moore to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, Tuesday, 12th September, 1918, Brotherton Library, Leeds.
3. c.time of Héloïse and Abélard? See Hone, op.cit., p.353.

first pages of A Story-Teller's Holiday (1918) were to be published as they were originally written, "a rare instance in my literary life(1)"; was thrilled with his advertisement for In Single Strictness (1922): "I dictated it, and got it right the first time(2)"; and wrote in ecstasy to Gosse in 1927:

"For thirty years I have been dictating, and the story I enclose is the only successful dictation - my yoe lamb dictated in two mornings, reeled off whilst standing (sic) on the hearth-rug(3)."

In conversations with Goodwin, he tells us more about his method:

"...the first process is rubbish. What I dictate is nothing at all. It is only after two or three times that I even begin to recognise it. The first thing in writing, to my mind, is a conception of the scene - the environment, the planning of it, the proportioning of it in regard to itself and the story of which it is a part. It is easy enough to write when you have it before you. But I have to try several times before I can get that. I must get it into my head - no, take possession of it ... Afterwards comes the choice of words, the felicitous phrases, the conception of the scene - how much to put in and how much to leave out - since no scene is to be isolated but all must depend on each ... But ... there are no manuscripts. It's impossible to say just when the finished thing takes shape(4)."

1. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, Monday, 22nd October, 1917, Brotherton Library.
2. Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.116.
3. 121 Ebury Street, 4th June, 1927, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.
4. G. Goodwin, Conversations with George Moore. pp.108-9.

His conversations with Barrett Clark, too, throw interesting light on his dictation:

"(Moore) remarked that he found it easy to dictate, especially his first drafts. He merely gets his ideas down in this way, in order that he may know what to discard and what to use. As a rule he cannot dictate at first even a paragraph that will satisfy him. It must be gone over and over again to make it right - ready for publication. 'Can you imagine,' he asked, 'dictating all the descriptions in a novel, and all the dialogue, everything in its proper order, with due regard for balance, turning out so much a day, day in and day out, shutting off the tap at four o'clock and starting in again next morning? Oh, out of the question! I couldn't do that. I have to write and rewrite, scratch out, revise, dictate, re-dictate. What I have set down upon paper at first is hardly more than a skeleton of what will remain as the finished product. Many pages of what I publish have been pulled to pieces and revised twenty times, at the very least<sup>(1)</sup>'".

Important though dictation was, Moore insisted that it served only a preliminary function. He told Beverley Nichols:

"I hear strange stories about my methods of writing. I am told, for instance, that some of my books have been entirely dictated. That is not so. I may dictate a story, of course, after it has for a long time been working in my mind, but I only do so in order to obtain a rough outline of it. No. Even that is not true. I dictate it in order that I may not be entirely idle. Were I to sit in

---

1. op.cit., p.72.

this room alone, I might well be wondering if I should have sufficient energy to write for half an hour after tea. The presence of another person spurs me on. But I never publish a dictated word. I may dictate a second time from the first draft, but afterwards I write and re-write over and over again until I am satisfied. And even then I make extensive alterations on my proofs(1)."

Charles Morgan gives us more precise details of this method:

"In his later years he worked by dictating to short-hand. The passage was typed, read by him, and, to some extent, revised with the pen. Then he would go to his secretary again, and with the typed draft on his knee, re-dictate, not only elaborating and expanding as Balzac did in proof, but often using the draft for no more than a sentence or two and giving to his secretary, who was sometimes distracted by his drifting to and fro, what was in effect a new draft unconnected with the old. The process was then repeated, and repeated again and again, the structure of the story itself as well as the forms of expression being built up as the revisions continued(2)."

Morgan's reference to 'later years' is perhaps misleading. Shawe-Taylor says that Moore acquired his first secretary during his Irish period, and suggests that this was perhaps one of the sources of Moore's discovery of oral narrative, in that his thoughts flowed more easily in dictation than in silent composition(3).

- 
1. Beverley Nichols, op.cit., pp.258-9.
  2. op.cit., pp.9-10.
  3. Hone, op.cit., p.469.

Letters to his painter friends, too, give us insight into Moore's practice. He wrote to Ross:

"I am leaving the new story for you - a rough text it is true, but one that contains everything essential. Your blue pencillings of weak passages will enable me to produce a finished text quickly. You see the last pages were only written this morning and some time ought to elapse before the final revision. Your criticism will be as good as three months and will enable me to see the story in perspective(1)."

And Blanche, paraphrasing a letter received from Moore, 'circa' 1917, tells us that Moore's system had a mathematical severity which he advocated also for Blanche's writings on art. However short the title, review, essay or novel, the composition should always be firm in line, "like one of Ingres's pictures":

"There should be no haste in writing, each paragraph should be set out beforehand, each chapter arranged according to a logical scheme, and each subject should be exhausted before another was approached(2)."

Understanding of his method of work helps us to see exactly how Moore carried out his revisions.

Heloise and Abélard provides a good example. In 1918, Moore was 'dreaming' the book(3). Each day he dictated

1. 121, Ebury Street, S.W., 15th December, 1917. Margery Ross, op.cit., p.321. About A Story-Teller's Holiday.
2. J-E. Blanche, Portraits of a Lifetime, London, Dent, 1937, p.151. Blanche's quotation marks.
3. The story was in his mind as early as 1895. See Celibates, London, W. Scott, 1895, p.451.

1500-2000 words of 'rigmarole'. He did not look at the day's results: dictation made him familiar with the story and helped him to 'write' it more successfully later. He told Mrs. Williamson(1):

"My life passes by in loneliness and composition. I see hardly anybody, nobody, for long but my secretary... Heloise and Abélard is the theme of my dictations; and these are continued without interruptions and are locked away in a closet as soon as transcribed for my plan is to proceed with scarcely more knowledge of the furrow behind me than the ox. I am told that the dictations read very pleasantly lapsing occasionally into rigmarole which is inevitable; I am not credulous but the story seems to shape itself easily and well. I recognise good material in it and ask myself if I shall be able to write it adequately when the year of writing comes to pass..."

The 'preparatory cartoon' was nearly complete, Moore wrote to Best on 24th October, 1919(2), and Best was once again asked to read the proofs: in a year's time, with a fee.

"I rewrite my books on the proofs," wrote Moore, "but I cannot correct proofs."

Best(3) offered to undertake the task as a labour of love but, characteristically, received no reply. Moore was undoubtedly immersed in his book. He wrote to Mark Fisher(4):

1. Undated letter. See Hone, op.cit., p.352.
2. 121 Ebury Street, National Library, Dublin, MS 3884.
3. See pencil note to the above letter.
4. 121 Ebury Street, 21st April, 1920, National Library, Dublin, MS 1596.

"I do nothing and think of nothing but Héloïse and Abélard. A man who sets out to write an epical story is really not master of his own life; he thinks all day of what he is writing and goes to bed thinking of what he has written and what he will write in the morning. This is my last long book and as soon as it is finished I shall be able to give my attention to other things."

The historical background presented endless difficulties, and as usual he applied to various quarters for information. Mrs. Crawford helped him considerably with the setting(1). He wrote to her from 121 Ebury Street, 8th January, 1918,(2), saying that he did not think the story could be moulded into artistic shape: it seemed suddenly to turn into odds and ends, into history. Letter after letter showed him struggling through his difficulties, speaking of abandoning the project, and reproaching her for not sending immediately the advice he needed. No sooner was the book published than he brought out Fragments

- 
1. See the series of letters at National Library, Dublin, MS 2645.
  2. National Library, Dublin, MS 2645.

from Héloïse and Abélard (1921)(1), and, four years later,

---

1. Society for Irish Folklore. Quinn, op.cit., item 6757, mentions Héloïse and Abélard, 2 vols., London, priv. printed, 1921, 1st ed., 1500 copies, with the Fragments included. The actual changes in the Fragments are few. Vol.2 of the 1921 edition, p.25, becomes Fragments, pp. 9-18 - pages which were later included (with very slight alterations - e.g. Héloïse's eyes change from brown to grey) in the 1925 edition (pp.255-264). This additional passage reveals a significant part of Héloïse's character: her great love for Abélard, which overrides her fear of the Canon, conventional morality and the world's opinion. It is she who comes to his room, and she who detains him in hers. The passage indicates strongly the pagan in her, by contrast with the Christian in Abélard. This conception is underlined in Moore's letter to Eglinton, 21st July, 1920 (op.cit., p.54), and the central theme is thus strengthened. Astrolabe becomes more credible. The 1921 version's vague hedgehog simile (vol.2, pp.138-9, becomes Fragments, p.19 - 1925, p.369) is expanded into his personal anecdote of Chenniez's finding a hedgehog in a ditch and putting him into a tub of water to make him swim; an episode which adds realism and humour to his portrait. He alone relates in the third person the whole story of Perronik, and his tale is told, in short sentences, more dramatically than is usual in Moore (1921, vol.2, pp.140-142 becomes Fragments, pp.19-21. Retained with only slight alterations in 1925 - pp.271-3). He is made less precocious. It is Madelon, not Astrolabe, who is credited in the revision with the remark that, where there is a helmet there is a head. And language is simplified: "She beguiled them to ride" becomes "She was very clever and promised to wed the one who could ride..." "Have my life" becomes "kill him". "For long whiles" becomes "for a very long time". "Make off" becomes "run away"; "evil" becomes "wicked"; "cut away the bark" becomes "chopped a big hole in the bark"; "whole suit" becomes "big suit"; "in mother's story" becomes "mother says"; "he took jump after jump" becomes "he jumped and jumped his horse"; "great shriek" becomes "big cry"; "I think" is inserted at one point; and "upheld" becomes "hold up". (The speech of Astrolabe in other parts of the book did not seem to require alteration in the revision, probably because it was sufficiently simple in short passages; whereas the length of the story of Perronik showed up the precocity). Moore's remark in the preface to the Fragments (p.6) that he rewrote the dialogue for a younger child is, in effect, an evasion of the fact that, in the first version, he wrote hardly at all in a child's language.

a further revision(1).

In order to understand fully his changing enthusiasms and his search for a perfection which he failed to discover in English fiction, we must examine next Moore's theories of the novel.

---

1. London, Heinemann, Uniform edition, 1925. In a letter to Gosse (121 Ebury Street, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134) 10th December, 1921(?), Moore wrote that he would have to correct the book; and in a further letter to the same correspondent (121 Ebury Street, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134) on 22nd June, 1922(?), he mentions the proofs of the revised edition: "I shall never do as well again, which is sad." Changes, other than those appearing in the Fragments, are made, but they are merely slight verbal alterations.

CHAPTER IIMOORE'S THEORY OF PROSE FICTION AND NON-FICTION

Moore believed(1) that the English novel was the

---

1. We must never, of course, take Moore too seriously. Often he commented on books that he had not read. For example, he mentions, in Conversations in Ebury Street, that Silas Marner is less purposeful than Daniel Deronda, only to reveal a page or two later that he has never read the latter. (Conversations in Ebury Street, London, Heinemann, Ebury edition, 1936, pp.61, 63.) He held Mrs. Gaskell to be the most commonplace of all writers: but he had read only Phyllis (sic) (Conversations in Ebury Street, p.218). In Avowals, he tells us that Prevost does not describe Manon, but that he is always before us because the author realised him intensely (Avowals, London, Society for Irish Folklore, Limited edition, p.19); yet in a letter to Gosse (121 Ebury Street, 3rd November, 1912, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134, Moore says that he read only half a dozen pages and then lost the book. He criticised Butler as a bore without having read him (see J-E. Blanche, Portraits of a Lifetime, p.145). And, in spite of his scathing criticism of Proust, according to James Whitall he had "probably not read as much as a paragraph of his writing and refused all my offers to lend him the volumes, giving excellent reasons for so doing." (James Whitall, English Years, London, Cape, 1936, pp.307-8). When his reading of a book is fresh in his mind - e.g. Sense and Sensibility (see Avowals, 1919, pp.37ff.) - his criticism is detailed and often good. Far too often, however, he deals in distant memories of sampled works and so his comments degenerate into generalities. Max Beerbohm (A Christmas Garland, pp.181-2.) satirises effectively, and with little exaggeration, Moore's attitude to other writers: he has just heard of Dickens, is sick of worshipping false gods, Zola and Yeats - Dickens is the only doorstep worth scrubbing - Moore does not know if he wrote many books - it is enough that he wrote Pickwick - he has read only one chapter - but Dickens is better than Balzac etc. All of which shows that many of Moore's judgments must be treated with reserve and all his changing enthusiasms sifted with care. Many of his opinions undoubtedly came from his 'aestheticising' with his fellows, and not from his own reading.

product(1) of second-rate minds working on secondary ideas(2). It was the weakest part of our literature: "silly", "illiterate", "sentimental", "erudite", "pompous"(3), "subaltern"(4), "mindless"(5), "a hackney"(6), "mercenary" and "child of our middle age"(7). English

---

1. He maintained that the Slav and the Celt dealt with primary ideas, until he remembered Scott and R. L. Stevenson - See "Since the Elizabethans", Cosmonopolis, London, vol.4, no.10, October 1896, p.42.
2. In later years Moore said that the writer was not expected to put his best thoughts into the novel. (See J. L. Balderston, "The Freedom of the Pen. A Conversation with George Moore", Fortnightly Review, n.s. CII, no.DCX, 1st October, 1917, p.540. Rewritten in Avowals, 1919, ch.3.)
3. Avowals, London, Society for Irish Folklore, 1919, p.16.
4. "Some Characteristics of English Fiction", North American Review, vol.CLXX, January 1900, p.506.
5. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, Pimlico, S.W., 3rd November, 1912, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.
6. Avowals, 1919, p.6.
7. "Some Characteristics of English Fiction", pp.506-7.

genius, he maintained, went into poetry(1). True, the essay, because of Pater, Landor and De Quincey, had a high place in his esteem; but the novel had never been more than drawing-room entertainment(2). It was never serious and never intended to help us understand life; it dealt only in externals and superficialities, never stretching our minds or widening our perceptions. England, unlike France and Russia(3), had produced no great tragic novelist, because manners, not passions, had been our main concern(4).

---

1. This theory was first propounded in "Since the Elizabethans", though in Avowals (1919), whose aim was to search for a "first-rate mind expressing itself in English prose narrative", (Avowals, 1919, p.15. See also letter to Gosse, 18th March, 1918, Brotherton. "Remember that my intention is explicit - that no first-class mind has expressed itself in prose narrative") the idea is attributed to Gosse: "English genius expressed itself so fully in poetry that very little was left over to sustain and dignify the other arts" (Avowals, 1919, p.45. See also letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, 20th March (no year), Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134: "It was you Gosse, I answer that first wrote that English genius went into poetry - my paper is but an extension of that idea... I am so much out of sympathy with English fiction - I hardly dare to write English prose narrative - that I am unable to find dialogue for you that would seem to you adequate.") The fact that Moore's private and public pronouncements are alike indicate that the latter are to be trusted.
2. "The Freedom of the Pen", p.539.
3. It was Zola and the Russian novelists who gave Moore this belief in serious fiction, Zola even maintaining that the novel should be the handmaiden of Science - a theory to which Moore for a time subscribed.
4. North American Review, 1900, p.517.

Above all, the English novel was not a contribution to art; no novelist had been able to manage a story reasonably throughout(1) and none had given the novel organic wholeness(2). For this reason, Moore declared(3), he returned to England in 1880 with the avowed intention of founding the English 'aesthetic' novel(4) and winning freedom for English fiction(5):

"I left France for England", he told W. L. Phelps, with characteristic overstatement, "with only one purpose, to write the aesthetic novel. The artistic novel in Victorian days did not exist in England. Thackeray, Dickens and George Eliot wrote novels about various classes of people,

1. Letter to Eglinton, 9th January, 1917, op.cit., p.38.
2. Pater always excepted.
3. An afterthought of later years, of course: lack of spending money was the real cause - see Hone, op.cit. pp.80ff.
4. See Goodwin, Conversations, p.58. At the very end of his life, he reiterated that the task he had imposed on himself was to write 'art narratives' - see letter to L. Gillet, 10th March, 1932, G-P. Collet, "Louis Gillet et George Moore", Etudes anglaises, August 1953, p.253.
5. Statement to Zola. See J. Eglinton, "Recollections of George Moore", pp.98-9.  
Note that the observations which follow apply largely to Moore's whole career. True, he began with Naturalism (itself concerned with form as the English novel was not), and emerged finally as a 'melodic line' stylist. The principles underlying his numerous phases and discipleships, however, remained basically the same. Throughout his whole career, with ever-increasing dogmatism, he believed in form, and, consequently, held that the English novel was largely worthless.

but they were all afflicted with a conscience; they had a moral bias, fatal to art. Nearly all Englishmen are cursed with a conscience - it is a bad thing to have. In the ordinary sense of those words, I have no religion and no morality. The Victorians never wrote exclusively from the standpoint of pure art, to tell the truth about men and women as they really are, with no regard to conventions. I did this. I founded the artistic novel in England, and after a long struggle, won my battle. It has been my whole life's work(1)."

Unity of theme was of prime importance to Moore(2): there must be no digressions(3), and every part must be strictly related to the central motive. Art, he wrote in the Confessions, is a "rhythmical sequence of events described with rhythmical sequence of phrase" (4). The selection and arrangement of material, the planning and proportioning of environment in relation to the story: these were his constant concern(5). "The art of prose narrative", he wrote to Evelyn Moore, "is in selection and arrangement(6)". Gosse was told to reshape the end of his Memoirs:

1. W. L. Phelps, op.cit., p.822.
2. Goodwin, Conversations, p.89.
3. Goodwin, Conversations, p.62. For melodic line digressions, see Chapter V.
4. Confessions, p.136.
5. Goodwin, Conversations, pp.108-110.
6. 121, Ebury Street, 15th March, 1923, National Library Dublin, MS 2648.

"There is one thing I do know and that is how a book should shape itself(1)."

Maurice Moore had a similar lecture about his life of their father: much of the election material must be omitted and G. H. Moore must not go East:

"... the interest of narrative depends entirely on sequence. The moment you break the sequence that moment the interest begins to droop(2)."

Moore's passion for unity was fanatical. Yeats tells us that for construction

"he would sacrifice what he had thought the day before not only his best scene but 'the best scene in any modern play', and without regret: all must receive its being from the central idea, nothing be in itself anything. He would have been a master of construction, but that his practice as a novelist made him long for descriptions and reminiscences....(3)"

Exposition was Moore's greatest stumbling-block. He wrote to Gosse in 1921:

"To allow the subject to emerge like a cloud, to tell the reader everything he need to know about the people and no more, and to do this without showing one's hand, is what you do unfailingly and with ease and what I do with great difficulty.... My difficulties end with

1. Letter to Gosse, 4 Upper Ely Place, Dublin, Wednesday, 4th December, 1906, Brotherton. See also ditto, 15th November, 1907, 4 Upper Ely Place, Dublin, Brotherton.
2. Letter to Maurice, 121 Ebury Street, S.W., 24th August, 1912, National Library, Dublin, MS 2647.
3. W. B. Yeats, Autobiographies, p.436.

the launching of the story; as soon as it is launched I have little difficulty. But oh! these first chapters(1)".

It was because he always wrote with the end in view, he told Nancy Cunard, that he had such great difficulties with the opening chapters:

"It is only by vain writing that the subject becomes us. I have tried to get out my first chapter of the story I related to you many times - ten or a dozen times and it is only beginning to yield to my iterated attacks. The difficulty of story writing is the even distribution of the theme throughout the chapters. My difficulty is always with the first two or three chapters, most people (sic) with the last; and the explanation of this is that I always write with the end in view, almost gluttonously like a child at the cake during dinner. And the moral of all this is that you must take the muse by force. In love we woo at intervals, but in art we are always wooers(2)."

His difficulties with exposition persisted to the end of his life; when Aphrodite in Aulis was eventually tamed, he was exultant over the first chapter,

"which gave me a great deal of trouble, but which I mastered in the end, and it is now as good as I can make it, of that I am sure(3)".

1. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, 9th December, 1921, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.
2. Letter to Nancy Cunard, 121 Ebury Street, 13th August, 1921, National Library, Dublin, MS 2648. The dates of this letter would seem to indicate that it refers to the revised Lake, but this cannot be so, because the exposition is so little altered.
3. Letter to S. Atchley, 27th October, 1927, "Letters from George Moore". The Greek Background of Aphrodite in Aulis", annotated by P. J. Dixon, London Mercury, vol.31, November 1934, p.19.

Endings were different:

"The ends of stories have no difficulties for me; the end leads me as a magnet leads. But the beginnings are terrible, and it is the beginnings of stories that will eventually compel me to leave off writing stories(1)."

He told Beverley Nichols:

"Whatever else people may say about my stories, ...they cannot deny that the endings are good. I have always the end in view. I do not read many modern novels, but in those which come my way I am constantly noting that the author does not end a story so much as leave it off. He merely ceases to write, leaving the characters still to work out their destinies, the issues to determine themselves. I could not possibly write a story in that manner. If I did not know how my story was going to end, I could not write it at all. Often, while I have been writing, and have felt weary, or uncertain as to how it was going to turn out, I have been buoyed up and encouraged simply by the thought of the ending(2)."

On the other hand, according to Nancy Cunard, Moore believed that endings need not always be clearly defined: they might come on a note of suspense. A dismal ending, however, must be avoided at all costs: it must be tragic or happy(3).

Only rarely did he complain of the obstacles to

1. Letter to S. Atchley, 26th June, 1927, op.cit., p.17. The same statement occurs in a letter to Eglinton, 25th June, 1927 - see Hone, op.cit., p.412.
2. B. Nichols, op.cit., p.258.
3. N. Cunard, op.cit., p.109.

rounding off a story. While working on The Lake, he wrote(1), that he was experiencing great difficulty, and that the story was as hard to write as Sister Teresa. Evelyn Innes/Sister Teresa, precisely because the end was not properly conceived from the beginning, had a number of endings. A Mere Accident was changed in the revision(2), and Aphrodite was revised almost solely for the sake of an altered ending(3).

Preoccupation with the story line was constant. The selection of emotions, he said, depended not merely on verisimilitude, but also on grouping and chiaroscuro. In a novel, he maintained, "the characters are the voice, the deeds are the orchestra". One of his objections to English novelists was that their characters accomplished deeds beyond their capabilities. "It is this sense...of the chord, that separates Homer from the fabricators of singular adventures. And it is this sense of harmony that separates us from circulating literature; our melody may lay itself open to criticism, but the chord is beautiful always(4)".

Concern with form took many shapes in Moore. In view

1. 4 Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 22nd October, (1904). See Hart-Davis, op.cit., p.36.
2. John Norton, Celibates, London, W. Scott, 1895.
3. London, Heinemann, 1931.
4. Confessions, p.133.

of his theory of inspiration, it is small wonder that he was surprised at Bennett's method of composition: writing out the title of the book, the numbers of the chapters; then inscribing chapter one at the top of the page, and afterwards going through from the beginning until he came to the end(1):

"Do you know how he works? Well, he sits down at his writing table when he is ready to start a new book, calls the maid, has her fetch him his paper (the finest quality antique), his box of water-colours and a glass of water. He then paints an elaborately decorated title page, like the illuminated manuscript of some 12th century monk, and covers it with huge lilies and dimpled cupids. It is all very nicely and neatly done - but in rather doubtful taste. He then fills in the title with ornamental lettering, using the blackest of black ink. Then he starts writing, and goes straight ahead without pause or the use of notes, and never alters a word or a comma. Not a single word. When he showed me the huge manuscript of The Old Wives' Tale I asked if he had written that in the same way, and he pointed out several pages. The first and only draft! I could not believe my eyes. Not an erasure. I declare I couldn't have written that opening description of the Midlands without working it over a dozen times. I would most certainly have got things all mixed up; the proportions would not have come right until after I had written or dictated many versions and revised them with the greatest care and trouble. Most writers would have had to do the same thing, but not Bennett: he tells me he never even

---

1. N. Cunard, op.cit., p.111.

looks at a manuscript after he finishes the first and only draft. Yes, an interesting fellow...(1)"

Above all, Moore insisted that humour must be omitted from fiction: the English novel had a disgraceful habit of treating it as a literate, instead of a commercial, quality (2). In large quantities, it squeezed all life out of narrative:

"A living and moving story related by a humorist very soon becomes a thing of jeers and laughter, signifying nothing. We must have humour, of course, but the use we must make of our sense of humour is to avoid introducing anything into the narrative that shall distract the reader from the beauty, the mystery and the pathos of the life we live in this world. Whosoever keeps humour under lock and key is read in the next generation, if he writes well, for to write well without the help of humour is the supreme test(3)".

He once said of Pater:

"...he has no humor, but it's so easy to be facetious...I have great difficulty keeping smart aphorisms and humorous passages out of my own work. Pater knew better than that. He knew what was right and what was futile and frivolous(4)."

1. Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.70. No doubt the criticism would have been harsher had not Moore been flattered by Bennett's calling him his 'spiritual father' in literature. (Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.69.) Bennett was inspired to write of the Five Towns by a reading of A Mummer's Wife - see e.g. Goodwin, Conversations, p.177,
2. Moore was, of course, justified here: the English novel has been concerned very largely with eccentrics, the French with more typical characters - hence the difference in seriousness.
3. Avowals, 1919, p.78.
4. See Barrett Clark, op.cit., pp.71-2.

In English fiction, Moore maintained, man was a joke or a creature of habit: Jane Austen chose the latter, Dickens the former approach(1).

Another interesting aspect of Moore's theories is his treatment of the moral idea. He held, especially in his early days, that an anecdote that did not represent a great moral idea could never be great literature(2). Fielding was thus condemned to oblivion and Maupassant to the second rank of writers. It was the difference between Anna Karenina and Vanity Fair: Tolstoy's intention was to contrast moral aspects, not social differences(3). Jane Eyre, too, failed because it was not the symbol of a moral idea(4). Moore allowed, in his early, less bitter days, that Hardy did begin with an idea, but he could not mould it or breathe life into it(5). Bret Harte's tales were nearly always a dramatisation of a moral idea(6), and the stories and characters of Balzac and Flaubert were also based on moral truths(7). But Moore's thinking here was inconsistent: throughout his life, there was a false dichotomy in his mind between words and things. In

1. North American Review, January 1900, p.515.
2. See e.g. preface to Poor Folk, p.vii.
3. See e.g. Cosmopolis, 1896, p.52.
4. North American Review, 1900, p.517.
5. Confessions, p.132.
6. Preface to Poor Folk, p.vii.
7. Cosmopolis, 1896, pp.42-3; "A Tragic Novel", Cosmopolis, vol.vii, July 1897, e.g. p.38.

contradiction to his belief that the novel should have intellectual significance, he said at times that ideas died and only men lived. Writing of Huysmans in the full tide of his reaction against Zola, he stated(1) that ideas were well enough until you were 20, after which only words were bearable(2). Again, speaking of D. H. Lawrence's 'failure', he said that men were more interested in things than in ideas(3). Even at the end of his life, he wrote to Eglinton:

"...ideas are worthless, yours, mine, and everybody else's. Ideas are pernicious: things are the only good(4)".

And in 1924 he published Pure Poetry, an anthology attempting to exclude all thought poems(5).

Insistence on a moral idea, of course, does not excuse moralising intervention, propaganda or dogma on the part of the author. To Moore moralising was anathema (6), and he was thus extremely severe with George Eliot and Tolstoy. Without the didacticism, he told Eglinton, Tolstoy would have been a greater writer(7). Wells wrote utilitarian novels and used the novel for the propagation of ideas:

1. See Chapter III.

2. Confessions, p.143.

3. Letter to D. H. Lawrence, enclosed in letter to Eglinton, 22nd January, 1918, op.cit., pp.42-3.

4. Letter to Eglinton, 4th April, 1927, op.cit., p.71.

5. Limited edition, London, Nonesuch Press, 1924.

6. See e.g. Goodwin, Conversations, p.55.

7. Letter to Eglinton, 9th October, 1919, op.cit., p.51.

so "il échappe à ma critique"(1). Zola and the Naturalists were deserted, Joyce was condemned:

"Art is concerned with what the eye sees and not with the thinking mind..To the mind life is but the dreaming of a shade, but our actions arise from the belief that it is a great deal more than a shade, and history will continue to be written notwithstanding Mr. Joyce's protest. I am by temperament an artist, that is to say by temperament one who is interested in appearance; a metaphysician only in the belief that the appearance may be illuminated faintly by a moral conception, but oh so faintly! With Joyce it is just the opposite. There is no appearance in Joyce; it is all syllogism(2)."

Turgenev, on the other hand, was too great an artist to allow his purpose to overshadow his conception and he never intruded his personality; his characters were so real that they taught only as life teaches(3):

"Won't you young men ever understand", Moore complained to Wolfe, "that writing isn't preaching, nor controversy, nor yet rhapsody, but the plain and unembroidered way of telling a story... I'm not saying that a tale doesn't sometimes call for a digression, but argument or views of the author's are not that. They're just ignorance of his art... Of course, the author has a point of view, but it should be a point of view of people, not of things. He takes figures out of the

1. André Billy, "Le Centenaire de George Moore", Le Figaro Littéraire, Saturday, 31st May, 1952, p.2.
2. G-P. Collet, "Louis Gillet et George Moore", Etudes anglaises, August 1953, p.252. Moore, letter to Gillet, 20th August, 1931, about an article by Gillet on Joyce
3. cf. "Avowals", January-April 1904, p.483 (Avowals, 1919, p.132). Balzac and Turgenev, of course, pulled Moore in different directions.

Human Comedy or Tragedy, and lets them live it out according to the truth or the untruth that is in them.... That's art - to make your own attitude no more than a legitimate expectation(1)".

There was inconsistency, however, between Moore's theory and practice: like the French realists and Gautier, he greatly admired detachment(2), but sometimes, as in Esther Waters, allowed his feelings to take command. And despite all his concern with form, he insisted that the creation of souls was the most vital thing; form was important only in so far as it revealed life(3). In practice, ironically, Moore's sense of form was far greater than his power to create character, and it remains the most striking feature of his later work.

The first English novelist, Defoe, was to Moore a hack, who wrote a masterpiece in the first half of Robinson Crusoe(4) and was unable to finish the book(5). But it was Fielding's Tom Jones, the first comedy of manners(6), that received the first real blast of Moore's criticism of English prose fiction. It had dictated the form of the whole English novel, restricting it to the description of

1. H. Wolfe, Dialogues and Monologues, pp.22-4.
2. In his early years, especially, he took great delight in the notoriety his cynical pose brought him.
3. Goodwin, Conversations, p.16. See also "Avowals", January-April, 1904, p.482; Avowals, 1919, p.131.
4. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, 18th April, 1918, Brotherton.
5. cf. Cervantes: see letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, 18th April, 1918, Brotherton.
6. "Some Characteristics of English Fiction", p.509.

the manners and customs of different classes. It was drawing-room entertainment, dealing only with secondary emotions. It had no mystery, passion or sensibility; it was a completely impersonal book. The invention of episodes was poor, the characters without individuality or moral significance(1), the comment 'mindless' - Moore's most scathing epithet(2). Fielding was also, said Moore, the first English author to sit down and write for money(3). It is doubtful if Moore had read Smollett, but he used him to attack the English novel's lack of synthesis(4). Scott's work Moore disliked even more than Fielding's. The latter was occasionally allowed some merits: Moore was concerned mainly with attacking the literary historians' picture of him as the great founder of the English novel.

1. The Squire, an exception, was real, but too obvious for praise, said Moore. See Avowals, 1919, p.19.
2. See "Avowals", Pall Mall Magazine, January-April 1904, p.326. For Moore's views on Fielding, see "Since the Elizabethans", pp.44ff; letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, 3rd November, 1912, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134; letter to Eglinton, 121 Ebury Street, 8th January, 1916, op.cit., p.32; letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, 4th October, 1918, Brotherton; Avowals, 1919, pp.6, 81; Pall Mall Magazine, January-April 1904, p.325. Moore's views are similar throughout all these articles and letters, reaching their culmination in most dogmatic form in Avowals, 1919.
3. "Avowals", January-April 1904, p.325. At first he allowed that the style was breezy and the narrative free and fluent ("Since the Elizabethans", p.45). In his later years, however, even these virtues were denied: a "detestable book", he told Barrett Clark (op.cit., p.123). Fielding had "no sense of form, and no style". He painted by the mass and "le jambe no portait pas" (H. Wolfe on "The Writer" in "Mr. George Moore's work": obit. notice in Observer, Sunday, 22nd January, 1933, p.17.)
4. Avowals, 1919, p.26.

But Scott had no saving graces. He improvised novels to buy farms and turned literature into a trade(1); never was he concerned with the inner life of the soul. Picturesque episodes brought us no nearer the core of life than material enjoyments in English country-houses(2). In short, Scott was mere entertainment(3).

Moore's attitude to Dickens was an ambivalent one. At times he treated him as part of the flotsam of the English novel(4). On other occasions, he allowed that he could be incisive, even revealing truth beneath the laughter and, though he could never create a soul, he could

1. Avowals, 1919, pp.27-8.
2. "Since the Elizabethans", pp.53,56.
3. Cosmopolis, 1897, p.39. Rider Haggard, regarded by Moore as a disciple of Zola in that they both recorded facts (Impressions and Opinions, London, Laurie, 1914 ed, p.46) is also cited as an example of the commercialisation of art for the villa, along with Robert Buchanan and Hugh Conway. This put him in the same category as Scott (Confessions, p.134). On 19th November, 1889, The Hawk, (vol.4, no.94, pp.549-50, "Bye-bye Buchanan") published a scathing attack by Moore on Buchanan; on 21st January, 1890 (vol.5, no.103, pp.75-6, "Baboonacy") another, on Rider Haggard; and on 15th April, 1890 (no.115, pp.434-5, "Advertised Incompetency") a third, on Hall Caine's The Bondman. Lytton and Disraeli were also kin to Scott in that they wrote mercenary literature to pay their election expenses (Avowals, 1919, p.57.)
4. In a letter to his brother Maurice he spoke of 'rubbishy Dickens' (92 Victoria Street, 18th April, 1898, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646.); and Goodwin quotes Moore's opinion that Dickens was merely for human consumption or use (Conversations, p.58). Again, he relied too much on noisy humour: see Cosmopolis, 1897, p.48 - also e.g. Moore's comment that Dickens would have sentimentalised or laughed over Emma (the original of Esther Waters - see Confessions, London, Heinemann, 1952 ed., p.108). However, as C. Weygandt points out, in A Century of the English Novel (London, Brentano, 1927, p.81), Moore could not have done the scenes in the home of Esther Waters if Dickens had not earlier written similar scenes.)

conjure up admirable silhouettes(1) His misfortune was to be born out of his time: he was a great visionary, living in an age when the English soul was in eclipse(2). The account in Avowals (1919) described a man of genius who illustrated an abominable literary tradition. He had more talent, Moore maintained, than Flaubert, Zola, Goncourt or Daudet(3), but - and this is Moore's thesis - he would have learnt from them the value of seriousness: a receptive mind like his would have understood that a convict waiting in a marsh for a boy to bring him a file is not a subject for humour.

In Thackeray's favour there was far less to be said(4). He conceived of the novel as a subaltern and mercenary

1. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, Pimlico, S.W., 3rd November, 1912, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134. See also "Since the Elizabethans", p.44, Avowals, 1919, p.227 and Pall Mall Magazine, January-April, 1904, p.326.
2. North American Review, 1900, pp.514-15.
3. When he wrote this Moore had long reacted against his Naturalist phase.
4. Many are the disparaging references to him scattered throughout Moore's work. "Trashy Thackeray" (letter to Maurice, 92 Victoria Street, 18th April, 1898, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646), "Thackeray's simperings", ("Some of Balzac's Minor Pieces", Fortnightly Review, xlvi, n.s., no.cclxxiv, 1st October, 1889, p.501), lacking in 'depth of life' and soul ("Avowals", Pall Mall Magazine, January-April 1904, p.325), "badaud de Ficcadilly" (Avowals, 1919, p.227): these indicate the tone of Moore's remarks.

literary form(1) shunning the primary emotions(2). His humour was thin compared with L'Education Sentimentale(3), his criticism of life trivial(4) - worse than Fielding's because more mincing - and, unlike Dickens, he did not widen our perceptions(5). His characterisation was as superficial as Fielding's(6) and his style was modelled on Fielding's robbed of its gusto, though with some compensation in the spacing and ordination of parts. Only one virtue would Moore allow him: he improved the form of the novel(7). Vanity Fair was one of the most original and grandly designed of all novels, far superior in this respect to Fielding(8).

---

1. North American Review, 1900, p.510.
2. Cosmopolis, 1896, p.44.
3. Cosmopolis, 1897, p.48.
4. Fortnightly Review, 1889, p.492.
5. See Avowals, 1919, pp.81-4.
6. Cosmopolis, 1896, p.44.
7. Cosmopolis, 1896, p.44.
8. Impressions and Opinions, p.55. Moore drew a parallel between Anna Karenina and Vanity Fair, stating that the former owed much in form to Thackeray: the four parts and four families, two aristocratic and two commercial, with the idea that they overlapped, and with the governess as the central point and connecting link between the families. The design fitted the purpose admirably. The intention of the two books was identical: a comprehensive vision of life as represented by the wealthy classes; and they were equal in constructive skill and management of the four families. (Cosmopolis, 1896, pp.51-2; Avowals, 1919, p.149; May-August 1904, p.76.)

Moore believed that, because of a natural inability to write synthesis(1), no woman could be a great writer. He conceded, in his early years, that the Brontës wrote some admirable novels, but by 1904(2), he was saying that Jane Eyre was merely "a melodrama written with naturalness and spirit". His later opinion was harsher: the plot was 'Mother Goose'(3). Emily's Wuthering Heights was melodramatic(4), written with vehemence, but with little of that rare literary quality, heat: the tangled threads revealed a lyric poet trying to construct prose narrative. George Eliot's handicap was that she wrote like a man(5):

- 
1. Pall Mall Magazine, January-April, 1904, p.329.
  2. Pall Mall Magazine, January-April, 1904, p.329.
  3. "An Imaginary Conversation. 'Gosse and Moore'", 2nd Convers., Fortnightly Review, vol.CV, January, 1919, p.149. Villette was charming, he said (North American Review, 1900, p.517), but mainly a plagiarism of her sister's Agnes Grey: one of Moore's great discoveries (Conversations in Ebury Street, pp.222-3).
  4. "Some Characteristics of English Fiction", p.517.
  5. cf. A Modern Lover. London, Tinsley, 1883, vol.I, p.72. Remark made by Harding, Moore's spokesman in the majority of his early novels. G. Sand, too, was an excellent example of a woman's inability to create anything new in art: her picture of love was no different from a man's (A Modern Lover, I, pp.572-3). Women's fatuity in art was one of Moore's favourite theories - see e.g. "From the Naked Model", The Hawk, vol.4, no.99, 24th December, 1889, pp.699-701.

in Hetty's story, a true woman's moulding would have been Hetty's living to try to save her child(1). Maggie seemed for a moment to embody an ethical principle, but the flood turned the book into an ordinary adventure novel(2) - though later Moore came to see that the composition of The Mill on the Floss was better than most English fiction(3) and that G. Eliot had a better conception of what a novel should be than most English writers, a sense of rhythmical progression and a well-modulated narrative(4).

Trollope was another writer dealing with secondary emotions(5); he was not concerned with the inner life(6). There was a little more to be said in his favour than in Scott's, since he did not turn literature into a trade: but he also was a popular writer, catering for all his reader's interests(7). But it was Hardy who, above all

1. Preface to A Communication to my Friends, p.xlvii. Written after Moore's 'moulding' of Esther Waters, of course. Elsewhere, Moore calls G. Eliot "pompous" (letter to Maurice, 92 Victoria Street, 18th April, 1898, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646), "pedantic" (Fortnightly Review, 1889, p.501), "canting" (Fortnightly Review, 1889, p.492) and - most damning - "trivial" (Avowals, 1919, p.16). She was too moralising ("Since the Elizabethans", p.44) and she did not know the limits of her own talents (Confessions, 1952, p.136).
2. North American Review, 1900, p.517.
3. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, 17th December, 1918, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.
4. Confessions, 1952, p.136: Conversations in Ebury Street, p.61. Along with G. Eliot, Moore put C. Reade, another "clod", "carle" and writer of "wooden fictions" (letter to Gosse, 4 Upper Ely Place, Dublin, Weds. 28th November, 1906, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134. See also letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, 14th March, 1921, Brotherton).
5. "Since the Elizabethans", p.44.
6. "Since the Elizabethans", p.55
7. Avowals, 1919, p.86.

Moore detested(1). He could not write(2); his works were merely ill-constructed, mechanical melodramas(3); and he had not that most important literary instinct, which tells a writer which theme may and which may not be developed(4). He illustrated the English novelists' failure to make organic wholes of their stories: Far from the Madding Crowd began well but fell away, and the

1. His dislike increased with Hardy's rising fame and his own neglect. He was furious, for example, when the Prince of Wales went to Max Gate to tea with Hardy, though he forced himself to laugh it off (See J-E. Blanche, More Portraits of a Lifetime, p.87). Hardy was commonplace (Letter to Gosse, 92 Victoria Street, 11th April, 1899, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134), "woodenheaded" (Letter to Gosse, 4 Upper Ely Place, Dublin, Wednesday, 28th November, 1906, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134), "one of George Eliot's miscarriages", (Letter to C. K. Shorter, 121 Ebury Street, 17th April, 1917, National Library, Dublin, MS 2136. See also Confessions, p.131; and Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.79), did not write English and produced only "servant-girl literature" (Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.71). Towards the end of his life, Moore always referred to him as the Village Schoolmaster (G. Goodwin, Conversations, p.47) or simply "The Villager", along with Conrad the Sailor and Henry James the Eunuch (Memoirs of my Dead Life, London, Heinemann, 1936, preface, p.xvii).
2. G. Goodwin, op.cit., p.49. See also N. Cunard, G.M.: Memories of George Moore, p.109; and H. Wolfe, Dialogues and Monologues, p.23.
3. Conversations in Ebury Street, pp.76-98. See also Barrett Clark, op.cit., pp.122-3, 79. A. Billy, "Le Centenaire de George Moore", p.2 and W. L. Phelps, op.cit., p.823.
4. In illustration, he said that the central point of Tess was the scene where the heroine confessed to Angel her previous relations; but where soul-revealing dialogue was needed, Hardy passed it over with a single impersonal comment (see e.g. Goodwin, Conversations, p.158).

conclusion did not come in the range of literary criticism(1). Meredith, too, lacked the power to create souls. His prose was anonymous and his phrases were mere 'sterile nuts'(2). But he had two great merits in Moore's eyes, which raised him above Scott; he was not a slovenly writer and his art was not tainted with commercialism(3). Paradoxically, the best thing in his novels was their poetic thought(4).

Stevenson was at first referred to merely as a smart young man. The Master of Ballantrae was badly written, and displayed no design or creative impulse:

"We float on a painted ocean in a painted boat among a little wretchedness of card-board and tinsel...(5)"

In the Confessions, however, Moore wrote of him that his periods were sparkling, rhythmical and aptly conveyed his meaning. Unfortunately, all his thoughts were neatly polished before they were written down, so that they lost all their richness and harmony: his style, said Moore, not his brain, prevented him from being a thinker(6). In later

1. Confessions, 1952, p.132 .
2. Confessions, p.130. Moore said also that Meredith put on his style so thickly that his characters could not be seen through it. (p.131).
3. Confessions, p.131.
4. N. Cunard, G.M. Memories of George Moore, p.73.
5. The Hawk, vol.4, no.92, 5th November, 1889, pp.489-490.
6. Confessions, p.138.

life, when Moore himself became more interested in style, he learned to praise Stevenson's "radiant page"(1). He saw him primarily as a man who did not know his limitations, a great man of letters who had nearly all the gifts except that of storytelling(2), and yet persistently strove after story. He had not the narrator's power of illuminating by means of anecdote(3). His personality was far more interesting than the wooden characters he invented(4): he had not the sympathetic insight to create characters outside the range of his own experience. Travels with a Donkey and An Inland Voyage proved that he was the greatest painter on ivory who ever lived(5), but as a novelist he merely skimmed gracefully over the surface of secondary emotions(6). He was drawn into the conventions of the English novel, producing stories of adventure and revealing nothing of the

1. See Desmond MacCarthy, "George Moore as a Critic", (review of Conversations in Ebury Street), Sunday Times, 23rd March, 1930, p.8.
2. His letters, Moore said, were those of a man who could not write a story - see Avowals, 1919, p.47.
3. Avowals, 1919, p.47.
4. Preface to Lewis Seymour and Some Women, London, Heinemann, 1917, pp.vi-viii.
5. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, 15th November, 1913, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134. See also letter to Eglinton, 6th January, 1914, op.cit., p.21.
6. "Since the Elizabethans", p.43.

inner, eternal mystery of life(1). Like Scott, he was in the last resort a "marchand de camelote"(2).

Conrad was to Moore always "the Sailor"(3). Moore thought that anyone could write stories about ships disappearing in a blue mist(4), and that Chance was the aftermath of the worst things in Stevenson:

"Islands lying about veiled in grey and blue haze and bathing in les eaux ménagères of Henry James(5)."

Worst of all, "He can't tell a straightforward story in a straightforward way(6)". Henry James also belonged to the same class of failures, though at first Moore admitted his good qualities(7). In Confessions he said that James was the first English writer he knew whom he could regard as

1. "Since the Elizabethans", pp.55-6; J. L. Balderston, "The Freedom of the Pen. A Conversation with George Moore", Fortnightly Review, cii, n.s., 1st October, 1917, p.540: preface to Lewis Seymour and Some Women pp.vi-viii.
2. Ave, p.4.
3. e.g. Memoirs of my Dead Life, London, Heinemann, Ebury edition, 1936. Prelude, p.xvii. See also N. Cunard, op.cit., p.110.
4. G. Goodwin, Conversations, p.49.
5. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, 1st April, 1917, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134. See also letter to C. K. Shorter, 121 Ebury Street, 17th April, 1917, National Library, Dublin, MS 2136: "Chance" was "merely a piece of Stevenson's wreckage afloat in Henry James's slops." ; Desmond MacCarthy, Portraits, p.197; Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.79.
6. Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.79.
7. See "Turgueneff", Fortnightly Review, xlivi, n.s., no. ccliv, 1st February, 1888, p.251. Significantly, omitted from the 2nd edition, Impressions and Opinions, 1913.

an artist. Nothing ever happened in his stories, but suppression or maintenance of story was a matter of personal taste; and James, like Moore, preferred character studies to adventures. Unfortunately, James's models, taken from the drawingroom, had long since had all the rough edges of their characters rubbed smooth. Like Stevenson, he was a man of talent who made concessions to the foolish and hypocritical taste of his time(1). In his later period, Moore was harsher. Because James mistook detail for psychology, and because he never discovered the inevitable word, his creations remained mere shadows. Like Tolstoy, he was too analytic for creation. Worst of all - and this put him into the central stream of the English novel - he strove continuously for humour(2).

1. Confessions, pp.128, 139.

2. Avowals, 1919, pp.181-7. (See also p.207.) For the later Moore, James was simply "the Eunuch" (Memories of my Dead Life, Prelude, p.xvii. See also N. Cunard, op.cit., p.110); alternatively, the butler who wrote tangled trivialities. (Letter to Eglinton, 22nd September, 1917, op.cit., p.39). Proust, too, wrote of trivialities. Moore could find no pleasure, he said - though there is no indication that he had read Proust - in reading 30 pages about something that might have been fully expressed in two, especially when he was not always sure what he was reading about. Proust might be clever, but he had no sense of artistic selection. In his best moods Moore might admit that he was out of sympathy with Proust's generation - see Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.131 but, more frequently, he was scathing in his criticism. His favourite 'mot' in his later years was: "he writes like a man trying to plough a field with a pair of knitting needles!" (See N. Cunard, op.cit., pp.154-5; Desmond MacCarthy, Portraits, pp.197-8; and James Whitall, English Years, pp.307-8).

Kipling belonged to the same category. He had a wide knowledge of life(1), but was able to turn it to little of literary merit. He had a real literary talent, but his anecdotes were well-hammered and had not the sensibilities or depth of Bret Harte. He could write but it was a reporter's pen that he used(2). His mind was vulgar(3), summed up in the words, "I know a trick worth two of that"(4), and he knew nothing of the heart.

Such were the failures of the writers of drawingroom comedy and secondary emotions, the formless adventure story narrators, 'commercial artists' and peddlers of trivialities, the novelists who lacked seriousness and the storytellers 'manqués' who strove in vain after story. Out of the ruins of this sweeping attack, how many English novelists survive as serious, 'poetic', tragic or 'primary emotion' writers? A mere handful of pure novelists, of whom only Jane Austen and Anne Brontë are dealt with at length,

1. Letter to Gosse, Tuesday night, 5th July, 1893, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.
2. A. Billy, "Le Centenaire de George Moore", p.2.
3. Letter to Gosse, 92 Victoria Street, 11th April, 1899, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.
4. Avowals, 1919, p.165, etc; Pall Mall Magazine, May - August 1904, p.375, etc. Moore agreed with W. L. Phelps that the criticism of Kipling was the best in Avowals - see Phelps, op.cit., pp.820-821.

and even these with reservations. Jane Austen was the first serious English novelist, though even her characters, he believed at first(1), were unmoved by human passions: it was the sense of tragedy beneath the treacherous calm which induced us to read pages of tedious trifles. No one, he stated, could go further than she did in limiting prose fiction to the novel of manners: she was the logical development of Tom Jones. In Avowals (1904), Moore said that, although she was alone among women in creating a style, it was mere wool-work(2). By 1918, however, he had changed his views for he had now read Sense and Sensibility (3) and maintained that Marianne had more passion than any other character in literature; here was the burning human heart for the first time in English prose narrative(4). For Moore, Jane Austen's originality lay in the fact that she invented a new medium of literary expression: a formula for the description of domestic life. For this all later novelists - even Balzac - were indebted to her. Her greatest merits were an unfailing sense of her own limitations(5) and an awareness of the pathos of domestic life. The ancients would have approved of her because

- 
1. "Some Characteristics of English Fiction", pp.511-12.
  2. Pall Mall Magazine, January-April 1904, p.328.
  3. See Avowals, 1919, p.37.
  4. ib., p.42.
  5. "Turgueneff", Fortnightly Review, p.250.

Pride and Prejudice tended towards the vase rather than the washtub: a rare thing in English fiction. In Sense and Sensibility, she was at her best and worst. The book lost shape by the inclusion of the witty scene between Dashwood and his wife as to the amount he could contribute to his mother's and sisters' maintenance: but, despite this and other errors, the theme of the book, disappointment in love, had never been better written. She was the first writer to permit her characters to form themselves and their tale, though even she used too thin a brush and too few colours(1).

It was on Anne Bronte that Moore held the most unorthodox views. She might have developed into a superior Jane Austen, possessing as she did all Jane Austen's qualities as well as heat(2). Moreover, her novels had organic unity. True, in The Tenant of Wildfell Hall(3), through lack of experience, she broke down in the middle of the story, but the weaving of the narrative in the first 150 pages revealed the born storyteller. And Agnes Grey was the most perfect prose-narrative in

---

1. H. Wolfe, Observer, 22nd January, 1933, p.17.

2. "Conversations in Ebury Street", p.215.

3. See Conversations in Ebury Street, —, pp.214ff.

literature, simple and beautiful, the one story in which style, characters and subject were in perfect harmony. Her eyes were on the story always, and she never descended to comedy or drama for the sake of the reader(1). While writing about Agnes's first set of pupils, she had in mind the second, and each situation was linked up with the preceding and succeeding ones(2). It was for her form that she received Moore's highest praise(3).

---

1. Conversations in Ebury Street, p.220.
2. See Conversations in Ebury Street, pp.214ff.
3. One other novelist should be mentioned in this group of 'serious' writers, if only to place Moore's views in perspective: D. H. Lawrence. Moore regarded him as a man of talent, but said he was unbalanced (Goodwin, Conversations, p.49). Lady Chatterley's Lover was the work of a poetic mind, but failed because of its lack of subject (Goodwin, Conversations, p.170); Sons and Lovers, was very talented but Lawrence did not know how he was going to end it (Goodwin, Conversations, p.180. See also letter to Eglinton, 22nd September, 1917, op.cit., p.39, and again 22nd December, 1917, op.cit., p.40.) Strangely enough, in view of his success with a kind of internal monologue in The Lake, and of his friendship with Ed. Dujardin, Moore had little sympathy - he was too much of a reactionary - with the 20th century psychological novel, saying once of Henry James that what was firmly imagined needed no psychology (Avowals, 1919, p.184). True, Dujardin's Les Hantises was a masterpiece, and in Les Lauriers sont coupés he had discovered the archetypal form, though the psychology was a little 'naturalist'. (Letter to Dujardin, 92 Victoria Street, 22nd July, 1897, op.cit., p.40. Also ditto, 19th April, 1898, p.41). But Gide and Huxley were only clever: after a while one felt the hollowness beneath the brilliance (Goodwin, Conversations, p.103). And Virginia Woolf's Jacob's Room was merely sneered at: "That woman does not understand narrative". (See J-E. Blanche, More Portraits of a Lifetime, 1918-38, London, Dent, 1939, p.50).

So, in straight fiction, Moore eliminated virtually all competition in England. It was only when he turned to non-fiction English prose writers that he found shrines at

---

cont. It is obvious, however, that Moore knew little of the works of his 20th century contemporaries. Not that this deterred him from dismissing them contemptuously.

Towards the end, he may have mellowed somewhat in character, but his judgments were as dogmatic as ever. When asked by reporters what he thought of contemporary English writers, he replied characteristically, "There are none" (H. Wolfe, "The Three Interviews of George Moore", Portraits by Inference, London, Methuen, 1934, p.172.) And James Whitall tells us that Moore always indulged in a tirade against certain modern writers, demanding agreement and sulking dreadfully if he did not get it ("George Moore", Bookman, N.Y., vol.lxxvi, no.3, March 1933, p.215).

The only modern writer of whom considerable mention is made is his fellow-countryman, Joyce. Over the years, Moore's attitude towards him hardened. In 1902, he thought an article by "this boy" "preposterously clever" (Some passages from the letters of A. E. to W. B. Yeats, Cuala Press, Dublin, 1936, p.34). But in later years, Moore said, of Anna Livia Plurabelle and other sections that came out before the whole of Finnegans Wake, that Joyce had invented a language that only Joyce could understand (N. Cunard, op.cit., p.134). We have Blanche's testimony that the success among intellectuals of Ulysses and Lady Chatterley's Lover poisoned Moore's old age (More Portraits of a Lifetime, 1916-38, p.93). And Gerald Griffin records that Moore made disparaging remarks about Joyce's success with interior monologue, largely because of his jealousy that Joyce revolutionised the technique of the English novel and that his works were more widely read in cultured Europe than those of any other English writer (Griffin, "George Moore", The Wild Geese, London, Jarrolds, 1938, pp.60-1). Some of Moore's remarks to Barrett Clark were positively vicious: Joyce was "a sort of Zola gone to seed". Of Ulysses he said: "...it is absurd to imagine that any good end can be served by trying to record every single thought and sensation of any human being. That's not art, it's like trying to copy the London Directory" (Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.110).

which to worship. He gave full praise to four writers only: Sterne, Borrow, Landor and Pater. Moore greatly admired Sterne(1): his Sentimental Journey was the perfect essay in which the English excelled - though Tristram Shandy constantly outraged the melodic line(2). Highest praise was given to him because he was "a serious writer"(3), whose prose recalled antiquity more than that of any other modern artist(4), and who had the most beautiful touch in English prose literature - "and art is touch"(5).

Borrow, whom Moore took great delight in 'discovering', also received one of Moore's highest compliments: "he could write"(6). Like Jane Austen, he wrote to please himself, and so was still read. Neither Sterne nor Borrow fitted into Moore's conception of the novel, if it could be maintained that they wrote novels(7): but, actually, in contrast to R. L. Stevenson, both saved their talent by refraining from story-telling(8).

1. See e.g. André Maurois, "Visites à George Moore", Les Nouvelles Littéraires, Saturday, 12th May, 1928, p.1.
2. H. Wolfe on "The Writer" in "Mr. George Moore's Work", Observer, Sunday, 22nd January, 1933, p.17.
3. Avowals, 1919, p.16.
4. Avowals, 1919, p.22.
5. Letter to Mme. Emily Lorenz Meyer, Hotel Brighton, 218 Rue de Rivoli, Paris. Post: 1st April, 1914, National Library, Dublin, MS 1595.
6. Letter to Gosse, 4 Upper Ely Place, Dublin, Wednesday, 28th November, 1906, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.
7. Letter to Gosse, 18th March, 1911, Brotherton.
8. Avowals, 1919, pp.59-63.

Landor was, from the beginning, one of Moore's masters in prose style. As early as the Confessions, he wrote:

"A writer as great as Shakespeare, surely?  
The last heir of a noble family. All that follows Landor is decadent(1)."

And even though we may regard as fantasy the description, in A Communication to My Friends(2), of Moore's extolling to Zola the virtues of Landor's austerity, we may accept as valid his statement, in "Since the Elizabethans"(3), that Balzac and Landor have said something essential on every subject on which the heart may be moved. In 1917, he was to re-discover Landor, and wasted no time in informing his friends of the fact:

"My admiration for Landor increases day by day, and for me he is now the great writer of the English language. Did you ever read the dialogue between Helena and Achilles? There is nothing as beautiful in Shakespeare or in Landor himself, unless the dialogue between Dante and Beatrice(4)."

"... in many a dialogue he catches the sweep and swell of the sea about whose shores he meditated and remembered and in other moods the tinkle of the Italian lake(5)."

1. p.133.

2. p.xxxix.

3. p.44.

4. Letter to Eglinton, 20th February, 1917, op.cit., p.38.

5. Letter to Ross, 121 Ebury Street, London, S.W. (March 1917), op.cit., pp.297-8.

"I continue to read Landor and every evening am more convinced that he stands shoulder to shoulder with Pericles(1)."

"I have been reading Landor all the evening having at last discovered the author of my instinctive pure delection (sic) (2)."

In the following year he wrote to Eglinton:

"The great prose writers of England are Landor, Hawthorne and Pater(3)."

His published comments were equally enthusiastic: Landor, Pater, De Quincey, Carlyle and Ruskin had nobler ambitions than merely amusing the drawing-room, he said in the Fortnightly Review(4). And in Avowals (1919) he wrote:

"... the thought is a sad one that the next generation may be more concerned with my writings than with Landor's or Pater's, and merely because they are inferior(5),"

though, in an exuberance of praise for Kipling's English, Landor and Pater were said to have written with only part of the language(6). This last was, no doubt, an over-

1. Letter to Ross, 121 Ebury Street, S.W., 5th March, 1917, op.cit., p.298.
2. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, Wednesday night, 29th March, 1917, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.
3. 14th January, 1918, op.cit., p.40.
4. Balderston, op.cit., 1917, p.540.
5. Avowals, 1919, p.30.
6. ib., p.167; Pall Mall Magazine, May-August 1904, p.376.

statement made in the heat of another enthusiasm(1), for Landor became more and more a part of him. He wrote in Conversations in Ebury Street:

"My admiration for Landor is without limit; . I place him above Shakespeare, and to imitate him would be honour enough for me(2)."

Goodwin states that for Moore Landor was the greatest figure in English literature and that he got more from him than he did from Shakespeare(3). Havelock Ellis tells us that, with Moore's later concern with correctness of English usage came

"a new worship for Landor in style, a worship, which, even to so confirmed a Landorian as I am, seemed rather extravagant, yet was the outcome of a stern and classic ardour(4)."

And, according to Tonks(5), Moore said, not long before his death, that he would not open Balzac again; but, Tonks says, he remained faithful to Landor and Pater to the last.

Moore's later prose style reveals clearly the influence of Landor's 'marble mind'(6).

1. Desmond MacCarthy comments that the writer who helped him most was for the time exalted above all others, and that he changed his views of authors when his own work took on a new direction ("George Moore as a Critic", Review of Conversations in Ebury Street, Sunday Times, 23rd March, 1930, p.8).
2. p.62. Conversation with Freeman.
3. Goodwin, Conversations with George Moore, p.174.
4. Havelock Ellis, My Confessional. Questions of our Day, London, John Lane, 1934, p.211.
5. See Hone, op.cit., p.446.
6. "Since the Elizabethans", p.50; Pall Mall Magazine, January-April, 1904, p.324.

Pater was even more important. He was regarded by Moore as the greatest artist in English prose fiction. He always held the end in view(1) and never compromised with his art. After having read Marius for the second time(2), Moore wrote to Gosse that

"the occasion is the greatest that can happen in any life worth talking about... The great English prose work has been written and perfectly written, and you and I would do well to lay aside our pens. It has not been given to you or to me to do the one desirable thing - to write a work in all kinds of various meters (sic) and yet in one metre. He raises literature to the 'condition of music'. Marius is as beautiful in texture as Wagner's music or Manet's painting; it is like an old dream house built of old marble full of venerable memories and yet 'a thing of today(3)'".

And in a letter to Blanche on 13th December, 1887, he called him

"... our only great writer. This book(4) is my idea of all that is beautiful and sweet(5)."

Pater, he said, spoke out of as deep a sense of life as the best English poets(6). He was the one English prose writer

1. Confessions of a Young Man, London, Heinemann, 1952, preface, p.ix.
2. The first was in 1885 - see e.g. Hone, op.cit., p.112.
3. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, Thursday, 13th Aug. 1914, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.
4. i.e. Marius.
5. Fresh Combe Lodge, Beeding, Sussex, J-E. Blanche, Portraits of a Lifetime, London, 1937, p.293.
6. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, 10th December, 1921(?), Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.

who raised prose from the factual to the visionary plane; the only one to consider prose, like verse, as a medium for dream and ecstasy(1). His style had the same beautiful continuity as Greek sculpture. The art of prose was in the long rather than the short sentence, and Pater's sentences were very long, his prose flowing to a murmurous melody. He found the inevitable word without seeking it. Marius was different from every other prose narrative because of its seriousness and lack of all jokes. Pater was the first to discover in English prose that life was neither jocular nor melodramatic. His object in "White Nights" was not to tell a story, which when read was not worth a second reading, but to relate the states of consciousness through which Marius passed. He knew he was not a story-teller and never plunged into story. The whole book was always in his mind and each chapter was sought in its relation to the whole(2). Towards the end of his life Moore told Vernon Lee:

"The poorest page of Pater is better than the best I ever wrote...I some-

---

1. North American Review, 1900, p.506.

2. Avowals, 1919, chs.9, 10, 11; "Avowals", May-August 1904, pp.527-33.

times think I am myself only beginning to appreciate him(1). Pater wrote better than I write, better than I shall ever write, because he had a finer mind than I have. You can't write beyond your mind..; Pater knew that, and he had a great mind(2)."

Of American fiction Moore knew little. He said that Bret Harte was a consummate artist, who did not leave loose ends and did exactly what he wanted to do(3) and he regarded Poe as a marvellous storyteller(4), whose methods Stevenson constantly appropriated(5). For Hawthorne he had great admiration: he was the foremost American writer, "an artist of the first rank"(6). Many passages of The House of the Seven Gables, said Moore, were moulded into beautiful

1. Even in 1904 (Pall Mall Magazine, May-August, pp.531-2), he was saying that he did not understand Pater always as well as he did now.
2. See Barrett Clark, op.cit., pp.71-2. For further praise of Pater, see the following: Letter to Tonks, 121 Ebury Street, 28th December, 1917, National Library, Dublin, MS 2648; letter to Eglinton, 16th October, 1914, op.cit., p.25; letter to Eglinton, 26th January, 1919, op.cit., p.48; "Literature and the Irish Language", Ideals in Ireland, ed. by Lady Gregory, London, The Unicorn, 1901, p.49; Avowals, 1919, pp.90 177-212; Pall Mall Magazine, May-August, 1904, pp.527-533; Confessions, p.141 ("Marius was the stepping-stone that carried me across the channel into the genius of my own tongue"); A Mere Accident, London, Vizetelly, 1887, pp.65-8.
3. Impressions and Opinions, 1913 ed., p.29.
4. Avowals, 1919, p.90.
5. Confessions, p.138.
6. W.L. Phelps, op.cit., p.824.

rhythms, just like Pater(1). Like Pater, too, Hawthorne strove to make each separate sentence a work of art. Moore quotes the passage in The House of the Seven Gables where the old maid Hepzibah opens shop for the first time: it was restrained, dignified and serious, with a vision as intense as Balzac's, and genius akin to Turgenev's(2). Gosse was made to praise the graceful proportions, the temperate dignity of the portrait and the beautiful, calm mind(3). Unfortunately, the English novel's failings could be seen in the ending, and in the inclusion of the melodramatic paraphernalia: panel pictures, Judge Pyncheon and the document plot. Like Stevenson, Hawthorne failed because he tried to write stories and, not being a born storyteller, "he wrote them as a pianist plays a fiddle or a fiddler plays the piano"(4). The Blithedale Romance contained as beautiful writing as any in English: the first two hundred pages were comparable with a Greek story, but then the book declined into commonplace, reaching the

- 
1. Letter to Eglinton, 14th January, 1918, op.cit., p.40.
  2. Avowals, 1919, p.96.
  3. Avowals, 1919, p.97.
  4. Letter to Eglinton, 14th January, 1918, op.cit., p.40.

depths in Zenobia's suicide(1). Hawthorne seemed to prove that the perfect moulding of a story was alien to the English character.

French prose narrative was in a completely different category from English fiction, on the right lines from the beginning. Rousseau's Confessions (included in Moore's very wide definition of a 'novel') was highly praised for its unique reality: its abstention from humour(2) - for Moore, this was the keynote of most French writing.

In Balzac was to be found almost everything. He had one of the most intense minds in literature, and attacked his subject like a panther(3). He rethought with speed and power all the moral and intellectual ideas of Europe(4), and his criticism of Life was the most profound and comprehensive attempted by any writer. If he was inferior to Shakespeare, it was only in verbal qualities(5), and this was because his mind was too full of ideas to take pains with expression(6). He was concerned with the primary

1. Letter to Eglinton, 14th January, 1918, op.cit., p.41.
2. Avowals, 1919, p.79.
3. Celibate Lives, London, Heinemann, 1937, Advertisement, p.vii; also preface to Poor Folk, trans. by Lena Milman, London, Elkin Mathews & John Lane, 1894, p.xi.
4. North American Review, 1900, p.515.
5. "Some of Balzac's Minor Pieces", Fortnightly Review, vol.xlvi, 1st October, 1889, p.503.
6. Conversations in Ebury Street, p.58.

emotions(1), had the gift of narrative(2), was a great creator of souls(3) and widened our perceptions of life(4). He had not the perfect taste of the Greeks, but more abundance(5). He founded the realistic method, but the Romantic Movement saved him from drifting among the shallows of Naturalism(6). He also invented the purely pictorial method in literature, though his pictures always revealed the soul. He created the French novel: Flaubert, Zola, Daudet, the Goncourts, Bourget, and Maupassant merely developed various sides of his work(7). He achieved the melodic line in his stories, as in Eugénie Grandet. Sometimes, he over-modelled and over-harmonised; sometimes, as in Contes Drolatiques and Massimilla Doni, he failed to get

- 
1. "Since the Elizabethans", pp.42-3.
  2. Fortnightly Review, 1917, p.540.
  3. e.g. Impressions and Opinions, 1913 ed., p.5.
  4. Cosmopolis, 1897, p.38.
  5. Avowals, 1919, ch.13: essay in French on Balzac and Shakespeare.
  6. Conversations in Ebury Street, np.58-9.
  7. Impressions and Opinions, 1913 ed., p.43.

cadence of line, balance and proportion(1). At times, it is true, he could be as sentimental and melodramatic as Dickens(2). But Le Curé de Tours was the finest short story ever written, a more perfect work than Une Vieille Fille in that it was not a novel cut down to the limits of a short story. It began at the right point, developed economically without long delays, ended in perfect rhythmical sequences and achieved a perfect balance. And all this (as in Curé de Tours) with means slighter than Othello's handkerchief(3). Throughout his career, Moore

1. Letter to Eglinton, 18th January, 1919, op.cit. p.47. Many years earlier, Moore had held that the Contes Drôlatiques were, in many ways, Balzac's finest achievement, because he had been forced to discipline himself; there was less chance of wandering into philosophical by-ways. Consequently, there was an unusual discrimination in composition and style, and the book was beautifully written and constructed. His opinion of Massimilla Doni, however, remained the same: "an example of a beautiful theme which Balzac failed to develop properly" - see Fortnightly Review, 1889, p.499.
2. Avowals, 1919, p.77.
3. Conversations in Ebury Street, p.51; Impressions and Opinions, 1913 ed, pp.28ff.

regarded Balzac as one of the very finest novelists and the great moral influence on him(1).

Moore's attitude to Flaubert changed considerably throughout his life. Ferguson(2) wrongly assumes that Moore was, at the beginning of his writing career, a disciple of Flaubert. True, in his preface to The Rush for the Spoil (1886)(3), he called L'Education Sentimentale the final vindication of the divine power of words, and in the Confessions (1888) he tells how at first he had been enchanted by Flaubert's wonderful delicacy and subtlety of workmanship(4). But in the Confessions he also wrote of his current thoughts:

"I am sick of reading; I have nothing to read. Flaubert bores me. What nonsense has been talked about him! Impersonal! Nonsense, he is the most personal writer I know. That odious pessimism! How sick I am of it(5)..."

1. Confessions, pp.66-7.
2. o.cit.
3. Translation of Zola's La Curée (tr. from 34th Fr. ed.), London, Vizetelly, 1886, p.vi.
4. 2nd ed., 1888, p.289. Flaubert, the Naturalist, of course, influenced the content of his early books.
5. 2nd ed., 1888, p.297.

He had written similarly in the essay on Turgenev (February 1888):

"Flaubert's work is full of these devices (1), but they are too apparent; they are forced down our throats as if with a steel fork... Flaubert attempted and achieved this(2) in Un Coeur Simple, but the execution is wire-drawn, it is too much like a painting by Mr. Holman Hunt, and the artist's intention is unpleasantly obvious from the first... The impersonality of the artist is the vainest of delusions; Flaubert dreamed of it all his life, but Madame Bovary, with the little pessimistic flip at the end of every paragraph, is the most personal of books(3)."

Thus, while Moore was interested in Flaubert in the 1880's, the latter exerted no great influence on his work at this stage, and was treated by Moore only as one of his "minor awakenings"(4). It was in the 1890's, when the writers of 'decadence' became interested in Flaubert's aestheticism and pessimism, that Moore himself became enthusiastic. The description of the 1849 Revolution in L'Education Sentimentale, he said in "La Débâcle"(5), was the highest achievement in all prose fiction. He was a

1. i.e. narrative technique.
2. i.e. creating in 'bare narrative' the intellectual charms of the psychological novel.
3. Fortnightly Review, 1st February, 1888, pp.244, 248, 249.
4. Confessions, pp.139-40.
5. "La Débâcle", Fortnightly Review. LII. n.s., 1st August, 1892, p.208.

greater artist, Moore held, than Balzac or Zola. Madame Bovary in plan and characters was little different from Balzac, and the latter had not such conciseness of thought and unexpected beauty of phrase. On the other hand, in Balzac, the characters would have unfolded more naturally, and would have been all flame; in Turgenev and Tolstoy also they would have lived more intensely because Balzac and the Russians loved life, while Flaubert was always anxious to show his contempt for life. Nevertheless, in L'Education Sentimentale, Moore said, he invented a new form, whose method might on the surface seem an objective series of pictures of the external world, but which contained an idea behind each one. All details contributed to the unity of the pictures; objectivity and subjectivity were subtly mingled often in the same passage; episodes were wonderfully interwoven into a close texture. Profusion of detailed description was dominated by conception, and episodes ended on a suspended cadence, never a full close. Thus Flaubert invented new rhythms in prose fiction. The stream of narrative flowed with imperturbable tranquillity throughout the long tragedy: and tragedy was the continuous development of a primary idea(1). Moore learned much from

---

1. "A Tragic Novel", Cosmopolis, July 1897, pp.38-59.

Flaubert about the technique of novel-writing and the flow of narrative. In "My Impressions of Zola", he compared Zola unfavourably with Flaubert(1), and in 1896, he called L'Education Sentimentale the sublime type of the descriptive novel(2). According to Harris, Moore said that Flaubert was the greatest artist France ever produced:

"How I could ever have admired that farthing dip (i.e. Zola) when the sun of Flaubert was lighting the heavens and warming the earth, I can't imagine. One's aberrations are astonishing. One changes not every seven years as the physiologists say, but every three years or so(3)."

In his later period, however, Moore came to say that, though his writing was like beautiful marquetry, delicate and subtle, he was not a storyteller(4). His 'inevitable

1. "My Impressions of Zola", English Illustrated Magazine, xi, 1894, p.485.
2. Letter to Frederic Lees, January 1896, "Recollections of an Anglo-Parisian Bibliophile", 2, "George Moore in Paris", Bookman, London, September 1932, p.296. However, in 1898 he wrote to Dujardin, "You have written some pages which Flaubert forgot to write in L'Education Sentimentale, to speak more truly Flaubert meant to write them and tried ... but he failed." (19th April, 1898, Letters to Dujardin, p.41.)
3. Contemporary Portraits, 2nd series, N.Y., published by the author, 1919, p.114.
4. Avowals, 1919, p.130. The difference between the 1904 and 1919 Avowals here is subtle:  
1904: "Flaubert's writing is as beautiful marquetry, and his best books are not novels, but satires..." (January-April, p.482). 1919: "Flaubert's writing is as beautiful as marquetry, or was thought to be so once. Be this as it may, he is no tale-teller; his best books are not novels, but satires." (p.130).

word' cry, said the 'melodic line' Moore, was raised to conceal the monotony of the short sentence relieved by a startling adjective: and the art of prose narrative was in the long sentence. At times, Moore went further, saying people thought Flaubert wrote well because he bellowed that writing was difficult: his own Esther Waters was far superior(1). He told Barrett Clark:

"Flaubert... is not so good a writer as I used to think him. Ten years ago I realized that he was not a great writer, and when I said so nobody believed me. Today everyone admits I was right(2)."

Huneker gives part of the explanation of this change of attitude when he writes that Moore decried Flaubert in Avowals because he suffered from revulsion after attacking the critical pioneers; the public had come round to Moore's point of view and so Moore abandoned Flaubert(3). And Jean-Aubry told Collet, some months before his death:

1. Letter to Tonks, 121 Ebury Street, Saturday, 14th August, (1920), National Library, Dublin, MS 2648.
2. Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.80. See also letter to Tonks, 1920:  
"Esther Waters is to Madame Bovary what the sea is to a goose pond by the wayside, the sides caked and cracked by sun with a few feathers afloat in the thick greenish water".
3. J. S. Huneker, "The Recantations of George Moore" (about Avowals), Variations, London, Laurie (N.Y., Scribners), 1922, p.23.

"A l'époque où je voyais Moore régulièrement, il me parlait avec admiration de Balzac et de Wagner. En revanche, il se montrait sévère pour Flaubert, à qui il reprochait de mal écrire. Je crois qu'il voulait brouiller les pistes. Son entêtement même à eluder mes questions sur ce point m'a toujours intrigué. Il me donnait l'impression de rejeter une influence qui alors, le gênait(1)."

Towards Zola and Naturalism Moore's attitude changed considerably throughout his career. At first, in the late 1870s, he was dazzled by the new naturalistic theories, and with characteristic enthusiasm rushed to praise them, recognising in them also his chance to write novels that would not be watered-down Dickens or Thackeray:

"One day.... I took up the Voltaire. It contained an article by M. Zola. 'Naturalisme', 'la vérité', 'la science', were repeated some half a dozen times. Hardly able to believe my eyes, I read that one should write with as little imagination as possible, that plot in a novel or in a play was illiterate and puerile... for a third time I experienced the pain and joy of a sudden and inward light. Naturalism, truth, the new art... impressed me as with a sudden sense of light... I looked forward to the weekly exposition of the new faith with febrile eagerness. The great zeal with which the new master continued his propaganda, and the marvellous way in which subjects the most diverse, passing events, political, social, religious, were caught up and turned into arguments for, or proof of

1. See G-P. Collet, Moore et La France, Geneva, Droz, 1957, p.148.

the truth of naturalism astonished me wholly. The idea of a new art based upon science, in opposition to the art of the old world that was based on imagination, an art that should explain all things and embrace modern life in its entirety, in its endless ramifications, be, as it were, a new creed in a new civilization, filled me with wonder, and I stood dumb before the vastness of the conception, and the towering height of the ambition. In my fevered fancy I saw a new race of writers that would arise and with the aid of the novel would continue to a more glorious and legitimate conclusion the work that the prophets had begun; and at each development of the theory of the new art and its universal applicability, my wonder increased and my admiration choked me... it was the idea of the new aestheticism... that captivated me, that led me away, and not a substantial knowledge of the work done by the naturalists(1)."

Irony apart, this passage gives a fair indication of Moore's early enthusiasm.

In 1882, he wrote to Zola, introducing himself and asking permission to translate L'Assommoir, and was eventually invited to visit him(2).

The translation of L'Assommoir (1887), in common with

1. Confessions, pp.59, 60, 62.
2. See "My Impressions of Zola", Impressions and Opinions, London, Laurie, 1913, pp. 66ff. One must not take too literally Moore's account at the beginning of this "Visit" and elsewhere: he exaggerated his friendship with most of the French writers, and especially with Zola - see e.g. Hone, op.cit., pp.72-3. "There was never any real intimacy between my husband and Mr. Moore," Mme. Zola told Barrett Clark in 1922 - see Hone, op.cit., p.143.

that of Thérèse Raquin (1868) and Joie de Vivre (1884), was never undertaken, but Moore was still eager to be "un ricocher (sic) de Zola en Angleterre"(1). He wrote from Moore Hall, praising Zola's new novel, Germinale (1885), and then went on, in his execrable French, to express his debt to Zola:

"Mais mon cher Maître comment expliquer ma reconnaissance pour tout ce que vous avez fait pour moi? Comme je vous ai souvent dit et je suis fier de le repété: c'est à vous, à vos livres de critique, que je dois le talent qu'il paraît que je possède. Je vous doit tout, et la dette s'accroît toujours. La meilleure récompense, il me semble, est de faire de bons livres et de vous faire honneur ainsi(2)."

He signed himself "votre élève dévoué".

In a preface to Pot-Bouille(3), he praised Zola's unfailing use of the right word, beauty of phrase and epic grasp of the whole theme. If Zola's epic faculty made too

1. All references to Zola's letters here are, unless otherwise stated, to Auriant, "Documents Inédits", "Un Disciple Anglais d'Emile Zola. George Moore," Mercure de France, Tome 297, 1st May, 1940, pp.312-323. Most letters are undated, but refer to the few years following 1882.
2. Auriant, op.cit., p.317.
3. Piping Hot, translated from the 63rd French edition, London, Vizetelly, 1885.

perfect a whole of his miscellaneous material, at least the lives of his characters were bound into close unity(1). And in a preface, to La Curee, the story of Renée's incestuous passion for her stepson, which became an allegory of the corruption of the Second Empire(2), was highly praised.

By 1886, however, a change was coming about, for a number of reasons. In the first place, the pace and effort of working up material for A Drama in Muslin (1886), though he knew the background, was too much for Moore. Moreover, adherence to Zola's theories was forcing him into schizophrenia: A Drama in Muslin, for example, led him to equality for women, a position quite untenable for a man who believed that women would never create great art and that their true place was in the home(3). Zola's theories led him to left-wing politics and humanitarianism, which clashed with his role as landlord and nostalgic attitude to feudalism. So, although he was admittedly(4) influenced by Zola in his first three novels, he now began to move

1. Preface, pnviff.

2. Preface, p.ii.

3. See e.g. A Modern Lover, 1883, I, pp.72-3.

4. See Moore's account in J. G. Huneker, Steeplejack, London, Laurie, (N.Y., Scribners), 1921, II, p.228.

away from him in his work. Probably the reference to Don Juan at the beginning of A Drama in Muslin indicates Moore's interest in a decadent theme and the consequent break with Zola.

Parnell and His Island (1887)(1) deepened the split between subjectivity and objectivity in Moore. He came to realise that Zola's vaunted impartiality (that a novelist's task was merely to record, not to judge, preach or tell a story) was unattainable(2). His imagination had begun to break with Zola, though his theory lacked behind. A split was inevitable, for many of his ideas were now in complete contradiction to one another. He began also to realise the inadequacies of Zola's style for describing 'poetic' aspects of life. There was another factor, too. Parnell and his Island makes it quite clear why Moore could not write a Naturalist or social novel: his concern with the terrible conditions in Ireland was mainly aesthetic. The scathing attack on Ireland and the Parnellites, the descriptions of misery and poverty, were all grist to his artistic mill. Moore himself makes this clear when he says that ugly bog and Irish hovels are as good a subject for

1. London, Swan. Sonnenschein, Lowrey.
2. It is only fair to add that, by the end of his life, Zola had also realised this.

art as a picturesque English village. He does not care, he says, whether one picture is cognate in political feeling with the preceding one; in fact, he would like each to be evocative of dissimilar impressions and the whole to produce the blurred uncertain effect of nature. Contradictory facts, he says, he has left contradictory(1). All this made the break with his master inevitable: from

---

1. Parnell and His Island, pp.234-5.

Where his allegiance lay may be deduced from his siding with the hard-up landlord, his opposition to Parnell's plans to reduce rents (Parnell and His Island, e.g. p.91), and the tone of his revolting descriptions of the peasants (e.g. p.144). And yet he recognised the causes of the peasants' miseries; he realised that the world was changing; and, as we can see from A Drama in Muslin, despite the artistic detachment for which he strove, his sympathies were engaged in the situation of the people. A Roman Catholic with a hatred of Catholicism, an Irishman with a love/hate relationship with his native country, and a landlord, critical of both peasantry and Establishment, attacking himself in Land League terms (in Parnell and His Island): small wonder that Moore was schizophrenic during this period.

this period, Zola ceased to be his main inspiration(1).

By December 1887, he was writing to Blanche:

"... he does not address the scholarly instincts in readers and if a man does not do that I fail to see what ground he claims my attention and consideration(2)."

There was yet another reason for the departure from Zola's methods: in England Naturalism was only just beginning to make itself felt, but by now the movement was declining in France. Huysmans' A Rebours, which sounded the death-knell of Naturalism, appeared in 1884. Moore reviewed it in the St. James' Gazette(3) and, although it was too late to have any effect on A Mummer's Wife, the book did influence A Drama in Muslin. Moore told Zola(4) that, although his new novel preserved the root idea of the school, it contained novelties in composition and marked a great advance in language compared with A Mummer's Wife. A Drama in Muslin was, in fact a hotch-potch of styles, although Zola was still the greatest single influence; by the time

1. Parnell and his Ireland indicates, however, how close to his own experience A Drama in Muslin is. The tenants' meeting on the drive (Parnell and his Ireland, pp.61ff) is reproduced verbatim in A Drama in Muslin (pp.123ff).
2. Fresh Combe Lodge, Beeding, Sussex, 2nd December, (1887), J-E. Blanche, Portraits of a Lifetime, London, 1937, p.292.
3. "A Curious Book", 2nd September, 1884, pp.6-7.
4. Hone, op.cit., p.119.

of A Mere Accident (1887), Huysmans(1) and Pater were the dominant influences(2).

The same trend away from Zola may be seen in Moore's letters of this period. He wrote to Blanche:

"Do you know the little cocotte in L'Education Sentimentale? She is as true to life as Nana, more true to life(3)."

In 1887 came the Manifesto of the Five; scientific naturalism was fast giving way to idealism and symbolism. And although Moore wrote a commiserating letter to Zola(4), he himself had taken the same path. Edouard Dujardin(5), Mallarmé, the Symbolists and the music of Wagner: all had their effect on Moore at this period. He was always a sponge, soaking up new aestheticisms.

1. It was partly the influence of Huysmans which turned Moore away from Zola.
2. In the fly-leaves at the end of various Vizetelly eds. of Moore's early works (e.g. A Mummer's Wife, Vizetelly, no. 3, 1887), A Modern Lover, A Mummer's Wife, A Drama in Muslin, A Mere Accident and Spring Days are all advertised as "A Realistic Novel". Even the Vizetelly A Mere Accident (1887) at the end advertises the book in the same terms. Oddly enough, the title-page of this book bears no such advertisement.
3. See Hone, op.cit., p.120.
4. August, 25th 1887 - see Hone, op.cit., p.133.
5. Editor of La Revue Wagnérienne and La Revue Indépendante, and author of Les Lauriers sont coupés, the first novel to employ interior monologue.

In 1888 appeared Confessions of a Young Man, chapter 8 of which, "The Synthesis of the Nouvelle Athènes", attacked Zola's method and style:

"What I reproach Zola with is that he has no style; there is nothing you won't find in Zola from Chateaubriand to the reporting in the Figaro.

He seeks immortality in an exact description of a linen-draper's shop; if the shop conferred immortality it should be upon the linendraper who created the shop, and not on the novelist who described it.

And his last novel L'Oeuvre(1), how spun out, and for a franc a line in the Gil Plas. Not a single new or even exact observation(2)."

True, Moore expressed the hope, in a letter to Zola(3), that he understood the criticism in the Confessions: but in the same letter, he was critical of La Terre (1889) and Germinale (1885), though still signing himself "votre élève et ami très dévoué." Then his article on Turgueneff, February, 1888, showed the definitions of Naturalism to be both material and contradictory. And in April, 1888(4) came the famous visit to Médan(5) and the break with Zola. "It is the eternal law - children

1. 1886.

2. Heinemann, 1952, p.77.

3. Fresh Combe Lodge, Beeding, Sussex, 17th March, 1887, Auriant, p.318.

4. See e.g. Hone, op.cit., pp.142-3.

5. It was, apparently, Manet who persuaded him to go - see G. Jean-Aubry, "Zola et George Moore", Les Nouvelles Littéraires, Saturday, 17th January, 1925, p.5.

devour their fathers", Zola is said to have remarked - according to Moore, that is(1). "Shall I ever forget," he wrote in Avowals (1904)(2), "Zola's sadness when I began my recantation?(3)" But in an article on Le Rêve, favourable to Zola though not to Naturalism(4), published in the St. James' Gazette , on 2nd November, 1888, Moore set out to debunk Zola's claims as a realist and the existence of the Naturalist novel as a whole:

"The realistic novel is the 'rara avis', and should be welcomed as such. At the present moment there are not a dozen in the world, nor is there likelihood of the number being appreciably increased. An unusually intellectual generation may produce from three to five. The man will never be born who will write three: two at the utmost(5)."

1. Impressions and Opinions, 1913 ed., p.73.
2. Pall Mall Magazine, January-April, p.482.
3. Gilbert Phelps compares this visit to Medan with James's to Paris in 1875: for both, the result was disillusionment. "It was Amico Moorini...who went to visit Zola at Médan; it was George Moore who returned." (Gilbert Phelps, op.cit., p.97). And Phelps adds that the main agent in the transition, as with James, was Turgenev, whom Moore met in the same year. In fact, none of these statements is true. Amico was by no means yet exorcised. And, as we have seen, by 1886 Moore was moving away from Zola's methods; by 1887, he was becoming critical of Zola; and the influence of Pater, Huysmans and Wagner (Dujardin claims that he introduced Moore to Wagner and Bayreuth, and that Moore's association with La Revue Indépendante turned him from Naturalism - see "Quand George Moore vient à Paris", Les Nouvelles Littéraires, Saturday, 18th November, 1922, p.1.) was prior to that of Turgenev.
4. No doubt it was designed to placate Zola.
5. pp.3-4. "M. Zola 'on the side of the Angels'". Later in the first edition of Impressions and Opinions, 1891, under the title "Le Rêve", pp.122-129.

Zola's annual volume, he said, was a poem and had nothing to do with realism. In judging Zola, the critics had been deceived because they had examined the matter and closed their eyes to the form, "and it has become necessary to remind them that mire is not more real than clouds." Zola's unique gift lay not in his magnificent descriptive powers, but in his "power of lifting detail into such intense relief that the illusion of life is more vivid in his works than in those of any other writer", so that, "deceived by the brilliant lighting and by the ingredients used, M. Zola has been written down a realist." Nevertheless, Zola had done what no novelist, not even Balzac, had done: he had created a recognizable form of novel," a form that owes all to his genius and will perish with it; for the form is narrow and sterile, like the form of Racine, and admits of no further development." The weaknesses of Le Rêve, said Moore, were obviously offshoots of its strength:

"M. Zola has never attempted to grapple with mental problems, or to follow the strange and complex mysteries of the mind's mechanism: had he done so, the Zola novel would not be as recognizable in style as it is."

This clearly links up with the transfer in Moore's allegiance evident in the Turgenev article. Le Rêve, then,

is praised: it may be, as Hone suggests.(1), that this novel was intended to show that Zola could portray the spiritual sides of life, and Moore accepted the will for the deed; or it may be that Moore, a little conscience-stricken by the Confessions affair, was paying a final tribute to Zola, now that he had deserted him - if so, the praise was backhanded, Zola being extolled for his non-Naturalist qualities, a fact which indicates quite clearly the change that had come about in Moore.

After he had heard that the Confessions was to contain an attack on La Terre (1888), his latest novel(2), Zola

1. op.cit., p.144.
2. Actually, the book attacked, not La Terre, but Naturalism and the Goncourts. (And see G. Jean-Aubry, "George Moore et E. Zola", Bookman's Journal, vol.xi, no.39, December 1924, p.99. Also "Zola et George Moore", Les Nouvelles Littéraires, Saturday, 17th January, 1925, p.5. For Moore's account see "My Impressions of Zola", Impressions and Opinions, 1913, pp.70ff.) Ironically, Moore told Aubry years later that La Terre was the one book by Zola in which, in spite of its brutality, the truth and power of the pictures remained living and clear in his mind. (Bookman's Journal.) - though J. W. Robertson Scott (The Life and Death of a Newspaper - the Pall Mall Gazette - London, Methuen, 1952, p.205) records that, in a letter of his earlier years, Moore had written, "Regarding La Terre I used my best endeavour to prevent Vizetelly from publishing it. It is a horrible book!"

refused to write a preface to La Ferme du Cabotin(1).

All the same, it is noticeable how little destructive criticism there was in Moore's letters; moreover, throughout, he referred to him as "mon cher Maître" and apologised for the Confessions passage; and they saw each other in London and Paris several times afterwards(2). The die, however, was cast.

L'Assommoir, hailed from the beginning as a masterpiece, remained for Moore Zola's greatest achievement, because it contained his finest character, Gervaise(3). When he first read the book, he tells us in the Confessions (4), he was impressed by its strength and decorative grandeur, and especially by the immense harmonic development of the idea. The fugal treatment of different themes seemed highly original: for example, the wonderful development of the fight motive. The river-like roll of the narrative was magnificent: if it sometimes broadened into lakes, it never stagnated. Later, Moore says, he

1. The French translation of A Mummer's Wife, 1888. Zola wrote to Moore from Médan on 15th August, 1886 (Letter put into Jean-Aubry's hands by Moore, and entitled 'mon cher ami'. See Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 17th January, 1925, p.5), saying that Charpentier told him not to read A Mummer's Wife in the magazine version because it was a bad translation, but to wait for the full text of Alexis. Zola would then write the preface for Moore to publish in London.
2. See Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 17th January, 1925, p.5.
3. Cf. Impressions and Opinions, 1912 ed., p.78.
4. pp.62-3.

qualified this praise in two important respects: he came to realise that the language was an imitation of Flaubert and Chateaubriand; and, being deceived by the substitution of Paris for an exotic background, he did not at first realise that the qualities he most admired were Romantic, not Naturalistic(1). So, by 1888, the epic grasp had become a narrow vision, the beautiful style only journalism, the new and original methods mere crudities. From 1888 onwards, after the break with Zola, Moore's favourite criticism was that he had no sense of selection:

"Art is not nature, art is nature digested. Zola and Goncourt cannot, or will not, understand that the artistic stomach must be allowed to do its work in its own mysterious fashion. If a man is really an artist he will remember what is necessary, forget what is useless; but if he takes notes he will interrupt his artistic digestion, and the result will be a lot of little touches inchoate and wanting in the elegant rhythm of the synthesis. I am sick of synthetical art; we want observation direct and unreasoned(2)."

Zola, of course, did select but, according to Moore, now a zealous disciple of Huysmans and Pater, he selected the wrong things.

By 1890, in *The Human Animal*(3), Moore was saying that

1. ib. p.63. However, he always admitted the Realists could write - see Confessions, pp.148-9.
2. Confessions, p.83.
3. The Hawk, vol.5, no.111, 18th March, 1890, pp.313-314.

Zola had no soul and in any other writer his limitations would be fatal. As always, the novel contained vivid detail and harmonious form, as if Zola were writing about an actual experience, for the book "brings with it just the same sense of conviction as would the autobiography of the inspector of Charing Cross railway station, were he to write out his experience of twenty years(1)."

Impressions and Opinions (1891) went further:

L'Assommoir was good only because here, more than in any other book, Zola was a pupil of Flaubert(2). And "during the last ten or a dozen years a striking resemblance has grown up between the Zola novel and the popular newspaper...(3)"

And so it went on. In an article on La Débâcle (1892)(4), Moore said that Zola hesitated between history and fiction and came to believe that what counted was mass rather than form. His early novels were poor in psychological interest, rich in scenes of human emotion; but in La Débâcle, Moore said, there was nothing intense. Enormous armies marched on vast plains, but the soul-revealing gesture was missing.

1. p.313.

2. p.78.

3. p.79.

4. Fortnightly Review, 1892, pp.204-10.

A letter to Gosse(1), 5th July, 1893, criticised Zola's methods as being a mixture of Flaubert's and the Goncourts'. His best book, L'Assommoir, belonged to Flaubert's school, and never did a pupil follow more faithfully and obsequiously the method of his master. Since then, Zola had abandoned the short phrase enforced by a pictorial epithet and gone into a sea of verbiage, formless and void. La Débâcle and L'Argent were just not art. There was no desire or capacity for realism in Zola; his talent began and ended with a great power for reproducing the inessential. Flaubert discovered and formulated new artistic principles; Zola discovered none and disintegrated those he borrowed.

In an article entitled, "My Impressions of Zola" (1894)(2), Moore stated that he and his friends had hailed L'Assommoir as a masterpiece, as the sublimation, the apotheosis of Flaubert, merely because they longed for a genius to applaud.

And in January 1896 he wrote to Frederic Lees:

1. Tuesday night, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.
2. The English Illustrated Magazine, London, vol.xi, p.489. The article is basically the same as Impressions and Opinions, but contains additional passages.

"I regard Zola now with different eyes. His work seems to me to be a vile vulgarisation of L'Education Sentimentale. On the whole my Mummer's Wife seems to me less vile than any of the other innumerable books proceeding from that sublime source...Zola, Maupassant and the obscure and unspeakable tail(1)."

Moore's final opinion of naturalism can perhaps be seen best in his criticism of George Clausen's naturalistic painting, "Labourers after Dinner":

"Until I saw Mr. Clausen's 'Labourers' I did not fully realize how terrible a thing art becomes when divorced from beauty, grace, mystery and suggestion. It would be difficult to say where and how this picture differs from a photograph ... it is as clear as a newspaper, and it reads like one ... Mr. Clausen has seen nothing but the sordid and the mean ... I can find among the unquestioned masters no slightest precedent for the blank realism of this picture. The ordinary man's aversion to such ugliness seems to be entirely right ... The mission of art is not truth, but beauty...(2)"

In later years, he would say of Zola:

"The man had no art. A clever man, but too damned thorough." At the house of a 'cocotte'. La Valtesse, "Zola was collecting notes (My God, what masses of notes!) preparing to write Nana; he was in search of local color. I don't think he felt comfortable there, and clearly he had come for strictly scientific purposes; at any rate he scarcely looked at

1. "Recollections of an Anglo-Parisian Bibliophile", p.296. Cf. his views on Balzac.
2. See Modern Painting, London, Walter Scott, 1893, pp.117-119.

the woman, but asked at once to see her bed-room; and what do you think he wanted there? To measure it with a yard-stick, get its exact dimensions! Good God! Art is a coquette, and Zola never suspected it; you must woo art." Bennett's tart in The Pretty Lady was finer than anything Zola ever imagined: "Zola believed that because a thing was true it was necessarily a work of art(1)."

All the same, according to Hone, when Moore heard of Zola's death, he said, "That man was the beginning of me(2)".

Perhaps the last word, however, should go to Yeats, getting his own back for Hail and Farewell:

"In the early autumn Zola died(3), asphyxiated by a charcoal stove. Innumerable paragraphs and leading articles made Moore jealous and angry; he hated his own past in Zola. He talked much to his friends on Saturday nights. 'Anybody can get himself asphyxiated'. Then after some six weeks announced that he himself had awakened that very morning to smell gas, a few minutes more and he would have been dead; the obsession was over(4)."

1. Barrett Clark, op.cit., pp.108-110.
2. Hone, op.cit., p.144. Zola's most permanent legacy to Moore was probably his radical attack on 19th century social and literary conventions.
3. 1902.
4. W. B. Yeats, Autobiographies, p.452. For a full study of Moore and Zola, see the following: M. Brown, op.cit., ch.4; Hone, op.cit., ch.3; Auriant, op.cit.; Jean-Aubry, op.cit.; Wm. C. Frierson, "George Moore: Naturalist", The English Novel in Transition, 1885-1940, University of Oklahoma Press, Oklahoma, 1942, pp.60-84; A. J. Farmer, Le mouvement esthétique et 'décadent' en Angleterre, 1873-1900, Paris, 1931. (Bibliothèque de la Revue de Litt. Comp. tom.75, pp.83ff); & Sonja Nejdefors-Frisk, George Moore's Naturalistic Prose, Upsala Irish Studies, III, 1952, pp.38ff. Many other writers have also studied this influence.

Moore liked the Goncourts for their admiration of Degas; and Edmond de Goncourt was the first to give Moore a living example of a writer entirely devoted to his work. The Goncourts brought him a taste for modern sensations, gave him a sense of nuances and snapshots, and helped him to recognise the resources of language(1). In the first flush of Moore's naturalism, Edmond was called one of the greatest prose writers of modern times(2). By 1888, however, the brothers were referred to as collectors of bric-a-brac, not artists(3).

Before disillusion with Flaubert had set in, Moore saw Maupassant mainly as a superficial imitator and populariser of Flaubert's style and thought(4), at his best when, as in Boule de Suif, he was composing under Flaubert's immediate influence. La Maison Tellier existed merely on the surface(5); probably the nearest Moore ever

1. See Collet, op.cit., pp.161, 172.
2. "A Breakfast with Edmond de Goncourt", Saint James's Gazette, 13th May, 1884, pp.6-7.
3. Confessions, p.81.
4. Pierre et Jean, he said, was written in a style which was a rather thin mixture of Zola and Flaubert: "the usual naturalistic gravy well watered and gone a little cold." And we did not see Pierre's soul ("Guy de Maupassant", The Illustrated London News, 16th January, 1892, p.82).
5. Preface to Poor Folk, p.ix.

came to making on a French writer the kind of comment with which he obliterated the English novel. True, Une Vie, though desperately faulty in construction, contained some of the best pages of modern literature. And, despite his failure as a serious novelist, Maupassant had the gift of narrative(1). His short stories, though unfortunately small(2) and over-simplified, were skilfully proportioned and beautifully executed miniatures(3). However, narrative was not everything and Maupassant was a good short story writer only because he had nothing else.

Huysmans had a great influence on Moore, especially through A Rebours. Strangely enough, Moore's first mention of this book, while praising the erudition, the lightness of touch and grace, and the delicacy with which the hero's depravities are told, was only mildly favourable - it was "a curious book"(4). He explained in a letter to Zola, 22nd September, 1884:

"Il(5) n'est pas tout à fait ce que j'aurais écrit si je n'étais pas forcée de consulter le goût d'un rédacteur en chef(6)."

1. Letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, 14th March, 1921, Brotherton.
2. Avowals, 1919, pp.89,131.
3. Preface to Poor Folk, pp.viii-ix.
4. "A Curious Book", pp.6-7.
5. i.e. the review.
6. See Collet, op.cit., p.188.

He was still under Zola's spell, too. But the change was soon to come about. J-E. Blanche recalls the influence Huysmans had on Moore during his post-Zola period:

"I watched Moore forge his miraculous technique. The Temple courts(1) are as peaceful as the quadrangles of the universities. A greenish haze rising from the trees and lawns pervaded the study in which Moore sat bent over Huysmans's books, meditating, questioning. Huysmans's writings, charged with archaic expressions, scientific and scatological terms, far-fetched images, his syncopated rhythms, and his 'raboteuse' phraseology, disturbed this restless searcher still bewitched by Tourgenieff's prose(2)."

The two writers had much in common, including their progressive enthusiasms: for Gautier, the Goncourts, the Impressionists, Zola and the Symbolists. Confessions of a Young Man, too, is enthusiastic about Huysmans:

"Happily, I have A Rebours to read, that prodigious book, that beautiful mosaic... Huysmans speaks of Mallarmé in A Rebours, and in hours like these a page of Huysmans is as a dose of opium, a glass of something exquisite and spirituous... Huysmans goes to my soul like a gold ornament of Byzantine workmanship: there is in his style the yearning charm of arches, a sense of ritual, the passion of the Gothic, of the window(3)."

By 1900, though his fiction had moved away from Huysmans, Moore could admire his technique, saying that the most

1. Moore's home, 1889-1896.

2. J-E. Blanche, Portraits of a Lifetime, p.143.

3. Confessions, pp.143-4.

wonderful part of En Route was the massiveness of the chapters which led up to the visit to the monastery(1). In 1904, Huysmans was included among the few "intellecutal men" who "have written prose narrative worthy of our consideration"(2), and in Avowals (1919) Moore was pleased to call him "mon ami Huysmans"(3). The truth is, however, that A Rebours was the only work of Huysmans that really influenced Moore: he had probably never read his early naturalistic novels, and his anti-Catholicism no doubt prevented his studying Huysmans' later work(4).

1. See letter to Mrs. (Nia) Crawford, Queen's Hotel, Llanfairfechan, 5th July (1900), National Library, Dublin, MS 2645. A significant statement in view of his denials of Huysmans' influence on Evelyn Innes: See Moore's letter to Huneker, Dublin, 2nd April, 1904, J. G. Huneker, Steeplejack, II, p.228.
2. "Avowals", January-April 1904, p.482.
3. p.284.
4. Other French writers were summarily dismissed. Dumas was merely ragtime one beat, up and down (letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, Wednesday, 14th April, 1920, Brotherton); Loti sometimes a delightful writer (letter to Dujardin, 4 Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 5th May, 1903, op.cit., p.46), at other times an inferior R. L. Stevenson (Avowals, 1919, p.47). But see also pp.170-176; May-August 1904, pp.377-9); and Anatole France a second-rate writer of charm and culture (Goodwin, op.cit., p.72) with a diamond-cutter's skill (letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, London, S.W.1., 10th September, 1926, Brotherton), or worse, "always sucking a lollypop", with Thais' "cheap tinsel" (Barrett Clark, op.cit., pp.70-71).

What distinguished Russian from English and French fiction was that the manner of weaving was not apparent. One could follow the method in English and French fiction, say where the design began and discover the manner in which the colour harmony was composed. In Russian fiction, the picture was apparent only in the result. The life in the book was as mysterious as real life; the vulgar mechanism of preparatory scenes was concealed; and so inherent and complete was the logical sequence that we were unconsciously prepared for each event. Vulgar foreshadowing was unnecessary and we watched the unfolding of the story as we watched the unfolding of roseleaves.

Dostoevsky, however, was too laborious for Moore to give him his unqualified admiration. In Impressions and Opinions (1891), he was referred to merely as "Gaboriau with psychological sauce"(1): an opinion based on Crime and Punishment, retracted partly in the preface to Poor Folk(2), but retained in the revised Impressions and Opinions(3). Later, he was called a sculptor in snow, admirable but lacking permanence. His genius was too Northern, too remote from Greece, to be fully admired by Moore(4). Poor

1. Impressions and Opinions, 1891, p.71.
2. p.x.
3. 1913, p.48.
4. Goodwin, Conversations, pp.144-5.

Folk, Moore had said in 1894(1), though vividly related, remained, like Maupassant and Kipling, 'little literature'. Dostoevsky was not so perfect a writer as Turgenev, his form not so pure, his insight less subtle and the texture of his work coarser. But he had many merits. Poor Folk was written in letters, the most artificial of all forms of narrative, but the difficulties of form were overcome so easily that there was no trace of composition. The narrative of a disreputable drunkard's grief for the death of his son was simple and unforgettable. The theme deepened throughout the book, Dostoevsky's genius maintaining the sensation of vibration to the very end, and a simple drop into the minor key preserved the illusion at the close of the book(2).

Tolstoy was another of the writers towards whom Moore's attitude vacillated considerably. In 1890, he criticised severely Tolstoy's concern in the Kreutzer Sonata with morality:

"More unwholesome stuff than this it is impossible to conceive(3)."

It was "a mental lollipop" for the prurient to suck. Yet, after having read Anna Karenina, in 1892, he wrote to

1. Preface, p.x.
2. Preface to Poor Folk, pp.xiiff.
3. "Prurienty", Hawk, vol.5, no.112, 25th March, 1890, pp.347-8.

Maurice that it was the greatest novel ever written(1). Each character stood for a human idea and (in contrast to the English novel) events in this book and in War and Peace were important only in so far as they revealed what was passing below the surface(2). No one pushed the principle of homogeneity so far as Tolstoy here: the snipe-shooting scene, for example, was as vivid as anything in Flaubert, and at the same time more completely part of the whole. No mechanism was visible: the picture existed merely in its results. Similarly, in the ending, he strove to make his picture vanish at the corners and not break off(3). Later, however, Moore became highly critical of Tolstoy. Above all, he disliked the way in which the moralist more and more swamped the artist in him(4): War and Peace was spoiled by too much theory(5); Anna Karenina was written to prove that, if a woman left her husband for her lover, moral disintegration and suicide were the inevitable outcome; and Resurrection distorted nature's rhythms in order to show that, if a girl indulged in love outside marriage, she would

1. Monday night, 27th September, 1892, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646. Characteristic of Moore's enthusiasm on finishing a book.
2. Cosmopolis, 1896, p.56.
3. Cosmopolis, 1896, p.58.
4. Preface Ave, pp. ix-x.
5. Letter to Mrs. Crawford, 92 Victoria Street, S.W., Sat., 17th April, 1900.

become a prostitute and drunkard(1). Naturally, a man so interested in moral theories soon lost interest in character. In any case, Tolstoy was not a great psychologist: he was uncertain about the soul(2), and lacked Turgenev's creative imagination. The merits of War and Peace lay in its vast architecture, its numerous characters and events, all perfectly controlled by a dominant motive: and in the retention of the central idea, that the hero of the novel was really Providence, until the last book(3), where the threads were neatly gathered up(4). But the merits were outweighed by the defects. The first two volumes were a series of varied pictures as if his intention were to illustrate the whole of civilised life; but the pictures were second-rate, soon became monotonous and failed in their enormous task(5). Despite all the movement and colour of the book, on looking back one saw the barrenness of it -

1. Avowals, 1919, chs. 5, 6, 7 (1904, May-August, pp.70-77, 234-40).
2. See e.g. "Avowals", May-August 1904, p.75.
3. Preface to Sister Teresa, London, Unwin, 1901, p.vii; letter to Mrs. Crawford, 92 Victoria Street, S.W., Saturday, 17th April, 1900.
4. Avowals, 1919, p.146; "Avowals", May-Aug. 1904, p.75.
5. Toor claimed that Hugo's Notre Dame de Paris, which he read in 1920, suggested the literary methods of Flaubert, Zola and Tolstoy; in fact, he maintained that different scenes in War and Peace, each representing an epoch, sprang naturally from Hugo's book (letter to Eglinton, 19th November, 1920, op.cit., p.56).

by contrast with Turgenev, whose stories seemed slight until long after reading them. Tolstoy was a master at describing the actual, but his realism was irrelevant; War and Peace was a great spectacle, but it had no story, because no one in it suffered or dreamed. In short, Tolstoy was not a natural storyteller. Moore's final comment on him was that no writer ever walked in the wrong road as well as Tolstoy; but he was not a genius, for genius is an instinctive knowledge of the right road.

And so we come to Turgenev, whom Moore regarded as the finest of all writers of prose fiction, referring to him as "the great master of fiction"(1) and "the greatest artist since antiquity"(2). Yet his attitude towards him did develop. In 1888, in the Fortnightly Review article, Moore showed that he placed Turgenev midway between Balzac's philosophic, romantic realism and Jane Austen's maiden-lady variety. This was really the compromise effected by the reaction against Victorianism: care for both the external and the internal, concern with the novel's technical potentialities combined with an awareness of the dangers of an over-aesthetic approach. In 1888, Moore saw Turgenev as

---

1. Letter to Meyerfield, 4 Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 8th January, 1902, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460.

2. Preface to Poor Folk, p.xi.

belonging to the 'thought school' as distinct from the 'fact school'. By contrast with the English novelists, he had an intense, penetrating mind, and was concerned always with provoking intellectual responses. He was a scholar, who chose to work in the novel, and put into it his highest thoughts. Virgin Soil summed up his genius completely, but it was in his short stories that he was unique. He had complete mastery over his material, fashioning the slightest events into wonderful stories. He was the finest master of the Eastern 'conte', as distinct from the western analytical novel. In Toc Toc, for example, events were chosen so unerringly that they followed one another with perfect naturalness and harmony. Only once did Moore criticise Turgenev's form: because his characters were not evolved from his inner consciousness, but delineations of his friends, the characteristics of Bazaroff, his most vital creation, were very strongly marked, and yet had to be fitted into the story. This explained why Fathers and Sons, alone among Turgenev's novels, was a series of scenes held together by the personality of the central figure, and so lacked the simplicity and balance of his greatest work<sup>(1)</sup>. His special power was his skill

---

l. Impressions and Opinions, 1913. ed., p.64.

in laying bare the nerve of an emotion(1); and he always found the unique word that lit up a soul(2).

Gilbert Phelps rightly observes(3) that Turgenev's influence was one of Moore's really profound aesthetic experiences, "which more perhaps than any other had the effect, at a crucial point in his career, of turning him inwards to find his own kind of originality, to touch the springs of his own creativity." For Moore, as for James, says Phelps, the discovery of Turgenev was the climax of his formative phase.

In 1888, Moore, still not wholly free from the influence of realism, thought that, compared with Balzac's fire, Turgenev had a certain amount of thinness and reserve, and seemed to be too conscious an artist. He continued to praise, however: Turgenev had a fecundity akin to Michael Angelo(4); he saw his race with a clear vision(5). And

1. Fortnightly Review, 1888, pp.237-51. This article was reprinted in Impressions and Opinions, 1891. When the book was revised in 1913, slight alterations were made (e.g. French titles were translated into English, in accordance with Moore's later beliefs), but there were no changes in the opinions expressed on Turgenev.
2. Confessions, p.126.
3. op.cit., p.96.
4. Cosmopolis, 1896, p.46. In "Avowals", January-April 1904, p.484, he said that Turgenev was like Phidias and that neither would ever be as much admired as Michael Angelo.
5. North American Review, 1900, p.515.

gradually, like James, Moore's appreciation of Turgenev deepened as Moore himself grew more mature, "so that it ran parallel with and interpenetrated all the later currents that entered into his work, eventually perhaps superseding them all(1)." It went along with his interest in the Aesthetic movement, Impressionism and the Celtic revival. As time went on, Moore became more and more enamoured of Turgenev as he himself came to place increasing stress on 'poetry', as well as clarity and simplicity. Turgenev was no longer accused of 'thinness' and 'reserve': a change of emphasis seen in Moore's imaginary story, in A Story-Teller's Holiday(2), of Dostoevsky's tale to Turgenev. And from his middle years on, great importance was attached to Turgenev's narrative gift(3): he and Balzac were the only real tale-tellers(4):

"Balzac is life as we live it...Turgenieff is life as we think it. Balzac is the whole of life, whereas Turgenieff is the heart, the ceaseless throb of the heart that knows no change(5)."

1. G. Phelps, op.cit., p.99.
2. London, Heinemann, 1928, vol.2, ch.lix.
3. Fortnightly Review, 1917, p.540.
4. "Avowals", January-April 1904, p.482; Avowals, 1919, p.130.
5. "Avowals", January-April 1904, p.482: Avowals, 1919, pp.131-2.

For Moore, Turgenev became the perfect artist but, in addition, profound and humane, and, because he saw beneath the superficial aspects of reality, superior to Dostoevsky and Tolstoy even in content and moral force.

The passion for narrative remained central to Moore's 'credo'. He held that a storyteller was born not made(1). Naturally, he himself possessed this rare gift, and it was his frequent complaint that modern writers did not:

"Have you noticed that nobody writes now... They don't want to tell stories, those fellows(2)."

In his later years, Moore constantly poured scorn on the profusion of modern 'novelists':

"It is true that not every writer can write a novel, just as it is true that every novelist is not always a writer. People never seem to realise there is such a thing as a narrative gift - the power to tell a story. But now... everyone with any power of expression... seem (sic) to think they know how to write a novel... and what surprises me is they never seem to realise what the technique of a novel means; how it all has to be planned out to a nicety, every chapter decided on before the act of writing commences. Even then, as in my case, I often find that, in spite of the most carefully laid plans, things begin to go wrong and have to be done all over again(3)."

1. Preface to Lewis Seymour and Some Women, p.vi.
2. H. Wolfe, Dialogues and Monologues, London, Gollancz, 1928, p.16. Largely imaginary conversation, but Moore read it and made no objection, as the thoughts are his.
3. Goodwin, Conversations, p.180.

Moore had possessed this unique virtue from the beginning of his career. A Modern Lover, he states in the preface to Lewis Seymour(1), "was the book of a young man who, in a moment of inspiration, hit upon an excellent anecdote."

"...one day it took shape suddenly as I left the Gaiety Bar by the swing doors leading to Catherine Street, to which delightful surprise was added the conviction, not less delightful, that I had found at last my real business in life. I was a tale-teller(2)."

Narrative, he says, is the supreme prose gift, and, with characteristic egotism, he refers to the story of his first novel as "'an anecdote that the folk behind me invented and that the artist in front of them developed(3).'"

Eglinton states(4) that Moore taught one how to distinguish between the telling of a merely good story, complete in itself, and the art manifested in long-sustained narrative line. What Moore admired in Rousseau's Confessions, he says, was the power of manipulation and invention. Moore understood a subject like the origin of Christianity if he could see it as a 'story':

1. p.v.
2. "Apologia pro scriptis meis", Fortnightly Review, cxii, n.s., October 1922 , p.531.
3. Preface, p.viii.
4. J. Eglinton, "Recollections of George Moore", in Irish Literary Portraits, London, 1935, pp.108-9.

"The belief that he possessed a special faculty of this sort distinguishing him from his fellows was strong within him, and perhaps was partly justified, but it led him into enterprises for which his lack of scholarship and the poverty of his spiritual experience alike disqualified him(1)."

For Moore, the great storytellers were Anne Brontë, Poe, Balzac and Turgenev (though, because the highest art was the art that concealed art, Balzac was a lesser artist than Turgenev, who achieved a Greek perfection of form.) Sterne, Borrow, Landor and Pater were great writers because they refrained from storytelling, by contrast with Hawthorne and R. L. Stevenson, who were great essayists and stylists misled into writing novels. Of those writers who were not in the first rank and yet not part of the flotsam of the novel, Moore specifically mentioned Flaubert and Tolstoy as not being storytellers. The remainder were, with few exceptions, mere adventure storytellers like Conrad or drawing-room comedy writers like Fielding. The greatest praise that Moore could bestow on a writer was that he wrote like the ancients(2). Even Balzac was excluded from this select company, which was confined to The Six: Sterne, Jane Austen, Landor, Pater, Hawthorne and Turgenev.

1. Eglinton adds that he cannot see the advantage of uplifting the story of the Gospels or even Heloïse and Abelard into the tenuous atmosphere of "pure narrative".
2. Also Moore's highest aim for himself. See e.g. letter to Dujardin, 11th January, 1909, op.cit., p.74.

In spite of all the influences that went into his writing, Moore once maintained that his form "rose out of what I had to say quite naturally(1)": in the light of this claim, it is appropriate to examine now Moore's own work.

---

1. Conversations in Ebury Street, London, Heinemann, 1936, p.62.

CHAPTER III

SHIFTING LITERARY ALLEGIANCES:

MOTIVES GOVERNING REVISIONS

One of George Moore's first true(1) motives for revision was the removal from his work of influences that he felt he had outgrown(2). Into this category comes his first group of novels: A Modern Lover (1883), A Mummer's Wife (1885), A Drama in Muslin (1886) and A Mere Accident (1887).

A Modern Lover(3) was first published in 1883 in three volumes by Tinsley Brothers. It marked a break with the English novel in theme and treatment: though immature, it was important in introducing a sense of form into English fiction. Being without the literary skill to unfold the

1. As we have seen, his own statements are rarely to be trusted.
2. We must remember that, according to Moore, he brought French 'seriousness' into English fiction. He told W. L. Phelps: "I founded the artistic novel in England, and after a long struggle, won my battle."(op.cit., p.822). As he said to Barrett Clark: "I happened to come upon the literary scene at the right moment, being present at the beginning of an important artistic and literary rebirth. I came to France.....and I became a Frenchman...I wrote the first 'serious' novels in the English language! I invented adultery, which didn't exist in English fiction until I began writing. Now, I simply happened - that's all." (op.cit., p.66).
3. The words 'a modern lover' appear in "La Maitresse Maternelle", Pagan Poems, p.82.

story, Moore said in later life, he "devised an uncouth text out of his memories of Balzac, Zola and Goncourt(1)". As Milton Chaikin has shown(2), many features of A Modern Lover reflect Balzac's Illusions Perdues (1837-43)(3): Lewis and Rubempre are similar in their humble origin, feminine appearance, poverty and hatred of that poverty, love of luxury, cleverness and ambition, attraction to women, weak characters, frequent contemplation of suicide, artistic nature and continual compromise. Both are sponsored by wealthy and discontented older women and attempt to seduce them. The themes are also alike: the abandonment of aesthetic aims for commercial success. The hero rises from poverty to wealth and has relationships with a number of women. Gwynnie is based on Bérénice, Helen partly on Coraline and Mrs. Bentham partly on Mme. de Bargeton. A host of details are similar, for example, Gwynnie's and Bérénice's sacrifices for their lovers - and

1. Preface to Lewis Seymour and Some Women, p.v.
2. For the influence of the French Naturalists on Moore, see Milton Chaikin, "The Composition of George Moore's A Modern Lover", Comparative Literature, vol.7, no.3, Summer, 1955, pp.259-64, and The Influence of French Realism and Naturalism on George Moore's Early Fiction, N.Y. University Ph.D. thesis, 1954.
3. From Balzac Moore no doubt obtained the idea of including certain characters in a series of novels. Moore was obviously attracted by Balzac's and Zola's coverage of a wide range of society.

both benefactresses try to hide their feelings from the hero. There are also the satirical portraits of society (upper class in Moore, provincial in Balzac), and physiognomical interpretation of character. Again, there is the Balzacian struggle for money and concern with the power of money(1). Moore himself mentioned the source of his novel in the revised version of the Confessions, in a Colloquy between 'Self' and 'Conscience':

"I: 'But it is nonsense to suggest that Lewis Seymore (sic) is myself;... you know that my original notion was to do the side of Lucien de Rubempré that..'  
 Conscience: 'That Balzac had the genius to leave out.'"(2)

Irony or not, this is no doubt the truth.

Other traits of Lewis's character derive from different sources: his opportunism with women, for example, from Garnotelle in the Goncourts' Manette Salomon (1867)(3). Moore was indebted also to Flaubert(4). The three women in A Modern Lover are taken from L'Education Sentimentale(5);

1. cf. Vain Fortune, London, Henry, 1891. The theme is also common in both Zola and Flaubert. (Moore was impressed by Zola in this respect - see Preface to La Curée, pp.ii and vii.)
2. Confessions, London, Laurie, 1904 ed. (revised), pp. 277-8.
3. He was friendly with Edmond at this time. G-P. Collet sees the influence of Charles Demailly and Manette Salomon in the series of rather isolated chapter tableaux. See George Moore et la France, p.164.
4. See W. D. Ferguson, op.cit., pp.25-34, 88, 93. A useful study but parallels are pressed too far.
5. Moore's novel had, as its first title, Three Women - see letter to his mother, 8th April, 1883, National Library, Dublin, MS 4479.

the heroes are in some ways similar; details of the story are the same - for example, both heroines are called away by illness, on both occasions merely for the sake of retarding the love-affair(1); and both writers use the carriage to promote love-affairs(2). These influences, however, are superficial, having little bearing on plot, characters or style. The first thing that strikes one, in fact, is the difference between the two books and the characters of the heroes, Seymour achieving popular success, Frédéric remaining timid(3).

Other details are reminiscent of Maxime Saccard in Zola's La Curée (1872). Zola influenced also Lewis's eroticism and both Mrs. Bentham and Lady Helen inherit characteristics from Renée. More important, Moore owed to him much of his narrative technique and style. He refers in the Confessions(4) especially to the fugal treatment, involving repetition and variation of motifs, a device employed, for example, in the carriage drive with

1. Retained in Lewis Seymour and Some Women.
2. Removed in Lewis Seymour and Some Women.
3. Enid Starkie. (From Gautier to Eliot, London, Hutchinson, 1960, p.73) plays down the influence of Flaubert and Zola on A Modern Lover.
4. 1952, p.62.

Mrs. Bentham when she comes to Paris(1). It is used again in the scene of the ball. After the introduction of the theme 'motif', 'black coats and white shoulders', we turn to specific characters and incidents, and macrocosmic and microcosmic views alternate until the crescendo is reached. Again, Moore imitates Zola's use of smells(2), and his pictures of social gluttony(3). Many details are exact copies of Zola(4).

So there is considerable plagiarism here, with much of the material reshuffled and the joins disguised because Moore was happy in his models: Zola and Balzac went well together in that both were satirical in their treatment of society, both were apologists for love and both Lucien and Maxime possessed feminine qualities.

Moore himself, as we have seen, largely admitted these plagiarisms. He wrote to Zola, in his deplorable French,

1. The latter is in only the 1885 Vizetelly one-volume revised edition, pp.124-30. The scene was put together from two scenes in La Curée. In the preface to The Rush for the Spoil, pp.iv and v, Moore mentions the scenes he used. Details, method and style are borrowed from Zola: e.g. A Modern Lover, pp.116-125; La Curée, Paris, 1927 edition, pp.7, 14, 17, etc.
2. A Modern Lover, I, p.13; La Curée, pp.170, 41.
3. A Modern Lover, II, p.149; La Curée, pp.264-5.
4. On the other hand, there is no incest or perversion in A Modern Lover, as there is in Zola's book.

acknowledging his debt:

"Que mon roman a eu du succès peut vous intéresser, car, comme je vous l'ai déjà dit je dois tout ce que j'ai à vous. Mon livre n'est pas bien hélas je le sais bien mais il a réussi(1)."

But, in fact, A Modern Lover owes less to Zola than to Balzac, Flaubert and the Goncourts. Moore's style and ability to create atmosphere derived partly from Zola, but he in turn owed much to Flaubert and the Goncourts. And this is the crux of the matter: there is a veritable hotch-potch of influences here. We may take, for example, the hero. Lewis was undoubtedly based on Moore's artist friend in Paris(2), Lewis Weldon Hawkins(3), but owes many traits to characters in Balzac, Flaubert, Zola and the Goncourts. This inter-dependence explains Lewis's resemblance to George Duroy, the hero of Maupassant's Bel-Ami, published two years after A Modern Lover, for both were influenced by Balzac's Les Illusions Perdues.

In spite of the resemblance to Zola, and the naturalistic flavour of the theme, A Modern Lover is not a Zolaesque novel, merely a realistic one(4). Even the Athenaeum(5) said that, though at first it seemed disgusting,

1. Auriant, op.cit., p.315.

2. Moore was in Paris 1873-1880.

3. See e.g. Confessions and Hone, op.cit., p.95.

4. Moore had to work the art-material out of his system before he could write a true Zola novel.

5. Athenaeum, no.2906, 7th July, 1883 (part 2), pp.13-14.

it was not really so for a naturalist(1). There is no suggestion of note-taking; Moore knew the background well(2). Nor is there to us anything really shocking in the work: nowhere, in spite of the theme (the hero's use of women to achieve material success) and the scene where Gwynnie poses for Lewis, do we get more than kisses, jokes about nude models and acceptance of adultery. Yet there is a cataclysmic break with the Victorian tradition here - above all in the fact that the Victorian moral conscience is replaced by raw instinct(3). As Arnold Bennett says:

"No discerning student could read A Modern Lover in 1883 without being impressed by the profound difference between it and all previous English novels. It was candidly erotic; it depressed; it presented a group of principal characters so unsavoury that one cannot possibly respect any of them; it scorned to be either bright or breezy or wholesome or anything that might secure the approbation of a great and enlightened public(4)."

Yet, in 1883, Moore was still hidebound by the Victorian morality which he affected to scorn and reject. Although he wished to shock the Victorian moral conscience, and

1. This reviewer, incidentally, said that the idea of the book was probably suggested by Murger's Buveurs d'Eau.
2. However, see A Drama in Muslin, infra.
3. cf. A Drama in Muslin, pp.228-9.
4. Fame and Fiction, p.249.

although he made much play with his ideas about the artist's integrity(1), he wanted his books to sell. Compromise was inevitable. He wrote to Zola:

"J'étais force> de faire des escamotages épouvantables mais que voulez-vous? Il faut faire un pas et il est fait(2)."

The real interest of the book is not aesthetic but historical: it was the first English novel to reflect French realism and, as such, together with A Mummer's Wife and A Drama in Muslin, had an important influence on the Victorian novel.

By 1885, Moore was already revising A Modern Lover(3), though the alterations are only slight: some changed chapter-headings; a few verbal alterations; a rewriting of two lines in the concluding sonnet: and some cuts in dialogue and description to adapt the book to the one-volume edition. One important change is made in order to make it more explicit that Mrs. Bentham becomes Lewis's mistress: in the first edition, Lewis and Mrs. Bentham drive to an hotel; in the second, five additional pages(4) deal with the ride home from the opera and the hero's finally successful attempt to

1. cf.e.g. Dialogue between George Moore and his conscience, Confessions, 1952, pp.167-8.
2. Auriant, op.cit., p.315.
3. London, Vizetelly, one-volume. 1885.
4. pp.125-30.

enter her room(1). Again, Book 2, chapter 11 of the 1883 edition deals with Lewis's forthcoming marriage to Helen; the equivalent chapter in 1885(2) is concerned with Gwynnie's story since we left her. But this revision is merely slight.

In 1917 A Modern Lover was completely rewritten and published by Heinemann under the title, Lewis Seymour and Some Women(3).

When considering the possibility of a new version, Moore tells us in the preface to Lewis Seymour and Some Women, he came to the conclusion that the story was too badly written to revise, and so he decided to write a new book.

1. In this respect, the 1917 edition is nearer to the 1883 version. For a further example of additional material, see 1885, pp.151-2.
2. chapter 23.
3. (a) Heinemann agreed with Gosse that it was an awful title, and so Moore suggested to Gosse Lewis Seymour and his Admirers. The original title, however, remained. See letter to Gosse, 5th August, 1916, Brotherton.  
 (b) Heinemann actually printed six copies of a 1916 edition, of which one in the Ashley Library, British Museum (from the T. J. Wise Collection), has the following inscription: "'This is one of six copies of Lewis Seymour and Some Women printed without alteration from the author's MS. The book was, however, never issued in this form; certain passages were excised, and others re-written in the version finally published.' C. S. Evans, General Manager to Wm. Heinemann, September 1920"  
 The changes are few and insignificant, and the edition is interesting only as an illustration of the extremities induced by Moore's method of revision.

However, he rewrote the novel for the 'canon' on a false premise: he was trying to create a readable work out of the original, because he was fond of the theme (a fondness due partly, no doubt, to its being his first novel, which was favourably received, and partly to the fact that it arose out of his own experiences as a painter, which he delighted in glamourising throughout the remainder of his life.) There is, however, little originality in the theme - for example, Mrs. Bentham, the 'maitresse maternelle', who occupies a large part of the story, is familiar in literature long before Moore(1). Ironically, the revision is no better than the original; in some ways, it is very much worse.

As Hone says,

"He found that *A Modern Lover* was so full of nonsense that it resisted ordinary revision; but he had a soft corner in his heart for the earliest of his stories, and so he composed a new novel exhibiting the latest evolution of his style and written round the original anecdote.... In the new treatment of the anecdote Lewis's exploitation of women was treated in a spirit of frivolity which would have appalled the reviewers(2) who, in 1883, had dealt so kindly with *A Modern Lover*(3)."

1. Incidentally, "La Maitresse Maternelle" appears, in a poem of this name, earlier in Moore's work, in Pagan Poems.
2. cf.e.g. Sir Henry Norman Long, Fortnightly Review, vol.34, n.s., no. 204, 1st December, 1883, pp.879-80.
3. Hone, op.cit., p.334. Privately, Moore himself was doubtful about it. See letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, Monday, 27th March, 1917, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134; also ditto, 1st April, 1917.

Nevertheless, the revised version contains significant changes. One of the main reasons for the revision after 34 years was the removal of French influences. For example, what there is of Zola is largely omitted in 1917. Moore's theory of heredity plays only a small part in 1883 - Moore was not to write a fully Naturalistic novel until he had detached himself from his Paris environment - but it is present in the first version and omitted in 1917 - e.g.:

"Lewis was the only child born of this ill-assorted match... his beautiful blue eyes had in them a silly look, which horrified the father. The mother's dullness seemed to have fallen on the son... (1)"

Another omission is Gwynnie's religious environment:

"Religion had been laid so carefully about her early life that it was the soil to which tended the roots of all her thoughts. If her father had not taught her his faith, there was one word he had engraven on her mind, which was 'Duty': therefore, if Lewis could persuade her that it was her duty to save his life at the cost of her modesty, she would do so, as Lady Godiva saved Coventry. Still, of all the virtues, modesty is the dearest to the Methodists, and her struggle was the bitterest; and, decided either way, would infallibly influence the rest of her life. If she refused, and so caused her lover's death, remorse would cloud her life; if she consented, pure as might be her intentions, she would have lost her modesty, and then, what would she have to keep her from sin and ruin?

1. I. pp.104-5.

But still, on the other hand, the sacrifice of all she held dear to save not only the temporal but the spiritual life of the man she loved, might so poetise and etherealise her nature that it would be able to withstand all temptations which might otherwise have attended it, and enable her to live in the past as a saint lives in the future. This transfiguration would undoubtedly be the result of subjecting so fervid a nature as hers to so fearful a test, but would it endure through her whole life, or for a time only? Would the struggle for existence which she would be engaged in, slowly but surely grind away the beautiful structure of feminine devotion she had raised, and leave her neither good nor wicked in the end, but only sordidly commonplace? These were the different issues which her decision involved, and which it is one of the objects of this story to trace(1)."

The last sentence, in particular, reveals Zola's influence.

Omitted, too, are the analysis of Lady Helen's background(2); the long, tedious account of the tennis-match, with its massing of detail(3); the fugal treatment(4); the reference to odour and movement(5); and the connection between man and his surroundings(6).

On the other hand, the passage about the novelist's "gaining the day for the study of the surroundings," choosing, not unpleasant subjects, but getting to the unsentimental

1. 1883, I, 37-9.
2. 1883, I, ch.11.
3. 1883, I, ch.11.
4. 1885, pp.124-30.
5. II, pp. 132-3.
6. II, p.80.

root of things, and the novel's function as "contemporary history, an exact and complete reproduction of social surroundings," is present in both versions(1). It is strange that this passage, spoken by Harding (the cynical critic and novelist in nearly all Moore's early work, who generally voices Moore's own thoughts) should be retained in 1917, when Moore himself had long realised the fallacy of Naturalism, that the novel is not a contemporary history but an interpretation of reality.

Detailed Flaubert influences, such as the colouring, the carriages and the political references(2) are omitted.

The story is basically the same in all versions, though improved in 1917 by reduction in length. Certain incidents are, however, rewritten. The Paris section is enlarged, better written, stripped of much of its comment, description and analysis of motive, and given more narrative. At the same time, it contains much irrelevance, especially undigested gobbets of history, with which the style is unable to cope. These comprise mainly the love-affairs of kings, as related to Lewis by Mrs. Bentham. And the love-affairs are spicier than in 1883: by 1917, Moore's public, though small, was

1. 1883, I, pp.76-8; 1917, p.30.

2. e.g. A Modern Lover, 1883, II, pp.123-6: reduced drastically in 1917, p.206. For full details, see Ferguson, op.cit., pp.11 ff.

stable, and he could now give free rein to Amico Moorini's sensuality, infantilism and desire to shock, in a way that, despite all his bravado(1), was impossible in 1883, when he was courting public favour(2).

In chapter 23(3), a number of authors are discussed by Mrs. Bentham and Lewis in a long, irrelevant, Avowals-style passage(4), whose sole 'raison d'être' is Lucy's search for

1. For an excellent article, 'debunking' Moore's claim, in his early works, to have ignored public demands and conventions, see Wm. C. Frierson, "George Moore Compromised with the Victorians", Tollopian, vol.1, no.4, March 1947, pp.37-44.
2. The later version is much more salacious than the earlier, and Lewis has degenerated. His posing in the nude before Lucy on their first night together (p.108) drew from Freeman the heated but largely justified comment:  
"...the anecdote has been deliberately and grossly sensualized, and the further degradation of Lewis Seymour, with the degradation of his women, makes beauty more impossible than mere cynicism might... I think it is the sole instance of his ruining a poor book by revision or re-writing: and he has ruined it because the revision was conceived in a perverse mood - was it merely for the sake of shocking his amanuensis? - while bathing and meditating upon the imperfection of his first novel. The reader too might crave for a bath when he had finished it." (Freeman, op.cit., p.81).
3. 1917.
4. Harding's speech on morality and literature, etc. pp. 278-9, very similar to Avowals, ch.3. Again, Leek's statement (1917, p.273) that a man should seek temptation to resist it, orines us in line with A Story-Teller's Holiday (1918), which Moore wrote soon after Lewis Seymour and Some Women.

a subject for Lewis's painting - though one must add that this narration, in Moore's later style, of stories from literature, such as the Decameron, is an improvement on the analysis and comment with which the first edition was over-loaded(1). Similar irrelevant anecdotes in Moore's later manner include Helen's story of the madman(2) and Harding's mockery of Puritanism in his story of the lecher on the censorship committee(3). One incident added in 1917(4) is the story of the woman pursued by a huntsman and his dogs: an interesting example of Moore's economising on material for it had already been used in Evelyn Innes(5).

Omitted from the 1917 version are the fashionable parties at Lucy's house, Claremont, along with all the tiresome conversations; the long quarrel between Helen and her parents; the ludicrous wedding, with all Lewis's ex-girl-friends turning up tearfully: the Seymours' financial difficulties; most of the society nonsense, which was the weakest part of A Modern Lover; some of the fatuous conversations between Lord Senton and Day; and the episode of

1. The story longest dwelt on is that of Daphnis and Chloë (pp.169ff), which Moore was to publish in a full version seven years later (The Pastoral Loves of Daphnis and Chloë, limited ed., London, Heinemann, 1924.)
2. Lewis Seymour and Some Women, pp.241-2.
3. Lewis Seymour and Some Women, p.281.
4. pp.127-8.
5. Revised edition, Unwin, Adelphi Library, October 1908, ch.21.

Holt's sacrificing Thompson, the leader of the Moderns, so that Helen will manoeuvre his wife into 'society'.

Narrative is simplified: the 1917 version achieves its purpose of getting Lewis into Lucy's bedroom without the tortuous preliminaries of the early editions; the long passages, in which Lucy laments her age and the passing of her love, are omitted; Mrs. Thorpe's role is drastically reduced, as is Lucy's pursuit of Lewis; Ripple's literary activity, which plays too large a part in 1883, is cut to a minimum; and the number of characters is cut down - secondary characters occupied far too large a place in the first version. Author intervention, moralising, description, contemporary background and constant analysis (especially of the relationship between Mrs. Bentham and Lewis, their temperaments and weaknesses - in the later version, we are allowed to judge for ourselves Lewis's failings) are modified and replaced by narrative and dialogue, thus giving Lewis Seymour much greater continuity than A Modern Lover.

Lewis Seymour is simplified also by the removal or moderation of the conscious aestheticism of the original. In the story of a dilettante artist, based (wisely - it is the book's greatest merit) on Moore's Paris experiences, there is inevitably much talk of art, but the first version is full of 'aestheticising' and description which Lewis Seymour

largely removes to allow the story-line much greater prominence: for example, A Modern Lover's fatuous account of the battle between the pictures of the three schools (Moderns, Mediaevalists and Classics) is omitted along with much of the period artificiality and the information about the Moderns and their opinions of Lewis throughout the novel.

The final version also alters the Gwynnie Lloyd story. In the first version, she appears, at the end of the book, as Helen's maid, so that all three women who have separately influenced Lewis's life are present to congratulate him on his election to the Academy: a most artificial and improbable coincidence. The revision, however, is little improved, for she is introduced in the final chapter, when Helen sees her looking at Lewis's pictures at the Academy and asks her story. In both versions, Gwynnie's reintroduction is a clumsy device to bring the wheel full circle and create a spurious unity.

The 1883 ending is weak and inconclusive, but that of the later version, too, is botched: Lucy, unaware of Helen's presence in the room, informs Lewis of his election to the Academy. However, so much of the Lucy story has been omitted from the 1917 version that her presence is hardly justified.

The exposition, on the other hand, is much improved in

1917. Chapter 7 of the 1883 version is merely a straight narrative of Lewis's past life, which he mulls over in the carriage on his way to Mrs. Bentham's, and there is little attempt to link the narrative with the preceding or succeeding chapters. In 1917, chapter 8, the treatment is more subtle: thoughts mingle with monologue and are interspersed competently with descriptions of the passing countryside, the present gliding smoothly into the past. Similarly, chapter 9 in Lewis Seymour and Some Women is an improvement on the 1883 version's chapter 8. A Modern Lover gives a straight account of Mrs. Bentham's past life; in Lewis Seymour and Some Women, thoughts are mingled with scene, and Mrs. Bentham's background emerges skilfully from her desire to know of Lewis's past.

Transitions are managed more skilfully in the revisions, and climaxes are smoothed over: Helen's marriage(1) and the birth of her baby(2) are merely mentioned; Gwynnie expresses no surprise at the news that Helen is Lewis's wife(3). The moral - a man's achieving fame at the expense of three women, but only at the cost of ethical and aesthetic impoverishment - explicit in A Modern Lover, is implicit in Lewis Seymour and

- 
1. 1917, p.263.
  2. 1917, p.294.
  3. 1917, p.303.

Some Women. Over-writing is removed in 1917: for example, the melodrama of Gwynnie's overcoming her doubts to pose in the nude for Lewis, in order to save his life(1), and Mrs. Bentham's pursuit of Helen and Lewis on their walk(2).

The 1917 version is thus a considerable advance on the first edition in the simplification of the narrative and the improvement in the writing. Nevertheless, Lewis Seymour and Some Women, apart from being less important historically in Moore's development, is a pallid version of the story, an unworthy revision.

Moore's next novel was A Mummer's Wife, published by Vizetelly in the Spring of 1885(3). The germ of the story is taken from Flaubert's Madame Bovary (with a few details from L'Education Sentimentale). Common to both novels are the heroine nurtured on sentimental literature, the ruthless inevitability with which their tragedy is worked out, the early marriage and the adultery. Husband and mother-in-law reveal obvious resemblances, whilst the hero, though stated by the author to be based on a real person whom Moore knew,

1. 1883, I, chapter 2.

2. I, p.200.

3. The Complete Catalogue of the Library of John Quinn, Item 6647, refers to the original autographed MS of A Mummer's Wife, ch.24, 51 pp. folio (the complete MS of this chapter), with numerous corrections: "Whole paragraphs have been deleted; sentences written on the versos of the leaves, only to be inked through; and interlineations inserted on nearly every page."

Dick Maitland, (1) undergoes literary treatment similar to Flaubert's lovers'. However, the central theme of the two novels is not identical, for Flaubert's tale deals with the progressive disillusion of sentiment. True, we see Kate's sentimentality often confronted with harsh reality, ~~as~~ when she "abandoned herself to an ineffable sentiment of weakness, of ravishment," and Dick kisses her roughly(2). And the love-scene culminates in anti-climax, with Dick and Kate crashing among the crockery, and the hero limping away, bleeding and humiliated(3). But this contrast does not constitute the central strand of the story(4). In all this,

1. For details, see Moore, "The Nineness in the Oneness", Century Magazine, n.s., vol.lxxvii, November 1919, p.64. Dick first appears, a slight sketch, as Dick Lendsell, in one of the earliest short stories written by Moore, Under the Fan, published in Tinsley's Magazine, vol.30, February 1882, pp.135-154. Like the later Dick, he is a theatre manager (Lennox is actually a theatre company manager) and an extrovert. The following passage (Tinsley's Magazine, p.140) might well describe Lennox:  
"Yet there was little of the swindler in his face; it was more that of the sensualist, who loves good living, and does not much trouble himself about the rights and wrongs of things."
2. London, Heinemann, Ebury edition, 1937, p.69. All references to the 1918 revision are taken from this edition.
3. ibid., p.71.
4. C. Heywood ("Flaubert, Miss Braddon and George Moore", Comparative Literature, XII, Spring 1960, pp.151-8) maintains that A Mummer's Wife owes more to Miss Braddon's The Doctor's Wife (1864) than to Flaubert's Madame Bovary.

there is no significant change in the revisions.

While the germ of the book came from Flaubert, many aspects of the story - the first important Naturalistic novel in English - derive from Zola: e.g., the alcoholism of the heroine and the sordid environment. The main characters and plot features in the first part of the book owe much to Thérèse Raquin (1867): the relationship between the sick, domineering husband and the neurotic wife: the background of commerce: possibly the mother-in-law; the sensual lover and adultery. The interaction of Kate's nervous and Dick's sanguine temperament is obviously an imitation of the governing idea of Zola's book. In fact, the opening situation of a wife, burdened with an offensive husband, committing adultery with a more handsome male is taken from this novel. Moore had Thérèse Raquin in mind while writing A Mummer's Wife, as we see from the letter to Zola asking for permission to translate the book(1). Other details were influenced by La Conquête de Plassans (1874) (2): Dick comes to lodge at the Ede household as Abbé Faujas does at the Mourets'; the opposition of mother (Zola) and wife (Moore) are overruled; both heroines submit to their lovers and both come to realise the frustrated boredom of their lives. In this respect, Kate also resembles Hélène in Une Page d'Amour (1878): both are moody, brooding and sentimental; and both books

1. Auriant, op.cit., pp.315-6.

2. Which Moore praised in Fortnightly Review, 1892, p.205.

begin with illness(1). Nana (1880), Chaikin says(2), "must have suggested" the theatrical background and the vulgarity of the actresses, but it is more likely that Moore thought first of his own early experiences, as he did with his French and artistic life in A Modern Lover. However, Kate's sordidness, alcoholism, hysteria and attempts to crush her craving for drink in the second half of the novel, are certainly derived from Gervaise in L'Assommoir(3). While a number of these factors belong to the common stock of the novel, they are too frequent to be dismissed as coincidence.

Again, it was Zola who supplied the method(4): the visit to the ugliest town in England for the collection of material; the experiences with a travelling opera company: the documentary notebook(5): the repellent scenes and the

1. For a full study of Zola's influence, see M. Chaikin, "George Moore's A Mummer's Wife and Zola", Revue de Litt. Comp., vol.31, 1957, pp.85-8. An interesting exercise though comparisons are at times naive and far-fetched.
2. ibid., p.87.
3. See Moore's prefaces to Le Curée, p.1, and Pot-Bouille for praise of Zola.
4. cf. A Communication to My Friends, especially pp.xxi-xxvi.
5. Vizetelly saw the weak points in the story outlined to him and suggested the search for an ugly town as the setting for the book. The town took shape for Moore as he wandered through it, for a week, with his notebook. He finally returned to London, "brimming with slang and theatre lore" (A Communication to My Friends, p.xxv). Hone (op.cit., p.98) states that Jimmy Glover, conductor of the opera company, claimed to have composed A Mummer's Wife, because he told Moore so many stories; though Maurice Moore thought his brother did not bring Jimmy Glover into the book - see Maurice's letter to Hone, 5, See View Terrace, Milesbury Road, Dublin, n.d., National Library, Dublin, MS 2648.

concern with sordidness, disease and deathbeds; the impressionist scene painting and visual effects(1); the smells: ether(2), iron and cinders(3); size(4). bodies(5) and soapsuds(6); the emphasis on instinct; the group scene(7); the repetition, as in Kate's recurring bouts: the interrelationship between mood and environment; the repetition of the chief motives in what Moore called Zola's fugal movement(8): heredity and environment, alcoholism, neurosis and sordidness; the grouping of facts in a logical sequence; the rather colourless style; and 'the correspondances' ("audible colour and visible sound")(9). Moore could well claim success in delivering a blow "en pleine poitrine de l'école sentimentale(10)."

1. e.g. 1885, 2nd edition, p.7. Unless otherwise stated, references to the first version are taken from the second edition, 1885.
2. p.11.
3. p.70.
4. p.148.
5. p.153.
6. p.226.
7. e.g. the tableau of the railway dinner (ch.XII) - we move from one character to the next, each with his own characteristic folly - cf. Under the Fan, where actors and addresses one by one display their weaknesses at a party.
8. See Confessions, p.62.
9. p.109.
10. Auriant, op.cit., p.315.

Naturalistic details shape the course of the story.

The heroine herself is weak, sentimental, commonplace:

"She was not strong nor great, nor was she conscious of any deep feeling that if she acted otherwise than she did she would be living an unworthy life. She was merely good because she was a kindhearted woman, without bad impulses, and admirably suited to the life she was leading(1)."

Dick is painted with a similar brush, as we can see from his calculated planning of the first love-scene: the bribing of the guide, the creation in Kate of a suitable frame of mind, and the attempt to remember a love-scene from one of his plays(2). The setting of the first section of the story is wholly naturalistic: the Ede household, the querulous, asthmatic husband, the unhappy wife and the domineering mother-in-law, the grey monotony of life in a pottery-town: the physical details of Ede's asthmatic attacks, the sick-room and the ether; Dick's coarse jokes about kissing and asthma; the detailed description of the potteries, the technical processes carried out in endless rooms and the chamber-pots. Similar detail provides the basis of the opera company scenes(3): the chaos behind stage, which contrasts vividly with Kate's romantic impressions on her

1. p.49.

2. Ch.4.

3. Ch.10.

previous visit(1); the noisy, vulgar, foul-smelling chorus-girls; the coarse dressing-room conversations: the detailed knowledge of theatre conditions and certain comic operas; the strong sensuality; the relish of food and drink and all physical movement; and the materialism and stress on money throughout. In the final section of the story, we have the sordid decline of Kate into poverty, madness, dipsomania, disease and death. Details are given of her animal-like behaviour, ripping open Dick's face and smashing furniture(2); of her vomiting over the plush seats of a carriage(3); of her dropsy and distended stomach(4). The description of the drink-sodden state of mind(5), which leads directly to her baby's death, is excellent in its realism, as is the funeral, with the brown box looking like lost luggage, the station-house-looking church and the gloomy parson(6). The scenes between Kate and Dick at home, in the theatre and in the street are described in terrifying detail(7); while the poverty of the room in which she dies, and her sordid, friendless death are fine examples of restrained naturalism(8).

- 
1. Ch.9.
  2. Ch.25.
  3. p.372.
  4. p.435.
  5. pp.324-6.
  6. pp.329-30.
  7. e.g. Ch.25.
  8. Ch.30.

In glaring contrast with sentimental fiction, even her last wish, to see her husband before he dies, is denied her. So, in the first third of the book, we get details of the mercer's day-to-day life; in the second, details of the theatre; and in the third, clinical details.

Above all, passages on environment and determinism permeate the whole novel:

"She had inherited the vague distrust of her class against all that was itinerant; otherwise she was quite unprejudiced(1)."

"Her story, until the arrival of Mr. Lennox, was unmarked by any event of importance, and its psychological significance can be well and easily inferred from the following statement of the facts(2)."

"It will therefore be seen that the mother's influence was at an unfortunate time counteracted(3)."

"The hearts of the people change but little - if at all. When rude work and misery does not grind and trample all feeling out of them, they remain ever children in their sentiments, understanding only such simple emotions as correspond to their daily food. The contrary is seen in the woman of the world. At thirty she hates the man she loved at twenty; the books that charmed her when she was a girl she learns to regard as contemptible. Her taste changes; she requires as she goes on more subtle and complex sensations, just as the epicure in his progress from one dish to another demands higher seasoning and stronger delicacies.

- 
1. 1887, p.9.
  2. 1887, p.37.
  3. 1887, p.38.

But in the woman of the people there is no intellectual advancement; she never learns to judge, to discriminate, What pleases her at one age does at another. Toil, if not sufficient to kill, preserves. The rich man changes, the peasant remains the same; and what is witnessable in centuries is witnessable in a single life. The years may freeze, but otherwise they do not alter a working woman's heart; and should a thaw come, the simple sentiments of her youth again burst into blossom. Her choice of books shows how little time has taught her. The same grotesque adventures enrapture her as they did before. She is as incapable at thirty as at twenty to distinguish between the false and the true; - apparently even less so, for if experience has influenced her taste at all, it has rendered it more childish and ignorant, and now more than before is her imagination the palpitating prey of the absurd fiction, and now more than ever does she relish the stories of supernatural heroism, abnegation and sacrifice.

But sentiment above all: 'true' rhyming to 'you', 'regret' to 'forget', 'part' to 'heart', is sufficient to force her to tears, to produce a gross exultation of the senses. The wording may be simple, the substance commonplace; but the mere statement that two people are separated and love each other is sufficient. For her the art is never deficient, and the same sing-song cry will never fail to give her the same sensations of regret and longing.

And so it used to be with Kate(l)."

In Chapter 9, there is a significant passage on environment:

1. 1867, pp.86-7. Note that two paragraphs before this passage are retained in the revision.

"She was a simple woman of the people, whose febrile and vacillating imagination had on one side been crushed and repressed by the circumscribing and monotonous routine of her humble life, and on the other exalted by the fervour of a faith which, although it had not been able to mould her character, had nevertheless endowed it with a certain idealism of thought; and when to these influences are added the demoralising effects of hundreds of sentimental and romantic stories, read in her early youth, it will be understood with what abandonment of the senses, with what alienation of the brain, Kate threw herself into the enjoyment of this evening; with what frenzy she waited for Dick, who was going that night to act for her(1)."

Kate is deeply conditioned by her life of drudgery, and home ties are strong:

"The knowledge of the power of bearing children forces every woman to look at her home as a bird to its nest. In the highest and lowest ranks this natural instinct is counteracted by circumstances, but the whole life of the middle-class woman tends to confirm it. She is rich enough to possess a home, but too poor to leave it, except on the rarest occasions. Her power begins and ends there; she is unknown beyond it. She may be vile or virtuous, but in either case her good or bad qualities flourish within the threshold of her own door.

And with Kate the ties of home, or rather those of locality were, of course, doubly strong(2)."

Dick's character, too, is influenced by his environment:

"Actors who are not gypsies by nature invariably marry after a few years of

1. 1887, p.107.
2. 1887, p.125.

travelling. The monotony of constant change, the incessant veneering of the mind with new impressions, no sooner produced than wiped out, the certain breaking up of all ties that their mechanical hurry from town to town entails, forces the most fickle to long to be, if no more, constant to their heart's desire, and instinctively leads the most volatile to dream of something stable and tangible. For the travelling actor there is no society. He arrives in a strange town: the discomfort of living in a whirl of new lodging-houses he has probably grown accustomed to, but the dreadful hours of inoccupation passed amid fresh scenes and unfamiliar faces remain as burdensome as ever. Many of his 'pals' are married; he cannot intrude upon them, and therefore his only amusement or distraction is a chance of conversation in a public-house. These influences had been at work upon Dick for a long time past(1).

The theatrical environment into which Kate is drawn coarsens and debases:

"...Kate was ag in surrounded by a herd of females. The strangeness of the costume lent them a coarseness more than their own. It was horrifying to see Beaumont holding her dress above her calves. The conspirators had pulled off their wigs, and there was something indescribably painful in the contrast their close-cut pates made with their knee-breeches, and long coats of old time. Familiarity hides many of the abominations of our lives from us, and we have no suspicion of the truth until we change the form. The bitterness or sweetness of a well-worn adage appeals to us when it is clothed in new language; in the old words, its philosophy would have passed unperceived. And thus it was with these supers and chorus-girls. In pea-jackets and print dresses

1. 1887, p.126.

their coarseness would have attracted no attention: to see and judge of their animalism it was necessary to disguise them in the costumes of the Directoire(1)."

In one passage, Kate realises that the ideal elopement in books does not correspond with reality:

"The world is for ever out of tune with our desires, and although her present surroundings were by many times handsomer than those she had left, the sum of inward and outward contradictions remained as evenly balanced as ever(2)."

A similar contrast between dream and reality is revealed in her disappointment with London(3). Another interesting passage comments on how Kate soon falls, because of her weak nature, into the easy ways of the actors(4). Chapter 13 contains an account of Kate's aversion to public-houses:

"Horror of a public-house since her childhood, had been vigorously impressed on Kate's mind; and she had always been taught to consider as the most degraded of human beings the dark-shawled and crumpled-bonnetted women who slide out the swinging doors to slink down an alley. It astonished her, therefore, to hear Montgomery say that he saw no more harm in having a drink and a bite in a pub than anywhere else. The point was argued passionately, but it did not prevent them from enjoying themselves(5)."

This is followed soon afterwards by a similar passage in

1. 1887, p.122.
2. 1887, p.147.
3. 1887, p.287.
4. 1887, p.158.
5. 1887, p.168.

which Kate is sent a ring by an admirer and is urged to wear it, all the chorus-girls drinking to his health - but Kate's conscience worries her:

"The method of an antecedent life, the teaching of years, rose in revolution and denied her right to act thus(1)."

It is the strongest shock to her moral nature since she left Hanley; only when she has drunk a couple of whiskies is she able to laugh at Dolly's dirty stories.

The central thesis, that change of environment leads inevitably to disaster, is frequently stated by the author in 1887:

"The continual nerve-excitement in which she lived, the rich diet, the brandies and sodas supped in the dressing-rooms, the constant gratification of bodily pleasure, combined to produce in her naturally placid nature violent revolts and demands for passionate outbursts. Often at her music lesson she would grind her little teeth; a sudden thought would strike her that he had taken advantage of her absence to go round and see one of the girls(2)."

"The broad, simple lines on which her views of life and things had formerly been based, had become twisted, broken, and confused; her tastes were now more complex and her desires more febrile. Even her principles of honesty had become shaken. Anecdotes of clever swindles no longer wounded her feelings; she now listened to and laughed at them with the rest. The middle-class woman, in a word, had disappeared, and the Bohemian taken her place; and had it not been for the anger with which

1. 1887, p.185.
2. 1887, p.193.

she repulsed all levity of conversation, and the cold way she frowned upon the spicey little stories, the delight of theatrical supper-tables, the closest scrutiny might have failed to find a clue wherewith to trace her back to her origin(1)."

This thesis is summed up in the statement:

"Our lives run in grooves; we get into one and we follow it out to the end(2)."

To get into the part of Serpolette, Kate takes sherry and thinks of the lighter side of her youth, freeing herself from the weight of ten years' work, "and trod the heaviest tread on the head of her anterior life(3)":

"But her love could not, now that a pause had come in her life, keep back the terrible weight of early influences. Kate had not become an actress, she was merely a middle-class woman veneered with Bohemianism, and again the peace and calm on which she had been nourished began to appear through the varnish, and when she thought that there was nothing before her but this ever-rolling hurry from town to town, from lodging-house to lodging-house, she grew appalled at the future that awaited her. It seemed to her like some horrible punishment, and she often awoke screaming from nightmares in which she was bound to a wheel that rolled on for ever(4)."

"Upon a stock of many generations of middle class people, people whose ideas had ever been confined to a routine of material and

1. 1887, p.194. Osbert Burdett ("George Moore", Obituary, London Mercury, vol.27, March 1933, p.419) says that the causes of Kate's drinking in the revised version are too vague: no such charge can be brought against the original versions.
- 2: 1887, p.321.
- 3: 1887, p.198.
4. 1887, p.209.

spiritual life, both being accepted as earnestly as uninquiringly, the artistic graft had taken but sparingly; and it was clear that as soon as the bonds of love that bound it were taken off, it would fall as an excrescence, rejected by hereditary instincts(1)."

Kate's emotion during the funeral of her baby is hatred of herself for her drunkenness and neglect, rather than grief:

"This blank in her affections was partly inborn, partly the result of later circumstances. She had met Dick in her seven-and-twentieth year, when the sap of her slowly-developing nature was rising to its highest point, when it was burning and forcing to blossom the fancies and passions of a dreamy youth. A few more years would have killed those desires, as the October winds the flowers, and Kate would have lived and died an honest workwoman. But Dick had passed in time for the harvesting, and the flower had fallen into his hands. He had absorbed her heart and drained it of all the love it could feel for living thing - the febrile, emotional, dissolute life she had since led had worn out her lymphatic temperament, and to her existence was now no more than a nervous erethism; and the gentle imagination had become morose, cynical, and dissatisfied.

We have, therefore, arrived at the period of decadence of Kate's character(2)."

And in the end,

"Kate's Bohemianism rushed away as water flows out of sight, when a sluice is suddenly raised, and she became again the middle-class working woman, ever thinking

1. 1887, p.215.
2. 1887, p.264.

of, ever willing to work in the interests of her home<sup>(1)</sup>."

The fullest statement of the thesis occurs in Chapter 27:

"Kate Ede was the result of centuries of inherited customs and forms of thought, and when to this be added a touch of light-headedness, so ordinary in character that, in the shop in Hanley, it had passed unperceived, it will be understood how little fitted she was to effect the psychological and even physical changes that her new life demanded. She was the woman that nature turns out of the workshop by the million, all of whom are capable of fulfilling the duties of life, provided the conditions in which they are placed, that have produced them, remain unaltered. They are like cheap Tottenham Court Road furniture, equal to an ordinary amount of wear and tear so long as the original atmosphere in which they were glued together is preserved; change this and they go to pieces. This is precisely what ~~had~~ happened in the case of Kate Ede. Not a whit worse was she than others of her kind, but one of those million chances of which our lives are made had drifted Mr. Lennox across her life. From the first moment he entered her house the whole temperature of her blood and brain had been altered. But the introduction of a passion into a character does not add to it any more than a gust of wind does to a landscape. Principles may be overthrown as trees may be blown down. Morals may be perverted as land-marks may be destroyed, but no new element of vitality or strength is gained in either case. It was so with Kate, but in this instance a deadlier disaster than a hurricane had occurred. It was as if a country ~~had been~~ gradually submerged by a great tide that after saturating and washing over it for years had slowly retired, leaving behind it only wastes of foul-smelling mudbanks and

---

1. 1887, p.344.

putrid reaches of slime and decaying matter. So much Bohemianism had done for Kate Lennox. The brackish ooze had penetrated her whole nature; it was heavy with it as a sponge that has just been soaked in the sea with brine. It was a sort of mental dissolution. Every sentiment in her was dead or sodden in drink: nothing human was left except an inordinate, an exaggerated love of her husband, which grew like a fungus out of all this physical decay(1)."

Kate declines, as Moore says in Salve, because she is without sufficient personal conscience to detach herself from the conventions in which she was brought up(2).

And yet, on the whole, partly because of the blacklisting of A Modern Lover by Smith's and Mudie's circulating libraries, Moore softened the harsher aspects of Zola's naturalism. The seduction scene is not dwelt upon(3); hardly a detail of Kate's sexual relationship with Dick is included; the baby's birth is not described(4); the asylum to which Kate is confined is merely mentioned(5); the descriptions of London prostitution are couched in general terms(6); and the heroine's sole experience of prostitution is remembered by her only vaguely(7). The wages of her sin are madness, dipsomania, disease and death. Even her death, while naturalistic and inevitable, is free from Zola's worst

1. 1887, pp.310-11.

2. Salve, London, Heinemann, 1947, pp.23-24.

3. p.146; cf. Esther Waters.

4. ch.22.

5. ch.27.

6. p. 423. The 1918 version (Ebury edition, p.382) tones down some of the details of the first version

7. p.432.

excesses. And neither Mrs. Forest nor the incident of the baby's death would have been created by Zola.

So, while Naturalism shaped much of the plot, Moore toned down several incidents to conform to the scruples of his readers and of his own temperament.

The book was revised slightly, with a preface included, for the sixth edition (1886)(1). Of this version, Moore says, characteristically, that he found nothing to revise on the grounds of morality:

"In revising my text for this new edition, I have had an opportunity of considering whether I had written any phrase or word that would give offence to the modest mind. I have searched diligently, and have found nothing. If I have erred it has been on the side of too great reticence of expression(2)."

Today, at least, we can agree. On the other hand, he found much to alter for artistic reasons:

"Redundant words have been taken out, and sentences have been recast. Flowers have their perfumes, phrases their cadences, and in the music of accents an undercurrent of delicious idea, or rather subtle suggestion is conveyed. How much this book was, and is still, wanting in this

1. Moore, in a letter to his mother, (3 Danes Inn, Wych Street, Strand, 15th October, 1885, National Library, Dublin, MS 4479) said that a sixth edition of A Mummer's Wife would soon be on the market, a revised version, to which he had written a preface. And the preface to the ninth edition, 1887, (i.e. the 1886 preface), p.vii, stated that seven editions had 'gone off' within a year.
2. Preface, p.viii.

inestimable quality, none knows better than I. I should have liked to have re-written every paragraph; but life is brief, and we must admit a finality in all things - even in artistic work(1)."

A very revealing statement, coming so early in Moore's novel-writing career. His remarks on the amount and type of revision undertaken here are, in the main, true.

A Mummer's Wife was revised again in 1918(2) for two main reasons: to remove the Naturalistic influences and to improve the actual writing - the first because he had long passed through this phase, the second because the style was much inferior to the conception. Moore told Eglinton that he had thought the books of an old man were very much better than those of a young man, but that A Mummer's Wife did not seem to bear this out: if the book had been written in English and not a compound of two languages, it would have been hailed as a masterpiece. The adventures of the mummers pleased him immensely, recalling the adventurous books written in antiquity(3). And, after the revision, his comments on the novel continued to vacillate between fondness for the

1. Preface, p.ix.
2. Throughout the thesis, where references are made to the standard Ebury and Uniform editions, they are to be taken as identical with those of the final version of the text. Page numbers for the London, Heinemann, 1918 A Mummer's Wife are taken from the Ebury edition, London, Heinemann, 1937.
3. Letter to J. Eglinton, 8th January, 1916, Letters of George Moore, op.cit., p.31.

matter and dislike of the style(1). In actual fact, removal of the Zola influences took precedence over stylistic improvement.

In 1918 Moore did not remould the book, give it melodic line treatment or even shape the minor characters(2) and the story itself, with its naturalistic framework, remains unaltered. However, within this framework, important changes are made. The first of these is the removal of the prefatory quotation by Victor Duruy(3), which appeared in the first two versions:

"Change the surroundings in which a man lives, and, in two or three generations, you will have changed his physical constitution, his habits of life, and a goodly number of his ideas(4)."

This quotation, the essence of determinism, is replaced in the 1918 edition by a Dedication to Robert Ross, in which he claims that "the wandering life of the mummers gives an old-world adventurous air to the book, reminding you of The Golden Ass - a book I read last year and found in it so

1. Barrett H. Clark, op.cit., pp.65-6, 77, 104.
2. See "Apologia Pro Scriptis Meis", Fortnightly Review, cxii, n.s., October 1922, p.543.
3. Taken from his L'Introduction générale à l'Histoire de France, Paris, Hachette, 1865, p.277: "Changez le milieu où il vit, et vous changerez, au bout de quelques générations, sa constitution physique, ses moeurs, avec bon nombre de ses idées."
4. For a similar statement of the theme, see Moore, "Apologia Pro Scriptis Meis", Fortnightly Review, cxii, no. DCLXX, n.s., October 1922, p.534.

many remembrances of myself that I fell to thinking it was a book I might have written had I lived two thousand years ago(1)". Quite obviously, Moore in 1918 wished to show that his brand of realism had always been romantic rather than naturalistic.

Many of the 1887 version's coarser, ugly or repellent Zolaesque details and references to animal instincts - for example, the worst aspects of Ede's physical illness(2), certain details of the sick-room(3), and the appearance of Dick's dishevelled bedroom(4) - are removed in 1918. In 1887(5), the odour of iron and cinders in Hanley "poisoned the melting air, and rose through it from the black gulf below like intestine exhalations from the open belly of a lately slaughtered animal(6)". The pottery ovens' 'bellies'(7) become 'rotundities'(8), and many other physically revolting descriptions are omitted; the overfilled slop-

- 
1. Ebury edition, p.lxiv.
  2. 1887, pp.8-9, 11, 14, 80, 95. References to the 1886 version are taken from the London, Vizetelly, 1887 (9th) edition.
  3. 1887, pp.46, 71.
  4. 1887, p.30.
  5. Omitted in 1918.
  6. 1887, p.54.
  7. 1887, p.52.
  8. Ebury edition, p.53.

pail(1); details of Kate's madness and illness(2); the nausea and continuous vomiting(3); the discoloured sheets of the bed in which she dies(4); and "the quivering mass of flesh on the bed"(5). A passage on the theatre dressing-room is rewritten to remove references to the sickly smell of the soapsuds, the sight of bosoms, and the animal repulsiveness of the scene(6). Nature similes(7) are generally omitted in the 1918 version, but another naturalistic feature, the expression of strong emotions through physical reactions, rather than psychologically, is retained in 1918(8).

More important, all the deterministic and environmental passages are expunged from the 1918 version(9).

---

1. 1887, p.192.
2. 1887, p.350.
3. 1887, p.348.
4. 1887, p.347.
5. 1887, p.349.
6. 1887, p.180; Ebury edition, p.193.
7. e.g. several on pp.128, 136 of the 1887 edition.
8. e.g. 1887, p.312: Ebury edition, p.346; 1887, p.316: Ebury edition, p.350.
9. Some elements in the 1887 edition are not deterministic and are retained in the final version: for example, the accident in the pottery factory (1887, p.66), and the entry of the superb girl into the room just when Kate is making some impression on Dick (1887, p.339). On this aspect, See William Newton, "Chance as employed by Hardy and the Naturalists", Philological Quarterly, October 1951, State University of Iowa Supplement to vol.30, no.4, pp.154-75.)

Thus, though the most repulsive naturalistic details are omitted in the revision, many others remain, in such scenes as Ralph's illness, Kate's decline into dipsomania, and the deaths of the baby and of Kate herself. And, though the revision cuts out the philosophy of determinism in passage after passage(1) the naturalistic framework of the story remains: Kate's desertion of her lower-middle-class background leads inevitably to tragedy.

The influence of Balzac is removed in 1918. Moore wrote to Eglinton on 8th January, 1916(2) that he was working on A Mummer's Wife, "freeing it from imitations of Balzac, which the story in no wise needed." Now, it is true that some of the first versions' descriptions of the Potteries are reminiscent of Balzac - e.g. in chapter four where Kate is looking down the valley. In the first version, the scene is painted objectively and realistically; whereas the 1918 version, which incorporates Kate's recollections of her childhood, is nearer Moore's later style of reverie, with the sharp contrasts considerably modified. But that Moore

1. Most of the account of Kate's environment in chapter 8 is retained, though one important passage is omitted: her reading of a sentimental novel that influenced her greatly, and her associating the characters with people in her life, (1887, p.94.)
2. Eglinton, op.cit., p.31.

should mention his freeing the story from imitations of Balzac, which are slight, and ignore the influence of Zola, which is in the very bones of the book, is an indication of how strongly he had reacted against the French Naturalist, who had become to him merely watered-down Balzac.

There are certain other changes in 1918. The 1887 version is very diffuse; 1918 deletes most of the author comment and analysis(1). On the other hand, the 1918 version has a number of irrelevancies. For example, Dick's interview with Mrs. Forest in the hotel, which in 1887 is merely summarised in a paragraph(2), is in 1918 expanded to four pages(3). And Mrs. Forest's fatuous irrelevance throughout is hardly less annoying in the last edition than in 1887. However, the final version, in general, compresses the material used in 1887(4). Description is cut(5), and sometimes replaced by dialogue(6); often long, static analysis is converted into dialogue or monologue(7); and the dialogue generally has greater verisimilitude in 1918(8). Much of the writing in

- 
1. 1887, e.g. pp.19, 20, 23, etc.
  2. 1887, pp.283-4.
  3. Ebury edition, pp.315-319. Moore wrote to Ross, 121 Ebury Street, S.W., 1st January, 1916, (Margery Ross, op.cit., p.276): "I hope that I have not developed the eccentric lady out of the frame. Of course I do not think I have, but I would like to have your opinion, in fact more than anybody else's".
  4. e.g. 1887, pp.88, 128, 136, 211, 227-8. Ebury edition, pp.93, 136, 143, 225, 243.
  5. 1887, pp.11, 18, 51-2, etc.
  6. e.g. 1887, pp.124-5; Ebury edition, p.133.
  7. 1887, pp.278 ff; Ebury edition, pp.305 ff.
  8. e.g. 1887, p.130; Ebury edition, p.138.

1887 is bad, melodramatic or flat; the revised version goes some way towards remedying this(1). Melodramatic passages are toned down(2) or totally eliminated(3), and the style generally is improved. Many flat passages, however, are retained in the revision(4).

Some changes are made also in character and incident. The hero, Dick Lennox, is made more attractive in 1918 by the omission of certain passages - e.g., reference to his becoming exasperated with Kate's pleadings(5); mention of

1. He had written to his friend, Robert Ross, on 1st January, 1916, (121 Ebury Street, S.W. Margery Ross, op.cit., p.276):

"I have finished the weeding of A Mummer's Wife, and hope that I have not pulled up some flowers with the weeds which were plentiful...I will point out one or two passages that were discarded, typical weeds. The best help you can give me, if you are still minded to help, would be first to ear-mark the pages that are not sufficiently written. It takes one no time to put things right and I enjoy doing it in proof, but the expense is dreadful."

The letter, of course, gives the impression that the revision was concerned only with verbal changes.

2. 1887, pp.100, 274.
3. e.g. 1887, pp.60, 62-3, 64, etc. Many are single sentences, often Zolaesque similes, and the number illustrates clearly the method of revision in this book.
4. e.g. Ebury edition, pp.189-90.
5. 1887, p.129.

his love-affair with Leslie(1); the expression of his hope that his relationship with Laura will be Platonic(2); his weariness of Kate(3); his dwelling on the fact that Laura is wildly in love with him(4); and her acceptance of Dick's wife on the grounds that she is merely a drunkard(5). In the 1887 version, part of Dick's reaction to Kate's ripping open his face is how he shall account for it to Laura(6). He is harsher with Kate in this edition(7); his actions are more calculated, his nature at times more callous. Though he will do nothing to hurt her feelings, he wants her to go to an asylum, and calculates his gestures: he intends the removal of his hat and the revelation of his wounds to be a 'big effect'; he speaks "as cautiously as a man who was playing dice with his life at stake." "He felt that the slightest imprudence of phrase might ruin him(8)". And after she has met him one night on his way home from the theatre, he changes his route(9). Above all, his reaction to the news that Kate is dying is more callous in 1887: his parting words to Laura, as she goes to nurse Kate, are

- 
1. 1887, p.126.
  2. 1887, p.283.
  3. 1887, p.284.
  4. 1887, p.295.
  5. 1887, p.309.
  6. 1887, p.293.
  7. See e.g. p.307.
  8. 1887, pp.318-19.
  9. 1887, p.347.

concerned with rehearsals(1). In the revised version, Dick has long ceased to be interested in Kate, but his indifference is not so callous. Omission of all these passages renders Dick more completely the fat, easy-going sensualist that Moore intended and thus, in the revised version, a more sympathetic character - also a more effective one, for his and the world's indifference to Kate's plight are more cruel than harshness(2).

Kate's character also undergoes some alteration: the rewriting and omission of melodramatic sentences(3) and the omission of certain passages(4) improve the account of her superficiality and sentimentality. Analysis of her reactions to events is considerably cut down(5). The account of her baby's death is more convincing in 1918 because Kate is in a drunken stupor, and her thoughts are more skilfully mingled with comment(6). And our sympathy

1. 1887, p.348.

2. Moore always admired Dick - see e.g. letter to Gosse, 121 Ebury Street, S.W., Sunday, n.d., but written not before 1918, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134. And this admiration has been justly echoed by others: Eglinton (see Moore, letter to J. Eglinton, 21st September, 1928, Eglinton, op.cit., p.81); Susan Mitchell - not exactly a friend of Moore's (op.cit., p.44); and Henley (cf. Goodwin, *Conversations*, London, Benn, 1929, p.177.)

3. e.g. 1887, p.264; Ebury edition, p.288.

4. e.g. 1887, pp.14-15.

5. e.g. 1887, pp.142-3.

6. 1887, pp.260-2; 1937, pp.285-7.

for her is heightened in the revision by the fact that Laura is much less of a caricature and so Kate's jealousy is more justified. There is some attempt to see more of the action through Kate's eyes(1) and, for example, to interweave landscape with reminiscence(2), but no re-orientation of the whole novel.

Mrs. Laura Forest, that absurd pseudo-poetess introduced into the first version, no doubt, for variation, is less of a freak in the revision, owing to the omission of certain passages of her rambling conversation, along with details of her oddities, her ogling and her glass eye(3). Old, pitiable, flaunting like a cockatoo and wholly ludicrous(4), she becomes, in the revised version, a little more credible, a more genuine eccentric.

Hender, Kate's assistant in Hanley, has her part cut slightly(5), as does Mrs. Ede, Kate's mother-in-law(6).

In certain respects, narrative is handled more competently in the revision. For example, in 1887, Dick is rather clumsily introduced into the exposition by Ede(7);

1. e.g. Ebury edition, pp.131-2.
2. Ebury edition, pp.52-3.
3. e.g. 1887, pp.296-7.
4. See 1887, p.281.
5. e.g. 1887, pp.25, 27, etc.
6. e.g. 1887, p.19.
7. 1887, p.9.

whereas, in 1918, he emerges more naturally from Kate's thoughts(1). A bad piece of writing, where Kate is drunk on stage(2), is omitted in 1918, and the drink and jealousy themes, dealt with clumsily in a long passage of analysis in 1887(3), are treated gradually and more subtly in the revised version. Chapter 27 is a good example of the tightening up of structure that takes place in the final edition: in 1887, scene(4) is followed by analysis and narrative(5), succeeded in turn by scene(6); in 1918, the generalised narrative is omitted and the two scenes become one(7).

Thus the main changes in the 1918 revision, which Moore thought a great advance(8), are the removal of many naturalistic passages, the improvement in the handling of characters and narrative and the simplification of the style.

A Mummer's Wife was succeeded by A Drama in Muslin, which was first published in book form by Vizetelly in

1. Ebury edition, p.2.
2. 1887, pp.185-6.
3. 1887, pp.193-5.
4. p.313.
5. pp.313-4.
6. pp.314ff.
7. Ebury edition, pp.346ff.
8. See Barrett Clark, op.cit., pp.65-6.

1886(1).

The story is basically the same in both the 1886 and the revised version of 1915, the main theme being the horrors of the marriage mart in Ireland and the subsequent tragic frustration of enforced celibacy, set against a background of the Irish problems in the 1880s. Unlike A Mummer's Wife, A Drama in Muslin is not wholly Zolaesque. In 1886, Zola wrote to Moore saying that Moore's articles in the Figaro(2) pleased him very much and, since reading them, he had had an idea:

"Pourquoi ne faites-vous pas toute de suite un roman sur l'Irlande, mais un roman social, vrai, audacieux, révolutionnaire, qui serait la vie de la liberté? L'Angleterre en serait bouleversée, jamais occasion pareille ne s'est offerte de remuer un peuple. Songez-y. De l'audace, de l'audace, encore de l'audace!" He added, "Et travaillez, c'est ce qui vaut le mieux(3)."

- 
1. It appeared first, in the Court and Society Review, from 14th January to 1st July, 1886, vol.2, no.80 - vol.3 no.104. The first book publication is different from the magazine version only in the tidying up of certain transitions and the addition in the book of such lines as these concerning May's love-affairs:  
 ' "Who was it?"  
 "Don't ask me → what does it matter?"  
 "I am very sorry. Do you love him very much?"  
 "No, no; it was an old man." (1886, p.318. Not in 1915)  
 These lines seem to indicate that, while they could not go into the magazine, they were put into the 1886 edition to shock his readers.
  2. "Lettres sur L'Irlande" - see above.
  3. 15th August, Médan, G. Jean-Aubry, "George Moore and E. Zola", Bookman's Journal, vol.xi, no.39, December 1924, p.99. Also G. Jean-Aubry, "Zola et George Moore", Les Nouvelles Littéraires, Saturday, 17th January, 1925, p.5.

It was the kind of work, however, of which Moore was clearly tiring. Nor was he really the man for the task, neither a socialist nor a political writer. In any case, he had by this time completed A Drama in Muslin.

But though A Drama in Muslin was not a Naturalistic novel, Zola was still the dominant influence: witness the stress on environment, determinism and heredity (a clearer statement than A Modern Lover or A Mummer's Wife); the emphasis on the effect of 'milieu' on the characters of the girls; the thesis; the axiomatic statement of Naturalistic theories; the sympathy for women's rights (contrary to his deepest prejudices); the refusal to make concessions to sentiment; the realistic portrayal of Alice and her attitude to religion, her love-affairs and marriage; the attack on organised Catholic religion (and its adherents), a matter of form to the rich, a superstitious mystery to the poor; the ruthless dissection of Castle society and the marriage-mart; the analysis of the peasants' wretchedness and poverty, as well as of their unpleasant smell and habits (reminiscent of La Terre); the attack on the extravagance and fatuity of the gentry and on the lack of social planning; the documentation, the history, the newspaper reports of the outrages; the continual stress on 'analysis' of character; the strong connection between character and appearance; the

characterisation through detailed description: the contention that ideas come not from individuals but from the intellectual climate of the age; the conception of the novelist's task as the dissection of 'domestic grief'; the inclusion of what critics of Naturalism called 'baser impulses' and 'nasty detail'(1); the crude emotions of the Castle and Rotunda Balls; the odours; the sickness and ugly details(2); the crude Zolaesque nature imagery; the animalism; the fugal, rhythmic treatment in the repetition and variation of motifs; the recurrence of Land League gossip themes, along with tags associated with each character - for example, Mrs. Barton's 'pearly laughter' and fluttering white hands - like Zola, Moore used repetition to underline characters' offensiveness; the alternation of background and foreground; the accumulation of detail; the management of crowd scenes (e.g. the 'Spinsters' Ball'(3) and the Castle Ball(4)); the impressionistic pictures; the light effects; the violence of the language; and even the framework of the novel.

- 
1. See e.g. Review of A Drama in Muslin, Athenaeum, no.3065, 24th July, 1886, p.110.
  2. e.g. London, Vizetelly, 1886, pp.292, 295.
  3. pp.86-93.
  4. Book 2, ch.3.

Milton Chaikin(1) suggests *Pot-Bouille* (1884) as a probable source of the husband-hunting comedy, and points to a number of minor resemblances between Mrs. Barton and Mme. Josserant: both have two daughters to marry off; both abuse their husbands and are in command; and both reprove their daughters for spoiling their good looks by crying(2). How much the book was based on Zola may be seen from the fact that, though this was a background he knew well, Moore still used the naturalistic notebook method: hence his desire to be invited to the Castle(3). Nevertheless, the deterministic and naturalistic passages here are incidental; more important than Moore's explanation of Alice's mastery of her environment in terms of hereditary health are the characteristics which enabled her to succeed. Alice determines her own destiny, and the book is not cynical or pessimistic.

Balzac's influence can be seen in the long soliloquies, in some of the views expressed on women and celibacy, and in a number of traits of character. Chaikin(4) states that the two main themes of the book come from both Zola and Balzac;

- 
1. "Balzac, Zola and George Moore's A Drama in Muslin", Revue de Littérature Comparée, vol. xxix, 1955, p.542.
  2. Pot-Bouille, tr. from 63rd French edition, London, Vizetelly, 1885, p.43; A Drama in Muslin, London, Vizetelly, 1886, p.131.
  3. Hone told Lynn C. Bartlett (see Bartlett, A Critical Study of the Early Novels of George Moore, B.Litt. thesis, Magdalen College, Oxford, 1954, p.106) that Moore's description of a gown was taken almost word for word from an Irish newspaper.
  4. "Balzac, Zola and George Moore's A Drama in Muslin", p.540.

the pettiness and sterility of Irish provincial society, and the husband-hunting; but Balzac's picture of small-town life, says Chaikin, seems particularly in Moore's mind: the narrowness, rivalry, avarice and celibacy. Alice herself, with her strong desire for marriage, no doubt owes something to Mlle. Cormon in Une Vieille Fille (1836). (The main difference is that Alice rebels against her circumstances and marries happily. She is not a creature of instinct and she escapes her environment.) The ending is nearer Balzac than Zola, especially in its marriage and more optimistic note.

Flaubert is much less of an influence in A Drama in Muslin. Certain scenes bear a resemblance to Madame Bovary, but Moore's main debt here is to Flaubert's narrative technique. Moore was proud of his success in combining related but dissimilar themes in such a way as to emphasise the general pattern of the book, the personal tragedy of the girls played out against the darker tragedies of the Irish background. The method is used in e.g. Madame Bovary, where parts of the Mayor's speech are interwoven with the love-making of Rodolphe and Emma<sup>(1)</sup>. As Hone points out<sup>(2)</sup>, Moore

1. Paris, Michel Lévy, 1857, ch.8.  
 2. op.cit., pp.117-118.

went further in scenes dealing with several interests and including the interlocking of two sets of conversations, one inside and the other outside the Bartons' house(1).

But other influences were at work in Moore's writing. As C. M. Bowra has said(2), the poet and story-teller in him were always running away from the realist and finding satisfaction in the unfamiliar. He began now to experiment with a number of styles in order to escape from the flatness of A Mummer's Wife, in the same way as he tried to deal, in Alice and Cecilia, with more spiritual natures than those in A Mummer's Wife or Zola.

One source of experimentation was with the Goncourts' adjectival effects: for example, the passage about the light shaping a nose, a shoulder etc.(3). And the theme itself is similar to that of Renée Mauperin: a psychological study of a middle-class environment(4).

Gautier, too, seems to have influenced A Drama in Muslin:

1. Book I, ch.7.
2. "George Moore", New Oxford Outlook, vol.1, no.1, May 1933, p.46.
3. 1886, p.49; 1915, p.49.
4. The Goncourts wished to call their novel La Jeune Bourgeoise and then La jeune bourgeoisie - see G-P. Collet, George Moore et La France, p.165.

the description of the sunset(1) has the same tints as, for example, Mademoiselle de Maupin(2).

More important, for the first time in Moore's work, we see the influence of Huysmans(3) in the excellent passage about the Dublin streets looking like a beggar(4); in the picture of the swallows and bats(5); in the graphic descriptions of atmosphere; and in the word-images - for example, the simile of evening like a corpse(6). Compared with Huysmans, of course, Moore's effects are amateurish, his similes careless, crude and tasteless. However, Symbolism, as a whole, plays a considerable part in A Drama in Muslin, especially the theory of the 'correspondances' of sounds and colours (every vowel having its counterpart in colour, according to René Ghil), which, begun by Baudelaire, was systematised by Rimbaud, codified by Ghil, taken to its logical conclusion by Huysmans - and imitated rather feebly

1. 1886, pp.18-19; 1915, pp.18-20.
2. Paris, 1891, 2 vols.I, p.85, II, p.50.
3. For studies of Huysmans' influence on Moore, see A. J. Farmer, op.cit.; S. M. Steward, "J. K. Huysmans and George Moore", Romanic Review, vol.25, no.3, July-September 1934; and G-P. Collet, George Moore et la France, ch.6.
4. 1886, p.158; omitted in 1915.
5. 1886, p.270; 1915, p.286.
6. 1886, p.16; omitted in 1915.

by Moore(1). Comparison with Huysmans will reveal the book's weakness, its comic desire to shock, but it is important historically and as an indication of the way Moore's work was tending(2). The vague suggestive imagery also comes from the Symbolists: the description of evening, for example, is very like Rimbaud's Illuminations (1886)(3). Impressionism, too, had a considerable influence on A Drama in Muslin, as we may see from the many portraits, the scene of the prize-giving(4), and the sensuous colouring of the girls, their dresses and the landscape(5).

Other influences went into the style: for example, in the strange ramblings of Cecilia, the frustrated, neurotic Lesbian(6), about the depravity of the world and the joys of Heaven(7), Hone(8) sees the manner of the Euphuists.

1. The description of the dressmaker's shop is the best example. 1886, p.162; 1915, pp.169-70. The passage induced Miss Mary Robinson and her sister to write in their own humorous touches in the margin - see Anne. Mary Uclaux, "Souvenirs sur George Moore," Revue de Paris, XII, March 1933, p.118.
2. For other examples, see 1886, p.99 - omitted in 1915 in the middle of a long passage; 1886, p.173 - 1915, pp. 181-2.
3. 1886, p.18 - 1915, pp.18-19.
4. Book 1, ch.1.
5. Book 1, ch.1.
6. Startling in 1886.
7. Book 3, ch.6; omitted in 1915.
8. op.cit., p.121.

Add to this hotch-potch a desire to write like Pater(1) (the Symbolists, of course, were close in spirit to the Aesthetic school), to become a second Jane Austen, and to be a popular novelist; add, too, the muted, wistful tone reminiscent, at times, of Turgenev, and the introduction for the first time in his work of satirical humour and of serious psychological study, plus a good deal of sentimental romanticism: it is plain to see why Moore spent the next few years tying himself up into aesthetic knots(2).

Yet another influence must be mentioned: that of Ibsen. A Drama in Muslin is an attack on social conventions, and Alice's thoughts on the rights of women are reminiscent of Nora(3). Neither wishes to become a mere plaything of man. Moore himself talks of the connection with Ibsen, of "'a hatred as lively as Ibsen's of the social conventions that drive women into the marriage market. It seems strange.... that the critics of the 'eighties failed to notice that the theme of A Drama in Muslin is the same as that of the Doll's House(4)'". And he prides himself on the fact that he had not read Ibsen when he began A Drama in Muslin. In the middle of writing the book, he says, he was read a poor

---

1. See his cf. in the preface to Muslin, p.vii.

2. A Drama in Muslin itself was saved by its theme, its solid substance and its basic realism.

3. e.g. 1886, pp.98-9, 101; omitted in 1915.

4. Preface, Muslin, pp.viii-ix.

translation of Ibsen:

"The fact that he was writing the same subject from an entirely different point of view prejudiced him (ie. the young Moore) against Ibsen; and the making of a woman first in a sensual and afterwards transferring her into an educational mould with a view to obtaining an instrument to thunder out a given theme could not be else than abhorrent to one whose art, however callow, was at least objective(1)".

He goes on to say that he was writing of a Puritan but not a sexless Puritan and, if women could not win freedom without leaving behind their sex, they had better remain slaves: a slave with sex was better than a free eunuch. Alice, the young Moore thought (according to the older Moore), represented her sex better than the archetypal hieratic and clouded Nora(2). If she fails to excite our wonder like Nora, it is because A Drama in Muslin is a comedy and "in comedy the people are not and perhaps should not be above life size(3)". So much for Moore's powers of self-deception, and his explanation of Ibsen's greater stature as a writer.

Such a collection of influences destroys the unity of tone; yet A Drama in Muslin, crude though it is, remains alive and vigorous.

In 1915, the book was thoroughly rewritten and published

1. ib., p.xi.
2. ib., p.xi.
3. ib., p.xii.

by Heinemann under the title, Muslin(1). As usual, Moore was highly pleased with the revision. He wrote to Gosse:

"You have no idea what a bright sparkling book it is now that it has been redeemed from occasional stupidities(2)."

In the 1915 preface(3), he explains that the French epigrams could not be omitted without much re-writing, "and remembering my oath never to attempt the re-writing of an old book again, I fell back on the exclusion of A Drama in Muslin(4) as the only way out of the dilemma." He also remembered some disgraceful pages. But then he thought of the hiatus:

"A Drama in Muslin, I reflected, is a link between two styles; and a book that has achieved any notoriety cannot be omitted from a collected edition, so my publishers said...."

1. The title caused Moore some difficulty. In 1912 (Salve, London, Heinemann, p.32), he said that Holy Muslin would be a better title and Balblanc better still. In 1915, he was suggesting to Gosse (Sunday, 20th June, 1915, Westport Lodge, Westport, Ireland, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134) The Bateing (sic) of Mrs. Barton, and calling the original title "my single vulgarity" (See also preface to Muslin, p.v.) In the preface to Muslin (p.v.) he suggested, in addition to these titles, Neophytes, ébutantes, and Mousseline (but the use of French was not justified, and Milord's epigrams poisoned his memory of A Drama in Muslin.)
2. Westport Lodge, Westport, Ireland, Sunday, 20th June, 1915, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.
3. pp.v-vii.
4. ie. from the 'canon'.

After a romanticised account of his obtaining a copy of A Drama in Muslin, he went on:

"...I carried a delightful evening under my arm. A comedy novel, written with sprightliness and wit...and it needs hardly any editing. A mere re-tying of a few bows that the effluxion of time has untied, or were never tied by the author, who, if I remember right, used to be less careful of his literary appearance than his prefacer, neglecting to examine his sentences, and to scan them as often as one might expect from an admirer, not to say disciple, of Walter Pater."

The reference to Pater is part of his attempt, as we shall see later, to play down the influence of Zola. As for the rest, it is a masterpiece of understatement, capped only by Freeman who, as so often, seems to take Moore at his own evaluation, saying that he was content with a touch here, a pruning there, "and that general stealthy amendment which gives to his first books something of the beauty of the later(1)."

Many sections of the revised version are omitted for a complex of reasons, involving the removal of the influence of Zola, of the crude attacks on Catholicism, and of the severe criticisms of the gentry and the Vice-regal court - aesthetic and intellectual motives being closely mingled. For example, the following section(2) is omitted in 1915:

- 
1. Freeman, op.cit., p.87.
  2. 1886, pp.68-72.

the patronising description of the peasants and the girls outside the church(1); Alice's remark, sympathetic to the peasantry, that she disagrees with her mother's saying the countrypeople look sour and wicked, because she "had already begun to see someth'ng wrong in each big house being surrounded by a hundred small ones, all working to keep it in sloth and luxury(2)"; the realistic description of the church(3); and the reference to "the prayer of the mother who grovelled, beating her breast, before the third Station of the Cross(4)". This last is significant because Moore goes out of his way to cut this single phrase from the passage, while retaining the comic detail about the priest, and, more important, the disgusting smells and voices of the peasants. There are some Zolaesque references to the "sour odour of cabin-smoked frieze" and "whiffs of unclean leather, mingled with a smell of a sick child(5)," which are retained in 1915(6), and which show clearly that Moore here is not eliminating the Zola influence but, on the contrary, retaining most of the Zola elements which deal with the peasantry. The revision then omits Alice's view of the falseness of the Mass and her

1. 1886, p.68.
2. 1886, p.68. Alice's character is weakened by the omissions in 1915.
3. 1886, p.69.
4. 1886, p.70.
5. 1886, p.70.
6. 1915, p.71.

cynicism about Catholicism generally; the mumbling, the by-play, the trivialities, the incomprehensible sermon and the congregation's utter lack of comprehension; the narrow-mindedness; the satire on the Catechism; and the excellent contrast between the peasantry and the gentry(1). It is highly significant that the whole passage on the gentry is omitted, while all but a couple of sentences relating to the peasantry(2) are retained: the man clearing his throat with loud guffaws, the saliva splashing on the earthen floor; the circle of dried and yellowing faces indicating creatures of damp cabins; their superstitious groans and breast-beating(3); and their use of the church for their own purposes(4). These Zolaesque elements, had they applied to the gentry, would have been omitted. The removal especially of the contrast between the gentry, who pray elegantly and come to church to arrange a ball, and the peasantry, who pray coarsely and come to church to arrange a Land meeting, weakens the revision considerably. A Drama in Muslin is a thesis-novel, but Muslin does not gain artistically by the removal of this element because the story is distorted by Moore's prejudiced omission of only one-half of the social background. His aim here is

---

1. 1886, pp.70-72.

2. 1886, p. 71.

3. 1886, p.71; 1915, pp.71-2.

4. 1886, p.68; 1915, p.69.

not merely the removal of Zolaesque didacticism in the interests of art: he is willing to retain Naturalistic passages unfavourable to the peasantry. Omission of the strong anti-Catholic passages, on the other hand, must be ascribed to Moore's aesthetic motives and the crudeness of his attack for, between 1886 and 1915, Moore's hatred of the Catholic religion intensified and became more extreme, as we can see from the final version of Evelyn Innes/Sister Teresa (1908-9) and from Hail and Farewell (1911-1914). The 1915 passage has thus no attack on the gentry and almost no criticism of organised religion, whereas A Drama in Muslin attacks the Church savagely, in phraseology akin to that used in Moore's letters to Maurice about The Lake(1).

A passage in which Alice feels sorry for the men outside the ballroom is retained(2), but the first eight pages(3) of Book I, chapter 6(4) are omitted in 1915. These deal with the whole background of the Irish situation, especially the murders; unpleasant references to the landlords; their lack of unity; Mrs. Barton's and Milord's 'sang froid'; a long passage on Alice's thoughts about religion, the marriage-mart

1. Seaford House, Belgrave Square, S.W., 25th November, Saturday (1905) and (5th December, 1905), National Library, Dublin, MS 2646.
2. 1886, p.87; 1915, p.92. Her memory of it later (1886, p.171) is omitted.
3. 1886, pp.94-102.
4. Ch.11 in 1915.

and her rebellion against the social laws; and much moralising author comment and melodramatic writing(1). Once again, Zola elements are omitted, Alice's character is weakened, the thesis-novel aspects are removed, eight pages of static analysis and bad writing are bluntly excised, and the unity created by the underlying theme is destroyed leaving little more than a succession of episodes.

The omission of descriptions of the wretchedness and poverty of Dublin, and of the fatuity of Dublin society(2) once again shows that generally passages bitterly attacking the aristocracy are omitted, while those attacking the peasantry in a similar manner are not; and that, conversely, passages favouring the gentry and society are retained, while those favouring the peasantry are deleted. What Moore did here was to purge from his book those elements, uncharacteristic of an Irish squire, which he derived from Zola in his first zeal for Naturalism.

Revision of the passages quoted above was designed to achieve a number of objects: to correct the radical outlook, to remove the Zola influence and to improve the novel

- 
1. She cries for a mission (1886, p.98): cf. Mildred Lawsons's cry for a passion. And her plea, "Give me life, give me love!" (1886, p.100) is exactly that of Gogarty in the Lake.
  2. 1886, pp.157-9.

aesthetically. Other passages show more clearly the omission of separate factors(1). In the passages on religion, it is the cruder attacks, those meant to shock, which are omitted: the nuns' frustration finding an outlet in shaping girls for future husbands(2); Alice's sceptical view of the Bethlehem drama(3); the satirical account of the prize distribution and service(4); Harding's cynicism(5) and Moore's(6). Much of this material is hardly in character and barely relevant, and the revision gains by its exclusion. Towards the end of the novel, when the attack on Catholicism is less crude, Moore's attitude is somewhat different. For example, on page 319(7), not only is a humorous and satirical reference to Catholicism not omitted, but an additional one is inserted: wasn't a Papist "one who couldn't worship God till somebody had turned Him

1. Not that Moore was particularly consistent: on page 292 of the first edition, two references, sympathetic to the peasant ("The poverty that these peasants endure is something shocking" and "nothing to eat but a potato".) are omitted while, on the following page, several more are retained. Elsewhere mention of the poverty is retained; but the incident of the eviction which Alice and her husband observe, after the wedding ceremony, is considerably cut down (1886, pp.322-4; 1915, pp.335-6).
2. 1886, pp.13-14. Withdrawn because of the threat of a libel action - see Hone, op.cit., p.124.
3. 1886, p.14.
4. 1886, p.15.
5. 1886, pp.151, 182, 196-7.
6. 1886, p.187.
7. 1915. 1886, p.308.

into a biscuit"? This is much more in Moore's true vein. Again, an unflattering portrait of a priest, "large, pompous, and arrogant...his hands...crossed over his portly stomach," and a reference to the church's symbolising coarse superstition, are retained(1). A number of these characteristic remarks on Catholicism, usually in the author's own person or through some character other than Alice, creep into the revised text(2).

Zolaesque passages on heredity are omitted almost throughout - for example, the derivation of Alice's character(3) - but sometimes there are anomalies. Retained, for instance, are the author's remarks on "the corporeal and incorporeal hereditaments of Alice Barton and Lady Cecilia Cullen,"(4) which, he explains "were examined fully in the beginning of this chapter(5)".

Again, an immature passage on the rights of women and

- 
1. 1886, p.321; 1915, p.334.
  2. How absurd Moore's method of revision sometimes becomes may be seen from the following change:"the thorny ditch of agnosticism, or the soft feather-bed of belief" (1886, p.150) is altered to the"soft feather-bed of agnosticism, or the thorny ditch of belief." (1915, p.161.)
  3. 1886, p.38.
  4. 1886, p.196; 1915, p.208.
  5. In fact, they were not, for the passage was omitted, 1886, p.187.

their attitude to men is retained(1), as is the socialistic contrast between poverty and wealth, in the episode where the poor look through the windows of the carriages going to the Viceregal reception(2).

The revision also removes a section(3) dealing, in omniscient author style, which Moore's characteristic ideas of good and evil, instincts, conscience, and the ideas of the age, Schopenhauer, and Zolaesque heredity:

"...conscience is no more than the indirect laws - the essence of the laws transmitted by heredity...Is it therefore unnatural or even extraordinary that Alice Barton, who is if anything a representative woman of 1885, should have, in an obscure and formless way, divined the doctrines of Eduard van Hartman, the entire and unconditional resignation of personal existence into the arms of the cosmic process? Cecilia, as has been shown, with her black hatred of life concentrated upon a loathing of the origin of existence, was but another manifestation of the same stratum of thought(4)".

In the same way, the whole of Book 3, chapter 6, dealing with Cecilia's visit to Alice, is omitted: her religious mania, passion for Alice, and jealousy of any man approaching her friend; her religious sensuality(5); her hatred of the

1. 1886, pp.195-6; 1915, pp.207-8.
2. 1886, p.171; 1915, p.179.
3. pp.228-9.
4. pp.228-9. See also 1886, p.187, removed in 1915.
5. See also another passage omitted: 1886, p.60.

flesh, her congenital celibacy (one of the book's themes), her horror of life(1) and desire for martyrdom; the nightmares in which she suffers the martyrdom which Alice will suffer in the marriage-bed; her obsession with the deformity which has set her apart; and her belief that calm prayer has enabled her to defeat life. The style of the chapter is melodramatic in the extreme, but the author's main aim is to remove the Zola determinism, heredity and environment. Part of Cecilia's letter dealing with her bitter views on physical love(2) is also deleted.

And the following passage . . . with its Zolaesque narrative method is omitted:

"The history of a nation as often lies hidden in social wrongs and domestic griefs as in the story of revolution, and if it be for the historian to narrate the one, it is for the novelist to dissect and explain the other; and who would say which is of the most vital importance - the thunder of the people against the oppression of the Castle, or the unnatural sterility, the cruel idleness of mind and body of the muslin martyrs who cover with their white skirts the shames of Cork Hill?"(3)"

The Naturalistic technique of describing character through physical appearance - the sane, almost stern Alice being contrasted with the sensual May - is cut out(4). Zola's ugly

1. cf. John Norton in Moore's next book, A Mere Accident.
2. 1886, pp.184-5.
3. 1886, pp.203-4.
4. 1886, pp.166-7.

metaphors are excised: for example, the grim, morbid and melodramatic references to poverty and 'scabs'(1), and the superb simile describing the underlings at the reception, who swarm about the mock court "like flies about a choice pile of excrement"(2). And the melodrama of May's revelation of her sensuality is toned down: instead of an old man(3), she is given merely a lover(4). Moore thus removed all the worst excesses of Zola, both in ideas which he no longer shared and in the method of presentation.

The construction of Muslin is not based on Naturalistic principles and Naturalistic theories are generally deleted(5). The sympathy for women's rights, the influence of 'milieu' on the characters(6); the idea that the novelist's task is to dissect domestic grief; the repeated emphasis on 'analysis' of character(7); the notebook method entailing passages extraneous to the story, and the violence of the language: all are removed or modified in the revision.

1. 1886, pp.170-71. See also p.143.

2. 1886, p.181.

3. 1886, p.318.

4. 1915, p.332.

5. e.g. 1886, p.38.

6. The Goulds' room, showing their poor origins, is retained (1886, p.83; 1915, pp.86-7), but 'hideous' and 'dismal' are omitted.

7. e.g. 1886, p.187 (Cecilia).

What survives is the refusal to make concessions to sentiment; the realistic portrait of Alice and her attitude to religion and the marriage market; the realistic study of the fortunes of the girls; the heroine's marriage to a frumpy middle-aged doctor, Olive's failure to marry, and May's unregenerate behaviour after Alice has saved her from scandal; the fugal treatment, repetition and variation of motives; the Rotunda Ball; the crude emotions of the Castle Ball, the smell of sweat, the accumulated detail and crowd management of the presentation and the procession: the display of materials(1) influenced by Au Bonheur des Dames(2), some impressionism in style(3); and a few Nature metaphors(4). We see from this that the Naturalism has become realism, which survives along with a certain influence in narrative technique. Otherwise, Zolaism is drastically excised from the novel, and this was Moore's main purpose in undertaking the revision (though not all of the topical, as Hone claims(5), is omitted in 1915).

In view of all this, it is amusing to read Moore's preface to the revised version, where he is at great pains to play down Zola's influence on A Drama in Muslin:

1. 1886, Bk.2, ch.2; 1915, ch.16.
2. Edit. Fasquelle, 1897, ch.4, pp.125ff.
3. e.g. 1886, pp.17, 49; 1915, pp.17, 49.
4. 1886, p.216; 1915, p.232.
5. op.cit., p.117.

"'It was life that interested him(1) rather than the envelope,' I said. 'He sought Alice Barton's heart as eagerly as Kate Ede's'...and...I fell to wondering how it was that the critics of the 'eighties could have been blind enough to dub him an imitator of Zola. (A soul searcher, if ever there was one'...whose desire to write well is apparent on every page, a headlong, eager uncertain style (a young hound yelping at every trace of scent), but if we look beneath the style we catch sight of the young man's true self(2)'"

In 1885, he says, he was too much absorbed in his craft, in observing and remembering life to be interested in moral ideas(3). Freeman takes this on Moore's own evaluation, saying that, in 1886, the social theorist was almost silent in Moore, that life was his concern, especially the four girls, puppets of the social drama and living persons in the book. All that Freeman will allow is that the artist occasionally sleeps and that the theorist crudely introduces extraneous pages which are the result, not of sociological impatience, but of artistic irritability(4). The simplicity of the story, however, says Freeman, is never lost(5). This is not strictly true. What we can say is that. Moore was never a socialist or a radical, and was concerned

1. i.e. the young Moore.
2. Preface to *Muslin*, p.viii.
3. ib.p.xi. Another lie: in 1886, he observed; 'remembering' was a product of his later evolution.
4. Freeman, op.cit., p.88.
5. op.cit., p.88.

artistically, not emotionally or intellectually, with the state of Ireland but, contrary to his own ideas and temperament, he included Zolaesque material and employed a Zolaesque approach, simply because he was so much under the French writer's influence at the time. It is this which accounts for the vehemence of his repudiation of Zola in the 1915 preface to Muslin.

Moore also excises some of Balzac's influence. The long soliloquies are omitted or condensed in 1915, along with certain views on celibacy and women's emancipation(1). Other passages remain. Freeman suggests(2) that Moore spent his strength vainly on a voluptuous description of the Viceregal drawingroom(3), as if he would be Balzacian by mere excess. And Moore himself, in 1915, was not desirous of suppressing at least one flattering reference: he says in the preface(4) that the young Moore seems to have meditated a small 'comédie humaine' - small only because he could not stand the strain of Balzac's 14-hour shifts.

1. cf. Eugénie Grandet, Une Vieille Fille and La Femme de trente ans - for example, the passage (cut out in 1915, not necessarily because of Balzac's influence) in which Moore describes Alice's loneliness when she realises no man will want her (1886, p.97).
2. op.cit., p.88.
3. Retained in 1915.
4. p.xii.

Flaubert's influence on the book's narrative technique remains, as do the episodes that bear a certain resemblance to Madame Bovary: for example, the departure from the convent, the Castle Ball, and Olive's elopement and illness. Ferguson (1) finds a few parallel passages(2), most of which are omitted from Muslin. A Drama in Muslin, according to Ferguson(3) is the last of Moore's works in which Flaubert colouring is prominent, and half of the examples of this are retained in Muslin.

The influence of Gautier, the Goncourts, Huysmans and the Symbolists generally survives in the revision, while that of Ibsen largely disappears with the Zola. In fact, the best is excised, the weaker part remains.

From the foregoing, it is obvious that the first version suffers from constant analysis, comment, theorising and moralising by the author. We have examined some of this material in the Zolaesque passages of author comment; it is appropriate now to examine the whole picture.

Omitted is some of the author's buttonholing of the

1. op.cit., pp. 46-8.
2. e.g. A Drama in Muslin, pp.53, 72, 297 - from Madame Bovary, Oeuvres Complètes, Paris, Gonard, 1910, pp.51, 159, 21: pp.131, 258 - from L'Education Sentimentale. Ouevres Complètes, pp.461, 516.
3. op.cit., pp.89-90.

reader: "you wondered(1)"; "let us look at the elder sister"(2); "...if you will(3)"· "you see(4)": "examine the..(5)"; "let us(6)": his moralising comments(7); his often crude interference to analyse and explain: "The explanation of this seeming anomaly is found in the last line of the preceding paragraph...(8)": some of the straight author comment, background painting and narration(9); references to George Eliot and Thackeray(10), and George Eliot and C. Brontë(11); and much analysis of, and comment on the character, appearance and reactions of Alice and others: e.g. "this straight-souled girl(12)". How crude the interference

- 
1. 1886, p.22.
  2. 1886, p.33.
  3. 1886, pp.67,76.
  4. 1886, pp.226, 255.
  5. 1886, p.194.
  6. 1886, p.324. Though often examples are retained: "as we have seen" (1886, p.235; 1915, p.247); "you see" (1886, p.84; 1915, p.88); and "just in front of me" (1886, p.173; 1915, p.181).
  7. 1886, pp.61, 263.
  8. 1886, p.66.
  9. 1886, pp.52 -3, 114-11, 140, 150, 266-7, 279.
  10. 1886, p.294.
  11. 1886, p.296.
  12. 1886, p.67. See also 1886, pp.20-21, 25-6, 32-3, 102, 116, 145-6, 147, 148-9, 149-50, 150-51, 153, 179, 186-7, 193, 194, 226, 233, 247, 247-8, 252, 253, 255-6, 262, 263, 291-2, 296, 307.

often is may be seen from the following:

"She was but one of the many débutantes who, amid the chaperons, sat wearily waiting on the high benches. Some are(sic) but seventeen, and their sweet, clear eyes seem as a bright morning...(1)".

The simplification in the revision, the greater proportion of narrative, the increased pace and greater unity, are a considerable gain.

Some comments and details uncharacteristic of Alice are deleted in the revision; for example, her outburst(2), the opening of her scene with Harding(3) and her delight in marrying before the others(4). In 1886, she thinks of her sister as "the silly beauty"(5); in the revision this becomes "beautiful sister"(6).

Other characters are improved: for example, the caricature of Arthur Barton is generally omitted(7).

It is noticeable that the important changes in the main story (as distinct from the social background) are concerned with Alice. Olive's story, including some melodramatic incidents, such as her attempted elopement and ensuing illness, ~~is~~ virtually untouched.

1. 1886, p.193; omitted in 1915. For a similar change of tense, see 1886, p.266.
2. 1886, p.109.
3. 1886, p.146.
4. 1886, p.312.
5. 1886, p.103.
6. 1915, p.103.
7. 1886, pp.25, 26, 37, 39.

Changes of incident not already mentioned include the omission of the irrelevant episode of the girl in red and the singer(1). Alice's flirtation with Harding is played down, presumably (because the episode has no significance) to render credible her forgetting him so easily(2). Symbolism is not generally omitted in 1915, but a number of descriptive passages are deleted(3).

Sometimes, a change such as the following is made in the angle of narration:

"It was a large, dull room(4)";  
 "The girls looked round the large, dull room(5)".

This, however, is rare. Dialogue is a little more credible and natural in 1915, with speeches breaking into one another. Sometimes, narrative is transformed into dialogue. The worst (though not all) of the melodramatic over-writing is cut out(6) and the author's French phrases are anglicised in 1915(7).

1. 1886, pp.154-5.
2. See e.g. the perceptive comment (1886, p.182) which makes Harding look at her in surprise, and which is replaced by a much less intelligent remark in 1915 (p.193).
3. e.g. Nature: 1886, p.22. Interiors: 1886, pp.27, 115, 173. Exteriors: 1886, p.172.
4. 1886, p.83.
5. 1915, p.86.
6. e.g. 1886, pp.144, 156-7, 217-220, 227, 231-2, 263, 266, 280.
7. e.g. 1886, p.221; 1915, p.233; 1886, p.234; 1915, p.246.

Hone(1), thinking, no doubt, of the transformation in the revised version, says that Muslin is a skilful revision; but in many ways this is a very bad method of rewriting; leaving out sections, reshaping and adding a few paragraphs (mainly at the beginning of the book), touching up generally and leaving a number of sections unchanged. This is not a revision aimed at recreation in the melodic line manner. And though several writers have praised Muslin(2) what Moore has really done is to remove the Zolaesque exposition of the political, religious and social background of the story (except where it suited his more reactionary political outlook to make no change), and to omit those ideas in which he no longer believed (ideas, it should be added, that were held only tenuously in 1886). It is true that the unity of the revised version is enhanced by the excision of extraneous social, political and religious comment, and artistic considerations were undoubtedly one of Moore's motives for undertaking the rewriting. At the same time, that they were not his sole concern may be seen from the fact that only certain passages of author comment are omitted, while others of importance are retained. And, with all its crudities, A Drama in Muslin is a better novel than Muslin.

---

1. op.cit., p.326.

2. e.g. Freeman, op.cit., p.89.

In 1886-7, the influence of Zola and the Goncourts was replaced by that of Huysmans and Pater, to be followed by Turgenev. It was these writers, together with Balzac, who turned Moore away from things, backgrounds, external realities and determinism to 'souls', inner conflicts and realities, and individual emotions. A Mere Accident(1), though intrinsically feeble, marked the first major turning-point in Moore's novel-writing career(2).

The hero of the novel, John Norton(3) is based upon Edward Martyn, the "dear Edward" and masterpiece of Hail and Farewell(4):

1. London, Vizetelly, 1887. The story was, at first, to be called An Accident - see fragment of a letter from Moore to an unknown correspondent, n.d., National Library, Dublin, MS 2648 - Hone, op.cit., p.131, appears to ascribe the letter to his brother Julian.
2. In his later autobiographical introductions, essays and prefaces, Moore made no mention of A Mere Accident - see e.g. A Communication to my Friends. In the same vol. as A Mummer's Wife, London, Heinemann, Ebury edition, 1937, p.lv; also preface to Muslin, London, Heinemann, 1915, p.ii. And David Garnett informs us ("Current Lit.", New Statesman and Nation, vol.vi, no.124, n.s., Saturday, 8th July, 1933, p.46) that Moore would not repeat even the name of the book, nor acknowledge it directly, and dreamed that the day would come when every critic would reject the idea of its being Moore's.
3. Norton appears also in Mike Fletcher, London, Ward & Downey, 1889.
4. cf. Hone, op.cit., p.130.

"There is no doubt that I owe a great deal of my happiness to Edward; all my life long he has been exquisite entertainment. And I fell to thinking that Nature was very cruel to have led me, like Moses, within sight of the Promised Land. A story would be necessary to bring Edward into literature, and it would be impossible to devise an action of which he should be a part. The sex of a woman is odious to him, and a man with two thousand a year does not rob nor steal, and he is so uninterested in his fellow-men that he has never an ill word to say about anybody...but for lack of a story I shall not be able to give him the immortality in literature which he seeks in sacraments.... Turgenev's portrait of him would be thin,, poor, and evasive, and Balzac would give us the portrait of a mere fool. And Edward is not a fool. As I understand him he is a temperament without a rudder; all he has to rely upon is his memory, which isn't a very good one, and so he tumbles from one mistake into another... If I had been able to undo his faith I should have raised him to the level of Sir Horace Plunkett, but he resisted me; and perhaps he did well, for he came into the world seeing things separately rather than relatively, and had to be a Catholic. He is a born Catholic, and I remembered one of his confessions - a partial confession; but a confession: If you had been brought up as strictly as I have been - I don't think he ever finished the sentence; he often leaves sentences unfinished, as if he fears to think things out. The end of the sentence should run: You would not dare to think independently. He thinks that his severe bringing-up has robbed him of something. But the prisoner ends by liking his prison-house, and on another occasion he said: If it hadn't been for the Church, I don't know what would have happened to me(1)."

- 
1. Vale, London, Heinemann, Uniform edition, vol.10, 1947,  
pp.191-2.

Yeats told Lady Gregory:

"He (i.e. Moore) had hoped to write an article called 'Edward Martyn and his Soul'. He said, 'It was the best opportunity I ever had. What a sensation it would have made. Nobody has ever written that way about his most intimate friend. What a chance! It would have been heard of everywhere(1).'"

In fact, that is what Moore did. The physical appearance (large mouth, luminous eyes, aquiline nose(2)); the unhappy childhood: the love of Wagner(3) and Palestrina(4), organs and Church music and architecture; the concern with Catholicism and chastity: the antipathy towards women(5); the will leaving something to all his tenants: the Gothic hall, his mother's additions and Norton's hatred of it all except his study in the tower with its Spartan furniture(6); the asceticism(7); the failure to come to terms with life(8);

1. See Hone, W. B. Yeats, 1865-1939, London, Macmillan, 1942, p.160. Cf. Yeats, Autobiographies, p.137.
2. A Mere Accident, pp.49-50.
3. John Norton only, pp.335-8.
4. This perhaps owes something also to Huysmans' A Rebours.
5. A Mere Accident, p.103.
6. A Mere Accident, pp.165-6. Moore makes Norton hate the smug materialism of Sussex villas and downs and exclude from the College library all sensual literature. Des Esseintes' room (see e.g. Against the Grain, London, Fortune Press, n.d., ch.1) is not Spartan.
7. Yeats tells us (Autobiographies, p.386) that Edward drank little (Norton's liqueur-drinking possibly comes from Des Esseintes); on the other hand, Sister M-T. Courtney, (op. cit., p.49,) says that, while Edward's private rooms and some of his ways of life show Anchorite tendencies, he was a Sybarite in his love for good wines. but ate enormously and thought himself an ascetic because he partook of only one meal a day and suffered from a subconscious hatred of women.
8. This may also owe something to Huysmans.

the hatred of vulgarity, though himself possessed of an element of coarseness; the sensuality of his father with his peasant mistresses(1); the dominant mother seeking to marry her son to women quite unsuited to his temperament; and the whole mother-and-son relationship: all are taken from Edward(2).

Other elements derive partly from Moore's own character: the aestheticism and the decadence, the love of impressionistic pictures(3) and the books on Norton's shelves(4). The Pater passage is pure Moore(5):

"It is a breath of delicious fragrance blown back to us from the antique world; nothing is lost or faded, the bloom of that glad bright world is upon every page... Never did

1. Hugh Monfert, the final version of the story(1922) only. Yeats says (op.cit., p.386) that he used to get down from his horse to chase a girl for a kiss.
2. John Norton includes also a Crusader ancestor(p.334) and the hero's love of travel(p.334). Hugh Monfert (In Single Strictness, London, Heinemann, Limited edition, 1922) adds further factors: e.g. Hugh writes a poem about the Parthenon (Hugh Monfert, pp.73-4) - the subject of verses burned by Edward in his youth (See Courtney, op.cit., p.62).
3. A Mere Accident only, pp.72-4. Yeats says (op.cit., p.387) that Martyn possibly under Moore's influence, came to appreciate the Impressionists, but that the pictures Martyn possessed were devoid of sensuality. This seems to suggest that Moore was deviating from the character of Martyn when he referred to the sensuality in the painting of the dancing-girls.
4. A Mere Accident, p.77; John Norton, pp.340-41.
5. Martyn, too, read Pater: see Courtney, op.cit., p.49.

I read with such rapture of being, of growing to spiritual birth. It seemed to me that for the first time I was made known to myself; for the first time the false veil of my grosser nature was withdrawn, and I looked into the true ethereal eyes, pale as wan water and sunset skies, of my higher self. Marius was to me an awakening...Indeed, it was Pater's book that first suggested to me the idea of the book I am writing(1)."

The idea of Stevenson's deriving from Poe(2) is found in Moore's autobiographical works(3), and what Norton says of Tertullian(4) may well characterise Moore himself:

A "spirit, so full of savage contradictions, so full of energy that it never knew repose(4)."

The more lurid examples from Latin literature(5), the love nuns have for Christ(6), and the love of the "elderly maiden of elderly grace" for the saint in the amusing "Legend of St. Cuthman"(7) are also very characteristic of Moore.

More important, A Mere Accident contains the usual hotchpotch of literary influences. Although it marks the first and most important turning-point in Moore's writing, certain elements remain as a hangover from Naturalism. Among

1. A Mere Accident only (1887, pp.66-8).
2. 1887, p.65.
3. e.g. Confessions of a Young Man, p.138.
4. 1887 only - p.81.
5. 1887 only.
6. 1887 only.
7. 1887 only - pp.203-9.

these is a long section(1) on John and his mother, which deals with heredity, traces the derivation of his business sense from her, includes an absurd passage on thought and the instincts(2), and makes a number of Zolaesque observations:

"...however marked may be the accidental variations of character, hereditary instincts are irresistible, and in obedience to them John neglected nothing that concerned his pecuniary instincts(3)."

"Our diagnosis of Mrs. Norton's character involves no accusation of laxity of principle(4)". The two principles which guided her were "reason and hereditary morality."

"...John had inherited the moral temperament of his mother's family, and with it his mother's intelligence, nor had the equipoise been disturbed in the transmitting; his father's delicate constitution in inflicting germs of disease had merely determined the variation represented by the marked artistic impulses which John presented to the normal type of either his father's or his mother's family. It would therefore seem that any too sudden correcture of defect will result in anomaly, and, in the case under notice, direct mingling of perfect health with spinal weakness had germinated into a marked yearning for the heroic ages, for the supernatural as contrasted with the meanness of the routine of existence. And now before closing this psychical investigation, and picking up the thread of the story, which will of course be

1. A Mere Accident, pp.20-32.
2. A Mere Accident, p.21.
3. A Mere Accident, p.23.
4. A Mere Accident, pp.26-7.

no more than an experimental demonstration of the working of the brain into which we are looking(1), we must take note of two curious mental traits both living side by side, and both apparently negative of the other's existence: an intense and ever pulsatory horror of death, a sullen contempt and often a ferocious hatred of life(2)."

Mother and son are made the illustration of a theme(3):

"It was so with John and his mother...  
For example...(4)"

Certain Zolaesque phrases stand out:

"Each interval of thought grew longer; the scabs of forgetfulness were picked away, the red sore was exposed bleeding and bare(5)."

"and the sour dirty smell of the scaly hide befouls the odorous breath of the roses(6)."

"...the foul smell was in her nostrils, and the dull, liquorish look of the eyes shone through the darkness(7)."

"And the pity of it! The poor white thing lying like a shot dove, bleeding, and the dreadful blood flowing over the red tiles...(8)"

And there is correspondence between character and physical appearance:

1. My italics.
2. A Mere Accident, pp.27-8. Moore took Edward's mixture of coarseness and false refinement and treated it in a Zolaesque manner.
3. Both versions are, to a certain extent, illustrations of a theme - see e.g. A Mere Accident. pp.135-6, John Norton, pp.366-7 - but John Norton is, in this respect, considerably modified.
4. A Mere Accident, p.29.
5. A Mere Accident, p.130.
6. A Mere Accident, p.241.
7. A Mere Accident, p.244.
8. A Mere Accident, p.263.

the "indications of cerebral distortions" above the eyes; the exposing of "what the phrenologists call the bumps of ideality": "the yearning of the large prominent eyes", suggesting intelligence; the timid mind which "would seek support in mysticism and dogma(1)".

Milton Chaikin(2) sees a more particular debt, in conception, details and language, to La Faute de l'Abbé Mouret (1875)(3). He notes especially abbe Mouret's aestheticism and adoration of the Madonna; his succumbing in illness to the attractions of Albine, a child of nature, but later return to his vocation; Albine's suicide (though Kitty's is different from Zola because of the entry of chance); the conflicts between self-expression and self-repression; the heroes' mixed heredity and masochism; the recurrence of white as a symbol of purity (Zola uses the symbol repetitively as a leitmotif(4)), and the stain left on it by the world(5); the significance of flowers(6) throughout both books(7); the heroes' discomfort at the sound of laughter and rustling

1. A Mere Accident, p.49.
2. "A French Source for George Moore's A Mere Accident". Modern Language Notes, Baltimore, vol.lxxi, January 1956, pp.28-30.
3. cfs. are to Paris, 1928 edition.
4. e.g. La Faute, p.137; A Mere Accident, p.103.
5. e.g. La Faute, pp.135, 136; A Mere Accident, pp.103, 253.
6. e.g. La Faute, p.131, A Mere Accident, p.179.
7. Note flowers at Kitty's funeral, A Mere Accident, pp.276-7. cf. Albine's death, mentioned in Impressions and Opinions, 1913, p.77.

skirts(1): Norton's identification with nature in the passage in which he succumbs to Kitty, and the parallels between him and Brother Archangios.

These parallels are interesting and significant, but Chaikin, while he allows other influences, goes too far: many of the factors mentioned, such as the flowers and the religious sensuality, are the common stock of the post-Zola Symbolist and decadent movements.

A much more important influence was Pater. A Mere Accident was the first of Moore's novels written under the influence of Huysmans(2) and Pater(3), and the latter remained the most important shaping influence on his prose(4). He took Moore back from Zola to Gautier and his true 'aesthetic' personality(5); he influenced him in the choice

1. La Faute, pp.87, 88; A Mere Accident, p.119.
2. Especially in method - cf. Mike Fletcher. Huysman's influence is discussed under the revision, John Norton (see below).
3. Moore became acquainted with Pater in the Spring of 1885 - see Avowals (1919), p.179 - but Norton is the first Moore hero to mention Marius. We must bear in mind that in England, naturalism and aestheticism were never so distinct as in France, and Moore's work here reflects England, not France. In any case, it was the aesthetic, not the sociological aspects of Naturalism which had always attracted Moore.
4. For Pater's influence on Moore, see Brown, op.cit., ch.5: and Sean O'Faolain, "Pater and Moore", London Mercury, vol.34, August 1936, pp.330-33.
5. Witness the number of articles on literature, art and the theatre that Moore wrote after having escaped from the restriction placed upon him by Zola's method and vocabulary. Many of the essays were collected in Impressions and Opinions, 1891, and Modern Paintings, 1893.

of decadent themes, especially that of 'religious sensuality'. As Malcolm Brown points out(1), of the dozen novels written by Moore after his abandonment of Naturalism, nine deal with the Christian-pagan 'motif': the sensual temperament yearning for asceticism: Vain Fortune, Sister Teresa and Héloïse and Abélard: the ascetic turning to paganism: The Lake, The Brook Kerith, Ulick and Soracha, as well as several short stories(2); and sensuality combined with asceticism, "religious sensuality": A Mere Accident, Mike Fletcher, and Evelyn Innes.

Pater's influence is seen also in the aloofness, the spiritual aspects of domesticity and the quiet features of nature. It is very much in evidence in the style and vocabulary, in words such as 'opulence', 'hieratic' and 'comeliness'. And from Pater came the idea of making Norton write the history of the Latin language. The intellectualising is Paterian, as is in part the replacement by suggestive touches and symbols of Moore's old Zolaesque technique of piling up detail.

1. op.cit., pp.109-110.

2. The theme of the nun escaped from a convent, with which Moore had an obsession, occurs in a playlet, Ginevra, in his first work, Flowers of Passion (1878) and in his last (unpublished) novel, Madeleine de Lisle, of which there is now no trace.

It is strange that Moore, in the very act of praising Pater for his delicacy, should have written a book like A Mere Accident, included in it such a violent incident as the rape, and sent a copy to him to review in The Guardian(1). Pater, of course, declined the offer, and wrote to Moore that "the object of violent acts was not clear to him"(2)."

But the most important influence in A Mere Accident is Huysmans' A Rebours. The reaction against Naturalism; the scorn for human mediocrity(3); the pessimism, the citing of Schopenhauer(4), the hatred of the classic Latin authors

- 
1. See Avowals (1919), p.203; "Avowals", May-August 1904, p.532.
  2. See Avowals (1919), p.204; "Avowals", May-August 1904, p.532. Partly for this reason, the melodrama of the novel was toned down or omitted in the 1895 revision.
  3. e.g. Against the Grain, p.219. cf. Norton's disgust with humanity in the terrible scene in the 'Colonies' in London, where he realised the stupidity, the foulness and the horrible domesticity of humanity: "...there are rare occasions...when we see life in all its worm-like meanness. Last week I was in London; I went to a place they call the 'Colonies'. Till then I had never realised the foulness of the human animal, but there even his foulness was overshadowed by his stupidity. The masses, yes, I saw the masses, and I fed with them in their huge intellectual stye (sic)...there were oceans of tea, and thousands of rolls and butter...It seemed as if all the back-kitchens and stair-cases in England had that day been emptied out - life-tattered housewives, girls grown stout on porter, pretty-faced babies, heavy-handed fathers, whistling boys in their sloppy clothes, and attitudes curiously evidencing an odious domesticity." (A Mere Accident, pp.56-8. Des Esseintes and Norton hated this domesticity and John's nervous reactions are often watered down Huysmans - e.g. A Mere Accident, p.174.) This attitude, as we have seen, may owe something also to Martyn.
  4. Against the Grain, p.85; A Mere Accident, p.134.

and love of the decadents (1); the 'religious sensuality'

- Ch.3. It is interesting to note that, while the ideas are from Huysmans, Moore does branch off on his own; for example, Des Esseintes is not attracted by Tertullian's works (Against the Grain, pp.36-7); whereas Norton is fascinated by them (18~~H~~7, pp.80-82).

The books on the shelves are, in some instances, altered in the revision: John Norton omits Prudentius, Sedulius, St. Fortunatus, Duns Scotus (included in A Mere Accident with characteristic carelessness) and Milo (A Mere Accident, p.77), and includes among the modern writers two additions, Newman and the Restoration dramatists (John Norton, p.341).

In A Mere Accident, ch.2, there is a long passage on the MS of a Latin poem by Milo, that Norton is reading, and another on Strabat, both writers being quoted in the original and even a discussion of the latter's 'construe'. included. (A Mere Accident, pp.71-72; omitted from John Norton.) A Mere Accident deals also with Norton's book, his theories on the universal language of the Middle Ages and the manner in which Christianity saved the Latin language in a time of decline. He traces the effect that such a radical alteration in the music had on the instrument, and then, with ample quotation, discusses Tertullian, St. Cyprian, Lactantius, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome and St. Augustine. He enlarges on St. Augustine as the great prose writer and Prudentius as the great poet of the Middle Ages, tracing the modern novel from the psychologically dramatic qualities of the one and the English ballad and allegorical poetry from the other. Sedulius, Sedarius, Fortunatus and St. Gregory of Tours are discussed, even down to details of rhyme, metre and vocabulary, and Angilbert is said to be an anticipation of Poe. What is important is that only certain parts of this long section (A Mere Accident, pp.78-99) are relevant to Norton's character: St. Ambrose's praise of the virgin above the wife (A Mere Accident, p.84); Prudentius's last hymn about the virgin (A Mere Accident, p.91); Fortunatus's love-affair with Radegonde, and his composition of a poem

(a common theme of decadence); the search for spiritual tranquillity; the passion of the hero, Des Esseintes, for all the sensual effects of colours(1), symbolism and wine(2); the flowers(3) and dreams(4); the perfumes(5), books(6),

---

cont. in praise of virginity, in which he speaks disgustedly of the love with which nuns regard the Redeemer and the reward awaiting them in Heaven for their chastity.

(A Mere Accident, pp.96-7. A favourite theme of Moore's: see A Story-Teller's Holiday, etc.). John Norton replaces the whole of this section with a sentence or two on John's book and a short passage (John Norton, pp. 341-2) on women by Marbodus, a poet not mentioned in A Mere Accident, which does fit in with Norton's character. In this way, John Norton is given greater unity and interest than A Mere Accident. Only too accurate is Moore's statement to Julian (Fragment. National Library, Dublin, MS 2648.) that, during the summer (1886?) he had been through all the Latin authors from the second to the eighth centuries. R. Ellis Robert's remark ("George Moore", Nineteenth Century, vol. 113, March 1933, p.374) that the quotations revealed a real love for the subject, and Hone's comment (op.cit., p.131) that the chapter created the right impression do not explain away its appalling tedium and irrelevance.

1. See A Modern Lover, p.61.
2. e.g. As Inst the Grain, ch.13; A Mere Accident, p.76. Though Norton is not carnal, like Des Esseintes; the latter is self-indulgent, Norton restrained.
3. See A Mere Accident, ch.7. In A Mere Accident, however, these are not connected with Norton, but appear in Kitty's dream.
4. Ch.8. A Mere Accident, ch.7. The parallel must not be pressed too far: many of the elements of Kitty's dream were common property of French 19th century writing.
5. Ch.10: A Mere Accident, pp.63-4.
6. Ch.12. A Mere Accident, ch.2.

pictures(1) and music(2); the meagre plot(3) - the lack of both physical and psychological action: all these were, to a greater or lesser extent, taken over in A Mere Accident(4). The imitations, however, are pallid: Kitty's erotic dreams(5), pale into insignificance alongside those of Des Esseintes(6). A Mere Accident, in short, while taking over many of the ideas of A Rebours, waters them all down almost beyond recognition.

By 1895, Moore had begun revising his work to remove earlier influences. Celibates, published by Walter Scott, London, in that year, contained three tales: Mildred Lawson (a story which reveals the influence of Flaubert and Turgenev); John Norton (a revised version of A Mere Accident) and Agnes Lahens (the only one never revised).

1. Ch.5. A Mere Accident, pp.72-4. Different from Huysmans. These are the six Impressionist paintings in John's room, four of which (Monet's "Japanese Girl", "A Suburb", and "Cliff Edge", and Degas' "Drop Curtain") are catalogued, with a criticism of each. Edward collected Impressionists, see Courtney, op.cit., p.49.
2. Ch.15. A Mere Accident, p.63 (though A Mere Accident/John Norton are different from A Rebours, where the music is more varied.)
3. A Mere Accident has one more incident than A Rebours: the rape. (Most of Moore's succeeding novels were examinations of states of soul (e.g. Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa) with little plot (e.g. Lake) and this may have derived partly from Huysmans.
4. One of Moore's most characteristic phrases, "the book fell to his knees", is actually Huysmans' (p.77).
5. A Mere Accident, chapter 7.
6. Ch.8. Nevertheless, the style of A Mere Accident is more poetic than that of A Mummer's Wife: a fact which, I-T. Courtney (op.cit., p.56) tries to maintain, was due to Edward's companionship.

John Norton is a considerable revision. The first Norton was overlaid with Huysmans misanthropy, as well as with Paterian aestheticism and Zolaesque Naturalism. What is particularly interesting is that many of the changes in the second version are motivated by a desire to remove the Huysmans influence(1), at the same time making Norton a more credible figure. The first Norton was an odd mixture of Martyn, Moore, Pater and Huysmans, of ascetic, artist and sensualist. By removing most of the exotic imitations of A Rebours, (which had obviously impressed Moore with its culture), Moore makes Norton a more consistent creation. He omitted the absinthe and the perfumes(2), the pictures and the series of sensations, the 'Colonies' and the funeral; he modified considerably the hatred of the world, the disgust with vulgarity and the religious sensuality(3).

John Norton omits, too, the Naturalistic elements. The Zolaesque phrases disappear, the correspondence between character and physical appearance is largely omitted, and the passage on heredity is cut out. Both heroes have an odd

1. In one or two details, there are additional Huysmans Symbolist echoes in the revision: for example, the love of Byzantine art (John Norton, p.334. "Huysmans goes to my soul like a gold ornament of Byzantine workmanship," Moore said in the Confessions (p.144)), and the 'correspondances' between different senses (Against the Grain, ch.4; John Norton, p.370).
2. And also the odour of the tramp in Kitty's memory, A Mere Accident, p.236.
3. e.g. 1887, pp.63-4; 1895, omitted.

mixture of idealism and practicality, but this is toned down in 1895; there is none of the first version's stress on the contradiction between the practical side of Norton's nature on the one hand, and his artistic and ascetic side on the other. Nor does the 1895 version suggest that he hid this asset and flaunted his spiritual nature(1).

The slight Flaubert and Symbolist influences are modified in 1895(2), and Pater's influence diminishes with the disappearance of the Latin literature and the consequent greater stress on Norton's psychology.

Other changes take place in the central character. Norton's college bedroom with its narrow iron bed, iron washstand, 'prie-dieu', three-cornered wardrobe and life-sized Christ(3) is omitted, but the Spartan furniture of his livingroom and his hatred of upholstery because of its softness and lack of design(4) are retained. Some of the musical details are altered. In place of discussion of books in the library(5), the later version has a passage(6) on

1. Norton's business side may have owed something to Moore's friend, Colvill Bridger - cf. Hone, op.cit., p.146.
2. John Norton, ch.11.
3. 1887, p.74.
4. 1895, pp.338-40. Several reviewers praised Norton as a sympathetic study of a young man of monastic ideals: e.g. Athenaeum, no.3533, review of Celibates, 13th July, 1895, p.64.
5. A Mere Accident, pp.64 ff.
6. pp.334-6.

Wagner and Palestrina, including Norton's hobby-horse, boys' voices in Palestrina(1): detailed discussion of Wagner's "Parsifal" follows on naturally from talk about the Crusades and the Grail. Most of the architectural details of Norton's plan for converting his house into a monastery are omitted from John Norton, but his interest in architecture is retained. Less extreme than his predecessor, Norton makes no mention of girls in the revision. The first Norton disliked even kissing his mother(2): a ~~near~~-caricature omitted in the revision. In his relationship with Kitty, however, certain passages are rewritten to render more clearly Norton's hatred of the sensual touch: for example, the 1895 version rationalises Norton's dislike of birds - there is something electric about them, "something in the sensation of feathers I can't bear"(3). And several passages are inserted to illustrate that he sees Kitty as a Greek statuette(4) - a distrust of certain natural impulses(5).

1. Sister M-T. Courtney says (Edward Martyn and the Irish Theatre, N.Y. 1952, p.58) that John Norton shows a growing admiration for Palestrina and a diminished interest in Wagner. And she points out that the similarities in thought and style between John Norton (p.336) and Martyn's writings are so great as to suggest that they came from the same pen: Morgante the Lesser. p.277: Heather Field, p.19; Collected Papers (Essay. 1895) p.173.
2. A Mere Accident, p.104.
3. 1895, p.355.
4. cf.1895, pp.354, 381, 389, 394, 396. A joke on Edward Martyn perhaps.
5. Though he indulged in others.

Thus, in keeping with the theme of Celibates, increased emphasis is laid on Norton's hatred of sex and marriage. in 1887, he was redeemed by falling in love; the 1895 version stresses his abnormality.

Changes are made, too, in the structure of the story. A Mere Accident has surely the worst exposition ever written. The first 100 pages are almost completely static analysis of Norton's character, background, home and college. Most of this John Norton omits: the conventional description of the south country, the grounds of Thornby Place(1), the exterior and interior(2); the incredible letter from John to his mother, raving over Latin literature(3); the history of Mrs. Norton's lifelong friendship for Mr. Hare and her plans for John and Kitty(4); and much of John's monologue on his character and interests(5). The amount of repetition here is

1. Based on the house of his friends, the Bridgers - see e.g. Hone, op.cit., p.134.
2. A Mere Accident, pp.5-12.
3. A Mere Accident, pp.36-8.
4. A Mere Accident, pp.41-6.
5. A Mere Accident, pp.51-2, 52-9, 69-74, 75-6, 78-100.

enormous(1).

John Norton drastically curtails this exposition: ten pages in chapter one give us Mrs. Norton and Hare, and Mrs. Norton's relationship with John; chapter two in twenty-one pages details John's tastes, his character being made more consistent and the whole more readable. The exposition is thus reduced to more reasonable proportions and the cataloguing excised. It remains, however, static. The revision does not revolutionise the exposition; it merely shortens it and tidies it up. Two separate walks with

1. e.g. A Mere Accident, pp.25, 53-4, 30, 56, 137.  
Consider the following passages:

"The artistic was the side of Mrs. Norton's character that was unaffectedly kept out of sight, just as young John Norton was careful to hide from public knowledge his strict business habits, and to expose, perhaps a little ostentatiously, the spiritual impulses in which he was so deeply concerned."  
(A Mere Accident, p.22).

"...their talents for business were identical; but while she thought the admirable conduct of her affairs was a thing to be proud of, he would affect an air of negligence, and would willingly have it believed that he lived independent of such gross necessities."  
(A Mere Accident, pp.29-30).

Much of chapter two is a repetition of chapter one, especially the extract from Norton's letter to his mother - e.g., mention is made twice, word for word, of the "Indian Summer" and Fronto (A Mere Accident, pp.38, 68). All this is omitted from John Norton.

Kitty(1) are reduced to one(2), and the long poem, "The Legend of St. Cuthman"(3) is omitted, along with much of the conventional nature description(4). John Norton is thus reduced to true short story length by the omission or reduction of analysis, description, moralising and repetition(5). All these cuts create greater unity in the structure of John Norton; chapters are shorter, the narrative line is less cluttered and the tempo is swifter. As in A Drama in Muslin, omission rather than rewriting is Moore's method in this revision.

Some changes are made in the story. In A Mere Accident, the gipsy's fortune-telling leads Norton to declare his love and Kitty abstractedly accepts him(6). In John Norton, he kisses her violently(7) and this provides a link with the tramp's brutal treatment of her soon afterwards and her seeing her attacker's face in all men. Moreover, John, though he is forgiven for what Kitty regards as a passing whim,

1. A Mere Accident, chs. 5 and 6.
2. John Norton, ch.9.
3. A Mere Accident, pp.203-9.
4. e.g. A Mere Accident, pp.176-7, 231-2, 279.
5. e.g. A Mere Accident, pp.5-13, 18, 110, 152, 273, 278.
6. A Mere Accident, pp.211-13.
7. John Norton, pp.408-9.

prays that an accident might lead him out of the difficulty into which "a chance moment had betrayed him"(1). Immediately afterwards comes the accident of the rape. The irony is too coincidental and melodramatic to be effective, but it provides a better link with the succeeding action. On the other hand, the verbal link with the scene with Norton is cut out, the author passing from one scene to the other without any attempt to bridge the gap created.

The ending of the revised version is completely rewritten and extended. In A Mere Accident, Norton longs for the priesthood, but remembers that he cannot preserve his personal life there and so decides that the world shall be his monastery. In John Norton, he comes to the conclusion that he should not have been on intimate terms with Kitty, that he could never have married her, that she went mad because he kissed her by force and that to escape into a monastery is the only course for him:

"Thornby Place should soon be Thornby Abbey, and in the divine consolation of religion John Norton hoped to find escape from the ignominy of life(2)."

This ending is more logical and fits in more appropriately with Norton's character.

- 
1. John Norton, p.413.
  2. John Norton, p.452.

The rape, however, (which is retained in the revision though no longer described) was aesthetically a two-fold error: first, it was violent (and so earned the wrath of the critics); secondly, 'it was a 'deux ex machina', having no connection with Norton's story and, as such, typical of the Victorian novel Moore condemned. If Norton had failed to make a success of marriage(1) or broken off his engagement beforehand, and gone back to his college, the 'motif' would have been sound: as it is, in A Mere Accident and John Norton, the rape precludes any logical development. Moreover, it renders Norton's dilemma less obvious and creates a divergence of interest by distracting our attention to Kitty.

Thus, in spite of certain improvements in 1895, John Norton is more unified and consistent than A Mere Accident, more credible and less an illustration of a theme - the method of revision is too crude for any real advance on A Mere Accident. The first version has little to recommend it, except the poem (which is irrelevant) and the character study of Norton (which is too static); the most that can be said of the second is that it removes the worst excesses of A Mere Accident and makes it into a readable story. (2)

1. Hugh Monfert approximates more closely to this.
2. Moore's next novel, Mike Fletcher, published by Ward and Downey in 1889, was the only one which he never revised. He once told an American journalist that it was nearly the worst book ever written, and he could not revise it, because he did not know what it was about (See Goodwin, Conversations, p.43.)

On the whole, then, Moore's attempts at removing from his early stories traces of influences that he had outgrown did little to improve their quality.

## CHAPTER IV

### CHANGES IN NARRATIVE, STRUCTURE AND STYLE

The next group of works (Spring Days, Vain Fortune, Esther Waters, Evelyn Innes/Sister Teresa, A Story-Teller's Holiday and Aphrodite in Aulis) was revised to effect an improvement in the story, treatment, structure and style.

Spring Days was first published in the Evening News from 3rd April to 31st May, 1888(1) and touched up a little, with a preface added, for publication under the title Spring Days. A Realistic Novel. Prelude to 'Don Juan', London, Vizetelly, 1888(2). After the book had received a bad press, Moore wrote to the Marquise Clara Lanza(3):

"I am a great admirer of Jane Austen and I said to myself, 'I will recreate Jane Austen's method in Spring Days.' It was an attempt not to continue, but to recreate Pride and Prejudice, Emma etc. Apparently I have failed horribly(4).."

1. Nos. 2062-2111. On 24th, 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th and 31st March it was advertised as showing "How the Middle Class Live". It was, says Moore, the first time a daily paper had published a 'feuilleton' - see letter to Maurice, Freshcombe Lodge, Beeding, Sussex, 20th March, 1888, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646.
2. Vizetelly's one-vol. novels, no.29. The 'Don Juan' was Mike Fletcher, London, Ward and Downey, 1889. The letter of 20th March, 1888 to Maurice said that Spring Days was a prelude to an account of a young man in London. The 1888 preface to Spring Days (p.iv), stated: "Spring Days is the prelude to this book. It will be called Don Juan. Of this idea of man, so complex and so strange, so full of subtle psychological interest, the dramatist, the librettist, and the poet have given us only a pretty boy with whom numerous women fell in love."
3. 23rd September, 1888. See Hone, op.cit., p.148. Also Marquise Clara Lanza, "My Friendship with George Moore, 3,000 Miles Away, Bookman, N.Y., July, 1918, p.481.
4. In actual fact, imitation of Jane Austen entailed mainly an unsuccessful attempt at the portrayal of middle-class village social life and the use of gentle irony.

Malcolm Elwin is near the truth when he says that Moore was unsure of his intention:

"What seems to have happened...was that, starting out with his Don Juan notion, he placed it against the background of county society, which he saw in Sussex, and which he intended to treat as he had treated Dublin in A Drama in Muslin, then read Jane Austen on remembering that she had written of county society, and finally floundered in a morass of confusion, with Zola pulling on one hand, Jane Austen on the other, and Flaubert and Huysmans in turn hanging on to the hair of his head(1)."

The book was revised slightly in 1912(2) and a new preface included(3). Moore explains in this preface to the second version:

"The book was omitted from the list of my acknowledged works, for public and private criticism had shown it no mercy; and I had lost faith in it. All the welcome it had gotten were (sic) a few contemptuous paragraphs scattered through the press, and an insolent article in The Academy...(4)."

However, 'dear Edward', A.E. and R.I. Best(5) persuaded him (no doubt as a joke) that it was one of his best works, with the result that Moore re-read the book, finding in it great zest and admiring a story "as free from sentiment or morals as Daphnis and Chloë(6)."

"A good book," he told Barrett Clark in 1922, "but the public didn't care for it. I shall include it in my collected works(7)."

1. Op.cit., p.78.
2. London, Laurie.
3. Only one considerable change was made: the omission of a dozen pages (1888, pp.68-80).
4. Preface, 1912, p.v. G. Barnett Smith, Academy, vol.34, no.855, 22nd September, 1888, p.184.
5. See preface.
6. Preface, p.x.
7. Op.cit., p.132.

However, he later lost faith in it again and the book was finally omitted from the Heinemann Uniform edition. It is significant that A Communication to my Friends mentions the book only in a footnote(1).

Vain Fortune followed Spring Days as the next experiment in Moore's search for a narrative mode. Intrinsically unimportant, it has nevertheless an interesting history. It was first published in the Lady's Pictorial Magazine from 4th July to 17th October, 1891(2) under the pseudonym 'Lady Rhone'. Hone(3) says that it was written twice before it appeared serially, and during its run Moore rewrote it again for the edition, printed under his own name, which was published in the Autumn of 1891 by Henry. J.T. Grein, a colleague of Moore's in the Independent Theatre and a member of Henry's firm, told Hone:

"Time after time Moore, who had no secretary in those days, would tear up his pages and begin all over again."

In addition to the ordinary edition, 150 copies of a large paper edition were printed.

1. Op.cit., p.lv.
2. Vol.22, no.540 (no.392, enlarged series) - vol.22, no.555 (no.407, enlarged series).,
3. Op.cit., p.171.

But no sooner had Henry published the book than Moore bought back his rights in it for £100(1) in order to rewrite it again for an American publisher(2), and the revised version was published by Scribner's, N.Y., in 1892(3).

Then, some months after the 1892 edition had been published, Moore received a letter from a Madame Couperus, offering to translate the English edition into Dutch. He sent her the American edition and asked her which she preferred. She replied that there were many things in the English edition that she would like to retain, which were omitted from the American edition, and that 100-odd pages which he had written for the American edition seemed equally worthy of retention. She then proposed that the two versions could be combined without altering a sentence. Moore gave permission for this, glad of a suggestion of which he would avail himself when he came to publish a new English edition:

"The union of the texts was no doubt accomplished by Madame Couperus, without the alteration of a sentence; but no such accomplished editing is possible to me; ...the inclusion of the hundred or more pages of new matter written for the American edition led me into a third revision of the story(4)."

1. See Hone, op.cit., p.174.

2. See prefatory note to 1895 edition, p.v.

3. Moore sent Maurice a copy of the revised version on Friday (27th September, 1892); see letter of this date to Maurice, 8, King's Bench Walk, Temple, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646.

4. See prefatory note to the 1895 edition, pp.v-vi.

So, in 1895, a third edition of the book was published by Walter Scott, with five illustrations by Maurice Greiffenhagen. It was headed a "new edition completely revised" and Moore in the prefatory note(1) adjured his readers "to read this new book as if it were issued under another title."

This was the final version of the book, though in later life Moore said that he might revise the story if he could obtain a copy of the Scribner edition, which he thought was the most satisfactory:

"I know better now what to do with the man in that book. When I wrote the story I tried to explain him; now I realise that all I need to do is show him. How explain the inexplicable? Think of Becque, now, who spent years of his life talking about some masterpiece he was going to write; explaining it to his friends but never finishing it; and there's Dukas, the composer, eternally explaining, but doing nothing. It's the same with characters in a novel: you study a man for a whole lifetime and in the end you know nothing about him but what you can describe(2)."

The book was finally excluded from the 'canon'.

Through all these editions, the revisions are artistically of little significance. The first edition improves slightly on the magazine version by cutting out inessentials, reducing the length of the exposition, and

1. p.vii.

2. Barrett H. Clark, op.cit., p.135.

removing or pruning certain incidents. In the 1892 and 1895 versions, considerably more rewriting took place, though, as Moore says<sup>(1)</sup>, neither the skeleton nor its attitude is altered. What happens is that, in the 1892 version, Moore changes the central viewpoint from Hubert to Emily. The first two chapters are completely new, treating of Emily's past life and bringing it up to the present. The third chapter, however, deals with material which is the same as that in the 1891 and 1895 versions; and, for the rest, though there is some rewriting, most of the changes are merely a reshuffling of the material. The final third of the book is the same in both the 1891 and 1892 versions. The 1895 version restores Hubert as the central character, while retaining Emily in the foreground. All three versions, however, suffer from this dichotomy: in none did Moore concentrate satisfactorily on one central character, and none of the revisions can be said to show any significant advance. Moore's real purpose was to improve the shape and in this he failed. Although more significant and interesting (because of its autobiographical features) than its immediate predecessors, Vain Fortune has grave faults of construction, is really little more than good women's magazine fiction and is not improved in the various revisions. It remains a book that Moore

---

1. Prefatory note to 1895 edition, p.vi.

never really made up his mind how to write(1).

Parts of Esther Waters(2) were first published in the Pall Mall Gazette, 2nd-14th October, 1893(3), sub-

1. It does, however, throw a revealing light on Moore at work. We see something of the cost entailed in his sacrifices for art; something also, in Hubert Price's outrageous claim to have written a great play, of Moore's initial ludicrous enthusiasms for A Mere Accident, Spring Days, Mike Fletcher and other inferior works. And, as Malcolm Brown points out, "Hubert's systematic disparagement of all the important figures of literature shows precisely how Moore's nihilistic critical method came into existence." (Brown, op.cit., p.123).
2. The Complete Catalogue of the Library of John Quinn, items 6671 and 6672 mentions 1) the original Aut. MS of Esther Waters, chapters 1-14, 344 pp. folio, complete with the sole exception of the first 2 pp. of chapter 1: "Comparison with the printed book discloses the extensive changes Moore made in the MS before it reached the printer's hands. Chapters, paragraphs, and sentences were worked over so extensively that it was difficult at times to identify the chapter quickly. Even the numbers of the chapters differ in the printed book from those indicated in the MS, and there is a great quantity of matter in the printed books which is not in this MS, and 'vice versa'." 2) Esther Waters, pp.69-228 inclusive: "This portion of Esther Waters comprises the pages of the First Edition as indicated above, worked over by Moore for a new edition, and profusely corrected by the author himself, scarcely a page being without some change or other. In various instances full paragraphs have been deleted or additions made."
3. The original title of the book was Mother and Child, which Moore in 1893 considered changing to The Travellers' Rest (see letter to Dujardin, Hogarth Club, 1st May, 1893, Letters from Moore to Ed. Dujardin, p.33; also A Communication to My Friends, p.xlvii), but finally decided on Esther Waters: a title which, according to Hone (op.cit., p.193), "was an afterthought due to a chance conversation with a working woman in the Temple who bore the perfect name." Vol.57, nos.8901-8912; chapters 20-29 of the 1894 edition.

titled "Pages from the Life of a Workgirl". The book itself was issued by Walter Scott, London, in 1894, with the serialised extracts slightly revised.

By 1899, Moore was revising the book.

"The text of the original edition of Esther Waters," he said in the Preface, "was achieved largely on the proof-sheets. But this method of composition, however inseparable from certain literary temperaments, is not conducive to finish of detail, and on reading my book (sic) its general proportions, its architecture, seemed to me superior to the mere writing; the carving of the ornamentation above door and window I recognised as being in many places summary and preparatory; and it has been love's labour to try to finish what I had left unfinished(1)."

Further information about this revision is given in a letter to Dr. Heilborn, where we learn that, at first, Moore did not like the idea of a popular edition but, hearing that the type was to be reset, he was tempted by the prospect of a revised text. So he read the book for the first time and, while it was being printed, he cut out 10,000 words and wrote in 12,000. On first writing it,

---

1. London, Walter Scott, 6d. edition, 1899.

"my mind was full of my subject and I did not know what I had got down on paper, I mean that I did not separate (sic) what was in my head from what was on the paper. So I had never read my book; I had forgotten it...the George Moore who wrote that book is dead - well the book enchanted me. I had no idea, no sort of idea that I had written so good a book. The one part I did not like was the part when she goes to London, the hospital, the confinement etc. This part contained one very bad scene indeed, the scene when Esther lays down the rich woman's child and goes off to her own. The idea of the scene was good, the execution seemed to me melodramatic(1)."

In the rewriting, the melodrama of the scene where Esther leaves Mrs. Rivers(2) is removed and Esther is made more sympathetic. Melodrama is excised, too, from a passage dealing with the workhouse(3). The baptism scene also dissatisfied Moore. Baptism was not the doctrine of the Plymouth Brethren, he told Gosse, and a summary of Esther's views would be better than dialogue. The scene, he said, was not impressive: it fell flat, and a bit of English interest in dogma would be more characteristic(4). In the revised text, Esther is made to say that baptism is not the way with the Lord's people: she must wait until the baby is a symbol of living faith in God(5). Again, most of chapter 34, dealing with the episode of Bill and

1. Sun. (c.1899), National Library, Dublin, MS 2648.
2. 1894, pp.141-3; 1899, pp.74-5.
3. 1894, p.150; 1899, p.78.
4. See letter to Gosse, 92, Victoria Street, 2nd February, 1899, British Museum MS A 1192.
5. 1894, p.147; 1899, p.77.

Sarah Tucker(1) is omitted: this is an improvement, although a certain amount of this material, irrelevant to the central theme, survives in the 1899 version(2) which, in addition, adds further minor anomalies that indicate the folly of such a revision. Other changes are slight: dialogue is rendered more realistic, and an author comment on Esther's consciousness of the injustice of fate is deleted(3). Moore's claim that he had "considerably improved the writing, the mere writing of the book(4)," may be accepted as partly true. As always, the number of changes diminishes towards the end of the novel.

He himself admitted later, in a letter to Meyerfield(5), that this edition was hurriedly revised, but maintained that the new text was better than the original. However, in a further letter to the same correspondent(6), he wrote that the alterations were merely verbal, and that the revised version was still carelessly written, as he did not have sufficient time for correction.

In 1917, Esther Waters was revised again - the alterations were mainly verbal - for the American edition(7),

1. This is the scene mentioned in Ave (p.60).
2. And 1917; 1920 is the best version here, as the episode is short and seen from Esther's point of view.
3. 1894, p.190; 1899, p.96.
4. Letter to Dr. Heilborn, Sun. c.1899, National Library, Dublin, MS 2648.
5. Bayreuth, Post Restant, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460
6. 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 8th December, 1903, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460.
7. N.Y., Brentano.

the preface to which stated that three leading American publishers refused the proofs of the first edition, not because they thought it an immoral book, but because they were not sure that the public might not think so(1). When Esther Waters was approved by the public, these publishers offered to issue an authorised but non-copyright edition in America. However,

"the loss of copyright is not only a pecuniary but a moral loss. A non-copyright book is issued by so many different firms that it brings neither profit nor credit to anyone. It is printed and published anyhow, it is flung upon the market, it is the mere dust of the ways, in the control of no one, it passes beyond hope of redemption from numberless errors; and, if the author should wish to introduce corrections into the work, he finds it almost impossible to do so owing to the number of different editions(2)."

He adds, characteristically, that he believes this version to be superior to the original text.

The final version of Esther Waters, published in 1920 by the Society for Irish Folklore(3) contains more important changes than the 1917 version. First, unity is increased by further concentration on Esther's point of view: for example, some descriptions are seen through her eyes. The opening evocation of the landscape(4) is,

1. Preface, 1917 edition, p.v.
2. p.vii.
3. This ltd. edition was reprinted by Heinemann: London, 1952, Uniform edition, vol.4.
4. 1894, p.2; 1920, p.2.

in 1894, third person narration; the 1920 version cuts this down and sees it through the eyes of the porter and Esther. Where the first three versions have, "Some market gardening was done in the low-lying fields, whence the downs rose in gradual ascents," 1920 has the following:

"The girl thanked him and strolled up the platform, gazing across the low-lying fields out of which the downs rose in gradual ascents(1)."

Sometimes this change is made partly in earlier editions and then completed in the final edition:

"She had never seen anything like it before, and stopped to admire. The uncouth arms of elms roofed the roadway, and pink clouds showed through like pictures(2)."

"She had never seen anything like it before, and stopped to admire the uncouth arms of elms, like rafters above the roadway; pink clouds showed through...(3)."

"...and, having never seen an avenue before, she stopped to admire the rough branches of elms, like rafters above the roadway...(4)"

However, many passages are unchanged. And not all the changes are designed to focus the narrative through Esther. The description of Margaret Gale, for example, is, in

1. Speaking of his inability to write in his early novels, Moore pointed to the difference between the opening chapter in the original and revised editions - see J. Freeman, op.cit., pp.71-2.
2. 1894, pp.3-4.
3. 1899, p.10; 1917, p.5.
4. 1920, p.4.

1894(1), third-person narration; in 1920, her appearance emerges partly from Margaret's own speech(2).

More flow and smoothness of style are obtained in the various revisions, especially in the final one(3). Narrative and description are often changed to dialogue(4), and dialogue is made more real by the addition of colloquialisms, slang and abbreviations, and by the removal of pedantic phrases(5). Moore does not pander so much to the public after the first edition: swear words, for example, are printed in full(6). Author comment and moralising are cut(7) and touches of depressing or realistic description deleted(8). One source of stylistic weakness is removed: often, in 1894, Moore underlined with comment a scene which had already made its point(9).

However, although there are thousands of alterations, and although very few pages remain unchanged, the revisions are, as Moore says in the prefaces, concerned with detail, not structure. There is no attempt to recreate the whole

1. pp.9-10.
2. p.11.
3. 1894, p.10; 1920, p.12.  
1894, p.1; 1920, p.1.
4. 1894, p.115; 1920, p.128.  
1894, p.11; 1920, pp.12-13.
5. 1894, p.173; 1920, p.191.
6. e.g. 1894, p.12; 1920, p.14.
7. 1894, p.24; 1920, p.27. 1894, p.157; 1920, p.173  
(the last a Zolaesque comment on character and circumstance).
8. 1894, p.2; 1920, p.2.  
1894, p.132; 1920, p.146.
9. e.g. 1894, p.187; 1920, p.207.

book in the mode of 'imaginative reverie', as in The Lake, which was revised in the following year: Esther Waters was a 'social' novel, and did not really lend itself, any more than A Mummer's Wife, to this treatment. As Charles Morgan writes:

"In common with many of Moore's texts, it has since been revised, roughnesses of style to which his later taste objected being smoothed away, but... Esther Waters has proved to be a book of which the substance so far transcended the manner that it derives none of its claim to greatness from the perfecting of its detail(1)."

The 1920 edition was the final revision of Esther Waters, but in December, 1931, Moore wrote a "Colloquy(2)", and this, too, denies fundamental revision(3).

Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa have a long and complicated history, which illustrates both the painful and the futile aspects of Moore's method of composition. Evelyn Innes was first published by Unwin in May or June(4), 1898(5). It was then revised for American publication by Appleton(6). In August, 1898, Unwin published a second edition, revised

1. "George Moore at 80", Observer, Sunday, 21st February, 1932, p.6.
2. See Uniform edition, 1932.
3. p.ix.
4. John Denny Fischer (Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa by George Moore. A variorum edition, University of Illinois, 1958, p.xii) gives May.
5. This edition was also published by Tauchnitz, Leipzig, 2 vols., 1898.
6. Fischer, op.cit., p.xii.

slightly, and in October a third edition, revised slightly once more. This was a trial edition of twelve copies of the second edition corrected by the pasting over of certain pages with proofs of the revised text(1). In June, 1901, Unwin issued a popular, sixpenny edition, fairly thoroughly revised, and, in 1908, a completely rewritten version in the Adelphi Library. Sister Teresa was first published by Unwin in June, 1901; somewhat rewritten for Tauchnitz later in the same year(2); and completely rewritten for publication by Unwin in 1909. Moore spent fourteen of his best years writing and re-writing these two books(3) which he came to regard finally as a complete failure. This way madness lies. Moore knew he had failed with Evelyn Innes: the book, and its sequel, lacked the simple lines he sought. Ironically, it was ruined finally by over-revision.

The composition of the books and their many revisions, however, affords an illuminating glimpse into Moore's methods of work. By 1895(4) he had completed the plan.

1. The private issue was circulated in October, 1898 - see Fischer, p.xii.
2. Leipzig Tauchnitz Collection of British Authors, vol.3535, 2 vols. "Specially rewritten for the Tauchnitz edition."
3. During this period, he was concerned also with The Untilled Field, The Lake and Memoirs of My Dead Life, but the largest part of this time was spent on Evelyn Innes/Sister Teresa.
4. See letter to Maurice, Boodle's, St. James' Street, S.W. (1st May, 1895), National Library, Dublin, MS 2646.

He wrote to Maurice on 15th August(1) that he was working ten hours a day on the book:

"I never before wrote with ease. It is a pleasure to write this book. Hitherto I have had to drag myself to the writing table now I can't drag myself away. I am making myself ill. The composition of this book is a joy. I cannot think what has come over me to be able to write like this. It must be very bad or very good. I shall do a great book this time or cut the whole thing(2)."

By February, 1896, however, difficulties had arisen.

On 20th February, he wrote to Dujardin(3):

"My story is difficult; difficult is not the word - I am afraid it is impossible(4)."

However, on Friday, 29th September, Maurice was informed that the book was coming on and would be something wonderful:

"One of the most beautiful books ever written. I shall get an anguish and an emotion into this book that perhaps has never been got into a book(5)."

And on 18th April, 1898, he told Maurice(6):

1. Wednesday night, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646.
2. See also letter to Maurice, Boodle's, St. James' Street, S.W., Monday, (3rd November, 1895), National Library, Dublin, MS 2646.
3. Op.cit., p.36.
4. See also letter to Maurice, 92, Victoria Street, Wednesday, 6th May, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646.
5. Boodle's, St. James' Street, S.W., National Library, Dublin, MS 2646. See also letters to his mother, 8, King's Bench Walk, Temple, Wednesday, 15th July, (1897?), National Library, Dublin, MS 4479, and to Dujardin, 15th July, op.cit., p.39. Characteristically, he wrote to Lady Cunard: "Evelyn Innes is being printed but I am still writing it." (92, Victoria Street, 10th February, 1898, Letters, op.cit., p.26).
6. 92, Victoria Street, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646.

"It is inferior to Turgenev and Balzac but I think it is better than trashy Thackeray and rubbishy Dickens and pompous Eliot. But it cannot be fairly judged until the second part Sister Teresa is written."

In view of the obstacles he faced in creating a credible musical world, it is difficult to see why he experienced such joy in the writing(1). Publication of the book, however, swiftly changed his mood. Reviewers' criticism brought him "very near to thinking that I had given three years to the concoction of an imbecility...(2)"

Moore made certain changes for the American Appleton edition, 1898, largely in order to tone down the sexual passages for a more prudish American public: chapter 11, for example, omits three pages dealing with the bedroom scene and Owen's sensualist philosophy(3). Many of the changes are trivial, serving only to illustrate Moore's concern with financial success and popularity, rather than with aesthetic considerations.

He was pressing on with the second half, Sister Teresa(4), and, at the same time, working on the second and third editions of Evelyn Innes. He wrote

1. See Hone, op.cit., pp.131-2, for a discussion of Moore's ear for music.
2. Letter to Dujardin, 20th June, 1898, op.cit., p.43. See also letter to Gosse, 92, Victoria Street, Monday, Post: 20th July, 1898, British Museum MS A 1193.
3. 1st edition, pp.146-8.
4. See letter to Maurice, Hotel de la Ville de Lyon et de Londres, Fontainebleau, Thursday, 6th August, 1898, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646.

to Lady Cunard in September, 1898:

"I have altered Evelyn Innes and enormously improved it - some of the alterations are in the second edition, but the more interesting alterations will not appear till the third edition. I will send you a copy, one of a dozen which I am having printed for myself(1)."

The second English edition of Evelyn Innes (1898) made as many changes as the American edition, but once again they are unimportant. Often, indeed, Moore's revised thoughts are worse than his original ones: for example, Amico Moorini raises his head in an absurd passage in which Ulick explains that he has always loved Evelyn...the world is full of truth, not individuals... "Evelyn listened and smiled enraptured, allowing him to lay his head against her knee(2)." There are some changes in narration. Two pages, dealing with Evelyn's sexual attraction to Wagner's music and her friendship with the Russian are written into the story between chapters 11 and 12 to bridge an awkward gap which continued to cause Moore concern. Changes are made, too, in chapter 19, where repetitive narrative is cut down and focussed more on Evelyn.

By 28th September, 1898, Moore was writing to Dujardin(3) that he hoped to send, the following week,

1. Airlie Castle, Alyth, Letters, op.cit., p.28.
2. 1st edition, p.265; 2nd edition, p.267.
3. Op.cit., p.43.

a copy of Evelyn Innes with all the corrections, that is, the text of the third edition. In fact, the alterations are few and trivial(1). The tension of the love scene between Ulick and Evelyn is heightened by removing from the dialogue some of the irrelevant topics(2); a passage is interpolated to make it clear from the beginning of their affair that Ulick is to embody Evelyn's spiritual desires(3); and, once again, chapter 12 is tampered with, Moore adding further comments on Owen's love for Evelyn and eliding the description of Evelyn's student days in Paris.

In 1900, Moore was still working on the text of the two books(4). On 17th April, he told Mrs. Nia Crawford(5) that he could improve the first hesitating conception of Evelyn: it was now clear to him from end to end, as was Esther Waters. The ending, nevertheless, continued to disturb him. On 22nd April(6) he wrote to Heilborn:

1. I am indebted to Fischer, op.cit., for information about this revision.
2. E.g. Unwin, 2nd edition, p.294; 3rd edition, p.295.
3. 3rd edition, p.183.
4. See letters to Mrs. Nia Crawford, 92, Victoria Street, S.W., Wednesday, 28th March, 1900, National Library, Dublin, MS 2645, and Gosse, 92, Victoria Street, Saturday night, 2nd April, 1900, Brotherton.
5. 92, Victoria Street, S.W., Saturday, National Library, Dublin, MS 2645.
6. 92, Victoria Street, S.W., London, c.1900, National Library, Dublin, MS 2648.

"...Your suggestion for the end of Evelyn has occupied my thoughts from time to time. It is this, that Evelyn marries Owen Asher and that he, her friends, her amusements, even her child, if she should have one, remain dim and obscure to her, whereas the life in the convent is the one real thing in her life, the one thing that she feels - she is as it were a shadow among shadows...I have no fault to find, it is very true to life and it is probably what would happen. But - there is a but, - she achieves nothing, it seems a little flat, a little pointless. You will answer 'Yes like life'. I shall not settle anything. I shall go on and write the end that comes - perhaps it will be that end(1). Since I saw you I have worked out a plan for leaving the end in doubt - the reader does not know if she drowns herself in the pond as I told you or if the new singer who appears suddenly in Ulick Dean's opera at Naples is the true end. He is lead (sic) however to believe that neither is the true end - for Evelyn was seen on her way to Bayreuth. She did not sing there but merely heard one of the operas and departed suddenly. The last that is seen of her is on board a steamer, on leaving the canal, moving out into the Red Sea, on its way to the East moving towards the sunrise - There Evelyn is going, to the East, to seek the ancient wisdom of the world at its original sources and the book ends with: and the future adventures of Evelyn are unknown(2)."

The damaging uncertainty of conception here throws a revealing light on the book's failure.

Meanwhile, he plodded along with Sister Teresa(3).

1. In fact, Moore did not use this ending.
2. This last part-sentence was later used to end The Brook Kerith: another indication of Moore's hoarding of his material. Note also that the heroine of The Lake goes to seek the origins of Christianity.
3. See letter to Mrs. Crawford, 92, Victoria Street, S.W., Thursday, 26th April, 1900, National Library, Dublin, MS 2645.

On 3rd July(1), he told Mrs. Crawford that the first chapter was solidly constructed, but the second and third were not. Two days later(2) he had rewritten chapter two and made it solid, but still could not pile the third chapter into shape, and it was no use trying to write it until he could see it as a pile, massive.

The proofs of Sister Teresa disappointed him and immediately he contemplated revision(3). Moore seemed incapable of judging his work in MS form and had to wait for publication: an expensive business for the writer and a nightmare for his publisher.

By 30th July, 1901, he was telling Gosse(4) that he intended to rewrite the first 60 pages of Sister Teresa because the opening was weak(5), though two days later(6) he wrote to Maurice that he believed the book was a success.

The 1901 edition of Evelyn Innes was considerably rewritten and shortened(7) and the material was rearranged.

1. Queen's Hotel, Llanfairfechan, North Wales, National Library, Dublin, MS 2645.
2. Queen's Hotel, Llanfairfechan, 5th July, National Library, Dublin, MS 2645.
3. See letter to Mrs. Crawford, 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, Monday, 1st July, 1901, National Library, Dublin, MS 2645.
4. 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.
5. See also letter to Meyerfield, Hotel Continental, 3, Rue Castiglione, 1st Arr., Paris, Tuesday, 1901, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460.
6. 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 1st August, 1901, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646.
7. Over a quarter of the book was cut out.

In the preface Moore stated:

"The penalty I am paying for the premature publication of Evelyn Innes did not end with the division of my story into two parts. After having written for a couple of years on the second part of my book, the first part struck me as singularly diffuse; it read to me more like a sketch for a book than a book, and I appreciated Mr. Unwin's idea for a sixpenny edition more than ever, for it has allowed me to remould Evelyn Innes. The story of course has not been altered, but the text is almost entirely new. No one, perhaps, has rewritten a book so completely... the new version, notwithstanding many additions, is 90 pages shorter than the original(1)."

In the new edition, the main method of revision is the omission of paragraphs and sections(2). These include author interference(3); many of Owen's absurdities and Evelyn's adolescent behaviour; the worst examples of plot anticipation - for example, Evelyn's seeing in detail the future of her love affair with Owen(4), and her appreciation of what is to be the basic conflict of the whole novel(5); much of the over-writing and the 90-ish aestheticism(6); and a good deal of repetitive and irrelevant material,

1. p.7.
2. Where Moore added, the material was not new but composed of scraps from the first edition.
3. Chapters 9 and 31.
4. 1898, 2nd edition, p.47.
5. 1898, 2nd edition, p.108. See also 1898, 2nd edition, p.125; 1901, p.161.
6. e.g. 1898, 2nd edition, p.187.

especially dialogue(1). A great deal of the clogging matter - for example, much of the musicology - is cut(2). And there are character changes. In 1898, Evelyn and Ulick consummated their love in her dressing-room at Covent Garden during an interval in a performance of "Tristan"(3); in 1901, to preserve Ulick's purity, Moore rewrote the scene, so that the two lovers merely hold hands(4). This links up with an important change in the revision: the substitution of A.E. for Yeats as the model for Ulick Dean(5). Perhaps Ulick's colourfulness detracted from Evelyn in 1898(6). This is how Evelyn/Amico sees Ulick in 1901:

"All the while she admired his tall thin figure, she wondered if she would like him better without a beard, for you cannot kiss a man with a beard with any comfort. He was dressed in an old grey suit of clothes, and she could not think of him in any other, and he wore a loose necktie and a soft felt hat, and she liked him in it. One did not think of Ulick's clothes...what she liked best in him was his eyes; they were so wide, and so grey, and so tender that it was always a pleasure to look into them... Ulick's naturalness made everyone natural...(7)."

1. e.g. 1898, 2nd edition, p.9; 1901, p.12.
2. e.g. 1898, 2nd edition, chapters 26 and 31.
3. 1898, 2nd edition, chapter 22.
4. 1901, p.111.
5. Cf. Hone, op.cit., p.234.
6. In 1901, chapter 18, Ulick is subordinated to Evelyn.
7. p.74.

He is etherealised, and his Yeatsian aloofness is omitted(1). Again, additional material(2) deals with the bicycle tour of Ireland's sacred places which Moore had recently undertaken with A.E.(3). By 1901, Yeats had served his purpose: he had rescued Moore from the materialism of fashionable life, as Ulick's spiritualistic pantheism rescues Evelyn from Owen's materialism(4).

Moore shows some concern in this edition with the chapter divisions: 9 chapter endings are altered. At the end of chapter 9 in the first edition, Moore related the meeting of Owen and Evelyn in London and then went on to describe their trip to Dover: this not only ruined the effect of an important climax, but by repetition reduced the force of the later Calais/Paris journey. In 1901, the chapter ending is more effective. The conclusion of chapter 10 is improved by the addition of dialogue, that of chapter 15 by the removal of an anti-climax and chapter 32 by the deletion of a repetitive passage. The scene(5) in which Evelyn acts her repentance

1. See e.g. 1901. p.74.

2. Chapters 24, 25, 26.

3. Included here are Ulick's narration of the legends of Mongan and Bran, which were removed from 1898, 2nd edition, chapter 23.

4. The two strands of Moore's life at this time may be traced here, Owen representing his social phase and Ulick his return to poor Ireland - see Hone, op.cit., pp.215-6.

5. 1898, 2nd edition, chapter 16; 1901, chapter 19.

before her father is, to its great benefit, considerably reduced. And the end of chapter 24 indicates a new awareness in Moore of the need to distinguish between major and minor climaxes, and to avoid constant overstatement. In the same way, Moore divided several chapters in the middle: for example, where chapter 31 of the first edition described Monsignor's reaction to Evelyn's coming to confession, the 1901 version leaves until the following chapter the explanation and the confession. However, Moore still sought, unsuccessfully, for a method of bridging the six-year gap between chapters 11 and 12.

In June came the Unwin Sister Teresa, revised for Tauchnitz in the same year. The changes here are significant only as an indication of the hotchpotch created by this method of revision. Tauchnitz has an extra chapter<sup>1</sup> containing some, though not all, new material, which prepares us for Evelyn's advocacy of the contemplative, as opposed to the active, schism in the convent and creates a more solid basis for her friendship with Sister Mary John which is later to provide one of volume two's best scenes. Chapter 5 clumsily reshuffles

---

1. Vol.2, chapter 6, pp.51-62.

the episode of the nuns' prayers and Evelyn's temptation - to no great purpose. Ulick's reintroduction is rewritten and the steady growth of his love for Evelyn is much more credible than the first edition's hasty offer of marriage. And we get what is probably the first expression in Moore's writings of his preference for oral narrative:

"This century attaches an undue importance to the written word. A man brings a certain force, certain ideas into the world, and though he fills volumes he does not increase the number of the ideas he brings into the world(1)."

The ending of these two editions is bathos: Evelyn's conflict is over only because she is ill and too cowardly to come to a decision - a solution which does not fit in with her character.

There was no time to revise the proofs. Six months later Moore began work on the books once more. He wrote to Meyerfield on 24th June, 1902(2) saying that he wished to rewrite the middle of Evelyn Innes:

"(it) is not satisfactory and I am sure I can make it more interesting."

He had found the mistake, he told Maurice a year later(3):

1. Chapter 6, p.88.
2. 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460.
3. 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 25th June, 1903, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646.

"...now I know that I can make that book as good (sic) or even better than Esther Waters. For six years I sought the enigma, at last I have discovered it(1)."

Six months on again(2), he was saying to Meyerfield that the original edition of Evelyn Innes was written as well as he could write it:

"I spoilt it in the second edition(3). It was not the writing of Evelyn Innes that displeased me, it was the construction of the story, it seemed to me to be all on the flat, but I think I have hit upon the true composition now...I have got rid of Ulick Deane, it was he who spoilt the story(4)."

By 11th December, 1904(5) he had begun to revise Sister Teresa with some assistance from Mrs. Crawford(6), and on 2nd January, 1905, was writing to Meyerfield:

1. Presumably, this refers to the chastity motive - see below.
2. 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 8th December, 1903, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460.
3. i.e. presumably, 1901.
4. See also letters to Meyerfield, 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 9th January, 1904, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460, ("The sixpenny edition of Evelyn Innes is not worth sixpence"), and 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 12th July, 1904, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460.
5. Letter to Meyerfield, 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460.
6. See e.g. letter, Hotel Continental, Thursday, 1st half of 1905. A further letter to Mrs. Crawford, (Shelbourne Hotel, Dublin, Wednesday, 21st December, 1904, National Library, Dublin, MS 2645) unconsciously reveals the greatest weakness of his method of revision: he does not know if the letters he wrote for her still exist or if the letter he attributes to Owen is as good as the one written at the time under the immediate stress of emotion.

"I hope you will see the point I have aimed at in the revision of this book. I have striven to elucidate a motive that was there already, the motive of personal chastity. This becomes the theme of the book; you will find it here and there and everywhere, just as you find in Hamlet the theme of revenge for his father's murder. The insistence of this motive will make the book and the character much stronger and more interesting(1)."

In 1905, Egon Fleischel, Berlin, published a German translation of Evelyn Innes/Sister Teresa, Irdische und Himmliche Liebe(2). For the first volume, Evelyn Innes, Moore used the first and third editions of Evelyn Innes, supplementing the third edition with rejected parts of the first edition, correcting sections that he was retaining from the third edition, and revising passages restored from the first edition.

First, he continued his experimentation with chapter divisions(3). In the first chapter, he decided that Evelyn's entrance came too early and so the whole chapter is concerned exclusively with the exposition of Innes' character, appearance and musical interests. The first meeting of Owen and Evelyn is greatly improved: in the original edition, Owen's hesitation as to whether he liked

1. 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460.
2. The corrected text was prepared in June, 1904 - see J.D. Fischer, op.cit., p.xii. I am indebted to Fischer for the observations on this edition.
3. e.g., 1898, 2nd edition, p.420; 1901, p.160; 1905, vol.I, p.348.

her or not was, in the light of their later passion, absurd. Chapter 3 in the earlier editions contained a change of scene, which Moore now skilfully removes. Chapters 3 and 4 of the 1901 edition are recombined into one chapter, as in the first edition: an improvement, as the break gave undue prominence to one of the very narrative junctions that Moore was trying to avoid. As in the first edition, too, Evelyn's acquaintance with Owen up to the time of their elopement now occupies only one chapter, and the break coincides with the natural time-lapse between Owen's departure and return. The end of chapter 4 has a smoother transition(1). The 1901 transition between Owen's tale of his journey and Evelyn's joining the musicians was abrupt(2), a fault which Moore now sought to remedy by reintroducing parts of the rejected text(3). In addition, the digression dealing with Owen's meditation in 1901, chapter 6, is omitted, so that once more we return to the first edition. Again, the love-scene in chapter 8, which was reduced in 1901(4), is restored in 1905 but breaks off at a more suitable point. The beginning of 1901, chapter 9, is improved in 1905, a stronger passage replacing Evelyn's trivial, theatrical behaviour(5).

1. 1905, p.41.

2. 1901, p.27.

3. 1905, I., pp.45, 46.

4. 1901, pp.36, 37.

5. 1901, pp.37, 38; 1905, I., pp.76, 77.

The gap of six years was still causing Moore concern: in 1901, he had introduced two short chapters(1); in 1905, he wrote two new ones(2). Fresh dialogue here shows a change in Moore's conception of Evelyn: her veering between the two poles of her nature was never entirely credible. Moore suggests now that she was unhappy in her sinful life and thus prepares the ground for her later conversion(3). Then a passage is omitted: Ulick's critique of Evelyn's operatic roles, his part in her reunion with Innes, Evelyn's musings during her visit to St. Joseph's and the description of the Covent Garden rehearsal. Transitions are smoother in 1905, later events are prepared for earlier, dialogue is more relevant and unnecessary material is deleted, so that greater organic unity is created.

Change in this edition is not confined to structure. Ulick Dean - first Yeats and then A.E. - now disappears altogether, to be replaced by the Greek, Harold Leigh. In the interests of unity, he is also more fully subordinated to Evelyn: Ulick had become such a major figure that Moore had been unsuccessful in dismissing him credibly(4).

1. 1901, pp.62-5.

2. 1905, I, pp.149-165.

3. 1905, I, pp.154, 155.

4. 5 chapters in the 1901 edition (pp.97-113), dealing with the Evelyn-Ulick love affair, are deleted in 1905, in order to reduce its undue prominence.

Evelyn's falling for Harold through boredom(1) is also more credible than her falling in love with Ulick because of his spiritualism.

In the 1905 version of Sister Teresa(2), Moore used mainly the first edition, but incorporated also certain changes made in the Tauchnitz edition. However, he did not alternate between editions so rapidly as he did for Evelyn Innes. Alterations were made at the beginning of the 1905 Sister Teresa because the German public read the two novels in one, whereas the English readers had a lapse of three years between the first editions of Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa, and so had to be reminded of certain details. In the first edition of Sister Teresa, two attempts were made to seduce Evelyn(3); in the Tauchnitz edition, the first was deleted and the second revised; in 1905, Moore reintroduced and revised the first and removed the second(4). Finally, the ending of the 1905 version is an improvement on the first two versions, which were clumsily handled.

By 1907, Moore was planning the final versions of the two books, the incentive this time being a French translation of Evelyn Innes for Hachette(5), which, in fact, never

1. I, p.192.
2. i.e. vol.2 of the German edition.
3. pp.4, 7.
4. 1905, II, p.4.
5. See letter to Mme. Emily Lorenz Meyer, 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 2nd September, 1907, National Library, Dublin, MS 1595. From Hugh Walpole's Collection. As usual, he said that the book was now perfect. See also letter to Dujardin, Nevill Holt, Market Harborough, 12th October, 1907, op.cit., p.64.

materialised(1). He wrote to Gosse on 17th October, saying that he had been three months rewriting Evelyn Innes, and thinking nine years how to put it right:

"I mean how the idea might be lifted from the bottom to the top of the orchestra: the vision came suddenly and then I resketched the book as easily as a maid seduces a man(2)."

He called the new version "the deformed transformed(3)."

On 18th January, he sent Meyerfield the preface to the new Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa:

"I feel that I have done something that has never been done before in literature. The task, you will admit was a big one - to rewrite two such solid books as Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa from end to end. What compelled me to do this was I think, more a sense of cleanliness than anything else. Ten years ago I made rather a nasty mess of the two books; I tried to wipe them about the edges in different editions, but it was no use; the mess had to be cleaned up. Well, now it has been cleaned up...the experiment is a unique one(4)."

1. It was Unwin who actually published the book, in 1908.
2. Nevill Holt, Market Harboro', Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.
3. See also letter to Dujardin, 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 4th January, 1908, op.cit., p.65.
4. 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460.

"It is true that the desire to re-write Evelyn Innes has haunted me for the last nine years, ever since the publication of the book...as soon as the buzz of daily work had died out of my ear, a whisper began in it...of exasperated regret that the soul of Evelyn Innes had eluded me so completely...But to re-write three hundred thousand words is a formidable task, and perhaps I should have continued to dream Evelyn's soul till the end of my life, without finding courage to undertake the task, if accident had not forced me to undertake it...Perhaps it was the fear of a translation done from the original text that spurred on my imagination, or perhaps it was...that I was beginning, about this time, to overtake the phantom. Evelyn Innes was growing tired of the pursuit which had lasted now for nine years, and on my return to Dublin she had become docile as a studio model...For the last three months she has sat to me for her portrait, and if it is not judged to be a good one I declare the fault to be the writer's; and I would not countenance any attempt to explain away the deficiencies which may be discovered in the second portrait by the supposition that second portraits are never satisfactory(1)."

The last sentence is characteristic. He had achieved, he told Dujardin, a love story, "and therefore something unique amongst English novels":

"There is plenty of sentimentality in the English novel, plenty even of love and also of prudery, but there is not a single love story. By a love story I understand a story of two beings who come together, love and then are separated by material or spiritual happenings - it matters not which - and who are at length united in death, in peace, in marriage - it matters not which. That is how the ancients understood love stories, and that is what I have accomplished, perhaps without any definite intention of doing so. The story is intrinsically classical, though on the surface it is quite modern(2)."

1. Preface, pp.v-vi.

2. 11th January, 1909, op.cit., pp.74-5.

All the same, he complained to Meyerfield that he was weary of Sister Teresa:

"Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa have eaten up too much of my life; I regard them very much as the man does the piano upon which he has played a great deal: too much of his life has gone into the instrument for him to be interested in it(1)."

On completion of the revisions, he thought that he had succeeded with Sister Teresa but not with Evelyn Innes(2); but he came gradually to realise that all the rewriting had been in vain. The final sign of his disgust with Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa was that, after 1909, he never tampered with them again.

The 1908 revision of Evelyn Innes is much more thorough than its predecessors, and the structure, in particular, is considerably improved. The story line is simpler. Whereas the first edition had contained a series of unshaped episodes, mingled with lengthy digressions on music, art, literature and philosophy(3), and static, repetitive analysis of Evelyn's state of mind, the 1908 version is a coherent and continuous thread of narrative(4). Where material is added or extended, it

1. Letter, 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 30th June, 1909, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460.
2. See letter to Meyerfield, 13th August, 1909, Nevill Holt, Market Harborough, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460.
3. Compare the 2nd edition, 1898, chapter 33, with 1908,
4. Chapter 23.

is usually relevant - e.g. the drama and colour of Louise's party at the Savoy(1) convey more concretely Evelyn's abandonment of her singing career - but new digressions are sometimes introduced, e.g. on Wagner(2). The central idea of Evelyn's struggle is given greater prominence. In chapter 15 (1908), greatly improved by being transposed into dialogue, Owen says she will never be able to play Isolde because her religion will come between her and her art; whereas in the first edition she is a triumph as Isolde. Again, the 1908 edition stresses more often throughout the novel Evelyn's determination eventually to marry Owen; motivation is improved throughout.

The first chapter is better shaped than any of its predecessors, musical information is used sparingly, and the unity of the chapter centres around Innes. The opening of the revised version prepares more skilfully for the introduction of the main motive: the rather abstract thesis of sense versus conscience is replaced by a more human conflict between her love for her father and her love of Owen. Then again, Evelyn's training to become a singer and a detailed description of her first role are important additions in 1908(3): we see more of Evelyn as

- 
1. 1908, chapter 36.
  2. 1908, pp.215-9.
  3. Chapters 15, 16, 17.

a fledgling and as a mature singer(1), and the review of her singing(2) is important in establishing her character. Moreover, the gap between her early days in Paris and her success as a singer in London, which had caused Moore great concern in 1898 and 1901, is thus satisfactorily bridged in 1908. Apart from the 1905 version, Moore had in the past merely given a résumé of Evelyn's and Owen's affairs; now, he skilfully outlines the background. Having dealt with Evelyn and Owen, Moore turns our attention to Ulick; and, after Ulick, Monsignor: an indication of his heightened awareness of the value of form, economy in the use of material and calculated effects. In 1898, Moore stated the conflict between religion and sensuality in the first chapter of the book, with the result that dramatic effectiveness was lost and characterisation was static throughout; in 1908, Evelyn gradually and credibly comes to realise the purposelessness of her mode of existence, and her entry into the convent is only the final act in her conversion to Catholicism. Her character is dynamic, and the clue to our - and her - understanding of it is retained to the end. We now realise the cause of her anger when she asks Owen to marry her, knowing in her heart that it would be

---

1. In 1898, she was born a star overnight and was presented by Moore without criticism.  
2. pp.132-7.

disastrous. The whole scene, owing to its relevance and artistic shaping and selection, is much more effective than in previous versions, where it had been merely a fragment in an unrelated sequence, lost among minor matters(1). Again, in earlier editions, we had learnt only indirectly that Evelyn had become Ulick's mistress, and so the effect of this important development was lost.

Chapter 29 shows an advance in treatment of the theme: Evelyn does not return immediately to Catholicism, but merely takes the first step in this direction. The transition from chapter 29 to chapter 30 is improved because the two Monsignor episodes are closer together; in the earlier editions, Evelyn's remorse had been interrupted by her love-affair with Ulick in a way that cast serious doubts on her sincerity. The final version also improves the transition between Evelyn's scene with Monsignor and her meetings with Owen and Ulick by arranging for her to go to London to engage an accompanist.

There are a number of character changes. Evelyn is more mature in the final version: it is Owen, not she, who is nervous at the elopement(2). Much of Owen's

---

1. e.g. 1898, chapter 21.

2. See also her 'sang-froid' at Mme. Savelli's.

atheism, Ulick's mysticism and Monsignor's personality, along with their effect on Evelyn, are cut. In 1898, she sways like a reed in the wind before each in turn. The final version makes her an ordinary girl who has 'sinned' and has a conscience which causes her to dismiss her lovers and go into a convent. Innes, too, is a normal father rather than an eccentric musician. As to style, Moore tried to eliminate barren patches and to introduce greater variety into the narrative and dialogue, but in spite of, for example, the repentance scene, the writing is on the whole little improved.

The final version of Sister Teresa was published in 1909. In the preface Moore once again stressed the unity of the two parts; insisted, too, that it was "not a revised edition of a book written ten years ago, but an entirely new book written within the last eighteen months(1)." The 1909 edition is a more thorough rewriting than the 1908 Evelyn Innes, the main change being in the part played by Owen. Moore recasts him as a 'great lover', who sees his desertion by Evelyn as the greatest of classical love-stories(2): without

---

1. Benn, Essex Library edition, p.v.

2. Chapter 5, pp.42-3.

doubt, Moore deluded himself into believing that mention of the great love stories would enhance Owen's stature(1). A relatively minor character in the first two editions of Sister Teresa, Owen now assumes greater importance than Ulick. From chapters four to sixteen inclusive, for over 100 pages, the story shifts to him and all the action is seen from his point of view. Chapters five to nine inclusive narrate his adventures abroad. Moreover, his journeys and his hawking(2) are dealt with in irritating, smart 90-isms(3), and his search for the picturesque and cruel is reminiscent of the early Moore. He uses Ulick to appeal to Evelyn's senses in order to keep her away from the convent: a device he would not have employed in 1901(4).

1. In fact, our knowledge of Owen is little increased: all we are shown is his inability to forget Evelyn.
2. Memories of Moore's experience with Howard de Walden.
3. See also the irrelevant conversation between Owen and Harding in chapter 15. Even psychological analysis was preferable.
4. Owen is also more stridently anti-Catholic than in 1901:

"They have got her, they have got her!... That blasted priest shall not get her. Those ghouls of nuns!...those blasted ghouls, haunters of graveyards, diggers of graves, faint creatures who steal out of the light, mumblers of prayers." (Benn edition, p.133).

He tears melodramatically at the fringe of the hearth-rug, and the whole incident is rendered especially ludicrous by Harding's and Moore's fatuous comments about Owen's being noble in his grief:

Ulick, too (no longer based on Yeats or A.E.), has sadly degenerated from the mystic and pantheist of earlier editions. He determines to emulate Owen's immaculate appearance<sup>(1)</sup>, goes in for cigars, and relishes living in Berkeley Square. The incident of Owen's seeing

cont.

"he jibbered (sic) at one moment like a demented baboon, at the next he was transfigured, and looked like some Titan as he strode about the room... You know those Papists, Harding, how they cringe, how shamefaced they are, how low in intelligence. I have heard you say yourself they have not written a book for the last four hundred years (one of the central ideas of Hail and Farewell)... paralysed brains, arrested intelligences... They have got her, and her mind will be poisoned. She will get the abominable ascetic mind. The pleasure of the flesh transferred! What is legitimate and beautiful in the body put into the mind, the mind sullied by passions, that do not belong to the mind. That is what papistry is!" (p.134).

Similarly, the prioress is made more worldly in 1909: she is glad that Evelyn confessed her sin in Italy and not in the convent, for "Evelyn could be of great use to them." (Benn edition, p.162). Such anti-Catholicism becomes at times sheer caricature: "Once they had sat enfolded in each other's arms under a flowering oleander. Christ was watching them!" (p.203. See also chapters 29, 35).

And in chapter 30, Cecilia has a Moorini dream about a dwarf who gets into her bed, rolls up his nightshirt, and says he is her counterpart. (In 1901, it is Evelyn who has a bad dream).

Yeats wrote to Lady Gregory, (Abbey Theatre, 24th January, 1910, The Letters of W.B. Yeats, ed. by Allan Wade, London, Hart-Davis, 1954, p.547):

"He (i.e. Moore) is in a state of triumphant delight because he has discovered that his family were Protestants until his grandfather turned Catholic in order to trade in Spain."

1. Benn edition, chapter 11.

Evelyn in a slum is transferred to him(1): an anomaly because such details as the raising of his stick are much more characteristic of Owen. And the end of chapter 12, where Owen, who is staying at home, reminds Ulick that he has an appointment with Evelyn and must not forget to take his hat, is patently absurd.

After the revision, Moore said that he was trying to create a love story: at the time of writing, his purpose in introducing this fashionable Edwardian society material was to inject greater variety and action into the story in place of the tedious convent detail with which the first version was saturated(2). But the loss was much greater than the gain, for the new material, being Owen's story, is completely irrelevant, destroying that unity centred on Evelyn which was one of the merits of the 1901 edition. Evelyn is neglected - we see little of Sister Teresa - while Moore attempts to bring other characters to life. In line with his idea of the separation of the lovers(3), Evelyn and Owen meet, part and are finally

1. Benn edition, chapter 12.

2. Gardening, woodwork and pets replace much of the detail of the first edition (e.g. in chapter 24). Only the most interesting episodes and conflicts, such as the schism, Sister Mary John etc., are retained.

3. cf. Héloïse and Abelard.

reconciled - in friendship, not marriage(1). But the final version has no real thread, being too frequently a string of isolated incidents lacking any connection with the heroine - this, in spite of Moore's boast that he had at last found in the chastity motive the unifying theme he sought.

In some respects, the 1909 version is an improvement. Transitions are smoother - e.g. between scenes in the convent garden(2). Moore's improved power to shape a unified episode out of fragments is evident in the incident of the dream(3). And Evelyn's reference to the nuns' plans to establish a school(4) skilfully prepares the way for their revolt and eliminates the necessity for the exposition that clogged earlier versions. The Thornton Grange episode is completely rewritten in 1909. Previous editions contained only a statement of Evelyn's disillusion with the behaviour of her former friends; now their conversations and characters are presented dramatically(5). Earlier editions had shown the strength both of Evelyn's

1. A favourite idea of Moore's - cf. Dried Fruit, Court & Society Review, 7th December, 1885, pp.41-5.
2. 1901, chapter 22; 1909, chapter 21. See also 1901, p.111; 1909, pp.181-2.
3. 1901, chapter 26; 1909, chapter 30.
4. 1909, p.225.
5. Dialogue is improved throughout, large blocks of speech being broken up.

sensuality and of the nuns' prayers and had heightened Evelyn's desire to enter a convent because, among worldly surroundings, chastity was obviously impossible for her. But, in view of Moore's determination that the 1908-9 version should be a love-story, this episode had to become one of the key sections of the book. The final version is greatly improved in that a fresh round of sensuality is aroused in Evelyn, not by an unmotivated upsurge<sup>(1)</sup> but specifically by Owen himself. In 1909, in spite of herself, Evelyn succumbs convincingly to the luxury she has recently been denied. Motivation is also improved in the scene of Evelyn's attempted suicide, which takes place at the climax of her sensual life and justifies her determination to embrace religion; structure is strengthened in that the climax of her worldly life coincides with her determination to change that life. The 1909 version thus brings some improvements in structure.

To sum up: the 1898-1901 revisions removed minor defects; those of 1905-9 alter the structure of the novels, to a greater extent smooth out transitions at the end of scenes and chapters, revise character and theme, and transform third-person narration into dramatic incidents, dialogue and character conflict.

---

1. In 1901, to satisfy her, Ivan had conveniently appeared.

In the 1905 edition, Moore began the radical revision with which he continued in the final versions, where change of emphasis brings about a better balance between various characters and between episodes in the plot. In the final editions, he shows a new understanding of the proper conception and treatment of theme and a new mastery of the technique of combining episodes into a continuous line of narrative. Incidents are now evaluated and subordinated to the whole conception, accentuated or played down according to the demands of the plot. And the revelation of Evelyn's character is kept back until character and situation finally coincide to disclose the whole. But the defects of the book outweigh its merits. Unity of structure is impaired: in no edition is Owen a really convincing figure and to give him greater prominence in the 1909 Sister Teresa is a grave error. An equally serious mistake is Evelyn's finally leaving the convent, as she does not intend to take the veil(): whereas in 1901 she cannot face life and so remains a nun, in 1909 she came to the convent as an escape, especially after her father's death, and emerges finally to found a home. Adequate preparation of this fresh development is impossible in the final chapter and the

- 
1. One effect of this is that the part played by Monsignor in her life is drastically cut.

changes in Evelyn's character necessary to justify the new ending distort the whole novel, which was, after all, specifically a study of her temperament: failure to conceive the ending from the beginning ruined fourteen years' work. Such major changes demanded further alterations to preserve harmony, with the result that much of the writing is only superficially altered but creates a false impression that the whole has been rewritten(1). Finally, the 1908-9 version, while solving some problems, created others, sometimes of the same variety as those that Moore had already removed.

Moore himself came to dislike the books intensely. W.L. Phelps tells us that, when Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa were mentioned to the author in later life, he shuddered with horror:

"Oh, that is a bad novel, very bad. I rewrote it and rewrote it in the vain endeavour to improve it. But it was hopeless. I could make nothing of it... no amount of correction could save that book(2)."

In the Preface to The Lake(3), he expresses the same thought as a gentle Moorism:

1. This may, of course, have been deliberate on Moore's part.
2. Autobiography with Letters, p.820.
3. Ebury Edition, 1936, pp.viii-ix.

"...I will confess to very little admiration for Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa. The writing of Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa was useful to me inasmuch as that if I had not written them I could not have written The Lake or The Brook Kerith. It seems ungrateful, therefore, to refuse to allow two of my most successful books into the canon merely because they do not correspond with my aestheticism. But a writer's aestheticism is his all; he cannot surrender it, for his art is dependent upon it, and the single concession he can make is that if an overwhelming demand should arise for these books when he is among the gone - a storm before which the reed must bend - the publisher shall be permitted to print Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa from the original editions, it being, however, clearly understood that they are offered to the public only as apocrypha(1)."

He never again attempted a best-seller.

Two other books are worthy of mention here. Written in Moore's melodic line period, but revised mainly to improve the structure, A Story-Teller's Holiday first appeared in one volume, privately printed, in a limited edition, published by the Society for Irish Folklore, 1918. It was the first of Moore's books to be issued

---

1. Characteristic humbug about his aestheticism when, in fact, he had sacrificed it for popular success.

for subscribers only(1). By May, 1917, the first three stories were on paper in a rough plan(2), but the usual rewritings were to follow. After he had written the 'Garden of Eden' story, Moore found that it did not fit into the book and that third-person would need to be transferred into first-person narrative. By the end of August, 1917, the story was "thrown once more into the melting pot, and was being red dictated at the rate of two or three thousand words a day(3)."

---

1. In a letter to R.I. Best (121, Ebury Street, 9th April, 1917, National Library, Dublin, MS 3884), he explained that he abhorred the modern idea that literature was written for everyone and sent round with the morning loaf and milk up to standard, and he ought to have separated himself from it long before. He gives further information about the change in the preface to the 1918 edition, "A Leave Taking", where he speaks of the persecution of his books ever since Flowers of Passion, and the fact that the libraries do not cater exclusively for men and women of letters. By private printing, he says, he has cut himself off from many readers, but the alternative was to cease writing. The real reason, of course, was just the reverse: he realised that he would never be read by a wide public. He was believed, however. J.C. Squire wrote in 1922, "Some years ago Mr. George Moore, determined no longer to court the insults of the library censorship, announced his intention of having his future books privately printed and issued to subscribers." ("Mr. George Moore's Tapestry," Books Reviewed, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1922, p.63. Review of Héloïse & Abélard, from the Observer, 13th March, 1921). Freeman (op.cit., p.178), who thoroughly disliked Moore's bawdiness, gives a further reason for the change: that Moore took advantage of the immunity peculiar to the private issue to produce such books as A Story-Teller's Holiday.  
2. See Hone, op.cit., p.335.  
3. Hone, op.cit., p.339.

Five years after the publication of A Story-Teller's Holiday. Moore was revising the longest story in the book, Ulick and Soracha. He wrote to Professor Edmund Curtis, on 5th November, 1923, saying that he had twice dictated about three-quarters of the story to the point where Tadhg is captured by the Scots(1). By 11th March, 1924(2), he had finished dictating the book. The text, he told Curtis, was mostly worthless, but he had threshed the subject out in every scene: some would not be altered much, and he had been over them twice. On 16th March, he told Nancy Cunard(3) that his romantic story had been 'draughted' in several dictations and merely required going over with the pen. This, however, proved difficult, and by 14th October, he was informing Best that Ulick and Soracha and income tax were making his life almost unendurable:

"The new story is as difficult to write as  
The Lake...(4)"

On 16th February, 1925, he told Best that he had at last begun to write the book:

"I mean, the story has at last begun to unroll after having tied itself into almost inextricable knots for six months(5)."

1. 121, Ebury Street, London, S.W.1, 18th February, 1924,  
National Library, Dublin, MS 4477.
2. See letter to Curtis, 121, Ebury Street, London, S.W.1,  
National Library, Dublin, MS 4477.
3. 121, Ebury Street, National Library, Dublin, MS 2648.
4. 121, Ebury Street, National Library, Dublin, MS 3884.
5. 121, Ebury Street, National Library, Dublin, MS 3884.

But a fortnight later, on 28th February, he wrote to Eglinton(1) saying that he had broken down in Ulick and Soracha: after six months he was still in the same blind alley. A further letter, written about this time, to John Garvey, describing with enthusiasm his 'new draft', reveals clearly Moore's method of work:

"It was all simple to me except the beginning, and I began the story fifty times and these fifty beginnings often brought my secretary to the verge of tears. She has now confessed her tears - not very long ago, for it is not so very long ago that this capricious and intractable story ceased to kick and plunge and became tractable, a perfect palfrey always looking round to see if I am near and turning her left side for me to mount her(2)."

But his troubles were by no means over. A year later, on (?) 2nd January, 1926, he wrote to Lady Cunard(3), telling her that he was adding chapters to the story and that he was again in a blind alley. On 31st December, he had been about to throw up the sponge and withdraw the book, but a night of insomnia had revealed the 'long-sought-for-secret', and on 1st January he was a new Narcissus: "I hope to finish this terrible book during the coming week." But on 7th January(4) he was writing:

1. 121, Ebury Street, op.cit., p.67.
2. See Hone, op.cit., p.399.
3. Saturday night, George Moore. Letters to Lady Cunard, p.142.
4. 121, Ebury Street, ibid., pp.143-4.

"I am tired, for every day I strive with the narrative of Ulick and Soracha. The book is in type but I have had to write the beginning over again, adding two new chapters, and these I write in feverish anxiety lest I should fail again."

A month later, on 3rd February, he wrote in calmer mood to Best: he had finished Ulick and Soracha that very day. The book, he said, had been in type some time, but a scene between Ulick and his father had held him at bay:

"Tolstoi would have written it astonishingly well. My scene is just a little better than my contemporaries would have written it(1)!"

Two days later, however, he was writing to Lady Cunard about "that horrid book Ulick and Soracha"

"It went wrong again and I was frightened that I would not be able to finish it and might have to withdraw the book. You can imagine my mental trouble...(2)."

On 26th February, he told Best that he had been held up by a stoppage in the entrails of his story; operations had failed to relieve it but it did not die - he had thought of a remedy at the last moment(3). Yet he was still depressed with his story. He wrote to Eglinton on 6th July(4), informing him that he was always down in the

1. 121, Ebury Street, National Library, Dublin, MS. 3884.
2. 121, Ebury Street, 5th February (Post 1926),  
George Moore. Letters to Lady Cunard, p.144.
3. 121, Ebury Street, National Library, Dublin, MS 3884.
4. 121, Ebury Street, op.cit., pp.68-9.

mouth when he had published a book. He had looked on Ulick and Soracha for the past few days as his disaster. Even after publication, he was not entirely satisfied. He wrote to Best on 16th August:

"I think the scene at Donogh O'Brien's is good enough as it stands, but I am provoked by an unholy longing to mend it(1)."

The real source of his difficulties was two-fold: history did not possess 'the melodic line', and Moore was no scholar.

Ulick and Soracha, designed mainly to improve the writing, to increase the number of Irishisms and to promote greater flow, was published finally in a limited edition by the Nonesuch Press in 1926(2).

In 1928, another version of A Story-Teller's Holiday, considerably revised, was published in two volumes by Heinemann in the Uniform edition. The book was worthy of correction, he wrote to Ernest Longworth on 4th February, 1928(3). And Longworth recalls, in the preface to A Story-Teller's Holiday(4), how Moore, in a Home and near death, complained that insufficient time was left him to

1. 121, Ebury Street, National Library, Dublin, MS 3884.
2. As early as 10th December, 1921(?) Moore had said he would have to correct the book (letter to Gosse, 121, Ebury Street, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134) and, by 1923, he was working once again on it.
3. Hone, op.cit., p.416.
4. 1928, vol.1, p.ix.

write prefaces and revise new editions of old books; yet when he was home again he revised Ulick and Soracha once more, for the new A Story-Teller's Holiday. He informed Lady Cunard on 6th May, 1928(1), that the opening chapters had to be remoulded as these were the faulty ones and he was now confident "that the story will soon be among my best things." The gap left by the removal of the story of Albert Nobbs to Celibate Lives(2) was filled in 1928 by a new story, Dinoll and Crede(3), which first appeared (with only a few punctuation and paragraph variations) as The Hermit's Love Story, published in Nash's Magazine, with illustrations by F.R. Gruger, in August, 1927(4).

In addition to revisions similar to those in the 1926 Ulick and Soracha, the 1928 version of this story makes some important alterations in the narrative. For example(5), there is a change in the introduction of the story's central motive: the portrait of Soracha. In 1926, Ulick cannot keep his mind on his father's portrait, but then Roudier tells him of O'Melaghlin's urging him to paint him and his daughters. The sole link here is that Roudier has a personal story for Ulick

- 
1. 121, Ebury Street, op.cit., p.165.
  2. London, Heinemann, 1927.
  3. 1928 edition, vol.2, pp.225-34.
  4. No.411, pp.12-15, 84, 86.
  5. 1926, pp.44-50; 1928, II, pp.33-8.

as well as an Irish one. The later version has a much better link in that, when Roudier shows Ulick a portrait of his father, Ulick sees another portrait - of Soracha; this leads on naturally to the story of O'Melaghlin's wish. Again, one of the semi-comic incidents (Ulick's surreptitiously examining Soracha's picture), which occur so frequently in the Tadhg-Ulick relationship, is replaced by a passage developing the thought of the purity of Ulick's future relationship with Soracha<sup>(1)</sup>. Greater stress is placed on this in the love-lust passage than in 1926, and a new passage is added. In this way, the status of the Ulick-Soracha love-affair is raised. The 1928 version omits the comic episodes of Ulick's giving Tadhg the box and thinking he has for once outwitted his servant, of Tadhg's wishing Ulick to confess to Father Carabine in order to prepare himself for battle, and of his drinking on his way to the priest after having received praise from the Earl for his playing. The same passage introduces other changes also: for example, the omission, in 1928 (except for a brief reference to the nun's story and portrait at the beginning of the passage), of Soracha and Ulick's plans.

---

1. 1926, pp.82-8; 1928, II, pp.55-61.

The 1928 edition has, instead, much greater concentration on the state of Ireland. This produces a change in the character of the hero: in 1926, he is concerned mainly with Soracha, is delighted that he can outwit Tadhg, and tries to convince himself that he is putting Ireland first; in 1928, he does put Ireland first, his part in defeating Bruce is his sole preoccupation, and there is no mention of Soracha. In this way, the 'motif' of Ulick's Irish crusade is strengthened.

Ernest Longworth, in his preface to the 1928 edition, tells us that, when Moore returned from the nursing-home, he revised Ulick and Soracha "for inclusion in the present text and to discover a stronger motive for the carrying off of Soracha from her convent. On looking deeper into the heart of the trouvère he was able to develop a motive which existed in germ in the original text... (1)" By discarding some of Ulick's frivolity, Moore suggested that he was carrying her off for a noble purpose: that this was not merely a rape or one of his customary seductions, but that for the first time in his life he felt love, not lust. He is thus viewed in the final version as a noble knight releasing Soracha from vows in which she no longer believes. This changed conception falls in line with

---

1. p.ix.

Moore's characteristic ideas of love and religion, and strengthens the central 'motif' of the rape of Soracha.

The remaining novel is Aphrodite in Aulis(1), Moore's last published work.

Moore began the story in 1927. He told Gosse:

"I am writing the story of Rhesos and Thrasillus, and it's developing, as you said it would, into a book(2)."

It was the incident of the bather which first attracted him: the legend of two girls who sought a shepherd to tell them which had the more beautiful form:

"The legend possessed me the moment I read it with its exceeding beauty, and I could not do else but build a story about it(3)."

But, after a time, he said he should begin earlier with Rhesos's father setting out for Aulis, and thus Kebren gradually became the central figure and the episode of the swimmer, the beauty of whose rump gave Rhesos the inspiration for his statue of Aphrodite, became only one of various incidents.

1. Moore first proposed to call the book The Fair Rump of Aphrodite, and was dissuaded only by Wolfe's remark that a title should not begin with four mono-syllables. (Wolfe, Portraits by Inference, p.172).
2. 121, Ebury Street, 28th June, 1927, Brotherton.
3. See letter to Eglinton, 12th November, 1929, Eglinton, op.cit., p.84. Also letter to Atchley, 121, Ebury Street, 16th May, 1927, London Mercury, November, 1934, p.16.

By 9th February, 1928, the MS was being revised(1).

According to Gillet(2) Moore read him at least three different openings for the book(3). Humbert Wolfe tells us(4) that originally the beginning contained the lively account of the fishmonger, the hero's father (which now appears twenty pages later). The first sketch was warm and living, says Wolfe, but it seemed to Moore to lag and so, beautifully written though it was, he rejected it in favour of the shorter and sharper opening of the published text. While in hospital in 1928, Moore swore that he would quickly revise and re-orchestrate the book. But, when he recovered, he became concerned with the faults: he thought the first chapter with the account of the fishmonger father did not give out the theme, and it might be better to begin with the son striding down and have him there as he was required from the first page. This meant rewriting the first part(5).

Geraint Goodwin supplies us with further information on the genesis of the first chapter:

1. See letter to Lady Cunard, 121, Ebury Street, Tuesday, (post. 8th February, 1928), George Moore. Letters to Lady Cunard, p.161.
2. "George Moore", Revue des Deux Mondes, vol.14 (8th per.), 1st April, 1933, p.672.
3. No changes take place in the opening of any of the published texts.
4. Preface, George Moore, London, 1933, pp.xxii-xxiii.
5. See e.g. Wolfe, op.cit., pp.123-4.

"There was the Old Man, a thick wad of manuscript on his knee, beginning to read. It was his latest book - the best of them all, he said - but it was not going easily. He had burnt the first draft, months and months of patient labour, but it had gone into the fire with as little heed as an old newspaper.

'Something wrong with the damn thing, don't y'see, but blest if I know where.'

...There was something wrong somewhere, he would tell himself, and would make a search...

...And then half-way through(1) I felt a jar. He had broken the sequence. He had begun with indirect statement, a long descriptive preamble, which must have been very fine, but which made one drowse; and then suddenly, with the voice heard by the young sculptor, 'To Aulis', the book sprang to life.

'I have it,' I shouted. 'It's there it should begin. It's like a cup broken in half, you see. What I mean to say -'

'By God, you're right!'...

'I've been months and months on that,' he said. 'I knew there was something wrong somewhere, d'ye see? But it has been too long with me. That's the best of getting a fresh mind on it.'

'Well, I shouldn't take my word for it,' I said, with more modesty than I felt.

'It's just your word backed by my judgment, d'ye see(2)?'"

A complete rewriting followed. On 20th December, 1928, he wrote to L. Gillet:

"By writing every day, Sundays included and by thinking of nothing else, I have written a new text of Aphrodite in Aulis (the first version was valueless,...(3))"

1. i.e. Moore's reading aloud.
2. Goodwin, Call Back Yesterday, pp.182-4.
3. G.-P. Collet, "Louis Gillet et George Moore," Etudes anglaises, --, August, 1953, p.252.

By 12th November, 1929(1), he was mending the book in the proof. Through all the severe illness of this period, the constant revision continued. To an interviewer discussing Aphrodite in Aulis,

"Mr. Moore indicated that his method was one of constant and pitiless rejection. For example, the whole of the first version had been thrown on the scrap-heap. 'But,' said the breathless young man, stricken with awe at this magnificent carelessness, 'where is the MS? It must be priceless.' 'I don't know,' said Mr. Moore, 'I expect that Miss Kingdom burned it.' You could see from the disturbance in the syntax, noticeable even in this writer's style, that the young man had almost sobbed(2)."

Moore's fanatical zeal was incredible:

"The book progressed, as all George Moore's work progressed, very slowly, with every word considered, reconsidered, and accepted with the same care that St. Peter addresses to the admission of souls to heaven. Like Anatole France, when a chapter was finished, George Moore went back and first rejected all adjectives and adverbs, then mused upon nouns and verbs, and finally threw the chapter away and started again. This is a possible method with all life before one. It is a source of anxiety both to the author and his friends when his future is severely limited. Nevertheless, George Moore was persuaded that time and the art of the surgeon would give him the time that he needed. He was right. It is true that the first published version of the last chapter did not please him. It is equally true that he put off his return to the nursing-home for three weeks while, sustained only by literary integrity, he beat pain and finished his chapter(3)."

1. See letter to Eglinton, op.cit., p.84.
2. H. Wolfe, Portraits by Inference, p.174.
3. H. Wolfe, Portraits by Inference, pp.172-3.

The first edition of the book was published in 1930(1), the second (revised) in 1931, and a third (with slight verbal changes) in 1932. Even now Moore was not satisfied: he turned once more to Best for emendations. On 25th April, 1932, he wrote from Ebury Street, thanking him for his numerous corrections, especially in the first half of the book. He had been rewriting bits all morning, "considering, accepting and rewriting paragraphs, for there was a great deal that shocked me(2)." And on the 26th, he wrote that he had been working all the previous day on Best's admirable suggestions:

"There was good, bad and indifferent writing in the book, but it pleased me on the whole and, when the corrections find their way into a new edition, the book will make charming reading for anybody who likes good English.

The part of the book which pleased me most was the part without a single correction, i.e. the burning of Otanes...Altogether I like the book and detest myself for having written it so negligently in parts(3)."

Best added a note to this letter:

"I scamped the reading of the second half because he wrote(?) for the correction."

Poor Moore! He did not live to bring out a final edition including these emendations.

The alterations in the second version are very slight,

1. London, Heinemann, Limited edition.

2. National Library, Dublin, MS 3884.

3. 121, Ebury Street, National Library, Dublin, MS 3884.

except for the ending, which is skilfully rewritten(1). Humbert Wolfe tells us that, because of illness, Moore allowed the story to end less definitely than he intended, and a conclusion of which he did not approve appeared in the first de luxe edition. Here again, as Wolfe says,

"the comparison between the two versions shows how resolute to the end of all was his search for perfectibility(2)."

Almost as soon as the book was published, Moore began working on the new ending. He told Sir John Thompson-Walker:

"The end of the story should be triumphant, - triumphantly glad or triumphantly sorrowful, and the writing of The Passing of the Essenes(3) prevented me from seeking as eagerly as I would have done in other circumstances for a triumphant end(4)."

He had discovered an ending more illuminating and more essential to the character of Rhesos than the 'alfresco love-making'(5) of the first edition. He wrote to Atchley in January, 1931:

- 
1. 1930, chapters 22 and 23 become 1931, chapter 22.
  2. Preface, George Moore, p.xxiii.
  3. London, Heinemann, Uniform edition, 1931.
  4. See Hone, op.cit., p.428.
  5. See Hone, op.cit., p.433.

"I have found the ideal end, an end that outends all my other ends...I walked out of my house and round Belgrave Square, and roared the new end out to my secretary when I returned (who took it down in short-hand as quickly as I could speak it) in desperate fear lest I should die without having got it down on paper(1)."

The 1930 edition ends with a long description of Rhesos and Earine going to the woods and making love on a beautiful bank, and then returning to the temple to join Thrasillo斯 in the honour due to them. Rhesos regrets that Earine has had to deprive herself of children in order to remain his model, but now he gratifies her wishes and they set about having a baby. But this happiness is not really relevant to the central theme or the characters - children would mean little to Earine or Rhesos if his sculpture were not successful - and the second version wisely removes the scene. In 1931, Earine and Rhesos tell Kebren that his speech has been praised all over the Greek world as greater than Pericles; they talk of the speech Kebren is to give at the banquet because Earine and Rhesos are now going to Syracuse; and the book closes with Kebren on the steps watching Earine and Rhesos crossing the valley. So the novel which began with the voice of the god calling Kebren to Aulis, and went on to trace

---

1. London Mercury, 1934, p.20.

his journey(1), ends with Kebren's gazing across the valley after his successful son. The first version's nature descriptions, the retrospective matter, the reverie, especially the memories of the two lovers interwoven with their thoughts, are beautiful, but the second sacrifices them in the interests of greater compression and unity. The ending, as Charles Morgan says(2) is brilliantly transformed.

From revisions concerned with structure, we turn to the 'melodic line'.

---

1. Ideas characteristic of Moore's later work: cf. Hail and Farewell, The Brook Kerith, Héloïse and Abélard and A Story-Teller's Holiday.
2. "George Moore at 80," Observer, 21st February, 1932, p.6.

CHAPTER VIRISH PERIOD: THE MELODIC LINE1. Introduction

At the end of the century, Moore left England for Ireland. His version of his motives for this step, the most vital of all his life's 're-creations', is given most fully in his conversation with William Archer:

"My duty takes me to Ireland...when once you feel that a thing is wrong, you can't go on doing it...The moral atmosphere(1) is unbearable(2)."

He goes on to explain his hatred of England's materialism, greed and Imperialism, his loathing of the Boer War and Kipling's England, and it is very largely to this that he attributes his escape to Ireland:

"I must escape from the Brixton Empire... This empire of vulgarity, and greed, and materialism and hypocrisy, that is crawling round the whole world, throttling other races and nationalities - all for their own good, of course! and reducing everything to one machine-made Brixton pattern."

When Archer asks if he expects to find in Ireland "a green oasis in a wilderness of khaki," he replies:

1. i.e. in London.

2. Wm. Archer, Real Conversations, London, Heinemann, 1904, V, "Conversation with George Moore. Victoria Street," (May, 1901), pp.85-7. See also Conversation 4, The Critic, N.Y., vol.xxxix, July, 1901, pp.47-56.

"I am going to find a primitive people, in place of a sophisticated - I may say decadent - people. I am going in search of air that I can breathe without choking. The first concern of every man is the moral atmosphere in which he lives. Some people are quite at their ease in an atmosphere of cruelty, lust of gold, and all the gratifications of the senses. Others desire an atmosphere in which tenderness, and pity for humanity and the cultivation of ideas, count for more than so-called material advantages...my duty is there: I am going at last to do my duty. I have been an absentee landlord - I have behaved wrongly in every way! It is only of late, when I have seen how insatiate Imperialism was degrading the English race, that I have recognised how all art, all morality, all spiritual life, is rooted in nationality. I am going, so far as in me lies, to help Ireland to recover her own language, and save her soul."

Moore, of course, dramatised (not to say 'melodramatised') his attitude to the Boer War, but he was genuinely revolted by England's materialism, the more so because of his former excessive love of his adopted country:

"My love for England is monstrous, preposterous. I know, and I have poured all this great love into Esther Waters. I suppose that this love and loving comprehension of England is some sort of atavism(l)."

He loathed the way public opinion was prepared for the War.

---

1. Letter to Maurice, 8, King's Bench Walk, Temple, Monday, 11th September, 1893, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646.

As Susan Mitchell, often a severe critic of Moore, says:

"Mr. Moore's departure from England at the time of the Boer War was forced on him by a real loathing of London's attitude at that time and by as sincere a desire to stand by his country as was possible to his wayward heart...the interior sincerity that prompted his return to Ireland I have never doubted, however I may have chuckled at his staging of the part he played here(1)."

But the real motive for his return was neither the Brixton Empire, the Boers and English materialism; nor the voice which he heard, in echo augury, in the Chelsea road(2); nor his nationalistic longings; nor his desire to assist in the rebirth of the Irish language (though he made a speech to the Irish Literary Theatre(3) and, if he could not learn Irish himself, insisted on his nephews' being brought up in their mother tongue(4)); nor the visit that Yeats and Martyn paid him in London in 1897(5) to seek his aid in the founding of an Irish

1. Op.cit., p.72.

2. See e.g. Salve, p.26.

3. Ideals in Ireland, pp.43-51.

4. He even revoked a will in their favour because Maurice had not taught them Irish - see letter to Mrs. Maurice Moore, 24th April, 1901, Hone, op.cit., pp.229-30.

5. See Ave, Uniform edition, pp.30 ff.

Literary Theatre(1); nor the desire Diarmuid and Grania begot in him to tell the story of modern Ireland(2); nor the difficulties he was experiencing with his house in Victoria Street(3); nor the letter revealing the plot which he could not publish in England and so went to Ireland to publish in Freeman's Journal(4); nor, indeed, the fact that his English friend 'Stella'(5) was prepared to live in Ireland for the sake of her ideals. Important though all these factors were, his real motive was aesthetic. Characteristically, even this was disguised as a despair of English art: he wished to escape, he said, from English aesthetic degeneration. In the conversation with Archer, he speaks of the

1. His play, The Bending of the Bough, London, Unwin, 1900, proving a failure, an opportunity for escape came with the proposal of collaboration with Yeats on Diarmuid and Grania. In Salve (Uniform edition, p.24), Moore repudiates A.E.'s suggestion that he was led back to Ireland by Yeats after he had lived as much of his life as was necessary in Paris and London. Moore said that Yeats and Martyn were merely instruments.
2. "Avowals," Pall Mall Magazine, January-April, 1904, p.319. See also Ave, Uniform edition, p.4.
3. See Salve, chapter 1.
4. Moore had received letters telling him that quarter would not be given if a token of surrender were raised. He claimed in Salve (p.25) that, but for his article, all the Boers would have been murdered.
5. Miss Clara Christian.

destruction of beautiful buildings, the creation of 'artistic' villa residences, the bad modern plays and the bad accounts of bad literature in the newspapers(1). Only long after, he says, did he understand that it was the aesthetician, not the moralist, crying in him,

"that I desired the preservation of the Boers not because they were men like ourselves, but because they were the descendants of the great Dutch painters of the seventeenth century.

I believed that, if the Boers drove the English out of Africa, art would spring up in the Transvaal as art had sprung up in Holland when the Hollanders drove out the Spaniards; and when the news reached me that Ireland was engaged in the charming adventure of a language revival, Ireland became the country of my aesthetic election(2)."

In reality, his aesthetic motives were much less disinterested: he was deeply concerned about his art; with Evelyn Innes he had reached a dead end. As Yeats says:

"He had exhausted his England in A Mummer's Wife and Esther Waters, and had turned to us, seeking his new task with an ungovernable childlike passion(3)."

1. Hail and Farewell was to show the depth of his renunciation of England, while at the same time he retained his love of her literature. As he dreamed his country's resurrection, he began to hate the strong and love the weak, and this meant moral decay for a pagan.
2. Op.cit., p.86.
3. W.B. Yeats, Autobiographies, p.428.

In the period 1895-8, he found that he was no longer taken seriously; as Hone states(1), he hated the growth of a national mood in which his own works would be overlooked. Celibates and Evelyn Innis marked a break with French influence without the substitution of a new influence in its place, and the result was failing inspiration. Freeman comments: "...his own earth was needed to renew and enhance his imaginative power(2)," even for books with such a foreign setting as The Brook Kerith and Heloise and Abelard. And Graham Hough says that Yeats took him to Ireland when the possibilities of realism seemed exhausted(3). It was to find himself once more that he returned to his native land, to seek a new audience in a country where there was as yet little competition.

And it was in Ireland that he found the style which was the foundation of all his future work. True, in later years, he was fond of attributing to Wagner his discovery of the 'melodic line' in narrative; he tells

1. Op.cit., p.220.

2. Op.cit., p.128.

3. "George Moore and the Novel," Image and Experience. Studies in a Literary Revolution, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1960, chapter 7, p.203.

us, in "The Nineness in the Oneness":

"...It was not till I heard 'Tristan' a third time that the musical pattern began to disclose itself. I went to Bayreuth again and again to hear Wagner, and to Munich to hear Wagner and Mozart, and for some years was seldom absent from the symphony concerts, where I listened with more critical ears to my old friends, Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven, thinking how a story might be woven from start to finish out of one set of ideas, each chapter rising out of the preceding chapter in suspended cadence always, never a full close; and as an example of the kind of book that comes out of such ideas as these, I will name 'The Brook Kerith', for the story begins like a brook; the old woman telling stories to her grandchild may be compared to the 'Fanfare of the Rhine', and the brook widens out as it flows, a smooth current, not very rapid, but flowing always, turning sometimes east, sometimes west, winding, disappearing at last mysteriously like a river(1)."

W. Francis Aitken supports this claim, referring to Moore's desire for harmony of theme and smoothness of narrative, and pointing a comparison with the 'Swan' 'motif' in "Lohengrin"(2). And Harold Acton(3) observes that the

1. Century Magazine, vol.xcix, n.s., vol.lxxvii, November, 1919, pp.65-6.
2. "George Moore," Bookman, London, vol.lxxxiii, no.498, March, 1933, p.488.
3. "George Moore and the Cunard Family," London Magazine, vol.5, no.3, March, 1958, p.55.

'melodic line' was Moore's before he consciously developed it; music was one of his greatest bonds with Lady Cunard. However, while Wagner might have given Moore a sense of flow and implanted in him the idea of a novel approaching the condition of music, with each character following its own thread of development, it remains true that the roots of his style lay in Ireland.

Moore claimed, too, a French source for his later prose, stating that it derived from his '*Epître Dédicatoire*' (to Dujardin) in The Lake(1). He told Goodwin:

"At this time I had been writing in different ways wondering which was better than the other. However, this epistle dedicatory was in French, and one sentence in particular pleased me, a description of the Seine and the poplars and the swallows flying low over the water. It is rather a good sentence that, though rather long. I remember I sat back and wondered to myself - 'Why don't you write like that in English?' There was a good deal of use of the present participle - it doesn't do in French, though in English, and possibly Greek, it is all right. And so it was to come about that I was to find an English style in French(2)."

1. pp.v-vi.

2. Goodwin, Conversations, p.128.

But while French style, Dujardin and Mallarmé<sup>(1)</sup> helped to draw Moore away from Naturalism<sup>(2)</sup>, Yeats' symbolism had a far greater influence. As Hough says, Yeats' and Ireland's 'reactivation' of the Symbolist discussion, which Moore himself had imbibed in France but not yet used in his work, was a turning-point in his literary life<sup>(3)</sup>. It was chiefly to Yeats that Moore owed his renewed search for an ideal rhythm in composition.

Yeats himself says that Moore

"was never to attain the discipline of style... He did not know that style existed until he returned to Ireland in middle life; what he learned, he learned from conversation, from acted plays, from pictures<sup>(4)</sup>."

Stephen Gwynn maintains<sup>(5)</sup> that association with Yeats harmed Moore's gift in that Moore was not a poet and

1. Mallarmé no doubt influenced his reverie: see e.g. Jean Noel, "George Moore et Mallarmé", Revue de Littérature Comparée, July-September, 1958, p.376; and L. Gillet, "George Moore," Revue des Deux Mondes, vol.14 (8th per.), 1st April, 1933, p.674.
2. See e.g. John Rothenstein. The Life and Death of Conder, London, Dent, 1938, p.110. Moore's whole career might be described as a movement away from realism towards reverie.
3. Graham Hough, "George Moore and the Novel," A Review of English Literature, vol.1, no.1, January, 1960, p.38. (Image and Experience, pp.203-4.)
4. Autobiographies, pp.405-6.
5. "Ebb and Flow," 'George Moore' (Obituary), Fortnightly Review, n.s. vol.cxxxiii, 1st March, 1933, p.388.

yet set out to write poet's prose, the result being the dead waxwork texture of The Lake and Evelyn Innes:

"When Yeats writes in prose one hears a poet speaking; but in Moore's later books, on which so much eulogy is bestowed, I seem to hear the voice of a clergyman reading the lessons."

One would not agree entirely with this, but Yeats, too, states that collaboration with him was an "unmixed misfortune for Moore":

"...it set him upon a pursuit of style that made barren his later years(1)."

His early works, says Yeats, gained nothing from their style; the later were written under "a misunderstanding of his powers":

"Style was his growing obsession, he would point out all the errors of some silly experiment of mine, then copy it. It was from some such experiment that he learnt those long, flaccid, structureless sentences, 'and, and and, and and' ... Sometimes he rebelled: 'Yeats, I have a deep distrust of any man who has a style,' but it was generally I who tried to stop the obsession. 'Moore, if you ever get a style', I would say, 'it will ruin you. It is coloured glass and you need a plate-glass window.' When he formed his own circle he found no escape; the difficulties of modern Irish literature... had been in the formation of a style. He heard these difficulties discussed. All his life he had learnt from conversation, not from books. His nature, bitter, violent, discordant, did not fit him to write the sentences men murmur again and again for years. Charm and rhythm had been denied him. Improvement makes straight roads; he pumice-stoned every surface because will had to do the work of nature. I said once: 'You work so hard that, like the Lancelot of Tennyson, you will almost see the Grail.' But now, his finished work before me, I am convinced that he was denied even that 'almost'."

Yeats, of course, was countering the charges made in Vale(1), that he had, in his unfortunate search for a style, ruined his later writing. Both writers thus praised each other's earlier, and criticised adversely their later work.

The opening of Ulick and Soracha states that Moore's 'oral narrative' style came from the Irish 'shanachies', but this is mere romanticising. Writers in the 1890s frequently lamented the decline of the spoken word: Yeats evolved a philosophy of the spoken word and oral rhythms, and Moore used this. It was dictation to his secretary of draft after draft that led to the emergence of the melodic line narrative. Moore saw that, when one reads narrative in a book,

"one is much more acutely conscious of its transitions, interpolated retrospects, its struggling movements from one consciousness to another, than one is in listening to a story that is told orally."

He realised that the English novel was too far removed from its origin in fable and

"set himself to apply the virtues of oral narrative to the rich and complex language he had inherited from the past(2)."

1. See Vale, London, Heinemann, 1914, pp.165 ff.
2. Charles Morgan, "George Moore: A Centenary Appreciation," p.351.

He believed that a writer should never lose sight of the spoken language; otherwise he would write so pedantically that no thoughts would come(1):

"He had great faith in the spoken word, perhaps because he thought that prose should go like a song. And, indeed, he wrote as one would speak - or, rather, as no man ever spoke, but as all must aspire to(2)."

He told Eglinton at the end of his life:

"No written story ever reads like a spoken story, and no story ever will. Half of a spoken story is in the voice and gestures of the teller; his very presence carries the story along, and he skips over obstacles without the listener perceiving the skips. Wherefore a written story is always, twice, three or four times as long as a spoken story(3)."

And, speaking of Sarah Gwynn(4), he once told Barrett Clark:

"I often tell my stories far better than I write them(5)."

He wrote to Nancy Cunard in 1926 reminding her "that as literature rises out of speech it must always retain the accent of speech; even in description of landscapes or the human mind speech should never be quite lost sight of - living speech is to literature what the wheel is to the

1. Goodwin, Conversations, p.176.

2. Goodwin, Call Back Yesterday, p.182.

3. Letter to Eglinton, 6th July, 1926, op.cit., pp.68-9.

4. In Celibates, 1895.

5. Barrett Clark, op.cit., p.117.

wheelbarrow(1)." The Lake bears him out: Charles Morgan wrote that the book is an almost flawless example of his method, the idealisations of the rhythms of the speaking voice, "the prose instrument he invented and perfected(2)." His later writing is a unique blend of the spoken and the written word.

Moore was probably always inclined to reverie, a habit no doubt fostered by his solitary walks, and 'imaginative reverie' seems to have its roots here.

As Desmond MacCarthy says:

---

1. 121, Ebury Street, 8th January, 1926, National Library, Dublin, MS 2648.
2. Times Literary Supplement, review of The Lake and The Untilled Field, 2nd February, 1933, p.73. Seumas O'Sullivan (Essays and Recollections, Talbot Press, Dublin and Cork, 1944, p.98) states that, in Moore's reading aloud, there was "a rather monotonous lowering of pitch at the end of his sentences" - this may have some connection with his style. Beverley Nichols, on the other hand, maintains that Moore "talks much as he writes, with the same musical cadences, using words clearly and economically." And John Eglinton ("George Moore at St. Winifred's Well" (written in 1927) (in Desmond MacCarthy, Life and Letters, vol. ix, London, 1934, p.68)), says that in talk Moore discovered the resources of his own mind; phrases struck out by him in the heat of discussion would reappear in his writings.

"His genius is a genius for reverie; phase after phase in his own life or in the life of some man or woman he has known, reflection after reflection, image after image, rise, turn and evaporate like wreaths of smoke. The mood of reverie is a quiet, patient one; poignancy of emotion is foreign to it...The artistic tranquillity of recollection comes easy to Mr. Moore; his difficulty has perhaps been to find sufficiently strong feelings to remember. He had all his life, it seems, been more interested in examining the wrinkles in the sand left by the tide than in bathing in the sea(1)."

From all this, it is evident that the 'melodic line' is no mere stylistic technique.

---

1. Portraits, pp.199-201. An interesting sidelight on this is seen in Moore's own statement in a letter to Ross (121, Ebury Street, S.W., 26th June, 1913, op.cit., p.243) that, if he constantly wrote plays, they would consist principally of asides and monologues:

"A man only seems natural when he is speaking aside or to himself; he seems quite mechanical when he is uttering little phrases to people standing by his elbow, as in Granville Barker's plays. Archer thinks that by the suppression of asides and monologues we have advanced, but the movement is retrograde, at least it is to me."

## 2. Melodic Line Devices

Of the characteristics of the 'melodic line', 'oral narrative' and 'imaginative reverie', the following are the most important: the progressive simplification of narrative; the concern with depth rather than breadth(1); the emphasis on unruffled narration, muted climax, suspended cadence and ironic anticlimax; the anecdotes, introduced when the smoothness of the style led to a flagging of interest, generally not irrelevant but tributary to the main theme, though sometimes irrelevance protrudes even through the cloak of the monolithic style(2); the invention of ingenious episodes, rather than the unravelling of complicated events; the exclusion of the author's personality, of Amico Moorini(3), of a too personal vocabulary, and (on the whole) of humour; the lack of commitment(4); the sacrifice, in the interests of harmony, of those sharp stylistic contrasts, characterisation tricks, colloquialisms and individual eccentricities of character and speech which were the stock-in-trade of the Victorian novel(5); the

1. A river, deep and clear, was one of his favourite images.
2. Morgan (*op.cit.*, pp.46-7) said that anecdotes were, to Moore, windows in the corridor of narrative and exposition.
3. This was one of the most important reasons for his adoption of the rule of evenness and for his lack of variation of tempo.
4. "My work is limited to exhibition" (*copy of letter to Gosse, Hotel Continental, Paris, Friday, (22nd May, 1926)*, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134).
5. These were, in any case, not Moore's 'forte', and were of no use in The Untilled Field, the first book in the new style, because the stories were intended for translation, with the result that the effect of all these devices would be lost.

break-away from the old fashioned, obvious and abrupt changes of narrative plane(1); the transitions from speech to thought, feeling, retrospect, dialogue, narrative, comment, thought stream, action, observation, etc., in fact, the refusal to recognise the existence of different narrative planes; the mingling of landscape with character; the ability, in the end, to make a transition from anything to anything else; the languid ease of movement (sometimes degenerating into sluggishness or frozen artificiality); the shift in emphasis from realistic scene-painting to concentration on style; the avoidance of the purple patch, the passage out of key, 'le mot juste' and the striking phrase; the modulated rhythms and harmony of style; the long, flowing sentences(2); and, finally, the enormous care expended on the joining of phrase to phrase, sentence to sentence, paragraph to paragraph, and

1. Moore was not the first in the field here, but previous experiments had all been based on the written word: Moore saw that we are more aware of the transitions in a written than in a spoken story.
2. Moore read twice to Barrett Clark the MS of a much-revised preface to In Single Strictness. After the second reading, Clark suggested that it was too long for one sentence; to which Moore replied: "It's clear, isn't it? If a long sentence is clear it is as good as a short sentence - better. Better, I say. Without long sentences there can be no literature!" (B. Clark, op.cit., p.75).

chapter to chapter, in one continuous flow(1). As Humbert Wolfe says:

"For him the structure of life, and therefore of art, was rhythmical. There was, he thought, an almost audible scansion in action that could and must be recaptured and recorded in the written page. The story to live must flow in and out of the rhythm of the characters. There must be no imposition of events, however picturesque, upon that inevitable flow(2)."

Thus, the 'melodic line', because of Moore's lack of critical terminology, is a nebulous, umbrella term, referring sometimes to narration, sometimes to stylistics. 'Reverie' is equally amorphous, but is used mainly to indicate the slow, meditative re-creation of past experience.

At its crudest, greater flow is merely a matter of inserting 'and', often to excess:

1. Wayne Shumaker (English Autobiography, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1954, Part III, chapter 8, "The Narrative Mode: Moore's Hail and Farewell", pp.185-213) has written an interesting study of how Moore bound together the Hail and Farewell trilogy (1911-4) with such themes as Wagner, 'Stella', etc., characters necessary to the theme being introduced volumes earlier, kept in our minds just sufficiently and then brought in when needed. This was the basis of his future work.
2. "Mr. George Moore's Work", "The Writer". Observer, Sunday, 22nd January, 1933, p.17.

"And they had gone downstairs together, and after walking about the streets in the neighbourhood of the Place de la Bourse, she proposed a café to him: and once out of the heat and noise of the street, some of her old liking for him had returned, though indeed she was annoyed with herself for having written the letter, and with him for having taken her at her word so easily(1)."

However, the device employed most frequently by Moore is the substitution of the present participle for the finite verb, thus creating long, flowing sentences:

"And then her thoughts passing from Harold to her mother, she remembered the pain that his mother's failings used to cause Harold during the last years of her life; for there was no denying that her mother often drank more wine than was good for her, and when that happened her tongue was unrestrained - she talked with her butler during dinner about the cedars of Lebanon; and though Harold admired his mother's contributions to the Saturday Review, he could not bring himself to accept them as sufficient atonement for her social transgressions(2)."

Comparison of the following passages from the 1905 and 1921 editions of The Lake reveals how the jerky style of the original is transformed by a characteristic addition of 'and', 'but', 'for' and the present participle:

1. Henrietta Marr, Celibate Lives, London, Heinemann, Ebury edition, 1937, pp.114-5.
2. Henrietta Marr, pp.101-2.

"...for a while. But he had never been out of sight of this lake except the years he had spent in Maynooth. When he left Maynooth he had pleaded that he might be sent to live among the mountains by Kilronan Abbey at the north end of the lake...when Father Conway died he had been moved round to the western shore. Every day in his life he walked by the lake; there was nowhere else to walk...(1)."

"...for a while, and he had only been out of sight of this lake in the years he spent in Maynooth. On leaving he had pleaded that he might be sent to live among the mountains by Kilronan Abbey, at the north end of the lake, but when Father Conway died he was moved round to the western shore; and every day since he walked by the lake, for there was nowhere else to walk...(2)."

Short sentences are combined into longer ones:

"Mildred looked at the cold face, so claylike, and trembled. The horror of the situation crept over her; she had no strength to go, and listened meekly to Ellen(3)."

"Etta looked at the cold face, so clay-like, and the horror of the situation creeping over her, she lost strength to go, and listened meekly to Ellen(4)."

How necessary this rewriting often was may be judged from the following crudity: "he had jumped into the road and squeezed through the stile; he had run across the field(5)." This becomes in the revision: "...he had jumped into the road, squeezed through the style, and

1. The Lake, 1905, pp.6-7.
2. The Lake, 1921, p.5. All references to the revised (1921) Lake are taken from the London, Heinemann, Ebury edition, 1936.
3. Mildred Lawson, Celibates, p.145.
4. Henrietta Marr; p.127.
5. The Lake, 1905, p.37.

run across the field(1)." But the revision of books like The Lake goes deeper than this; the following is characteristic:

"Once more standing at the edge of the lake,  
he listened. He could only hear...(2)"  
"and once at the edge of the lake, he stood  
waiting for nothing seemingly but to  
hear...(3)."

Sometimes, the process is exaggerated, and the first version reads better - for example, in the following passage from The Lake, where three sentences are made clumsily into one by means of adjectival and prepositional phrases and a present participle:

"...Church Island, the largest island in the lake, some seven or eight acres. Trees flourished there, and in the middle of the island were the ruins of the church from which the island took its name. Only an arch remained overgrown with bushes(4)."

"...Church Island, some seven or eight acres, a handsome wooded island, the largest in the lake, with the ruins of a church hidden among the tall trees, only an arch of it remaining...(5)."

Sometimes sentences are even distorted to produce greater flow:

1. The Lake, 1921, p.25.
2. 1905, p.39.
3. 1921, p.27.
4. The Lake, 1905, p.69.
5. The Lake, 1921, pp.47-8.

"Of landing places there seemed to be no sign(1)."  
 "...into which it was nearly time they should jump(2)."  
 "Out of whose toothless gums...(3)."

Whereas vocabulary is sometimes simplified - as in The Brook Kerith - construction is often complicated to obtain long, periodic sentences. And as with the sentence, so with the paragraph: the first seven paragraphs of chapter one of the 1916 edition of The Brook Kerith are reduced to one in 1927, the eighteen of this chapter to four, the twenty-eight of the second chapter to six, and the fifteen of the fourth chapter to three.

Equally important in Moore's later writing is the device of repetition to bind together narrative, speech and description. With great skill the prose of the following passage is bound together by the changes rung on the words 'Long Hand the Guff', 'jailer', 'demon', 'damned soul', 'hell', 'stream', 'ruined castle', 'key', 'punishment' and 'burning':

"She was giving him the usual religious instruction, hell, of course, figuring largely in it, and he had asked her if being burnt for ever hurt as much as being burnt for a short time. He knew nothing about burning at the time and his mother had laughed: and encouraged by her laughter he said: Is there no other punishment but

1. Hugh Monfert, In Single Strictness, p.117.
2. Hugh Monfert, p.116.
3. Hugh Monfert, p.117.

burning in hell? Oh yes, she had answered, and told him a little story - that one of the punishments of hell was the hopelessness of ever getting out of hell, and so that this torment of hope might be stimulated, the damned were allowed to try to get out of hell, to steal the keys. He had asked his mother where the keys were, and she told him of a ruined castle some miles from the main road, reached by a narrow lane, and that it was in this castle that the jailer of the damned dwelt. There was a little stream across the road over which the jailer was not allowed to pass, and the damned soul knew that if he could hit off the time when the jailer was having his dinner, he could take the keys from the rail on which they hung. The soul crawled along the little walls so that none should see him; once he had crossed the bridge he was in the power of the demon that lived in the ruined tower, and when he got under the walls of the castle his plan was to cry out: Long Hand the Guff are you there? If he cried three times he might be sure that Long Hand the Guff was away upon some other business. But Long Hand the Guff kept a good watch and before the soul had cried out for the third time: Long Hand the Guff, are you there? the demon was out of the ruined castle, and the soul fled, knowing that if he could only reach the stream he would be safe. But every moment Long Hand the Guff would gain upon him, till at last he would feel the great arm stretching out to seize him, and just as he put his foot into the water the hand would clasp about his neck and drag him back. None had ever escaped Long Hand the Guff. If he had asked his mother what punishment Long Hand the Guff put the soul to in the ruined castle he could not remember, but the flight of the soul from the ruined castle to the brook and the coming stench of the demon upon the unfortunate soul had sunk into his mind(1)."

---

1. Hugh Monfert, pp.138-9.

The 'dream' passage is characteristic in its repetition of Moore's favourite imagery:

"Those dawn dreams shake one's nerves, said Hugh; and strange to say I, who rarely dream, dreamed last night. We were very tired and for a long time we must have lain dozing; dreams, it is said, come just before waking. I wish I could remember my dream - something about a hermitage; for me it was one, though it was filled with eighteenth century furniture. You were dreaming of Wotton Hall, said Percy(1)."

Repetition of a word, phrase, or material object to obtain cohesion is employed frequently in the 1921 Lake(2). There is an excellent illustration of this in the repetition of "river", "traditions and symbols", "belief" and "merit" in the description of Poole:

"...Mr. Walter Poole's conversation was usually gentle, like a quiet river, and very often, like a quiet river, it rushed rapidly when Mr. Walter Poole became interested in his subject. 'How very superior all this is,' the priest said. 'The river of thought in him,' the interviewer continued, 'is deep or shallow, according to the need of the moment. If, for instance, Mr. Walter Poole is asked if he be altogether sure that it is wise to disturb people in their belief in the traditions and symbols that have held sway for centuries, he will answer quickly that if truth lies behind the symbols and traditions, it will be in the interest of the symbols and traditions to inquire out the truth, for blind belief - in other words, faith - is hardly a merit, or if it be a merit it is a merit that cannot be denied to the savages who adore idols(3).'"

1. Hugh Monfert, p.100.
2. See e.g. 1905, p.57; 1921, p.39. Also 'parasol', 1905, p.31; 1921, p.21.
3. The Lake, 1921, pp.97-8; not in 1905.

In the same way, the following meditation rings the changes on "serious", "secretary", "extraordinary" and "letters":

"'She seems interested in her work,' he muttered; and his mind wandered over the past, trying to arrive at a conclusion, if there was or was not a fundamental seriousness in her character, inclining on the whole to think there was, for if she was not serious fundamentally, she would not have been chosen by Mr. Poole for his secretary. 'My little schoolmistress.' the secretary of a great scholar! How very extraordinary! But why is it extraordinary? When will she write again? And every night he wished for the dawn, and every morning he asked if there were any letters for him. 'No, your reverence, no letters this morning;' and when Catherine handed him some envelopes they only contained bills or uninteresting letters from the parishioners or letters from the Board of Works...(1)"

Moore, in his revisions, took pains to introduce this repetition, as we can see from a comparison of the 1905 and 1921 versions of The Lake:

1905: "But what had he done in spite of Father Peter's warning...(2)"

1921: "...but unable to resist that beguiling tongue, for Mrs. O'Hara had a beguiling tongue(3)."'

1905: "He gashed his chin, however, for he could not keep his attention fixed on his work(4)."'

1. The Lake. 1921, p.81.

2. p.33.

3. p.23.

4. p.47.

1921: "...gashing his chin, however, for he could not keep his attention fixed on his chin(1)."

Such repetition of a material object to keep it in our minds is particularly frequent in his later work:

"...thinking of her bathroom and the comfort of it, remembering that in the hotel in the Quartier Latin there was no bathroom, and that she and Cissie and Elsie had had to go to some public baths, a thing that she disliked to do. Bathing, she had said, where all the bodies in the town have been...Etta turned over and over, thinking how pleasant it was to go straight from one's bedroom to one's bath; and returning from her bath in a white wrapper...(2)"

Repetition of proper names is employed in the same manner - for example, those of Gerard de Rousillon and the Emperor in Hugh Monfert(3), O'Grady in The Lake(4), or L'Homme Masqué in the following passage from Henrietta Marr:

- 
1. pp.32-3.
  2. Henrietta Marr, Celibate Lives, p.104.
  3. p.158.
  4. 1921, p.78.

"And then it began to be noticed, Davau said, that I disappeared from the auditorium when 'L'Homme Masqué' was in the arena, and to show that I was not 'L'Homme Masqué' I took a seat in full view of the public; and on that very night it so happened that 'L'Homme Masqué' only just escaped defeat. The man who was nearly overthrown was your cousin, Etta interjected. You were 'L'Homme Masqué' in turns(1)."

This is a wearisome trick, and it is interesting to note that what later became a deliberately introduced stylistic device began as a looseness in construction; compare the following passages from the 1905 and 1921 editions of The Lake - the first version's clumsiness is replaced by a subtle use of repetition:

"...perched on an alder bush; the bush was the only one amid a bed of flags and rushes(2)."

"...perched on a bush, the only one amid a bed of flags and rushes; 'an alder bush,' he said(3)."

The hunt metaphor in The Lake throws further light on his methods:

1905: "And to live on, never seeing her or ever hearing from her seemed to him the most unbearable lot that could have fallen to his share. The hunt was over, and the spoil lay hearing with dying ears the horns calling to each other in the echoing distances."

1. Herrietta Marr, p.131.
2. 1905, p.9.
3. 1921, p.7.

1921: "The grave is dreamless! But there might be a long time before he reached it, living for years without seeing or even hearing from her, for she would weary of writing to him. He began to dream of a hunt, the quarry hearing with dying ears the horns calling to each other in the distance...(1)"

In the later version, the personalisation of the hunt, the introduction of dreams, the repetition of 'dream' and 'hearing' and the effective use of assonance ('dreamless', 'reached', 'years', 'seeing', 'hearing', 'weary', 'dream') create a fine passage of tightly-knit prose.

Another of Moore's devices for binding together the narrative more tightly and achieving an unbroken story-line is the introduction of a fresh thought into the last part of a sentence:

"His books are not written for the many, but for the few, and he does not desire a larger audience than those with whom he is in natural communication from the first, and this without any faintest appearance of affectation(2)."

"Her forgiveness had brought real relief; but Miss Glynn said in her letter that she was alone in Berkshire, Mr. Poole having gone to London to seek information regarding the altars of the early Israelites(3)."

1. 1905, pp.234-5; 1921, p.135.
2. The Lake, 1921, p.97.
3. The Lake, 1921, p.81.

"But there, she had neither his skill nor his strength, not even strength to pull on her stockings, only just enough to pull them off and roll herself into bed again and rest, which she did, lying between sleeping and waking till the maid knocked at her door and handed her a letter from Elsie(1)."

"And the three marched across the grass plot, their arms about each other's waists, and whilst questioning Etta about herself and teasing her about themselves, they frequently looked where their lovers sat smoking, Etta's attention drawn to a girl who hung over Morton, desirous that he should listen only to her(2)."

Then there is the abrupt ending of a cadence on an open monosyllable:

"Oliver was in command of the raiders, and at first he seems to have been successful; he pillaged and burnt every town, gathering a large booty wherever he went, till a great host of Saracens surrounded his army; but Roland and the Crusaders came to his rescue, despite their belief that they would never see the light of another day(3)."

But 'flow' is not merely a matter of stylistics, and the 'melodic line' introduces major changes in narrative technique. One of the most important narrative devices used by Moore is the muting of a climax, the deliberate, sometimes ironic anticlimax. A good example of this occurs in the 1921 Lake(4) where there has been a long build-up to the introduction of Nora into the conversation

1. Henrietta Marr, pp.133-4.
2. Henrietta Marr, p.136.
3. Hugh Monfert, p.130.
4. The scene is not in 1905.

between O'Grady and Gogarty; at the moment when we expect the culmination, Moore plays down the introduction of the vital factor(1). O'Grady's departure is another good suspended cadence: it is not stated directly - merely, "till the car came round to take Father O'Grady away(2)," followed immediately by Gogarty's meditations. In Hugh Monfert, the wedding of Hugh and Beatrice is dismissed in a phrase(3), the muted climax underlining the central theme of the novel: it is the Hugh-Percy, not the Hugh-Beatrice relationship with which we are concerned.

Even more important is Moore's management of transitions. Changes of plane from narrative to thought and on to speech and reminiscence are smooth and unbroken:

"He had always looked upon his mother as the most unselfish of women, and to find her one of the most selfish frightened him; and his thoughts passing on he was drawn to seek excuses for her willingness to sacrifice his happiness. She is some years over fifty, and if she is to enjoy her grandchildren no time must be lost; that is her point of view, and she is so absorbed in her dream of grandchildren that she forgets me. He laughed aloud and repeated her words: You are the last. Her passion for grandchildren could be nothing else than it is, he added, for she married that the family might linger on for another couple of hundred years, having no thought for the fact that everything ends sooner or later, even the glorious name of Montferrat. And his thoughts deviating a little, he remembered her father, Joe Huxtable...(4)"

1. The Lake, 1921, p.88.
2. 1921, p.94.
3. First sentence of chapter 12, p.171.
4. Hugh Monfert, p.48.

Transitions from one passage of exposition to another are well managed: for example, the link between the quarrel and the Barn in Hugh Monfert(1). The delight in long, weaving sentences, the subtle changes of plane from narrative to dialogue and thought-stream to retrospect, and the smooth changes of speaker, are seen perhaps at their best in this story:

"But Hugh could not be shaken out of his lethargy, coma, stupor, whatever it was; he lay back inert and all Percy could get out of him was: I can't go over that story to-day, half of it is forgotten, Percy; my brain will not work. Whereupon Percy watched Hugh's great broad face, his long, loose mouth and his vague, shifting eyes, saying: I shall get nothing out of him today. It is strange, he added, to lie without seeing or hearing, and yet awake.

Percy's restless mind, plain upon his thin, pale face, was able to penetrate Hugh's almost animal indolence, now and again stirred by remembrances of Stanislaus College; the great, red-brick tower in which a bell tolled, bringing them to lessons and to play, the long narrow passage down which he was sent to the prefect's room to be flogged...(2)"

Morning passes into luncheon without apparent break(3), and speeches merge into one another(4). Changes of plane and person are skilfully introduced, and transitions are smooth, even where there is a paragraph division:

1. p.52.
2. Hugh Monfert, p.137.
3. p.73.
4. p.112.

"But do you think, Beatrice asked, that Percy is at present old enough - Has enough command of his talent? Hugh interjected. Indeed I do.

And the girl sat listening, her long thin hand (so like Percy's, Hugh thought) laid upon the open book, her eyes awake like Percy's when a thought flashed into her mind. Her thoughts do not move so quickly as his, he said to himself, but they move; and he continued to praise the drawings that Percy had made, taking note of the intellectual stir upon her face, a flushed face, shadowed with bright brown hair. A prettier face than Percy's, not so thin, but of the same cast of countenance, he thought during a pause that had fallen upon them. You have seen him draw then? Beatrice asked(1)."

The revised Lake, too, excels here. Sudden transitions are often removed from the first version by the alteration of a few words: for example, "They had been smiling gently, but suddenly she seemed to tell him...(2)" is changed to, "And wandering they went, smiling gently on each other, till she began to tell him...(3)." Again, in the 1921 edition, transitions from one narrative plane to another (from description to dialogue, thought-stream to retrospect) are smooth:

"Father O'Grady's coming had been a pleasure to him, for they had talked together; he had confessed to him, had been shriven. At that moment he caught sight of a newspaper upon his table. 'Illustrated Magazine', he muttered, his thoughts half away; and he fell to wondering how it had come into the house. 'Father O'Grady must have left it,' he said, and began to unroll the paper...(4)"

1. pp.146-7.

2. The Lake, 1905, p.225.

3. The Lake, 1921, p.131.

4. The Lake, 1921, p.95.

The following passage contains an excellent transition from speech to narrative, narrative to reverie and reverie to the magazine account viewed through Gogarty's eyes:

"'I suppose it isn't fair,' the priest said, 'to judge a man through his interviewer; but if this interviewer doesn't misrepresent Mr. Walter Poole, Mr. Walter Poole is what is commonly known as a very superior person. He would appear from this paper,' the priest said, 'to be a man between thirty and forty, not many years older than myself.' The priest's thoughts floated away back into the past, and, returning suddenly with a little start to the present, he continued reading the interview, learning from it that Mr. Walter Poole's conversation was usually gentle...(1)"

Transitions between letter and narrative are also subtle and varied in this edition(2). Skilfully handled transitions are woven, too, into the fibre of Henrietta Marr:

"...her father and mother had built a veranda on their return from one of their Italian journeys, forgetful that a veranda, as its name implies, is not English, and that a sloping roof, a portico, connected with a sturdily-built low house in grey stone, is an incongruous adjunct. The house would have been better without it, Etta reflected, though on a day like this, almost oriental, a veranda is something more than a piece of unnatural picturesqueness. We have been having the same weather here for some time, miss, said the butler, to whom Mrs. Marr used to address most of her conversation during dinner, and all the fields about are opening in great cracks...(3)"

1. The Lake, 1921, p.97.
2. See e.g. 1921, p.102.
3. p.105.

"...her thoughts often turned to Ralph Hoskin, whom she had met in the National Gallery in the very beginning of her career, before she knew anything of her craft. Ralph could help her. But will he come to Sutton if I write to him?"

She fell to thinking whether they were enemies or friends, and to discover which she began to recall the story of their friendship, how he had stopped before her easel and complimented her on her work, one of Gainsborough's landscapes(1)."

The whole tale is a tightly-knit web of narrative, moving easily from one plane to another: narrative, description, thought-stream, reminiscence and recollection, reported and remembered conversation, dialogue, and monologue. Moore's method of imaginative reverie weaves scene and summary so tightly together that it is almost impossible to extricate the two strands.

Again, transitions in the 1926 The Untilled Field, reveal the advance Moore has made:

- 
1. Henrietta Marr, p.112.

"And at six o'clock next Monday morning he was making his way to Corrie convinced that it was a mistake to interfere with the genius of the Irish people. 'Which is herding cattle today as it was when Finn McColl drank the drugged wine at Tara. Put we Americans are so superficial. We would set up industries in this pretty, pastoral country; we would teach them smelting, an art which they would have invented for themselves had it been in their nature: whereas - ' He stopped to admire, for though he was still some distance from the village the fair had already begun, buyers having advanced far out into the country so as to anticipate rivals. 'The finest herdsmen and finest horsemen,' he muttered to himself when a gate was held across the road, and a boy rode a horse barebacked over it with a rope in his jaws for a bridle. 'What they like is a horse - in their own pronunciation a harse - and a bad rider is as rare in Ireland as a bad cook is in France.' The jumping of the gate was acclaimed by a great clapping of hands, which suddenly ceased.

'The Angelus, sir,' a peasant said(1)."

Nature description, too, is often threaded in skillfully with thoughts and dialogue. The Welsh landscape in Hugh Monfert(2) permeates the boys' experiences, and the beautiful view seen by Monfert and Dr. Knight in the evening at Wotton Hall is woven in with Hugh's state of mind(3).

Transitions between chapters are also smooth in Moore's later writing. Two examples will serve to illustrate his method.

1. The Untilled Field, 1926, pp.220-1.
2. In A Mere Accident and John Norton, descriptions were mere purple patches.
3. Hugh Monfert, pp.62-3. Note the anti-climax at the close.

Mildred Lawson has the following transition from chapters 12 to 13:

Ch.12: "'You have wrecked two lives. Oh, that any one should be so wicked, that any one should delight in wickedness. I cannot understand.' 'You are accusing me wrongly...But let me go. It is not likely that we shall arrive at any understanding! 'Go then, you came to gloat, you have gloated, go.'

Ellen threw herself on a chair by the bed-side. Her head fell on her hands. Mildred whisked her black crape dress out of the studio."

Ch.13: "It was not until the spring was far advanced that the nostalgia of the boulevards began to creep into her life. Then, without intermission, the desire to get away grew more persistent, at last she could think of nothing else...(1)"

In Henrietta Marr, the transition from chapters 5 to 6 is as follows:

Ch.5: "You have wrecked two lives. Oh, that anybody should be so wicked, that anybody should delight in wickedness! I cannot understand it.

You are accusing me wrongly. But let me go. It is not likely that we shall arrive at any understanding.

Go, then.

Ellen threw herself on a chair by the bedside, and Etta whisked her black crape dress out of the studio."

Ch.6: "She began new pictures, attributing every failure to the death of Ralph, saying to herself or to Ethel Brand (if she happened to be a visitor at the Manor House, which she frequently was during the winter): Ralph was the only painter in England, at least the only one I knew, who could help me, who could criticise my work from a painter's point of view. You know what I mean? Ethel Brand, whose thoughts...(2)"

1. Celibates, pp.147-8.
2. Henrietta Marr, p.128.

So, by showing the effects of Ralph's death on Etta in this way, Moore creates a very close link in style and content with the previous chapter where she is in Ralph's house after his death. An even better example is the following:

Mildred Lawson

Ch. 13: "Elsie's letter gave explicit directions, she was not to go to Fontainebleau, she was to book to Melun, that was the nearest station, there she would find an omnibus waiting, which would take her to Barbizon, or, if she did not mind the expense, she could take a fly, which would be pleasanter and quicker."

Ch. 14: "A formal avenue of trim trees led out of the town of Melun. But these were soon exchanged for rough forest growths: and out of cabbage and corn lands the irruptive forest broke into islands; and the plain was girdled with a dark green belt of distant forest(1)."

Henrietta Marr

Ch. 7: "...and she read that she was not to go to Fontainebleau, but to Melun, where she would find an omnibus waiting that would take her to Barbizon; or, if she did not mind the expense, she could take a fly, which would be pleasanter and quicker. But be sure not to miss the five o'clock express, the letter said, and she felt that Elsie's letter had restored her to health and strength. Soon after she was out of the house in the street, making purchases, returning with them, enjoying every minute: the packing of her clothes, the drive through Paris to the Gare de Lyons, the train journey, and the long plains that Millet had painted."

1. Mildred Lawson, Celibates, pp.159-160.

Ch. 8: "So a formal avenue of trees leads out of the town of Melun, she said, and the plain is girdled with a dark green belt of distant forest(1)."

There is no break at all in the Henrietta Marr extract - though the final impression is one of artifice.

Moore was proud of his ability to write exposition and some of his later revisions are superb. Hugh Monfert, for example, begins with a tightly-knit first chapter(2) largely in the form of reminiscence while Hugh is shaving. We learn of Knight's coming down to mediate between Hugh and his mother concerning an heir. Contemplation of the motives for his mother's willingness to sacrifice his happiness leads naturally on to details of her background - in particular, her father, Joe Huxtable (a rich peasant who married her to the aristocratic Monfert), Hugh's childhood, her husband, her redemption of the estate from debt and the financial reasons for his not going to Oxford. All this might now be wasted, and so

1. Henrietta Marr, p.135.

2. The second and third chapters are by no means so good: Knight's letter rather clumsily imparts information about the schooldays of Hugh and Percy; there is a great deal of repetition of the story of Mrs. Monfert's economy and her desire for an heir, both she (chapter 3) and Hugh (chapter 2), putting their case to Dr. Knight; and, at one point, there is an absurd oversight, where a passage of dialogue (about Hugh's age) is repeated almost verbatim two pages later (pp.68 and 70). These two chapters, especially the long walk in chapter 3, with its tiresome descriptions, are extremely tedious. Moore had, no doubt, spent a long time polishing chapter 1 (as he did, later, the story of Long Hand the Guff). Chapters 2 and 3 were obviously not retyped sufficiently and illustrate once again Moore's difficulty with exposition.

we return to Knight as the mediator. The compression, economy and unity here are excellent, with smooth transitions from present to past, action to reminiscence: "and once more forgetful of his shaving...(1)"; "...and his thoughts passing on...(2,)"; "...and his thoughts deviating a little, he remembered...(3)"; "...and he began to consider...(4)"; "...and he continued in his thought...(5)"; "...and to atone for the thought that had come into his mind unasked, he dwelt on...(6)"; "...and he remembered...(7)"; "...and the image of himself and his mother...rose up in his thoughts clear and distinct. He could still hear her voice if he listened for it...(8)"; "...and he stood, razor in hand, appalled by the calamity(9)"; "...and he thought of...(10)"; "...All I ask (and again he began to shave himself)...(11)"; "...A sudden sense of the humour of this quarrel obliged him to stop shaving, and whilst thinking...he recalled...(12)"; "...and he stood thinking...(13)"; and "...stopping on the staircase...(14)."

1. Hugh Monfert, p.47.
2. p.48.
3. p.48.
4. p.50.
5. p.50.
6. p.50.
7. p.50.
8. p.50.
9. p.52.
10. p.52.
11. p.52.
12. p.52.
13. p.53.
14. p.53.

Moore does not continue too long with the facts; the story of Joe Huxtable is broken soon with, "Such thoughts as these must have come to his grandfather...(1)."

Questions, too, help to maintain the illusion: "Was it the desire to raise herself socially? It may have been that...(2)." The whole is an excellent illustration of the melodic line.

Another means of improving narrative flow is the introduction of phrases to render speech through the consciousness of the characters. It is interesting to note how this device, coupled with a tightening of the construction, omission of the repetitive 'vaguely' and the substitution of a present participle for a finite verb, increases the continuity of the following passage from The Lake:

1905: "The earth and sky were enfolding in one tender harmony of rose and blue, the blue shading down to gray, and the lake floated amid vague shores, vaguely as a dream floats through sleep. The swallows were flying high, quivering overhead in the blue air. There was a sense of security and persuasion and loveliness in the evening(3)."

1921: "And he watched the earth and sky enfolded in one tender harmony of rose and blue - blue fading to grey, and the lake afloat amid vague shores, receding like a dream through sleep(4)."

There are in The Lake many such beautiful passages of "thought blended with sense; and sense sunken in thought(5)."

1. p.49.

2. p.49.

3. The Lake, 1905, p.268.

4. The Lake, 1921, pp.156-7. See also 1905, pp.271-2; 1921, pp.158-9.

5. Freeman, op.cit., p.169.

The 'fountain speech' is a beautiful illustration of how in revision Moore bound together narrative, reflection and speech:

1905: "He had often desired a fountain - a garden without a fountain had always seemed to him incomplete - but it would be too expensive to bring water up from the lake. It was a pity, for a fountain amid his roses would be a refreshment for the garden all the summer-time. Now it occurred to him, and suddenly, that she shed light upon his life, just as a fountain sheds refreshment upon the garden. - she was like a fountain! A fountain was the only simile he could find that conveyed any idea of the extraordinary woman, controlled, no doubt, as the fountain, by some law; but a law hidden from him. The water seemed to burst up as it liked. The water sang a tune which could not be caught and written down in notes, but which nevertheless existed. The water was full of iridescent colours, changing every moment. The fountain was the best simile he could find for that joy and beauty and grace, that enchantment of the senses, one by one, which he had known, which had appeared to him in the name of Rose Leicester."

1921: "His thoughts melted into nothingness, and when he awoke from his reverie he was thinking that Nora Glynn had come into his life like a fountain, shedding living water upon it, awaking it. And taking pleasure in the simile, he said, 'A fountain better than anything else expresses this natural woman,' controlled, no doubt, by a law, but one hidden from him. 'A fountain springs out of earth into air; it sings a tune that cannot be caught and written down in notes; the rising and falling water is full of iridescent colour, and to the wilting roses the fountain must seem not a natural thing, but a spirit, and I, too, think of her as a spirit! And his thoughts falling away again he became vaguely but intensely conscious of all the beauty and grace and the enchantment of the senses that appeared to him in the name of Nora Glynn(1)."

Continuity is seen at its best in such a revision as the following, where stilted and circuitous narration(1) is replaced by a smooth piece of prose:

Lake 1905: "...the lake seemed to doze and murmur about the smooth limestone shingle. There was a chatter of ducks in the reeds; the reeds themselves were talking. This year the sky was brighter; there was more blue in it, the clouds lifted. The lake was very still; there was less mist about. Suddenly it occurred to him that it was this day last year that he had begun to grieve about her. As he wandered about the shore, sorrow had begun to lap about his heart like soft lake-water. He had thought he was grieving deeply, but that was because he did not know what grief was. Since last year he had learned all that a man could know of grief."

Lake 1921: "...and he remembered how the lake warbled about the smooth limestone shingle, and how the ducks talked in the reeds, how the reeds themselves seemed to be talking. This year the clouds lifted; there was more blue in the sky; less mist upon the water, and it was this day last year that sorrow began to lap about his heart like soft lake water. He thought then that he was grieving deeply, but since last year he had learnt all that a man could know of grief(2)."

One final aspect is worthy of mention: Moore's later narrative device of enriching the story with 'myths'. This is well illustrated by Hugh Monfert, where there are, in addition to slighter references, four main ones: the stories of Ferabras(3), Long Hand the Guff(4), Gerard de

1.  $7\frac{1}{2}$  sentences become  $2\frac{1}{2}$ ; 4 sentences become 1.

2. 1905, p.262; 1921, p.152.

3. Hugh Monfert, pp.130-1.

4. Hugh Monfert, pp.138-9.

Rousillon(1) and Floripar and Guy of Burgundy(2). These myths are told with great zest, are skilfully woven into the narrative and are made relevant by the 'monolithic' style, the manner of their introduction and their relation to the central character: Ferabras deals with belief in miracles, Long Hand with the stultifying effects of Catholicism, Gerard de Rousillon with physical and spiritual love, and Floripar with love and purity. In this way they are made acceptable to the reader(3).

---

1. Hugh Monfert, pp.158-9.
2. pp.160-1. The habit of inserting stories from literature into his work is present in Moore from his very first novel. And in A Mere Accident (chapter 2), he retells stories from Latin literature. No doubt this tendency is linked up with the often naive enthusiasm with which Moore rushed to tell everyone of each new discovery he made.
3. Some incidents, however, are almost totally irrelevant - e.g., the long account of the eccentric Welsh doctor (Hugh Monfert, pp.93-6), the cockle-woman, the woman dreaming of her dead son, and much of the inn scene (chapter 4). In spite of the 'oral narrative' features, Moore said in the 'Advertisement' to Celibate Lives (London, Heinemann, Ebury edition, 1937, p.viii) that the story of Hugh Monfert was lacking in melodic line - presumably he was referring to such episodes as these. (Sister M.-T. Courtney suggests (op.cit., p.63) that part of the reason was that Moore was bound by the model before him). Other incidents (such as Dr. Knight's walk with Mrs. Monfert (chapter 3) and the boys' visits to St. David's Cathedral (chapter 5, and Ramsey Island (chapter 6,) are made overlengthy by dreary and irrelevant dialogue.

Such are the main features of the melodic line.  
Priscilla and Emily Lofft is a good example of Moore's method.

### 3. Priscilla and Emily Lofft

In the Advertisement to In Single Strictness<sup>(1)</sup>, Moore wrote that Priscilla and Emily Lofft was a story of "two sisters - spinsters, one because of her devotion to her sister, the other from lack of sex impulse - and the characteristics of the two sisters are enshrined in a pathetic little story." The tale is indeed a simple one. Two sisters, leading sheltered lives, living together and reading the same books, have their first and only misunderstanding when, by accident, a copy of Emma Bovary falls into the hands of one of them, revealing to her something of the life she has missed, and only after her death is her secret discovered by her sister. The story is common to both versions, but the method of treatment is completely different, and a comparison of the two shows the great advance made by Moore in the intervening twenty years.

The exposition and narration in 1902 are quite straightforward and unsubtle: the sisters journey to Aix-les-Bains and stay at a 'pension' where they are forced to take separate rooms. Here we learn their history: they used to come to Dublin every year from the West of Ireland, but neither got within sight of

---

1. B. Clark, op.cit., p.116.

marriage until Ismena went to Paris to study art. Then both became engaged, all four met and, when the suitors saw the two sisters together, "neither loved his betrothed as much as he had done before(1)," and both engagements were broken off. Ismena and Letitia went to live in Dublin, and were finally forced to visit France for the sake of Letitia's health. Their life at Aix is described, the eternal novel-reading and Letitia's sudden resolve that she no longer desires a double room, a discovery arising from the fact that she has found, behind her dressing-table, a copy of Emma Bovary(2). Details of Flaubert's story are given and Letitia dwells on it night and day. Her motives and her line of reasoning for taking it back to Ireland are well drawn. On arriving home, she hides the book in the tool-house. The drawing-room and their novel-reading habits are described, and the discussion turns on Letitia's wishing to read novels about life, instead of Scott and Mrs. Henry Wood. She then goes into the garden, whose description and history are given. In the tool-house, she can read in

- 
1. Emma Bovary, Lippincott's Monthly Magazine, vol.69, May, 1902, p.590.
  2. Moore's second use of the book - cf. A Mummer's Wife.

peace. More details of Emma's story(1) are given, but the garden gate clicks and Letitia goes off to meet Ismena, who is looking for the French dictionary. Letitia says it is in the study and resolves to put it there. From this point, owing to rain, no opportunity of visiting the tool-house is presented to her, and when it is fine, Ismena is always with her. More pages of Scott are skipped by moving on the marker, and further pretence of reading him is practised while she speculates on how her book will end. Then she falls ill, and writes a note saying that there is a parcel in the summer-house, but Ismena is unable to find it and, when she returns, Letitia is dead. Only the garden assuages her grief. One day, remembering the parcel, she begins a search, finds the book, and discovers that she had read it in France in her youth. She then realises why Letitia was so often in the garden. The end leaves her wondering how Letitia could have done such a thing.

The story is written in a robust vein of rather broad humour, rare in Moore, of the type he was later to condemn so heartily. Particularly amusing are the suitors' reasons for breaking off the engagement(2); the book in Letitia's

1. Priscilla and Emily Loftt gains by cutting out most of the details of Emma's story; the name is also omitted in Priscilla and Emily Loftt, which concentrates on the book's influence on Priscilla.
2. Emma Bovary, p.590.

underskirt pocket thumping against her legs all the way to Ireland(1); the reading of the eternal Waverley novels under the great Victorian chandelier(2); Letitia's constant moving of the book-marker in order to deceive her sister(3); and her puzzlement about the possible ending of her book: was it to be a convent, or would Emma's husband die so that she might marry the clerk - "But then she would not be purished for her sins!(4)" The best humour in this vein, however, is the broad satire on the English novel:

"They had begun reading Mrs. Henry Wood before they left Dublin; Letitia was in the middle of the twelfth and Ismena was finishing the thirteenth volume. The librarian said he could supply them with all her works...(5)."

"One can discuss Scott or Dickens or Thackeray, but one cannot discuss emotions that one ought never to have felt with one's sister(6)."

"Letitia had never read anything like this in Sir Walter Scott or in Mrs. Henry Wood(7)."

"It was only in the garden she could read it; in the drawing-room she read Scott with Ismena(8)."

1. : Emma Bovary, p.591.
2. p.594.
3. p.594.
4. p.594.
5. p.590.
6. p.591.
7. p.591.
8. p.592.

"'You don't seem to care for Old Mortality?'  
 'I admire it, but I don't care to read it.  
 How many more novels are there, Ismena, in  
 this edition?'

'Thirteen or fourteen, I think, dear; we  
 ought to get through them all before February.'  
 In those fourteen novels Letitia saw nothing  
 but breastplates and ramparts...

'Before we went to Aix we began Mrs. Henry  
 Wood. You insisted on reading her and you  
 did not finish her works.'

'I read eighteen, and then I began to get  
 confused about the characters and to muddle  
 up the stories.' ...Felix Holt, if I remember  
 right, is about democracy, socialism and  
 Methodism. I should like to read about life,  
 about what people really feel...(1).'

Towards the end of this passage a more serious and even pathetic note is struck, as we arrive at the core of the story(2); but, on the whole, pathos is omitted from Emma Bovary.

The worst feature of the story is the feebleness of the ending: the clumsy redundancy of Ismena's finding the parcel on two separate occasions; the farcical, "when she brought it to her sister, her sister was dead(3)"; the lapse of six months before Ismena remembers the parcel, though Letitia's instruction was clear enough; the repetition; the feeble climax in

1. Emma Bovary, pp.592-3.

2. See also the scathing attack on the endings of Scott and Mrs. Henry Wood (Emma Bovary, p.594).

3. Emma Bovary, p.595.

which the whole effect is thrown away:

"She remembered that it looked like a book.  
At last she found it, and it was a book.  
She had read it in France long ago...(1);

Ismena's irrelevant reminiscence about the person who had given her the book; and the extremely weak final sentence,

"'Oh,' she said, 'who ever would have thought this of Letitia(2)!"'

Priscilla and Emily Lofft exists on a totally different plane. All the broad satire and comedy, farce, melodrama and Amico Moorini are omitted(3), and the keynote is a gentle, Turgenev-like pathos, well befitting the tranquil melancholy of faded lives. This highly successful change of key is the most striking feature of the revision. The blackbird immediately sets the tone, and Moore's characteristic later style is seen to perfection in the long first sentence:

- 
1. Emma Bovary, p.595. To have previously read it detracts from the effect of her sister's furtive reading, which is the core of the story.
  2. Emma Bovary, p.595.
  3. Priscilla and Emily Lofft has only one humorous touch of this kind: "It seemed to her hard to believe that a woman had ever lived in Ireland so licentious as the woman in the book, even during the Protestant ascendancy." (Priscilla and Emily Lofft, p.40).

"A blackbird whistled in the garden when Emily flung the drawing-room door open and gazed into the emptiness of the old faded room, her eyes falling straightway upon a portrait painted in clear tones of two children sitting on a green bank overshadowed by trees, turning the leaves of a picture book, twins, seemingly, so like were they one to the other, light-hearted girls, with brown ringlets showering about their faces(1)."

The drawing-room to which Emily returns after her sister's funeral brings memories flooding back into her mind, and her aunts are skilfully introduced by means of their paintings on the walls(2). Memory, thought and speech are skilfully woven together:

"...had she lived another two months, all would have been changed; and Emily asked herself if it would be harder for her to live in a new house, a house repapered, repainted, and refurnished, a house that would bear no memory of Priscilla, or to live in this old house in which her sister's presence lingered like a ghost. Every piece of furniture, every picture, reminded her of something she had said to Priscilla or Priscilla had said to her. If that bird would only cease, she muttered, and fell to thinking that she had hated to hear him sing on the day that Priscilla died(3)."

A blackbird had sung on the day they came to Dublin as children, and the bird provides a good transition to the

1. Priscilla and Emily Lofft, p.26. A strange touch of Zola description (Letitia's tooth with an ominous black speck on it (Emma Bovary, p.589) is removed in Priscilla and Emily Lofft).
2. p.26.
3. p.27.

story of their early life(1), their arrival as orphans in Dublin when they were ten years old. There follows a description and history of the garden, in which they are finally allowed to play. Emily returns to her present grief, and then the blackbird whistling outside reminds her of her schooldays, and the Reverend Mother's remark about the difference in ability between her and her sister. Their likeness is dwelt on and this leads smoothly to the memory of their being dressed similarly, when older, by Mrs. Symond, which in turn opens the way naturally to the relation of Emily's spinsterhood, the breaking off of her engagement with James Mease as he would not allow Priscilla to live with them, and the cause of Priscilla's death - because of the scandal they had to go to the country, where Priscilla caught a cold. A new thought now enters Emily's mind: perhaps Priscilla wishes her to stay in Dublin to remember her. Consideration of her reason for remaining introduces another excellent transition:

"Lonely evenings, she said, the words provoked by the sight of the books in the bookcase...(2),"

and so their reading is brought in. The books they have

- 
1. Priscilla and Emily Lofft, p.27.
  2. p.33.

read together remind her of the death, the doctor, his recommending the south again, and the details of Priscilla's illness. She remembers having met a friend coming from the house and, on being told that Priscilla was ill, she decided to get a doctor, but the next day Priscilla was dead, and Emily tries to forget her struggle for breath. Then she recalls that Priscilla died striving for speech: pencil and paper were brought, but she failed to write, and Emily wonders about the secret, for they had never hidden anything from each other.

"What could it be? They had never been separated; only at Aix had they ever occupied different rooms. And her thoughts passing out of Dublin...(1)."'

- so we learn of the stay in France, the separate bedrooms, Priscilla's preference for this state of affairs, her hiding something beneath her pillow, and Emily's present deduction that this, their sole misunderstanding, must be connected with the mystery. Narrative and dialogue are skilfully mingled:

- 
1. Priscilla and Emily Lofft, p.35.

"...the proprietress warned them that they would find it very hard to get a double-bedded room in any of the hotels. It being the height of the season, she said, you may not be able to get a room at all. And have to sleep in the streets, Emily whispered to Priscilla, forgetful that the proprietress spoke English. The nights are very cold, the proprietress answered, and the thought of the danger that a cold might be to Priscilla compelled her to accept the two rooms...(1)."

The scribbled words 'in the garden' are now(2) cleverly introduced. Because she may never find a solution, Emily wonders whether she will ever be less unhappy than she is now, and this leads naturally on to her friends' consolations, the story of her life since Priscilla's death, the gradual spiritualising of her grief and Priscilla's presence in the room or emergence from the potting shed. Sometimes, it seems that she is asking for Emily's help, and it is Emily's powerlessness that keeps her in Dublin, because she feels that a secret will be revealed to her. Years pass until one day, a shower drives Emily to the potting shed and she finds the novel and the dictionary, realising that she has discovered the secret. Details of the story are told naturally, and a former conversation is skilfully woven in. Finally, Emily's piecing together of Priscilla's motives for reading the book and for her subsequent secrecy

1. Priscilla and Emily Lofft, p.35.
2. p.36.

is masterly: she knew no man who could have given it her - so Priscilla must have found it - in her bedroom at Aix - a previous occupant must have left it - but the housemaids would see it - so it must have fallen behind a chest of drawers - but why did Priscilla bring it to England? - because she could not give it to the proprietress or leave it behind without tarnishing her reputation, and there were no fires to burn it - she was too ashamed to confess to Emily that she had read it, and therefore had to carry it to England - so Priscilla's spirit had kept Emily there to burn the book. The book is sacrificially burnt, Emily is freed, and she goes to bed as the blackbird whistles in the dusk. The burning of the book becomes a symbol of Emily's freedom from the house, its memories and conventions, and provides the story with a more definite ending than is usual in Moore(1).

The economy here is remarkable: almost every detail tells. Where Emma Bovary narrates a straightforward story beginning at Aix and ending in Dublin (with a backward glance, after the first incident, to show how the sisters came to Aix), Priscilla and Emily Loft begins after Priscilla's death, and so almost

- 
1. In Emma Bovary, there is no mystery, as we know from the beginning.

the whole is told in retrospect, skilfully interspersed with the present. Where the first story is plain narrative almost throughout - the only important dialogue is the passage on Scott and Mrs. Henry Wood - the later version, skilfully mingling action with speech, narrates the story through Emily's consciousness, thus ensuring a tight unity and coherence. Priscilla and Emily Lofft's greatest merit, of which there is no indication in Emma Bovary(1), is the beautiful, slow unfolding of the story by means of subtle transitions from one narrative plane to another, from past to present and back again to past. It is a superb example of Moore's later story-telling.

- 
1. Note the clumsiness of the transitions, e.g. Emma Bovary, p.591.

#### 4. The Untilled Field

Another book which went beyond mere stylistic revision was The Untilled Field(1), 1903(2). Moore dedicated the Irish edition, which was published in 1902, to his brother's sons, in the following words:

"My nephews, Rory and Ulick Moore, are native Irish speakers. They may be called to continue a literary tradition into the fourth generation. In this case, they will be able to do it in Irish and by writing in Irish they will continue the literary tradition of our country."

These tales, however, are not the traditional Irish story: Moore did not strive after effect, and the tales convince by their quietness and freedom from exaggeration, neither the comedy nor the pathos being accentuated. As the book was the first product of Moore's Irish period, it naturally reveals the influence of Yeats' symbolism and stress on the spoken word, especially in the idealisation of speech

1. Brown (op.cit., p.158) is perhaps right in seeing in the title a note of self-congratulation on his good fortune in staking an early claim on Irish folk art.
2. A Tauchnitz edition, with a few minor alterations, was also brought out in 1903. Moore informed Dujardin on 5th May (op.cit., p.45) that his book had had a good send-off, but he was not satisfied and had already recast it for Tauchnitz. He told Eglinton that he would approve of the omission of two stories, In the Clav and The Way Back: "They seemed to be less deep-rooted in the fundamental instincts of life than some of the others; and I have introduced many other little changes which will make the book more worthy of your acceptance." (Preface to Tauchnitz edition, May, 1903, p.6. To 'My dear John Eglinton'.)

rhythms. A kindred influence, and an important one, which Moore himself acknowledged, was that of Turgenev:

"Some chance words passing between John Eglinton and me as we returned home one evening from Professor Dowden's were enough. He spoke, or I spoke, of a volume of Irish stories; Tourguenieff's name was mentioned, and next morning...I was writing Homesickness...(1)."

"Stories about things, without moral or literary tendencies - stories like Turgenev's... That is what we want - a wonderful story(2)."

Turgenev's influence can be traced in both the matter and the method of Moore's book; in the whole tone and atmosphere of the stories: the treatment of the background, characters and occupations of the Irish people; the spontaneity and freshness; the pictures of peasant life told with irony and humour; the way in which the characters unfold from within; the domination by rulers (secular in Turgenev, religious in Moore); the concern

1. Lake, 1936, p.vii. See also Salve, London, Heinemann, 1947, Uniform edition, vol.9, pp.120-3.
2. Salve, p.122. See also the preface to the Tauchnitz edition where Moore says that he told Eglinton a story about an Irish dancing-girl, which led Eglinton to suggest that he should write a volume of short stories about Irish life, a book of memories unified by the independent observation and criticism of one returning to his native land. Eglinton (Introduction to George Moore. Letters to Edward Dujardin, p.14) confirms that he advised Moore to write a series of stories on the model of Sketches of a Sportsman.

with moods rather than plot; the departure from conventional narrative devices, such as climax; and the 'suspended cadence'(1). In one respect, Moore went even further than Turgenev: in his attempts to exclude wholly the author's voice. The stories evolve naturally, with little apparent manipulation by the author. Moore's search for the 'melodic line' has its roots here, and one of its effects is to rob his stories of Turgenev's life, warmth and mellowness. Nor, of course, was Moore the poet or creator his master was: The Untilled Field lacks the intensity of emotion and the creativity of Turgenev, and captures only in part the natural simplicity of the Russian writer. Nevertheless, The Untilled Field has a real sympathy missing from some of Moore's earlier books: to a technical exercise in the Turgenev manner (Celibates) has now been added the stimulus of Yeats and Ireland(2).

1. Flaubert's influence was also important here.
2. Dostoevsky's Poor Folk no doubt also influenced the tone of some of the stories about poverty. The book itself in turn influenced other writers: the racy speech possibly did inspire Synge's dialogue, as Moore claimed (Preface to The Untilled Field, 1936 edition, p.xiii). And Joyce's Dubliners certainly owed something to Moore's book, despite the change from a rural to an urban environment. So Moore's claim that he was writing to provide models for younger writers (Preface to The Untilled Field, 1936 edition, p.ix) has something of truth in it.

The book was altered slightly for the Tauchnitz edition, 1903(1).

In 1914, it was revised for publication by Heinemann. Gosse apparently did not think this revision successful; whereupon Moore wrote saying(2) that it was a frontier book between his new and his old style, and the revisions were undertaken to press it a bit over the frontier. The writing was smoother and the transitions easier, he said. The most important revision here was that of The Wild Goose. Broadly speaking, the first half of the story was thoroughly rewritten in 1914; then Moore seems to have tired of it, and the second half was revised in 1926. As the changes in matter and method were only partly completed in the 1914 edition, which thus represents a half-way stage in a continuous process of revision, it

1. See Bibliography. Many of the tales were published in the German Nation: a risky business for Meyerfield, for he could never be sure when Moore was satisfied with the text. After numerous alterations throughout the year, Moore told him, on 1st December, 1902, that the book was so much changed that he would have to retranslate it all except perhaps The Wedding Gown, and even that would have to be revised. Her Window was cut down, and rewritten at least twice (see e.g. letters to Meyerfield, 19th March and 1st December, 1902, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460), and Homesickness was claimed to be better in the revision, but would be better still in the proof (letter to Meyerfield, 26th September, 1902, National Library, Dublin, MS 4460).
2. Letter to Gosse, 121, Ebury Street, S.W., 1st March, 1915, Ashley Library, National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.

will be most profitable to study the first and last versions of the story.

The outline of The Wild Goose is roughly the same in all versions. Ned Carmady, a young American journalist visiting the land of his fathers, falls in love with and marries Ellen Cronin, staunchly Catholic daughter of a wealthy dairyman in the County of Dublin. She sees in him the future leader of the Irish people, and encourages him in his politics, only to find that he is anti-Catholic and anti-clerical. She reads his writings and confesses his activities to a priest; the marriage founders and he returns to America. But whereas the first version (1903) concentrates much more on the political background, the last (1926) deals almost solely with Ned's personal predicament. The main theme in both versions - as in Moore's next book, The Lake(1) - is the attempt to escape from the bond of Catholicism in order to find freedom for the soul, but the treatment differs:

- 
1. The Lake and The Wild Goose differ, however, in that Gogarty is escaping to his love; his love and freedom are identical. Ned is escaping from his love, for she represents the claims of Catholicism and Ireland.

"In Professor Tonks' studio on Saturday nights the doctrine always implicit in the conversation, sometimes explicit, is that art is correction, and Michael Angelo's drawings are often produced as testimony that he sought with unwearvings eagerness a new line more perfect than the last.

'If,' I said...'Michael Angelo held that art is correction, he would not shrink from the avowal that correction of form is virtue, and virtue being available to the smallest as to the greatest, the new edition of The Untilled Field will allow me to seek an outline that eluded me in the first version of The Wild Goose; and should I find the needed outline, the story will become, perhaps, dearer to me than the twelve that precede it and that need no correction(1).'"

The main changes in 1926 concern the religious material. In 1903, Ned's mind is inclined to pagan rather than Christian Ireland(2): he loves pagan myths and ancient sites(3); holds that cattle are part of the earth(4); intends to write a book, A Western Thibet(5); says that there is nothing like faith for fattening(6), that people talk of Cuchulain but prefer an Archbishop and are always paying a priest(7); and, like Gogarty, believes in the gospel of Life(8). The monks, he says, know how to look after their bodily welfare(9); and, when Ellen asks him if he is a good Catholic, he says that religion

1. Introductory note to 1926 edition, January, 1926.
2. The Untilled Field. 1903, p.303.
3. pp.303-4.
4. p.329.
5. p.304.
6. p.309.
7. p.304.
8. p.361.
9. p.317.

does not help them to love each other(1). He is interested only in the fight for free will against Catholicism(2); when she consults Father Brennan about the suckling of her baby(3), he protests violently against her submitting herself body and soul to the priesthood. And when Ellen objects that Catholicism cannot be condemned because of its priests, Ned says that the clergy deserve a better religion(4). He mocks baptism(5), makes fun of her belief in miracles(6) and passes satirical comments on newspaper references to 'worthy' parish priests and 'brilliant' young clergymen:

"His eyes went down the columns of the newspaper and he said, 'All the old flummery. Ireland's fidelity to her religion, etc., her devotion to Rome, etc., - to everything,' he said, 'except herself. Propagations of the faith, exhortations to do as our ancestors had done, to do everything except make life joyous and triumphant.'...He read of 'worthy' parish priests, and a little further on of 'brilliant' young clergymen, and at every meeting the chair was taken by the 'worthy' or by the 'good' parish priest.

...And he heard daily of new churches and new convents and the aquisition (sic) of property by the clergy. He heard tales of esuriency and avarice, and the persecution of the dancing girl and the piper.

'The clergy,' he said, 'are swallowing up the country,' and he looked for some means whereby he might save the Gael(7)."

1. 1903, p.320.
2. pp.330-1.
3. pp.340-1.
4. p.342.
5. p.342.
6. p.343.
7. pp.343-4.

He looks forward to the time when he will be able to say that the Gael has spent enough on his soul and should spend the rest on his body - but though the population is declining, priests will not admit that there are too many churches: the subtle ecclesiastical mind knows that, when men cease building churches, they cease to be religious:

"Long years ago in America he had watched a small snake trying to swallow a frog. The snake sucked down the frog, and the frog seemed to acquiesce until the half of his body was down the snake's gullet, and then the frog bestirred himself and succeeded in escaping. The snake rested awhile and the next day he renewed his attack. At last the day came when the weary frog delayed too long and Ned watched him disappear down the snake's gullet.

A good deal of Ireland was down the clerical throat and all would go down if Ireland did not bestir herself...A nation is successful when its forces are at balance, and nations rise and fall because the centre of gravity shifts...

Ned did not look upon religion as an evil; he knew religion to be necessary; but it seemed to him that the balance had been tilted in Ireland(1)."

He makes anti-clerical speeches(2); reads a Nihilistic book(3); and tells Ellen he is trying to save the clergy from themselves(4). Ellen comes to see that he hates, not priests but religion, and that his hatred is influenced

1. 1903, pp.345-6.
2. p.347.
3. p.348.
4. p.350.

by his reading(1). In his speech at the Rotunda, joy is to be the keynote: that Catholics are leaving Ireland because there is no joy; the economic causes of emigration are only secondary; if his critics say that Ireland cannot afford pleasure, his reply is that fifteen million pounds are spent every year on religion(2). You cannot have a religion, he says, without a country, a clergy without laity. In Ireland, as the laity decline, the clergy are actually increasing(3). Moreover, a celibate clergy cannot continue the population; at the present rate, Ireland will disappear into America in twenty-five years(4). The clergy are increasing their wealth and land enormously, he says, as estates pass to them in increasing numbers(5); all teaching is now done by clerics; and if Ireland is the poorest country in the world, the Irish Church is richer than any other. All money in Ireland goes into religion, he says:

"Heaven may be for the laity, but this world is certainly for the clergy(6)."

Money is not even being distributed fairly in religion, he claims: the curates are destitute while the bishops

1. 1903, p.356.
2. pp.374-5.
3. p.376.
4. p.377.
5. p.378.
6. p.379.

live in luxury(1). When Father Murphy denounces Ned's statement that people are emigrating in search of sin, Ned wonders why the audience cannot see the contrast between his views and his well-fed appearance(2). The curates, says Ned later, are merely ecclesiastical serfs(3). He attacks, too, the ugliness of Church architecture(4) and the Church domination of the newspapers(5). Finally, he quotes indiscreetly one day John Mitchell's words, "The Irish would be free long ago only for their damned souls," and the tide turns against him. A priest says that this is French Revolutionary doctrine and a bishop denounces his words as the words of Anti-Christ(6). But Ned continues to believe that the interests of Ireland are always sacrificed to those of Rome(7) and that Ireland is suffused in "a mean ineffectual atmosphere of nuns and rosaries(8)."

In addition to Ned's criticisms, the 1903 edition attacks the Confessional(9), which though viewed through Ellen's sympathetic eyes, emerges as a solace for battered

1. 1903, p.379.
2. p.381.
3. p.383.
4. p.344.
5. p.384.
6. p.384.
7. p.387.
8. p.388.
9. pp.360-2.

old charwomen and young girls forced there by their parents(1).

The 1926 version, on the other hand, contains only a few references to religion. Ned tells Ellen that Ireland is still going Romewards, and that this is not his way(2); that a shrine outlasts its creed(3); that it is a matter of indifference to him which religion Ireland gets, so long as it is a new one(4); and that heretics are interested in religion, while others are content with a religious formula because it is more comfortable(5). He still satirizes the idea of a baby's exclusion from heaven without baptism(6). He is also to edit the 'Heretic', and the agrarian movement is to be followed by an anti-clerical movement to rid Ireland of its priests and suppress the monasteries and convents - Ned would advocate that people should leave their money to their relations instead of to their priests(7). Moreover, he composes an article on Jesus, Paul and Patrick as heretics: Patrick is Ireland's sole heretic, he says, and, ever since the tenth century, Ireland has been

1. It has the defect of being third person narration, insufficiently linked to the central character.
2. The Untilled Field, 1926, p.278.
3. p.217.
4. p.274.
5. p.274.
6. p.260.
7. pp.265-6.

sinking deeper, struggling to free herself but held back by the parish priest; if another Patrick appeared, Ireland would not listen(1). But this is virtually all. The attack on Catholicism is thus greatly modified, and it is confined to the priests rather than their religion(2). In 1903, Ned is concerned especially about Ireland's fate as the priests strengthen their grip - this is the point of his tirades against their acquisition of wealth and property and his tale of the snake and the frog. So in the first edition he is involved in a conflict that is both social and personal: he seeks salvation for himself and the Gael; in 1926, characteristically, the social side is almost entirely deleted and interest is centred on Ned's personal problem. This change brings about greater unity and a simplified story line. The national/social and personal themes are uneasily combined in 1903 and too much detail obscures the outline of the story; in 1926, stress is laid almost wholly on temperament, with religion subordinate and in perspective; the Church is important only insofar as it illustrates Ned's character. It is this(3) which makes the 1926 version

---

1. 1926, pp.274-5.

2. pp.260-1.

3. Cf. The Lake, 1921.

such a success(1).

The corollary to all this is that the background of Irish life is less substantial in 1926: there is little of heroic myth or contemporary politics(2). Again, there is insufficient exposition of Ned's desire for freedom to explain convincingly Ellen's reaction to the realisation that her money is to finance anti-clericalism(3); and her doubts(4) whether her husband will continue to live with her seem unjustified because we know so little of his politics. Omission of a passage such as the following also weakens the background material:

"The fight for free will would have to be fought in Ireland some day, and this fight was the most vital: but he agreed with her that other fights would have to be fought and won before the great fight could be arranged for. The order of the present day was for lesser battles, and he promised again and again he would not raise the religious question, and every time he promised his wife his life seemed to vanish. The lesser battles were necessary, but it was the fight for free will that interested him. A politician is the man who does the day's work; he must not forget that; and he was a politician(5)."

1. As a result of the changes in the religious theme, several minor characters disappear - e.g. Father Murphy, the young curate who supported Ned at the Rotunda, the old charwoman and the young girl.
2. e.g. Ellen's nationalism and Irish speech are considerably modified. The Ireland of the 1926 edition is more modern; that of the first edition is the Ireland of 1903 with all its fermenting politics, religion, nationalism and Irish language movement. The 1926 edition loses considerably by its omission.
3. 1926, p.265.
4. 1926, p.268.
5. 1903, pp.330-1.

However, the introduction of the fair restores something of the balance and, on the whole, there is sufficient background in 1926, at least as much as in The Lake.

The restriction of theme is connected with an important change in technique. In the first place, the 1903 version shows almost no grasp of a continuous treatment of a period of time. The lengthy retrospective exposition dealing with Ned's past life is succeeded by his hearing of Ellen and learning of her past from his landlady. He then meets her in the house, and, on their fourth encounter, proposes to her. The marriage is reported, and then come the pleasures of marriage and of electioneering, rather loosely fused, and an awkward transition to America:

"He turned and entered into conversation with some people who interested him, and the day passed in conversation. 'It is a curious change,' he said, three weeks later, as he walked home from a restaurant...(1)."

This is followed by the episode of the suckling of the baby and a badly handled section in which Moore brings together the various aspects of Catholicism that Ned dislikes, followed immediately by a host of satirical comments on priests referred to in the newspaper. Then come a long narrative account of his attitude to religion,

---

1. 1903, pp.332-3.

the quarrel and reconciliation, Ellen's betrayal and their parting, the overlengthy Rotunda speech, the wild geese, and finally his departure for America. All this material is disjointed; there is no sure grasp of events; and tension is relaxed in various ways. There is too much description in the suckling incident(1), in Ned's preparation for his proposal(2), and in the proposal scene itself(3). Too many examples of Ned's anti-clericalism(4) are given, along with an excess of background material(5). The lapse of time occurring when Ned goes to America relaxes the narrative(6) and author explanation of intervals in the story breaks the continuity. As Gettmann says(7), when Ned walked from one house to another, Moore felt bound apparently to trace his steps(8).

The revised version is a great improvement. The quarrel incident is tightened up so that it becomes one continuous scene; the garden episode, the child's going

1. 1903, pp.333-40.
2. p.315.
3. e.g. pp.327-9.
4. e.g. pp.340-4.
5. e.g. pp.344-7.
6. This period is cut down successfully in 1926, with the telegram coming at the beginning of section 4, immediately after he has gone to America at the end of section 3.
7. Op.cit., p.550.
8. e.g. pp.322-3, 307.

to bed, and a section of the drawing-room scene are omitted; and comment and narrative are reduced(1). Thus, in 1926, episode follows episode without intervening matter.

Again, Moore removes many indications of the past tense: 'she said one day'(2), 'another time'(3), 'and from that day'(4), 'but next day'(5), 'one day'(6), 'he said one morning'(7), 'sometimes he thought'(8), 'He used to go...'(9), 'But next day'(10), 'about this time'(11), 'next morning'(12), 'on another occasion'(13), 'And presently Ned came back with a net'(14).

Many passages of summary are skilfully dramatised, including the exposition of Ned's and Ellen's background(15).

1. 1903, pp.352-5; 1926, pp.262-3.
2. 1903, p.372.
3. p.372.
4. p.372.
5. p.356.
6. p.383.
7. p.384.
8. p.385.
9. Replaced by the first sentence of section 6 in 1926, a straightforward statement: "The beautiful outlines of Howth..." (1926, p.273); whereas the 1903 edition has: "He used to go for long walks on the hills, and one day, living in the furze amid the rough grass..." (p.385).
10. 1903, p.356.
11. p.344.
12. p.343.
13. p.325.
14. p.318. This becomes: "And when he came back with a net..." (1926, p.240).
15. 1903, pp.301-4 (Ned); pp.305-6 (Ellen); 1926, pp.235-8 (Ned); e.g. p.229 (Ellen). The opening sentences establish immediately the key to the whole story: that a shrine outlasts its creed (1926, p.217).

Especially worthy of note is the fact that the brief narration of Ned's acquaintance with Irish life(1) is replaced by a dramatic six-page(2) account of the fair with its vivid dialogue and lively portrait of the bustle and turmoil: the man picking up a chicken which has been trodden on by cattle, and putting it in his pocket, thinking no one observes him; the giant Moran; the old woman with the skinny cow, and the man who is prepared to bet any gent 2/6d. that he can read a newspaper through the animal; the lively exchanges with the old-clothes men; Ned's inability to cope with the smell in the tap-room; and the successful drovers getting drunk in the pub. After their first meeting, in 1903(3) both Ellen and Ned watch the stars and think of marriage, the future, and fate. This long passage of narrative, unreal in its duplication of their attitudes, is replaced in 1926 by a dramatisation of their relationship. Similarly, in the proposal scene, much of the narrative is changed into dialogue:

- 
1. 1903, p.304.
  2. 1926, pp.220-6.
  3. pp.311-3.

1903: "He was told she was in the garden, and he was glad to dispense with the servant's assistance(1)."

1926: "'Miss Ellen isn't in the house, sir. You'll find her fishing in the garden(2).'"

"Ellen asked him if he would like to see the child(3)," becomes,

"Where is baby?(4)."

Again, Moore's customary essays on Irish history(5) and - as in the following - on marriage, are transformed into a kind of interior monologue:

1903: "Well, the sensual coil was broken, and if he did not follow her now she would understand that it was broken. He had wanted freedom this long while. They had come to the end of the second period, and there are three - a year of mystery and passion, and then some years of passion without mystery. The third period is one of resignation. The lives of the parents pass into the children, and the mated journey on, carrying their packs. Seldom, indeed, the man and the woman weary of the life of passion at the same time and turn instinctively into the way of resignation like animals. Sometimes it is the man who turns first, sometimes it is the woman. In this case it was the man. He had his work to do, and Ellen had her child to think of, and each must think of his and her task from henceforth. Their tasks were not the same. Each had a different task; she had thrown, or tried to throw, his pack from his shoulders. She had thwarted him; or tried to thwart him. He grew angry as he thought of what she had done. She had gone into his study and read his papers, and she had then betrayed him to a priest(6)."

1. 1903, p.316.

2. 1926, p.239.

3. 1903, p.352.

4. 1926, p.261.

5. 1903, pp.303-4; 1926, p.217.

6. 1903, p.371.

1926: "The sensual coil that had bound them was broken; once more he was a free man. He was glad, and fell to thinking how mysteriously life works out her ends, for they had come to the second period without knowledge of the course or destination of their lives.

'For there are three periods,' he said - 'a year of mystery and passion, then some years of passion without mystery, and a period of resignation, when the lives of the parents pass into the children and the mated journey on, carrying their packs. Seldom, indeed, do the man and woman weary of the life of passion at the same time and turn instinctively into the way of resignation, like animals. Sometimes it is the man who turns first, sometimes it is the woman. In our case it is the man. Each has his and her work to do; each has a different task. She has thrown, or tried to throw, my pack from my shoulders, thwarted me, or tried to thwart me, for to do so is her mission, part of the general mission of woman. But life is interested in the man, too; yet Ellen was sent into my study to read my papers so that she might betray me to the priest(1)."

These changes create greater unity and continuity, and show the advance made by Moore in his handling of narrative. Susan Mitchell(2) says that the charm of The Wild Goose was a delicate thing which the 1914 edition shattered; that Moore's passion for rewriting led him astray in The Untilled Field. On the whole, however, the 1914 and 1926 'melodic line' treatment is a considerable improvement, though the polemical interest is lost.

1. 1926, pp.271-2.

2. Op.cit., pp.74-5.

By 1931, Moore was once again working at The Untilled Field: the final version of the book, published by Heinemann in that year, contained the same stories as the 1926 edition, except that In the Clay and The Way Back(1), the two stories rejected from the Tauchnitz and later editions, were rewritten as a new story, The Fugitives. Moore was still seeking the 'melodic line'. In the Clay (the first story in the book) is feebly written; the 'flashback' of Rodney's life(2) is clumsy; the exposition is too long(3), almost half the story-length, and joins on crudely to the main incident. The two strands (Rodney's working out what happened to the statue, and Lucy's account of Father Tom's realisation that she is the model) criss-cross uneasily. The whole story is long drawn out, Lucy's dialogue with Rodney bears on caricature and her departure is incredible. Similarly, The Way Back (the final story) is static, comprising only Harding's account of his meeting with Lucy and the conversation on Ireland. The dialogue between Rodney and Harding is unreal, the humour is unsuccessful, Harding's meeting with Lucy coincidental and the arson episode fatuous. The

1. Both Heinemann, 1903.
2. p.7.
3. Cf. A Mere Accident.

second story opens like another episode of the first, and references to, for example, the broken statue show that it was intended as a sequel. It was thus logical to combine the two into one story. Fugitives transfers Carmady to the beginning of section 2 and omits his anti-Catholic and anti-Irish rantings, most of the discussion and Harding's motives for returning to Ireland(1). The later version thus gains greatly in unity and compression. It ends on a strong relevant note: the priests discussing nudity. But, in spite of the improvements, Fugitives remains two isolated episodes dealing with the same characters and joined only by the sentence:

"A month later Rodney and Carmady met by chance in Piccadilly(2),"

and by Harding's introduction of the third exile, skilful though this is. The theme and the intention to satirise Ireland are present in both versions, though less evident in 1931. In 1903, the first story centres on Catholicism, the second on Lucy. She and Rodney (and, to a lesser extent, Carmody) are victims of Ireland, and this is intended to be the main strand of the first version, but there is only an unhappy compromise between the two elements

1. The 'flashback' is removed. Characters such as Carmody and the charwoman are reduced to their true dimensions, and irrelevant material such as Rodney's childhood history and artistic career is omitted.
2. London, Heinemann, Ebury edition, 1936, p.235.

in both the 1903 stories. In 1931, the same division obtains in the two parts, though, to bring it in line with the Lucy story, the anti-Irish element is cut to a minimum. The revision thus follows the pattern of the revised A Drama in Muslin and The Wild Goose in its movement from a political to a personal theme.

## 5. The Lake

After The Untilled Field came The Lake. The first version(1) marked the most important turning-point in Moore's novel-writing career. French influences were still present: the book was dedicated to Edward Dujardin, whose Les Lauriers sont coupés, the first 'interior monologue' novel, no doubt influenced Moore; Mallarmé's influence, too, can be seen in the effective use of symbolism. But these were remote from Zola. The book was Moore's furthest departure from Naturalism, continuing as it did - though analysis has become 'reverie' and the protagonist's situation is reversed - Evelyn Innes' spiritual doubts. It was written at a time, as Eglinton says(2), when the cast of his mind ceased to be almost French(3). The two great new influences in his work were Yeats and Turgenev(4). It was Yeats who told Moore that his mind was "argumentative and abstract"(5) and The Lake was perhaps Moore's reply to this criticism: Gogarty's intellectual reasons for rejecting dogma are not shown.

1. London, Heinemann, 1905.
2. Letters from George Moore to Edward Dujardin, 1886-1922, p.14.
3. As Hone says (op.cit., p.261; see also J. Hone, "George Moore. The Making of a Writer", Times literary Supplement, 29th February, 1952, p.150), Moore in 1905 returned to half-hidden memories, and the change determined the form and content of all his later work.
4. A. N. Jeffares points out (George Moore, London, Longmans Green, "Writers and Their Work", no.180, 1965, p.25) that Moore's movement from Esther Waters to The Lake parallels that of Joyce from Dubliners to A Portrait of the Artist.
5. Hone, op.cit., p.261.

Turgenev's influence was equally important: witness the change-over from external to internal, from thesis to simple narrative; Gogarty's mental struggles; his frustrated love; the lyricism of landscape, cloud and lake, distant and near objects; and, above all, the way in which memories, thoughts, acts, peasants' dialogue, meditations on local history, observations, moods, atmosphere and landscape are all projected through Gogarty's consciousness, so that landscape is absorbed into character. Turgenev's influence on Moore is seen at its best in The Lake(1).

The Untilled Field and The Lake were the foundations of Moore's later manner, and the latter was the first book in which he began to obtain mastery over a true style; the first book, too, with its slow movement, of which his detractors were able to complain that he seemed more interested in style than content; the turning-point for those who criticised his pre-Lake naturalistic style and those who attacked the post-Lake monotony of his prose 'epics'. But though the stylistic roots of The Brook Kerith and Héloïse

1. Wagner was another influence, Moore liked to think: "...the writing of The Lake would not be as it is if I had not listened to 'Lohengrin' many times;...the pages in which an agitated priest wanders about a summer lake recall the silver of the prelude. The sun shining on the mist, a voice is heard in vibrant supplication, is (sic) the essence of the prelude..." ("The Nineness in the Oneness", The Century Magazine, vol.xcix, n.s. vol.lxxvii, November, 1919, p.66. Also in The Chesterian, n.s. no.1, September, 1919.)

and Abelard are to be found in his Irish stories, monotony has not yet set in.

The revision of the book in 1921(1) was Moore's greatest achievement in imaginative reverie. Its structural and stylistic changes, which are more thorough and far-reaching than those in any other of his works, show the remarkable advance made by him in his handling of narrative.

The basic story is the same in both versions, but the later edition has a number of significant alterations which improve greatly the presentation of the theme. First, there is a change in viewpoint. In 1905, Moore was content to divide up the correspondence between the hero and heroine in roughly equal proportions; in the revised version, Gogarty's correspondence is almost five times the length of Nora Glynn's(2). A great increase in unity and concentration is thus obtained by the focussing of interest on the

1. London, Heinemann. All references to this text are taken from the London, Heinemann, Ebury edition, 1936, which is identical with the 1921 edition.
2. Rose Leicester, 1905. The number of letters indicates little: 1905, Gogarty to Rose, 15; Rose to Gogarty, 6. 1921, Gogarty to Nora, 14; Nora to Gogarty, 6. But the proportion of matter is highly significant: Gogarty's letters to Rose constitute c.73 pp., Rose's to Gogarty, c.65 pp; Gogarty's to Nora, c.40 pp., Nora's to Gogarty, 8½ pp. Gogarty's letters form approximately the same proportion of the whole book in 1905 and 1921 (about 1/5), but not the same proportion of epistolary matter (1905 approx. ½; 1921 approx. ¾). The heroine's letters are drastically reduced and narrative/reverie is increased in 1921 in proportion to the whole book. Thus, owing to the reduction of the heroine's correspondence, Gogarty's letters play a more prominent part

central character. The restriction of viewpoint intensifies, simplifies and gives direction to the whole course of the story, while allowing the reader to identify himself more closely with the central figure.

This effect is heightened by a shift in the balance between narrative and epistolary matter. On completion of the book, Moore was obviously doubtful about the correspondence. He told Maurice(1) that The Lake had many admirers, some even thinking it his finest book, but that the best critics(2) thought the correspondence the least interesting part of the novel:

cont. in 1921 than in 1905, and Rose's consequently less. In 1905, Rose has nearly half the total of epistolary matter and about 1/5 of the whole book; in 1921 she has approximately 1/6 of the total of epistolary matter, and about 1/24 of the whole book. (The later version is a little shorter than the earlier). The 1905 edition leaves one with the impression of very long, irrelevant letters by Rose; in 1921, these suffer drastic excision.

1. Seaford House, Belgrave Square, S.W., 26th December, (1905), National Library, Dublin, MS 2646. See also letter to Mme. Emily Lorenz Teyer, 4 Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 26th March, 1907, National Library, Dublin, MS 1595.
2. See e.g. Athenaeum, review of The Lake, no.4075, 2nd December, 1905, p.758.

"It wouldn't be improved by merely shortening the letters - the difficulty seems insuperable, how to write natural letters out of which a girl like the spring would emerge a girl with a white face and her hands wet with flowers. You are right about the letters..."

This makes it clear that Moore had doubts about the heroine's letters, but not about the epistolary technique as such; that he retained the letter-form in the revision because it served its purpose: to render "the flux and reflux of sentiments"(1) in Gogarty's soul, while at the same time providing a solid framework to ensure against vagueness. He did not think the epistolary method was bad; but, by 1921, he had come to think that 'imaginative reverie' was better. He did not transpose the whole of the novel (the task of revision was already large enough), but he did make important changes.

First, reverie is added in 1921 at several significant points. After the heroine's first letter to Gogarty, the 1905 edition has two sentences, purely factual(2). These are replaced in 1921(3) by a page of reverie, with subtle intermingling of thought and narrative, Gogarty realising how much Nora hates him, reflecting on her unawareness of

1. Preface to 1921 edition (Ebury edition, 1936, p.viii).
2. 1905, p.109.
3. pp.70-1.

his agony and indulging in self-justification. Nora's second letter to Gogarty is interrupted to give his reactions, and the letter is followed by three-quarters of a page of his thoughts, his joy at her forgiveness and his reflections on her character(1); whereas, in 1905, Rose's letter is followed immediately by a letter from Gogarty(2). Again, a page of reverie, dealing with Gogarty's profound concern about Nora's position as Poole's secretary, and his annoyance with O'Grady's apparent failure to appreciate the dangers of such an intimate relationship(3), is inserted after O'Grady's letter to Gogarty. After Nora's third letter, the 1921 edition has a quarter-page reverie in which Gogarty ponders over its uncharacteristic nature(4); and between the heroine's fourth letter and Gogarty's reply over a page of narrative and imaginative reverie is included(5).

---

1. 1921, p.81.

2. 1905, pp.132 ff.

3. 1921, pp.82-3. 1905 has neither the O'Grady letter nor the reverie.

4. pp.101-2. Not in 1905.

5. 1921, pp.110-1.

The significant fact here is that reverie is inserted after four of the heroine's six letters to Gogarty: the 1905 edition already included comment after the remaining two, so that in the revised version Gogarty's reactions are shown after all Nora's letters. All this matter is added at the expense of three very long, largely irrelevant letters from Rose(1). In addition, reverie in the 1905 edition is expanded in 1921(2).

Letters, then, are not rewritten as reverie, but have reverie added and are, to a certain extent, replaced by reverie, other letters and incident(3). Sometimes, straight narrative is strengthened by reverie, as in the striking episode in which Gogarty walks miles with his curate, Moran, in order to prevent his drowning his loneliness in drink.

A study of the proportions of narrative/reverie and correspondence in 1905 and 1921 emphasises this change:

1. Freeman, op.cit., p.169, is thus correct when he says that, in some degree, letters are replaced by reverie. Gettman (op.cit., p.546) misinterprets Freeman here: reverie is introduced at the expense of Rose's letters; it is not that Gogarty's letters are rewritten as reverie.
2. e.g. 1905, p.209; 1921, pp.118-9; 1905, p.263; 1921, p.153, where Moore probably wishes to lengthen Gogarty's last reverie before his departure.
3. e.g. Rose's letters are replaced by O'Grady's visit, his letters, and Gogarty's reactions.

letters in 1921 constitute just over  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the book, while narrative occupies almost  $\frac{3}{4}(1)$ . In 1905, the corresponding proportions are: letters, just over  $2/5$ ; narrative, just under  $3/5(2)$ .

So, too, with the sequence of letters and narrative in the two versions. In 1905, in the important middle section of the novel, from letters 8 to 23, there are only 5 sections of narrative, and letters have a massive preponderance(3). In the equivalent section in 1921(4), which thus has greater variety, there are 14 sections of narrative/reverie(5): conclusive proof of a shift of

1. Approx.  $53\frac{1}{2}$  pp. letters,  $148\frac{1}{2}$  pp. narrative.
2. Approx.  $142$  pp. letters,  $192$  pp. narrative.
3. After the first seven letters, when the correspondence has got into its stride, three letters come in succession (8-10); then narrative; 6 more letters in succession (with a gap in the middle of one letter), (11-16); narrative; 3 more in succession (with a gap in the middle of one letter), (17-19); narrative; 2 more in succession (22-3); and then the ending alternating between narrative and letters.
4. Letters 8-27, there being 4 more letters in 1921 than in 1905.
5. After the first 7 letters come, as in 1905, 3 letters in succession, and then narrative. But then comes the 11th; narrative; 12th (gap in the middle); narrative; 13th; narrative; 14th; narrative; 15th and 16th; narrative; 17th (gap in the middle); 18th, 19th; narrative; 20th; narrative; 21st (gap in the middle); 22nd, 23rd; narrative; 24th; narrative; 25th; narrative; 26th and 27th etc.

emphasis in the revised version(1).

Centralisation of the narrative is illustrated best by the numerous passages in the revised version which are seen through Gogarty's consciousness(2). The device -

1. The correspondence upon which the book is based is infinitely better handled in 1921: irrelevant letters are shortened, omitted and, sometimes, replaced by narrative. Greater variety is obtained by intermingling Gogarty's comments (e.g. 1921, pp.80-1), by the introduction of only part of a letter (1921, p.83), by reported correspondence (e.g. 1921, p.79), and by such devices as Gogarty's resolving never to write again and then immediately settling down to do so (1921, p.102). Transitions between the correspondence and other narrative planes are much smoother; introductions and endings are more subtle. Above all, the length of letters is reasonable: the volume of Rose's letters in 1905 is so unreal that even Gogarty has to joke about it (1905, p.194). During his revisions, Moore corrected a number of errors. For example, he changed "remembrances" (1905, p.55) to "thankfulness and dreams" (1921, p.38), because there was no indication that Gogarty had been forgiven. But he made several new errors in the revision: for example (1921, p.118) Gogarty mentions having returned Nora's letter; but, in 1921, he has not done so, for there is no offending letter to return. (The error is repeated, 1921, p.119). Again, (1921, p.113), Gogarty thinks that her letter might be intended to induce him to go to Rome: but, at this point, she has mentioned only Munich. This error is also repeated (1921, p.118) when Gogarty mentions in his letter her invitation to Rome. Baker (The History of the English Novel, vol. ix, p.188), notes these discrepancies but attributes them wrongly to Moore's habit of dictating and re-dictating from the MS, so that, when a letter was omitted, the cross-references were forgotten. But the references were actually in the first edition (1905, pp.196 and 192-3) and are retained in 1921, owing to faulty revision.
2. Desmond Shawe-Taylor, ("The Achievement of George Moore" Hone, Life, p.471) even maintains, with some justification, that Moore was so intoxicated with his discovery of imaginative reverie, that he did not sufficiently differentiate Gogarty's musings from his own; that often Gogarty is nearly absorbed in the personality of his creator - see infra: author's intrusion.

which ensures unity in narration - is basically simple: place the central figure where he can see the localities in which he has spent his life; he can then describe these places as they appear before his eyes, and this leads on naturally to memory and reminiscence. Thus, owing to the nature of the subject and to the epistolary method, there was in the original edition a great deal of psychological thought-stream. The revised Lake, however, takes the process much further, adapting passages in order to channel thoughts and observations more completely through the hero's consciousness. The result is that reminiscences, emotions, thoughts, spoken phrases and descriptions of the landscape combine smoothly into flowing narrative. The exposition of the priest's past life is a particularly successful illustration of this method. Moore wrote in the preface to the revised edition:

"...my reason for liking The Lake is related to the very great difficulty of the telling, for the one vital event in the priest's life befell him before the story opens, and to keep the story in the key in which it was conceived, it was necessary to recount the priest's life during the course of his walk by the shores of a lake, weaving his memories continually, without losing sight, however, of the long, winding, mere-like lake, wooded to its shores, with hills appearing and disappearing into mist and distance(1)."

---

1. Op.cit., p.viii.

In a letter to Gosse(1), he said that no one else could have written the inner life of the priest, curling and going out like vapour, always changing and always the same.

Sometimes, this process is merely a matter of inserting inverted commas and adding, "saying"(2), or "he ejaculated"(3). Sometimes, inverted commas with a change of tense serve the purpose(4). In other passages, to make the thought more personal to Gogarty, a phrase or clause is introduced. For example, the 1905 version has, "it seemed to him"(5); the later edition makes the transformation to Gogarty more complete: "and he fell to thinking"; "the thought brought him to his feet"; "thinking that"; "and then he remembered"(6). More subtly, "Roses are happily within the reach of all"(7) becomes, "Roses all may have, and it was pleasant to think that..."(8). Or "that was the question and he crossed the beeswaxed floor"(9) is changed to, "that was the question he asked himself as he crossed the beeswaxed floor"(10).

1. 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, Wednesday, 28th November, (1906), National Library, Dublin, MS 2134.
2. e.g. 1905, p.61; 1921, p.42.
3. 1905, p.71; 1921, p.49.
4. 1905, p.262; 1921, p.152.
5. 1905, p.201.
6. 1921, p.114.
7. 1905, p.87.
8. 1921, p.60.
9. 1905, p.88.
10. 1921, p.60.

Often a thought is reshaped for inclusion as direct speech:

1905: "Everything about her was attractive and winning, even her name, and he wasn't sure that her very English name had not prejudiced her chances of keeping her situation(1)."

1921: "'Nora Glynn. How well suited the name is to her. There is a smack in the name. Glynn, Nora Glynn,' he repeated, and it seemed to him that the name belonged exclusively to her(2)."

And many new and characteristic Moore thoughts are introduced in inverted commas(3). Often the change is as simple as:

1905: "The earth and sky were enfolding in one tender harmony of rose and blue...(4)"

1921: "And he watched the earth and sky enfolded in one tender harmony of rose and blue...(5)"

1905: "There had never been such weather in Ireland before; the sky was like boiled starch(6)."

1921: "There had never been such weather in Ireland before, and the day he rode his bicycle over to see Father Peter seemed to him the hottest day of all(7)."

1. 1905, p.30.
2. 1921, p.22.
3. e.g. 1921, p.47.
4. 1905, p.268.
5. 1921, pp.156-7.
6. 1905, p.29.
7. 1921, p.20.

There is action in such soliloquies. More elaborately, third-person narration may be replaced by a fresh passage(1). Thus, reflections, instead of being third-person narration, become part of the hero's consciousness.

In one instance, a complete incident is re-orientated, so that we see it through Gogarty's eyes. The details are the same in both versions, but the method of presentation is significantly different. In 1905, the information about Ellis(2) is given in Rose's letters. In 1921, O'Grady, the priest who looks after the heroine when she is in London, visits Gogarty, leaving behind, when he goes, a copy of the Illustrated Magazine containing an article on Poole. Gogarty reads this article and the whole is seen through his eyes. In 1905, we are given merely the plain facts that Ellis has written a book, The Source of the Christian River(3), and that the journalist, regarding him as a great man and this interview as the beginning of his literary career, begins by saying that the fact that he, a Wesleyan minister's son, should interview an agnostic, is a sign of the times(4). That is all. 1921 expands this into three pages in which

1. e.g. 1905, p.29; 1921, p.20.
2. Poole in 1921. He was fashioned on Dujardin - see Francesco Cardasco, "George Moore and Edward Dujardin", Modern Language Notes, vol.62, April, 1947, p.246.
3. Title of Dujardin's book - see Épitre Dédicatoire, The Lake, Ebury edition, p.v.
4. 1905, pp.137-8.

Gogarty's reactions, mingled with the matter of the article, are traced in detail: his scorn for "the castle of learning in which the great Mr. Poole sits sharpening the pen which is to slay Christianity"(1); his satiric attitude to the interviewer's unction; the hint of a deeper jealousy of Poole when it appears that he is not much older than Gogarty himself(2); his annoyance on reading Poole's 'clever' thought that history owes nothing to theology, but theology owes a great deal to history(3); his anxiety, indicated in his restless pacing about the room, that Nora should live in such an atheistic environment; scorn and anxiety bursting eventually into anger as he throws the paper aside(4); and, finally, condemnation of himself for being solely responsible for forcing Nora into a situation so dangerous to her beliefs.

These subtle transitions in mood, skilfully mingled with information about Poole, are an excellent illustration of the advance in treatment in 1921.

Landscape is treated in the same way. Some critics(5) maintain that the background of Gogarty's daily life is so lightly sketched in that we are left with the irritating

1. 1921, p.96.

2. 1921, p.97.

3. 1921, p.98.

4. 1921, p.99.

5. e.g. Desmond Shawe-Taylor (Hone, op.cit., p.471) and Forrest Reid, "The Novels of George Moore", Westminster Review, vol.172, August, 1909, p.208.

impression that he has nothing to do all day but to dream of Nora and the mountains across the lake.

Moore no doubt went rather far in his reaction against Zolaesque environment, thus creating to some extent the impression of an aesthete debating in a vacuum. But he emphasises in his preface(1) that his idea was "the essential rather than the daily life of the priest... The drama passes within the priest's soul; it is tied and untied by the flux and reflux of sentiments, inherent in and proper to his nature; and the weaving of a story out of the soul substance without ever seeking the aid of external circumstance seems to me a little triumph."

Viewed in this light, there is ample background in the novel: the history and Irish legends of the district; Gogarty's interest in Marban; his childhood, family, upbringing, schooling and preparation for the priesthood; his visits to his sisters at the convent; his attempts to get the abbey roofed and a bridge built across the lake; his efforts to help his drinking curate; his ordeal with the parish gossip; the quarrel over the Protestant/Catholic baptism; and Pat Kearney's desire to be married for a pound(2). These and other details

1. Op.cit., p.viii.

2. Moore obtained information about the villagers and their quarrels from Maurice and then put it 'into key': see letter to Maurice, 4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, 15th February, 1904, National Library, Dublin, MS 2646. For information requested on the opening historical material, see ditto, 30th April, 2nd May, and 29th July, 1904.

are quite sufficient to fill in the background of Gogarty's life. In any case, it is not the fault of the revision if the background is regarded as scanty, for it is almost the same in both versions, except that the final edition inserts an extra passage(1) about a peasant who comes to Gogarty for administration of the sacred elements to his dying wife: when he arrives, the doctor says that she is out of danger, but her husband insists on her having the sacrament, and Gogarty sadly leaves the doctor and peasant arguing. This addition bolsters up the background while, at the same time strengthening the central theme, for Gogarty is "not many yards down the road"(2) when his thoughts revert to Nora(3).

Great improvement, too, is effected in the author's attitude to his story. In 1905, moralising comment is frequent:

"Life is but a shadow, and the generations go by like shadows. Very wonderful is life's coming and going, but, however rapidly life passes, there is always time for wrong doing; and only time for repentance is short. Atonement may be withheld. We always atone sooner or later; the question is in what world do we atone for the sin...(4)"

1. 1921, pp.110-1.
2. 1921, p.111.
3. It is possible that the passage is intended also to bring out the bad side of Catholicism, and this strengthens the central theme by showing Gogarty's move away from Catholicism.
4. 1905, p.52; omitted in 1921. See also 1905, pp.112, 223.

There is also in 1905 a more serious intrusion of the author: that of 'Amico Moorini'. Here the 1921 edition marks a great advance. Most prominent among these Moorini traits in 1905 is the author's egotism. Rose says, for example, that Ellis abandoned poetry because it was useless to write English verse unless one were a great poet, "and to be a great poet one must have a special voice and a poet's voice is as rare as De Reszke's - feeling that he had not this voice, Mr. Ellis abandoned poetry for scholarship(1)." This is merely an echo of Moore's pride in the prescience which led him to abandon poetry(2). On the other hand, Rose says, one may write French verses, as Ellis does, "just as a nobleman may indulge in private theatricals, but should refrain from the public stage(3)." Amico Moorini constantly inserted French verses and translations into his early works(4), so that this is merely self-praise. Moore's 'decadent' beliefs are seen again in Rose's version of Ellis's conception of a poet as one who can "tiddle-diddle-diddle like a canary in a cage(5)": many can philosophise, psychologise and botanise in verse, but poetry is not writing in metre, nor the

1. 1905, p.124.

2. Cf. e.g. Confessions of a Young Man, 1952, p.106.

3. 1905, p.172.

4. e.g. Confessions, pp.100-6.

5. 1905, p.124.

invention of beautiful images and harmonious sentences. According to this doctrine, Shakespeare, Shelley, Swinburne and Poe are the great poets. Ellis reads aloud to Rose Keats' "Nightingale" and Shelley's "Skylark", and she has to admit that Shelley "does the tiddle-diddle-diddle better than Keats(1)." And the same doctrine is applied to music. Again:

"The poet will therefore act as a sort of agent in advance to the man of learning. You may, as Mr. Ellis often says, know every secret of heaven and earth, and your knowledge will avail you nothing if you are not a poet...(2)"

All this is an absurd regurgitation of Moore's "pure poetry" belief(3).

In addition, there are Moore's opinions of Rubens, Ruysdael and other painters, and the spewing out of all his uncritical adoration of Wagner, including the belief that "The Ring" is "the greatest musical work the world has ever known(4)":

- 
1. 1905, p.124.
  2. 1905, pp.192-30.
  3. See Pure Poetry, London, Nonesuch Press, Limited edition, 1924.
  4. 1905, p.187.

"...having experienced more intense emotions than anyone else, Wagner was able to distil a magical juice out of them, which sinks into the flesh, enters the very current of the blood, transforms, disintegrates, and produces a sort of syncope(1)."

Other callow Moore 1890-isms are to be found in Rose's philosophising on the peasant,

"Seeing a peasant driving his plough, one ceases to discuss 'The Valkyrie', and one wonders which is right - the man who drives his plough, or one's self, who has travelled to hear 'The Ring'(2),"

and her sentimentalising over the stones of Bayreuth:

"...the old streets are paved with the original cobble-stones. Millions of feet will pass, bruised and aching, but the cobble-stones shall never pass away, and they hurt one's feet terribly... Nevertheless, I would not have these old streets torn up and paved in asphalt or wood. The cobble-stones are part of the entertainment. They remind one that one has to suffer for the Master's sake(3)."

Her attitude to Ellis's eclecticism also reflects Moore's 1890-ish belief: Ellis cannot see "why he should allow you the privilege of walking about in his mind as in a public

1. 1905, p.188. For a study of the influence of Wagner on Moore, see Edward Lockspeiser, "George Moore and some contemporary musicians," The Chesterian, vol.18, no.134, July-August, 1937, pp.161-2.
2. 1905, p.187.
3. 1905, pp.185-6.

place(1)."

Above all, Moore's naturalistic practice of note-taking is dragged in (though, by 1905, he had long abandoned the habit). In the desert, Ellis makes notes on his Jerusalem journeys: "Every night he wrote in his tent, transcribing the impressions of the day, and he wrote on until the pencil fell from his hand and

1. 1905, p.127. Even her raving over Ellis's glossy, mustard-coloured hair (1905, p.127) may, according to Gettman (*op.cit.*, p.547), be an illustration of Moore's vanity about his own yellow hair. G.-P. Collet, however (*George Moore et la France*, Geneva, Droz, 1957, chapter 7, p.198), shows that Ellis's appearance was based on Dujardin's. They were physically alike: gleaming mustard hair, curling on a projecting forehead, clean-shaven face, high nose, monocle, and long chin: Moore used Arquetin's painting of Dujardin as a model. Temperamentally, there were similarities, too: both were reserved on first acquaintance, were unpredictable in their reactions, and regarded their own personality as sacred. Both began by writing verse and went on to scholarship. Both made scholarship intelligible to laymen, and studied the origins of Christianity as scholars, not Christians. Both went to Jerusalem, each evening made notes on the day's observations, and thought that, if history owes nothing to theology, theology owes much to history. Both were passionate Wagnerians and visited Bayreuth. Ellis met there Emile Carton and planned with him the Wagnerian Review, as Dujardin met Houston Chamberlain, co-founder of the Revue Wagnérienne. All this indicates that Moore borrowed much of his portrait from his friend.

sleep was no longer to be resisted(1). And Rose herself adopts this practice, thinking nothing of writing a 30-page letter to Gogarty: she must write down her thoughts or they will pass away(2). Unable to decide whether or not she expects him to reply to her detailed impressions of the countryside and the architecture, the pictures and the music, Gogarty finally sends back her 'document', "it being clear to me that my business is merely to read, to approve, and to return(3)."

All this author intrusion is omitted from the 1921 version. It might, of course, be argued that Moore was projecting here and intended Rose to be superficial, so that no inference can be drawn about his egotism and Amico Moorini; also that Gogarty has little sympathy with Rose's views(4). Two factors militate conclusively against this. First, Moore was writing a story with a serious theme, the search for life through the rejection of dogma; thus, his hero is a serious character, and deliberately to create a superficial heroine would impair

---

1. 1905, p.129.

2. 1905, p.165.

3. 1905, p.196.

4. We must remember, however, that he is not unbiased.

the status of his hero(1). Secondly, we know that this immature, egotistical young Moorini makes his appearance even in Moore's most mature work; to the end, he never quite succeeded in 'exorcising' him.

One of the biggest changes in the 1921 version is the excision or curtailment of Rose's letters(2). For long sections in 1905, they are static and do not advance the action, in contrast to O'Grady's letters and the narrative by which they are, to some extent, replaced. Rose's letters destroy unity, because we often forget that Gogarty is reading them, and tempo, because of the vast amount of repetition. The excision of these letters marks a great advance in Moore's handling of the story.

1. This is, in fact, what actually occurs in 1905.
2. The fourth letter (28 pages - 1905, pp.165-93) is reduced to one sentence in 1921 (a mention of Rubens' "Descent from the Cross," which appears in Gogarty's letter, 1921, p.111); of the others, her first is reduced from 8 to 2/3 pages, her second from 12½ to 1, her third from 4½ to 1, her fifth from 5 to 1½, and her sixth from 6½ to 4½.  
There is a vast amount of repetition of material in 1905 (especially 1905, pp.110-53, 208-9, 222-3, 229), all of which is cut down or omitted in 1921. In one passage (1905, p.259), cut out in 1921, Rose is four times stated to be as mysterious as the spring. The comparison between her and the fountain is also repeated too frequently in 1905 (1905, pp.260-1; 1921, pp.151-2). Only at the end of the revision, when Moore was tiring, is repetitive material not omitted (e.g. 1921, pp.178, 182).

Their only possible justification would be to persuade Gogarty to abandon dogma for life, and this does not fit in with the author's desire to make the central character take the decision. That this was Moore's intention is clear from the beginning: Rose's sin takes place before the story opens and her seducer does not enter into it; this and the story of her flight are revealed to us in retrospect; and the remainder of our knowledge of the heroine comes from her letters and Gogarty's memories. So, even in the first edition, the main character was always the priest. The whole novel centres around his doubts as to his course of action, and Rose is the instrument of his awakening; but, after the initial incident, we need to feel only the pressure of her personality on Gogarty's thoughts and moods. Moore realised this in 1905, but Rose's rambling letters seriously obscured the presentation. Small wonder that the critics<sup>(1)</sup> found the correspondence less interesting than the lyricism of the landscape and the soul struggles of the priest - "and it was on the letters that the characterisation of the girl chiefly

---

l. e.g. Academy, review of The Lake, vol.69, 18th November, 1905, pp.1200-1.

depended(1)." This is the greatest failure of the first edition, and the improvement in the revised edition is, indeed, striking. In removing or drastically curtailing these letters, Rose is reduced to her true stature as a secondary character who is important only for her influence on the protagonist, and the whole narrative achieves that concentration on the central character which creates a restricted viewpoint and a tight unity(2).

Owing to the omission of Rose's rhapsodies, Ellis's part in the novel is drastically reduced. He now occupies his true place: as an influence on Rose and, therefore, on Gogarty's thoughts and feelings. Some of the details - the yellow curls, for example, and the eclecticism - remain(3). But Rose's simperings over his character, his learning and his opinions have disappeared,

- 
1. Hone, op.cit., p.261.
  2. Nora's letters, moreover, are relevant to the central theme. Whereas Rose merely chatters about herself and Ellis, Nora's letters are full of things which affect Gogarty and their relationship. Her correspondence enables Gogarty to escape from himself (cf. 1921, p.105), for the cities she mentions transport him in imagination, whereas Rose's rambling letters are inserted for their own sake. The heroine's correspondence is thus put into perspective and its whole purpose is justified. Nora, too, answers points made in Gogarty's letters, as Rose rarely does.
  3. 1921, p.97.

and the facts the reader needs are given mainly in the Illustrated Magazine article. It is interesting to note how skilfully Poole is put into his place: in her letter to Gogarty of 20th July, Nora mentions Poole's wonderful book - "but I cannot write about it today": the sun is shining, the country is beautiful and Edith (Poole's daughter) is waiting to be taken for a walk(1). In such ways, Nora avoids discussing Poole. Ellis had too much influence on Rose and, thus, indirectly, on Gogarty: this made the priest's conversion less satisfactory. Because of Rose's tedious adulation, Ellis plays far too large a part in the novel, thus destroying the unity. Poole, on the other hand, is mentioned only in the conversation between O'Grady and Gogarty, in the magazine account, and in fewer than two dozen sentences in Nora's letters(2). He thus takes his rightful place as a source of jealousy in Gogarty's mind.

The Dutch professor in the red dressing-gown and the French exegetist, Emile Carton, who is dragged in

---

1. 1921, p.81.

2. And these refer to his book and plans to travel abroad - she scarcely mentions him as a man.

probably as another potential rival for Gogarty, are omitted in 1921(1), to the great improvement of the unity of the narrative(2).

The difference in treatment in 1921 brings with it a great change in the character of the heroine. Moore originally conceived Rose as a symbol of spring which would release Gogarty from the frozen earth of dogma.

He wrote to Maurice:

"Rose Leicester represents the spring tide and her breath awakes Gogerty, he gets up and goes in search of life. The story is no more than a sun myth the earth is frozen in dogma and the spring comes and warms it to life(3)."

Such a conception is embodied in both versions but, in practice, Rose turns out to be a brittle, garrulous young flirt, quite unworthy of the priest's love(4).

1. Except for Gogarty's reference to the probability of Nora's meeting many scholars in Europe.
2. Other characters remain largely unchanged.
3. Seaford House, Belgrave Square, S.W., Saturday, (5th December, 1905), National Library, Dublin, MS 2646.
4. This may be due to the fact that her letters were written not by Moore, but by his friend, Mrs. (Nia) Crawford. A letter from Moore to Mrs. Crawford (Hotel Continental, 3, Rue Castiglione, Paris, 3rd October, 1903, National Library, Dublin, MS 2645) establishes beyond doubt that she originally wrote Rose's letters. Whether Moore altered them, 'put style on them', or even used them at all, it is impossible to say with certainty, though, from the remarks in this letter, it seems that he did. Hone, strangely enough, says nothing on this point, apart from general references (e.g. p.205) to the help she gave Moore at various times.

Her uncritical adulation of Ellis's appearance and views, the callous paganism and affectation of 'culture'(1) revealed in her story of the Italian murderer(2), the tactlessness(3) of her remark about the Irish hills being like an old priest reading his breviary: all this makes us resent Gogarty's dependence on her - she is not worthy to convert him. It seems doubtful, indeed, if Moore realised in 1905 how naive he had made Rose. Nora is much better qualified to win the priest's regard:

"her independent mind... displayed itself in every gesture, in the way she hopped over the stile, and the manner with which she toyed with her parasol - a parasol that seemed a little out of keeping with her position, it is true... Her independence betrayed itself in her voice: she talked to the parish priest with due respect, but her independent mind informed every sentence, even the smallest, and that was why she was going to be dismissed from her post(4)."

1. 1905, p.235.

2. pp.232-3.

3. 1905, p.231.

4. 1921, p.21. The difference is stressed again several times, e.g. "happiness" (1905, p.31) is changed to "happy original mind" (1921, p.22). There is really an imperfect revision here. In 1905, the sentence follows on naturally from Gogarty's being impressed by her good looks: "What impressed him this time far more than her looks was her happiness." But, in 1921, it has been emphasised that the heroine is not really pretty, rather, independent-minded, and that it is this last factor which will lead to her dismissal. Then comes the statement, "What surprised him this time far more than her looks was her happy, original mind." Yet it was precisely this (and not her appearance) which impressed him most in his first meeting with her - a careless revision at an important juncture in the narrative. In the same way, Nora's last letter seems more appropriate to Rose, probably owing to insufficient revision.

She is more complex and mature than Rose; hero-worship has become in her adult respect(1).

Because the heroine is greatly improved, Gogarty also goes up in our esteem. Moreover, the weaker aspects of his character are toned down or omitted. His first letter to O'Grady is more restrained and mature than in the 1905 version(2), and his letter of 10th September to Nora(3) reveals a manly tone. The revised version has a central figure with whom we can sympathise: he says that Nora is happy and it would be wrong for him, who made her so wretched, to complain that she is too intent on material things. Such feelings replace all the self-pity of the earlier version. In 1905, Gogarty is a petty creature. He criticises O'Grady in his letter of 27th June to Rose. He is prosy, longwinded, tedious and repetitive, at times even pompous. The following passage can hardly be said to reveal an attractive personality:

1. There are certain anomalies in the portrait of Rose: e.g. her superficiality in these letters does not match up with the taste in music and flower decoration which so impressed Gogarty. The Rose of his remembrance is much deeper than the Rose of the letters, and this is not due solely to Gogarty's idealisation of her character, but is, rather, a result of the fact that Mrs. Crawford's letters were probably altered very little.
2. 1905, pp.55-6; 1921, pp.38-9.
3. 1921, pp.111-3.

"Here abstract wrongs do not appeal to us; and it seems to me that I miss the tragedy of my remorse just as the convalescent may in a sense regret the excitement and the danger that he has passed through(1)."

He is more uncomplimentary and sarcastic in 1905(2) than in 1921, saying, for example(3), that he was right to return her letter, to prove she was not going to fool him, "she and the cultured Mr. Ellis". At times, Gogarty is brutal to Rose, saying on one occasion(4) that she views the world as a toy-shop and likes a wide variety of men. At the same time, he romanticises her more in 1905. In 1921, his melancholy is of a gentler nature, in harmony with the lake beside whose shores he broods. The Gogarty of the first version is thus harsh and satiric, embittered, jealous, and self-pitying; with the disappearance of these traits, Gogarty becomes a more sympathetic character(5), maturer, mellower and more profound(6). His

1. p.117: omitted in 1921.
2. e.g. letter of 6th September.
3. 1905, p.201.
4. 1905, p.209: omitted in 1921.
5. See e.g. 1921, p.145.
6. The sympathetic portrait of a Catholic priest is the result of considerable restraint in both versions for, in his letters, Moore was bitterly anti-Catholic. He wrote to Maurice:

"I do not agree with you that it is easy to see what Gogerty will degenerate into when he gets to New York - according to you papists everybody is a degenerate and a creature if he ceases to believe in the Pope's indulgences the immaculate conception and a hundred and one other disgusting fables. It seems to me that a man who puts his trust in life and leaves a comfortable home is a stronger man than he who remains at home ladling out superstitions which

changes of mood are well-drawn in both versions but, owing to the increase in imaginative reverie in 1921, they are both more numerous and more subtle in the revision. In the later version, too, his love is more skilfully indicated and nuances of emotion are subtler. Thus, the Gogarty of the revised version has deeper motives and greater complexity.

The result of these changes is that the story, in addition to having greater unity, is much more skilfully

---

Cont. he only half believes in." (Seaford House, Belgrave Square, S.W., Saturday, 25th November (1905), National Library, Dublin, MS 2646). Maurice has misunderstood the book:  
"It didn't seem interesting to represent a man exciting a vast intelligence and erudition to decide that the sixty million suns that compose the milky way are not presided over by a being up in the sky, a being who has established a church on this miserable (planet?) with power of opening and closing the gates of eternity...It passes my intelligence to understand why you consider Eliza religious, she goes into a convent just as she would go into the shoe trade. She seems to me to be without a trace of religious feeling. Her brother seems to me much more religious for he is at least interested in religion. Eliza is interested in rule. I may have expressed myself badly or insufficiently or you may be blinded by prejudice." (Seaford House, Belgrave Square, S.W., (5th December, 1905).  
"...you are wrong about the priest - It requires much more will to break off prejudice than to acquiesce (sic)." (Seaford House, Belgrave Square, S.W., 26th December, (1905)).

handled(1). A salutary compression is noticeable in the rewriting, not only in the heroine's letters - for example, the final version's summing up in one statement by Gogarty(2) of what Rose takes pages to say in her letters - but also in the volume of information about Gogarty(3). The ending of the revised version is also a good illustration of Moore's increasing economy. In 1905, Gogarty comes out of the lake, rests, meditates and walks to Tinnick; by 1921, Moore realises that this is unnecessary for, once Gogarty is out of the water, the story is over. We do not need to delay between the lake and the steamer; the closing sentences are sufficient. Again, considerable duplication of material in narrative and letters(4) holds up the story in the first version. A gross example of this occurs in Gogarty's letter of 7th July to Rose, where he repeats much of the information

1. It is interesting to note that Moore believed in 'good' and 'bad' subjects and thought that he had found a bad subject in the priest's revolt against celibacy. He wrote to Howard de Walden shortly before the book came out: "It is a great misfortune to choose a bad subject; I am writing better than I used to but I cannot redeem the subject." (See Hone, op.cit., p.260).
2. That Nora had an instinct of her destiny from the beginning. (1921, p.111).
3. e.g. 1905, pp.207-8; 1921, p.118.
4. See e.g. 1905, pp.55 ff.; 1921, pp.37-8.

given in the preceding narrative. The 1921 version, by avoidance of duplication, obtains a much tighter unity, and, in contrast to the earlier version, neatly sums up the information by allowing O'Grady to tell Gogarty, in the middle of a letter, that Nora has just been made Poole's secretary(1).

The exposition of The Lake is a masterpiece. Charles Morgan tells us that in its earliest MSS it did not begin where it does now:

"The opening retrospect - a flawless exercise in a narrative method of extreme difficulty - was undertaken that a formal unity might be preserved which, if the story had begun earlier, would have been inevitably broken. If the first draft of the story was extant, as we believe it is not, a comparison between it and the novel in its final shape would indicate more clearly than anything else the purpose to which Moore, as an originating and experimental artist, has devoted his life(2)."

Moore, immediately he had written a book, almost invariably thought it his best, until he came to read the proof-sheets, when he almost invariably reversed his opinion. The Lake, however, came to be a permanent favourite of his, because of the difficulties which he had overcome. The exposition was left unaltered in 1921 except for the virtual elimination

1. 1921, p.75.

2. "George Moore at 80", Observer, 21st February, 1932, p.6.

of the pluperfect tense, which caused Moore such difficulty and was used so imperfectly in 1905(1).

Incident is handled far more skilfully in 1921 than in 1905. In the first edition, by an absurd coincidence(2), Moran(3), who knows nothing of the matter,

1. He had written to Huneker in 1906 (4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, (26th October), Steeplejack, Vol.2, pp.230-1), praising Ibsen's originality of technique:

"First quality: the omission of any statement regarding his subject-matter; every other dramatist states his subject in the first act, Ibsen never, in any of the important plays. Second quality: his manner of telling a story backwards. Rosmersholm is all told backwards, and the difficulty of this form is enormous. I experienced it in the first fifty pages of *The Lake*; to write fifty pages in the past participle is no easy task, and Ibsen did that in dialogue without anybody perceiving that the characters were asking and answering questions."

Osbert Burdett, ("George Moore" (Obit.), London Mercury, vol.27, March, 1933, p.424), says that the retrospective method was not a difficulty but the charming evasion of difficulty, the very way out for a semi-creative man. However, that Moore experienced great torment in composing an exposition is beyond doubt.

2. Gogarty himself notes the coincidence in his letter to Rose, 7th July.
3. In both versions, one derives the impression that Moran is introduced always for the sake of the plot. In 1905, he brings the magazine; both versions contain the incident of his desiring to get drunk, the purpose of which is to illustrate Moran's escapism as a foil to Gogarty's discovery of truth; and he appears also in the 'premonition' episode, when he has an instinct that something dreadful is about to happen to Gogarty. In this respect, both versions are open to the most familiar and frequently justified charge levelled against Moore after 1905: that his novels are built up artificially, and are, therefore - despite the skill with which the joints are dovetailed and disguised beneath the 'monolithic' style - in the final analysis synthetic.

brings Gogarty a periodical containing an article on a man of whom Gogarty himself has only recently heard. Furthermore, the magazine is left on the table and the housekeeper throws it into a corner, where it gets hidden under a mass of newspapers, coming to light a few days later only by chance - and all this to no purpose. Finally, the article itself is clumsily handled.

In view of this, it is small wonder that Moore wrote to R.I. Best:

"The Lake...never was right until I brought over the priest from London; he is in the last edition(1)."

By this device, the construction is improved and the coincidences are removed, for it is O'Grady who leaves behind him the copy of the magazine(2). The O'Grady visit(3) serves a further function by making it clear that Gogarty is in love with Nora(4). The scene is full of subtle interplay of emotion, and the difficulty

1. 121, Ebury Street, 14th October, 1924, National Library, Dublin, MS 3884.

2. 1921, p.95.

3. This substitution of O'Grady's visit for Moran's is the only substantial change of incident in 1921.

4. e.g. 1921, p.93.

of the two men in broaching their subject is well-drawn. The later version is thus a great improvement on the earlier, though not without faults of its own: Gogarty has to retell his life story, if only briefly, in order that O'Grady shall realise he is in love; a character is brought in who plays no further part in the story; and the scene is too long, despite the truth of Moore's statement that "the dialogue between the two priests is the best thing in the book(1)."

The drinking episode marks a great improvement in unity because the first edition is about Moran and therefore irrelevant in that it has no real implications for Gogarty; the later edition makes the whole episode revolve around Gogarty and, by the addition of one passage(2), puts the whole in perspective: instead of Gogarty's memory of the scene, which is in any case repetitive, we have his reflections on whether the aim of life is to trample on or to encourage self.

The symbolism, which plays an important part in

- 
1. Letter to Best, 121, Ebury Street, 14th October, 1924, National Library, Dublin, MS 3884.
  2. 1921, p.129.

the story, is unchanged but is better expressed in the revision(1). The curlew, with its legs bound, represents Gogarty's past and future(2), the bird symbolising his instincts, the cord the shackles of the parish and his narrow mode of life. But it is especially the superb symbolism of the lake that conjures up all the loneliness and misery of Gogarty's existence: its grey shores reflecting his melancholy(3), its placid waters his stagnant life, and the reeds and ducks he sees every day the monotony of his parochial duties; its wistfulness echoing his(4); its permanence a reminder that it will be there when he is gone(5); his sadness always linked with it(6), and his desire to drown himself in it never far removed(7); and, when he has decided to break away from his old life, the lake reflected in the sky symbolising his new-found happiness, contrasting with the lake below, symbol of all his former unhappiness(8): above all, the dive of the naked faun into the lake, discarding his clerical clothes, donning lay garments on the other side, and leaving behind him

---

1. e.g. 1905, p.57; 1921, pp.39-40.

2. 1921, p.159.

3. 1921, p.4.

4. 1921, p.29.

5. 1921, p.39.

6. 1921, p.135.

7. 1921, p.142.

8. 1921, p.156.

at last all his wretchedness; the splashing of his foot in water reminding him of Philip Rean's baptism, so that the lake becomes now the symbol of his baptism into a new life(1); and the final magnificent, "'There is a lake in every man's heart,' he said, 'and he listens to its monotonous whisper year by year more and more attentive till at last he unsirds(2).'" All this is retained and improved stylistically in 1921.

The weaknesses of the 1905 version thus lie in the vast irrelevance of Rose's correspondence; the uncertainty in the handling of incidents; the author's attitude to his story; the intrusion of Amico Moorini; the 1890-isms; the coincidences, melodrama and sentiment; and the duplication of material, bad writing and disjointed style. The strength of the first version lies in the exposition, the natural background, the symbolism and the central idea (but not its execution), all of which are retained in 1921. The strength of the latter lies in addition in the concentration of the narrative on the central character, and the consequent gain to the unity of the narrative; the improvement in the characters of Gogarty and Rose;

---

1. 1921, p.200.

2. 1921, p.202.

the introduction of the 'melodic line' and the greater maturity of style; in short, that progressive simplification of narrative for which Moore constantly strove. The result is a new novel - the "perfected Lake", Moore called it(1) - unified in theme, structure and style. In its final form, it may well lay claim to be considered George Moore's greatest work.

- 
1. Letter to Best, 121, Ebury Street, 14th October, 1924, National Library, Dublin, MS 3884; see also undated letter to Steer, in which he says that it will be his most perfect work - D.S. MacColl, Life, Work and Setting of P.W. Steer, London, Faber, 1945, p.66.

CHAPTER VICONCLUSION

Moore began his writing career more feebly equipped than perhaps any other considerable writer. This fact accounts for most of his motives for rewriting: his realisation that his first drafts were unpublishable, and his constant desire to make the writing worthy of the subject; his search for a style and, when he had 'discovered' the melodic line, his pursuit of perfection in it; his passion for his craft; his rejection of one influence after another and the resulting purges (to keep pace with his changing enthusiasms); the thinness of his experience, which necessitated his working it economically into successive rewritings; his philosophy of revision - that the correction of form is virtue; the need for eternal vigilance where Amico was concerned; and his passion for self-renewal, which led him finally to believe that inspiration lay in the corrections and creativity in the act of revising. He did not revise to gratify his vanity, to please his 'disciples' or for commercial gain: though in later life he may have realised the financial advantages of his method, he never flinched from sacrificing royalties to the expensive correction of books in proof.

The tradition of English fiction was anathema to him: he strove all his life to create the 'aesthetic' novel, a more serious and shapely work of art on the French and Russian model. In the process, he wrote the first important Naturalist novel in English. Paradoxically, his major revisions of his first

novels - A Modern Lover, A Mummer's Wife, A Drama in Muslin and A Mere Accident - were intended to purge his work of Naturalistic and other French influences that he had discarded. A Drama in Muslin, in particular, was revised because his true character had emerged from beneath the distorting dogma of Zolaism, and a political story became a personal one. (Similarly, The Wild Goose and The Way Back were later transformed into personal narratives.) The method of revision in this early group varied. A Modern Lover was completely rewritten, the number of characters was reduced, and author comment, description and background material were cut down. In A Mummer's Wife and A Drama in Muslin the method was largely one of omission of lengthy passages and scores of sentences. Omission and reduction, along with a reshaping of the central character and structure, were the main technique also in A Mere Accident.

By 1887, after his first three novels had been completed, Moore's writing disintegrated, and A Mere Accident, Spring Days, Mike Fletcher and Vain Fortune were a series of disasters. Apart from Esther Waters, his most successful novel (which was revised three times, with hundreds of minute stylistic changes), the barren Nineties were taken up with rewriting and recasting A Vain Fortune and Evelyn Innes/Sister Teresa. The material of the former was reshuffled twice in an attempt to shape a better story, but all three versions failed because the author was unable to decide on the central character or the mode of

narration. Evelyn Innes/Sister Teresa underwent numerous rewritings (changes in structure, reshuffling of material, cuts, additions, re-shaping of character according to different models, attempts at unification and simplification of the narrative), because Moore did not make up his mind what kind of story he was creating, and did not know how to write the books or bring them to a close(1). These novels were the end of the road. A complete break was necessary, and this came with his return to his native country.

Yeats and Ireland changed the whole course of Moore's writing. Realism gave place to 'reverie' and the 'melodic line' took shape in The Untilled Field and The Lake, whose revisions(2) were Moore's highest achievement in 'imaginative reverie'. The Lake, especially, was almost completely rewritten, with narrative unified through the central character, and author intrusion and much of the correspondence omitted. Other novels and short stories written initially in the melodic line manner (The Brook Kerith, Héloïse and Abelard, and Perronik) were revised - with innumerable small alterations - to perfect the style and flow, and are more open to the charge of monotony levelled at Moore's later works. Two stories - A Story-Teller's Holiday/Ulick and

1. cf. A Mere Accident/John Norton.

2. i.e. The Wild Goose and The Lake.

Soracha and Aphrodite in Aulis - were rewritten to improve their structure. From this period, Moore's revisions were linked with his method of work: the preparatory scenario containing the main ideas, the dictation to shorthand and reading back of draft after draft, the follow-up with the pen, and the rewriting on the proofs.

On the whole, notwithstanding the best of his realist works (A Mummer's Wife and Esther Waters) and such beautifully finished stories as those in In Single Strictness/Celibate Lives, Moore was most at home in the books with an Irish setting - A Drama in Muslin, The Untilled Field, The Lake and A Story-Teller's Holiday - although revision did not necessarily bring total re-vision: the final The Lake is a superb novel, but A Drama in Muslin and The Wild Goose, while gaining artistic shape, lost in the rewriting much of their interesting polemical matter.

Creatively, Moore may remain in the second rank of writers but, on a limited canvas, he achieved in such works as The Wild Goose and The Lake a near-perfection that was due largely to his method of rewriting. As he said in the epitaph that he coined: "Here lies George Moore, who looked upon corrections as the one morality." (1)

1. G. Goodwin, Conversations with George Moore, London, Benn, 1929, pp.73-4.

BIBLIOGRAPHYI MS. MATERIAL1. National Library. Dublin

- MS. 1595. 41 aut. letters from Moore to Mme. Lorenz Meyer, 1907-14, with some miscellaneous material. From Hugh Walpole's collection.
- MS. 1596. 19 aut. letters from Moore to Mark Fisher and family, 1902-22.
- MS. 2134. Transcripts of approx. 160 letters from Moore to Sir Edmund Gosse(1880-1929), with some miscellaneous items. Transcribed by J.Alex Symington, University of Leeds, from the originals, formerly in the collection of T.J.Wise.
- MS. 2135. Copies of 74 letters from Mrs. Craigie(pseud. John Oliver Hobbes) to Moore, with miscellaneous items, 1894-1909. Transcripts made by C.K.Shorter from the originals lent him by Moore.
- MS. 2136. 10 aut. letters from Moore to Gosse and 8 aut. letters from Moore to Shorter, 1880-1926. From the collection of T.J.Wise.
- MS. 2137. Typescript with corrections by Moore of part of Conversations in Ebury Street.
- MS. 2645. 101 aut. letters from Moore to Mrs. Nia Crawford, c. 1900-1932, with miscellaneous items.
- MS. 2646 & MS. 2647. 200 aut. letters from Moore to Maurice Moore, with miscellaneous items, 1887-1913.
- MS. 2648. 107 documents concerning Moore, including letters to and from him, some originals, some copies, being materials collected by J.M.Hone for his biography of Moore.
- MS. 3884. 42 mainly aut. letters from Moore to R.I.Best, c. 1913-32, with a miscellaneous item.
- MS. 3888. 30 items: aut. letters from Moore to various correspondents, with some associated documents.
- MS. 4460. 125 aut. letters from Moore to Max Meyerfield, c. 1900-1928.
- MS. 4477. Memoir and notes by E.Curtis on his conversations with Moore, with copies of 9 letters from Moore to Curtis, 1923-4.
- MS. 4479. 74 aut. letters, mainly from Moore to members of his family.
- MS. 4894. Memoir by Maurice Moore on his relations with his brother, with 22 associated documents, including aut. letters from Moore.
- MS. 5647. 49 aut. letters from Moore to his secretary, Miss Ethel Palmer, mainly 1917.

2. Brotherton Library, University of Leeds

Collection of 126 aut. letters from Moore to Gosse, 1887-1929, with 2 letters to Mrs. Gosse, 11 to Philip Gosse, and 2 to L.R.Macleod.

3. British Museum

MS. 1186.	Aut. letter from Moore	to Swinburne.
MS. B 1189.	" " " "	" Gosse.
MS. A 1192.	" " " "	" "
MS. A 1193.	" " " "	" "
MS. A 1196.	" " " "	" "
MS. B 1197.	" " " "	" "
MS. 3670.	9 " letters	" " " Shorter.
MS. A 3671.	" letter	" " " T.J.Wise.
MS. A 3672.	" " " "	" " " "
MS. B 3672.	" " " "	" Gosse.
MS. 3676.	Misc.	
MS. A 4386.	Aut. "	" " " T.J.Wise.
MS. 5739.	" "	" Gosse.

II(A) COMPLETE LIST OF MOORE'S REVISIONS OF HIS NOVELS AND SHORT STORIES

1. A Modern Lover

- 1) London, Tinsley, 3 vols., 1883.
- 2) London, Vizetelly, 1 vol., 1885. Slight revision.
- 3) London, Heinemann, 1917. Major revision. Title changed to Lewis Seymour and Some Women.  
6 proof copies, published in 1916, contained slight variations from the 1917 edition.

2. A Mummer's Wife

- 1) London, Vizetelly, 1885.
- 2) London, Vizetelly, 1886. 6th edition. Slight revision.
- 3) London, Heinemann, 1918. Considerable revision.

3. A Drama in Muslin

- 1) Court and Society Review, vol. 2, no. 80 - vol. 3, no. 104, 14th January - 1st July, 1886.
- 2) London, Vizetelly, 1886. Slight changes.
- 3) London, Heinemann, 1915. Major revision. Title changed to Muslin.

#### 4. A Mere Accident

- 1) London, Vizetelly, 1887.
- 2) Rewritten and title changed to John Norton, one of 3 stories in Celibates, London, Walter Scott, 1895. Considerable revision.
- 3) Hugh Monfert, one of 5 stories in In Single Strictness, London, Heinemann, 1922. New story on the same theme.

#### 5. Spring Days

- 1) Evening News, nos. 2062-2111, 3rd April - 31st May, 1888.
- 2) London, Vizetelly, 1888. Slight changes.
- 3) London, Laurie, 1912. Slight changes.

#### 6. Vain Fortune

- 1) Lady's Pictorial Magazine, vol. 22, no. 540 (no. 392 enlarged series) - vol. 22, no. 555 (no. 407 enlarged series), 4th July - 17th October, 1891. Under pseudonym 'Lady Rhone'.
- 2) London, Henry, 1891. Some rewriting.
- 3) New York, Scribners, 1892. Considerable rearrangement of material.
- 4) London, Walter Scott, 1895. Considerable rearrangement of material.

#### 7. Esther Waters

- 1) London, Walter Scott, 1894.  
Pall Mall Gazette, vol. 57, nos. 8901 - 8912, 2nd - 14th October, 1893, "Pages from the Life of a Workgirl." Selections from the forthcoming book. Chs. 20-29 of the 1894 edition. Slight differences.
- 2) London, Walter Scott, 1899. 6th edition. Some stylistic revision.
- 3) N.Y., Brentano, 1917. Some stylistic revision.
- 4) London, Heinemann, 1920. Considerable stylistic revision.

#### 8. Celibates

- London, Walter Scott, 1895. Contains 3 stories:
- a) Mildred Lawson (later revised as Henrietta Marr);
  - b) John Norton (revised version of A Mere Accident);
  - c) Agnes Lahens (never revised).

## 9. Evelyn Innes/Sister Teresa

### A. Evelyn Innes

1. 1st edition, London, Unwin, May - June, 1898.  
 (Also Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 2 vols., 1898).

#### Notes

- 1) Moore, letter to Lady Cunard (92, Victoria Street, 10th February, 1898, Letters to Lady Cunard, 1895-1933, p.26) says that the book is to be published in April.
- 2) Moore, letter to Maurice (92, Victoria Street, 18th April, 1898, National Library, Dublin, MS. 2646) states that the book is finished and will be published in one month.
- 3) Unwin Adelphi Library edition, October, 1908, gives May.
- 4) J.D. Fischer, op. cit., p.xii: May.
- 5) Hart-Davis, op. cit., p.28, footnote: June.
- 6) Moore, letter to Dujardin (Letters from George Moore to Edouard Dujardin, 1886-1922, p.43), 20th June, 1898, mentions that the book has been criticised, which suggests publication before this date.
- 7) British Museum copy is stamped 1st July, 1898.
- 8) English Catalogue, 1898, p.154, gives June.

2. N.Y., Appleton, 1898 (see Fischer, op. cit., p.12).  
 Slight revision.

3. 2nd edition, London, Unwin, August, 1898. Slight revision.

#### Notes

- 1) Hart-Davis, op. cit., p.28: August.
- 2) Unwin Adelphi Library edition: August.
- 3) Fischer, op. cit., p.12: August.
- 4) British Museum copy is stamped September 19th.
- 5) Revision mentioned in Moore, letter to Lady Cunard (Airlie Castle, Alyth, Letters, op. cit., p.28) Sept.

4. 3rd edition, London, Unwin, October, 1898. Revision.

#### Notes

This was a trial edition of 12 copies, consisting of copies of the second edition corrected by the pasting over of certain pages with the proofs of the revised text. The letter of September, 1898 (see above) states that "this little edition will be out next week." Hart-Davis (see above) says that Moore sent Yeats a copy, 28th October. Fischer, op. cit., p.xii, informs us that this privately issued special edition was circulated in October, 1898.

On 28th September, 1898, Moore wrote to Dujardin (op. cit., pp.43-4) saying that he hoped to send, the following week, a copy of Evelyn Innes with all the corrections, i.e. the text of the third edition.

5. London, Unwin, June, 1901, popular 6d edition. Fairly thorough revision.

Notes

- 1) Unwin Adelphi Library edition gives June (but states, wrongly, 3rd edition).
- 2) Moore's letter to Mrs. Nia Crawford, 12th June, 1901 (4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin. National Library, Dublin, MS. 2645), says that Evelyn Innes/Sister Teresa are to be published "this month", Evelyn Innes first in the sixpenny edition. See also Moore's letter to Maurice, 13th June, 1901 (4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin. National Library, Dublin, MS. 2646).
- 3) The British Museum copy (one of the few of this edition) bears the date-stamp 5th July, 1901.
- 4) English Catalogue, 1901, p.134, gives July.

6. Berlin, Fleischel, 1905. German version. Considerable revision.

Note

Moore also negotiated with Hachette for a French edition, but the translation did not materialise - see Fischer, op. cit., p. xii.

7. London, Unwin, Adelphi Library edition, October or November, 1908. Complete rewriting.

Notes

- 1) Hone, op. cit., p.283, wrongly gives 1909.
- 2) Adelphi Library edition states 5th edition October, 1908.
- 3) Fischer, op. cit., p.cxxxv, says October.
- 4) Moore, letter to Mme. Emily Lorenz Meyer (4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, National Library, Dublin, MS. 1595. From Hugh Walpole's collection), 27th October, 1908, says that the revised Evelyn Innes is to be published on 4th November, and he has finished Sister Teresa.
- 5) English Catalogue, 1908, p.182, gives November.

## B. Sister Teresa

1. London, Unwin, June, 1901.

Notes

- 1) Moore, letter to Mrs. Nia Crawford, 12th June, 1901 (see above) says June, after the revised Evelyn Innes.
- 2) British Museum stamp 1st July, 1901.
- 3) English Catalogue, 1901, p.134: July.

2. Leipzig, Tauchnitz collection of British authors, vol.3535, November or December, 1901. "Specially rewritten for the Tauchnitz edition." 2 vols. Some rewriting.

Notes

- 1) Moore, letter to Meyerfield, 17th December, 1901,

(4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin, National Library, Dublin, MS. 4460) says that Sister Teresa has just been printed by Tauchnitz. See also Moore's letter to Maurice, 28th November, 1901(4, Upper Ely Place, Dublin. National Library, Dublin, MS. 2646). Both letters state that he has rewritten the first 50 pages.

- 2) The advertisements on the cover would seem to suggest November.
- 3) After the popular edition of Evelyn Innes - see e.g. Fischer, op. cit., p.xii.

3. Berlin, Fleischel, 1905. German version. Some revision.
4. London, Unwin, June, 1909. Complete rewriting.

#### Notes

- 1) English Catalogue, 1909, p.185: June.
- 2) R.A. Gettmann(P.M.L.A., June, 1944, p.541) states wrongly that Sister Teresa was revised in 1928.
- 3) Although he originally decided to exclude the novels from the limited Carra edition, Boni and Liveright (1920-24), Moore later allowed the two volumes to be reprinted for this edition from the original texts - see Fischer, op. cit., p.xii.
- 4) Both novels were finally excluded from the Heinemann Uniform and Ebury editions.
- 5) Moore(as his letters show) worked on the final revisions of Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa during the years 1903, 1904, 1906, 1907, and 1908, and, if we bear in mind that he referred to both the first book and the combined books as Evelyn Innes, we can see that it is sometimes difficult to say when he is discussing a) Evelyn Innes and b) Evelyn Innes/Sister Teresa; so in certain parts of the text the two books have been dealt with together.

#### 10. The Untilled Field

- 1) Six stories appeared in an Irish version, An T-Ur-Gort, (translated by Padraig O'Sullivan), Dublin, Sealy, Bryers and Walker, 1902.  
The Wedding Gown, translated into Irish by Torna(Tadhg O'Donoghue), appeared in the New Ireland Review, vol.xvi, January, 1902, pp.299-310.  
Mr. Dumpty's(1903 Dempsey's) Quest in Irish, translated by Torna, and in English, appeared in the New Ireland Review, vol. xviii, November, 1902, pp.167-78.

Almsgiving, in Irish, translated by Torna, and in English, appeared in the New Ireland Review, vol. xviii, December, 1902, pp. 239-49.

- 2) London, Unwin, 1903. Contains the following stories:
  - a) In the Clay.
  - b) Some Parishioners.
  - c) The Exile. Slightly rewritten version of the story in (A) Harper's Weekly, vol. 46, 20th September, 1902, pp. 1321-5; (B) Pall Mall Magazine, vol. 28, no. 113, September, 1902, pp. 218-28. The two magazine versions are slightly different.
  - d) Home-Sickness. Slightly rewritten version of the story published in (A) Harper's Weekly, vol. 46, 16th August, 1902, pp. 1111-13; (B) Pall Mall Magazine, vol. 28, no. 113, September, 1902, pp. 76-82. The two magazine versions are slightly different.
  - e) A Letter to Rome.
  - f) Julia Cahill's Curse.
  - g) A Playhouse in the Waste.
  - h) The Wedding Gown.
  - i) The Clerk's Quest.
  - j) Almsgiving.
  - k) So On He Fares.
  - l) The Wild Goose.
  - m) The Way Back.
- 3) Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1903. Same stories as Unwin, 1903, except that a) In the Clay and The Way Back are omitted, and b) Some Parishioners is split up into 4 stories:
  - A. Some Parishioners.
  - B. Patchwork.
  - C. The Marriage Feast.
  - D. The Window.
- 4) London, Heinemann, 1914. Same stories as Tauchnitz 1903 edition except that one title is changed: The Marriage Feast becomes The Wedding Feast.
- 5) London, Heinemann, 1926. Stories same as 1914 edition.
- 6) London, Heinemann, 1931. Stories same as 1926 and 1914 editions, except that a new story, The Fugitives, is added, based on the two stories rejected after the first edition, In the Clay and The Way Back.

### Changes in the Story

- A. The Exile. Some rewriting. 2 versions: 2 & 3; 4, 5 & 6.
- B. Home-Sickness. Some rewriting. 2 versions: 2 & 3; 4, 5 & 6.
- C. A Letter to Rome. Slight changes. 3 versions: 2; 3; 4, 5 & 6.
- D. Julia Cahill's Curse. 3 versions: 2; 3 (considerably rewritten); 4, 5 & 6.
- E. Some Parishioners. 3 versions: 2; 3; 4, 5 & 6 (considerable differences).
- F. A Playhouse in the Waste. Slight changes. 3 versions: 2; 3; 4, 5 & 6.
- G. The Wedding Gown. All editions identical.
- H. The Clerk's Quest. Slight changes. 2 versions: 2 & 3; 4, 5 & 6.
- I. Almsgiving. All editions identical.
- J. So On He Fares. All editions identical.
- K. The Wild Goose. 4 versions: 2; 3 (slight changes); 4 (thorough rewriting); 5 (thorough rewriting) & 6.

### 11. The Lake

- 1) London, Heinemann, 1905.
- 2) Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1906. Slight revision.
- 3) London, Heinemann, 1921. Complete rewriting.

### 12. The Brook Kerith. A Syrian Story

- 1) London, Laurie, 1916.
- 2) London, Laurie, 1921. 5th edition. Thorough stylistic revision.
- 3) London, Heinemann, 1927. 7th (Uniform) edition. Even more thorough stylistic revision.

### 13. A Story-Teller's Holiday

- 1) London, privately printed, Society for Irish Folklore, limited edition, one vol., 1918.
- 2) Ulick and Soracha, London, Nonesuch Press, limited edition, 1926. This tale, which formed a large part of A Story-Teller's Holiday, is abstracted and considerably rewritten.
- 3) A Story-Teller's Holiday, London, Heinemann, Uniform edition, 2 vols., 1928. Considerably revised. This edition includes the revised Ulick and Soracha, further revised. The story of Albert Nobbs (1918 edition, pp. 264-322) is replaced by a new story, Dinoll and Crede,

which appeared first as The Hermit's Love Story, illustrated by F.R.Gruger, in Nash's Magazine, no. 411, August, 1927, pp.12-15, 84 and 86. (Apart from a few punctuation and paragraph alterations, it is identical with A Story-Teller's Holiday, vol. 2, 1928, pp.223-34).

#### 14. Héloïse and Abélard

- 1) London, privately printed, Society for Irish Folklore, 2 vols., 1921.
  - a) Fortnightly Review, vol. cviii, no. dcxlv, September - October, 1920, pp.516-28, 688-702, chapters from the forthcoming Héloïse and Abélard (1921, I, pp.82-100, 100-122). First extract slightly different from 1921 book; second extract no change.
  - b) Century Magazine, vol. 100, n.s. 78, October, 1920, pp.783-92, "Héloïse First Meets Abélard": a selection from certain chapters of the book (part of ch. 6; ch. 7; part of ch. 8: viz. pp.80-100 of the 1921 edition). Virtually identical with the first Fortnightly selection.
  - c) Dial, vol. lxix, no. 5, November, 1920, pp.448-454, "How Héloïse passed the winter of 1117 with her uncle, Canon Fulbert of Notre Dame, and his good servant, Madelon." Identical with vol. I, 1921, pp.71-9.
- 2) Fragments from Héloïse and Abélard, London, privately printed, Society for Irish Folklore, 1921. Some rewriting.
- 3) London, Heinemann, Uniform edition, 1925. Some rewriting.

#### 15. Perronik the Fool

Short story developed from the embryo in Héloïse and Abélard, London, Society for Irish Folklore, 1921, vol. II, pp.135-6, 140-43.

- 1) London Mercury, vol. 4, nos. 23 & 24, September - October, 1921, pp.468-81, 586-601; and Dial, vol. 71, no. 5, November, 1921, pp.497-533. (Hone is wrong in stating, op. cit., p.405, that the story first appeared in the Carra edition, 1924).
- 2) N.Y., Boni & Liveright, Carra edition of Moore's collected works, vol. 21 (with Daphnis and Chloë), 1924. Same version.

- 3) Mount Vernon, New York Press of W.E.Rudge, limited edition, 1926. Slight verbal changes.
- 4) Eure, France, Hours Press, limited edition, published and printed privately by Nancy Cunard, 1928. Slight verbal changes.

16. In Single Strictness, London, Heinemann, 1922.

Contains 5 stories:

- a) Wilfred Holmes: slightly revised version of story in London Mercury, vol. 5, no. 28, February, 1922, pp.356-72. Appeared also in Mercury Story Book.
- b) Priscilla and Emily Lofft: complete rewriting of Emma Bovary, a story in Lippincott's Monthly Magazine, vol. 69, May, 1902, pp.589-95.
- c) Hugh Monfert: a new story on the John Norton theme.
- d) Henrietta Marr: complete rewriting of Mildred Lawson in Celibates.
- e) Sarah Gwynn: never revised.

17. Celibate Lives, London, Heinemann, 1927.

Contains 5 stories:

- a), b), d) & e) identical with In Single Strictness, but Hugh Monfert is replaced by Albert Nobbs(pp.44-96), a story taken, with slight alterations, from A Story-Teller's Holiday(pp.264-322).

18. Aphrodite in Aulis

- 1) London, Heinemann, limited edition, 1930.
- 2) London, Heinemann, Uniform edition, 1931. Ending rewritten.
- 3) London, Heinemann, Uniform edition, 1932. Slight verbal changes.  
Best, at Moore's request, sent him on 21st April, 1932, some suggested emendations to the 1931 edition, but Moore did not live to bring out a final edition including these emendations. (Information supplied to me by Best).

## (B) OTHER WORKS BY MOORE REFERRED TO IN THE TEXT

## 1. Books

- Flowers of Passion, London, Provost, 1878, Poems.
- Pagan Poems, London, Newman, 1881.
- Under the Fan, Tinsley's Magazine, vol. 30, February, 1882,  
pp.135-154. Short story.
- Literature at Nurse, London, Vizetelly, 1885. Pamphlet.
- Dried Fruit, Court and Society Review, 7th December, 1885,  
pp.41-5. Short story.
- Parnell and His Island, London, Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey, 1887.  
Sketches. First published, as Lettres sur Irlande, in  
Figaro, Supplement littéraire, 31st July-4th September,  
1886.
- Confessions of a Young Man, London, Swan Sonnenschein, 1888.  
Autobiography.
- Impressions and Opinions, London, Nutt, 1891. Essays.  
Revised, London, Laurie, 1913.
- Modern Painting, London, Walter Scott, 1893. Essays.  
Enlarged ed., London, Walter Scott, 1898.
- The Bending of the Bough, Comedy in 5 Acts, London, Unwin, 1900.
- Literature and the Irish Language, in Ideals in Ireland, edited  
by Lady Gregory, London, The Unicorn, 1901, pp.43-51. Speech.
- Avowals. Criticism.
- 1) Pall Mall Magazine:
- Vol. 32, January - April, 1904:  
I, pp.319-29: Various novelists(greatly expanded and  
altered in Avowals, 1919, chs. 1 & 2).  
II, pp.481-6: Turgenev(Avowals, 1919, ch. 4).
- Vol. 33, May-August, 1904:  
III, pp.70-77) Tolstoy(Avowals, 1919, chs. 5, 6 & 7).  
IV, pp.234-40).  
V, pp.373-9: Kipling and Loti(Avowals, 1919, ch. 8).  
VI, pp.527-33: Pater(greatly expanded in Avowals, 1919,  
chs. 9, 10 & 11).
- The Pall Mall material, though in general written up different  
-ly, appears also in Lippincott's Monthly Magazine under the  
title, "Avowals", the first 6 " of a new series of Confessions  
of a Young Man" :
- Vol. 72, no. 429, September, 1903:  
I, pp.343-52: Various novelists.  
II, pp.481-8: Turgenev.  
III, pp.608-16) Tolstoy.  
IV, pp.697-703)

Vol. 73, no. 434, February, 1904:  
 V, pp.99-107: Kipling and Loti.  
 VI, pp.168-78: Pater.

It is clear that Moore wrote the 1919 Avowals with the magazine material before him, expanding and altering, but retaining the vast majority of his opinions, keeping the same contents order, and even using the same language.

2) London, Society for Irish Folklore, limited edition, 1919.  
 Revised version.

A number of chapters, generally revised slightly for book publication, had already appeared in magazine form:

1. Avowals, 1919, ch. 1 appeared, as "An Imaginary Conversation. Gosse and Moore," in the Fortnightly Review, vol. civ, n.s., nos. dcxxii & dcxxiii, 1st October and 1st November, 1918, pp.612-26, 772-85.
2. Avowals, 1919, ch. 2 appeared, as "An Imaginary Conversation. Gosse and Moore "(2nd conversation), in the Fortnightly Review, vol. cv, n.s., nos. dcxxv & dcxxvi, 1st January & 1st February, 1919, pp. 139-52, 303-20.
3. Avowals, 1919, ch. 3 appeared, as "The Freedom of the Pen. A Conversation with George Moore," by J.L.Balderston, in the Fortnightly Review, vol. cii, n.s., no. dcx, 1st October, 1917, pp.539-51.
4. Avowals, 1919, ch. 13 appeared in an English version by Moore, "Shakespeare and Balzac: A Study of Creative Genius," in the Century Magazine, N.Y., vol. lxvi, n.s., May, 1914, pp.83-92.
5. Avowals, 1919, ch. 16 appeared, as "The Dusk of the Gods. A Conversation on Art with George Moore," by J.L.Balderston, in the Atlantic Monthly, vol. cxviii, August, 1916, pp.165-75.

3) London, Heinemann, 1924. Slight revision.

Memoirs of my Dead Life, London, Heinemann, 1906. Autobiography.  
The Apostle, Drama in 3 Acts, Maunsel, Dublin, 1911.  
 Scenario in English Review, vol. 5, June, 1910,  
 pp. 564-76.  
 New text(acts 2 & 3), Dial, N.Y., 74: 537-61,  
 75: 43-72, June - July, 1923.  
 London, Heinemann, limited edition, 1923.

- Ave, 1911; Salve, 1912; Vale, 1914: Hail and Farewell trilogy,  
London, Heinemann. Autobiography.
- Esther Waters, London, Heinemann, 1913. Play in 5 Acts.
- Elizabeth Cooper, Comedy in 3 Acts, Dublin & London, Maunsell,  
1913.
- Pure Poetry, London, Nonesuch Press, limited edition, 1924.  
Anthology.
- The Pastoral Loves of Daphnis and Chloe, London, Heinemann,  
limited edition, 1924. Translation.
- Conversations in Ebury Street, London, Heinemann, limited  
edition, 1924. Criticism. (Revised edition, London,  
Heinemann, 1930).
- " George Moore and John Freeman," Dial, October, 1923,  
pp.341-62, is virtually a reprint of ch.4(Ebury edition,  
1936).
- " The Cinderella of Literature," Fortnightly Review,  
vol. cxiii, no. dclxxvi, April, 1923, pp.529-38, is a  
reprint of ch.17(Ebury edition, 1936). This article,  
entitled " Mr. Moore talks to Mr. Gosse," appeared also in  
the Atlantic Monthly, vol. cxxxii, April, 1923, pp.450-57.
- " George Moore and Granville Barker," Fortnightly Review,  
vol. cxiv, no. dclxxix, 2nd July, 1923, pp.40-54, and  
Dial, August, 1923, pp.135-50, is a reprint of ch. 18  
(Ebury edition, 1936).
- A Communication to My Friends, London, Nonesuch Press, limited  
edition, 1933.

## 2. Articles

- " A Breakfast with Edmond de Goncourt," St. James' Gazette,  
13th May, 1884, pp.6-7.
- " A Curious Book," St. James' Gazette(about A Rebours),  
2nd September, 1884, pp.6-7.
- " Turgueneff," Fortnightly Review, xlili,n.s., February, 1888,  
pp.237-51. (Reprinted in Impressions and Opinions, 1891.  
Revised slightly in 1913).
- " M.Zola on the Side of the Angels," St. James' Gazette(on  
Le Rêve), 2nd November, 1888, pp.3-4. (Later in 1st  
edition of Impressions and Opinions, 1891).
- " Some of Balzac's Minor Pieces," Fortnightly Review, vol. xlvi,  
n.s., no. cclxxiv, 1st October, 1889, pp.491-504.
- " Our Dramatists and their Literature," Fortnightly Review,  
vol. xlvi, n.s., no. cclxxv, 1st November, 1889, pp.620-32.  
(Later in Impressions and Opinions, 1891).
- " The Master of Ballantrae," Hawk, vol. 4, no. 92, 5th November,  
1889, pp.489-90.

- " My Article and My Critics," Hawk, vol. 4, no. 93, 12th November, 1889, pp.519-20.
- " Bye - bye, Buchanan," Hawk, vol. 4, no. 94, 19th November, 1889, pp.549-50.
- " Impressionism," Hawk, vol. 4, no. 98, 17th December, 1889, p.670.
- " From the Naked Model," Hawk, vol. 4, no. 99, 24th December, 1889, pp.699-701.
- " Three Books," Hawk, vol. 4, no. 100, 31st December, 1889, pp.734-5.
- " Baboonacy," Hawk, (on Rider Haggard), vol.5, no. 103, 21st January, 1890, pp.75-6.
- " The Human Animal," Hawk, vol. 5, no. 111, 18th March, 1890, pp.313-14.
- " Pruriency," Hawk, vol. 5, no. 112, 25th March, 1890, pp.347-8.
- " Advertised Incompetency," Hawk, (on Hall Caine's The Bondman), vol.5, no. 115, 15th April, 1890, pp.434-5.
- " Guy de Maupassant," Illustrated London News, C, 2752, 16th January, 1892, p.82.
- " La Débâcle," Fortnightly Review, n.s., vol. lii, no. cccviii, 1st August, 1892, pp.204-10.
- " My Impressions of Zola," English Illustrated Magazine, vol.xi, January, 1894, pp.477-489.  
Revised slightly for Impressions and Opinions, 1913.  
Included with Confessions of a Young Man under the title,  
"Visit to Médan", slightly revised, in Uniform edition,  
London, Heinemann, 1952.
- " Since the Elizabethans," Cosmopolis, vol. 4, no. 10, October, 1896, pp.42-58.
- " A Tragic Novel," Cosmopolis ( on L'Education Sentimentale ), vol. 5, no. 7, July, 1897, pp.38-59.
- " Some Characteristics of English Fiction," North American Review, vol. clxx, no. dxviii, January, 1900, pp.504-17.
- " The Nineness in the Oneness," Century Magazine, vol. lxxvii, n.s., November, 1919, pp.63-6.  
First printed in Chesterian, n.s., no. 1, September, 1919, pp.4-10.
- " A Communication to Book-Collectors," Times Literary Supplement, 10th March, 1921, p.157.
- " Apologia pro Scriptis Meis," Fortnightly Review, cxii, October, 1922, pp.529-44.
- " Sunt Lacrimae Rerum," Fortnightly Review, cxiv, December, 1923, pp.906-13.

### 3. Prefaces

Preface to Zola, Pot - Bouille(Piping Hot), translated from the 63rd French edition, London, Vizetelly, 1885.

Preface to Zola, La Curee(Rush for the Spoil), translated from the 34th French edition, London, Vizetelly, 1886.

Preface to Dostoevsky, Poor Folk, translated by Lena Milman, London, Elkin Matthews & John Lane, 1894.

Introduction to Martyn, The Heather Field and Maeve, London, Duckworth, 1899.

### III WORKS ON MOORE: BIBLIOGRAPHICAL. BIOGRAPHICAL & CRITICAL

Bennett, Arnold, Fame and Fiction, London, Grant Richards, 1901, ch. 18.

Huneker, J.G., "Literary Men who Loved Music," Overtones. A Book of Temperaments, N.Y., Scribners, 1904, ch. 4.

Archer, William, "Conversation with George Moore, Victoria Street,"(May, 1901), Real Conversations, London, Heinemann, 1904, V, pp.85-7.

Beerbohm, Max, "Dickens," A Christmas Garland, London, Heinemann, 1912.

Huneker, J.G., "The Hater George Moore," The Pathos of Distance, London, Laurie(N.Y., Scribners), 1913.

Wells, H.G., Boon. The Mind of the Race, The Wild Asses of the Devil and The Last Trump, London, Unwin, 1915, ch. 4, sec.2.

Mitchell, Susan L., George Moore, Dublin, Maunsel, 1916.

Sherman, Stuart P., "The Aesthetic Naturalism of George Moore," On Contemporary Literature, N.Y., Holt, 1917.

Harris, Frank, Contemporary Portraits, 2nd ser., N.Y., published by the author, 1919.

Williams, Iolo A., Bibliographies of Modern Authors, no. 3, George Moore, London, Chaundy, 1921.

Huneker, J.G., Steeplejack, London, Laurie(N.Y.Scribners), 2 vols 1921.

Danielson, Henry, "Bibliography, 1878-1921", in Freeman, John, Portrait of George Moore in a Study of his Work, London, Laurie, 1922.

Huneker, J.G., "The Recantations of George Moore," (about Avowals), Variations, London, Laurie(N.Y., Scribners), 1922.

Squire, J.C., "Mr. George Moore's Tapestry," (review of Heloise and Abélaard, rptd. from Observer, 13th March, 1921), Books Reviewed, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1922.

ed. Huneker, Josephine, Letters of J.G.Huneker, London, Laurie, 1923.

Gosse, Sir Edmund, "Second Thoughts"(from Sunday Times), More Books on the Table, London, Heinemann, 1923.

Symons, A., "Confessions and Comments," Dramatis Personae, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1923.

Complete Catalogue of the Library of John Quinn, sold by auction in 5 parts. The Anderson Galleries, N.Y., 2 vols., 1924, vol. 2, pp.650-661, George Moore.

- Booth, J.B., Old Pink 'Un Days, London, Grant Richards, 1924.
- Nichols, Beverley, "George Moore or the Cause of all the Trouble," Are They the Same at Home? London, Cape, 1927, ch. 45.
- Weygandt, C., A Century of the English Novel, London, Brentano, 1927.
- Newton, A.E., This Book-Collecting Game, Boston, Little, Brown, 1928.
- Wolfe, Humbert, Dialogues and Monologues, London, Gollancz, 1928.
- Blanche, J-E., Mes Modèles, Paris, Stock, 1928. Translated by Clement, Walter, as Portraits of a Lifetime, London, Dent, 1937. Incorporates articles from Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 16th June, 1928, p.6, and 23rd June, 1928, p.6.
- Goodwin, Geraint, Conversations with George Moore, London, Benn, 1929.
- ed. Eglinton, John(pseud. for Magee, William), Letters from George Moore to Edouard Dujardin. 1886-1922, N.Y., Crosby Gaige, 1929.
- Cutler, B.D., & Stiles, V., Modern British Authors. Their First Editions, London, Allen & Unwin, 1930, pp.118-121.
- MacCarthy, Desmond, Portraits, 1, London & N.Y., Putnam, 1931.
- Rothenstein, William, Men and Memories, vol. 1, 1872-1900, London, Faber, 1931; vol. 3, 1922-38, London, Faber, 1939.
- Farmer, A.J., Le mouvement esthétique et décadent en Angleterre, 1872-1900, Paris, Champion, 1931, Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, tom. 75. Rptd. from Université de Grenoble Lettres-Droit, Annales, n.s. 7, no. 2(1930), 254-98.
- Collins, Norman, The Facts of Fiction, London, Gollancz, 1932.
- Wolfe, Humbert, George Moore, London, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1933.
- Edgar, Pelham, "French Realism: Gissing, Moore and Bennett," The Art of the Novel from 1700 to the Present Time, N.Y., Macmillan, 1933, ch. 22.
- Ferguson, W.D., The Influence of Flaubert on George Moore, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press(London, O.U.P.), 1934.
- Wolfe, Humbert, "The Three Interviews of George Moore," Portraits by Inference, London, Methuen, 1934.
- Ellis, Havelock, My Confessional. Questions of our Day, London, John Lane, 1934.
- Swinnerton, Frank, The Georgian Literary Scene. A Panorama, London, Heinemann, 1935.
- Goodwin, Geraint, Call Back Yesterday, London, Cape, 1935.
- Doran, George H., Chronicles of Barrabas. 1884-1934, N.Y., Harcourt, 1935.
- Morgan, Charles, Epitaph on George Moore, London, Macmillan, 1935.
- Hone, Joseph M., The Life of George Moore, London, Gollancz, 1936.
- Some Passages of AE to W.B.Yeats, Dublin, Cuala Press, 1936.

- Whitall, James, English Years, London, Cape, 1936.
- Dobrée, Bonamy, Introductions to English Literature, vol. 4,  
The Victorians and After. 1830-1914, London, Cresset Press,  
1938.
- Baker, E.A., The History of the English Novel, London, Witherby,  
vol. ix, 1938, ch. 5.
- Jackson, Holbrook, The Printing of Books, London, Cassell, 1938,  
ch. 7.
- Griffin, G., The Wild Geese, London, Jarrolds, 1938.
- Rothenstein, John, The Life and Death of Conder, London, Dent,  
1938.
- Elwin, Malcolm, Old Gods Falling, London, Collins, 1939.
- Phelps, W.L., Autobiography with Letters, N.Y., O.U.P., 1939,  
ch. 89.
- Blanche, J-E., More Portraits of a Lifetime(1918-38), London,  
Dent, 1939.
- Hone, Joseph M., The Moores of Moore Hall, London, Cape, 1939.  
ed. Bateson, F.W., Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature,  
London, C.U.P., 1940, vol. 3, 1800-1900.
- Frierson, William C., "George Moore: Naturalist," The English  
Novel in Transition. 1885-1940, Oklahoma, University of  
Oklahoma Press, 1942, pp. 60-84.
- Eglinton, John, Letters of George Moore, Bournemouth, Sydenham,  
1942.
- O'Sullivan, Seumas(pseud. of Starkey, James), Essays and  
Recollections, Dublin & Cork, Talbot Press, 1944.
- MacColl, D.S., The Life, Work and Setting of P.W. Steer, London,  
Faber, 1945.
- Horgan, John J., Parnell to Pearse. Some Recollections and  
Reflections, Dublin, Browne & Nolan, 1948.
- Clark, Barrett H., Intimate Portraits, N.Y., Dramatists Play  
Service, 1951.
- ed. Ross, Margery, Robert Ross: Friend of Friends, London, Cape,  
1952.
- Robertson Scott, J.W., The Life and Death of a Newspaper(Pall  
Mall Gazette), London, Methuen, 1952.
- Courtney, Sister M-T, Edward Martyn and the Irish Theatre, N.Y.,  
Vantage Press, 1952.
- Nejdefors-Frisk, Sonja, George Moore's Naturalistic Prose,  
Uppsala Irish Studies, III, Lund, Carl Bloms, 1952.
- Chaikin, Milton, The Influence of French Realism and Naturalism  
on George Moore's Early Fiction, N.Y. University Ph.D. thesis,  
1954.
- Shumaker, Wayne, "The Narrative Mode. Moore's Hail and Farewell,"  
English Autobiography, Berkeley, University of California  
Press, 1954, Part 3, ch. 8.
- Bartlett, Lynn C., A Critical Study of the Early Novels of  
George Moore, B.Litt. thesis, Magdalen College, Oxford, 1954.
- Wade, Allan, The Letters of W.B.Yeats, London, Hart-Davis, 1954.

- Brown Malcolm, George Moore: A Reconsideration, Seattle,  
University of Washington Press, 1955.
- Yeats, W.B., "Dramatis Personae, 1896-1902," Autobiographies,  
London, Macmillan, 1955.
- Edel, Leon, The Psychological Novel, 1900-1950, London,  
Hart-Davis, 1955.
- Phelps, Gilbert, The Russian Novel in English Fiction, London,  
Hutchinson's University Library, 1956.
- Cunard, Nancy, GM: Memories of George Moore, London, Hart-Davis,  
1956.
- Collet, G-P., George Moore et la France, Geneva, Droz, 1957.
- Fischer, John Denny, Evelyn Innes and Sister Teresa by George  
Moore. A variorum edition. University of Illinois Ph.D.  
thesis, 1958.
- Hough, Graham, "George Moore and the Novel," Image and  
Experience. Studies in a Literary Revolution, London,  
Gerald Duckworth, 1960, ch. 7.
- Jeffares, A.Norman, George Moore, London, Longmans, Green  
(Writers and their Work, no. 180), 1965.

#### IV ARTICLES ON MOORE: BIOGRAPHICAL AND CRITICAL

- Athenaeum, review of A Modern Lover, no. 2906, 7th July, 1883,  
pp.13-14.
- Wallace, William, review of A Mummer's Wife, Academy, vol. 26,  
no. 656, 29th November, 1884, p.354.
- Athenaeum, review of A Drama in Muslin, no. 3065, 24th July,  
1886, p.110.
- Wallace, William, review of A mere Accident, Academy, no. 794,  
23rd July, 1887, p.51.
- Moore, Augustus, "A Woman's Man," Hawk, vol. 4, no. 98,  
17th December, 1889, pp.673-4.
- Peck, H.T., "The Rise of Mr. George Moore," Brockman, N.Y.,  
vol. 1, no. 5, June, 1895, pp.322-4.
- Athenaeum, review of Celibates, no. 3533, 13th July, 1895, p.64.
- Archer, William, Conversation 4, Critic, N.Y., vol. xxxix,  
July, 1901, pp.47-56.
- Athenaeum, review of The Lake, no. 4075, 2nd December, 1905,  
p.758.
- Huneker, J.G., "George Moore and his Religious Novel "(review  
of The Lake), New York Herald Sun, 22nd April, 1906, mag.  
sec., p.7.
- Huneker, J.G., "The Character of Mildred Lawson," Forum, 52,  
1914, pp.770-71.
- Sphere, "A Literary Letter: Mr. George Moore's Romance of  
Syria," vol. lxvi, no. 868, 9th September, 1916, p.238.
- Times Law Reports, 23rd November, 1917.

- Lanza, Clara, " My Friendship with George Moore 3000 Miles Away," Bookman, N.Y., xlvi, July, 1918, pp.480-86.
- Anglin, Norman, " George Moore, Juvenal and Johnson," Manchester Quarterly, vol. xi, no. clvii, January, 1921, pp.30-48.
- Dujardin, Edouard, " Quand George Moore vient à Paris," Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 18th November, 1922, p.1.
- Jean-Aubry, G., " George Moore and Emile Zola," Bookman's Journal, vol. xi, n.s., no. 39, December, 1924, p.99.
- Jean-Aubry, G., " Zola et George Moore," Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 17th January, 1925, p.5. Also Bulletin de la Société Littéraire des Amis d'Emile Zola, no. 7(1925), pp.9-13.
- Colum, Padraic, " Dublin in Literature," Bookman, N.Y., vol. lxiii, no. 5, July, 1926, p.555.
- Maurois, André, " Visites à George Moore," Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 12th May, 1928, p.1.
- Freeman, John, " A Story-Teller's Holiday," Bookman, London, vol. lxxv, no. 449, February, 1929, pp.267-8.
- MacCarthy, Desmond, " George Moore as a Critic" (review of Conversations in Ebury Street), Sunday Times, 23rd March, 1930, p.8.
- Morgan, Charles, " George Moore at 80," Observer, 21st February, 1932, p.6.
- Lees, Frederic, " Recollections of an Anglo-Parisian Bibliophile," II, " George Moore in Paris," Bookman, London, lxxxii, September, 1932, pp.296-7.
- Bishop, E.W., " George Moore and his Work," Sunday Times, 8th January, 1933, p.5.
- Wolfe, Humbert, " The Writer" in " Mr. George Moore's Work" (obit.), Observer, 22nd January, 1933, p.17.
- Gwynn, Stephen, " Ebb and Flow" (obit.), Fortnightly Review, n.s., vol. cxxxiii, 1st March, 1933, p.388.
- Duclaux, Mary, " Souvenirs sur George Moore," Revue de Paris, xl, part 2, 1st March, 1933, pp.110-30.
- Whitall, James, " George Moore" and " Working with George Moore," Bookman, N.Y., vol. lxxvi, no. 3, March, 1933, pp. 209-18, 252-3.
- Roberts, Ellis R., " George Moore," Nineteenth Century, vol.113, March, 1933, pp.369-83.
- Aitken, W.Francis, " George Moore," Bookman, London, vol. lxxxiii, no. 498, March, 1933, p.488.
- Eglinton, John, " George Moore at St. Winifred's Well," (written 1927), Life and Letters, London, vol. 9, March - May, 1933, pp.67-76.
- Gillet, L., " George Moore," Revue des Deux Mondes, vol. 14, 8th per., 1st April, 1933, p.674.
- Bowra, C.M., " George Moore," New Oxford Outlook, vol. 1, no. 1, May, 1933, pp.43-51.

- Garnett, David, "Current Literature," New Statesman and Nation, vol. 6, no. 124, n.s., 8th July, 1933, p.46.
- Steward, S.M., "J-K. Huysmans and George Moore," Romanic Review, vol. 25, no. 3, July-September, 1934, pp.197-206.
- Dixon, P.J., (annotator), "Letters from George Moore. The Greek Background of Aphrodite in Aulis," London Mercury, vol. 31, November, 1934, pp.14-21.
- O'Faolain, Sean, "Pater and Moore," London Mercury, vol. 34, August, 1936, pp.330-38.
- Hone, J., "Exegesis of George Moore," Dublin Magazine, xii, January - March, 1937, pp.8-16.
- Gilomen, Walther, "George Moore and his Friendship with W.B. Yeats," Aarau, Switzerland, English Studies, Amsterdam, vol. xix, June, 1937, pp.116-20.
- Lockspeiser, Edward, "George Moore and Some Contemporary Musicians," Chesterian, vol. 18, no. 134, July-August, 1937, pp.158-63.
- Swinnerton, Frank, "Variations of Form in the Novel," Essays and Studies, vol. xxiii, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1938.
- Auriant, "Documents Inédits, Un Disciple anglais d'Emile Zola, George Moore," Mercure de France, tome 297, 1st May, 1940, pp.312-23.
- Gettmann, Royal A., "George Moore's Revisions of The Lake, The Wild Goose and Esther Waters," PMLA, vol. 59, June, 1944, pp.540-55.
- Cooper, Douglas, "George Moore and Modern Art," Horizon, vol. xi, no. 62, February, 1945, pp.113-30.
- Frierson, William C., "George Moore Compromised with the Victorians," Trollonian, vol. 1, no. 4, March, 1947, pp.37-44.
- Cordasco, Francesco, "George Moore and Edouard Dujardin," Modern Language Notes, vol. 62, April, 1947, p.246.
- Newton, William, "Chance as Employed by Hardy and the Naturalists," Philological Quarterly, State University of Iowa, Supplement to Vol. 30, no. 4, October (1951), pp.154-75.
- Morgan, Charles, "George Moore: A Centenary Appreciation," Listener, vol. xlvi, no. 1200, 28th February, 1952, p.351.
- Hone, Joseph, "George Moore. The Making of a Writer," Times Literary Supplement, 29th February, 1952, p.150.
- Billy, A., "Le Centenaire de George Moore," Le Figaro Littéraire, 31st May, 1952, p.2.
- Collet, G-P., "George Moore et la France; a propos d'un centenaire," Revue de Littérature Comparée, vol. 26, October, 1952, pp.477-9.
- Collet, G-P., "Louis Gillet et George Moore," Etudes anglaises, August, 1953, pp.250-54.

- Schwab, A., " Irish Author and American Critic: George Moore and James Huneker," Nineteenth Century Fiction, vol. 8, no. 4, March, 1954, pp.256-71; vol. 9, no. 1, June, 1954, pp.22-37.
- Chaikin, Milton, " The Composition of George Moore's A Modern Lover," Comparative Literature, vol. vii, Summer, 1955, pp.259-64.
- Chaikin, Milton, " Balzac, Zola and George Moore's A Drama in Muslin," Revue de Littérature Comparée, vol. xxix, October - December, 1955, pp.540-43.
- Swinnerton, Frank, " Written Dialogue," Writer, vol. 17, no. 1, n.s., January, 1956, p.4.
- Chaikin, Milton, " A French Source for George Moore's A Mere Accident," Modern Language Notes, vol. lxxi, January, 1956, pp.28-30.
- Chaikin, Milton, " George Moore's A Mummer's Wife and Zola," Revue de Littérature Comparée, vol. xxxi, January - March, 1957, pp.85-8.
- Acton, Harold, " George Moore and the Cunard Family," (review of N.Cunard, GM: Memories of George Moore(London, Hart-Davis, 1956) and George Moore. Letters to Lady Cunard, 1895-1933(edited with introduction and notes by Rupert Hart-Davis, London, 1957) ), London Magazine, vol. 5, no.3, March, 1958, pp.54-7.
- Noel, Jean, " George Moore et Mallarmé," Revue de Littérature Comparée, vol. xxxii, July - September, 1958, pp.363-76.
- Brown, Calvin S., " Balzac as a Source of George Moore's Sister Teresa," Comparative Literature, vol. xi, Spring, 1959, pp.124-30.
- Gerber, Helmut E., " George Moore: An Annotated Bibliography of Writings about Him," English Fiction in Transition. 1880-1920, vol. 2, no. 2, Parts I and II, Summer-Fall, 1959; vol. 3, no. 2, 1960; vol. 4, no. 2, 1961.
- Hough, Graham, " George Moore and the Novel," A Review of English Literature, vol. 1, no. 1, January, 1960, pp.35-44.(See also his introduction to Esther Waters, London, D.U.P., 1964).
- .....