WORDSWORTH AND GODWIN : A STUDY OF INFLUENCE

(Volume II : Appendices,Notes and Bibliography)

by

Hieronim S. Kwiatkowski

Submitted for the Degree of Ph.D.

to the Department of English

University of Glasgow

October 1989

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Volume II : Appendices and Notes

CONTENTS

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER TWO

Godwin's Cursory Strictures.

Godwin's Cursory Strictures, first published anonymously in the Morning Chronicle of October 20th, 1794, several days before the start of Hardy's trial, should be seen as a culmination of the earliest period of Godwin's career: both in terms of his active defence of victims of government repression and also with regard to his **acting** on the principles of Political Justice, particularly those of justice and sincerity.

Godwin had written in protest after the legal injustices to Muir and Palmer; in this case he was determined not just to write but to forestall the inevitable injustices that, he foresaw, would arise from successful indictment of Hardy and the others. Hence, at the end of Cursory Strictures, he writes:

> I anticipate the trials to which this Charge is the Prelude. I know that the judge will admit the good intentions and honest design of several of the persons arraigned: it will be impossible to deny it; it is notorious to the whole universe. He has already admitted that there is no law or precedent for their condemnation.**(1)**

The content of the charge and the argument of Cursory Strictures are not unknown and need little summary: Eyre's charge **(2)** was that although no individual act by the defendants constituted treason, their intentions might reasonably be assumed to be treasonable, and their activities might themselves lead to treason. Godwin demolished the case by showing that there was no statute or law of precedent that covered the charges delivered, and also that much of the charge was based upon assumed probabilities for which not a piece of

reasonable evidence could be produced. Godwin's argument is apposite and concise.

But the real interest here lies in an area that has received little attention: namely the language in which Cursory Strictures is couched, and the reaction it produced; these, above all, show the courage of Godwin.(3) Eyre's charge itself shows the seriousness of the situation facing the defendants (and, until their acquittal, the seriousness for anyone associated with them:(4)

> That a traiterous and detestable Conspiracy has been formed for subverting the existing Laws and Constitution, and for introducing the System of Anarchy and Confusion which has so lately prevailed in France. (The Charge p 1)

Godwin's reply in Cursory Strictures shows no sense of intimidation. (Though the Morning Chronicle published Cursory Strictures on receiving it, a subsequent first attempt to publish it in pamphlet form was repressed by indirect government action through the Treasury.(5)) Speaking of the important statute of Edward III (the one which, in Godwin's opinion, Eyre was perverting), Godwin states:

> This law has been sanctioned by the experience of more than four centuries; and, though it has been repeatedly attacked by the encroachment of tyrannical princes, and the decisions of profligate judges, Englishmen have always found it necessary in the sequel to strip it of its mischievous appendages and artificial glosses, and restore it to its simplicity and lustre. (CS p 2)

He mellows his attack somewhat early in the pamphlet when speaking of Eyre:

> In all this preamble of the Chief Justice, there is certainly something extremely humane and considerate. I trace in it the language of a constitutional lawyer, a sound logician, and a temperate, discreet, and honest man. I see rising to my view by just degrees a judge, resting upon the law as it is, and determinedly setting his face against new, unprecedented, and temporising constructions. (CS p 6)

However, this takes on even more bitter irony in view of the later attack:

> Every paragraph now presents us with a new treason, real or imaginary,

> pretendedly direct, or avowedly constructive. Division and subdivision rise upon us, and almost every one is concluded with awful denunciation of Treason. The Chief Justice is no longer contented with the plain treasons of 25 Edward III, or the remoter treasons of Foster and Hale. His whole discourse hangs by one slender thread. He perpetually refers to the new and portentous treason of his own mere creation,...(CS p 11)

It was, no doubt, the courageous and sincere language of Godwin's attack as much as the perspicacity of his mind that stung another Judge, Buller, (though he signed himself "Judge Thumb" initially) to what purported to be an answer(**6**) to Godwin in the Times, October 25th, 1794(**7**); but which is clearly more of an attack on Godwin's personal integrity. Having accused Godwin of attempting to "influence the Jury", he continues:

> Such being the obvious tendency of this publication, I must consider it not as the offspring of an honest, well-intentioned, though mistaken mind, but of one from motives the most detestable and malignant, endeavouring to corrupt the most valuable part of the English Constitution, viz. the Trial by Jury.(**8**)

The argument which ensues does not answer Godwin's criticisms and relies very much upon the view that lawyers know the law best:

> One hardly knows how to answer so impudent and false an accusation, mixed with such malignant insinuations, without the smallest argument to support them. -If the Author had not been most stupidly ignorant of the laws of his country, or wilfully misapprehended them, he would have known that it hath been the universal practice of ages, in all cases of legal doubt, for Judges not rashly to decide, but to leave such cases to be maturely considered, and discussed, and to receive a solemn adjudication by the Judges of the land. (The Answer p 7)

He concludes with a public call that,

> the Attorney General, by a public prosecution of the author of the pamphlet, entitled Cursory Strictures etc. will rescue the judicial character and the trial by jury, from any future attacks of the same nature. (The Answer p 8)

Godwin was under attack. True, his authorship of Cursory Strictures was at that stage not certain, but it would not have been difficult to uncover it, and, taken

together with Godwin's personal relationship with the prisoners, it certainly would have rendered him vulnerable to prosecution.

Godwin's reaction was to publish, very soon afterwards, his Reply(**9**) to Buller's attack. We do not know if this was published before or after Hardy's acquittal, though the opening of the pamphlet does suggest a very swift reaction from Godwin, and its content seems to presume no judgement in Hardy's case. Its argument disposes effectively of the so-called Answer to Cursory Strictures, and its courage speaks for itself as it concludes (Godwin apparently knowing the author of the Answer):

> The public will judge between us, which of us argues with candour, and which is guilty of malignity. I am totally unconcious of any of his epithets belonging to me; and therefore hereby return them untouched upon his hands, to be employed in the next argument in which he shall have equal occasion for them.(The Reply p 7)

Godwin's anonymous authorship might seem an important personal protection, but it was a very doubtful protection. Equally, we should remember that he chose not to reveal his identity publicly after the acquittals, when he might have reaped praise and would have had the real protection of public acclaim. There is no doubt that Godwin showed, at this time, what he meant by "sincerity"; and that he demonstrated an **active** moral courage. The testimonies and records of Hazlitt, **(10)** Mary Shelley,**(11)** and Parr,**(12)** bear witness only in a superficial manner to that courage.

Moreover, he did not stop there; one more incident is worth recording here. The next real assault on individual liberties came in 1795, when as a result of the huge meeting held by the London Corresponding Society and the attacks on the king's coach in October, Grenville and Pitt introduced their new bills against treason

(highly repressive and which were ultimately passed). On 21st November, Godwin published his lengthy Considerations on Lord Grenville's and Mr. Pitt's Bills, concerning Treasonable and Seditious Practices and Unlawful Assemblies by a "Lover of Order". In this pamphlet (which lacks the economy and force of argument of Cursory Strictures)**(13)**, Godwin states:

> Lord Grenville's bill relates to the most important of all human affairs, the liberty of the press. Mr. Pitt's bill touches upon one of the grand characteristics of English liberty, the fundamental provision of the bill of rights, the right of the subject to consult respecting grievances, and to demand redress.(Considerations p 23)

These bills, in Godwin's view, were designed to encompass any

> offence, present or future, definite or indefinite, real or fictitious.
> (Considerations p 29)

In a sense, these bills were seen by Godwin as a repeat of the government's intentions in 1794; but this time the mood of society was turning against Godwin. He did not take up specific political issues again. Nevertheless, as this brief summary re-inforces, his career over the years 1785-95 demonstrates consider able **activity** related to the ideas he professed. In assessing the Wordsworth-Godwin relationship, and Wordsworth's view of it, it is essential to remember this context.

APPENDIX I TO CHAPTER THREE

Wordsworth and Godwin: the external evidence of their relationship.

It has been assumed by most critics of Wordsworth who have written at length on the Godwin-Wordsworth issue (**1**) that all of the external evidence for the evidence for the relationship between Wordsworth and Godwin had been uncovered by Mary Moorman and presented in her biography(**2**) following upon her reading of Godwin's diaries in the Abinger Shelley-Godwin collection.(**3**) In fact, since then, further evidence has been produced by Mrs Moorman in the form of the letter from Wordsworth to Godwin of 9th March 1811.(**4**) In addition, my own examination of Godwin's diaries in the Abinger MSS reveals some small inaccuracies in dating by Mrs. Moorman,(**5**) and also some additional evidence of the extent and nature of the relationship between the two men.

However, acknowledging Mrs Moorman's evidence of a lasting if somewhat erratic relationship between Wordsworth and Godwin, I believe it is possible to build further upon this by adding small but important additional pieces of evidence, and also taking into account the pattern of Wordsworth's and Godwin's meetings(**6**) and the correspondence either between Wordsworth and Godwin (brief though that is), or in which Wordsworth mentions Godwin.

A pattern which emerges helps to explain Wordsworth's reaction to Godwin in their personal relationship; it also raises questions about the often-claimed "rejection" of Godwin in Wordsworth's writings. In looking at their personal

relationship, especially as it reflects upon Wordsworth's reaction to Godwin and his ideas, it is necessary to go beyond the limits of the date of the second edition of Lyrical Ballads and even of the 1805 Prelude; moreover, it is appropriate to look at this issue in two phases: 1795-1802 (the period of Wordsworth's most immediate interest in Godwin) and from 1803 onwards.

Godwin's diary in fact records nine(**7**) meetings with Wordsworth between the first one on 27th February, 1795 and the 15th August of that year, as well as two instances of Godwin calling on Wordsworth but finding him not at home (in July and August). As Moorman states, quite a few of these involved unaccompanied calls by Wordsworth and, equally important, in the last visit of that year, Wordsworth was accompanied by William Mathews with whom, the year before, he had planned his periodical, The Philanthropist.(**8**) Wordsworth had, by this time, announced his intention not to go ahead with the project, probably, in part, due to his fears regarding the treason trials of 1794.(**9**) He must have felt some discomfort over this as he and Mathews conversed with Godwin, whose role in those trials had, by that time, been recognised. But perhaps of significant interest is the fact that at the time of the later stages of this group of visits, Godwin's diary contains constant entries referring to work on what was undoubtedly his revision of Political Justice for its coming second edition. (He was also also, of course, involved in minor revisions to Caleb Williams at this time.)

This external evidence of Wordsworth having substantial personal contact with Godwin at a time when Godwin's ideas were in a state of development(**10**) is important, for it gives some further support to the conclusion which has to be drawn from Wordsworth's reaction to Godwin's writings around 1795-98: that

there can be found a parallel development of interest, moving from the socio-political to the individual and psychological dimensions. This is more than just coincidence.

So, when, as Moorman has recorded, we examine Wordsworth's and Godwin's next series of meetings, four in June of 1796,(**11**) it has to be remembered that this is fairly recently after Wordsworth's having received his copy of the second edition of Political Justice (**12**) (which led, of course, to his much-quoted criticism of the Preface to that edition(**13**)). Equally important is the fact that Godwin is, at this time, preparing to write The Enquirer(**14**) where he elaborates on his ideas of "nurture" and the young. On three of the above occasions Wordsworth was accompanied at these meetings by Montagu, recognised as a keen follower of Godwin's ideas and whose son, Basil, was now staying with the Wordsworths at Racedown, and it is impossible not to believe that Wordsworth was involved in conversations immediately pertinent to Godwin's work in progress.

It is perhaps indicative of the rather limited importance that Godwin attached to his personal relationship with Wordsworth (at least in terms of its effect upon his ideas) that at the end of Notebook VII of Godwin's diary(**15**) where Godwin - towards the end of the year 1796 - lists persons he had met in the previous years, the name of Wordsworth appears under the year 1795 over a deleted name as a very obvious addition, just as Wordsworth's first visit was an addition in the entry of 27th February, 1795. By the time Godwin comes to compile his autobiographical notes, Wordsworth's name does not appear in 1795 or '96 as someone important in Godwin's development, though Coleridge is mentioned in

Wordsworth did not visit Godwin again until December 13th 1797, by which time, of course, he had completed The Borderers, and actually had the manuscript with him in London. As Moorman has noted, the length of time since Wordsworth's previous visits probably reflects Wordsworth's disillusion with or declining interest in Godwin's ideas. However this may not have been totally Wordsworth's decision, at least in1802, for by that time, Godwin's marriage to Mrs. Mary Jane Clairmont had led to his receiving markedly fewer visitors. Nevertheless, this point can also be seen as a beginning of the new and rather odd relationship between Wordsworth and Godwin that was to develop well into the early 1800's. But, before turning to this phase, attention should be drawn to evidence that Godwin's link with the Wordsworth family continued in 1798, and beyond, via another member of that family: Richard Wordsworth.

There is a series of entries in the diary which suggest this. On 2nd April, 1798, Godwin writes:

> Call on Carlisle, Lawrence,? Fenwick, **W/worth atty**, [my emphasis] Montagu...

That "atty" is surely an abbreviation for "attorney". On the next day, we have:

> Call on W/worth; adv Montagu

and then, on 14th April,

> call on W/worth,atty

again, followed by, on 16th April, a visit to "W/worth and Montagu"; and then, the next day,

> ...call on W/worth....

This series of entries, together with a later series in 1804, showing Godwin

visiting one "R.W/worth"(**17**) must refer to Wordsworth's brother Richard who was practising law in London. It is impossible to find out exactly the nature of Godwin's business, though the start of his financial insecurities might explain much of it; it is perhaps a tenuous link with Wordsworth himself (his relations with Richard were never very close), but it does establish a continuing link at this time.

If it is fairly easy to explain Wordsworth's ceasing to visit Godwin through a combination of his lack of interest and/or the new Mrs Godwin's hostility to some of her husband's acquaintances, it is **not** so easy to explain the resumption of meetings between the two. It might appear probable that Coleridge (who, after 1800, was a close companion of Godwin) was instrumental in bringing the two together; but this is unlikely. Coleridge is not mentioned in connection with Godwin and Wordsworth in the diary until 1808 , but there exists in Godwin's diary an entry dated 18th? Sept, 1801, which reads:

Write to M & W/worth....

The reason for Godwin writing this letter is undoubtedly the fact that on September 6th, twelve days before, Wordsworth was present in Scotland at the re-marriage of Montagu (M), Godwin's long-time friend. It is possible that Godwin wrote to Wordsworth at this time.

In 1806, in April, the Wordsworths visited London for eight weeks. During that period, Wordsworth and Godwin met on seven occasions (not five as Moorman indicates).(**18**) Why? Some of the names at the meetings recall the earlier Godwin circle of the 1790's: Johnson, Horne Tooke. It is difficult to see how, after nearly nine years, an acquaintanceship should be revived so suddenly without

some intermediate link. That link must be Richard. Those many meetings - the last three having been in February 1806, surely explain how Wordsworth and Godwin could have come together again, at a time when Godwin was in increasing penury with his reputation in almost total decline. Perhaps Richard mentioned his brother was due to arrive in a few months; this is possible and even likely when we look at the next meeting in 1807 - a meeting which has gone unnoticed up till now, and one which also provides some documentary evidence on the nature of the relationship between the two at this stage.

On 17th January, 1807, Godwin enters:

Call on Wordsworth and Taylor....

This is certainly not William; more likely Richard. Three months later, William Wordsworth, with Mary and Sara Hutchinson, visited London. Godwin, perhaps forewarned by Richard, called on William Wordsworth on 19th April, the purpose of that visit being made clear by a letter Wordsworth sent to Godwin only two days later (a letter which, as yet appears to have remained unpublished). It reads:

TuesdayNoon/Morn? 36 lower?
Apr.21, 1807

Dear Sir,

First let me thank you for your kindness in calling upon me. In answer to your very friendly invitation of Mrs Wordsworth and her Sister to drive with you and Mrs. Godwyn on Thursday I am sorry to say, that Mrs. W - and Miss Hutchinson, who are greatly obliged to you, must decline the pleasure of waiting upon you as they have laid down a general rule, which they do not in any instance mean to break through, of not going out **anywhere** except to ? & ? French? to dinner, on for the Sunday? [doubtful], they having come up to town for a very short time merely to see a little of the outside of this huge city. For myself I regret that I am engaged on that day but I mean to do myself the pleasure of calling on you very soon, and then we can.....I hope.....fix upon a day which will suit us both. I am with great respect, your most? truly?

Wm Wordsworth **(19)**

This letter, though perhaps sounding a trifle arch, is cordial, and if we read the letters Wordsworth wrote to De Quincey (MY, 143-5) who at this same time was desperate to meet Wordsworth, we find that Wordsworth's excuses regarding haste in his letter to Godwin are genuine. This is **not** the letter of one close friend to another, but it does show a cordial relationship which Wordsworth is willing to continue. Though he did not in fact have time to visit Godwin on this occasion, he did do so over many years at intervals.

When Coleridge's lectures began early the next year, providing another opportunity for Wordsworth to come to London (initially to look after Coleridge), there occurred , on 3rd March, the tea party, as Godwin's diary records:

> Call at Coleridge; tea Coleridge's, w.Wordsworth, Lamb and De Quincey.

There is evidence of several visits by Godwin to Richard Wordsworth in December 1809(**20**) and in February 1811(**21**). On 5th March, Godwin writes in his diary:

> Write to W/worth.

This is the letter to which Wordsworth replied on 9th March,(MY, Pp 467-70) a letter that has drawn some attention because of the refusal of Wordsworth to comply with Godwin's request to versify a fairy tale (for Godwin's current business venture of the children's library), and Wordsworth's comments about the cost to him of Godwin's not paying the postage on the volume of tales. The tone of Wordsworth's letter is anything but censorious, and he takes greater pains to explain both situations than is really necessary. Finally, the request for a copy of Godwin's Essay on Sepulchres indicates some continuing interest by Words-

worth in Godwin's work; no doubt, in this case, related to Wordsworth's recently published Essay on Epitaphs.

Despite Crabb Robinson's record that Godwin left Rydal Mount feeling bitter against Wordsworth's political stance at the time, **(22)** and Lamb's account of Wordsworth's margin note to Godwin's comments on "modern poetry",**(23)** Wordsworth continued, at intervals, to meet Godwin over an extensive period. **(24)**

The whole picture of the external evidence for the Wordsworth-Godwin relationship is not complete, however, unless we complement the above pattern of meetings and intervals with some brief references to Godwin that are to be found scattered throughout Wordsworth's letters up to 1800. As indicated in my main argument (see opening to Chapter Four, Part 1), Wordsworth's comment on the quality of the Preface to the second edition of Political Justice is well justified and acute; perhaps less so is a comment in a letter dated 25th February, 1797 where Wordsworth makes the quip to Wrangham:

> Let me hear from you very soon and I do promise not a Godwynian Montaguan Lincolnsian promise that I will become a prompt correspondent. (EY,177)

Perhaps by this stage Godwin's reputation for financial and other unreliability did justify this, but he scarcely merits such a link with Montagu. Similarly, if this is a reference to Godwin's objections to promises in Political Justice, it is a particularly inept one. In the context of the relationship outlined above, it can scarcely be seen as a reaction against Godwin. It comes as no surprise to read Wordsworth's unenthusiastic response to Godwin's Memoirs of the author of a Vindication of the Rights of Woman in a letter dated 6th March, 1798 (though we

know the book was sent for and arrived on 14th April(**25**)):

> I have not yet seen the life of Mrs. Godwyn. I wish to see it, though with no tormenting curiosity.(EY,212)

It is, however, Wordsworth's comment regarding Godwin in a letter at the end of 1799(**26**) which is most puzzling. Wordsworth writes:

> The said Mr. G I have often heard described as a puppy, one of the fawning, flattering kind in short, a polite liar, often perhaps without knowing himself to be so.

I am unsure as to whether this outburst does, as the editors of Wordsworth's letters suggest, relate to the possible part-authorship by Godwin of a review of Lyrical Ballads in the Monthly Review of May, 1799(**27**); but, even if this were the case, it is surely inexplicable to find Wordsworth's writing here as if he had not met Godwin. Godwin, though not the most pleasant of company, certainly did not deserve the epithets "fawning" and "flattering"; yet, even if he did, how does this reflect on Wordsworth's previous interest in him and, even more, his later sustained acquaintance with him? It smacks very much of "pique", and for critics determined to read much into it, should be seen in the full context of the relationship.

The whole pattern of the external evidence given above reveals a somewhat contradictory relationship. Certainly not "discipleship" by Wordsworth followed by a swift and final rejection; more, perhaps, something of a parallel (though in many ways very different) to the pattern of friendship and then quarrels with Coleridge.

The significance of this is the supporting context it provides to a more complex and conscious reaction to Godwin than has previously been accepted: avid

interest and then reaction against Godwin's ideas; an apparent souring of the personal relationship, followed by a return to a sustained acquaintance. If we also consider the respective roles played by the two figures during the period of radicalism (especially the 1794 reaction and the treason trials), and consider also Wordsworth's penchant for portraying the origins of his poetic vision in the experiential and the spoken word (as opposed to theoretical constructs), then the apparent contradictions in the external evidence can be seen to parallel the tensions and conflicts emerging in Wordsworth's Prelude and its relation to earlier writings.

APPENDIX II TO CHAPTER THREE.

Two Possible Alternative Sources for Adventures on Salisbury Plain.

At the end of his Reading Text of Adventures on Salisbury Plain, Gill, 1977, in an enigmatic note cites the possibility of Wordsworth's having drawn upon part of Joseph Fawcett's The Art of War. (1) Gill is probably repeating the earlier claim by Beatty (2) regarding Fawcett's poem, and since Wordsworth was acquainted with Fawcett, (3) and Godwin knew and admired him, (4) to such an extent that some consider that the much-revered figure of Clare in Caleb Williams to be modelled upon Fawcett, some cognisance should be taken of this suggestion.

However, I cannot agree that this is a substantive source for Wordsworth's revised poem. There are parallels of detail, e.g. the "soul-sinking solitude" of the murderer in Fawcett's poem, and his surrender to the law after finding his guilt unbearable. However, Fawcett is much less accomplished in his handling of the incident, and lacks the gradual development of narrative and dramatic power:

> With wildest superstitions seized , he dreads
> That preternatural Providence will point
> Its finger to his guilt. Whate'er he gain
> He finds that Peace and he have parted, ne'er
> To meet again. (p 43)

Fawcett simply states the feelings of his murderer rather than dramatising them, and when he tries to do the latter, he uses exclamatory verse and images of superstition (such as Wordsworth dropped in the revised version of his earlier poem). The following lines demonstrate his handling of the moral crux of the poem:

> His life an heavy load upon him lies
> He can no longer bear; all wan and worn,
> The conscience-wither'd wretch a witness comes
> Against himself; and a gloomy refuge seeks,
> In the dire executioner, from one

More dire within. (pp 44 - 5)

This is what Wordworth's poem might have been without the depth of moral vision and psychological conviction it gained from Caleb Williams. There is none of the carefully modulated evocation of state of mind; Fawcett's work is all rather frenzied. More important, the attitude to the court of law in Fawcett is very different. There is no reluctance on the part of the crowd to condemn him:

> . . . . . a crowd of curious eyes
> The hall of justice choak, with hungry gaze
> And gloomy eagerness to work the case
> Of such a monstrous mind. (p 45)

Fawcett's intention, obvious in the irony of the situation here, is to show how a single brutal act is considered murder, attracting such a response, while acts of war, when perpetrated "on gasping myriads at a time" (p 45), are not.**(5)** There is the assumption of the guilt of the murderer, but he is not portrayed as someone who has been brutalised by military discipline.

Much as Wordsworth's favourable comment on the poem might divert attention from Godwin's novel as the principal source, there is little in Fawcett's piece that has the power of Godwin's novel.

Miss Welsford, 1966, points to Wordsworth's having read in the New Annual Register for 1786 an account of

> a sailor who committed a murder, and after suffering the horrors of a guilty conscience for years, confessed to a companion during a thunderstorm and gave himself up to justice. **(6)**

Having examined the New Annual Register for that year and the narrative poem entitled An Irregular FRAGMENT, found in a dark Passage in the Tower, (From the 2d Volume of Miss William's Poems) (7), I find this a rather fascinating piece

which is as Gothic in context as the title suggests. It takes the form of a monologue in which the murderer of a royal child, a sailor, it is hinted, tells us of his guilt, and then is interrupted by a lengthy narrative of the murder by a phantom of guilt (really a projection of the sailor himself). In fact, the details of the murder take up a great deal of the poem, and it is through this that much of the sailor's feelings of guilt are implied. The tone of the whole is held (though not successfully) at a rather hysterical pitch, as the sailor is constantly pursued by phantoms of guilt, which threaten him until, eventually, the whole thing breaks off; reminding us that it is, as the title indicated, a "fragment".

I find the whole piece unconvincing; and the manner in which the guilt is handled, the Gothic tone and the conventional moral assumptions suggest an unlikely source for Wordsworth. A few lines from the poem will exemplify:

> Rise winds of night! relentless tempests rise!
> Rush from the troubled clouds, and o'er me roll;
> In this chill pause a deeper horror lies,
> A wilder fear appals my shuddering soul. (p 211)

This level of pitch (faintly reminiscent of Lear in this example) is held throughout most of the poem, which closes thus:

> As starting at each step I fly,
> Why backward turn my frantic eye,
> That closing portal past?
> Two sullen shades - half-seen advance! -
> On me, a blasting look they cast,
> and fix my view with dangerous spells,
> where burning frenzy dwells:-
> Again their vengeful look - and now a speechless - (p215)

There is, of course, some parallel: the sailor, the murder, the guilt. But the lack of any psychological depth or social context again makes this an unlikely alternative source; there is nothing here that Caleb Williams does not offer.

Godwin's novel had so much more that Wordsworth has drawn upon that this "fragment" cannot be seriously considered as a substantive source.

APPENDIX I TO CHAPTER FOUR

Wordsworth's The Borderers and Schiller's The Robbers.

Coleridge's comment regarding Schiller's play, The Robbers, demands some response. In my view, Schiller's drama can be seen as neither the principal source for, nor any great influence upon, Wordsworth's play; the two works are, in most respects, very different. One of the principal contrasts between the plays can best be illustrated by a quotation from the Preface to an edition published in English in 1792.(**1**):

> A distinguishing feature of this piece, is a certain wildness of fancy, which displays itself not only in the delineation of the persons in the drama, but in the painting of those scenes in which the action is laid. This striking circumstance of merit in The Tragedy of The Robbers was observed and felt by a critic of genuine taste, who, in an excellent account of the German Theatre, in which he has particularly analysed this Tragedy, thus expresses himself: "The intrinsic force of this dramatic character, (the hero of the piece) is heightened by the singular circumstance in which it is placed. Captain of a band of inexorable and sanguinary banditti, whose furious valour he wields to the most desperate purposes; living with these associates amidst woods and deserts, terrible and savage..(**2**)

It is precisely this sense of place which is missing from Wordsworth's play, as argued in my principal text.

There are also significant disparities of plot: for example, the "prodigal son" theme which initiates the motivation of both Franz and Karl, and which also leads to Karl's becoming the leader of the robbers. It is only after Karl has begun the attacks so viciously pursued by Spielberg in particular that we become aware of a theme of individual liberty against despotism. Similarly, Spielberg's motivation for forming the band of robbers is clearly declared: a mixture of reformist intentions and self-interest. Once he has joined the band, Karl's reformist desires

are much more overt than anything in The Borderers, for example:

> Do you observe these four costly rings, one on each finger? - Go and report punctually to their worships, on whose sentence hangs life and death, what you shall hear and see - This ruby I drew from the finger of a minister, whom I stretched at the feet of his prince during the chase. He had fawned himself up from the lowest dregs, to be the first favourite; - the ruin of his neighbour was his ladder to greatness - orphan's tears helped him to mount it...(3)

Moreover, there are considerable difficulties in attempting to see Karl and Franz as sources for Mortimer and Rivers. As one critic points out, a weakness in Schiller's play, if the conflict between the brothers is to be seen as the principal theme, is that

> the antagonists do not meet on common ground until the action is nearing its conclusion. They pursue separate courses and the dramatic action alternates between them without bringing them into contact with each other. (4)

Above all, in the manner of examination of motives and morality in Karl, we see a distinct divergence between Karl and Mortimer. For example, Mortimer, as leader of the band of robbers, never has the stature of Karl; but, equally, if we try to see the origins of Rivers (rather than Mortimer) in Karl, then there is no equivalent in The Borderers to speeches such as:

> Hear them not, thou avenger in heaven! - How can I avert it? Art thou to blame, great God, if thy engines, pestilence and famine, and floods, overwhelm the just with the unjust? Who can stay the flame which is kindled to destroy the hornet's nest, from extending to the blessed harvest? Oh! fie on the slaughter of women and children and the sick! - How this deed weighs me down! It has poisoned my fairest achievements! - There he stands, poor fool, abashed and disgraced in the sight of heaven; the boy that presumed to wield Jove's thunder..(5)

Even the Karl - Amelia - Franz plot bears only the remotest resemblance to that of Mortimer - Matilda - Rivers.

Perhaps, inevitably, there are aspects of The Borderer which remind us of

Schiller's play; for instance, the relationships between Old Maximilian and Amelia and Herbert, Matilda show some similarities, but the disparities are even greater. The only coincidence, for which a more convincing case might be made out, is Wordsworth's use of the dungeon; for the dungeon as a punishment features prominently as an element of plot in both plays.

But Wordsworth's concerns with the nature of motives and morality have little to derive from this play. Despite both of the endings offered by Schiller in 1781 and 1782, Wordsworth chose neither, since neither suited his purpose.

Margaret Cooke, who has written a very detailed argument for the Wordsworth-Schiller link, undermines her own case when she tells us:

> Marmaduke [Mortimer] is driven from his home by personal misunderstanding; and an idealist's desire to set right the infamies of an age drive him to throw in his lot with a band of free-booters, dealing with rough justice, whose leader he becomes. Like Karl Moore, he is of noble character and aspect. (6)

Any examination of Wordsworth's play will show that these are the very points which Wordsworth fails to realise in a convincing manner in his play.

In part, this is caused by the weakness of Mortimer's character; but there is another reason. In the first act, Wilfred says to Mortimer, of Rivers:

> Dear Master! gratitude's a heavy burthen
> To a proud soul. - Nobody loves this Rivers; . . . (I,i,9-10)

I find the "gratitude/ingratitude" theme in this play a bit of a red herring. It is not fully developed, and Wordsworth is inconsistent in what he tries to draw from Godwin who has a particular context when he makes such apparently extreme statements as:

> Gratitude, therefore, if by gratitude we understand a sentiment of preference which I entertain towards another, upon the ground of my having been the subject of his benefits, is no part either of justice or virtue. (PJ,'96,I,84,I,130)

At the conclusion of his celebrated "Fenelon" argument, Godwin is merely pointing to the dangers of gratitude as mere sentimentalism which might hinder decisions of true moral worth. I suspect that Wordsworth is trying to oppose Godwin's view, but his introduction of this gratitude theme smacks more of Iago than of Godwin. For, whereas I have stated that Rivers is not Iago, Wordsworth is, here, drawing upon Shakespeare's character in the creation of Rivers, with unhappy results. This introduction of "Ingratitude", reminiscent of Othello, is linked to matters of compassion and sympathy as Wordsworth chooses to ignore Godwin's clearly stated position on the interaction of the passions and reason in order to isolate and reject the power of reason that seems so enhanced in the second edition of Political Justice. Thus, the treatment by Wordsworth of these kindred feelings - gratitude, sympathy, compassion - is inconsistent and clumsy. Mortimer, the man of benevolence and feeling, asks Rivers in the second act:

> if compassion's milk

Be known unto you,... (II,i,83-4)

Yet, later in the same act, he speaks of Herbert's deceit and betrayal of Matilda thus:

> ..tales which would draw tears from iron
> Work on her nature, and so turn compassion
> And gratitude to ministers of treason, . . . (II,iii,368-70)

This is confusing, since this is Godwin's view of compassion and gratitude without the power of reason to guide it. This is doubly ironic since Mortimer is, at this stage, becoming the dupe of very much the same kind of error (another example of the parallelling of plots to point the central theme). So, we hear with echoes of Macbeth, Mortimer's words:

> Now for the cornerstone of my philosophy:
> I would not give a denier for the man
> Who could not chuck his babe beneath the chin
> And send it with a fillip to its grave. (III,ii,92-5)

We are not convinced by this; not only because of the inadequate dramatic presentation of Mortimer's decline, but because of his unimposing dramatic stature throughout the play. It is revealing, I think, that Wordsworth felt the need to draw on Shakespeare so often in the play, from the ingratitude and and jealousy of Rivers, and some of his manipulations, to the unfortunate blend of the Gloucester plot in Lear, as well as the death chamber scene in Macbeth in the later scenes between Mortimer and Herbert.

Rivers' statement,

Compassion! Pity! pride can do without them, . . . (III,v,74)

is as unconvincing as Mortimer's assertion of feeling and the role of feeling at the end of the play in the 1842 version:

we may find

In such a course fit links of sympathy.(V,2275-6)

If Wordsworth intended this as a criticism of Godwin, it fails, since it in no way reflects Godwin's views. To try to strip compassion or sympathy of benevolence or sincerity is impossible; Godwin did not attempt it, and why Wordsworth tried to is difficult to understand. Here we have either an example of him misunderstanding Godwin; or, in his attempt to explore the possible role of reason in relation to these qualities, Wordsworth overreached himself. The fault lies partly in his inability to cope with his sources, as we see from Rivers' speech in Act II (i,1ff), where the opening of the speech relies upon Iago, and the rest of it draws further upon that source, going beyond the "rationalisation" of Falkland.

APPENDIX I TO CHAPTER FIVE.

Wordsworth, Hartley and Godwin.

Before looking in any detail at those ideas of Hartley's which might have attracted Wordsworth, it is pertinent to make one or two general remarks regarding the nature of Hartley's work in relation to Wordsworth. The whole question of the very conventional framework within which Hartley developed his ideas, to such an extent that the second volume of his Observations on Man is devoted to the relationship between his associationist theories and matters of Christian example and salvation, leads one to treat with caution the possibility that Wordsworth had a natural attraction to Hartley's total view. Professor Beatty's own citing(1) of Wordsworth's letter to Richard Sharp, where Wordsworth speaks of Hartley as one among "the men of real power who go before their age" leads Beatty to continue:

> [Wordsworth] exclaims, **obviously referring to his own rediscovery** [my emphasis] of Hartley's book upon Man, "How many years did it sleep in almost entire oblivion!"(2)

But I find Beatty's enthusiasm unconvincing. The letter was written in 1808 when Wordsworth was already moving towards a much more conventional acceptance of Christianity than the Wordsworth of 1798 and the years immediately following. (3) I also find it difficult to accept the premise that in that "exclamation", Wordsworth is "obviously referring to his own rediscovery" of Hartley. I find nothing in the letter to justify this.

Beatty doubts whether Wordsworth ever really studied Hartley, or accepted anything like all of the details of his scheme; he also seems to suggest that

Wordsworth is more likely to have read Priestley's edition of 1775.(4) Hartley's original is a rather off-putting text.(5) However, examination of the original and the Priestly edition show that, with the exception of Priestley's "ignoring" of the second part of the original, his simplification of the first volume still produces a fairly complex, weighty, and closely-argued text; one which, I suggest, is not the source of Wordsworth's very limited knowledge of Hartley's ideas.(6)

It is my view that what can be shown to be of possible Hartleian origin in Wordsworth could often equally have been derived from what he read in Wordsworth's Political Justice (or possibly even what he heard from Coleridge). Moreover, attention will be drawn to one particular change in Godwin's interpretation of Hartley (which Beatty misinterprets) that suggests that Wordsworth's "associationist psychology" is a Godwinian interpretation of Hartley. This, in turn, follows from the earlier developments we have seen in Wordsworth's borrowings from Godwin, as the poet turns from the politico-social aspects of Godwin's ideas to centre on the psychology of the "mechanism of the human mind". (7)

It will be useful to give a brief summary of Beatty's list of points in the sixth chapter of his book. For it is in this chapter that Beatty is careful to stress what Wordsworth did **not** take from Hartley: particularly the details of the complex but speculative physiology of "vibrations" and "vibratiuncles" that forms the sensationalist basis for Hartley's complex theory, and which comprises a substantial part of Hartley's work, providing the fundamental basis for the highly mechanistic nature of his theory. This, in fact, is more original to Hartley than is the doctrine of "Association"(8) to which, Beatty claims, Wordsworth is

attracted. Therefore, before going on to examine other aspects of the Wordsworth-Hartley question, it should be noted that it is difficult to see how it is possible to prove Wordsworth read Hartley prior to completion of the Lyrical Ballads or The Prelude, unless we can find, in those poems, clear links between Wordsworth's thought and Hartley's elaboration of the known idea of associationism.

Beatty provides a numbered statement of the specific links he finds between Wordsworth and Hartley:

> I have endeavoured to make it clear that Wordsworth accepted Hartley's theory as regards (1) the operation of association, (2) the origin of all knowledge in experience, (3) the secondary and derivative nature of emotion, (4) optimism, (5) necessitarianism, (6) individualism, (7) the nature of virtue, (8) the end of man as happiness, and (9) the three stages by which the mind develops.(9)

Rather than take all of these in the order in which Professor Beatty presents them, it is more appropriate to tackle the more obviously vulnerable points first; for some of his arguments are undoubtedly more difficult to counter than others.

However, I shall begin with the first point. It is possible to counter the need to suppose Wordsworth deriving knowledge of the idea of association directly from Hartley through what Beatty himself says regarding Godwin and Hartley in his quotation of the well-known note in Political Justice in which Godwin acknowledges his debt to Hartley:

> The above will be found to be a tolerably accurate description of the hypothesis of the celebrated Hartley. It was unnecessary to quote his words as it would be foreign to the plan of the present work to enter into a refutation of any individual writer. The sagacity of Hartley, in having pointed out the necessary connexion of the phenomena of the mind, and shewn the practicability of reducing its different operations to a single principle, cannot be too highly applauded. The reasonings of the present chapter, if true, may be considered as giving further stability to his principal doctrine of freeing it from the scheme of material automatism

with which it was unnecessarily clogged.**(10)**

Astonishingly, Beatty has misquoted here: the last sentence should read:

> ...doctrine, **by** freeing it from the scheme of material automatism with which it was unnecessarily clogged.(my emphasis)

The deletion of the comma as well as the substitution by Beatty of the word "of" for "by" suggests more than just a misprint here. The result is a significant difference in meaning. For what Beatty's misquotation suggests is that Hartley's own elaboration of the ideas of associationism was what freed that document of the "material automatism", whereas the correct reading (and especially that comma, grammatically and syntactically unnecessary, and, no doubt, there for emphasis) stresses Godwin's own development of associationism. This is important in Wordsworth's poetry and ideas, for the Godwinian addition of the process of "thought" is to be found in Wordsworth's application of the ideas of associationism.

Godwin himself admits this is not a very significant change, but Beatty is unjustified in his comment: "In this note, Godwin has the tone of a discoverer of Hartley.."**(11)**and all that comes after. Godwin's change is not extensive, but it is important:

> The second system, which represents thought as the medium of operation, is not less a system of mechanism according to the doctrine of necessity, but it is a mechanism of a totally different kind. (PJ,'96,I,401)

The difference between Hartley's and Godwin's views are adequately summed up by Clark:

> Although Godwin strongly defends a form of determinism, he is anxious to avoid a position which would allow no place for mind. He suggests that there are two types of deterministic theories. The first, which he attributes to Hartley, explains all human action in materialistic terms. "Vibrations, having begun upon the surface of the body, are conveyed to the brain; and,

> in a manner that is equally the result of construction, produce a second set of vibrations beginning in the brain, and conveyed through "traces" on the brain which physically interact. "Mind or perception," at least as Godwin has explained it, "is altogether unnecessary to explain the appearances." The alternative system would admit that mind and thought are a necessary element in the explanation of the operation of causality.**(12)**

It is important to see, in light of Wordsworth's texts, which of the two theories Wordsworth shows evidence of drawing upon, if any.

This quotation is also useful in dealing with two more of Beatty's headings in his list. Clark's summary makes clear the divergence of view in the necessitarian stance of the two writers. It is also relevant to Beatty's statement regarding Hartley's belief in the origin of all knowledge being experience. Godwin's position is basically sensationalist, the "tabula rasa" position of Locke, but again the difference lies in that second level of "thought". Beatty's description of Hartley's "hierarchy of mental complexes" **(13)** has to be contrasted with Godwin's view that sensation and understanding are different, in that the understanding does not derive from experience: hence, to put it simply, and without going into the differences between Hartley's theories on the formation of simple and complex ideas,**(14)** or Godwin's theory of the train of ideas and the analytic quality of the mind,**(15)** the essential difference that emerges is the importance Godwin gives to the role of "mind" and place of "thought", and hence, to reason. This also points the differences in how Godwin and Hartley arrive at their respective processes of moral judgement. For Hartley, we have the rather speculative link between ideas especially complex ideas) and the "pleasures and pains" which he identifies, the highest being those associated with the moral sense.**(16)** For Godwin, the role of thought removes any such speculative approach: from here

on, the necessitarian stance and the role of reason in the choice between truth and error leads to moral choice.

Beatty's claim regarding Hartley's optimism again points the similarity to Godwin, who shares the same optimistic outlook in his own idea of perfectibility. Beatty's argument on this is very confused.(**17**) The best examples of Godwin's optimism can be found in Book IV, Chapter X, Of Self-Love and Benevolence. With regard to Hartley's belief that the end of man is happiness, again, Godwin's stance as a hedonistic utilitarian (as opposed to a psychological hedonist) needs no illustration, and parallels Hartley's view. Also, what Beatty refers to as "the nature of virtue" is very similar in Hartley and Godwin. Which brings us to compare the statements of both writers on the subject of "benevolence" (a principal focus of Wordsworth's earlier play). Godwin's view is contained in the key chapter Of Self-Love and Benevolence. For example:

> This pleasure and pain however, though not the authors of my determination, undoubtedly tend to perpetuate and strengthen it. Such is conspicuously the case in the present instance. The man who vigilantly conforms his affections to the standard of impartial justice, who loses the view of personal regards to the greater objects that engross his attention, who, from motives of benevolence, sits loose to life and all its pleasures, and is ready without a sigh to sacrifice them to the public good, has an uncommonly exquisite source of happiness. When he looks back, he applauds the state of his own affections; and, when he looks out of himself, his sensations are refined, in proportion to the comprehensiveness of his sentiments. He is filled with harmony within; and the state of his thoughts is uncommonly favourable to what we may venture to style the sublime emotions of tranquillity. It is not to be supposed that an experience of the pleasures of benevolence should not tend to confirm in us a benevolent propensity. (PJ,'96,I,430-1)

Such language, introduced into the second edition, (I have had occasion to quote this passage previously, in my argument on the Preface to the Lyrical Ballads and in my discussion of Simon Lee) is forgotten by those who see Godwin as some

champion of "naked reason". Hartley's view of benevolence is more concisely expressed, and is then explicitly subsumed under gratitude:

> Gratitude includes Benevolence, and therefore has the same Sources with some additional ones; these last are the explicit or implicit Recollection of the Benefits and Pleasures received, the Hope of future ones, the Approbation of the Moral character of the benefactor, and the Pleasures from the Honour and Esteem attending Gratitude, much enhanced by the peculiar baseness and Shamefulness of Ingratitude.**(18)**

Having therefore shown that Hartley and Godwin show considerable similarities in the areas discussed above, there remain two apparently more serious difficulties: namely, Beatty's contention that Hartley demonstrates the secondary and derivative form of emotion, that it is "factitious"; and, second, the doctrine of the "three ages of man".

With regard to the first, Godwin is confusing over this. At times he appears to suggest that, in motivation toward action, desire comes first and reason makes the choice; at other times, he sees desire arising out of choice. To add to the confusion, we also find Godwin using the term "factitious passion",**(19)** clearly in a different sense from Hartley. What can be said of Godwin is that the relationship between passions and the intellect interest him greatly, especially in the second edition of Political Justice:

> We are no longer at liberty to consider man as divided between two independent principles, or to imagine that his inclinations are in any case inaccessible through the medium of his reason.(PJ,'96,80)

With regard to Professor Beatty's assumptions concerning Hartley, I would agree with him that there is no ambiguity in Hartley's view of the "factitious nature" of the emotions; but Beatty is over-selective in his quotations, tending to give Hartley's ideas a flexibility which, due to their mechanistic nature, they lack. He quotes (but oddly in this case, does not give his exact source),**(20)** Hartley's

description of the origin and nature of the passions "into two Classes of Love and Hatred" which, "excited to a certain degree.....may be termed Desire and Aversion;" (I,369) thus continuing his very mechanistic and rather rigidly classified documentation of the emotions:

> all Love and Hatred, all Desire and Aversion, are factitious and generated by association, i.e. mechanically.(I,371)

Once again, therefore, the difference between Hartley and Godwin lies in Hartley's much more strictly mechanistic approach, which, inevitably, leads to a more strictly defined pattern of explanations. For all his confusions, Godwin leaves much more room for manoeuvre.

It is this rigidity and the detail accompanying many of Hartley's processes that would seem unlikely to attract Wordsworth. To take three examples (relevant to the main body of argument regarding Wordsworth), we might turn to what Hartley has to say regarding the subjects of memory, the imagination, and poetry.

It is interesting to note that Beatty has taken much of his illustration from Hartley's Introduction, and much less from the vast body of detailed argument in the two volumes. (This is understandable, for Hartley is much more palatable and comprehensible in that Introduction; Priestley's own introductory essays amplify this effect of apparently easy access to Hartley's ideas.) In the case of memory and the imagination, any reader looking at the introduction can see the attraction of a belief in a link between Wordsworth and Hartley:

> Memory is that Faculty, by which the Traces of Sensation and Ideas recur, or are recalled, in the same Order and Proportion, accurately or nearly, as they were once actually presented.
> When Ideas, and Trains of Ideas occur, or are called up, in a vivid manner, and without regard to the Order of formal actual Impressions and perceptions, this is said to be done by the power of Imagination or

Fancy.(**21**)

However, closer examination of what Hartley has to say regarding memory in the main argument of his work, once again presents a more rigid framework,(**22**) and we find such statements as:

> However, the Power of Recollection declines in general, and is entirely lost by degrees. It confirms the Reasoning, that a new set of Strong impressions, destroys this Power of Recollection. For this must both obliterate the Effects of the foregoing Impressions, and prevent the recurrency of the ideas. (I,375-6)

and also:

> Thus, first, many Persons are known by relating the same false Story over and over again, i.e. by magnifying the Ideas, and their Associations, at last to believe that they remember it. It makes as vivid an impression upon them, and hangs as closely together, as an Assemblage of past Facts recollected by Memory. - Secondly, All Men are sometimes at a loss to know whether clusters of Ideas that strike the Fancy strongly, and succeed each other readily and immediately, be Recollection or mere Reveries. And the more they agitate the Matter in the Mind, the more does the Reverie appear like a Recollection. (I,377)

More interestingly, Hartley states:

> Thirdly, if the specific Nature of Memory consist in the great Vigour of the Ideas, and their Associations, then, as this Vigour abates, it ought to suggest to us a Length of Time elapsed; and vice versa, if it be kept up, the Distance of Time ought to appear contracted. (I,378)

Hartley's system is a very detailed and rigid one, made up of many propositions logically linked, and many of these propositions would seem unattractive to Wordsworth. There is also much in Hartley's mechanistic system which seems merely to have been formally systematised from what must have been common enough personal experience to any thinking man, for example in the last case quoted above.

To turn to the subject of imagination, in the main argument of his work, Hartley has, in the first part, very little to add to his initial statement on imagination in the

Introduction:

> The Recurrence of Ideas, especially visible or audible ones, in a vivid manner, but without any regard to the Order observed in past facts. (I,383)

This seems to be all he can attribute to the powers of imagination, and, indeed, the rest of this brief paragraph suggests Hartley is having considerable difficulty in fitting "imagination" into his framework. It is, in fact, in his second volume under the section entitled Of the Rule of Life that we find an extension of his arguments on imagination. The titles of his propositions make his arguments clear enough: Prop. 55, The Pleasures of the Imagination ought not to be made a primary Pursuit;(I.242) Prop. 56: The Pursuits of the Pleasures of the Imagination ought to be regulated by the Precepts of Benevolence, Piety, and the Moral Sense.(I,245)

Beatty actually quotes the last paragraph of the first proposition above in support of his argument on the "three ages of man", but some considerable doubt can be shed on the likelihood of Wordsworth having read this. First, it occurs in the second volume of Hartley's work, so overtly devoted to conventional Christian and religious values, not immediately attractive to Wordsworth. Second, it does not occur in the Priestley edition. Third, though this section allows Beatty to advance his view of the powers of imagination leading to a "higher purpose", namely matters of moral insight, these two propositions see that moral insight in conventionally Christian terms; and the "pleasures of the imagination" cited here are vague, for instance: "mere imagination"; "The frequent Repetition of these Pleasures cloys.."(I,242) If Wordsworth did read this (he might have been attracted to the titles of these propositions), he would find little to accord with his

own developing views on the imagination.

Finally, in the section entitled Of the Pleasures arising from the Beauty of the Natural World, Hartley states:

> Poetry and painting are much employed in setting forth the Beauties of the natural World, at the same time that they afford us a high Degree of pleasure from many other Sources, but this comes to the same thing, as far as the general Theory of the factitious, associated Nature of these Pleasures is concerned.(I,49)

Whereas this may underline Hartley's belief in the factitious nature of pleasures associated with nature, later statements in this section again cast doubt on the likelihood of Wordsworth drawing upon Hartley's detailed observations on the relationship between the pleasures of nature and Wordsworth's own beliefs. For, whereas Hartley states,

> It is a confirmation of this History, that an attentive Person may also observe great Differences in the Kind and Degree of the Relish which he has for the Beauties of Nature in different Periods of his Life; especially as the Kind and Degree may be found in the main to agree with this History. (I,421)

he also presents us, almost immediately following the above, with a view with which Wordsworth clearly could not agree:

> The same Observations hold in respect of the Pleasures from the Beauties of Nature in general....These all strike and surprise the young Mind at first, but require a considerable Time before they come to their Maximum; after which some or other will always be at its **Maximum** for a considerable time. However, the Pleasures of the Imagination in general, as well as each particular Set and Individual, must decline, so as to be consistent with our **summum Bonum**, by yielding, in time, to more exalted and pure Pleasures, whose Composition they enter, I will endeavour to show hereafter.(I,422)

Similarly, in the section on poetry **(23)** Hartley's arguments regarding the characteristics of poetry, such as "figurative language" (related to his earlier extensive discussion of this subject **(24)**, The Harmony, Regularity, and Variety

of the Numbers or Metre, and of the Rhymes,(25) seem unlikely to have aroused Wordsworth's sympathy. Even Hartley's exhortation that the poet

> should choose such Scenes as are beautiful, terrible, or otherwise strongly affecting, and such Characters as excite Love, Pity, just Indignation, etc. or rather, that he should present us with a proper Mixture of all of these. (I,413)

I come finally to Beatty's belief in the "three ages of man". In my own reading of Hartley, I fail to see this. Even Beatty's own illustrations in the second edition of his book do not justify his case; for example, his quotation from Volume II, Prop. 50, where he quotes Hartley:

> [The pleasures of the imagination] are to men in the early part of their age, what playthings are to children; they teach them a love for regularity, exactness, truth, simplicity;(26).

The whole passage from which this quotation is taken is typical of many passages in Hartley, where we will, in fact, take cognisance of matters of the relative awareness or knowledge at certain stages of development of human life. Indeed, in the section Of Poetry, we find Hartley saying:

> As the Pleasures of Imagination are very prevalent and much cultivated, during Youth; so, if we consider Mankind as one great Individual, advancing in Age perpetually, it seems natural to expect, that in the infancy of Knowledge, in the early Ages of the World, the Taste of Mankind would turn much upon the Pleasures of this Class.(I,431)

Or we can cite his Prop. 80, To describe the Manner in which Ideas are Associated with Words, beginning from Childhood. Inevitably, Hartley is interested in "development" to use Beatty's term, and we do not find constant references to the periods of childhood, youth and adulthood. But to try to impose upon this a structure such as proposed by Beatty with his idea of the three ages is to distort Hartley's meaning. What Hartley is interested in is the notion of acquisition of knowledge and all that stems therefrom, as were many eighteenth

century thinkers, not least William Godwin, who, in both Political Justice and The Enquirer (27) shows considerable interest in how learning progresses, in terms of psychological development, epistemology, and their relationship to morality.

The relationship between Wordsworth, Hartley and Godwin, and the idea of associationism is much more problematic than Beatty suggests. For there is much that is common between Godwin's thinking and that of Hartley (not least because Godwin derives much of his "psychology" from Hartley); the essential difference is that Hartley's is consistently more mechanistic.

As shown in my principal argument in Chapter Five, Part 2 in the section on the Preface to the Lyrical Ballads, the associationist elements in Wordsworth's poetry suggest that he is more likely to have derived his knowledge of association from Godwin, especially with its important modification in the role given to "thought".

APPENDIX II TO CHAPTER FIVE.

The Idea of "Nurture" in The Enquirer.

In view of the fact that Wordsworth and Godwin met regularly, and Wordsworth continued to show a considerable interest in the work of Godwin during the period of composition of The Enquirer, (See Appendix I to Chapter Three, p 8), it is important to be aware of the ideas Godwin was developing at this time; which, no doubt, would have been the subject of some of the discussions between the two men. The pages of The Enquirer offer insight into Godwin's views, particularly on the matter of education. The intention here is not to give a detailed account of Godwin's views on education: that has already been done thoroughly in Pollin's book, Education and Enlightenment in the Works of William Godwin.(1) What is examined here is what Godwin has to say concerning the education of the young (during the period 1793-97) and some of the implications this has for his views on the individual and society.

Some brief initial reference to Pollin's work will be helpful. As the title of Pollin's book suggests, Godwin sees education as an instrument whereby improvement of the individual and hence, of society, can be achieved. In this connection, Godwin identified themes which concerned him throughout his life: what kind of teacher was appropriate for the young; the place of language and of literature in learning. Pollin's arguments in his Chapter IV, entitled The Elite as Agents of Improvement, with its Platonic overtones(2) in the use of the term "elite", is rather strained, not least in light of his denial of any Platonism in the later works of Godwin and later editions of Political Justice (a reasonable view), and his

very grudging acceptance of a Platonic stance in the first edition(3) (which seems to fly in the face of most other commentators on Godwin). Pollin falls prey to Godwin's confusions and inconsistencies (especially in the first edition). Godwin appears to know what kind of teachers are **not suitable**, but he seems less sure over what people would be appropriate to the task. Pollin's thesis in the opening Synopsis to Chapter IV, "Godwin's presentation of the elite as the solely reliable agents of improvement is largely ignored in commentaries", suggests that other commentators find as little evidence in support of it as I do.

Though Godwin does admit of the difficulties in preserving the independence of view of teacher and pupil that Pollin mentions, the key essay in The Enquirer is Essay IX of Part I: Of the Communication of Knowledge. The final paragraph of that essay begins:

> Nothing can be more pitiable than the condition of the instructor in the present modes of education. He is the worst of slaves..(p 84)(**4**)

The important phrase is "in the present modes", for Godwin has already drawn our attention to this at the end of Essay VII, Of Public and Private Education, where he states:

> We have here considered only the modes of education at this time in practice. Perhaps an adventurous and undaunted philosophy would lead to the rejecting them altogether, and pursuing the investigation of a work totally dissimilar. There is nothing so fascinating in either as should in reason check the further excursions of our understanding.(p 64)

Then, in a footnote, Godwin points us to Essay IX., Godwin reminds us(**5**) in this chapter that the "true object of juvenile education, is to provide, against the age of five and twenty, a mind well regulated, active, and prepared to learn,"(p 78) seeing a continually active and enquiring mind as a precondition of his perfectibilian process:

> Education in one sense is the affair of youth, but in a stricter and more accurate sense the education of an intellectual being can terminate only with his life. (PJ,'96,II,21)

It is the nature of that mind, and the means of **nurturing** it that is Godwin's great concern throughout The Enquirer (as well as in Political Justice). Before looking at Godwin's proposal in Essay IX, it is necessary to highlight Godwin's views in 1796-7 on the nature of the human mind.

In The Enquirer, apart from one or two brief acknowledgements of possible early innate differences, Godwin is seen as firmly committed to belief in a "tabula rasa" approach.**(6)** The first essay of The Enquirer makes this quite clear, and it is interesting to read what Godwin says, and the language in which he expresses his beliefs:

> When a child is born, one of the earliest purposes of his institutor ought to be, to awaken the mind,to breathe a soul into the, as yet, unformed mass.(p 3)

Even much later on, when speaking of the change from childhood to adolescence, Godwin's language and ideas reinforce a sense of fascination with and reverence for the developing human psyche:

> The thoughts of childhood indeed, though to childhood they are interesting, are in themselves idle and of small account. But the period advances, in which the case is extremely altered. As puberty approaches, the turn which the mind of a young person shall then take, may have the most important effects upon his whole character. When his heart beats with a consciousness that he is somewhat, he knows not what; when the impatient soul spurns at that constraint, to which before it submitted without a murmur; when a new existence seems to descend upon him, and to double all that he was before, who shall then watch his thoughts and guide his actions? (p 121)

This tone of respect for the individual is one which pervades the essays of The Enquirer. It reminds us of Godwin's statement in Political Justice:

> Children are a sort of raw material put into our hands, a ductile and

> yielding substance, which if we do not ultimately mould in conformity to our wishes, it is because we throw away the power committed to us, by the folly with which we are accustomed to exert it. (PJ,'96,I,49)

This notion of the plasticity of mind is stressed in the opening to the first essay of The Enquirer in the context of one of Godwin's themes from Political Justice on the effects of poverty, which he sees as a danger for the children of peasants who show "a promise of understanding, a quickness of observation...at the age of seven years", where this freshness and potential is soon "brutified by immoderate and unremitted labours".(16-17)(**7**) Not for Godwin the romanticised view of rural peasant life, as he stresses his opposition to traditional views of division of labour which results, for many, in poverty:

> He that is born to poverty, may be said, under another name, to be born a slave."(p 162)(**8**)

The reason for this is that "the poor are condemned to a want of that leisure which is necessary for the improvement of the mind."(p 164) And in the next essay of this later section, Of Avarice and Profusion, Godwin states:

> Mechanical and daily labour is the deadliest foe to all that is great and admirable in the human mind.(p 171)

Finally, in what is a key section on equality he states:

> It was perhaps necessary that a period of monopoly and oppression should subsist before a period of cultivated equality should subsist...This much is certain, that a state of cultivated equality, is that state which, in speculation and theory, appears most consonant to the nature of man and most conducive to the extensive diffusion of felicity. (175-6)(**9**)

So, to achieve this, what should we offer the mind of the developing child? Godwin's answer is: learning, and not pedantry. He rejects Pope's view of man,

> Nature well known, no prodigies remain,
> Comets are regular, and Wharton plain. (p 19)

and suggests that we adopt an alternative humility,(**10**) whereby we will see that

"the character of man is constantly changing"(p 25), and in the famous "seed" image,**(11)** suggests that one of the most important benefits to "a man's future intellect" is "an early taste for reading".(p 31)**(12)** Then, in a passage uncharacteristic of the view of Godwin as the cold rationalist, he states:

> Books gratify and excite our curiosity in innumerable ways.....When I read Thomson, I become Thomson; when I read Milton, I become Milton. (p 33)

What Godwin suggests here, as he does several times throughout The Enquirer, is that the experience of reading literature can be a most useful and accessible way of extending the experience (and thus arousing the curiosity) of the young. If such an early taste for reading is developed, then the dangers of pedantry can be avoided:

> It must be aided by favourable circumstances, or the early reader may degenerate into an unproductive pedant, or a literary idler. (p 34)

Those "favourable circumstances" referred to are the careful sympathetic nurturing of the young by the tutor or "companion" advocated in Essay IX.

Another benefit of literature is that it will develop in the child his use of language, a matter Godwin stresses in The Enquirer, Essay III, Of the Study of the Classics (as well as in Book I, Chapter VIII of Political Justice).**(13)** Though some of Godwin's ideas seem a little odd (for example, "He that is not able to call his idea by various names, borrowed from various languages, will scarcely be able to conceive his ideas in a way precise, clear and unconfused."(p 47)), his linking of linguistic facility with concept development is very perceptive.**(14)**

Godwin's concern in thus nurturing the human mind is not that the mind should learn "facts", but that it will learn how to learn, and will love to learn. He states

this clearly in Political Justice:

> It is a well-known maxim in the forming of juvenile minds, that the instruction, which is communicated by mere constraint, makes a slow and feeble impression; but that, when once you have inspired the mind with a love for its object, the scene and the progress are entirely altered. (PJ,'96,I,321)

This theme is constantly re-iterated in The Enquirer, and it is in trying to create those "favourable circumstances" mentioned earlier that Godwin deals with the difficulties such as his rejection of any system of national education dealt with in Political Justice, Book VII, Chapter VIII, and also the type of teacher/ instructor who might not be appropriate as the guide of the young (Part II of The Enquirer,Of Trades and Professions). In Essay VII of the first part of The Enquirer, entitled, Of Public and Private Education, Godwin complicates things even more by praising the "sympathy" which can be offered by private education, and yet also preferring the wider opportunities and self-confidence that public education can bring. Godwin's dislike of both over-familiarity and isolation in early years ("A boy, educated apart from boys, is a sort of unripened hermit, with all the gloom and lazy-pacing incident to that profession." (p 59)) is expressed here. Once again, Godwin's sense of respect for the individual is very much in the perspective of that individual's social role.

Godwin's own view or plan for the education of the young is outlined in Essay IX,Of the Communication of Knowledge:

> This plan is calculated entirely to change the face of education. The whole formidable apparatus which has hitherto attended it, is swept away. Strictly speaking, no such characters are left upon the scene as either preceptor or pupil. The boy, like the man, studies, because he desires it. He proceeds upon a plan of his own invention, or which, by adopting, he has made his own. Everything bespeaks independence and equality. The man, as well as the boy, would be glad in cases of difficulty to consult a person more informed than himself. That the boy is accustomed almost

> always to consult the man, and not the man the boy, is to be regarded rather as an accident, than anything essential. Much even of this would be removed, if we remembered that the most inferior judge may often, by the varieties of his apprehension, give valuable information to the most enlightened. The boy however should be consulted by the man unaffect edly, not according to any preconcerted scheme, or for the purpose of persuading him that he is what he is not.(pp 80-1)

There can be little doubt that Godwin does place great importance on who the "companion" of the young might be. He has stated in Political Justice:

> Education will proceed with a firm step and with genuine lustre, when those who conduct it shall know what a vast field it embraces; when they shall be aware, that the effect, the question whether the pupil shall be a man of perseverance and enterprise or a stupid and inanimate dolt, depends upon the powers of those under whose direction he is placed, and the skill with which those powers shall be applied.(PJ,'96,I,45)

It is after this essay that the more famous (or infamous) essay Of Cohabitation occurs, warning of the dangers of loss of respect for individuals. Yet what has been given less attention in this essay is Godwin's concern for the young and, again, the language in which this is couched:

> There is a reverence we owe to everything in human shape. I do not say that a child is the image of God. But I do affirm that he is an individual human being, with powers of reasoning, with sensations of pleasure and pain, and with principles of morality; and that in this description is contained abundant cause for the exercise of reverence and forbearance. (p 88)

Godwin has stated that all education is a form of despotism.(p 60) He is anxious to minimise this:

> If we cannot avoid some exercise of empire and despotism, all that remains for us is, that we take care that it be not exercised with asperity, and that we do not add an insulting familiarity or unnecessary contention, to the indispensible assertion of superiority. (p 100)

In the remaining essays of Part I, and also in Part II, Godwin constantly impresses upon the reader the crucial nature of the relationship between "pupil" and "teacher":

> There is no conduct in the education of youth more pernicious in its consequences, than the practice of deception.... It cuts off all generous reciprocity between children and persons of mature age.(p 101)**(15)**

Godwin is once again stressing his belief in truth and sincerity. "Speak the language of truth and reason to your child", says Godwin in Political Justice, "and be under no apprehension for the result."(PJ,'96,I,44) Much later in that work, in the chapter, Of Obedience, Godwin states:

> Hence it follows that the deference of a child becomes vicious whenever he has reason to doubt that the parent possesses essential information of which he is deprived. Nothing can be more necessary for the general benefit than that we should divest ourselves, as soon as the proper period arrives, of the shackles of infancy; that human life should not be one eternal childhood; but that men should judge for themselves, undebilitated by the prejudices of education, or the institutions of their country. (PJ,'96,I,238)

There is no idealisation of childhood in Godwin, rather a profound respect for it, and an anxiety that it be carefully nurtured into the adulthood of individual independence and social responsibility.

Political Justice shows Godwin's interest in the human mind; The Enquirer allows him to develop this in some greater detail, focusing particularly on how that mind can best be developed for the benefit of both the individual and society. In its wide range of subjects, including its consideration of the role of language and of literature, there can be little doubt that this work, and Godwin's own ideas as expressed in discussion, would have held a considerable interest for the young Wordsworth.

NOTES TO PREAMBLE.

1. Legouis, 1921.

2. A. Grob, Wordsworth and Godwin: A Reassessment, 1967.

3. A. Grob, The Philosophic Mind, 1973, 160n.

4. Grob, 1967, 98.

5.Bateson, 1957, also quotes the relevant part of this letter, with the comment:
> This is not the voice of a disciple clearly. But is it that of a disillusioned enthusiast either?(pp 120-1)

6. Locke, 1980, 90.

7. N. Roe, Wordsworth and Coleridge, The Radical Years, 1988, 226.

8. Roe, 1988, 161.

9. Locke, 1980,60.

10. See Chapter One, note 53.

11. Gill, 1989, 106.

12. Bateson, 1954, 120.

13. I have to agree with Peter Marshall, 1984, (significantly, a recent commentator on Godwin) who discusses the nature and extent of the role played by Godwin in Wordsworth's development (pp 128-33). Whilst I am unable to agree with all of his conclusions, based on such a summary discussion, his point is well taken that Godwin's "influence on Wordsworth was therefore neither as clear-cut nor as temporary as most critics assume." (p 132)

14. Merchant, Wordsworth's Godwinian Period, 1942, 23.

15. Roe, 1988, 6-7.

16. Willey, 1940, 212:
Godwin...who for Wordsworth and his contemporaries represented the workings of "naked Reason"....

17. Legouis, 1921, ix, in his list of contents to Chapter III, lists "Becomes a Disciple of Godwin".

18. Harper, 3rd Ed., 1929, 182.

19. Pollin, 1962, describes Wordsworth as one of [Godwin's] greatest disciples, at a time when he is supposed to have sloughed off the reformist ideas of Godwin. (p 68)

20. Havens, 1941.

21. Moorman, 1957.

22. Gill, 1989. Gill, of course, reflects more recent criticism's caution over the biographical status of The Prelude as he comments on the limitations of the critical context of Moorman's biography (Preface,p vii), and then, on the same page, stresses that Wordsworth's "strong self-representation must be assessed, not simply followed." He reinforces this view in his Introduction:

> For the biographer...[The Prelude] is a problem.(p 2)

Nevertheless, despite such qualifications, Gill often turns to The Prelude as a source for his developing view of the poet.

23. Again, the idea of the "moral crisis" originates with Legouis, the title of Chapter III of his book being Moral Crisis.

24. Grob, 1967, 100, does in fact do so: "the crisis demands a fuller explanation than Wordsworth himself provides". He goes on to say that a view of the crisis as

> a symbolic enactment through the intellectual struggles of Wordsworth of that important historical process by which man freed heart from head and delivered his emotions from bondage to a narrow and unfeeling rationalism has tended to oversimplify the events of that period in Wordsworth's career and its aftermath and has, in consequence, given rise to numerous half-truths, which require qualification, and, in some cases, serious distortions, which demand correction.

Grob, unfortunately, makes little of that challenge.

Paul Sheats, 1973, with his view that Wordsworth was prone to periods of "psychic crisis", rejects the view that the "third crisis" was as a result of Wordsworth's espousal of Godwin's ideas (see pp 105-7), and states:

> To hold Godwin responsible for Wordsworth's crisis is unjust to the philosopher's noble ends, which Wordsworth certainly perceived.

In precluding a Godwinian-inspired "crisis", however, Sheats (partly due to his own theory) fails to challenge the evidence in The Prelude that links the "crisis" with Wordsworth's period of rationalistic enquiry, so often presented in Godwinian terms in the poem.

Jonathan Wordsworth, 1977, 18, in his description of the five-book Prelude of 1804, in speaking of Wordsworth's difficulties over portraying the reasons for his imaginative impairment, comes close to the grounds on which the "moral crisis" might effectively be challenged, but fails to develop that challenge. (For my argument relating to this, see Chapter Six.)

Finally, Gill, 1989, 102-3 questions Wordsworth's account of his "crisis" as being "too stark, too confident in its elisions and retrospective patterning", but concludes:

> The essential proposition of The Prelude cannot be gainsaid. During his time at Racedown Wordsworth did change.....(p 103)

Thus, by failing adequately to develop the doubts he expresses, he fails also to explore and challenge the question of the moral crisis; and turns once again to a reliance on The Prelude, though in a somewhat different manner from earlier critics.

25. I take the phrase from the title of the book by Salvesen, 1965.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1. Marshall, 1984, states:

> It would appear.....that Godwin's metaphysics and psychology are more subtle than is usually assumed.(p 97)

2. De Quincey, Notes on Gilfillans Literary Portraits, Works, Edinburgh, Vol 11, 1863, P 281. A fuller discussion of De Quincey's comment is to be found in Chapter Four, P 1, pp 167ff? in my discussion of Godwin's revisions in the second edition.

3. E.g. J.P. Clark, 1977; Locke, 1980; Marshall, 1984; I acknowledge the useful summary references and quotations from these works by Philp, 1986, p 281. However, there is also an earlier tradition of commentary that assumes Godwin's utilitarian stance: see note 39, below.

4. Philp, 1986, has the most sustained argument on the role of rational dissent in Godwin's thinking and in Political Justice particularly; however, Godwin's dissenting background has been acknowledged by most commentators, though few have seen the central importance of dissent in his development. Philp acknowledges those who have in his note on page 16. Additional to that list, I would cite: George Woodcock,1963, who acknowledges the role of Sandemanianism and the dissenting tradition in Godwin's ideas on reform, and especially his notion of "parishes"; and also Pollin, 1962, who recognises the role of dissent and how, partly as a result of Godwin's immersion in rational dissent, he drove

> further the principle and sanctity of private judgement than any of his contemporaries. (p18)

5. Philp also sees the issue of "private judgement" as central to Godwin's argument, and focuses on Godwin's interest in the individual, which I see as essential to understanding Godwin's ideas as developed in the first edition of Political Justice, and which are further enhanced in the revisions of the second edition; this, in turn, is important in the understanding of Wordsworth's reactions to Godwin's thinking e.g. in his challenge to Watson's case in Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff.
Marilyn Butler, 1981, adds the further historical perspective that Godwin's anarchism

> with its emphasis on the "sacred and indefeasible right of private judgement"...also draws deeply on the old feeling inherited from the Commonwealthmen and the sects. (p 44)

6. Wordsworth, The Prelude, 1805, Book X, ll. 867-900. (Norton Critical Edition, 1979).

7. Godwin admits to difficulties over this in the Preface, though he claims the result did not "materially.....injure the object of the work..." (P.J.,'93 ix/x)

8. Godwin acknowledges openly such sources as Montesquieu, Helvetius, Holbach and Rousseau, as well, of course, as Hartley; the influence of the first group, the so-called "philosophes" has been interpreted by some commentators as Godwin attempting to import the ideas of this period from France into English thinking. See also notes 15 and 18.

9. Apart from Burke's well- documented reaction to Political Justice, it will be seen in Part 2 of this chapter that although the philosophical and gradualist approach to reform was acknowledged in the reviews of Godwin's book, the selection of ideas discussed or often quoted suggested a strong political import to Political Justice.

10. Marilyn Butler, 1984, has two particularly apt comments. In her introductory essay, she states:

> Literary critics usually regard Political Justice as peripheral to their subject, perhaps of most interest because some great writer, Wordsworth or Shelley, had to reject it before arriving at the more subjective, irrationalist theories appropriate to poets. If the philosopher and the literary critic collaborated, their account of the book's meaning would be enriched..."(p 2)

While Wordsworth's rejection or otherwise of Political Justice is very much at the heart of my argument, I do take the point that she makes about

> the need to relate its "perennial matter" to its method and manner.

In relation to both the first edition and the nature of the changes at the time of the second edition, such an awareness is essential. Of the first edition, Butler goes on to say:

> The 1793 version of Godwin's Political Justice well exemplifies the early positive phase of radical writing, with its large horizons, optimism, extremism and impracticality.(p 11)

I would agree with this, and feel that an understanding and acceptance of this is essential to understand what it was that appealed to Wordsworth in the first edition; and how, as I shall show, the changes in the second edition to what Butler describes as a "more subtle individual text" is reflected in Wordsworth's shift of interest in his reaction to that text.

11. Cursory Strictures on the Charge Delivered by Lord Chief Justice Eyre to the Grand Jury: 2nd October, 1794, (London 1794). Godwin's publication of this and his role in the treason trials is discussed fully in Chapter 2, Part 1.

12. The clearest contradiction is Godwin's early intention to find some place for political institution in his scheme; soon rejected as a result of his commitment to private judgement.

13. Book IV, Chapter I, Of Resistance. This chapter was entirely re-written for the second edition.

14. Bk IV, Ch II, Section IV, Of the Species of Reform to be Desired. This section was totally omitted from the substantially rewritten early chapters of Bk IV in the second edition.

15. Godwin's attitude to the French Revolution seems ambivalent; he claims to go beyond its aims. But as E Halevy,1972, states:

> Godwin lays down a new condition for the harmony of interests.....that men cease to become egoistic and become reasonable.(pp 217-2)

Priestley's comments ,1946, Vol. III, pp 43ff seem to support Halevy's view; and Woodcock,1963 writes:

> The French Revolution certainly gave Godwin the impulse to write Political Justice....But the ideas put forward.....had been established long before the French Revolution.(pp 57-8)

More recent commentators such as Philp, 1986, reject a direct connection between the Revolution and the ideas of the "philosophes" in Godwin's intent and arguments (see Philp, Chps. 2 and 3).

16. PJ, '93, I, Preface, vii. Godwin states that he

> was accordingly desirous of producing a work, from the perusal of which no man should rise without being strengthened in habits of sincerity, fortitude and justice.

17. Bk II,Ch IV, Of the Exercise of Private Judgement.

18. Priestley's point (1946, Vol III, p 28), showing how Godwin departs from the views of some of his sources, e.g. Holbach and Helvetius, by refusing to see government as a potential power of good (as they had), is important. Hence, as Priestley shows, (p 29) Godwin's distinction between government and society is crucial in the argument. David Fleischer, 1951, pp 71ff, also makes this point; and later, pp83ff, points out the divergence between Godwin and Rousseau on this matter. See also Philp, 1986, Chapter 2, where he stresses Godwin's divergence from the views of the "philosophes".

19. Bk IV, Ch II, Of Revolutions, Section II, Mode of Effecting Revolutions. Replaced in the second edition by Bk IV, Ch II, heavily revised.

20. It is worth noting that in the rest of this paragraph, Godwin's optimism and belief in perfectibility through the application of reason causes him not only to draw a distinction between the "general concert" of the revolution in France and America as opposed to the divisions resulting from the resistance against Charles 1st, but to assert that the distance in time between the latter and the former suggests that time and the **informed** nature of the later revolutions indicate that

> If these revolutions had happened still later, not one drop of the blood of one citizen would have been shed by the hands of another, nor would the event have been marked with so much perhaps as with one solitary instance of violence and confiscation.(PJ,'93,I,204)

21. For example:

> Vol I, P 200, Bk IV, Ch II, Of Revolutions, Section I, Duties of a Citizen: He that desires a revolution for its own sake is to be regarded as a madman. He that desires it from a thorough conviction of its usefulness and necessity has a claim upon our candour and respect.

This was deleted in 1796.

Vol II, p 593, Bk VI, Ch I, General Effects of Superintendence of Opinion.:

> The evils of anarchy have been shown to be much less than they are ordinarily supposed.....

There are deletions and revisions of this passage to "tone down" the effect in 1796.

Vol II, p 735ff, Bk VII, Ch V, Of Coercion Considered as a Temporary Expedient, the paragraph which begins

> Anarchy in its own nature is an evil of short duration.

Again this was heavily revised in 1796.

Vol II, pp 875-6, Bk VIII, Ch VIII, Of the Means of Introducing the Genuine System of Property., with statements such as

> Massacre is the too possible attendant upon revolution, . . . (p 875)

Yet with Godwin's judgement:

> The impartial enquirer would behold [such massacre] as the last struggles of expiring despotism, which, if it had survived, would have produced mischiefs, scarcely less attrocious in the hour of their commission, and infinitely more calamitous by the length of their duration. (p 876)

Yet again, this was substantially revised for 1796.

22. See Chapter 2, Part 2. pp 86ff.

23. Bk IV, Ch II, Of Revolutions, Section II, Of Political Associations. This becomes Bk IV, Ch III in 1796.

24. For example, I feel Brailsford, 1951, sees Godwin's parishes as a more substantial idea than Godwin intended, though Brailsford does point to an important aspect of Godwin's sketch:

> He is chiefly concerned to warn his revolutionary friends against abrupt change.(p 89)

Even so, I feel Priestley's view is more accurate than Brailsford's. Woodcock, 1946, similarly seems to give this brief element in Godwin's book more attention than it deserves (pp 71-3). Monro, 1953, with his views on Godwin's ideas on reform derivative of Priestley's Introduction, seeing Godwin "primarily as a moralist" (p 169), also feels the section on parishes is given too much attention, but for different reasons; Monro claims that Godwin

> was not really a political reformer in the ordinary sense. He is not very interested in blue-prints for a brave new world.

I cannot agree; Godwin was attempting to be both a moralist and an **active** reformer, and he sees a strong relationship between individual morality and social improvement.

25. Fleischer, 1951, puts this very neatly in his brief reference to Godwin's ideas on necessity:

> the social engineer....has at his disposal an irresistable force by co-operation with which, in his manipulation of the variables of the environment, he can determine the direction in which men move.(p 62)

Nevertheless, as Monro, 1953, points out in his concluding chapter (especially pp 181 and 191-5), Godwin's determinism sometimes conflicts with his view of reason qua "reason" in the "rationalistic tradition".

26. Bk IV, Ch V, Of Free Will and Necessity, Footnote to opening paragraph. Kramnick, 1976 (p 55) supports this view in A Note to the Reader.

27. It is interesting to note that Halevy, 1972, states of Godwin:

> To Hume and Hartley he owed his determinism. (p 193)

The necessitarian basis of Godwin's psychology seems to be assumed in this statement. However, I would have to accept Priestley's comment in his Introduction that Godwin's psychological foundations are limited initially, and

> exhibit the stress resulting from the effort to combine elements derived from the different and often incompatible traditions. (p 6)

28. As early as the second sentence of the opening paragraph to Political Justice, Godwin's **assumptions** regarding benevolence are obvious:

> All men will grant that the happiness of the human species is the most desirable object for human science to promote; and that intellectual or moral happiness or pleasure is extremely to be preferred to those which are precarious or transitory. (PJ.,'93,I,1-2)

It can also be seen in his definition of virtue, which

> may be defined as a desire to promote the benefit of intelligent beings in general, . . .(PJ.,'93,I,254)

where we see the rather elitist context of his assumptions of benevolence (though Godwin's view was, of course, that **all** should aspire to the highest pleasures). Yet Godwin's subsequent attempts to argue for benevolent intent by indicating the incompatability of self-love with virtue (PJ.,'93,I,356) are ultimately unconvincing.

29. J. Priestley, Doctrine of Philosophical Necessity Illustrated, being an appendix to the disquisitions relating to Matters and Spirit, London, 1777. Philp, 1986, (P 89) points to Collins' A Philosophical Inquiry Concerning Human Liberty, London, 1717, being a source.

30. Locke,1980, states:

> Everything turns, therefore on the perfectibility of man, yet that is something which Godwin, in this first edition, does not establish, or even argue for. Instead, he puts so much trust in the rapid march of events to prove him right that the chapter called Human Inventions Capable of Constant Improvement, so far from being a proof of future progress, is merely a history of the past triumphs of reason and truth. It is only in his second edition that Godwin recognised the need for a proof of this central, crucial, highly contentious assumption, and so added a key chapter on the omnipotence of truth. Without that proof, the argument of the original edition floats in an intellectual vacuum, a remarkable piece of original and moral speculation, a fascinating but implausible account of what society would be like if men were truly rational, if they were indeed Houyhnhnms and not mere Yahoos. Without that proof, Political

Justice remains what at first it seems, more political fantasy than political philosophy. (pp 59-60)

Whilst this argument usefully provides the title for Locke's book(A Fantasy of Reason), and while he is correct in saying that Godwin's ideas are not fully developed in the 1793 edition, Godwin has introduced the idea of perfectibility, and it is characteristic of the structure and the prose of the first edition that Godwin's enthusiasm for his idea masks its insecure foundations. Nevertheless, it is essential to his vision, even in the first edition.

31. The Characters of Men Originate in their External Circumstances.

32. The arguments of this chapter are for the most part an abstract, the direct ones from Locke on the Human Understanding, those which relate to experience from Hartley's Observations on Man, and those respecting education from the Emile of J.J.Rousseau. (PJ,'93,I,18)

33. F.K.Brown, 1926, rather oddly states:

> To the great influence of government upon the lives and characters of men Godwin indeed gave very little consideration.(p 26)

Woodcock, 1946, takes the opposite view:

> Of all the modes of operating upon mind government is the most considerable.(p 49)

I would agree with Woodcock, that Godwin did recognise the influence of government; above all in the way in which it inhibits and represses the exercise of private judgement (and it was this growing realisation as he wrote the first edition that leads to some of the contradictions in the first edition over the role of government - see note 12, above). Halevy, 1972, states:

> Helvetius and Godwin, in fact agreed that individual differences in the human race could all, or almost all....be explained from moral or social causes. To this is due the extreme importance for both of them, of the political problem of pedagogy; as opposed to education so-called, whose action ceases after childhood, and to books which only reach the select few, political institutions exert their influence on everyone and throughout the whole of life.(p 193)

Fleischer, 1951, had earlier made much of this point in a lengthy argument (pp 69ff); worth quoting is this:

> To sum up: First, vice is only error translated into action; secondly, mind is of itself adapted to the quick detection of error; thirdly government impedes the activity of mind..... This indicates what Godwin meant when he charged government with being the chief cause of evil in the world, and in these three statements we have the germ of every principle of importance in Godwinian philosophy. (p 72)

34. Philp. 1986, makes virtually the same point as I do:

> Godwin goes on to argue that as our knowledge of moral truth advances and as our societies thereby become more enlightened, the need for government interference with private judgement diminishes. (p 95)

35. Brown, 1926, points briefly to this and cites many early "influences" on

Godwin, but then continues:

> But in many instances he [Godwin] added his own thought to what he took. The improvement made on the psychology of Condillac has been noted; his divergence from the famous theory of Perfectibility is as notable... Vaguely used and understood for the most part, it was taken to mean that man could become perfect by his own efforts, and this view was freely attributed to Godwin by those who had not carefully read his work.
>
> His theory of Perfectibility was, in fact, very different and much more sensible..... [man] is susceptible..... to continuous improvement. The difference is clear and considerable....the two theories are opposite. (p 54)

J. Passmore, 1970 in his opening to Chapter 8, states:

> Pelagius and Augustine agreed on one point - the alternatives were clear, at least the extremes. Either man could perfect himself by the exercise of his own free will, or else he could be perfected only by the infusion of God's grace.... In the seventeenth century, however, a third possibility began to be canvassed.....Perhaps men could be perfected not by God, not by the exercise of their own free will.....but by the intervention of their own fellow men.(p 149)

He then concludes, later in the same chapter:

> What happened, indeed, is that the idea of perfectibility came to be entirely divorced from the idea of perfection.(p 149)

As I have indicated in my argument, an important development in Godwin's concept of perfectibility lies in the idea of human malleability, and the potential this has, appropriately directed, for improvement.

36. E.g. Bk I,Ch VIII:

> This idea has been partly founded upon the romantic notions of pastoral life and the golden age. Innocence is not virtue.(PJ,'93,I,71)

37. E.g. Bk I, Ch VI, Human Inventions Susceptible of Perpetual Improvement.

38.This second section of Bk IV,Ch IV was almost completely re-written in 1796 as Bk IV,Ch VI.

39. Various commentators on Godwin have made this point, and have noted the problems with different emphases. Fairly typical is an early one from Brown:

> His argument was contained in two important theses: (a) the characters of men originate in their external circumstances, and, (b) the voluntary actions of men originate in their opinions. These shrewdly argued and extremely characteristic theses were of deceptive simplicity; for if once they were admitted, the philosopher's case could not be refuted.(p 47)

40. Note 3 to this chapter cites recent examples; the brief quotations below exemplify the view of earlier commentators:

Priestly, 1946:

> But the language of utility was almost inescapable for a writer of Godwin's generation. Consequently, we find Godwin accepting that pleasure and

pain are the only absolute good and evil.....Nevertheless, he overturns the whole utilitarian scheme by introducing a qualitative scale of pleasures..... Utilitarianism, on the other hand, at least as formulated by the French writers and by Bentham, tended to ignore the claims of the individual.(pp 15-16)

Even this admits of "flaws" in Godwin's application of utilitarianism.

Brailsford, 1951:

> Godwin was like Helvetius and Priestley, a Utilitarian in ethics, and defined duty as that mode of action on the part of the individual which constitutes the best possible application of his capacity to the general benefit, in every situation that presents itself.(p 77)

Fleischer, 1951:

> Admittedly, Godwin's moral principles are really borrowed (as distinct from their moral derivation) from diverse ethical systems, but he does attempt to base these principles formally on the utilitarian ethic. For the rest, it may be granted that the strain of this attempt is visible in his system.(p 66)

Monro, 1953:

> Godwin then arrives at the utilitarian solution, at about the same time as Bentham, and apparently independent of him. But his utilitarianism is free from the inconsistencies in which both Bentham and Mill entangled themselves..(p 14)

and:

> But it is at least arguable that Godwin was not a confused and half-hearted utilitarian, but an exceptionally clear-sighted one, who has been much neglected by the historians of utilitarianism.(p 15)

Halevy, 1972:

> The actual interpretation given to the principle of utility by Godwin remains very uncertain..(p 193)

and:

> Godwin's true role, in the history of the formation of Philosophic Radicalism, is to have brought about the fusion between the Utilitarian and democratic ideas.(p 202)

41. This view has been argued strongly and cogently by Philp, 1986, see especially pp 53-56 and 81-89, deriving his argument from Godwin's dissenting stance. Marshall, 1984, cited by Philp as seeing Godwin as a utilitarian, admits that Godwin is not consistent in his utilitarianism:

> Godwin appears to depart from the utilitarianism of the philosophic radicals by emphasising like Mill the importance of intentions as well as consequences in his account of virtue. (p 100)

This is just the point that Philp stresses; but Marshall then states:

> His departures from utilitarianism are more apparent than real.(p 103)

42. This is dealt with later in Chapter Four, Part 1, where the effects of Godwin's

revisions in the second edition are discussed in relation to the role these played in Wordsworth's development.

43. This section was deleted and replaced by the more expansive Bk IV,Ch II in 1796 which reinforces Godwin's view of reason as the manner of perceiving truth.

44. Fleischer, 1951, p 72 says that for Godwin "vice is error translated into action". Though he is speaking from the perspective of the 1796 text, this point is well taken and represents Godwin's view even in the first edition.

45. I think that passages such as this from the first edition give reason to doubt the claim by Locke, 1980:

> The style of Political Justice provides a fitting expression of Godwin's faith in the powers of truth and the primacy of reason; in accordance with its own precepts, the book generates light not heat. He writes smoothly and clearly..(p 60).

The passage I have quoted in the text here, on the contrary, testifies to both the energy and the inelegance that characterises the first edition, as Godwin, in his haste over publication, thinks through his ideas.

46. Bk II, Ch VI, Of the Exercise of Private Judgement.

47.This has, of course, been acknowledged by Godwin himself throughout Political Justice as well as by all commentators on his work; I am particularly indebted to Philp, 1986, on this issue, particularly pp 96-8.

48. See Bk I, ch. III and Bk IV ch V (see PJ193. I,18 and 284)

49. Thompson, 1978; Butler, 1984.

50. W. Hazlitt, William Godwin in The Spirit of the Age, 1963, pp 182ff. Despite the many books written on Godwin, and the interest in his work which has grown since 1946, Hazlitt's essay surely remains one of the most perceptive (as well as contemporary) appraisals of Godwin and Political Justice (though perhaps his estimate of Caleb Williams is a little over-enthusiastic). This essay, together with the collection of documents by Kegan Paul, 1876, (despite its innaccuracies) still remains the best and most accessible view of Godwin.

51. De Quincey's much quoted condemnation of Godwin's second edition is dealt with at the opening of Chapter Four, Part 1.

52. De Quincey, Works, 1863, Vol 11, p 281.

53. It is difficult to be sure exactly how many copies of the first edition of Political Justice were sold, but it is clear that Godwin's book did sell very successfully (Locke,1980 quotes sales of all three editions at over 4000 copies). There is also the mythology that developed over the price and accessibility of the book; Mary Shelley's claim regarding Pitt's assertion that because the book cost three

guineas it

> "could never do much harm amongst those who had not three shillings to spare" (Kegan Paul, 1876, I, p 80)

has been quoted by all biographers up till 1980. The more recent studies by Locke, 1980, p 60, Marshall, 1984, p 122, and Philp, 1986, P 105, whilst establishing the cost of the first edition at one pound, sixteen shillings, have not produced the total sales of the first edition. G.S.Veitch, 1913, (reprinted 1964) records the fact that workmen

> formed clubs for the express purpose of buying and reading Political Justice, and its sale and influence were considerable. (p 269)

See also note 59.

54. The external evidence regarding the Wordsworth/ Godwin relationship, whilst assumed and referred to from Chapter Three onwards, is specifically examined and discussed in Appendix I to Chapter Three.

55. Particularly, Philp, 1986; Marshall, 1984; Locke, 1980. Of earlier commentators, Pollin, 1962 has been the most significant in acknowledging this quality in Godwin's approach to reform; whilst E. Rosen, in his doctoral thesis of 1965, published 1987, also stresses this, e.g in his opening comments where he quotes Godwin's statement to Lady Caroline Lamb:

> ....I am a philosopher. (Kegan Paul,1876,I,266)

56. See particularly Locke, 1980, pp 60-3. Despite the brevity of this, Locke still gives the fullest and most reliable summary to date of the reception of the 1793 edition. Marshall, 1984 gives limited information on the reviews at the time though he does, (pp 122ff) give the fullest account so far of the book's reception by individuals. Earlier commentatiors are less helpful: interestingly, Kegan Paul's collection (1876) gives no information at all on the reception of the first edition, whilst e.g. Pollin, 1962, p 370 simply quotes from John Fenwick on Godwin in Public Characters of 1799-80, London, Richard Phillips, 1799 (though, of course Pollin's synoptic bibliography of Godwin criticism, 1967 has been invaluable in tracing the relevant reviews). R. Grylls, 1953, notes Southey's acclaim, while Woodcock, 1946, and Rodway, Godwin and the Age of Transition, London, 1952, both refer to Pitt's much-quoted interest in the book and the existence of pirated editions. Brown, 1926, quotes a contemporary biographer on the general excitement Political Justice caused.
Such, in general, has been the very sketchy information on the reception and impact of the first edition of Political Justice, upon which judgements about Wordsworth's drawing upon e.g. reviews of Godwin as opposed to Political Justice itself have had to be made.(See also note 57, below.)

57. Derek Roper, 1978, writing of the periodicals referred to in this examination of the response to Godwin's Political Justice notes the radicalism of the Analytical Review (p 22 and 178), the increasingly reformist line of the Critical Review from 1791 onwards (p 22), even more so after 1793 (p 177) and, in the case of the Monthly Review, the sympathies with moderate dissent (p 174) and the French Revolution (p 175). The strongly establishment bias of the British Critic is explained by its funding:

by well-wishers and by Pitt's secret-service money. (p 23)

Roper makes the point strongly regarding the political bias of these reviews, that,

> by the end of 1791 these positions were generally known and could be allowed for by readers. (p 36)

Roper's own judgement that none of the reviews of Political Justice "can be called satisfactory" (p 202), due to lack of coherence and specific criticism, could well be directed at his own examination of these reviews; it represents little more than a sketchy summary of each review with no overall viewpoint emerging, and, as such, contributes little to an understanding of the importance of e.g. dissemination of Godwin's ideas or the impact of Political Justice.

58. E.g. Holcroft was the author of the three reviews from March to May, 1793 in the Monthly Review; whilst Price wrote those of June and August in the Analytical Review. I can find no evidence, however, to support the suggestion by Marshall, 1984, p 119, that Godwin's former tutor Kippis might have written the review in the New Annual Register.

59. Roper, 1978, acknowledging the role that periodicals have had historically in dissemination as well as criticism, also makes the point that the reviews reached a wide public

> through the subscription libraries, literary societies and book clubs which flourished in the latter part of the century.(p 19)

He also adds:

> Through these clubs, or by the art of friendly arrangements for passing copies through several hands, these journals carried literary news into the quietest villages and to persons of modest means and education. (pp 25-6)

60. Also mentioned in the review of August, 1793, p 400.

61. Private judgement and its key role in Godwin's thinking is also mentioned more briefly in the reviews in the Literary Magazine of March,1793, p 225.

62. Several of the reviewers simply summarise Godwin's book by chapter; it seems clear that, especially in the earliest reviews, the authors prepared the earliest instalments of their reviews before they had completed reading the book. So, most of Godwin's arguments and topics can be found mentioned or summarised to some extent across the reviews or in a comprehensive summary such as is to be found in the Analytical Review and the Monthly Review; but as is argued in my text, certain themes are highlighted and attract particular attention.

63. See Analytical Review Aug. 1793, p 388; particularly highlighted by the reviewer as "the great object to which all our researches are directed"; also, British Critic, July, 1793, p 311, where Godwin's simplistic assumption of the power of truth is questioned in a generally scathing review of his book.

64. See British Critic, July, 1793, p 312, again a very hostile review. Also, Literary

Magazine, March 1793, p 225 (where the reviewer confesses to being unable to follow Godwin, but finds his reasoning in this doctrine "strong, and his positions well founded"). But see particularly the Analytical Review, June, 1793, pp 122-3, where Godwin's ideas on perfectibility are see as "exceedingly pertinent".

65. British Critic, July 1793, p 313; see also Analytical Review, August 1793, p 390, for the role of thought in Godwin's ideas on voluntary actions.

66. Analytical Review, June, 1793, p 130.

67. See page pp 13-14 of this chapter; Chapter 2, Part 2, page pp 86ff.

68. Analytical Review August 1793, pp 319ff.

69. The Critical Review, July, 1793, p 294.

70. Literary Magazine and British Review, April 1793, p 307.

71. Monthly Review, April 1793, pp 439ff.

72. This review opens unpropititiously for Godwin, to say the least, with the sentence:

> When we meet a man who frequently and violently extols his own wisdom, knowledge and sagacity, the obvious and most infallible conclusion is, that he is shallow, ignorant, and foolish. (p 307)

Eventually, the reviewer concludes by saying of himself with regard to Godwin's book:

> He takes leave of it finally, careless whether he shall ever view it again; certainly neither wishing or expecting to behold another like it. (p 318)

In fact, the British Critic, as a periodical, did continue to review Godwin's work; see B.R. Pollin, Godwin Criticism, A Synoptic Bibliography, 1967, pp 34-38.

73. The three-part review in The Critical Review seems particularly to cool in its enthusiasm between April and October.

74. The Critical Review, October, 1793, p 154.

75. New Annual Register for 1793-94, p 219.

76. e.g. Holcroft in the Monthly Review of April, 1793, states:

> On the mechanism of the human mind, and on the principle and tendency of virtue, he suggests many ingenious and profound ideas, but which are so connected with and dependent on each other, that we rather refer the reader to the work itself than offer him a partial and inadequate abstract of them. (pp 438-9)

In the Literary Magazine and British Review of March 1793, the reviewer states of Godwin's arguments on perfectibility:

> In chapter VI our author proceeds to prove that human inventions

> are capable of perpetual improvements..... In this part, he is too diffuse for us to follow him, but his reasoning is strong, and his positions well founded. (p 225)

One also comes across instances where the reviewers simply refer the reader to Godwin's book for explication of the argument.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO.

1. The Prelude, 1805, Book IX, 97.

Texts used and consulted for The Prelude are:

> i)The Prelude, 1799, 1805, 1850, edited by Jonathan Wordsworth, M. H. Abrams and Stephen Gill, Norton Critical Edition, New York, 1979. This is the principal text for all references to the 1805 text,and for references to the 1850 text (but see also (iii), below). References are to version, book and line number.
>
> ii) The Prelude 1798/99, edited by Stephen Parrish, Cornell, Ithaca, 1977 has been the text used (and referred to principally in Chapter 3) for all line references to the 1798/99 Prelude (using the Reading Text).
>
> iii) The Fourteen Book Prelude, edited by W. B. Owen, Cornell, Ithaca, 1985 has been used where appropriate; where references to the 1850 text are made, the references to this edition are also given in brackets,where this differs from the 1805 line reference.
>
> iv) Also consulted : The Prelude, A Parallel Text, edited by J. C. Maxwell, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1976 reprint.

2. Discussed later in this section.

3. The Prelude, 1805, Book IX, lines 328-341 (hereafter in format: 1805,IX,328-341).

4. The composition of Descriptive Sketches is most recently ascribed to between 6th December, 1791 and early December, 1972 (See Hayden, 1977, Vol. I, P 930); Birdsall, 1984, editor of the Cornell edition of the poem cites Reed, Chronology,MY, 1967, 128, as ascribing most of the composition to after mid-May 1792, with Birdsall suggests a further burst of writing in the summer and autumn (p 10).

5. Annette's baby was born on 15th December, 1792. By a simple process of arithmetic, this sets the start of the affair, no matter how "whirlwind" it was, or how early the conquest was achieved, around February to March 1792.

6. p 151.

7. Editions of Descriptive Sketches used or consulted are:

> i) Descriptive Sketches, edited by Eric Birdsall, Cornell, Ithaca, 1984. My textual references are to this edition using the 1793 and 1836 Reading Texts (with reference to 1849 where necessary). Birdsall's very helpful

introduction on the development and textual variations of the poem make clear that the 1836 revision is the most significant (see pp 18-23).

ii) Wordsworth: Poetical Works, Vol. I, ed. E. De Selincourt, Oxford, 1940.

iii) William Wordsworth: The Poems, Vol. I, ed. Hayden, who prints the 1849 text with the 1793 text as an Appendix.

8. Descriptive Sketches, line 2. Where the date of the version is clear from the context, only the line reference is given; otherwise, the date is given also.

9. 1836, 9-12.

10. E.g. lines 43 to 45 of the original; c.f. the revised 1836 equivalent lines (41-43), with subsequent minor revisions for 1845-49 (line 42).

11.1793, 41-44; 1836, 39-42.

12. Legouis, 1926, 145, found these lines "detestable".

13. See Birdsall, 1984, 52-3, Critical Apparatus; and Hayden, 1977, I, p 99 for text of this revision.

14. E.g. 309ff of 1793, and 264ff of 1836 (with a further mellowing in the 1845-49 revisions, e.g. 1849, 262 - Birdsall, Crit. App.).

15. Legouis, 1921, 157 is reduced to a somewhat speculative comment where he leaves aside empirical evidence and suggests to his readers:

> who that examines his own heart can fail to discover within it, even on one and the same day, the materials both for a sorrowful and a joyous poem?

Harper, 1916, I, 195, misses the point, mainly through dependence upon the view of Legouis. He states:

> Three lines near the beginning and an occasional reference later to the pleasure of "Melancholy" might lead to the overhasty inference that the poet was in love when he set out upon his journey in 1790.

We do not know exactly when the final 1793 form of these lines was written; and the love that does permeate this poem is that of 1792, not 1790. Meyer, 1943, 71, seems totally oblivious to the problem raised here. Bateson, 1954, 84-5, also draws attention to some of the deleted lines to which I refer here (though not in the revised form); but, linking them with a passage from a letter by Dorothy Wordsworth in 1793, has little more to suggest than that they show that Wordsworth was a "dangerous young man" to have around "if there were any young hearts in the vicinity". I can only assume that Bateson is not being totally serious in this comment.

16. Composed between early October and late Autumn 1804; originally in Book IX of the 1805 Prelude (lines 556ff), but published in 1820 under Poems Founded

in the Affections.

17. 1849,128. A phrase originally pencilled into a revision between 1836-45, but altered then to "each and all" prior to 1849 text (Birdsall, 1984, 53, Crit. App.).

18.Birdsall, 1984, makes the point in his Preface to the Cornell Descriptive Sketches (p 10) that the poem is

> an imaginative exploration of the poet's mind.

Whilst I have reservations regarding some of Birdsall's interpretation of the poem in his Preface and Introduction, his view of the limitations as seeing the poem as even originally simply a descriptive poem are correct; for the psychological dimension of this poem undoubtedly explains some of the poignancy of the 1793 text particularly. Hartman, 1964, Chapter 3, whilst offering an interpretation of the poem that again questions the limitations of any original descriptive intent, and seeing it as a "mental journey" (p 104), this time related to Wordsworth's early confrontations with nature and his imagination, again sees the importance of the consciousness (as opposed to simply a formalised mood such as melancholy) behind the poem.

19. E.g. Legouis,1921, 215; Meyer 1943, 81-5 (who attributes the strongest link); Moorman, 1957, I, 197-199; Gill, 1989, 69-70 (who does not appear to suggest any explicit link).

20. From Fenwick Notes, quoted by Harper, 1916, I, 193.

21. Legouis, 1921, 153.

22. Legouis, p 216, sees the evidence of this and Beaupuy's influence beginning at line 740 of the 1793 text; Meyer, though basically in agreement, points also to an earlier passage (332-355) and links this with the passage so reminiscent of Rousseau (520-555) to establish his case regarding Wordsworth going beyond "the sense and their little reign (p 74). I find his linking of these passages very strained, as well as his suggestion that the latter passage demonstrates how Wordsworth's

> political convictions were unmistakably interwoven with and dependant upon sheer pious mysticism... (p 74).

These lines seem to me muddled in thought and expression, something the 1836 revision helps rectify. Nevertheless, the whole of the "Man entirely free..." passage is more of an unfortunate interjection than a harmonised development of the thought in this poem.

23. As opposed to providing evidence of a commitment to republicanism, as Meyer suggests, pp 84-85.

24. Even the textual variation of lines 408-410 of the 1793 MS in the Henry Huntingdon Library adds little in the way of a specific dimension to the sense of human tribulation. (See De Selincourt, 1940, PW, I. 67, Crit. App.); it is interesting to note that lines 408-413 describing this scene were omitted from 1820-1832 (Birdsall, 1984, 78, Crit. App.).

25. Oddly enough, as Harper, 1916, I, 196 has noted, it is here that one feels that some of the lines

> might have been written by the hand of Pope..... for condensing into maxims the philosophy of Rousseau...

The line that really stands out is

> Confessed no law but what his reason taught.(524)

The ironies (unintentioned), in view of Godwin's work to come, are clear.

26. As Legouis seems determined to see it.

27. Meyer, 1943, 86, calls it

> Artistically inept and hackneyed in style...

Whilst most critics are generally in agreement, the comment by Roe, 1988, 70-1, is more perceptive in its recognition of the effectivess of Wordsworth's couplets in the climactic "Liberty shall soon rise..."(1793 774-9) being at odds with and "undercut" by the imagery of these lines.

28. Of which Meyer also speaks, p 86.

29. Meyer, p 84, concludes :

> It is manifest that Wordsworth had learned well the lessons of Michael Beaupuy.

I can find no other critic who re-asserts Wordsworth's own view so firmly. Again, Roe, 1988, makes an important point concerning Wordsworth's claim in The Prelude regarding that "sounder judgement" that he acquired from Beaupuy and the disparate generalities of his radical thought evidenced in Descriptive Sketches when he suggests (p 71) that Wordsworth's own experiencing of the unrest in Orleans brought

> a new complexity in his response to the Revolution after Septemebr 1793.

That this is one of the influences on Descriptive Sketches I do not challenge; it helps re-inforce my suspicion of Wordsworth's claims for Beaupuy.

30. The acceptance by a number of significant critics of Wordsworth's claims regarding Beaupuy can best be exemplifed through the claims of Legouis, 1921; Meyer, 1943; Bateson, 1954; Moorman and Schneider, 1957; Beer, 1978; Roe, 1988; and Gill, 1989.

Legouis, pp 201-214 undoubtedly sees Beaupuy as the seminal influence that Wordsworth claims, using The Prelude as his source (as indeed most critics continue to do):

> Passionately in love with devotion and sacrifice, Beaupuy, in Wordsworth's eyes was the ideal at once of a warrior and a citizen, and remained for him the type of "soldier philosopher".(p 212)

However, Legouis does not produce evidence beyond The Prelude to substantiate Beaupuy as the only important influence in the development of Wordsworth's humanitarian philosophy.

Meyer's view, heavily dependent upon that of Legouis, is that Wordsworth's intention in writing Descriptive Sketches was suddenly changed, particularly by his "communion with Beaupuy" (p 81), and that those discussions caused him

> to wish to supply himself with information concerning the manners, politics, and traditions of the people(p 81)

and that Beaupuy's teachings simply reinforced a predisposition in Wordsworth towards republicanism. Yet despite the fact that Meyer himself admits that the last hundred odd lines of Descriptive Sketches

> must be numbered amongst the poorest Wordsworth ever wrote, (p 83)

he still concludes (pp 84-5):

> Wordsworth had learned well the lessons of Michael Beaupuy and that political liberty was definitely associated in his mind with republican government.

Whilst one has to accept that the poem shows evidence of Wordsworth's interest in republicanism, I think Meyer over-states his case.

Moorman uses The Prelude as her source for agreeing with any of Wordsworth's claims regarding Beaupuy,and states:

> As for Wordsworth, the impact of Beaupuy upon his life was something that he never forgot or regretted, and which became all the brighter in his memory when the high hopes for mankind, which they both had cherished, crumbled as the years passed by. (I, p 193)

This statement seems to me vague enough to encompass all of Wordsworth's claims and to question none of them; in this way, it seems as undiscriminating in the face of evidence available to support the very significant claims Wordsworth makes as the seminal influence in the development of his radical and humanitarian thought as is her acceptance of Wordsworth's admiration for Beaupuy as a man of **action** (pp 193-4), the irony of which I discuss later in this chapter.

Schneider, 1957, 199, rather unconvincingly claims that Beaupuy

> formed a solid structure out of the shadowy impressions that Wordsworth brought to republican France from England.

Exactly what he means by "solid structure" is as unclear as it is contradicted by the evidence of Descriptive Sketches.

Beer, 1978, 22, has little to say in support of his claim that Wordsworth's "own involvement"in the Revolution

> was procured only when his own reactions were reinforced by those of Beaupuy and the "hunger-bitten girl.

This is highly questionable, not least regarding what is meant by "involvement", as the researches of e.g. Roe, 1988 have shown.

Roe himself, p 58, recognises how generalised are Wordsworth's claims concerning Beaupuy,and claims that Wordsworth's

> discussions of political theory with Beaupuy lacked the "vital interest" which would engage his emotions.

and sees Wordsworth's response to the "hunger-bitten girl incident" as having the "force of sudden revelation". This distinction is important; for it is to this "revelation" and its foundation in the experiential that Wordsworth is turning when making his claims regarding Beaupuy; but attempting also to ascribe anything he learnt in his radical and humanitarian development to the same source.

Wordsworth's most recent biographer, Gill deals only briefly with Beaupuy (p 57 and pp 60-2), acknowledging Beaupuy's influence in the development of Wordsworth's humanitarianism:

> "Man he loved/As man - here is the key" (p 61)

and reinforces the importance to Wordsworth of Beaupuy's role in his experiental development:

> No doubt Beaupuy's image remained so vividly in Wordsworth's mind because he was conscious that what he owed most to him had been "personal example".(p 61)

It was to such "personal example" or observation that, by 1804, Wordsworth would be attracted as the focus in portrayal of his development, ignoring other important experiences as the figure of Beaupuy matched his intent.

31. This event actually happened in 1792, but is introduced into the 1850 edition (The Prelude, 1850, Book VI, 414ff, (Cornell, 415ff)). Yet it is not in the 1805 edition, no doubt because it seemed then as irrelevant as the 1850 addition seems intrusive. Also, I suggest that Wordsworth's initial composition of Books IX and X seemed an adequate reflection of his revolutionary and radical concerns as he then perceived them, without adding this. Also, it might have seemed to Wordsworth in coming to revise the poem, and perhaps noting some of the tensions in his attempt to portray the experiential and nature as seminal in his moral development, to be able to add such lines as

> "Stay, stay your sacriligious hands." - the Voice
> Was Nature's, uttered from the Alpine throne!; . . ." (1850,VI,430-1)

Examination of the Cornell transcriptions and photographic representations (See Owen, 1985, pp 691-7) show Wordsworth had little trouble adding the Chartreuse incident; the only interesting point being that the line which immediately follows the two quoted above,

> I heard it then, and seem to hear it now

appears to be an addition by Wordsworth; as if he feels the need to reinforce the view that nature's voice and role in this originates from earlier; which only reinforces the obtrusion of this incident into the 1850 text.

32. It is interesting to note that this addition (1850, VII, 512ff) not only seems extremely intrusive; it is further made to seem so by its breaking of the momentum of the passages immediately preceeding, which refer to the younger Wordsworth's criticism of the law and parliamentary system, followed by an equally biting criticism of the clergy and their "captive flock". (1805, VII, 566; 1850,VII,572). For all his praise of Burke in this passage, Wordsworth's writing of this did not come easily; witness his attempts to describe Burke as "A British Pericles",(See Owen, 1985, Transcripts of MS D pp 788-91); the phrase did not ultimately appear in the poem.

33. 1805, X, 241ff; 1850, X, 276ff. The effect in the later edition is undoubtedly to "tone down" the passage, deleting, in particular, Wordsworth's accusation:

> True it is
> 'Twas not concealed with what ungracious eyes
> Our native rulers from the very first
> Had looked upon regenerated France;... (1805, 241-4)

Owen's transcriptions and photographic representations of MS D show a straightforward deletion here, though there is evidence of Wordsworth struggling with the section immediately preceding this one.

34. As will be seen in Part 2 of this chapter, in the discussion on the Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff, Wordsworth makes overt claims to republican sympathies.

35. Roe, 1988, 39, has pointed to this tension:

> The immediate challenge of France, however, was the possibility of realising his self-commitment as action, and, in retrospect, it appears as a crux between alternative revolutionary identities, and the self who became the poet of The Prelude and The Recluse.

I would agree with Roe, but, as will be seen in my argument, I feel that, in addition to his experiences of France, his reaction to the treason trials of 1794 in England and his contact with Godwin were also part of that crux in his development. The extent to which Wordsworth was actually involved in revolutionary France remains unclear. Again, Roe, 39-42, has wriiten of Wordsworth's claim that he would

> willingly have taken up
> A service at this time for cause so great,
> However dangerous.(1805,X,134-6)

that such "service" may have taken place. The evidence he offers is not conclusive, and his insistence that the

> evidence of imagination in The Borderers, The Prelude, and The Excursion insists upon Wordsworth's awareness of his active revolutionary self...(p 39)

can be interpreted differently, especially in The Prelude: i.e. in terms of the unease and tension reflected in what he might have wished to have happened and what actually did happen when he reflects upon this period and attempts to reconstruct it and its significance in The Prelude.

36. See: Woodcock, 1946, 106ff; Brailsford, 1951, 40ff; and Grylls, 1952, 9ff. Grylls interestingly makes the treason trials the Prologue to her study of Godwin, giving this event the significance I feel it deserves, albeit in a somewhat melodramatic manner and one which is not always as informative as it might be. More recently, two commentators, Frederick Rosen, in his doctoral thesis of 1965, published London, 1987, 159ff, and Marshall, 1984, 133-40, give the best account to date. Marshall particularly holds to the view that I would support: that Godwin took considerable personal risks at this time as he defended actively both principles and individuals.

37. E.P. Thompson, 1970, 123.

38. Report of the Committee of Secrecy, Great Britain Parliament Sessional Papers, Reports from Committees, Vol. XIV, 1794. Readex Microprint Edition, Ed. E.L.Erikson, N.Y., 1964, Report No. 112, p 4.

39. Ibid P 44.

40. It should be remembered that Godwin was not only given a position by the Whigs as writer of the historical section of the New Annual Register, but also as a principal contributer to Fox's liberal journal, The Political Herald and Review,

where, through the letters of "Mucius", he had delivered scathing attacks on Pitt, in somewhat flamboyent language at times:

> Your folly, sir, is greater than your hypocrisy; and at the moment in which your effrontery would have blasted, your ignorance has redeemed, the name of Britain.....While you imagine that you sit secure among your creatures, the honour of a British parliament revolts against your profligacy.

(Godwin on Pitt and Warren Hastings, The Political Herald and Review, March, 1786, 181-2).
In another of the letters of Mucius, To the People of Ireland. (Advice to resist the loss of independence.) of November, 1786, we find Godwin almost on the brink of inviting the Irish to armed resistance (p 274); a fact that should be remembered when considering the somewhat ambivalent attitude to violent reform that Godwin displays in the first edition of Political Justice.
For a fuller account of Godwin's literary and political activities at this time, see J.W.Marken, 1961, 517-533.

41. For a full account of this incident, see H. Meikle, Scotland and the French Revolution, London, 1969.

42.For the complete text of this letter, see Kegan Paul, 1876, I, 121-3.

43. Although almost all Godwin's biographers record the fact that Political Justice was considered by the Cabinet, the researches of Philp, 1986, 105, shows there is no evidence to substantiate this story.

44. Political Justice, Book VI, Chapter II, Section III.

45. Letter from William Godwin to Joseph Gerrald, Jan, 23rd, 1794 (Kegan Paul, I, p 126).

46. Further evidence that Godwin was personally at risk in his defence of the various victims of government repression can be seen from the interest taken by the Committee of Secrecy in all those (e.g.the Constitutional Reform Society and the London Corresponding Society) who, in any manner gave support to Muir and Palmer, and to Gerrald. (See Committee of Secrecy, first Report, Pp 12 and 22.) In the latter case, the London Corresponding Society's Resolution XVIII of January 23rd, 1794 which, referring to Muir and Palmer, reads,

> The Virtuous and Spirited Citizens now in confinement for matters of opinion...may we show them by our conduct that they are not forgotten...

is immediately followed by the Committee's own comment:

> On this paper, it appears unnecessary to offer any comment, or to do more than call the attention of the House to the concluding Resolution.

This comment by the Committee is typical of the innuendo used to create the case against the reformers.

47. Godwin had visited Gerrald in prison; and in his diary on March 15th, 1796, he writes "Gerald dies". (Abinger, Microfilm Reel I) By this time, Gerrald had already been some months in Botany Bay.

48. Hazlitt, London, Dent, 1963, 192. Hazlitt speaks of

> twelve innocent individuals, marked out as political victims to the Moloch of Legitimacy, which then skulked behind a British throne, and had not yet dared to stalk forth....from its lurking-place.... If it had then glutted its maw with its intended prey (the sharpness of Mr. Godwin's pen cut the legal cords with which it was tempted to bind them), it might have done so sooner, and with more lasting effect.

49. Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson, Barrister-at-Law, F.S.A., Selected and Edited by Thomas Sadler, Ph. D., Vol. I, London, 1869, Pp 26-7.

50. Abinger, Reel I.

51. Cursory Strictures on the Charge Delivered by Lord Chief Justice Eyre to the Grand Jury, October 2, 1794. First published in the Morning Chronicle, October 21st. Printed as a pamphlet and sold by D.I.Eaton, London, 1794.
Hereafter referred to as CS.

52. Hazlitt, p 192.

53. On turning to Godwin's diary entry for a clue to the reason for this additional entry, we find mention of Wordsworth, though it seems likely that this entry simply refers to Godwin's reading some of Wordsworth's writings at this time. It is difficult to decipher all of the details of this entry which reads:

> "W? Wordsworth, ca la theatre, Macbeth, W M.J. ?? at Mrs Beresford's"
> (Abinger,Reel I)

This probably means that Godwin was simply reading some of Wordsworth's work at the time (though exactly what is difficult to ascertain; entries for July 4th and 7th later in the year show him having reached p 25 and then p 108 of "Wordsworth") since "ca la" is his usual abbreviation for dipping into works. The fact that the comma separates "ca la" from the name "Wordsworth" is problematic, but it is difficult to see how the phrase could refer to the word "theatre". According to Reed, Chronology, MY, 1975, 407, Note 5, the first journey Wordsworth is recorded as taking in 1809 was to Kendal on 2nd and 3rd February.

54. For a full discussion of this, see **Appendix** to this chapter.

55. The evidence given in the Appendix to this chapter bears witness to this fact; it is perhaps worth adding that in Godwin's attack on Grenville's and Pitt's bills in 1795 Godwin defended vigorously the right to publish and speak out against such oppression:

> Lord Grenville's bill relates to the most important of all human affairs, the liberty of the press. Mr. Pitt's bill touches upon one of the grand characteristics of English liberty, the fundamental provision of the bill of rights, the right of the subject to consult respecting grievances, and to demand redress.
> (Considerations on Lord Grenville's and Mr. Pitt's Bills), London, 1795.

56. They first met on 27th February, 1795. This is recorded on the fourth page of notebook 7 of Godwin's diary. (Abinger,Reel I)

57. Nevertheless, Mrs Moorman's comment that the government's policy of repression

> drew from Wordsworth one of his bitterest strictures. He felt even in 1804 too strongly to write about it at length.(1957,I,254)

is without foundation. Granted Wordsworth's supposed radical beliefs and intent at this time, it is surely the scant response to the terrible oppressions of 1794 that strikes one.

58. Discussed on in chapter two, Part 1, pp 67-8, and chapter six, p 320

59. Discussed in Part 2 of this chapter.

60. EY,119.

61. There have, in recent years, been two published suggestions that Wordsworth did, in fact, become involved in the publication of his intended periodical. The first is by Kenneth Johnston, 1986, referring to The Philanthropist (Daniel Isaac Eaton, London, 1795-96); the second reference to this is by Roe, 1988, 276-9, in his Appendix: Wordsworth and Daniel Isaac Eaton's Philanthropist. (Roe seems unaware of the existence of the earlier article.) In his article, Johnston suggests that the brief appearance of a "small,liberal opposition paper called The Philanthropist,(p 373) despite Moorman's belief (1957,I,256n) that it contained nothing from Wordsworth's pen, offers evidence that Wordsworth did, in fact, become involved in his planned publication, though not a monthly periodical. Johnston seems too determined to persuade us that this is the case. His claim of Wordsworth's "voluminous" (p 372) correspondence with Mathews seems as exaggerated as his failing to see a discrepancy between Wordsworth's declared intentions in those letters and some of the themes of the early editions of The Philanthropist makes us suspicious of his claims, e.g.: one of the early editions

> accepts the existence of the king and the aristocracy as being, along with the clergy, "admirably adapted to the genius of the English people ...(Johnston,1986,376).

Johnston does make some interesting points, but I find his examples unconvincing e.g. his illustration of the Godwinian theme of the effects of poverty on the mind (p 388) seems particularly uncharacteristic of the manner in which both Wordsworth and Godwin wrote on that subject.
Roe is much more cautious, and certainly does not see any major contribution by Wordsworth to this publication; he suggests that some verse and one editorial might come from Wordsworth's pen. I find his most convincing reference is that referring to the distress resulting from war (Roe,pp 278-9). This does indeed echo some of **Godwin's** arguments on the effects of war, such as I argue in Chapter Three of this thesis might have helped crystallise Wordsworth's ideas prior to his writing the Salisbury Plain poems. However, there seems to be more evidence related to Godwin than to Wordsworth, and I have to agree with Roe's conclusion that,as yet, no conclusive evidence exists to establish a definite

link between Wordsworth and this publication. Above all, such evidence as has been suggested scarcely makes a case for Wordsworth taking the kind of public stance in defence of human liberties that Godwin did.

> 62. I cannot say that I entirely approve of the character of Tooke. He seems to me to be a man much swayed by personal considerations, who courted persecution... (EY, 137)

63. Godwin's diary records this on 1st May, 1806. (Abinger,Reel I)

64. Though the fact that, in later years, Godwin did indulge in remembering such moments of achievement, suggests he **would** have been more likely to mention this to Wordsworth than not.

65. 1805, X, 636-656.

66. One is reminded of Godwin's lines in the letter to Mucius quoted in chapter Two, p 67 (although I am not suggesting that Godwin had this in mind), as well as the general tenor of Political Justice.

67. This passage is further discussed in Chapter 6, p 320.

68. In February, 1793. Wordsworth's "toning down" of his reaction to this by 1850 has already been discussed; see note 33, above.

69. Havens, 1941, 535, sees it in this light, and then continues, mistakenly, in my view, to state that:

> Godwin's "Reason" was a child of the Revolution and, though less vague, less idealistic, and far more patient, was as strongly **a priori** as its parent and blind to reality.

As I have stated in Chapter 1, see p 10-12, more recent scholarship has recognised considerable divergences between the ideas of the philosophes, and those of Godwin. See also Chapter one, notes 8,15, and 18.

70. M. Butler, 1984, 7, states:

> The twelve month period beginning in February 1792 was the **annus mirabilis** of eighteenth-century radicalism.

71. It is difficult to see how far Wordsworth intends us to take this as meaning that he actually involved himself in the events of the Revolution; there seems to be no evidence to support this. It seems more likely that he was simply a participant observer. Yet, as I have already pointed out, this concern with **active** radicalism is one which seems to haunt Wordsworth as he reflects on his development.

72. Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff, The Prose Works of William Wordsworth, Edited by W.J.B. Owen and Jane Worthington Smyser, Vol. I, Oxford, 1974, 31ff. All line references to Wordsworth's Llandaff are to this text.

73. Legouis, 1921, 226-231 does not make a direct link between Godwin and Llandaff, while Harper, 1929, 185-6 does. Owen and Smyser, 1974, give a list, in footnotes to the Introduction to their edition of Llandaff (p 23) of those who have made a case for or against Godwinian influence. Only three of the studies referred to make any real contribution to the debate over Wordsworth's text: Wordsworth's Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff in Studies in Philology, XXVIII, 1931, pp 522-531 by Edward Niles Hooker, who sees Paine as the seminal infuence; the reply to that article in The Influence of Godwin in Wordsworth's Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff, Studies in Philology, XXIV, 1932, pp 588-606 by Charles W. Roberts who makes a strong case for Godwin's influence; and the third contribution which seems to add something to the debate is the short reference to Llandaff in Politics and the Poet, by Todd, 1957, 58-62, who makes a crucial point regarding the language of Godwin being reflected in Llandaff (though he scarcely explains this). Of Wordsworth's two most recent biographers, Moorman, 1957, I, 255, claims the letter "shows no trace of Godwin's doctrines", whilst Gill, 1989, 85, simply assumes no link. Roe, 1988, 33, sees Paine (along with Burke) as the inspiration for Wordsworth's arguments.

74. He does, of course, refer to the first edition implicitly in his comment on the quality of the Preface to the second edition.

75. Rather than simply picking out "verbal echoings", which Niles Hooker and Roberts have done more than adequately. This can prove dangerous: e.g. the reference that Roberts cites (605) to Wordsworth's use of the phrase in Landaff,(428) "talents and industry", seeing Godwin as the source, ignores the fact that Wordsworth used this phrase in a letter to William Mathews in May, 1792 (EY, p 77). The sentence in which this phrase occurs is quoted in note 82, below.)

76. Where there is a more complex issue than merely a matter of order, as suggested by Beatty, 2nd Ed., 1927, (Reprint of 1960). Beatty (who sees strong Godwinian influence) says that Wordsworth argues against

> monarchy, the aristocracy, the clergy and special privileges

and for

> democracy and parliamentary reform..... in an order which strongly suggests the order in Godwin's book. (p 30)

I find only a measure of truth in this. Wordsworth actually follows the order of Watson's argument quite closely in order to structure his own argument. What he does do is to diversify and elaborate at times, and, especially at the start of the letter to introduce certain fundamental philosophical premises. But one can see Wordsworth returning to specific sections or pages of Godwin's book, as I note in my argument.

77. Roberts suggests this; in places, with some force.

78. Meyer, 1943 and Moorman, 1957 rather vaguely attribute composition to Spring, 1793. Roberts, in his article, argues strongly for June, 1793, and Reed, Chronology,EY, 12 and 142, relying on Roberts, dates composition as "probably June or shortly thereafter". Owen and Smyser, 1974, 20 (and note 5) claim that

after a careful study of the topical allusions in the Letter itself it was

> most probably written in February or March, for **all** of the allusions are to events antecedent to the execution of Louis or to the "present convulsion (54) immediately attendant on that event.

I am not persuaded that Owen and Smyser have successfuly rejected Roberts' case regarding the variety and time-span of Wordsworth's allusions. Roe, 1988, 126, accepts Owen's and Smyser's earlier dating.

79. Owen and Smyser, 1974, 23, speak of Wordsworth having difficulty in "mastering" Godwin's arguments in Political Justice before setting out to write the letter. What careful examination of the two texts does is to vindicate common sense. Wordsworth has **not** yet "mastered" Godwin's book. But he had read it (and not just Vol. II as Roberts suggests at the end of his article(p 606)), offering unsatisfactory arguments to support his contention; for it is important to note that many of the arguments in Godwin's work upon which Wordsworth draws are to be found in Vol I. See also note 91, below.

80. The edition of Watson's Appendix used is that printed in The Prose Works of William Wordsworth, Ed. Grosart, Vol. I, London, 1876, 24-30. Hereafter referred to as "Grosart"; line references are from this text.

81. Whether Wordsworth composed Llandaff by March or nearer to June, it does allow time for a cursory reading of Political Justice by Wordsworth (which is all that Llandaff evidences), for him to have been aware of its much advertised publication (see note 84), and possibly also for some of the reviews to have appeared prior to composition.

82. It is perhaps significant, and not a little ironic, to contrast Wordsworth's obvious outrage here, with his reference in The Prelude to his first tour of the Alps; he records here how

> We bore a name
> Honoured in France, the name of Englishmen.(1805, VI, 409-410)

There is no hint here of the feelings Wordsworth obviously had in 1793. Even in his letter to William Mathews from Blois in May 1792, Wordsworth writes:

> You have the happiness of being born in a free country, where every road is open, where talents and industry are more liberally rewarded than amongst any other nation in the Universe. (EY,77)

83. Grosart, 24.

84. The imminent appearance of Political Justice was advertised in advance in the Morning Herald of 8th and 16th February. After publication, there were announcements of its availability in the Morning Herald of 21st and 25th February and the Times of 22nd February. (Owen and Smyser, Note 4 to p 23);There was also an advertisement in the London Chronicle (Reed, Chronology, EY, 141).

85. PJ, '93 Preface, p viii.

86. PJ,'93, Preface, p ix. Significantly, this phrase was changed in the 1796 edition to "the omnipotence of **opinion**" (this is discussed in Chapter 4, Part 1). In fact, although Godwin, in the 1796 and 1798 editions reprinted a Preface to the First Edition over the original date of 7th January, 1793, this is not the original Preface, but has extensive changes.

87. Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff, lines 20-23. Part I of Book I, Chapter IV of Political Justice, on the subject of Literature, under the general title of the chapter, Three Principal Causes of Moral Improvement Considered (deleted from the 1796 edition), and linking literature and truth, opens the argument on the omnipotence of truth which so pervades Godwin's book, where he states:

> A certain quantity of truth will be sufficient for the subversion of tyranny and usurpation. (PJ,'93,23)

88. By June 1793, a number of reviews had appeared, all generally favourable and supportive:

> Literary Magazine and British Review: reviews in March and April, 1793;
> Critical Review: first review (of three) in April 1793;
> Holcroft's three reviews in Monthly Review, in March, April and May - which summarised all of Godwin's book.
> Price's first review (of two) in Analytical Review in June, 1793.

For details of the content of these reviews, see Chapter One, Part 2.

91. Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff, line 17. Hereafter line references only are given.

92. An idea which, as Niles Hooker properly points out (p 525), derives from Paine.

93. PJ,'93,I,60-3. Deleted from the second edition, and therefore, in that edition, not as clearly juxtaposed with **civil** oppression and servility. This example contradicts Roberts' assertion that Wordsworth had read only Vol. II of Political Justice. (See note 79, above)

94. Owen's and Smyser's note here (p 51, note to lines 28-30) seems very weak, and points their determination not to acknowledge any recourse to Godwin by Wordsworth.

93. Paine scarcely uses the term "slavery" at all in Rights of Man, and, when he does, it is in a more restricted sense, e.g.:

> Government with insolence is despotism, but when contempt is added, it becomes worse; and to pay for contempt is excess of slavery.(Paine, Penguin, 1976, 142-3).

94. E.g. 1793, line 158.

95. Grosart, p 24.

96. Line 27. Wordsworth does echo the words of Watson at times, as well as

simply quoting them in places. He obviously had Watson's text open in front of him as he composed Llandaff, and yet will make changes to phrases. To expect exact verbal parallels from Godwin's book is to expect too much; what were more likely to make an impression on Wordsworth from a book of the scale of Political Justice were themes in argument, especially repeated argument, and, as my discussion shows, there are examples of this (e.g in attitude to violent reform, or the opressions of political institutions.)

97. Specifically, the paragraph entitled (Tendency of Positive Institutions) To Inform Judgement - Its Inaptitude for that Purpose. (PJ,'93,I,123-4)

98. Beginning l.399ff.

99. Owen and Smyser, 1974, in their note on p 52 to lines 56-8 claim Wordsworth "exaggerates Watson's views on the guilt of Louis". But Wordsworth's target is, for the reasons I give in my main argument, exactly the text that Owen and Smyser quote from Watson:

> The monarch, you will tell me, was guilty of perfidy and perjury. -I know not, that he was guilty of either; but admitting that he has been guilty of both-who, alas! of the sons of men is so confident in the strength of their own virtue...as to be certain that under similar temptations he would not have been guilty of similar offences? Surely it would have been no diminution of the sternness of new republican virtue...if it had pardoned the perfidy which its own oppression had occasioned-...

100. In the critical Bk II, Chapter II, Of Justice.

101. See pp 77 and 80 above.

102. See, specifically, his statement in Vol. II, p 413, and, more important, p 821, where he states:

> Republicanism is not a remedy that strikes at the root of evil.

Ironically, Watson seems closer to Godwin here, although it is important to note that Wordsworth is supporting the republican model because of its democratic principles.

103. Line 181.

104. See p 79, above.

105. Line 193.

106. PJ,'93,II,668. The separateness of this passage on "prejudice" from Book I, Chapter III might seem an objection to my argument. However, I would point to two facts: (i) the notion of "prejudice" has already occurred in the context of oppression in the section on the "priesthood" in Book I, Chapter VII, Section II (already discussed earlier).(ii) A fact not commented upon before is that, despite the lack of an index in Political Justice, it is remarkably easy to trace the main principles and topics of the book through the chapter headings, the

margin titles, and the table of contents in both volumes. Thus, a growing familiarity with Godwin's ideas on even a single reading of the book soon facilitates the possibility of a more extensive and ranging "exploration" of the text.

107. Line 265, "Appearing as I do the advocate of republicanism...."

108. Line 276.

109. Book VII, Chapter II.

110. Though it is worth noting that even Book IV, Chapters I and II cited above were substantially revised in 1796.

111. Down to line 119.

112. See Chapter One, Part 2, p 33

113. Chapter One,Part 1 pp 12-13

114. The revisions to Political Justice in 1796 are discussed in Chapter 4, Part 1.

115. Roberts, p 598, is aware of this to some extent, but has not shown anything like the full weight of evidence in Godwin's first edition.

116. Chapter One, Part 1.

117. This chapter was completely re-written in 1796; the later version, though somewhat toned down in its acceptance of violent resistance under special circumstances, still admits quite forcefully of its possible occasional necessity.

118. Again, revised in 1796, when this statement was deleted.

119. See note 11.

120. Whether these were merely as observer, as Moorman, 1957, I, 202-8, suggests, or perhaps, albeit briefly, as a participant, as Roe, 1988, 39ff, has claimed (though he also traces Wordsworth's developing reaction against the violence of the Terror, pp 70-1 and 80 particularly). Gill, 1989, 62-5, does not support the view of Wordsworth as active participant, seeing him, rather, as a "bewildered spectator".(p 63)

121. Roberts, Pp 593-4 and 600-604.

122. Book V, Chapter II.

123. Book V, Chapter III.

124. Roberts and Niles Hooker are particularly relevant here. Though I have a preference for Roberts' view (and his thoroughness), I feel that the

contradictory claims they feel justified in making regarding Paine and Godwin as sources point more forcefully my own conclusion.

125. Beginning on line 215.

126. Line 265.

127. Niles Hooker has suggested this argument does not draw upon Godwin because Wordsworth is more concerned with the principles of law than its effect upon individuals. This is not the case, as will be seen.

128. See also, PJ,'93,II,767.

129. Line 320.

130. Roberts (pp 602-4) argues convincingly for Godwin as the source here; I agree. He also shows Wordsworth drawing closely on Godwin's arguments on monarchy and caprice or whim, hereditary monarchy, and the dependence of "millions" upon monarchs.

131. Line 428; but see cautionary note, 75, above.

132. Also see: PJ,'93,II,466 and again, 804 and 806.

133. Also see: PJ,'93,II,791.

134. Also see: PJ,'93,I,35 and 39.

135. See especially: PJ,'93,II,768-9 and 779-80.

136. Line 480.

137. Todd, 1957, 59-60 in a rather unconvincing argument, nevertheless implies this, correctly, in my view. Marshall, 1984, 133, recognises that both Wordsworth and Godwin were "inspired by a humanitarian concern for the poor", though Marshall in his perceptive pages on Wordsworth and Godwin fails to recognise any debt to Godwin in Llandaff, suggesting that "it seems likely that it was not before the summer of 1794" that Wordsworth first read Godwin.

138. I strongly disagree with Niles Hooker p 531, that Paine is the principal influence in Wordsworth's attempt to structure his thoughts and argument. However, neither can I totally accept the assertion by Todd, 1957, 62, that Wordsworth's letter reflects the "calm logic of Godwin"; this underestimates the force of the language of the first edition of Political Justice, though I do agree that Wordsworth's method of argument is closer to Godwin than to what Todd calls "the clamant defiance" of Paine.

139. That Wordsworth was becoming interested in a more systematic and structured approach is reflected, ironically, in the opening sentence of his

fragment of 1798 known as the Essay on Morals, where, reacting strongly against such an approach, Wordsworth states:

> I think publications in which we formally and systematically lay down rules for the Actions of Men cannot be delayed too long.

In the next sentence, he describes

> such books as Mr. Godwyn's.....as impotent to their intended good purposes.

For a fuller discussion of the significance of the Essay on Morals and its place in Wordsworth's development, and his relationship with Godwin and his ideas, see Chapter 5, Part 2, pp 279ff.
Interestingly, Marshall, 1984, 129, takes the view I do: that Wordsworth did go on, after Llandaff to a "systematic study of Godwin's philosophy"; this will be evidenced in later texts, but I contend that such a systematic study was preceded (and probably initiated) by an earlier swift reading of Political Justice, as is suggested by what emerges in Llandaff.

140. There seems little argument amongst most critics both of Godwin and Wordsworth that there is clear evidence of the influence of Godwin in this correspondence; see e.g. Marshall, 1984, 128-9, who points to heavy drawing upon Godwin, even in parallels of imagery. Moorman, 1957, 255 in her biography states:

> whereas the Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff shows no trace of Godwin's doctrines, the letter to Mathews of June 1794 certainly does.

Moorman offers no evidence for rejecting any Godwinian influence in Llandaff, and her discussion of the June letter is not very penetrating. Roe's assumed very early dating of Llandaff (1988,p 126) and his arguments regarding Wordsworth's likely attraction to Rights of Man and Paine's ideas (pp 33-4) lead him to preclude Godwin as a significant source for Wordsworth in Llandaff. Gill, 1989, 85-6, is fairly summary in his acknowledgement of Godwin's influence in the letters to Mathews, but does accept that they show Wordsworth had absorbed the "essential message" of Political Justice. However, in view of the arguments I have already advanced earlier in this chapter, I find considerable irony in Gill's assertion,

> In the summer of 1794 Godwin's was the voice Wordsworth most needed to hear. Firstly, it convinced him that by writing, by using his imagination and powers of language, he would be **actively** campaigning.....for the wider reign of truth.(p 86)

141. Already alluded to, see note 82.

142. Wordsworth even states:

> You will naturally expect that writing from a country agitated by the storms of revolution, my letter should not merely be confined to us and our friends. But the truth is that in London you perhaps have a better opportunity of being informed of the general concerns of France than in a petty provincial town in the heart of the king[dom] itself. (EY, 77)

However, Wordsworth does, later on in the same letter, show himself aware of developments in France such as the murder of General Theobald Dillon (EY 77-8), as Roe, 51, acknowledges. See note Chapter three, Part 2, p 123

143. It is extremely difficult to pin down exactly when Wordsworth met Beaupuy, and when the walks, of which he speaks in The Prelude, took place. The departure of Beaupuy's regiment on 27th July, 1792 is acknowledged by all commentators. Reed, Chronology, EY, 1967, 130, suggests Wordsworth might have met Beaupuy as early as January, 1792. It seems, however, reasonable to assume that by May 19th, he had indeed met with Beaupuy, albeit the discussions between them might have been limited. But there is clearly no evidence in this letter of the impact claimed in The Prelude.

144. To which he briefly refers in this letter as having been "written last summer". (EY,120)

145. Already discussed, see pp 66-7

146. Marshall, 1984, 128, claims that "the first hard evidence of Wordsworth's having read Political Justice comes in the June 8th letter. Whilst, in the context of the correspondence with Mathews, I would generally agree, the quotation given here is at the very heart of Godwin's thinking.

147. Previously discussed. See Chapter One, Part 1, pp 13-14 and Chapter 2, Part 2, p.....?

148. Godwin makes much of the idea and language of "enlightenement": e.g. PJ,'93,I,50 in his reference to only the most "**enlightened**, product of an extraordinary teacher" (my emphasis) being free from the effects of political institutions; or his suggestion in his chapter Of Constitutions that that

> form of society will appear most perfect to an enlightened mind, which is least founded in the principle of permanence.(PJ,'93,II,654)

Pollin, 1962, has argued forcefully the importance of this in Godwin's view of progress and the doctrine of perfectibility.

149. Discussed in Chapter One, Part 1, pp 21ff

150. See also Godwin's arguments against political associations in Book IV, Chapter II, Section III.

151. See pp 65ff.

152. As already indicated, Godwin's assertion was that as a writer of such a work as Political Justice, he was **actively** involved in reasoned reform.

153. Discussed in Chapter Five.

NOTES TO APPENDIX TO CHAPTER TWO

1. Cursory Strictures, (hereafter referred to as CS) p 25.

2. The Charge Delivered by the Right Honourable Sir James Eyre, Lord Chief Justice of His Majesty's Common Pleas and one of the Commissioners.....to Enquire of Certain High Treasons, and Misprisons of Treason...to the Grand Jury. Printed in pamphlet form by D.I.Eaton, London 1794. (hereafter referred to as The Charge)

3. A courage especially impressive, if we compare it with e.g. the reaction of Maria Revely, a member of the more "liberal" group, who, on being called as a witness by Holcroft, declared herself willing to give evidence, but only if Holcroft's life were in danger (which, in the event of a conviction of Hardy etc. it would have been).

4. By his constant visits to them in prison and his subsequent daily appearance at the trials.

5. The following Work was originally published by **Mr. Kearsley** who, on receiving a menace from the Treasury, discontinued its sale:- **Daniel Isaac Eaton**, who does not, perhaps, consider a menace from that place in the same way as Mr. Kearsley, - but believes that a **Treasury Mandate** is not yet generally adopted by the law of the land, was **thereby** induced upon implication made to him, not only to sell what remained of the first edition, but also to offer to the public, at half price, a work, which as its only crime is, perhaps, the containing more law than the Charge on which it animadverts, cannot but be very acceptable to those who would rather expend sixpence than a shilling. And as posterity may need every proof that a charge, so fraught with labour and invention, was ever given, the Charge itself is annexed at the same reduced price. (prefaced to Eaton's edition of CS).

6. Answer to Cursory Strictures,...said to have been Written by Judge Thumb, D.I.Eaton, London, 1794.

7. According to Godwin, this article was intended for the Morning Chronicle, but it was refused insertion.

8. Answer to Cursory Strictures, (Hereafter referred to as Answer), pp 1-2.

9. A Reply to an Answer to Cursory Strictures Supposed to be Wrote by Judge Buller, By the Author of Cursory Strictures, D.I.Eaton, London 1794, p 7.

10. The Spirit of the Age. See note 48 to Chapter One.

11. Mary Shelley's note on the Trials, reproduced in Kegan Paul, 1876, I, 129ff.

12. Letter from Parr to Godwin of 10th November, 1794, Kegan Paul, I, 136-7.

13. Despite the favourable reviews it received in the Monthly Review and the Monthly Mirror.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE.

1. The Prelude, 1805, Book VIII, 482-6. References are to texts of Norton Critical Edition.

2. 1850, Book VIII, 349.Although, for reasons given by Owen, 1985, in his Introduction to the Cornell edition of The Fourteen Book Prelude (pp 6-9), exact dating of MS D is difficult, the deletion of "three" and revised superscription of "two" in MS D suggests an 1832 dating of revision. See, Owen, photographic representations and transcriptions, pp 848-9.

3. The editors of the Norton edition have noted this shift; they have correctly seen the significance of the change as supporting Wordsworth's claims regarding Beaupuy. This, in my view, is a conscious strategy by Wordsworth in the pattern of later revisions to his poem. However, the editors miss the point regarding the original "**three** and twenty summers", which would,as I have said, relate to Wordsworth's earliest contact with Godwin's ideas.

4. 1805,XII,313ff. The editors of the Norton text (who, incidentally, include Stephen Gill) assert that

> it is doubtful whether much of Salisbury Plain was composed during Wordsworth's journey in August, 1793. (p 456)

This is despite Gill's 1975 claim in his edition of the Cornell The Salisbury Plain Poems that "the poem was composed at once"(p 5 of Introduction). Gill refers to the reference in the letter to Mathews of 23rd May, 1794 (see note 144 to Chapter Two); that letter indeed seems to suggest that Wordsworth, having written the poem, had worked on it further, since he says in the 1794 letter that the poem is now "ready for the press".
The implications of this lend weight to the importance of the original 1805 "three and twenty summers" (i.e. the summer of 1793) as dating Wordsworth's interest in man from a period associated not only with Llandaff but also with the earliest Salisbury Plain. Any extended period of writing or early revision of the poem allows Wordsworth to further acquaint himself with Godwin's ideas, though, since the extant copy of the first version of the poem belongs to April, 1794 (Norton p 456, Note 9), Wordsworth was presumably still working his way through Political Justice.

5. Wordsworth writes to Coleridge on 29th March:

> I am now after a halt of nearly three weeks started again; and I hope to go forward rapidly. (EY, 465)

6. I am grateful to the editors of the Norton edition of The Prelude for their comprehensive summary of the history of the texts of the poem; see particularly pp 517-20.

7. A fuller discussion of Wordsworth's development of The Prelude between the five book and the 1805 versions is to be found in Chapter Six.

8. The additional writing and re-organisation from the intermediate five book version was started around the end of March, 1804, and was completed by May, 1805.

9. The same quality has already been noted in some of the passages already discussed in the previous chapter, particularly in relation to Wordsworth's experiences in France.

10. In 1805, Wordsworth uses the title

> Retrospect: Love of Nature Leading to Love of Mankind.

By MS D (probably by 1832), Wordsworth has revised this to

> Retrospect, Love of Nature Leading to Love of Man.

(See Owen, Cornell Fourteen Book Prelude, 1985, pp 814-5.)
This is a small yet significant change to the title; suggesting Wordsworth's greater confidence in what he was trying to present as he came to revise his poem, as opposed to the tensions to be seen in the creation of this Book in 1804.

11. 1805, XI, 275 ff.

12. In his letter to Wordsworth of 30th May, 1815. Coleridge's account of how he had conceived the poem Wordsworth had hoped to write seems to make ludicrous demands. Coleridge wished Wordsworth to write

> a **Philosophical Poem**, the result and fruits of a Spirit.....trained and disciplined...

concerning e.g.

> the faculties of Man in the abstract.....the Human Race in the concrete...

and eventually

> to conclude by a gigantic swell on the necessary identity of a true Philosophy with true Religion... (Collected Letters of S.T.C.,Ed. E. Griggs,,Vol. IV, O.U.P.,1959.)

13. I am indebted to the editors of the Norton edition of The Prelude for their collation of letters relevant to Wordsworth's composition of The Prelude in their section on References to The Prelude in Process, 1799-1850 (pp 529-40), from which source I have selected some of the quotations here.

14. In that Preface, Wordsworth describes The Prelude as "the Anti-chapel" to "the body of a gothic church". In his Introduction to his parallel text of The Prelude, Maxwell, 1976, suggests that to describe The Prelude thus is misleading. I would agree; the poem undoubtedly has its own autonomy, above all, in the role it has in what I am suggesting is Wordsworth's "re-invention" of himself.

15.The lines here are evocative of Wordsworth's description to Sir George Beaumont (25th December, 1804, EY, 518) of his intention to write

> a Poem to be called The Recluse in which it will be my object to express in verse my most interesting feelings concerning Man, Nature and society;....

A task he felt he had to delay, pending greater poetic maturity.

16. For editorial guidance, and discussion related to these changes in the 1798-9 Prelude, I am grateful for the information in Reed, Chronology,EY, 1967, Appendix IX, and the Introduction and Transcriptions in the Cornell edition of the 1798/9 Prelude, edited by Parrish, 1977.
All line references are to Parrish's edition, and I have indicated where this is to be found in his consolidated reading text, or in the transcriptions or reading texts associated with these.

17. See Parrish, 1977, 54, lines 450-59 for his Reading Text of the 1798/99 closing lines of the first part of the two-part Prelude.

18. Those beauteous colours of my early years
Which make the starting-place of being fair
And worthy of the goal to which [?she] tends
Those hours that cannot die those lovely forms
And sweet sensations which throw back our life
And make our infancy a visible scene
On which the sun is shining. . . (Parrish, p 130, 270-276 of MS JJ)

19. Parrish, 1977, p 271 (Transcriptions of MS V, 456-61 and U); and p 12 of Introduction.

20. Parrish, p 271 (Transcriptions of MS V, 451-6 and U); and p 14 of Introduction.

21. Parrish, p 13, has also referred to this point.

22. Though the addition of some lines in MS 16, not ultimately used, and written just below some of Wordsworth's calculations of the number of lines, show evidence of an even more troubled spirit (Parrish, p 145, Transcription of MS 16):

Here we pause
Doubtful; or lingering with a truant heart
Slow and & stationary character
Rarely adventurous studious more of peace
And soothing quiet which we here have found.-

23. Parrish, 1977, 50, Reading Text of 1798/9 Prelude, 288-96.

24. J. Wordsworth, The Five Book Prelude of Early Spring, 1804, 1977, 16, states:

His conclusion was to consist of the "spots of time sequence."

I discuss the implications of this more fully in Chapter Six.

25. Wordsworth did, of course, have reasons for eventually positioning the passage in Book XI, entitled, Imagination, How Impaired and How Restored; but, after his decision to place it in the proposed final book of the five book Prelude, the effect upon earlier incidents is considerable.

26. Parrish, 1977, 60, Reading Text of the 1798/9 Prelude, second part, see 242-6.

27. Parrish, 1977, pp 184-7. Transcriptions for MS RV. This manuscript, the original fair copy of 1799 version, the second part, was first completed to 453 lines, and was then expanded to 491 lines. Despite Parrish's comments on his editing procedure here,(p 167), examination of the photographic reproductions of this page leads me to treat this as an addition to the text.

28. 1805, Bk II, 217. Havens, 1941, 318-9, finds this as confusing and illogical as I find it irrelevant and intrusive. It is as if Wordsworth has chosen to build on the addition already noted in MS RV, again interrupting the flow and power of the original idea as he returns to it in his composition of what was to become the 1805 text.

29. Moorman, 1957, I, 107-8 is more content than I am to accept Wordsworth's claims, and is obviously more convinced by the experiences of these passages than I am; yet she admits (but apparently feels no need to consider further) difficulty in determining "wherein he thought the difference lay" in Wordsworth's perceptions at this point, and then suggesting it lies in the word "human-heartedness", Moorman continues:

> His increased interest in and love for the human occupants of his landscape began to show him that the earth and sky were not his inheritance only, but theirs as well.

30. Parrish, 1977, 29n. For texts and critical commentary,see Jonathan Wordsworth, The Music of Humanity, 1969, 172 and Appendix 3, P 274; Parrish, 1977, 151-5, and in his Introduction, pp 29ff on the Alfoxden manuscript as a source; and the Cornell edition of The Ruined Cottage and The Pedlar, ed. Butler, 1979, especially pp 105-9)
Clearly, the textual situation here is complex, taking account not only of the Alfoxden fragments (DC MS 14) but of the DC MS 16 excerpts from The Pedlar (see Parrish, Transcriptions, p 159). However, it does point to the origins of this passage as dating from around 1798.

31.Though, as J. Wordsworth, 1969, remarks, p 225, "the episode of the discharged soldier" (with which, he says, the rest of Book IV is "padded out"), "has very little to do with dedicated Spirits."

32. See Cornell edition, Owen, 1985, transcriptions, pp 561ff: these show Wordsworth's tortuous attempts in MS D to revise this, reflecting his sense of dissatisfaction with the placing and "raison d'etre" of this incident in The Prelude.

33.

> it seemed
> To me that in this label was a type
> Or emblem of the utmost that we know
> Both of ourselves and of the universe,
> And on the shape of this unmoving man,
> His fixed face and sightless eyes, I looked,

As if admonished from another world."(1805, VII, 617-23)

34. Roe, 1988 significantly gives little attention to this interlude in Wordsworth's development.

35. See 1805, Bk VIII, 62ff; 1850, 70ff. Again Owen's Cornell edition shows in the transcriptions of MS D (pp 820ff) Wordsworth's unhappiness with this passage, leading to the extensive deletion that is in the published 1850 text.

36. 1805,VIII, 182-5:

And shepherds were the men who pleased me first:
Not such as, in Arcadian fastness
Sequestered, handed down among themselves,
So ancient poets sing, the golden age;...

37. Wordsworth's having virtually completed the five-book Prelude by May, 1804, and then having re-arranged and expanded that to the extent of Books VI, IX, and some of X, followed by VIII (plus VII and the rest of X) by the autumn of that year testifies to the speed of composition.

38. See 1805, VIII, 631-40 and 641ff.

39. The text used for examination of Salisbury Plain of 1793-4 (hereafter refererred to as SP) and Adventures on Salisbury Plain of 1795 (hereafter referred to as ASP) is the Cornell edition , The Salisbury Plain Poems of William Wordsworth, Gill, 1975. All line references and stanza numberings refer to the Reading Texts.

40.Most significantly, Gill, 1972, and Jacobus, 1976, 148-58 acknowledge Godwin's influence in the 1795 ASP, but not in the earlier SP. Roe, 1988, also does not see any Godwinian influence in SP. Earlier critics have paid scant attention to the link, and where they have, this has not been followed up. See note 106, below.

41. See e.g. Gill, 1972, especially pp 62-5, and Roe, 1988, 132. (Strangely, Jacobus, 1976, scarcely acknowledges Godwin's novel as a source, principally because she rejects the alternative suggested source of Fawcett's Art of War in favour of Shakespeare's Lear instead of Godwin's Caleb Williams (pp 155-6). Interestingly, critics of Godwin who have commented on his influence on Wordsworth have not made the link except Marshall, 1984, 129, who sees "many parallels" (and cites Gill's 1972 article), but who, despite referring to the much-quoted sentence by Wordsworth to Wrangham (of 20th November, 1795, EY, 159) that the purpose of the revised poems was

partly to expose the vices of the penal law and the calamities of war as they affect individuals.

does not see the significance of this also for the earlier Salisbury Plain.

42. Although Gill, in his recent biography of Wordsworth, 1989, p 77, calls the earlier SP

like the Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff..... only a private utterance of outrage and alienation,

in his earlier 1972 article (see note 40, above), he has a very useful summary (note 4 to pp 49-50) of the rather confused response of critics to the Salisbury Plain poems since Meyer, 1943, showing how critics have failed to recognise the force of social protest that drives both of these poems, a force that is recognised by critics since Jacobus, 1976, p 148, recognised SP as the

most impressive protest poem of its time.

Yet even these critics fail to see the full significance of the **moral** as well as social import, and Godwin's role in Wordsworth's attempt to once again systematise his fundamental moral and social approach to protest in the poems.

43. The view of e.g. Meyer, 1943, pp 134-5, that

it should be evident that Wordsworth, with a year in revolutionary and republican France behind him.....did not have to go to William Godwin to discover that war was evil, that the poor suffered in times of war as well as peace, or that the British penal code needed reform...

is a view that later critics and biographers have, in part echoed, e.g. Moorman, 1957, Roe, 1988, Gill, 1972 and 1989. Yet the crucial point is missed if we try to see Godwin as the **sole** original source of Wordsworth's inspiration. As I intend to show, Godwin's key role was in crystallising for Wordsworth the significance of these experiences, particularly with regard to the role of protest through literature.

Roe, 1988, 128-9, recognises that

Mary Jacobus and others have been at a loss to account for Wordsworth's emergent stature as a poet of human suffering at this moment in 1793.

I find the response of both Jacobus, (pp 140, 142-3) and Roe to this question inadequate; for whilst agreeing with Roe's support for the view that a key to this question lies in the

anti-war protest, as well as the more general humanitarianism and protest of the period,

this, though it cannot be rejected, fails to acknowledge the humanitarianism that is so much the context of Godwin's concern for the individual in Political Justice; especially in all of his attacks on oppression, both military and civil, both of which are carefully paralleled in SP.

44. A discussion of the external evidence regarding the personal relationship between Godwin and Wordsworth is in Appendix I to this chapter.

45.See the Advertisement prefixed to the first edition of Guilt and Sorrow, Hayden, 1977, I, 118.

46. De Selincourt, 1940, PW, I, 330; Gill, 1977, 4-5; Hayden, 1977, I, 934. Wordsworth's reference to Mathews of 23rd May, 1794 (see chapter 2,note 144) is interesting and worth some further attention here. He states:

I have another poem written last summer ready for the press... (EY, 120)

which suggests that initial composition did take place in the summer of 1793, but that work on it might have continued for some time thereafter (until the poem was ready for the press"); i.e. during the period when the reviews of Political Justice

were appearing. There is further mention of the poem, of course, in the letter to Mathews of 7th November, 1794, where Wordsworth writes:

> You inquired after the name of one of my poetical bantlings, children of this species ought to be named after their characters, and here I am at a loss, as my offspring seems to have no character at all. I have however, christened it Salisbury Plain...(EY, 136).

By this time, as earlier letters to Mathews have shown, Wordsworth was well steeped in Godwin's ideas.

47. For instance, Welsford, 1966, with whose views I have little sympathy, devotes a forceful preface to a defence (against Wordsworth himself) of a strictly chronological study of Wordsworth in order to examine "the evolution of a poet's thought and feeling".(p 3) Yet, she immediately proceeds, in her section on The Prehistory of Salisbury Plain to cite important background material to the earliest version of the poem using the later Prelude as her source. My argument so far indicates that unlike previous critics such as Legouis, Meyer, Moorman etc., I have considerable reservations over relying upon either The Prelude or the Fenwick Notes (a caution shared by recent critics such as Chandler, 1984, see pp 6-8 - though I clearly disagree with his thesis on Wordsworth's Burkean stance in his early development. I therefore find some contradiction between adopting a chronological approach, and yet still using The Prelude as an authoritative source upon which to draw to fill in some of the inevitable gaps. Even if we accept Wordsworth's account of coming across

> a bottom, where in former times
> A murderer had been hung in iron chains. (The Prelude,1805,XI,288-9)

which Wordsworth suggests (and various commentators accept) was part of his inspiration for Salisbury Plain, I have always been puzzled by the purported impact of this when, by his own admission, there was practically nothing to see (certainly no skeleton) except a name carved on the ground.

48. De Selincourt, 1940, PW, I, 330.

49. ibid.

50. Guilt and Sorrow; or Incidents upon Salisbury: Advertisement Prefixed to the First Edition of the Poem, Published in 1842, Hayden, 1977, I, 118-9.

51. This is discussed fully and more appropriately in the concluding section of chapter 6, see pp 353ff.

52. See chapter 2, note 144.

53. Roe, 1988, 51, also quotes this part of the letter; he seems unable to locate any great sense of distress or evidence of any heightened feeling in Wordsworth at this time.

54. A letter dated February 17th, 1794 (EY, p 113) gives the next example in Wordsworth's correspondence to his political attitudes; but there is no mention of war. The key letter as far as this subject is concerned is once again, the letter

to Mathews of 8th June, 1794 (previously discussed, Chapter Two, part 2 in the context of the strong Godwinian influence acknowledged in that letter); Wordsworth's equivocation here reflects the conflict he feels over violent revolution at that time. While his reference towards the end of that letter to "the execrable measures pursued in France"(EY, p 128) indicate his general attitude to what was happening, again it offers little support to Wordsworth's claims in the Advertisement to Guilt and Sorrow.

55. Nevertheless, it would be impossible to deny that Wordsworth had witnesssed many atrocities in France. I do not wish to reject the view of e.g.Moorman, 1957, I, Chapter VI regarding Wordsworth's experiences in France in 1791-2, a picture much enhanced by the recent study of Roe, 1988, very amply argued and substantiated in Chapter 2. However, the question still remains: where would Wordsworth have gained first hand experience of the domestic tribulations of a **war** of the kind he assumes in SP?

56. Wordsworth's Fenwick Note also suggests the part played in the composition of the Salisbury Plain poems by his "rambles over many parts of Salisbury Plain", which led to

> the writing of this poem, and left on my mind imaginative impresssions the force of which I have felt to this day.....in remembrance of that part of my journey, which was in 1793, I began the verses - "Five years have passed."(PW,I,330)

This note would appear to vindicate the view that Wordsworth is, in the Fenwick Note, ascribing the source of inspiration to the complete series of poems; hence it is appropriate to begin questioning such sources from the earliest version, and to treat them as relevant throughout the later versions.

57. It is not suggested here that Godwin derived his objections to these institutions solely from Godwin (as I have already made clear in my argument concerning Llandaff); nevertheless, these pages would not only have drawn Wordsworth's attention, but his approbation.

58. PJ,'93,II,513-4. Godwin ascribes the quotation from Rousseau in a note referring to "Du Contrat Social etc. etc. etc."

59. Roe, 1988, 79, argues such a view; suggesting a

> significant alteration in his ideas of the Revolution in late 1792.

60. I cannot find any equivalent evidence in Wordsworth's own records of his experiences. Wordsworth's descriptions of the atrocities in his letter of 19th May 1792 have already been discussed, see p 123, Even in the section on The Prelude,

> Domestic carnage now filled all the year...(1805, X, 329ff)

including the two lines,

> The maiden from the bosom of her love,
> The mother from the cradle of her babe...(331-2)

do not record an experience equivalent to what Wordsworth portrays in SP, or what Godwin evokes in the passage regarding the field of battle.

61. Wordsworth actually wished to call it A Night on Salisbury Plain, but baulked at the clumsiness of the name; see letter to William Mathews of 7th November, 1794, EY, 136.

62.Salisbury Plain, Gill,1977, Reading Text. References are to stanza and then line.

63. e.g. Stanza 6:

> No shade was there, no meads of pleasant green,
> No brook to wet his lips or soothe his ear,
> Huge piles of corn-stack here and there were seen
> But thence no smoke upwreathed his sight to cheer;
> And see the homeward shepherd dim appear
> Far off - He stops his feeble voice to strain;
> No sound replies but winds that whistling near
> Sweep the thin grass and passing, wildly plain;
> Or desert lark that pours on high a wasted strain.(SP,46-54)

64. Noted by Welsford, 1966; though I have doubts regarding her argument, based on the patterning of imagery in the poem, which leads Miss Welsford to draw parallels with Paradise Lost (p 19).

v

65. See Gill, 1977, P 111, Additions, (27)

66.

[27v]

Beguiled of self
Of social orders all-protecting plan — c. 400–405
Himself forgot [?stile]
Delusion fond he spoke in tender [?]
Forgetting self
And of the general care man pays to man
~~Hope~~ Joys second spring and hopes long treasured smile
[?sorrows]
Sounds that but served her deep breast to beguile
[——?——?——]
And [?oft] the long sigh and oft repeated no
along forsaken
As wind that moan [?~~thro~~ ?a] ruined pile
Tell that the ruin is more perfect so
brea
Did those deep [?]thed sighs her desolation show

Of general care by social orders plans
[?]
of blessings unforeseen times lenient
ever [?lessening]
Of tears and sorrow still [?contracting] shew

Nor less when he beheld at night [?from ?far] — 181–182
Black bodies dimly tinged with sullen red
[?Exc] [?marked]
What ~~viewed~~ he in those wild assemblies rude
The thoughts that bow the common spirit[?s] down

67. Gill, 1972, 49; Jacobus, 1976, 153.

68. Philp, 1986, 116, stresses this point correctly when, speaking of the isolation of Caleb Williams, he writes of Caleb's inability to cope with his isolation:

> This is not new to Godwin - his distinction between society and government indicates that his stress on independence is to be understood in the context of man retaining society and discussion, but removing co-ercion.

69. Gill, 1977, 29, note to line 261.

70. See Chapter Two, part 2, pp 94ff

71. See Gill, 1977, transcriptions and photographic representations, pp 98-9.

72.See final sentence of quotation from Political Justice on p 126

73. E.g.

> A numerous class of mankind are held down in a state of abject penury;... (PJ,'93,I,9)

Book I, Chapter V, Influence of Political Institutions Exemplified, devotes a large part of its argument to the effects of poverty after an opening summary of topics that Wordsworth could hardly have missed:

> ROBBERY AND FRAUD, TWO GREAT VICES IN SOCIETY; ORIGINATE 1.IN EXTREME POVERTY-2.IN THE OSTENTATION OF THE RICH-3.IN THEIR TYRANNY-RENDERED PERMANENT -1.BY LEGISLATION-2.BY THE ADMINISTRATION OF LAW-3. BY INEQUALITY OF CONDITION.(PJ,'93,I,33)

This list of topics (such as opens every chapter in Political Justice) with its strident upper-case catalogue of oppression and its results, could hardly have been missed by Wordsworth. This chapter contains statements such as:

> Vast numbers of their inhabitants are deprived of almost every accommodation that can render their life secure.....the women and children lean with an insupportable weight upon the efforts of the man,...(PJ,'93,I,34)

or

> A perpetual struggle with the evils of poverty, if frequently ineffectual, must necessarily render many of the sufferers desperate. (PJ,'93,I,35)

Also, in Book V, Chapter XIII, Of the Aristocratical Character, Godwin, speaking of the effects of oppression, refers to how:

> the lower orders of the community are exhausted by all the hardship of penury and immoderate fatigue. . . (PJ,93,II,484)

74. Roe, 1988, 176, suggests of this stanza that Wordsworth "had found his sage in reading William Godwin"; though he seems to imply a possible Godwinian influence here, he does not explicitly state this. He is also in some difficulty since he admits of no Godwinian influence in Llandaff, and, on the same page as the above quotation, ascribes Wordsworth's reading of Political Justice to 1794. Roe thus fails to recognise the phrase "labours of the sage" as a metaphor for the rational process and the perception (above all of error in the pursuit of truth) that

reason brings in Godwin's construct.

75. Gill, 1977, in a note on this final stanza, refers without comment to the article by Gillchrist, 1969. The usefulness of Gillchrist's article seems to me not to lie in the parallel he draws between Wordsworth and Spenser, but rather in his rejection of Meyer's misinterpretation of the final stanza as a call for revolution

> designed to inflame all thinking readers and to incite them to action against a government.(Meyer, 1943, 119)

Although Gillchrist himself chooses to quote rather over-selectively from Wordsworth's correspondence with Mathews, and fails to see the ambivalent attitude to violent reform I have noted in this thesis, his support of Schneider's reading,

> that truth may conquer human misery and ignorance by its own light alone, and without the aid of force(Schneider, 1957, 215)

renders much of his own article redundant. In fact, Gillchrist himself admits that

> even without the Spenserian associations, it seems clear that the mace is not a weapon wielded by champions of reason, but reason itself.(p 17)

76. Gillchrist, 1969, in acknowledging this, (p 13) fails to see the full significance of this metaphor of conflict, or of its deletion after 1793 (see note 4 on p 13 of his article); hence he fails to acknowledge the fuller significance of his comment and its support for a Godwinian influence in the first Salisbury Plain poem.

77.Roe, 1988, 127, states:

> Salisbury Plain is poetry not a polemical pamphlet.

Whilst this is obviously true, the failures in the poetry derive principally from Wordsworth's determination that the polemic is the purpose of this poem.

78. The contraints of the Spenserian stanza are obvious, and lapses into the personifications reminiscent of Descriptive Sketches have been commented upon. Yet there is evidence of Wordsworth's attempt to develop some flexibility, somewhat at the cost of the syntax.

79. The Shelley-Godwin collection of Lord Abinger.

80. Caleb Williams, Ed. D. McCracken, London, 1970.Hereafter referred to as CW; all page references are to this edition.

81. Philp, 1986, 106, also makes this point when he says that Caleb Williams

> is not simply a deduction from the first edition of Political Justice; it both advances certain of Godwin's central concerns and offers us a modification of his arguments which prefigure changes which he makes to the second edition.

Though I cannot agree with the whole of Philp's consequent interpretation of the novel, this view that Godwin was, in his novel, experimenting with and taking his ideas forward is essential to an understanding of Caleb Williams.

82. Such an approach necessarily precludes some of the interpretations of the novel that isolate it from Political Justice; I have little sympathy with such views.

For instance, Harvey, 1976, claims some critics see Caleb Williams as "inadequately dramatised preaching..." or "a curious Pendant to Political Justice. He claims that

> the professed aim of providing an analysis of social justice cannot be taken too literally (p 237)

in the novel, stating that

> Caleb's insistence on the truth and its results has nothing to do with Political Justice except in so far as it lampoons Godwin's ideas on necessity(p 247)

At the other end of the scale, I am equally unsympathetic to the view of e.g. Furbank, 1955, who claims:

> In this plot, Caleb Williams is clearly Godwin himself, Falkland the "ancien regime", and the opening of the trunk is the writing of Political Justice.The secret of the trunk is the guilty secret of government, and in describing Caleb's fierce glee, a terror at making the discovery, he is describing his own emotion concerning the theme of that work.
>
> (pp 215-6)

83. It was published in the second edition in 1796. A useful summary of the various speculations as to why the Preface was originally withdrawn can be found in McCracken's Introduction to the Oxford edition of the novel, 1970.

84. This was the original title of the novel with The Adventures of Caleb Williams as a subtitle; but Godwin changed the order in 1831, perhaps, as Marshall, 1984, 147, has suggested, reflecting a wish to divert the reader from the political to the psychological significance of the work. But this does not disguise its original political and moral import.

85. See Preface to first edition, McCracken, 1970, p 1.

86.For a full discussion of Godwin's use of "imaginative literature", see D. McCracken, 1970, where he expounds the view I have expressed here, that Godwin was very conscious in his choice of the novel form.

87. Godwin's account of the composition of Caleb Williams, from the Preface to the Standard Novel edition (1832) of Fleetwood; Appendix II to McCracken's edition of Caleb Williams, 1970, 339.

88. My own comments on the changes between the first and second editions of Political Justice and the relationship between reason and feeling are in Chapter Four, Part 1.

89. In further support of this, I draw attention to Godwin's statement in the Advertisement of the 1831 edition of St. Leon, where he states that Caleb Williams is about the crime of Falkland, the curiosity of Caleb, and

> the state of doubt in which the reader might be for a time as to the truth of these charges...

This answers such surface responses to the novel as that by Leslie Stephens, 1902, 146 who asks why we are interested in the events of the novel and can only suggest

that though an interest in mysterious crimes is wrong, it is natural. Godwin demanded more of his readers, and anticipated our interest in how and if truth would ultimately assert itself; and, if so, with what consequences?

90. I am here assuming the published ending to the novel. The original ending was never published, and there is some debate over which ending is true to the experience of the novel. My own view is that the published ending was what Godwin wanted us to read and that it has a coherence with the experience of the novel. Although my ultimate interpretation of the novel differs, I would agree with much of the argument of Philp, 1986, pp 114, though I find it strange that as the most significant proponent of a perfectionist stance in Godwin's Political Justice, he does not seem to see its application here, preferring the rather complex idea (and compromise, to my mind) of the "Mixed-motive game".
For a detailed examination of the two endings, see Dumas, 1966.

91. McCracken in his Introduction, p xix, does comment on the role of truth in the novel; but,in my view, he underestimates its role. His judgement seems odd:

> Truth does have its power in the final court scene, but that power is tainted by the institution of the law.... Truth and justice reside only among individuals in this tale, never in instituitions.

But this is just the point Godwin is making; what we see, in that final scene is the triumph of truth through **sincerity** as Caleb and Falkland face each other, and as, at last, they both break free from the influence of institutions.

92. Bernbaum, 1949, Guide Through the English Romantic Movement classes this novel as a didactic one; I prefer McCracken's term "propagandist" (Introduction, p xvi).

93. Such conflicts in the novel, are confusing. Angus Wilson, 1951, 38 has pointed to such incidents when he speaks of

> the conflicts and themes of the novels, their remarkable, if obsessionist, psychological insight and their strange moral ambivalence that fill in the gaps in Godwin's political views, that refute the charge of naivety...

94. Garrod, 1927 states (Of Guilt and Sorrow):

> Some time in 1794 Caleb Williams was published, and I think it is difficult not to believe that the central idea of the plot of Guilt and Sorrow is actually derived from a reading of that book. (p 83).

However, apart from his recognition in a very general way of the role of Godwin's necessitarian views in the poem, Garrod makes little of this, preferring to refer, again very generally, to wider Godwinian issues in the poem.

95. See notes 40 and 41.

96. Gill, 1972, puts the same point very well in the concluding sentence of his article:

> Whereas we recognise that Godwin is fictionalising philosophic propositions, we recognise that Wordsworth is moving among the real passions of men. (p 65)

However, I feel that such a statement would be more appropriate as a contrast to the Wordsworth of 1798 rather than 1795.

97.In addition to examples given in earlier pages of this argument, see also:
Caleb's statement regarding Falkland's state of guilt:

> he is anxious at such times to draw into solitude...(CW,p 105)

Caleb, during one of his attempts to escape from prison says:

> Here I am an outcast, destined to perish with hunger and cold. All men desert me. All men hate me.((CW, p 251)

98. Gill, 1977, ASP, Transcriptions, p 167.

99. Book V, Chapter V, Of Courts and Ministers. In the paragraph entitled Characters of Ministers: of their Dependants, Godwin says of the dependant:

> Each of these has his petty interests to manage and his empire to employ under the guise of servility.(my emphasis) (PJ,'93,I,416)

100. For an extended note on other possible sources for Adventures on Salisbury Plain, see Appendix II to this chapter.

101. Jacobus, 1978, 154, suggests the gibbet is the symbol of "untutored barbarism" (PJ,'93,I,9) that is Godwin's view of punishment as part of the criticism of the penal code in this poem.

102. It is incidents of such psychological power, so reflective of Caleb Williams which convince me that Fawcett's Art of War and the Fragment from the New Annual Register cannot be seen as essential sources for this poem; see note 100, above.

103. See also p 209: Caleb's description of his moods in prison.

104. At last by cruel chance and wilful wrong
My father's substance fell into decay
Oppression tramples on his tresses grey:
His little range of water was denied;
Even to the bed where his old body lay
His all was seized;..." (SP,29,256-60)

105. Pages 66-73.

106.It is this incident in the poem which attracted the attention of earlier critics, though they have made little of the link between Wordsworth's poem and Godwin's novel. Legouis, 1921, mentions this briefly in a note to p 309:

> The timely assistance given by the [robbers] to Caleb bears a resemblance also to that destowed by the kind-hearted thieves upon The Female Vagrant.

Garrod, 1927, 84, also makes little of it, stating:

> it recalls a similar glorification of the life of a band of pick-pockets in Caleb Williams.

Basil Willey, 1940, suggests the link in little more than an aside and fails to understand the full implications of it. due to a lack of any detailed reference. Also, like Garrod, his reference is to the 1842 Guilt and Sorrow and takes no account of the genus of the poem. Hence he misses the point, seeing only "the most Godwinian passages which Wordsworth has softened down", as he puts it. (p 264)

107. Reminding us of Caleb's statement, already quoted above:

> I found among them benevolence and kindness; they were strangely susceptible of emotions of generosity.(CW, p 218)

108. I take the view that these lines do refer to her unhappiness over her activities, and not to any sexual misdemeanor as suggested by Meyer, 1943, p 131. Neither the punctuation nor the sense of the lines justifies such a view.

109. Wordsworth apparently did not find it so unsatisfactory, at least at first, publishing it in the Lyrical Ballads of 1798 as The Female Vagrant. Yet, in 1799, in a letter to Coleridge of 27th February, Wordsworth writes:

> I also took courage to devote two days (O wonder) to the Salisbury Plain. I am resolved to discard Robert Walford and invent a new story for the woman. The poem is finished all but her tale.(EY, 256)

The rest of the reference in the letter suggests further problems with the vagrant's story.

110. Falkland, I will think only of thee, and from that thought will draw ever fresh nourishment for my sorrows!(CW, P 325)

There are many other examples at the end of the novel.

111. PJ,'93,I,129-30. For instance, Godwin states:

> Now it is well known that no principles of evidence have yet been laid down that are infallible.

112. Punishment is a specious name; but is in reality nothing more than force put upon one being, by another who happens to be stronger. But strength apparently does not constitue justice, . . . (PJ,'93,I,134)

NOTES TO APPENDIX I TO CHAPTER THREE.

1. See, for example, Grob, 1967, 98, who uses Moorman's information as his starting point for his comments on the external evidence. The more thorough studies of Godwin's diaries, examining e.g. his social circle, such as that by Philp, 1986 (see particularly appendices on pp 231ff) are not concerned specifically with Wordsworth. Even as late as Roe, 1988, Moorman's researches are taken as the assumed knowledge on the external evidence, though, as noted below,(see note 6) Roe does refer to Godwin's diaries. Gill, in his 1989 biography of Wordsworth, assumes the evidence available from Moorman, though he does cite Roe as a source.

2. Moorman, 1957, see especially I, pp 262-5, 297, 309, 334-5, 584. II: Pp 72, 118, 292-3, 335.

3. The Shelley-Godwin Collection of Lord Abinger, microfilm copy : Reel 1, Godwin's diary, 1788-1815; Reel 2, Godwin's diary (ctd.) to 1836, the autobiographic notes, 1773-1796, and the biographical fragment (44 pages), 1756-69; Reel 15, which contains the letter from Wordsworth of1807. Hereafter referred to as Abinger and by reel number.

4. W.W. to William Godwin, 9th March, 1811,(MY, 467-70). This letter originally published in Kegan Paul, 1876, II, 218-20.

5. E.g. Wordsworth did not visit Godwin on 28th March, 1795 (see Moorman, I, 262ff). Godwin called on Wordsworth on 18th August of that year (after Wordsworth and Mathews had called on the 15th) only to find him not at home. Also, Wordsworth and Godwin met on 25th, not 28th June, 1796. (Abinger, Reel 1)

6. It is important to look at the very fullest context of the meetings between the two figures; otherwise, it is easy to distort the emerging picture, as I feel Roe does, when, after looking at the pattern of meetings and attempted meetings between Wordsworth and Godwin over the period 28th February to 18th August, 1795, where he notes Godwin being the initiator of calls in the latter stages (as well as Wordsworth not being at home sometimes),Roe suggests that this could be

> attributed to a gradual cooling of Wordsworth's enthusiasm for Political Justice and its author. (p 195)

and then proceeds to build on such evidence an extended argument concerning the two.

7. Surprisingly, Mrs Moorman, who includes 28th March, where there is no record in Godwin's diary, mentions

> no less than nine meetings with Wordsworth between February and August 1795. (p 262)

though her own account totals eleven! Grob, 1967, accepts this figure. The discrepancy appears to be explained by Godwin's adding "nah",(not at home).

8. Discussed by me in Chapter Two, Part 2, see pp 93ff

9.Again discussed earlier, see Chapter Two, Part 1, pp 65ff

10. Godwin's diary shows him at work on the revision of Political Justice for the second edition when Wordsworth met him. (Abinger, Reel 1). See also the reference to the opening to his autobiographical notes: Chapter Four, Part 2,

11.Viz. June 7th, 18th, 19th, and 25th.

12. EY, 170-1.

13. Discussed in Chapter Four, Part 1, pp 169ff

14. The name The Enquirer does not appear in Godwin's diary until January, 1797; Godwin initially refers to it as Essays. He started writing these essays on 30th July, 1796 (having just re-read a significant part of Political Justice). It is impossible not to believe that he had been well advanced in the thought of this work the previous month when he saw Wordsworth on four occasions; similarly, it would appear likely that he discussed some of these ideas with Wordsworth.

15. Abinger, Reel 1.

16. In his autobiographical notes for 1795, he even mentions John King, "A notorious Jew money-lender" in order to "analyse his nature as a moralist".(Abinger, Reel 2)

17. E.g. 29th February, 1804: "Call on R. W/worth"
2nd March: "Call on R. W/worth."
There are, in fact, a total of 31 meetings which Godwin had with a "W/worth" - sometimes referred to as "R.W/worth", between 28th February 1804 and 18th February 1806; some of these were with "W/worth" alone. Additional details such as the entry of 9th February 1806, which reads "Case for Wordsworth" and February 18th,
"Call on Wordsworth (warrant of attorney)...." (Abinger, Reel 1)
all lend further evidence to support the view that this must refer to Wordsworth's brother Richard. On all of these occasions, there is ample evidence that Wordsworth was not in London.

18. April 22nd, 25th, 29th; May 1st, 7th, 16th, 19th. Moorman has not acknowledged the last two meetings.

19. Abinger, Reel 15.

20. Four visits between December 4th and 14th.

21. Two (possibly three) visits: on 15th and 23rd February (and possibly 26th).

22. See Moorman, II, 292-3 and 335.

23. Quoted by Gill, 1989, pp 314-5.

24. 1816 (when Godwin visited Wordsworth at Rydal Mount), 1817, 1820, 1828, 1831 and 1835.

25. See Journals of Dorothy Wordsworth (Dorothy's Alfoxden Journal),ed. De Selincourt, London, 1941, P 15.

26. W.W. and D.W. to S.T.C., 24th and 27th December, 1799 (EY, 276-7).

27. See W.W. to Joseph Cottle of 27th July, 1799 (EY, 267), and also note 1 to EY, 277.

NOTES TO APPENDIX II TO CHAPTER THREE.

1. The Art of War by Joseph Fawcett, London, 1795.

2. Gill's note is to lines 811-9 of Adventures on Salisbury Plain, p 154; the article by Beatty is Joseph Fawcett: The Art of War, 1918.

3. See e.g.Moorman, 1957, I, 219-20; Gill, 1989, 54. Both references are to Wordsworth's attendance at Fawcett's lectures at the Old Jewry.

4. See, Kegan Paul, 1876, I, 17, quoting from Godwin's diary.

5. Jacobus, 1978, 155, recognises this, and rejects Fawcett's poem as a source:

> But Wordsworth's purpose is very different. The guilt of Fawcett's assassin exists to expose, by contrast, society's acceptance of mass murder.

Gill, 1972, p 62 also sees Wordsworth's poem as more complex:

> Fawcett's interest is more simple and certainly less human than Wordsworth's.

He sees Caleb Williams as the prime source for Wordsworth's poem, though in his 1989 biography of Wordsworth, he does refer to the poet's favourable comment on Fawcett's poem in the note to The Excursion. (p 98, note 18)

6. Welsford, 1966, 8, who cites De Selincourt, 1940, PW, I, 334 as her source; De Selincourt is quoting from Beatty, 1918.

7. New Annual Register, 1786, 211-5.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR.

1. An addition that critics as early as Meyer question; in Meyer's case, inadequately, describing this addition as "apparently for spectacular effect" (Meyer, 1943, 158). Meyer's questioning of the whole purported "moral crisis" issue as presented by Legouis (1921, Chapter IV), is an important clue in the interpretation of this part of The Prelude. My own full discussion of the significance of Wordsworth's addition here is in Chapter 6, pp 335ff)

2. Grob, 1967, 100 and 111ff challenges such a narrow interpretation, yet accepts the idea of the "crisis" without acknowledging that this is an addition, not present in 1805.

3. Grob quite rightly states:

> The relationship of The Borderers to Godwinism still remains one of the most exasperating matters in Wordsworth scholarship and has probably generated more conflicting and irreconcilable commentary than any other single issue. (Grob, 1967, 118n)

My own acknowledgement of and debate with this body of critical opinion is to be found in Part 2 of this chapter.

4. Discussed in Appendix I to Chapter III.

5. See Chapter One, Part 4. Peter Marshall recognises this in a review of Kramnick's edition of Political Justice:

> It is a pity that the edition Isaac Kramnick should have chosen to publish is the third edition of 1798. What is gained in consistency, it lost in daring.

This, of course, is much more true of the difference between the 1793 and 1796 editions. Marshall continues:

> Godwin toned down the more extreme passages on anarchy, marriage and immorality, and revised, partly under the influence of his wife, his views on the role of feeling and the value of pleasure. (Marshall, 1976)

There is more to the toning down than Marshall implies here (as I show in my main argument), but I agree with Marshall when he states that it is "the first edition that is historically important"; it is also highly relevant to the student of the Wordsworth/Godwin relationship. See also Chapter One, note 10.

6. I have already alluded briefly to these misrepresentations and misinterpretations in the Preamble to this thesis.

7. Gill is the only critic who seems to have passed a comment on Wordsworth's views. He states, of Godwin's outburst :

> This is quite extraordinary. Godwin's Preface, which is perfectly well written, is simply an explanation of why he thought revision necessary and in what sections it is most obvious. Perhaps Wordsworth reacted against its egotism...(Gill,1989,104)

I think Gill's last point is the most relevant; I cannot agree that the Preface is well written.

8. One has to be careful in dealing with the Prefaces printed in the second edition of Political Justice. In the 1796 edition, Godwin reprints what purports to be the Preface of the 1793 edition; in fact, this is a revised version with one or two significant changes (e.g. see Chapter four part 1, pp 171ff), though it does retain the force and style of the original.

9 .Political Justice, second edition, 1796; referred to hereafter as PJ '96.

10. The kind of detailed study that has been done by e.g. Philp, shows that in addition to Godwin's own claims regarding his rehabilitation of the role of feelings in the second edition, there is a clear sense in which, through e.g. his introduction of the notion of imperfectly voluntary actions, "Godwin does not, as he does in the first edition, get reason to do all of the work."(Philp,1986,150) Whilst I am aware of Philp's detailed and complex arguments regarding the diminishing effect on Godwin of rational dissent and its conception of reason as sufficient to motivate us to act justly in the face of the growing influences (through Godwin's widening social circle after the publication of Political Justice and Caleb Williams) of the British Moralists and the tradition of sensibility in the developing fiction of the times, the key issue seems to me, as Philp admits, that despite Godwin's revisions, the role of private judgement, of truth, and of sincerity remain central to Godwin's thought. What Godwin **does** do, is to see the weakness of some of his assumptions with regard to these central tenets, and becomes concerned to develop a moral psychology to explain his moral philosophy and underpin his essential perfectibilian stance. This, I discuss more fully in my argument on the revisions to Book I Chapters IV and V (pp 183ff). While the place of sensation and feelings in motivation to benevolent action is recognised, as Godwin intended , the crucial role of reason must also be acknowledged; as Philp himself admits at the end of his argument on the ethical dimensions of Godwin's revisions:

> reason and sentiment are not contrary principles at war. Sentiment may be our lower nature, but it is sentiment which makes us feeling, experiencing, beings capable of pleasures and pains. Reason comes to order this realm. (166)

11. The revised "omnipotence of opinion" is published by Kramnick, 1976, 69 and Priestley, I, ix, (though Priestley notes the revision in his textual notes: III, 38). Both editors are therefore faithfully replicating Godwin's revised version of the 1793 Preface as published from 1796 on, yet fail to comment on the significance of this revision.

12. E.g.:

> that description of ethics deserves to be held in slight estimation, which seeks only to regulate our conduct in articles of particular and personal concern, instead of exciting our attention to the good of the species.
>
> (PJ,'93,I,vii)

becomes, in 1796:

> that description of ethics will be found perhaps to be worthy of slight estimation, which confines itself to petty detail and the offices of private life, instead of leading men to consider themselves principally under the

relation in which they stand to the whole body of mankind.(PJ,'96,I,vi-vii)

13. I do not use the term "toning down" in the same sense as e.g. Brailsford, 1951, 68, who speaks of the second edition of Political Justice being "toned down", referring to a "growing caution" in Godwin's ideas. Philp,1986,121, rightly rejects this view, as he does the comment by Woodcock:

> [Godwin's] weakness may not be justifiable: at least it can be understood.(Woodcock,1943,14)

14. From Locke on Government, Book I. Quoted by Godwin: '93,I,10; '96,I,13.

15. It is, however, worth drawing attention to the effect the revision of these chapters had in leading to the deletion of the original Book I, Chapter IV, Three Principal Causes of Moral Improvement Considered: Literature, Education, Political Justice. The revised chapters, with their sometimes painfully slow attempts to justify Godwin's empirical basis for his view of perfectibility replace a chapter which, once again, early in the book, contained spirited assertive prose, e.g. in the section on literature (no doubt of interest to Wordsworth). In this, Godwin states:

> While we only dispute about the best way of doing a thing in itself wrong, we shall indeed make a trifling progress; but, when we are once persuaded that nothing is too sacred to be brought to the touchstone of examination, science will advance with rapid strides. Men, who turn their attention to the boundless field of enquiry, and still more who recollect the innumerable errors and caprices of kind, are apt to imagine that the labour is without benefit and endless. But this cannot be the case, if truth at last have any existence. Errors will, during the whole period of their reign, combat each other; prejudices that have passed unsuspected for ages, will have their era of detection; but, if in any science we discover one solitary truth, it cannot be overthrown.(PJ,'93,I,21-2)

There is no equivalent to the assertive optimistic prose of this in Chapters IV and V of '96. Perhaps Godwin recognised the effect of these changes when he added his note on "matters of close and laborious speculation".(PJ,'96,I,15-16) But, in fact, to read the second edition properly, the reader can not do as this note advises.

16. Chapter I of Book II:

> Mr. Locke begins his celebrated Treatise of Government with a refutation of the patriarchal scheme of sir Robert Filmer; and, having thus cleared his ground, proceeds to observe, that "he, that will not give just occasion to think that all government in the world is the product only of force and violence, and that men live together by no other rules but that of beasts, must of necessity find out another rise of government, and another original political power*." Accordingly, he proceeds through the greater part of his treatise to reason abstractedly upon the probable history of the early ages of mankind, and concludes that no legitimate government could be built upon any other foundation than that of an original contract.
>
> It is to be suspected that this great man, friend as he was to the liberty and interests of mankind, intrepid and sagacious in his search after truth,

has been guilty of an oversight in the first step of the investigation. There are two modes, according to which we may enquire into the origin of society and government. We may either examine them historically, that is, consider in what manner they have or ought to have begun, as Mr. Locke has done; or we may examine them philosophically, that is, consider moral principles upon which they depend. The first of these subjects is not without its use: but the second is of a higher order and more essential importance. The first is a question of form; the second of substance. It would be of trivial consequence practically considered, from what source any form of society flowed, and by what mode its principles were sanctioned, could we be always secure of their conformity to the dictates of truth and justice.

It is farther necessary before we enter upon the subject carefully to distinguish between society and government. Men associated at first for the sake of mutual assistance. They did not foresee that any restraint would be necessary, to regulate the conduct of individual members of the society, towards each other, or towards the whole. The necessity of restraint grew out of the errors and perverseness of a few. An acute writer has expressed this idea with peculiar felicity. "Society and government," says he, are different in themselves, and have different origins. Society is produced by our wants, and government by our wickedness. Society is in every state a blessing; government even in its best state a necessary evil."(PJ,'93,I,77-79)

17. Whatever doubt there might be over whether or not Godwin, in the first edition, adopts a consistently utilitarian stance, there can be no doubt that his expansion of the ideas of voluntary and involuntary actions and his admission of the role of feelings (and hence of pleasure and pain) in motivation towards benevolent action show a firm utilitarian stance. Philp, who sees Godwin's 1793 position as essentially perfectionist, admits of the change to a consistent utilitarian ethic in the second edition. (Philp, 1986, Chapter Seven)

18. See '93,I,128-37; '96,I,180-3.

19. Reason is the only legislator, and her decrees are irretrievable and uniform. (PJ,'93,I,166)

Immutable reason is the true legislator, and her decrees it behoves us to investigate. (PJ,'96,I,223)

20. The 1793 edition divided Book IV Chapter II into four sections:
a. Duties of a Citizen
b. Mode of Effecting Revolutions
c. Of Political Associations
d. Of the Species of Reform to be Desired.

This was revised, in 1796, to become two chapters: Chapter II developed out of (a) and (b); Chapter III out of (c). (d) was deleted in 1796.

I also cite here Philp, who appears to be the only commentator to have recognised just how much Godwin has retreated from his overtly radically reformist stance of the 1793 edition. Although Philp does not claim, as I do, the

equivocal nature of Godwin's attitude to reform via violent revolution in the 1793 edition, his arguments and numerous noted textual revisions (see -particularly pp 122-130) support my view that, in the second edition, Godwin felt a need consciously to review and re-state his position on violent reform.

21. Monro, 1953, makes the point that Godwin did not see his work as a blue-print for some future reformed society. This is true in the '96 edition, but he does seem to toy with the idea in '93, as in this section.

22. The note to Book I, Chapter IV reads:

> In the plan of this work it was originally conceived that it was advisable not to press matters of close and laborious speculation in the outset. It appeared as if moral and political philosophy might assume something more than had been usual of a popular form, without deducting from the justness and depth of its investigation. Upon revisal, however, it was found that the inference of the First Book had been materially injured by an overscrupulousness in that point. The fruit of the discovery was this and the following chapter, as they now stand. It is recommended to the reader who finds himself deterred by their apparent difficulty, to pass on to the remaining divisions of the enquiry. (PJ,'96,I,25-6)

Book IV, Chapter VII, Of Free Will and Necessity, has the note:

> The reader, who is indisposed to abstruse speculations, will find the other members of the treatise connected, without an express reference to the remaining part of the present book.(PJ,'96,I,365)

Godwin also printed this note in the '93 edition; I, 284. Book IV, Chapter VII also refers explicitly to Book I on three occasions ('96,I:364,377,383). Also, Book IV Chapter IX refers to the same chapter on one occasion: I,403.

23. Although a few sentences from '96, Book I, Chapter V can be traced back to '93, Book I, Chapter VII, this chapter is, in effect, additional.

24. If by the reasons already given we have removed the supposition of any original bias in the mind that is inaccessible to human skill, and shown that the defects to which we are now subject are not irrevocably entailed upon us, there is another question of no less importance to be decided, before the ground can appear to be sufficiently cleared for political melioration. There is a doctrine, the advocates of which have not been less numerous than those for innate principles and instincts, teaching "that the conduct of human beings in many important particulars is not determined upon any grounds of reasoning and comparison, but by immediate and irresistible impression, in defiance of the conclusions and conviction or the understanding. "Man is a compound being", say the favourers of this hypothesis, "made up of powers of reasoning and powers of sensation. These two principles are in perpetual hostility; and, as reason will in some cases subdue all the allurements of sense, so there are others in which the headlong impulses of sense will for ever defeat the tardy decisions of judgement. He that should attempt to regulate man entirely by his understanding, and extirpate the irregular influences of material excitement; or that should imagine it practicable by any process

and in any length of time to reduce the human species under the influence of general truth*; would show himself profoundly ignorant of some of the first laws of our nature."

This doctrine, which in many cases has passed so current as to be thought scarcely a topic for examination, is highly worthy of a minute analysis. If true, it no less than the doctrine of innate principles, opposes a bar to the efforts of philanthropy, and the improvement of social institutions. Certain it is, that our prospects of melioration depend upon the progress of enquiry and the general advancement of knowledge. If therefore, there be points, and those important ones, in which, so to express myself, knowledge and the thinking principle in man cannot be brought into contact, if, however great be the improvement of his reason, he will not the less certainly in many cases act in a way irrational and absurd, this consideration must greatly overcloud the prospect of the moral reformer.

There is another consequence that will flow from the vulgarly received doctrine upon this subject. If man be by the very constitution of his nature, the subject of opinion, and if truth and reason when properly displayed give us a complete hold over his choice, the the search of the political enquirer will be much simplified. Then we have only to discover what form of civil society is most conformable to reason, and we may rest assured that, as soon as men shall be persuaded from conviction to adopt that form, they will have acquired to themselves an invaluable benefit. But, if reason be frequently inadequate to its task, if there be an opposite principle in man resting upon its own ground, and maintaining a separate jurisdiction, the most rational principles of society may be rendered abortive, it may be necessary to call in mere sensible causes to encounter causes of the same nature, folly may be the fittest instrument to effect the purposes of wisdom, and vice to disseminate and establish the public benefit. In that case, the salutary prejudices and useful delusions (as they have been called) of aristocracy, the glittering diadem, the magnificent canopy, the ribands, stars, stars and titles of an illustrious rank, may at last be found the fittest instruments for guiding and alluring to his proper ends the savage, man.(PJ,'96,I,53-7)

One is tempted to ask how Godwin did without this chapter in 1793, but the answer lies in his note to '96, Chapter IV, where he states that, on coming to the revising of his work, he saw that "the inferences of the First Book had been materially injured" by his attempts "not to press matters of close and laborious speculation at the outset." He then states: "the fruit of the discovery, was this and the following chapter as they now stand."(PJ,'96,I,25-6)

25. See note to Book IV Chapter IX; '96,I,401. (Also in the first edition: '93,I,320)

26. Godwin, of course, also introduces into his revised text, the idea of **imperfectly** voluntary actions, to explain many human actions which, he admits, might arise out of the application of e.g. general principles or even some self-interested motivation since he now appears to accept that it is impossible to assume that all actions could be approached on a "first principles" basis

with all of the paraphernalia of perception, judgement, etc. that would involve.
27. To say that "X is good" no doubt is to say that "X is desirable"; but that is not to say that "X is desired". (Monro, 1953,185.)

28. But on Godwin's own admission, this refers only to his first definition of passion, "an ardour and vehemence of the mind"(PJ,'96,I,81-2). His attempts to deal with other passions which might be exemplified by "avarice" or "hunger" prove more of a problem, and we find Godwin thrown back on assertions such as:

> Truth is not less powerful or less friendly to ardent exertion than error, and needs not fear its counter.(PJ,'96,I,83)

I would take the view that Godwin is still open to Monro's criticism. I also remain unconvinced by Philp's arguments on Godwin's introduction into the second edition of a complex pattern of "indirect motives" (Philp, 1986, 150-3). It is indeed "voluntary actions" that are essential in Godwin's view to the process of perfectibilty, and the role of achieving voluntary action is paramount.

29. See my previous fuller arguments on this, pp 179ff, above.

30. The chapters are: '93, Book IV, Chapters V to IX; '96, Book IV, Chapters VII to XI.

31. ...the most coherent account of the second edition is to say that Godwin retains a core of doctrine, centred on the full and free exercise of private judgement, and that he tries to integrate into his account of this core a more consistent attention to pleasure, feeling and sentiment. Throughout the second edition of Political Justice the pursuit of utility is entirely structured by Godwin's vision of a society in which everyone lives according to the dictates of his private judgement, where each person's will comes to conform to the dictates of truth, and where each thereby achieves a fully autonomous, benevolent and rational existence...
The changes in Godwin's ethical theory do not challenge....his central beliefs. (Philp, 1986,159)

32. The notion of "experiment" is, crucial to an understanding of what Wordsworth set out to achieve in The Borderers. Throughout this argument, I shall use the term and refer to other critics who have seen the play as an experiment, though not the conscious literary experiment that I hold the play to be. In support of my own view, I draw attention to the Introduction to a symposium of essays on The Borderers in Studies in Romanticism, Vol. 27, No. 3, 1988, where the editors, M.G. Cooks and Alan Bewell, state:

> In its attempt to ground moral, political, and poetic beliefs on this imagined border world, The Borderers anticipates the "experimentalism" of the later poetry; notably, Lyrical Ballads and The Prelude.

Despite the debate that has existed, especially since Jacobus, 1976, regarding how far the Lyrical Ballads do draw on earlier tradition rather than being seen as a conscious break with the tradition of English poetry, the comment above does point to Wordsworth's conscious attempt in The Borderers to experiment with ideas and literary form.
This is, however, not the same kind of experiment as that suggested by Priscilla

St. George, 1967 (See note 59, below.)

33. This is acknowleged by Osborn, who states,

> If the influence of Political Justice on the formulation of Rivers' character has been overstressed by commentators, that of Caleb Williams has been oddly neglected. (Osborn, 1970, 403; and 1982, 31)

While the first part of this comment is somewhat lacking in discrimination regarding which edition of Political Justice is involved, I agree with the comment on Godwin's novel. The link, having first been suggested by Legouis in a brief note (1921, 309) was then further acknowledged by Garrod (1927, 83-4). However, Garrod makes no attempt to substantiate his assertion, which is possibly why he fails to be aware of the implications of it. No doubt the fact that he was probably unaware at this time of the existence of the Preface to the Borderers, and probably also lacked the textual resources to show the genus and development of the Salisbury Plain poems is significant. More recently, Osborn, in his essay, makes the point :

> The various details which W.W. borrowed from Caleb Williams, such as the Band of Borderers.....are common critical knowledge. (1970, 403n)

However, the themes that Wordsworth borrowed from Godwin's novel and his treament of these, as Osborn states, have not received adequate attention. Osborn makes the point that

> Wordsworth's themes are substantially differentiated from Godwin's. The parallels between Falkland's relationship to Williams and that of Rivers to Mortimer are deliberately ironic. (1970, 404)

He then explains that the fundamental modifications to the plot are

> the change from a deliberate to an unintentional crime, and from "reputation"2 to "independence" as the villain's most precious possession. [These] help to transform Godwin's study of the tragic condition of man in society into a means of exploring the nature and limitations of human consciousness. (1970, 405)

Osborn's last point here is crucial, though not in the interpretation Osborn suggests; for Wordsworth's attempt to explore and demonstrate those "limitations" was for the purpose of testing and ultimately demonstrating the in adequacy of Godwin's theoretical stance in the revised Political Justice against the realities of human frailty. More recently, F.B.Pinion, 1984, suggests Falkland as a possible source for Rivers, but once again fails to make anything of this; whilst Marshall hints at but does not develop one of the key points when he states:

> Wordsworth.... drew on Godwin's novel..... for his central situation in which a repeated crime springs from the intense relationship between two protagonists. (1984, 131)

34. I have considerable sympathy with the arguments of Meyer, 1943, Chapter V, as far as they go, though he does fall short of a proper examination of Godwin's role in The Borderers. I feel no need to repeat his sound rejection of the ideas of Legouis (who assumed the wrong dating of the play), Garrod, De Selincourt and Campbell and Mueshke. Apart from occasional appropriate references to these critics on particular points to which later commentators have not responded, I refer to more recent comment on the play where this is apposite.

35. Charles Smith, who mentions Garrod's suggestion of Caleb Williams as a source but fails to follow it up, demonstrates the links between Wordsworth's play and Shakespeare extensively. However, I cannot agree with his subsequent views:

> In working out his theme, Wordsworth seems to have used the classic mental science, or Elizabethan psychology, dividing the mind into Passions, Reason and Conscience. There is less Hartleian theory or terminology than one might expect, since Wordsworth supposedly met Hartley's ideas through Godwin.(1953, 630)

He concludes:

> it is often felt that Wordsworth's failure in writing this tragedy was caused by his pre-occupations with Godwinism to the detriment of the play's action.....the real cause lies elsewhere....in Wordsworth's unfortunate attempt to model a tragedy of thought - a tragedy of intellectual presumption - on a tragedy of passion.(638)

Peter Thorslev is nearer to the truth when he states:

> The Shakespearean echoes seem to me not very significant; the Romantics were saturated in Shakespeare and there are more verbal echoes in The Cenci or Byron's dramas. (1966, 90)

My own view is that Wordsworth often falls back on Shakespeare when either his source of Caleb Williams (which he ultimately found restrictive) or his own abilities at psychological portrayal fail him.

36. Though I cannot agree with Hartman's interpretation of the play (1963), I draw support from his distinction between the motivation of Iago and Rivers. However, David Marshall makes a crucial point when he states that Rivers, like Iago, fabricates "fictions and scenarios for others to act out" (Marshall, 1988, 392). It is through this quality in Rivers' character that Wordsworth creates the sophistication of opinion and error which reason ultimately fails to penetrate.

37. I have therefore used and acknowledge the invaluable aid of the Cornell edition's Reading Text of the Early Version with its parallel Later Version (1842) and transcriptions, which has made a realisation of the experience of the early complete play possible. I have used the names of the characters of that version; when quoting from critical commentary (which often uses the 1842 character names), I have indicated the 1797 equivalents.

38. For an excellent summary of these more substantial changes, see Osborn, 1982, 16-17.

39.The two relevant notes are: that to the edition of Poems, Chiefly of Early and Late Years, (PELY),(London,1842), and the 1843 Fenwick Note.

40. in 1926.

41. I refer to this essay as Preface to the Borderers, and it is referred to in the argument as Preface. This title is taken from the version of the text by Owen and Smyser, 1974, 75-80; line references are to that text. Osborn, 1982, 61ff, publishes this text as an Essay Prefaced to the Early Version (1797), then using

the title On the Character of Rivers. De Selincourt, simply refers to it as Wordsworth's "prefatory essay" (Works,I,1940,345).
There is justification for the title Osborn uses. The purpose of Wordsworth's essay is clear from Coleridge's letter to Cottle sent with the two tragedies for publication (Coleridge also submitted Osorio), accompanied by "small prefaces containing an analysis of our principal characters" (S.T.C.L. ,i,399-400, quoted by Osborn, p 5).
Finally, Owen and Smyser print the epigraph from Pope's Epistle to Cobham as a post-script to the Preface in their edition (p 80), whilst Osborn publishes it (p 71) as an epigraph to the Reading Text of the Early Version of the play, though this does not appear in the transcript of that text (see p 450)

42. PELY,1842: quoted in Osborn,1982,813; De Selincourt,I,1940,342:

> The study of human nature suggests this awful truth, that, as in the trials to which life subjects us, sin and crime are apt to start from their very opposite qualities, so there are no limits to the hardening of the heart, and the perversion of the understanding to which they may carry their slaves. During my long residence in France, while the revolution was rapidly advancing to its extreme of wickedness, I had frequent opportunities of being an eye-witness of this process, and it was while that knowledge was fresh upon my memory, that the Tragedy of The Borderers was composed.

43. Osborn,815; De Selincourt,Works,I,343:

> I wrote a short essay.....still more to preserve in my distinct remembrance what I had observed on transition in character, and the reflections I had been led to make during the time I was a witness of the changes through which the French Revolution passed. I.F.

44. Osborn,815; De Selincourt, Works,I,343: where Wordsworth, in the Fenwick note says that he wrote

> a short essay illustrative of that constitution and those tendencies of human nature which make the apparently motiveless actions of bad men intelligible to careful observers.

45. Osborn,814; De Selincourt, Works,I,342-3:

> My care was almost exclusively given to the passions and characters, and the positions in which the persons of the Drama stood relatively to each other, that the reader (for I had no thought of the stage) might be moved and to a degree instructed by lights penetrating somewhat into the depths of our nature.

Then, speaking of his attempt to have the play staged (probably much at Coleridge's insistence):

> I incurred no disappointment when the piece was judiciously returned as not calculated for the stage. In this judgement I entirely concurred...

There is corroborating evidence to support Wordsworth's claims here. Reed (Chronology,MY) quotes G.B.Greenbough as reporting that, in response to another attempt to stage the play in 1800, Wordsworth

> said he would not submit to having one syllable altered, that if in its

present form it was not fit for the stage, he try the **experiment** my emphasis) whether it was adopted for the closet. (Chronology,MY, 1975, 72n).

As well as Wordsworth's being willing to see this as a closet drama, in his later comments on the play, this reference is also interesting and lends some support from the poet to the idea of the play being an "experiment".

However, some doubt must be shed on the confidence of these later statements by a comment as early as 1798 by Wordsworth in a letter to James Webbe Tobin from Alfoxden on 6th March, where Wordsworth states:

> If I ever attempt another drama, it shall be written either purposely for the closet, or purposely for the stage. There is no middle way.(EY,212)

This strongly suggests Wordsworth's dissatisfaction with his literary achievement at this time.

Perhaps the final point to be made is that, in America, the premier there of The Borderers in New Haven 12-15th November, 1987 has led to a re-appraisal of the view that the play is only intended to be read, generating a symposium of essays in Studies in Romanticism,Vol.27,No.3,1988.

46. Owen and Smyser,1974, state:

> The paper is water-marked 1795, and the writing is presumably not earlier than late 1796 or early 1797.(p 5)

Osborn,1982, simply suggests the essay "must have been composed after the play had largely been completed" (p 15), but also suggests that it pre-dates Act III, scene iv.

47. S.T.C.L.,I,399-400. Coleridge's request to Cottle is quoted by Osborn,1982, 5.

48. Owen and Smyser,1974,76,ll. 2-3.

49. Ibid, ll.20ff.

50. Ibid, pp81-2. Seeparticularly notes to ll. 35-7 and 40-1.

51. Pinion,1984, is right in saying:

> To illustrate the danger of reason divorced from feeling, [Wordsworth] selects a special type of character, not a typical Godwinian who would exercise reason in the cause of benevolence,.. (p 61)

52. E.g. Owen and Smyser,1974,85, note to ll.153-62.; Moorman,1957,I,304-5.

53. Note that Godwin identifies "superstition" with "error" in Book I,Chapter IV of the first edition of Political Justice, though I would doubt that this is Wordsworth's source for his obscure passage in the Preface which is more reflective of his unclear thought over the whole question of superstition, introduced rather late into III,iv, and totally unsupported by the rest of the play. In the revisions for Adventures on Salisbury Plain, he did,of course, delete the passages on superstition from the earlier Salisbury Plain.

54. Meyer,1943,191, takes the same view as myself.

55. For instance, the necessitarian view assumed in his statement,

> Let its malignant feelings be fixed on a particular object and the rest follows of itself. (ll.103-4)

A more puzzling example is that of the final sentence, where Wordsworth tells us:

> We forget that his feelings and his reason are equally busy in contracting its dimensions and pleading for its necessity.

Though Godwin would have emphasised the role of reason in guiding feelings in the first edition, by the second edition he sees the roles of feeling and reason as interdependent in the necessitarian process of motivation. What is so strange, therefore, in relation to this concluding sentence to the Preface is Wordsworth's decision to dramatise a separation of the two.

56. MacGillvray, 1934, 104-111.

57. A dating accepted by Osborn, 1982, 3ff. Osborn's account,in his Introduction, of the textual background to the play is invaluable, and I am indebted to his work. This is particularly the case is the support he gives for my contentions regarding some of the psychological and motivational weaknesses in earlier stages of the play; Osborn's account of the Ur-Borderers and Wordsworth's initial stages of composition underpins my contentions.

58. Godwin's autobiographical notes, 1773-1796, Abinger, Reel 2.

59. Reference to a few critics will point the conflicting views that exist. In contradiction of Beatty's view that The Borderers is the result of Wordsworth's "application of Godwinian principles as a rule of life,and his recoil from the consequences involved" (Beatty,1927,30),Allen (1923) writes:

> If readers of Wordsworth infer that The Borderers is an isolated attempt to unmask by means of fiction the doctrine of Godwin's Political Justice, they attach to the play a significance it can hardly claim.(p 268)

After examination of other works of fiction seen as critical reactions to Political Justice, she concludes that Wordsworth wrote his play to dissect the ideas that had betrayed him and to clarify his own spiritual difficulties through this very concrete expression of them. I cannot accept this conclusion, though the idea of Wordsworth writing as a conscious experiment is relevant.

In her article, Wordsworth's Personal Experiment in The Borderers, Priscilla St. George (1967) suggests that the play

> which was written for the poet's own needs and shown to no-one, [a rather astonishing slip!] shows that Wordsworth was attracted to Godwin's philosophical approach....if not his theory. (p 255)

My own earlier arguments on Wordsworth adopting Godwin's approach cause me to agree; but I cannot concur with the view that this approach "offered Wordsworth a direct but specious route to the apocalyptic vision" (p 256) Though I cannot accept all that she says, Miss St. George's comment that Wordsworth was "probing the doctrine for for an exact discovery of why it will not serve as supporting philosophy for his imagination" (p 258) is useful if

directed too much towards some personal commitment by Wordsworth. What this article does do is to suggest the conscious nature of Wordsworth's experiment in writing this play.
Hartman, 1964, (to whom St. George makes reference), is equivocal, neither accepting nor rejecting that

> Oswald [Rivers] was conceived in revulsion as a critique of Godwin's separation of head from heart. (p 127)

This was, of course, not the case in the second edition of Political Justice.
Pinion, 1984, states, in a singularly summary argument:

> whatever his views on the fallibility of cold reason, [Wordsworth] had not rejected Political Justice wholly..(p 64.)

60. The Gothic element in The Borderers has attracted the attention of several critics, though, again there are differing viewpoints on the significance of this. Campbell and Meuschke, 1926, see the Gothic element mainly in the trappings of the ruined castle and the dungeons; J.H.Smith, 1934, explains the Gothicism as deriving from Wordsworth's reading of William Gilpin's Observations Relative to a Picturesque Beauty(1786). Thorslev, 1966, overstates his view of the play as Wordsworth's "only experiment unequivocally in the Gothic mode"(p 84).
All of the above, however, fail to identify Godwin's novel as an obvious source of the Gothic in this play.
Osborn, 1982, 7ff, sees Wordsworth's Fragment of a Gothic Tale as a key source, particularly in the genesis of the play from the Ur-Borderers to the Ev-Borderers. I would not wish to dipute the role the Fragment played in the early stages of Wordsworth's conception of the play, but would point to two significant parts of Osborn's own argument. He himself has to infer much, particularly Danby's role in Act II (p 10), and Osborn has pointed out that development of the play is seen to have been in two phases (p 7), to the earlier of which he ascribes a "Gothic and sentimental" quality (to which Wordsworth's Fragment does seem more relevant as a source), whilst the later phase is more "psychological" in orientation. As my main argument shows, this latter phase is the crucial dimension in the experience of the play (Wordsworth's Preface effectively admits this). Yet though Osborn, as already stated, notes the neglect of Caleb Williams as a source, he has failed to recognise the singular blend of Gothic setting and penetrating psychological depth in the novel.

61. For an extended note on the relationship between Wordsworth's and Schiller's plays, see Appendix to this chapter. Several critics have been happy to accept Coleridge's suggestion of The Robbers as a source, though substantive supporting argument is scarce. A significant exception is the article by Margaret Cook, 1916 to which I refer in the Appendix. I cannot see such strong links as she claims.

62. It is interesting to note that, in 1842, Wordsworth added, immediately afterwards:

> Strong feelings to his heart
> Are natural. (I,33-4)

Two points should be made. Such amplification of the characterisation and

motivation particularly of Rivers and Mortimer in the early stages of the play are a key feature of the 1842 revisions (both major and minor) as Wordsworth tries to eliminate the weaknesses of the early version, and also to create dramatically characters and motivations as outlined in the Preface. The second point is that this expansion simply reinforces the similarity to Falkland, pointing up, even in such a late revision, the orginating source of Rivers as a character.

63. E.g. Caleb tells us, of Falkland: "His eyes were full of animation.."(CW,5); and, even at the end of the novel, after Caleb has suffered so much at the hands of Falkland (and yet still has, on several occasions, declared his admiration for his pursuer), he states:

> Mr Falkland is of a noble nature. (CW,323)

64. Osborn's textual notes and history (1982) support this contention in their reconstruction of the play's genesis. He summarises:

> What the sample of Wordsworth's work on The Borderers in the Rough Notebook strongly suggests - and it is only a sample - is that his work on the story and of the consequences of Ferdinand's (later Mortimer) deception by Danby (Rivers) preceded his work on the way in which that deception was achieved. (p 13)

(The "Rough Notebook" refers to DCMS 12, containing the earliest drafts of the play.) My own study of the play and of Osborn's transcripts of DCMS 12 lead me to agree with Osborn. I am therefore very much in agreement with his inference (p 15) from the later drafts in the Notebook of the first act, that Wordsworth's attention was increasingly shifting (as the play began to develop) to a philosophic and psychological focus.

65. De Selincourt, 1940, Works, I, 345-9) admits that Wordsworth's description in the Preface is not so comprehensively portrayed in the drama, but he explains this through Wordsworth's interest in Rivers' philosophical and moral stance and Wordsworth's inadequate dramatic skill. I think De Selincourt understates the case, and there are other reasons for the inconsistencies in the play (as I have suggested in my main argument). Priscilla St. George, 1967 has also noticed this discrepancy:

> Oswald's [Rivers'] master passions, states Wordsworth, are "pride and love of distinction". If this is so, we are never shown it dramatically.(p 260)

66. Some critics, (for example Campbell and Meuschke) see the Herbert-Matilda relationship as worthy of considerable attention, due to the fairly extensive appearance of this relationship in the play. I confess to finding some of the exchanges between these two tedious, and poorly integrated into the drama; though, as will be seen, they are important in identifying the dramatic structure of the play and its central theme. Nevertheless, what Wordsworth thought was important is not necessarily successful.

67. In the Preface, Wordsworth himself says that "there are particles of that poisonous mineral of which Iago speaks gnawing his inwards." (ll.126-7) Wordsworth, in such a statement, assumes that Rivers is not Iago. I have

some sympathy with the response of Meyer to De Selincourt's assertion that Rivers derives directly from Iago. Meyer makes the point that the resemblance between the two "is probably more apparent than real, and cites, amongst other arguments the fact that "Wordsworth is more interested in Oswald's (Rivers) philosophy" than in the character, and also cites the distinction between Iago's totally destructive motivation and Rivers' commitment to "Man's intellectual empire". (Meyer, 1943, 172-3n)

68. The slight expansion of these lines in the 1842 revision re-inforces this and reminds us again of Falkland's bitterness (as well as Tyrrel's jealousy of Falkland).

69. Osborn, 1982, 814; De Selincourt, Works, I, 342.

70. II,iii,330ff. Osborn,1982,17 sets the play shortly after the Battle of Evesham, a year earlier, in August 1265.

71. It is also a reason for rejecting Schiller's play as a significant source.

72. I acknowledge the chapter by Meyer, 1943, on The Borderers (Chapter V) as saying all that needs to be said on the subject of political reform. It is a theme given attention, but not prominence in the play, as Meyer points out. This is significant; for it reflects the shift in both Wordsworth's and Godwin's interest towards the individual. Wordsworth, like Godwin in the second edition of Political Justice, is far less interested in government (and its impositions on private judgement) than upon the individual and his motivation and psychology.

73. Wordsworth's intentions are clear in such as paragraph as:

> If after these general remarks (I am asked) what are Rivers' motives to the atrocity detailed in the drama? - I answer they are founded chiefly in the very constitution of his character; in his pride which borders even upon madness, in his restless disposition, in his disturbed mind, in his superstition, in irresistable propensities to embody in practical experiments his worst and most extravagant speculations, in his thoughts and in his feelings, in his general habits and his particular impulses, in his perverted reason justifying his perverted instincts. The general moral intended to be impressed by the delineation of such a character is obvious: it is to shew the dangerous use which may be made of reason when a man has committed a great crime. (Preface 145-52)

This clearly shows the focus of Wordsworth's interest, not simply in Rivers, but in the play itself. However, like Osborn, I have grave reservations regarding the reference to superstition, which seems to be an idea added into the Preface and III,iv, and which is certainly not realised in the play.

74. As previously indicated, Wordsworth does draw on other sources, principally from Shakespeare. Osborn's text is most useful in acknowledging such borrowings.

75. It is worth noting in the Preface Wordsworth's statements concerning Rivers:

> He is perpetually imposing upon himself; he has a **sophism** [my

emphasis] for every crime. (ll. 59-60)

and

> Such a mind cannot but discover some truths, but he is unable to profit by these and in his hands they become instruments of evil.

He presses truth and falsehood into the same service. (ll.70-3)

76. David Marshall, 1988, makes the critical point that "Rivers (like Iago) fabricates fictions and scenarios for others to act out". (p 392).

77. See pp 184ff of this chapter.

78. I prefer this term as opposed to that used by Campbell and Meuschke, 1926, who state:

> This juxtaposition of crass opposites, this balancing of two claims to allegiance, is dramatically inept. (p 471)

Though they have seen the same patterning of contraries, I cannot agree with their interpretation that this represents "the powerful conflict between reason and passion" reflecting Wordsworth's use of a cold philosophy so clearly against his own feelings.

79. Godwin's concern over the problem of "evidence" is expressed in the first edition of Political Justice in Book II, Chapter IV, where he states:

> it is well known, that no principles of evidence have yet been laid down that are infallible. ('93,I,130)

Though Godwin deleted this in 1796, not only is the question of evidence and its relationship to truth a key issue in Godwin's novel (and beyond simply contemporary criticisms of the law - it is also fundamental to the relationship between Caleb and Falkland); Godwin retained his further references to the problems of evidence in Book VII Chapter IV (much the same argument as in the deleted '93, Book II, but more suited to the immediate context), and also the brief Chapter VII of Book VII, entitled Of Evidence. Godwin's list of uncertainties over evidence, especially concerning "intentions" is formidable. In some ways, Mortimer's failure to perceive the truth through Rivers' machinations is related to some of these issues. In fact, Godwin's concerns over evidence (reflected in Caleb's experiences) seem to contradict his confident assertions regarding the power of reason to perceive truth.

80. It is a feature of Wordsworth's revisions to the play that the 1842 text has fewer and generally less overt references to some of the key Godwinian themes upon which Wordsworth was drawing; as if there is a "toning down" or even an attempt to obscure some of these. Examples which refer to "truth are:

> 1797 Well! today the truth
> Shall end her wrongs. (Mortimer, I,i,43-4)
> 1842 this day will suffice
> To end her wrongs. (Marmaduke, I,71-2)

Or Rivers' lines in IV,iii:

> You will be taught to think - and step by step
> Led on from truth to truth, you will soon link
> Pleasure with greatness, . . . (206-8)

which are deleted from 1842.
Similarly, even with the question of "reason", Wordsworth appears in the revisions to retreat from some of the more overt examples of this theme. For example, assuming that the epigraph from Pope with its ironic if rather gnomic relevance to Godwin's ideas on reason was prefaced to the earlier version of the play, it does not appear in the revised edition.
Again, whilst Wordsworth retains, in 1842, Rivers' claim that Mortimer's decision to kill Herbert is "an act of justice" (1797: II,i,57/1942: II,638), the reference to it being "an act of reason" in 1797 (II,i,81) is deleted by 1842.

81. Further weight is given to this view by Wordsworth's own words in the Fenwick note, where he states:

> My care was almost exclusively given to the passions and the characters, and the position in which the persons in the drama stood respectively to each other. (PW,1940,I,342)

Roger Sharrock, 1964, draws attention to some of the points I raise here (though he fails to see the pattern beyond the involvement of the principal characters in the play). He ascribes this to the drama being about "appearance and reality", the "keynote" of the first two acts being "the ambiguity of appearances"(p 177). His failure to relate his argument to the central Godwinian issue of truth and error and the problems of opinion and evidence (though Sharrock does mention the latter term) stem from his apparent determination at the outset to defend the play and to play down the role of Godwin in it.

82. Note that, in the later 1842 text, "good" and "just" become "wisest and best"; as if Wordsworth, again in his revisions, sought to tone down some of the sharper Godwinian moral edge to his language. This, like the changes associated with the words "reason" and "truth" reflects the pattern of changes suggesting an attempt to obscure his earlier source. (See also notes 80 and 83.)

83. It is worth noting that in the later version, the emphasis on "must" is not retained; as if Wordsworth wishes to retreat from the Godwinian premise (drawn from Caleb Williams) of the threat of truth being perceived in such a confrontation. In light of his views of the power of truth as he tests Godwin's ideas in the play, and also the dramatic flaws and the assumptions he makes about a separation of reason and feeling, such a later modification is understandable.

84. Wordsworth actually reinforces this in the 1842 revision in the action involving yet another figure in the play who contributes to the pattern I have identified: the beggarwoman who helps Oswald (in that version) in his deceit because she herself was deceived. In the second act, however, she realises that she has been deceived only when she has been interrogated by the borderers and has

> made last night
> A plain confession, such as leaves no doubt,
> Knowing what otherwise we know too well,
> That she revealed the truth. (II,1419-22)

85.The whole of Godwin's added discussion on the relationship between reason

and the passions is important here (Book I, Chapter V). However, it is important to remember that the reason Godwin has enhanced and highlighted this is, once again, to make the premise to his arguments on necessity more comprehensible; so this is not new to Political Justice.

86. Which is, in a sense, all the more puzzling, given his concluding statement in his Preface:

> ..we are too apt to apply our moral sentiments as a measure of the conduct of others. We insensibly suppose that a criminal action assumes the same form to the agent as to ourselves. We forget that his feelings and his reason are equally busy in contracting its dimensions and pleading for its necessity.(ll.178-182)

87. Garrod, 1927, 92-3, speaking of Godwin's influence in The Borderers, states that a feature of Godwin's thinking is the constant demand for proof. Apart from the fact that this greatly oversimplifies Godwin, Rivers appears to show disdain for proof in this confusing speech, not least because of his ability to fabricate or otherwise manipulate the evidence that offers such so-called proof.

88. To see this period, as Wordsworth portrays it in The Prelude, as a barren one is very misleading. Writing of the period 1795-1798, Marjory Levinson, 1986, in her essay entitled Insight and Oversight: Reaching Tintern Abbey, states (p 19):

> There are two theories abroad that explain this segment of time and this body of work, and E.P.Thompson has handily summarised both. One critical position has it that "Wordsworth the poet begins at the moment when Wordsworth the politically committed man ends." (E.P.Thompson, p 149) Or "as if to make room for the exercise of his poetical faculty," Wordsworth withdrew from active political life. (Legouis, p 252) In 1796, following several years of disillusionment, Wordsworth's utopian hopes "took refuge in the free land of thought and meditation." "Free" of his political enthusiasm and its attendant anxieties, Wordsworth embraced his muse. According to the other point of view, (Erdman's, Thompson's, Woodring's)" the creative impulse came out of the heart of this conflict between a boundless aspiration and a peculiarly harsh and unregenerate reality.... Once the tension slackens, the creative impulse fails also.". (Thompson, p 152, Erdman, unpublished remarks, March 1981; Carl Woodring, Politics in English Romantic Poetry, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1970).

Levinson sums up the contrasting and often conflicting ideas evident and developing in Wordsworth's work at this time; but I do not see the picture as being polarised in the way suggested above. The Borderers is a prime example of these energies and conflicts. I have some considerable sympathy with the view put by John A. Hodgeson:

> In a broad sense, however, the mature poetry of 1798 and beyond only reviews and extends the philosophical debate already highly developed in the earlier poetry, particularly The Borderers. (1980,3)

89. I would agree with De Selincourt, 1934, 163, that Wordsworth's choice of

plot was unfortunate because of its unsuitability for the purpose of making clear the central idea of the play. De Selincourt, however, does not see the full implications of this, having failed to respond to Garrod's (admittedly unsupported) suggestion regarding the origins of the play, hence seeing Othello as the most obvious source.

90. C.f. section (d) on "Reason versus Sophistry".

91. E.g. the constant asides of Rivers, especially when he is alone.

92. In the 1842 revision, where Wordsworth drew on the earlier Act III, scene iv and introduced an additional twenty lines at the start of the play, this is reinforced from the opening, as doubts are expressed concerning the ability of Mortimer to avoid danger in Rivers' company:

> **Wallace** His absence, he hath thought, whate'er his aim,
> Companionship with One of Crooked ways
> From whose perverted soul can come no good
> To our confiding, open-hearted, Leader (I,8-10)

This, essentially, sums up the action of the play. Despite my objection to Garrod's diatribe (pp 85-6) against the dishonesty and immorality of what Wordsworth is doing here, I have to agree that the necessitarian stance, in the revised version particularly, almost precludes "the salt of human drama". Yet, in a sense, Garrod has mistaken Wordsworth's intention; for that intention is not primarily dramatic, but moral and philosophic. Wordsworth is using his drama to explore and test the implications of Godwin's thought. For Wordsworth, at this time, the idea of perfectibility was still attractive, and he wished to explore and test the more fully explicated process of the second edition of Political Justice; the test he set proved too much for his dramatic powers.

93. See note 91, above.

94. Political Justice, quoted on pp 212-3, above.

95. E.g. Mortimer, I,i,59ff; or Matilda describing Mortimer to Herbert:

> His face bespeaks
> A deep and simple meekness; and that soul
> Which with the motion of a glorious act
> Flashes a terror-mingled look of sweetness
> Is, after conflict, silent as the ocean,
> By a miraculous finger stilled at once. (I,i,136-41)

See also Lacy, in the revised text, I,4-5, as again Wordsworth recognised the need to enhance the very sketchy characteristics of Mortimer in the original.

96. See extended note at end of this chapter, as Appendix II.

97. It is only in light of Godwin's naive yet dogmatic assertions of the potential power of truth over error that the full ironies of statements such as these can be appreciated; and here the necessitarian inevitability only adds a black humour to the irony, albeit rather clumsily.

98. Significantly, this half line closes the opening scene of the play.

99. Roger Sharrock, 1964, tries, in my opinion unsuccessfully, to defend Wordsworth against this view. Sharrock starts from a rather extreme premise, suggesting that The Borderers has been "read purely as a document of a phase in Wordsworth's development" and treated "as an indispensible document but a bad play, a melodramatic turgid closet drama, in which characters are merely the mouthpieces for philosophising speeches".(p 170) However, I find his own arguments on the dramatic power of the play unconvincing. Even his case for the setting draws more on the background to the play and on Wordsworth's stated intentions concerning the play than on evidence from the play itself. I cannot accept his statement that "the relationship of Marmaduke [Mortimer] and Oswald [Rivers] dominates the play" (p 176) other than at a very surface level, for, as I have shown, Mortimer's early portrayal makes his subjugation to Rivers inevitable, and what becomes dominant is the character and the machinations of Rivers; moreover, despite Sharrock's account of Mortimer's "disintegration", I see little dramatic power in this. Despite his mention of truth,

> [Marmaduke] has to establish the truth of evidence so as to be sure of the right grounds for action. The evidence is bewilderingly contradictory, and the choice correspondingly hard to make, (p 177)

Sharrock's determination to resist the "philosophising" label leads him to ignore the obvious reference that even the above has to the central Godwinian theme of truth and error, and hence to replace it with his alternative theme of appearance and reality.

100.This is reinforced in this early version by Rivers' urgent

> But 'tis an act of reason (II,i,81)

101. Welsford, 1966, 146, has identified as the source of this speech the following passage from Political Justice:

> The genuine and whole some state of mind is, to be unloosed from shackles, and to expand every fibre of its frame according to the independent impressions of truth upon that mind. How great would be the progress of intellectual improvement, if men were unfettered by the prejudices of education, unseduced by the influence of a corrupt state of society, and accustomed to yield without fear to the guidance of truth, however unexplored might be the regions and unexpected the conclusions to which she conducted us? (PJ,II,195) (This is from PJ '96)

Whether or not this is the specific source (and that must be open to debate since the spirit of this passage is echoed throughout much of Political Justice), it is important not to separate the term "the guidance of truth" in this passage from the various other claims Godwin makes for truth (see, e.g. the passage quoted on pp 212-3, above.)

102. See p 208, in this chapter.

103. The "domestic affections", the scant treatment of which in the first edition of Political Justice was a criticism Godwin acknowledged, and which he tried to correct in the second edition, as well as in his next novel, St. Leon, in the Preface

to which he reinforces his belief in humam feelings.

104. II,iii,267ff, where Mortimer tells of his inability to kill Herbert because he saw the features of Matilda in his face. Also, III,iii,1ff, where Mortimer and Herbert wander to the ruined castle.

105. The influence of the Fragment from a Gothic Tale I accept, does represent an important source for these incidents in the play, and (as Osborn, 1982, has shown in his Introduction) influenced heavily the original design of what he refers to as the Ur-Borderers. Wordsworth also draws heavily upon Shakespeare for this part of the play which is obviously more dramatic in intent than the psychologico-moral context of the play overall, and the influence of Godwin does recede here. However, I also suggest that, in these scenes, the Gothic quality obscures the central conflict as Wordsworth perceived it.

106.See Part 1 of this Chapter Three, Part 2, p 149.

107. The 1842 version, with its explicit concluding "expiation" theme differs considerably from the original. The idea of expiation appears to come from nowhere, and is not justified by the experience of the play itself, despite Wordsworth's revisions to the final scene.

108. Geoffrey Hartman, 1964, explores this idea as well, suggesting that Rivers seeks, with Mortimer "a radical self-decreed exile from the common life of humanity" (p 129). However, he simply notes that Wordsworth explored these choices, "and found them weak"; thus failing to recognise the positive significance for Wordsworth's development in the final ambivalence and inconclusiveness.

109. See note 45.

110. Such as that by Roe, 1988, who takes the view:

> By working through his doubts about Godwin and the political revolution in The Borderers, Wordsworth effectively cleared his mind of the intellectual debris of the previous five years. (p 223)

A view that is strongly challenged by the evidence of the residual influence of Godwin that will be shown in Lyrical Ballads of 1798.

111. William Jewett, 1988, makes a perceptive comment, when he states:

> The fiction of The Borderers is close to autobiography not because it tells us about a particular non-fictive self and its acts, but because it examines the act of reflection and re-construction that establishes the position from which the solitary (or Hamlet or Wordsworth) will be able to examine his former self and its acts. (p 401)

It is this ambivalence that is at the heart of the final experience of The Borderers both for Mortimer and for Wordsworth; and, for Wordsworth such reflection and re-construction involved the implications of the writing of the play, and the consequences of its literary failure.

NOTES TO APPENDIX I TO CHAPTER FOUR.

1. The Robbers, translated by A.F.Tytler, Lord Woodhouselee, London, 1792, Preface, pp ix-x. This, the first (and not very good) English translation is the one Wordsworth would have read, if he read it in English.

2. The "critic of genuine taste" is, as the Preface acknowledges, a reference to Account of the German Theatre, by Henry MacKenzie, Esq., Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Vol. 2.

3. The Robbers, trans. Bohn, 1849, 33.

4. Stahl, 1954, 14.

5. Bohn, 1849, 55.

6. Cooke, 1916, 160.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE.

1. Jewett, 1988.

2. Simpson, 1987.

3. This view originates with Legouis (pp. 309-315) and has dominated since: e.g. Moorman, I, pp 382ff; it is assumed in the notes to de Selincourt's edition of these poems, as well as the edition by Brett and Jones, 1963. Legouis' own note to his main argument qualifies his view that Lyrical Ballads show "a reaction against Godwin: "Though the chief object of this chapter is to illustrate Wordsworth's reaction against Godwin, it may not be useless to add that this reaction did not extend to every part of Godwin's system". (309n)
Legouis then refers to The Convict, but does not follow up the full import of his remark.

4. Essay on Morals, so entitled by Owen and Smyser, 1974, in their text, pp 103-104, is, in fact, an incomplete essay found in MS JJ, with a suggested dating of October-December, 1798. For further details of dating etc., see Owen and Smyers, 102; and much more helpful, Geoffrey Little, 1961, 9-10.

5. The phrase comes from Expostulation and Reply. Basil Willey, 1940, 137, acknowledges Beatty's linking of the term with Hartley's system (see note 6, below), showing his own belief in Wordsworth's adoption of Hartley's ideas, despite his later more enigmatic comment regarding the relationship between Wordsworth and Hartley:

> How much of all this teaching not only influenced Wordsworth, but actually accounts in advance for the some of the peculiarities of his development as a poet, is an interesting topic. (p 147)

6. The most powerful supporter of the view that Wordsworth turned from Godwin to Hartley is, of course, Professor Beatty (see Appendix I to this chapter). Similarly, Basil Willey, 1940, and Brett and Jones ,1963 (see e.g. their Introduction, p xxxiii ff) assume Wordsworth's adoption of a Hartleian approach. A rejection of this view can be found in The Romantic Theory of Poetry, A.R. Powell, 1926, 128ff;) and also J.C.Smith , 1944, 89-91.of 1958.

7. EY, 219-220; the parenthesis to S.T.C.'s letter to Cottle regarding typographical matters.

8. EY, 267-8 : Wordsworth comments, in his reaction to Southey's review of Lyrical Ballads in the Critical Review of 1798, that Southey knew that Wordsworth "published these poems for money and money alone".

9. W.W. to Henry Gardiner:

> I do not yet know what is to become of my poems, that is, who is their publisher. It was undecided when I came off, which prevented my sending you a copy, but you will see them advertized.

Lyrical ballads with a few other poems is their title. (EY, 232)
For a useful further view of the confusions over the first edition, see R.N. Daniel, The Publication of the Lyrical Ballads, M.L.R., XXX, 1938, III, pp. 406-410.

10. The lines entitled Expostulation and Reply, and those which follow, arose out of a conversation with a friend who was somewhat unreasonably attached to modern books of moral philosophy.(Owen and Smyser, 1974, 117)

11. Moorman, I, 351.

12. Lines Imitated from Catullus (Lesbia), April 11th, 1798
The Hour Bell Sounds and I Must Go, May 10th, 1798.

13. Moorman, I, 507

14. De Selincourt, 1940, PW,I,.?

15. See Reed, 1967, Chronology,E.Y., 344-5, Appendix XVI. Also, Robert Woof, Wordsworth's Poetry and Stuart's Newspapers: 1797-1803, Studies in Bibliography, 15, (1962), 149-189.

16. There is,of course, the added problem of the possibility that Coleridge was responsible for the changes in the Morning Post version of the poem; see, e.g. Stephen Parrish, 1973, 192-195. I have my doubts about what Parrish has to say regarding Coleridge's hand (the author seems too bent on giving added support to his basic argument in his book regarding the respective roles of Wordsworth and Coleridge in Lyrical Ballads); and I certainly feel that his judgements about Wordsworth discarding what Coleridge had rejected from the MS version does not hold throughout the poem.

17. Godwin condemns transportation in Book IV Chapter IV (PJ,'93,I,313-4) and in Book VII, Chapter IV, suggesting approval of "removal to a country not yet settled" (PJ,'93,II,756-7), adding, in 1796,: "Something may be alleged in favour of this mode of proceeding."(PJ,'96,II,384-5)

18. Jacobus, 1976, 186, acknowledges this also, though, in her comments on the effect of what she calls the "censored" version published in the Morning Post, she fails to see the point of Godwin's differentiation between transportation and colonisation; hence her view that, with "its radicalism suppressed", Wordsworth's poem seems little different from "tamer" analogues to be found at the time.

19. The poem originally began with a more extensive introduction of description; see De Selincourt, 1940, PW,I,312.

20. See particularly Book II, Chapters XI-XIII.

21. Hazlitt, My First Acquaintance with Poets:
He [Coleridge] liked Richardson, but not Fielding; nor could I get him

1to enter into the merits of Caleb Williams.(p 274)

22. The "gentleman of the neighbourhood, a man of talent and learning who..... returned to pass his time in seclusion on his own estate" (I.F.note), namely, the Rev. Mr. Braithwaite of Satterhow, about whom very little seems to have been known, certainly not enough to check Wordsworth's portrayal of his character. Gill, 1989, 129 still seems content to accept this as Wordsworth's principal source, whilst Meyer, 1943, on the other hand, suggests

> the powerful contributory influence of the chapters on Self-Love and Benevolence and Good and Evil in William Godwin's Political Justice. (p 190)

23. It has been recognised by other critics, the strongest outburst having come from De Selincourt, 1940, in his notes to the poem, where he describes the poem as Wordsworth's

> revulsion from the intellectual arrogance and self-sufficiency of Godwinism, from which he recovered during his years at Racedown and the warning that man should still suspect and still revere himself implies renunciation of the Godwinian view that man's vices are due to society, rather than to the innate perfection of human nature. (PW,I,329)

The first part of this comment represents what might be termed the "accepted" view, which, of course, I am challenging throughout this thesis; the final part seems an unjustified and over-simplistic interpretation of Godwin.

24. E.g. The Borderers, IV,ii,5ff.

25. ibid : IV,ii,99ff; IV,ii,150ff; and II,i,1ff.

26. Moorman, 1957, I, 312.

27. Lines 46-60 have of course been commented upon by Parrish, 1973, 66-70 as having possibly been written by Coleridge. However, despite his consideration of J. Wordsworth's note (1969, 206n), he seems unwilling to concede any significant contribution by Coleridge. In view of the links I have established with Godwin's thinking and Wordsworth's particular interest in this, I concur.

28. See Appendix I to this chapter on Wordsworth, Hartley and Godwin.

29. The only critic who has recognised the full impact of Godwin and the significance of this is Jacobus, 1976. In her chapter, The Godwinian Background Jacobus acknowledges that, as with Tintern Abbey,

> the Yew-Tree lines are transitional, looking back to the Godwin-influenced Wordsworth of the mid-1790's, and forward to the period of Coleridge's strongest influence in 1797-98. (p 15)

The isolation of Mortimer at the end of The Borderers that I have discussed earlier gains some support from Jacobus, who states: "The Yew-tree lines record

Wordsworth's realisation that withdrawal is no answer;" (p 132) she then continues (pp. 33-4):

> The lesson preached by the Yew-tree lines is a Godwinian one of altruistic, self-rewarding involvement with society - a belief that "men are capable of understanding the beauty of virtue, and the claims of other men upon their benevolence".(PJ,I,357) The concluding lines of the poem seem to echo Godwin's definition in Political Justice of "the truly wise man":
>
> > The truly wise man will be actuated neither by interest nor ambition, the love of honour nor the love of fame. He has no emulation. He is not made uneasy by a comparison of his own attainments with those of others, but by a comparison with the standard of right.....All men are his fellow labourers, but he is the rival of no man. Like Pedaretus in ancient story, he exclaims: "I also have endeavoured to deserve; but there are three hundred citizens in Sparta better than myself, and I rejoice". (PJ,I,361)

Frankly, I find this reference a trifle laboured, but agree with the general argument put forward by Jacobus.

30. Legouis' effect upon the whole Wordsworth-Godwin issue is fascinating. It is to him that we owe, of course, the first identification of Wordsworth's interest in Godwin, and we must remain in his debt. Yet it is also to Legouis that we owe the entrenched position (more recently less so) of the notion of Wordsworth's "discipleship" of Godwin, of a reaction against him, of the so-called "moral crisis" of Wordsworth. Despite the passing of the years, though his ideas have been elaborated upon and sometimes challenged, it is his view that still remains the seminal one. Perhaps because, though most critics they have read their Wordsworth carefully, they have not given similar attention to Godwin's writings.

31. Legouis and others have referred to Godwin's sentence:

> Gratitude, therefore, if by gratitude we understand a sentiment of preference which I entertain towards another, upon the ground of my having been the subject of his benefits, is no part of either justice or virtue. (PJ,'96,I,130)

32. See Chapter Three, note 73.

33. Godwin develops this further in The Enquirer where he speaks of the poor being "brutified by immoderate and unremitted labours". (pp 16-7)

34. Chapter Three, note 73 gives further examples of this.

35. It is interesting to note that Hartley subsumes "benevolence" under "gratitude" (I,474; and, in Priestley's edition, 307-8).

36. Legouis actually quotes this in referring to TheLast of the Flock; but this sentence in fact illustrates perfectly the form of gratitude that Godwin has rejected earlier, albeit in a rather extreme form:

> Observe the pauper fawning with abject vileness upon his rich benefactor,

and speechless with sensations of gratitude for having received that which he ought to have claimed with an erect mien, and with a consciousness that his claim was irresistible." (Legouis, p 311, quoting from Political Justice, 1793, II, 800).

37. See Schneider, 1957, 222-3, who cites Godwin's diary as the source.(Abinger papers).

38. It seems to me that Simpson, 1987, fails to respond adequately to this poem in terms of his own initial ideas (see second paragraph of opening to this chapter) regarding Wordsworth's challenge in the Preface. He states:

> Invited to "make" our own tale out of the raw materials of this incident, we at once accede to a creative stature and admire a poet who is prepared to record events that are inconclusive and even potentially inconsequential. In his assertion of the ordinary event as of great poetic importance, Wordsworth is mounting the sort of attack upon decorum that offended so many readers of his early work, and still offends others today.(p 49)

Yet, a few pages further on, Simpson also says:

> Simon can hardly stay alive, let alone work, so that he is not a very efficient image of self-sufficiency. Wordsworth does not play up his potential as an emblem of persistence in adversity, but rather seems to stress the pointlessness of it.(p 157)

But that "pointlessness" is exactly the point, as Wordsworth consciously or subconsciously draws upon the "semantic residues" of his meetings with and reading of Godwin; which is, I suggest, as important a context for the understanding of this poem as are the other facets of displacement to which Simpson draws our attention.

The ironic shift in tone in the concluding lines has been noted by many writers. Griffin, 1977, 394, writing of this poem

> as a manipulation and a rhetorical tour de force [a view that] prevails among modern critics who have taken the poem seriously

refers to two critics in that vein of thought, and their ideas regarding the conclusion of the poem:

> According to John F. Danby, we sense that "we are deliberately being tempted" or "challenged" to make the wrong response while being shown the right one - a view of the poem's design with which Paul Sheats's still more recent reading largely agrees. As Sheats puts it, the speaker "sets a trap for the reader's pride," tempting us to turn away from the old man, then turning round upon us with a new irony and an uncomfortably "cool scrutiny," finally inviting us to join in a conclusion that resembles "an act of charity."

Although I use the term "benevolence" rather than "charity", it is clear that the nature of Wordsworth's involvement with the reader is a complex one (Griffin explores this in great detail) and includes the reader's response to the poet's involving him in an emotion such as reflecting upon a benevolent act. Such complexities cast serious suspicion upon earlier, more simplistic "anti-Godwinian" readings of the poem.

39. The original reference to this is in Legouis, 1921:

> The man who holds with Godwin that property is the cause of every vice and source of all the misery of the poor..(p 310)

Moorman,1957, I, 382 accepts this view, and Hartman, 1964, 143, seems willing to accept Legouis' interpretation.

40. W.W. to Charles James Fox, 14th January, 1801.

41.Clark, 1977, 289.

42. Book VIII, Of Property, Chapter III, Benefits attendant on a system of equality.

43.Political Justice, Book I, Chapter III:

> The women and children lean with an insupportable weight upon the efforts of the man, so that a large family has in the lower orders of life become a potential expression for an uncommon degree of poverty and wretchedness. (PJ,'96,I, 34)

44. C.f. Simpson, 1987:

> Wordsworth thus remains absolutely clear that there is a strong relation between poverty and brutality. Whatever may or may not be innately, poverty **does** have a brutalising effect on most of us. The declining shepherd of Last of the Flock (LB, 78) finds that he loves his family less as his flock disappears. (p 92)

45. See second paragraph to opening page of this chapter.

46. Brett and Jones, 1963, in their edition of Lyrical Ballads state in their notes that this poem

> consciously refutes Godwin's belief that lying is unnatural to children and is only the product of an evil social system. (p 285)

47. In his letter to Wrangham of March, 1796: "Among other things he lies like a little devil"(EY, 168)

48. EY, 179ff, D.W. to Mrs John Marshall, March 19th, 1797.

49. EY, 220ff, D.W. to Mrs William Ransom, June 13th and July 3rd, 1798.

50. Though it should also be noted that Dorothy does state:

> I am convinced it is not good for a child to be educated alone after a certain age.(EY, 221)

c.f. Godwin's similar view on private and public education (see p 64.of Appendix II to this chapter).

51. See Appendix I to Chapter Three, p 8

52. For a fuller discussion of this and Godwin's ideas on education in The Enquirer, see Appendix II to this chapter.

53. The Enquirer, P. 101:

> There is no conduct in the education of youth more pernicious in its consequences than the practice of deception.

54. Political Justice, 1796, Book VI, Chapter VIII.

55. Ibid Book I, Chapter IV, I,43ff.

56. See The Enquirer, pp 58-9.

57. De Selincourt, 1940, PW, I,363.

58. Hazlitt, My First Acquaintance with Poets, 271-2.

59. ibid, p 268.

60. Hazlitt, Lectures on the English Poets, the essay on The Living Poets, where, I think, even Wordsworth does not escape the criticisms levelled at the "Lake" group, and, explicitly, Southey. Also, of course, the essay, Mr. Wordsworth in Spirit of the Age.

61. Jacobus, 1976, makes the point:

> The younger Wordsworth portrayed in The Prelude had been a poet whose imagination
>
> to the works of art
> The notions and images of books
> Did knowingly conform itself.(The Prelude, 1805, Book VIII,516-8)
>
> The poet he became was no less responsive, but his responsiveness increasingly took the form of reassessment rather than imitation, challenge rather than conformity. (p 1)

62. The phrase, of course, comes from Expostulation and Reply(l. 24); for a fuller investigation of the relationship between Wordsworth and Hartley's ideas, see Appendix I to this chapter.

63. See Schneider, 1957, 109.

64. Hartley, 1749, I, 420.

65. There is no need for me to go into the question of Wordsworth and his attitude to science; this can be found well documented and discussed in Schneider, 1957, e.g. Pp. 214ff and also 230ff in Chapter 9, The Intellectual Revolt. However, my own view on Wordsworth's supposed "moral crisis" and recovery therefrom is very different from Schneider's.

66. He did , of course, use a fragment from it in Old Man Travelling.

67. EY, 154, W.W. to William Mathews [20 and] 24 Oct. [1795]; also EY, 160ff,

D.W. to Mrs. John Marshall, Nov. 30th, 1795.

68. This is suggested by Brett and Jones, 1963, 282, (though, interestingly, not by Beatty, 1927, who does mention the poem), arising from Moorman's placing the poem as one of the "curse-cycle" (Moorman, 1957, I, 383).

69. Priestley's edition, 1775, 24.

70. As Levinson, 1986, puts it, referring to Wordsworth's more conscious placing of the poems in the 1800 volumes :

> We recall that Lyrical Ballads 1800 installs Tintern Abbey as the conclusion to a volume that opens with Expostulation and Reply and The Tables Turned; both lessons in non violent reading. What the first two poems teach, the last demonstrates. .....We are cautioned not to ask our guests rudely where they (these poems) come from and who they are. Or again, rather than murder to dissect, we are asked to swallow the poem whole. (pp 55-6)

71. Recent historicist approaches suggest this latter view. For example, Levinson, 1986, writes:

> The speaker looks on Nature through the spectacles of thought; mixing metaphors, the "still, sad music of humanity" drowns out the noise produced by real people in real distress. (p 45)

72. I find it difficult to accept the explanation of this by Parrish, 1973:

> By giving the creature in the poem the name of the creature who flashed before his eyes, Wordsworth may have been obeying a law of association, even one of the "laws by which superstition acts upon the mind.(p 106)

The account of the incident mentioned by de Selincourt concerning Montagu's mother (PW,I,514) is be found in Horace Walpole's letter to the Countess of Upper Ossory of 8th and 9th April, 1779, (Letters of Horace Walpole. Ed. Paget-Toynbee, Vol. X, Pp. 396-399). It gives no clue.

73. Jacobus, 1976, has made the essential point about this:

> More than any other, he had - in Coleridge's phrase - to create the taste by which he was enjoyed, forcing his readers to undergo the process of re-definition which is central to his poetry.(p 2)

74. Levinson, 1986, 51.

75. ibid, p 12.

76. So described by Miss Darbishire, The Prelude, 2nd ed., revised, Oxford, 1959, xxvi.

77. Little, 1961, 10.

78. Owen and Smyser, 1974:

> It is difficult to guess why (Wordsworth) should have singled out Paley

for particular mention,(p 105)

79. [Wordsworth] mentioned Paley, praised the naturalness and clearness of his style, but condemned his sentiments, thought him a mere time-serving casuist, and said that the "fact of his work on Moral and Political Philosophy being made a text-book in our Universities was a disgrace to the national character.(My First Acquaintance, p 267)

80. Schneider, 1957, see especially: pp 182-5, 194-6, and 212.

81. Halevy, 1972:

It is for Godwin an obvious consequence of the principle of utility that the quantity of happiness experienced in a society is in proportion to the number of individuals capable of happiness and consequently to the total number of individuals. Had not Paley interpreted the principle of utility in the same way? (pp 218-9)

82. W, Paley, Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy, 1775, (1778 edition, corrected, used for references), pp 46-7.

83. This has been noted by Little, 1961 (though he has not been specific):

"Habits" is an important term which obviously means very much more to Wordsworth than conventional behaviour or mannerisms. It is, like other Wordsworthian conceptions, very much easier to grasp intuitively than to explain; but briefly, it may be said to comprehend our fundamental and consistent reactions, overt and private, to the moral environment, which are best formed and influenced by nature and upbringing, and not by system-building and reasoning.(16-17)

84. Little, 1961, 16.

85. This, of course, reflects his reaction to his reading of and response to the second edition of Political Justice, (as I have argued in Chapter Four, Part 1) as well as much of the apparent motivation behind his writing of The Borderers (see Chapter Four, Part 2).
Jacobus, 1976, in her discussion of the argument in Lines Left upon a Seat in a Yew Tree seems to suggest the same thing as I am suggesting here regarding the argument in Wordsworth's fragment:

by 1797, Wordsworth had undergone a partial reaction against Godwin. Though Godwinian benevolence can be put forward as a cure for alienation, Godwinian reason has become suspect.(p 18)

Yet later in the same chapter, Jacobus pronounces Wordsworth's second sentence of the Essay on Morals as Wordsworth's "final verdict on Godwin".(p 31)

86. Political Justice, 1793, Book I, Chapter IV.

87. E.g. Brett and Jones, 1963; Owen and Smyser, 1974.

88. The definition by Hartley of the role of association in poetry is clearly not what

Wordsworth means here:

> The Beauties and Excellencies of good Poetry are deducible from Three Sources. First, the Harmony, Regularity, and Variety of the Numbers or Metre, and of the Rhyme. Secondly, the Fitness and Strength of the Words and Phrases. Thirdly, the Subject-matter of the Poem, and the Invention and Judgement exerted by the poet in regard to his Subject. And the Beauties arising from each of these are much transferred upon the other Two by Association.(I, 428)

89. Despite the confidence of Brett and Jones, 1963, Introduction, xlvii.

90. E.g. Hartley, 1749, see 56ff; also 269ff: Chapter III, Section I, Prop. 79, Words and Phrases must excite Ideas in us by Association, and they excite Ideas in us by no other Means.

91. See lines 130, 236-7, 324, 437.

92. Owen and Smyser, 1974, 169; note to l. 109.

93. Again, Owen and Smyser have seen most of this passage (lines 341ff), "The end of poetry is to produce excitment..." as deriving from Hartley.

94. Particularly, of course, Chapter III, Section I. Of Words and the Ideas Associated with Them, and the section in Chapter IV, Of Poetry.

95. p 171; note to ll. 142-4:

> Hartley's definitions (Hartley, p iii) seem relevant: "The understanding is that faculty, by which we contemplate mere sensations and ideas, pursue truth, and assent to, or dissent from, propositions".....The understanding is the "judging power".

96. See Appendix I to this chapter on Wordsworth, Godwin and Hartley, pp 32-3

97. See particularly: EY, 285-92 and 302-15.

98. EY, 290, W.W. to Messrs. Biggs and Cottle, August 1st, 1800.

99. EY, 306-7 and 308-9. W.W. to Messrs. Biggs and Cottle, Dec. 18th, 1800.

100. EY, 312ff. W.W. to Charles James Fox, 14th January, 1800. This letter shows Wordsworth arguing the social purpose of his poetry; his belief in the fruits of private industry and also the "domestic" affections is not far from Godwin's view on these matters.

101. Accounts of Godwin's decline are to be found in many of the books written about him. However, two early pieces which still seem to me to give the clearest and most effective accounts of Godwin's demise and the nature of the reaction against him are: Hazlitt's account in his essay William Godwin in Spirit of the

Age, and B. Sprague Allen in an article entitled The Reaction Against William Godwin, 1918, Needless to say, my own view of Wordsworth's rejection of Godwin differs markedly from that of Allen. Of the more recent commentaries, Marshall, 1984, gives an effective account of the beginning of the reaction against Godwin (Chapter XIII).

102. e.g. Wordsworth's several visits to Godwin in 1806 and 1808, and, of course, later meetings and correspondence (discussed by me in Appendix I to Chapter Three).

103. E.g. Wordsworth's comment to Wrangham:

> I do promise not a Godwynian, Montaguian, Lincolnsonian promise.. (EY, 177)

or in his letter to Coleridge:

> The said Mr. G. I have often heard described as a puppy, one of the fawning, flattering kind in short, a polite liar, without perhaps knowing himself to be so.(EY, 276-7)

Earlier in the same letter, Wordsworth speaks of Godwin being a "worse Philosopher"(EY, 276)

104. See correspondence relevant to the writing of this poem : EY, 305-6.

105. See note 103.

106. The Enquirer, Part II, Essay III, Of Beggars. Godwin recognises two types of beggar:

> the beggar who exercises the vocation for a time only, driven by the pressure of so overwhelming calamity

and

> the beggar who regards it as as the regular form of his subsistence.(190)

Godwin disapproves of the second. Wordsworth would, no doubt, have rejected such a "classification", but it should be noted that Godwin's tone throughout the essay is, on the whole, sympathetic.

107. De Selincourt, 1940, PW, IV, 236; Note to lines 67-70 in app. crit.

108. See pp 252 and 283.

109. De Selincourt, 1940, PW, IV, 237; Note to lines 107-110 in app. crit.

110. I take my justification for this from Mrs Moorman's account of John Wordsworth's statement to Mary Hutchinson in 1801 that Wordsworth believed that Joanna and Nutting "show the greatest genius of any poems in the second volume." (Moorman, 1957, I, P. 506).

111. Godwin's diary records a number of meetings between the two.(Abinger, Reel I)

112. EY, 320-1, Note: Lamb in a letter to W.W., postmarked 30th January, 1801.

113. EY, 518, W.W. to Sir George Beaumont, Dec. 25th, 1804.

114. Jewett, 1988.

115. See p 277 of this Chapter

NOTES TO APPENDIX I TO CHAPTER FIVE.

1. Arthur Beatty, Wordsworth, his Doctrine and Art in their Historical Relations, 2nd Ed., 1927.

2. Beatty, 1927, 102. The letter concerned is to Richard Sharp, 29th September, 1808, (EY,275-7). The comment on Hartley is actually one example of number of illustrations by Wordsworth of inadequate financial recompense for scholarship and authorship.

3. Witness the well-known remarks by Coleridge, 15th May, 1796, where he describes Wordsworth as "at least a semi-atheist" (STCL,I,216); also, in 1803, where Coleridge speaks of "a most unpleasant dispute" with Hazlitt and Wordsworth who had spoken irreverently, even "malignantly" of "the Divine Wisdom" (STCNB, Entry 1616).

4. Hartley's Theory of the Human Mind, on the Principle of Association of Ideas; with Essays Relating to the Subject of It. By Joseph Priestley, L.L.D., F.R.S., London, 1775.

5. Priestley effectively admits this in the opening of the Preface to his edition:

> It has long been the opinion of all admirers of Dr. Hartley among my acquaintance, that his Observations on Man could not have failed to have been more generally read, and his "theory of the human mind" to have prevailed if it had been more intelligible; and if the work had not been dogged with a whole system of moral and religious knowledge; which, however, excellent, is, in a great measure, foreign to it. (p iii)
>
> Priestley goes on to explain his editorial intentions, which are to exhibit Hartley's "theory of the human mind" as far as it relates to the doctrine of "association of ideas" only.

6. Bateson, 1954, writes:

> ...the exaltation of David Hartley's Observations on Man as a major influence in Wordsworth's thought is another example of the same fallacy...(p 121)

By "fallacy", he means the belief in a major influence by Godwin on Wordsworth.

7. Both Godwin and Hartley have sections dealing with "the mechanism of the human mind": Hartley, in the Conclusion to the first volume of his work (also reproduced by Priestley); Godwin in Political Justice 1796, Book IV, Chapter IX.

8. The idea of "association" can be found in the works of Locke and Hume.

9. Beatty, 1927, 124.

10. ibid p 99.

11. ibid.

12. Clark, 1977, 50.

13. Beatty, 1927, 110.

14. See Hartley, I, 73ff: Prop. 12, Simple Ideas will run into Complex Ones, by means of Association.

15. See Book IV, Chapter IX: Of the Mechanism of the Human Mind.

16. Hartley:

> There are certain Tempers of Mind, with the actions over flowing from them, as Piety, Humility, Resignation, Gratitude, etc. towards God; of Benevolence, Charity, Generosity, Compassion, Humility, Gratitude, etc. towards men; of Temperance, Patience, Contentment, etc. in respect of a person's own private Enjoyments or Sufferings; which when he believes himself to be possessed of, and reflects upon, a pleasing Consciousness and Self-approbation rise up in his Mind, exclusively of any direct explicit Consideration of Advantage likely to accrue to himself, from his Possession of these good Qualities. In like manner the View of them in others raises up a disinterested Love and Esteem for those others. And the opposite Qualities of Impiety, Profaneness, Uncharitableness, Resentment, Cruelty, Envy, Ingratitude, Intemperance, Lewdness, Selfishness, etc. are attended with the Condemnation of both ourselves and others. This is, in general the State of the Case;...(I,493)

Also:

> And thus we perceive that, all the Pleasures and Pains of Sensation, Imagination, Ambition, Self-interest, Sympathy, and Theopathy, as far as they are consistent with one another, with the Frame of our Natures, and with the course of the World, beget in us a Moral Sense, and lead us to the Love and Approbation of Virtue, and to the Fear, Hatred, and Abhorrence of Vice. This Moral Sense therefore carries its own Authority with it, inasmuch as it is the sum total of all the rest, and the ultimate Result from them; and employs the Force and Authority of the whole Nature of Man against any particular Part of it, that rebels against the Determinations and Commands of the Conscience of moral Judgement. It also appears, that the Moral Sense carries us perpetually to the pure Love of God, as our highest and ultimate Perfection, our End, Centre and only Resting-place, to which we can ever attain.(I,497)

17. Beatty, 1927, 118-9.

18. Hartley, I, 474.

19. When once we have entered into so auspicious a path as that of disinterestedness, reflection confirms our choice, in a sense in which it can never confirm any of the factitious passions we have named.

(PJ,'96,I,428)

20. It is actually Hartley: Section III,Of the Affections in General, Prop. 89, To explain the Origins and Nature of the Passions in General. (I,368ff)

21. Hartley, I, Introduction, p iii.

22. I, 369ff.

23. I, 428ff.

24. I, 291ff; Prop. 82, To explain the Nature of figurative Words and Phrases and of Analogy, from the foregoing Theory.

25. I, 428ff.

26. Beatty, 1927, 112.

27. See Appendix II to this chapter: The Notion of Nurture in The Enquirer.

NOTES TO APPENDIX II TO CHAPTER FIVE.

1. Education and Enlightenment in the Works of William Godwin, Burton Ralph Pollin, 1962.

2. In the Synopsis to chapter IV, Pollin summarises thus:

> He relies upon the evolution of a group of philosophers, largely literary in profession, free from the prejudices of class and the taint of profit-seeking, although sufficiently affluent to preserve independence of judgements. (p 154)

3. In this, he argues against the view of Priestley, 1946, I, in his Introduction, see especially pp 8,12,13,20,80 and 109. Also, Priestley's article: Platonism in William Godwin's Political Justice, 1943.

4. Page references are from: The Enquirer, Reprints of Economic Classics, 1965.

5. I say "reminds" because, in a footnote to this sentence, Godwin refers us to the close of Essay I, which he has concluded thus:

> The springs of the mind, like the joints of the body, are apt to grow stiff for want of employment. They must be exercised in various directions and with unabating perseverance. In a word, the first lesson of a judicious education is, learn to think, learn to discriminate, to remember and to enquire. (p 6)

It is also important to link this with the very earliest stages of Godwin's argument. The first sentence of Essay I states: "The true object of education, like that of every other moral process, is the generation of happiness."(p 1) Godwin at once links education with his desire for reform and challenges those who fear the implications of education:

> It is only thus that important reforms can be produced. Without talents, despotism would be endless, and public misery incessant.(10-11)

6. Pollin, 1962, 222, feels that in 1798, Godwin is still avoiding the issue of innate differences at birth.

7. Essay III: Of the Sources of Genius.

8. The Enquirer, Part II, Essay I, Of Riches.

9. Godwin also rejects a primitivistic stance here, reinforcing his view from early on in Political Justice.

10. Essay IV, Of the Sources of Genius.

11. This "seed" image is the cause of much speculation regarding its influence on Shelley.

12. Essay V: Of an Early Taste for Reading.

13. Political Justice,1796,Book I, Chapter VIII: Human Inventions Susceptible of Perpetual Improvement.

14. Pollin discusses this adequately, and no further elaboration is needed here.

15. It is interesting to note that later in this same essay, Godwin, after praising the work of Rousseau (so often considered a seminal influence on Godwin), criticises him:

> His whole system of education is a series of tricks, a puppet-show exhibition, of which the master holds the wires, and the scholar is never to suspect in what manner they are moved. (p 106)

NOTES TO CHAPTER SIX.

1. This has, of course been well documented, but the degree to which Wordsworth was determined to distort any reader's perception of the key "influences" on his developing poetic vision is admirably exemplified by his response in early 1801 to the request from Anne Taylor for

> an account of such events in [Wordsworth's] life as may have had an influence in forming [his] present opinions.(EY, 327)

Wordsworth responded thus:

> I was born at Cockermouth, about twenty-five miles from the place where I now dwell. Before I was nine years of age, I was sent to the Grammar School of Hawkshead, a small market-village near the Lake of Esthwaite: there I continued till the beginning of my eighteenth year, at which time I went to Cambridge, where I remained three years and a half. I did not, as I in some respects greatly regret, devote myself to the studies of the University. This neglect of university studies will be easily comprehended by you, when I inform you, that I employed the last of my summer vacations in a pedestrian tour in the Alps. Since I left Cambridge, my time has been spent in travelling upon the continent, and in England: and in occasional residences in London, and in different parts of England and Wales. At present I am permanently fixed in my native country. I have taken a house in the Vale of **Grasmere**, (a very beautiful spot of which almost everybody has heard,) and I live with my Sister, meaning, if my health will permit me, to devote my life to literature. It may be proper to add that my Father was by profession an Attorney, and that he and my Mother both died when I was a Boy.

Writing of this passage, Chandler, 1984, rightly draws attention to the disparity here between what Wordsworth chooses to recount and what is known about events in his life up to that time (even what is acknowledged in The Prelude of 1805). But I find it almost naive that Chandler should find Wordsworth's prefatory remark "puzzling" (p 7), for my own study makes it very clear that Wordsworth had by this time decided what it was that was "significant" in his poetic development, and what, as a result, should be drawn to the attention of any reader.

2. I take this term from J.Wordsworth, William Wordsworth: The Borders of Vision, 1982.

3. See, for example, Chapter Two, Part 1, pp 56ff and Chapter Three, Part 1, pp 102ff

4. As do, for example, the editors of the Norton Critical Edition of The Prelude, p 474, note 1 to l.280.

5. For my earlier discussion of these poems, see Chapter Five, Part 1, pp 264ff

6. Discussed earlier, see Chapter Five, Part 2, pp 279ff

7. Wordsworth writes:

> I know no book or system of moral philosophy written with sufficient power to melt into our affections.....to incorporate itself with the blood and vital juices of our minds..(ll.18-21)

and then:

> they contain no picture of human life.(ll.36-7)

8. See also J.Wordsworth, 1977, for an equally sceptical response to "books" at the conclusion of the fourth book of the five book Prelude.

9. Wordsworth is, of course, referring here to the first of the Salisbury Plain poems. For a fuller discussion of the context of these lines and the question of the version referred to, see pp 354ff

10. See Chapter Three, Part 2, pp 120ff regarding the dating of Salisbury Plain.

11. With reference to my comment on the tortuous syntax, the lines which introduce this alleged view of Coleridge's, and precede the lines quoted are:

> Nor is it, friend, unknown to thee; at least -
> Thyself delighted - thou for my delight
> Hast said, perusing some imperfect verse
> Which in that lonesome journey was composed,
> That alsoI must then have exercised. . .(356-60).

12. See Norton Critical Edition,p 456, note 9 to l.365 of 1805 text.

13.Wordsworth, in the original two-part Prelude posits this question four times.

14. For an interesting discussion of this, see J. Wordsworth, 1982, 36ff.

15. A reconstruction of the five book Prelude is to be found in The Five-Book Prelude of Early Spring 1804, J. Wordsworth, 1977. The indication in this article that the "spots of time" passage was intended to conclude this version of the poem, as well as the much abbreviated treatment of Wordsworth's imaginative "impairment" suggest that Wordsworth was ready to complete his poem at this stage, without an alleged "moral crisis".

16. I say this, because Book Five of the five-book version, corresponding more or less, as it does, to 1805 Book XI,123-388, preceded by approximately the first third of what is now 1805 Book XIII, and with no equivalent to Books IX and X and the earlier lines of XI, would have allowed a more confident, and less self-conscious and self-justifying conclusion than does 1805.

17. I am grateful to the editors of the Norton Critical Edition for their invaluable History and Presentation of The Prelude, pp 510ff.

18. I am unconvinced by Moorman's response to a question I think she perceptively poses (1957,I,211-2); as with many of her responses, she simply seems willing to accept the account of The Prelude as a satisfactory answer.

19. See opening page of Chapter Five.

20. The Snow Man, Wallace Stevens.

21. See Norton Critical Edition, p 519.

22. Discussed earlier, see Chapter Two, Part 1, p 58

23. Divided, of course, in 1850, into Books X and XI.

24. See Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff, ll.360ff.

25. See Norton Critical Edition, p 376, note 7 to l. 320.

26. Discussed earlier, see Chapter One, Part 1, pp 13-14.

27. See Chapter Two, Part 2 pp 86ff for my discussion of this.

28. See Chapter Two, Part 2, pp 67 68

29. I would agree with the view of F.B.Pinion, 1988, 16-17, that it is highly doubtful that such a visit ever took place, and that Wordsworth's words to Carlyle were misunderstood.

30. See Havens, 1941, 271-2.

31. For my earlier discussion of Wordsworth's involvement in the political and radical ideas of the time, see Chapter Two, Part 1.

32. The reference to "household love" is deleted by 1850. Wordsworth was, of course, aware of Godwin's rehabilitation of the domestic affections in the 1796 edition of Political Justice.

33. Whether or not this does refer to his account of his conversations with Beaupuy about

> civil government, and its wisest forms,
> Of ancient prejudice and chartered rights, . . .(1805,IX,330-1)

these are also the issues that Godwin raised and challenged in his first edition of Political Justice.

34. See J. Wordsworth, 1977, 16ff.

35. The fact that Wordsworth says that these "wild theories" existed "as from the first", and the reference to the fact that he "had but leant a careless ear" do suggest that this cannot refer directly to Godwin. This has been noted by critics such as Havens, 1941, p 539, and by the editors of the Norton Critical Edition, p 400, note to line 776.

36. As I have suggested, his earlier correspondence and e.g. Descriptive

Sketches have litttle to offer; see Chapter Two.

37. Rivers in The Borderers; III,v,32-3.

38. As I have argued in Chapter Four, Part 2.

39. See p 32, above.

40. See Chapter Two, Part 1, p 55 Finch, 1970, draws attention to an early example in the development of The Prelude of Wordsworth's use of such rhetorical devices. Discussing the Preamble to the 1798/9 Prelude, he states (p 12):

> the "city's walls", however, are imaginative. In so far as they have actuality as walls, they are Goslar's, but their symbolic function is to stand for a way of life Wordsworth chiefly associated with London, and from which he chose a permanent escape when he went to live at Grasmere.

41. For a useful summary of this, see Parrish, 1977, 25.

42. See J. Wordsworth, 1977, 15ff.

43. See 1805,XI,128-30:

A trifler would he be
Who on the obvious benefits should dwell
That rise out of this process; . . .

44. and yet I knew a maid,
Who, young as I was then, conversed with things
In higher style. (198-200).

45.Particularly the equivalent of 1805,XI,123-37 on the two "reasons"; See J. Wordsworth, 1977, 19 for fuller details.

46. Whilst the "dramatic story" refers to The Recluse, I find it ironic that Wordsworth does not make this refer more directly to The Borderers. It would have been in his interests to cite an example of "reasonings false", and of his attempts to wrestle with some of Godwin's ideas on "motive" and "right and wrong" (truth and error). However, whilst I am not convinced that the fact that Wordsworth addresses this to Coleridge again (who had by this time a knowledge of The Borderers) precludes this as a reference to that play (since the address to Coleridge seems more of a general apostrophe), I can see no case for assuming this is even an ironic reference to Wordsworth's play.

47. See p 331 above.

48. J. Wordsworth, 1977, though he expresses it differently, seems to recognise Wordsworth's constant returning to and discomfort over this period, as Wordsworth seeks to convince his readers of the motivations lying behind his imaginative impairment and subsequent restoration. Speaking of the five-book Prelude, he states:

> Neither here, nor in later versions of The Prelude is [Wordsworth] very clear as to the terms in which he should describe "Imagination Impaired" p 18)

49.See Norton Critical Edition, The Texts: History and Presentation, p 150.

50. J. Wordsworth, 1977, has speculated on Wordsworth's reasons for using some of this material and returning extensively to the period of "moral crisis":

> In order to lead up to its conclusion in the restorative "spots of time" the five-book Prelude had made a not altogether convincing attempt to portray "Imagination Impaired"; the lines in question lack credibility because of their failure to relate the faltering of imaginative power to the external events, social and political, which had been its cause. Wordsworth's account of the visit to France in 1790, while illustrating the lack of political awareness in his former self, introduces politics to the poem for the first time; and by early June, when composition paused for the summer, he seems to have written a version of Book XI and the first half of X. The poetry of experience had become part of Wordsworth's overall scheme. (p 24)

In fact, Jonathan Wordsworth seems to me to miss, here, the implications of his own earlier comment; see note 48, above.

51. See J.Wordsworth, 1977, 16 and 22.

52. See note 51.

53.For text of this, see Norton Critical Edition: MS Drafts and Fragments,1798-1804, 3(b), pp 499-500:

> The unremitting warfare from the first
> Waged with this faculty, its various foes
> Which for the most continue to increase
> With growing life and burthens which it brings
> Of petty duties and degrading cares,
> Labour and penury, disease and grief,
> Which to one object chain the impoverished mind
> Enfeebled and [?], vexing strife
> At home, and want of pleasure and repose,
> And all that eats away the genial spirits,
> May be fit matter for another song;
> Nor less the misery brought into the world
> By degradation of this power misplaced
> And misemployed [?where] [??]
> Blind [?], ambition obvious,
> And all the superstitions of this life,
> A mournful catalogue.

J. Wordsworth, 1977, has a full discussion of this: pp 18-19.

54. This passage is, by 1850, revised, deleting this line.

55. The intention of this, which is rather unclear in 1805, is illuminated by the revision of the 1850 text:

> If reason be nobility in man,
> Can aught be more ignoble than the man
> Whom they delight in, blinded as he is
> By prejudice, the miserable slave
> Of low ambition or distempered love? (1850,XII, 70-4)

56. Political Justice, 1796, I, 69

57. 1850, XII, 88-92.

58. See Norton Critical Edition, p 421, note 2.

59. See Chapter Three, Part 1, p 106ff.

60. J. Wordsworth, 1977, 20.

61. Parrish, 1977; Reading Text of Part I of two-part Prelude, ll 290-4.

62. See J. Wordsworth, 1977, 16.

63. Note the change by 1850 text to the use of the term "theories"(XIII,70) to replace "bottomed on false thought/And false philosophy".

64. Note the economy of the change by the 1850 text to "No composition of the brain", . . .(XIII, 82).

65.I refer to Gill's (1975) Cornell edition of the Salisbury Plain poems, see Introduction, p 3; also the Norton Critical Edition of The Prelude, p 456, note 9 to 1805 text of Book XII. There is, however, a crucial difference: Gill assumes Coleridge's remarks refer to the earliest version of the poem, Salisbury Plain, whilst the Norton edition editor assumes (rightly, in my view) that it refers to the later Adventures on Salisbury Plain.

66. I.e. his judgement in Biographia Litereria, see pp 46-9.

67. Biographia Literaria, p 47.

68. Chronology,EY, 1967, 173-9.

69. Biographia Literaria, pp 48-9.

70. In Gill, 1975, Introduction, see note 65, above; also Norton Critical Edition of The Prelude, p 456, 1805, XII, note to line 365.

71. Biographia Literaria, p 48.

72. Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Texts and Sources : William Godwin.

An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, and Its Influence on the General Virtue and Happiness, In Two Volumes, Printed for G.G.J.and J. Robinson, London,1793. (the first edition)

Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and Its Influence on Morals and Happiness, The Second Edition, corrected. Printed for G.G.J.and J. Robinson, London, 1796.

Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, Photographic Facsimile of the Third Edition, corrected, ed. F.E.L. Priestley, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1946.

Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, ed. Isaac Kramnick, Penguin Harmondsworth, 1976. (the third edition)

A Reply to An Answer to Cursory Strictures Supposed to be Wrote by Judge Buller by the Author of Cursory Strictures, D.I.Eaton, London, 1794.

Considerations on Lord Grenville's and Mr. Pitt's Bills, concerning Treasonable and Seditious Practices and Unlawful Assemblies, in Uncollected Writings of William Godwin, 1785-1822, ed J.W Marken and B.R. Pollin, Scholar Press, Florida, 1968.

Cursory Strictures on the Charge Delivered by Lord Chief Justice Eyre to the Grand Jury: 2nd October, 1794, D.I.Eaton, London, 1794.

Caleb Williams, ed. David McCracken, Oxford University Press, London, 1970.

Shelley-Godwin Collection of Lord Abinger, microfilm copy, unclassified: Reel 1 (Godwin's diary, 1788-1815); Reel 2 (Godwin's diary ctd. to 1836, autobiographical note, and biographical fragment).

The Enquirer, Reflections on Education, Manners and Literature : a Series of Essays, Reprints of Economic Classics, Augustus M. Kelley, New York, 1965.

II. Primary Texts and Sources : William Wordsworth.

Descriptive Sketches, ed. Eric Birdsall, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1984.

Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth, ed. E. De Selincourt, The Early

Years, 1787-1805, revised Chester L. Shaver, Oxford University Press, London, 1967.

Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth, ed. E. De Selincourt, The Middle Years, 1806-11, revised Mary Moorman, Oxford University Press, London, 1969.

Lyrical Ballads, Wordsworth and Coleridge: the text of the 1798 edition with the additional 1800 poems and the Prefaces, ed. R.L.Brett and A.R.Jones, Methuen, London, 1963.

The Borderers, ed. Robert Osborn, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1982.

Shelley-Godwin Collection of Lord Abinger, microfilm copy, unclassified, Reel 15.

The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth, ed. E. De Selincourt and Helen Darbishire, Vol. I, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1940.

The Prelude,1798-1799, ed. Stephen Parrish, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1977.

The Prelude, 1799, 1805, 1850, ed. Jonathan Wordsworth, M.H.Abrams, and Stephen Gill, Norton Critical Edition, New York, 1979.

The Fourteen Book Prelude, ed. W.B.Owen, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1985.

The Prelude, A Parallel Text, ed. J.C.Maxwell, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1976.

The Prose Works of William Wordsworth, ed. W.J. B. Owen and Jane Worthington Smyser, Vol. I, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1974.

The Salisbury Plain Poems, ed. Stephen Gill, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1975.

William Wordsworth : The Poems, ed. John O. Hayden, Vol. I, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1977.

III. Other Primary Texts and Sources.

An Irregular Fragment, found in a dark Passage in the Tower (from the 2d Volume of Miss William's Poems, in New Annual Register, 1786, 211-15.

Analytical Review, June 1793, 121-30; August 1793, 388-404.

British Critic, July 1793, 307-18.

Buller, Sir Francis, Answer to Cursory Strictures. On a Charge Delivered to the Grand Jury, October 2, 1794, by Lord Justice Eyre,. Said to have been Written by Judge Thumb. In the Minesterial Paper called The Times, October 25, D.I.Eaton, London, 1794.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, Biographia Literaria, Dent, London, 1965.

The Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, ed. E.L.Griggs, Vol. IV, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1959.

Critical Review, April 1793, 361-73; July 1793, 290-6; October 1793, 149-54.

De Quincey, Thomas, Notes on Gilfillan's Literary Portraits, Works, 2nd Edition, Vol. 11, Adam and Charles Black, Edinburgh, 1863, 280-90.

Eyre, Sir James, The Charge Delivered by the Right Honourable Sir James Eyre, Lord Chief Justice of His Majesty's Common Pleas and one of the Commissioners.....to Enquire of Certain High Treasons, and Misprisons of Treason....to the Grand Jury. D.I.Eaton, London, 1794.

Fawcett, Joseph, The Art of War, J. Johnson, London, 1795.

Hartley, David, Observations on Man, his Frame, his Duty, and his Expectations, in two parts, Printed for S. Richardson, London, 1749.

Hazlitt, William, Lectures on the English Poets and Spirit of the Age, Dent, London, 1963.

My First Acquaintance with Poets, in The Collected Works of William Hazlitt, Vol. XII, ed. A.R.Waller and Arnold Glover, Dent, London, 1904, 259-75.

Literary Magazine and British Review, March 1793, 224-6; April 1793, 306-10.

Monthly Review, March 1793, 311-20; April 1793, 435-45; May 1793, 187-96.

New Annual Register, 1793/4, 218-9.

Paley, William, Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy, 5th Edition, Corrected, R. Faulder, London, 1788.

Paine, Thomas, The Rights of Man, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1976.

Priestley, Joseph, Hartley's Theory of the Human Mind, on the Principle of the Association of Ideas; with Essays Relating to the Subject of It. Printed for J. Johnson, London, 1775.

Report of the Committee of Secrecy, Great Britain Parliament Sessional Papers, Reports from Committees, Vol. XIV, 1794, Readex Microprint Edition, ed. E.L. Erikson, New York, 1964.

Schiller, Friedrich, The Robbers, translated by A.F.Tytler, Lord Woodhouselee, London, 1792.

The Robbers, in The Works of Schiller, Early Dramas and Romances, translated by Henry G. Bohn, Bohn Standard Text, London, 1849.

Watson, Richard, Lord Bishop of Llandaff, Appendix to his Late Sermon, in The Prose Works of William Wordsworth, ed. Alexander B. Grosart, Vol. I, London, 1876.

IV. Secondary Sources.

Allen, B. Sprague, "The Reaction against William Godwin", Modern Philology, XVI, 1918, 224-43.

"Analogues of Wordsworth's The Borderers", P.M.L.A., XXXVIII, 1923, 267-77.

Bateson, F., Wordsworth: A Re-interpretation, Longman Green, London, 1954.

Beatty, Arthur, Joseph Fawcett: The Art of War, University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, 2, 1918, 224-69.

William Wordsworth: His Doctrine and Art in their Historical Relations, 2nd. Edition, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1927, Reprint of 1960.

Beer, John, Wordsworth and the Human Heart, Macmillan, London, 1978.

Bernbaum, Ernest, A Guide Through the Romantic Movement, 2nd. rev. edition, Ronald Press and Co., New York, 1949.

Brailsford, H.N., Shelley, Godwin and their Circle, 2nd Edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1951.

Brown, Ford, K., The Life of William Godwin, Dent, London, 1926.

Butler, Marilyn, Romantics, Rebels and Reactionaries. English Literature and its Backgound, 1760-1830, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1981.

Burke, Paine, Godwin and the Revolutionary Controversy, University Press, Cambridge, 1984.

Campbell, Oscar.J. and Mueschke, Paul., "The Borderers as a Document in the History of Wordsworth's Aesthetic Development", Modern Philology, XXIII, 1926,465-82.

Chandler, James K., Wordsworth's Second Nature: A Study of the Poetry and the

Politics, University of Chicago Press, London, 1984.

Cooks, M.G. and Bewell, Alan, Introduction to Studies in Romanticism: The Borderers: A Forum, 27, No. 3, 1988.

Cooks,Margaret, "Schiller's The Robbers in England", M.L.R., XI, 1916, 156-75.

Clark, J.P., The Philosophical Anarchism of William Godwin, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1977.

Crutwell, Patrick, "On Caleb Williams", Hudson Review, 11, 1958, 87-95.

De Selincourt, Ernest, Oxford Lectures on English Poetry, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1934.

Dumas, D. Gilbert, "Things as They Were: The Original Ending of Caleb Williams", Studies in English Literature, VI, 1966, 575-97.

Finch, John Alban, "Wordsworth's Two-Handed Engine", in Bicentenary Wordsworth Studies, ed. Jonathan Wordsworth, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1970, 1-13.

Fleischer, David, William Godwin. A Study in Liberalism. Allen and Unwin, London, 1951.

Furbank, P.N., "Godwin's Novels", Essays in Criticism, 5, 1955, 214-27.

Gallaway, W.F., "The Conservative Attitude Toward Fiction, 1770-1830", P.M.L.A., 1940, 1041-59.

Garrod, H.W., Wordsworth: Lectures and Essays, 2nd. edition, enlarged, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1927.

Gill, Stephen, "The Original Salisbury Plain: Introduction and Text", in Bicentenary Wordsworth Studies, ed. Jonathan Wordsworth, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 142-79.

"Adventures on Salisbury Plain and Wordsworth's Poetry of Protest", Studies in Romanticism, 12, 1972, 48-65.

Wordsworth: A Life, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1989.

Gillchrist, T.J., "Spencer and Reason in the Conclusion of Salisbury Plain" E.L.N., VII, 1969, 11-18.

Grob,Alan "Wordsworth and Godwin: A Re-assessment", Studies in Romanticism, 6, 1967, 98-119.

The Philosophic Mind. A Study of Wordsworth's Poetry and Thought, 1797-1805, Ohio State University Press, Columbus, 1973.

Griffin, H.L., "Wordsworth and the Problem of Imaginative Story: the case of Simon Lee", P.M.L.A., 19, 1977, 392-409.

Grylls, R., William Godwin and his World, Odhams, London, 1953.

Halevy, E., The Growth of Philosophic Radicalism, Faber and Faber, London, 1972.

Havens, R.D., The Mind of a Poet, John Hopkins, Baltimore, 1941.

Harper, George M., "Rousseau, Godwin and Wordsworth", Atlantic Monthly, 109, 1912, 639-50.

William Wordsworth, His Life, Works and Influence, John Murray, London, 1st edition, 2 vols., 1916; 3rd edition, 1 vol., 1929.

Hartman, Geoffrey H., "Wordsworth, The Borderers and Intellectual Murder", J.E.G.P., LXII, 1963, 761-68.

Wordsworth's Poetry, 1797-1814, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1964.

Harvey, A.D., "The Nightmare of Caleb Williams", Essays in Criticism, 26, 1976, 233-52.

Hodgeson, John, Wordsworth's Philosophical Poetry 1797-1814, University of Nebraska Press, London, 1980.

Hooker, Edward Niles, "Wordsworth's Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff", Studies in Philology, XXVIII, 1931, 522-31.

Hume, Robert D., "Gothic Versus Romantic: A Revaluation of the Gothic Novel", P.M.L.A., 84, 1969, 282-90.

Jacobus, Mary, Tradition and Experiment in Wordsworth's Lyrical Ballads (1798), Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1976.

Jewett, William, "Action in The Borderers", Studies in Romanticism, 27, 1988, 399-410.

Johnston, Kenneth R., "Philanthropy and Treason: Wordsworth as Active Partisan", Studies in Romanticism, 25, 1986, 371-409.

Legouis, Emile, The Early Life of William Wordsworth, 1770-98. A Study of The Prelude, translated by J.W.Mathews, Dent, London, 1921.

Levinson, Marjorie, Wordsworth's Great Period Poems, Cambridge University

Press, London, 1986.

Little, Geoffrey, "An Incomplete Wordsworth Essay upon Moral Habits", R.E.L., II, 1961, 9-20.

Locke, Don, A Fantasy of Reason, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1980.

MacGillivray, J.R., "The Date of Composition of The Borderers", M.L.N., XLIX, 1934, 104-111.

Marken, J.W., "William Godwin and the Political Herald and Review", New York Public Library Bulletin, LXV, 1961, 517-33.

Marshall, David, "The Eye-Witnesses of The Borderers", Studies in Romanticism, 27, 1988, 391-8.

Marshall, Peter H., "William and Mary", review of Kramnick's edition of Political Justice in the New Statesman, 10th December, 1976.

William Godwin, Princeton University Press, New Haven, 1984.

McCracken, David, "Godwin's Literary Theory. The Alliance between Fiction and Political Philosophy", Philological Quarterly, 49, 1970, 113-33.

Introduction to Caleb Williams, Oxford University Press, London, 1970, vi-xxii.

Meikle, H., Scotland and the French Revolution, Cassells, London, 1969.

Merchant, W.M., "Wordsworth's Godwinian Period", Comparative Literary Studies, 1942, 18-23.

Meyer, George Wilbur, William Wordsworth: The Formative Years, University of Michigan Press, London, 1943.

Monro, David H., Godwin's Moral Philosophy, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1953.

Moorman, Mary, William Wordsworth: A Biography; The Early Years: 1770-1803, Oxford University Press, 1957; The Later Years: 1803-1850, Oxford University Press, 1965.

Osborn, Robert, "Meaningful Obscurity: The Antecedents and Character of Rivers", in Bicentenary Wordsworth Studies, ed. Jonathan Wordsworth, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1970, 393-42.

Parrish, Stephen, The Art of the Lyrical Ballads, Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass., 1973.

Passmore, John, The Perfectibility of Man, Duckworth, London, 1970.

Paul, C. Kegan, William Godwin, his Friends and, Contemporaries, 2 Vols., London, 1876.

Philp, Mark, Godwin's Political Justice, Duckworth, London, 1986.

Pinion, F.B., A Wordsworth Chronology, Macmillan, London, 1988.

Pollin, Burton Ralph, Education and Enlightenment in the Thought of William Godwin, Las Americas Publishing Co., New York, 1962.

Godwin Criticism, A Synoptic Bibliography, Toronto University Press, Toronto, 1967.

Powell, A.R., The Romantic Theory of Poetry, Boyd, Edinburgh, 1944.

Priestley, F.E.L., Introduction to Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, Photographic Facsimile of the Third Edition, corrected, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1946.

Reed, Mark L. Wordsworth: The Chronology of the Early Years, 1770-1799, Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass., 1967

The Middle Years, 1800-1815, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1975.

Rieger, James, The Mutiny Within: The Heresies of Percy Bysshe Shelley, George Braziller Inc., New York, 1967.

Roberts, Charles W., The Influence of William Godwin in Wordsworth's Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff, Studies in Philology, 1932, 588-606.

Rodway, A.E., Godwin and the Age of Transition, Harrap, London, 1952.

Roe, Nicholas, Wordsworth and Coleridge: The Radical Years, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1988.

Roper, Derek, Reviewing Before the Edinburgh 1788-1802, Methuen, London, 1978.

Rosen, Frederick, Progress and Democracy: William Godwin's Contribution to Political Philosophy, ed. Maurice Cranston, Garland Publishing, London, 1987. (Published Doctoral Thesis of 1965.)

Salvesen, Christopher, The Landscape of Memory: A Study of Wordsworth's Poetry, Edward Arnold, London, 1965.

Schneider. B.R., Wordsworth's Cambridge Education, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1957.

Sharrock, Roger, "Wordsworth on the Moral Frontier", Durham University Journal, LVI, 1964, 170-83.

Sheats, Paul, The Making of Wordsworth's Poetry, 1785-98, Harvard University Press, Harvard Cambridge, 1973.

Simpson, David, Wordsworth's Historical Imagination, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.

Smith, Charles J., "The Effect of Shakespeare's Influence on Wordsworth's The Borderers", Studies in Philology, L, 1953, 625-39.

Smith, J.C., A Study of Wordsworth, Oliver and Boyd, London, 1944.

Smith, J.H. "The Genesis of The Borderers", P.M.L.A., XLIX, 1934.

St. George, Priscilla, Wordsworth's Personal Experiment in The Borderers, Etudes Anglaises, 20, 1967, 254-64.

Stahl, E.L., Friedrich Schiller's Drama: Theory and Practice, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Stephens, Leslie, "William Godwin's Novels" in Studies of a Biographer, 2nd Series, III, London, 1902, 119-54.

Thompson, E.P., The Making of the English Working Class, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1970.

The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays, Merlin, London, 1978.

Thorslev, Peter, Wordsworth's The Borderers and the Romantic Villain-Hero, Studies in Romanticism, V, 1966, 84-103.

Todd, F.M., Politics and the Poet, Methuen, London, 1957.

Veitch, G.S. The Genesis of Parliamentary Reform, Constable, London, 1913., Reprint of 1964.

Welsford, Enid, Salisbury Plain: A Study in the Development of Wordsworth's Mind and Art, Blackwell, Oxford, 1966.

Willey, Basil, The Eighteenth Century Background, Chatto and Windus, London, 1940.

Wilson, Angus, "The Novels of William Godwin", World Review, 28, 1951, 37-40.

Woodcock, George, William Godwin: A Biographical Study, Porcupine Press, London, 1946.

Anarchism, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1963.

Wordsworth, Jonathan, The Music of Humanity, Nelson, London, 1969.

"The Five-Book Prelude of Early Spring", 1804, J.E.G.P., 76, 1977, 1-25.

William Wordsworth: The Borders of Vision, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1982.